

GOVERNMENT  
OF  
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+++

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+++

REGULAR PUBLIC HEARING

+++

WEDNESDAY

MARCH 6, 2024

+++

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

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT MEMBERS PRESENT:

FREDERICK L. HILL, Chairperson  
LORNA L. JOHN, Vice-Chairperson  
CHRISHAUN S. SMITH, NCPC Designee  
CARL H. BLAKE, Member

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

JOE IMAMURA, Commissioner

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

CLIFFORD MOY, Secretary  
PAUL YOUNG, A/V Production Specialist

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

MATT JESICK  
MICHAEL JURKOVIC  
CRYSTAL MYERS  
KAREN THOMAS

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

OFFICE OF ZONING ATTORNEY ADVISORS PRESENT:

SARAH BAJAJ, ESQ.  
COMETRIA COOPER, ESQ.  
CARISSA DEMARE, ESQ.  
RYAN NICHOLAS, ESQ.

The transcript constitutes the minutes from  
the Regular Public Hearing held on March 6, 2024.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

## AGENDA

Application No. 21017 of Phillip H. Bishop . . . . .	8
Application No. 20996 of 106 13th Street, LLC . . . . .	86
Application No. 21059 of 44th Street, LLC . . . . .	127
Application No. 21054 of Marie-Joelle Voil Relief . .	137
Application No. 21060 of Delafield, LLC . . . . .	184
Application No. 21075 of 301 Delafield Place NW, LLC	195
Application No. 20997 of Derrick Richardson and 408 Newcomb, LLC . . . . .	205

**NEAL R. GROSS**COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

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

2 (9:37 a.m.)

3 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Good morning ladies and  
4 gentlemen to the Board of Zoning Adjustment. Today's 03-06-  
5 2024 public hearing will please come to order. My name is  
6 Fred Hill, Chairman of the District of Columbia Board of  
7 Zoning Adjustment. Joining me today is Vice Chair Lorna  
8 John, Board member Carl Blake and Chrishaun Smith, and Zoning  
9 Commissioner, Dr. Imamura.

10 Today's meeting and hearing agenda are available  
11 on the Office of Zoning's website. Please be advised this  
12 proceeding is being recorded by a court reporter and is also  
13 webcast live via Webex and Youtube Live. The video of the  
14 webcast will be available on the Office of Zoning's website  
15 after today's hearing -- after today's hearing. Accordingly,  
16 everyone who is listening on Webex or by telephone will be  
17 muted during the hearing. Also be advised that we do not  
18 take any public testimony at our decision meeting session.  
19 If you're experiencing difficulty accessing Webex with your  
20 telephone call-in, then please call hotline number at 202-  
21 727-5471. Once again, 202-727-5471 to receive Webex or log-  
22 in call-in instructions.

23 At the conclusion of this decision meeting  
24 session, I shall in consultation with the Office of Zoning  
25 determine whether a full or summary order may be issued. A

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

7                   In today's hearing session, everyone who is  
8 listening on Webex or by telephone will be muted during the  
9 hearing. And only persons who have signed up to participate  
10 or testify will be unmuted at the appropriate time. Please  
11 state your name and home address before providing oral  
12 testimony or oral presentation. Oral presentation should be  
13 limited to the summary of your most important points. When  
14 you're finished speaking, please mute your audio so that your  
15 microphone is no longer picking up sound or background noise.  
16 All persons planning to testify either in favor or in  
17 opposition should have signed up in advance. They'll be  
18 called by name to testify. If this is an appeal, only  
19 parties are allowed to testify. By signing up to testify,  
20 all participants completing oath or affirmation as required  
21 by Subtitle Y408.7.

22                   Request to enter evidence at the time of an online  
23 virtual hearing such as written testimony or additional  
24 supporting documents other than live video, which may not be  
25 presented as part of the testimony may be allowed pursuant

1 to Y103.13 provided that the person making the request to  
2 enter an exhibit explain (A), how the proposed exhibit is  
3 relevant, (B), the good cause that justifies allowing the  
4 exhibit into the record, including explanation of why the  
5 requestor did not file the exhibit prior to the hearing  
6 pursuant to Subtitle Y206. And ©, how the post-exhibit would  
7 not unreasonably prejudice any parties. The order of  
8 procedures for special exceptions and variances are pursuant  
9 to Y409.

10                   At the conclusion of each case, an individual who  
11 was unable to testify because of technical issues may file  
12 a request for leave to file a written version of the planned  
13 testimony to the record within 24 hours following the  
14 conclusion of public testimony in the hearing. If additional  
15 written testimony is accepted, than parties will be allowed  
16 a reasonable time to respond as determined by the Board. The  
17 Board will then make its decision at its next meeting  
18 session, but no earlier than 48 hours after the hearing.  
19 Moreover, the Board may request additional specific  
20 information to complete the record. The Board and the staff  
21 will specify at the end of the hearing exactly what's  
22 expected and the date when a person must submit the evidence  
23 to the Office of Zoning. No other information shall be  
24 accepted by the Board.

25                   Finally, the District of Columbia Administrative

1 Procedures Act requires a public hearing on each case be held  
2 in the open before the public. However, pursuant to Section  
3 405B4 and 406 of that Act, the Board may consistent with its  
4 rules, procedures, and the Act enter into a closed meeting  
5 on a case for purposes of seeking legal counsel on a case  
6 pursuant to D.C. Official Code, Section 2-575B4 and/or  
7 deliberate on a case pursuant to D.C. Official Code, Section  
8 2-575B13, but only after providing a notice in the case of  
9 an emergency closed meeting and after taking a roll call  
10 vote. Mr. Secretary, do we have any  
11 preliminary matters?

12 MR. MOY: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members  
13 of the Board. I do have a few quick announcements related  
14 to today's hearing docket. First, we have three case  
15 applications that have been granted postponements of today's  
16 docket. The first is Application No. 21061, Brunor  
17 Properties, LLC rescheduled to March 20th, 2024. Application  
18 No. 21031 of CP 4th Street SE, LLC, postponed to and  
19 rescheduled to April 10th, 2024. And Application No. 21067  
20 of o2001 RIA Owner, LLC, rescheduled to May 8th, 2024.

21 Finally -- Yes. Finally, the Chairman has  
22 reviewed and granted a way in which to allow three late  
23 filings into the applicable case records pursuant to Subtitle  
24 Y, Section 206.7 and Section 103.13. Any other late filings  
25 during the course of today's live hearing should be presented

1 before the Board by the Applicant or other parties or  
2 witnesses after I call the case. Other than that, that's all  
3 I have, Mr. Chairman.

4 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So Mr. Moy, you want to  
5 call our next case?

6 MR. MOY: Yes, sir. So the next case on the  
7 Board's public hearing session is Application No. 21017 of  
8 Phillip H. Bishop. This is an amended application for the  
9 following: Area variance from the alley lot height  
10 requirements of Subtitle D, Section 5100.1(a), use variance  
11 from Subtitle U, Section 600.1(f)(1), and pursuant to  
12 Subtitle X, Section 901.2 for a special exception under  
13 Subtitle D, Section 5201.3(a) from the side yard requirements  
14 of Subtitle D, Section 5100.1(d).

15 As you'll recall, Mr. Chairman, back on December  
16 20th, 2023, the Board granted a request for party status in  
17 opposition and it was to 11 persons. I can read those names  
18 if you wish, but I believe they are in the hearing session.  
19 Other than that, that's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

20 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Can you read the application  
21 number for me again?

22 MR. MOY: Yes. 21017 of Phillip H. Bishop.

23 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, I have -- Give me one  
24 more minute.

25 MR. MOY: That's fine. Take your time, Mr.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Chairman. The staff is lining up all the -- all the party  
2 status individuals, so that's ongoing now. There's 11 of  
3 them.

4 MS. WILSON: This is not my case. I just wanted  
5 to let you know.

6 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.

7 MS. WILSON: I don't know why I've been brought  
8 in, so I just wanted to mention that to staff.

9 MR. YOUNG: Okay, that's being rearranged. Sorry  
10 about that.

11 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yeah, I got a little -- I got  
12 a little confused also. So we're on 21011, okay, Mr. Young?

13 MR. YOUNG: 21017?

14 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sorry, 21017. Okay. All  
15 right. Okay, that was confusing me. All right. I've got  
16 21017 and then I guess, Mr. Young, if you could bring in the  
17 parties. Mr. Moy, can you hear me?

18 MR. MOY: Yeah, I'm still here.

19 CHAIRPERSON HILL: I got a little confused. Did  
20 we already grant party status?

21 MR. MOY: Yes, back on December 20th.

22 CHAIRPERSON HILL: December 20th, okay.

23 MR. MOY: And it's a lot of names -- a lot of  
24 individual people.

25 CHAIRPERSON HILL: No, no. I see. I see. I'm

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 just trying to remember December 20th. Okay. All right,  
2 let's first hear from -- if the Applicant can hear me, if  
3 they can introduce themselves for the record.

4 MR. BISHOP: Can you hear me?

5 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes. Is it Mr. Bishop?

6 MR. BISHOP: That's correct. Phillip Bishop, good  
7 morning.

8 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Good morning. And you're the  
9 Applicant, sir. Correct?

10 MR. BISHOP: That's correct.

11 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Are you representing yourself?

12 MR. BISHOP: That's correct.

13 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. Mr. Bishop,  
14 are you going to use your camera or can you use your camera?  
15 Okay, great. Thank you. Nice to see you.

16 MR. BISHOP: Good morning.

17 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Good morning. Okay.

18 MR. BISHOP: This is the first time I've used your  
19 application here, so I'm not as familiar with it, so excuse  
20 my ignorance.

21 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure, no problem. It takes a  
22 while for all of us. Let's see. Is Michelle Romo and Taras  
23 Matla in the room?

24 MS. ROMO: I'm in the room. Taras is actually  
25 putting the baby down for a nap --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRPERSON HILL: No problem.

2 MS. ROMO: -- but I'll speak primarily. Yeah.

3 Sorry --

4 CHAIRPERSON HILL: That's fine.

5 MS. ROMO: -- we don't have care.

6 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Let's see. And then  
7 Stacy Raina and Lalit Raina?

8 MR. RAINA: Yeah. Lalit, I'm here. Stacy,  
9 unfortunately could not make it today.

10 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right, Mr. Raina,  
11 nice to see you.

12 MR. RAINA: Thank you, sir.

13 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Is Mildred Colette Bell  
14 here with us? Ms. Bell, can you hear me?

15 MS. BELL: Good morning.

16 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Good morning. One moment  
17 please. Okay. All right. Now you guys are abutting the  
18 subject property. Correct?

19 MS. BELL: That's correct.

20 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. And then --

21 MR. BISHOP: I don't know that they're abutting  
22 the property. They may be in the -- They may be in the area,  
23 but I don't know if they're abutting the property.

24 CHAIRPERSON HILL: I'm going to --

25 (Simultaneous speaking.)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 CHAIRPERSON HILL: that's okay, Mr. Bishop. Mr.  
2 Bishop -- I'll figure it out, Mr. Bishop. So Ms. Romo,  
3 you're abutting the property. Is that correct?

4 MS. ROMO: Yes, I'm abutting the property. I'm  
5 at 2215 Bunker Hill Road NE and other party members, Ms. Bell  
6 and the Raina's abut the property and Ms. Anna Hartfield who  
7 I don't think could be online today, but she's another party  
8 member.

9 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.

10 MS. ROMO: And then the others are in the alley.

11 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, got it. Ms. Romo, I'm  
12 trying to remember what we did the last time we were together  
13 and so if you'll bear with me.

14 MS. ROMO: No problem.

15 CHAIRPERSON HILL: I think I remember now talking  
16 with you. And so were you all able to get together --

17 (Simultaneous speaking.)

18 MS. ROMO: Yes.

19 CHAIRPERSON HILL: -- people?

20 MS. ROMO: Yes.

21 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.

22 MS. ROMO: So if it's okay with the Board, when  
23 it comes to our time, I have about 13 minutes to present and  
24 then the other five members who were able to sign on today  
25 have about two minutes to talk about specific points that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 directly affect them based on where they live.

2 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great. So let's see.

3 Is Sarah Romero and Astudillo del Pozo with us?

4 MR. JAVIER: Francisco -- Yes, Francisco is here.

5 Sarah is at work --

6 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.

7 MR. JAVIER: -- so I'll be representing the two  
8 of us.

9 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great. Thank you. And  
10 then Brian and Janella Ferguson? Are the Ferguson's here?

11 MR. FERGUSON: I'm sorry. Good morning. This is  
12 Brian Ferguson. My wife is not able to be here, but I'll be  
13 testifying for us.

14 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great. Mr. Ferguson, are  
15 you on the phone? Oh, no. I see you now. Okay, great. And  
16 then Bonita Beati? Is Ms. Beati here?

17 MS. ROMO: She wasn't able to be here today.

18 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. No problem. And then  
19 Anna Hartfield -- Are you here, Ms. Hartfield? I don't see  
20 you. MS. ROMO: She wasn't able to be here  
21 today either.

22 CHAIRPERSON HILL: That's fine.

23 MS. ROMO: We organized on who would be speaking.

24 CHAIRPERSON HILL: No, that's great, Ms. Romo.  
25 I appreciate it. And I just want to make sure I'm not

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 anybody. So am I missing any of the party status people?  
2 Okay. All right, there we go. All right. So that's that  
3 part. Okay. All right, great.

4 So just so everybody knows how this is going to  
5 work, the Applicant will have an opportunity to give their  
6 presentation as to why they believe they're meeting the  
7 criteria for us to grant the relief that's being requested.  
8 And they'll be talking about the project, the regulations.  
9 And again, depending upon the way the Applicant has organized  
10 their presentation, will speak again to the regulations and  
11 the criteria.

12 Then we will hear from the -- those parties in  
13 opposition. And then we're going to hear from the Office of  
14 Planning. And then everyone will get an opportunity to  
15 basically ask questions of each other. And at that time --  
16 At any point in time, the Board will chime in if they have  
17 any questions. That's at least kind of how I think I'm going  
18 to run it. And we'll see as we go along -- The only change  
19 may be when we start to ask questions.

20 So Mr. Bishop, that being the case, you may go  
21 ahead and begin your presentation. I'm going to put 15  
22 minutes on the clock, Mr. Bishop, so I know where we are and  
23 you can begin whenever you like.

24 MR. BISHOP: Well good morning to everyone.  
25 First, I wanted to take the opportunity to thank a few people

1 for their efforts. First of all, I thank BZA Boardmembers  
2 and Chairman Hill for creating the platform to address this  
3 issue during this request as I'm trying to right a wrong,  
4 right and you will understand what I'm saying when I finish  
5 this presentation. I would like to also thank the ANC  
6 Commissioner Borrego, who took time to meet with me to  
7 discuss this matter before now. And the Office of Planning,  
8 Matthew Jesick and Joel Lawson who also met with me and had  
9 great extension since the conversation about this matter.  
10 I'd like to thank my advisor, Don Isaac -- Reverend Donald  
11 Isaac for his time and effort and Mr. Lorenzo Brown, my  
12 project manager. I'd like to thank my attorney, Jeff Styles  
13 and I'd like to thank Robert Lee, a representative of BZA for  
14 giving the time and effort to direct us in completing this  
15 process.

16 It's been a tedious process. We have taken -- We  
17 had to resubmit several times to get the correct information  
18 in terms of the type of filing that had to be done. It's  
19 been rather rigorous and a lot more than I requested or  
20 engaged in from the beginning.

21 Let me just give you a little bit of information  
22 about who I am. My name is Phil Bishop. I was raised in  
23 Charlottesville, Virginia, the youngest of ten. I started  
24 in the real estate business here in the District of Columbia  
25 at the age of 22 where I became a realtor. Since then, I've

1 been an investor, a landlord in the commercial and  
2 residential industry. My government career expanded in  
3 compliance audit technology over the last 30 years. The past  
4 15 years, I put in with the D.C. Police and Metropolitan  
5 Police Department and the FBI as a compliance officer in the  
6 Wales/NCIC FBI program. I retired with D.C. Police in 2016.  
7 I am founder and CEO of the Good Works Organization, Inc.  
8 which is a 501(c)(3) organization designed to help people in  
9 their needs of mental health, physical, spiritual, and  
10 financial needs.

11                   I'll read to you the introduction to the filing.  
12 This is in third party -- yeah, third party written. The  
13 property is currently a vacant lot and the intended use is  
14 to build a single family dwelling. It is currently being  
15 used as a general public illegal -- general public without  
16 permission as a catch-all dumping area because it appears to  
17 be an abandoned property. Mr. Bishop, owner, intends to  
18 construct and occupy the residence. The owner is a retired  
19 civil servant of the District of Columbia serving  
20 approximately 30 years, the last 15 years with the  
21 Metropolitan Police Department. As owner, occupant, and tax  
22 payer on this property in excess of 16 years proves  
23 commitment to said property and community.

24                   The owner purchased the property in 2008. After  
25 several years, a decision was made to build a residence on

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 the property. This would serve as a concerted effort to  
2 utilize the property in disparage used as a dumping area and  
3 appearance of an abandoned lot. In an effort to follow the  
4 protocol, owner contacted DCRA Office of Zoning, Department  
5 of Building, then referred to DOB to check (audio  
6 interference) authorization to build. Upon receiving the  
7 authorization notification from a technician on or about  
8 September 20th, 2020 on DOB, that the property was buildable  
9 by right. The owner proceeded to take the corrective steps  
10 by securing a licensed architect and engineer of services at  
11 considerable expense to develop plans and drawings to build  
12 the residence on the approved alley lot.

13 The owner extended considerable funds over 16  
14 months in efforts working with architects and engineers,  
15 submitting applications to offices of the various utilities  
16 requested, requesting -- representing various disciplines  
17 required by DOB, only to be told at the 11th hour after more  
18 than four zoning reviews that approval would not be granted  
19 to build in the Board of Zoning (audio interference) would  
20 have to intervene as a decision maker. The reasoning  
21 conveyed by the technician or resident of authority was  
22 presented to the architect as a technical error mistake. An  
23 error that the District of Columbia should be considered  
24 sharing financial responsibility.

25 We understand that there are three components in

1 the regulations that allows for a variance. The exception  
2 that's been requested for height and width -- the 2 feet  
3 height on the plans and the 1 foot width on the rear setback  
4 can be offset and will be corrected by the plans. We will  
5 be changing the plans to meet that requirement of the height  
6 and the rear corner setback. So the only variance we're  
7 looking at is the variance for consideration to build a  
8 single family house.

9                   The three areas of consideration for a variance  
10 is one, the property is affected by exceptional shape, size,  
11 topography, and other extraordinary exceptional situations  
12 or conditions. Two, the owner would encounter an undue  
13 hardship if the zoning regulations were strictly applied.  
14 And three, the variance and exception would not cause  
15 substantial detriment to the public good and would not  
16 substantially impair the intent, purpose, integrity of the  
17 zone plan and body in the zoning regulation or map. Those  
18 are the three areas that we were -- we're addressing in the  
19 application.

20                   The property affected by the exceptional situation  
21 and condition, which is the third one I mentioned. The  
22 phrase exceptional situation or condition in the variance  
23 test applies not only applies to the land, but also to the  
24 existence and configuration of the building of the land.  
25 Moreover, the unique exceptional situation or poor condition

1 may rise from confluence of factors, which affect a single  
2 property. In this case, the property is larger than most in  
3 the area and bounded by an alley. The property is being  
4 utilized by neighbors as a parking lot and dumping ground and  
5 whatever they find applicable to their satisfaction.  
6 Therefore without authorized supervision or oversight, the  
7 possibilities are endless in regard to secure and a safer  
8 use.

9                   We are a well-lit structure -- where a lit  
10 structure would be a tremendous advantage to the overall  
11 security of the community. Vast of the property require  
12 maintenance and regular oversight to determine undesirable  
13 traffic that may create hazardous conditions. It is not a  
14 District property or park service land to maintain and  
15 without regular usage, creates an undue hardship to the  
16 owner. It is an expense to undertake by the owner to make  
17 safe for the community. The District is in need of  
18 additional housing and therefore to build on this property  
19 would be extremely beneficial from a security and useful  
20 endeavor.

21                   Exceeding the height limit and the side yard  
22 requirement can be addressed by modifying the plans to adhere  
23 to regulations required by Chapter 51, alley lot and  
24 regulations, R Zones general provisions 5102 and 5104. The  
25 owner is in agreement to make the modifications to the

1 drawings pursuant to DOB. Not substantial detriment to the  
2 -- No essential detriment to the public good, nor substantial  
3 impairment in the community.

4                   Intent: Purpose and integrity of the zone plan.  
5 The current zoning is residential and the owner -- Applicant  
6 proposes to build a single family residential unit,  
7 consistent with existing neighborhood. The owner/applicant  
8 is not proposing to building a multi-family commercial unit  
9 contrary to existing community. The requested relief can be  
10 granted without harm to the public good and without a threat  
11 to the integrity of the zone plan. Therefore the  
12 construction of property will increase security by dwelling  
13 habitants. The property build-out will adhere to the zoning  
14 regulations. There will be no -- there will not be any  
15 obstructions leading to the dissipation and peaceful  
16 tranquility to existing properties. The property will not  
17 abate air or lighting to other dwellings or of the community.  
18 There will not be any detrimental affect to existing parking  
19 due to the construction will include indoor off-street  
20 parking.

21                   The proposed lot will access emergency and fire  
22 vehicles, as well as utility and trash removal services  
23 vehicles and will be able to maneuver through the alley as  
24 required and as needed. The proposed dwelling would not  
25 substantially add to the amount of traffic, noise, or light.

1 The house will only -- will only be occupied by a single  
2 family. Additionally, the proposed plan calls for two indoor  
3 parking spaces. The property shall not take away existing  
4 parking. The proposed dwelling will cover 70 percent of the  
5 lot and will be proportional in scale with other houses in  
6 the area. Seventy percent of the lot will also maintain  
7 existing open space around the lot, thus having little impact  
8 on the light and air surrounding the houses.

9 Hardship: The owner emphatically contends that  
10 the need for a variance request was instigated by erroneous  
11 and costly information provided by DCRA pursuant to an email  
12 dated September 25th, 2020 by Ms. China-Barber, support team.  
13 See attached document. The email informed the owner that a  
14 dwelling could be constructed by owner, built by right as  
15 long as the development standards are met. The standards  
16 were listed in the email as well. The email was the green  
17 light to make the appropriate plans as follows: The labor  
18 categories, architect, engineer, attorneys, otherwise plans  
19 and drawings (audio interference) municipal ages for permits  
20 and authorizations.

21 Upon completion of the necessary administrative  
22 requirements to start forbidding for construction  
23 proceedings, DCRA informed the owner that permits could not  
24 be obtained to build by right. That it would be necessary  
25 to enlist Board of Zoning adjustments pursuant to Chapter 51,

1       alley lots regulation R-Zones even though 51.03 lot occupancy  
2       was removed at the time it was in place and it did not list  
3       having to go to BZA for an approval. The erroneous  
4       information created such an unnecessary enormous expense,  
5       approximately \$35,000 in drawings to the tax payer, as well  
6       as the embarrassment of the Agency and a fact that required  
7       16 months to realize that the Department of Building Office  
8       of Zoning Administration issued a referral memo to the Board  
9       of Zoning Adjustments and hopes to expedite the process for  
10      the owner.

11           Even the original referral memorandum was  
12       erroneous and it instructed the owner to provide three  
13       special exception items. The owner modified the Office of  
14       Building that the -- notified the Office of Building that the  
15       memorandum was incorrect and that the corrected document  
16       would be necessary before submitting could be made to the  
17       Board of Zoning adjustments. This took over -- took several  
18       months to correct. The corrected documents were finally  
19       realized on November 9th, 2023. So we're talking about over  
20       three years of filing, processing, and then be given the  
21       wrong information.

22           The original incorrect memorandum from the  
23       Department of Building Office of Zoning Administration was  
24       first sent to the owner notifying him of the items that need  
25       to be addressed by the Office of Zoning on July 13th, 2023

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 under the authorization of Mr. LeGrant. Only after the Board  
2 of Zoning and Appeal rejected the Applicant's submittal three  
3 times, did the Office of Zoning Administration furnish the  
4 correct referral memorandum identifying the types of relief  
5 necessary to consider the application. The effort which  
6 lasted in excess of 16 months, inclusive of planning, time,  
7 cost (audio interference) attorney, coupled with the lack of  
8 assistance by the District of Columbia government, a task  
9 that should have been seamless became laborious, emotional,  
10 financial, and mental hardships. I rest my case and point.

11 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Bishop.  
12 All right, Ms. Romo, can you hear me?

13 (No audible response.)

14 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. You basically have kind  
15 of the same amount of time as Mr. Bishop, but we'll get to  
16 everybody. Okay? So go ahead and give your presentation.

17 MS. ROMO: Okay, thank you.

18 CHAIRPERSON HILL: And we'll get through all the  
19 testimony.

20 MS. ROMO: Okay, thank you. And just to state,  
21 I misspoke earlier that Ms. Hartfield and Ms. Beati are  
22 actually on the call. I don't see them in the room, but they  
23 texted me to correct and say that they are in fact here  
24 today. So sorry about that. I was wrong.

25 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. That's all right. I

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 guess if Mr. Young sees them in the room, Ms. Hartfield --  
2 Okay, well Hartfield -- Anna Hartfield, Mr. Young, if you see  
3 her and then you said, Foreti?

4 MS. ROMO: Beati.

5 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Beati -- Beati.

6 MS. ROMO: Beati, yes.

7 CHAIRPERSON HILL: And then Beati, if you see that  
8 person in the room, Mr. Young. All right, Ms. Romo, go  
9 ahead.

10 MS. ROMO: Thank you. Thank you very much. Board  
11 Chairperson Hill and Board members, thank you for the  
12 opportunity to address the Board in opposition to the relief  
13 requested in Application 21017 of Phillip H. Bishop, which  
14 is 2229 Rear Bunker Hill Road NE, Square 4239, Lot 64.

15 My name is Michelle Romo. I live at 2215 Bunker  
16 Hill Road NE and I live at one of the adjacent properties  
17 abutting the alley lot. I've lived in this house since 2019  
18 and I'm one of many here today (audio interference) in order  
19 to oppose this application. I'm a civil servant and I've  
20 worked in the District for the federal government for over  
21 ten years. All three children of mine were born here and two  
22 of them go to DCPS. The other one is still too young.

23 I'm joined by members of the party who represent  
24 families, retirees, public civil servants, educators, small  
25 business owners, and more. As already noted, our party

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 members who are working for DCPS can't be here today because  
2 they're serving students. We're a diverse neighborhood, both  
3 culturally and generationally. We have six-month-old babies,  
4 two oxygenarians and residents who have lived here for a few  
5 years to residents who have lived here for well over 50  
6 years. And we're united in opposing this development.

7           I'd like to draw your attention to Exhibit 34,  
8 which is a letter of opposition that a total of 30 neighbors  
9 in the immediate vicinity signed. Since the time is short,  
10 I want to reference just a few main points of the arguments  
11 that are found in that letter and also give other neighbors  
12 a chance to speak. We'd also like to correct many statements  
13 in the application that are false and of course, can answer  
14 any questions that you may have.

15           The application does not meet any of the criteria  
16 needed to grant zoning relief and there's three points we  
17 want to elaborate on. One, the owner has not experienced  
18 exceptional practical difficulties or exceptional undue  
19 hardship. Two, granting relief would not be in harmony with  
20 the general purpose and intent of the zoning regulations and  
21 the zoning maps. And three, such a relief would adversely  
22 affect the use of neighboring properties and cause  
23 substantial detriment to the public good. The neighbors  
24 would suffer severe negative impact if the Board were to  
25 grant relief.

1           On the first point, the owner has not experienced  
2 exceptional practical difficulties or exceptional undue  
3 hardship. The architectural drawings that the owner  
4 mentioned that he spent money on is a self-inflicted choice.  
5 It's abundantly clear that building a residential unit is  
6 prohibited. Alley dwellings are not allowed in low density  
7 residential zones as R1B where this lot is wholly located.  
8 You could do a simple online search, which notes that the use  
9 code for this alley lot is 093, vacant zoning limits. And  
10 that would also be on his yearly tax statement. Residential  
11 use of the alley lot has been restricted since at least 1935  
12 when it was subdivided. And in Appendix A of the letter, you  
13 can see a historical subdivision document that says that you  
14 cannot build a residential unit there.

15           If the owner received a confusing email from DCRA,  
16 he needs to address that with DCRA or DOB directly. It's not  
17 a valid argument to waive zoning regulations, especially at  
18 the great expense of the neighbors. And we'd also like to  
19 note that our former ANC commissioner told him several years  
20 ago that you couldn't build a residential unit on that lot.

21           The owner has not demonstrated undue financial  
22 hardship. While the application claims that owning and  
23 paying taxes on the lot for 16 years demonstrates commitment  
24 to the property and the community, in fact, it has gone up  
25 for tax sale due to unpaid taxes multiple times. The letter

1 found includes publically available links to three tax sales  
2 where this lot was listed in 2010, 2011, and 2015.

3                   The owner states that it's difficult to maintain  
4 the property and it appears abandoned. However, it's the  
5 owner himself that neglects it. He doesn't fence it. There  
6 is a fence, but it's broken. The gate's not locked. He  
7 doesn't abate it or otherwise take care of it. There is a  
8 very long history of neglect of this lot with excessive  
9 vegetation, poison ivy, mosquitos, garbage debris.  
10 Neighbors over the years have raised concerns and the ANC has  
11 been involved when working with the city to abate the lot and  
12 urging the owner to take responsibility.

13                   In Appendix B of the letter, you can see just a  
14 few pictures of overgrown vegetation and some fallen trees  
15 that the city had cleared after a storm. DCRA has abated the  
16 lot multiple times. DDOT has cleared dangerous trees, in  
17 addition to the ones that you see in those pictures. And  
18 this has all been at the tax payer expense. In fact,  
19 currently there are over \$6,500 in unpaid DCRA fines due to  
20 neglect of the property. And those are attached in Appendix  
21 C of the letter. Further, the owner has made no effort to  
22 develop the alley lot in any ways that are actually  
23 permissible such as with agricultural use, artistrial use,  
24 camping by the owner, solar facility, or parking lot.

25                   A brief historical point about the lot, as

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 mentioned, it was subdivided in 1935. Then the owner who  
2 lived at 4025 22nd Street bought the lot and owned that lot  
3 for about 30 years. It changed hands a few times, likely due  
4 to her errors. She passed away. And was later joined with  
5 the owners of 2219 Bunker Hill Road bought that lot in the  
6 70s and joined it together. And they sold the lot together,  
7 the house and the lot together. Unfortunately in the 80s,  
8 that owner was foreclosed upon and the bank only repossessed  
9 the house, leaving to a lot of confusion about who owned the  
10 lot. And the lot itself went idle until it eventually went  
11 up to D.C. tax sale. And it was one of multiple lots  
12 purchased by Mr. Phillip Bishop in 2004. And was deeded to  
13 him in 2008 for a purchase price of \$2,000.

14 I mention this bit of history only to demonstrate  
15 that it's not just some vacant alley lot in the District that  
16 has been idle for years. It has been a lot that's been  
17 actively used by families in the community for decades. You  
18 can still see remnants of basketball hoops that are there.  
19 It doesn't have to be developed with a house for it to be  
20 used. It has in fact been used as a recreational green space  
21 for most of its existence. It's only under Mr. Bishop's  
22 ownership that it's become neglected. And it's unreasonable  
23 to suggest that the only solution to his neglect of the  
24 property in question is the construction of a house that's  
25 way out of scope, proportion, and character to the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 surrounding neighborhood.

2                   To the second point, granting relief would not be  
3 in harmony with the general purpose and intent of zoning  
4 regulations and zoning maps. The purpose of R1B is to  
5 protect quiet residential areas, now developed with detached  
6 dwellings and to stabilize the residential areas and promote  
7 suitable environment for family life. According to DC's  
8 Office of Planning, this area is classified as RLD,  
9 residential low density. And further, there were no changes  
10 to this area in the 2020 Comprehensive Plan Amendment, which  
11 is included -- a map of that is included in Appendix D of the  
12 letter. Allowing for a residential alley dwelling would  
13 increase the density of the neighborhood and substantially  
14 impair the intent, purpose, and integrity of the zone plan.

15                   The Applicant's statement makes many claims that  
16 are incorrect, especially when referencing the claims  
17 regarding public good and the character of the neighborhood.  
18 The application states that the neighborhood has had many  
19 alley dwellings and that there were alley dwellings in the  
20 late 19th Century. In fact, there are no alley dwellings in  
21 the entirety of our single member district and the  
22 surrounding districts, which are suburban in nature. In the  
23 late 19th Century, this area was completely undeveloped.

24                   The application states that the property, which  
25 is 2,850 square feet is the largest on the block. In fact,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 it is the smallest on the block. For example, other nearby  
2 lots range from about 4,500 square feet to 7,900 square feet.  
3 The application claims that the proposed house size is  
4 proportional in scale with the other houses in the area.  
5 This is untrue. Other houses on the block are moderately  
6 sized, most of them are three bedrooms, not five, and we have  
7 ample set-backs. You can see in Appendix E, there is a map  
8 pulled from the city, which shows buildings in relationship  
9 to some green space.

10                   The application proposes a house of 2,964 square  
11 feet on, as I said, a 2,850 square feet lot. This leaves  
12 almost no green space. It's incongruent with other  
13 properties on the block. The letter provides a very long  
14 list of lots and their square footage and house sizes. I'll  
15 only share one example with you today as you can read the  
16 others in the letter. But the address at 2223 Bunker Hill  
17 Road NE has a 1,835 square foot house on a 7,121 square foot  
18 piece of land. So as you can see, very different.

19                   Further, all of our houses are subject to normal  
20 rear and side requirements. Our rear requirements -- yard  
21 requirements are 25 feet. Our side yard requirements are 8  
22 feet. Our requirements for percentage of pervious surfaces  
23 is 50 percent. With an alley dwelling unit, if it were  
24 allowed to be built would not be subject to any of these  
25 requirements and it would be completely incongruent with the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 neighborhood and set a dangerous precedent.

2 The application also cites examples that do not  
3 provide any precedence for alley structures and are therefore  
4 noncomparable. They are simply not in the R1B zone. The  
5 example in the application listed 1331 Gufflers Court SE in  
6 Capitol Hill. And that's an RF1 zone. The other example  
7 listed is 21 Evarts Street NE, that's in the R3 zone. And  
8 actually it is currently still a vacant lot. There is no  
9 house on there and it's a shed. And that piece of land has  
10 been on the market for a while for almost \$1 million.

11 I'll also note that there are lots significantly  
12 larger than the lot in this application that are in zones  
13 that do allow for alley dwellings and they've still been deemed  
14 unsuitable for residential units. They have otherwise been  
15 turned into community gardens, which would be a permissible  
16 use and actually most welcome to the community to mitigate  
17 against flooding.

25 On the issue of flooding, building a house would

1 increase flooding in the area. The alley lot is a permeable  
2 space. It serves an important function to absorb rainfall  
3 and reduce flooding in the neighborhood, which is a high  
4 water table. And this area is home to several historic  
5 streams. In Exhibit 36, I uploaded a map that the city  
6 provided. And you can see historic streams of the  
7 neighborhood.

8 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Ms. Romo, do you know how much  
9 more you have? I'm not -- I'm just trying to time  
10 everything.

11 MS. ROMO: I think just two minutes.

12 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.

13 MS. ROMO: Yeah. The District repaved the T-  
14 shaped alley in July of 2023 to mitigate against flooding.  
15 You can see in Exhibit 36, Pictures 1 and 2 show -- pictures  
16 well after a storm and you can still see water moving. That  
17 lot absorbed approximately 1,800 gallons of rain water per  
18 inch of rain, which according to the rain fall that we've had  
19 in previous years can be anywhere between 75,000 to 118,000  
20 gallons of rainwater a year. That is a lot of water that can  
21 be displaced if a structure were to be built. Even now, we  
22 still get flooding in our back yards. My garage, which abuts  
23 the property line leaks and so does the retaining wall. You  
24 can see that from those pictures that water is still  
25 draining. Imagine if that whole lot was concrete. Where

1 would that water go? It would be a severe detriment to the  
2 neighborhood to convert it to mostly impervious surfaces.

3 On the issue of light, an alley dwelling would in  
4 fact reduce light and cast shadows in the neighborhood.  
5 Several residents including myself have solar panels. A  
6 shadow study was not included in this application. You can  
7 see in that Exhibit 36, Picture No. 6 shows a picture of my  
8 backyard that I snapped two days ago. We're currently  
9 working with the solar company to put solar panels on our  
10 roof, to also put them on the garage. We first had to offset  
11 the cost and wait for the city to cut down one of its tree's.  
12 But solar panels aside, you can see that the garage is one  
13 story. And a two-story house, plus roof deck, plus being  
14 already 3 feet higher would cast significant shadows into our  
15 backyard. My shadow according to an online simulator tool  
16 that the District provides would be in the shadow all day as  
17 a result of that. We've invested a lot in our house and our  
18 community. My children play in the backyard and I want them  
19 to have some sunlight.

20 One more point regarding DPWs report on  
21 construction that I would like to raise for the Board that's  
22 not included in the letter. The report noted that if  
23 construction were to be allowed, residents in the area must  
24 place their waste receptacles and recycling containers at the  
25 front of their properties if this construction does indeed

1 occur in the alley. We would like to note that this is  
2 impossible. You can see from the photo No. 5 that was  
3 submitted, the east side of 22nd Street is a single lane with  
4 no parking or stopping permitted. Residents could not put  
5 trash cans in the street. Even if they were allowed to put  
6 trash cans on the sidewalk, all of the houses on 22nd Street  
7 and most of the houses on Randolph Street are not street level  
8 at the front. It would be impossible, especially for elderly  
9 residents, some of whom use wheelchairs, to haul heavy trash  
10 cans up and down the stairs even if they were allowed to put  
11 them on the sidewalk.

12 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Ms. Romo, can I ask you to kind  
13 of wrap up?

14 MS. ROMO: I'm done.

15 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.

16 MS. ROMO: So there are more issues to raise, but  
17 I want to leave that to the other neighbors to raise other  
18 issues such as privacy, parking, pollution. Thank you very  
19 much.

20 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Romo.  
21 Okay. You guys, we have a lot of people to walk through  
22 today and Ms. Romo mentioned that each one going to try to  
23 take two minutes. So we're going to try to keep it to that.  
24 I see, is it Ms. Raina?

25 MR. RAINA: Ms. Raina could not be here today.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 CHAIRPERSON HILL: No problem. Mr. Raina, can you  
2 do me a favor and introduce yourself for the record with your  
3 address and then you'll have two minutes.

4 MR. RAINA: Okay. My name is Lalit Raina. Our  
5 address is 2223 Bunker Hill. Can you hear me all right?

6 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes. Yes, I'm just listening.

7 MR. RAINA: Okay. I've lived in D.C. for about  
8 22 years and in this property for the last -- since 2014.  
9 Stacy Raina, my wife, could not be here. She's a speech  
10 therapist at BCPS. Our property is adjacent to this -- to  
11 this lot and has the longest border. I essentially would like  
12 to address two main issues; privacy and parking.

13 The application proposes residential principle  
14 dwelling unit that has significantly reduced set-backs versus  
15 any of the property on this square. The proposed structure  
16 with roof deck would give occupants visibility into at least  
17 16 neighbors backyards affording literally no privacy to the  
18 residents impending the full and complete enjoyment of their  
19 properties.

20 The application also proposes two parking spots  
21 for a five-bedroom house with roof deck. And it's unclear  
22 whether there is adequate turning radius to park those two  
23 vehicles into the property. Visitors to this house  
24 essentially -- in case of roof deck get-togethers, et cetera  
25 would occupy all the parking on the Randolph Street and Bunker

1 Hill Road that residents rely on. Parking is already tight  
2 and a nightmare, especially during frequent road  
3 constructions and DDOT work. We have no parking permit, so  
4 adding a vacant lot construction would make this situation  
5 untenable, especially with construction vehicles, delivery  
6 trucks in and out all the time. It would be even worse for  
7 elderly neighbors who would have to park further away. It's  
8 just going to be a nightmare.

9                   We've invested our life savings into this house  
10 and this community. We're rasing a daughter who's about to  
11 enter high school. A principle dwelling unit in this area  
12 would be -- would severely have an effect to our family.  
13 Thank you.

14                   CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, sir. I have Ms.  
15 Bell.

16                   MS. BELL: Yes.

17                   CHAIRPERSON HILL: Go ahead, Ms. Bell. If you  
18 could introduce yourself for the record with your address and  
19 you'll have two minutes.

20                   MS. BELL: I am Mildred Colette Bell and I live  
21 at 2219 Bunker Hill Road NE. I am 81 years old. I have  
22 lived in the District for 60 years and lived at that address  
23 since 1994. When I originally purchased this house, we  
24 thought that the alley was a part of our property. We  
25 thought that the property was a part of our property and I

1 maintained it. Since 2008 when we became aware that it had  
2 been sold, I still have done major work in trying to keep the  
3 property clear. I was the one who cut down the trees with  
4 that storm. I had moved out of the property for about five  
5 or six years and during that time, the storm and the property  
6 was totally unkept after Mr. Bishop purchased the property.  
7 I have never seen him, which means that he has never taken  
8 care of the property.

9                   I also use the property as passageway to get to  
10 the alley to empty or to put my trash out. And it would be  
11 very difficult for me, an 81-year-old woman to not be able  
12 to use that alleyway. The property also has been, according  
13 to the neighbors who were dumping trash, they have not dumped  
14 since I came back, but who were dumping trash there, they  
15 said they were given permission to do so. Because he was not  
16 involved and has been totally negligent of the property, it  
17 was misused.

18                   I have submitted a document about my testimony,  
19 about my opposition for this and I would like for that  
20 document to be put into the records -- the written document.

21                   CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Ms. Bell, is it not in  
22 there?

23                   MS. BELL: I'm not sure because it was late  
24 yesterday afternoon after the -- after the 24-hour --

25                   CHAIRPERSON HILL: Have you already submitted it?

1 MS. BELL: Yes.

2 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Mr. Moy, do you know  
3 where that is?

4 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Exhibit 37.

5 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great. It's already in  
6 there, Ms. Bell. Thank you, Vice Chair John.

7 MS. BELL: And just one last point is that I so  
8 enjoy the foliage -- the trees from my balcony. And in my  
9 elder age, would love to continue to have that, instead of  
10 looking out at a house and not having control of the kind of  
11 noise and disruptions that would come from that house into  
12 my -- into my very backyard. It's like waking up and there's  
13 a house built in your backyard. Thank you.

14 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, Ms. Bell. Thank you.  
15 Let's see. Mr. Ferguson, can you hear me?

16 MR. FERGUSON: Yes, sir.

17 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Could you go ahead and  
18 introduce yourself for the record and then give your two  
19 minute testimony?

20 MR. FERGUSON: Yes, sir. Good morning. My name  
21 is Brian Ferguson. I'm also representing my wife, Janella.  
22 We live at 4021 22nd Street NE, that's directly across the  
23 alley from the proposed building. I'm going to keep this  
24 really brief because much of this has been covered by other  
25 parties in the ANC letter.

1                   First, about the zoning regulations, realizing  
2 this is just to re-stipulate some of the things that have  
3 been said. Doing a quick look, I am not by any means an  
4 expert on the -- what do you call it -- zoning standards.  
5 The lot occupancy is for R1B is about 40 percent use of the  
6 lot. This lot occupancy for the proposed building is stated  
7 to be 70 percent of the lot. And again, this is not in  
8 keeping with R1B redevelopment standards. It's really -- You  
9 can tell it's clearly not less than 50 percent of the lot  
10 size. In fact, I have a feeling that if we did an assessment  
11 on it, it would be over 70 percent of the lot use size.

12                  My family also has concerns about the set-backs.  
13 That's already been addressed by Ms. Romo. This is  
14 essentially a building that would be right on top of the  
15 alley that runs behind my house, a 30 foot structure that  
16 would be there. And the set-backs, I believe from the  
17 diagrams are about 5 feet, so it's not in keeping with the  
18 rest of the area.

19                  Just real briefly my other -- I have three other  
20 concerns. One which is to reiterate what was said by Mr.  
21 Raina, privacy. This is an issue because currently we enjoy  
22 quite a lot of privacy in our backyard. And I guess my  
23 question to everyone for consideration is how would anyone  
24 feel about a 30 foot well-lit building being built  
25 essentially in everyone's backyard? This raises a lot of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 concerns and I think it would detriment all of the  
2 neighborhood because it is in the center of the block, which  
3 affects the entire neighborhood. Also, increased noise and  
4 activity because of its location. You know, there's noise  
5 for the duration of construction, as well as moving forward,  
6 noise, light, and activity in the center of everybody's back  
7 yard.

8                   My last thing that I'll say is we have strong  
9 concerns again addressed by Ms. Romo earlier about water.  
10 We get a lot of water down through here. We've also spent  
11 some money already in our property to divert water around  
12 because we get water in our basement. And we have a lot of  
13 concerns that opening up this and making it nonpenetrable,  
14 again as Ms. Romo stated, is going to let a lot of water pass  
15 down into our property, which is downhill along the flood  
16 lines. The re-work of the alley has done great work to  
17 divert this water, but there is a concern with the volume of  
18 water that would be displaced and possibly some of the  
19 alleyway may have other issues because of the reduction of  
20 this space. If it's allowed to be built on. It may re-  
21 aggravate the water issues.

22 That's all I have. I appreciate your time.

23                   CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Mr. Ferguson. Ms.  
24 Hartfield, can you hear me or Mr. Hartfield? Mr. Young, were  
25 you able to find them?

1 MR. YOUNG: I was not.

2 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Or Ms. Beati -- Beati?

3 MR. YOUNG: No, I did not see that name on.

4 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. We'll just how we  
5 continue to move here. Is it Francisco? Was there a  
6 Francisco?

7 MR. JAVIER: Yes.

8 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great. Could you please  
9 introduce yourself for the record and give us your testimony?

10 MR. JAVIER: Yes. My name is Francisco Javier  
11 Astudillo del Pozo. I'm representing here, me and my wife.  
12 We live at 4017 22nd Street NE. I am right next to the  
13 previous testimony person. And I'll be pretty much the  
14 permanent ocean view from whoever lives in this -- in this  
15 house that is proposed.

16 So I'm not going to say a lot of new things.  
17 They've all been said already. What I want to make a point  
18 about the fact that we live in a hill and 22nd Street for us  
19 is not level. And that we don't have parking. The parking  
20 is on the -- on the other side of the street. So for us, the  
21 back -- the alleys in truth is our entrance. That's what we  
22 use to come home. We bring the car, we park, and then we  
23 enter because it's our level entrance. Right? Bringing  
24 groceries, I have two kids; eight and 13 years old. If I  
25 have to park on the other side of the street for the time

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 that the construction will take place and I have to bring  
2 groceries across the street, be careful with my kids, it is  
3 a nightmare scenario. 22nd is actually a busy street. It's  
4 not -- It's a very busy street. There is cars and buses all  
5 the time. So having access from the alley is truly, truly  
6 a really good thing for us given the situation of the houses,  
7 particularly on 22nd Street. And those are the main points.

8 Another big worry of mine is the trash. I don't  
9 know if this is going to be a temporary issue or a permanent  
10 issue cause I don't know why I heard that if that house is  
11 allowed to build, we're not going to be able to leave our  
12 trash in the back anymore. We'll have to bring into the  
13 front, which I think has been explained that is almost  
14 impossible because there is -- there is no room for it. It  
15 will have to be on the sidewalk. And I'm 49 years, I can do  
16 it, but imagine anybody that is older than me, I mean  
17 bringing those big trash cans. It just doesn't make any  
18 sense.

19 So you know, I listen to the testimony from Mr.  
20 Bishop and you know, I ended up with idea that he's trying  
21 to do this for own good and it's just not the case. What  
22 he's trying to do is not going to help us in any way or form.  
23 And with that, thank you very much and that's it for me.

24 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. Did I miss anybody  
25 from the opposition that's here, Ms. Romo?

1 MS. ROMO: Yes, one last --

2 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Oh, Mr. Matla.

3 MR. MATLA: Yeah, Mr. Matla. Can you hear me  
4 okay?

5 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes. Could you introduce  
6 yourself for the record and give us your two minutes of  
7 testimony please?

8 MR. MATLA: Of course. Good morning to all the  
9 BZA members. My name is Taras Matla. I currently reside at  
10 3215 Bunker Hill Road NE (audio interference) correct the  
11 spelling of my name for the record. My last name is spelled  
12 M-A-T-L-A. The record had it as M-A-L-T-A (audio  
13 interference) confusion with the island in the Mediterranean  
14 Sea. (Audio interference) testimony.

15 In addition to what other members have noted, I'd  
16 like to raise environmental and light (audio interference).  
17 With respect to the environment, our property abuts (audio  
18 interference) Hill Park. Our family often observes deer and  
19 many type of birds such as (audio interference), Cardinals  
20 (audio interference), Hawks. And (audio interference) with  
21 this would -- like the one that's proposed would  
22 significantly disrupt the surrounding wildlife habitat and  
23 threaten the existing biodiversity of the area. A new  
24 housing development of this hill would also increase  
25 pollution in the area with construction that would generate

1 significant dust and emissions, which are especially  
2 detrimental to the health of children who play in our  
3 backyards. The influx of additional vehicles and emissions,  
4 as well as expansion of impervious surfaces would also cause  
5 further pollution. A new structure would also impede air  
6 flow and reduce ventilation in the area.

7 With respect to light pollution, I'm also  
8 concerned about increased light pollution at night. The  
9 construction of an alley dwelling in a residential  
10 neighborhood will almost certainly require the insulation of  
11 indoor and outdoor lighting systems, which can emit  
12 significant amounts of light directly onto adjacent  
13 properties contributing to light pollution. The alley lot  
14 in question is situated in close proximity to existing  
15 structures, mainly our home, further intensifying concerns  
16 about light intrusion as any new construction may directly  
17 impinge upon neighboring properties. With that, I thank you  
18 for the time to speak and I yield back the balance of my  
19 time.

20 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, thank you. Let's see,  
21 did I miss anyone? Okay. Now I guess that's what I have.  
22 Mr. Del Poso, how do you say your name? Go ahead, unmute  
23 yourself.

24 MR. JAVIER: Sorry, I already spoke.

25 CHAIRPERSON HILL: No, I know. How do you say

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 your name?

2 MR. JAVIER: Francisco Javier Astudillo del Pozo.

3 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Astudillo --

4 MR. JAVIER: Del Pozo.

5 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Astudillo del Pozo.

6 MR. JAVIER: Yes.

7 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Astudillo del Pozo, when  
8 you think that 49 is old, you should probably check your  
9 audience.

10 MR. JAVIER: No, that's not what I said. I said  
11 that I'm young and I have no issue with the trash.

12 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Oh, I'm sorry.

13 MR. JAVIER: I'm worrying about the people that  
14 are older than me.

15 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Older than 49.

16 MR. JAVIER: No. I know there is older people in  
17 the neighborhood.

18 CHAIRPERSON HILL: That's all right. It's okay.  
19 It's all right.

20 MR. JAVIER: That's what I meant.

21 CHAIRPERSON HILL: I'm just letting you know, you  
22 might want to check that statement.

23 MR. JAVIER: No, no, no, no. That's not what I  
24 meant.

25 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great. Can I hear from

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 the Office of Planning please?

2                   MR. JESICK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members  
3 of the Board. My name is Matt Jesick presenting OPs  
4 testimony in this case. While I won't rest on the record  
5 exactly, I think our written report pretty succinctly sums  
6 our review of the variance criteria.

7                   We came to the conclusion that the application did  
8 not result -- excuse me -- the exceptional situations on the  
9 property did not result in undue hardship to the owner. The  
10 owner has not demonstrated that the other permissible uses  
11 in the R1 zone would not be viable or feasible. We also had  
12 concerns about impacts to the neighbors specifically  
13 regarding privacy. And should a building be built on this  
14 site, we had some suggestions for how privacy could be  
15 increased.

16                   We also on the last part of the test, had concerns  
17 about the impacts to the intent of the regulations granting  
18 a variance without a finding of an undue hardship would go  
19 against the intent of the regulations. And the regulations  
20 also while would normally seek to allow residential on a  
21 vacant lot in the R1 zone specifically, residential on an  
22 alley lot is prohibited. And it would be expected that there  
23 would be a high level of privacy in the rear yards of the  
24 adjacent homes. And again, we were concerned about the  
25 privacy and therefore we thought that the application might

1 impair that intent of the regulations.

2 That concludes my verbal testimony, but I'm happy  
3 to take any questions. Thank you.

4 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Mr. Jesick. One  
5 moment before I get to questions. Mr. Young, is there anyone  
6 here wishing to testify for the public?

7 MR. YOUNG: (Audio interference) -- signed up.

8 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Could you please  
9 introduce that witness?

10 MR. YOUNG: That is Stephanie Rones.

11 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Ms. Rones, can you hear  
12 me? Ms. Rones?

13 MR. MOY: Mr. Chairman, while you're waiting for  
14 her, I just want to remind you that about 10 o'clock, Ms.  
15 Rones attempted to file her written testimony into the  
16 record. Okay?

17 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Ms. Rones, can you hear  
18 me? Mr. Moy, if you could put her testimony into the record  
19 please.

20 MR. MOY: Yes, sir.

21 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great. Ms. Rones, can you hear  
22 me?

23 (No audible response.)

24 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yeah, I can hear you now. Can  
25 you hear me?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 MS. RONES: Okay. Yes, I can hear you. Good  
2 morning.

3 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Good morning. Ms. Rones, if  
4 you could introduce yourself and then give your three minutes  
5 of testimony and give us your address also.

6 MS. RONES: Okay. My name is Stephanie Rones and  
7 I live at 2218 Randolph Street. My backyard abuts the alley  
8 across from the proposed house. I submitted my testimony and  
9 I want to focus on one aspect within my two minutes. So let  
10 me get to that point.

11 (Audio interference) -- Okay. I want to focus on  
12 racial equity. Now that the homes in this area are selling  
13 for over \$1 million, Mr. Bishop is asking us to grant him  
14 permission to build what reports to be a two-family home on  
15 an alley lot. This would be -- the BZA would be amiss to  
16 grant this exception to the zoning laws. (Audio  
17 interference) I have lived in this neighborhood for most of  
18 my life. My parents bought their first house two streets  
19 down from where I live presently. My grandparents lived on  
20 22nd Street. They bought their house when there were racial  
21 covenants against selling to Negroes. We have a long history  
22 of civic participation in this neighborhood. I grew up --  
23 I went to the public schools, John Burroughs in particular.  
24 And my siblings went to McKinley High School.

25 I don't want to be -- wait a minute, let me see --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 nostalgic. I don't want to be nostalgic, but this  
2 neighborhood was made up of single family homes with middle  
3 class Black residents. What we're seeing now is a  
4 cannibalization -- I apologize -- of the smaller homes, the  
5 cottages. The millionaires are coming and buying these small  
6 houses and turning them into what I call McDonalds mac size  
7 houses. This proposed house would also be an oversized house  
8 in a back alley lot. It would destroy the character of our  
9 neighborhood.

10 I'm going to skip all of this other stuff, which  
11 talks about kids playing in the alley, running up and down  
12 the street. And I would like to just close with two  
13 paragraphs from Chapter 24 of the DC Racial Equity Plan.  
14 "Upper northeast neighborhoods are home to many lifelong  
15 Washingtonians and have a history of strong civic  
16 participation. The area of Woodridge was majority Black  
17 neighborhood and now we're down to 40 percent. There has to  
18 be some intent to prevent economic gentrification in the city  
19 of Washington. Therefore, the DC Racial Equity Plan speaks  
20 to using such tools as zoning regulations to slow down the  
21 progression of our neighborhoods being turned into enclaves  
22 for the very rich." Thank you very much.

23 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Ms. Rones. All  
24 right. Mr. Young, if you could excuse the witness from the  
25 hearing room. All right. Let's see. I'm going to start

1 with my board members. Do my board members have any  
2 questions for anyone? And if so, raise your hand. Let's go  
3 ahead and start with Commissioner Imamura as he raised his  
4 hand first.

5 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Chairman, this is a  
6 question for Ms. Romo and for anyone else that would like to  
7 respond. It seems as if this property has suffered from some  
8 neglect as it's been described by many (audio interference).  
9 Generally, peoples behaviors don't change. You also heard  
10 Mr. Bishop's plight here to construct this single family  
11 home. My question is because it's fallen into sort of  
12 disrepair or unkempt, what would you like to see on this  
13 piece of property, knowing that these are not protected,  
14 right, as a legal right. But that it's, you know, now in  
15 disrepair or just unkempt with trash, with fallen debris or  
16 whatever was described. What is it that you hope or would  
17 like to see? Otherwise, it will remain this way for, you  
18 know, quite some time.

19 MS. ROMO: For the question, I mean it would be  
20 wonderful to see it as a community garden or you know, some  
21 sort of other use that would keep previous structure --  
22 previous means the rain can go in. Right? That's what I  
23 mean, yeah. Yeah, impervious -- not impervious. Sorry.  
24 That would be a great -- a great benefit to the community  
25 personally. We haven't all discussed this together, so I

1 don't want to speak for other people in the party. A few of  
2 us have talked about that. But certainly not a big building  
3 in the back.

4 I think, you know, as I said that other people  
5 have used it in the past to play basketball. I can imagine,  
6 you know, a space where kids could play. You know, maybe not  
7 a playground, but you know, some sort of other recreational  
8 -- recreational space. But a garden comes to mind. Many of  
9 us have participated in the River Smart Programs from D.C.  
10 and we have Casey trees in our backyard and we have rain  
11 gardens and all of that. I can see them doing that with that  
12 lot and it being really, really wonderful. But I don't want  
13 to speak, you know, for anyone else if others have something  
14 to say.

15 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Ms. Romo. I  
16 guess what I should have -- I should have expanded the  
17 question to suggest that, you know, that would also bring  
18 value to the property owner as well. So I can see where a  
19 community garden would bring value to the community, but how  
20 could the property owner also benefit from it as well? But  
21 I appreciate your response and your perspective. I also want  
22 to thank all those that provided testimony for your  
23 participation in the public process. That's very important.  
24 I appreciate the perspective and the lens that you view this  
25 issue through. So with that, Mr. Chairman, I don't have any

1 further questions unless there's anybody else that would like  
2 to add --

3 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Smith -- Mr. Smith, you had  
4 a question?

5 MEMBER SMITH: My question was more so to the  
6 Applicant.

7 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Smith.

8 MEMBER SMITH: Hold on one second. Mr. Bishop --  
9 and this is more to --

10 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Oh, there you are. Okay. I'm  
11 sorry, Mr. Smith, go ahead.

12 MEMBER SMITH: Okay. And this is more to the  
13 statements that you made about your -- the reasons why you  
14 feel that you have an exceptional -- exceptional situation  
15 here with this property. And you had noted that within --  
16 you noted within the staff report this -- the question about  
17 the matter of right or the special exception uses. Can you  
18 explain to me and expound a little bit more in this hearing  
19 on the reasons why you think the matter of right use that are  
20 allowed within the R1B zone are not viable uses (audio  
21 interference) beyond economic. I get that a single family  
22 house is, you know, a more economic practical use of the lot,  
23 but that's not the primary reason for granting a variance.  
24 So can you expand on the reasons why any of the matter of  
25 right uses or special exception uses are not viable uses?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1                   MR. BISHOP: I'm not quite certain I understand  
2 your question --

3                   MEMBER SMITH: My question is you're requesting  
4 a variance for use that is not allowed within this zone.  
5 There are uses that are allowed within this zone as a matter  
6 of right where you can go pull a building permit or by  
7 special exception and you have to come here before this Board  
8 and it's a lower hurdle. So why do none of those uses work?

9                   MR. BISHOP: Yes. Thank you so much. I  
10 appreciate that. Let's go back a little bit. Let's be  
11 clear. I'm in this place -- in this space right now because  
12 I was told by DCRA that I could build by right a single  
13 family house. That's why I began the process of pursuing it  
14 to build a single family house. That's why I spent 16 months  
15 and four reviews to Office of Zoning to consider this matter  
16 and to give me an approval to build by right a single family  
17 house. This is -- I'm in this position not because of my  
18 own, I'm in this position because I was told that I could  
19 build by right. That was the first thing I did was to  
20 approach this and understanding what was necessary, what  
21 could I build? And what could I not build? And I was told  
22 that I could build and that's why I pursued it in this matter  
23 to address it in this form.

24                   So coming to BZA for an approval or to the public  
25 for an approval was never a part of the original plan.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 That's why I expressed the emphasis of the hardship. The  
2 hardship is being misled, misinformed, and then to have spent  
3 thousands of dollars over and over again to do plans,  
4 reviews, and submissions over 16 months to be told all the  
5 sudden, no, you can't build -- After all the other  
6 disciplines are approved, the address has been approved, the  
7 electric -- everybody has done their part. At the fifth  
8 house, 16 months later, I'm told I've got to go to BZA to get  
9 an approval.

10 MEMBER SMITH: Mr. Bishop, let me -- Mr. Bishop,  
11 thank you and a lot of what you stated is within the letter  
12 that you -- letter of intent.

13 MR. BISHOP: But let's be further clear. In  
14 relation to the property and stuff, it is a residential  
15 property consistent with a residential community. It is  
16 built based on the regulations that requires what can be  
17 built in an alley lot. In 5103, it gives you specific  
18 revelations with the set-backs, what they are and so on and  
19 so forth. The height, what it is and so on and so forth.  
20 This is what we were obtaining -- attempting to accomplish.  
21 Okay?

22 So I'm not -- I'm not actually trying to put a  
23 round peg in a square hole for the sake that I don't have  
24 anything else to do. I have a background -- background in  
25 compliance. So I wasn't approaching it in this fashion.

1 That was never the intent.

2 MEMBER SMITH: Mr. Bishop, thank you.

3 MR. BISHOP: I'm coming to -- I'm coming to the  
4 same city, the same municipality to ask for relief that put  
5 me in the position I'm in currently right now.

6 MEMBER SMITH: Correct. So you're here -- Mr.  
7 Bishop, you're here before this Board requesting relief for  
8 this particular use. I don't -- the question of whether you  
9 need a variance is not necessarily up for debate. You're  
10 here for a variance, so I'm, you know, asking the question  
11 because we have to -- we have to understand the reason why  
12 you're here for an exception -- explaining your exceptional  
13 situation. So there are a list of uses and you know, I just  
14 simply asked that particular question.

15 Now getting back to your initial statement of the  
16 reasons why you're here is because an erroneous determination  
17 by a zoning official -- an official with the city -- with the  
18 District of Columbia. And you referenced Ms. China-Barber  
19 was -- Is Ms. China-Barber with the Office of Zoning?

20 (Simultaneous speaking.)

21 MEMBER SMITH: -- and provided you with the zoning  
22 compliance letter?

23 MR. BISHOP: That's correct. We submitted to --  
24 We submitted to Zoning again four reviews to Zoning over 16  
25 months. This was not -- This was not one error. This wasn't

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 one mess-up. This was a time and time and time again  
2 submission to make this approval be granted. We obtained --

3 MEMBER SMITH: Mr. Bishop, I don't think that you  
4 heard my question. My question was did Ms. China-Barber sign  
5 the right or signed a zoning compliance letter that was  
6 requested by you as a zoning determination of whether this  
7 can be built?

8 MR. BISHOP: Yes. She sent me a notification  
9 indicating not to build by right and gave me the  
10 specifications that I could build by.

11 MEMBER SMITH: An email?

12 MR. BISHOP: I gave you a copy of that in an  
13 email.

14 MEMBER SMITH: This short blip of an email. Did  
15 you get a letter on the Office of Zoning's -- I mean Office  
16 of Zoning Administrator's letterhead spelling out whether you  
17 can build a residential use in an alley lot in the R1B zone?

18 MR. BISHOP: I sent correspondence to them. They  
19 responded back and gave me information in a short email.

20 MEMBER SMITH: Okay. So that was in 2020. So  
21 you've gotten three different determination letters from --  
22 two from the previous zoning administrator and the third from  
23 this current zoning administrator. All three of those  
24 letters -- one was a variance -- the last one was a variance.  
25 The first two were special exceptions. So you had to come

1 before this Board for some matter of relief. And you -- In  
2 that first -- In that first letter, you received that letter  
3 in 2022 -- 2023. Am I correct?

4 MR. BISHOP: The memorandum referencing and  
5 referring --

6 MEMBER SMITH: Mr. Matt LeGrant.

7 MR. BISHOP: -- requesting for the variance,  
8 correct.

9 MEMBER SMITH: Well, special exceptions at the  
10 time -- there were three special exceptions.

11 MR. BISHOP: Right. That's correct.

12 MEMBER SMITH: And you did receive those -- those  
13 two letters?

14 MR. BISHOP: Yes. And then --

15 MEMBER SMITH: So you were aware that you got --  
16 (Simultaneous speaking.)

17 MEMBER SMITH: -- letters from a previous zoning  
18 administrator stating that you needed relief, that this  
19 wasn't a matter of right. Okay.

20 MR. BISHOP: That's after the 16 months and the  
21 four submissions for approval. This was not prior, that's  
22 after that.

23 MEMBER SMITH: Okay. Okay. Do you have the  
24 letter from Ms. China-Barber or it's just -- or it's just an  
25 email from her?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1                   MR. BISHOP: Sir, I just told you that it was an  
2 email and it was a correspondence --

3                   MEMBER SMITH: It was just an email.

4                   MR. BISHOP: -- request from them -- from them and  
5 from her, yes.

6                   MEMBER SMITH: I just want clarification on that  
7 because in your email -- the email strand, it looks like  
8 there was a letter. It's saying here, "You should now be in  
9 receipt of the zoning compliance letter as of September 24th,  
10 2020." So I just wanted to make sure that there wasn't a  
11 letter.

12                  MR. BISHOP: No, it was email communications.

13                  MEMBER SMITH: Okay.

14                  MR. BISHOP: All of it was email communications.  
15 Every time I got a letter, it's been -- they decided 16  
16 months later that I needed to go to BZA to get it approved,  
17 that they couldn't do it themselves. This is after we've  
18 submitting to Zoning four times for approval and obtained all  
19 the other discipline approvals, anticipating walking out the  
20 door of the building (audio interference).

21                  MEMBER SMITH: Okay. All right. I think that's  
22 all the questions that I have for now, Chairman Hill. Thank  
23 you, Mr. Bishop.

24                  CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Mr. Smith. I saw  
25 Vice Chair John's hand up at one point. Okay, there it is.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 Vice Chair John, you're on mute.

2 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: I have one quick question  
3 for the Office of Planning. And Mr. Jesick, can you clarify  
4 why you did not discuss racial equity in analyzing the three  
5 criteria for the variance? Is there something in the  
6 criteria that requires discussion of racial equity?

7 MR. JESICK: The Board of Zoning Adjustment is  
8 tasked with evaluating the criteria contained in the zoning  
9 regulations and specifically for variances. That is whether  
10 there is -- there are exceptional conditions, which give rise  
11 to an undue hardship and whether granting the variance would  
12 result in detriment to the public good and impairing the  
13 intent of the zoning regulations. So the Board typically  
14 does not get into policy matters in the same way that the --  
15 say the Zoning Commission would.

16 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay, thank you for that.  
17 And Mr. Barber -- Mr. Bishop -- I'm so sorry. You purchased  
18 this lot at a tax sale. So did you do any research on the  
19 lot? You're an experienced developer and what research did  
20 you do on that lot to decide for yourself whether it was  
21 buildable and a good investment?

22 MR. BISHOP: Well, at that time -- you're talking  
23 about almost, what, 18 years ago. I was not an experienced  
24 developer. I was just in the business -- I had not bee in  
25 the business that long. I purchased a property as a lot in

1 light of it seemed to be a good location. It was a good size  
2 lot and felt I could do something with it at some point in  
3 time. Shortly after I purchased it, I had the sense that it  
4 was limited issues that I could, you know, use it for. So  
5 I went to the community and I said, you know, are you guys  
6 interested in this property? Maybe it's a benefit to you  
7 guys in some way. I printed out flyers. I posted it on  
8 doors. I offered it to the community. Noone responded. I  
9 think one person responded with some level of interest, but  
10 didn't move forward. Noone responded other than that. I put  
11 it in -- A realtor listed it for sale. Noone responded. No  
12 takers. Okay?

13                   Later on, several years later, I decided maybe I  
14 could do something with this lot because I saw some other  
15 development on alley lots. As a matter of fact, the property  
16 I quoted on my appeal identifies a lot that's on 13th Street  
17 in the Capitol Hill area that was built on an alley lot. And  
18 it's the same basic kind of structure as -- as a matter of  
19 fact, it was one of the lots that I owned -- that I bought.  
20 And they built a home on that lot. So I said well, maybe  
21 that's a possibility. I put it to my understanding of what  
22 it could be built on. I go to the city and I request the  
23 Zoning Office to give me their opinion as to whether I can  
24 build or not build a residential property on it. And I  
25 wanted to take it on my own understanding and knowledge. I

1 said let me go to the source and that's what I did. And then  
2 they told me yes, I could build. I moved forward to get it  
3 -- you know, to do so. Not anticipating I'd have to go to  
4 BZA for an approval.

5 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: So all of that was in  
6 2020.

7 MR. BISHOP: That's correct.

8 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: So you owned the lot  
9 essentially from the time of the tax sale to 2020. And did  
10 you consider any other options besides sale and a residential  
11 unit?

12 MR. BISHOP: No, I didn't consider anything at the  
13 time. I was preoccupied with a number of other issues.

14 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay, all right. Thanks  
15 a lot.

16 MR. BISHOP: Thank you.

17 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Let's see. Mr. Bishop,  
18 I just have one question. Oh, sorry. Mr. Blake, go ahead.

19 MEMBER BLAKE: I have a couple questions for Mr.  
20 Bishop. I just want to make sure based on what you said that  
21 your decision to go forward -- you heard back and forth that  
22 you may or may not be able to build on this lot incidentally  
23 from ANC people and so forth. But your single issue, which  
24 drove you to actually begin this process was the email from  
25 the technician at the DCRA at the time. It sounds to me that

1 was the thing that caused you to go forward, once you heard  
2 that. Everything else was kind of no, no. You may need  
3 relief. But that particular instance was the thing that  
4 triggered your development activities.

5 MR. BISHOP: Let me correct you. No, I did not  
6 talk to the ANC about building or having a right to build on  
7 the lot. That was never a conversation with them about that.  
8 Okay?

9 MEMBER BLAKE: Okay.

10 MR. BISHOP: Making the decision was simply going  
11 to the source. Again, I have a background in compliance.  
12 I went to the source. If I wanted to know some information  
13 or approval by someone, I'm going to go directly to the  
14 source. And I went directly to the Office of Zoning and said  
15 whether I can or I cannot do with this particular lot? And  
16 they told me that I could in fact build. They gave me  
17 specifications to build and I moved forward with such.

18 MEMBER BLAKE: Yeah, I was asking you which letter  
19 did you get that caused you to make the decision in the  
20 investment? Was it the email from the technician or was it  
21 the determination letter from the ZA? When did you start  
22 spending all this --

23 (Simultaneous speaking.)

24 MR. BISHOP: The email from the technician is what  
25 led me to move forward to begin hiring an architect and an

1 engineer and then determining and moving forward with all the  
2 plans and all the submissions. But we submitted again, not  
3 only just the technician an email, but we submitted to the  
4 Office of Zoning four different reviews over 16 months before  
5 they came back to say oh, now we can't approve this. You've  
6 got to go to BZA. We were leaving out of the office with a  
7 building permit in hand when they came to me and said oh,  
8 we've got a problem. The technician made an error.

9 MEMBER BLAKE: And have you -- Are you familiar  
10 with -- I assume with the other properties you've developed  
11 over the years, you're familiar with the Zoning administrator  
12 determination letter -- the process to get that and so forth?

13 MR. BISHOP: No, I'm not --

14 (Simultaneous speaking.)

15 MR. BISHOP: I have not developed a lot of  
16 property in D.C.

17 MEMBER BLAKE: Okay.

18 MR. BISHOP: No. I had an architect who was  
19 working on this and submitting these revisions and these  
20 plans and this approval. I was not doing it myself. I'm not  
21 -- I wasn't the project manager. The architect was the  
22 project manager.

23 MEMBER BLAKE: Okay. And your architect was not  
24 aware of the -- of the requirements of Zoning. He was (audio  
25 interference) with the emails?

1                   MR. BISHOP: Exactly. And he saw the email and  
2 accepted the email and said this is fine. We can use this  
3 to work with and he moved forth. And again, we didn't -- we  
4 did submit once or twice to Office of Zoning, the plans for  
5 approval. We submitted four times of revisions over 16  
6 months.

7                   MEMBER BLAKE: Okay.

8                   MR. BISHOP: Yeah, so they could have told me on  
9 the first review, oh, this does not work. It was never --  
10 That was never the case. I mean, you know, so I was very  
11 much, you know, misled.

12                  MEMBER BLAKE: But you were told though on two  
13 occasions that there would be a degree of -- the email aside,  
14 you were told in the -- each of those determination letters  
15 from the ZA that you would need to come before the Board for  
16 relief.

17                  MR. BISHOP: No, they didn't get me that letter  
18 of that notice until 16 months later. That didn't come until  
19 Office of Zoning, Mr. LeGrant, the Director at the time said  
20 no, we can't grant this approval. That was 16 months later  
21 and four reviews later --

22                  MEMBER BLAKE: Okay.

23                  MR. BISHOP: -- in addition to the letter of  
24 memorandum or the letter from the -- from the email -- a  
25 letter from the technician saying you can build by right.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 MEMBER BLAKE: Okay. The other question I have  
2 for you is slightly different. You have also a request for  
3 an area variance and also a side yard request. You indicated  
4 that you were going to change the dimensions of your property  
5 to fit that requirement.

6 MR. BISHOP: That's correct.

7 MEMBER BLAKE: Is that reflected in the existing  
8 plans?

9 MR. BISHOP: No. No. And we addressed it in our  
10 revision substitute document that said that we will make the  
11 revisions.

12 MEMBER BLAKE: Okay. But the actual revisions  
13 that fit that are not in that document.

14 MR. BISHOP: That's correct.

15 MEMBER BLAKE: You are still in this -- We have  
16 to respond -- and I'm sure that you understand that we're  
17 going to discuss this -- we do need to speak to each of your  
18 requests and your current requests are for these elements as  
19 well. So then we may need to -- just be aware of that.

20 MR. BISHOP: Yes. I'm just giving you -- Again,  
21 I'm giving you a heads up that those -- those items will be  
22 removed because I'm going to make the modifications.

23 MEMBER BLAKE: Thank you very much.

24 MR. BISHOP: Thank you.

25 MR. MOY: Mr. Chairman, if I may -- if I may make

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 a notation for the -- for the case transcript that Mr. Bishop  
2 has used the words "Office of Zoning" where I think -- I  
3 believe he's referencing the Office of the Zoning  
4 Administrator or the staff at DOB because there was no person  
5 by the name of China-Barber at the Office of Zoning.

6 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Moy.  
7 Thanks for that clarification. Give me one second, Mr.  
8 Raina. So this is now important. We are here to speak to  
9 the regulations that require us to look at the relief that's  
10 been requested of an area variance or use variance or special  
11 exception from the side yard. I say that because now I'm  
12 going to ask Ms. Romo if she has any questions. Okay? And  
13 we've now gone -- Wow, we've almost gone two hours. Okay?  
14 So I have a full day yet still to happen and it's up to the  
15 Board to ask their questions. Now Ms. Romo, do you have any  
16 zoning-related questions to Mr. Bishop within the  
17 regulations?

18 MS. ROMO: In the application like the other parts  
19 of the side yard and height or do you just mean --

20 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Do you have a question for Mr.  
21 Bishop, Ms. Romo?

22 MS. ROMO: Okay, sorry. I mean it's more of a  
23 question/comment, but to his statement that he was at the  
24 beginning an inexperienced developer, having started --

25 CHAIRPERSON HILL: That's okay. That's okay.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 This isn't further testimony. Do you have any questions?

2 MS. ROMO: I mean I have a question of if he's an  
3 experienced developer, what did he do with other vacant lots  
4 that he bought in the Summer when he bought this lot?

5 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Ms. Romo, that is not  
6 pertaining to the -- That does not pertain to the current  
7 application in front of us.

8 MS. ROMO: Okay.

9 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Let me ask a different  
10 question.

11 MS. ROMO: Okay.

12 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Do you have any questions for  
13 the Office of Planning?

14 MS. ROMO: I have no questions for the Office of  
15 Planning.

16 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. I'll go back again. Do  
17 you have any questions for Mr. Bishop?

18 MS. ROMO: I don't have any further questions for  
19 Mr. Bishop.

20 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Mr. Bishop, do you have  
21 any zoning-related questions for Ms. Romo?

22 MR. BISHOP: No.

23 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, all right.

24 MR. BISHOP: I can make comment?

25 CHAIRPERSON HILL: In one moment, Mr. Bishop.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. BISHOP: Okay.

2 CHAIRPERSON HILL: You'll have an opportunity --  
3 Hold on, Mr. Bishop. You'll have an opportunity for  
4 rebuttal. Okay? And then Ms. Romo -- you don't get  
5 rebuttal, Ms. Romo. You're in party status. You will get  
6 an opportunity to give a little bit of a conclusion for us.  
7 Okay? Now that's not within the regulations, but I allow it  
8 because I like to hear from everybody at the end. And then  
9 Mr. Bishop will have the final word as it is his application.  
10 Okay?

11 So now, Mr. Bishop, you will have an opportunity  
12 for rebuttal, meaning you can have other statements on the  
13 testimony that was given. However, I would like to advise  
14 you to clarify it or keep it within the context of the  
15 regulations that are before us because then what's going to  
16 happen is Ms. Romo will ask any questions that she might have  
17 concerning your rebuttal. Okay? So go ahead, Mr. Bishop,  
18 do you have any rebuttal?

19 MR. BISHOP: Well one, they made reference to the  
20 fact that the property was unkempt and not being maintained.  
21 The property is a fenced vacant lot. It's a fenced vacant  
22 lot that has a -- had a lock on it to prevent people from  
23 getting into it and dumping and things of that nature.  
24 Apparently somebody broke into it at some point. I've come  
25 back and I replaced it. Then, you know, I'm not going to sit

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 there and watch a vacant lot. You know, that's just not --

2 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So Mr. Bishop, I  
3 understand. Go ahead.

4 MR. BISHOP: Yeah. Again, I offered to -- I did  
5 offer the property to sell to the community and there was no  
6 takers. The Office of Planning made a comment relative to  
7 privacy. The privacy -- These properties sit -- existing  
8 properties sit within 12 feet of one another. There is no  
9 privacy between one property adjacent to another property  
10 currently. One neighbor can look into another neighbor's  
11 yard currently.

12 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.

13 MR. BISHOP: So there's limited privacy within the  
14 entire area in itself.

15 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.

16 MR. BISHOP: This is an inner city development --  
17 inner city property.

18 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Bishop -- Mr. Bishop, we  
19 do 15 cases of this a day, right, every week. So we know  
20 what the properties are like and how they sit next to each  
21 other. So go ahead, privacy was something else that you just  
22 mentioned.

23 MR. BISHOP: Okay. Let me see. Let me just try  
24 to minimize some of this. It's been a long day.

25 CHAIRPERSON HILL: We haven't even started our

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 day, Mr. Bishop.

2 MR. BISHOP: Construction -- It's anticipated that  
3 the construction period will probably take about six months  
4 -- six to seven months to complete. That would be an  
5 interruption to the alley, okay, just to give you some  
6 information. This will not affect the service of trash --  
7 the trash service. So I don't see why there are making  
8 reference to that.

9 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.

10 MR. BISHOP: The set-backs that are there in place  
11 are limited to the rules of the alley lot construction, which  
12 is not consistent with the front road access normal  
13 construction set-back requirement. So I heard a comparison  
14 to one set-back requirement --

15 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Okay. Okay.

16 MR. BISHOP: Okay. That's pretty much all I have  
17 to say.

18 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great. Thanks, Mr.  
19 Bishop. All right. Ms. Romo, I've got five items. Do you  
20 have any questions about those five items in any of the  
21 things that he just said? Do you have a question about any  
22 of the things that he just said?

23 MS. ROMO: I have a question. You said that you  
24 tried to go around the neighborhood and sell it multiple  
25 years ago --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 CHAIRPERSON HILL: No, that's not what he --  
2 That's not what he just said. That was None of the -- That  
3 was None of the rebuttal issues.

4 MS. ROMO: Oh, yeah. I thought he said that he  
5 tried to go around and noone wanted it.

6 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Was that on the -- Was that the  
7 rebuttal?

8 MEMBER SMITH: He did say that.

9 CHAIRPERSON HILL: What's your question, Ms. Romo?

10 MS. ROMO: Why did he not try, you know, many  
11 neighbors don't know about that. Why didn't he try to do  
12 that several years ago before he undertook this construction  
13 idea?

14 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Bishop, I guess Ms. Romo's  
15 asking why didn't you try -- Ms. Romo, I understand, why  
16 didn't you try harder to reach out to people?

17 MS. ROMO: No, that was almost 20 years ago. Why  
18 didn't he try in 2020 or 2019?

19 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Mr. Bishop, why didn't  
20 you try again?

21 MR. BISHOP: At the time, I decided I wanted to  
22 keep the lot and use it for my -- use if for my (audio  
23 interference).

24 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Got it. Okay, thank you. Ms.  
25 Romo? You guys, I think the record is really full by the

1 way. You guys like -- There's plenty of testimony. We've  
2 heard everything -- we understand everything that's going on.  
3 Mr. Raina, you've had your hand up for a while. Go ahead and  
4 ask your question. Ms. Romo is being your spokesperson and  
5 she's done a pretty darn good job. So what's your question,  
6 Mr. Raina?

7 MR. RAINA: (Audio interference) I've been at the  
8 property since 2014. I did not see any pamphlets or flyers  
9 come through us about the sale of this lot --

10 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, all right.

11 MR. RAINA: -- because it would be ideal for me  
12 to buy because it's absolutely adjacent to my lot. I have  
13 the longest border.

14 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Raina -- Mr. Raina, I got  
15 you. Okay, thank you. All right. Okay. All right, Ms.  
16 Romo, you can go ahead and give a brief conclusion. I'll  
17 give you two minutes. Okay? And then Mr. Bishop, you'll  
18 also have two minutes for a conclusion. Go ahead, Ms. Romo.

19 MS. ROMO: Thank you so much. I think we've  
20 already addressed a lot of the points already raised. In  
21 conclusion, we urge the Board to deny this requested relief.  
22 Building an alley dwelling on the vacant lot in our zone is  
23 totally incongruent with the neighborhood. It would have  
24 severe detrimental impacts to our neighborhood. We've talked  
25 a lot about water. We've talked a lot about light. We've

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 talked a lot about privacy. And the owner has had man  
2 opportunity to use that lot in permissible ways or sell it  
3 if he wanted to, to other neighbors. So I don't have very  
4 much further.

5 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.

6 MS. ROMO: I think we've all said what needs to  
7 be said. But I really thank you for the time today and thank  
8 you to the BZA for -- the BZA staff even not even present  
9 today, but for explaining the process because this was all  
10 new to us and we did not understand the process until we had  
11 multiple conversations with the Board of Zoning staff to help  
12 us understand the procedures and how this all worked. So  
13 deep appreciation for that and thank you so much.

14 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. All right. Mr.  
15 Bishop, would you like to go ahead and give a conclusion?

16 MR. BISHOP: Yes. I just want to say that I  
17 didn't propose this or initiate this process to be a burden  
18 to anyone. And certainly I began the process and trying to  
19 do it correctly. That's why I went to Zoning to get the  
20 preliminary approval of what I could and could not do with  
21 it. I understand there's some inconvenience for construction  
22 of any -- in any aspect of the word. It's an inconvenience  
23 to the neighbors. It's an inconvenience -- you know, it  
24 happens. This is what it is. When your home was being  
25 built, it was an inconvenience to your neighbors. That's

1 what happens.

2                   But in light of the property being -- it's a large  
3 lot. It sits there and it has no value at this point. I'm  
4 trying to create value to it. District of Columbia needs  
5 more housing units, okay, and I can just say this, it's a  
6 nice design. It's going to compliment the area and it's  
7 going to be an asset to the community. It's not going to be  
8 a detriment to the community. And for me to have a lot of  
9 that size to say okay, using it for community purposes, I  
10 mean I'm not public -- I'm not Planning Commission. I'm not,  
11 you know, Public Works. I am an individual person who's paid  
12 taxes on this lot for 17+ years. I should have a right to  
13 maybe do something with it of value.

14                   So I understand your concerns. I can only just  
15 say that, you know, I will do what I can to minimize any  
16 inconvenience during the construction and try to accommodate  
17 you -- the community in any way. But I didn't ask to be in  
18 this predicament. I asked the BZA to grant my relief as the  
19 city issued me the preliminary to move forward to begin with.  
20 Thank you.

21                   CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, thank you. Mr. Bishop,  
22 I actually have a final question for you. What happened at  
23 your ANC meetings?

24                   MR. BISHOP: I met with the ANC Commissioner.

25                   CHAIRPERSON HILL: You met with the ANC

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 Commissioner. Did you present to the full ANC?

2 MR. BISHOP: Yes. Well no, to -- no, to the one  
3 gentleman --

4 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Why didn't you present to the  
5 full ANC?

6 MR. BISHOP: It was never -- It was never -- It  
7 was never presented or -- I sensed when I presented to him,  
8 it was being presented to whoever needed to see it. I didn't  
9 -- He didn't make a comment that it needed to go anywhere  
10 else.

11 CHAIRPERSON HILL: You didn't --

12 MR. BISHOP: I presented to him and the community  
13 -- the neighbors that were invited through him.

14 CHAIRPERSON HILL: And he didn't say that you had  
15 to present in front of the full ANC?

16 MR. BISHOP: No.

17 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, fine. Okay. All right.  
18 Do any of my board members have anything else before I  
19 conclude this hearing? All right. I'm going to close the  
20 hearing on the record. Thank you all very much for the time.  
21 As you know or before you guys disappear, you know, we do  
22 this more or less as a volunteer thing for the city. And  
23 we're here every week and we try to hear everyone as best we  
24 can and rule on the regulations in the way that we're  
25 supposed to. So I hope you all have a nice day and I'll

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 close the hearing on the record. Thank you.

2 MR. BISHOP: Thank you.

3 CHAIRPERSON HILL: If I might suggest to my board  
4 members, we come and deliberate on this after we take a  
5 break. Okay? So let's take a quick break. It's 11:30, we'll  
6 come back (audio interference).

7 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the  
8 record at 11:31 a.m. and resumed at 11:50 a.m.)

9 MR. MOY: The Board has returned to its public  
10 hearing session after a quick recess. And the time is at or  
11 about 11:50 a.m.

12 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, thanks. All right. I  
13 wanted to discuss this because I'd rather have this -- Well,  
14 whatever. I'm ready to discuss it. It's disappointing that  
15 I think the Applicant had followed recommendations that might  
16 have led him astray as to what could be done as a matter of  
17 right on that property. I'm a little confused by the record  
18 as to when the Applicant knew that there was at least a  
19 special exception, if not a variance, necessary to do the  
20 work that he was planning on doing on the -- on the property.  
21 You know, what the Board is tasked with doing is again seeing  
22 whether the criteria is met for the relief that's being  
23 requested. In this case, there's an area variance, there is  
24 a use variance, and there's a special exception. That is  
25 what's before us.

1           In terms of if the Applicant relied on some other  
2 recommendations from a different agency is not necessarily  
3 before us. Although I know that in the past, I think we've  
4 talked about it, but I'm not really sure whether or not we  
5 were able to give it any kind of criteria within the  
6 regulations in terms of whether it's an exceptional situation  
7 or exceptional condition.

8           In this particular case, I don't think that the  
9 Applicant is meeting the criteria for the lot. I think the  
10 lot has, you know, matter of right uses that could be used  
11 with that lot. And I don't think that -- I mean as we all  
12 know, a use variance is the highest bar for us to reach. And  
13 an area variance also -- any kind of variance -- I don't  
14 think there's an exceptional situation. I guess I could see  
15 -- I'm even seeing it as practical difficulty. I mean the  
16 owner is not able to do what he wants to do, which would have  
17 the greatest economic impact. But there still are other  
18 things that he can do with the property and I do think that  
19 this would conflict with the -- with the zone regulations.

20           I would agree with the analysis that the Office  
21 of Planning has put forward. Also, we didn't see anything  
22 from the full ANC. We got a letter from, I believe the  
23 single member district and it was, you know, in opposition.  
24 And it pretty much outlined where there was -- they didn't  
25 really necessarily get me the criteria. So I don't see how

1 I could be in favor of this application. And so I'm going  
2 to ask who would like to go next? Mr. Smith, thank you.

3 MEMBER SMITH: So like you, I'm a little -- I  
4 truly understand the concerns raised by Mr. Bishop regarding  
5 detrimental reliance with an employee, I think named China-  
6 Barber, I believe. But based on the email within the record  
7 submitted by the Applicant, it does not demonstrate to me  
8 that the information provided by Ms. Barber meant that a  
9 single family house is a matter of right. She did not use  
10 that term in the email that she sent Mr. Barber. She stated,  
11 and I quote, "that a single family is okay for building as  
12 long as all of the development standards are met".

13 So a use permission can be seen as a type of  
14 development standard. So there was a caveat sentence that  
15 she did add. And you know, commonly that would lead to a  
16 followup discussion probably with a zoning determination  
17 letter. And I see within the email strand that there was  
18 some type of zoning determination letter, but that was not  
19 provided by the Applicant. And the Applicant is saying that  
20 he relied on that email from Ms. Barber. And again, in that  
21 email, it does not explicitly state that a single family home  
22 is allowed as a matter of right.

23 So one of the hardships that was stated by Mr.  
24 Barber was detrimental reliance. And I don't think that's  
25 standard has been met in this particular instance, especially

1 given that there were two additional -- well, three zoning  
2 determination letters that were written over the past --  
3 between 2020 and 2024, four years almost that stated -- well,  
4 3-1/2 years, I guess that some type of relief before the  
5 Board of Zoning Adjustment was required at that time.

6 So again, to what Chairman Hill stated, what's in  
7 front of us is a request for a variance -- a use variance.  
8 And based on what's within the record and what was stated by  
9 the Applicant as part of his testimony, I don't think there's  
10 anything within the record or part of the testimony that was  
11 provided that showed that the Applicant couldn't pursue a  
12 viable use that was a matter of right or a special exception.  
13 We did not receive any information to support the Applicant's  
14 request before us to construct a single family house. So I  
15 do not believe based on that testimony that the first prong  
16 of the variance test has been met.

17 And I agree with Chairman Hill that constructing  
18 an alley -- an alley lot into a single family house could be,  
19 as presented today, detrimental to the public good because  
20 of our privacy concerns that weren't addressed even in the  
21 record by the Applicant with their submitted design and site  
22 plan and other concerns that were raised by the Office of  
23 Planning. And I do believe that it would -- it is contrary  
24 to the intent -- purpose and integrity of the zoning  
25 regulations as within the R1 and R2 zones, family residential

1 uses, single family homes are banned in essence. They're not  
2 allowed for the zoning regulations. And they're contrary to  
3 the R1 and R2 zoning regulations because those are the two  
4 lowest density single family zones within the zoning  
5 regulations.

6 The intent is these properties to be single family  
7 homes be on larger lots, affording a level of privacy and a  
8 maximum amount of light and air to those particular  
9 properties. So I do believe that this again would be  
10 contrary to the intent of the zoning regulations. So with  
11 that, I do not believe they've met the standards for the  
12 three prong test with a variance and I will not support the  
13 application.

14 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. Mr. Blake?

15 MEMBER BLAKE: Yes, Mr. Chair. I would agree with  
16 the analysis provided by Board Member Smith and you as well.  
17 I don't believe that the prongs have met for the use  
18 variance. The Applicant certainly did not demonstrate that  
19 the other matter of right in special exception uses are  
20 possible. And I agree that the -- It seemed that the  
21 discussion suggested that, that one particular email from Ms.  
22 China-Barber was the catalyst. But I would think that a  
23 licensed -- D.C. licensed architect would know that a  
24 determination letter would be a more appropriate step to make  
25 this type of allocation of resources.

1                   So I think that while the Applicant explained that  
2 they didn't understand that, I think the architect should  
3 have recognized that, that was probably not sufficient. I  
4 also think that the Applicant has not completed the  
5 application because they really haven't even gone through the  
6 process of the -- visiting with the ANC or meeting with the  
7 ANC, which again the explanation was because I didn't think  
8 I needed to. But that's not a sufficient reason. Ignorance  
9 is not the right reason. And certainly if you just had  
10 representation, then perhaps you would, you know, have the  
11 right answer.

12                  I think that that again, we vote against the area  
13 variance -- I mean the use variance. And I would argue that  
14 we would dismiss the area variance and the special exception  
15 request.

16                  CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Dr. Imamura.

17                  COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I agree with the analysis  
18 provided by the Office of Planning, as well as my colleagues  
19 here. I think Boardmember Smith brought up some very good  
20 points as did Boardmember Blake. I don't feel that the  
21 Applicant provided substantial evidence that would warrant  
22 consideration of the use variance demonstrating, you know,  
23 viable -- other viable uses. I didn't see why that -- I  
24 didn't see that in signed testimony and why that wouldn't  
25 work.

1           I think Vice Chair John also asked some very  
2 insightful questions that lent themselves to a little - a  
3 clearer picture about the timeline -- timeframe. I feel in  
4 this case, there are many points -- checkpoints, I think  
5 where the Applicant probably could have sought clarity about  
6 this. I'm a little surprised that somebody that's an  
7 experienced developer didn't go before the ANC or provide  
8 better outreach to the neighbors. I think that would have  
9 been another moment there to kind of scratch your head and  
10 say okay, there's a lot of opposition here. You know, what  
11 can I do?

12           I think it was a narrow focus -- somebody who had  
13 a lot of energy behind their idea, but you know, developing  
14 in D.C. is tough, but it requires, you know, a lot of  
15 outreach, not only to agencies, but to neighborhoods -- to  
16 neighbors, ANC. So I feel like there's a lot of missing  
17 parts to this. I'm in agreement, I'm not prepared to vote  
18 in support of these variances and agree that we can dismiss  
19 the area variance and special exception use. That's all I  
20 have, Mr. Chair.

21           CHAIRPERSON HILL: Vice Chair John?

22           VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
23 I don't have a lot to add. I think everybody basically  
24 covered what I would have said. I'm not in support of the  
25 application and you know, this is really a self-created

1 hardship as well. And as an experienced investor, I think  
2 between 2000 -- well, before this property at a tax sale, we  
3 should have known that there were inherent risks in doing  
4 that. And he took no action between 2000 and 2008 to find  
5 out or explain to the Board how the property could have been  
6 used either as a matter of right or a special exception. So  
7 as I said, I'm not in support.

8 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. So what I  
9 would also point out to the community that I'm sure is  
10 continuing to watch, something can be done with that lot.  
11 Like there are matter of right options that are available to  
12 the developer. What that person might pursue, I'm not clear  
13 on, but there are. There's also special exception options  
14 that are available to the developer, meaning there are things  
15 that they might be able to do that would have a lower bar  
16 with which to come before the Board of Zoning Adjustment.  
17 Those special exceptions would be something that again, would  
18 have to go through the same community process, same Office  
19 of Planning process. They'd have to go before the ANC and  
20 get a full vote before the ANC if they were to go with some  
21 kind of special exception route.

22 That all being said, I've just been pointing out  
23 to the community that something can be done with that lot.  
24 And so you know, don't be surprised if something gets done  
25 with that lot. All right. I'm going to go ahead and follow

1 the suggestion of Boardmember Blake and I'm going to make a  
2 motion to deny the use variance in Application 21017 and  
3 therefore dismiss the area variance and the special exception  
4 request (audio interference).

5 MR. NICHOLAS: If the Board is choosing to vote  
6 on the merits of the area of variance in the special  
7 exception, then we would advise the appropriate remedy to  
8 dismiss or to deny the relief excuse me rather than  
9 to dismiss it.

10 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. Then, that  
11 being the case

12 (Simultaneous speaking.)

13 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: May I also add something,  
14 Mr. Chairman? It's that the applicant in written testimony,  
15 and I believe in oral testimony, indicated that they request  
16 for special exception for the side yard and the height would  
17 be withdrawn, a new plan submitted, and was no longer seeking  
18 that relief. So I leave it to OZLD to advise again. I  
19 suppose we could deny this as OZLD recommended. Please chime  
20 in if I'm correct.

21 Mr. Nicholas, do you want to add to what I said?

22 MR. NICHOLAS: The application is based off of the  
23 memo that's been filed in the record from the ZA's office.  
24 So because there has not been a new memo filed or a  
25 self-certification, we would advise the Board to vote on the

1 relief. And since it would be on the merits, a denial would  
2 be a more appropriate option.

3 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. Thank you.

4 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. I'm going to make a  
5 motion. Application number 1 21017, as caption read by  
6 the secretary, and ask for a second. Ms. John?

7 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Second.

8 CHAIRPERSON HILL: The motion remains seconded.

9 Mr. Moy, take a roll call.

10 MR. MOY: Thank you, sir.

11 When I call your name, if you'll please respond  
12 to the motion made by Chairman Hill to deny the application  
13 for the relief requested? The motion to deny was second by  
14 Vice Chair John.

15 Zoning Commissioner Dr. Imamura?

16 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

17 MR. MOY: Mr. Smith?

18 MEMBER SMITH: Yes.

19 MR. MOY: Mr. Blake?

20 MEMBER BLAKE: Yes to deny.

21 MR. MOY: Vice Chair John?

22 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yes.

23 MR. MOY: Chairman Hill?

24 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes to deny.

25 MR. MOY: Staff who would record the vote, it's

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 five to zero to zero on the motion made by Chairman Hill to  
2 deny. The motion to deny was second by Vice Chair John.  
3 Vice Chair John also voted to deny the application, as well  
4 as denials from Zoning Commissioner Dr. Imamura, Mr. Smith,  
5 Mr. Blake, Vice Chair John, Chairman Hill.

6 The motion carries, sir, five to zero to zero.

7 CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right. Thanks, Mr. Moy.  
8 Okay. You can call our next one, Mr. Moy.

9 MR. MOY: The next case before the Board is  
10 application number 20996 of 106 13TH Street, LLC. This is  
11 a self-certified self-certified application pursuant to  
12 Subtitle X Section 1002 for use variance from the Subtitle  
13 U Section 301 to allow restaurant use on the second floor of  
14 an existing building.

15 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Dr. Imamura, can you  
16 hear me?

17 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes, I can, Mr. Chairman.

18 CHAIRPERSON HILL: I know that you're not on this  
19 case. And probably I'm looking at my Board members  
20 this actually might take a little bit longer or not longer.  
21 I don't know. Are we going to probably do lunch after this  
22 case?

23 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yes.

24 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Then, Dr. Imamura, I'm  
25 just letting you know you'd have more time, okay? So I will

1 I have no idea when we end here, but you can monitor the  
2 situation. And I hope you enjoy your break.

3 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
4 You all take as much time as you'd like. I'll take an  
5 extended lunch.

6 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Well, you're  
7 going to have to come back, so all right.

8 (Simultaneous speaking.)

9 MR. MOY: The only other thing I wanted to add for  
10 the record, Mr. Chairman, is that you the Board last heard  
11 this at its hearing on January 31st, 2024, in the you had  
12 asked for supplemental information, and this is a continued  
13 hearing.

14 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Excellent. Thank you, Mr. Moy.  
15 I appreciate it.

16 All right. Could the applicant please introduce  
17 themselves for the record?

18 MS. WILSON: From Sullivan & Barros, on behalf of  
19 the applicant in this case.

20 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. So, for the  
21 record, Commissioner Stidham was on this application, and  
22 she, unfortunately, is on travel today. So we will see where  
23 we get, in terms of if we need Commissioner Stidham's vote.

24 So, Ms. Wilson, if you were to tell us what has  
25 happened since the last time you were with us.

1 MS. WILSON: Sure. And I have a very brief  
2 presentation, and it's limited to responses to a few points  
3 from OP's report.

4 (Simultaneous speaking.)

5 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Is it in the

6 MS. WILSON: We filed late because yeah.

7 CHAIRPERSON HILL: I think I see it. I got it.

8 MS. WILSON: OP's report was filed Monday, and so  
9 I wanted wanted to talk to OP a little bit too.

10 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure. Go ahead then.

11 MS. WILSON: Great. Thank you. And I think we  
12 do have some witnesses signed up, just if you have questions  
13 about the additional info we submitted. We're not planning  
14 to submit any additional testimony. So we have Spiro  
15 Gioldasis, who is the owner, Ziad Demian, the architect,  
16 Chander Jayaraman, the SMD, and then, Guy Reinbold available  
17 if there are questions about the additional submission.

18 Next slide, please. So this is a list of exhibits  
19 we submitted. If you recall, on January 31st, we had a  
20 substantial hearing with a lot of community support and  
21 testimony. The Board requested additional information  
22 related to the cost of bringing the building up to code for  
23 residential use, as well as the cost to convert this space  
24 to residential and mixed-use, operating costs, the  
25 matter-of-right and special exception uses, and photos of the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 upstairs. And so, we submitted all of those, along with some  
2 other exhibits that we resubmitted, so everything would be  
3 together in one place.

4 Next slide, please. So, in terms of Agency  
5 responses, the ANC continues to support the restaurant  
6 expansion. And I believe the Chair of the ANC is on today.  
7 And then, for the OP report, we really appreciate them taking  
8 another look. There has been an acknowledgment of financial  
9 hardship, and that the third prong could be met if the Board  
10 finds that we do meet the variance test.

11 Next slide, please. And in terms of the first  
12 prong, that seemed to be OP's issue in the report. It's  
13 similar to the first report on this point, basically noting  
14 that mixed-use buildings are not unique. We are not arguing  
15 that it is unique solely because it is mixed-use. The  
16 argument is more nuanced in that the building is too small  
17 and has been too neglected to sustain the available by-right  
18 or special exception mix of uses permitted in this zone.

19 The nature of this being mixed-use with  
20 purpose-built commercial space on the lower level is one of  
21 the factors in the confluence of factors that makes this  
22 property unique. Other factors include the size of the  
23 building. It's relatively small and two stories. The fact  
24 that the upstairs and overall building was neglected and not  
25 brought up to code. The history of other failing business

1 in this specific property is also unique, as well as evidence  
2 of commercial use on all three levels at one point.

3                   The report goes on to discuss the mixed-use  
4 building at the corner of the block. If you could go to the  
5 next slide, please. So I planned to discuss this at the  
6 original hearing, but I think I skipped over it. So I  
7 appreciate the opportunity to talk about this in more detail.  
8 It's a great property to compare to the subject property to  
9 highlight how unique the subject property is.

10                  For some context, that property on the corner  
11 there had the address of 1307 East Capitol Street. It is a  
12 purpose-built mixed-use building as well, with two levels of  
13 residential use above, and a total of three stories. It  
14 currently has six condo units on the upper floors, a dry  
15 cleaner on the first floor, and potentially, a small office  
16 use, based on tax records which show ownership of two  
17 separate commercial units.

18                  There was, at one point, a barber shop on that  
19 first floor. But under the 1958 regulations, changes from  
20 one non-conforming use to another were permitted via special  
21 exception. So that property was approved to change the  
22 non-conforming barber shop use to a dry cleaner and office  
23 in the 90s. And under the current regs, that would require  
24 a variance.

25                  And of course, an apartment building is not a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 conforming use in this zone, and the applicant in this case  
2 could never fit six units in the upstairs space, either  
3 physically or without variance relief.

4                   The subject property is clearly distinguishable  
5 from this large, three-story mixed-use building on the corner  
6 with six condo units, a dry cleaner, and an office. It's  
7 such a helpful comparison to show how the mixed-use model has  
8 failed in the subject property but can be successful in other  
9 larger properties. And this has been mentioned in our  
10 filings that the size of the property is one of the  
11 confluence of factors that makes our property unique.

12                   And this further supports the argument that the  
13 subject property is unique, and this leads directly to the  
14 hardship, for if the applicant could sustain two commercial  
15 uses and six condo units in the subject building, we would  
16 not be in front of you today. It's a completely different  
17 set of circumstances, a unique set of circumstances that has  
18 brought us in front of the Board for this case.

19                   Next slide, please. And then I do want to clarify  
20 some suggestions or assumptions from the OP report, related  
21 to that second floor. It's not quite accurate to say that  
22 the applicant removed multiple units because there was never  
23 any evidence of legal rental for two units. They would've  
24 required a C of O for two units. There's never a   there's  
25 never been a C of O for two units, and there is a history of

1 this space being used as storage for the restaurant uses  
2 below. So, at most, there was some incidental residential  
3 use. The applicants did not remove legal residential units.

4                   And again, not only was this space not up to code  
5 for residential use, the building was simply not safe due to  
6 structural issues. I think OP's report is effectively  
7 suggesting the applicant could have done something to save  
8 on cost by saving some infrastructure. The neglect was  
9 severe. And if OP and the Board would like more info on that  
10 in addition to the testimony and all of the evidence in the  
11 record, we do have a structural engineer report from 2018 and  
12 some photos we could submit for rebuttal evidence.

13                   And I'd also like to note we submitted two  
14 separate estimates for two separate costs, evidencing the  
15 total cost of bringing the building into compliance for  
16 residential use above. One is the cost to convert the  
17 upstairs to residential, and this is where the report  
18 suggests we could have saved on some costs. But the other  
19 cost is to bring the building up to compliance for mixed-use.  
20 And that cost, to make the building code-compliant for both  
21 uses, is in the \$220,000 range. And so, that exists  
22 independent of whether anything was taken out or put back  
23 upstairs.

24                   And then, to take a further step back, this  
25 analysis of costs is tied into the fact that, at most, you

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 would only be able to have two units in this space, and they  
2 would be quite small units, unlike the property two doors  
3 down with six residential units above and commercial units.  
4 And the likelihood of renting the two newly created units  
5 above a restaurant is so unlikely that this type of  
6 renovation is completely infeasible. It would be a better  
7 financial decision to not do anything because who would fund  
8 such a project?

9 And all of this is part of the point that I  
10 apologize. We have some I don't know if you can hear  
11 that. We have some yard work being done.

12 CHAIRPERSON HILL: I can't hear anything.

13 MS. WILSON: Can you hear me?

14 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yeah. I hear you. We can't  
15 hear the yard work.

16 MS. WILSON: Okay. Just me. So all of this is  
17 part of a larger point that this space is too small to  
18 sustain both residential use and restaurant use. Converting  
19 the upstairs to residential use is cost-prohibitive, which  
20 is true regardless of whether some infrastructure was  
21 salvageable. And if the relief were not granted, the option  
22 would be to leave this space as is and eventually close the  
23 restaurant rather than take seats away from and add debt to  
24 an already struggling restaurant.

25 The other by-right or special exception uses are

1 infeasible, similar to the residential use, for the similar  
2 reasons to the residential use, or because this space is not  
3 conducive to that type of use, for example: solar panels.

4                   And the unique hardship fits within the use  
5 variance standard from the Court of Appeals in Palmer. For  
6 the Board to grant use variance relief, it must be shown that  
7 the regulations preclude the use of the property in question  
8 for any purpose for which it is reasonably adapted, i.e., can  
9 the premises be put to any conforming use with a fair and  
10 reasonable return arising out of the ownership thereof?

11                   The issues here run with this building and are  
12 unique to this building, not only this owner. This is a  
13 long-time restaurant use on the first level. There is an  
14 extremely popular restaurant here that can't sustain the use  
15 due to the size of the building. And this would be the case  
16 for any future owner as well, and this is evidenced by the  
17 history of turnover.

18                   The OP report does again mention that if the Board  
19 finds there is a unique hardship, then the third prong can  
20 be met. And that's because the use variance regulations  
21 permit that under certain unique circumstances, a variance  
22 is permissible.

23                   This concludes my presentation, but again, we are  
24 happy to answer any questions about the presentation or  
25 additional information we've submitted to the record. Thank

1 you.

2 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. Okay. Go ahead and  
3 drop that, Mr. Young. Okay. Let me go through a variety of  
4 this.

5 Commissioner, can you hear me?

6 MR. D'ANDREA: Yes, I can.

7 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Commissioner, could you  
8 introduce yourself for the record and please give us your  
9 testimony?

10 MR. D'ANDREA: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Hello.  
11 My name is Frank D'Andrea. I am the commissioner for ANC SMD  
12 6B04 and also the chair of ANC 6B's Planning and Zoning  
13 Committee. My testimony is brief.

14 On February 27th, 2024, the regularly scheduled,  
15 properly noticed meeting, with quorum present, ANC 6B's  
16 Executive Committee voted 6-0-0 to authorize me to provide  
17 this supplemental testimony regarding BZA case 20996. ANC  
18 6B continues to support the applicant's request for a use  
19 variance for the reasons given in our initial letter and ANC  
20 report. We believe that supplemental filings for the  
21 applicant lend further weight to their their and our  
22 arguments.

23 I'll note that the supplemental testimony from the  
24 Office of Planning was posted late, and therefore, ANC 6B was  
25 not afforded adequate time to prepare a response to their

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 assertions and to also make our filing deadline.

2 I want to thank you for your time. And I'd be  
3 happy to answer any questions that the Board might have.

4 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. Mr. Young, is there  
5 anyone here wishing to speak from the community?

6 MR. YOUNG: They just signed up.

7 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. You want to give me  
8 their names, please?

9 MR. YOUNG: It is Ziad Demian and Guy Reinbold.

10 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Mr. Demian, can you  
11 sorry. Go ahead, Ms. Wilson.

12 MS. WILSON: I apologize. Those were two of our  
13 witnesses in case there were questions about the application.  
14 I they're not yeah. I don't think they're planning to  
15 testify in the community portion.

16 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Who were they what were they  
17 going to speak towards?

18 MS. WILSON: So Mr. Reinbold is an expert in  
19 restaurant and hospitality use. And Mr. Demian is an  
20 architect and neighbor, and he worked with the owner to  
21 produce the estimates for the residential renovation and put  
22 them in contact with a contractor and walk the space. So if  
23 there are any questions about either the cost projections or  
24 any questions about the restaurant use or the residential  
25 use, they're available.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yeah. That's great. Okay, Ms.  
2 Wilson. Let's see. So does anybody have any questions for  
3 the applicant or any of the commissioners or the witnesses  
4 here?

5 Sure. Go ahead, Ms. John.

6 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you. So, Ms.  
7 Wilson, please remind me when the property was purchased.  
8 I it's in the record, but I don't remember.

9 MS. WILSON: Spiro Your Honor, I believe it was  
10 2018 it was purchased.

11 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. And when and at  
12 that time, the building was configured for two units  
13 upstairs; they may not have been legal, right? And they  
14 would have been two small units. And there would've been  
15 stairs to the downstairs, separate stairs, right? As I  
16 recall, there are two doors in the front of the building.

17 MS. WILSON: Correct. There was a set of stairs  
18 leading up, and we kept that set of stairs.

19 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay.

20 MS. WILSON: But we just removed the wall, I  
21 believe, separating the stairs from the residential or the  
22 restaurant space.

23 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay.

24 MS. WILSON: As part of yeah, larger okay.

25 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Sure. And this structural

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 evaluation was also done in 2018?

2 MS. WILSON: Correct.

3 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Was that before or after  
4 the property was purchased?

5 MS. WILSON: I believe it was after. I would have  
6 to have Mr. Gioldasis confirm.

7 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay.

8 MS. WILSON: He's he's on, but yes.

9 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: And then, the upstairs  
10 renovation was done after the structural evaluation, right?

11 MS. WILSON: Correct. Yes.

12 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: All right. I don't have  
13 anything else at the moment. Thank you.

14 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Anyone else

15 (Simultaneous speaking.)

16 MEMBER SMITH: wanted to follow up to the same  
17 line of questioning Ms. John stated.

18 I was looking at the pictures of the upper floor  
19 that were requested by us, and it looks like the space had  
20 been renovated as part of the as part of when the  
21 restaurant was renovated. Were there permits received for  
22 that third floor? Because I seem to remember the scope of  
23 work that was discussed with the previous variance was work  
24 would be completed on the ground floor and the basement. So  
25 there was a permit done, received to renovate the upper floor

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 as well?

2 MS. WILSON: Sure. First, I'd like to say a few  
3 words. Not for any specific use because of the state of the  
4 condition of the building, they had to like, they had to  
5 make the second floor safe just so the restaurant space could  
6 open.

7 MEMBER SMITH: It looks like it meets does it  
8 meet the commercial mixed-use building code? It looks like  
9 a very extensive renovation. As far as safe, you put in exit  
10 signs, the sprinkler. It looks to be fairly complete for  
11 occupancy.

12 MS. WILSON: I'll have to have Spiro confirm, but  
13 I think it's just I don't think there's any specific use  
14 because it would've had to been up to residential standards  
15 for residential use, and we didn't apply for a residential  
16 use. So it's not been inspected, and it's not up to code for  
17 residential standards and mixed-use. It was just brought up  
18 to basic safety compliance because the building was falling  
19 down.

20 And that's when I mentioned the structural  
21 engineer's report that I'm happy to submit, but DOB would  
22 never have approved the residential use if the floor above  
23 was in its condition when it was purchased, so it had to have  
24 a base level of safety and compliance. But it is not  
25 currently configured or up to code for residential use.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 MEMBER SMITH: Okay. Thank you. Could you  
2 (Simultaneous speaking.)

3 MEMBER SMITH: Could you confirm if there was a  
4 building permit that was issued for that upper floor and what  
5

6 MS. WILSON: There was a building permit issued  
7 for the upper floor too.

8 MEMBER SMITH: Okay. This this top floor. And  
9 okay. All right. I think it's that suffices. Thank  
10 you.

11 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Anyone else? Sure. Go  
12 ahead, Mr. Blake.

13 MEMBER BLAKE: Sure. Could you explain you  
14 said there was a permit issued? Was it I mean, you can  
15 issue permits for various things individually. What exactly  
16 permits were issued for that? It wasn't for I'm just kind  
17 of curious what it was because I think we had talked about  
18 it in the previous order to kind of limit that third-floor  
19 activity second-floor activity. Could you what types  
20 of permits were issued to for that?

21 MS. WILSON: Spiro, you might be able to answer  
22 this question better than I can. There's no C of O for a use  
23 on that third floor though. So it's not it wouldn't be  
24 we're not allowed to legally use it for anything at this  
25 moment. So I imagine the permits were just related to

1 bringing it up to code for safety. But again, I'm not the  
2 expert on that, so I'll have to defer to either Spiro or  
3 perhaps Mr. Demian can speak to what types of building  
4 permits can be issued without a C of O for that particular  
5 use.

6 MR. DEMIAN: This, as an architect

7 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Could you introduce yourself  
8 for the record, sir?

9 MR. DEMIAN: Yes. This is Ziad Elias Demian. I'm  
10 an architect and a neighbor. Usually, if they're not allowed  
11 to occupy it, the owner is required by law and by code to  
12 rehab the building enough to be safe. So, basically, also,  
13 they need to maintain minimum temperature requirement and  
14 safety, minimum lighting. Even for what we call a cold, dark  
15 shell that is not used at all, they need to bring it up to  
16 level for you have to meet the Green Building Act  
17 requirement anyway: insulation greening, no leakage air  
18 leakage, all of this stuff.

19 So the way I saw it is they they built the  
20 container. It's insulated. It's safe structurally safe,  
21 insulated, but it's it does not have a C of O. That's my  
22 understanding of it, but that's what would be required for  
23 any developer to do with their building. They can't just  
24 leave it unfinished.

25 MEMBER BLAKE: But the question I asked was what

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 permits were issued. I understand we were kind of figuring  
2 out, speculating. What permits were issued? It's like a  
3 straightforward

4 (Simultaneous speaking.)

5 MEMBER SMITH: Can I expand on what Mr. Blake said  
6 and Mr. Demian Demian?

7 MR. DEMIAN: Demian is good, yeah.

8 MEMBER SMITH: Yes. And you said that you're a  
9 neighbor; you're not associated exactly with the applicant?

10 MR. DEMIAN: Well, I'm up on the applicant team  
11 right now. Initially, I was a neighbor supporting the  
12 project, but they solicited my advice to, as an architect,  
13 to be an expert witness and to answer architectural  
14 questions.

15 MEMBER SMITH: Okay. Thank you. But I am  
16 familiar with a little bit of the building code, and your  
17 statement of a shell this is beyond a shell. The all  
18 the fixtures has been have been installed, right down to  
19 electrical fixtures on the floor. It's spaced about five or  
20 six feet are outlets. So it seems to me, this is beyond the  
21 shell, so just you know, just as a follow up for to Mr.  
22 Blake's question. So could you expand on what type of  
23 permits were issued on this floor?

24 MR. DEMIAN: I was not the original architect, so  
25 I don't speak to that.

1 MS. WILSON: I'm

2 MR. DEMIAN: I think the owner can speak to that.

3 MS. WILSON: And I'm on the website for I'm on  
4 DOB's website right now, looking up the permit details here.  
5 And so, there was one building permit issued, and it was for  
6 renovation and cellar addition to an existing two-story, plus  
7 cellar, restaurant. And so, I imagine, and Spiro can  
8 confirm, that the upstairs was part of this building permit  
9 approval. We were just not permitted to get a C of O for  
10 that space, and which is why that space is unoccupied.

11 Is that correct, Spiro?

12 (No audible response.)

13 MS. WILSON: I'm not sure if you're muted or not.  
14 There's also a supplemental electrical permit  
15 issued.

16 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes, it is. You're on mute,  
17 sir.

18 MR. GIOLDASIS: Yes. I can hear you now. Can you  
19 hear me?

20 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes. Could you introduce  
21 yourself for the record, please?

22 MR. GIOLDASIS: Yes. Spiro Gioldasis, the owner  
23 of 106 13.

24 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Could you repeat the question?  
25 Or who had the question?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 MS. WILSON: I was just confirming that as part  
2 of the building permit issued for the restaurant, was this  
3 upstairs space included, except we are, of course, not  
4 allowed to occupy the upstairs space, so the C of O did not  
5 include this upstairs space? Did that did that make  
6 sense? Is that what happened?

7 MR. GIOLDASIS: Yes. That is that is correct.  
8 We had to we had to reinforce the entire building to make  
9 it safe. And as Demian said, it had to meet requirements,  
10 heated space, safety, and everything so it would sell.

11 Now, you said there's light fixtures. There's no  
12 light fixtures. It's all temporary, hanging from the  
13 ceiling.

14 MEMBER SMITH: But it's outlets.

15 MR. GIOLDASIS: Oh, outlets.

16 MR. DEMIAN: I'm actually looking at the picture  
17 of the second floor. I would like to share it somehow if I'm  
18 allowed. There's only ductwork. There's brick wall  
19 exposed brick wall. There's the front facade, and everything  
20 else is just basic. A sprinkler system and no lights. So  
21 I'm happy to share it with, maybe, Alexandra, and she can  
22 share. I can email it to somebody. It doesn't look like  
23 it's finished to be used.

24 MEMBER SMITH: This one is in the record.

25 MS. WILSON: In 117C, yeah. If that's helpful,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 we can pull up the or I'd ask Mr. Young to please pull up  
2 the photos.

3 CHAIRPERSON HILL: In 117C.

4 MR. DEMIAN: Or I can if I'm allowed to share,  
5 I can just pull it up.

6 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yeah, you can't share.

7 MS. WILSON: Yeah, it's just an open open  
8 ceiling, ductwork, sprinklers, and exit signs that I imagine  
9 are required for any space.

10 MR. YOUNG: What was the exhibit number?

11 CHAIRPERSON HILL: 117C as in Charlie. I think  
12 it's the last one.

13 MR. DEMIAN: No. That's the basement.

14 MS. WILSON: Three and four.

15 MR. DEMIAN: Yeah, this is it.

16 MEMBER BLAKE: I have a question along these  
17 lines. What else would have to be done to complete the  
18 renovation for a restaurant on that that were used on that  
19 floor?

20 MS. WILSON: Could Spiro or Ziad speak to that?  
21 Would it be a simple matter of putting tables and chairs and  
22 some restaurant staff space? Would you all be required to  
23 close the ceiling? What's the extent of that?

24 MR. DEMIAN: It depends on the the owner  
25 program. Me the restaurant owner could tend to spend a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 lot of money or a little money. In this case, they would  
2 just have to put tables and chairs and use it. If they would  
3 like to add a bar, then there's a little more cost to it, or  
4 not not sure what the intent of the owner would like to  
5 use, but it's a it won't be anywhere near what you would  
6 have to do to do in residential work.

7 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Did you recognize me, Mr.  
8 Chairman?

9 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yeah, sure. Go ahead, Ms.  
10 John. I'm sorry.

11 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you. Just a  
12 question for the architect. So are these ceilings high  
13 enough to be code-compliant for a residential unit?

14 MR. DEMIAN: The ceiling, if they high enough?

15 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yeah. Is it over seven  
16 feet or whatever the code requires?

17 MR. DEMIAN: It I think, from what I'm seeing,  
18 it's high enough so that you can you can make it  
19 residential.

20 (Simultaneous speaking.)

21 MR. DEMIAN: The way the infrastructure is right  
22 now, it looked like now you have to dodge all the ductwork  
23 and all this stuff. So it can actually be a little bit  
24 complication to actually make it yeah.

25 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yeah. But the original

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 configuration for the two units would've had duct work which  
2 would have had maybe to be upgraded or something like that.  
3 These are like commercial-grade insulations.

4 MR. DEMIAN: I'm not sure I follow the question.  
5 If were you talking about the previous unit?

6 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Let me yeah. Let me  
7 rephrase that. We don't have photographs of what the  
8 upstairs looked at looked like at the time that the  
9 property was purchased. All that's being offered is a  
10 structural report, which we really haven't seen, which I  
11 accept which show that there's some structural damage that  
12 needs to be done. But I was wondering if these this is  
13 commercial grade ductwork, or would a residential unit have  
14 different ductwork than what I'm seeing here?

15 MR. DEMIAN: I mean, it could be used for either.  
16 I think they were these were designed to serve either  
17 residential or commercial.

18 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay.

19 MR. DEMIAN: But it yeah.

20 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you.

21 MR. DEMIAN: Since they are open ceiling right  
22 there, you'd probably have to just just do whatever you  
23 can do to meet the minimum to be temperate environment in  
24 there.

25 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. Thank you.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Anyone else while I have  
2 this slide up?

3 MEMBER BLAKE: Wait. The controls for this unit,  
4 is that is this an independent unit for this floor, or is  
5 it controlled elsewhere part of the restaurant's structure?

6 MR. DEMIAN: That's a question for Spiro. I'm not  
7 aware of the of how they're the system was configured.

8 MS. WILSON: About the the air conditioning,  
9 correct?

10 MR. GIOLDASIS: It's separated. It's all  
11 upstairs.

12 MEMBER BLAKE: It's all it's a single system  
13 for upstairs, independent of that lower level?

14 MR. GIOLDASIS: Separate use for upstairs system.

15 MEMBER SMITH: The air conditioning, the sprinkler  
16 system

17 MR. GIOLDASIS: No, not the sprinkler.

18 MEMBER SMITH: Is the is it is the  
19 electrical separate?

20 MR. GIOLDASIS: No, the electrical is not.

21 MEMBER SMITH: Okay.

22 CHAIRPERSON HILL: I didn't hear you, Mr.  
23 Gioldasis. The AC and heating is separate or is not  
24 separate.

25 MR. GIOLDASIS: It is it is separate.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you.

2 MEMBER SMITH: It's not separately metered? The  
3 water is not separate?

4 MR. GIOLDASIS: No.

5 MEMBER SMITH: The electricity is not separate?

6 MR. GIOLDASIS: No, no.

7 MEMBER SMITH: Okay.

8 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Anyone else?

9 (No audible response.)

10 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Going to do that. I  
11 just wanted to recognize the Office of Planning. The Office  
12 of Planning, Ms. Myers, could you introduce yourself for the  
13 record?

14 MS. MYERS: I'm with the Office of Planning.

15 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.

16 MS. MYERS: Do you want me to speak further, or  
17 did you just want me to just introduce myself?

18 CHAIRPERSON HILL: I just wanted to acknowledge  
19 you, Ms. Myers. And so if they had any questions there for  
20 the Office of Planning. I mean, the Office of Planning  
21 hasn't changed its position, correct, Ms. Myers?

22 MS. MYERS: Correct. We we have the same  
23 position.

24 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. Does anybody  
25 have - oh. Sure. Go ahead, Mr. Blake.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 MEMBER BLAKE: The additional information you  
2 learned in today's discussion and follow-up to the comments  
3 made by the Office of Planning in an earlier it -- that  
4 also -- did you factor that into the -- your thoughts as  
5 well, as of these new revelations today?

6 MS. MYERS: Yeah. It's we were aware that the  
7 upstairs use units were neglected and needed to be improved.  
8 And I believe we said I know, in the most recent report,  
9 that we understand the applicant would need to make  
10 improvements to it in order to meet building code standards.  
11 We did have some questions about did they have to completely  
12 remove them, but we didn't we didn't really dispute that  
13 either way because we we just didn't know.

14 But the the main point of our our argument  
15 is that we did not feel there were sufficient exceptional  
16 situations related to the building or the property that  
17 result in a undue hardship to the owner. You could still do  
18 units up there. It could still be a habitable space up  
19 there. And so, it did not change our position on  
20 recommending denial in this case.

21 MEMBER BLAKE: Thank you.

22 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Let's see. All right.  
23 Anyone else for anybody else? And then I'm going to let Ms.  
24 Wilson have the last word.

25 Okay. Go ahead, Ms. Wilson. Last word?

1 Anything?

2 MS. WILSON: My computer's been

3 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes. We can hear you.

4 MS. WILSON: Okay. Great. Thank you again for  
5 the opportunity to present today and for allowing us the  
6 opportunity to present additional information.

7 This property has a history of failed businesses  
8 and neglect, and without the relief, unfortunately, Pacci's  
9 would add would be the next victim of that list. We  
10 appreciate you all considering all of the information in the  
11 record. And with that, I'll I'll conclude.

12 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thanks, Ms.  
13 Wilson. All right.

14 If my fellow Board members, unless you have any  
15 other questions, I'm going to close the hearing and the  
16 record.

17 (No audible response.)

18 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Going to close the  
19 hearing and the record. Thank you all very much for your  
20 participation today.

21 Okay. Let's see. So so I, in this case, am  
22 going to disagree with the Office of Planning. So I think  
23 that the applicant has made their case, and I'm going to see  
24 if I can convince some of my Board members that they've made  
25 their case, right?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1           I think that the building is unique. I think that  
2 the fact that that third floor would take more cost in order  
3 to convert it into a residential unit, and it's not really  
4 a feasible residential unit, in my opinion, as well as the  
5 other items that the applicant has put forward in terms of  
6 a confluence of factors. I think that those things not being  
7 separately metered, that's also something that I would agree  
8 with.

9           I think that, you know, it       I guess, you know,  
10 the track record of that building not being able to succeed  
11 as a restaurant, I mean, you know, or a commercial space, I  
12 think that that also does indicate some uniqueness to this  
13 situation    or sorry    to the condition.

14           I guess, the comparison with the other unit at the  
15 end of the block and how it's a much larger mixed-use, in  
16 order to have the residential units on there might, again,  
17 add to the uniqueness of this particular property. I think  
18 that that    those    some of those criteria that I mentioned  
19 do lend to the property owner of the building having issues  
20 and having a practical difficulty.

21           I think that the easiest argument       and I'll  
22 continue to hope that some of my Board members can help me  
23 make my argument, or I will continue to try    is that the  
24 third prong, the community       you know, and it being  
25 detrimental to the zone plan I don't think is correct.

1           I think that, and I might not be articulating this  
2 as well as possible, but I think that the fact that, like,  
3 we listen to the ANCs and are supposed       not supposed  
4 we're supposed to give great weight to the ANCs. The ANCs,  
5 I think, actually took the time to give their analysis to the  
6 criteria of the regulations and not just we want a good  
7 restaurant. And so, they took time.

8           The community       there is a tremendous amount of  
9 outreach to the community       or from the community that this  
10 location has had difficulty with the use. This location has  
11 had difficulty with the use. And that we have a letter from  
12 the council member from that Ward also speaking to the  
13 regulations and not just that they would like this particular  
14 business to stay there. I'm going to think a little bit  
15 harder about some of my arguments as I hear from my fellow  
16 Board members. Who would like to go next?

17           VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. I'll try.

18           CHAIRPERSON HILL: There you go, Vice Chair John.

19           VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: So I'm going to give great  
20 weight to the Office of Planning's report. Now, I    I don't  
21 know if this is fixed in stone, but I've really struggled  
22 with this application. It seems to be a great restaurant,  
23 and the community is in support. And I would love to go to  
24 lunch or dinner there, but at the end of the day, we have to  
25 look to see how the application complies with the criteria

1 for relief.

2                   And it seems to me that the hardship here, if  
3 there's one, is self-created, that the applicant bought the  
4 property for the purpose of it seems to me; I don't know.  
5 That's what I get from form the testimony and the record  
6 with the purpose of building of operating a restaurant,  
7 which has done well and needs more space. And so, the  
8 applicant is now seeking to expand to the second floor.

9                   There is only a brief time when that second floor  
10 was used for commercial purposes, and that was in June of  
11 1982. The rest of the time it was either not used or used  
12 as an apartment for the original owner of the property.

13                   What's missing for me is what was the condition,  
14 in the record, of that upstairs, why it could not be brought  
15 up to code and operated as a residential unit for one or two  
16 units. It was configured as a residential unit with two  
17 doors, and we see that a lot at the Board and separate  
18 stairs. And there's certain things that have to be changed  
19 to make it, you know, compliant for a residence, and we don't  
20 have that information in the record. We have information  
21 about what it would cost now after the changes were made.

22                   And looking at the photographs, it's it's  
23 renovated for a non-residential use is, I think, everyone  
24 agrees. So in terms of the exceptional hardship or or  
25 exceptional condition, I can't get there.

1           I appreciate Ms. Wilson's photograph of the store  
2 at the corner, the corner store with the six units above.  
3 And that doesn't help this case because it showed that  
4 that there is residential use that can be made above an  
5 existing commercial use. That's how I look at that  
6 photograph.

7           So I will stop rambling for now. As I said, this  
8 is a very difficult case. We see these from time to time,  
9 and it's always a struggle. So I would like to hear what the  
10 rest of the Board says.

11           MEMBER SMITH: I guess I'll go next. I have  
12 struggled with this case as I've struggled with the previous  
13 variance request. But based on the information that was  
14 presented in the record and the testimony provided by the  
15 applicant and the Office of Planning, I give great weight to  
16 OP's staff report on this particular case for the exact same  
17 reasons Ms. John is always so so much more articulate  
18 than me. I you know, I probably should've went to law  
19 school probably. I would've been trained better with public  
20 speaking. But I agree with her assessment of the exceptional  
21 situation.

22           The exceptional situation that was presented to  
23 us was predicated on this being a mixed-use building or  
24 this being a very a small building and residential would  
25 not work on the upper floor of this of the third the

1 upper floor in this building. To me, that's a very extremely  
2 weak argument and in not only the District of Columbia but  
3 across the country because there are many buildings of this  
4 particular size and of this particular nature, different  
5 that has different uses on multiple floors of a building of  
6 this particular size.

7                   And matter of fact, all over Capitol Hill. There  
8 are a number of    of pocket    of buildings that are    they  
9 may be non-conforming because they may be some    this    the  
10 ground floor space has been continuously occupied with some  
11 type of commercial use. But there was some type of    there  
12 is and was some type of residential use that is above these  
13 buildings.

14                   And as Ms. John stated, I don't think that the  
15 applicant advanced their argument    her argument by showing  
16 or using an example of a mixed-use building. While slightly  
17 larger with an additional floor, it does show that this  
18 particular type of arrangement, use    mixed-use arrangement  
19 does work and has worked. And it has historically worked  
20 within this    within this particular building.

21                   I do agree that, based on the information within  
22 the record, and note specifically that exhibit that shows the  
23 picture, that the request before us is more of an undue  
24 hardship that    a self-imposed hardship because there was  
25 a renovation that was completed. And it seems to me that

1 that renovation the renovation that was done, whether it's  
2 you know, it can be you know, they can go do the the  
3 Department of Buildings and and pull a C of O or not, the  
4 renovation that was completed was with the intent for this  
5 particular space to be used as non-residential use.

6 It is not it seems that it's an open question  
7 of whether there's a separate the ductwork is separate.  
8 The AC system, the HVAC system is separate. We are the  
9 the property owner is on the record that the electrical  
10 system is fully tied together. The water system is fully  
11 tied together. And that was fully completed at least the  
12 electrical because we can see that was fully completed as  
13 part of the the renovation of this building with no  
14 anticipation for it to remain a conforming use, which would  
15 be residential.

16 I do also want to bring up a point that was raised  
17 by the Office of Planning and that I had raised periodically  
18 regarding non-conforming uses. It is the intent of the  
19 Zoning Ordinance for non-conforming uses to go away. And for  
20 it to remain, it must you must show beyond beyond  
21 reasonable doubt, ironclad case, to me, that the zoning  
22 regulations for this particular property are in error. I  
23 don't think they were in error. I don't think were in error  
24 previously when we heard the previous variance.

25 This the preponderance of uses here, within

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 this area, are residential. And it was the intent of the  
2 Zoning the intent of Zoning Ordinance for these  
3 non-conforming uses to go away. And for me, I am  
4 uncomfortable with expanding a non-conforming use even  
5 further, when I do believe that there could've been reason  
6 for this to remain residential. This is entirely  
7 self-imposed. So with that, I would recommend denial of the  
8 request at bear.

9 CHAIRPERSON HILL: You're the only one left, Mr.  
10 Blake.

11 MEMBER BLAKE: This situation is very challenging  
12 because this is clearly what the people in the community want  
13 is a restaurant in their neighborhood. And this is a  
14 successful restaurant. And because the people want it so  
15 much, it just -- it's very difficult as we go through the  
16 regulations to determine how to get there.

17 I do believe that the comments that you made, Mr.  
18 Chairman, did meet the practical difficulty standard, but not  
19 the undue hardship standard as you described it in your  
20 discussion. When Vice Chair John outlined her position, I  
21 think, too, it did speak to the difficulty in making this  
22 reach the standard for an undue hardship, likewise, the  
23 as well as being the a unique circumstance and as Mr.  
24 Smith also pointed that out.

25 I think that, you know, I I really look at

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 this, and I think about the fact that this restaurant has  
2 failed because it's not a restaurant building. It's a  
3 residential building that we're somehow trying to make fit  
4 a commercial space. So everything every every time I  
5 hear it didn't work, it's because it wasn't supposed to work.  
6 And it when you when I hear, you know, it's not  
7 configured properly, because it wasn't configured for this.  
8 And so, we're trying to make this work because people really  
9 want it in the community, but the reality of it is is this  
10 really wasn't designed for that purpose.

11 We look back in the history, and we see that  
12 you know, I I agree with the argument that was made about,  
13 you know, was this commercial space. It was built as a  
14 single unit. It was used and once they started using it  
15 as a commercial space, it made it more difficult to have the  
16 upper level used as a residential space. Now, granted, we  
17 could have somebody who says, look, I'm going to have my  
18 I'm going to, you know, make up a camp-like structure up on  
19 the second floor, so I could sleep there sometimes when I'm  
20 working late, and that happens.

21 But the building has changed its usefulness as a  
22 pure residential structure as they started using it for  
23 as we used the first floor for the deli and all the other  
24 things, and then as we used the lower floor. So its  
25 usefulness changed. And it's also a very small building.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 So and it was constructed as a single unit. So for those  
2 reasons, I think it it's interesting.

3 But trying to do this, the you go back to the  
4 applicant purchase of this building. It wasn't necessarily  
5 perfect for it then, and but we've tried to make it work.  
6 And if you go back to Dwyer v. D.C. BZA, the expectation was  
7 that, you know, maybe we could make this thing bigger and  
8 better and work out. But that's not a good reason for us to  
9 say that this works, and it meets the criteria because I  
10 don't necessarily think it does.

11 But this is very challenging. So I'm going  
12 kind of going back and forth because I see elements at which  
13 this should be okay, but it does run aground and afoul with  
14 most of the elements here. We've seen cases cited, you know,  
15 in various places, even by one of our councilmen, but there's  
16 some elements of, you know, detrimental reliance that support  
17 those cases. These they all of these are very  
18 different. So this case, to me, gives me is very  
19 challenging.

20 So I am definitely in agreement with the Office  
21 of Planning and the other Board Board Member Smith and  
22 Vice Chair John that this does not meet the criteria for  
23 approval, even though it is what we want to do, the community  
24 wants done. And it's what they it just it's struggling  
25 to make the meet the criteria. So I I would be voting

1 against the application.

2 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thanks. So I don't know  
3 what you all might or might not be willing to do, right?  
4 Insofar as I've got one more well, okay. Let me see.

5 I've worked with all of you guys for years, and  
6 I appreciate your analysis. And at the beginning of each  
7 thing that you said was that you were struggling with this,  
8 right? So if we put it might not change you all's mind  
9 if we put this off another week and think about it, okay?  
10 And then come back for decision. I, at least, got one shake  
11 of the head yes. And I know I got one shake of the head no.  
12 I know where my no's are, Mr. Smith. And so, I'm just  
13 teasing.

14 And so, I guess, I will make a statement. And  
15 this is where I wish the Zoning Commission had us have a  
16 little bit more flexibility. I mean, to me, it seems like  
17 the Board is here for also the grey areas, right? That's  
18 why, you know, if we if everything is black and white,  
19 then we can just check off all the boxes, and the  
20 applications can just move through the way they move through,  
21 right? It's the grey that comes into where we believe an  
22 argument one way or the other.

23 And I am not trying to change the opinion that's  
24 I'm really not. I'm really not trying to change the  
25 opinion of people. I'm just trying to understand that the

1 applicant and the attorneys have put forward an argument that  
2 could be understood as being accurate, right? Sorry.  
3 They're putting forward their argument.

4                   And I know that the Office of Planning is  
5 listening to me, and even OZLD is listening to me. I wish  
6 I was a better articulator at times about an argument. And  
7 I might try this week to wrap my head about a better argument  
8 if you all would be willing to put this off one week just for  
9 a decision. I don't necessarily think the thing's going to  
10 change.

11                   So just to let the applicant know and the  
12 community know, I don't necessarily think it's going to  
13 change. But if you all would be willing to put it off for  
14 one week, at least then I could get Commissioner Stidham's  
15 vote. And then, at least, I can think about whether I can  
16 make a better argument. I might not be able to make a better  
17 argument. Would you all mind if we put this off one week?

18                   VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: No.

19                   MEMBER BLAKE: No.

20                   MEMBER SMITH: I'm good on that.

21                   CHAIRPERSON HILL: So I would like to clarify for  
22 the audience, I don't know if this is going to change at all  
23 because I'm it doesn't seem like this I I would  
24 it seems as though the Board is understanding that this  
25 argument is not enough to meet the criteria for us to grant

1 this relief. Nonetheless, I appreciate the I appreciate  
2 the willingness of my colleagues to put this off for a week.  
3 Okay. All right. I'm going to put this off for a week.  
4 So, Mr. Moy, we'll come back for a decision next  
5 week.

6 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Mr. Chairman  
7 (Simultaneous speaking.)

8 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: One thing. We're not  
9 requesting anything for the record. We're going to disregard  
10 anything that comes in. This is a very full record. It's  
11 already difficult. And I don't know what anybody else can  
12 say at this point.

13 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Nope. The record is closed.  
14 Yeah, the record is closed, Mr. Moy.

15 MR. MOY: Yes. The record is closed, and you are  
16 going to, of course, allow the opportunity for Zoning  
17 Commissioner Stidham to weigh in.

18 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yeah. Okay. What's next week?  
19 Next week is

20 MR. MOY: March 15th.

21 CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right. We'll do decision  
22 3/15.

23 MR. MOY: 3/13. 3/13.

24 CHAIRPERSON HILL: 3/13. 3/13. Okay. Great.  
25 Okay. So, you guys, let's take lunch, okay? Is one is

1 1:40 okay?

2 (No audible response.)

3 CHAIRPERSON HILL: We'll try for 1:40 and see what  
4 happens.

5 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay.

6 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. Let's  
7 let's do 1:45. Is 1:45 better?

8 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Well, I I have an  
9 appointment, Mr. Chairman. I may miss a case after lunch.

10 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. I'll call you, Vice  
11 Chair John.

12 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you. Thank you.

13 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you. All right.  
14 We'll try, let's try 1:40 then. Okay. We'll come back at  
15 1:40. Thank you.

16 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the  
17 record at 1:03 p.m. and resumed at 1:43 p.m.)

18 MR. MOY: I did hear you.

19 CHAIRPERSON HILL: I think, I mentioned I wanted  
20 to push back 20997 to the end of the day.

21 MR. MOY: Yes, sir.

22 CHAIRPERSON HILL: So let's go ahead. I don't  
23 know what you have next because I didn't see the line up.

24 MR. MOY: I can tell you.

25 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 MR. MOY: That's 21054 of Marie.

2 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Okay, then you may call  
3 it.

4 MR. MOY: Okay, after a quick lunch recess, the  
5 Board has returned to its public hearing session. The time  
6 is at 1:44 p.m., at or about 1:44 p.m. And the next case  
7 before the Board is Application No. 21054 of Marie Joelle-  
8 Voil, I'm going to spell that, J-O-E-L-L-E dash V-O-I-L-E.

9 This is an application for special exceptions  
10 pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 9, Section 901.2 under  
11 Subtitle D, Section 5201 from rear yard requirements.  
12 Subtitle D, Section 207.1 which would allow an accessory  
13 structure in a required rear yard and accessory building  
14 location requirements Subtitle D, Section 1105.2.

15 And the variance pursuant to Subtitle X, Section  
16 1002 from accessory building requirements of Subtitle D,  
17 Section 1105.6 permanently located in the R-3/GT zone at 1921  
18 37th Street Northwest Square 1296 Lot 356.

19 And only ones in the Panel, Mr. Chairman, is the  
20 applicant's team. Thank you.

21 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, if the applicant can hear  
22 me, if they could please introduce themselves for the record.  
23 Can the applicant hear me? Oh, great. Could you introduce  
24 yourself for the record?

25 MS. VOIL: Yes. I am Marie-Joelle Voil. I bought

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 -- thank you first for the Board to consider my case. And  
2 to listen to what I have to say. So --

3 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Ms. Joelle Voil, Ms. Joelle  
4 Voil, are you able to use your camera?

5 MS. VOIL: Is it okay?

6 CHAIRPERSON HILL: It's not working yet.

7 MS. VOIL: -- I have --

8 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Oh, there we go. There we go.  
9 Okay great.

10 MS. VOIL: Okay.

11 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Go ahead. Ms., could  
12 you say your name please again?

13 MS. VOIL: Yes. Marie-Joelle first name and last  
14 name Voil, V-O-I-L.

15 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Ms. Voil, is it just you  
16 that's here today?

17 MS. VOIL: No, on my architect is here too. Mr.  
18 Roberto Ramirez.

19 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Do you see the architect, Mr.  
20 Young?

21 MR. YOUNG: I do not see him yet. Staff said they  
22 talked to him and said he should be getting on shortly.

23 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.

24 MS. VOIL: Maybe I should give him a call. No?

25 CHAIRPERSON HILL: It's possible. Ms. Voil, let

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 me do this. Why don't, we're going -- we'll do the next case  
2 and bring yours back.

3 MS. VOIL: Okay. Okay.

4 CHAIRPERSON HILL: We'll wait for the architect.

5 MS. VOIL: Okay. Thank you so much.

6 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure. Mr. Moy, can we do that?

7 MR. MOY: Yes, we -- staff can do whatever you  
8 want, Mr. Chairman, you're the Chair.

9 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes, I wish. If that were the  
10 case, then I would get to decide.

11 MR. MOY: Okay, sir. So if staff can line up the  
12 next group of Panelists to Application No. 21059 of 44th  
13 Street LLC. This is a self-certified application for area  
14 variance pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 1002 from lot  
15 dimension requirements Subtitle D, Section 202.1 property  
16 located in the R2 zone at 1053 48th Street Northeast Square,  
17 5153 Lot 801.

18 And let me check one other thing. And again, we  
19 have the applicant's team. Thank you, sir.

20 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Mr. Moy. If the  
21 applicant can hear me, if they could please introduce  
22 themselves for the record. Or wait a minute, they're coming  
23 on perhaps.

24 MR. MOY: Yes, just a second, Mr. Chairman. I've  
25 got to get a hold of the staff to bring in the applicant.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure, no problem.

2 MR. MOY: He's waiting to be called into the  
3 Panel.

4 MR. YOUNG: Who was it? All I have on my list is  
5 Dave Bloom.

6 MR. MOY: Marty Sullivan. Marty Sullivan, Paul.  
7 Oh, perfect.

8 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Sullivan, can you hear us?  
9 Great. Could you introduce --

10 MR. SULLIVAN: Hi, yes. I'm sorry. That may have  
11 been my fault. I may not have, I thought I had signed up to  
12 testify. Maybe I didn't. I just did now, but so that's  
13 probably why I wasn't in there. Sorry about that, Mr. Young.

14 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Could you introduce yourself  
15 for the record, Mr. Sullivan?

16 MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you, Marty Sullivan with  
17 Sullivan and Barros on behalf of the applicant.

18 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great. Okay, Mr.  
19 Sullivan, if you want to go ahead and walk us through your  
20 client's application and why you believe they're meeting the  
21 criteria for us to grant the relief requested.

22 I'm going to put 15 minutes on the clock so I know  
23 where we are. And you can begin whenever you like.

24 MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you. If Mr. Young could  
25 please load the presentation. And also, the architect is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 with us, but he's available for questions. I don't -- I  
2 think I can handle the presentation by myself.

3 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.

4 MR. SULLIVAN: This is 1053 48th Street Northeast.  
5 Next slide please. So the property is in the R2 zone. It's  
6 a vacant lot. The applicant is proposing to construct a new  
7 semi-detached two-story single family dwelling.

8 But in order to construct the building, the  
9 existing tax lot must be converted to a record lot. So new  
10 record lots for semi-detached buildings require 30 feet of  
11 lot width and 3,000 square feet of land area.

12 The tax lot has 23 feet of lot width and 2,674  
13 square feet of land area. The proposed building itself will  
14 meet all development standards with some granted minor  
15 deviations for the side yard which is 7.75 feet instead of  
16 8.

17 And without this relief, the applicant cannot  
18 construct anything on the vacant lot. So we're seeking area  
19 variance relief from the lot width and lot area dimensions  
20 for a new record lot for this lot. Next slide please.

21 The Office of Planning recommends approval ANC7C  
22 voted in support of the application. Their letter was  
23 submitted just this morning. And we've also met with  
24 Deanwood Citizens Association and DDOT has no objection.

25 Next slide please. So this is, you're looking at

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 the lot in between the white house on the right and the  
2 building on the left. Next slide. This is the plat. The  
3 applicants actually significantly underbuilding what they  
4 could build.

5 They just to fit in with the area they're building  
6 two stories. It's about 27 percent lot occupancy I think.  
7 A 48-foot rear yard and it's a semi-detached zone so they're  
8 straddling the north lot line which is adjacent to a side  
9 yard of a building to the north.

10 Next slide please. So there's at least about  
11 eight or ten feet of the side yard to the north of that.  
12 Next slide. Next slide. Next slide. Next slide. Sorry,  
13 I have too many engineering plans in here. This is the floor  
14 plan for the building.

15 It's a three bedroom, two-story building. No  
16 basement either. Next slide please. And this is the front  
17 elevation. The side elevation. The side elevation is on  
18 this side straddling the lot line. Next slide please.

19 And next slide please. So I'm going to go to the  
20 next slide first please before we get back to this. So when  
21 these lots were originally established around 1908 is when  
22 this plat was from, the entire block was made up of 25 foot  
23 wide lots.

24 Our lot is on the left side of the two lots you  
25 see in square 5153. It's about three or four lots down. It

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 starts at lot 24 then goes 23, 22, 21. We're lot 22. The  
2 lot to the south of us is lot 21. So next slide please.

3 Now this diagram explains what happens. At some  
4 point long ago the owner of record lot 22 conveyed a two foot  
5 wide strip along it's south property line to the owner of  
6 record lot 21. At that point, the lot to the south became  
7 a tax lot.

8 The lot to the north became a tax lot. The north  
9 lot is 23 feet wide. The south lot is 27 feet wide. But it  
10 effectively obstructed the record lot situation in that case  
11 which still exists so there are still record lots there, but  
12 the record lots are 25 feet wide as originally established.

13 The tax lots have different widths. So the owner  
14 of tax, of this tax lot, the applicant in this case, does not  
15 own the entire record lot and therefore it can't get a  
16 building permit for that record lot. So it needs to plat  
17 lot, the 23-foot wide lot as a record lot.

18 In doing so, in granting the variance, the Board  
19 isn't giving anybody the ability to do more homes than were  
20 originally contemplated for this. It's essentially just  
21 changing the yards from the two subject lots.

22 And without the relief, the applicant can't build  
23 on it. So what I've measured here is just measurements to  
24 show the lot width on the left of the two record lots, 22 and  
25 21, the 25 feet wide.

1                   And then on the right side of this it shows the  
2 23 foot dimension and the 27 foot dimension of the actual tax  
3 lots which represent the ownership interest in these lots.  
4 The applicant owns the smaller lot of these two. Next slide  
5 please.

6                   Or, I'm sorry, previous slide to this one. And  
7 one slide previous to this please. So the extraordinary  
8 condition affecting the property and the practical difficulty  
9 is the vacant status of the lot and the tax lot status.

10                  It's unbuildable without being a record lot. And  
11 because of the history of this property, the tax lot has an  
12 existing underlying record lot, but that doesn't line up with  
13 the tax lot.

14                  So the applicant can't utilize the record lot  
15 because of the two feet of the underlying record lot being  
16 owned by the neighbor. The applicant hasn't been able to  
17 purchase that land without creating nonconformities with that  
18 neighbor's side yard and also without considerable expense.

19                  So without relief, the applicant cannot obtain a  
20 record lot and cannot build anything on this property. Next  
21 slide please. Next slide. Next slide please. Here's the  
22 detail of those extraordinary conditions.

23                  I went into most of this already. So I don't want  
24 to repeat myself. I, just to note again, if improving the  
25 variance doesn't create a new lot out of thin air, doesn't

1 allow for development beyond what was always intended for  
2 these two lots just that instead of one home on each of the  
3 two 25 foot wide lots there's now a home on a 23 foot lot and  
4 a home on a 27 foot wide lot.

5                   And our side yard is on the space facing the  
6 larger lot. So theoretically the south owner could sell back  
7 the two feet and then we would have a buildable lot. Now  
8 even though it's undersized, it would be buildable because  
9 it still is a record lot.

10                  And if that happened, the ownership interest would  
11 line up with the record lot. But that hasn't, that's not  
12 possible. Haven't been able to do that. So the practical  
13 difficulty exists. Next slide please.

14                  There's no substantial detriment to the public  
15 good or impairment of the zone plan. The applicant is  
16 requesting relief based on the unique configuration of the  
17 lot and the conditions in the area.

18                  There's a mix of lot sizes in the area, but most  
19 of them are 25 feet wide. The lot already exists as a tax  
20 lot and the degree of relief is not significant, seven feet  
21 of width and again, all the development standards are being  
22 met and being significantly underbuilt.

23                  They are with the two stories, no basement, 27  
24 percent lot occupancy and a 48 foot rear yard. We do have  
25 a parking space as well. Next slide please. And that's it.

1 So if the Board has any questions for myself or Mr. Bloom,  
2 the architect. Thank you.

3 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, before I turn to my  
4 Board, may I hear from the Office of Planning?

5 MS. THOMAS: Yes. Good afternoon, Mr. Chair,  
6 members of the Board. Karen Thomas with the Office of  
7 Planning. And as explained by Mr. Sullivan, the Office of  
8 Planning concurs that the basically the lot's history and the  
9 inability to create increase this lot size creates a  
10 practical difficulty.

11 It is an exceptional situation rather than creates  
12 a practical difficulty in developing the lot. So without  
13 being able to convert to a record lot from the tax lot  
14 status, the applicant will not be able or anybody, or the  
15 owner would not be able to build on this lot.

16 So with that, we will rest on the record of our  
17 report and I will be happy to take any questions. Thank you.

18 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Ms. Thomas. Does  
19 the Board have any questions for the Office of Planning or  
20 the applicant? Go ahead Commissioner, I mean yes, Dr.  
21 Imamura.

22 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: No questions. Just a  
23 comment for Mr. Sullivan. I know he said there are too many  
24 engineering plans. I like to think there are architectural  
25 plans and you can never have too many, Mr. Sullivan. But

1 thank you very much.

2 MR. SULLIVAN: Noted. Thank you.

3 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Dr. Imamura. Anyone  
4 else for questions or comments? All right. Mr. Young, does  
5 anyone here wish to speak? Mr. Sullivan, anything you would  
6 like to add at the end?

7 MR. SULLIVAN: No, thank you.

8 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right, go ahead and  
9 close the hearing and the record. Thank you. Okay, I think  
10 this one is actually relatively straightforward. I would  
11 love to have understood the story as to those two feet as to  
12 why the guy, I mean was just like his rose bed or her rose  
13 bed or something was like, you know, they wanted the two  
14 feet.

15 So I can understand the explanation and the  
16 reasoning that the applicant is putting forward as well as  
17 that of the Office of Planning as well as giving great way  
18 to the ANC and I will be voting in favor of this application.

19 Mr. Smith?

20 MEMBER SMITH: I agree with your assessment of  
21 this particular case, Chairman Hill, and I will rest on your  
22 comments and will support the application as well.

23 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. Mr. Blake?

24 MEMBER BLAKE: As for the application, I will be  
25 voting in favor of it.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. Dr. Imamura?

2 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Likewise, Mr. Chairman.

3 I'm prepared to vote in support and agree with your summary.

4 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. Vice Chair John?

5 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: I have nothing to add and  
6 I am in support of the application.

7 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great. Thank you. I'll make  
8 a motion to approve the Application No. 21059 as captioned  
9 read by the Secretary and ask for a second. Ms. John?

10 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Second.

11 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Motion made and seconded. Mr.  
12 Moy, will you take a roll call please?

13 MR. MOY: Thank you, sir. When I call your name,  
14 if you'll please respond to the motion made by Chairman Hill  
15 to approve the application for the relief requested, the  
16 motion to approve was second by Vice Chair John. Zoning  
17 Commissioner Dr. Imamura?

18 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

19 MR. MOY: Mr. Smith?

20 MEMBER SMITH: Yes.

21 MR. MOY: Mr. Blake?

22 MEMBER BLAKE: Yes.

23 MR. MOY: Vice Chair John?

24 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yes.

25 MR. MOY: Chairman Hill?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.

2 MR. MOY: Staff would record the vote as five to  
3 zero to zero and this is on the motion made by Chairman Hill  
4 to approve the application. The motion to approve was seconded  
5 by Vice Chair John who also voted to approve the application  
6 as well as approval from Zoning Commissioner Dr. Imamura, Mr.  
7 Smith, Mr. Blake and again, Vice Chair John, and Chairman  
8 Hill.

9 Motion carries, sir, on the vote of five to zero  
10 to zero.

11 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Mr. Moy. Do you  
12 want to call back the case? Do we have the architect on that  
13 one now?

14 MR. MOY: Oh, okay, he's just entered the room.

15 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great. Then do you want  
16 to go ahead and call it once again please?

17 MR. MOY: Yes, I will. Thank you. One second.  
18 Okay, so once again, for clarity in the transcript, this is  
19 Application No. 21054 of Marie-Joelle Voil. This is for  
20 special exceptions pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 901.2  
21 under Subtitle D, Section 5201 from rear yard requirement,  
22 Subtitle D, Section 207.1 to allow an accessory structure in  
23 a required rear yard, assessor building location requirement  
24 Subtitle D, Section 1105.2.

25 And a variance pursuant to Subtitle X, Section

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 1002 from accessory building requirement Subtitle D, Section  
2 1105.6 property in the R-3/GT zone at 1921 37th Street  
3 Northwest Square, 9th Square 1296 Lot 356. And once again,  
4 it's the applicant and her architect. Thank you, sir.

5 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, thank you. Could the  
6 applicant again introduce themselves for the record? You're  
7 on mute. There you go.

8 MS. VOIL: Okay. Sorry, my name is Marie-Joelle  
9 Voil. And I am living at 1921 37th Street Northwest.

10 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, Ms. Voil, is your  
11 architect here? Mr. Ramirez, can you hear me?

12 MR. RAMIREZ: Yes, I can hear you.

13 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Could you introduce yourself  
14 for the record please, sir?

15 MR. RAMIREZ: First name Roberto, last name  
16 Ramirez.

17 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great. Mr. Ramirez, are you  
18 going to be doing the presentation for us?

19 MR. RAMIREZ: I will.

20 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Can you use your camera?  
21 It's okay if you can't, just curious.

22 MR. RAMIREZ: Yes, hold on.

23 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure.

24 MR. RAMIREZ: I'm having a hard time with, there  
25 you go.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.

2 MR. RAMIREZ: Can you see me?

3 MS. VOIL: No.

4 CHAIRPERSON HILL: No, but that's all right, Mr.  
5 Ramirez. Why don't you go ahead and walk us through your  
6 client's application and why you believe they're meeting the  
7 criteria for us to grant the relief requested?

8 I'm going to put 15 minutes on the clock and you  
9 can begin whenever you like.

10 MR. RAMIREZ: Okay, would you be able to show the  
11 drawings that were submitted or --

12 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure. Do you know which  
13 exhibit it might be? Or that you want us to look at?

14 MR. RAMIREZ: Right, the plans and elevations we  
15 can start with.

16 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, do you know which  
17 exhibit? Let me just look here.

18 MR. RAMIREZ: Oh, I would have to look it up.

19 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes, that's all right. I'm  
20 also -- maybe Mr. Young can take a guess. I'm pulling it up  
21 right now.

22 MR. YOUNG: 18.

23 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Let's go ahead and pull that  
24 up then please. All right, I see it.

25 MR. RAMIREZ: Yes.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1                   MR. MOY: There's a brief pause. I was just  
2 notified that the, that the Commissioner Putta from ANC2E has  
3 made a filing in the case record. If you will allow it into  
4 the record, then you could view it.

5                   CHAIRPERSON HILL: Oh, yes, please. Thank you.

6                   MR. YOUNG: The Commissioner is also on.

7                   CHAIRPERSON HILL: Oh, great. Commissioner Putta,  
8 can you hear me? Commissioner Putta, can you hear me?

9                   MR. PUTTA: Yes, I can. Yes, I can. Hi. How are  
10 you?

11                   CHAIRPERSON HILL: Good Commissioner, doing well.  
12 Would you like to introduce yourself for the record?

13                   MR. PUTTA: Oh, thank you. Thank you, Chair Hill.  
14 Hi. I will put myself on camera in a few minutes, but for  
15 now, thank you for having me. Sorry I didn't sign up in  
16 advance.

17                   We have a new Executive Director for our ANC and  
18 our meeting was held just less than 36 hours ago. But we did  
19 unanimously support this project. My name is Kishan Putta.  
20 I am the Commissioner for this District ANC2B01. Thank you.

21                   CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great. Great, Commissioner.  
22 Thank you for joining us today. Let's see. Okay, Mr.  
23 Ramirez, you can go ahead and begin.

24                   MR. RAMIREZ: Okay, so were we able to pinpoint  
25 to the exhibit that has the --

1 CHAIRPERSON HILL: It was Exhibit 13 I think.

2 MR. RAMIREZ: Okay.

3 MR. YOUNG: 18.

4 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Oh, 18, 18. Do you see it in  
5 front of you?

6 MR. RAMIREZ: Yes, hold on. I can, yes. Okay,  
7 sorry about that. Okay, so that's the cover sheet. That  
8 just gives you a breakdown of the zoning information that we  
9 submitted which pretty much tells you the square footage of  
10 the rebuild garage.

11 And the rear lot setback encroachment. But what  
12 I wanted to get to is if you could switch to the next page,  
13 so basically this is an existing structure that it's under,  
14 you know, over the years it just has been deteriorating and  
15 so Marie has elected to rebuild it.

16 And in the process, if you can switch to the next  
17 slide, then you can see the size of it in elevation. The  
18 next slide. That's pretty standard. It's just a little shed  
19 garage and what we're proposing if you go back to the next  
20 slide, is a much-improved esthetically garage with a new  
21 overhead door, new entry and small window looking towards the  
22 rear wall.

23 And a new set of stairs that would take you up to  
24 the roof. If you could show the next slide, and it would be  
25 a flat roof with some railing. Right? Which Ms., which

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 Marie is proposing to utilize as an area -- basically she  
2 wants to maximize her rear yard.

3 As you can see, it's very narrow. The path to get  
4 to the house is about seven feet from the alley so there is  
5 no, you know, real room to do any kind of planting, gardening  
6 on the side here along the adjacent neighbor. And I  
7 apologize about the two pets.

8 CHAIRPERSON HILL: No, you're good.

9 MR. RAMIREZ: Timing.

10 CHAIRPERSON HILL: We can hear you.

11 MR. RAMIREZ: So you know, so that's kind of what  
12 the layout of the rear yard, the garage and the alley is here  
13 and what she's proposing is to, you know, capture some of the  
14 outer space for her use.

15 She's an older person who doesn't have the funds  
16 to do a, you know, another fixation of the house and she can  
17 put a roof, I mean a deck on top of the roof so being that  
18 she's going out of her way to improve the aesthetics of the  
19 alley by putting in a new garage, she wants to, you know,  
20 take advantage of the outdoor space that the roof provides  
21 and have that be kind of a retreat for her.

22 Somewhere where she could, you know, put up a  
23 chair, read in the afternoons on a nice day. Have some  
24 planters decorated with different type of flowers so that's  
25 just, it would bring esthetics and color and just overall

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 beauty I think to this alley that's just a pretty typical  
2 alley for a, you know, D.C. neighborhood.

3 You know, so that's kind of where, you know, we  
4 are with this. I realize that Office of Planning didn't  
5 really appreciate her I guess sentimental value of, you know,  
6 her property and what she wanted to do with the space.

7 I just wanted to also emphasize for the Board that  
8 there is precedence for this. There's several houses within  
9 walking distance of her house that have done this or  
10 currently have the same situation where it's an existing  
11 accessory building with a deck.

12 Or some type of deck that it is no way near as  
13 aesthetically pleasing as what she's proposing to do. So you  
14 know, that's yes, so that's kind of where we are in terms of  
15 her, you know, her proposal and what, you know, she wants to  
16 give back to the neighborhood.

17 I mean, other than that, I mean, she's had support  
18 from the, she's got full support from the ANC. All her  
19 neighbors, there's several letters like seven of them I think  
20 we submitted from her, you know, adjacent end neighbors  
21 within walking distance that are in support of her doing  
22 this.

23 So we feel like this is a, you know, not only it  
24 will be a benefit for her, but also for the neighborhood.  
25 If you think about an older person having the advantage of

1 not having to go up three stories up to the roof to, you  
2 know, enjoy some of her outdoor activities because there's  
3 no really a way to do that on the ground below, you know,  
4 because of the amount of space that she has unfortunately.

5                   And also, I mean, she was telling me that she also  
6 has like pollen allergies and so forth. Therefore, she  
7 cannot, you know, it's not like she can walk to a park. She  
8 doesn't drive so there are a lot of aspects I guess to this  
9 that, you know, we would like for you guys to consider  
10 realizing that Office of Planning was against it.

11                  But we see a lot of value in doing this for her,  
12 improving her, you know, her daily life, you know, for the  
13 better. And I think overall. I mean, if you look at the,  
14 if you scroll down to the last couple of images, you'll see  
15 the elevation. It's pretty generic.

16                  It's, you know, the material that's going to be  
17 used is sympathetic to the neighborhood. I mean, you know,  
18 fabric siding for the walls and the railing. I mean, it  
19 could be very nice.

20                  I don't know if the Board had a chance to see some  
21 of the pictures that she submitted also as part of the  
22 packet, that kind of gives you an example of what she has in  
23 mind for the space.

24                  That's kind of where we are with this and I, you  
25 know, so we, you know, we would like for you guys to consider

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 all the parameters and all the variables for this project.

2 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Mr. Ramirez. All  
3 right, you want to drop that? Thank you, great. Okay, may  
4 I turn to the Office of Planning please.

5 MS. MYERS: Crystal Myers with the Office of  
6 Planning. The Office of Planning is recommending approval  
7 of the special exception relief requested in this case  
8 related to the rear yard of the house and the accessory  
9 building distance to the property line, to the rear property  
10 line.

11 But we are in denial of the use variance for the  
12 roof deck for the accessory building. According to the  
13 Zoning Administrator's Office, the existing garage is  
14 nonconforming because it does not conform to the current  
15 setback requirements.

16 I just want to note that we wrote our report  
17 related to the relief in the revised Zoning Administrator  
18 letter and just responded to those noted relief. So I  
19 understand that you probably would like me to go into the  
20 denial section of our report.

21 As I said, we are in support of the special  
22 exception, but I suspect perhaps not require me to go through  
23 that as much so I'll just get straight down to the use  
24 variance.

25 So when it comes to the use variance, while the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 provision of an additional private open space on the property  
2 is understandable, the applicant has not presented a case  
3 that indicates an undue hardship.

4           The applicant argues the property is very narrow  
5 and does not have sufficient private open space. They point  
6 out that there are accessory garage and the brick pathway  
7 take up most of their rear yard.

8           OP reviewed the subject property and surrounding  
9 neighbor properties and the property is not exceptionally  
10 narrow or small in this area. Though the property is  
11 slightly smaller and narrower than the minimum for the zone,  
12 this is not an exceptional, this is not exceptional for this  
13 row.

14           Most of the neighboring properties are similar in  
15 size and some are even smaller than the subject property.  
16 And similar to the subject property all of the properties in  
17 this row have small rear yards.

18           The applicant in regard to the undue hardship, the  
19 applicant could increase their open space on their property  
20 in other ways without a use variance. In regard to the no  
21 substantial detriment to the public good, the requested use  
22 relief would not appear to likely result in a roof deck that  
23 would cause a substantial detriment to the public good.

24           The proposed roof deck would be alongside the  
25 parking areas of the adjacent properties so it should have

1 little impact on them as they park their cars. And the  
2 applicant, has been discussed, the applicant did submit  
3 photos of five examples of existing accessory garage roof  
4 decks in the nearby area.

5 These examples further show that the proposal  
6 would likely not be greatly out of character for this area,  
7 however, OP does not know the history of these projects and  
8 assumes they were probably done before zoning disallowed this  
9 use.

10 As for substantial impairment to the zoning  
11 regulations, while OP is generally supportive of the owner's  
12 attempts to maximize the enjoyment of her space, of her  
13 property including through the provision of decks, the zoning  
14 regulations were specifically amended to not allow a roof  
15 deck on an accessory building in this zone.

16 So granting the requested use variance would be,  
17 without identifying an extraordinary or exceptional situation  
18 on the property would substantially impair the purpose and  
19 integrity of the zoning regulations which is why we are  
20 unable to be supportive of the variance relief.

21 But again, the additional, the other relief needed  
22 we are in support of. And so with that, I will conclude our  
23 testimony on this.

24 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Ms. Myers. Yes,  
25 sure, Mr. Smith?

1 MEMBER SMITH: Ms. Myers, I have no qualms with  
2 what you presented. I just have a question about the  
3 decision about this being a use variance versus an area  
4 variance.

5 Was that, the decision to go with a use variance  
6 is because that was what the application was? It was for a  
7 use variance? And that's the reason why the analysis was  
8 done from the standpoint of it being a use variance?

9 MS. MYERS: This case was, it was referred to by  
10 the Zoning Administrator's Office so we're relying on their  
11 determination. And admittedly, their determination letter  
12 doesn't say either way.

13 MEMBER SMITH: Right.

14 MS. MYERS: It's an area variance or a use  
15 variance so I followed up with them. And they communicated  
16 with me through emails that it's a use variance case. So we  
17 wrote our report in response to that determination.

18 MEMBER SMITH: Okay. That was in writing that  
19 they sent you?

20 MS. MYERS: Yes, in writing. They unfortunately  
21 they did not update their referral letter to specify. But  
22 I mean it does sort of make sense. It's a use, you know, so  
23 it kind of, you know, understand why it's considered a use  
24 variance.

25 But I realize that it would have been much more

1 helpful if they would have updated their referral letter.

2 MEMBER SMITH: Okay, thank you. That was the  
3 clarity I needed. Still not sure that it, still not clear  
4 that it's a use variance, but thank you for the clarity that  
5 they at least on the record saying that they see it as a use  
6 variance. Thank you.

7 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, anyone else? Okay, --

8 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Just --

9 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure, go ahead, Vice Chair  
10 John.

11 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Just to make things  
12 difficult for you, Ms. Myers, why do you think it's a use  
13 variance?

14 MS. MYERS: Use variance because it's not related  
15 to one of the development standards so like what occupancy  
16 or rear yard, you know, width or anything like that which are  
17 typically where area variances related to.

18 So that's just my understanding, but I have not  
19 talked extensively with the Zoning Administrator's office  
20 either way on that particular issue.

21 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay, fair enough. Thank  
22 you.

23 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Blake?

24 MEMBER BLAKE: Yes, Ms. Myers, do you have any  
25 comment on the intent of that regulation?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. MYERS: It did look into this a little bit.  
2 I was not around at the time this changed, but apparently it  
3 changed back in 2016 and my understanding is that at the time  
4 the community asked for it.

5 So it was part of the updates that were done at  
6 the 2016 version of the regulations.

7 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, Commissioner Putta, can  
8 you hear me?

9 MR. PUTTA: How are you? Would you, I can get on  
10 camera --

11 CHAIRPERSON HILL: That's all right, Commissioner.  
12 That's all right.

13 MR. PUTTA: It's not allowing me to so, --

14 CHAIRPERSON HILL: That's all right.

15 MR. PUTTA: All right, cool.

16 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Would you mind just telling us  
17 what happened at the ANC meeting?

18 MR. PUTTA: Yes.

19 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Or give your testimony.

20 MR. PUTTA: For sure, for sure. Thanks, it's good  
21 to see you all again. I came before you maybe a little more  
22 than a year ago. In ANC2E, if you -- just to remind you all,  
23 we, you know, most of the individual property cases are with  
24 the Old Georgetown Board, but my neighborhood, Berleith, is  
25 not in Old Georgetown, so I get the BZA cases.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           It's more and more of them it seems. And I don't  
2 come before you and take up your time unless it's a, unless  
3 I think that it's worth doing so. And I think so in this  
4 case. The last time I came before you was another case where  
5 I couldn't understand it.

6           I couldn't understand it and even the members of  
7 this Board couldn't understand and you had to ask similarly  
8 why was, what was the history here? Why was this strange  
9 rule put in? And in that case it was for an accessory  
10 dwelling unit in my zone.

11           You could only be on one floor and it had to be  
12 the top floor. It couldn't be the ground floor where, you  
13 know, someone with a knee injury or a disabled person  
14 couldn't, you know, would have to climb stairs and they  
15 needed a special, not an exception, but something else in  
16 order to have a two-floor, a tiny 450, you know, square feet,  
17 but on two floors.

18           And similarly, the answer came back after a break  
19 where they were trying to find out. They said a community  
20 requested it way back when it was formed. At that time,  
21 there were objections to that ADU, but our ANC supported it  
22 unanimously and you supported it at the time.

23           Once again, once again ANC supports this  
24 unanimously, but in a difference from that case, is that this  
25 one had no objection. No neighbors have objected. You know,

1 I can, the neighbors who would have, you know, asked for this  
2 last time, they all knew that this was on our agenda, but no  
3 one objected to it.

4 The immediate neighbor wrote a letter of support.

5 The other immediate neighbor is a landlord and doesn't care.

6 Seven letters of support. No objections. I don't, I usually

7 do rely on the Office of Planning as often do you as well.

8 They are smart, they are capable, and they do good  
9 work for our city and I support their goals of more housing.  
10 And they said that they usually do try to let people maximize  
11 their enjoyment.

12                   Here, it's, you know, I'm before you as a  
13 community guy, as a Commissioner, not as a zoning expert.  
14 It seems like they, the Office of Planning admits there's  
15 really no harm that they can think of from this. DDOT has  
16 no issue with it. They have no issue with it.

17 It's not out of character. There is precedent.  
18 There are at least five other addresses that I could list to  
19 you within one or two blocks where there's a roof deck on top  
20 of a garage. And so the only real harm is to, you know, to  
21 the rules which are very strange in this situation so I would  
22 ask you to in this case support it.

23 I didn't understand why it was a variance at  
24 first. Because we support so many accessory dwelling  
25 buildings that are not just one floor, but two floor and all

1 this is a deck on top of the, on top of one floor.

2 It's not tall, it's not obtrusive. There are  
3 several others like this already and I know the variances --  
4 unfortunately, it's supposed to be a variance. Again, I'm  
5 not the rules expert.

6 I wish it was a special exception and we could get  
7 this through like we have with so many other special  
8 exceptions including the one two years ago. This is a  
9 variance. I guess technically and I'm not a lawyer.

10 Ms. Marie-Joelle Voil, she can't afford a lawyer.  
11 She has a very small house, she has a renter in the basement.  
12 She doesn't have the money. She barely had the money to get  
13 all this together. And I feel for her.

14 I know that a variance, the standard is supposed  
15 to be undue hardship. And I'm just here to tell you that's  
16 in the, in my view, that's in the eye of beholder. That's  
17 relative. What is undue hardship?

18 I'm sure there's technical definitions. I didn't  
19 look up the lawyerly definitions of undue hardship, but in  
20 my view, it is an undue hardship for Ms. Voil and she has to  
21 get a variance first of all, not just a special exception,  
22 a variance.

23 And so all the work she did, she wrote a Burden  
24 of Proof document and submitted it back in September. She  
25 went around and took pictures of all of the other five

1 houses. You can look at it. I believe it is Exhibit 8  
2 possibly.

3 And if you could let her speak, she'll tell you  
4 herself. She want around, took pictures of all of her  
5 neighbors who have already done this. Not just in the  
6 distant past, I mind you, there was one I'm sure one of them  
7 was done recently.

8 It's very modern looking and I know that one. It  
9 was, it was pretty recently. I don't know what year, but I  
10 think it was in the last decade. And so it just seems like  
11 an undue hardship to me. She has a tiny, tiny, back yard.

12 She doesn't have a place to even garden. She's  
13 a wonderful elderly woman in our neighborhood. Let her have  
14 her garden on top of her garage is what I'm here to tell you.  
15 I think I might have had more to say, but I'll be happy to  
16 answer any questions.

17 We voted for this unanimously and there was no  
18 question about it from start to end.

19 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Commissioner. Yes,  
20 Commissioner, I know you're ANC, I know you guys, I know you.  
21 And I know that you all do good work trying to understand the  
22 regulations and I don't know what's going to happen here, but  
23 what I'm saying is we also from the BZA perspective, don't  
24 want to stop things from happening that sound good for an  
25 idea.

1           It's just that the regulations for us tend to keep  
2 us from being able to do things maybe that we want to do.  
3 I don't know if that's going to, I'm just, I'm just  
4 explaining like there was something that happened earlier  
5 that is also kind of we're pushed up against regulations.  
6 Mr. Blake, you had a question?

7           MEMBER BLAKE: For Ms. Myers if possible. Yes,  
8 could you please just give me a quick glimpse of what is  
9 matter of right and what might be special exception for this  
10 accessory dwelling in this?

11           Just so that I can be clear on what the  
12 alternative to this would be under lesser standard.

13           MS. MYERS: You mean in the accessory building  
14 what would be matter of right? For the accessory building?

15           MEMBER BLAKE: Yes, what could be matter of right  
16 or special exception in this spot? Different than what we're  
17 talking about right now?

18           MS. MYERS: I mean, she currently would like to  
19 use it as a garage. That is allowed. Storage, that's all  
20 I can think of at the moment. But I think a garage is  
21 primarily what she would like to use it for.

22           MEMBER BLAKE: Would she be allowed to have a  
23 second story on it?

24           MS. MYERS: Yes, I'm not sure. I mean, accessory  
25 buildings, usually you can go up to a second story, but I'm

1 not sure in this one --

2 MEMBER BLAKE: A special exception.

3 MS. MYERS: A special exception is what you're  
4 saying? Then I guess as a special exception, I just don't  
5 know off the top of my head. But I mean, in this specific  
6 zone, it specifically calls out roof decks on accessory  
7 buildings are prohibited.

8 MEMBER BLAKE: Okay, so Ms. Myers, I guess my  
9 question is if you removed the roof deck from this structure,  
10 would that be a matter of right or would it be special  
11 exception?

12 MS. MYERS: If it had complied with the setback  
13 requirements, then it would have been a matter of right. We  
14 would never even have this case before us. The special  
15 exception is more related to the existing building not being  
16 in the required setbacks.

17 And so even though the applicant kind of looks at  
18 this as replacing their existing building, the Zoning  
19 Administrator's Office looks at this as a new building. And  
20 it didn't, and the setbacks currently are non-conforming so  
21 the special exceptions would allow for the new building to  
22 be essentially in the same space as the existing building  
23 which would allow it to continue serving as a garage.

24 MEMBER BLAKE: I was talking more about the  
25 variance requirement. So it's --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 MS. MYERS: The variance is -- that's just a roof  
2 deck. If you were to remove the variance --

3 MEMBER BLAKE: Roof deck, remove the roof deck.

4 MS. MYERS: Yes.

5 MEMBER BLAKE: Off that exact structure. Is it  
6 permissible by matter of right or would -- it would be  
7 special exception because of the location. Right? But aside  
8 from that, is there any other requirement that we'd have, any  
9 other relief we require?

10 MS. MYERS: The very, the roof deck, there is no  
11 matter of right for the roof deck. So once the, if the  
12 variance relief were not granted, then this would just  
13 strictly be I think what she would like to use it for would  
14 be strictly a garage.

15 MEMBER BLAKE: But it would be the same  
16 configuration say for the staircase and the platform above  
17 the garage.

18 MS. MYERS: I believe so, but I mean, I think the  
19 architect would probably have to weigh in on that. If you  
20 were to remove the roof deck, would that change anything  
21 else? I don't know.

22 MEMBER BLAKE: Okay, thank you.

23 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Can you hear me?

24 MR. RAMIREZ: Yes, I can hear you.

25 CHAIRPERSON HILL: If the roof deck isn't

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 approved, can this move forward with -- like how would you  
2 alter the plans?

3 MR. RAMIREZ: We, well it's been, you know the way  
4 it was designed was done with a flat roof with the idea of  
5 building the, you know, we anticipated the roof decks so it's  
6 already, the structural support's already in place.

7 So it would just be a matter of adding the  
8 railing. In other words, yes. It could move forward. I  
9 don't know.

10 CHAIRPERSON HILL: I'm asking a couple of  
11 questions I guess.

12 MR. RAMIREZ: Okay.

13 CHAIRPERSON HILL: If you, if this didn't get, if  
14 the roof deck did not get approved, would you change the  
15 design?

16 MR. RAMIREZ: We could. But I don't see the need  
17 for it.

18 CHAIRPERSON HILL: No, no, no, I'm not saying you  
19 could. I'm just saying like maybe you would and I got the  
20 architect actually here today with us, but like, you know,  
21 would you make, you know, a triangle roof or would you do  
22 something else?

23 MR. RAMIREZ: Oh.

24 CHAIRPERSON HILL: If you didn't get the roof  
25 deck?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1                   MR. RAMIREZ: Right. We would have to revisit the  
2 roof design.

3                   CHAIRPERSON HILL: So you might do something for  
4 storage.

5                   MR. RAMIREZ: If Ms. Marie felt like she wanted  
6 to change the look of it, the --

7                   CHAIRPERSON HILL: Right.

8                   COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Mr. Ramirez?

9                   CHAIRPERSON HILL: Go ahead Dr. Imamura.

10                  COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Sorry, Mr. Chairman. I  
11 just couldn't help myself. Mr. Ramirez, why would you want  
12 to, I mean essentially what it is just removing the  
13 staircase.

14                  So I'm not sure why you'd want to put more time  
15 and money into redesigning the project.

16                  MR. RAMIREZ: I guess I'm not, I'm sorry, I  
17 didn't, did not, I didn't answer the question?

18                  CHAIRPERSON HILL: That's all right, Mr. Ramirez.  
19 I think I'm the one confusing the question limit. Dr.  
20 Imamura, I was asking if the roof that were gone if you  
21 would, you know, if you would do something different with the  
22 --

23                  COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: If you would, right, Mr.  
24 Chairman. I mean, that would an aesthetic preference, but  
25 in order to keep costs down, I mean all it is as just really

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 the removal of the railings and the staircase that's leading  
2 to the roof deck.

3 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Right.

4 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: It's pretty simple.

5 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Ms. Myers, can you hear me  
6 again? I'm sorry, now I'm confused. So there's an accessory  
7 building that is a new accessory building. Do you know if  
8 they could put a second story on there?

9 MS. MYERS: I just looked it up. I mean, the regs  
10 in D50, 5,002 so 5-0-0-2, says that you can do an accessory  
11 building up to 22 feet. So it could be a second level. And  
12 my understanding is that would be a matter of right.

13 MR. PUTTA: No.

14 MS. MYERS: Oh, no?

15 MR. PUTTA: It's not.

16 MS. MYERS: Okay. Well I --

17 MR. PUTTA: Our zone is just so restrictive.

18 MS. MYERS: Oh, okay. I will concede on that.  
19 This zone is not the typical R zone because they do have some  
20 more special combined as we know with the roof deck so I just  
21 hadn't noted --

22 CHAIRPERSON HILL: That's all right. So it's  
23 possible that they could do a second story with a special  
24 exception?

25 MS. MYERS: That's what I'm hearing.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Commissioner Putta, that's what  
2 you're saying?

3 MR. PUTTA: Yes, that's what's required, but  
4 that's not what she wants to do. She doesn't have the money

5 --

6 (Simultaneous speaking.)

7 CHAIRPERSON HILL: -- Commissioner.

8 MR. RAMIREZ: I'm sorry. Did you say something?

9 CHAIRPERSON HILL: No, one second, Mr. Ramirez.  
10 I'm just making a point.

11 MR. RAMIREZ: Yes.

12 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Commissioner Putta, I --

13 MR. PUTTA: She could. She could with a special  
14 exception.

15 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Got you. Commissioner Putta,  
16 like we've been here again with your neighborhood and I get  
17 it. Like I don't remember, I wasn't around, well I was  
18 around when --

19 MR. PUTTA: Yes.

20 CHAIRPERSON HILL: -- the regulations were  
21 rewritten. But I wasn't involved in them and I guess you  
22 guys -- I don't know, I mean, you've been a Commissioner for  
23 a long time. Like it sounds as though you all came down and  
24 lobbied the Commission for --

25 MR. PUTTA: No.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 CHAIRPERSON HILL: -- certain things. No?

2 MR. PUTTA: Not our ANC. Not our ANC. It was a  
3 couple of loud people possibly.

4 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, well that's too bad that  
5 that's how that might have happened because it's in the  
6 regulations now that you can't have the roof deck on the  
7 garage.

8 MR. PUTTA: Right.

9 CHAIRPERSON HILL: And I can see why people would  
10 have argued that meaning, you know, we have people argue all  
11 the time that people now will look down into their yards,  
12 they'll be able to see into their windows and during the  
13 regulations or when they were rewritten, perhaps your  
14 neighborhood just was very vocal or a couple of people were  
15 vocal. You know?

16 And so that has, that is what is changing this  
17 into, according to the Zoning Administrator, a use variance.  
18 And I know we've had discussions about variances before and  
19 use variances and how high a bar that is for us to get over.

20 MR. PUTTA: Right. Just a, can I just quickly  
21 ask? I was just curious. Even so, you are technically  
22 legally allowed, you -- the Board, are allowed to approve  
23 this if you wanted to?

24 CHAIRPERSON HILL: It's not so much if we wanted  
25 to, it's --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 MR. PUTTA: Right, if you -- oh, okay.

2 CHAIRPERSON HILL: If we believe that the, oops,  
3 if we believe that the applicant --

4 MR. PUTTA: Right.

5 CHAIRPERSON HILL: -- is meeting the criteria of  
6 the use variance and I don't know again if you were here  
7 earlier. We were having a discussion about a use variance.  
8 And it was a very difficult discussion. And so --

9 MR. PUTTA: I'm just wondering, well I'm just  
10 wondering why this was, why this was on the agenda if it's  
11 not legally allowed or I don't know what is required for this  
12 use variance. I would like to know.

13 CHAIRPERSON HILL: It is, it is legally allowed  
14 to ask for the use variance. And so then they're asking for  
15 the use variance and now we have to determine whether or not  
16 they meet the criteria for us to grant the use variance.

17 MR. PUTTA: Right. Undue hardship basically.  
18 Right?

19 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Well the three-prong test. I  
20 mean undue hardship is, you know, what's the exceptional  
21 situation that's leading to a practical difficulty that also  
22 isn't going to harm the zone plan.

23 MR. PUTTA: Right.

24 CHAIRPERSON HILL: And the Office of Planning is  
25 actually saying that the zone plan is going to be harmed.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 You know? Which is something that they usually, you know,  
2 the third-prong is usually the easiest one.

3 MR. PUTTA: Yes, I see.

4 CHAIRPERSON HILL: And so --

5 MR. PUTTA: I see, I see.

6 CHAIRPERSON HILL: So, Commissioner, give me one  
7 second now. So I thought I said, oh, so Mr. Ramirez, you had  
8 a question?

9 MR. RAMIREZ: Yes, I just find it interesting that  
10 the Office of Planning or variance per se, you know, it  
11 sounds like a two-story accessory building would be favorable  
12 which it's taller, it's more obstructive, you know, in terms  
13 of --

14 MR. PUTTA: Right.

15 MR. RAMIREZ: -- blocking an area, daylight to the  
16 neighbors, et cetera. As opposed to what Marie is trying to  
17 do which is basically do a roof deck over her --

18 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Right. She has, we can, I'll  
19 just again refer you and know Commissioner Putta, to the  
20 Office of Planning's report.

21 MR. PUTTA: Right.

22 CHAIRPERSON HILL: And the Office of Planning  
23 points out the three criteria that the Board looks at and,  
24 Commissioner, you know that we look at that for area  
25 variances, we look at that for use variances.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 MR. PUTTA: Yes.

2 CHAIRPERSON HILL: I'm going to just move on real  
3 quick here. Mr. Young, is there anyone here wishing to  
4 testify?

5 (No audible response.)

6 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Does the Board have any  
7 final questions of anybody?

8 (No audible response.)

9 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.

10 MS. VOIL: Sorry, could I say something?

11 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure, of course.

12 MS. VOIL: Oh, okay. I just want to tell you that  
13 apparently according under the 1105.4 it's two stories  
14 allowed in R3GG. So that my zoning so and I saw them in my  
15 neighborhood also.

16 So I mean, so I was, you know, I was thinking if  
17 they'll allow another floor on the top of my accessory  
18 building, you know, why I can't have my little deck?

19 CHAIRPERSON HILL: How do you say your name, Voil?

20 MS. VOIL: What is it, why?

21 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Viola.

22 MS. VOIL: Voil.

23 MR. RAMIREZ: Voil, Voil, Voil.

24 MS. VOIL: Yes. And if I could say something too  
25 that I bought my house in 1986. And so it has been, you

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 know, after I retired. When I was working at the French  
2 Embassy then in 1992 they shipped me back to Pakistan and  
3 then I've been all over the world.

4                   And then my always my dream for me was to come  
5 back to my house and to fix it up for my old age. So I made  
6 the paper, I finally arrive in America, and then, you know,  
7 it's really important for me to have this little deck.

8                   Because, you know, Ms. Myer I don't think that,  
9 I don't know if she saw the plan, but there is no other room  
10 for me to do anything to have any plan because the brick it's  
11 a pass way to go down --

12                   MR. PUTTA: That's right.

13                   CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, Ms., how do you say your  
14 last name?

15                   MS. VOIL: -- to the apartment so there is no  
16 other way for me and if, you know, I can't go to the park,  
17 I mean for me to be really easy to have something like that  
18 in my back yard, it will be safer, it will be peaceful and  
19 I'm sure, you know, like Mr. Putta say, it's wonderful for  
20 the neighborhood to have some flowers, some plants.

21                   So you know, I really, it was my dream and I have,  
22 you know, I don't think that it's fair to not allow me to do  
23 it. And so I --

24                   CHAIRPERSON HILL: It's not --

25                   (Simultaneous speaking.)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 MS. VOIL: -- can't see other --

2 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Ms. Voil, how do you say it?

3 I want to make sure I'm pronouncing it.

4 MS. VOIL: It's okay. Voil.

5 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Voil.

6 (Simultaneous speaking.)

7 MS. VOIL: My first name is Marie-Joelle and my  
8 last name is Voil.

9 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Ms. Voil, it's not an issue  
10 that we don't want you to have the deck. It has nothing to  
11 do with whether or not we want or don't want you to have the  
12 deck. The deck seems perfectly lovely to me and everything  
13 that you said sounds perfectly lovely to me.

14 We're not allowed to grant something if we don't  
15 think that it meets the criteria. And unfortunately it's in  
16 the regulations. It says decks on roofs are not to be  
17 allowed.

18 MS. VOIL: Yes, but then you could build another  
19 story so could I have another story instead of my deck?

20 CHAIRPERSON HILL: That again, that again, that  
21 again I guess you can talk with the Office of Planning and  
22 I can, we can see what the Office of Planning -- maybe you  
23 can work with the Office of Planning. I don't really know  
24 enough about that particular zone now as to whether or not  
25 you would then have to go through a special exception and get

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 all the architectural drawings for the second story.

2                   And I think that, you know, that is something that  
3 I don't know enough about off the top of my head right now  
4 to say one way or the other. Mr. Blake, had your hand up?

5                   MEMBER BLAKE: I do see the reading at D1105.4  
6 that she could do some other things and I think it would be  
7 helpful just to clarify first which another issue which  
8 concerns me, is this the use variance or an area variance?

9                   I know the Office of Planning had said that it is  
10 a, that they cooperated with the, you know, Zoning  
11 Administrator that it's a use variance, but it seems to me  
12 we should clarify whether it's an area variance or it's a use  
13 variance. It's a lesser standard.

14                   Still may not make move, but it definitely I think  
15 important to determine whether it is a use or an area  
16 variance because it seems more like an area variance to me  
17 than a use variance in the sense that all the things that can  
18 be done, the actual building itself can exist.

19                   It can exist with everything except this deck  
20 which the deck is not a use, the deck is a component of the  
21 building. But I understand that the stipulation, I just want  
22 to make sure we're clear, as to whether it's a use variance  
23 or an area variance.

24                   CHAIRPERSON HILL: Now, Mr. Blake, where was all  
25 this great arguments when I needed it earlier? You know,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 these are lovely, you know, particular, I need, yes, so okay.  
2 So I think let's go ahead and, okay, Mr. Smith, before you  
3 move on, Mr. Smith, I was going to say I think we're going  
4 to ask, we're going to ask for clarification from the Zoning  
5 Administrator if this is a use variance or an area variance.

6               Okay? And that means we can come back. I don't  
7 know who we have to ask to get that. Right? And then, if  
8 perhaps -- oh, go ahead Mr. Smith.

9               MEMBER SMITH: Well, I'll tell you we have the  
10 clarification. I think Ms. Myers said that in an email she  
11 received an email from the Zoning Administrator or her office  
12 stating that this is a use variance.

13               So I think it's on the record that the Zoning  
14 Administrator considers it a use variance. I disagree. I  
15 do believe, I believe it's an area variance. Because a roof  
16 deck is not a use, it is an accessory structure related to  
17 a matter of right use.

18               So I think personally it's an area variance and  
19 we can make a decision now. We're vested with the power to  
20 make the decision of whether it's an area variance of use  
21 variance or not.

22               So I think amongst the Board, I think we can make  
23 that determination without additional clarification from the  
24 Zoning Administrator because we have it.

25               CHAIRPERSON HILL: Is that correct, OZLD?

1 (No audible response.)

2 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, so if the Board  
3 determines that this is an area variance, this is the first  
4 I've done this, then we would then request the Office of  
5 Planning to review this as an area variance meaning --

6 MEMBER BLAKE: Correct.

7 CHAIRPERSON HILL: -- that the difficulty test  
8 will be applied. Ms. Myers, do you know how long that might  
9 take for the Office of Planning? Oh, sorry, hold on, hold  
10 on. I got Ms. Johns' hand up.

11 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHNS: And we still have to find  
12 that there's an exceptional condition.

13 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes, I don't know. I mean, I'm  
14 just --

15 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHNS: Well --

16 CHAIRPERSON HILL: -- I'm just moving along with  
17 the steps here.

18 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHNS: -- well, you know, we  
19 still have to have an exceptional condition. And so I'll  
20 just end there.

21 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So let me, there's a  
22 variety of things we can do. We can also just vote. Right?  
23 So I would suggest perhaps we ask the Office of Planning to  
24 look at this as an area variance.

25 And then also, if they would be willing to speak

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 to the applicant because the applicant is not represented by  
2 counsel, if there are other possible things that they might  
3 be able to do with that second story, insofar as -- and  
4 again, I apologize Ms. Myers to throw this on you.

5           But I don't know what is and isn't allowed in  
6 terms of a second story on an accessory, you know, building  
7 there. Handling in that ANC or in that zone, they might have  
8 to go through a special exception for that.

9           So perhaps the Office of Planning could at least  
10 let the applicant know what the options are and then given  
11 the fact that the ANC has already approved a roof deck, and  
12 seems to be in favor of a second story of some kind, perhaps  
13 Commissioner Putta, you would know whether or not your ANC  
14 in general seems to be in favor of second stories on garages.  
15 You don't know?

16           MR. PUTTA: Yes, no, of course I know. That's  
17 what all the cases are Chair Hill. And I don't come before  
18 you for most of them, but there was the one last year when  
19 the person wanted to live on both floors because he had a  
20 parking space and didn't need a garage on the first floor.

21           And that needed even more than a special  
22 exception. In any case, it's a special exception. Yes, we  
23 would approve it. My neighbor, Ms. Voil, doesn't have the  
24 money for a ADU. She just wants a garden and she didn't have  
25 any other place to put it so it's unfortunate. But I hope

1 you'll consider it.

2 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Commissioner, I know you. I'm  
3 also trying to consider. We're moving along here. Right?  
4 And so go ahead, Dr. Imamura. Give me a second, Ms. Voil.

5 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: All right, Chair Hill.  
6 This is a great example of the Board I think for the public  
7 anyway with that we try to get to yes. We find creative ways  
8 to do that.

9 I'm curious, I certainly understand Commissioner  
10 Putta's comment about Ms. Voil's economic circumstance and  
11 the additional time, money and effort to, you know, for the  
12 second floor. You know, as a special exception or whatever  
13 it might be.

14 I would only ask and you can see, Commissioner  
15 Putta, that this, you know, the Board's trying to move in a  
16 direction that could potentially support the applicant here  
17 as Vice Chair John mentioned that there's still this  
18 exceptional circumstance or exceptional condition.

19 I would ask I guess, I don't -- I'm curious. Does  
20 that second story structure have to be enclosed?

21 MR. PUTTA: Enclosed, oh right.

22 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Or can that be an open air  
23 structure?

24 MR. PUTTA: Yes, I mean, it's an EDU. Right?  
25 Well, sorry. Whenever it comes up, it's an EDU so it's a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 dwelling unit so that would, I meant that would seem to mean  
2 that it has to be enclosed and livable, but I mean --

3 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Does it --

4 MR. PUTTA: -- it can be used for other things.

5 (Simultaneous speaking.)

6 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: -- really need four  
7 enclosed walls? It's architecturally speaking, it could be  
8 framed. Right? With a trellis of some kind?

9 MR. PUTTA: Yes.

10 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Right? To have sort of the  
11 volumetric space of a second story --

12 MR. PUTTA: Yes.

13 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: -- but, I guess my point  
14 here is --

15 MR. PUTTA: Yes. Get it to us as a special  
16 exception.

17 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: -- it would be, it wouldn't  
18 take an incredible amount of additional time by the architect  
19 if it were an open air structure as a second story. So --.

20 MR. PUTTA: Yes. Yes, I was wondering the same  
21 thing. If it was a special exception to a second floor, you  
22 know, like nobody would object. Nobody would --

23 (Simultaneous speaking.)

24 MR. PUTTA: -- it would still require --

25 CHAIRPERSON HILL: I have to interrupt. I have

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 to interrupt. So we have to move on. I know that some of  
2 our Board members have some issues that we have to kind of  
3 get to. Ms. Voil, you had your hand up?

4 MS. VOIL: Yes, I would like, you know, because  
5 I'm not American, you know. My English is not very well, but  
6 you know, I read the 1105.4 and they say that you don't need  
7 an exemption to build a second story.

8 CHAIRPERSON HILL: No, you do.

9 MS. VOIL: And if --

10 (Simultaneous speaking.)

11 MS. VOIL: -- then somebody with American could  
12 read it.

13 CHAIRPERSON HILL: One second.

14 MS. MYERS: I think the confusion is that --

15 MR. PUTTA: Wrong zone.

16 MS. MYERS: We're not looking at an accessory  
17 dwelling unit. If this were an accessory dwelling unit, then  
18 it would be a special exception.

19 MS. VOIL: Yes, it is an accessory, on the eleven  
20 --

21 MR. PUTTA: I see.

22 MS. MYERS: This is not an accessory dwelling  
23 unit. This is just a garage so she --

24 MR. PUTTA: I see.

25 MS. MYERS: -- could do the second level.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1                   MR. PUTTA: Oh, as long as it's not for living,  
2 she can do second level. Got it, got it, got it.

3                   MR. RAMIREZ: Real quick, it's interesting that  
4 you guys are supportive of an open structure because that's  
5 something that --

6                   MEMBER SMITH: Let me, can we tone it down just  
7 because it is coming to a point that it sounds like it's a  
8 deliberation. It's not a deliberation. The reason why I  
9 brought up an area variance is it has nothing to do with  
10 trying to move to yes.

11                  It is more of a procedural discussion of whether  
12 this falls under use variance or an area variance. I do  
13 agree with Ms. John, I don't think that we need to go into  
14 a back and forth discussion of whether you're putting a roof  
15 or something over top of that that you know, whatever, okay  
16 Chairman Hill.

17                  CHAIRPERSON HILL: I kind of lost control here for  
18 a little while.

19                  MEMBER SMITH: Yes.

20                  CHAIRPERSON HILL: This is what we're going to try  
21 to do. Okay? Again, and Dr. Imamura, I appreciate your  
22 comment. And again, for the record, the Board is not always  
23 trying to get to yes. The Board is here to make sure that  
24 the regulations are upheld.

25                  And that is what we're here for. And if you guys,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 that's all, that's the only reason why we're here. And so  
2 per these regulations, the way that this application is  
3 before us, I believe that the Office of Planning is looking  
4 at their analysis correctly.

5 So therefore, the roof deck would probably get  
6 denied. So I'm curious to go back. The Board has now  
7 determined that it could possibly be an area variance. Oh,  
8 I'm sorry, we've now determined that it is an area variance.

9 I don't think that's anything we have to vote on.  
10 Is that correct, OZLD?

11 MS. MYERS: Correct.

12 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So now we're going to  
13 ask the Office of Planning to review this as an area  
14 variance. It still might be no, because there might not be  
15 any extraordinary or exceptional situation. Okay?

16 Which is still the first prong. So you still  
17 might be in a no. Okay? Which is fine, that's just the way  
18 the regulations are. However, if Ms. Voil, if you would meet  
19 or if Ms. Myers, if you would be willing to have a  
20 conversation with Ms. Voil because she doesn't have  
21 representation, just to kind of speak to the regulations and  
22 what could possibly be some options, that would be helpful.  
23 Is that something that would be acceptable, Ms. Myers?

24 MS. MYERS: I'm happy to talk further with her.

25 CHAIRPERSON HILL: So Ms. Myers, Ms. Voil, I'm

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 sorry, Ms. Voil, Ms. Myers is going to reach out to you.

2 MS. VOIL: Okay, thank you.

3 CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right, so that being the  
4 case, I'm going to hold this in, not abeyance. I don't know  
5 what we're going to do. We're going to now wait for the  
6 Office of Planning to give us a new report on an area  
7 variance.

8 And then we'll have an opportunity to speak with  
9 the applicant where something different might happen. And  
10 so I'm going to put this on, Mr. Moy, what is the 27th  
11 looking like for us?

12 MS. VOIL: Sorry, I won't be here the 27th.

13 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.

14 MS. VOIL: I be leaving from the 20th to the 5th  
15 of April.

16 MR. PUTTA: You could do it virtually though.  
17 Right?

18 MS. VOIL: Yes.

19 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Commissioner, let me move on  
20 here. Okay, right. So then, okay, all right, Ms. Voil, are  
21 you going to be, you think you're going to be able to do this  
22 virtually from wherever you are on the 27th?

23 MS. VOIL: Oh, okay, I will try. I will try.

24 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Well, okay, if you can't I  
25 guess then you can ask for a postponement. So let's try to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 get, actually, Mr. Moy what does the 27th look for us, look  
2 like for us?

3 MR. MOY: On the 27th, your docket, on your docket  
4 you have six cases and one appeal.

5 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Oh, dear God. Okay. Well  
6 that's not good for us. So when are you back, Ms. Voil?

7 MS. VOIL: After the 5th of April.

8 CHAIRPERSON HILL: After the 5th of April. So  
9 let's, what about the 10th of April, Mr. Moy?

10 MR. MOY: 10th of April, well, that's not any  
11 better because right now you have nine cases on the 10th of  
12 April.

13 CHAIRPERSON HILL: I'll take the 10th case over  
14 six and appeal. Okay?

15 MS. VOIL: Okay.

16 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Unless, Mr. Moy, you got  
17 another alternative?

18 MR. MOY: Well, on the 17th of April you have only  
19 four cases and one appeal.

20 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Cases and appeal, this is all  
21 confusing. The appeal could be --

22 MR. MOY: You don't like that one?

23 CHAIRPERSON HILL: No, that's -- I don't like any  
24 of them so far. So, let's go with the 7th, Ms. Voil?

25 MS. VOIL: Yes.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right, would you be able  
2 the 17th of April?

3 MS. VOIL: Yes.

4 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, so all right. So then,  
5 if you are available the 17th of April, then how about we get  
6 a report from the Office of Planning, by the 10th of April.

7 MS. VOIL: Okay.

8 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Is that okay, Ms. Myers? And  
9 then Ms. Voil, like Ms. Myers, you're going to reach out to  
10 Ms. Voil in the next couple of days?

11 MS. MYERS: The architect as well. Right?  
12 Because he's been my primary communication with her, yes.  
13 But yes, I will reach out to the applicant team.

14 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great. So, Mr. Ramirez,  
15 they're going to be reaching out to you and what again,  
16 they're looking at the Office of Planning has now been asked  
17 to look at this as an area variance.

18 MR. RAMIREZ: I understand.

19 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Meaning the roof deck. Okay?  
20 And the Office of Planning has been asked to speak with you  
21 about possible alternatives that would be either a special  
22 exception or matter of right options for Ms. Voil. Do you  
23 understand?

24 MR. RAMIREZ: Yes.

25 CHAIRPERSON HILL: And I would find, and I'll be

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 thankful that the Office of Planning is speaking to you.

2 MR. RAMIREZ: Okay.

3 (Simultaneous speaking.)

4 CHAIRPERSON HILL: So and I mean it in a good way.  
5 I mean it in a good way. I mean it in a good way meaning  
6 they're trying to help. Okay? This is not an adversarial  
7 conversation. Okay?

8 MR. RAMIREZ: Okay. Thank you.

9 CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right, then we will see you  
10 back here on April 17th.

11 MS. VOIL: Okay.

12 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.

13 MR. MOY: If, just listening to your conversation  
14 with the submissions, would you also open up the opportunity  
15 for depending on OP's submission working with the applicant  
16 with the applicant adding new information into the record  
17 that may be depending on the alternatives and maybe possibly  
18 revising her burden of proof?

19 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.

20 MR. MOY: Because we were talking about the three-  
21 prong test.

22 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes. So then, you, Mr.  
23 Ramirez, will have to after speaking with the Office of  
24 Planning, determine what is the next step forward and then  
25 make your argument for that step.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 MR. RAMIREZ: Okay.

2 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay? All right. That still  
3 puts me, Mr. Moy, at getting reports from the Office of  
4 Planning by the 10th. Correct?

5 MR. MOY: Correct.

6 CHAIRPERSON HILL: So are you looking for  
7 additional submissions of some point, is that why you're  
8 asking?

9 MR. MOY: Well it would be, it would be the one  
10 that I just suggested because depending on the findings with  
11 OP and the applicant, she may, the applicant may need to do  
12 more.

13 CHAIRPERSON HILL: So you might have to give us  
14 information by April 3rd, Mr. Moy.

15 MR. MOY: That could work.

16 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, so Mr. Ramirez, you talk  
17 with the Office of Planning. Ms. Voil, you talk with the  
18 Office of Planning and see what your next decision is. You  
19 can leave it the way it is, the Office of Planning is going  
20 to make their analysis based on what the Board has all just  
21 asked for which is an area variance for a roof deck.

22 I'm sorry for an area variance for the plans that  
23 you have put forward. I still don't know whether you're  
24 making it. Apparently, you know, some of my fellow Board  
25 Members have pointed out that the first prong it's there's

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 probably nothing necessarily extraordinary or exceptional  
2 with your situation.

3                   But maybe the Office of Planning will have a  
4 different idea. However, it only needs to be a practical  
5 difficulty now which is a lower standard. However, if you,  
6 Mr. Ramirez, decide that things change and you need to submit  
7 new information to us, please submit it to us by April 3rd,  
8 including an argument for the area variance.

9                   MR. RAMIREZ: Okay, but so earlier you stated that  
10 you wanted a response from the Office of Planning by April  
11 10th.

12                   CHAIRPERSON HILL: So what's going to happen is  
13 you're going to speak with the Office of Planning. Okay?  
14 If you decide to do nothing and stick with the area variance,  
15 you will have to submit something to us that argues for an  
16 area variance. It won't be terribly difficult.

17                   It's not different really from what you've already  
18 put forward. Just say that now you're arguing an area  
19 variance. Okay?

20                   MR. RAMIREZ: All right.

21                   CHAIRPERSON HILL: Submit that by April 3rd.  
22 Okay? And any other possible alternatives. I got you Mr.  
23 Blake. And any other possible alternatives, you don't, I  
24 don't know what's going to happen in your discussions.

25                   You might have some different idea and by April

1 3rd we'll need to know it because then the Office of Planning  
2 is going to tell us what they think of your submissions by  
3 April 10th. Okay?

4 MR. RAMIREZ: Got it.

5 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Which will then bring us back  
6 here for a hearing, a continued hearing, on April 17th.  
7 Okay? Mr. Blake, you had your hand up?

8 MEMBER BLAKE: Yes, there was some questions about  
9 what the actual special exception relief being requested was.  
10 Well we should clarify that in the application as well I  
11 think.

12 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, I'm confused. What was  
13 the special exception questions?

14 MEMBER SMITH: We are set back. I think Mr. Blake  
15 is referencing.

16 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Whether or not that was even  
17 needed?

18 MEMBER SMITH: That's correct.

19 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So Ms. Myers, I guess  
20 in your report if you can clarify on April 10th whether or  
21 not that rear yard requirement is needed or not, special  
22 exception.

23 MS. MYERS: To reach out to the Zoning  
24 Administrator's Office to see if they can submit an updated  
25 or if they would like to revise their -- okay, then I will

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 do that.

2 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. For the record, I  
3 had my thumbs up. Okay. All right, are we all good? Okay.  
4 We will see you all on April 17th. Have a nice trip, Ms.  
5 Voil.

6 MS. VOIL: Okay, thank you.

7 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, bye-bye. Bye  
8 Commissioner Putta.

9 MS. VOIL: Bye-bye.

10 MR. PUTTA: Take care.

11 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Bye-bye.

12 MR. RAMIREZ: Thanks.

13 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, you're welcome. Bye-bye.  
14 Give me a second. Go ahead and call the next one, Mr. Moy.

15 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman,  
16 I have to step away for a few minutes.

17 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes, sure.

18 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: So I won't be on this  
19 case. Thank you.

20 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes, thank you.

21 MR. MOY: Okay, so the next case is Application  
22 No. 21060 of Delafield, LLC, self-certified application  
23 pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 901.2 for a special exception  
24 under Subtitle U, Section 421 to allow a new residential  
25 development.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1           I believe it's a six-unit apartment house probably  
2 located in the RA1 zone at 333 Delafield Place Northwest  
3 Square 3304 Lot 79 and CN and well who you have before you,  
4 Mr. Chairman and the Board is the applicant's team. Thank  
5 you.

6           CHAIRPERSON HILL: Can you tell me the number  
7 again, Mr. Moy?

8           MR. MOY: 21060.

9           CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, if the applicant can hear  
10 me, if they could please introduce themselves for the record.

11           MR. WILLIAMS: Hi members of the BZA. This is  
12 Zach Williams, attorney representing the applicant.

13           CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Williams, have you been  
14 watching today?

15           MR. WILLIAMS: I have.

16           CHAIRPERSON HILL: I hope you have as more  
17 smoother case than we've had today, Mr. Williams.

18           MR. WILLIAMS: I hope so too.

19           CHAIRPERSON HILL: Well we both are hoping for the  
20 same thing, Mr. Williams.

21           MR. WILLIAMS: Hope to make this one quick for you  
22 all.

23           CHAIRPERSON HILL: You can go ahead and tell us  
24 why you believe your applicant, your client is meeting the  
25 relief, meeting the criteria for us to grant the relief

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 requested. I'm going to put 15 minutes on the clock so that  
2 I know where we are and you can begin whenever you like.

3 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, sir. I do have a  
4 presentation. It's brief and I'll allow Mr. Young to pull  
5 that up. Great, thank you so much. Members of the Board  
6 Zoning Adjustment, with me today are the owners of the  
7 project Vic Narula and Chirag Patel as well as our architect  
8 Dave Bloom who will all be available for questions at the  
9 conclusion of the presentation.

10 This is a case at 333 Delafield Place Northwest.  
11 I am Zach Williams as I mentioned. I am with the firm of  
12 Venable and representing the applicant today. Next slide  
13 please. The first slide shows the zoning map with the  
14 property highlighted in green.

15 As you can see, this block of Delafield Place  
16 Northwest is shown to the RA1 zone and comprised mainly of  
17 existing apartment houses. Next slide please. Going down  
18 to the lot that is at issue today, 333 Delafield Place, this  
19 is a single lot with a little bit over 3,000 square feet of  
20 land area.

21 You can see the survey here on this slide of the  
22 existing building on the lot. As I mentioned, it's zoned  
23 RA1. At this time, there's a two-story apartment house on  
24 the lot that has four units.

25 The floor print that you see here on the survey

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 is not going to be changing this application. All the work  
2 that's proposed is within the existing building. Next slide  
3 please. Here are two photographs of the property.

4                   On the left, you can see the property from the  
5 front looking at the property from Delafield Place Northwest,  
6 the road and in the rear there's an alley in the rear and  
7 you're looking at the rear of the property there of 333  
8 Delafield Place. Next slide please.

9                   The proposed project is fairly straightforward.  
10 It's to add two units to the cellar of this existing  
11 apartment house to bring it up to six units total. There  
12 will be no exterior changes to the structure except that we  
13 will be adding a parking pad with three parking spaces at the  
14 rear along with the fence and the screening that's required  
15 for that area. Next slide please.

16                   The relief requested is special exception to add  
17 two units to an existing four-unit apartment house in the RA1  
18 zone. All of the work is by right, permitted without any  
19 further zoning relief. Next slide please.

20                   Walking through the special exception standards,  
21 first the relief must be in harmony with the general purpose  
22 and intent of the zoning regulations. Here the RA1 zone  
23 allows for low to moderate density development and we will  
24 be adding just two units to this existing four-unit apartment  
25 house.

1                   So we'll be in harmony with the purpose and intent  
2 of the RA1 zone. The project, as I mentioned, is going to  
3 meet all development standards in the RA1 zone. Will not  
4 make any additional changes to the exterior of the building  
5 except for and except for lot occupancy and density which are  
6 currently not in conformance. Those will not be changing.

7                   Those have been there since the house was first  
8 built. The neighborhood in this block as I mentioned, has  
9 apartment houses that actually run along both sides. So this  
10 particular project is in harmony with the existing buildings  
11 on the street.

12                  And actually here the case just after this case,  
13 another apartment house on this exact same block that I  
14 believe has 20 or so units. So this one is obviously a lot  
15 less than that, but that's an existing project already  
16 existing on the street. Next slide.

17                  Finally, the relief is not going to adversely  
18 affect the neighboring properties here. We typically think  
19 about light, air and privacy. We're not going to change the  
20 footprint here so there should be no impacts in that aspect  
21 of the project.

22                  We will be adding three parking spaces however.  
23 And that will mitigate the additional two units that we're  
24 proposing. Next slide. There's also some good precedent  
25 here. Actually the house just next door adjacent to this one

1 received BZA relief just last year, just a year ago to do the  
2 exact same thing to add two additional units to a four-unit  
3 apartment house.

4                   The difference there is they actually were not  
5 adding any parking spots and we are adding parking spots as  
6 I already mentioned. Next slide. Finally, we do have ANC  
7 and OP support in the record. ANC40 voted to support the  
8 application.

9                   And Office of Planning recommends support with  
10 conditions that are acceptable to the applicant. And that  
11 concludes my presentation. Thank you.

12                   CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Mr. Williams. All  
13 right, could I hear from the Office of Planning?

14                   MR. JURKOVIC: Good afternoon, Chairman and  
15 Members of the Board. This is Michael Jurkovic, Development  
16 Review Specialist with the Office of Planning. OP recommends  
17 approval with conditions of the special exception for  
18 expansion of the apartment house use relief as requested by  
19 the applicant.

20                   And stands on the record of the report. I am here  
21 to answer any questions. Thank you.

22                   CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, does the Board have any  
23 questions for the applicant or the Office of Planning? Go  
24 ahead, Mr. Blake.

25                   MEMBER BLAKE: There's a second condition from the

1 Office of Planning which requests that the rear yard area is  
2 not dedicated to parking, pedestrian access or trash and  
3 recycling storage should remain grass or other soft  
4 landscaping. Is that reflected in the existing plans?

5 MR. JURKOVIC: From the most recent plans that I  
6 reviewed that were in the record, the rear of the property  
7 was just generally marked to be asphalt. And as the  
8 applicant's represented it was stated that the applicant is  
9 in acceptance of the recommended conditions.

10 So I would, like I said, the condition is based  
11 on the most recent site plan submitted to the record and with  
12 the purpose of this review to include site plan review for  
13 the purposes of landscaping and other items, we would  
14 recommend that as much of the areas in the back stay, you  
15 know, even landscaped or grass as feasible.

16 MEMBER BLAKE: Yes, I think the question was  
17 actually to applicant if it had been reflected in the  
18 existing plans with that condition.

19 MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, that's actually a good  
20 question. It reminds me that I should have raised earlier  
21 we actually submitted plans after the 21-day deadline in  
22 response to some staff comments.

23 And I don't know that the Board officially ruled  
24 on that motion that we filed. I just want to make sure the  
25 record is accurate so we have the most recent plans formally

1 as part of the record.

2 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Moy, do you know if those  
3 are uploaded in the record yet?

4 MR. MOY: I can check, Mr. Chairman.

5 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Let's let, let's let the  
6 staff check while we continue to move forward. Mr. Young,  
7 is there any one here wishing to speak?

8 MR. YOUNG: We do not.

9 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. I mean, in  
10 an effort to get something done today, I am pleased, I am  
11 fine with the conditions. And I believe the applicant will  
12 do what they say they're going to do. But I will wait until  
13 we find the plans.

14 MR. JURKOVIC: The record that the applicant did  
15 actually submit plans soon after I added my report to the  
16 record.

17 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.

18 MR. MOY: Could you take a look at Exhibit 20 and  
19 Mr. Zachary Williams and tell me if those are the plans we're  
20 referring to? Exhibit 20. Then it's in.

21 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, well let me just look at  
22 them. We're just looking to the rear yard now. Here later  
23 on to ask about it. Mr. Williams, where does it show  
24 Condition 2?

25 MR. WILLIAMS: So there was a couple of things we

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 changed in these plans. One was the screening so the fence  
2 around the trash receptacles, that's a new feature of the  
3 plan. And direct response to comments from staff.

4 And then there's also, you can see where it says  
5 turf there in the back.

6 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.

7 MR. WILLIAMS: That's another feature as well.

8 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Jurkovic, oh, God.  
9 Jerkovich?

10 MR. JURKOVIC: Yurokovich.

11 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yurokovich, sorry. Mr.  
12 Yurokovich. I'll get it right one day. Is that acceptable  
13 with the Office of Planning is speaking on concerning their  
14 condition?

15 MR. JURKOVIC: That would be obviously better than  
16 what was initially submitted to the record. We would  
17 encourage, you know, any sort of landscaping the applicant  
18 would be willing to place there past just grass and turf.  
19 But ultimately I would say that it would be acceptable.

20 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Williams, you're getting  
21 a very mediocre pass here. So are you going to try to do  
22 more than that?

23 MR. WILLIAMS: Well, like I said, we are, the  
24 conditions as written in the report from OP are acceptable  
25 to the applicant. And if the Board wants to include those

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 conditions as part of its approval, that's fine with us.

2 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. I'm -- okay.  
3 Does the Board have any further questions or comments? Mr.  
4 Williams, do you have anything at the end you'd like to add?

5 MR. WILLIAMS: I do not, thank you.

6 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. I'm going to close the  
7 hearing and the record. Okay. I think that it was  
8 relatively straight forward. In so far as, you know, they're  
9 not changing the envelope or the footprint of the existing  
10 building.

11 They're trying to add the two units in the  
12 basement. I think that the conditions of the Office of  
13 Planning has put forward do help with some of the possible  
14 issues with the project. I mean, I will go ahead and agree  
15 with their conditions that they are putting in their report.

16 I'm not going to read them. I'm just going to  
17 cite them if a motion is made and I will be voting in favor  
18 of this application. Mr. Smith, do you have anything to add?

19 (No audible response.)

20 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Blake?

21 MEMBER BLAKE: I am in support of the application  
22 and agree to the assessment and give great weight to the  
23 Office of Planning's report and recommendation.

24 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. Dr. Imamura?

25 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Mr. Chairman, I'm in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 agreement with my colleagues.

2 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. I will make a  
3 motion to approve Application No. 21060 as captioned and read  
4 by Secretary including the conditions that are mentioned on  
5 the first page of the Office of Planning's report one through  
6 three and ask for a second, Mr. Blake.

7 MEMBER BLAKE: Second.

8 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Motion made and seconded, Mr.  
9 Moy, take a roll call please.

10 MR. MOY: I recite here your motion, the OP Report  
11 was the reference to Exhibit 19 or Exhibit 18?

12 CHAIRPERSON HILL: That's a good question. Give  
13 me a second here. Exhibit 19. The conditions of the OP  
14 Report in Exhibit 19.

15 MR. MOY: Okay. When I call your name, if you'll  
16 please respond to the motion made by the Chairman Hill to  
17 approve the application for the relief requested along with  
18 the conditions that as cited by the Office of Planning.

19 I'll leave it at that. The motion was second by  
20 Mr. Blake. So Commissioner, Dr. Imamura?

21 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

22 MR. MOY: Mr. Smith?

23 MEMBER SMITH: Yes.

24 MR. MOY: Mr. Blake?

25 MEMBER BLAKE: Yes.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. MOY: Chairman Hill?

2 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.

3 MR. MOY: The staff would record the vote as four  
4 to zero to one. And this is on the motion made by Chairman  
5 Hill to approve. Motion to approve was second by Mr. Blake  
6 who also voted to approve the application as well as approval  
7 from Zoning Commissioner Dr. Imamura, Mr. Smith, of course  
8 Mr. Blake, Chairman Hill.

9 We have one Board Member not participating.  
10 Again, the motion continues on a vote of four to zero to one.

11 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Mr. Moy. Mr. Moy,  
12 you may call our next case.

13 MR. MOY: The next case before the Board is  
14 Application No. 21075 of 301 Delafield Place Northwest, LLC.  
15 Self-certified application pursuant to Subtitle X, Section  
16 901.2 special exception under Subtitle U, Section 421.

17 Property located in the RA1 zone at 301 Delafield  
18 Place Northwest Square 3304 lot 892 and before you is the  
19 applicant's team. Thank you, sir.

20 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. If the applicant  
21 can hear me, if they could please introduce themselves for  
22 the record.

23 MR. DeBEAR: Chair and Board Members, my name is  
24 Eric DeBear from Cozen O'Connor, liaison counsel on behalf  
25 of the applicant.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right, Mr. DeBear, nice to  
2 see you. If you want to, please go ahead and walk us through  
3 your client's application and why you believe they're meeting  
4 the criteria for us to grant the relief requested.

5 I'm going to put 15 minutes on the clock so I know  
6 where we are and you can begin whenever you like.

7 MR. DeBEAR: I'm going to have my client also  
8 introduce themselves, Chair.

9 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.

10 MS. ZURBRIGG: Hi, good afternoon everyone. I'm  
11 Elin Zurbrigg. I am Deputy Director of Mi Casa, Inc., we're  
12 the applicant, obviously.

13 MR. DeBEAR: Thank you. And if Mr. Young could  
14 pull up our presentation filed in the record. So this  
15 application concerns Mi Casa's property at 301 Delafield  
16 Place Northwest. Next slide please.

17 To provide the Board with some brief background,  
18 the project is located at the corner of Third Street  
19 Northwest and Delafield Place Northwest in the RA1 zone.  
20 Next slide please.

21 The property is improved with an existing 23 unit  
22 residential building that is two stories plus a cellar level.  
23 There is a 16-foot wide public alley to the rear of the  
24 property. And it is in the Petworth Brightwood neighborhood  
25 that is primarily residential in nature. Next slide please.

1           I'm going to turn it over to Ms. Zurbrigg just to  
2 give the Board some brief background on Mi Casa.

3           MS. ZURBRIGG: Thank you so much. So Mi Casa,  
4 Inc. is an affordable housing developer based in the  
5 district. We've been providing affordable rental and  
6 homeownership opportunities for district residents for more  
7 than 30 years.

8           And as in all of our affordable rental projects,  
9 301 Delafield Place comes with a commitment to long-term  
10 affordability for D.C. residents. We have equipment to keep  
11 it affordable for at least 40 years.

12           We're currently working on securing our financing  
13 to complete the building renovation. And that's why we are  
14 here before you. We acquired the property under the District  
15 Tenant Opportunity to Purchase Act law when the tenants voted  
16 that they wanted to maintain the building as an affordable  
17 rental building.

18           And as such, they voted to assign the rights to  
19 Mi Casa to purchase the building. Could you go to the next  
20 slide please? And so essentially what we committed to doing  
21 in this project is through an agreement, a development  
22 agreement with the residents.

23           We committed to keeping the building affordable,  
24 very affordable to the income levels at the building  
25 extremely low-income and very low-income. And also too

1 substantially renovated the building to improve living  
2 conditions.

3 It took several years to secure the public  
4 financing to renovate the building. And we are now at a  
5 point where we are, we have applied for and are intending to  
6 secure our permits and begin the building renovation in May  
7 of this year.

8 And the plan is to significantly improve resident  
9 comfort through energy efficiency upgrades especially heating  
10 and cooling the building has had many, many, decades of  
11 deferred maintenance and then transitioning away from fossil  
12 fuels to convert the building to all electric and adding  
13 solar.

14 The residents have patiently waited for this  
15 renovation so it's very important to them to see it  
16 fulfilled. And then as you can see here on the slide, our  
17 plans are to renovate the entire building with no increases  
18 for footage, no changes in the building footprint.

19 And only reconfiguring so that we can provide two  
20 additional very affordable units to families who need them  
21 so the two and three bedroom unit each that are in very high  
22 demand.

23 MR. DeBEAR: Thank you. And if Mr. Young could  
24 go to the next slide. So to give the Board a summary of  
25 outreach ANC4D is in support of the Office of Planning is in

1 support and DDOT has submitted a report with no objection.  
2 Next slide, please.

3 You see here the existing floor plan. Apologies  
4 if it is a little blurry, but much of the cellar level is  
5 either unused or underutilized. It was crawl spaces, there  
6 is a laundry room, other spaces that just simply aren't as  
7 useful as dwellings. Next slide please.

8 So what is being proposed you can see here is  
9 basically just reconfiguring the cellar level to better use  
10 that space and provide two additional units, one of which  
11 will be a two-bedroom and one of which will be a three  
12 bedroom.

13 Again, there's no structural expansion, no  
14 increase to the footprint. The yellow highlights you see are  
15 two new retaining walls. The one on the left would be for  
16 bioretention, the one on the right would be for a window well  
17 to provide light and air along that corner of the building  
18 which will have one of the new units.

19 Next slide please. We're here before you today  
20 seeking relief for a new residential development in the RA1  
21 zone under Subtitle U 421.1 this is required despite being  
22 an existing apartment building. It is required to add the  
23 two units. Next slide please.

24 We believe we've met the general special exception  
25 standard. This is a moderate density multi-dwelling

1 development that's consistent with the RA1 zoning. The  
2 project will renovate underutilized space to create two  
3 family sized affordable dwellings and it is otherwise  
4 compliant with the RA1 standards.

5 We are not seeking any other relief including  
6 vehicular and bicycle parking. Next slide please. There  
7 will be no adverse impacts. The neighboring property can no  
8 structural expansion and a modest increase in density of two  
9 units.

10 Yet improvements to landscaping and storm water  
11 management on the property. Next slide please. And there  
12 are special conditions associated with this request that  
13 existing planned area schools and public streets recreation  
14 and other services can accommodate the increase in residents  
15 for both of those.

16 We believe that net increase of two units will not  
17 have a substantial impact. Nonetheless, the OP report  
18 identifies sufficient capacity at area schools and again, in  
19 terms of streets, public transit being able to minimize any  
20 impacts. Next slide please.

21 The OP is required to refer for comment on a  
22 variety of issues. Again, OP is supportive of the project.  
23 There will be no impact to light and air because there's no  
24 structural expansion.

25 In terms of parking, because we are expanding an

1 existing use, a Subtitle C705 does not require any additional  
2 parking. So there is no parking at this building and there  
3 will continue to be no parking.

4 And then we believe we are maintaining the  
5 character and development scheme of the neighborhood. Again,  
6 it is a neighborhood with several moderate density apartment  
7 buildings as you, as the Board heard on the case just before  
8 ours.

9 And we do believe we'll be improving the  
10 landscaping of the property as reflected in the plans. Next  
11 slide please. And finally, again, just identifying that  
12 we've required, sorry, filed the required plan sets in the  
13 case record as evidenced by the OP report as well.

14 Next slide please. And with that, I'll open it  
15 up to any of the Board's questions.

16 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. Before I turn to  
17 the Board, may I turn to the Office of Planning?

18 MR. JURKOVIC: Good afternoon, again, Chairman and  
19 members of the Board. Mike Jurkovic, Development Review  
20 Specialist for the Office of Planning. OP recommends  
21 approval with condition for the special exception for  
22 expansion of the apartment house use as requested by the  
23 applicant and stands on the record of the report. I am here  
24 to answer any questions. Thank you.

25 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. Does the Board have

1 any questions for the applicant or the Office of Planning?

2 (No audible response.)

3 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Young, is there anyone here  
4 wishing to speak?

5 MR. YOUNG: We do not.

6 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. DeBear, do you have  
7 anything you would like to add at the end?

8 MR. DeBEAR: I do not, thank you to the Board for  
9 your time today.

10 CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right. I'm closing the  
11 hearing and the record. Mr. Young, if you could please  
12 excuse everyone. Would someone else be willing to start  
13 deliberation? Mr. Blake?

14 MEMBER BLAKE: Sure. Having viewed the case  
15 record, the materials and the testimony today, I believe the  
16 Applicant has met the burden of proof to grant the requested  
17 relief pursuant subject to under U421, pursuant to 91.2.

18 This is basically the addition of two cellar units  
19 which will not result in any change to the exterior or  
20 massing of the building. So for that reason, I think  
21 consistent with the Office of Planning's report, I believe  
22 they've met all the conditions of that.

23 DDOT has no objections and ANC4D is in support of  
24 the project. I do believe that the conditions outlined by  
25 the Office of Planning should be incorporated and I would be

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 in support of the application.

2 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Sorry. Mr. Smith?

3 MEMBER SMITH: I have nothing to add. I agree  
4 with Mr. Blake's assessment of this case and will support the  
5 application as well.

6 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. Dr. Imamura?

7 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Mr. Chairman, and thank you  
8 Board Member Blake for your analysis.

9 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes, thank you Board Member  
10 Blake for your analysis as well as the recommendation for the  
11 Office of Planning's recommendation in their condition. I  
12 am going to go ahead and make a motion to approve application  
13 No. 1, oh sorry, 21075 as captioned read by the Secretary  
14 including the condition that was in the Office of Planning's  
15 report in Exhibit 18. And ask for a second, Mr. Blake.

16 MEMBER BLAKE: Second.

17 CHAIRPERSON HILL: The motion is made and second.  
18 Mr. Moy, if you will take a roll call.

19 MR. MOY: When I call your name, if you'll please  
20 respond to the motion made by Chairman Hill to approve the  
21 application for the relief requested along with the condition  
22 that was noted in the OP report which I believe was under  
23 Exhibit 18. The motion to approve was second by Mr. Blake.  
24 Zoning Commissioner Dr. Imamura?

25 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 MR. MOY: Mr. Smith?

2 MEMBER SMITH: Yes.

3 MR. MOY: Mr. Blake?

4 MEMBER BLAKE: Yes.

5 MR. MOY: Chairman Hill?

6 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.

7 MR. MOY: Staff would record the vote as four to  
8 zero to one. And this is on the motion made by Chairman Hill  
9 to approve. The motion to approve was second by Mr. Blake  
10 who also voted to approve the application as well as approval  
11 from the Zoning Commissioner Dr. Imamura, Mr. Smith, Mr.  
12 Blake, and Chairman Hill and one Board Member not  
13 participating. Motion carries on a vote of four to zero to  
14 one.

15 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great. You guys, we have  
16 one more case. Can we just take a quick ten-minute break?

17 (No audible response.)

18 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, thank you.

19 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the  
20 record at 3:35 p.m. and resumed at 3:48 p.m.)

21 MR. MOY: Yes, sir, I hear you.

22 CHAIRPERSON HILL: You want to go ahead and call  
23 the last one?

24 MR. MOY: Okay. The Board has returned to its  
25 public area session after just a very quick ten-minute

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 recess. The time is now at or about 3:48 p.m. The next  
2 case, Application No. 20997, 20997 of Derrick Richardson and  
3 408 Newcomb, LLC.

4                   This application is pursuant to Subtitle X,  
5 Section 901.2 for special exceptions. As follows, under  
6 Subtitle C, Section 714.3, from the screening requirements  
7 for surface parking, Subtitle C, Section 714.2, Subtitle D,  
8 Section 207.5 to allow a rear wall of a semi-detached  
9 building to extend further than ten feet.

10                  And pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 1002, for a  
11 use variance. Subtitle U, Section 201 to allow an apartment  
12 house and a variance from Subtitle C, Section 204.1 to allow  
13 expansion of an existing nonconforming use.

14                  Property located in the R3 zone at 408 Newcomb  
15 Street Southeast Square 5996 Lot 47. And the applicant's  
16 team is in the Panel. Thank you, sir.

17                  CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great. Thank you. If the  
18 applicant can hear me, if they can please introduce  
19 themselves for the record.

20                  MR. McDONALD: Hi, my name is Matt McDonald. I'm  
21 the architect for the applicant and Mr. Derrick Richardson  
22 who I believe is also on the call.

23                  CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, Mr. Richardson, can you  
24 hear me? If so, would you introduce yourself for the record?

25                  MR. RICHARDSON: Yes, sir. I don't know if you

1 can hear me or not.

2 CHAIRPERSON HILL: We can.

3 MR. RICHARDSON: Okay. Yes, sir, and good  
4 afternoon. I am Derrick Richardson. I thank you all for  
5 your time. It's the first time I've been through this  
6 process. And with all due respect, I sat here all day and  
7 I, you know, I envy your job.

8 But I appreciate you taking my time up.  
9 Respectfully I just got out of the hospital yesterday and I  
10 wanted to be here so Mr. Matt and also Valerie Sanderlin is  
11 online to represent me. And for your allowing them to speak  
12 for me, I certainly appreciate it.

13 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Mr. Richardson.

14 MR. RICHARDSON: Yes, sir.

15 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Hi, Mr. McDonald. If you want  
16 to go ahead and walk us through your client's application and  
17 why you believe they're meeting the criteria for us to grant  
18 the relief requested and I will follow along and give, I'm  
19 going to put 15 minutes on the clock so I know where we are  
20 and you can begin whenever you like.

21 MR. McDONALD: All right, thank you. I believe  
22 the OP had our submitted Burden of Proof. I kind of walked  
23 you through and if they can pull that up or do I pull that  
24 up?

25 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Are you speaking of Exhibit 28?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1                   MR. McDONALD: Probably. I don't have the exhibit  
2 list in front of me.

3                   CHAIRPERSON HILL: Well, one Burden of Proof is  
4 an Exhibit 28.

5                   MR. McDONALD: Okay.

6                   CHAIRPERSON HILL: It's a written version --

7                   MR. McDONALD: Yes.

8                   CHAIRPERSON HILL: -- Burden of Proof. Okay,  
9 right.

10                  MR. McDONALD: Correct.

11                  CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.

12                  MR. McDONALD: I just got to -- so OP has already  
13 reviewed our application and has recommended approvals and  
14 we also have support from the local ANCs also. I'll run  
15 through our Burden of Proof.

16                  So we, there's some with physical, I think I know  
17 for the Burden of Proof you have to address the three points,  
18 the physical characteristics of the property create an  
19 exceptional and undue hardship for that owner and you need  
20 a property consistent with the zoning regulations granting  
21 the application whether or not the substantial detriment  
22 to the public good and granting the application will not be  
23 inconsistent with the general intent and purpose of the  
24 zoning regulations in that.

25                  Regarding the physical characteristics of the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 property, we believe the original configuration of the  
2 property as designed was a four unit apartment building.  
3 Many neighboring buildings including 404 Newcomb directly  
4 adjacent which they share the party wall with our four unit  
5 building configurations already.

6 The sale price of additional units in the area,  
7 Ward 8 have a medium income of \$25,000 which is 38 percent  
8 lower when compared to all other Wards of the district. A  
9 48 configuration anticipates the sale price per unit between  
10 280 and \$310,000.

11 If it was a two-unit configuration, the sale price  
12 changes to closer to \$500,000 which limits access to the  
13 local residents to purchase a property in their neighborhood.  
14 Therefore, housing in a four-unit configuration is more  
15 affordable and accessible to the current neighborhood  
16 residents which is a very important request from the ANC in  
17 granting this approval.

18 And in encouraging this application as well. So  
19 to maintain this building with less than four units would  
20 result in a hardship for the owner regarding the property's  
21 value. And some of this stems from the building being  
22 previously damaged beyond repair almost by fire.

23 The building was purchased in 2004 for \$187,000.  
24 The construction costs are anticipated to be a minimum of  
25 \$750,000. The owners also paid city fines to date due to the

1 vacant property and the entire damage in excess of \$90,000.

2 We're anticipating permitting costs between city  
3 permits and design and engineering fees of over \$50,000. And  
4 secured, site security costs which includes temporary  
5 barriers to prevent, you know, essentially squatters is  
6 almost \$8,000.

7 So the current owner costs are \$1.275 million.  
8 So kind of based on that, we need to get a follow up for a  
9 four unit configuration would result in sales of about \$1.24  
10 million while a two-unit configuration would result in sales  
11 closer to a million dollars.

12 Which both would likely be a financial loss for  
13 Richardson, but a four-unit building makes it a little more  
14 palpable I think for him to be able to renovate his property.  
15 So I think between the existing, the original and historical  
16 configuration of the building and the financial hardship,  
17 that's why we're I think how we've complied with point one  
18 of the Burden of Proof.

19 Regarding that this renovation will not be of, the  
20 application will not be a substantial detriment to the public  
21 good, prior to the purchase of this building by Mr.  
22 Richardson, it was not being used as a single family home,  
23 but as a two-unit apartment building.

24 Therefore, any current levels of noise, traffic,  
25 lighting would be minimally affected and as well as the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 addition of four parking spaces in the rear will actually  
2 reduce the street frontage parking in the neighborhood.

3 In addition to this building, there also appears  
4 to be at least 20 or more buildings located within several  
5 blocks of this property that were designed and constructed  
6 as four-unit apartment buildings.

7 I believe granting this application will maintain  
8 the character of this neighborhood and be consistent with the  
9 current use of the neighboring buildings. The building is  
10 currently in the current state, has been damaged by fire and  
11 is unable to be occupied.

12 Granting this application will allow the owner to  
13 upgrade the building both from an aesthetic and safety  
14 standpoint and provide newer, cleaner, safe living units for  
15 the residents.

16 By expanding the building to allow units with two  
17 bathrooms and two bedrooms, two bathrooms, I think this  
18 allows more potential open and more potential residence which  
19 is overall positive for the public good.

20 We've also reviewed this project with the ANC  
21 twice and I have received support every time from them, most  
22 recently we received a letter of support from the ANC8C  
23 Commissioner for this project and the unanimous support from  
24 the ANC indicates their belief that this is a project that's  
25 for the betterment of the neighborhood.

1                   And just to reiterate the lower sale price assists  
2 with the neighborhood with affordable housing inventory and  
3 is aligned with the affordable housing goals within the  
4 district.

5                   And then granting the application will not be  
6 inconsistent with the general intent and purpose of the  
7 zoning regulation map for several reasons. Based on the  
8 floor plan on adjacent properties, it's clear this property  
9 was previously existed in a four-unit configuration.

10                  And the purpose of the R3 zone is to allow for  
11 road dwellings while including an area within each roadway  
12 or mingled and detached dwellings, semi-detached dwellings  
13 and groups of three or more road dwellings.

14                  The intent appears to be in this design is to  
15 limit the scale and size of buildings and provide a lower  
16 density than zones which allow large format apartment  
17 buildings.

18                  We're not proposing a large format apartment  
19 building. It's just a four-unit use which brings it back to  
20 the historical use. The scale is street fronted, the façade  
21 of the building will remain unchanged.

22                  And the two bedroom configuration actually I think  
23 brings it closer to what the intent of the zoning is for not  
24 just, you know, single person living in a small one-unit  
25 apartment building.

1                   So for that reason we saw granting this  
2 application will not be inconsistent with the general intent  
3 and purpose of the zoning regulations. And then  
4 additionally, there have been previous cases of a similar use  
5 variance being approved or similar variances.

6                   404 Newcomb and 411 Mellon are both approved  
7 fairly recently to almost the exact same configuration. I  
8 think that was BZA case 19710. But I think it is a strong  
9 precedent in that neighborhood for this type of a, this type  
10 of renovation.

11                  MEMBER SMITH: Mr. McDonald?

12                  MR. McDONALD: Yes.

13                  MEMBER SMITH: I have a question. Thank you for  
14 giving that history, but variances all stand on their own.  
15 It's not a precedent set when we pass, when a Board or a  
16 previous Board has approved something similar, a similar  
17 variance.

18                  But I do have a question for you that you had  
19 stated. You had said that the units were while there was a  
20 CFO for two units --

21                  MR. McDONALD: Yes.

22                  MEMBER SMITH: -- about for the operation of two  
23 units that historically or the design, the interior design  
24 and layout gives the preponderance of it being four units.  
25 So where there two vacant units in there? Can you expand on

1 how the layout and how there was four units?

2 MR. McDONALD: So it's hard, it's hard to when I  
3 first visited the property, it was completely gutted with  
4 fire. There was no, there were no rooms. I actually had  
5 originally assumed it was a four-unit building based on my  
6 walk through after the fire because it looked like there  
7 were, there you, you know, it looked like where there were  
8 essentially spaces for two kitchens on each floor.

9 I am assuming one of the kitchens may have been  
10 converted to a under-sized bedroom that really wasn't an  
11 appropriate bedroom before in order to make the two-unit  
12 configuration.

13 There was an original four unit certificate of  
14 occupancy from 1984 so I think this was, this was changed  
15 sometime in the 1990s from a four unit to a two unit.

16 MEMBER SMITH: Was there some type of remnants of  
17 a wall between --

18 MR. McDONALD: Yes, there were remnants, so the  
19 units were first floor and second floor. I believe is how  
20 I assumed what the pre-fire condition was. So just based on  
21 my understanding of the, my familiarity with the building  
22 next door, it looked like there were plumbing hardware and  
23 roughage for what would have been a kitchen on, two kitchens  
24 on each level that had been abandoned.

25 MEMBER SMITH: Okay. So you're basing on the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 rough-in and the layout of the adjacent four-unit apartment  
2 buildings?

3 MR. McDONALD: And the previous certificate of  
4 occupancy as well.

5 MEMBER SMITH: Okay. Great, that's helpful.  
6 Thank you.

7 MEMBER BLAKE: And could you address that question  
8 because it seems pretty much you would know. You used the  
9 facility. Correct?

10 MR. RICHARDSON: Yes, sir. When I bought the  
11 property, as a matter of fact, it was an inspector who  
12 referred me to the property. I bought the property as first  
13 to live in and it was a Section 8 tenant living on the top  
14 floor.

15 Now what he did, the person I bought it from, he  
16 said he converted it because as Section 8 go, he has Section  
17 8 tenants, whatever. He said you get more money for four  
18 bedrooms than two bedrooms so he knocked the walls down and  
19 made it two, just two units, upper floor and lower floor.

20 The walls in there, there were four kitchens in  
21 there, but it made it a set of four one-bedroom units. He  
22 took the wall out on each floor and made it what's it, four  
23 bedrooms, two bath.

24 And that's where it was and then they was there  
25 when I bought it with the intent to do the construction, of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 course, the Section 8 tenants that were on my property and  
2 suddenly we got a fire over there from vagrants. But that's  
3 the way it was. There was four kitchens in there.

4                   But he just changed the wall to get more money.  
5 I wasn't concerned about this. You know, it was good to have  
6 the money for the tenants being Section 8, but again, it was  
7 the first property I bought.

8                   I bought to live in, of course, to help me retire  
9 also to get some income. But as time went on that's what  
10 happened. And looking to convert it back since the fire  
11 happened and everything in the neighborhood has turned over  
12 to, you know, there have been four units.

13                   So I was trying to put it back after the fire.  
14 That's when I found out we had to go through all this process  
15 to do that.

16                   MEMBER BLAKE: Thank you. Sorry, Mr. Chair.

17                   CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. McDonald?

18                   MR. McDONALD: I think I don't have much else to  
19 add. I was starting to answer questions from people at this  
20 point.

21                   CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, that's fine. All right,  
22 I am going to turn to the Office of Planning.

23                   MR. JESICK: Chairman and members of the Board,  
24 my name is Matt Jesick representing the Office of Planning  
25 in this case. In our initial report at Exhibit 24, we were

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 unable to recommend approval of the requested variance and  
2 asked the applicant to provide more information.

3                   And since that time, we did meet with the  
4 applicant and they did submit additional information to the  
5 record. And based on that new information, we were able to  
6 conclude that they met the three-part variance test.

7                   And I can get into more detail on that if the  
8 Board would like. We are also recommending approval of the  
9 special exception for the parking lot screening. And that  
10 analysis is in Exhibit 24 and also as we stated in Exhibit  
11 24, we do not feel that the relief to C204 or D207 is  
12 necessary in this case.

13                   That concludes my verbal testimony, but happy to  
14 answer any questions. Thank you.

15                   CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, Mr. McDonald, are you  
16 aware that the Office of Planning doesn't think you need  
17 C204.1 or D207.5?

18                   MR. McDONALD: I am now, yes. I think that was,  
19 we received a memo from the Zoning Administrator that  
20 included those originally which is why we have them in there,  
21 but we're happy to follow OP's recommendation on this.

22                   CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay and withdraw then your  
23 request for D207.5 and C204.1?

24                   MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.

25                   CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right, Mr. Young,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is there anyone here wishing to speak?

2 MR. YOUNG: We do not.

3 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, Mr. McDonald, do you have  
4 anything you would like to add at the end?

5 MR. McDONALD: I just wanted to, you know,  
6 reiterate that the ANC, I think they -- I believe you have  
7 their support letter, but I think this is a very, the  
8 Affordable Housing aspect that's triggered by the four units  
9 was a very key and important part of the ANC approval and  
10 support for this project.

11 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, thank you, Mr. McDonald.  
12 Okay, I'm going to close the hearing and the record. Will  
13 you excuse everyone, Mr. Young? Thank you all very much.  
14 Okay, so now what's before us again is a special exception  
15 for the screen requirements, for the surface parking and then  
16 the use variance for the four apartment house units.

17 I would agree with the analysis of the Office of  
18 Planning as provided concerning both the screen requirements  
19 and the four units. I think that, you know, it was the  
20 argument that it was originally four units, now if they can  
21 only do two units it's not going to be financially feasible.

22 And due to the fire, had some other implications  
23 that made this a unique situation that results in a practical  
24 difficulty for the owner. So I'm going to be in favor of  
25 this. And I also note that the ANC8C was in support and I

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 will be voting in favor of this application. Mr. Smith, do  
2 you have anything you would like to add?

3 MEMBER SMITH: I don't have anything to add. I  
4 agree with the Office of Planning's assessment of this  
5 particular case of the findings of a hardship due to from  
6 financial standpoint.

7 And also the fact that this property has  
8 historically been it seems prior to up until that fire, based  
9 on information submitted by the applicant, the property  
10 owner, and the representative for the property owner that  
11 this was in a four-unit configuration.

12 And I do believe that it meets the standards for  
13 the three-prong test for relief from the variance. So I will  
14 support the application.

15 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. Dr. Imamura?

16 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
17 I am in agreement with your analysis as well as the Board  
18 Member Smith. Don't have anything further to add.

19 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. Mr. Blake?

20 MEMBER BLAKE: I'm in favor of the application.  
21 I do believe that concludes the factors does contribute to  
22 an exceptional situation. And given the location, it's  
23 consistent.

24 It's, you know, inconsistent with the neighborhood  
25 and I will be voting in favor of the application. In favor

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 of both the special exception as well as the variance.

2 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. All right, I'm  
3 going to make a motion to approve Application No. 20997.  
4 Pursuant to Subtitle X 901.2 for special exceptions under  
5 Subtitle C 714.3 from the screening requirements for service  
6 parking in Subtitle C714.2 and pursuant to Subtitle X1002 for  
7 a use variance from Subtitle U201 to allow an apartment house  
8 four unit and ask for a second, Mr. Blake.

9 MEMBER BLAKE: Second.

10 CHAIRPERSON HILL: The motion is made and  
11 seconded. Mr. Moy, if you take a roll call?

12 MR. MOY: Thank you, sir. When I call your name,  
13 if you will please respond to the motion made by Chairman  
14 Hill to approve the application for the relief requested as  
15 amended as well by the Board and the motion was second by Mr.  
16 Blake. Zoning Commissioner Imamura?

17 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

18 MR. MOY: Mr. Smith?

19 MEMBER SMITH: Yes.

20 MR. MOY: Mr. Blake?

21 MEMBER BLAKE: Yes.

22 MR. MOY: Chairman Hill?

23 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.

24 MR. MOY: Staff would record the vote as four to  
25 zero to one. And this is on the motion made by Chairman Hill

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 to approve. The motion to approve was second by Mr. Blake  
2 who voted to approve the application as well as approval from  
3 Zoning Commissioner Dr. Imamura, Mr. Smith, Mr. Blake,  
4 Chairman Hill, no other Board member participating. Motion  
5 carries, sir, on the vote of four to zero to one.

6 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Mr. Moy. Mr. Moy,  
7 is there anything else before the Board today?

8 MR. MOY: There's nothing from the staff, sir.

9 CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right, gentlemen, it seems  
10 longer today. I don't know, maybe it's the gray day or  
11 something. No? It seems --

12 MEMBER SMITH: Not in comparison to the last two  
13 weeks.

14 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right, okay well  
15 then it must just be me. So you all have a good day then.  
16 We are adjourned. Thank you.

17 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the  
18 record at 4:09 p.m.)

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

C E R T I F I C A T E

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Public Hearing

Before: DC BZA

Date: 03-06-24

Place: teleconference

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

*Neal R. Gross*  
Court Reporter

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1716 14TH ST., N.W., STE. 200

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-7831

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)