GOVERNMENT OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY

JUNE 26, 2024

+ + + + +

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

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBER PRESENT:

TAMMY STIDHAM, NPS Designee

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

KEARA MEHLERT, Secretary PAUL YOUNG, A/V Production Specialist

OFFICE OF PLANNING DEVELOPMENT REVIEW STAFF PRESENT:

JOEL LAWSON, Associate Director SHEPARD BEAMON MAXINE BROWN-ROBERTS MICHAEL JURKOVIC

OFFICE OF ZONING ATTORNEY ADVISORS PRESENT:

SARAH BAJAJ, ESQ. CARISSA DEMARE, ESQ.

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Regular Public Hearing held on June 26, 2024.

CONTENTS

Application	No.	21031	of	CP 4th Street SE, LLC	4
Application	No.	21133	of	Arel Properties, LLC	35
Application	No.	21134	of	Frederick and Ruth Elliott	67
				The Family Place,	89

(10:33 a.m.)

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

BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: When you're ready, please call the first hearing case.

MS. MEHLERT: The first case in the Board's hearing session is Application No. 21031 of CP 4th Street, S.E., LLC.

As amended, this is a self-certified application pursuant to Subtitle X Section 901.2 for special exceptions under Subtitle C Section 710.3 from the vehicle parking location restrictions of Subtitle C Section 710.2(c)(2) for all lots, under Subtitle D Section 202.4 from the minimum lot area requirements of Subtitle D Section 202.1 for Lot 820 for voluntary inclusionary development, under Subtitle D Section 5201 from the rear yard requirements of Subtitle D Section 207.1 for lot 820, and the alley lot side yard requirements of Subtitle D 5100.1(d) for lots 818 and 819, and pursuant to Subtitle X Section 1002 for an area variance from the front setback requirements of Subtitle D Section 206.2 for Lot 820.

This project is to construct five new two-story attached principal dwellings on an unimproved lot to be subdivided as four alley record lots and one street-facing record lot in a voluntary IZ development.

Project is located in the R-3 Zone at 3931 through 3939 4th Street, S.E., Square 6153, Lots 816, 817, 818, 819

2.0

2.1

and 820. 1 The public hearing was originally scheduled for 2 3 March 6th. It was postponed at the Applicant's request to 4 April 10th. 5 The application was amended on March 20th and the hearing was administratively rescheduled to today. The 6 7 merits have not been heard. 8 BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you, Ms. Mehlert. 9 Good morning, Ms. Moldenhauer. 10 MS. MOLDENHAUER: Good morning, Vice Chair John 11 and members of the Board. My name is Meridith Moldenhauer, zoning counsel for the Applicant. joined today by the Applicant and our 13 I am I'd like them to introduce themselves if that's 14 architect. 15 okay. 16 BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Sure. Go ahead. 17 MR. EGOEGONWA: Hello. I'm Manny Egoegonwa, managing partner here with Cubed Partners. Thank you for 18 19 having us. 20 BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you. 2.1 MR. EGOEGONWA: Andrew? MR. RASHID: Andrew Rashid with Rashid Architects. 22 2.3 BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you. So, please go 24 ahead, Ms. Moldenhauer. Tell us why you're here and how your

application meets the requirements for approval.

2 pull up our PowerPoint, which is at Exhibit 32 in the record, we can walk through a brief review of the application and be 3 happy to answer questions. 5 Next slide. Next slide. Introduced ourselves You can see here this is a grouping of tax lots already. 6 7 that front on 4th Street and have alley access all located 8 in the R-3 Zone. 9 Next slide. Here is an existing condition image 10 of the property. You can see on the image on your right-hand side, the metal stair that kind of goes down to the grade of 11 And you can see the existing trees on the site 12 the site. both in the right image and the left image. 13 14 Next slide. I'll now turn it over to Manny to introduce himself and a little bit about the project. 15 16 MR. EGOEGONWA: Absolutely. Thanks, Meridith. 17 Once again, Manny Egoegonwa, managing partner with Cubed Partners. Cubed Partners is a minority-led boutique 18 19 real estate firm focused in the Washington area delivering 2.0 quality affordable Aa housing within the District and also 2.1 within difficult developed areas. 22 And we've been around for a few years now and we're looking to continuous work on solving the housing 23 24 issues within the city. 25 Next slide, please. So, we're here today and

MS. MOLDENHAUER: Absolutely. If Mr. Young could

Meridith and Andrew will talk more about it, but we're here 1 to develop the -- to talk about and seeking approval on the 2 3 five lots that you saw earlier in the presentation. 4 They are subdivided for five single-family homes, 5 four of which are alley-facing and one facing the main street, which is 4th Street, S.E. 6 7 There is a build out paper alley that we're also 8 developing which is also a part of the dedication that we're 9 going through. 10 And as is noted on the presentation there, that's Lot 821 and we are looking into creating a 24-foot wide 11 public alley that will consist of an actual roadway, sidewalk and greenspace area as we've discussed with DDOT. 13 And with that, I will turn it back to Meridith and 14 15 happy to answer questions as we go along. 16 BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you. 17 MS. MOLDENHAUER: Next slide. I'll turn Great. it over to Andrew to walk through some of the architectural 18 plans and then I'll walk through the relief. 19 20 Andrew, you're muted. 2.1 MR. RASHID: I always do that. Sorry, everyone. 22 (Laughter.) 2.3 MR. RASHID: We were tasked with designing these As we took this on, this project, we 24 affordable units. didn't think of them that way. We thought of them as doing

quality design work. These are three-bedroom, 2-1/2-bath units, two-story units.

As you can see, it creates a kind of a community for these families on this alley facade. We have one parking space per unit, which has been worked out with DDOT, in the public space. And that is defined by curbs, as you will see later in the renderings. We have a link to 4th Street on the right side with a sidewalk that walks down the whole site.

Next slide. You can see it's quite a bit of a slope down this site. We are limited to a 20-foot height in this area because of the alley. And this is a very modern architecture that we are designing to.

Next slide. You can see the renderings. We're using a fiber cement material as the siding for these facades. We've tried to articulate the entries and give a variety of materials.

You can see these aren't very imposing on the neighborhood due to their 20-foot height, but they're three different -- two different unit types. There are three of the same, two of a more rectangular oblong shape.

The next slide. As you can see in the slide, the sidewalk coming from 4th Street on the right, the curbs that delineate the parking spaces so that we don't have the whole site parked and the stepping down along the site and the quality of the design and the materials.

2.1

2.3

Meridith?

2.1

MS. MOLDENHAUER: Thank you very much. Next slide. So, we're here today to discuss variance relief from the front yard setback requirement, special exception relief for the location of the surface parking spaces as they're located between the front facade and the front property line, side yard relief for two lots, rear yard relief for one lot, and minimum lot area requirements for one lot.

Next slide. The variance relief is from the front setback requirement. We're proposing a 25.5-foot front setback. We've outlined how we satisfied the variance standard.

Next slide. We've outlined and identified that there is a confluence of factors here pertaining to multiple, different and unique conditions that are associated with this front street-facing lot.

One, preservation of a front yard tree that was identified in our discussions with DDOT and OP. We will continue to work with the D.C. arborists to preserve that tree, as identified in the report.

As shown both in the existing conditions and the architectural plans, the public walkway that gets you down the sloping topography of the site from 4th Street down to the facade, as well as the paper alley, these confluence of factors contribute to the difficulty of complying with the

front setback requirement and create practical difficulties for that compliance.

There is no substantial detriment to the public good or impairment of the zone plan as this does create all-affordable, townhome-style, single-family homes for family-style units that will have less visibility on 4th Street and is also obviously consistent with the desire to have more residential homes in the R-3 Zone.

Next slide. We are seeking special exception relief to the location of the surface parking spaces. You can see, in blue here, it's only for these four lots because the farthest lot is a street-facing lot.

And so, that parking space is actually going to be located on the side of the lot and does not have the same issue of area of relief from the front facade to the front lot line as these four blue circles show. So, we're seeking the ability to have a special exception relief from that location requirement.

Next slide. We are also seeking special exception relief from the side yard. In an alley lot, you must have a five-foot side yard from any and all non-alley lots.

You can see that the first lot that we are developing is a non-alley lot because it has 4th Street facing. The abutting apartment building that the Applicant owns as well is a non-alley lot.

2.0

2.1

And so, the two circles are areas where we would have a required five-foot side yard, but we are seeking relief as we are proposing zero.

Next slide. We are seeking special exception relief from the rear yard requirement as this is a front-facing lot.

You can see we have the front facade. We have our two side yards that we are proposing a zero rear yard here for our street-facing lot to be consistent with the design concept and to create, as Andrew said, this community feel and it's a very well-designed concept. So, we're seeking rear yard relief on that front-facing street lot.

Next slide. Last, we are seeking special exception relief pursuant to the IZ -- opt-in IZ requirement for this street-facing lot as we are not able to provide a 4,000 square foot lot; but, under the special exception permission for opting into IZ, we are allowed to provide a lot of 3,000 feet.

And so, we're asking for that special exception for the minimum lot area requirement going from the 4,000 required for a detached home to 3,348 square feet.

Next slide. All of these special exception reliefs I have identified, the parking, the side yards, rear yard and the minimum lot, we believe satisfy the special exception requirement as it is in harmony with the purpose

2.0

and intent of the zone plan.

2.1

The project proposes five family-size affordable homes that will add to the D.C. housing stock. It will not tend to adversely affect the neighboring properties as it does create a community that is less visible from 4th Street, given the topography, but also creates a consistent character that is compliant with the design requirements of the surrounding neighborhood.

Next slide. There are special conditions for seeking the special exception relief to surface parking. We have satisfied that.

It is not practical to locate the parking in another location, it is more efficient use of the land, and that we have provided buffering and appropriate greenspace. We have located this in order to not create an interior garage space, which would have lost habitable space, in order to provide these family-style units.

We have proposed a location that we believe is consistent with creating a well-designed landscaped streetscape.

And we also, as we noted in OP and DDOT's comments, there is appropriate curbs. That way it limits the ability to park only in that parking space and nowhere else on that front area of the facade. The Board obviously may impose additional restrictions as they find appropriate.

1 Next slide. We have had numerous meetings where 2 the Applicant has gone and presented to the ANC. The ANC did 3 formally vote on this and had a unanimous vote in support in 4 February. 5 We have communicated with the ANC to request their resolution be placed into the record on numerous times; 6 7 however, they have not done that, but we did present to them 8 both regarding the alley closing. 9 They did submit a resolution to the D.C. Council 10 in connection with the alley naming and that is currently pending as a billable for D.C. Council. 11 And then we also 12 presented to them outlining all of these zoning issues. DDOT has also issued their letter in support or 13 14 their no objection at Exhibit 22 in which we understand we will be working with them in connection with public space 15 16 review and continuing to work with them for the alley dedication and public space approval for that improvement. 17 18 And OP has issued a letter of support at Exhibit again, 19 which, those conditions we consent to 20 outlined in that report. 2.1 Next slide. The conditions. OP has outlined that 22 obviously we must obtain the alley approval for the alley 23 dedication. We understand that and are pursuing that. 24 That pursuant to the minimum lot requirement, that

be designated as

of

the

units

which

IZ,

voluntarily opting into the IZ program. 1 2 The resolution that any potential heritage or 3 special trees on the property be preserved and comply with law, obviously the Board is aware that we must and will 5 comply with all heritage tree and tree laws as required. That we maintain and design the parking pads 6 7 unless tress require minimum shifting, obviously we will work 8 and if there's minor modifications of shifting those, we will 9 coordinate with DDOT and public space. 10 That we preserve the front yard tree that is part of our contributing factor for the variance for the street-11 facing lot and we agreed to do that. conditions compliance 13 DDOT that with DDOT standards on the alley design, construction, and dedication 14 15 and we acknowledge and will work with them during the public space review process. 16 17 Next slide. That concludes our presentation. thank you for your time and are available for any questions. 18 19 BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you, Ms. Moldenhauer. 20 Does the Board have any questions? 2.1 MEMBER BLAKE: Ι have one question 22 Moldenhauer. You mentioned the ANC. I assume you're talking 2.3 about ANC 8D. 24 MR. EGOEGONWA: That's correct.

MEMBER BLAKE:

25

Could you elaborate a little bit

1	on the interaction with ANC 8E?
2	MR. EGOEGONWA: Sure.
3	MS. MOLDENHAUER: I'll let my client do that.
4	Yeah, thank you.
5	MR. EGOEGONWA: Absolutely. And I've been directly
6	involved in all the presentation. I made all the
7	presentations to the ANCs.
8	The last meeting, which I believe was in February,
9	as noted, was met we met at the library and, like I said,
10	overwhelming support for the development.
11	I had several conversations with our single member
12	district what's her name? Lakesha Williams and she,
13	you know, told me she was going to send resolution over. And
14	that was not received, but she has been very supportive of
15	the development. She has expressed support and also
16	expressed her support even at the broader ANC.
17	MEMBER BLAKE: Have you met with ANC 8E?
18	MR. EGOEGONWA: No.
19	MEMBER BLAKE: Okay. I believe they are across the
20	street and we should have given notification; is that right,
21	Ms. Moldenhauer?
22	MR. EGOEGONWA: We can confirm that.
23	I think when we started this process right before
24	the there was a bit of a redistrict then. We I believe
25	we started I don't know why you're saying, 8E, and I'm

thinking what it was prior before it became 8D. 1 And we had -- this was back in early '23 or even 2 late '22 and we had met with that particular -- this is when 3 Salim was the ANC commissioner of single member district for 5 whatever that ANC was. So, I don't recall now if it was 8E, but we had 6 7 had our initial conversation back then. And then only to 8 find out that the lines had changed and we were now 8D. 9 we started our conversation with 8D and where Commissioner 10 Williams became the point of contact there. 11 MEMBER BLAKE: All right. Thank you. 12 BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you. Just to clarify, 13 you met with both ANCs at some point? 14 So, I'm trying to recall what the MR. EGOEGONWA: 15 ANC used to be that we were in, as I go back through my 16 emails, okay, when -- I believe the name is Commissioner 17 He was the ANC commissioner at the time before there was a redistricting done and we became an 8D. 18 19 So, what I'm trying to say here is today we have 2.0 inserted some email or connection note, as I note here, to 21 8E in particular today, but I 'm -- but we've been very 22 focused on 8D. But I'm noting for the Board here that we had some 2.3 24 conversations in our prior work -- prior district --

onetime conversation at the beginning of this process before

told that did not belong to 1 we that 2 So, Ι apologize that Ι don't have particular. 3 particular ANC location here as I look for it in my emails. 4 BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. And while you do 5 that, does any other board member have a question for the Applicant? 6 7 Go ahead, Commissioner Stidham. STIDHAM: 8 MEMBER Ms. Moldenhauer, could you 9 explain why you can't meet the side yard requirements that 10 you're asking relief for? Maybe you said it in 11 presentation and I missed it. 12 MS. MOLDENHAUER: So, obviously, given that it is a special exception, we don't have to -- for side yards and 13 for rear yards you don't have to describe -- actually, it's 14 15 on a variance you don't have to say why we can't meet it. 16 All we have to -- we have to satisfy the special exception 17 requirements to be able to seek relief from it. 18 And so, we believe that we do satisfy the special exception standards to seek relief both from the side yard 19 2.0 and the rear yard, and the parking lot, based on the fact 2.1 that we have proposed a design that we think is more in harmony with the overall plan and the zone plan and that 22 23 there's no adverse impact to the zone plan or any abutting 24 neighbors.

Okay.

MEMBER STIDHAM:

25

Thank you.

1	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Board Member Smith so,
2	before I go to the Office of Planning, Ms. Moldenhauer, can
3	you put up the slide that shows the walkway to Fourth Street?
4	MS. MOLDENHAUER: Sure. Mr. Young, if you can put
5	up Slide No. 4, that would be great.
6	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you. There's
7	background noise in somebody's phone. Thank you.
8	MS. MOLDENHAUER: So, if you look at the right-
9	hand image here, you can see kind of between the two trees
10	that are there to the right of that white pole. You can see
11	a metal railing and then there's an opening that goes down.
12	That's the current stair that goes down.
13	And I don't know if Mr. Young can see that and can
14	circle that, but it's on the right-hand photo image. That's
15	the existing condition.
16	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Um-hm.
17	MS. MOLDENHAUER: Is that what you're asking for,
18	Ms. John, to kind of understand where that is now?
19	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: I'm trying to understand the
20	variance. I think I understand it, but I wasn't quite sure.
21	So, that's where you can't pull the building forward because
22	of that walkway. Is that what you said?
23	MS. MOLDENHAUER: Yes, because of the walkway. And
24	then if we can also and because of the tree.
25	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Yeah.

1	MS. MOLDENHAUER: So, the tree is located in the
2	front yard. And in order to then be able to preserve both
3	the walking path, have privacy from the side of the facade
4	of the home even though it's deemed to be the front of the
5	home, it's really kind of the side and it's where we have
6	windows into the kitchen.
7	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Um-hm.
8	MS. MOLDENHAUER: And so, to have a distance that
9	provides, you know, kind of privacy from that walkway as well
10	as preserving the tree in the front on the property, we need
11	to set back from that critical tree root.
12	And that is part of the confluence of factors for
13	why we're asking to be built back farther than the front yard
14	range on the block, but I would note that it is consistent
15	with the square.
16	There are other properties on the square that are
17	within the range we're asking for.
18	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Um-hm. Okay. Thank you.
19	Thank you, Mr. Young. So, if there's no more questions from
20	the Board, I'll go to the Office of Planning.
21	MR. LAWSON: Hi. Good morning, Madam Chair and
22	members of the Board. I'm Joel Lawson
23	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Good morning.
24	MR. LAWSON: Joel Lawson of the Office of
25	Planning. Very briefly, as the Applicant mentioned, the

1	Office of Planning has recommended approval of this
2	application.
3	There's a fair amount of relief being requested,
4	but we think that the Applicant has adequately addressed the
5	relevant tests for each aspect of that relief.
6	I can go through that in more detail if you'd
7	like, but for now I'll just say that we're standing on the
8	record of our report.
9	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. Thank you. Does the
10	Board have any questions of the Office of Planning?
11	Okay.
12	MR. LAWSON: Excuse me, Madam Chair. I should
13	note I should have noted this earlier. There are a number
14	of conditions attached to OP's recommendation.
15	All of those are intended to help mitigate
16	potential impacts and to help justify the relief that is
17	being requested. The Applicant has agreed to each one of
18	those conditions.
19	I would just note that the Applicant's
20	presentation mentioned the resolution of DDOT issues with the
21	improvements and they have agreed to address DDOT's
22	conditions as well.
23	One of those relates to the resolution of heritage
24	and special tree issues (audio interference)
25	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Mr. Lawson, we're having

1	difficulty hearing you.
2	MR. LAWSON: I'm sorry.
3	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Can you maybe turn your mic
4	up or something?
5	MR. LAWSON: Yeah. Is this better?
6	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: A little better. Thank you.
7	Yes.
8	MR. LAWSON: Okay. I'll just speak louder. I
9	think my mic is already turned up.
10	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Yeah.
11	MR. LAWSON: Sorry. So, I just wanted to note
12	that DDOT's condition that we agree with regarding resolution
13	of heritage and special trees extends a little bit further
14	than beyond further beyond the Applicant's property.
15	It includes trees that could be impacted by this
16	proposal, which could include areas of the alley that will
17	need to be installed to service this site by the Applicant.
18	So, I just want to make it clear that that
19	condition is a little bit broader than the Applicant's
20	property, but the Applicant has agreed to those conditions.
21	Thank you.
22	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. Thanks. I had just
23	one question about the IZ condition because the Applicant is
24	seeking relief under the IZ regulations.

So, if that relief is granted, it would be a

I'm not quite sure why it would be a condition. 1 Are you just seeking to highlight it or --2 3 That's exactly right, Madam Chair. MR. LAWSON: 4 BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. MR. LAWSON: It is a bit of an unusual form of 5 relief and we want to make sure that, as they go through the 6 7 permitting process, that the need for that inclusionary zoning unit remains very clear and obvious to people through 8 9 the permitting process. Thank you. 10 BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. So, we'll 11 maybe see how the lawyers can properly address that in writing the order because it's captioned as one of the areas seeking relief. 13 14 Mr. Blake, I saw your hand up. 15 MEMBER BLAKE: Sure. Mr. Lawson, could you please 16 address Condition No. for and how that the me 17 requirement -- that condition is appropriate relative to the relief request? 18 19 LAWSON: Yeah. For the sake of brevity, MR. 2.0 Condition 4 relates to the parking pads. I believe that's 21 the one you're referring to. And OP has proposed that 22 parking pads can be no larger than what is shown on the 23 drawings. 24 We just want to, again, make sure that the parking pads that are already a little bit larger than we would

1	normally anticipate for a single-car parking spot not get any
2	larger.
3	However, I do think it's appropriate, or OP felt
4	it was appropriate, to provide a little bit of flexibility
5	regarding those parking pads if some adjustments to the
6	parking pads are needed to ensure the preservation of one of
7	the trees either on the property or directly adjacent to the
8	property.
9	So, it provides that little bit of flexibility,
10	but not to make the parking pads larger than is shown on the
11	drawing.
12	MEMBER BLAKE: Okay. Thank you.
13	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. So, the plan now, Ms.
14	Moldenhauer, requires 12-foot parking 12-foot parking
15	pads?
16	MS. MOLDENHAUER: The parking shows a 15 by 20
17	parking pad.
18	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: 15 by 20. Okay. Did I see
19	Board Member Smith's hand up? Board Member Smith?
20	MEMBER SMITH: You did, but my question was in
21	relation to the same that Mr. Blake asked.
22	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. Thank you.
23	Commissioner Stidham, did you have any questions?
24	MEMBER STIDHAM: No. No, ma'am.
25	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you. Mr. Young, is

1	there anyone signed up to testify?
2	MR. YOUNG: We do not.
3	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you. Do you have your
4	hand up, Board Member Blake?
5	MEMBER BLAKE: I do. I wanted to ask the Office
6	of Planning one last question if Mr. Lawson is still there.
7	You had mentioned some issue about potential surface parking
8	conflicts at the rear of the property.
9	Can you discuss that briefly?
10	MR. LAWSON: Yeah. It's an issue that I know that
11	the Applicant has been discussing with DDOT. There is some
12	current surface parking kind of in behind the Applicant's
13	behind the subject site. That parking seems to be at least
14	partly within the area where the new alley would have to go
15	through.
16	So, it's essentially so, it's not legal parking
17	because it's not on private property, but we feel it's
18	appropriate that the Applicant resolve and make sure that the
19	owners of or the people who use those parking spaces are
20	aware of that conflict and address the concerns that they may
21	have.
22	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay.
23	MEMBER BLAKE: Thank you.
24	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you. Any other
25	questions?

So, Ms. Moldenhauer, do you have any closing comments?

MS. MOLDENHAUER: So, I would just indicate that we have had extensive conversations with OP and DDOT. We area aware of the various points that were made and have been in tough with abutting property owners as well as are aware of the need to obviously be able to build out the alley in order to provide access to the project and understand that there may be additional work that we will have to do to comply, as we said, with the D.C. arborists and requirements under the D.C. Tree Preservation laws.

We are aware of those and we will work out those issues, obviously, as we continue down this path. We are excited for this project.

We did note that we would -- given that there was this redistricting and the point regarding the ANC, we would obviously request to close the record, but to simply send formal notification to the abutting ANC and provide maybe 30 days for them to follow up. We think that that would be appropriate.

We have had conversations back in December of 2022. As I said, this project has been going on for a very long time because of the complicated nature of the alley dedication and other factors that the Applicant has had extensive communication with many of the ANC members and

2.1

2.3

community members prior to the redistricting this past year. 1 2 And so, we feel as though community outreach has 3 been substantial, but we do want to ensure that we comply. So, we would be happy to send a notification and leave the 5 record open for that purpose. MR. EGOEGONWA: And then just to clarify, it was 6 7 8C that --8 MS. MOLDENHAUER: Previously 8C. 9 MR. EGOEGONWA: 8C. 10 BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. Thank you. So, Ms. Moldenhauer, we have been following this 11 new policy where we don't deliberate until we have all of the information in the record. 13 And because notice to the affected ANCs is a 14 15 statutory requirement, I'm inclined to agree with you that 16 the case needs to be continued. I don't know if the time is 17 30 days. 18 Madam Chairwoman, Ms. Mehlert, are we looking at the 30-day notice period or should it be longer? 19 2.0 MS. MEHLERT: So, I'll note that the application 2.1 was noticed from the Office of Zoning to ANC 8E. it's just the Applicant is saying that they didn't serve it 22 23 to 8E, but we formally noticed to them in terms of meeting 24 the requirements.

BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. So, they had actual

notice from the Office of Zoning? 1 2 MS. MEHLERT: Correct. 3 BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. Well, then I have to reverse what I just said. So, unless I hear from the lawyers 5 in the next five minutes, or less, I'm going to close the record and the hearing based on the fact that there was 6 7 actual notice to the ANCs and I quess one of the lawyers can 8 chime in if I'm not correct. 9 So, thank you, Ms. Moldenhauer, and I just want 10 to commend you on your slide presentation because there's so 11 many areas of relief. It was very easy to track through the requests that you're seeking. I'11 13 So, with that, thank you for your presentation and excuse the other witnesses. 14 15 MS. MOLDENHAUER: Thank you all for your time. 16 MR. EGOEGONWA: Thank you. Thank you. 17 BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. So, are we ready to deliberate? I think I'll go ahead and get started. 18 19 Mr. Young, if you could put up those conditions? I believe there was a slide with all of the conditions toward 2.0 2.1 the end. And while you look for it, I'll begin. 22 I thought that the only question I had about the application was in terms of the variance request and the --23 24 whether the application met the standard for a confluence of factors and I thought that that requirement was met primarily

because of the difficulty with the walkway.

2.0

2.1

And as to the special exception requirements, I thought they were fairly straightforward. And I think, given the topography that they were working with, that it's a good design.

I think the requirement for the IZ development should be stated in the order itself, not as a condition, since the Applicant did request relief from Subtitle D 202.4. And that is with respect to Lot 820, which would be -- I believe that would be the IZ unit, but the lawyers can make that correction in the order if I'm incorrect.

I thought aside from that, the Office of Planning did a good job in analyzing each of the different areas of relief.

I did not think that there would be any impact to light and air and privacy based on the layout of all of the units and how the slope is sort of -- how the units are built into the slope. I thought that was really quite effective.

In terms of the DDOT conditions, now, typically the Board does not include DDOT's conditions because that would be outsourcing the Board's authority over zoning to DDOT, or vice versa, giving DDOT a veto over the Board's authority for zoning.

So, while all of those conditions are quite worthy and the Board would support them, it would not be something

that the Board would include as a condition.

2.0

2.1

Then the paper alley, taping over the paper alley, and that would be something the Applicant would have to work out with DDOT; however, as the Applicant, I'm sure, understands, the Applicant has to meet the requirement for the 24-foot alley at permitting.

In terms of the tree issues, I would make the same comment. And, let's see, the dedication, which is clearly not something the Board would concern itself with.

The issue of the parking pads, I think either the plan should reflect 12-foot parking pads or not and I don't think the record should be unclear as to what the Applicant is actually going to build. And so, I would not accept OP's condition.

And apparently it's required to the pervious surface requirement, but that would be something that could be addressed at permitting.

Similarly, I think I discussed the preservation of the trees, but that's also something that is beyond the scope of the Board's authority. It's not a zoning issue and neither is stormwater management.

Although they are all appropriate and something that, in my opinion, should be done, they are not within the scope of the Board's authority.

So, the only condition which is not a condition

in the order that this is an IZ project and there must be one 2 unit dedicated to an IZ unit -- an IZ purpose. And it might 3 be Lot 820, but that, I believe, can be clarified. 5 So, with that, I'm going to ask my board members if they would like to add any comments. Thank you, Mr. 6 7 Young. Board Member Smith? 8 9 Thank you, Vice Chair John. MEMBER SMITH: Ι 10 think all of your comments were fairly spot on on conditions. 11 12 Given everything that has been presented just looking at the request on special exceptions, I do believe 13 they've met the burden of proof for us to grant the special 14 exceptions from the vehicle parking requirements, the rear 15 yard requirements, side yard requirements, as well as the 16 17 area variance from the front setback requirements. 18 Given the constraints -- the zoning constraints on this particular property and the nature of how these lots 19 20 are laid out, to me, was more of a question about some of the 2.1 conditions that were proposed by the Office of Planning. 22 I think they have gone through them cautiously and 23 that they point by point are the reasons why they should be 24 included specifically as conditions. 25

that I think should be included is the -- a clear statement

I do support your approach to OP's recommended

condition by the IZ unit. I think it could be something that could be memorialized or more clearly stated within the order, but it's not something that we would necessarily need to condition given that it is already a zone requirement at this point.

I do agree that I believe that the other conditions are noble and they're worthy, but they do not have a direct rational nexus to specifically even the trees, the tree conditions, to the proposed special exceptions and area variance at hand.

And some of those, I believe, such as condition proposed by the Office of Planning, Condition 5, preservation of existing trees in the front yard area and preservation of adequate fending during construction, would be evaluated at the time of any rating permit that would result as well as the overall building permit. So, that would be captured through the DOB process, I believe.

So, I'm going to agree with your assessment and I agree with the Office of Planning's assessment on the reasons why they have met the burden of proof.

I would not recommend including any other conditions, but only memorializing Condition 2 as it relates to the IZ -- the voluntary IZ unit into the order. So, with that, I will support the application.

BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you, Board Member

2.1

Smith.

2.0

2.1

Board Member Blake?

MEMBER BLAKE: Thank you, Vice Chair and Board Member Smith. I basically -- it's a very complicated yet simple project. It's very attractive and I appreciate the information and I will not spend a lot of time on it.

I will say I agree with the Office of Planning's report. I agree with the assessment you made, Vice Chair John, not to include the conditions as I do think there is an issue with that.

In the initial request, I do believe there was parking relief requested for all five. So, that may have to be amended because there's just four for the parking relief in the front yard.

I believe it's only for four as opposed to all five units. I think 820 does not need that, as Ms. Moldenhauer pointed out today, but I believe the initial request was for all five.

I was just looking at the Applicant's statement. It may have been revised. I did not see that, but that's the only thing that I would point out. Otherwise, I think that I'm in support of the application. I think the variance test was adequately met.

And it would have been nice to see some -- the rest of, you know, the street context, but I'm comfortable

that this is an attractive way to develop a challenging 1 2 property. 3 BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you. 4 Commissioner Stidham? 5 MEMBER STIDHAM: Thank you. I think you all spoke well of the analysis and I agree with what you've all already 6 7 said, including what is included in OP's report. 8 And I also concur that the addition of the IZ 9 appropriate and requirement in the order is 10 included. And that they have met the requirements of the 11 special exception, as pointed out in OP's report, and I'm 13 prepared to support. 14 BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Stidham. 15 Thank you, Board Member Blake, for pointing out 16 17 the issue of the vehicle parking for all lots, which is mentioned in the caption. 18 19 And so, we -- let's see. I would suggest that we 2.0 change it to -- and specify the lots that were presented in 21 the Applicant's -- let me see if it's in the Applicant's prehearing statement. 22 23 It is in the Applicant's PowerPoint presentation. 24 Let's see if there's any clarification in the prehearing statement.

1	So the I think it's appropriate to point out
2	that the Applicant's PowerPoint presentation Mr. Young,
3	I hate to bother you again, but would you please put up that
4	slide that shows the parking relief in the PowerPoint
5	presentation?
6	And I'll try to find it. It would be slide
7	it's towards the end. Okay. Slide they're not numbered.
8	It's 14. Slide 14. Okay. And note in the order that
9	parking relief is requested for lots 816, 817, 818 and 819.
10	Okay. So, based on the testimony, I believe it's
11	appropriate to make that notation in the caption or in the
12	order, and I will then make a motion to approve Application
13	No. 21031 as captioned and read by the Secretary and as
14	amended pursuant to the Board's order for clarification
15	purposes and ask for a second, Mr. Blake.
16	MEMBER BLAKE: Second.
17	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Ms. Mehlert, would you
18	please take a roll call?
19	MS. MEHLERT: Please respond to the Chair's motion
20	to approve the application noting the amended relief for the
21	vehicle parking location requirements of Subtitle C Section
22	710.2©. It's for Lots 816, 817, 818 and 819.
23	Vice Chair John?
24	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Yes.
25	MS. MEHLERT: Member Smith?

1	MEMBER SMITH: Yes.
2	MS. MEHLERT: Mr. Blake?
3	MEMBER BLAKE: Yes.
4	MS. MEHLERT: Commissioner Stidham?
5	MEMBER STIDHAM: Yes.
6	MS. MEHLERT: Staff would record the vote is 4 to
7	0 to 1 to approve application 21031 on the motion made by
8	Vice Chair John and seconded by Mr. Blake with one board
9	member not participating.
10	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you. So, we spent
11	quite a bit of time on this case and I think we can take a
12	quick ten-minute break. And then we can make a decision at
13	some point whether we want to work through lunch, okay?
14	Let's take a ten-minute break, Ms. Mehlert. Thank
15	you.
16	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
17	record at 11:23 a.m. and resumed at 11:42 a.m.)
18	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Ms. Mehlert, would you
19	please call us back in?
20	MS. MEHLERT: The Board is back from a quick break
21	and the next case in the hearing agenda is Application No.
22	21133 of Arel Properties, LLC.
23	This is a self-certified application pursuant to
24	Subtitle X Section 901.2 for special exceptions under
25	Subtitle D Section 5201 from the side yard requirement of

1	Subtitle D Section 208.3 and the lot occupancy requirements
2	of Subtitle D Section 210.1.
3	This is to construct a new semi-detached, three-
4	story principal dwelling located in the R-2 Zone at 1119 48th
5	Place, N.E., Square 5158, Lot 10.
6	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you. Would the
7	Applicants please introduce themselves? I believe that's Mr.
8	Freeman.
9	MS. DAVIS: This is Beth Davis and I'm here on
10	behalf of the Applicant, Arel Properties. With me today is
11	Mr. Mark Freeman, the architect on the project.
12	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. Just a minute.
13	And did you sign up to testify, Ms. Davis?
14	MS. DAVIS: I did. I signed up this morning.
15	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. All right.
16	MS. DAVIS: And I certified and I I can't think
17	of what it's called. I swore myself in.
18	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you. Are you choosing
19	not to use your camera?
20	MS. DAVIS: Yeah. There's something wrong. Even
21	when I turn my camera on, all you'll see is, like, red
22	static.
23	So, I'm not sure what's going on with my computer,
24	but Mr. Freeman is going to be doing most of the
25	presentation. I'm just here in an administrative capacity.

BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. All right. 1 2 MS. DAVIS: Thank you so much. 3 BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. Please tell us why you're here and how your application meets the criteria for 5 approval. MS. DAVIS: Mark, you're muted. 6 7 MR. FREEMAN: Can you hear me now? CHAIR JOHN: Yes. 8 BZA VICE Please introduce 9 yourself for the record. Give your name and home address. 10 MR. FREEMAN: My name is Mark Freeman. I am with The -- my office address is 1308 9th 11 Aggregate Architecture. 12 Street, N.W., Suite 200 in Washington, D.C. My home address is 1610 Jackson Street, N.E., in Washington, D.C. 13 14 I am the architect representing Mr. Rick Leavey of Arel Properties and the -- as Ms. Miller noted, we are 16 asking for a special exception to construct a semi-detached, 17 single-family home in the R-2 Zone. 18 And the special exceptions that $\nabla M = 0$ are specifically asking relief from are Subtitle D 208.3. 19 2.0 of the R-2 zones one side yard, a minimum of eight feet in 2.1 width, shall be provided for all semi-detached buildings, and 22 in Subtitle D 210.1, except as provided elsewhere in this 23 title, the maximum permitted lot occupancy shall be set forth 24 in the following table, Table D 210.1, which allows for, in R-2, all other structures to be a maximum of 40 percent lot

occupancy.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

Per Subtitle D 5201.1 for a principal residential building on a substandard non-alley record lot described in Subtitle C 301.1, the Board of Zoning Adjustment may grant relief from the following development standards.

These standards include A, lot occupancy for a maximum of 50 percent in the R zones, and C, yards, including alley centerline setbacks.

If I may ask for Exhibit 8 to be put up so I can walk through the presentation of the architectural drawings?

BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Would you put that up, please, Mr. Young.

MR. FREEMAN: May we scroll down to the second page, please. This is our site plan. What we are noting is we are Lot 10. We are specifically adjacent to Lot 11, which is also a semi-detached structure.

The address is 1128 48th Place, N.E. This was previously approved for a side yard setback relief in a previous BZA case and was also granted similar relief to build within a side yard. We are asking for similar relief from our end from the other side.

The lot directly to our south, which is Lot 815, is owned by Ms. Trina Campbell and Greg Davis. That is a 10.33 wide lot before their lot of 20.33 wide is directly to the south and that is Lot 816. These two lots are used for

them and 815 is specifically used as their side yard.

If I could have page 9 brought up of our drawings,

this illustrates the existing condition in our pictures.

Keep going. Page 9, sir, please.

So what we have here is our existing condition pictures. You will note that the lot to the north, which I noted as 1121, that is the building that is currently under construction to the left on the left side of the left picture.

The building on the right, which can also be better seen in Picture No. 3 in the center bottom, that is the principal dwelling of Trina Campbell and Greg Davis.

The area in between is our lot, Lot 10, as well as Lot 815. So, there is approximately 30.66 feet separating the left side of 1121 and the side of the detached home.

We are going to infill. And when we construct our structure and have 3.33 left, a combined separation between this home and our structure will be 13.66 feet or 13 feet 8 inches.

Okay. if you can scroll down two more pages, please, sir? So the program for the structure -- and, as you can see here, we have the red shaded area. That is the are of the structure that will be extended into the side yard.

We have a program of a family room and study along with a bedroom and bath on the first level. We then have an

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

open floor plan concept of a living room, dining room and kitchen on the second level.

The area shaded in blue is a rear deck. This is the area which we are asking for relief to have an additional ten percent lot occupancy. This includes a balcony off of the primary suite at the rear on the third level.

And if you could also go to the next page, sir, please? And then this is, again, to continue with the program, we are presenting a three-bedroom plus -- or actually it's a four-bedroom, 3-1/2-bath residence semidetached. The top floor has three bedrooms; a primary suite and two bedrooms.

The anticipated purchaser for this development would be a single family. By allowing the additional relief into the side yard, we would be able to construct just under a 2400 square foot residence.

If we were to construct by right and maintain an eight-foot side yard, the actual gross square footage would be 1700 or just under.

So, we have presented to the ANC and the Deanwood Citizens Association and discussed the -- because of the substandard lot and the R-2 Zone, the minimum lot width is meant to be or determined as 40 feet and we are just over half of that in width.

We believe if we were to build on a standard lot,

2.0

2.1

2.3

we would not be asking for relief for both the size, 1 setback or the square footage. 2 But because of the lot 3 constrictions, we are here. 4 But, nevertheless, we believe the larger square 5 footage and the larger footprint provides for a more ample and sizeable single-family unit that would help for this 6 7 neighborhood. 8 If I could have you now go to page 3, please. 9 Scroll back up. 10 Thank you, sir. So, this is axonometric. On the left illustrates what the single-family home or semi-detached 11 12 structure would look like if it were to be built by right. And then on the right with the additional red 13 shaded, 14 that illustrates it with the special 15 relief. We believe, through the relief from the request, 16 17 that it provides for a more aesthetically pleasing structure. It's not tall and thin. 18 19 And also as I just walked you through the plans 20 and the program, that it would provide for more ample spaces 2.1 for bedrooms and living space for the single family. 22 If I could have you zoom down -- or scroll down Again, this one more, please? These are perspective views. 23 24 illustrates the massing within the specific properties

adjacent to it.

We believe that, through this presentation, we are showing that we meet the criteria of Subtitle D 5210.4 that we are not affecting light and air, that we are not affecting adjacent privacy, and the proposed building does not substantially visually intrude upon the character, scale or pattern of other houses or 48th Place frontage.

If I can go to the next -- so, what we show here is our shading analysis. This is shown in -- during the summer solstice.

We believe -- what we are showing in the bottom left corner is the area in red where there is an increased shading. You can see that that is primarily out in the street. It does not necessarily affect any adjacent neighbor. The other time frames do not show.

And if you look -- and what we are illustrating here is -- the two rectangles on the top are the by right. The two rectangles on the bottom are with the special exception relief.

And then if you can scroll down one more page, please, sir? You will see again up on the top this is the existing condition, would be by right. But then down below you will see that the shading analysis specifically the bottom left around three o'clock would be -- the shade would be primarily on our property. And then towards the 6:00 p.m. hour you will note that it is across the alley to the bottom

2.1

|right.

2.0

2.1

We believe that these increased shadings do not adversely affect properties other than what is currently there and would be minimally realized or minimally understood.

If you can just scroll down one more page, please, you will now see the presentation of the winter solstice. I think the most extreme here is at 12 o'clock, which is the bottom right.

You will note that there is an increased shading there on the property directly to the north and -- two properties to the north, but, again, we do not believe it is -- would be maximally felt. It is more of a minimal increase and so, therefore, we meet the burden.

BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you, Mr. Freeman. Did you have anything else?

MR. FREEMAN: No, I'm sorry. My computer was just having a little trouble.

I believe, based on our presentation and based on our discussions and discourse with ANC 7C, who also provided us with unanimous support -- we also presented in front of the Deanwood Citizens Association, which provided us their letter of support.

Mr. Rick Leavey signed and executed a construction agreement, which was part of a requirement from the Deanwood

Citizens Association. He was unable to be here. He was not able to reschedule a medical appointment. So, unfortunately, it is just me today and he sends his sincere apology for not attending.

But other than that, we -- he has presented and discussed with both of those agencies his outreach in community outreach. He canvassed the neighborhood. He knocked on specifically the two neighboring structures -- well, the one that's under construction, he didn't knock on that one, but the one to the south.

And then we were able to receive some letters of support. We were able to receive the support from the neighbor to the north.

The one to the south, Ms. Campbell and Mr. Davis, we have certified letters noting delivery of the plans. We also have his knocking on the door. And during the ANC and the DCA, discussed our outreach with that neighbor specifically.

To date, we have not heard from them unless they are here and present to speak on their behalf. We have reached out to them multiple times, but have not received support or any indication of any concern about any of the issues that would be raised as a part of a special exception -- request for special exception.

That concludes my presentation. I appreciate the

2.0

2.1

1	Board's consideration of our request and I thank you for your
2	time this morning.
3	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you, Mr. Freeman.
4	That was very clear and I appreciated your shadow studies
5	that stepped us through all of the conditions, including that
6	notation in red showing any changed conditions. It's a pet
7	peeve of mine. So, I didn't have to mention that to you
8	today. So, I'm grateful.
9	Does the Board have any questions?
10	Okay. Let's go to the Office of Planning.
11	MR. JURKOVIC: Good afternoon, Vice Chair John and
12	members of the Board. This is Mike Jurkovic, Development and
13	Review Specialist with the Office of Planning.
14	OP recommends approval of the requested special
15	exception relief to the minimum side yard and maximum lot
16	occupancy requirements for the proposed semi-detached
17	dwelling.
18	I am here to answer any questions. Thank you.
19	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you. Does the Board
20	have any questions for the Office of Planning?
21	Okay. Thank you, Mr. Jurkovic.
22	Is there anyone signed up to testify, Mr. Young?
23	MR. YOUNG: Yes, we do.
24	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. Could you bring them
25	in, please.

1	MR. YOUNG: You have Greg Davis, Trina Campbell,
2	and also the ANC commissioner, Antawan Holmes, is on.
3	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you. Good morning,
4	Mr. Holmes. Commissioner Holmes, please identify yourself.
5	MR. HOLMES: Yes. Can you hear me?
6	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Yes. Are you choosing not
7	to use your camera?
8	MR. HOLMES: I'm using my phone because I'm en
9	route.
10	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay.
11	MR. HOLMES: So, if you can hear me now, this is
12	Commissioner Antawan Holmes
13	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Yes.
14	MR. HOLMES: 7C07 chair just calling. And,
15	again, we were this is about the testimony that we
16	submitted before for Case 21133.
17	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. So, you have written
18	testimony. Are you saying that you're going to just rely on
19	the written testimony?
20	MR. HOLMES: There was testimony, it would be the
21	same to say, yes, ANC7C did meet with the Applicant to
22	discuss the project the proposed project at 1119 48th
23	Place, N.E.
24	And they did go through all of the paperwork and
25	discussions with the community in terms of giving a

1	presentation and doing a community maintenance agreement or
2	discussing it.
3	There was, again, that one issue about the
4	neighbors, but they said they had certified mail to the
5	residents at 1117 and had not heard anything from them.
6	And so, we went ahead and, on our previous meeting
7	back in June, we approved them and you have the letter.
8	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. Thank you. Does the
9	Board I'm sorry, does the Applicant have any questions for
10	Commissioner Holmes?
11	MR. FREEMAN: No, ma'am.
12	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you. Does the Board
13	have any questions for Commissioner Holmes?
14	Okay. Thank you. Well, thank you, Mr. Holmes.
15	MR. HOLMES: Thank you.
16	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you. And who is your
17	next witness? Is that Mr. Davis?
18	Can you hear me, Mr. Davis?
19	MR. DAVIS: Yes, ma'am. Good morning.
20	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Good morning. Please
21	introduce yourself for the record and give us your home
22	address.
23	MR. DAVIS: Hello. My name is Gregory Davis. I
24	live at 1117 48th Place.
25	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. Please give us your

testimony. You have three minutes.

2.1

2.3

MR. DAVIS: Yes, ma'am. As far as meeting with the ANC, I have not -- he has not reached out to me. So, that's one thing that's not true.

The builder has not reached out to me. That's another thing that's not true. The approximation to my property, it would be privacy -- it would be privacy and air as well.

You have to excuse me if I can't articulate my words as well as you all educated people. I have a high school education. That's all. Excuse me.

But I've lived here since 2011. I've maintained both properties on both sides -- both lots on both sides of my house as -- when I purchased the home, they said it was built on two lots and it turns out it was built on four. I came home one day from work and I had notes on my fence stating that it's been sold in a tax sale.

I have cut grass, watered grass, fertilized it, removed leaves, paid people to remove downed trees and everything on this property and I just feel that it's a monstrosity.

It's going to be just towering over my house and I fear for the foundation of my home as well for the proximity of the structure itself as far as the foundation on -- what they would have to provide to support that size

1	house that close to my house. I have serious concerns about
2	that.
3	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: So, Mr
4	MR. DAVIS: And I
5	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Go ahead.
6	MR. DAVIS: Yes, ma'am.
7	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: No, when you're finished.
8	You're doing fine so far. So, were you finished with your
9	testimony?
10	MR. DAVIS: Yes, ma'am.
11	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. I just want to be
12	clear. Your house is a single-family house that's right next
13	to this property?
14	MR. DAVIS: Yes, ma'am. Right next to the
15	proposed property where they would like to build. I think
16	I'm within three to five feet between my house and the marked
17	property lines where they had the grounds the property
18	surveyed.
19	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay.
20	MR. DAVIS: Yes, ma'am, and it's dangerously
21	close.
22	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: And how big is your side
23	yard? Were they accurate in saying that the side yard is at
24	least 10 to 13 feet away from the property line?
25	MR. DAVIS: No. That's not accurate at all.

Actually, from my house to the adjacent house where they're 1 under construction with right now as we speak, it's 25 to 30 3 feet. 4 So, if they would have build the house which would 5 -- I don't know what the footprint of their house would be, but that's apparently why they're requesting an extension so 6 7 that it could be built closer to my house. 8 The documentation and the pictures and the 9 presentation that he gave shows a fence where they -- a 10 privacy fence. That would have to be up against the adjacent house in order for me to -- in order for it to be ten feet 11 between my house and the house they propose to build. 12 13 just -- it's just not true. 14 BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Does the Board have Okay. 15 any questions -- I'm sorry, does the Applicant have any 16 questions for Mr. Davis? Well, nice to meet you, Mr. Davis, 17 MR. FREEMAN: and I sincerely apologize that our outreach did not get to 18 19 We definitely tried and I'm glad that you're here so you. 20 that we may speak and address your concerns. 2.1 One thing that we do not have in the case file is If I could share that or 22 our existing survey that was done. 2.3 share my screen -- I don't know if that's possible. 24 not, I can make sure that that is added to the record.

the survey that was provided to us,

But

1	particular property he is correct. He has two properties.
2	He has Lot 816 and Lot 815. This specific house is on 816
3	and is actually right on the property line between 815 and
4	816.
5	So, technically, his single-family doesn't his
6	single-family dwelling does not have a side yard by the way
7	that his lot is subdivided and broken down.
8	He does own him and his wife own 815, which is
9	in between his structure and our property and there is 10.33
10	feet of width in lot 815.
11	And actually the Office of Planning, their report
12	illustrates this in Exhibit No. 22. Towards the end of the
13	report there is a site map from the zoning map, and it
14	illustrates and it puts the dot on our lot. And there is a
15	lot in between his lot and our lot.
16	When we build so, our lot is 20.33 feet wide.
17	When we leave a 3.33-foot separation or side yard and then
18	there is Lot 815, which is 10.33, we would have a combined
19	separation of his lot, 815, and our remaining side yard, of
20	13.66 feet.
21	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you. So, Lot 815,
22	which is a 10-foot wide lot; is that correct?
23	MR. FREEMAN: It is 10.33 feet wide.
24	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay.
25	MS. DAVIS: And just to note in Exhibit 22 that Mr.

1	Freeman referenced
2	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Who is speaking?
3	MS. DAVIS: This is Beth Davis. I apologize. I
4	believe that the dot that Mr. Freeman is referencing is
5	actually on the neighboring lot; is that correct, or is that
6	dot on their lot?
7	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: I don't think that's correct.
8	I think the dot, based on the Office of Planning report, is
9	on the subject property.
10	MS. DAVIS: Okay. I just wanted to verify because
11	when I looked at it
12	MR. FREEMAN: No, that is and Beth is correct.
13	It's on the wrong dot. It's our well, interestingly
14	enough
15	MS. DAVIS: It doesn't appear that the map is
16	accurate in that.
17	MR. FREEMAN: No. And I would say that that is
18	correct as well. Because the survey that we have and
19	unfortunately I did not realize it was needed. I should have
20	given this to you, but the lot because we have Lot 11 is
21	1121, which is the current semi-detached home that's under
22	construction.
23	We have Lot 10, which is directly to the south.
24	Then there is an intermediate lot at 815. And then his
25	property is on 816 or his home is on 816. So, there is

	a for in between chese two.
2	MR. DAVIS: May I say something?
3	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Who is speaking?
4	MR. DAVIS: This is Gregory Davis.
5	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Davis.
6	MR. DAVIS: Sorry for the interruption. The lots
7	that they are pertaining to, the two lots that they say they
8	own on one side of my house on the far south side of my
9	house there is another lot that they attained in a tax sale.
10	And then on the side that they want to build on, that's the
11	side that they attained.
12	So, the combination of the property, the space in
13	between the house, he's adding the lot on the other side of
14	my house, which is not the side that they want to build to
15	the lot on the side that they want to build.
16	So, he's adding space between the house from one
17	side of my house to the other side to combine it as and
18	make that to say that he has that much space in between my
19	house and the new construction.
20	So, that's just I mean, that's not true. That
21	should be on a map where he should show you the lot numbers
22	and their proximity to my house because it's one lot on one
23	side of my house that they own, and it's another lot where
24	they want to build that on one side of my home.
25	So, that's the space I'm guessing he's trying to

1 a lot in between these two.

1	combine. And if I'm wrong, you can correct me. Sorry for
2	the interruption, ma'am.
3	MS. DAVIS: May I speak on what is currently
4	showing up in D.C.'s Property Quest system?
5	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Who is speaking?
6	MS. DAVIS: This is Beth Davis. My apologies.
7	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Ms. Davis, I'm going to go
8	to the Office of Planning and ask Mr. Young to pull up
9	Exhibit the Office of Planning's report and pull up
10	Exhibit 5.
11	MS. DAVIS; Okay.
12	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Let's wait for Mr. Young to
13	pull that up.
14	MS. DAVIS: Not a problem.
15	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: And then I'll ask Mr.
16	Jurkovic to speak on this plan.
17	Mr. Young?
18	Can you go to page 5, which is the Office of
19	Planning exhibit? Please scroll down. Okay. Can you
20	enlarge that a bit?
21	Okay. Mr. Jurkovic, can you describe what is
22	happening there? It seems to me that the house has
23	additional land close to the lot line where this house is
24	going to be built. And it appears that there's a vacant lot.
25	I don't see a structure there.

Is that the house that we see in the picture which is brown, the half-finished house, or is that a different lot? MR. JURKOVIC: Yeah. So, the lot lines shown here are the record lots based on the GIS information that was available to me when I created this map. The highlighted lot is the subject property in question where the dot is shown. I believe the -- and then obviously, just you said, the currently under as construction, semi-detached dwelling to the north is not shown as I do not have that information ready for me to place into this map. To the south, I believe that is the existing record lot of the neighbor, which, yes, is comprised of three separate tax lots, to my understanding. So, this map shows the subject property for the application in blue. And the extent of all the neighbors' properties to the south are that one entire lot shown. 18 And my understanding is the closest tax lot to the subject property encompasses a portion of I believe what is a shed on the property to the south and does end on the northern wall of the detached single-family dwelling on that property. BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. All right.

able to see that, Mr. Davis?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

2.0

21

22

23

1	MR. DAVIS: I'm sorry, I'm so, the highlighted
2	one is actually where you say you want to build, correct?
3	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Well, you can speak to me.
4	The one with the dot is
5	MR. DAVIS: Yes, ma'am.
6	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: is where the Applicant
7	is proposing to build a house. The one to the north of that
8	is the property under construction.
9	And the one to the south, you can see it's a large
10	lot with a single-family house and a shed at the back. That
11	would be your lot, which the Office of Planning says is three
12	tax lots.
13	So, I believe the record is correct as we have it.
14	MS. DAVIS: Just to clarify, it's one record lot
15	and two
16	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Please identify yourself.
17	MS. DAVIS: This is Beth Davis. I just want to
18	clarify with the Office of Planning that the lot directly to
19	the south that's being shown all as one lot encompasses three
20	separate lots; two of them being tax lots and one of them
21	being a record lot. And that encompasses Lot 815, Lot 816
22	and Lot 007, which doesn't appear to be correct.
23	Because if you're telling me that that's three
24	separate lots, it would only include Lot 815 and Lot 816
25	because the property directly to the south, which is Lot 7,

does not belong to Mr. Davis.

2.0

2.1

BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: I don't believe anybody is saying that it does.

MS. DAVIS: Okay. I just want to make sure that we're clarifying because you said -- somebody said three lots and it appears only to be two.

BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: I said based on the Office of Planning's report, and, for now, that's the only official report in the record --

MS. DAVIS: Correct. And I just want to make sure that the lot that's there to the south is what Mr. Jurkovic is saying is that that is two lots; one record lot and one tax lot, not three.

BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Well, it's not necessary for clarification for our purposes. What's important to us is the size of that lot and the distance between the property line for the subject property and the single-family dwelling, which is Mr. Davis' dwelling to the south. So, thank you very much.

And just to address Mr. Davis again, Mr. Davis, I think -- and I thank you for your testimony, but I think what the record shows is that there is approximately -- well, I'm not going to clarify it, but based on the Office of Planning's report there is a lot in between your house and the subject property.

1	Does that clarify it for you? In other words,
2	they're not building on your lot.
3	MR. DAVIS: I understand. I understand. I was
4	thinking about the proximity, how close it is to the home.
5	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay.
6	MR. DAVIS: I'm concerned about the structure of
7	my house being damaged with the construction of this big
8	house the big house they plan on putting right here.
9	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. All right. Thank you.
10	Does the Applicant have any other questions?
11	MEMBER BLAKE: I have a question.
12	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. Mr. Blake?
13	MEMBER BLAKE: Yeah, I'm looking at this and I
14	think that lot 815 is really not depicted well in that table
15	that I see on the Office of Planning's report.
16	815 is not clear because I see the shed
17	overlapping on 815, which is the adjacent lot to 10, which
18	I believe is where the Applicant is building.
19	So, I do see where 816 and 815 are a shared lot
20	and it does look like it's not the same depicted the
21	same on the Office of Planning's report.
22	And I think Ms. Campbell is also on the line.
23	That actually is titled in her name. I'd like to maybe
24	she can also chime in. I appreciate it. Thank you.
25	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Ms. Campbell, please

1	introduce yourself for the record.
2	MS. CAMPBELL: My name is Ms. Campbell and I agree
3	with pretty much what Mr. Davis said.
4	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Ms. Campbell, where do you
5	live?
6	MS. CAMPBELL: 1117 48th Place, N.E.
7	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. Thank you.
8	MS. CAMPBELL: And I'm concerned about the lot
9	being built even, you know, rats coming when they start
10	digging up. I don't know if they do abatement or not.
11	And if it overshadows our house, you know,
12	creating some issues with, you know, us seeing certain
13	things.
14	And I just want to pretty much agree with what he
15	said. I don't want the building too close to our house or
16	in our house.
17	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay.
18	MS. CAMPBELL: And we would like to be compensated
19	for caring for that lot, building the trees a few trees
20	on the lot. Will that be torn down?
21	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: I don't know. I think the
22	issue of compensation is not something that the Board could
23	decide. It's not within the scope of our authority.
24	Neither is the construction agreement which the
25	Deanwood Citizens Association did submit to the record and

1	that should offer some protections.
2	Now, Mr. Davis and Ms. Campbell, did you all go
3	to the ANC meetings?
4	MS. CAMPBELL: We weren't aware of the ANC
5	meetings. And we live around the corner from the ANC
6	commissioner and he's never reached out to us and even said
7	that he signed off on anything, that some changes will be
8	made.
9	And I personally pretty much didn't understand
10	they sent something in the mail saying this what they were
11	building and we could come to the hearing.
12	That and I also saw them knocking on individual
13	doors in my neighborhood and they walked past me. They
14	didn't knock on my door to explain anything to me, but I did
15	get something in the mail.
16	And I saw them knock on my neighbor's door. My
17	neighbor said, oh, yeah, this is about the property next-door
18	to you.
19	So, I don't feel like we were informed enough to
20	understand this whole process.
21	MR. DAVIS: Excuse me. This is Gregory Davis.
22	May I say something, ma'am?
23	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Yes, sir.
24	MR. DAVIS: It's just been a lot of they haven't
25	been very transparent, ma'am, about the whole ordeal. That's

1	pretty much the issue along with the proximity to that
2	building next to this house. That's pretty much it. I don't
3	want to start to repeat myself.
4	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. All right. Okay. So,
5	thank you for your testimony. I think we have figured out
6	where the lots are and hopefully you can understand what's
7	in the record and what it shows.
8	And the only relevance well, the most important
9	issue is how close is their lot, their structure to your
10	structure in terms of what the regulation requires, which is
11	whether there's impact to any light and privacy light and
12	air or any issues with privacy. And that's what the Board
13	will decide.
14	And this is a special exception. So, generally
15	if they meet that requirement, the Board will grant the
16	relief or is authorized to grant that relief. So, the Board
17	will take into consideration your testimony.
18	MS. CAMPBELL: Thank you.
19	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you.
20	MR. DAVIS: Thank you.
21	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you.
22	Are there any other witnesses, Mr. Young?
23	MR. YOUNG: No, that was it.
24	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you. So, I'll go back
25	to the Applicant.

Do you have any closing statements? 1 2 MR. FREEMAN: At this time I believe our main concern is being fair and reasonable to all neighbors. 3 Ι believe it's unfortunate that there's been a misunderstanding 5 or miscommunication about our outreach and I want that on the We definitely tried. Commissioner Holmes was aware record. 6 7 of this as well. 8 At the end of the day if the Board of Zoning 9 Adjustment feels that additional discussion needs to occur 10 with Mr. Campbell -- sorry, Mr. Davis and Ms. Campbell, we, 11 as the Applicant, are willing to do that. 12 We do believe that we have illustrated and shown our -- and met the burden of proof from and within the zoning 13 willing 14 regulations, but, again, are more than we 15 participants. We live in and are residents of D.C. and respect 16 17 all residents and understand their position and are willing to discuss this further, as necessary, if the Board of Zoning 18 19 Adjustment requires such. Thank you. BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: 20 Thank you, Mr. Freeman, and 2.1 thank you for your testimony. 22 So, at this point I'm going to excuse all of the 23 witnesses and address the Board. Thank you, Mr. Freeman. 24 So, I would like to go to the Board to find

out how we should proceed. I'm a little concerned that the

owners of the property to the south were not very involved as of now.

On the other hand, in terms of what the regulation requires, there is, as is shown in the record and in the OP report, there is about at least ten feet of distance between the structure on the subject property and Mr. Davis' house.

So, I would like to find out how the Board recommends that we proceed. I'm not quite sure.

Board Member Smith?

MEMBER SMITH: I also share the same concern that you have. It does look like in the record, and I'm looking completely at the record of the list of names and mailing addresses of properties that were notified. It does look like the Davises were notified.

Mr. Davis' information is within the record, but I am concerned that it doesn't seem like that there was much dialog.

And also the Applicant stated -- I do remember him saying, nice to meet you. So, it sounds like there hasn't been any direct dialog with Mr. Davis being that he is the adjacent property owner, he and his wife.

So, I am more comfortable with giving the Applicant some additional time to give them the ability to speak directly with those -- with the adjacent property owners, the Davises, about their project and how it may --

2.0

2.1

how close their building is to the Davis' property and have 1 more discussion with them about the development process. 2 3 Campbell, Mr. Davis and Ms. some of those 4 questions that raised about questions about were 5 structural integrity to your house and rodent abatement, things of that particular nature, those are addressed not at 6 7 this board. They're addressed as the building permit 8 process. 9 So, I think it would be beneficial to the -- to 10 both parties here that that dialog would occur. So, I would prefer to defer this decision to allow some additional dialog 11 12 between the Applicant and the adjacent property. 13 BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you. Board Member Blake? 14 15 MEMBER BLAKE: Yes. And, as a good neighbor, 16 would like to see that because Ms. Campbell and Mr. Davis do have to live with this and I do think it would be very good 17 neighborly to have them have a dialog with the developer. 18 19 understand been And Ι that there's some 2.0 miscommunication, it seems, all over the place, but I think 21 it would be very helpful to have a dialog established between 22 the two of them. And if they could work out some of the issues that 2.3 24 are relevant to our decision, the legally relevant issues, There may be some others, but they that would be great.

1	should certainly have an opportunity to establish a dialog
2	given the fact of the proximity of their property. And they
3	are the most affected of all the people in this project. So,
4	I would encourage that.
5	Hell, if it weren't for the fact that they weren't
6	aware, they could have potentially got party status.
7	So, I think it's fair to have a reasonable dialog
8	with them prior to our making a decision.
9	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you, Board Member
10	Blake.
11	Commissioner Stidham?
12	MEMBER STIDHAM: I'm in complete agreement. Some
13	additional some dialog with the adjacent property owner
14	to help them understand what is being proposed, how it
15	affects their property, is really an important step that
16	needs to take place and encourage the Applicant to take those
17	steps to talk with them and meet with them directly.
18	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. All right. So, I'm
19	also in agreement. I think it's never a good idea when the
20	adjacent owner has not had an opportunity to have a
21	discussion to find out what impact would be on their property
22	even if the application is otherwise supported in the record.
23	So, Ms. Mehlert, what would be a good time to
24	continue this case?
25	MS. MEHLERT: So, Commissioner Stidham is back on

July 17th. I don't know if that's too soon in terms of 1 giving the Applicant and the neighbor time to meet. 2 3 BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: I think that should be fine. 4 Let me bring the Applicant back in. Mr. Freeman? 5 MR. FREEMAN: Yes, Vice Chair John. BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you. Are you available 6 7 to meet with Mr. Davis before July 17th? MR. FREEMAN: Yes, ma'am. 8 We will make every and 9 all opportunities to meet with them. I will send my contact 10 information to Commissioner Holmes. It seems that is the best, direct communication effort with them. 11 12 I do know that through the certified letter and the drawings, our information is on those. We welcome Ms. 13 Campbell and Mr. Davis to please reach out to us at their 14 earliest convenience and we will make sure to meet with them 15 and walk through them all of these issues. 16 17 I also believe with this additional time we can upload some additional information such as the existing 18 19 survey and some other clarifying documents that I think would 2.0 help in this discussion, but we appreciate and welcome this 2.1 opportunity and thank you for allowing it. 22 BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. Thank Mr. 23 Have a good day. 24 Okav. So, Ms. Mehlert, we'll continue the case until July 17th. And if the Applicant -- well,

1	Applicant submits additional information, we should put a
2	time for that submission and a response from the ANC.
3	MS. MEHLERT: The Applicant could submit something
4	by July 8th and the ANC could have until the 15th to respond.
5	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay.
6	MS. MEHLERT: That works?
7	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Yes. All right.
8	MS. MEHLERT: This is for a limited scope continued
9	hearing?
10	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Yes, yes, thank you. Limited
11	scope.
12	Okay. So, we have continued the case to July 15th
13	for a limited scope hearing with the ANC to submit any
14	response to the Applicant's filing by July 15th and the
15	Applicant to submit clarifying documents by July 8th.
16	Okay. Thank you. So, when you are ready, you can
17	call the next case.
18	MS. MEHLERT: The next case is Application No.
19	21134 of Frederick and Ruth Elliott. As amended, this is a
20	self-certified application pursuant to the special exception
21	
22	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Ms. Mehlert, you're breaking
23	up.
24	MS. MEHLERT: Can you hear me okay now?
25	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Now, I can.

1	MS. MEHLERT: Okay. As amended, a self-certified
2	application pursuant to Subtitle X Section 901.2 for special
3	exception
4	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: You're breaking up again, Ms.
5	Mehlert. Lots of gremlins today.
6	MS. MEHLERT: I'll just keep trying.
7	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Yeah, okay.
8	MS. MEHLERT: So, special exceptions under Subtitle
9	D 5201 and the rear yard requirement of Subtitle D Section
10	2071.1, the side yard requirements of Subtitle D Section
11	208.7, and the lot occupancy requirements of Subtitle D
12	section 210.1.
13	This is to construct a one-story rear addition to
14	an existing, detached, two-story principal dwelling located
15	in the R-1B Zone at 3800 25th Place, N.E., Square 4296, Lot
16	1.
17	And there is a request to postpone the hearing
18	from ANC 5B.
19	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you. Are the parties
20	here? Mr. Gooden?
21	MR. GOODEN: Yes. Good afternoon, Vice Chair John.
22	Thank you very much for this opportunity. My name is Mario
23	Gooden. I'm director of Mario Gooden Architect, PLLC, based
24	in New York.
25	My address is 333 West 39th Street, Suite 904, New

1	York, New York 10001. I am here with my associate Alonso
2	Ortega, and Mr. and Mrs. Frederick Elliott, who reside at
3	3800 25th Place, N.E., are also here.
4	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. Let me go to the ANC.
5	Is the ANC here?
6	MS. MEHLERT: The ANC is not here. They did sign
7	up, but we're unable to get in touch with them. Staff has
8	been trying to reach out.
9	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: So, the ANC is requesting a
10	continuance; is that correct, which the Applicant proposes?
11	MR. GOODEN: Which we oppose, yes, that is correct,
12	on behalf of Mr. and Mrs. Elliott.
13	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. So, if the ANC is not
14	here did they sign up, Ms. Mehlert?
15	MS. MEHLERT: Yes. Yeah. So, the staff has been
16	trying to reach out, but we have not seen them join the call.
17	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. Mr. Gooden, can you
18	tell me what your outreach to the ANC was?
19	MR. GOODEN: Yes, certainly. We first made contact
20	with the ANC in October of 2023 to notify them and to share
21	with them drawings for the addition project for Mr. and Mrs.
22	Elliott and also for the ANC to feel free to contact us at
23	any time if they have any questions.
24	On May 26 of this year the ANC chair met with Mr.
25	Elliott at 6:30 p.m. on the evening of the 26th at on

their property at the site. 1 2 Unfortunately, I was not able to attend that 3 meeting in person because I was out of the country and six hours ahead. However, I was available by telephone standing 5 by in the event that there were any questions from the ANC. Attending that meeting were Ms. Gail Brevard, the 6 7 ANC commissioner, and Ms. Shirley Rivens Smith, who is the 8 president of the neighborhood association and 9 commissioner. Mr. Elliott did inform me that neither Ms. Brevard 10 nor Ms. Smith had any questions when he shared with them the 11 12 footprint and drawings for the proposed project. We then had another email correspondence to Ms. --13 to the ANC notifying them of some slight changes to the 14 15 drawings -- this was maybe two or three weeks ago -- again 16 with the statement to please do not hesitate to contact us 17 if you have any questions as we'll be happy to answer your questions. 18 19 BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. So, there was never 20 a full meeting of the ANC? 2.1 MR. GOODEN: Not that I am aware of --22 BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Um-hm. -- as the ANC chair did not invite 2.3 MR. GOODEN:

that there might have been neighbors that would have attended

us to a full meeting.

24

We understood, from the ANC Chair,

1	the site meeting, but there were no neighbors that attended
2	the site meeting. It was just the ANC chair and Ms. Rivens
3	Smith.
4	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. And what contact have
5	you had with the neighbors on either side of the project?
6	MR. GOODEN: As required by BZA, we submitted 200
7	names and labels for drawings to be sent to the neighbors.
8	The neighbors immediately to the west of Mr. and Mrs.
9	Elliott, that is a rental property. Mr. and Mrs. Elliott
10	have resided at 3800 25th Place, N.E., for the past 50 years.
11	And then they have neighbors who are across the
12	alley and we have not had contact with them as this project
13	would not directly affect is not directly adjacent to
14	their property.
15	This property is on the corner of Perry Street and
16	25th Place, N.E., which makes it, you know, an atypical lot,
17	which is why we're seeking special exceptions.
18	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. So, if my board is in
19	agreement, and I want to hear from you, I think we because
20	the ANC is not here and they are requesting the postponement,
21	I think we should go ahead and hear the case and leave the
22	record open for the ANC to submit a response or arrange to
23	meet with the Applicant.
24	And I would like to hear from the Board starting
25	with you, Mr. Smith Board Member Smith.

MEMBER SMITH: I agree with your approach, Chair 1 2 John. 3 BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you. Board Member 4 Blake? 5 Thank you. Commissioner Stidham? MEMBER STIDHAM: I agree as well. 6 7 BSA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. And so, what we will 8 do, Ms. Mehlert, is continue the case for a limited scope 9 hearing based on anything that the ANC chooses to submit. 10 Thank you. So, Mr. Gooden, please tell us how your 11 Okay. 12 application meets the criteria for relief and we'll go ahead and put 15 minutes on the clock. 13 14 MR. GOODEN: Okay. Thank you. We are seeking 15 special exception from the rear yard requirement of Subtitle 16 D Section 207.1 pursuant to Subtitle D Section 5201.1 and 17 Subtitle 901.2; special for side Χ exception Subtitle D Section 208.7; 18 requirements of and special 19 exception from the lot occupancy requirements of Subtitle D 210.1. 20 2.1 If we could pull up our PDF presentation which I 22 believe is Exhibit No. 51 or 52? Thank you. So, we will 23 begin, just to give you an overview, with this rendering. 24 The existing house, which is a two-story, detached, singlefamily house.

We are looking to have a one-story addition which 1 2 would comprise of a bedroom suite with bathroom. is to make the Elliott's house all accessible at one level. 3 4 Mr. and Mrs. Elliott, as I have mentioned, have 5 resided here for 50 years and they are both retirees from the federal government. 6 Mrs. Elliott often uses a wheelchair. 7 8 it's necessary that they can occupy their house all on one 9 level as they desire to remain in the District. 10 they would be forced to move out of the District in order to have a house that they could have accessible all at one 11 12 level. We can go to the next slide, please. And the next 13 14 These are photographs -- or this is a photograph of slide. the existing condition. 16 As I mentioned, it is at the corner of Perry 17 Street and 25th Place, N.E. We are looking from 25th Place, N.E., towards the entry of the existing house. I'd also like 18 to note here that the existing house is only 12 feet wide. 19 2.0 We can go to the next slide. This is looking from 2.1 the northeast from the alley towards the existing house and towards the open area where we'd like to construct the 22 23 addition. 24 If we go to the next slide -- and I don't know if

we can zoom in or not, but, if we could, that would be

helpful.

2.0

2.1

I'd like to point out that there are two things which primarily make this lot somewhat difficult not only being a corner lot, but we have the building restriction line on the south side of the property where you see it says, front, and the building restriction line on the east side of the property which is 15 feet, and those two requirements would make it such that the addition that we are seeking to add would need to be 12 feet wide.

However, to make this more accommodating and to satisfy their needs, including ADA accessibility, we are seeking the special relief to what is now, for the sake of this conversation and for the sake of zoning, a side yard which is a nonconforming condition which is -- existing condition is 5 foot 4.

We are seeking to not go all the way to the property line, but to come within 1 foot 8 of the property line in order to make this addition more workable.

The other special exception that we are seeking is that the rear, as you see it labeled there, rear, what is actually now the side to the alley, but for the sake of zoning it is being labeled as the rear yard, that has a requirement of a 25-foot setback and we are at 23 feet. So, just a two-foot difference.

And then thirdly, there's the requirement of a 40

percent occupancy with our addition -- site occupancy with our addition. We're actually at 40.21, I believe, percent. So, just, you know, slightly, slightly over the 40 percent.

We can go to the next slide. So, the shaded shows the addition in relationship to the property to the house which is directly adjacent to the west, and also showing that because of the orientation this will have no adverse effects in terms of light and air on that property.

We can go to the next slide, please. The addition will have a basement which will connect to the existing basement.

We can go to the -- and this is the basement plan. The principal floor plan is the next slide. So, here we're showing the bedroom, the main sleeping area, the bathroom with a connection through to the existing house through what is now a window. So, we'll be cutting that window down to make it a doorway, a closet.

The Elliotts wish to be able to come directly into the house from the outside and then come up the steps, but we also have a chair lift -- a wheelchair lift for Ms. Elliott such that they are coming into a secure area and then moving up to the first floor.

And so, all of this is happening within the footprint that you saw in the shaded drawing on the previous slide.

2.0

2.1

We can go to the next one. That's just the roof plan which gives you the footprint. And to the next slide. So, the elevations, this is a one-story elevation really keeping it with a bay window projection so we are able to get some area in terms of the bay window.

And we've worked with the Office of Planning and also DDOT. Office of Planning suggests approval for the project. DDOT has no objections to the project and it does not impact the public right-of-way. So, we see that we have two large windows in this bay window facing 25th Place, N.E.

The exterior of the addition will be of a brick that is complementary to the brick of the existing house. And we'll go back to that other rendering in a second, but first we'll go to the next elevation.

The rear elevation. This is facing the neighbor's yard to the west. We have a window which will be of translucent glass so that we get daylight -- or frosted glass, I should say, which will get daylight, but not visible. So, there's no visual intrusion to the neighbor's yards in terms of privacy. And you see the existing two-story house there to the right side of this drawing.

We can go to the next slide. And then this rendering just kind of shows the disposition. The neighborhood has houses of various styles. This is a very simple, modern addition that we feel is, you know, somewhat

2.0

1	modest and, again, keeping in the spirit of the existing
2	house and really trying to make this really kind of workable
3	and livable so that the Elliott's can, you know, can maintain
4	their residency within the District.
5	And this may be the last slide, but we'll see if
6	there's another. Yes. So, to summarize, we are seeking the
7	three special exceptions, one to the rear yard in order to
8	make this new bedroom suite sort of workable and not be
9	minimized by the 12-foot width of the existing house.
10	The rear yard, which requires a 25-foot setback,
11	we have 23 feet. So, it's just a two-foot difference. And
12	so, we believe that we've met both of those special
13	exceptions.
14	And then the occupancy, which is 40 percent is
15	the requirement and we are at 40.21 percent or 40.12
16	percent. So, again, very minimal in terms of impact.
17	And, again, the Office of Planning in their very
18	thorough report, and we've worked very closely with them,
19	support the project.
20	And DDOT, we've met with them and they have no
21	oppositions to the project. So, thank you for your time and
22	I hope that I stayed within my 15 minutes.
23	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: It's okay. Does the Board
24	have any questions for Mr. Gooden?

Mr. Smith?

MEMBER SMITH: Really quickly. And the ANC is not here, but it seems like the reason for their opposition is there were some iterative changes to the project that kept occurring and they hadn't seen it.

Could you walk through -- can you, you know,

could you walk through -- can you, you know, state the changes that have occurred to this design over time? The last, you know, two or three redesigns that have occurred, can you speak to that? What is the substantive change?

MR. GOODEN: Certainly, Mr. Smith. There's only been one, let's call it, redesign. When we began this project working with the Elliotts last year, they also wanted to have a porch addition to the south side and a garage addition to the north side.

So, the significant change is that the porch and the garage are not part of the design at this point, but those changes, I believe, were made back in April or so.

The last, if you could even sort of call them changes, was just a change from one large window in the bay window projection to two windows.

MEMBER SMITH: Okay. Thank you for that. And those fairly substantive changes that you made with the porch and the garage, was that done more at the behest of your Applicant -- or your client, anyway, or was that part of discussions with the ANC?

2.1

1	MR. GOODEN: Those were actually part of the
2	discussions with DDOT because we were the in order to
3	make the porch that Mr. and Mrs. Elliott wanted, to make that
4	workable, it was going to encroach about one foot into the
5	building restriction line on the south side.
6	And on the east side of the property, which has
7	a building restriction line which is 15 feet, we had to push
8	the addition back so that it is within the building
9	restriction line.
10	So, we pushed it back. I believe it was 2-1/2 to
11	3 feet, but it was not a substantial change in terms of the
12	design or the layout of the floor plan.
13	MEMBER SMITH: Okay. So, at the, I guess, the SMD
14	meeting that they're referencing, what was the bed was in
15	front of this house? What were the plans that were submitted
16	at that time?
17	MR. GOODEN: Those were the plans and they had
18	already been submitted or subsequently they were
19	submitted, I think, maybe the day later, but the ANC saw
20	them. Those were the plans without the garage and without
21	the and without the porch.
22	MEMBER SMITH: Okay. But it was the smaller
23	windows, not the larger one window that you're proposing?
24	That's what you said?
25	MR. GOODEN: It was one large window and we

contacted the ANC, I think, within a week or maybe it was 1 less of May 26th saying we want to alert you to this change 2 in terms of the windows. 3 4 And this is, again, the window which doesn't 5 affect the neighbors. It's actually the windows that are on 25th Place, N.E. 6 7 MEMBER SMITH; Okay. All right. Thank you. 8 No more questions, Chair John. Thank you. 9 BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you. Thank you. 10 Mr. Blake? 11 MEMBER BLAKE: I don't have any questions right 12 now. Thank you. BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Commissioner Stidham? 13 MEMBER STIDHAM: No questions from me either. 14 15 BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you. So, I'll go to 16 the Office of Planning. 17 MR. Good afternoon, board BEAMON: members. Shepard Beamon with the Office of Planning. 18 And we've 19 reviewed the application of the proposed one-story rear addition and have found that the most recent submission met 2.0 21 the special exception criteria for Subtitles D and X for the rear and side yard relief and lot occupancy. 22 23 Therefore, OP is recommending approval as stated 24 in the report in the record. And with that, I will conclude

and take any questions.

1	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you. Does the Board
2	have any questions for the Office of Planning?
3	Okay. Does the Applicant have any questions for
4	the Office of Planning?
5	MR. GOODEN: No. I do not have any questions for
6	the Office of Planning. We've had some correspondence with
7	Mr. Beamon who has been very helpful through this process.
8	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. Thank you.
9	Mr. Young, is there anyone signed up to testify?
10	MR. YOUNG: We do not.
11	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: All right. So, Mr. Gooden,
12	do you have any closing statements that you'd like to make?
13	MR. GOODEN: Thank you. Thank you, Ms. John.
14	Just to, again, advocate for our client Mr. and Mrs.
15	Frederick Elliott who, as I said at the outset, have resided
16	here for over 50 years and they very much want to remain in
17	the District and to be able to build on their property to
18	have it accessible at one level. Otherwise, they would, in
19	fact, be forced to relocate, you know, in order to sort of
20	have a, you know, a livable house.
21	And I think that we've worked very, very closely
22	with them that, you know, this design satisfies their needs
23	and we seek your approval.
24	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you. All right. I
25	want to thank you for your testimony then. And so, we'll

close the record and the hearing.

2.0

So, I'll go ahead and start the deliberation. I have a few comments. First of all, I thought that the Applicant made an effort to communicate with the ANC and actually met with the ANC chair.

And even though the ANC requested to have the case postponed, the ANC was not responsive to the Office of Zoning's phone calls and did not appear at the hearing.

And so, I consider that motion waived or moot and the lawyers will correct me as to the right characterization of that.

In terms of the merits of the application, I think it's fairly straightforward. The relief that's being requested is nominal; rear yard relief of two feet, side yard of 1.8 inches -- 1 foot 8 inches and 42 percent lot occupancy relief.

And I guess that relief is just outside of what's authorized in the two percent discretionary authority of the zoning administrator, but, anyway, this is a self-certified application and I believe, based on the testimony and the record, that the Applicant meets — the application meets the requirement for relief for both the rear yard, side yard and lot occupancy.

And note that this relief is necessary because of the building restriction issues and the need to move the front of the building, you know, switched around to comply with the building restriction line so that -- building restriction requirements so that now the front yard is switched.

And so, I didn't think that the -- I didn't think that the changes were so significant that the ANC would be prejudice by not having, you know, been able to have a full ANC meeting.

and I'd like to hear what the other board members think. I'd also notice that Office of Planning is in support and has worked with the Applicant to come up with a solution for all of these architectural challenges and that DDOT has no objection. And, as we said before, there's no report from the ANC.

So, I'll turn to you, Board Member Smith.

MEMBER SMITH: Vice Chair John, I, by and large, agree with your statement so far. I do believe that the Applicant has done their due diligence to speak with the -- as much as possible to speak with the adjacent property owners and the ANC and the SMD regarding this one-story addition to the rear of their home.

Based on what was presented, I do believe that the requested relief is fairly, I wouldn't say, minimal, but I do believe that they -- how they have designed it, I believe, is in context with the neighborhood and in context with the

2.0

2.1

statements for us to grant approval.

2.1

I do believe it would be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the zoning regulations for this addition. This is an addition to a single-family home.

The, which I think is probably the bigger issue for the SMD and the ANC right now, and I don't think it's that they are opposed to it, I think they are erring on the side of caution.

The question of will it adversely affect the use of neighboring properties in accordance with the zoning regulations and zoning maps, I do not believe that it does given the scale and scope of what is proposed.

I think a porch and a garage would probably have a bigger impact, but the Applicant has removed those at the behest of DDOT given some regulatory constraints that they will face there.

I believe that the design changes that have occurred do not have or materialistically change the nature of this application given the relief that is being requested by the Applicant.

So, I will state that I am comfortable with what has been presented to us by the Office of Planning and the reasons why they meet the burden of proof for us to grant these special exceptions for this rear addition and would also support the application for all three of the special

1	exceptions.
2	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you, Board Member
3	Smith.
4	Board Member Blake?
5	MEMBER BLAKE: Vice Chair John, I agree with the
6	comments made by you and Board Member Smith. I will be in
7	support of the application. I have nothing else to add.
8	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you, Board Member
9	Blake.
10	Commissioner Stidham?
11	MEMBER STIDHAM: I am also in agreement with Board
12	Member Smith and your comments, Vice Chair John, and have
13	nothing to add either and am able to support as well.
14	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. Thank you. And with
15	that, I will make a motion to approve Application No. 21134
16	as captioned and read by the Secretary and ask for a second.
17	Board Member Blake?
18	MEMBER BLAKE: Second.
19	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Ms. Mehlert, would you take
20	the roll call?
21	MS. MEHLERT: Please respond to the Vice Chair's
22	motion to approve the application.
23	Vice Chair John?
24	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Yes.
25	MS. MEHLERT: Mr. Smith?

1	MEMBER SMITH: Yes.
2	MS. MEHLERT: Mr. Blake?
3	MEMBER BLAKE: Yes.
4	MS. MEHLERT: Commissioner Stidham?
5	MEMBER STIDHAM: Yes.
6	MS. MEHLERT: Staff will record the vote as 4 to
7	0 to 1 to approve Application 21134 on the motion made by
8	Vice Chair John and seconded by Mr. Blake with one board
9	member not participating.
10	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you. Okay. so, it's
11	1:06. We have one case left, I believe. Would you like to
12	have lunch or a coffee break? Lunch? Coffee break?
13	MEMBER SMITH: Coffee break.
14	MEMBER STIDHAM: Coffee break.
15	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Great. So, shall we take a
16	15-minute break, stretch our legs and have coffee? Okay.
17	Let's be back at 1:21.
18	MS. MEHLERT: Madam Vice Chair, just to let you
19	know, it sounds like OP had to evacuate their building for
20	a fire drill.
21	So, I'm not sure what the timing will look like,
22	but if they're going to be available in 15 minutes or not,
23	but just an FYI.
24	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay.
25	MS. MEHLERT: I'll keep you posted.

1	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. Thank you.
2	MS. MEHLERT: All right.
3	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
4	record at 1:06 p.m. and resumed at 1:28 p.m.)
5	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. Ms. Mehlert, can you
6	call us back in, please.
7	MS. MEHLERT: Yes. The Board has returned from
8	another quick break and the last case is Application No.
9	21139 of the Family Place Public Charter School.
10	This is a self-certified application pursuant to
11	Subtitle X Section 901.2 for a special exception under
12	Subtitle F Section 4910.1 from the density requirements for
13	a public school under Subtitle F Section 4902.1 and the lot
14	dimension requirements for a public school under Subtitle F
15	Section 4903.1.
16	This is for the use of an existing three-story
17	attached building as public charter school. It is located
18	in the RA-2 Zone at 1501 Park Road, N.W., Square 2676, Lot
19	808.
20	And the Applicant has requested expert witness
21	status for Jeff Stoiber who is not in the witness book.
22	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. Thank you, Ms.
23	Mehlert. Let's see.
24	Who is representing us today?
25	MS. WIGGINS: Good afternoon, Vice Chair John.

1	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. Thank you, Ms.
2	Wiggins.
3	Okay. Please introduce yourself for the record,
4	please. You'll have 15 minutes to start.
5	MS. TEMPLIN: Sure. I can go ahead and start. My
6	name is Lee Templin with the law firm of Goulston & Storrs
7	on behalf of the Applicant, The family Place.
8	I'll let Hailey Wiggins, executive director, and
9	Jeff Stoiber, projects architect of Stoiber & Associates, go
10	ahead and introduce themselves.
11	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. Ms. Wiggins, you
12	first.
13	MS. WIGGINS: Hi. Good afternoon. I am Hailey
14	Wiggins and I am the executive director of The Family Place
15	and The Family Place Public Charter School, and thank you for
16	allowing us to be here today.
17	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you. Mr. Kadlecek?
18	MR. KADLECEK: Hi. Cary Kadlecek from the law firm
19	of Goulston & Storrs. Lee is in the capable hands of guiding
20	this one today.
21	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. Thank you. And, Mr.
22	Stoiber, did I say that correctly? You're muted. Your mic
23	isn't on.
24	MR. STOIBER: Can you hear me now?
25	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Yes, I can hear you.

1 MR. STOIBER: Okay. Sorry. I'm very sorry about 2 that. 3 BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: It's okay. 4 STOIBER: My name is Jeff Stoiber. 5 registered architect in Washington, D.C., and the president of Stoiber & Associates Architects, an architectural firm I 6 7 started here in the District 41 years ago. 8 And I apologize, but I did sign up to be 9 I think it was said that I was not in the witness 10 book, but I did sign up. 11 BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you, Mr. Stoiber. Ι 12 looked at your resume and I am satisfied that you are an expert in architecture and we will include you in the witness 13 14 book. MR. STOIBER: Thank you, Vice Chair John. 15 16 BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. Thank you. So, Ms. 17 Templin, would you go ahead and walk us through the project? 18 MS. TEMPLIN: Yes. Thank you. 19 could please pull Mr. Young, you up the It's at Exhibit 27 of the record. 20 presentation? 2.1 Thank you. So, we are pleased to be here Great. BZA Application No. 21139 which seeks 22 today to present 23 special exception relief from the minimum lot area and lot 24 width requirements for public schools in the RA-2 Zone and for the maximum permitted FAR for public schools in the RA-2

1 Zone. 2 These special exceptions will facilitate the Applicant's use of the property as an adult public charter 3 school and child development center. 5 The Office of Planning recommends approval of the application found at Exhibit 24 of the record. DDOT has no 6 7 objection. Their report is at Exhibit 25. 8 And ANC 1A has submitted a resolution in support 9 of the application at Exhibit 19. No letters of opposition 10 have been submitted into the record. I'll now turn it over to Hailey Wiggins to give 11 a brief overview of the Applicant and the project. 13 MS. WIGGINS: Yes. Good afternoon, everyone. Again, thanks so much for allowing us to present before you 14 15 today. My name is Hailey Wiggins and I am the executive 16 17 director of The Family Place and The Family Place Public Charter School. 18 19 The Family Place is located in Columbia Heights, 2.0 3309 16th Street, N.W. And we have been there since '86 in 2.1 location and we've been serving low-income 22 residents since 1980. So, we're going on our 45th year of

services to open an adult public charter school.

We're very excited.

operations.

23

24

In 2018 we expanded our

And we're

currently operating out of the building that we've been in 1 since '86, but we have outgrown the space. 2 3 And so, we have purchased the new facility at 1501 4 The main purpose will be to continue providing our adult education services to D.C. residents. 5 6 Part of our model is a two-generation approach to 7 education. So, while we teach English and workforce 8 development and other skills to adult learners, 9 provide education and support for their children. 10 So, when a mom comes to learn English, she can bring her kids with her and we will watch them in our early 11 12 childhood classroom. -- we are planning on having 13 So, we do auxiliary use of an early childhood center in the basement 14 of the new location and -- but the primary use will be for 15 our adult education, our adult public charter school. 16 17 And we do -- we have met various times with the ANC and I believe that Commissioner Kenny is on the line as 18 19 well, but we have -- we met with the ANC, the overall general 2.0 meeting in April and May, as well as one of their committee 2.1 meetings and have received their support. 22 MS. TEMPLIN: Great. Thanks so much, Hailey. 2.3 I'll turn it over to Jeff Stoiber to briefly walk through the 24 plans. 25 MR. STOIBER: Good afternoon, everyone, and thank

you for the opportunity to present. Mr. Young, if you would 1 go to the floor plans? 2 3 BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: What page would that be? 4 MR. STOIBER: I apologize. I don't have that. Му 5 copy is underneath here. MS. TEMPLIN: I believe it should be the next page, 6 7 maybe. 8 MR. STOIBER: I think so, too. Okay. Great. So, 9 all, let me point out that we are really 10 expanding the condition space of the building 11 building envelope even though we technically have additional 12 FAR. The additional FAR results from us adding a ramp 13 at the front of the building. This ramp will both provide --14 15 it's a switchback ramp because we've got about 4-1/2 feet of grade change to traverse. 16 17 And this ramp is not only for ADA accessibility to the building, but it's also because we have an early 18 19 childhood space and that space is located on the lower level. 2.0 We have a requirement to be able to take infants 2.1 out of the space in their cribs or in specialized chairs that 22 have to roll to street level. So, we are required to have 23 A lift would not have worked. 24 And, again, because the grade level at the front the building and the sidewalk level is approximately halfway between our lower level and first floor, we needed to put a fairly extensive ramp -- what you see in the first drawing to your left, the lower level, and then you see it again on the first floor plan, the second plan -- to get the students down there.

The added bonus of that is we get more natural light into the lower level space for the early childhood development. We all know how important daylight is for development of children.

And so, the reason that that becomes additional FAR is it goes from cellar space to basement space and is now counted in the FAR, which it wasn't before, but the space -- the condition, the envelope space of the building has not changed.

The only other significant modification that we have made is to add a deck terrace at the second-floor level at the back of the building.

I will have -- some more parking will extend underneath that and that's simply to provide some outdoor space for all the students and staff to be able to get outside because we had to eat up a fair amount of the front yard with the ramp.

Some outdoor space where they can have outdoor learning experiences, outdoor staff experiences and just be able to get some fresh air, but it doesn't impact the FAR.

2.0

2.1

1 So, again, we're working with an existing lot at 2 which, again, we're asking for relief for because it's lower than the minimum standard as is the lot width. 3 4 MS. TEMPLIN: Great. Thank you, Jeff. 5 Mr. Young, if you could go to slide 7, which I believe is two slides after this? 6 Great. Thank you. 7 So, as mentioned, we are here today to request two 8 areas of special exception relief. First, from the minimum 9 lot area and lot width requirements for public schools in the 10 RA-2 Zone and, second, from the maximum permitted FAR for public schools in this zone and we believe we meet 11 12 standards for relief. First, with respect to the minimum lot area and 13 14 lot width requirements, the relief is in harmony with the intent and purposes of the zoning regulations and zoning maps 15 because the project does not alter the existing lot area or 16 17 width. Rather, the new public charter school use increases 18 the requirements. facilitate will 19 The relief the much-needed nonprofit work of The Family Place in providing education and 2.0 2.1 support to low-income families of the District. The relief will not adversely affect neighboring 22 properties because the adult public charter school will not 23 24 operate like a typical school. 25 Unlike traditional schools with much

populations, the current student enrollment is approximately 200 students and class times are staggered such that concentration of the students is spread out throughout the day.

In addition, the school currently operates just a few doors down at 3309 16th Street and is already very well-known in the neighborhood without having any adverse impacts.

Next slide, please. Second, with respect to the FAR, we are requesting only very minor relief of 0.1 FAR over the maximum permitted 1.8. The relief is in harmony with the intent and purposes of the zoning regulations and zoning maps.

The Applicant does not propose to expand the building itself, as Mr. Stoiber explained. Rather, the grade facade will at the front be lowered accommodate to accessibility such that a portion of what was previously contributes cellar counted as space now to t.he calculation and a rear balcony will also be provided.

The relief will not adversely affect neighboring properties because the de minimis addition of 0.1 FAR above the maximum permitted will have minimal impact.

The addition of a rear balcony will be unenclosed and, therefore, will have little to no impact on shade and the lowering of the grade at the front is to accommodate

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

1	accessibility and will not impact neighboring properties.
2	So, with that, we will conclude our presentation
3	and we're happy to answer any questions.
4	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. Thank you very much.
5	Does the Board have any questions for the
6	Applicant?
7	Is the ANC here?
8	MR. KENNY: Yes, I'm here. I am the ANC.
9	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay.
10	MR. KENNY: Yes.
11	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: So, the commissioner is here?
12	MR. KENNY: Yes.
13	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't see
14	you. Okay. You can go ahead and give your presentation now.
15	MR. KENNY: Great. So, yeah, The Family Place,
16	their current location on 16th Street as well as this new
17	location on Park Road are both within my single member
18	district 1A-05.
19	So, I have been working very closely with The
20	Family Place prior to this application just as a valued
21	community institution and through this application.
22	So, I'll, you know, read a portion of the letter
23	that we submitted and then add some comments of my own. This
24	letter has been voted and approved by ANC 1A.
25	So, at a duly noticed public meeting held on May

8th, 2024, with a quorum of eight out of ten commissioners present, Advisory Neighborhood Commission 1A voted 8 to 0 to 0 unanimously to support BZA Case No. 21139.

So, that's, you know, we were unanimous in our And I will add that this came after a thorough support. review at ANC 1A's housing justice and zoning committee after which -- during which we brought forward a number of concerns that some owners of adjacent properties have and the -- I and the members of that committee were satisfied that Applicants more than -- provided more than satisfactory answers to those questions, of which many were misunderstanding the nature of the application and that committee unanimously approved the application as well.

I'll say that, you know, as they noted, for over 40 years The Family Place has provided educational, medical, nutritional and childcare support to the families of Columbia Heights and Mt. Pleasant with wide reach across many other nearby communities as well.

Columbia Heights has some of the largest Spanish-speaking communities and some of the highest rates of food insecurity in the District of Columbia.

The Family Place is a critical support system for these and other groups providing them with education, food, access to childcare and medical care and compassion.

This great success of their programming has driven

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

ever-increasing demand in community their 1 our services. 2 3 Last year ANC 1A voted unanimously to support 4 their enrollment ceiling increase request to the D.C. Public 5 Charter School Board to increase enrollment from 183 to 225 for the 2024 to 2025 school year. And then to 275 starting 6 7 in the 2026-2027 school year. The D.C. Public Charter School Board approved The Family Place's application on August 21st 8 9 of last year. 10 The proposed second facility at 1501 Park Road, which we are considering here today, will accommodate the 11 12 previously approved growth and future growth as The Family Place continues to attract new clients for their services. 13 14 So, you know, we have pretty 15 demonstrated need for this facility. We are overjoyed that this additional facility for The Family Place will remain in 16 17 ANC 1A in Columbia Heights to be local to the community and populations that it serves. 18 19 And so, I, as a commissioner, in addition to a 2.0 unanimous vote of my fellow commissioners in ANC 1A lend our 2.1 enthusiastic support to this application. 22 BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you, Commissioner. 2.3 Applicant Does the have any questions 24 Commissioner Kenny?

MS. TEMPLIN: No questions. We just -- we greatly

1	appreciate all of the collaboration and engagement with ANC
2	1A and particularly Commissioner Kenny. So, thanks very
3	much.
4	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you. Does the Board
5	have any questions for Commissioner Kenny?
6	Okay. Is the Office of Planning available?
7	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Yes, Madam Chair.
8	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Good afternoon, Ms. Brown-
9	Roberts.
10	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Hi. Good afternoon, Madam
11	Chairman and members of the BZA. For the record, I'm Maxine
12	Brown-Roberts from the Office of Planning on the request to
13	allow a public charter school for adults on a lot that does
14	not meet the minimum lot area and lot width, and the building
15	would exceed the allowed FAR.
16	The special exception relief is allowed pursuant
17	to Subtitle X 901 and the proposal would meet the intent of
18	the zoning regulations and would not unduly affect the light,
19	air and use on adjacent properties.
20	The Office of Planning, therefore, recommends
21	approval of the requested special exception. Thank you,
22	Madam Chairman, and I'm available for questions.
23	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you, Ms. Brown-
24	Roberts.
25	Does the Applicant have any questions for the

1	Office of Planning?
2	MS. TEMPLIN: No questions. Thanks very much, Ms.
3	Brown Roberts.
4	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you. Does the Board
5	have any questions?
6	Okay. Thank you. Mr. Young, has anyone signed
7	up to testify?
8	MR. YOUNG: No.
9	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you. Does the
10	Applicant have any closing statements?
11	MS. TEMPLIN: No closing statements. Just, in
12	closing, we believe the application meets the special
13	exception standards for the requested relief and we greatly
14	appreciate the Board's time today.
15	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you very much. So,
16	with that, I'll go ahead and close the record and the hearing
17	and thank you all for your testimony and your presentations
18	today.
19	Okay. Does anyone want to start the discussion?
20	Okay. I didn't see any hands. I will start. I
21	thought that the project is fairly straightforward and the
22	relief requested is minimal.
23	An increase of 0.1 percent FAR and the lot
24	dimensions are 40 feet, which is not something that they can
25	change.

The need to obtain relief is primarily driven by the fact that the Applicant is trying to make improvements to comply with the code and for ADA requirements specifically by having to create this switchback ramp, as the architect explained, to accommodate the steep slope at the front of the building as well as the need to provide proper space for the children, meaning that the Applicant had to raise the ceiling or dig down to create the proper ceiling height to meet the requirements for housing children in that area.

So, in terms of light and air and privacy, I don't believe these minor changes would create any adverse impact on the residents -- on the neighboring properties.

And the application has been in existence -- I'm sorry, the Applicant has been operating for some time. So, in terms of adverse impact from noise or other potentially, you know, adverse impacts from noise, I don't believe that that would apply in this case.

So, the ANC is in support and gave a very strong presentation in supporting the Applicant's continued existence in that neighborhood. And I'm going to give great weight to the ANC's recommendations. There were no issues or concerns. Actually, there were no issues and concerns in the ANC report.

And with respect to the Office of Planning, I'm going to give great weight to the Office of Planning's

2.0

analysis and the recommendations that DDOT is also in support with no objection.

And I would like to hear from the rest of the Board starting with Board Member Smith.

MEMBER SMITH: I wholeheartedly agree with everything you stated here. I agree that the application is fairly straightforward. The requested relief is from the FAR requirements, an additional 0.1 above what is permitted in the zone.

And I believe that given the scale of the renovations, I feel that it's a fairly straightforward application when it comes down to this increase.

In addition to the second special exception requested, I believe that the two special exceptions would be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the zoning regulations.

This particular zone does allow for reuse as contemplated. So, I believe these uses -- the relevant standards are online with -- if this was a larger public school. So, this situation with the zoning regulations are a little -- probably a little rigid for this particular type of school. So, I believe the use is -- meets the general purpose and intent of the zoning regulations.

I do not believe what is proposed would adversely affect any of the surrounding properties. The ANC is on

2.0

2.1

1	record as being in support of the application and that this
2	particular use has been a great neighbor and an asset to the
3	surrounding community and those special conditions I would
4	recommend.
5	So, with that, I give OP's staff report great
6	weight noting, again, that the ANC is in support of it and
7	DDOT has no objection to this level of support that the
8	neighbors support it.
9	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you, Board Member
10	Smith.
11	Can I go to you next, Board Member Blake?
12	MEMBER BLAKE: Vice Chair John, thank you very
13	much. I agree with all the statements that you and Board
14	Member Smith have made. I'm in support of the application
15	and I will be voting in favor.
16	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you, Board Member
17	Blake.
18	Commissioner Stidham?
19	MEMBER STIDHAM: Thank you. I am in agreement with
20	what has already been noted and prepare to support as well.
21	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you. And with that,
22	I will make a motion to approve Application No. 21139 and ask
23	for a second from you, Board Member Blake?
24	MEMBER BLAKE: Second.
25	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Ms. Mehlert, would you please

1	take the roll call?
2	MS. MEHLERT: Please respond to the vice chair's
3	motion to approve the application.
4	Vice Chair John?
5	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Yes.
6	MS. MEHLERT: Mr. Smith?
7	MEMBER SMITH: Yes.
8	MS. MEHLERT: Mr. Blake?
9	MEMBER BLAKE: Yes.
10	MS. MEHLERT: Commissioner Stidham?
11	MEMBER STIDHAM: Yes.
12	MS. MEHLERT: Staff will report the vote as 4 to
13	0 to 1 to approve Application 21139 on the motion made by
14	Vice Chair John and seconded by Mr. Blake with one board
15	member not participating.
16	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Do we have anything else
17	before us, Ms. Mehlert?
18	MS. MEHLERT: There's nothing else.
19	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. So, thank you all for
20	your help today and I will see you next week when the
21	chairman will be back. Bye.
22	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
23	record at 1:55 p.m.)
24	
25	

<u>CERTIFICATE</u>

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Public Hearing

Before: DC BZA

Date: 06-26-24

Place: telenconference

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

Court Reporter

near aus 9