GOVERNMENT

OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY

OCTOBER 2, 2024

+ + + + +

The Regular Public Hearing of the District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment convened via Videoconference, pursuant to notice at 9:35 a.m. EDT, Frederick L. Hill, Chairperson, presiding.

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT MEMBERS PRESENT:

FREDERICK L. HILL, Chairperson CHRISHAUN S. SMITH, NCPC Designee

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBER PRESENT:

ANTHONY J. HOOD, Chairperson JOSEPH IMAMURA, AOC Designee

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

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

OFFICE OF PLANNING DEVELOPMENT REVIEW STAFF PRESENT:

RON BARRON
SHEPARD BEAMON
MAXINE BROWN-ROBERTS
CRYSTAL MYERS

OFFICE OF ZONING ATTORNEY ADVISORS PRESENT:

CARISSA DEMARE, ESQ.

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Regular Public Hearing held on October 2, 2024.

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

Application	No.	21101	of	Mendomas	s, LL	ıC		•		•	•	•	8
Application	No.	21160	of	Three Ta	ables	з, Т	he,	LL	С.				24
Application	No.	21164	of	Christo	pher	Mak				•			32
Application	No.	21010	of	NL 1271	5th	ST,	LL(C		•			46
Application	No.	21173	of	Kara Nas	seef	•				•			65
Application	No.	17552-	-A c	of Bened	ictin	ne F	ound	dat	ion	•	•	•	•
Application	No.	21172	of	1321 Ana	acost	ia	Rd S	SE,	LL	С		•	83
Application Benjamin					_					•			93
Application Departmen											•		
Application	No.	21101	of	Mendomas	s, LI	₋ C							

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 1 2 9:35 a.m. 3 BZA CHAIR Good morning, ladies HILL: and 4 The Board of Zoning Adjustment will come to 5 order. Today is 10/2/2024. 6 My name is Fred Hill, Chairman of the District of 7 Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment. Joining me today are 8 Board Members Chrishaun Smith and Zoning Commissioners 9 Anthony Hood, Dr. Imamura, and Rob Miller. 10 Today's meeting and hearing agenda are available on the Office of Zoning's website. Please be advised that 11 12 this proceeding is being recorded by a court reporter and is also webcast live via WebEx and YouTube Live. The video of 13 the webcast will be available on the Office of Zoning's 14 15 website after today's hearing. Accordingly, everyone who is listening on WebEx 16 17 or by telephone will be muted during the hearing. please be advised that we do not take any public testimony 18 19 during our meeting sessions. If you're experiencing difficulty accessing WebEx 2.0 2.1 or with a telephone call-in, then please call our OZ hotline 22 (202)727-5471 WebEx call-in number to receive at instructions. 2.3 24 At the conclusion of a decision meeting session,

I shall, in consultation with the Office of Zoning, determine

whether a full or summary order may be issued. A full order is required when the decision it contains is adverse to a party, including an affected ANC.

A full order may also be needed if the Board's decision differs from the Office of Planning's recommendation. Although the Board favors the use of summary orders whenever possible, an applicant may not request the Board to issue such an order.

In today's hearing session, everyone who is listening on WebEx or by telephone will be muted during the hearing. Only persons who have signed up to participate or testify will be unmuted at the appropriate time.

Please state your name and home address before providing oral testimony or your presentation. Oral presentation should be limited to a summary of your most important points. When you're finished speaking, please mute your audio so that your microphone is no longer picking up sound or background noise.

Once again, if you're experiencing difficulty accessing WebEx, call our OZ hotline number at (202) 727-5471 to sign up to testify.

All parties planning to testify in either favor or in opposition should have signed up in advance. They will be called by name to testify. If this is an appeal, only parties are allowed to testify. By signing up to testify,

2.1

all participants completed the oath and affirmation as required by Subtitle Y 408.7.

Requests to enter evidence at the time of an online virtual hearing, such as written testimony or additional supporting documents other than live video, which may not be presented as part of testimony, may be allowed pursuant to Y 103.13, provided that the persons making the request to enter an exhibit explain:

A, how the proposed exhibit is relevant; B, the good cause that justifies allowing the exhibit into the record, including an explanation of why the requester did not file the exhibit prior to the hearing pursuant to Y 206; and C, how the proposed exhibit would not unreasonably prejudice any parties.

The order of procedures for special exceptions and variances are pursuant to Y 409. The order of procedures for an appeal is pursuant to Y 507.

At the conclusion of each case, an individual who is unable to testify because of technical issues may file a request for leave to file a written version of the planned testimony to the record within 24 hours following the conclusion of public testimony in the hearing.

If additional written testimony is accepted, then the parties will be allowed a reasonable time to respond as determined by the Board. The Board will then make its

2.0

2.1

decision at its next meeting session, but no earlier than 48 1 hours after the hearing. 2 3 the additional Moreover, Board may request 4 specific information to complete the record. The Board and 5 the staff will specify at the end of the hearing exactly what expected and the date when persons must submit the 6 evidence to the Office of Zoning. No other information shall 7 8 be accepted by the Board. 9 Finally, the District of Columbia Administrative 10 Procedure Act requires that the public hearing on each case be held in the open, before the public. 11 12 However, pursuant to Section 405(b) and 406 of 13 act, the Board may, consistent with its rules of procedures and the act, enter into a closed meeting on a case 14 for purposes of seeking legal counsel on a case pursuant to 15 DC Official Code Section 2-575(b)(4) and/or deliberate on a 16 17 case pursuant to DC Official Code Section 2-575(b)(13), but only after providing necessary public notice in the case of 18 an emergency closed meeting after taking a roll call vote. 19 20 Madam Secretary, do we have any preliminary 2.1 matters? 22 Good morning. MS. MEHLERT: In terms of the 23 schedule Application 21163 today, No. of Kaelv

Michels-Gaultieri has been postponed to October 9, 2024.

Also.

24

25

the Chairman has reviewed and granted

to allow late filings into the applicable case 1 records pursuant to Subtitle Y Section 206.7 and Section 2 103.13. 3 4 Any other late filings during the course of 5 today's live hearing should be presented before the Board by the applicant, parties, or the witnesses after the case is 6 called. Any other preliminary matters will be noted when the 8 case is called. 9 BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. 10 All right. Good morning, everybody. Nice to see everyone in this virtual world. 11 12 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 9:40 a.m. and resumed at 9:43 a.m.) 13 14 I kind of have a BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. 15 hard stop today at 5:00, so I'm going to do my best to get 16 us moving along. I think there's a chance it could be a 17 later day, but I hope not. 18 So that being said, if you could call our next item, Madam Secretary? 19 Next the Board will address 2.0 MS. MEHLERT: Sure. 2.1 party status requests for Application No. 21101 of Mendomas, 22 LLC. This is a self-certified application pursuant Subtitle X Section 901.2, for a special exception under 23 24 Subtitle U Section 203.1(h), to allow daytime care use.

This is a child development center for 82 children

1	and 20 staff in a detached building. It's located in the
2	R-1B zone at 245 Peabody Street Northwest, Square 3388, Lot
3	811.
4	And there are three requests for party status in
5	opposition from Genell Anderson, Brandon Jamison, and Joshua
6	Toll. Each request also includes a request to accept an
7	untimely filing, since these were all submitted after the
8	originally scheduled hearing date.
9	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. Let's see. Could
10	the Applicant introduce themselves for the record if they can
11	hear me, please?
12	MS. WILSON: Alex Wilson from Sullivan & Barros,
13	on behalf of the Applicant in this case.
14	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Is it Ms. Anderson, Mr.
15	Anderson? I don't know. Can you hear me?
16	MS. ANDERSON: Genell. Can you hear me?
17	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes, I can hear you.
18	MS. ANDERSON: Okay, great. I'm Genell Anderson.
19	I'm at 211 Peabody Street Northwest.
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. Ms. Anderson, does
21	your camera work?
22	MS. ANDERSON: Um.
23	BZA CHAIR HILL: That's okay. That's okay if it
24	doesn't.
25	MS. ANDERSON: Hold on, hold on. I think I was

1	supposed to click this, right? Sorry about that. Did I do
2	that right?
3	BZA CHAIR HILL: There we go. Great.
4	MS. ANDERSON: All right.
5	BZA CHAIR HILL: Ms. Anderson, I don't know if
6	you've seen the regulations as to what party status means or
7	why you should be granted party status. However, do you
8	think you could tell me why you're more uniquely affected
9	than the rest of the general public?
10	MS. ANDERSON: Well, because I am in the middle
11	of 2nd Place and 2nd Street, right between the proposed
12	development and the charter school. And I truly believe that
13	because we're in R-1B. And the purpose of R-1B is to protect
14	quiet, residential areas now developed and to promote
15	suitable environment for family life. I've done some
16	BZA CHAIR HILL: Ms. Anderson?
17	MS. ANDERSON: Yes.
18	BZA CHAIR HILL: Ms. Anderson, I'm sorry to
19	interrupt. We're just talking about party status right now.
20	MS. ANDERSON: Okay.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: You've made your statement, and
22	I appreciate that. Let me just kind of work through this as
23	best I can.
24	Is Mr. Jamison around?
25	MR. JAMISON: This is Brandon Jamison here. I'm

1	the homeowner at 223 Peabody Street.
2	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. Thank you, Mr.
3	Jamison. Let's see. Mr. Jamison, again, the same question
4	to you. Could you tell me why you think you're more uniquely
5	affected than the general public?
6	MR. JAMISON: Sure. I own the home that's
7	directly adjacent to the property at 245 Peabody Street
8	Northwest. So I'm right next door.
9	I think that should the proposed CDC move forward,
10	I think I'm likely and my wife's likely to be impacted more
11	than any other neighbors in the area, particularly given the
12	fact that we are right next door. We have public parking
13	that we rely on right out front.
14	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Jamison, I appreciate
15	it. I think you're going to get I think this will all
16	work out. I'm just trying to figure out the party status
17	issue, and then we'll come back to testimony.
18	MR. JAMISON: Okay.
19	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Toll, can you hear me?
20	MR. TOLL: Yes, Chairman Hill. This is Joshua
21	Toll.
22	BZA CHAIR HILL: Great. Mr. Toll, where are you
23	located, please?
24	MR. TOLL: I'm at 6001 3rd Street Northwest. I'm
25	the homeowner there, along with my wife. And my back yard

is directly next to the property at issue, including my garage.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. Thank you.

Okay. So just so you guys know where we are -- and I'm going to let the Applicant chime in here in a minute -- what we're trying to determine is party status. And so what that means is, if you were given party status, that means that -- thanks for the time, Mr. Toll.

If you were given party status, you would be allowed to testify as a party. That means that the Applicant would make presentation. You would then have opportunity to make a presentation. You would have opportunity to ask questions of the Applicant. You would have an opportunity to ask questions of the Office Planning.

The Office of Planning is also going to give a presentation. And then the Board -- and you'll be able to ask questions of the Applicant, and the Applicant will be able to ask questions of you.

And then at the end, depending upon time constraints, sometimes we let those who are given party status give a conclusion. The regulations only state that the applicant gives a conclusion, but we tend to, in the beginning, allow the parties that have party status to give a conclusion. So in the beginning here now, what the Board's

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

trying to figure out is whether or not we think you should 1 be eligible for party status. 2 3 In addition to that, your filings were late. when I say late, I mean that the original case was -- I don't 5 I can't remember when it was originally scheduled. know. Your party status filing should have come in 14 days before 6 7 the original case. 8 And so I'm trying to figure out a little bit as 9 to why you're late. I'll start with that, and I'll start in 10 the same order of the introductions. Ms. Anderson, can you explain why you were late? 11 12 MS. ANDERSON: I'm late because by the time I attended the meeting, the group meeting, I found out that the 13 traffic statement was not completed. And so then there was 14 15 a postponement. And so I ended up filing -- I believe it was 16 8/12 or something like that originally. 17 So I was really dependent on our commissioners to really run this thing, to try to help us out, but then I 18 19 found out -- and then it was postponed after our first 2.0 The Applicant postponed it from May to June, 2.1 There was a postponement. quess. 22 And so I figured, well, let me hear what they have 23 to say in July. And nothing has changed. So then I said, 24 well, I need to fend for myself. I've been here since 1993.

Okav.

BZA CHAIR HILL:

MS. ANDERSON: I need to present this myself. 1 2 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. Mr. Jamison, the 3 same question for you. 4 MR. JAMISON: Yes. I was relying on my ANC, 5 Michael Cohen, to represent my interests before the BZA. understanding is that my ANC's recommendations and written 6 7 report will be given great weight by the BZA. My commissioner submitted a draft resolution that 8 included and reflected the concerns that I have as a neighbor 9 10 immediately adjacent to the property at 245 Peabody Street, 11 but his recommendation was not accepted within the last 12 couple of weeks. The Commission dismissed and disregarded all of 13 my personal concerns and those of my neighbors as part of 14 15 that public meeting that was conducted. So as a result of 16 that, I am now pursuing party status to make sure that my 17 concerns and those of my neighbors are accurately reflected 18 in the record. 19 Thank you, Mr. Jamison. BZA CHAIR HILL: 20 Mr. Toll, the same question. 2.1 MR. TOLL: Thank you. Really, two things. Yes. Firstly, I've attended every meeting that I've been invited 22 2.3 And we attended a meeting in July wherein me and other 24 neighbors raised serious concerns with the traffic study that

was conducted by the Applicant.

We raised a number of

We were told that they would collect additional 1 data, perform some revisions. 2 3 And I would note that the revisions to the traffic 4 study were not submitted until September 19th. So we've had 5 very little time to study those revisions. And once we did, we came to the conclusion that the traffic study was still 6 7 inherently flawed. We were able to get our request in only 8 a week after the traffic study was submitted. 9 And then secondly, I would emphasize that, as has 10 been stated, I was relying on my ANC. And it wasn't until 11 attended a meeting on September 23rd that I, 12 disturbingly, saw that the full ANC completely bulldozed our concerns as neighbors who would be affected by this project, 13 which was very surprising. 14 15 That was really over the objection of our representative, Michael Cohen. This event all took place on 16 17 September 23rd, and I got my request in three days later. 18 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, Mr. Toll. Thank you. And I neglected -- is the commissioner here or one of 19 the commissioners? 2.0 Tiffani Nichole Johnson for ANC 2.1 MS. JOHNSON: 22 4B-06 is on the call. 23 Okay, Commissioner Johnson. BZA CHAIR HILL: 24 are you? 25 I'm good. MS. JOHNSON: And you?

BZA CHAIR HILL: Good. Good, thank you.

Okay. All right. Ms. Wilson, before the Board starts to deliberate about party status, does the Applicant have anything they'd like to say?

MS. WILSON: Yes, just a few things to add. So this hearing was originally scheduled in April. We had a meeting in February where we received a large number of concerns and comments.

We ended up pushing this twice to continue the discussions with the neighbors. And so I know sometimes the Board does make exceptions in a first hearing, but this is the third scheduled date.

There is no waiver of the deadline simply because the person opposing lives next door, and certainly not because there was an ANC vote less than two weeks before a hearing. That does happen all the time. And so granting party status in this case would prejudice only the Applicant.

We have no issues with the neighbors having additional time to present beyond the typical three to five minutes. It's about the formal party status requests that will then push this to a full order, and it does feel like these are last-minute requests given the time line here. So it would prejudice the Applicant if party status requests were granted.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, all right. Commissioner

2.0

Johnson, do you have anything you'd like to say about the 1 2 party status? 3 If I may just reiterate -- what my MS. JOHNSON: 4 formal testimony will state is that the concerns of 5 neighbors were not dismissed at all in our resolution. Commissioner, I'm just 6 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. 7 trying to --8 MS. JOHNSON: I defer to Ms. Wilson with regard 9 to party status. 10 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Thanks, Commissioner. 11 So just so you guys know, Mr. Jamison, it's okay. 12 We're going to try to figure this out. Just so you all know, if party status is granted and even if it's not granted, I'm 13 going to put this case at the end of the day. And so there's 14 15 going to be time for you all to think about what you want to present as testimony one way or the other. 16 17 Okay, let's see. Dr. Imamura and Mr. Smith, these are my thoughts on this particular issue. As far as the 18 19 waiving of the deadline, I don't really mind the deadline so 2.0 much in this particular case insofar as it has been postponed 2.1 And so I can understand why the public didn't necessarily know what they wanted to do or what they didn't 22 23 want to do. 24 It was in April, then it was in February, and then

it was whenever it was. So you would have had to know that

you were going to oppose this back in April. I think as a member of the public, it might have been a little confusing.

However, I don't necessarily think that Ms. Anderson is any more uniquely affected than some of the other people on the street. What I would advise -- so I would be voting against Ms. Anderson.

However, I would advise that if -- I will be voting, however, or at least recommending party status for Mr. Jamison and Mr. Toll because I think they are adjacent enough to the property to understand that that is more of a unique situation. And I think that that has been the practice of the Board overall, but again, the waiver is not because they are adjacent properties.

The waiver is because I think that, from the testimony, it seems fair enough that they did apply last week. This thing has been going around for a little while, so I don't have an issue with that in this case. Although, as I will say, I have voted against party status for being late many times.

So those would be my thoughts. I'm going to turn to Mr. Smith next.

MEMBER SMITH: We have voted against party status for untimely filing for party status, but I agree with your assessment on this, given that this has been continued multiple times. There's been additional dialogue that has

2.1

been occurring since then.

2.0

2.3

Regarding the party status of Mr. Toll and Mr. Jamison, I agree with you based on the testimony and based on their unique position. Being that they're directly adjacent to the property in question, I am inclined to give party status.

And I agree with you that, based on the testimony of Ms. Anderson, I'm not inclined to grant party status given her distance away. There are multiple properties between her and the property in question currently. And based on what I heard, it didn't rise to the level that she was more uniquely affected.

So I am inclined to grant party status to the two that I just recently spoke about and to deny it to Ms. Anderson.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you.

Dr. Imamura?

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'll try to be succinct. I am in agreement with you and

Board Member Smith. I believe that Mr. Jamison and Mr. Toll,

due to their adjacency to the property, are more uniquely

affected.

I'm unconvinced by Ms. Anderson and her location that she, too, is uniquely affected. So I'm certainly not in support of Ms. Anderson, but again, in support of Mr.

Jamison and Mr. Toll. 1 In terms of their untimely filing, as you pointed 2 out, Mr. Chairman, there's been a number of delays here. 3 So in order to follow this entire thread, you would have had to 5 know that you were opposing this at the very beginning. It sounds as if they were willing to give the 6 7 Applicant some grace to make some improvement for their 8 traffic management study until they finally decided to file 9 in opposition. Given that there's already been some dialogue 10 here, it's just really a matter of aligning the timing here. And it just didn't work out this time. 11 12 Anyhow, I'm prepared to vote in support of Mr. Jamison and Mr. Toll. 13 14 Okay, great. BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Jamison, Mr. 15 Toll, do you guys know each other? 16 MR. TOLL: Yes. 17 MR. JAMISON: Yes. 18 Okay. And then do you know Ms. BZA CHAIR HILL: 19 Anderson? 20 MR. TOLL: Yes. 2.1 MR. JAMISON: Yes. 22 BZA CHAIR HILL: So then what I Okay, great. 23 would suggest -- we're going to have our day. And our day 24 is going to go on however long our day is going to go on.

The staff can maybe let you know how it's looking as to when

you might be coming on. I would suspect it's not going to be any earlier than 1:00, 2:00.

And so if you all want to talk together, Ms. Anderson can also be a witness for you or whatever you want to do. And if you could kind of determine who would be the presenter, the main presenter and then the other people can give their testimony during your presentation, that would be helpful to the Board. You don't want to necessarily repeat all the same stuff, but still, everyone should have an opportunity to give their testimony.

And also, Ms. Anderson, if you choose not to be a witness or you don't want to be a witness, then you can have three minutes as a member of the public to give your testimony, but you can't do both. So just decide which way you want to go. Either be a witness with Mr. Jamison and Mr. Toll, or just give your three minutes of testimony on your own.

Let's see. Did you all have any questions on anything I just said?

Okay. All right, then I'm going to go ahead and make a motion. I don't know if I have to make a motion, Madam Secretary, but make a motion to -- I'll make the same motion all the way around and then just try to get a second. I'm making a motion to allow all of the party status filings into the record. So that's number one.

2.0

2.1

2.3

1	Number two I'm making a metion to dony party
1	Number two, I'm making a motion to deny party
2	status to Ms. Anderson; and then I'm making a motion to give
3	party status to Mr. Jamison and Mr. Toll, and ask for a
4	second.
5	Mr. Smith?
6	MEMBER SMITH: Second.
7	BZA CHAIR HILL: The motion has been made and
8	seconded, Madam Secretary. Could you take a roll call,
9	please?
10	MS. MEHLERT: Please respond to the Chair's three
11	motions to grant the request for untimely filing, deny party
12	status in opposition to Genell Anderson, and grant party
13	status in opposition to Brandon Jamison and Joshua Toll.
14	Chairman Hill?
15	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes.
16	MS. MEHLERT: Board Member Smith?
17	MEMBER SMITH: Yes.
18	MS. MEHLERT: Dr. Imamura?
19	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.
20	MS. MEHLERT: Staff will record the vote as 3-0-2
21	on the motions made by Chairman Hill and seconded by Board
22	Member Smith.
23	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. And I'll just kind
24	of make a point to everybody on this call. What you're
25	trying to do is focus on zoning issues.

1	Now, obviously, you all are not experts in zoning.
2	So I would imagine you'll try to do your best to keep it to
3	zoning issues, but if you think it's really not a zoning
4	issue, then we really don't want to hear about it.
5	I've seen some stuff in the record that's talking
6	about people's reputation and what people think of people and
7	all that stuff. That's not anything that we're going to be
8	talking about. And if it is, I'm going to stop you, just so
9	everybody knows.
10	All right, then we'll see you guys later this
11	afternoon. I'm going to close this portion of the hearing.
12	If you all get together and talk, that's great. And if you
13	can somehow resolve it with Ms. Wilson by 1:00, that's ever
14	better. Try to do what you can do.
15	MR. TOLL: Sorry, Chair Hill. Will we get a phone
16	call from your staff alerting us as to when we should be back
17	on?
18	MS. MEHLERT: Yes.
19	BZA CHAIR HILL: We're going to do our best. It's
20	not going to be exact.
21	I don't even know if they have a phone number, Ms.
22	Mehlert, that they can call.
23	MS. MEHLERT: They can call the hotline number,
24	the (202) 727-5471, but staff will call when the case before
25	this one is going on so they have some heads up.

1	MR. TOLL: Thank you.
2	BZA CHAIR HILL: Great. Okay, great. All right,
3	you guys have a nice morning.
4	MR. TOLL: Thank you very much.
5	MR. JAMISON: Thank you.
6	MS. ANDERSON: Thank you.
7	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. That's that. Let's keep
8	chugging along.
9	MS. MEHLERT: Next in the Board's hearing session
10	is Application No. 21160 of Three Tables, The, LLC.
11	As amended, this is a self-certified application
12	pursuant to Subtitle X Section 1002, for a use variance from
13	Subtitle U Section 401, to allow a prepared food shop and
14	retail use in an existing non-conforming use, currently an
15	art gallery, on the first floor of an existing building.
16	It's located in the RA-2/DC zone at 1314 21st Street
17	Northwest, Square 69, Lot 228.
18	This hearing began on September 18th.
19	Participating are Chairman Hood, Board Member Smith, and
20	Chairman Hood.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. Chairman Hood,
22	welcome. Is this a continued hearing? Yes, okay.
23	All right. If the Applicant could please
24	introduce themselves for the record?
25	MS. WILSON: Hi. Alex Wilson from Sullivan &

Barros, on behalf of the Applicant in this case. 1 2 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Ms. Wong, do you want to 3 introduce yourself for the record? My name is Hollie Wong, owner of Ching 4 MS. WONG: 5 Ching Cha. BZA CHAIR HILL: 6 Okay, great. Ms. Wong, I love 7 the angle of the thing in the back. It's very artistic. 8 MS. WONG: Thank you. 9 BZA CHAIR HILL: You're welcome. 10 Okay. All right, let me see. Ms. Wilson, can you 11 tell us about some of -- can you outline these proposed conditions and how you got to them? 13 MS. WILSON: Absolutely. So at the hearing, the 14 discussion was, how can we very narrowly tailor the 15 conditions to only allow this use? 16 And so the current approved use is an art gallery, 17 which is defined as an establishment that derives more than 50 percent of its income from the display and sale of objects 18 of art. One of the things we were debating with DOB is this 19 2.0 already meets this definition. We're just trying to add the 2.1 tea pouring and tea sales. 22 So the intent of the condition we proposed is not to restrict or overburden that art gallery use, but to ensure 23 24 that this is maintained, that the principal is maintained.

1	BZA CHAIR HILL: I've got you.
2	MS. WILSON: That was the main request. And then
3	the rest are just related to what can be served and how it
4	can be served.
5	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes, I see the conditions.
6	Is the Commissioner here?
7	MR. JOHNSON: Commissioner Matt Johnson, 2B-06.
8	I am here.
9	BZA CHAIR HILL: Great. Commissioner Johnson, did
10	you have any testimony to give?
11	MR. JOHNSON: I would just say that the Commission
12	does not have any objections to this application. We voted
13	unanimously to support it, and we hope that the Zoning
14	Commission will do the same.
15	BZA CHAIR HILL: Great. Thank you.
16	Is the Office of Planning here?
17	MR. BRADFORD: Yes.
18	BZA CHAIR HILL: Great. Could you introduce
19	yourself for the record, please?
20	MR. BRADFORD: Philip Bradford, Development Review
21	Specialist, the Office of Planning.
22	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thanks, Mr. Bradford. Mr.
23	Bradford, does the Office of Planning have any comments
24	concerning the proposed conditions?
25	MR. BRADFORD: No. The Office of Planning has

1	nothing to add.
2	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Thank you.
3	Mr. Young, is there anyone here wishing to speak?
4	Okay. I'm looking to my fellow Board Members.
5	Do you all have any questions to anybody and do you have any
6	comments before we deliberate about the conditions to anyone?
7	Okay, great. All right. I'll just kind of talk
8	through this a little bit. I thought that the conditions
9	were very succinct, and I appreciate the time that the
10	Applicant and her attorney has gone through in the process.
11	I do think that it really ties to the art gallery aspect, and
12	it makes me feel more comfortable with the application.
13	Before I excuse everyone, do my fellow Board
14	Members have anything they want to ask anybody?
15	Okay. All right. Then I'm going to close this
16	hearing and the record, and excuse everyone. Thank you.
17	Chairman Hood, are you just with us here for this
18	one?
19	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Yes, it's this one.
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Is it? It's going to be a long
21	day, Chairman Hood. Chairman Hood, you're missing a day.
22	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Well, it's nothing I haven't
23	missed in the past.
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: All right. So I thought the
25	conditions, as I said I'm going to read over them.

Actually, I'll read over them during the motion. I'm comfortable with the conditions.

I was very concerned -- not concerned -- understanding how this was going to be tied to an art gallery and not a prepared food shop -- sorry -- tied more to an art gallery and not necessarily a restaurant or something like that.

It's because this is going to run with the land. So it is an art gallery, and it's going to stay an art gallery, but there's just these conditions to be able to sell tea in a way that's tied to the art gallery.

There was a letter in opposition concerning -- I think it was rats and other things that really applied more to a restaurant. I didn't think that that was necessarily going to happen here because it was so tied to the art gallery.

Mr. Smith, do you have anything you'd like to add?

MEMBER SMITH: Well, I agree with you. My concern
was the same concerns that you raised. And I think the
conditions tie this use down to it continuing to be primarily

-- the primary use will be an art gallery.

With these particular conditions, it's showing that the prepared food portion of this particular use will remain ancillary to the primary use. So I'm comfortable with moving forward with the use variance with these particular

2.1

conditions. 1 2 BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. 3 Chairman Hood? 4 ZC CHAIR HOOD: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 5 I think, as stated by both you and Board Member Smith, the conditions really help us get over that hurdle, which gave 6 7 us some pause. And I think, as noted, this is a well-needed and 8 9 well-adored use for this community. So I'm glad with the 10 conditions, we were able to make this happen as opposed to being an art gallery, which it looks like has overwhelming 11 12 support. And I did look at the opposition, as you stated, 13 Mr. Chairman, about the rats. I don't know if we can germane 14 15 that to one particular business, not in the District of 16 Columbia. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Chairman Hood. 17 BZA CHAIR HILL: 18 I'm going to make a motion, then. Well, I'm going to deliberate a little bit. 19 2.0 appreciate the analysis that the Office of 2.1 Planning has provided, as well as the time that the ANC has 22 spent working with this, as well as the letters of support 23 that have been put forward by the community and the testimony 24 that we took in support of this the last time we were

together.

1 I'm going to make a motion to approve Application 2 No. 21160 as captioned and read by the Secretary, including the conditions that: the maximum permitted number of seats 3 4 that may be occupied for any tea service is 17 seats; 5 Two, permitted beverage sales are limited to water and tea; three, permitted food sales are limited to tea, 6 7 biscuits, and cookies, and no other food items are permitted 8 to be sold; 9 Four, the approved food and beverage item -- tea, 10 water, tea biscuits, and tea cookies -- may not be consumed 11 on-premises or taken to go. Tea may be consumed on-premises. 12 They're not to be taken to go. Tea may be taken to go in any form -- loose tea, tea bags, brewed and poured into a to-go 13 14 cup. Cooking equipment shall be limited to only that 15 16 equipment necessary to prepare and serve tea and accompanying 17 pre-made tea biscuits or cookies. No baking or cooking of any biscuits or cookies is permitted on-site. 18 The vearly revenue from food and beverage sales may not exceed the 19 2.0 yearly revenue from the pottery gallery sales, artisan tea 2.1 wares, handicrafts, and unique gift items. 22 And ask for a second. Mr. Smith? 2.3 MEMBER SMITH: Second. 24 BZA CHAIR HILL: Motion made and seconded, Madam

Would you take a roll call, please?

1	MS. MEHLERT: Please respond to the Chair's motion
2	to approve the application with conditions.
3	Chairman Hill?
4	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes.
5	MS. MEHLERT: Board Member Smith?
6	MEMBER SMITH: Yes.
7	MS. MEHLERT: Chairman Hood?
8	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Yes.
9	MS. MEHLERT: Staff will record the vote as 3-0-2
10	to approve Application 21160 with conditions on the motion
11	made by Chairman Hill and seconded by Board Member Smith,
12	with two Board Members not participating.
13	BZA CHAIR HILL: Great. Thank you, Chairman Hood.
14	You have a good day.
15	ZC CHAIR HOOD: All right, you all have a great
16	day. Thank you.
17	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, give me one second. Oh,
18	Commissioner Miller. Everybody's here today. I'm all over
19	the city. Everybody is showing up. There's all kinds of
20	stuff. All right, give me half a second.
21	Okay. Madam Secretary, you can call our next
22	case.
23	MS. MEHLERT: Next is Application No. 21164 of
24	Christopher Mak. As amended, this is a self-certified
25	application for an area variance, pursuant to Subtitle X

Section 1002, from the rear yard requirements of Subtitle F 1 Section 207.1 and, pursuant to Subtitle X Section 901.2, for 2 3 special exceptions: 4 Under Subtitle U Section 421, to allow a new 5 residential development; under Subtitle C Section 305.1, to allow multiple primary buildings on a single record lot; and 6 under Subtitle F Section 201.4, to allow an increase in floor 7 area ratio for a voluntary inclusionary development. 8 9 This is a new, six-unit apartment house with two 10 stories of cellar, including one IZ unit, on the same lot as five 11 existing apartment house. So units in semi-detached building and two stories with basement. project is located in the RA-1 zone at 113 Wayne Place 13 Southeast, Square 6117, Lot 52. 14 15 This hearing began on July 31st. The Board requested additional information from the Applicant 16 17 continued the hearing to today. Previously participating were Chairman Hill, Board Members John and Blake, 18 Commissioner Miller. I believe Board Member Smith has 19 20 read-in and is participating today. 2.1 MEMBER SMITH: Correct. 22 BZA CHAIR HILL: Can you say that again, 23 Smith? I'm sorry.

have been sufficiently briefed. I will participate in this

MEMBER SMITH:

24

Yes. I've read into the record and

1	particular case.
2	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you, Mr. Smith.
3	Could the Applicant please introduce themselves
4	for the record?
5	MR. MAK: Hello. I'm Christopher Mak. I'm the
6	owner of the building.
7	BZA CHAIR HILL: Great. Mr. Mak, do you have an
8	attorney or you're just trying to do this on your own?
9	MR. MAK: I'm here presenting on my own. I have
10	a team here with my architect and project manager, but I'll
11	be presenting it on my own.
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I'm going to just talk to
13	my Board Members here a little bit because, Mr. Mak, there's
14	still some information that's missing from this before we can
15	actually, I think, hear this properly.
16	So the architect, who's your architect?
17	MR. MAK: Denver Terrance. He's on the call.
18	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Terrance, could you introduce
19	yourself for the record?
20	MR. TERRANCE: Good morning. I'm Denver Terrance,
21	representing Mr. Mak here as the architect of record.
22	BZA CHAIR HILL: Great. Thanks, Mr. Terrance.
23	So what I've been understanding is that you all
24	haven't completely met the C 305.2 requirements. So
25	basically, what you're asking for is a theoretical lot

subdivision, and then you want to put a building on those two 1 2 lots. 3 You have the developmental to show us how 4 standards are not met for each theoretical lot. 5 that you need the relief for each individual lot? There is no indication currently of the lot occupancy or the FAR on 6 7 each theoretical lot. So we don't have the numbers that we could even 8 9 We still don't have really what the numbers are for waive. 10 each one of those individual theoretical lots. 11 Do you understand that, Mr. Mak? 12 MAK: quess my understanding was theoretical lot lines were more for the side yard variance. 13 Section 305.1 and 305.2 list a lot of the requirements under 14 a theoretical subdivision, but FAR and lot occupancy for each 15 individual theoretical lot should be considered as a whole 16 17 for the entire lot. 18 BZA CHAIR HILL: They need to be thought of for each individual lot. And so you need to put a chart together 19 for each individual lot, for the lot occupants in the FAR for 2.0 2.1 each individual lot. 22 It shouldn't take the architect very long. And 2.3 so I think that's something that we could get into the record 24 relatively easily, and then you could make your case.

Okay.

MR. MAK:

1	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Terrance, do you understand?
2	MR. TERRANCE: I do understand. I think what Mr.
3	Mak said is how we interpreted. We were just doing a FAR for
4	the complete lot, not for each theoretical lot, but you're
5	right. It would be just a matter of plugging in some
6	numbers, doing some math to get the FAR for each particular
7	theoretical lot.
8	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Give me one second here.
9	Madam Secretary, you're not talking about this
10	case for the ANC and the Office of Planning, correct?
11	MS. MEHLERT: That was the previous one.
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, got you. Thank you.
13	MS. MEHLERT: The ANC Commissioner is here for
14	this case as well.
15	BZA CHAIR HILL: Great. Commissioner, can you
16	hear me? And if so, could you introduce yourself for the
17	record?
18	MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you. I am Commissioner
19	Lakiah Williams, and I am here with ANC 8D-08.
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you, Commissioner.
21	MS. WILLIAMS: You're very welcome.
22	BZA CHAIR HILL: Let me see. Let's see how this
23	goes real quick. Mr. Smith and Commissioner Miller, would
24	you agree with everything that I've said?
25	MEMBER SMITH: Yes, I agree with everything that

1	you said. On the C 305.48(c), the table of zoning
2	information including required and proposed development
3	standards, that's kind of in line with what you're stating
4	here.
5	I didn't see it within the record. I believe Ms.
6	John may have asked for that in the previous hearing. So
7	since some of that's still outstanding, we maybe can't decide
8	this today, but I'm happy to continue with the testimony.
9	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Terrance, did you see that
10	about the table? That's what I'm talking about.
11	MR. TERRANCE: I did not, but as we speak, I'm
12	punching numbers now to produce the FAR for each individual
13	theoretical lot.
14	BZA CHAIR HILL: I don't have that regulation in
15	front of me, Mr. Smith. Is there a table?
16	MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman?
17	BZA CHAIR HILL: Go ahead, Commissioner Miller.
18	MR. MILLER: I'm sorry to interrupt.
19	Mr. Terrance, while you're looking toward the FAR
20	for each theoretical lot, could you also provide, when you
21	provide that other information, each theoretical lot's lot
22	occupancy as well?
23	MR. TERRANCE: For sure.
24	MR. MILLER: Thank you.
25	MEMBER SMITH: I believe there's even more

1	development standards other than that.
2	Mr. Terrance, did you provide the side yards, the
3	required side yards?
4	BZA CHAIR HILL: I'm sorry to interrupt you, Mr.
5	Smith.
6	Do you see the regulation that Mr. Smith is
7	referring to, Mr. Terrance, and it outlines the table?
8	MR. TERRANCE: Yes. We looked at it some time
9	ago. The actual side yard and rear setbacks, we did consider
10	that for each theoretical lot. And we produced a graphic
11	site plan that shows the relief we're requesting there.
12	MEMBER SMITH: Okay.
13	BZA CHAIR HILL: I'm trying to look up the
14	regulation.
15	MR. TERRANCE: Just to go through real quickly,
16	the only areas that we were not meeting the required setbacks
17	was for the rear yard setback for the new building, where
18	Zoning required it to be 20 feet. We were not able to get
19	20 feet, but we were able to get 13 feet in the rear yard
20	setback for the second theoretical lot.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: So it's C, a table of zoning
22	information including required and proposed development
23	standards. It's the table that we're missing.
24	MR. MAK: Okay. Yes. I know we included a table
25	of the zoning information on the cover sheet of our site

1	plan. As we mentioned, we understood that to be applicable
2	to the whole lot and not theoretical lots independently. So
3	we can update that.
4	BZA CHAIR HILL: Got you, okay. Give me one
5	second here. I'm looking for the ANC.
6	Commissioner, do you want to give us your
7	testimony?
8	MS. WILLIAMS: Absolutely. Commissioner Williams
9	here. We voted with no objections on our 9/26 meeting this
10	past week. And we all voted unanimously for that particular
11	meeting in support of the project.
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I'm looking at my fellow
13	Board Members. I guess we can have the hearing and then just
14	wait for that information before we make a vote. What would
15	you guys like to do?
16	MR. MAK: Yes, we can do that.
17	BZA CHAIR HILL: No. I'm sorry. I'm looking at
18	my Board Members.
19	MEMBER SMITH: Give me two seconds. Let me look
20	at their site plan really quickly because, obviously, I
21	wouldn't want to make this decision on the fly, given that
22	there are additional development standards that may need to
23	be reviewed.
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: I'd rather now now you've
25	already made me uncomfortable. So let's go ahead, and we'll

1	continue this. Okay.
2	So Mr. Terrance, get all of that information
3	that's necessary within C 305.2, okay? And then we'll come
4	back.
5	Madam Secretary, when could we come back?
6	MS. MEHLERT: Well, you could come back on the
7	23rd of October.
8	BZA CHAIR HILL: How many cases on the 23rd?
9	MS. MEHLERT: There are six hearing cases, one
10	expedited review, and one decision case.
11	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Why do I think that you
12	said the 23rd was not going to be easy?
13	MS. MEHLERT: There's two cases that have party
14	status that day.
15	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. What about the 30th?
16	MS. MEHLERT: The 30th, there are seven hearing
17	cases.
18	BZA CHAIR HILL: But no party status?
19	MS. MEHLERT: There is one appeal. There's one
20	appeal.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Commissioner Miller, I
22	hate to do this. Do you mind coming back on the 23rd?
23	MR. MILLER: Sorry, Mr. Chairman. I would prefer
24	another date if possible.
25	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay.

1	MR. MILLER: It happens to be my birthday. I
2	think I am there for one case, but I was hoping that would
3	be a brief one and early on. If it's early on with the other
4	case I'm on, it could work.
5	BZA CHAIR HILL: If you have to be here anyway,
6	Vice-Chair Miller
7	MR. MILLER: Yes, I'll have to be there. If you
8	can put them together first I don't know. I haven't
9	looked at the schedule. I don't know what you might have
10	promised other people. So if we can look at that, yes.
11	BZA CHAIR HILL: Commissioner, that will be our
12	birthday present to you.
13	MR. MILLER: Thank you. That's a very wonderful
14	present.
15	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Smith?
16	MEMBER SMITH: I'm looking at the site plan here
17	just to provide some additional clarification. I do see your
18	zoning table, but I think it's just an open question of
19	whether that table is is that the theoretical lot, or is
20	that the entire lot currently?
21	So you probably want to drill down into this a
22	little bit more and provide that development standard
23	information for the theoretical lot, just provide that
24	clarification so we can move forward.

That would be helpful for the Office of Planning,

too, because they may want to take a look at this again just 1 to make sure that you're requesting the adequate relief 2 3 that's needed, just to be sure. 4 BZA CHAIR HILL: Each individual theoretical lot, 5 that's what we're looking for. And then now what Mr. Smith is saying is that you might need more relief perhaps. 6 Ι 7 don't know. And so then you've got maybe check again with the Office of Planning real quick. 8 9 Is the Office of Planning here? Mr. Beamon? 10 MR. BEAMON: Yes. 11 BZA CHAIR HILL: Great. Could you introduce yourself for the record? Shepard Beamon with the Office 13 MR. BEAMON: Yes. of Planning. 14 15 BZA CHAIR HILL: Great. Mr. Beamon, Mr. Terrance will try to get with you before we come back on the 23rd to 16 17 make sure, with the two individual theoretical lots, that there's no more issues. 18 19 Mr. Terrance, I didn't look at this one just yet, 2.0 but the site plan has to be for both individual theoretical 2.1 And then if the Office of Planning wants to provide a supplemental, they may. Otherwise, we have it in there if 22 23 there's not anything else they need to add. 24 Madam Secretary, is there any dates I need to give in order to get us back here by the 23rd?

1 MS. MEHLERT: If the Applicant could submit their 2 filings by October 10th, then the ANC and OP could submit by the 17th if they wanted to. 3 4 MR. TERRANCE: That should be no problem. We'll 5 have our information. 6 BZA CHAIR HILL: And I've got to look to my fellow 7 Board Members also, Mr. Smith -- thank you -- or Mr. Miller. 8 Is there anything else? I don't want to do this again. 9 Commissioner Miller? 10 MR. MILLER: I agree with everything that's been appreciate the Applicant's responses to these 11 said. 12 requests. I also appreciate the Applicant working with the 13 ANC 8D since our last hearing in July to garner their 14 support, and I appreciate all the work that the ANC has done 15 16 in this appreciate the Applicant's case. Ι previous 17 responses to Office of Planning's previous requests prior to that hearing and going forward. 18 19 In addition to all of the things that you've 2.0 outlined, that zoning table and each theoretical lot, do we 2.1 need a grading plan? Is a grading plan in the record? You 22 said is there anything outstanding. I want to make sure we have everything, and they don't have to go back again and 23 24 respond.

I guess I'm asking the Office of Planning and the

1	architect. Does U 421.4, which the new residential
2	development is seeking relief under, and the C 305.4(g)(5),
3	which is the multiple primary buildings on a single lot, do
4	they require grading plan, an existing grading plan and
5	final? Do we need that in the record if it isn't there?
6	BZA CHAIR HILL: That's what it says. Actually,
7	I'm just going to cut to what I understand also. Thank you,
8	Vice-Chair Miller.
9	The grading plan, existing and final for each
10	theoretical lot. Okay, Mr. Terrance?
11	MR. TERRANCE: Got it, got it.
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you, Commissioner Miller.
13	Thank you, Mr. Smith.
14	Commissioner Williams, are you running unopposed?
15	MS. WILLIAMS: No.
16	BZA CHAIR HILL: Are you running unopposed?
17	MS. WILLIAMS: I am not running.
18	BZA CHAIR HILL: You're not running?
19	MS. WILLIAMS: No.
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Was it one term? How many terms?
21	MS. WILLIAMS: It was one term.
22	BZA CHAIR HILL: One term? Are you moving out of
23	the SMD?
24	MS. WILLIAMS: I am not. I'll still be around.
25	BZA CHAIR HILL: We lost you right away, huh? All

1	right. Thanks for the two years.
2	MS. WILLIAMS: No problem.
3	BZA CHAIR HILL: All right. Anyone else before
4	we let everybody go? Okay. We'll see you guys back here on
5	the 23rd.
6	And Commissioner Miller, I'm sorry. We'll see you
7	then, too. We'll do it first thing, okay?
8	MR. MILLER: Have a great rest of your day.
9	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you.
10	MR. TERRANCE: Thank you.
11	BZA CHAIR HILL: Are you gone, Commissioner
12	Miller, or are you still with us?
13	MR. MILLER: I think so, unless there's something
14	that
15	BZA CHAIR HILL: No. You've got one more.
16	MR. MILLER: says I need to be here for
17	something.
18	BZA CHAIR HILL: Maybe I'm wrong.
19	MR. MILLER: I think I'm
20	MS. MEHLERT: You're done for today, Commissioner
21	Miller.
22	MR. MILLER: Thank you. I'll consider myself
23	dismissed. Thank you.
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Bye-bye.
25	All right. Well, if that's the case, I thought

I was going to -- okay. What number are we on? 1 Ιf that's the case, let's take a quick break. 2 Get a coffee. 3 See you all in ten minutes. 4 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the 5 record at 10:32 a.m. and resumed at 10:49 a.m.) 6 MS. MEHLERT: The next case in the Board's hearing 7 session is Application No. 21010 of NL 1271 5th ST, LLC. 8 amended, this is a self-certified application pursuant to 9 Subtitle X Section 901.2, for special exceptions: 10

Under Subtitle C Section 703.2, from the minimum parking requirements of Subtitle C Section 701.5; under 909.2, Section the loading requirements Section Subtitle C 901.1; under Subtitle С, Section 1501.1(d), to allow drinking establishment a eating or located within penthouse-habitable space; and under Subtitle G Sections 207.14 and 5200, from the rear yard requirements of Subtitle G Section 207.9.

This project is a new, seven-story building with basement, penthouse, and roof deck, for use as a hotel with approximately 130 hotel rooms, with an eating/drinking establishment and ground floor retail and/or service uses. The project is located in the PDR-1 zone at 1271 5th Street Northeast, Square 3591, Lot 3.

This hearing was originally scheduled for December 13, 2023, and was postponed twice at the Applicant's request.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

1	At the July 31st hearing, the Board postponed the hearing to
2	today.
3	BZA CHAIR HILL: Great. Thank you.
4	Let's see. If the Applicant can hear me, could
5	they please introduce themselves for the record?
6	MR. UTZ: Jeff Utz, Land Use Counsel for the
7	Applicant.
8	(Simultaneous speaking.)
9	BZA CHAIR HILL: I'm sorry.
10	MR. ALLEN: It's all right. Reynolds Allen with
11	EDENS, the Applicant.
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. So Mr. Utz, I think we're
13	going to have a disagreement here, but we can talk through
14	it. I still think that this is not something that we can
15	necessarily vote on, or at least I'm not comfortable voting
16	on it.
17	I know that the last time you were here, you guys
18	were still going through the Zoning Commission, I think. I'm
19	not even sure where you were, but the order's not in effect
20	at this point. And I still know that you don't know probably
21	when it's going to be in effect. It may be probably I'm
22	just taking a guess January or February. I don't know
23	exactly.
24	I'm looking at my Board Members. I know that Mr.
25	Smith, who I work with all the time, we definitely haven't

approved anything when we're not really allowed to approve anything yet. And you'd still have to wait for DOB anyway before you could actually get your permits until the thing went into effect.

I don't mind, I guess. This is where Mr. Smith

-- I know if Ms. John or Mr. Blake may be here, I might have
gotten a different answer. I don't know what Mr. Smith
thinks to hearing the case since everybody's here and then
we can vote when it takes into effect -- and I'll let Mr. Utz
argue his case -- or just kicking it down again until the
order takes into effect.

And before Mr. Smith gives us his opinion and/or Commissioner Imamura, we'll let Mr. Utz give us his argument.

MR. UTZ: Thank you, Chair. So you would like me to go ahead and kind of encapsulate our position on this now?

BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes, Mr. Utz. I saw the whole thing about like timing and blah, blah, blah, but you can't get your permits anyway until this takes effect. So I don't see what that does for you, but you can go ahead and make your argument.

MR. UTZ: Sure. Thank you. Well, thank you all for putting this on the agenda. I know that there was some discomfort last time, so we do appreciate the opportunity to talk today.

We did submit, essentially, an overview of our

2.1

2.3

argument on this point on September 3rd. That's Exhibit 27 in the record. I can run through the highlights on that. I'm happy to talk about this.

There's kind of a lot here, and there's a lot behind why we need this to go forward now, the Applicant needs this to go forward now, on the kind of business side of it. And I can let Reynolds speak to this more after I provide the legal overview.

There is a very time-sensitive sequence of events. We wouldn't even prepare construction drawings to submit for permit before we have certain assurances that we have the Board's approval, if we're so fortunate as to get it. So there is this kind of sequence where we wouldn't even be able to approach DOB to submit for permit because our drawings wouldn't be ready.

We would actually wait to have our entitlements in place from the Board before we would start typically on construction drawings and make that very significant investment to even get in a place where we could file for permit. So there's this kind of sequential, essentially regimented due to the investment necessary, a process that still awaits this project.

So this is a key step. It is the current key step for us. That's what's behind the urgency, and then the other part of that is the business underpinning of the project

itself.

2.0

2.1

Financing is very difficult to get in this environment. The Applicant has that arranged, and so there's a certain inertia that needs to encompass that to make this project go forward as soon as possible while all those factors are in place. I can let Reynolds speak to that a little more.

MR. ALLEN: Yes, thank you. Thank you, Jeff.

And thank you for letting us speak today on this. We understand that if a vote was taken, it would still be contingent on the Zoning order being issued. And we are comfortable with that risk and that understanding, primarily because we need to remove this uncertainty to be able to move the project forward.

With the uncertainty of knowing if the special exceptions will be granted, we can't move forward to get a partner in place. We can't move forward to get financing in place with that partner. Therefore, the project just stalls and does not move forward until this is determined.

So we would ask that the Board considers reviewing it, taking a vote on it, conditioning it on that written order. That would allow us to then know there is support, and we would be able to proceed forward.

Just for additional context, EDENS did not develop this project alone. We are not hotel developers. We have

lined up waiting for this decision 1 partners determine if they will proceed forward or not. 2 And until 3 that happens, we can't move anything forward. 4 So I plead with the Board to consider at least 5 hearing it, taking a vote, and conditioning that vote on the written order being issued and finalized, which we have 6 7 received a lot of community support. We've received support We've got the Zoning Commission 8 from all of our neighbors. 9 approval in place and just awaiting that order. 10 So if that's possible, we would be very 11 appreciative in order to see how we can make this project continue forward. We've been trying to get to this point for 12 13 nearly two years. 14 And I can provide some more of the legal MR. UTZ: 15 backing behind why we believe the Board is able to move 16 forward with a hearing and a vote today. 17 If we could pull up the presentation, we do have some slides that just kind of show the property, so putting 18 19 it in context, but then there is one particular slide that 20 might be helpful to show some thoughts around maybe --2.1 BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Utz, is that in Exhibit 31? 22 MR. UTZ: Yes. Which slide? 23 BZA CHAIR HILL: 24 MR. UTZ: We could just pull up the first page for

now, but then I do think we can quickly turn after some other

remarks to slide 3. It just kind of shines a light on something in particular.

So this rationale is in Exhibit 27, which is from September 3rd, but it kind of gives an overview of why we think the Board can hear this today and, ideally, could take a vote today.

First, as you mentioned, Chair Hill, the Zoning Commission has taken final action in the map amendment case. That happened on September 12th. At the time of our hearing on the 31st, the Zoning Commission had taken proposed action, but not final action. So there is that additional level of certainty now that didn't exist then.

The issuance of a written order is next, and that is going to be administrative. Although, as you mentioned, waiting for that issuance is going to cause significant delay, and it is very likely harmful for this project.

Secondly, the relief here actually does not depend on the zone in effect. We are seeking relief for a penthouse, eating and drinking establishment use, which would be the case no matter the zone. We are seeking relief for parking and loading. That would apply whether the zone is MU-8B or PDR-1.

And finally, the rear yard relief is required in both zones. And the formula for that rear yard is the same in both zones. The uses contemplated are matter-of-right in

2.0

2.3

both zones, although the parameters of the project would be different. It would actually be smaller under matter-of-right. So to the extent a modification would be needed, it would come in as a smaller set of asks.

Third, the zoning regulations are set up to allow an applicant to apply the zoning regulations in effect at the time of the Board's vote or at the time of an application for a building permit.

There is language in Subtitle A that sets up that dynamic. In this instance, the Applicant would be applying the MU-8B provisions, which in all likelihood would be those in effect at the time the application is in for a permit.

regularly Fourth, the Board does approve applications while there are pending changes to the Zoning Regulations or entitlement approvals that are required before, or at the same time, а BZAapproval be implemented.

There are about a half-dozen or more pending amendments right now that could affect the status of pending BZA cases, but it typically doesn't hamper the Board's ability to go forward with those and make the decisions that they make.

The Board also hears and approves cases that are contingent on other approvals, including the Public Space Committee, the Old Georgetown Board, the Historic

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Preservation Review Board, or others. A case before the Board that also requires HPRB approval could not proceed as proposed and approved by the Board unless and until HPRB signs off on that project as well.

If the Board would approve a project and HPRB subsequently does not approve a project, then that applicant would need to be returned to the Board for a modification approval. The same is true here. If somehow the Zoning Commission's map amendment is overturned, which we think is exceedingly unlikely here, the Applicant would have the ability to return to the Board to modify the project.

Fifth, it is noteworthy that the Zoning Commission also hears cases and grants zoning relief and approves projects in a similarly at-risk or contingent posture. A PUD that is accompanied by a map amendment is reviewed by the Commission before the map amendment becomes effective.

And the Commission regularly does grant approval for building envelopes, including zoning relief, prior to the effectiveness of a PUD-related map amendment when the building envelopes depend on those map amendments to be permitted. In these cases, the map amendments do not become effective until the recordation of a covenant with the Recorder of Deeds, which typically happens well after the Commission votes and even after the order comes out.

In fact, the PUD covenant needs the order attached

2.0

2.1

to it to be recorded and effectuated. So the Commission makes this sort of determination all the time before the map amendment is actually even approved, let alone effectuated.

Lastly -- and this is where it would be great to show slide 3, please -- the Applicant is willing to expressly condition the effectiveness of the Board's order, if we would be so fortunate as to get it.

Can you go one more slide, please? Thank you. That's good. That's the one that we are talking about right now.

We would be willing to insert this condition that would expressly dictate that the effectiveness is based on the Zoning Commission's issuance of a written order amending the map amendment. That condition can address the concern about ripeness here. The Zoning Regulations don't require that condition. It's just suggested to provide an extra level of comfort here.

In sum, we understand this is a bit unusual in nature, but we do request that there is a hearing today. We would love to present the application. And we would really appreciate the opportunity to get a vote from the Board.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Thanks, Mr. Utz. I'll tell you what, Mr. Utz. I'm going to do the best I can. I'm going to go have an emergency meeting right now and talk to legal, and then see what others' thoughts are. And we can

2.0

2.1

1	talk about it.
2	There's no reason why I would care. I should say,
3	as I said the last time, it looks like a great project.
4	We've reviewed the record already. We know the area. I
5	don't live far away.
6	I'd love to move forward, but the issue that I'm
7	having is kind of the precedent that I'm setting. You've
8	made a very nice argument, and I agree with it to a certain
9	extent. So let me do my little thing here.
10	Do you all mind if I do the emergency meeting?
11	And if so, raise your hand.
12	Okay. As Chairperson of the Board of Zoning for
13	the District of Columbia, in accordance with 407 of the
14	District of Columbia Administrative Procedure Act, I move
15	that the Board of Zoning Adjustment hold a closed meeting on
16	10/2/2024 for the purposes of seeking legal counsel on
17	Application No. 21010, to deliberate upon, but not vote on,
18	21010.
19	Is there a second, Mr. Smith?
20	MEMBER SMITH: Second.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: The motion made and seconded.
22	Madam Secretary, take a roll call, please?
23	MS. MEHLERT: Please respond to the Chair's motion
24	to hold an emergency closed meeting with legal.

Chairman Hill?

1	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes.
2	MS. MEHLERT: Board Member Smith?
3	MEMBER SMITH: Yes.
4	MS. MEHLERT: And Dr. Imamura?
5	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.
6	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. Sorry. Go ahead,
7	Madam Secretary.
8	MS. MEHLERT: Staff will record the vote as 3-0-2
9	to hold the closed meeting.
10	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thanks.
11	As it appears the motion has passed, I hereby give
12	the notice to the Board of Zoning. We'll recess this meeting
13	today at 10/2/2024 at 11:05 to hold a closed emergency
14	meeting pursuant to the District of Columbia Administrative
15	Procedure Act. A written copy of this notice will be posted
16	in the Jerrily R. Kress Memorial Hearing Room at this time.
17	Okay, see you guys in a little bit. Thank you.
18	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
19	record at 11:05 a.m. and resumed at 11:15 a.m.)
20	MS. MEHLERT: The Board has returned from its
21	emergency closed meeting on Application No. 21010 of NL 1271
22	5th ST, LLC.
23	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. Thanks.
24	Before we deliberate on whether or not we're going
25	to hear this today, does the Board have any questions of the

Applicant? 1 2 Then in that case, who would like to start 3 the deliberation? I can sum up what I know. 4 Go ahead, Mr. Smith. 5 MEMBER SMITH: So I appreciate the comments that were provided by Mr. Utz, the Applicant, regarding this. 6 7 Based on the information at hand, the Board of 8 Adjustment is only allowed to act on the zone as it exists 9 at the time of when we're reviewing and approving that 10 particular case. The zoning that exists at this particular time is 11 12 So the request before us is special exceptions for a zone that, while the map amendment has been approved by the 13 Zoning Commission, it is currently not in effect. 14 I believe that at this particular time, we cannot 15 legally act on the requests before us for the special 16 17 exceptions for the MU-8 zone. So at this particular time, my position is to continue this until after that zone has 18 That's my particular position. 19 been enacted. 20 BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you, Mr. Smith. 2.1 Dr. Imamura? 22 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Chairman, Ι certainly 23 amempathetic the situation of appreciate and οf t.he 24 Applicant.

Mr. Utz, thank you for your perspective and point

of view. I agree with Board Member Smith, as much as I'd like to help expedite.

I understand your strategy here. Once the order is written, you can act immediately. It also provides some assurances for investors, as you explained, but we have a process here. It's something that we've got to follow. I'm personally happy to hear the merits after the zoning law has been issued.

I've reviewed your application here. In my mind, down the road it may be a pretty straightforward case, but right now, I don't believe that the Board is in a position or has the authority to review this absent an official Zoning order issued.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Thanks.

I will repeat what was said by my other colleagues in terms of I will agree with them. And at the same time, I appreciate, Mr. Utz, what you're trying to do for your client. It is something that we have never done before. And so, I don't want to start to do it now, really.

I will, again, reiterate what I think I kind of said the last time, but I'll be a little bit more clear about it. You have gone through the process and your client's gone through the process wherein they've already presented before the ANC, and they have received approval. They've already presented before the Office of Planning, and they have

2.0

2.1

received approval. They've already presented before the Zoning Commission, and they've received approval.

So I'm kind of speaking to the people that are your investors or have concerns about moving forward. I obviously can't say what the Board is necessarily going to do, but all indications look as though it'll be a straightforward case when this order is published.

What I suggest as to when it is put into effect is take a guess as to when -- and Mr. Utz, you might know better than I, if you have any idea as to when this thing might take effect. Do you know when it might take effect?

MR. UTZ: We don't. It is a guessing game for us. It probably is Q1 2025, although we're not certain. It's really up to the Office of Zoning at this step.

We've drafted the order, and it exists in the record. And it is fairly straightforward. That case was also supported all across the line, by all stakeholders. Theoretically, it could be streamlined, but it is kind of a first-come, first-served sort of queue. So we're kind of subject to that instrumentality.

If there would be an appetite for it -- it sounds like this is not what was just discussed, but if there would be an appetite for it, we would appreciate the opportunity to have a hearing today and perhaps not to vote, if that would be --

2.1

1	BZA CHAIR HILL: I appreciate it, Mr. Utz. Even
2	that, Mr. Utz, doesn't seem to be if I thought it would
3	really help you necessarily, I don't even know if I could
4	convince my fellow Board Members, to be quite honest, because
5	it would be something then we would have to have an argument
6	with the next person that comes down the line that's in a
7	similar situation.
8	And so I'm not inclined to do that. What I am
9	inclined is to do everything I can to make this as efficient
10	and feasible for your client.
11	So what I would suggest is we'll go ahead I
12	doubt you'll be ready, but we'll go ahead and put you on for
13	maybe what do you think is you can have the first
14	hearing in January if you want. I don't know if you think
15	that and then you just go ahead and postpone if you still
16	don't have what you need.
17	Mr. Utz, I'm looking to you. What do you think
18	would be the earliest that you'd even have a shot?
19	MR. UTZ: I do think it's feasible that the order
20	is out in that time frame. So we would take the earliest
21	hearing that we could get along those lines.
22	BZA CHAIR HILL: The first one is the 22nd of
23	January, I believe, correct, Madam Secretary? What does the
24	22nd of January look like for us right now?
25	MS. MEHLERT: It is open.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. Dr. Imamura, you're
smiling. Our stuff is jammed up so far that even the first
one in January is not whatever.
Mr. Allen, I'll get to you.
Ms. Mehlert, that's what you've got.
So go ahead, Mr. Allen.
MR. ALLEN: This is just a question generally to
everybody. Is there a chance that this could happen sooner?
I am dancing here to try to keep this project alive.
Is it possible that there would be an opportunity
to be on November or December? And if those who are working
on the written order can help move it along quickly, that we
could come in sooner?
BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Utz is shaking his head as
though he thinks that that's a possibility.
Mr. Utz, I will do my best to at least put you in
a situation where you can say yes or no.
And Mr. Allen, I know that how you got yourself
to this point is not what we also want for you, but we're
doing the best we can. If you know somebody different or
some other way to get that thing sooner, there you go, but
now I just made somebody else have a problem.
So Mr. Utz, what do you think? November? I don't
know.

MEMBER SMITH:

We can kick it to November and see

1	if the order is out, but if the order is not out, you're
2	kicked again. So if you want to just try to keep it on the
3	calendar at an earlier date on the hope that an order comes
4	out, we can do that, but we will not act on this before the
5	order.
6	MR. UTZ: That would be our preference, yes, if
7	we could be inserted onto a November date.
8	BZA CHAIR HILL: That's fine. So then we're in
9	October whatever, right.
10	And I'm just looking at Madam Secretary. If this
11	is as clean as possible, it's still going to take me 20
12	minutes. I have to think about what we've got. So you let
13	me know, Madam Secretary, where I can find 20 minutes.
14	MS. MEHLERT: You may be able to find it on
15	November 20th.
16	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great, just before
17	Thanksgiving. So let's do 11/20, and let's see if we're all
18	thankful.
19	MEMBER SMITH: Well, let's not promise 20 minutes.
20	We really haven't heard the merits. So whatever it takes.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: I'm trying to plan my day, and
22	I agree, Mr. Smith.
23	Mr. Utz, you're still going to have to earn your
24	money, apparently, when you come back to us. So don't cheat
25	us. Don't cut us short. All right, so we'll start you on

the 20th and see what happens. 1 2 Thank you. MR. UTZ: 3 BZA CHAIR HILL: And I would like to reiterate, for the record, yes, Mr. Smith. I am very much going to take 5 a very close look at the regulations as they are before me when this case actually does come before us. And I want to 6 7 be very clear to that. I did not mean to be flippant. 8 All right. We'll 11/20,see guys you 9 hopefully. 10 MR. UTZ: Thank you. 11 BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. 12 right, let Mr. Smith, me see. Yes, appreciate that clarification. 13 I don't want anybody to be 14 like, really? 15 MEMBER SMITH: Right. 16 Okay, that's that. We actually BZA CHAIR HILL: 17 haven't done anything today yet. I think we did an expedited review of something. I don't know. We did something. 18 19 Okay, let's have a hearing. Go ahead, Madam 20 Secretary. 2.1 MS. MEHLERT: Application No. 21173 22 an application pursuant to Naseef. This Subtitle X is 23 Section 901.2 for a special exception under Subtitle D 24 Section 5201, from the rear yard requirements of Subtitle D Section 207.1.

1	This is for a one-story rear deck addition to an
2	existing, two-story, attached, principal dwelling located in
3	the R-3 zone at 4458 Greenwich Parkway Northwest, Square
4	1351, Lot 174.
5	This was removed from the July 24th Expedited
6	Review Calendar at the request of ANC SMD Commissioner JP
7	Szymkowicz for 3D-07. There was also an incomplete request
8	for party status from Commissioner Szymkowicz. However, the
9	ANC Chair submitted a letter noting ANC is not weighing in
10	on this case, and Commissioner Szymkowicz had not heard any
11	opposition.
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: Great. Thank you.
13	If the Applicant is here, if they could please
14	introduce themselves for the record?
15	MS. NASEEF: Hi. This is Kara Naseef from 4458
16	Greenwich Parkway Northwest.
17	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, Ms. Naseef. Are you
18	presenting before us?
19	MS. NASEEF: No. I don't have anything additional
20	to present unless you had any questions for me.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. We'll get to you in one
22	second then, Ms. Naseef. Is your camera working?
23	MS. NASEEF: I am trying to figure that out.
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. We'll give you a second,
25	then.

Is the Commissioner here? Is anyone here other than the Applicant? I see the Office of Planning, and we'll get to them once I get hear -- okay, great.

All right. Ms. Naseef, I know you were first with us for expedited review. Then, as you know how this all happened, we got to this point. So now we're actually having

All you have to do is tell us about your project, and tell us a little bit about what you understand the regulations are. And we will go on from there. So please go ahead and tell us about your project.

MS. NASEEF: Great. So we need to replace the rear deck of our townhome. We moved in two years ago, and the wood is just deteriorating. When we replace the deck, we would like to expand it by just about a foot to be consistent with the decks of our neighbors immediately on either side.

My understanding is that the reason we have to have a hearing is that, because our lot is so small, there are regulations around having a deck. And so we would be able to replace the current deck at the exact size under the regulations, but wouldn't be able to expand it at all without a zoning exception. And so that's what we're requesting.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Great. Thank you, Ms. Naseef.

Could I hear from the Office of Planning, please,

2.0

2.1

a hearing.

1	before I turn to my Board?
2	MS. MYERS: Good morning. Crystal Myers with the
3	Office of Planning. The Office of Planning is recommending
4	approval of this case.
5	I will note that we asked for the Applicant to
6	submit professionally drawn plans to complete the record by
7	the hearing date, and they have done so. So the Office of
8	Planning is satisfied and can stand on the record of the
9	staff report. Thank you.
10	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you, Ms. Myers.
11	Mr. Young, is there anyone here wishing to speak?
12	MR. YOUNG: No, we do not.
13	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Do my fellow Board Members
14	have any questions for Ms. Naseef and/or the Office of
15	Planning?
16	Go ahead, Dr. Imamura.
16 17	Go ahead, Dr. Imamura. COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Just a comment. Ms.
17	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Just a comment. Ms.
17 18	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Just a comment. Ms. Naseef, I just want to thank you for going through this
17 18 19	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Just a comment. Ms. Naseef, I just want to thank you for going through this process.
17 18 19 20	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Just a comment. Ms. Naseef, I just want to thank you for going through this process. I know it probably seems a little ridiculous for
17 18 19 20 21	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Just a comment. Ms. Naseef, I just want to thank you for going through this process. I know it probably seems a little ridiculous for a one-foot extension of your existing deck, but it is what

Anyhow, I just wanted to say thank you. Good luck

I've shown my cards. 1 on your deck. BZA CHAIR HILL: All right, thank you. Thank you, 2 3 Dr. Imamura. 4 All right. Ms. Naseef, is there anything you 5 would like to add at the end? No, that's all. Thank you for your 6 MS. NASEEF: 7 consideration. 8 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, thank you. All right, I'm 9 going to go ahead and close the record of the hearing and 10 excuse everyone, please. I don't think if I were to do this on my own, I 11 would be so professional as to say, thank you for your 13 consideration. I would just be so happy to leave. Ι 14 wouldn't even be so smart as this. I'd just be like, I've 15 got to go. I reviewed the record. I think it's really 16 Okay. 17 straightforward. As Dr. Imamura said, it could have been an expedited review, but it just kind of happened to get gummed 18 up a little bit. 19 20 And so I would agree with the analysis that the 2.1 Office of Planning has provided, the argument that the 22 Applicant has provided, and also that the ANC doesn't have 23 any issues, although they're not in the record as something 24 that we can give great weight to them. And I'm going to be voting to approve.

1	Mr. Smith?
2	MEMBER SMITH: No comments. I agree with your
3	statements.
4	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you.
5	Dr. Imamura?
6	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you. I'm in
7	agreement with you, Mr. Chairman. I'm prepared to vote in
8	support. I'm glad that it's 12 inches. If it were six
9	inches, that would drive me absolutely bonkers.
10	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. All right. I'm
11	going to make a motion to approve Application No. 21173 as
12	captioned and read by the Secretary and ask for a second.
13	Mr. Smith?
14	MEMBER SMITH: Second.
15	BZA CHAIR HILL: The motion has been made and
16	seconded. If you could please take a roll call vote, Madam
17	Secretary?
18	MS. MEHLERT: On the motion to approve the
19	application, Chairman Hill?
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes.
21	MS. MEHLERT: Board Member Smith?
22	MEMBER SMITH: Yes.
23	MS. MEHLERT: Dr. Imamura?
24	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.
25	MS. MEHLERT: Staff will record the vote as 3-0-2

1	to approve Application 21173 on the motion made by Chairman
2	Hill and seconded by Board Member Smith, with two other Board
3	Members not participating.
4	BZA CHAIR HILL: Great. Madam Secretary, you may
5	call our next case.
6	MS. MEHLERT: Next is Application No. 17552-A of
7	Benedictine Foundation in the St. Anselm's Abbey School.
8	This is a self-certified request pursuant to
9	Subtitle Y Section 704 for a modification with hearing, Order
10	No. 17552, and pursuant to Subtitle X Section 902.1 for
11	special exceptions under: Subtitle U Section 203.1(m), to
12	allow an addition to a building at an existing private
13	school; and Subtitle X Section 104, to allow modification of
14	a private school plan.
15	It's a one-story addition to an existing building
16	at an existing private school, located in the R-1B zone at
17	4501 South Dakota Avenue Northeast, Square 3977, Lot 133.
18	And as preliminary matters, the Applicant has
19	proffered two expert witnesses: Julianna von Zumbusch as an
20	expert in architecture and Ed Foley as an expert in
21	architecture.
22	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. If the Applicant
23	can hear me, if they could please introduce themselves for
24	the record?

MR. CORRIGAN:

John Corrigan. I'm the principal

1	of St. Anselm's Abbey School, but I'm not sure if I was
2	supposed to talk or if my representative was there.
3	BZA CHAIR HILL: That's all right, Mr. Corrigan.
4	Go ahead, Ms. Shiker.
5	MS. SHIKER: Good morning. And thank you, John.
6	He was very excited to be here. He had to step
7	out of class to get here on time. So good morning. I am
8	Christine Shiker with the Law Firm of Holland & Knight. I'm
9	representing St. Anselm's Abbey School for this private
10	school modification.
11	We do have John Corrigan, who is the Headmaster
12	of St. Anselm's, here today. We have representatives from
13	CGS Architects that we're just referencing their requested
14	expert status, and then Mark Cummings, the Director of
15	Finance and Operations, from St. Anselm's here today. Thank
16	you.
17	BZA CHAIR HILL: Great. Thanks, Ms. Shiker. Who
18	did you want expert status for again, please?
19	MS. SHIKER: So we had proffered both Ed Foley and
20	Julianna von Zumbusch from CGS Architects. Julianna is going
21	to do the presentation, so I think that we could look to her.
22	Again, she could answer any questions if you have any.
23	BZA CHAIR HILL: That's all right. Do you know
24	which exhibit it's in that has
25	MS. SHIKER: Yes. Both her and Ed's resumes are

1	at Exhibit 10 and 11.
2	BZA CHAIR HILL: Exhibit 10 and 11?
3	MS. SHIKER: That's what it shows on my screen.
4	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right, maybe I'm in
5	the wrong file. Okay, let's see.
6	Mr. Foley, I see you. And then who's the other
7	architect? I'm sorry.
8	MS. SHIKER: Julianna von Zumbusch.
9	Julianna, does your camera work?
10	MS. VON ZUMBUSCH: I'm getting the camera to work.
11	I'm working on it now.
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Ms. von Zumbusch and Mr.
13	Foley, give me one second.
14	Do you guys, Mr. Smith or Dr. Imamura, have any
15	questions for the two people that are being proffered as
16	expert witnesses?
17	MEMBER SMITH: No, no questions.
18	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I'm satisfied with their
19	resume.
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I want to get ahead of
21	this anyway in case they both come back at some point in
22	time.
23	So you guys have both been knighted as experts in
24	architecture. Congratulations.
25	All right. Ms. Shiker, do you want to go ahead

2 Mr. Corrigan, do you want to go 3 introduce yourself for the record? 4 MR. CORRIGAN: Yes. My name is John Corrigan. 5 I'm the Headmaster of St. Anselm's Abbey School. We are a Benedictine school in Washington, DC, 4501 South Dakota 6 7 We've been here since 1942, celebrating our 83rd The monastery has been here for 100 years. 8 It just 9 celebrated its 100th-year anniversary. 10 BZA CHAIR HILL: Well, that's wonderful. Thank you for being with us here today. 11 Congratulations. Ms. Shiker, do you want to go ahead and 12 walk us through your client's application, why you believe 13 they're meeting the criteria for us to grant the relief 14 15 requested? I'm going to put 15 minutes on the clock just so 16 I know where we are. And you can begin whenever you'd like. 17 Mr. Young, if you could please bring MS. SHIKER: up the PowerPoint presentation at Exhibit 26? 18 Thank you so 19 much. 20 Again, good morning. We are pleased to be here 2.1 before you today to present on this application requesting 22 approval for a modification to the private school plan for 2.3 this school. 24 Next slide, please. 25 The campus is a large site located at 4501 South

and tell us why you believe your client -- excuse me.

Dakota Avenue Northeast. Please note on this plan, north is plan left, so it's rotated. That's South Dakota Avenue running diagonally across the bottom corner of the screen. The campus is zoned R-1B. Therefore, we are here to do a modification under the special exception for the private school plan.

Next slide, please.

2.1

2.3

The application will result in the construction of a single-story addition to the main academic building. The addition is less than 10,000 square feet and will provide important space that's needed for the existing school population. There is no increase in students or faculty and staff as part of this request.

We are pleased to have the Office of Planning's support. We also are pleased to have DDOT expressing no objections to the addition. We have ANC 5A's support for the application, which is in the record at Exhibit 25. And we also have a letter from the Queen's Chapel Civic Association. Their letter of support is in the record at Exhibit 15.

Next slide, please.

This is the current site plan for the campus, again with north being on plan left. And at this point, I'll ask Ms. von Zumbusch to walk through briefly the proposed improvements. Thank you.

MS. VON ZUMBUSCH: Hi there. It looks like my

video is working now, so pleased to meet you all. Just to orient you, as Ms. Shiker gave a great introduction, the area that we are discussing is really in the center of the plan.

Our proposed development is a 10,000-square-foot addition, which will be primarily for library. It's located where there is an existing basketball court that is not planned to be replaced.

So if you see, there are three main areas of construction on the site. On the bottom of the plan is a gymnasium for performance arts. Right above that is the monastery, which is an active monastery with about 12 monks. And then to the left is the primary education campus. And that's really where we're tying in.

So we can go next.

You can see in orange, that is the area where we have the proposed addition. As we mentioned, primary use will be library. It is also replacing some ancillary office and support staff spaces, which will be replacing some temporary trailers that are currently on the site.

Next.

This is the floor plan to give a sense of the scale. As indicated, those are support spaces for the existing student body. One other program component that will be here is the admissions offices for the space. There is a small student chapel that is also replacing an existing

2.1

2.3

student chapel. So no expected visiting members from the outside community, but really just serving the existing student body.

Next.

2.0

2.1

This is a small aerial view that gives a sense of the scale of the project. It is located in the center of the site. The setback is greater than the adjacent building that it's tying into. There's a fairly forested area that separates this from 16th Street to the north, so there should be very little impact to the adjacent community.

Next, please.

This is the view from the existing drive. One item to note, since we don't have any increased student or staff capacity, we are maintaining all of the existing traffic pattern and parking that are on-site, which are currently in compliance with the existing BZA.

Next, please.

This is just another additional supplementary view to give a sense of the scale and feel of the project, which will be using similar materials to the existing structures on-site and existing academic campus. We are matching the height of the existing building adjacent for the primary roof structure, and then with a small tower element that meets within the zoning exceptions for small projections, such as a tower.

And I think that's our overview of the project. 1 2 MS. SHIKER: Can you go to the next slide, please? 3 Thank you. 4 So thank you very much. As indicated on this 5 slide and the next slide, the application meets the burden of proof for a modification to a private school plan. 6 7 gone through the different elements here. 8 Specifically, the proposed addition will not increase the number of students or the faculty and staff. 9 10 The addition is modest in size, having less than 10,000 11 square feet. 12 It really is intended just to improve the student experience and enhance the school's sense of connectivity and 13 14 community through bringing these additional facilities in. The addition, as Ms. von Zumbusch noted, is not visible from 15 16 outside of the campus. 17 Next slide, please. Again, the use is not objectionable for all of 18 19 these different reasons. Furthermore, the proposed addition 2.0 does not trigger any additional parking requirements. The 2.1 school continues to require 89 spaces and provide 160 spaces. 22 The school use site will be in harmony with the Zoning 23 Regulations as it continues the existing use that's been in 24 place for decades.

Next slide, please.

1	The St. Anselm's team has worked very closely with
2	the community and started this outreach even before it
3	submitted the application. As I had mentioned, ANC 5A and
4	the Queen's Chapel Civic Association both supported the
5	application and have letters in the record. We also
6	presented the application to the North Michigan Park Civic
7	Association earlier in September, and there were no issues
8	or concerns at that meeting as well.
9	So with that, we would open it up for any
10	questions that the Board may have. Thank you very much.
11	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you, Ms. Shiker, for your
12	presentation. And you might have mentioned this, but just
13	to be clear, your client is still comfortable with the
14	existing conditions that the enrollment shall not exceed 280,
15	that the total number of staff shall not exceed 70, and then
16	the minimum 87 parking spaces shall be available at the site
17	for the school's use, correct?
18	MS. SHIKER: Yes. We are not proposing any
19	changes to the past order. That's correct.
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Thank you. Thank you.
21	Do my fellow Board Members have any questions of
22	the Applicant?
23	Okay. May I turn to the Office of Planning, then?
24	MR. JESICK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members
25	of the Board. My name is Matt Jesick, presenting OP's

1	testimony in this case. The Office of Planning can rest on
2	the record and is happy to support this request for special
3	exception relief for St. Anselm's.
4	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. Thank you. Mr.
5	Jesick, I haven't seen you in a long time also. It's nice
6	to see you.
7	MR. JESICK: Good to see you.
8	BZA CHAIR HILL: All right. Does anybody have any
9	questions for the Office of Planning?
10	Okay. Mr. Young, is there anyone here wishing to
11	speak?
12	Okay. Ms. Shiker, do you have anything you'd like
13	to add at the end?
14	MS. SHIKER: No. We would just ask that the Board
15	deliberate on this so that hopefully St. Anselm's can move
16	forward with this next exciting adventure for their school.
17	Thank you.
18	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Thank you, Ms.
19	Shiker.
20	All right. Thank you, everybody. I'm going to
21	close the hearing and the record. You're all excused.
22	Would someone else like to begin the deliberation?
23	MEMBER SMITH: I was going to defer to you, Dr.
24	Imamura.
25	BZA CHAIR HILL: Dr. Imamura, you haven't been

with us for a while. 1 Come on. 2 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Board Member Smith is the 3 ranking member here. 4 BZA CHAIR HILL: All right. I'll start, and then 5 we'll let Board Member Smith clean up my comments. 6 So again, I appreciated the presentation that the 7 Applicant had put forward. I thought that they did a lovely job with explaining how they're meeting the criteria. 8 9 think all of the existing conditions are remaining in place. 10 think that the analysis that the Office of Planning had put forward was also helpful for me, as well as 11 12 the support that they've achieved with the ANC. And I will be voting in favor of this application. 13 14 Mr. Smith? 15 MEMBER SMITH: I agree with everything you just 16 said. Chairman Hill. This is, to me, fairly 17 straightforward application for both of these areas of relief of this modification. 18 19 I agree with the testimony that was provided at 2.0 the hearing, as well as what was provided by the Office of 2.1 Planning within their staff report, and that the existing 22 conditions will continue to carry forward to avoid any 23 adverse impacts that may presumably affect the surrounding

fairly large property.

This

is

properties.

24

25

What

the

Applicant is requesting, I do not believe, would have any 1 form of adverse impact on any adjacent property owners. 2 3 I'll note that the ANC has voted in support of the -- one of the ANCs has voted in support of the application, 4 5 ANC 5A. So with that, I will give OP's staff report great weight and support the application. 6 7 BZA CHAIR HILL: Great. Thank you. 8 Dr. Imamura? 9 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 10 I'm in agreement with everything that's been said. 11 only add that it's a nice design. I appreciate architectural vocabulary and materiality of it. I'm prepared 13 to vote in support. Great. Thank you, Dr. Imamura. 14 BZA CHAIR HILL: 15 All right. I'm going to make a motion to approve Application No. 17552-A, as captioned and read by 16 the 17 Secretary, including the existing conditions of: 18 One, the total enrollment shall not exceed 280 students; two, the total number of staff shall not exceed 70; 19 2.0 three, a minimum of 87 parking spaces shall be made available 2.1 on the site for the school's use; and ask for a second. 22 Mr. Smith? 23 MEMBER SMITH: Second. 24 BZA CHAIR HILL: The motion has been made and Madam Secretary, if you could take a roll call? seconded.

1	MC MULLIUM Diagram and to the Chairle matica
1	MS. MEHLERT: Please respond to the Chair's motion
2	to approve the application with the existing conditions from
3	the original order.
4	Chairman Hill?
5	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes.
6	MS. MEHLERT: Mr. Smith?
7	MEMBER SMITH: Yes.
8	MS. MEHLERT: And Dr. Imamura?
9	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.
10	MS. MEHLERT: Staff will record the vote as 3-0-2
11	to approve Application 17552-A with conditions on the motion
12	made by Chairman Hill and seconded by Board Member Smith,
13	with two Board Members not participating.
14	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you.
15	All right. I'm just going to keep chugging along
16	because I know that the last case we're going to have is
17	going to take a little bit more time. So let's see if we can
18	get through the next cases before lunch, and just see how it
19	goes.
20	If you could call our next case, please, Madam
21	Secretary?
22	MS. MEHLERT: Next is Application 21172 of 1321
23	Anacostia Rd SE, LLC. This is a self-certified application
24	pursuant to Subtitle X Section 901.2, for a special exception
25	under Subtitle U Section 421, to allow new residential

development. 1 2 This is a third-story addition to an existing, two-story, semi-detached building, currently a four-unit 3 apartment house, and creation of four new dwelling units. This is located in the RA-1 zone at 1321 Anacostia Road 5 Southeast, Square 5507, Lot 18. 6 7 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. Thank you. 8 If the Applicant could hear me, if they could 9 please introduce themselves for the record? 10 MR. WILLIAMS: Members of the Board, my name is 11 Zach Williams, Land Use Attorney at Venable, representing the 12 Applicant. With me today is the Applicant, Matt Medvene, and 13 the architect, Ryan Petyak. 14 BZA CHAIR HILL: Great. Thank you, Mr. Williams. 15 Welcome back. Also, Mr. Medvene, welcome back. 16 17 MR. MEDVENE: Nice to see you again. 18 All right. Okay. If you want BZA CHAIR HILL: to go ahead and walk us through your application, 19 2.0 Williams, and why you believe your client is meeting the 21 criteria for us to grant the relief requested? And you can begin whenever you'd like. 22 23 MR. WILLIAMS: Sure thing. Mr. Young, can we pull 24 up the presentation? Great, thank you. We can go to the

next page, please.

So this application is to expand an existing apartment house, a four-unit apartment house, to eight units at 1321 Anacostia Road Southeast. This is in the RA-1 zone, as shown on the zoning map. The property is located mid-block on Anacostia Road Southeast, between 30th Street and Minnesota.

Next slide, please.

2.1

Here's a survey showing the existing property. It's a pretty large lot, a little over 6,000 square feet of land area. As I mentioned, it's an RA-1 zone lot. This is an existing two-story, semi-detached apartment house on the lot with four units currently. There's alley access in the rear. We're looking to expand this to eight units total.

Next slide, please.

Here's some photos of the current conditions of the structure. As you can see, it's a semi-detached structure, two stories. I should note that all of the structures on this side of the block are similar apartment houses, just like this.

Next slide, please.

Here's the proposed site plan. We'll start here. The only changes to the site layout are to add three parking spaces. The footprint will stay exactly the same. We also have some landscaping here, some grading, which we've included in our plan set as well. You can see that as well

in the site plan here.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

Next slide, please.

The relief that is requested here is simply to add four units to the existing apartment house. All of the other work will be by-right and permitted in the RA-1 zone without relief.

Next slide, please.

Under the special exception standards that the Board is very familiar with, we first must ensure that the relief is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Zoning Regulations.

Here, as we know, the RA-1 zone allows for low-to-moderate-density developments such as this. The project, as I mentioned, will meet all of the development standards in the RA-1 zone. And while this is maybe not technically part of the standard, I did want to mention we'll be adding solar panels on the roof for the new addition as well.

Next slide, please.

The second important standard here is that the relief would not adversely affect neighboring properties. Light, air, and privacy are typically the standards we look at.

Here, as I mentioned, the footprint will remain exactly the same. The only changes to the site are a

third-level addition. The other two units will go in the cellar.

And as I mentioned, apartment and multi-family residential buildings are very common in this neighborhood. In fact, every single structure on this block is an apartment building.

Next slide.

2.0

We have some shadow studies here to show there's very limited impact from a shadow standpoint from this project. Here are the existing studies.

And if we go to the next slide, you can see very little impact. The worst is at the Winter Solstice, but just that. It's just a sliver, a little triangle on the right side there, in the bottom right-hand corner. Other than that, there's very little impact from this addition.

Next slide, please.

I did want to mention -- I know every case is different and every case stands on its own, but I did want to mention that just across the street, in 2020 the Board approved another eight-unit apartment house. That was a brand new, ground-up construction.

Here's a picture of it from the architectural renderings. This was just across the street and just, I think, goes to the point that these style and scope of apartment houses are typical in this area.

Next slide, please. 1 2 I did want to touch on our attempts at ANC and community outreach. We did not meet with the ANC in this 3 case, but it's not for lack of trying. We started reaching 5 out on June 12th. And as you can see, we continue to reach out regularly every couple of weeks through August 6 7 through September. We did get a response back from Commissioner Adams 8 9 in late August acknowledging receipt, but we never were added And the ANC didn't 10 to an agenda despite our requests. 11 indicate any interest in us presenting. We attached all the 12 revised plans. And with that, before I forget, we did make a 13 14 motion in the record to file revised plans within 30 days of 15 the hearing. That was in response to some comments from DDOT 16 and the Office of Planning. 17 I want to make sure those get into the record, Chairman Hill. I neglected to mention that at the beginning 18 19 of my presentation. 20 BZA CHAIR HILL: Let interrupt you, me Mr. 2.1 Williams, real quick. 22 Madam Secretary, are those the ones that are in 22? 23

Ι

would ask

confirm.

MS.

MEHLERT:

24

the Applicant

to

MR. WILLIAMS: That's correct. That's Exhibit 22. 1 2 Those are the current plans. 3 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I don't remember the 4 motion, but unless my fellow Board Members have any problems, 5 we always want to see the most recent plans. And so I have no problem allowing those into the record. 6 7 If my fellow Board Members have any issue with 8 that, if they could please speak up? Hearing none, okay. 9 Mr. Williams, you may continue. Thank you for 10 pointing that out. MR. WILLIAMS: We've also reached out to neighbors 11 12 in person, through phone, and through email. It's a little tricky here since these are all apartment houses. 13 So we haven't been able to -- well, we haven't heard any opposition 14 15 And we haven't been able to get any folks engaged on 16 this. 17 As far as I'm aware, there aren't any folks that are in attendance to speak today, although I'll wait to hear. 18 19 So we've definitely cataloged our attempts here to engage the 2.0 community and the ANC. Folks either haven't shown interest 2.1 or have not opposed the project. 22 So that's where we are as we sit here today. Ι the 23 would mentioned, Office of Planning as 24 recommended support for the application. And that concludes

my presentation. Thank you.

1	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you, Mr. Williams. Mr.
2	Williams, do you know why the ANC was kind of is typically
3	this ANC a little difficult to get in touch with? I don't
4	remember.
5	MR. WILLIAMS: I think it depends. I thought
б	maybe it was the summer time, and that could be what it was.
7	But from June through the end of September, other than that
8	one acknowledgement of our outreach, they never showed any
9	interest.
10	And at one point, I emailed the entire ANC, so
11	every single commissioner. Initially, I started with our SMD
12	and the chair. I expanded to the whole ANC. That generated
13	the one response we got, but that was all we got,
14	unfortunately.
15	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, thank you. Before I turn
16	to my Board, may I turn to the Office of Planning?
17	MR. BEAMON: Good afternoon, Board Members.
18	Shepard Beamon with the Office of Planning. We've reviewed
19	the application for the proposed four additional units.
20	We find that this request meets the special
21	exception criteria for Subtitles U and X. Therefore, we're
22	recommending approval, as stated in our report. And I will
23	rest on the record and take any questions.
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you.
25	Mr. Young, is there anyone here wishing to speak?

All right. Does my Board have any questions of 1 2 the Applicant or the Office of Planning? Dr. Imamura? 3 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, 4 just a brief comment. I just want to applaud the Applicant 5 for a couple things. One, I appreciate you bringing up the precedent 6 7 for BZA Case 49984. That's very helpful just to provide 8 context. I also appreciate your honesty about your efforts 9 to reach out to the ANC, as frustrating as that probably was. 10 I noted that you said that you've had a hard time engaging with the neighbors. 11 That's where the honesty part 12 comes in. So I appreciate your forthrightness on that and the fact that you thoroughly documented your emails to the 13 14 ANC. So that's regrettable. And the neighborhood has, 15 unfortunately, been under-served by the Commission if they 16 17 don't respond to these kinds of outreach efforts. thank you very much. 18 19 That's all I have, Mr. Chairman. 2.0 BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. I'll second the note 2.1 for Mr. Williams and the future applications. It is always 22 great to see just how you've reached out to the community, 23 whatever has taken place, as you know, Mr. Williams. 24 And I guess, Mr. Williams, one comment is if you -- I'm trying to think whether it was -- if you want to

put that into the record maybe before the hearing, it sometimes is helpful, definitely on expedited review, to know what has happened with the ANC if anything. So just an FYI.

All right. Anyone else?

Okay, great. All right. I'm going to go ahead and close the hearing and the record. Thank you all for coming, and thank you for your presentation.

Okay. I thought the presentation was done very well, actually. And I thought that the plans were easy to understand. I appreciate the shadow study. That was actually helpful to me. And I think that they are also meeting the criteria for us to grant this particular relief.

I will also agree with the Office of Planning's recommendation, and also that DDOT had no objection. I will note for the record, again, the outreach efforts that the Applicant has made, which is always necessary for us to at least understand what has gone on before approving or disapproving anything, knowing what's going on with the community. So I will be voting in favor of this application.

Mr. Smith, do you have anything you'd like to add? MEMBER SMITH: In this case, I do agree that they for the provisions the special met us to grant exceptions 421, the residential development from new standards. They provided the information about school zone Rarely is that an issue, and it's not an issue attendance.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

1	in this particular case.
2	The provisions of light, air, parking, recreation,
3	landscaping, as you stated, that was helpful for them to
4	provide the shadow study. It shows that it would not have
5	an undue impact on the surrounding properties.
6	Parking, they're proposing to construct three
7	parking spaces. So they're not asking for any relief from
8	the minimum development standards. They're in compliance
9	with that particular provision, and they provided us with a
10	very thorough landscape plan.
11	So with that, I give OP's staff report great
12	weight and support the application.
13	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you.
14	Dr. Imamura?
15	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Nothing further to add, Mr.
16	Chairman. I'm in agreement with everything that's been said.
17	I think this is pretty straightforward and complete.
18	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you.
19	All right. I'm going to go ahead and make a
20	motion to approve Application No. 21172 as captioned and read
21	by the Secretary and ask for a second.
22	Mr. Smith?
23	MEMBER SMITH: Second.
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: The motion has been made and
25	seconded. Madam Secretary, if you would take a roll call,

1	please?
2	MS. MEHLERT: Respond to the Chair's motion to
3	approve the application. Chairman Hill?
4	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes.
5	MS. MEHLERT: Board Member Smith?
6	MEMBER SMITH: Yes.
7	MS. MEHLERT: And Dr. Imamura?
8	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.
9	MS. MEHLERT: Staff will record the vote as 3-0-2
10	to approve Application 21172 on the motion made by Chairman
11	Hill and seconded by Board Member Smith, with two Board
12	Members not participating.
13	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. Let's see. All
14	right, let's go ahead and have our next case. And then we'll
15	probably take lunch, if that's good with everybody.
16	MS. MEHLERT: Next is Application No. 21175 of
17	Andrew Brady and Benjamin Fishel.
18	This is a self-certified application pursuant to
19	Subtitle X Section 901.2, for a special exception under
20	Subtitle E Section 207.5, to allow the rear wall of a rear
21	building to extend farther than 10 feet beyond the farthest
22	rear wall of an adjoining principal dwelling on an adjacent
23	property.
24	This is for a one-story rear addition to an

two-story rear building in the RF-1 zone at

1	Adams Street Northwest, Square 3124, Lot 84.
2	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. If the Applicant can hear
3	me, if they could please introduce themselves for the record?
4	MR. GROFF: I'm representing the Applicant, the
5	owners of the house, as the architect. My name is Brad
6	Groff.
7	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Groff, if you have
8	been watching the hearings today, if you could go ahead and
9	walk us through your client's application, why you believe
10	they are meeting the criteria for us to grant the relief
11	requested?
12	Wait a minute. Hold on. Madam Secretary, which
13	number was this case again?
14	MS. MEHLERT: This is 21175.
15	
	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. Again, it's
16	the day that keeps on giving. Okay, Mr. Groff, again, yes,
16	the day that keeps on giving. Okay, Mr. Groff, again, yes,
16 17	the day that keeps on giving. Okay, Mr. Groff, again, yes, I'm sorry. If you could please go ahead and walk us through
16 17 18	the day that keeps on giving. Okay, Mr. Groff, again, yes, I'm sorry. If you could please go ahead and walk us through your client's application.
16 17 18 19	the day that keeps on giving. Okay, Mr. Groff, again, yes, I'm sorry. If you could please go ahead and walk us through your client's application. Why you believe they're meeting the criteria why
16 17 18 19 20	the day that keeps on giving. Okay, Mr. Groff, again, yes, I'm sorry. If you could please go ahead and walk us through your client's application. Why you believe they're meeting the criteria why the grant is requested. I'm going to put fifteen minutes on
16 17 18 19 20 21	the day that keeps on giving. Okay, Mr. Groff, again, yes, I'm sorry. If you could please go ahead and walk us through your client's application. Why you believe they're meeting the criteria why the grant is requested. I'm going to put fifteen minutes on the clock so I know where we are and you can begin whenever
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the day that keeps on giving. Okay, Mr. Groff, again, yes, I'm sorry. If you could please go ahead and walk us through your client's application. Why you believe they're meeting the criteria why the grant is requested. I'm going to put fifteen minutes on the clock so I know where we are and you can begin whenever you like.

presentation in the file? 1 2 They did. MR. GROFF: 3 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. Then Mr. Young will 4 bring it up. 5 Application No.21175 6 Okay. So, appreciate everyone's time MR. GROFF: 7 today. We are applying for an exemption to the, special 8 exception that requests a building beyond ten feet beyond the 9 neighbors back of house. 10 All other setbacks are being met, including side We're within the bulk and the height requirements, 11 12 and this is an open air screened-in porch. The notices have been sent to all neighbors. 13 14 We've received three letters of support adjacent and immediate neighbors. 15 We presented to both the ANC 5E and the Civic Association in Bloomingdale and received 16 17 support from both within the first hearing. 18 The applications for both a deck and the rear extension have been submitted to the building department 19 2.0 under review. And so, this exception would just be for the 2.1 dimension. 22 If you go to the site plan, we'll show the actual dimension beyond the adjacent neighbor. Ten feet is allowed. 23 24 It's a nineteen foot past the existing neighbor. And so, the ask is for nine feet beyond that.

The light and air requirements have been met based on the orientation of the property. There's no shadow cast on either of the neighbor's property and the design of the structure is in keeping with the integrity of the condition of the neighborhood. There's some further more detailed drawings in the next few slides just to provide additional support, but that's it. CHAIR HILL: Mr. Groff is that Ι don't understand. Is that the end of your presentation? MR. GROFF: Yes, that's the end of the presentation. Thank you. BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I'm going to take a look at your slide deck. Does the Board have any questions of the applicant? MEMBER SMITH: I do have one. Just one. BZA CHAIR HILL: Sure, go ahead please, Mr. Smith. Mr. Groff, yes, we have notice and MEMBER SMITH: support from 51, 53, 45 Adams. Was there anything that came in, or have you heard anything from the neighbor at 47? So, the other neighbor, the property MR. GROFF: is abandoned. There was notice put in the mailbox, sent in the mail, and we made attempts to contact the estate that's in holding of the abandoned property at this point, but we had had no response.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

1	They've lived there for over four years and
2	there's been no one in the house.
3	MEMBER SMITH: Okay. So you said no one's been
4	living, you said no one's been living in house. That's what
5	you said?
6	MR. GROFF: Yes.
7	MEMBER SMITH: Okay. And it's being held by an
8	estate. Is that what you said?
9	MR. GROFF: An estate or another entity. We're
10	not sure of the exact entity.
11	MEMBER SMITH: Okay, all right. That's all I need
12	to know. Thank you.
13	MR. GROFF: I also just forgot to mention one, one
14	small point within the zoning text. There is allowance for
15	this special exception to be granted given all of the
16	requirements that we presented if they are met and there is
17	precedent for this to be approved under special exception
18	within the neighborhood.
19	MEMBER SMITH: Okay. Thank you for that. No
20	further questions, Chairman Hill.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Dr. Imamura.
22	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Chairman, I don't think I
23	have any other questions either.
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Can I hear from the
25	Office of Planning, please?

Good afternoon, Commissioners. 1 MR. BARRON: the record, my name is Ron Barron, Development Review 2 Specialist, the D.C. Office of Planning. Office of Planning 3 4 supports approval of the requested special exception. 5 We believe the addition would be in harmony with the general purpose of the RF-1 zone, and would unlikely have 6 7 an adverse impact on the privacy and use of neighboring 8 properties. 9 We can, we'll be happy to rest on our report in 10 the record at Exhibit 33, and I'm happy to answer 11 questions 12 you may have. 13 BZA CHAIR HILL: Great, thank you. I had a question for you, Mr. Barron. Now, when we, when the first, 14 when the 10-foot rule thing started, like, started. 15 I mean, like, if this were enclosed and heated or 16 17 air-conditioned or whatever, then they would have to come back before us again. Correct? 18 19 MR. if BARRON: So it enclosed, was mУ understanding is that if it was enclosed with solid walls, 2.0 2.1 then if they were to redo it as a, as a walled-in structure, then, yes, they would have to get relief. 22 23 There is some question as to whether or not relief 24 is actually required, given the fact that it's essentially

a two-level deck with the lower level screened in.

1	we were unable before the hearing to get any solid
2	determination from the Department of Buildings, so we decided
3	to proceed with the, with the hearing.
4	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, thanks.
5	MR. BARRON: So, yes.
6	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes, I was just curious because
7	I can't remember. Anyway, right, if it got enclosed, they'd
8	be back. Yes.
9	MR. BARRON: I did just get a note from Joel who
10	told me, who mentioned that this relief should cover it, so
11	they shouldn't have to get additional relief if they did.
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: Right. So if this was enclosed,
13	this is the relief that they're getting that.
14	MR. BARRON: Yes. Yes. So the question was
15	whether or not it actually applied. It needed to apply to
16	this deck, but if they were to convert it into an enclosed
17	end structure, then likelihood, this would be the relief they
18	would need for it.
19	BZA CHAIR HILL: Right. So they can enclose this
20	now without coming back to us. Is that correct?
21	MR. BARRON: That is what I'm being told.
22	BZA CHAIR HILL: Right.
23	MR. BARRON: Yes.
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. Okay. Does
25	anyone else have anything? Okay, I'm going to close the

hearing and the record and excuse everyone. 1 Thank you. 2 YOUNG: Ask if MR. there any public were 3 witnesses. 4 BZA CHAIR HILL: I'm sorry. Thanks, Mr. Young. 5 We do not have any. MR. YOUNG: BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Is there anyone here 6 7 from the public? And Mr. Young has said there's no one here Thank you, Mr. Young. 8 from the public. All right. I'm 9 going to go ahead and close the hearing on the record. 10 MR. GROFF: Thank you for your time. 11 BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Okay. I'm looking at you, Mr. Smith, because like I see it every week. going to vote in favor of this, but I'm a little bit 13 confused, right? 14 Like if this were an enclosed addition that's going 15 back more than the ten feet, I wonder if we would have had 16 17 more discussion than just a porch that is going to 18 enclosed. 19 so, it might be something that, and 20 appreciate that the Office οf Planning is apparently 2.1 That if the Office of Planning could kind of listenina. 22 helped understand m e 23 And you could reach out to the Office of Zoning 24 because I'm not clear as to, you know, what the Office of Zoning thoughts would necessarily been if this were

enclosed structure. And then, I'm confused as to what they 1 then could or couldn't do with that second floor. 2 3 I assume they couldn't do anything with it. They 4 couldn't build an enclosure on the second floor because then 5 they'd be back before us again I would assume. Yes, they would. 6 MEMBER SMITH: 7 BZA CHAIR HILL: Right. So based upon this, the 8 enclosure of a screen porch and the, the explanation that the 9 applicant has given, I don't have any issues with this 10 particular relief. I would also agree with the ANC in terms of their 11 12 support and also agree with the Office of Planning's 13 analysis, given what is before us. Still a little anyway given, given what is before us, I will be voting in favor of 14 15 this application, Mr. Smith. 16 I agree Chairman Hill, which MEMBER SMITH: 17 assessment on this and I was slightly uncomfortable with it, but what I'll note is that you know, the people that are most 18 affected by this are the adjacent property owners. 19 2.0 have letters in the record from all 2.1 adjacent property owners except for at forty-seven and it 22 sounds like someone passed away and it's, it's vacant, it's, 23 it's being held in an estate. 24 But the, the people that would be most directly impacted as relates to light air privacy are in support of

this, this particular application. And I'll note that it is 1 a fair, it's fairly open. 2 3 It's a glass structure, and you know, the, the wrinkle with this is if they can't, if they just remove the, 5 the glass, but it is as open as it can be short of, short of it being just stringing, just stringing mesh material of some 6 7 form. 8 So I am fairly comfortable with moving forward, 9 and if they were to build anything on the top, they would 10 have to come back before us. We are approving this subject relatively for it to be substantially in compliance with the 11 12 architectural plans. 13 So I'm fairly forward with going, fairly comfortable forward this particular 14 with moving with 15 application in support. BZA CHAIR HILL: 16 Thank you, Mr. Smith. Great. 17 Dr. Imamura. I lost Dr. Imamura. 18 Yes. It looks like he froze. MEMBER SMITH: 19 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: All right. I'm in Yes. 20 that place. All right. Clearly some connectivity issues. 21 I'm in agreement with everything that's been said, 22 prepare to vote, of course. Thank you. 23 BZA CHAIR HILL: All right. Great. 24 I'm going to make a motion to approve application number 21175 as captioned and read by the secretary and ask for a

1	second, Mr. Smith?
2	MEMBER SMITH: Second.
3	BZA CHAIR HILL: Motion has been made and second,
4	and Madam Secretary to roll call, please.
5	MS. MEHLERT: It's just on the chair's motion to
6	approve the application. Chairman Hill?
7	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes.
8	MS. MEHLERT: Board Member Smith?
9	MEMBER SMITH: Yes.
10	MS. MEHLERT: Commissioner, Dr. Imamura?
11	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.
12	MS. MEHLERT: Staff would record the vote as 3-0-2
13	to approve Application 21175 on the motion made by Chairman
14	Hill and second by Board Member Smith with two board members
15	not participating.
16	BZA CHAIR HILL: Great. If it's okay with you
17	guys can we just take a quick little break and then come back
18	and do the last. Can we take a quick little break, come
19	back, do one case, then have lunch, and then come back and
20	do the one that I think is going to take a little bit of
21	time.
22	Okay, we'll just take a quick little break. Thank
23	you. And then, call our next case.
24	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
25	record at 12:18:51 p.m. and resumed at 12:26:22 p.m.)

1	MS. MEHLERT: The Board has returned to from a
2	brief recess, brief break to its hearing session. Next is
3	application number 21186 of D.C. Department of General
4	Services as amended.
5	This is an application pursuant to Subtitle X §
6	1002 for Area Variances from Subtitle A § 301.3 to allow new
7	buildings not located on a record lot. And from Subtitle C
8	§303.1 to allow four new buildings with no street frontage.
9	This is for four new buildings on a tax lot
10	without street frontage, including an office building,
11	parking garage structure, fuel station, maintenance building,
12	logistics warehouse, two-vehicle storage buildings, and a
13	pump test area with canopy on the same tax lot.
14	This is located in the PDR-1 zone at 3 DC Village
15	Lane Southwest, Square 6264, Lot 804.
16	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, thank you. If the
17	applicant could hear me, if they could please introduce
18	themselves for the record.
19	MR. GIANNIOTIS: Hello, members of the Board, can
20	you hear me?
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes.
22	MR. GIANNIOTIS: Slight echo. Here we go. My
23	name is Spiro Gianniotis of Alphatec PC. I'm also here with
24	James Gapinski of AMT Civil Engineers. I'm here on behalf
25	of the D.C. Department of General Services, the applicant.

1 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Gianniotis, so if you 2 could explain to us why you believe your client is meeting 3 the criteria for us to grant this particular relief. 4 It's a little bit confusing, but I'm going to 5 follow along as best I can with your argument and your application, and you can begin whenever you like. 6 7 Application No. 21186 8 MR. GIANNIOTIS: Sure. Thank you. Can we please 9 pull up the slides? Thank you very much. We are pleased to 10 be here today to present you the DGS project for the new FEMS and OSSE Fleet Maintenance Facility at DC Village. 11 12 We have favorable recommendations from the Office 13 Planning, DDOT, and ANC 8D and are unaware of any opposition to application. Consequently, 14 this the 15 of time in your schedule, we will make an abbreviated presentation focusing on the burden of proof for 16 17 Area Variances we seek. 18 But we will, of course, elaborate on any aspects Next slide, please. of the project that you like. 19 The DGS 2.0 project before you involves a replacement of obsolete and 21 dysfunctional buildings at DC Village campus and replacing 22 them with new facility for FEMS and OSSE. 23 The proposed development is demolition of two 24 existing MPD structures and one existing OSSE trailer and And the construction of the new facilities is parking lot.

the new FEMS fleet maintenance facility.

2.0

2.1

The fleet logistics warehouse facility, the FEMS heated vehicle storage and covered parking, and the FEMS and OSSE shared fueling station, the FEMS and OSSE parking structure, the OSSE parking structure, and the OSSE administration and employee facility.

The site is located east of 295 across from the DC Water's Blue Plains Treatment Plant. The redevelopment site is circled in red and is just one small part of DC Village.

Well, this site plan shows many streets within DC Village, they are all private internal streets and are not located on the highway plan for the District of Columbia. Next slide, please.

The zoning map on the left of the slide shows the property within the PDR-1 district. As you'll note, the lack of street frontage for Lot 804, which is the site of the proposed redevelopment.

As determined by the office, by the zoning administrator's office, we need two areas of relief. First one is Subtitle A § 301.3 relief from the requirement that each new structure be located on its own lap of record.

And Subtitle C § 303.1 relief from the requirement that each record lot have at least one street lot line on a public street or a public access easement approved by DDOT.

And as applied to this DGS project, DGS site does not have any street frontage. Consequently, DGS cannot obtain its own record lot. Our project cannot meet either requirement due to the landlocked nature of the lot. Next slide, please.

You are all very familiar with a standard overview for an Area Variance listed here in the following slides. I will demonstrate how we meet each of these standards. Next slide, please.

Under the first problem of the Area Variance test, the property is affected by exceptional and extraordinary conditions. Lot 804 is landlocked and surrounded by other district government parcels that make up DC Village.

DC Village was developed for D.C. facilities beginning in the early 1900s. A home for the aged and infirmary and expanded throughout the Twentieth Century, but the D.C. government was not subject to zoning until 1990 for D.C. Code § 1-306.07.

Consequently, DC Village was developed without the need for any record lots or street frontage. The site is exceptionally large at roughly 10.4 acres, but is one of the few remaining sites in the district zone PDR-1, which can accommodate production, distribution, and repair facilities.

While the site does not have any public street frontage, it is well served by an internal network of private

2.0

2.1

roads. Finally, the comprehensive plan for Southeast Southwest plan specifically calls out DC Village for redevelopment.

Comprehensive plan recognizes need to redevelop and modernize DC Village site with the immediate priority being reorganized of existing uses and more efficient use for district operations. Next slide, please.

Under the second problem of the variance test, the owner will encounter practical difficulties if the zoning regulations are strictly applied. If relief from the record lot street frontage requirements are not granted, DGS could not obtain a building permit to replace outdated MPD and OSSE facilities.

This limited and valuable PDR zone property over ten acres in size will be rendered unusable and would create difficulty in fulfilling immediate priority of a comprehensive plan to reorganize existing district uses at DC Village. Next slide, please.

Under the third prong of the variance test, the granting of the variance will not cause any substantial detriment to the public good or impairment to the intent, purpose, and integrity of the zoning map or zoning regulations.

Variance relief to allow construction on the tax spot will allow DGS to replace obsolete existing district

buildings with modernized facilities to better serve 1 2 public good. 3 And the proposed PDR uses are consistent with the 4 zoning map and surrounding uses and will allow continuation 5 of these historical uses on the site. Next slide, please. Based on the foregoing, we believe we have met the burden 6 7 proof for the Area Variance belief. 8 We respectfully request the Board to grant our 9 application. We are also prepared to show you slides of the 10 proposed building, which are part of the record at Exhibit 62. 11 12 Otherwise, we are happy to answer any questions 13 you may have. Thank you. 14 BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. All right. Thank 15 you, Mr. Gianniotis. Let's see before I turn to my board, 16 can we hear from the Office of Planning, please? 17 MR. BRADFORD: Good afternoon Chairman Hill, members of the Board for the record. My name is Philip 18 19 Bradford, Development Review Specialist with the Office of 20 Planning. 2.1 The Office of Planning recommends approval of the requested Area Variances and finds the request meets the 22 criteria in Subtitle X and we stand on the record of the 2.3 24 report and I'm available for any questions.

Thank you.

BZA CHAIR HILL:

25

Mr. Gianniotis,

1	what's the square footage of these buildings? Of this one
2	building?
3	MR. GIANNIOTIS: FEMS maintenance facility, is
4	about 70,000 square feet. It's a one story facility to keep
5	the FEMS apparatuses and top line service, the fire trucks,
6	the bumper trucks and the ambulances, as well as, some of the
7	sprinter vans.
8	The logistics building, which is the warehouse is
9	about 30,000 square feet. The OSSE parking garage is about
10	120,000 square feet. That's for both levels. And then, the
11	OSSE administrative building is about 18,000 square feet,
L2	20,000 square feet.
L3	BZA CHAIR HILL: Wow. Incredible. Okay. Mr.
L4	Young, is there, is there anyone here wishing to speak?
15	Okay. Do my board members have any questions for anybody?
L6	Okay, Mr. Gianniotis, I don't think you've
L7	presented before to us, have you?
18	MR. GIANNIOTIS: I've had once before on a much
L9	smaller scale project, and it's nice to see some of you
20	again.
21	MR. GIANNIOTIS: I've had once before on a much
22	smaller scale project, and it's nice to see some of you
23	again. This was many years ago for me.
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, all right. Okay. All
25	right. Well, thank you very much for your presentation and

I'm going to go ahead and close the record and the hearing and excuse everyone please, Mr. Young.

Okay. For me, I did think it was actually kind of even though it's just a large lot. And I mean, I mean, that's like hundreds of thousands of square feet. I mean, just like big buildings. So, but I think that they are meeting the, the criteria for us to grant this.

I thought that, you know, it was, it was well walked through in terms of the exceptional extraordinary conditions, the practical difficulty, and the no substantial detriment to the public good.

I mean, this is a land-locked plot of 10.4 acres, and they needed to reorganize to help what is being pushed forward by the comp plan, and so I do appreciate the presentation and the Office of Planning's recommendation, as well as, their analysis.

And although I don't think we had anything directly from the ANC in this particular case, I will be voting in favor or maybe I did. I'm sorry, wait. I see maybe I was wrong.

Yes. Yes. So the ANC was actually in favor, and I'm sorry that I missed that, but we don't have, I think, the correct paperwork to deem it a great weight, but there is something here in the record from the chair, Wendy Hamilton, and I'm going to be voting in favor of this application. Mr.

2.1

1	Smith.
2	MEMBER SMITH: I have nothing to add, Chairman
3	Hill, I will support the application, as well.
4	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Dr. Imamura.
5	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I agree with your analysis,
6	Mr. Chairman, and also in agreement that the presentation was
7	well done, Very succinct and straightforward, very simple,
8	so very helpful to prepare to vote support.
9	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Thank you. Okay. I'm
10	going to make a motion to approve application number 21186
11	as captioned by the secretary and ask for a second, Mr.
12	Smith?
13	MEMBER SMITH: Second.
14	BZA CHAIR HILL: The motions we need and second.
15	And, Madam Secretary, if you take a roll call, please.
16	MS. MEHLERT: Please respond to the chair's motion
17	to approve the application. Chairman Hill?
18	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes.
19	MS. MEHLERT: Board Member Smith?
20	MEMBER SMITH: Yes.
21	MS. MEHLERT: Dr. Imamura?
22	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.
23	MS. MEHLERT: Staff and the present vote is 3-0-2
24	to approve application 21186 on the motion made by Chairman
25	Hill and second by Board Member Smith with two vote board

members not participating.

2.0

BZA CHAIR HILL: Great. Thank you. Okay, if you guys want to try to take lunch and let's try to take thirty minutes. So I'll come back at 1:10 p.m. Okay. Thank you. Bye-bye.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 12:39 p.m. and resumed at 1:16 p.m.)

BZA CHAIR HILL: If you could call us back on our next case.

MS. MEHLERT: The Board has returned has returned from its lunch recess and is returning to its hearing session. The next case is Application No. 21101 of Mendomas, LLC. This is a self-certified application pursuant to Subtitle X Section 901.2 for a special exception under Subtitle U Section 203.1(h) to allow a daytime care use. This is for a child development center for 82 children and 20 staff in a detached building.

The project is located in an R-1B zone at 245 Peabody Street, Northwest, Square 3388, Lot 811. The published hearing was originally scheduled for May 1st and postponed twice at the applicant's request and then the ANC's request and then earlier today, the Board denied party status in opposition to Genell Anderson and granted party status in opposition to Brandon Jamison and Joshua Toll.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. Thank you. Let's

1	see. Can the applicant hear me and if so, could they please
2	introduce themselves for the record?
3	MS. WILSON: I'm from Sullivan & Barros on behalf
4	of the applicant and I'm happy to introduce my team as well.
5	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay.
6	MS. WILSON: So Ms. Marily Medrano is here. She's
7	the owner and founder of Estrellitas Montessori School. Ms.
8	Maria Cristina Encinas is the operations director. I'm also
9	here with Dave Bloom from District Architecture, who is a
10	project architect, as well as Nicole White, who is our
11	transportation expert. And we'd also like to proffer her as
12	an expert and she's testified in front of this board numerous
13	times.
14	BZA CHAIR HILL: So is she not listed as an expert
15	then, Ms. Wilson?
16	MS. WILSON: She should
17	MS. MEHLERT: She is in our witness book.
18	BZA CHAIR HILL: I guess she's already listed then
19	as an expert in transportation, Ms. Wilson, so thank you.
20	Okay. Let me see here. Let's see. Mr. Jamison,
21	can you hear me?
22	MR. JAMISON: Yes, I can. Can you hear me?
23	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes. Could you introduce
24	yourself for the record?
25	MR. JAMISON: Yes. My name is Brandon Jamison.

1	I'm the homeowner at 223 Peabody Street, Northwest, which is
2	right next door to 245 Peabody Street. Thank you.
3	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Mr. Toll, can you
4	hear me?
5	MR. TOLL: Yes.
6	BZA CHAIR HILL: Could you please introduce
7	yourself for the record?
8	MR. TOLL: Thank you. For the record, I'm Joshua
9	Toll, homeowner at 6001 3rd Street, Northwest, which is also
10	adjacent to 245 Peabody. Thank you.
11	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Did you all have an
12	opportunity to talk with one another over the morning and do
13	you know who is going to begin the presentation or lead the
14	presentation?
15	MR. JAMISON: We did, Mr. Hill. I'm going to
16	start off. Mr. Toll we've got a few witnesses that will
17	present as well, and provide their own presentations and
18	statements. And Mr. Toll has his own presentation.
19	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I'm going to try to figure
20	this out. So the way this normally works, I think, and I
21	don't need to necessarily go talk to legal. I know Ms.
22	Wilson, you know it. You had to provide your witnesses ahead
23	of time, so I don't exactly know who you mean by witnesses.
24	I know that the person that was denied party status, Ms.
25	Anderson, was somebody who I thought maybe you guys would use

1 as a witness or present. 2 When you say witnesses, who else do you mean, Mr. 3 Jamison? 4 MR. JAMISON: It would include Ms. Anderson; my 5 wife, Jamison, Tara who was noted а witness as mу 6 application for and then Ms. Safa party status; 7 Ansari-Bayegan, who I believe also submitted a request to 8 provide witness statement, testimony. 9 Mr. Toll, go ahead, speak up. BZA CHAIR HILL: 10 MR. TOLL: Yes, she was noted as my witness. It's just going to be myself and my wife, and Ms. Ansari-Bayegan. 11 12 And then we would like to call Genell Anderson. 13 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, so the way again this normally works is you all kind of have the same amount of 14 15 time as the applicant. So the applicant is kind of going to 16 dictate how long this goes to a certain extent, although I'm not really going to rush it one way or the other. 17 is going to get an opportunity to speak, but that's just kind 18 of how it works, right? So you all together will get kind 19 2.0 of the same amount of time as the applicant. Okay? 2.1 keep that in mind and again, we want to hear from everybody. 22 I'm just trying to make sure this is done in an efficient way so that the board understands the time that it's committed. 2.3 24 Okav. Is the Commissioner here?

MS. JOHNSON:

25

Yes, Commissioner Tiffany Nicole

1	Johnson, ANC 4B-06. I am in the adjacent area, directly
2	across the street from the proposed child development center.
3	BZA CHAIR HILL: But Ms. Johnson, you're in the
4	ANC that this property is in, correct?
5	MS. JOHNSON: No. I am in the adjacent one, right
6	across the street.
7	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay.
8	MS. JOHNSON: The ANC as a whole, but not the
9	Single Member District.
10	BZA CHAIR HILL: Got it. You're in the adjacent
11	SMD.
12	MS. JOHNSON: Correct.
13	BZA CHAIR HILL: You're in the same ANC.
14	MS. JOHNSON: Yes.
15	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I wanted to make sure.
16	Okay. Great. Okay, so then as the representative for your
17	ANC, you are a party, an automatic party, and then you get
18	to give presentation, you get to give ask questions, et
19	cetera. And usually the order I go in is the applicant,
20	parties in support and opposition, go to the ANC. That's
21	just kind of the way I've been doing it.
22	So with that, I think everybody knows what they're
23	going to do.
24	Ms. Wilson, you may go ahead and give us your
25	presentation and explain to us why you believe your slient

1	is meeting the criteria for us to grant the relief requested
2	as per the zoning regulations, and you may begin whenever you
3	like.
4	MS. WILSON: Great. Thank you so much. Mr.
5	Young, could you please pull up the presentation. And it's
6	relatively thorough just given the circumstances. Next
7	slide, please, when you have a chance. Thanks much.
8	The property is located in the R-1B zone. It's
9	currently approved for the building that was purposed as a
10	church.
11	BZA CHAIR HILL: Ms. Wilson?
12	MS. WILSON: Yes?
13	BZA CHAIR HILL: If I can just pause for a second.
14	I appreciate that you said that it's relatively thorough and
15	I just noted that it's 67 slides long.
16	MS. WILSON: I won't be reading that. I'm just
17	going to go quickly through the presentation.
18	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, just checking.
19	MS. WILSON: Don't worry. I don't want to read
20	half of this.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: Just trying to make sure I know
22	where I am.
23	MS. WILSON: Okay. So it's currently approved for
24	the building that was purposed as a church. It was used as
25	a church up until its current vacancy. And the building has

been vacant for some time. I think we heard seven years at the ANC meeting. Ms. Marily Medrano purchased the property in 2023. She's the owner and applicant. She is proposing to upgrade and slightly expand the building and convert it to a child development center, Estrellitas Montessori, which she will also own. She will also operate it with Ms. Maria Christina Encinas.

The proposed upgrades and addition are well below the matter of right envelope and require no relief. However, child development center use requires special exception for approval. The Office of Planning is recommending approval. DDOT has no objection. ANC 4B voted to support with no objection. The SMD abstained but he did not object. And the continuing resolution that he wrote was also in support and there was never any resolution proposed to oppose the childcare. And Commissioner Johnson can speak more about in her testimony.

And we do have one letter in support from a neighbor at 219 Peabody, next to Ms. Anderson who currently child enrolled at one of the other Estrellitas locations and who would appreciate local childcare. capability of attested the the leadership to of Estrellitas.

Next slide, please.

So Ms. Medrano and Ms. Encinas successfully

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

operate Estrellitas on Colorado Avenue in D.C. and in Takoma Park, Maryland. And this will be a third location and a second location in the District. There have been some assertions that the other schools are closing and everyone is moving here, but Estrellitas is not moving the 200 plus children from both schools to this location. This location will be capped at 82 students.

They are in the process of renegotiating a lease for the Maryland location. Those families are looking to stay put. It's looking promising. If that lease falls through, they will move somewhere else near that location, but not to this proposed location.

Originally, the intention was maybe to move some families from the wait list off those locations to this new school. That is no longer the case for a number of reasons. We clearly communicated this at the ANC meeting, so that neighbor concern has been addressed and the goal is to and always has been to have the bulk of the children come from the local community. There's no way to move children over any time soon because either they will be off the wait list or hopefully have found a new daycare location before this process is over. And then certainly they're not closing that Colorado Avenue location. They had BZA approve that fairly recently so they have no intentions of abandoning that location.

2.0

2.1

2.3

What they are proposing is, as I said, 82 children ages 6 months to 5 years. There is no school in the immediate area within 1,000 feet serving this specific population of kids from 0 to 3 in this type of school. I know the neighbors had mentioned the charter school across the street. We will address that in great detail. But it does serve kids 3 through 5 and pre-K.

We also are proposing five parking spaces on site solely to be used by staff which exceeds the parking requirements. There are also four bike spaces proposed for parents outside and one long term for staff inside. As Ms. White, our traffic expert, will discuss in her presentation, there is a designated PUDO, pick up drop off area, along Peabody for parents. Additionally, as will be discussed in this presentation, there are other extensive conditions proposed after many months of discussions with the SMD and community and the main concerns relate to the charter school on the 100 block of Peabody and traffic.

Before I get into the rest of the presentation, just for some context and reasoning behind these conditions, they did not come out of thin air. The uses permitted via special exception. Presumably the goal of this type and other types of community serving special exception uses such as corner stores and retirement homes, is to create more inclusive and walkable neighborhoods and therefore hopefully

2.0

cut down on the need to use a car. And so in designing the condition to any approval, it was our goal to make it very clear up front to parents applying to the daycare and daycare employees of the conditions of the neighborhood and of the conditions of any order so they can make an informed decision about daycare choices and employment choices. And what is great about being in a neighborhood where there isn't this zero to three care is you may want to move your kid from existing daycare that's miles away and walk to this new facility.

We heard from a parent at the ANC meeting who said he planned to do just that. Unless you and/or a partner work in the exact same location, are working five days a week fully in office, not remote, you typically look for a daycare Because if there are days you don't go into closer to home. the office or work from home or your partner may have to take them or you switch off, it makes more sense for most people to have daycare close to home. It's the same reasoning as to why public schools are based on where you live, not where So parents and quardians are typically motivated to find daycare closer to the home. And it's our goal to encourage that and discourage vehicle use. And we intend to do that for a TDM plan as will be discussed in more detail White, but also by prohibiting the alley use and by Ms. having strict policies for vehicles and encouraging other

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

1	modes of transportation. And this will directly correlate
2	to who will choose this school. Because if you are a parent
3	or guardian who commutes to work five days a week in a
4	vehicle, you would likely be looking for a daycare that had
5	parking. Upon learning that this daycare does not have
6	parking available for parents and has a very strict drop off
7	policy which it advertises is probably not going to be the
8	daycare for your kids.
9	(Audio interference)
10	BZA CHAIR HILL: Ms. Wilson, Ms. Wilson, can you
11	guys hear me?
12	MS. WILSON: Yes.
13	MR. TOLL: Turned it off.
14	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. You started
15	breaking up like 30 seconds ago.
16	MS. WILSON: Oh, it's me?
17	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes, sorry.
18	MS. WILSON: I'm going to stop my video. Is that
19	more helpful?
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes, that's fine.
21	MS. WILSON: I've been having computer issues all
22	day. I'm so sorry.
23	BZA CHAIR HILL: No problem.
24	MS. WILSON: So the people who are choosing to go
25	to this daycare are going to be those who are less likely to

need cars as compared to other daycares as they have parking.

Next slide, please. Oh, no.

Can you all hear me?

2.0

BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes.

MS. WILSON: Okay, sorry. My computer is lagging. So Ms. Medrano and Ms. Encinas are proposing 82 children with 20 staff. So this slide is from Google Maps which shows the subject property and the alley surrounding the property and I believe that alley actually goes all the way up to Quackenbos and then to 2nd Street to the east and if you go to the IM Google Maps it appears that many do have off-street parking, metered or paved area or accessory garage. Mr. Toll's property is to the west across the alley. And so he appears to have an accessory garage. And most of these properties also have alley access.

Next slide, please.

Thank you. So these are just some photos of the subject property. The homes to the right of the subject property is owned by the Jamisons and the bottom left is a view of the subject property from the alley to the west. The rear to the property to the west and the garage of the property to the west abuts the alley. It's on the right hand side of the photo. The photo on the right hand side there's some garbage cans down there and that's the approximate location of the garage.

And so one of the conditions is that no parent be able to block or use this alley and blocking or using the alley will result in expulsion from the school and this will be in the handbook and the owners have provided phone numbers and emails so that if anyone decides not to follow the rules, then the neighbors can immediately let the school know and the school can terminate enrollment and it will be a straight-forward process.

Next slide, please. If you could please go to the next slide. Those are just some additional photos. Thank you.

For the special exception, there are four criteria for approval and then the main contention is that the first and the fourth which relate to The neighbor traffic. objections are predicated on the notion that this use is objectionable traffic, especially going to cause in combination with the charter school on the 100 block of There has also been allegations and letters that Peabody. we have not been transparent with our proposal because, for example, in our initial statement, we noted we expect most kids to arrive by foot or nonvehicle-related methods and that was and really is the expectation, given these conditions.

Ideally, the daycare would serve more children from the neighborhood who could walk. However, for the transportation statement, we modeled the mode split, meaning

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

the split in arrival between cars, bikes and on foot. We modeled that off the Colorado Avenue location in which they did parent surveys and coordinated it with DDOT and that Colorado Avenue site is different because there's a parking lot for parents to utilize. So the proportion of car usage may even be a bit higher than what we would expect for this site.

But even using the parent survey data from the Colorado Avenue site which may be on the higher end of vehicle use, the transportation study done by Ms. White shows that Estrellitas will not create objectionable traffic conditions, nor unsafe conditions for pick up and drop off.

Next slide, please.

The next conditions are relatively straight forward. I don't think this one has been controversial, but the children will be walked in small groups using these methods. The small groups will help limit noise and so there are not -- there's no danger to individuals traveling between any play areas to the center and facility.

Next slide, please.

Requirement 3. Fencing has been provided and design was also updated based on feedback and there's a designated PUDO area per DDOT as will be shown on the transportation presentation and we, of course, are amenable to other comments or suggestions as the board deems

2.1

necessary.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

Next slide, please.

So this in the other requirement at issue for the neighbors. This says if there is another CDC within 1,000 feet, the Board can approve only if it finds that the cumulative effect will not have an adverse impact on the neighborhood due to traffic, noise, or operation. So all this is saying is if you consider that K-3 program for the 3 to 5-year olds at the charter school is a CDC, which is a very small fraction of the overall kids in that school, the board just has to consider the cumulative impact from the 3 to 5-year-old program at the charter school combined with us, not the entire charter school.

So we've actually gone above and beyond this to address the cumulative impacts from the entire school as this was the neighborhood's number one complaint. So the traffic study has been tailored and the conditions tailored mitigate cumulative impacts based on the transportation study which includes the charter school. That was at the neighbors' request. It's not just our school. It's not just our school plus the 3-to-5-year-old program which would probably not have a huge overlap. We did it based on the entire school and it shows that there are no adverse impacts that would be created in terms of traffic as confirmed by DDOT.

Next slide, please.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

This just shows the relative locations between the subject property and Capital City Public School which has multiple means of access since it's next to a commercial corridor and a cross section of streets.

Next slide, please.

This is the C of O and all that I could find on Access DC for charter school. I don't see a C of O for a CDC. The charter school has children ages 3 to 5 on their C of O. They've had it since 2012. The only reason the C of O is to add a theater and if it distinguishable from the proposed child care use because it's a ladder use and not serve ages O to 3.

Next slide, please.

Regardless, the proposal has been reviewed for this charter city in mind and that top of mind. It appears that this school is being used as a reason to deny this case. There's not a formal C of O and even though having a CDC 1,000 feet is still okay, within a as there are not cumulative objectionable impacts regarding traffic and noise. It's a similar condition to the first one as the general special exception requirements. So this requirement would be to study the impacts from this specific pre-K program, not the school as a whole in conjunction with the proposed use. they mentioned we above and beyond this went

requirement. An objective traffic study reviewed by DDOT and an analysis from DDOT was provided. It was conducted during a midweek school day and it shows that even with the existing conditions at Capital City, the traffic conditions will not a level of objectionable due to the cumulative It was specifically studied and there's no need to further delay any process. This one has gone on about nine months due to the fact that the charter school exists. did our analysis knowing that. The analysis and conditions proposed entirely consider the existence of the school, the entire school, not just the pre-K program. And the neighbor concerns related to these cumulative impacts were considered as well, whether or not it's a formal CDC. Given that, surely if we just considered the pre-K program which is all we are required to do, the data would continue to show no adverse impacts on traffic.

To say that we did not consider the school as part of the analysis is entirely untrue and to say that the ANC approval, traffic study, and other conditions were proposed and created without considering the effects, the cumulative effects, is also untrue. What is true is there is no DOV issues C of O for a CDC for that charter school and that every analysis was done and condition provided specifically knowing the neighbors were concerned about this charter school.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

Next slide, please.

2.0

2.1

BZA CHAIR HILL: Ms. Wilson?

MS. WILSON: Yes.

BZA CHAIR HILL: I don't know if you want to take five minutes or we want to take five minutes, but the record is pretty full in that we've all reviewed the record and I appreciate what you're trying to do.

MS. WILSON: Okay.

BZA CHAIR HILL: No, no, no. I just want to clarify. We've had 15 minutes and I've gone through 14 slides and so I flipped through your side deck and I think a lot of it is helpful, but it's already in the record and so I need to know, do you want to take a couple of minutes and figure out how you want to condense this to where you're only going to another 15 minutes?

MS. WILSON: I know how to do it and I really appreciate that comment. Thank you so much.

BZA CHAIR HILL: I'm just going to pause and finish my statement, but I appreciate it, is that running through your traffic study person. I think we know all of the issues that so far the parties in opposition have put forward. We've seen the ANC report. We've seen the Office of Planning's report. So with that, I go ahead and see if you can get me through the rest of your presentation in another 15 minutes which will give me half an hour which

1	everybody else will get half an hour.
2	MS. WILSON: I can do that.
3	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay.
4	MS. WILSON: Can we jump to slide 26 please, or
5	25?
6	So these are just the proposed conditions to any
7	order and Ms. Wright will talk about a tenth one that we're
8	going to propose to prevent staff from parking on the block
9	and make sure that's in the Employee Handbook.
10	Next slide, please. Could you go to the next
11	slide, please? Thank you.
12	This is just a repeat. This is in the record.
13	It's the Employee Handbook language.
14	Next slide, please.
15	I just want to touch on this. One of the main
16	requests is why don't we do 12 kids or 24 kids? There is no
17	direct limit on CDCs per the zoning regulations. It's
18	governed by the building code regulations. And so we are not
19	proposing the maximum number of children that could be
20	proposed on the site which is 170 if we maxed out the
21	footprint and so with that, I will turn it over to
22	BZA CHAIR HILL: Why are you only for building the
23	82 and not the 170?
24	MS. WILSON: I was going to turn it to over Ms.
25	Medrano to talk about that. But the idea is being able to

appropriate amount of space for 1 quality space with the proposed addition and the financial 2 -- and still able to meet the financial impacts from this. 3 4 So I'm going to turn it over to Ms. Medrano and to Ms. Encinas to discuss that a little more. 5 And then we will turn it over to Ms. White for the traffic presentation. 6 7 MS. MEDRANO: Good afternoon. Thank you so much. 8 MS. WILSON: Could you please go to slide 31? 9 Thank you so much. 10 MS. MEDRANO: Yes. My name is Merily Medrano and I've been working in public charter education for over 20 11 12 years now and we started a parted a program Spanish immersion Montessori back in 2008 and we've extended the program since 13 we have a lot of families on the waiting list, we extended 14 lot of families, 15 Takoma and now we have a 16 families on the waiting list for our D.C. location. And for these reasons, we are trying to extend the services for some 17 of the families that came around that area to our current 18 location, Colorado Avenue. 19 purchase 2.0 the opportunity to saw 2.1 building since it was advertised as a childcare center and 22 we considered the community we're serving and where is the 23 need for children. Like I said, this is for children 3 to

extension of what we're doing right now and the reason of the

So we found that location perfect for the

vears old.

82 children is because we want to have a building that offers a quality service for the children during the day and in that time making sure that they have indoor space as well.

We could request or have more children because of this age, but we don't want to do that but at the same time we want to have a place with the quantity of children that sense to have a business in order to serve community. Again, some of the families are around that neighborhood can already travel to the current location and they're driving. So having the school close to them would minimize that. Our philosophy originally was that make sure that we are able to serve our direct community, people that work and go to work and having better peace of mind knowing that their children are safe and are well taken care of during the day until they return from work.

I will pass this on to Ms. Encinas.

MS. CRISTINA ENCINAS: Yes, I know it's limited time. My name is Cristina Encinas. I all the curriculum for, for us. It was important to have this space not only for the children be doing the education piece, but also for recreation and the community together. So that's why we didn't go beyond the -- to 170 because the extra space is actually for the recreational and community use for the families who will attend Estrellitas Montessori school. Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

1 MS. WILSON: Thank you. Could we go to slide 33 2 and with that we'll turn it over to Ms. White who is our 3 traffic expert. 4 MS. WHITE: Hi, I'm Nicole White, principal with 5 Design. We're located 727 15th Street, Symmetra at Northwest, Washington, D.C. I have 24 slides. I'll try to 6 7 get that down to half, if possible, but -- so we'll skip 8 around. 9 So first just note that prepared 10 transportation statement in accordance with DDOT's comprehensive transportation review guidelines. We submitted 11 12 an initial transportation statement in June. We met with the neighbors in July, received some good feedback, and at the 13 14 request of the community went back and collected some 15 additional data when school reopened in September and that's why we submitted a revised transportation statement 16 17 September. 18 So DDOT has indicated that they have no objection to the approval -- next slide, please -- to the approval of 19 2.0 the application with three conditions. I can go into our 21 response to the conditions, but there's no objection from the 22 information about the applicant on that. I do have some 23 conditions later in mу presentation. 24 Next slide. 25 And we can skip over the transportation networks.

1	BZA CHAIR HILL: Ms. Wilson, can you hear me?
2	MS. WHITE: I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.
3	BZA CHAIR HILL: I said Ms. Wilson, can you hear
4	me?
5	MS. WILSON: Yes, I can.
6	BZA CHAIR HILL: Are those three DDOT conditions
7	part of the ten conditions?
8	MS. WILSON: I believe so. Nicole, can you
9	MS. WHITE: I don't know the ten conditions.
10	MS. WILSON: So we referred DDOT conditions in the
11	ninth condition, so we're happy to incorporate.
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: I just was curious. Okay.
13	MS. WILSON: Absolutely, yes. Those will be
14	included.
15	BZA CHAIR HILL: All right, Ms. White. Thank you.
16	I'm sorry to interrupt.
17	MS. WHITE: Okay, no problem.
18	So, we'll skip over the transportation network,
19	understand that you went through the report and generally
20	understand the multi-modal conditions.
21	And we'll go to the next slide, please. And you
22	understand that the project meets the requirements of
23	parking. And that I do want to focus on this slide for a
24	second just to reiterate that parent pick-up/drop-off would
25	occur on Peabody. And the parking spaces would be reserved

for staff, and accessed through the alley for the staff. 1 2 We can go to the next slide, which is loading and And that has not been an issue, so I'll go 3 trash removal. 4 to the next slide in the interests of time. 5 And we'll go to the slide that focuses on the community comments from the July 16th meeting. 6 So, we can 7 go forward a slide, please. 8 Okay, thank you. 9 And so, we met with the community in July. 10 then in response to that meeting, Commissioner Cohen sent a succinct email that summarizes really three comments that we 11 12 heard from the community which are focused on the use of the 13 alley, and stacking on Peabody Street, particularly considering Capital City Public Charter School existing 14 15 activity, and also just to make sure there was on street 16 parking availability for staff pick-up/drop-off and residents 17 in the area. 18 So, the next slides I'll focus in on our response 19 to, to these concerns that we received. 2.0 Okav. So, I stated earlier the Parent Handbook 2.1 would include policies and consequences related to using the 22 alley for drop-off/pick-up activity. Also, the next slides will show how there would 2.3 24 not be a need to use the alley because there is adequate

space for pick-up/drop-off activity to occur

Street where it would be designated. 1 So, I'll go through that activity. 2 If we can go to the next slide, Peabody Street stacking. 3 4 All right. So, the neighbors expressed concern 5 that the daycare cars will prevent the consistent flow of two-way traffics on a local road. Per Commissioner Cohen, 6 7 this street also has a steady flow of drivers heading 8 eastbound to drop and pick up students at Capital City Public 9 Charter School. 10 So, the next slides I will outline some arrival 11 and departure data for the daycare based on activity at the 12 existing Colorado Avenue daycare facility owned bу That was used for us to really get a good 13 Estrellitas. understanding which to supplement what we had already done 14 15 in the June transportation in terms of transportation data. 16 If we can go to the next slide, please. 17 I just wanted to start with a high level comparison of the daycare versus the charter school. 18 19 So, the charter school has over 1,000 students. 20 The daycare would have 82 students. 2.1 The charter school has this discrete start and 22 dismissal time, from 8:15 to 8:30 for arrival, and 3:30 for 23 dismissal on most days, except for 1:30 p.m. on Wednesdays. 24 So, unlike a school, the daycare does not have an arrival and dismissal bell. Instead, activity is dispersed

over a longer period of time based on schedule of the parents.

So, I also wanted to show we have the impact area for the Capital City Public Charter School shown in blue. This is where we have observed a lot of the parking during pick-up/drop-off activity. Whereas, we are proposing the area in red for the primary pick-up/drop-off activity associated with the daycare.

Okay. We can go to the next slide. And here's where I'm going to -- I'll talk a little bit in detail and then try to go quickly through this, but I think it's important.

So, after the July meeting, Estrellitas they were asked to obtain sign-in/sign-out data for students so that we could really understand the arrival and departure patterns of students. So, this slide is showing the arrival period for four days in May. And we used that to come up with an overall average.

As this wrap indicates, students started to arrive as early as 7:15. And the last arrival was two-and-a-half hours later at 9:45. So, this really just is showing this dispersed period of arrival with a peak happening over a 1-hour period. And this is for the Colorado Avenue location.

For the afternoon, if you go to the next slide, the departure period for students -- next slide, please --

2.0

2.1

thank you -- the departure period for students at the Colorado Avenue location lasted for almost four hours. Students started to depart as early as 2:00 p.m. The peak activity occurred from around 5:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Next slide. Okay. So, we used this Colorado Avenue data to determine what would happen at the Peabody location. The blue line represents Colorado Avenue, the red line represents Peabody because Peabody has 82 students whereas Colorado has 150. So, I'm just showing you, trying to quickly walk through our methodology to get us to a couple slides down here.

Next slide, please.

So, again, the information that we originally had was based in sign-out -- sign-in and sign-out sheets for every student in the daycare. We know that every student will not arrive by vehicle. So, we had to make some adjustments for mode split and auto occupancy to get from person trips to vehicle trips.

So, the red line is showing person trips. The green line is showing vehicle trips with that 62.6 mode split.

By the way, this information is very consistent with what we have in terms of national rates from the Institute of Transportation Engineers. So, it is a really good way to validate our earlier transportation statement.

Next slide, please. And this is, I think, the 1 2 final graphic slide here. But I think this is really helpful to understand conditions. 3 4 So, this is the same curve, the vehicle arrival 5 rate that we expect for Peabody. The curve to the left represents what would happen in the morning. 6 You can see 7 there's a 15-minute arrival period for Capital City Public 8 Charter School. And we look at that compared to what we 9 expect for the arrival pattern. 10 The graph on the right shows the 3:30 dismissal period for Capital City Public Charter School. 11 And during 12 this time only one parent would be expected to pick up their child. 13 14 Instead, the activity associated with the daycare 15 would really start to happen about 90 minutes later. 16 Next slide, please. Okay. 17 addition looking at, looking to the sign-in/sign-out data there was a request to understand how 18 long each parent would park during drop-off and pick-up 19 20 period. 2.1 BZA CHAIR HILL: Sorry. 22 MS. WHITE: Bless you. So, we went to the Colorado Avenue location in 2.3 24 September and noted the arrival and departure time for every parent vehicle. The average duration of stay for the parked

vehicles was 4.3 minutes during the morning, and 11.1 minutes during the afternoon. Most parents took 5 minutes in the morning and 9 minutes in the afternoon.

Okay, next slide.

2.0

2.1

All right. Since we understand the arrival and departure times of each vehicle at the Colorado Avenue location, we could also determine the accumulation of total vehicles at any one time. So, the graphs on this slide represent a snapshot in time for every 5 minutes during the morning and afternoon.

The graph on the left tells us that there are not expected to be more than three parent vehicles parked at a time. So, the similar methodology was used where we scaled

BZA CHAIR HILL: Ms. White. Ms. White, you guys are at 30 minutes. And I don't know where you are in your slide deck. But I just want to let you know you're at 30 minutes.

And I think what might also be helpful, Ms. Wilson, is that if you all go through your slide deck and then we're going to listen to everybody else, and the Board is able to ask questions, it might be more helpful to actually specify where we are in this slide presentation. Thank you.

MS. WHITE: Okay. Let's, let's jump ahead then.

1	MEMBER SMITH: I've got a question while we're on
2	this slide.
3	The projected P.M. pick-up and I saw this in
4	DDOT's slide is projecting, what, about close to 11
5	vehicles between 5:20 and 5:30. Is that 11 vehicles,
6	different vehicles for each of those 5-minute intervals?
7	MS. WHITE: No. That is, so, the slide, a few
8	slides ago we talked about parents staying for about 11
9	minutes. And so, they're dwelling in, you know, they're
10	staying in a parking space for a time.
11	And, so, if you were to take a picture, like from
12	an airplane, every 5 minutes, we're saying every 5 minutes
13	there could be some of the same cars but there would be no
14	more than 11 cars parked since some may go and some may come.
15	But at any snapshot in time there would be 11 vehicles
16	parked.
17	MEMBER SMITH: So, in this particular instances
18	there would be 11 vehicles during that time that could
19	presumably be in association with the child development
20	center in that short block, in the portion that you propose
21	for the pick-up?
22	MS. WHITE: Yes. Eleven spaces that would be
23	occupied.
24	MEMBER SMITH: Eleven occupied. Okay.
25	MS. JOHNSON: Am I Commissioner Johnson am

1	I allowed to speak?
2	BZA CHAIR HILL: Sure. Go ahead, Commissioner.
3	MS. JOHNSON: So, I just wanted to state that
4	there is parking on Kansas Avenue in the 59-6,000 block of
5	Kansas Avenue, and the 5800 block of Third Street, NW. So,
6	there could potentially be a situation where not all of these
7	cars are parked on Peabody Street because there's always
8	available spaces. Even with Cap City teachers and some
9	students parking there, there is always ample space.
10	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay.
11	MS. JOHNSON: And it's only a block away.
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: Commissioner, I'm sorry to
13	interrupt you.
14	I guess if you could hold your comments, I guess,
15	for your presentation portion, that would also be helpful.
16	MS. JOHNSON: Okay, thank you.
17	BZA CHAIR HILL: Just because, you know, I don't
18	want everybody to be talking at the same time.
19	Okay, go ahead.
20	And to my fellow board members, again, and Ms.
21	White and Ms. Wilson, don't get me wrong. I appreciate all
22	the information that's here.
23	MS. WHITE: Okay.
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: I guess I'm just trying to get

1	record. But I'm pointing out to my fellow board members,
2	while this slide presentation is going on if you all have a
3	question on a particular slide, go ahead and ask it now, I
4	suppose.
5	MS. WILSON: And if I may, I think we'll have Ms.
6	White finish up. And then if there are separate questions
7	about the architecture, since it's technically all by right,
8	then we can answer those, too, if that's okay.
9	BZA CHAIR HILL: Great.
10	Go ahead, Ms. White.
11	MS. WHITE: Okay. We can, we can jump ahead from
12	this slide. And, again, I'm happy to come back and answer
13	questions. But, again, the takeaway is the accumulation of
14	the parked vehicles that we would expect at any tone time.
15	Next slide, please.
16	Okay. So, this slide is showing at three
17	different peak periods the number of vacant spaces in sort
18	of that key area, the prime pick-up/drop-off area, if you
19	will, that's outlined in red in the map. And from 8:15 to
20	9:15 we show that there were 20 available spaces; 4:45 to
21	5:45, 25.
22	3:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. the number went down
23	because of the dismissal time of Capital City Public Charter
24	School.
25	The next-to-last column is showing what we're

projecting to be the total parking demand associated with staff and pick-up/drop-off. And in each case that total parking demand is less than the available supply.

Let's pause here because this is new information.

I went out and did an additional observation yesterday, and then we talked as a team. And we, this is the tenth condition that we want to propose.

So, whereas we were in this table including the nine staff parking spaces, overflow I'll say, because the five spaces, you know, meets the zoning requirement, but we do expect some additional demand on street, the proposed additional condition is that they would not be able to use what we're calling this sort of key or prime pick-up/drop-off area.

Instead -- and I appreciate the ANC commissioner for what she suggested in terms of available parking spaces on Kansas Avenue, and then if we go to the next slide -- we're suggesting that we would, Estrellitas would include in the Employee Handbook that they would not, or parents would not be able to park in that area. And, instead, I'm thinking they should focus more on the areas to the west so that there is no competition in terms of the Capital City Public Charter School.

So, during the peak times we found just in the three blocks on both sides of the street here to the west,

2.0

2.1

1	that there were over 60 spaces that could be used by staff.
2	So, we sort of displaced them, creating even more space
3	available for parents during that pick-up/drop-off period.
4	So, we think that that would be helpful to the
5	neighbors and for Capital City Public Charter School.
6	We can go to the next slide. This is in the
7	record, the next slide, the pick-up/drop-off space part of
8	the DDOT report.
9	And then, again, that we agree with the the
10	next slide, please the three conditions. We support them.
11	The TDM plan, definitely won't read all of the detail, but
12	the applicant is okay with that and suggested that. The
13	short-term bicycle spaces are shown in our report and in the
14	architect's plan.
15	And what was not in our original study was the
16	long-term bicycle space. But we, per DDOT's comment, divided
17	the space to a storage room inside.
18	So, that concludes my abbreviated presentation and
19	I'm happy to answer questions.
20	MS. WILSON: Thank you, Ms. White.
21	That concludes our presentation. We are happy to
22	answer any questions, including any questions related to the
23	plan.
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great.
25	All right. Looking at board members. So, I mean,

I'm going to point out to my board members, and also those 1 other members of the party sides people in this particular 2 3 case, you know, we're looking at Subtitle U, 203, the special exceptions. Okay? Those are one of the things we're looking 5 at, and then Subtitle X, 901, the special exceptions. those are the criteria that we look at. 6 7 And I know that they're talking a lot about the 8 parking and the traffic, which is very helpful. So, if my 9 fellow board members have any questions on any of those, 10 would you -- or, if you have any questions about anything 11 that just happened, do you want to do questions now or are you going to wait until we hear from everybody? 13 MEMBER SMITH: I think I have two questions. Go ahead. 14 BZA CHAIR HILL: 15 MEMBER SMITH: The first one, what was building used for previously? This was some kind of, looks 16 17 like a church? 18 MS. WILSON: It was --19 It was the Mennonite church. MS. JOHNSON: 20 BZA CHAIR HILL: Who's answering? 2.1 MEMBER SMITH: Okay. Who's answering? 22 BZA CHAIR HILL: This is Commissioner Johnson. 23 MS. JOHNSON: 24 Before the redistricting, this location was in my single member district. It was a former church. The

church dissolved, and the property has been vacant. 1 2 Other individuals have come in trying to utilize 3 it for purposes that the community, and myself as well, felt were not in cohesive nature of our community. And so, we had 5 asked previously could a child development center come into And Medomas, the applicant, fell into our this location? 6 7 laps. 8 BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Smith, what was your second 9 question? 10 MEMBER SMITH: Well, the second question had to do with the demand, the parking demand. 11 12 Ms. White, your calculations of available parking, does that factor in I'm assuming there was some kind of 13 parking study that was done based on how much available 14 15 parking currently exists now, in a way? 16 Did you factor that in about the parking demand along that block and the adjacent blocks at this, at this 17 particular time during the week? 18 19 MS. WHITE: Yes. So, there was an earlier slide 2.0 that showed that prime survey area, the pick-up/drop-off area that we looked at. And so, in that area we observed a number 21 of vacant parking spaces during each time period, in the 22 23 morning drop-off, during -- which also somewhat coincided 24 with the Capital City Public Charter School, during Capital

City Public Charter School's dismissal time, and also during

the 5:00 p.m. to 5:30ish time period when the daycare pick-up 1 would take place. 2 And so, we have accounted for, I think I showed 3 20 to 25 vacant spaces in that area, a little less during 5 other times during the --6 MEMBER SMITH: Okay. 7 MS. WHITE: -- Capital City Public Charter School dismissal time. 8 9 MEMBER SMITH: Okay. And I think my last question 10 is, how does, how does the organization typically regulate, and typically parents, is a typical amount of time that they 11 12 typically sit, sit there for pick-up and drop-off, how has the organization typically in their other sites attempt to 13 regulate that to try to keep it to those shorter times? 14 I think our observation was just 15 MEMBER SMITH: really capturing the human dynamic of what it takes to -- I 16 17 mean, I think it might be hard to say you must get in and out in 5 minutes or less. I mean, we're talking about the 18 19 infants in some cases. And so --20 MEMBER SMITH: Agreed. 2.1 MS. WHITE: -- it's really understanding over, you know, 40 vehicles during this long period of observation, how 22 23 long they are taking in the morning. They are just in and 24 out. They're on their way to work.

see,

surprising to

Ιt

25

some

literally 1 minute and some took 4 minutes. And during the 1 afternoon maybe there's a little more talking, maybe there's 2 a little more debrief of what the child did in daycare that 3 day, and so that naturally takes longer. 5 MEMBER SMITH: That's what I'm more concerned I'm more concerned about the afternoon. There's more about. 6 7 lingering that's occurring. And there's a bigger clutch of parents coming to pick up and drop off their kids during 8 9 certain times, during that particular time. 10 Because everybody's, for the most part, getting 11 off pretty much around the same time. The daycare center's 12 closing, there's a hard stop, so there's less staggering that's occurring in the afternoon. 13 So, I just wanted to see how they had typically 14 15 regulated that at some of these other sites, if there were 16 any issues. 17 MS. MEDRANO: I can share some of the experience that we're going to have and how we'll handle it. 18 19 They pick-ups start after 3:00-3:30 and they're 20 Not everybody comes at the same time. 2.1 And how we do the dismissal is that the parents 22 arrive and we call the children and they wait at the door. So, that makes the dismissal easier. 2.3 And instead of the 24 parent walking all the way to the classroom and taking chat

with the teacher, and chat with other parents and all that.

1	So, usually it's quick. And like Nicole shared
2	with you, this current location we have 150 families in the
3	dismissal. There's more kids.
4	And that is my experience. Like I said, they
5	don't have a specific time of dismissal that they would
6	close, you know, at 5:00 and everybody has to leave at 5:00.
7	Parents start arriving from 3:00, 3:30, 4:45, you know, the
8	most of the parents that we studied and Ms. Nicole shared
9	with you.
10	MEMBER SMITH: Okay. Okay, that's all the
11	questions that I have now, for now, Chairman.
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you.
13	Dr. Imamura?
14	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
15	I just have one question for Ms. White, and one
16	comment.
17	One, I thought the slides were very helpful. And
18	I was hoping you'd actually crosswalk it with the Charter
19	School's arrival and departure. So, that was very helpful.
20	So, well done on preparing the slides.
21	And as an architect, I generally don't get into
22	that. It's very difficult for me to get interested in
23	transportation issues, but you managed to be successful. I'm
24	all in on this.

My question for you, though, and I understand you

might have a different bent on this, but 1 threshold for what would be objectionable? 2 So, my point is are we 50 percent below that? And 3 4 I know that this is relatively subjective. And I don't think 5 we've got DDOT here. Obviously, we have people who are in opposition that say it is objectionable, the data that you 6 7 just presented; right? The intensity there in 8 neighborhood is just a lot, it's consistent, right, with the 9 departure of the charter school, then, you know, the letter 10 got a development center here. But what is objectionable? 11 And how is that relative to where we're at with the numbers that you've shown? 13 14 So, the first threshold that we look MS. WHITE: 15 at is part of the scoping process with DDOT is the amount of, 16 the number of peak vehicle trips in any direction. And so, because that number was less than 25 in the peak direction, 17 then we're not even triggered to look at traffic analysis. 18 19 So, that's the first threshold, which starts to 2.0 indicate that the activity, the trip generation is relatively 21 low in this case and, therefore, no need to look in detail at traffic analysis. 22 23 parking, I would consider terms of what 24 objectionable is if we exceeded the parking supply based on

the pick-up and drop-off operations, and that the residents

based 1 have place to park. But those а 2 observations, there is adequate space to park. 3 Okay. I appreciate that. COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: 4 The other question, I was wondering if -- this 5 might be for you, Ms. White, or the architect -- and I'm I noticed this 90 degree parking at five spaces. curious. 6 7 Curious. I always believe there's a design solution to solve most anything. Why wasn't -- or maybe you did consider angle 8 9 parking, parking to squeeze in maybe an additional space or 10 two. Just walk me through at least the iteration that 11 you investigated that option. I'm 13 MR. BLOOM: Yeah, sure. This is Dave Bloom. with District Architecture. 14 15 Can you hear me? 16 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes. 17 BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes. 18 Thank you. MR. BLOOM: Great. 19 So, we arrived at five parking spaces as, you 2.0 know, if you're an architect you kind of know the push and 21 pull between developing a building, the square foot size of the building, what's leftover in terms of the rear yard, 22 23 meeting the zoning requirements for parking, or exceeding the 24 zoning requirements for parking and ADA parking. There's a bunch of different sort of issues that we try to

together with a coherent solution. 1 2 We did look at angled parking. It actually took 3 up slightly more space, especially when we take into account we need the 5-foot aisle for the accessible parking space. 5 And so that's how we ended up with the 90 degree parking to try to fit in as many as we could. 6 7 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Okay. Appreciate the 8 answers. 9 It is a push and pull. But, clearly, this is a 10 pretty significant issue for the neighborhood; right? And to your point, as parking becomes leftover space in the rear 11 yard, right, but here it needs to be sort of a comprehensive design solution. Right? So, whereas parking is a priority 13 and it is an important issue, where that would probably, or 14 could, impact the program of the building. 15 16 So, I'm certain, or at least I hope that you all 17 walked through that iteration through, yeah, your design solution. 18 19 All right, Mr. Chairman, that concludes all the 20 questions that I have. Thank you. 2.1 BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. 22 Mr. Jamison, can you hear me? 2.3 MR. JAMISON: I can, yes. 24 BZA CHAIR HILL: Do you have any questions? 25 Chairman Hill, as one of the parties MR. TOLL:

1	I was going to take the lead. We spoke before. I was going
2	to take the lead on asking questions of Ms. White and Mr.
3	Bloom.
4	BZA CHAIR HILL: That's all right, Mr. Toll.
5	That's okay. I got confused, then. I thought Mr. Jamison
6	was leading.
7	So, you're leading the questions and he's leading
8	the presentation?
9	MR. TOLL: Correct.
10	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I missed that part.
11	MR. TOLL: That's all right.
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: Go ahead, Mr. Toll.
13	MR. TOLL: Okay. Thank you.
14	Could I have Exhibit 28, which is the
15	transportation statement, brought up onto the screen.
16	Okay, great. And if you can just, right, if you
17	can just make that a little bit bigger. And my first
18	question is about the bottom of the page, last paragraph.
19	Okay, right.
20	So, Ms. White, can you hear me?
21	MS. WHITE: Yes, I can.
22	MR. TOLL: Okay. So, let me, this is your
23	transportation statement that you've submitted; correct?
24	MS. WHITE: Yes.
25	MR. TOLL: Okay. And let me bring your attention

1	to the final paragraph on the first page.
2	What you state here is that according to you this
3	is not triggering the threshold of 25 vehicle trips in the
4	peak direction. Is that correct?
5	MS. WHITE: Yes.
6	MR. TOLL: Okay. Now, if 25, if the actual demand
7	did exceed 25 vehicle trips, then that would trigger the
8	requirement to conduct a traffic impact analysis. Is that
9	correct?
10	MS. WHITE: In accordance with the DDOT
11	guidelines, yes.
12	MR. TOLL: And a traffic impact analysis is a much
13	more comprehensive traffic study than what you performed; is
14	that correct?
15	MS. WHITE: It would look at traffic analysis at
16	some intersections to be scoped with DDOT.
17	MR. TOLL: So, it is more comprehensive than what
18	you did; correct?
19	MS. WHITE: That, that's correct.
20	MR. TOLL: Okay. Now, the reason that you
21	concluded that there were fewer than 25 vehicle trips is
22	based on a number of assumptions that you made; correct?
23	MS. WHITE: Correct.
24	MR. TOLL: Okay. And if we could go to the
25	following page. And, I'm sorry, the following page again,

1	the third page.
2	Okay. So, let me ask you about the mode split.
3	What you state here is that the mode split was
4	provided by the applicant based on parent and staff surveys
5	from another daycare. Is that correct?
6	MS. WHITE: Correct.
7	MR. TOLL: Okay. And that means that you did not
8	study other daycares in the area to determine what mode split
9	existed there. Is that correct?
10	MS. WHITE: Correct.
11	MR. TOLL: And you relied on a single source of
12	information from the applicant itself. Is that correct?
13	MS. WHITE: No.
14	MR. TOLL: Okay, I'm sorry. How is that not
15	correct?
16	MS. WHITE: We also looked at census data.
17	MR. TOLL: Okay. And where is that contained in
18	your report?
19	MS. WHITE: On the page 3, the footnote, census
20	data from U.S. Census Bureau, 5-year estimates.
21	MR. TOLL: Okay. And where is the actual data
22	provided in the report?
23	MS. WHITE: We don't have it but can certainly
24	share it.
25	MR. TOLL: Okay. So, it's not in your report;

1	correct?
2	MS. WHITE: Just the reference that we used census
3	data.
4	MR. TOLL: Okay. But no explanation; correct?
5	MS. WHITE: Correct.
6	MR. TOLL: Okay. Now, you would agree with me
7	that the DDOT Guidance for Comprehensive Transportation
8	Review states that "a variety of sources provide insight into
9	various travel assumptions but, typically, no single document
10	or source provides a complete projection of future travel
11	demand."
12	Do you agree with that statement?
13	MS. WHITE: I don't have the exact CTR guidance
14	in front of me, but I will trust what you're saying.
15	MR. TOLL: Okay. However, to gather most of your
16	data in this case you did use a single source, which is the
17	Colorado Avenue location; correct?
18	MS. WHITE: For mode split?
19	MR. TOLL: Yeah. No, for the general conclusions
20	that you make regarding not only mode split but also time
21	spent at the location. All that data was based on your
22	observations of Colorado Avenue; correct?
23	MS. WHITE: Well, so the
24	MS. JOHNSON: I object. I object. Can we have
25	the actual language that you're referring to?

1	BZA CHAIR HILL: I'm sorry, who just spoke up?
2	MS. JOHNSON: This is Commissioner Johnson. I'm
3	just trying to ascertain what the correct language is.
4	MR. TOLL: I don't think she's permitted to
5	object. I'm sorry, I'm not
6	BZA CHAIR HILL: Hey, hey, you guys, hold on.
7	All right. Let me just clarify a couple of
8	things.
9	We're not a, I don't want to say a tribunal, we're
10	not a court. We're just an administrative hearing. And I
11	do the best I can to get through this.
12	MR. TOLL: Okay.
13	BZA CHAIR HILL: So, Commissioner, Mr. Toll is
14	just asking some questions, and I'm trying to follow along
15	with the questions. And, actually, at least Ms. White seems
16	to be able to answer them.
17	So, just let me kind of get through this with Mr.
18	Toll. And then, Ms. Johnson, if you have any questions you
19	can.
20	MS. JOHNSON: Understood. Thank you.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you.
22	Mr. Toll, what was your next question?
23	MR. TOLL: My question was the conclusions in the
24	slides that we just saw, as well as the traffic statement,
25	are largely based on observations at the Colorado Avenue

location. Is that correct? 1 2 So, if I can answer that. MS. WHITE: 3 MR. TOLL: Sure. 4 WHITE: We -- the original transportation 5 on trip generation rates from statement was based Institute of Transportation Engineers, which is the industry 6 7 standard, which is based on numerous daycare centers. So, that's what the initial trips were based on. 8 9 We also looked at the Colorado Avenue location. 10 And when we collected data from the sign-in/sign-out sheets it was very consistent with the Institute of Transportation 11 12 Engineers Trip Generation Manual. In terms of mode split, we obtained parent and 13 14 staff information from the Colorado Avenue location. We coordinated extensively with DDOT. 15 I don't want to say 16 extensively, but multiple times. We coordinated with DDOT on this mode split. We made adjustments to the mode split, 17 considering there are different factors. 18 19 And, in fact, my Table 1 in the transportation 2.0 statement outlines our review of how conditions were slightly 2.1 different from Colorado Avenue to Peabody, so that we could make those adjustments and coordinate them with DDOT. 22 2.3 And, in fact, in the June transportation statement 24 versus the September transportation statement we made a minor

adjustment to trip generation, based on guidance from DDOT,

1	to look at a more weighted mode split.
2	So, I feel very comfortable in coordinating with
3	DDOT and looking at all of this information, that we have
4	really good data in terms of mode split and trip generation.
5	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Toll. Mr. Toll.
6	MR. TOLL: Yes.
7	BZA CHAIR HILL: How many questions do you have
8	in general?
9	MR. TOLL: I'm trying to keep this as brief as I
10	possibly can. It's not too lengthy.
11	BZA CHAIR HILL: How many questions? We're
12	already lengthy, Mr. Toll.
13	How many questions to you have in general left?
14	MR. TOLL: I would say about eight additional
15	questions.
16	BZA CHAIR HILL: Eight additional questions.
17	Are they all related to Ms. White?
18	MR. TOLL: Yes.
19	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. And then are there any
20	more questions from your group?
21	MR. TOLL: I don't think we have any more
22	cross-examination questions.
23	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay.
24	MR. JAMISON: I only actually have one, one
25	question.

1	MR. TOLL: Sorry.
2	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Jamison?
3	MR. TOLL: Yes.
4	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Jamison, who is your
5	question going to be directed to?
6	MR. JAMISON: Ms. White.
7	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Why don't you go ahead and
8	ask your question now, Mr. Jamison.
9	MR. JAMISON: Okay. I believe it was during your
10	presentation, Ms. White, that there was a reference to a
11	parking lot at the Colorado Avenue location. So, my question
12	has to do with the extent to which that parking lot was taken
13	into account in conducting your traffic analysis.
14	There seemed to be a suggestion that the absence
15	of a parking lot at the Peabody location would discourage and
16	dissuade parents from coming to the location at Peabody which
17	I guess would tamp down the traffic concerns and issues
18	there.
19	But from my perspective that creates more concerns
20	in that the absence of a parking lot here at the Peabody
21	location will actually lead to higher congestion, and it
22	would not discourage parents from utilizing the location at
23	Peabody Street.
24	MS. WHITE: So, so our mode split was 60 point
25	something odd percent, or 62.6 percent, I think, for, for

And that was primarily based on Colorado Avenue 1 mode split information for parents, and adjusted. 2 3 There was no adjustment considered because there as a parking lot in terms of there being fewer vehicles. 5 think Ms. Sullivan spoke earlier suggesting that she thought it was reasonable to assume that if parents didn't have 6 access to a parking lot like they did at Colorado, then the 8 numbers that we assumed in our transportation statement might 9 be even less because there wouldn't be a parking lot. 10 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right, go ahead, Mr. 11 Toll. 12 MR. TOLL: Okay. Let me ask you about the vehicle 13 occupancy rate of 1.6 persons per vehicle. Do you see that noted on this page? 14 15 MS. WHITE: Yes. 16 Okay. Let me represent to you that you MR. TOLL: 17 have Figure 13 there. However, Figure 13 is traffic crash So, am I correct that that's a mistake on citation? 18 data. 19 That should be Figure 13 of the CTR MS. WHITE: 20 quidelines, not of our report. 2.1 Okay. And those --MR. TOLL: 22 So, we're referencing that we are MS. WHITE: 23 sourcing the DDOT's quidelines, their auto occupancy factor So, that is the Figure 13 in our case. 24 of 1.60. 25 And that information is not MR. TOLL: Okay.

1	provided here; correct?
2	MS. WHITE: We can easily pull that.
3	I mean, you extracted something from the
4	guidelines earlier, so the same Figure 13 could be obtained
5	from those guidelines.
6	MR. TOLL: Okay. So, that's based on a study that
7	was conducted in 2017; is that correct?
8	MS. WHITE: DDOT's guidelines?
9	MR. TOLL: Yes.
10	MS. WHITE: Don't know that off the top of my
11	head.
12	MR. TOLL: Okay. Do you know when the study was
13	conducted?
14	MS. WHITE: I don't know when they obtained the
15	1.6. I mean, it's in their guidelines.
16	MR. TOLL: Okay. And so the 1
17	MS. WHITE: Their 2022 guidelines, yes.
18	MR. TOLL: Right.
19	So, the 1.6 persons per vehicle, does that include
20	the parent who's driving?
21	MS. WHITE: No. That is I mean, this is, this
22	would include actually, I don't know for sure. But this
23	would include the fact that since it's for a school, I'm sure
24	that it would consider that the children have siblings, which
25	is the case of Estrellitas.

1	MR. TOLL: Okay. So, this only works, though,
2	that I mean if 60 percent of the students enrolled have
3	a sibling also enrolled; is that correct? That's what that
4	number means?
5	MS. WHITE: Not 60 percent. It's that for every
6	car that comes that there are 1.6 students in the car. And
7	so
8	MR. TOLL: Right. You're saying it's 60 percent.
9	MS. WHITE: Sixty percent?
10	MR. TOLL: Sixty percent I'll move on.
11	Clearly, you're not following the math.
12	But my question is
13	BZA CHAIR HILL: No, Mr. Toll. Mr. Toll, I'm kind
14	of following what you're saying.
15	It's 1.6 per vehicle. I don't know what you're
16	talking about with the 60 percent.
17	MR. TOLL: So, that means that, essentially, if
18	we have 10 vehicles, that means that you're claiming that
19	there will be 16 kids in the 10 vehicles; correct?
20	MS. WHITE: Okay. I see what you're saying.
21	MR. TOLL: Right. Which means that the
22	way that that math works out, if four vehicles have one kid
23	
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, Mr. Toll, I'm going to stop
25	you one second.

1	Go ahead and continue asking your questions so
2	that you can get to your presentation. Because a little bit
3	of this stuff, I mean, I almost want to talk to DDOT. So,
4	kind of like you're really getting into the weeds on this
5	I'm sorry, this exhibit.
6	You seem to think that it's wrong in a lot of
7	ways, so I'm trying to follow along with what you're
8	proposing is wrong. And then I really have to kind of cross
9	in with DDOT's report.
10	But go ahead and ask your next question.
11	MR. TOLL: Okay. My question is, is there any
12	part of this report provided for the proposition that 60
13	percent of the students enrolled will also have a sibling
14	enrolled?
15	MS. WHITE: No, we didn't do any data collection
16	beyond the DDOT guidance.
17	MR. TOLL: Okay.
18	MS. WHITE: For that, for that auto occupancy
19	factor.
20	MR. TOLL: Right. And if that 1.6 number is too
21	high, that does affect your calculations; correct?
22	MS. WHITE: Yeah. Any adjustment to 1.6 would
23	have an impact.
24	MR. TOLL: Okay. So, if we have, my next question
25	is if we have the 82 students and 60 percent are going by

1	auto, that's 49 students who are traveling by auto; is that
2	correct?
3	MS. WHITE: I'm sorry. Repeat that, please?
4	MR. TOLL: Right. We have the 82 students. And
5	per your mode split, 60 percent are traveling by auto to the
6	daycare. That's 49 students; correct?
7	MR. TOLL: Okay. And then if we divide that by
8	1.6, if your number's correct, that gives 30 vehicle trips;
9	correct?
10	MS. WHITE: I'm not clear on where you're getting
11	with this. So, yeah, okay, your math.
12	MR. TOLL: Okay, 30 vehicle trips. And that
13	exceeds the threshold of 25; correct?
14	MS. WHITE: Only the problem is your calculation
15	doesn't consider the fact that there is an arrival and
16	distribution over a time period. So, it's not all in one
17	hour. And so, your math is just assuming everybody's coming
18	in one hour.
19	MR. TOLL: Okay. Well, let's talk about that for
20	a moment because
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Toll. Mr. Toll, I'm doing
22	my best to help you with this. I need to get to your
23	presentation also.
24	MR. TOLL: Okay.
25	BZA CHAIR HILL: And you seem to be presenting as

1	you're asking questions.
2	What quest I'm going to let you have three more
3	questions, Mr. Toll. Go ahead and ask your questions.
4	MR. TOLL: Okay. Question one is that the arrival
5	window is larger at Colorado Avenue than the proposed arrival
6	window at 245 Peabody; correct?
7	MS. WHITE: The arrival window is larger at
8	Colorado versus Peabody? I'm not sure where you're getting
9	that information.
10	MR. TOLL: Well, you provided on the slide that
11	it would be 7:45 to 9:15 at Peabody; correct?
12	MS. WHITE: Yeah, that was the
13	BZA CHAIR HILL: Are you talking about, Mr. Toll
14	
15	MS. WHITE: Are you talking about the arrival
16	patterns?
17	MR. TOLL: No. I'm talking about the arrival
18	window provided on the slides that Ms. Wilson covered.
19	BZA CHAIR HILL: I'm sorry, which slide are you
20	talking about? Do you know?
21	MR. TOLL: Yeah, I do. Sorry. I have it right
22	here.
23	BZA CHAIR HILL: All right.
24	MR. TOLL: It was the school versus daycare
25	pick-up/drop-off indicated a 7:45 to 9:15 drop-off period for

1	Peabody.
2	BZA CHAIR HILL: Do you know the slide?
3	MR. TOLL: These aren't numbered, unfortunately,
4	so I can't give you a number.
5	BZA CHAIR HILL: So, tell me again what your
6	question is?
7	MR. TOLL: So, the 7:45 to 9:15 drop-off period
8	at 245 Peabody is shorter window than what you observed at
9	Colorado Avenue; correct?
10	MS. WHITE: I don't understand the question.
11	MS. ENCINAS: It's 7:30. We open at 7:30. Sorry.
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: All right, hold on. I'm sorry,
13	hold on.
14	Let Ms. White try and answer the question. And
15	I'm trying to understand the question also.
16	Go ahead.
17	MS. WHITE: I don't understand your question. I'm
18	sorry.
19	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay.
20	MR. TOLL: Right. I can repeat it.
21	So, the 7:45 to 9:15 drop-off period which is
22	stated on the slide for 245 Peabody, that 90-minute window
23	is shorter than the drop-off window that you observed at
24	Colorado Avenue, which was actually 2.5 hours; correct?
25	MS. WHITE: I don't see I'm looking for the

1	7:45 that you're talking about. I'm looking for the slide.
2	MR. TOLL: It's on the slide entitled school vs.
3	Daycare pick-up/drop-off that Ms. Wilson just covered. I'm
4	sure she can give us the slide number.
5	MS. WHITE: Oh, okay. Yeah that's sort of like
6	the that's the, where we're seeing the peak activity for
7	the daycare. It's not saying that it starts at exactly 7:45.
8	MR. TOLL: Okay.
9	MS. WHITE: I'm just noting that versus 8:15 to
10	8:30, which was the Capital City Public Charter School, that
11	the peak activity seemed to occur closer to 7:45 to 9:15.
12	MR. TOLL: Okay. I just have two more questions,
13	Chairman Hill, if that's okay.
14	BZA CHAIR HILL: Sure, Mr. Toll.
15	MR. TOLL: The next question is that you would
16	agree with me that DDOT categorizes Colorado Avenue as a
17	collector road, whereas DDOT characterizes Peabody as a local
18	road, which are different; correct?
19	MS. WHITE: I do not know the vehicle
20	classification. But I would assume that you're correct.
21	MR. TOLL: Okay. And then, finally, your study
22	did not assess how the alley next to 245 Peabody is actually
23	used by neighbors, and how it might be used by parents, not
24	to drop off or to pick up, but just to go through if traffic
25	conditions are objectionable on Peabody. You did not assess

1	how the alley would be used; is that correct?
2	MS. WHITE: We did not. We said the staff would
3	use the alley and that the alley would be used by trash
4	pick-up/drop-off, and that parents would be restricted per
5	the handbook from using the alley.
6	MR. TOLL: But it is a public alley, so the
7	parents can drive through it; correct?
8	MS. WHITE: They could drive through it if they
9	but they could not do pick-up/drop-off in the alley.
10	MR. TOLL: Okay. Okay, thank you.
11	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right, thank you, Mr.
12	Toll.
13	All right. Commissioner, can you hear me?
14	MS. JOHNSON: I can hear you.
15	BZA CHAIR HILL: Do you have any questions for the
16	applicant?
17	MS. JOHNSON: Yes.
18	When we met, I'll start at the bottom and work my
19	way up, when we met back in July and discussed specifically
20	the alley usage, what was your response? And was that
21	incorporated into the final traffic safety assessment?
22	MS. WHITE: Is that question of anyone in
23	particular?
24	MS. JOHNSON: That was a question, I guess I will
25	point it to Ms. Wilson.

1 I was not -- I did not attend the MS. WILSON: 2 July meeting, so I can't speak to that. 3 a condition proposed that will But have prohibit parental use of the alley. And we're happy to 5 propose a stricter condition in the handbook, such as parents are not allowed to use the alley. And we have an --6 7 MS. JOHNSON: How would that be imposed? Within our handbook, it's on slide 8 MS. WILSON: 9 25, it's also proposed condition to the order. So, when this 10 is approved it would be a condition to the order that we have 11 to adhere to, and show that we're putting the language in the 12 handbook. And so, the parents would have to read this. And 13 under slide 26 in my presentation. 14 It's 15 termination of enrollment of parents if they fail to abide 16 by the written policies and guidelines, including the parking 17 quidelines and use of the alley, could result in termination of the program. 18 19 And then we have the specific things talking about 2.0 pick-up and drop-off. But, we could also prohibit use of the 2.1 alley. 22 And, so, I'm not going to read all of this off 23 verbatim, but it shows parking spaces are exclusively for the 24 use of the staff --

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, Ms. Wilson, I'm sorry.

1	MS. WILSON: Yeah.
2	BZA CHAIR HILL: I think you answered the
3	question.
4	MS. WILSON: Okay.
5	BZA CHAIR HILL: What's your next question?
6	MS. JOHNSON: My next question is with regard to
7	trash pick-up, what steps are being taken and you kind of
8	insinuated about that so I'll, I'll move on to a different
9	one.
10	What, if any, information do you have regarding
11	Capital City being a charter school versus a child
12	development center?
13	MS. WILSON: On slide 12 of our presentation is
14	the C of O for the charter school. And it includes 1,000
15	students, or 1,020 students, ages 3 through 18, from early
16	childhood to 12th grade.
17	And then I went on Access DC and looked up the C
18	of O, child occupancy and use, and I still didn't see a child
19	development center. Regardless, we considered the school in
20	making our calculations regarding traffic.
21	MS. JOHNSON: Could that be because the
22	documentation that was provided was for an out of school time
23	care versus a full child development center?
24	MS. WILSON: Perhaps. I didn't investigate it
25	further than finding the C of O's because that was the rel

1	that was relevant for this proceeding. And we considered
2	the whole school in our process. So, it wasn't relevant to
3	go that far with respect to Condition No. 4 requirements.
4	MS. JOHNSON: My colleague did, and uploaded it
5	as a part of his exhibit. But it specifically says that the
6	most recent C of O is for out of school time placement.
7	So, I just wanted to add that to the record as
8	well.
9	Thank you.
10	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner.
11	Okay. All right, let's see now. So, Mr. Jamison,
12	can you hear me?
13	MR. JAMISON: Yes, I can hear you.
14	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great.
15	Do you want to go ahead and give us your
16	presentation?
17	MR. JAMISON: Sure. Do you have a sense of how
18	much time we get on our end, and maybe Mr. Toll and our
19	witnesses?
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yep. You'll have 40 minutes.
21	MR. JAMISON: Okay. Great, thank you.
22	So, let me go ahead and dive in. First of all,
23	I just want to thank the board for providing me and Mr. Toll
24	party status. As I've indicated before, I'm a homeowner at
25	223 Peabody Street, right next door to 245

I sought party status to oppose the 82-child, 20 staff member CDC as proposed, not because of any kind of personal animus towards Ms. Medrano or Ms. Encinas. I've met both of them. They are both very pleasant. And I appreciate their efforts to bring child care to Washington, D.C.

But my concerns arise from the size of the proposed CDC and the negative implication that it will have for the traffic safety on the local road that is Peabody Street, and the surrounding areas. And that's particularly in light of the traffic challenges that we currently in the emanating out of Capital City PCS, which is only a mere block away. And that's located at 100 Peabody Street, NW.

So, just to kind of walk you through, the applicant is seeking a special exception, as we all know, under Subtitle U-203(h). And that section prescribes that "the facility shall be located and designated to create no objectionable traffic condition and no unsafe condition for picking up and dropping off persons in attendance."

The CDC proposed fails to satisfy this requirement.

The CDC in accordance with the applicant's own traffic statement indicates that it will attract at the very least 65 vehicle trips, both during A.M. peak hours and P.M. peak hours to the 200 block of Peabody Street, and it will do so simultaneously with the drop-off time and near the

2.1

2.3

drop-off -- near the pick-up time for students at the Capital City PCS which, as I indicated, has already generated a number of substantial traffic problems and safety concerns within the neighborhood over the years.

The impact on the traffic, parking -- traffic, parking, and safety situation in the 200 block of Peabody Street cannot be overstated. As the increased vehicle trips to and from the proposed CDC will result in the occupation of most, if not all, parking spaces in the block preventing two-way traffic from advancing, and creating conditions ripe for automobile and pedestrian accidents.

The first major point that I would like to make is that should an emergency arise during these peak A.M. and P.M. hours for the proposed CDC and Capital City PCS, the ability for fire trucks, ambulances, police cruisers to navigate through the street to tend to individuals who may be injured or in harm's way will be severely hampered if not precluded entirely.

There's simply no way for a large ambulance, fire truck, or police cruiser to make its way through Peabody Street, NW, if there is often traffic and if both sides of the street are occupied by parked vehicles.

Second, the risk to pedestrians is particularly elevated for those individuals who park on the south side of Peabody Street and then have to traverse Peabody Street to

2.0

get to 245 Peabody Street where the proposed CDC would be located. Those parents and guardians will obviously be transporting young children across the street. And this proposed CDC is located between 2nd Street and 3rd Street, NW, and there is no crosswalk between these streets, and there's no proposal to have a traffic control officer there to provide safe passage to the CDC.

To ensure the safe passage of these pedestrians across Peabody Street, one or more crosswalks would need to be incorporated between 2nd and 3rd Street, and traffic control officers would need to be present, as I said, to ensure safe passage of those pedestrians.

But there are no assurances that these safety measures will be adopted. And as an illustration for my concern here, I would like to note that even given the traffic problems that are arising out of the Capital City PCS at 100 Peabody Street, NW, and the existence of broad community support for a traffic control officer there at the intersection of 2nd Street and Peabody Street, NW, the traffic control officer who was previously assigned to that location has been removed recently without notice and explanation.

In addition, even if there were guarantees of the incorporation of the additional crosswalks between 2nd Street and 3rd Street, and the present of traffic control officers,

2.0

2.1

which there are no guarantees of that, paradoxically, the implementation of those additional safety measures would only further exacerbate the traffic congestion that's being created from the Capital City PCS. And this would now be exacerbated and enhanced by the establishment of a CDC at 245 Peabody Street.

The third point I'd like to make is that the influx of traffic into the 200 block, 100 block, and surrounding areas will place an even greater burden on an already strained transportation system, and that regularly results in dangerous vehicles in the area, which residents have to bear the costs of this.

I can just speak to my own experience here over the last few months where my vehicle was sideswiped during the A.M. peak hours when a car, what cars typically do, they try to dive into any kind of open space in order to allow a vehicle to cross their face on Peabody. It was a particular instance where whoever was driving that vehicle obviously miscalculated and sideswiped my vehicle and caused \$1,300 of damage to my vehicle. And I've also had damage to a side mirror of my vehicle.

And I know I have neighbors who had had similar experiences and they've had to come out of pocket to redress those damages.

I think for these reasons and others, 59

2.0

2.1

residents, including those on the 200 block of Peabody Street, 5900 block of 2nd Place, NW, and the 6000 block of 2nd Street and 3rd Street, NW, have all signed off on a petition which is included in the record at Exhibit 34, and I think another, another exhibit as well, expressing their opposition to this application for a special exception to use 245 Peabody Street as a CDC for 82 children and 20 staff members.

I'd also like to highlight that the additional traffic, as I've said previously, will eliminate most, if not all remaining free parking spaces during the A.M. and P.M. hours, further exacerbating congestion in and around the 200 block of Peabody Street because a car will no longer be able to duck in behind parked vehicles to create space for oncoming traffic vehicles.

I'd also like to highlight some of the flaws and omissions that I noted in the Office of Planning's September 20, 2024, memorandum recommending approval of the request for Subtitle Y, section 405.5 of the a special exception. regulations state that the Board shall give great weight to the written report of the Office of Planning. But given the flaws in the admissions and in their memorandum, I do not believe should deference that the BZA pay their recommendation.

And one example that I would provide of a flaw or

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

omission in their memorandum is that it states that they are recommending approval of the requested special exception under Subtitle U, section 203.1(h), on the stating that the transportation issues related to the transportation network improvements can be mitigated through an assigned 10-space drop-off and pick-up area which will only allow for short-term 15-minute parking from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. in front of the property at 245 Peabody Street, NW.

That statement appears to conflict with other information in the record where the applicant indicates that will be only using three short-term drop-off and pick-up parking spots in front of the property at 245 Peabody; that the Office of Planning's assumptions are incorrect, and the applicant will not be designating 10 short-term parking spaces in front of the property to diminish the negative impacts on the transportation network. And the analysis on the basis for their recommendation should be visible.

On a related personal note, if the Office of Planning's assertion is correct that the applicant will designated 10 parking spaces in front of the property as short-term parking, this will be extremely problematic to me and my, my neighbors who are directly next door to the property at 245 Peabody Street, because there is only approximately enough space in front of 245 Peabody for three parking spaces. An additional seven short-term parking

2.0

2.1

spaces would encroach on the parking space directly in front of my home. And further down the way it is going east, and effectively eliminates our ability to utilize those parking spaces during weekdays, as we would have to have our cars moved from those spaces by 7:00 a.m. the next day to allow for that short-term 15-minute parking.

Furthermore, the Office of Planning's memorandum recommending approval is based at least in part on a finding that a CDC is not present within 1,000 feet of 245 Peabody Street, NW. As has been alluded to here throughout this hearing, I recently discovered that Capital City PCS was granted a CDC license effective September 13, 2024, noting that Capital City PCS with a capacity for 84 children from ages 3 to 5 years in age.

As I've indicated before, Capital City PCS is a mere block away from the property at 245 Peabody Street and is well within 1,000 feet of the property.

Both the Office of Planning's memorandum and the ANC 4B's adopted resolution, and this is No. 4B-24-0906, recommended approval of this special exception, indicating that there is no other CDC within 1,000 feet of the proposed CDC at 245 Peabody Street.

As a result, both the Office of Planning and the ANC 4B concluded that the application was in compliance with Section 203.1(g) of subtitle U. So, thus the issuance of the

2.0

2.1

CDC license to Capital City PCS in September of this year directly affects the applicant's compliance with Section 203.1(g) of Subtitle U.

And the fact that the Capital City PCS now holds a CDC license magnifies to me for this board to evaluate the extent to which multiple CDCs within a 1,000 foot radius of each other would have an adverse impact on the neighborhood due to traffic, noise, operations, or other similar factors set forth under Section 203.1(g) of Subtitle U.

And I would argue that there is not sufficient information in the record to make a determination on whether the current application complies with Section 203.1(g) of Subtitle U.

The party will be requesting relief as part of this hearing. We will be requesting a full traffic impact analysis as the number of peak hour vehicle trips generated in the applicant's traffic statement is conveniently set just below the 25 vehicle trips, and the peak direction standard which is required to trigger a traffic impact analysis.

And it goes without saying that the applicant contracted for the traffic statement that will support its request for a special exception under Subtitle U, Section 203.1(h).

In addition, it's this party's intention to present its own traffic study in conjunction with the traffic

2.0

2.1

impact analysis in response to the applicant's updated traffic statement.

And, finally, I would note that the delay -- that a delay in the issuance of a final order here is warranted until the parties have had an opportunity to flesh out the implications of having another CDC within 1,000 feet of the property at 245 Peabody Street, NW.

So, now I'd like to turn my presentation over to my wife and witness Tara Jamison.

MS. JAMISON: Can you hear me?

BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes, Ms. Jamison. Could you introduce yourself for the record before you begin?

So good afternoon. MS. JAMISON: Sure. My name is Tara Jamison and I own the property at 223 Peabody Street, NW, which is directly next door to 245 Peabody Street, NW, and shares a property line. I oppose the applicant's DC Board of Zoning application for 245 Peabody Street, NW, submitted to the Board by Mendomas, LLC, on January 26, 2024. I implore the BZA to disapprove Mendomas, LLC's application for leave under Section 901.2, special exception under the zoning regulations. The application does not meet the zoning regulations' special exception condition that a facility shall be located and designed to create no objectionable traffic condition and no unsafe condition for picking up and dropping off persons in attendance.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

2.3

The initial and updated transportation statements are insufficient and fail to adequately consider the existing traffic conditions on Peabody Street NW due to the close proximity of Capital City Public Charter School. The applicant uses data extrapolated from 5331 Colorado Avenue site to determine vehicle trips but doesn't consider those underestimated trip numbers and aggregate with the Capital City PCS trips.

The only estimates derived from actual observation at the 245 Peabody Street NW site are related to parking within a limited survey area. While there may be capacity for parking during the day, the CDC would consume nine spaces for employees and take over three spaces indefinitely creating a concentration of vehicles near the Peabody Street NW and 3rd Street NW intersection. This will make the majority of the 200 block of Peabody Street NW only passable by one vehicle exacerbating the same issue experienced on the block of Peabody Street NW. There will be clear stretches down the block where vehicles will have to squeeze through to pass one another endangering people and property.

There are glaring issues and inconsistencies in the applicant's transportation statement dated September 19, 2024. On page one, quote, The project is projected to generate 106 peak hour total trips and 22 peak hour vehicle trips in the peak direction. This is above the district's

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

threshold of 100 person trips but below 25 vehicle trips in the peak direction. The project's vehicle trip generation in the peak hour did not trigger the traffic impact analysis component of the CTR/Transportation statement, end quote.

The p.m. peak outbound auto trips for 245 Peabody Street NW is 22. That's only three trips below the threshold requiring a TIA. Just minimal adjustments to the applicant's assumptions could result in a totally different outcome, and an outcome that the applicant was very likely trying to avoid in order to minimize cost in effort and to preserve project plans. If we had the benefit of a TIA, we would understand how the adjacent intersections will be impacted. This is important since the intersection at Second Street NW and Peabody Street NW has documented safety and traffic issues due to Capital City PCS's operations, and the intersection at 3rd Street NW and Peabody Street NW is a busy thruway for vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians.

If we had the benefit of a TIA, we would be able to evaluate the mix of arterials, collectors, and local streets providing access to the site. This is important because the applicant is incorrectly equating the traffic conditions at 5331 Colorado Avenue NW, a collector street adjacent to a minor arterial street with the traffic conditions at 245 Peabody Street NW, a local street.

If we had the benefit of a TIA, you would have the

2.0

turning movement count to assess data on vehicles, bicycles, pedestrians, and trucks at all the intersections in the TIA This is important because we would then be able study area. to determine the actual volume of various modal activities adequately consider the safety of pedestrians bicycles due to the project's increased vehicular traffic and parking saturation. Without this information, subjecting a residential neighborhood to a business that will disrupt the quiet residential area based on questionable trip generation assumptions projected by a firm paid for by the applicant in support of their application.

On page 11, quote, Although no bicycle parking spaces are required, short-term bicycle parking spaces are planned to be installed on the west side of the front porch with access from the public alley, end quote. The applicant plans for bike traffic in the alley which contradicts their assurances that the alley will not be used by customers or as a part of the site's operations.

On page 18, quote, There will be different doors to pick up that will be explained once you sign a contract with our school and to facilitate the process, end quote. There is only one door on Peabody Street NW. The applicant clearly plans for pedestrian traffic in the alley to enter the facility which contradicts their assurances that the alley will not be used by customers or as part of the site's

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

operation. This means strollers, wheelchairs, and other aids for transporting children will be rolled through the alley.

Generally, the basis for estimating trips unreliable and inconsistent. In the applicant's statement, page three, quote, It is anticipated that most, if not all, children served will arrive on foot as the school is intended serve the local community, end quote. the transportation statement on page three, quote, The mode split was provided by Estrallitas Montessori based on parent and staff survey results from another daycare owned and operated the applicant in DC, end quote. And then the transportation statement on page 19, quote, Peabody Street vehicle trips during drop-off and pick-up were projected using person trips obtained from sign-in/sign-out sheets May 24 at the existing school at Colorado Avenue, end quote.

The critical issue comes down to one flawed assumption that a CDC that serves 82 children and 20 staff will only result in 21 vehicle trips on Peabody Street NW from 8:15 to 9:15 each day. Vehicle trip data from a center located on and near main corridors with various multi modal transportation options is not transferrable to a future center located on a local road two substantial blocks away from the closest bus line. The Peabody Street NW site will experience significantly more vehicle trips than the Colorado Avenue West site. It's common sense that as you decrease

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

1	transportation options and limit convenience, families will
2	resort to vehicle use, especially if the children are infants
3	and toddlers and they're moving from the applicant's center
4	in Takoma Park, Maryland to D.C.
5	The applicant's dismissal of the notion that they
6	did not intend on renewing a lease in Takoma Park and would
7	move those operations to D.C. as a revisionist history.
8	During a July 2024 community meeting, the applicant
9	acknowledged that they plan to close their location in Takoma
10	Park, Maryland and move those operations to 245 Peabody
11	Street NW site. Subsequently changing your answers after the
12	fact in order to question the validity of concerns raised
13	during this hearing, I believe, is disingenuous.
14	Thank you for the opportunity to be heard.
15	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you, Ms. Jamison. Mr.
16	Jamison?
17	MR. JAMISON: Yes.
18	BZA CHAIR HILL: Is Ms. Anderson available? Mr.
19	Young, do you see Ms. Anderson? Oh, there we go. Ms.
20	Anderson, can you hear us?
21	MS. ANDERSON: Can you hear me?
22	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes.
23	MS. ANDERSON: Okay. Perfect.
24	MR. JAMISON: Actually, let me step back we had
25	coordinated prior to this hearing during the recess Mr

Toll, did you want to go now and then call Ms. Anderson after you do your presentation?

MR. TOLL: Yes. Be myself followed by Safa Ansari-Bayegan and then Ms. Anderson, and we'll be very brief, cause I see the clock ticking down there. May I proceed?

MR. JAMISON: Yes, please.

MR. TOLL: Okay. Thank you. If I could have Exhibit 49 pulled up so that we could all see that. I want to just very briefly speak. And thank you, Chair Hill and distinguished members of the Board, for hearing from me today. I want to very briefly speak to supplement the concerns raised by talking about what I think will be dangerous traffic conditions created in the alley next to 245 Peabody.

I understand that the applicant has stated that they are going to do their best to prohibit parents from using the alley for pick-up and drop-off. However, what remains the case is that -- okay, right, so if you could just, yes, make that a little smaller? Right. So this first picture is a view from my garage. You can see that that white line on the left is the edge of my garage. You can see that it opens up onto the alley, and then we're looking right at 245 Peabody. So that's where I'm going to be attempting to back out each morning.

2.0

Then if we go to the next page, this is the right turn that I would be taking. You can see that Peabody Street there that I have to navigate the additional alley, and if there were obviously parents who were double-parked to effectuate pick-up or drop-off, they would obviously be blocking my path. And you can also see that Peabody Street is very narrow. There is cars on both sides. There's not enough space if there's cars on both sides for two-way traffic. And then we can go to the next slide.

This shows the other direction of the alley to the left of my garage. This shows that the alley hooks around and ultimately does connect to Quackenbos. And then next slide, please? And this is offered for comparison to the next slide. Right. This is a view of Third Street. You can see that there's dividing line, yellow line. There's room for cars parked on both sides of the street and then traffic in both directions, obviously a much bigger street than Peabody.

So briefly, the concerns that I wanted to raise -- you can stop sharing. The concerns I wanted to raise regarding the alley are that even if we accept the applicant that they will do their best to prohibit parents from using the alley for pick-up and drop-off, what we have, as stated, is that they are planning to install bike racks along the side of the building on the alley, so people, neighbors such

2.1

as myself who are attempting to use the alley to drive to work will be navigating that with bikers coming in the opposite direction, which I think is potentially quite dangerous.

We also know that there will be an ADA drop-off location. To the extent that students have mobility concerns, they will be dropped off in order to be able to access the ramp, which will further clog the alley and cause objectionable and unsafe conditions.

And we also know that -- I think that the -- I would respectfully submit to the Board that the conditions proposed by the applicant to prevent pick-up and drop-off are insufficient. They state there will be a warning assessed and then possible expulsion, but I don't -- with all due respect, I think expulsion is such an extreme remedy that I think we can all question whether that would be actually used. Certainly, monetary penalties would be more effective. Those are not being proposed here.

What's also not being proposed is someone who will actually be onsite at the alley to prevent parents from actually stopping there. I attended a meeting back in July of this year where I raised that possibility. I was told that it would be considered. However, that does not appear to have been actually effectuated, and my concern is that, as stated by Mr. Jamison, once you have congestion, once the

2.0

2.1

2.3

1	available parking spots on Peabody are taken, it's not going
2	to be possible for there to be two-way traffic on Peabody.
3	That is going to put additional pressure on the alley. It
4	will be very difficult to prevent parents from using the
5	alley once they figure out that if they use Quackenbos, they
6	can actually take the alley right to where the daycare is
7	located, so you are going to have parents driving in the
8	alley at the same time as your potential bikers. You'll also
9	have staff trying to park. You'll also have me and other
10	neighbors trying to use the alley for to actually be able
11	to exit our garages and drive to work. And then once per
12	week, you have DC Public Works trying to pick up our trash.
13	All of this together is not tenable in such a small alley and
14	is going to create unsafe conditions.
15	I'd now like to call Safa Ansari-Bayegan if she
16	could be promoted to be a presenter.
17	MS. JOHNSON: As the Commissioner, am I able to
18	state something for the record?
19	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes. One second, Commissioner.
20	Mr. Young, can you first drop this slid deck? Okay. And
21	there was somebody that Mr. Toll was trying to bring up.
22	MR. TOLL: Yes. Safa Ansari-Bayegan. She'll just
23	want to briefly present.
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. And Commissioner I mean
25	you're welcome to if you wouldn't mind, I mean I can't see

1	you so if you want to try to turn your camera on, that be
2	great but
3	MS. JOHNSON: Oh.
4	BZA CHAIR HILL: you're going to have a chance
5	to ask questions of the presenter, and then you're going to
6	have a chance to give your presentation. So you can talk
7	about anything you want during your presentation.
8	MS. JOHNSON: All right. Thank you.
9	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Thanks. Okay. Mr. Toll,
10	who were you speaking about and do you see them?
11	MR. TOLL: Safa Ansari-Bayegan. It's my wife.
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Great.
13	MR. TOLL: There she is. Okay.
14	MS. ANSARI-BAYEGAN: Good afternoon.
15	BZA CHAIR HILL: Could you introduce yourself for
16	the record and then give your presentation?
17	MS. ANSARI-BAYEGAN: Yes. My name is Safa
18	Ansari-Bayegan and I am a homeowner at 6001 3rd Street NW,
19	which is adjacent to 245 Peabody Street. Good afternoon,
20	Chairperson Hill and members of the Board. Thank you for the
21	opportunity to speak very briefly today. I would like to
22	present testimony in opposition of the applicant's proposal
23	for 245 Peabody NW.
24	I would like to note for the record that I'm also
25	the mother of a young child who will most likely be entering

Montessori school in the coming years, and I believe in this school model, and I'm not opposed outright to an additional CDC opening in the neighborhood but am concerned that this one in particular, as its being proposed and the size of it, will create unsafe conditions for the neighborhood and the young children who will be dropped off and picked up in gridlock traffic on a street that was not designed to withstand such concentrated traffic.

I want to emphasize today to the Board that the facility will be located and designated in this particular apologize, objectionable to create Ι traffic conditions and unsafe conditions for pick-up and drop-off of persons in attendance. The determination before the Board today really rises and falls with the traffic study that has been submitted, the statement, and that it is based on a number of assumptions that is not, respectfully, objective and shouldn't be the approval of -- the basis for approval of a project of this size.

The proposed school project should have triggered a comprehensive transportation review and a traffic impact analysis. And just because we are marginally lower at 22 peak hour vehicle trips in the peak direction per the traffic statements, those are not being triggered here. And those, I just want to highlight, are based on significant assumptions that would impact the vehicle trip number. One

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

page one, one of the assumptions is that drop-off and pick-up would be staggered depending on parental needs. We have no additional information for what those parental needs might be in this area. That assumption is also -- there's no further basis for that being the case at this Peabody location except the questionable assertion on page 20 that it is unlike a K-12 school.

On page three, the mode split again was provided by the applicant, and there's reliance on that single source and does not provide a complete production of future travel demand which is inconsistent with best practices per DDOT guidance. On page three, drop-off and pick-up data is based on activity at the existing Colorado School. I will not make any repetitions today. I think it's been accurately established that there are significant differences between that location and the proposed one on Peabody and that those differences have not been appropriately accounted for in the study.

On page three, table 2 mode split, the study presumes that more than a quarter of students will walk to school and only 12 percent will cycle. That is almost 37 percent of student traffic being non-auto and respectfully, that's a highly contrite number based on dissimilar conditions at the Colorado Avenue location, and a CTR and TIA would be highly likely to prove this assumption to be untrue.

2.0

1 Finally, three, peak hour vehicle on page 2 generation data is formulated on the basis of a number of questionable assumptions as discussed previously. And so at 3 4 this Board should require the applicant 5 supplement the record with a CTR and a TIA. 6 The approval of the relief, again, rises and falls 7 on a finding that it would not pose objectionable traffic 8 conditions and unsafe conditions for picking up and dropping 9 off young children. And I contend that on this record, the 10 BZA cannot make such a finding. I will also note for the record that I would urge the BZA to look closely at the 11 12 applicant's Exhibit 24C regarding conditions required for smaller CDCs that have been approved, which are far more 13 robust than what the applicant is proposing underscoring the 14 lack of response to neighborhood concerns regarding both 15 traffic, parking, and unsafe conditions as well as alley use. 16 17 Thank you for your time and for allowing me to be heard today. 18 19 Thank you. We will now call Ms. Genell MR. TOLL: 20 Anderson, and that will be our final witness. 2.1 MS. ANDERSON: Can you pull up my slide? 22 want to use one slide while I'm speaking, the first slide, 23 please. 24 BZA CHAIR HILL: I think it's Exhibit 48.

MS.

ANDERSON:

25

I can start and you'll see the

slide. It's just one slide that I'm going to use right now. I am less than 200 feet east of the church. I have been in the neighborhood since 1993. The CDCs are 560-feet apart. That's not a lot. The applicant stated the neighbors appear to try to use the school as a reason for denying the case even though there is no formal C of O and even though having a CDC within 1,000 feet is okay as long as there are no cumulative objectionable impacts regarding traffic and noise. We've gone over that.

I'm concerned about the volume of traffic. T'm We don't have options as the concerned about congestion. Colorado CDC. Understand that we have a 28-foot side street of single-family detached homes. Colorado and 14th Street They have a bus roundabout. There's a bus have resources. stop, bike path, traffic lights. Parents are walking from apartment buildings to bring their child to the CDC. That's not happening on Peabody Street. We have none of amenities and if we did, the street is too small, too narrow.

As it is now, children are riding their bikes on the sidewalk because the street is not safe. Peak time typically -- industry standard is the same for both CDCs -- will be the same -- 8:15 to 8:45. If there is an emergency, EMS or fire trucks will not be able to make it through. Like I said, I've been for -- since 1993. I am a senior and things can happen. I want to be able -- I want EMS or a fire

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

2.3

truck to get to me in real-time. Once a proposed CDC is open for business, it will be impossible to maneuver the tiny street.

Let me read to you an email from a resident on Second and Peabody to the CDC across the street and the I'm a neighbor by the school. The traffic during school dismissal has gotten worse, parents blocking intersections, blocking crosswalks, blocking homeowners, driveways and even pulling into driveway, mine. personally seen parents speeding down these narrow streets, 600 block of Second Street. It is only a matter of time that a child will be hit by a car. My question is, does the school have some type of security plan in place when the school crossing quard is absent? I do know that our ANC Commissioners have spoken to the school about the traffic situation. Something has to change because it's getting worse, especially the parents who have no respect for parking legally and slowing down in a school zone. I have attached And I'm not going to go through that. I'm going to skip that paragraph. I am very concerned about this traffic situation. Can we please do something? let's work together to make it safe for the children.

And here's the response from the head of school. Good afternoon, Ms. So and so. Thank you for reaching out and sharing your concerns. I have added our Director of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

Facilities and Chief Operating Officer on this thread as
well. As we have been voicing these same concerns, we have
been in conversation with Tiffani and Councilwoman Lewis
George regarding our safety concerns once we learned, at the
start of the school year, that we would not be granted
crossing guards as previously had as we previously had for
Second Street and Peabody Street. This was shocking to us
as we didn't have a heads up or much follow-up regarding that
decision. We have also voice our worries to our School
Resource Officers regarding parents not following the speed
limits and parking illegally causing dangerous situations for
students and other families. This is the head of school
writing this. We have increased our staff presence outside
as best as possible to support dismissal, and we have sent
numerous reminders to our families regarding speeding and
parking I don't think the handbook is going to help in
245's case letting them know that our neighbors will be
calling for ticketing. We've asked MPD to ticket cars as a
consequence of illegal parking and to also be present to
hopefully deter speeding and/or illegal parking.
Unfortunately, after five weeks of school, we have not been
able to garner support from MPD or DDOT as requested by us,
Tiffani, and Councilwoman Lewis George. We, too, are
concerned for our students' safety and hope that
collaboratively something can be figured out.

Finally, keep in mind I say to you do not approve this renovation of the church in R-1B. R-1B, as you know, was created to protect quiet residential areas and promote suitable environment for family life. Item 4 of the special exception regulations state more than one child/elderly facility in a development center or adult day treatment square or within 1,000 feet of another child development center or adult day treatment facility may be approved only when the BZA finds that the cumulative effect of these facilities will not have an adverse impact on the neighborhood due to the traffic, noise, operations, or other similar factors.

The reason I'm putting this picture up is because this is a view to the east towards the CDC, Capital City Charter School. And if you notice, cars are parked on both sides and then there are cars inching their way down Peabody Street. There is a bus -- and I'm right across the street from the bus -- there's a bus staged because he cannot make it down the street. So he's been there for a while just sitting. What happens when there is an emergency and an EMS or a fire truck has to go down the street?

I implore you, this is not right. I'm for daycare. My kids were in daycare. But to have 80 students -- to have 80 -- well, first, the applicant said 80 and then it became 82. You know, decide on that. We -- there are too

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

1	many kids. Also, why build a facility that can hold 170 kids
2	if you're only going to cap it at 82? Anyway, thank you for
3	listening to me.
4	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you, Ms. Anderson. Okay.
5	Let me drop that slide deck first if you wouldn't mind, Mr.
6	Young. Okay. Great. Mr. Jamison, you're at your time. Is
7	that good?
8	MR. JAMISON: Yes. That concludes our
9	presentation. Thank you.
10	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Great. Thank you. All
11	right. Do my fellow Board members have any questions of the
12	party in opposition? Go ahead, Dr. Imamura.
13	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
14	Mr. Toll, Mr. Jamison, Ms. Anderson. I know, Ms. Anderson,
15	you said you've been living there since 1993 I think,
16	somewhere thereabouts. Mr. Toll, forgive me, I forgot how
17	love you've lived at your residence.
18	MR. TOLL: I don't think I stated that. We moved
19	here in July of 2022, so we've been here for over two years.
20	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Okay. And Mr. Jamison, how
21	long have you been at your residence?
22	MR. JAMISON: February of 2023, last year.
23	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Okay. Great. So this
24	question, I guess, may be for Ms. Anderson then. What was
25	the traffic like when the church was in existence there seven

years ago?

MS. ANDERSON: We didn't have a problem with the
church at all. It was a small congregation, a Mennonite
congregation. The pastor lived next door. So they met
and also, a lot of the members lived in the neighborhood.
My neighbor, Ms. Miner, went to the church, and she would
also take the kids a couple of doors down. So it was truly
a neighborhood facility. If you want me to talk about the
CDC, I could, because Rabove was a middle school at one point
and then it the school bought it and it slipped through
us, because we just figured that not that many kids would be
at the school, but then the school started to grow and grow
and grow. And now most of our ANC meetings are spent trying
to figure out what the heck are we going to do. We keep
compromising, turned Peabody Street to a okay. I'm going
to stop. I see
COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Ms. Anderson.
I appreciate it. All right. Mr. Chairman, that's all I had.
BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Smith, do you have any
questions? Okay. Let's see. Commissioner, can you hear me?
MS. JOHNSON: Yes.
BZA CHAIR HILL: Do you have any questions of the
party status in opposition?
MS. JOHNSON: Just a couple of questions. From

25 a 4B-06 perspective, what has already --

BZA CHAIR HILL: Who are you asking the question 1 2 to, Commissioner? Sorry. 3 MS. JOHNSON: Oh. My apologies. Genell Anderson, 4 what has been done already to try and abate some of the 5 that you raised regarding parking along Street and Second Place? 6 7 MS. ANDERSON: According to the application? 8 MS. JOHNSON: No. What --9 MS. referring ANDERSON: Are you the 10 application? No, not the application. 11 MS. JOHNSON: What has already been done to date from an ANC perspective to mitigate 12 some of the traffic common concerns that have not already 13 been addressed by DDOT? 14 15 MS. ANDERSON: I'm not -- answer -- well, let me answer it this way. I know when Walmart came in place, we 16 17 -- you did talk to the -- to DDOT and they put the humps in place, right, in the street. And because the police would 18 -- there's a precinct a couple of doors down and so the 19 2.0 police would zoom down to get to 7-Eleven or wherever they 21 wanted to go, those humps were put in place. Also, on --22 there were crossing quards at Second Place and a crossing Now we don't have a 2.3 quard placed at Blair and Peabody. 24 crossing quard at Second Place and Peabody, right? 25

1	MS. JOHNSON: I understand that and I will
2	MS. ANDERSON: Okay.
3	MS. JOHNSON: get to that in moment.
4	MS. ANDERSON: Okay.
5	BZA CHAIR HILL: Why don't you I'm sorry,
6	Commissioner, cause we're going to have your testimony in a
7	minute, so this is just kind of questions I guess. Did you
8	have any other questions?
9	MS. JOHNSON: Well, I also wanted to ask Mr.
10	Jamison or any of the individuals, do you regularly receive
11	my newsletters that give information about things going on
12	in the community? Because if you had, you would have heard
13	that DDOT is the one that took away the safety officer at
14	Second and Peabody.
15	MS. ANDERSON: No
16	MS. JOHNSON: And I have been advocating
17	extensively to get that individual back.
18	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. So I guess the question
19	is and then Mr. Smith's about to add do you guys get
20	the email? That's all the question was.
21	MS. ANDERSON: We all get the email.
22	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay.
23	MS. ANDERSON: We get the email from our ANC 07
24	Commissioner as well but I'm not
25	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay.

MS. ANDERSON: -- I'm not understanding what this has to do with putting a large development on Peabody Street.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Sorry Commissioner, I'm going to let you give your presentation. So do you want to go ahead and give your presentation to the Board? Or you --MS. JOHNSON: Great. Thank you so much. Just For those who don't know, my name is Tiffani Nichole Johnson. I am the Commissioner for ANC 4B-06 and effective commissioner whose single-member district adjacent on the opposite side of the street from this Before the redistricting, this location proposed location. was also within my single-member district, and I am here today on behalf of ANC 4B to support the BZA application 21101 pursuant to the Commission's Resolution 4V2406 which Exhibit 47A and was approved bу the Commission September 23rd. And pursuant to that Resolution, am authorized to speak on this matter.

We approved supporting the applicant's request for a special exemption for a proposed child development center. No commissioners opposed this Resolution. We have always felt that there was a community-wide need to reactivate this As the Commissioner who dealt with this for many site. turn this site there were attempts to I listened to my constituents when that apartment building. recommendation was unanimously opposed. Now

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

further proposal for a child development center, and the vast majority of my constituents unanimously supported this effort.

The Commission's Resolution makes note of the fact that there are no other child development centers within the 1,000 block feet of this location. While Capital City is listed as a CDC, that license is for their before and after school programs. The license clearly states that. I am concerned that my fellow constituent failed to mention that aspect to our constituents. Capital City has always been offering before and after school care. They have never reached out stated that they were converting to a child development center.

As the ANC Commissioner representing the area that includes Capital City, I can attest that they have held themselves out to be a public charter school and never a CDC. They offer this service as a good steward of the community and responsive to the community's needs. I will admit that while Capital City being in our community has raised challenges, they have done the best that they can under the confines of the law to mitigate those concerns.

The bigger issue is not what one school or one CDC can achieve. My Commission has been vocal on our request for additional support from the Department of Transportation and from the Department of Public Works to fully implement all

2.0

2.1

2.3

regulations that currently exist the protect individuals who reside in the area and individuals who might We have made myriad resolutions regarding work in the area. most current one, Resolution mу additional requesting support from the Department of Transportation and from the Department of Public Works to fully implement all of the issues that I've already put into place such as residential parking placards, such as ensuring that our Kansas Avenue would be open to parking, making sure our Third Street would be open to parking for all of our teachers.

I want to acknowledge that Commissioner Cohen and reached out to our respective constituents. We held meetings with the applicant, and the Commission has equally listened to everyone's concern. Many of the issues that are addressed tonight going be are from mу previous constituents, and I hope they know that I initially had my own reservations about this for the same reasons that they But after going to the meetings, after talking with my fellow constituent, I felt that this is a process that we need in our community. I feel that holding the applicant and Department of -- DDOT accountable for the revised transportation demand plan that we, as constituents, asked for and holding our government officials accountable to their promises to provide additional traffic-calming efforts, the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

community will see a decrease in the traffic-calming issues that we have experienced by the presence of Capital City and the hypothetical CDC.

And during this last meeting that we had, I felt confident in the CDC's ability to not only listen and corroborate the community's concerns but also a willingness further dialoque. Ι do want to thank my Commissioners for supporting this application and to all the residents for their input and concerns regarding this. Ιt is what is best for Manor Park. That is what we all want to While we may not always agree, I look forward to continued discussions to occur as this process moves forward.

For the reasons stated above, I support ANC 4-B's supported unanimously vote in support of this BZA application.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner.

Questions from Mr. Smith. I see his hand up. Please, go ahead, Mr. Smith.

MEMBER SMITH: Okay. I think I have a couple questions. Thank you for your testimony, Ms. Johnson. Just one comment before I get into questions. The R-1B zone only allows for single-family detached. There was no -- an apartment can't be built here, just for full clarification.

Two questions. In the letter from the ANC, there were -- you said it is -- it was unanimous but there were

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

three abstentions. Can you provide some insight on the 1 reason for those three abstentions? 2 3 Well, we have a process within ANC MS. JOHNSON: 4 4B that we would like to receive all potential resolutions 5 ahead of time. What occurred in this instance was the resolution was received passed that date, and we literally 6 7 only had 24 hours to review it, make edits, vote on it, 8 The majority of individuals decided that we needed 9 to make some edits on it. The commissioner of record did not 10 state one way or the other that he was for or against those 11 edits, so a motion was made during that meeting to proffer 12 the revised resolution. 13 MEMBER SMITH: Okay. That's helpful. 14 MS. ANDERSON: Can --I'm sorry, go ahead. 15 MEMBER SMITH: 16 MS. ANDERSON: -- can I make a comment on that? 17 BZA CHAIR HILL: Let -- Ms. Anderson, give me a second. 18 19 MS. ANDERSON: Okay. 20 BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Smith -- and actually, you 2.1 can't, Ms. Anderson, so it's okay. Go ahead. 22 MEMBER SMITH: My next question is regarding some 23 of the discussion that may have happened at the ANC prior to 24 this letter. You provided, I think in some of your testimony - a lot of the testimony that I heard that you had directly

asked to Ms. Anderson and to Mr. and Mrs. Jamison regarding traffic-calming and the speed humps and the crossing guards, a lot of the testimony that I'm hearing today doesn't necessarily relate to traffic specifically. It's about parking and pick-up and drop-off, and I think I heard some question -- you know, concerns about queueing.

What were some of these discussions that happened at the ANC? You said that you feel that the CDC has sufficiently persuaded you that they will address some of these concerns that were raised, and it sounds like most of these concerns relate to parking and, again, pick-up and drop-off and the queueing. What was some of the -- what was said at the ANC? What were some of the concerns that was raised by the ANC? What were some of the measures that were brought up at the ANC to address some of those concerns?

MS. JOHNSON: Well, I apologize if my initial testimony wasn't sufficient. This has been parking for problem with regard to everyone in that community. What I have done is try and reach out to my constituents to ask do you want your particular rezoned for private parking. And the problem that comes in is half of my street in my single-member district, the other half is in Commissioner Cohen's. So we would have to have a meeting of the minds to ensure that their parking is set for a particular period of time. If that discussion needs

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

to occur, I am more than welcome to it. I have done it over 1 in -- on Oglethorpe Street NW. I'm welcome to that but that 2 3 is a situation that we have right now. 4 But we also have ample parking along Kansas Avenue 5 and Third Street NW which are both in my F&D up to the 5900 It is still ample parking and only a block away from block. 6 7 the proposed location of the child development center. 8 MEMBER SMITH: And that was raised at the ANC? 9 And -- Kansas Avenue from the same kind of dropping off 10 children less than five years old is fairly far to be, you 11 know, completely transparent about this. So what was the --12 what was --It wasn't --13 MS. JOHNSON: -- some of the discussion that may 14 MEMBER SMITH: 15 have had --16 -- it was not fully raised at the MS. JOHNSON: 17 NAC level. 18 So there wasn't any other MEMBER SMITH: Okay. 19 concerns raised at the ANC level about parking beyond the 20 residential parking --2.1 There was concern from parking from MS. JOHNSON: 22 residents, but there was not concern about once I'm gone, 23 who's going to be in my space, how long are they going to be 24 there, et cetera. But I then also issued the same mantra

that I am saying tonight is that there is ample parking along

1	the thoroughfare which is Third Street as well as Kansas
2	Avenue.
3	MEMBER SMITH: Okay. Thank you I think
4	that's all the questions that I have. It sounds like it was
5	raised in some way, shape, or form there but
6	MS. JOHNSON: It was.
7	MEMBER SMITH: but it doesn't
8	MS. JOHNSON: What the issue that was not
9	raised ever before documentation was submitted was the
10	licensure of Capital City.
11	MEMBER SMITH: Okay. And that there's no need
12	to get into that because this is completely separate from
13	that's completely separate from the application at hand. So
14	thank you.
15	MS. JOHNSON: Well, it's
16	MEMBER SMITH: Those are all the questions that
17	I
18	MS. JOHNSON: it's been raised and discussed
19	in the record, so I just wanted to put it out there that this
20	issue was never raised to me privately, to me through any of
21	my constituents, or to the ANC that somehow Capital City was
22	now just a child development center when they have been a
23	whole public charter school for over a decade.
24	MEMBER SMITH: Okay. Thank you. Duly noted.
25	Thank you.

MS. JOHNSON: Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

MEMBER SMITH: That's all the questions I have, Chairman Hill.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you, Mr. Smith. Dr. Imamura, do you have any questions? Okay. Mr. Jamison, do you have any questions?

MR. JAMISON: I think Ms. Johnson had alluded to raising certain concerns regarding to traffic in the area to the Office of Planning. I wanted to ask whether or not those same concerns were reflected in Commissioner Cohen's draft resolution which was ultimately rejected by the ANC.

MS. JOHNSON: I have this rejected resolution in front of me. We received this with little more than, I would say, 24, give it maybe 48, hours' notice to review this. has quidelines that we follow in terms of when resolution can be submitted so that we have time to review it, make edits, et cetera. We were in a 24-hour crunch time and the edits that I had submitted three days earlier were So that is how we came upon the situation that his rejected. initial resolution was not the final burden that was reviewed and approved by our committee. All of the proper processes were followed regarding amending the agenda, voting on, approved, seconded. So I do apologize that some constituents feel that by eliminating the resuscitation of all of the issues, it was not needed. We discussed that in the current

version of the resolution that was approved. We acknowledged that we had meetings, private meetings, public meetings, back and forth discussions regarding all of the constituents' concerns.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Commission, I'm sorry, I've got to get --

MS. JOHNSON: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

BZA CHAIR HILL: -- to the Office of Planning yet, so let's try to make our answers as concise as possible with all of this. Mr. Jamison, do you have any more questions?

MR. JAMISON: I'm good for now. Thank you.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. I want to turn to the Office of Planning. So what's going to happen next, the Office of Planning is going to give their report. Everybody will get a chance to ask questions of the Office of Planning. The applicant will then have a chance to give There will then be questions only on rebuttal. This is not an opportunity to restate your case. I just want to let you know, you guys, we're at 2 hours and 45 minutes right now -- is how long this hearing has gone on, okay, so meaning it's a full hearing. We're going to hear from everybody, and we'll have plenty of -- we will not deciding this today. We're going to have to chew on this and take a look at everything and so, you know, the Board will have a chance to digest all the testimony.

1 But I would like to take a quick break, okay? 2 let's take a quick like 10-minute break and we'll come right 3 Thank you. back, okay? 4 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the 5 record at 3:41 p.m. and resumed at 3:52 p.m.) Application No. 21101 of Mendomas, 6 MS. MEHLERT: 7 LLC. 8 BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Okay, so, like I said 9 before, I'm trying to be able to wrap this up by five o'clock 10 because there is kind of a stop going on at five o'clock. And that means that this hearing would have gone on four 11 12 And so, I think that's a fair amount of time to hear So, just pointing that out to everybody. 13 the hearing. I'm going to hear from the Office of Planning now. 14 Thank you. 15 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman 16 and members of the BZA. This is Maxine Brown-Roberts from 17 the Office of Planning, on the proposed daytime care at 245 Peabody Street, NW. 18 19 As outlined in our report, Office of Planning 2.0 recommends approval of the child development center for up 2.1 to age -- children and 20 staff members, with the conditions 22 of approval recommended by the applicant and DDOT, which are 23 proffered to generally mitigate any potential impacts to the 24 CDC, related to pickup and drop-off of children, traffic,

noise, and operations. The proposal would also be in harmony

with Intent Office on Regulations. 1 2 In response to statements made regarding stuff in 3 the OP report, our report was submitted to the BZA on September 20th. And earlier than that when we researched for 5 other CDCs in the area, the Capital City Charter School was not listed as a CDC, but as a charter school. And so, we 6 7 were not aware of that. 8 If the BZA wants us to go back and take a look at 9 that, we could take a look at that also. However, I think 10 that the issues related to traffic and the pickup and drop-off, the applicant and DDOT also took the Capital City 11 12 Operational School into consideration. Secondly, for the off-street parking restriction 13 submitted 14 quoted, these were in the applicant's 15 transportation statement. And we also stated in our report that traffic matters are deferred to DDOT's recommendation, 16 17 and if their recommendation is for a larger area, we will defer to that. 18 19 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And that's all I have. 20 And I'm open to questions. 2.1 BZA CHAIR HILL: Thanks, Ms. Roberts. Board have any questions for the Office of Planning? 22

questions for the Office of Planning?

MR. JAMISON:

Okay, let's see, Mr. Jamison, do you have any

23

24

25

Chairman, I raised this question

earlier during my presentation.

2.1

2.3

In the Office of Planning's memorandum, it indicates that the applicant will set aside a ten short-term, fifteen-minute parking spots directly in front of the location at 245 Peabody Street.

There's sufficient room for maybe three parking spots or so directly in front. So, the additional seven spots would have to spill into the parking spots directly in front of my home, and then kind of further on east down Peabody Street.

So, I wanted to confirm that that was not an error, that information that's reflected in the Office of Planning memorandum. Because I did see in the record, other indications that the applicant just intended to utilize the three spots in front of 245 Peabody Street for short-term parking.

MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: As we said, I think we've got that information from the applicant's submission. However, it may have been an error, and we would defer to what is it the applicant and DDOT are recommending.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Ms. Wilson, do you know what? I'm a little confused also. Can you clarify what the applicant and DDOT are recommending about those ten parking spaces?

MS. WHITE: It's three parking spaces. So, maybe

1	the number ten was from an initial demand calculation. But
2	the idea is 60 feet in front of the daycare.
3	BZA CHAIR HILL: Where is the three listed?
4	MS. WHITE: It is listed in DDOT's report I'm
5	pretty sure.
6	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, because I see the ten from
7	the other I see the Office of Planning's report.
8	MS. WHITE: I feel like I read it in DDOT's
9	report. But it is shown in one of the slides that shows the
10	zone on the curbside restrictions of where it has been
11	proposed.
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. So, it's three spots, Mr.
13	Jamison. What's your next question, Mr. Jamison?
14	MR. JAMISON: Let's see. I think Ms.
15	Brown-Roberts acknowledged that the Office of Planning was
16	not aware that there is another CDC within a thousand feet
17	of the CDC that's being proposed at 245 Peabody Street.
18	And I think, Ms. Brown-Roberts, you indicated that
19	the Office of Planning would be willing to go back and
20	evaluate the extent to which that additional CDC has an
21	impact on, I think, your recommendation to approve the
22	application? Is that correct?
23	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Well, if that's something that
24	the BZA wants us to do. However, as I also stated, that that
25	is in relation to the traffic and the parking and all that.

1	And I also think that those were taken into consideration in
2	the applicant's study. And also, in DDOT's evaluation.
3	So, I don't know that that would make a difference
4	to us because those are things that are really related to
5	traffic and parking, which are mainly for DDOT's
6	recommendation.
7	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Jamison, they're
8	basically saying if we ask them to, they will. What's your
9	next question, sir?
10	MR. JAMISON: That's all I have for now. Mr.
11	Toll, did you have any additional questions on the -
12	(Simultaneous speaking.)
13	MR. TOLL: No questions, thank you.
14	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thanks. Ms. Wilson, do you have
15	any questions of Office of Planning? For the record, she's
16	saying no. Commissioner Johnson, do you have any questions
17	for the Office of Planning?
18	MS. JOHNSON: We hear the information that states
19	that Capital City is deemed a child development center.
20	MEMBER SMITH: She didn't, Ms. Johnson, she didn't
21	specifically state that. She said that if the Board wants
22	the Office of Planning to go back and take a look at it to
23	see if they are classified as a CDC, they will do it.
24	But again, you can back and, let's say, for the
25	sake of argument, that it's not. It doesn't kill any

1	consideration for any future CDC. And I'm telling this to
2	the public.
3	It doesn't stop us from evaluating this. All it
4	simply does is require the Office of Planning to analyze the
5	cumulative effect. The cumulative effect is, in essence,
6	what we're all talking about now, traffic and parking.
7	What she is saying is that and this is not to
8	you, Ms. Johnson, this is more so to some of the questions
9	that was raised that was already analyzed in the traffic
LO	study that was evaluated by DDOT.
11	MS. JOHNSON: I just want to make sure that it's
12	not on the record that Capital City is a CDC, when it is not
13	classified as such.
L4	MEMBER SMITH: It isn't on the record as far as
15	within the record of somebody submitting it saying that it
16	is a CDC. The Office of Planning has not done that
L7	evaluation.
18	We can request as a Board for them to do that
L9	evaluation. But within the record, there is a letter from
20	the S&D officer that serves the S&D, that this property is
21	
22	MS. JOHNSON: My fellow colleague. All right, I
23	just wanted to make sure that the record was correct.
24	(Simultaneous speaking.)

MEMBER SMITH: It's in the record. We cannot

The record's correct in the sense that there's 1 a letter from your colleague that states that that's a CDC. 2 3 We can't change that. If we want the Office of 4 Planning to evaluate it, we can. And the Board can request 5 But it's not within her staff report. But that recommendation is not 6 MS. JOHNSON: 7 correct on the record from his fellow colleagues. But I 8 defer. 9 BZA CHAIR HILL: What I think you're asking, 10 Commissioner -- now, I'm even ask for clarity and I'm going to go to the Office of Planning -- Ms. 11 Brown-Roberts, 12 somewhere during this hearing, somebody said something about this now being a CDC, that other school. Right? 13 That they applied for it, or it was granted five days ago, or whatever 14 15 days ago. Do you know if that's in fact the case? 16 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: I don't. When I checked it, 17 which was before September, it was not. But I can check again and see if it that has occurred subsequently. 18 19 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, got it. 20 MS. JOHNSON: Ι will reiterate that that 2.1 information was never presented to me as the applicable 22 subsequent party, or the Commission, to state that there was 23 a CDC in that jurisdiction. Because there hadn't been any and there still isn't any, unless you consent to this. 24 25 BZA HILL: Commissioner, CHAIR we're

1	consenting one way or the other to whether there is or isn't
2	a CDC.
3	MS. JOHNSON: I'm just saying that
4	BZA CHAIR HILL: That's okay. I'm just saying,
5	like, we don't have that kind of authority anyway. So
6	MS. JOHNSON: I'm saying that the fact that there
7	was this CDC application from Cap City is news to me, as of,
8	like, yesterday.
9	BZA CHAIR HILL: That's fine. That's fine.
10	That's fine. Okay. Okay. So, no more questions for the
11	Office of Planning? Great. Mr. Young, is there anyone here
12	wishing to testify? Okay, who do we got?
13	MR. YOUNG: We have just one who is here, and
14	that's Michael Cohen.
15	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. Can you bring up
16	Mr. Cohen?
17	Mr. Cohen, can you hear me?
18	MR. COHEN: I am. Can you hear me?
19	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yeah, are you a commissioner?
20	MR. COHEN: I am. I am a commissioner.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Are you a commissioner in
22	the adjacent ANC?
23	MR. COHEN: No, this is my single-member district.
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: Oh. Are you testifying then as
25	a member of the public?

MR. COHEN: 1 Correct. 2 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. All right, Mr. 3 Cohen, you can go ahead and give us your name and address, 4 and then you'll have your three minutes to testify. 5 MR. COHEN: Great. My name is Michael Cohen, I live at 248 Quackenbos Street, NW, Washington, DC, 20011. 6 7 I'd like to note that I'm here as a public witness, as the 8 resolution that I put forward before ANC-4B was not adopted 9 by the Commission. 10 So, I'm not the commissioner of record for this case, even though this issue is in my single-member district. 11 12 So, therefore, essentially, I'm here on behalf of myself and the residents of 4B of seven, and not ANC-4B. 13 14 So, let me first admit I'm not a zoning expert. 15 I'm grateful that you all are. This project has gone on for 16 about nine months, during which time I've been acutely 17 involved, involving neighbors in meetings, newsletters, emails, conversations. I want to thank the neighbors, thank 18 the applicant as well. 19 2.0 Here's the bottom line the way that I see it. 2.1 There are two sides to this issue, right? Some folks tend 22 to support daycares in general, and then there's this issue 23 of this being a daycare project. 24 think that what I've found is the

Commission has supported daycares. No one on the Commission

wants to not support a daycare, right? No one's going to 1 vote against a daycare. 2 3 But the project itself has raised some significant red flags for me, specifically related to the size and 4 5 enrollment as it relates to this project. And that has been something that I raised with the applicant over time. 6 And 7 I think it's been very challenging. From my perspective, there is an objectionable 8 9 traffic condition that already exists due to Capital City 10 Public Charter School at the 100 block of Peabody. It exists on Peabody, it pushes into the 200 block of Peabody, it 11 12 exists on Second Street, it exists on Quackenbos, it exists I think that Ms. Anderson read a note from -- we 13 in alleys. have a school, Capital City Public Charter School. 14 And so, these are all issues that I raised with 15 The timeline's got a little wonky. 16 the Commission. ANC-4B 17 requested an extension, the applicant requested an extension. We kind of got down to the wire. I presented a resolution 18 19 Michael, I do have to defer. 2.0 MS. JOHNSON: 2.1 I'm not sure if that's even possible. 22 (Simultaneous speaking.) 2.3 BZA CHAIR HILL: Commissioner? Commissioner? 24 Commissioner? You're not allowed to interrupt him.

allowed to provide his testimony. You can ask questions

1	after he provides his testimony.
2	MS. JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you.
3	BZA CHAIR HILL: Go ahead, Mr. Cohen.
4	MR. COHEN: Yeah. So, I forgot where I was. But
5	essentially, the resolution I presented before the entire
6	Commission expressed great concern. It was generally
7	supportive of the idea of a daycare. The size and scope of
8	this, it expressed general concern.
9	The Commission as a whole did not want to
10	incorporate that concern. They wrote their own resolution,
11	which I abstained from voting on because, again, I'm not
12	going to vote against a daycare.
13	But this daycare project in particular, I felt had
14	the opportunity to create this cumulative traffic condition
15	where one already exists, and I couldn't not see it creating
16	that condition, with another one being in existence.
17	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Cohen.
18	Does the Board have any questions of the witness? No. Does
19	Mr. Jamison have any questions of the witness?
20	MR. JAMISON: I do not.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Commissioner, you had a
22	question of the witness.
23	MS. JOHNSON: Yes. I wanted to know, Michael,
24	what is the standard procedure for sending our executive
25	committee draft resolutions before our private meeting?

1	BZA CHAIR HILL: Commissioner? Commissioner? The
2	question is not about you just have to question his
3	testimony. It's not about how you guys do your work, or
4	whatever happened before. Like, did you have a question
5	about his testimony?
6	MS. JOHNSON: Yes, I do. And it's the same
7	question.
8	BZA CHAIR HILL: What's the question?
9	MS. JOHNSON: Michael?
10	BZA CHAIR HILL: Not Michael. What's the
11	question?
12	MS. JOHNSON: Commissioner Cohen, what is the
13	proper protocol for submitting documentation to our executive
14	committee for review ahead of the planning commission?
15	MR. COHEN: Ahead of the planning commission?
16	MS. JOHNSON: Ahead of the planning meeting.
17	MR. COHEN: So, there are times there are some
18	requirements where we're required to either present the
19	resolution at the planning meeting, or discuss the resolution
20	at the planning meeting.
21	When we were at the planning meeting, I explained
22	that there was a meeting that was going to be taking place
23	after the planning meeting, and that the resolution hadn't
24	been written yet. This is all
25	BZA CHAIR HILL: Let me interrupt you guys.

1	MR. COHEN: Yes.
2	BZA CHAIR HILL: Commissioner, I don't know how
3	you all's commission works. I am trying to just get through
4	my testimony. A member of the public gave some testimony.
5	Not as a commissioner, as a member of the public.
6	Do you have any questions for this member of the
7	public and his testimony?
8	MS. JOHNSON: I'm concerned that the protocol that
9	we have established for years is not being properly relayed
10	by Commissioner Cohen.
11	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I don't think that that's
12	what he was giving testimony to. But do you have another
13	question, Commissioner?
14	MS. JOHNSON: I do also have a question regarding
15	what steps have been taken to ameliorate the concerns
16	regarding some of the issues that we have experienced along
17	the Peabody corridor.
18	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Commissioner, I'm not
19	really sure who you're asking the question to. Like, a
20	member of the public has given testimony. And so, I think
21	you've asked your questions of that member of the public, and
22	now you seem to be giving testimony in some capacity, with
23	how
24	MS. JOHNSON: I am asking questions of what has
25	been done thus far, and who is the responsible party for

1	ameliorating those concerns.
2	BZA CHAIR HILL: Who are you asking the question
3	to?
4	MS. JOHNSON: I'm asking the question to Michael
5	Cohen, or I can ask it to the predecessor, Brandon Jamison.
6	BZA CHAIR HILL: We're currently in public
7	testimony. And so, I'm not really sure we went through
8	all the questions in terms of the presentation. And so, I'm
9	just trying to hear if you have any questions about the
10	testimony that Mr. Cohen just gave.
11	MS. JOHNSON: All right.
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right, so, I'm going
13	to go ahead and excuse the witness.
14	MR. COHEN: Thank you.
15	BZA CHAIR HILL: All right. Let me see, where are
16	we? Okay. So, we are now in rebuttal. So, Ms. Wilson, do
17	you have any I think the Board's going to have some
18	questions okay? at least I know I'm going to about
19	some of these conditions.
20	And do you have any rebuttal, Ms. Wilson?
21	MS. WILSON: To present some rebuttal points. And
22	then, also I do have a closing, and I'll reserve that for
23	myself.
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Okay.
25	(Simultaneous speaking.)

BZA CHAIR HILL: Give me a second. 1 Give me a second. 2 Give me a second. 3 MS. WHITE: Sure. 4 BZA CHAIR HILL: So, the way this works is, this 5 rebuttal testimony to all of the testimony that has happened before. The applicant is the applicant. 6 7 giving the application to the Board. Now, the applicant has an opportunity to refute 8 9 any of the stuff that was said about any of the testimony 10 they gave, which is now what Ms. White is about to do. 11 Then, all of the parties will have an opportunity 12 to ask questions only about the rebuttal. Not, again, about 13 giving testimony -- we're not starting at the beginning These are just questions that you might have on the 14 15 rebuttal. Ms. White, please give your rebuttal. 16 Thank you. Just wanted to reiterate MS. WHITE: 17 that the scope and methodology used for the transportation statement are consistent with industry standards and DDOT CTR 18 19 quidelines. 2.0 The calculations were approved by DDOT. 2.1 to clarify if the Board has any further questions about our 22 I don't want to get into all the details, given assumptions. 23 the time. the dismissal 24 reiterating that Capital City Public Charter School occurs about

minutes earlier than the peak time of departure for the 1 2 daycare. 3 During the morning drop-off for the daycare, the process is expected to last only four minutes. And we know 5 this from our Colorado Avenue surveys. projected 6 Thus, have from all of data we 7 collection, the following parking demand associated with 8 parent pickup/drop-off vehicles: During the morning peak hour, three vehicles. 9 10 During the time period when Capital City Public Charter School will dismiss, one vehicle. 11 During the pickup time, 12 around 5:00 to 5:30 p.m., the maximum cars parked would be eleven vehicles. 13 14 During the time when that maximum number of parked 15 vehicles -- eleven -- are parked, our survey of conditions 16 on Peabody between Second Place and Third Street indicate there would be 25 vacant spaces. 17 So, 25 vacant spaces for the eleven parent cars. 18 19 As we heard from Commissioner Johnson, there's 2.0 adequate parking in the area. Additionally, our 2.1 indicated 60-plus spaces west of Third Street. The idea is 22 these would be used for staff, and not necessarily parents. The spaces on Peabody from Second Place to Third Street are 23 24 expected to be most desirable for use by parents.

Thus, we have proposed an additional condition,

as I mentioned earlier, regarding staff parking, to help the 1 concern with parking. Staff will be restricted from parking 2 on Peabody between Second Place to Third Street and this 3 would clear up any concern about parking on Peabody. They 5 would be permitted to park west of Third Street. 6 There were comments about the alley. Just 7 reiterating that the handbook would restrict parents from using their vehicles to pick up and drop off students in the 8 9 alley. 10 Regarding bicycle parking, the short-term bicycle parking spaces were coordinated with DDOT in the location to 11 12 provide safe access for bicyclists. So, we would expect there could be use of the alley for bikes, but not for 13 pickup/drop-off by vehicles. And that concludes my rebuttal. 14 15 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, does the Board have any questions concerning the rebuttal of Ms. White? 16 17 MEMBER SMITH: I do have a question. I don't think I've seen as a professional planner, a lot of usage of 18 surveys from any particular site versus the ITE numbers. And 19 20 you're saying that the average time for pickup was based on 2.1 parent surveys at another site. What is the average number based off of 22 Because that seems to me that would be the most scientific 23 I'm sorry, Ms. White, you're on mute. 24 number to use.

Thank you.

MS.

WHITE:

25

Thank you for

that

So, to clarify, the trip generation was based on 1 instituted transportation engineers, trip generation rates 2 3 for lane use. 4 So, we did use that. We submitted that in the 5 transportation asked statement. We bу the June were community to look at Colorado Avenue. So, we pulled from 6 7 that the sign-in/sign-out sheets. We looked at that. 8 that aligned very well with the instituted trip generation 9 The institute of transportation engineer's -manual. 10 (Simultaneous speaking.) MEMBER SMITH: 11 Okay. Just quick question before 12 we -- so, that question came from the community, not from 13 DDOT. That is correct. DDOT concurs with 14 MS. WHITE: 15 our assessment. 16 MEMBER SMITH: Okay. 17 And the transportation statement, by MS. WHITE: the way, for September, was also based on ITE. We were just 18 providing this additional information to really show, because 19 2.0 ITE focuses on the peak one-hour. So, this other additional 2.1 information really shows us what happens from 2:00 p.m. on. 22 And so, we could see how that looks compared to Capital City Public Charter School. 23 24 There were questions about the mode split. think that's what you're asking about. And that was based

on parent surveys from the Colorado Avenue location. 1 that was coordinated with DDOT. We made adjustments to that. 2 3 And particularly, we made adjustments to staff 4 data and updated the trip generation based on tweaked mode 5 split for coordinating with DDOT. 6 MEMBER SMITH: And DDOT did not require you 7 explicitly to use the ITE data based on mode splits. They 8 allowed that adjustment. 9 ITE provides the trip MS. WHITE: Yes. So, So, the mode split is 10 generation, but not the mode split. more specific to, like, this urban setting, because daycare 11 rates in ITE is based on more suburban. 12 13 MEMBER SMITH: Okay. And DDOT doesn't have that something as a template. They pretty much rely on the data 14 15 that a private party may provide for them, in this particular 16 instance. 17 MS. WHITE: Yeah. 18 (Simultaneous speaking.) 19 As part of their own analysis. MEMBER SMITH: 2.0 MS. WHITE: Yeah. But it's definitely coordinated 2.1 and it's based on the specific location. So, in this case we even provided a table where we compared the Colorado 22 23 location transportation characteristics t.he 24 Peabody, so that we could validate and adjust the modes, but accordingly, when we coordinated with DDOT.

1	MEMBER SMITH: Okay.
2	MS. WHITE: The other, since you asked, the other
3	factor that had been questioned was the auto occupancy rate,
4	which is the 1.6, and DDOT CTR guidance that's based on
5	daycare. The auto occupancy for different uses, we used day
6	care, and that's based on national household transportation
7	survey data.
8	MEMBER SMITH: Okay, that's what I need to know.
9	Because I think you're exactly right. That's what was being
10	questioned as part of the testimony for this particular case.
11	So, I'm glad to hear that that was based on ITE data and
12	based on reliable data that DDOT accepts as part of their
13	review for this particular type of project. So, thank you.
14	BZA CHAIR HILL: Go ahead, Dr. Imamura.
15	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Chairman, I promise to be
16	brief. For Ms. White or Ms. Medrano. This may go back to
17	previous testimony, but there's a question here.
18	Is the current development center closing on
19	Colorado no. Okay. But you do have people that are on
20	a waiting list. Is that right? Is that what you said
21	earlier?
22	MS. MEDRANO: Yes.
23	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: And presumably, they may
24	actually end up at this location?
25	MS. MEDRANO: And some of the families that

applied and are on the waiting list live on that area, on that neighborhood.

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Okay. So, essentially, we're talking about, in terms of, like, the extrapolated data

we're talking about, in terms of, like, the extrapolated data that Ms. White took, is really from the same clientele that will be carried over. So, that's what I wanted to know. Thank you very much. That's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, thank you. Mr. Jamison, do you have any questions concerning the rebuttal testimony?

MR. JAMISON: Question for Ms. White about the assumption that it'll take parents and guardians four minutes to drop off infants and toddlers. So, children from ages zero to five.

It's a little bit hard to believe as a father with ha couple of children. So, I just wanted to flesh out exactly what that was based on, and whether any of these parents were utilizing the parking lot at the Colorado Avenue location, which obviously would not be present at the Peabody Street location.

MS. WHITE: So, yes, we did base it on the Colorado Avenue location. We based it on the arrival time and the departure time of each vehicle, for cars that were parked not only in the parking lot but also in the street. So, it was a mix of cars in the parking lot and on the street and how long it took.

2.0

2.1

1	We noted when a car arrived, and then when that
2	car departed, to get that dwell time.
3	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, Mr. Jamison, is that it?
4	MR. JAMISON: Give me one second. Mr. Toll, do
5	you see I know we have an additional question. I'm just
6	trying to locate
7	BZA CHAIR HILL: Sure, that's all right. And back
8	in the day, you all would have been in the same hearing room.
9	That's unbelievable. You would be sitting right next to each
10	other.
11	MR. JAMISON: Okay.
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: I mean, if you all could, like,
13	make it a succinct question. I mean, Ms. White just gave
14	very succinct rebuttal about how she came about her numbers.
15	Mr. Toll, do you have any questions about the rebuttal?
16	MR. TOLL: Yes. Ms. White, you mentioned in the
17	morning your projection was three vehicles would be at the
18	245 Peabody location. Is that what you said?
19	MS. WHITE: Yes.
20	MR. TOLL: And that's based on an assumption that
21	the distribution at Peabody would be the same as the
22	distribution at Colorado. Correct?
23	MS. WHITE: Yes.
24	MR. TOLL: And that's not taking into account any
25	of the differences between the locations. Correct?

1	MS. WHITE: That is assuming that they would have
2	similar arrival and departure patterns, correct.
3	MR. TOLL: Thank you.
4	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. Oh,
5	Commissioner Johnson, do you have any questions concerning
6	rebuttal?
7	MS. JOHNSON: I just had a question. Is the issue
8	and I guess this is for Mr. Toll, is the issue that
9	there's not a reliable, accessible transportation point?
10	Because that would be incumbent upon DDOT.
11	BZA CHAIR HILL: Commissioner, I apologize. This
12	is just questions concerning Ms. White's rebuttal.
13	MS. JOHNSON: Okay, my apologies.
14	BZA CHAIR HILL: That's all right. Okay. All
15	right. So, where we are is we've done everything we're
16	supposed to do, and now I think this is what I'd like to do.
17	Okay?
18	Like, it's been four and a half hours no, three
19	and a half hours. So, three and a half hours, and I think
20	we've heard from everybody. And I'm still a little unsure
21	as to what I think is helpful for me.
22	So, what I'd like to do, Ms. Wilson, is and I'm
23	looking at my fellow Board members and I don't really believe
24	I'm about to say this out loud but I might want a little
25	bit of a continued hearing okay?insofar as just to

understand the conditions. Okay? 1 2 Like, we've had everybody's testimony. We've gone through all of this. I'm kind of interested in hearing from 3 the Office of Planning also, whether in fact this other 5 school is now a CDC. Okay? And just knowing, right? And then, Ms. Brown-Roberts, are you there? 6 7 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Yes. 8 BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. I wish people called 9 me that around the house. That'd be so great. Mr. Chairman. 10 So, if you could please -- I just want to know what it is. Right? Okay? If it is in fact the CDC. 11 Right? 12 And if it is, if you could please go ahead and give us an evaluation based upon that now, it being a CDC. 13 Right? Now, in the regulations, it clearly says that even 14 it is a CDC, the Board of Zoning may find that 15 cumulative effect of these facilities would not have an 16 17 adverse impact on the neighborhood due to traffic noise and operations of similar factors. Which, to my colleague Mr. 18 Smith's point, is what we're already talking about. 19 20 So, I doubt that the Office of Planning's report 2.1 is going to be a whole lot different. But I will go ahead 22 and let the Office of Planning supplement that after finding 23 out whether this is or isn't a CDC. 24 it's CDC, then Ι don't need not а

Right?

supplemental report.

Then, Madam Secretary, I'd love

1	to have DDOT here. Okay? And so, we can go ahead and talk
2	to DDOT. Because the traffic stuff and Ms. White, by the
3	way, if you ever get recruited for an actual trial, you
4	should take it. Right? Like, you are a great witness.
5	Okay?
6	MS. WHITE: Thanks.
7	BZA CHAIR HILL: You are calm and you're able to,
8	like, answer the questions. Like, I would hate to be in a
9	trial against you. Right?
10	But DDOT I'm not the expert. Right? And so,
11	DDOT and Mr. Toll, you're doing a great job, by the way,
12	also. I don't know if you have traffic background or not,
13	but you must somewhere have traffic background in your
14	background, because I have no idea half the stuff you're
15	talking about either.
16	So, we're going to have DDOT here, okay? And
17	then, the conditions, the conditions are basically all we're
18	talking about, right? The adverse impact is really the
19	traffic. Okay?
20	You guys have to convince the Board and this
21	community that this is not going to be an adverse impact.
22	Right? Or an objectionable impact.
23	I'd like to point out that the regulations don't
24	say impact. There will be an impact. It's whether or not
25	this is objectionable. Okay? And objectionable,

unfortunately, is decided by the Board. Right? 1 2 So, I would love to delve a little bit more into 3 the conditions that you guys put forward. Okay? And I don't think I have the capacity to do it right now after three 5 And so, I think I would like to have a hours. Okay? continued hearing just on the conditions, and just to hear 6 7 from DDOT, and just to hear whether or not this is a CDC. 8 And if it is a CDC, Ms. Brown-Roberts, or Madam 9 somebody could ask DDOT whether we need any 10 supplemental information from them. Okay? 11 So, that's all that. Okay? Commissioner, are you 12 trying to raise your hand? MS. JOHNSON: Please. What is it in the statute 13 that is concerning you regarding Capital City not being a 14 15 CDC? I don't know if it is or isn't 16 BZA CHAIR HILL: 17 If it is a CDC, then it's within the thousand feet, so it's triggering more of a look-see. And somebody said in 18 here that it was a CDC. 19 2.0 Somebody said it's a CDC after like the Office of 2.1 Planning took a look. But either way, it doesn't matter. 22 If it isn't a CDC, it isn't a CDC. And I'll let you raise your hand. 23 24 MS. JOHNSON: I'm trying to understand what, within the confines of the statute, is up for interpretation,

1	so that I can bring that back to my constituents, and my
2	commissioner.
3	BZA CHAIR HILL: That's fine. I'm trying to
4	answer your question. And I see your hand, Ms. Encinas. I
5	see your hand. Commissioner, I'm referring to U-203.1(b)(4).
6	Right? Which says, more than one facility within a thousand
7	feet can still be approved by the Board, if we find that the
8	cumulative effect is not an adverse condition.
9	And so, I don't know if there is somebody made
LO	some statement somewhere along these three hours, that this
11	thing now is a CDC. Or they applied. I heard it somewhere.
L2	And so, I just want the Office of Planning to tell
L3	me whether or not that's the case. And if it is the case,
L4	they'll take a look at H4 and tell me whether or not that
15	changes anything. Right?
16	And what I'm saying is, I doubt it does. So, Ms.
L7	Encinas, you had your hand up?
L8	MS. CRISTINA ENCINAS: I think I mean, does the
L9	because I have worked in both charter schools and early
20	childhood centers there are two different and I think
21	that's what you're saying, CDC, they are a child development
22	center?
23	BZA CHAIR HILL: I don't know if they are or not.
24	MS. CRISTINA ENCINAS: No, a charter school, it's
25	a different

BZA CHAIR HILL: No, I know what a charter school 1 2 I thought somewhere -- it doesn't matter. is. 3 MS. CRISTINA ENCINAS: Okay. 4 BZA CHAIR HILL: I thought somewhere they applied 5 to be a CDC, is where the testimony was somewhere. (Simultaneous speaking.) 6 7 MS. JOHNSON: That was documentation that was there's confusion 8 submitted. But as what that to 9 documentation actually means. 10 (Simultaneous speaking.) BZA CHAIR HILL: Commissioner? Commissioner? 11 It doesn't matter. 12 Commissioner? Commissioner? I'm asking the Office of Planning now whether it is or it isn't. The 13 Office of Planning will tell us. 14 15 So, regardless, we're all going to come back here So, I'm looking at my Board members now. 16 again. Okay? So, 17 the conditions that the applicant is proposing, I kind of want to go over them a little bit more in detail at a 18 So we can understand 19 continued hearing, with DDOT. Okay? 20 this is or isn't going to create an objectionable 2.1 condition. 22 And so, I'm looking at my fellow Board members. Because I don't have an answer. I don't have a clear 23 24 answer right now. And I don't know if me going to get to

this record next week or something,

is going

provide any clarity on me, because I would want to know more about the conditions.

So, then I guess the only other thing I would mention, that I know we had thought about or somebody talked about, was that there had been before in the past, Ms. Wilson, for other similar types of institutions that the Board has approved.

Some of the conditions have been, like, somebody's out there at pickup and drop-off times. Right? Okay? That's a condition, right? And I got a thumbs-up, right? So, there's somebody there to mitigate any kind of problem, and that's a required condition. Right?

Now, the other one that I hate to say is, there might be a time limit to this. Okay? As to whether or not -- and you can argue for or against when we come back -- and the time limit that I would think would be more like a ten-year time limit, because there is financial things connected with the time limit. Right? You can't make an investment and make your money in five years.

So, I don't know, I'm just throwing this stuff out for the rest of my fellow Board members, okay? We're trying to figure out any kind of mitigating conditions. And if there is, any objectionable conditions.

So, I don't think we need anything further in terms of a conclusion, until we come back for the

2.1

supplemental.

2.1

2.3

Now, these are my thoughts. And I'm looking to my fellow Board members, do you all think this sounds logical? Mr. Smith.

MEMBER SMITH: Logical to me. I'll be honest with you, I am concerned about tying this down a little bit more regarding the parking and pickup and drop-off. It's a little too open-ended for me, especially given there is or will be a CDC, but it's at least at school. There's a lot of pickup and drop-off in association with this school.

So, there may be broad parking concerns. I'm not disputing the numbers that Ms. White provided. But what I am concerned about is tying down that pick-up and drop-off a little bit more. So, I agree with Chairman Hill.

Ms. Wilson, you have done great work with a lot of CDCs in the District over many years. So, take a look at some of those conditions that may have been applied, and see if we can apply some additional conditions. Think a little bit outside the box for a minute, given the size and scale of this particular CDC.

I would also open this up, take a look at parking again. I know you provided five parking spaces. But maybe there's an opportunity to provide more, provide some additional parking around the corner from the side that you're proposing.

(Simultaneous speaking.) 1 2 They're already provided. MS. WILSON: 3 Ms. Johnson, you may want to mute MEMBER SMITH: 4 yourself. 5 There may, even to some of your playground space, where you may can maneuver that to the size, and it sounded 6 7 like you may do some offsite playground arrangements as it is now. 8 9 Take a look at that and provide some additional 10 analysis when we return on -- if you can provide more or not 11 provide more. Maybe you can convert some of that parking maybe you're providing, into compact parking spaces. 13 I saw two. 14 Maybe playing around with it, you can get some 15 additional yield in some way, shape, form. And I think 16 that's all that I ask. And I agree with Chairman Hill, we 17 probably want to have DDOT here at the next hearing. that's where I'm at. 18 19 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, thanks. Dr. Imamura, do 20 you have any further clarity that you'd like to see from the 2.1 applicant? 22 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Mr. Chairman, no further 23 clarity that I'm looking for. I want to applaud Board Member 24 Smith in search for design solution that gets us a little

closer to what everybody's looking for.

1	And Chairman Hill, I have not been successful in
2	asking my family to call me Commissioner. But anyway, that's
3	a work-in-progress. But that's all I have and I'm amenable
4	to looking at the conditions a little more closely.
5	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. So, I think that what has
6	been stated before is that no one's opposed to childcare.
7	No one's opposed to daycare. The concern is the possible
8	objectionable results of traffic and this particular
9	institution here. Right?
10	What the Board is charged with is trying to
11	mitigate those factors, if there are any. So, Ms. Wilson,
12	again, I'd like to dive down into the conditions the next
13	time we're here.
14	Because just to let everybody else know, the
15	applicant doesn't suggest conditions, and then we determine
16	whether although it somehow happens that way the
17	Board's the one that actually sticks conditions on the
18	application.
19	Like, if the Board said, we want somebody out
20	there X hours and X hours, then the applicant has to do it
21	or they don't get approved.
22	So, we're trying to figure out what may or may not
23	work, and what may make the Board comfortable one way or the
24	other.
25	So, Ms. Brown-Roberts, just so I can still

investigate in my head, so if this is or isn't a CDC, I just want to know, and if it does or not trigger the thousand-feet thing. Okay? And if it does trigger the thousand-feet thing, then give us a little bit of a supplemental report on that. Okay?

MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: That's correct. Okay, Mr. Chairman.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. And then, Madam Secretary, if you could work with the Office of Planning, and if that thousand feet does get triggered, if you can just find out from DDOT if it changes anything with DDOT. Okay? I don't even know who talks to who or how it works. But just, okay?

And then, I guess, Ms. Wilson, if you want to try to submit anything after you've listened to all this, concerning also the Board -- what's it called -- tightening up the conditions, or doing whatever you think -- I think we're going to talk about it regardless the next time around, right?

But if you can get to a point where you think the Board might be more comfortable with it, great. And I am kind of a little curious about whatever the bike rack thing was talked about in the alley, and the door over on the alley. I'm just kind of curious as to whatever that meant, when we come back, unless you have an answer now.

2.0

2.1

1	Ms. Wilson? Did I lose Ms. Wilson? Ms. Wilson,
2	can you hear me? I think you should go to turning your
3	camera off, perhaps. Ms. Wilson, you're muted. And you
4	should probably turn your camera off. Can you hear us?
5	MS. WILSON: I can hear you. My computer is so
6	slow.
7	BZA CHAIR HILL: No, that's okay. Did you hear
8	everything that we said?
9	MS. WILSON: Yes. And we're taking notes and we
10	can go back through the record and we'll tighten up the
11	conditions and submit something by the date you offer.
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: And then, if you can also just
13	clarify with me how that alley is supposed to be used, as
14	well as there was a bike rack that was brought up and a door
15	on that side. And just how that alley may or may not be
16	used, or something.
17	MS. WILSON: Yep. Absolutely.
18	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. All right. Okay,
19	now let's look at the calendar. So, Madam Secretary, how
20	would this all play out?
21	MS. MEHLERT: I mean, I guess how long do we think
22	we like, OP and the applicant need to review these
23	items? You could put this on November 13th as a continued
24	hearing. There are five cases scheduled for that day.
25	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. So, let's work backwards

1	from November 13th then.
2	MS. MEHLERT: So, the applicant could submit by
3	November 30
4	BZA CHAIR HILL: You mean October 30th.
5	MS. MEHLERT: October 30th, and then the parties,
6	including ANC, parties-in-opposition, and then OP
7	supplemental, by November 6th.
8	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. And then, we can ask DDOT
9	to come on the 13th.
10	MS. MEHLERT: Yes.
11	BZA CHAIR HILL: And I can't remember, is that
12	where we put Commissioner Miller's stuff earlier? No.
13	MS. MEHLERT: No. That is actually, Dr. Imamura
14	is scheduled for the 13th.
15	BZA CHAIR HILL: Oh, great. Perfect. All right,
16	then let's try if we can, we'll try to do this first.
17	Okay? First thing in the day. So, everybody knows where
18	you're going to be. And then, you can finish and move on
19	with your day. Let's see. Yeah, that's it.
20	MS. JOHNSON: Will documentation be provided to
21	all ANC commissioners for 4B?
22	BZA CHAIR HILL: Madam Secretary, I guess you're
23	saying that it's submitted into the record which day again?
24	The 30th. October 30th the party will submit. And I believe
25	the party then has to submit to all the other parties.

1	Correct?
2	MS. MEHLERT: Correct. Anything needs to be
3	served to all the parties. That includes the ANC.
4	BZA CHAIR HILL: Commissioner, you'll get it on
5	the
6	MS. JOHNSON: I just want to make sure that all
7	parties in the Commission are going to receive that
8	documentation. Or am I incumbent to submit that to them?
9	BZA CHAIR HILL: This I don't know. Madam
10	Secretary, do you know where it goes to?
11	MS. MEHLERT: The requirement is that parties
12	serve the ANC, and that means serving the full ANC. So,
13	typically, we recommend sending to the ANC's general mail
14	address. I think most applicants as a courtesy also serve
15	sometimes the chair and the SMD that the subject property's
16	located in.
17	MS. JOHNSON: Okay.
18	(Simultaneous speaking.)
19	MS. JOHNSON: So, I should receive that
20	documentation by October 30th.
21	MS. MEHLERT: Correct.
22	MS. JOHNSON: Okay, perfect. Thank you.
23	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay.
24	MR. TOLL: Chair Hill, will the parties be able
25	to ask questions of DDOT at the next hearing?

1 Yeah, I hate BZA CHAIR HILL: to say Everybody gets asked questions of everybody else about the 2 supplemental portion. We're not going back about anything, 3 All we're going to talk about is what's going to be 5 presented next. And then, whatever happens with DDOT. 6 And then, what happens is, the Board probably 7 still will decide that day. The Board will then go back and 8 look at all of the testimony. Right? We'll go back and look 9 at this record, as well as whatever happens supplemental, and 10 then the Board will come back with a decision. Sorry to interrupt. Will the parties 11 MR. TOLL: 12 chance to submit proposed findings of conclusions of law? 13 14 BZA CHAIR HILL: I don't think so. Unless the 15 Board asks for it. But I don't know if the Board's going to ask for it. 16 What usually happens now is, like, they go ahead 17 and, you guys will get -- so, the 30th we'll get more 18 conditions, or whatever, right? We'll get something from the 19 20 applicant. 2.1 Then, on the 6th everybody else will get to tell the Board what they think of those submissions. 22 And then, 2.3 the Office of Planning is also going а 24 supplemental, if necessary, on the 6th.

And I guess we'll get something from DDOT maybe

1	on the 6th also, Madam Secretary?
2	MS. MEHLERT: We can ask. We can include them in
3	terms of submitting a supplemental report as well.
4	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. And then, you all
5	are going to be able to come back for the supplemental
6	hearing, and you can ask questions about anything that was
7	submitted.
8	And we're going to do this again but on the
9	supplemental information.
LO	MS. JOHNSON: Do the supplemental documents allow
11	supplemental specs that he's proffering?
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yeah. So, I think I'm answering
L3	your question, but I'm sorry if I'm not.
L4	On the 30th the applicant's going to submit the
15	information. Then, you all will have a week to respond to
16	that information.
L7	MS. JOHNSON: Understood. Thank you.
18	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Toll, is that helpful?
L9	MR. TOLL: Yes. Just to note that we would very
20	much appreciate the opportunity to do so, submit findings of
21	fact and conclusions of law.
22	But we understand that that's at the Board's
23	discretion.
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Yeah, and actually, I know
25	that the Office of Planning's legal department is listening

1	You all can help me with that the next time, because I know
2	that we've asked for it before, but rarely. And so, you can
3	just clarify that with me.
4	Okay. All right. So then, we are done, unless
5	I see my fellow Board members raising their hands. Okay.
6	All right everybody, we'll see you again then on November
7	13th. And Ms. Wilson, I do have one quick question from you.
8	Like, I am aware of how financing works and how
9	projects work. And this is now going to kick your client
10	back another month until the 13th, to at least find out
11	what's going on. How is that going to affect your client?
12	MS. WILSON: I mean, I don't know where to start
13	with that one. Because we're also probably looking at a full
14	order. So, I'm not sure.
15	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yeah, I can't do anything about
16	that.
17	MS. WILSON: Yeah yeah, I'll have to defer to
18	Marilyn and Christina, how does that month impact you.
19	BZA CHAIR HILL: Anyway, it's okay, Ms. Wilson.
20	I was just curious about financing and stuff. But I can't
21	do anything about it anyway.
22	MS. WILSON: Mm-hmm. Yeah.
23	BZA CHAIR HILL: All right. So, we'll see you
24	guys on the 13th. Okay?
25	(Chorus of thank you.)

1	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, thank you. Thank you all.
2	MS. JOHNSON: Thank you. Have a good evening.
3	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you, you too. So, just to
4	be clear, just to be clear, I am closing the hearing, except
5	for those supplemental items that the Board has requested.
6	Okay, thank you. Bye-bye.
7	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
8	record at 4:47 p.m.)
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

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

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Public Hearing

Before: DC BZA

Date: 10-02-24

Place: teleconference

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

Court Reporter

mae 1 ans 8