## GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY

MAY 14, 2025

+ + + + +

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

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT MEMBERS PRESENT:

FREDERICK L. HILL, Chairperson CARL H. BLAKE, Vice Chairperson CHRISHAUN SMITH, Commissioner JOSEPH IMAMURA, Zoning Commission Commissioner TAMMY STIDHAM, Zoning Commission Commissioner

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT STAFF PRESENT:

KEARA MEHLERT, Secretary PAUL YOUNG, A/V Operations

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Regular Public Hearing held on May 14, 2025.

## TABLEOFCONTENTS

Case No. 20184-B
Application of Fort Lincoln-Eastern Avenue, LLC 7
Case No. 21240 Application of 71 Florida Ave 39, LLC
Case No. 21249 Application of 4231 Clay ST NE, LLC
Case No. 21279 Application of ARP Morse, LLC
Case No. 21281 Application of Matthew Littleton and Christine Rocchio
Case No. 21289 Application of Saam Jahanbeen
Case No. 21151 Application of Dinesh Tandon and Nidhi Tandon 58

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

2 (9:30 a.m.)

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. The Board of Zoning Adjustment's 5/14/2025 hearing will please come to order. My name is Fred Hill, Chairman of the District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment. Joining me today are Board members Chrishaun Smith, Vice Chair Carl Blake, Zoning Commissioner Tammy Stidham and I believe Dr. Imamura.

Today's meeting and hearing agenda are available on the Office of Zoning's website. Please be advised that this proceeding is being recorded by a court reporter and is also webcast live via Webex and YouTube Live. The video of the webcast will be available on the Office of Zoning's website after today's hearing. Accordingly, everyone who is listening on Webex or by telephone will be muted during the hearing. Also please be advised that we do not take any public testimony at our decision meeting sessions.

If you're experiencing difficulty accessing Webex or with your telephone call-in, then please call our OZ hotline number at 202-727-5471 to receive Webex login or call-in instructions. 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.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In today's hearing session everyone who is listening on Webex or by telephone will be muted during the hearing and only persons who have signed up to participate or testify will be unmuted at the appropriate time. Please state your name and address before providing oral home testimony or your presentation. Oral presentations 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.

All persons planning to testify either in favor or in opposition should have signed up in advance. They'll be called by name to testify. If this is an appeal, only parties are allowed to testify. By signing up to testify all participants will have completed the oath or affirmation as required by Y-408.7. Requests to enter evidence at the time of an online virtual hearing such as written testimony, additional supporting documents other than live video which may not be presented as part of the 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 providing the exhibit into the record

including an explanation of why the requester did not file the exhibit prior to the hearing and 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 in Y-409.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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 expected, then parties will be allowed a reasonable time to respond as determined by the Board. The Board will then make its decision at its next meeting session, but no earlier than 48 hours after the hearing. Moreover, the Board may request additional specific information to complete the record. The Board and the staff will specify at the end of the hearing exactly what is expected and the date the person must submit the evidence to the Office of Zoning. No other information shall be accepted by the Board.

Finally, the District of Columbia Administrative Procedures Act requires that a public hearing on each case be held in the open before the public. However, pursuant to 405(b) and 406 of that Act the Board may, consistent with its rules and procedures and the Act, enter into a closed meeting on a case for purposes of seeking legal counsel on a case pursuant to the

D.C. Official Code Section 2-575(b)(4) and/or deliberate on a case pursuant to D.C. Official Code Section 2-575(b)(13) but only after filing the necessary notice in the case of an emergency closed meeting after taking a roll call vote.

2.

Madam Secretary, do we have any preliminary matters?

MS. MEHLERT: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board.

Regarding the schedule today Application No. 21291 of HDR Holdings, LLC has been administratively rescheduled and renoticed to June 11th, 2025. Application No. 21288 of Shilja Nair and Vijayalakshmi Vellayan has been postponed to June 25th, 2025 and Application No. 21080 of Aulona Alia has been postponed to July 2nd, 2025.

Regarding late filings the Chairman has reviewed and granted waivers to all late filings into the applicable case record pursuant to Subtitle Y, Section 206.7 and Section 103.13. Any other late filings during the course of today's live hearing should be presented before the Board by the Applicant, parties or witnesses after the case is called. Any other preliminary matters will be noted when the case is called.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thank you.

Good morning, everybody. I hope everyone is doing well today. Let's see.

Madam Secretary, can you call our first item of business.

MS. MEHLERT: The first in the Board's meeting session is Application No. 20184-B of Fort Lincoln-Eastern Avenue, LLC. This is the request by ANC 5C pursuant to Subtitle Y, Section 700.2 for reconsideration of an order issued on April 1st, 2025 that approved a one-year time extension to April 20th, 2026.

This is regarding a new residential development of 51 townhouse dwellings in a theoretical lot subdivision located in Square 4325, Lots 44, 802 and Parcel 174/15 to a property bounded by Eastern Avenue, Bladensburg Road and Fort Lincoln Drive, Northeast. As a preliminary matter, there is a request also by ANC 5C to extend the filing deadline in Exhibit 15.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thanks you all.

So I'm sure we've all had a chance to review everything and also all of the information that we received from the Office of Zoning's Legal Department. Before we get to the motion to extend the deadline, I guess, I think that, first I don't even know if this actually before us properly. Like, so this is for a motion to waive, I'm sorry, a motion for reconsideration of a extension and under Y-700.2 it says, so Y-700.2, reconsiderations of final orders, rehearing after final order. The party may file a motion for reconsideration of a rehearing of any decision of the Board granting or denying an application or appeal.

So this isn't anything granting or denying an application of appeal. This is just simply a time extension which is really kind of an administrative decision. We're not

actually going back to review the case which the Board decided upon, it's just whether or not we feel that they met the criteria for us to grant the time extension and at the time, the Board reviewed the application and agreed that they met the criteria for us to grant them a time extension. We weren't going back and rehearing the case or rehearing any of the issues of the case.

2.

So I think that this actually should be dismissed because it's not really before us, and as far as the extending the deadline, I suppose if I thought that this was something that would be properly before us then I would have been in favor of probably extending the deadline because there really wasn't, you know, that much difference in terms of whether or not it would prejudice the parties.

In terms of, again, Y-700.2, we could issue a waiver but I don't think that there's a good cause for a waiver for Y-700.2 in terms of reconsidering this decision by the Board before a time extension because, again, I don't think that it is a decision that we would be properly reviewing because it's not something we're supposed to be looking at in terms of the time extension and in addition to that, I think that it would prejudice the Applicant because this is something that goes live and effective when we issue the decision as opposed to a order where, I'm sorry, as opposed to an application where the Applicant has to wait for the order to be issued in order to move forward.

I will also say that in terms of the argument itself, just for the benefit of the ANC, that I think that the proposed development and the additional retail store fronts at those shops there at Dakota Crossing, I also don't think it constituted a substantial change of material facts that would undermine the Board's justification for approving the original application.

So even if we got this all the way through, I don't think that I would have been in favor of a reconsideration, or I'm sorry, would have been in favor of denying the time extension. But I think that, again, this is improperly before us so it should be dismissed.

I'm going to go around the table and hear if anybody has anything to add. May I start with you, Vice Chair Blake?

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Sure. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I, just for (indiscernible), I did not participate in the decision for the time extension but I have reviewed the complete record and I'm prepared to participate and vote in the post-hearing motion. There are a number of issues here which I think you have very well addressed and I agree with you that pursuant to Y-700.2 this is not appropriately before us. It is, this is more of a procedural motion and not a substantive application and therefore I do not believe that this applies for, that we should allow for the reconsideration.

So I also agree with the other points you made and I will be in support of your decision to deny the motion.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Smith?
2	COMMISSIONER SMITH: I have nothing to add. I agree
3	with the sentiments of you and the Vice Chair, and will vote to
4	deny the reconsideration.
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Commissioner Stidham? And just for
6	the record, again, I'm speaking that we should dismiss this.
7	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Sorry. Dismiss it. Sorry.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure. No problem.
9	Commissioner Stidham?
10	ZC COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: I have nothing to add to what
11	has already been said and I am also supportive of your decision
12	to dismiss.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
14	I'm going to make a motion to dismiss the motion for
15	reconsideration and request, oh, sorry. I'm going to make a
16	motion to dismiss the motion for reconsideration on Application
17	No. 20184-B concerning the time extension as I do not believe
18	this is before us properly as per Y-700.2 and ask for a second.
19	Mr. Blake?
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Second.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: The motion is made and seconded.
22	Madam Secretary, can you take a roll call, please.
23	MS. MEHLERT: Please respond to the Chair's motion to
24	dismiss the motion for reconsideration.
25	Chairman Hill?

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
2	MS. MEHLERT: Vice Chair Blake?
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Yes.
4	MS. MEHLERT: Mr. Smith?
5	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Yes.
6	MS. MEHLERT: Commissioner Stidham?
7	ZC COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.
8	MS. MEHLERT: Staff would record the vote as four to
9	zero to one to dismiss the Motion for Reconsideration in
10	Application No. 20184-B on the motion made by Chairman Hill and
11	seconded by Vice Chair Blake.
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you.
13	And I'm going to, again, appreciate, I appreciate the
14	efforts of the Office of Zoning's Legal Department in helping
15	with that analysis. Let's see.
16	So what I'd like to propose you guys is I had some
17	questions about some of the cases today and so what I'd like to
18	do is do an emergency closed meeting so we can discuss with Legal
19	some of the cases that are before, the cases that are before us
20	today and if anybody has any questions about those cases.
21	So as Chairperson for the Board of Zoning Adjustment
22	for the District of Columbia and in accordance with Section 406
23	of the District of Columbia Administrative Procedures Act, I move
24	that the Board of Zoning Adjustment hold a closed emergency
25	meeting on 5/14/2025 for the purposes of seeking legal counsel

1	on cases that are scheduled for 5/14/2025, deliberate upon but
2	not vote upon cases scheduled for 5/14/2025.
3	Is there a second? Mr. Blake?
4	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Second.
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Madam Secretary, take a roll call,
6	please.
7	MS. MEHLERT: Please respond to the Chair's motion to
8	hold an emergency closed meeting with OZ legal counsel.
9	Chairman Hill?
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
11	MS. MEHLERT: Vice Chair Blake?
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Yes.
13	MS. MEHLERT: Mr. Smith?
14	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Yes.
15	MS. MEHLERT: Commissioner Stidham?
16	ZC COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.
17	MS. MEHLERT: Staff would record the vote as four to
18	zero to one. The motion passes.
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.
20	Mr. Young, if you could please send an invitation to
21	all parties and, you know, all members and I will see you guys
22	at the other meeting.
23	For the public, we're going to go have a discussion
24	with the Office of Zoning's Legal Department and we'll be back
25	as quickly as we can.

1 Thank you. 2 (Whereupon, there was a recess for an emergency closed meeting with legal counsel.) 3 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Madam Secretary, if you can call us 4 back and then call our next order of business. 5 6 MS. MEHLERT: The Board is back from its emergency 7 closed meeting with legal counsel and is returning to its meeting session. 8 9 The next case is Application No. 21240 of 71 Florida Ave 39, LLC. 10 This is a self-certified application pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 901.2 for a special exception under Subtitle 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It's located in the R-2 zone at 4237 Eads Street, Northeast, Square 5089, Lot 72. This hearing began on March 26th and was continued on April 23rd. On April 30th the Board rescheduled decision and requested additional information. And participating are Chairman Hill, Vice Chair Blake, Mr. Smith and Commissioner Stidham.

U, Section 203.1(J) to allow healthcare facilities. This is for

a new 16 bed healthcare facility in an existing detached building.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thanks.

We've lost Commissioner Stidham for this discussion but I don't think we're going to decide today so what I've asked Commissioner Stidham to do is go ahead and watch this and when we actually come back for a decision, she'll be available for that.

So this is really kind of an opportunity for the Board to talk about this decision and see I think if there's any further clarification we might want from the Applicant. We did get some possible suggested conditions from the Applicant that seemed to try to address some of the Board's concerns on what we're supposed to be looking at for this case.

So I'd like to go over a couple of things real quick which is, again, this is a healthcare facility, right? This isn't an assisted living facility. This is an application for a healthcare facility. So that matters because there's a definition in zoning what the healthcare facility is. So that's something I just want to get out there.

The other is going through this list of conditions and seeing what things may or may not, again, the Board might want some specificity on as it comes to the things that we're supposed to be looking at which is, again, trash, traffic, you know, how this might affect the immediate community in terms of if this special exception were to be granted. Yeah. I was going to say something else but now I forgot. All right.

So, the first proposed issue that was put forward was the facility shall be a licensed assisted living facility with a maximum of 16 beds. I mean, so right off the bat I think, you know, the facility shall be, it's not something that's going to be licensed by us, it's going to be licensed somewhere else. But the facility shall be a healthcare facility with some kind of a

maximum that we're going to agree on. Is that correct? Would everybody agree with that? Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So to the Applicant, again, and this is maybe something even the Office of Zoning's Legal Department can help me with, that first condition would be the facility shall be a healthcare facility with a maximum capacity of X which we're going to get to, actually I'm sorry, you can say with a maximum capacity of 16 because what is before us, again, is an application for 16 beds. So it's not something that we are going to change the application -- change the Applicant's application. However, if through this discussion we think that a different number of beds might be something that would be amenable to the Board, the can determine whether or Applicant not to change application or just stick with the 16. So that's another thing that I wanted to throw out.

So that's that first condition and since I have the mike and I'm going to go around, everybody can also talk, I don't know where I am on this. Right? I really don't know. I mean, we're looking between eight, we're increasing from eight to sixteen. They can do eight by matter-of-right, right? And so they can do eight by matter-of-right. They're here for the additional eight. If it was an additional two, I mean it can go up to some number that's 300 or something. I don't know what the number is but, you know, it would have to be capped whatever it was. But I say that because I just don't know where I am.

So there shall be no, I'm sorry, there shall be no minimum age requirements for the guests, for the residents. We can't do that. That's not part of what, you know, the healthcare facility is what the healthcare facility is. So that's not even a condition that we could do. However, if the Board thinks that there is something that we, the Board, was trying to mitigate by a age requirement, we can go ahead and do that.

The service provider consistency. The facility shall have the same service provider as those used at 4237 Eads Street which is another facility that is up before us today and I think that other facility is going to have the same situation as this facility and that's why I know that the Commissioner is listening who's on the next one, and we aren't going to be able to do that because what if one facility sells and the other facility remains the same way.

Like, that doesn't address whatever our issues are, right? We have to figure out whatever our issues are and if that means foods delivering some way or housekeeping's delivering some way or the medical care is coordinated in some way, like, if there are hours or something, that's something we, the Board, have to figure out.

The next condition. Medical emergency protocol. The facility shall maintain a documented urgent care protocol along with state guidelines including triaging by on-site. You know, that's, again, getting into the minutia of how this is being

operated and it's not something that would address any of the issues that the Board has to look at in terms of the criteria.

2.

Visitor management. This is something that we could try to figure out, how to mitigate the time of people that are coming in and out either as guests or visitors and so I think that's something we can kind of talk to and I'll, again, after I go through this list I'll let everybody have their discussion and then they can kind of share what their concerns are with the Applicant and figure how we may or may not be able to come to conditions that make us comfortable.

No. 7 and 8. Noise and quiet hours. I guess we're, again, trying to talk about activity that might be disturbing to the community and the immediate neighbors and that would also include this outdoor space use. So trying to figure out how to come up with something that addresses a concern about noise, right?

Parking and transportation. And this is for the Applicant, again. There's, like, four spots. It's unclear as to, you know, who gets the spots. How many for staff? How many for visitors? What's the allocation? Where they are actually are? We need to actually see them on the plat to actually know where they are and then the screening, I didn't really understand. I guess that is trying to alleviate some of the concerns of some of the neighbors but, like, what's the screening, where's the screening? Is it landscaping, is it a fence? And so that's more

particulars that the Applicant can kind of speak to.

2.

The services. In terms of housekeeping, meal services and trash. These are things that, again, we need to kind of have beefed up. Like, when is it going to be picked up, you know, and how many, you know, how often is it going to be picked up? The hours it seems from six to ten seems a little bit unreasonable, meaning I don't think that they're going to get everything done by 10 a.m. every day, right? And so that seems as though that's something that would be not really doable and so I think that's something that we have to kind of talk through.

The time limit. I know that just from the discussions that we've had with OZLD that the Board is going to require some kind of a time limit and whether that ends up being five years, seven years, you know, ten years, you know, I don't know. But it seems as though, and this is now again for the Applicant that it seems like, you know, it's going to be around seven years perhaps if we start talking through this or something there'll be some kind of time limit. So if that has anything to do with the decision to move forward in this way, that's another thing that the Applicant can think about.

So I think I kind of touched on all of the issues and then just the last thing I would mention is that this is requiring a lot of work by the Board and so I say that also to the community which is that, you know, we happen to go through cases that are pretty simple maybe quickly, or it appears quickly, because we've

done our due diligence, we've read through the case files, and we're able to process things that are easily processed. This is not one of them, and that's why the Board is continuing to take a lot of time mentioning to the ANCs that sent all that transcripts which is very helpful, you know, 88 pages of transcript but it did show what had happened at those different ANC meetings and, again, brought up whether or not, you know, the outreach, whether the outreach was successful or not kind of was something that those transcripts spoke to.

2.

So that's where I kind of am with everything and I'll turn to my Board members also to help me clarify how to direct the Applicant. Oh, I'm sorry. The last thing was that we will come back here on June 11th for all of -- I don't know what cases we have with this particular Applicant moving forward, but, oh, no, sorry, it's June 4th, June 4th. We'll come back on June 4th because there's a holiday. There's another thing that's going on next week and then we're going to have to really spend a lot of time as a Board with whatever possible conditions are being presented next, whether or not it alleviates the concerns of the Board.

So that's all I've got to say and I'll turn it over to Mr. Smith, if I might.

COMMISSIONER SMITH: Chairman Hill, you touched on I think most of the major concerns that I had about the list of conditions and I, you know, completely agree with your statements

on all of them.

2.

On the question about where I am. Yeah, I am, was uncomfortable with the special exception in the other one because there is, I'm sensitive to the neighborhood's concerns. We've had several group home type facilities come up with special exceptions within this broader area of the city. So I am sensitive to some of those concerns that were raised about the amount of density.

But, you know, just as you stated within most residential zones these types of uses are allowed as a matter-of-right up to eight people. So it's presumed to be sort of residential in nature. This request for a special exception does allow us to mitigate the impacts of this type of use. Also I just want to put that out to the neighborhood that, yes, they are requesting a special exception but with the special exception it gives you reasonable control over certain types of impacts that you will see anyway if it's a matter-of-right.

You'll still see traffic if it's eight. You'll still see, you'll have noise concerns if it's just the maximum with the eight. You'll see trash pick-up. You'll see different food deliveries, even if it is eight. But at eight, you can't control it. But with the special exception, you can reasonably mitigate these impacts and it will force the Applicant to comply with those conditions. Hold their feet to the fire in a sense to be cooperative neighbors.

So I'd be a little bit more comfortable with moving forward with reasonable conditions on this particular case and the other case that we will have to deliberate that is also owned by the Applicant. I'm comfortable with the approach that you're taking with these conditions. I do believe that we need to tie down the hours for delivery or when housekeeping services will occur, any truck deliveries, any trash pick-up. They stated 6 a.m. to 10 a.m. That may be reasonable for all of that to occur. If the Applicant, and the Applicant's put out their, you know, condition that this will occur during those hours. So if the Applicant is comfortable with conditioning that to occur within those hours, I'm comfortable with writing that explicitly as a condition.

We do need a condition about how often trash pick-up will occur that, you know, is it two times a week, three times a week. We need that minimum condition number of times a week that that would occur. Within one of the conditions that they recommended they show that there would be a waste disposal area. Just as you stated we need that shown on a plat as well as the four parking spaces, as well as the screening treatment, whether there's landscaping or a fence. That needs to be shown on a revised survey so that we can, and the Zoning Administrator can, effectively enforce that going forward.

Use of outdoor space. Maybe there's a condition that requires that no amplified sound occur to mitigate any noise that

may occur with 16 residents. I welcome the Applicant crafting some condition that speaks to that fact and some form of a condition about supervision of the residents to address some of the concerns that the residents may have, the surrounding residents may have of people that are living here that they wander, or walk off, leave the facility in some way, shape or form.

This condition about large gatherings. That's hard to quantify and I would rather not condition that so I'll leave it at that. I'm fine with the condition of a maximum of 16 beds. I'm not comfortable with the minimum age requirement. Just as you stated Chairman Hill, I think it would be fairly hard to enforce. I think other conditions that we're proposing like noise and whatnot can effectively get at some of the questions that were raised about that.

And I think that's all that I had, Chairman Hill.

17 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Give me one second. Let me 18 just write this down.

(Pause.)

2.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Is it patient 16 beds? Sixteen beds? All right.

Vice Chair Blake?

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Mr. Chair, I just wanted to clarify something. Are we going to have a continued hearing or are we going to make it, just have a decision meeting on that on

that date?

CHAIRPERSON HILL: That's a very good question. I think given all that's going on we could have a continued hearing.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. The reason I said that is that I would, I do agree with all the areas that you and Board member Smith suggested to have greater clarity off of the conditions. I think that it would be helpful to have just a little written piece on each of the elements though.

For example, with regard to waste management. I would like to just say we're going to do waste management X, Y and Z. It'll be located in this spot reflected on the plan and these are the hours in which it'll take place. A brief description of each of those elements that they add and the condition that goes with it would be very helpful because certain things would not necessarily translate well into conditions, but it would be helpful to understand the process.

For example, again, we talked about parking. How many parking spaces will be devoted to staff? How many parking spaces will be devoted to use for deliveries and when deliveries will take place. That would be very helpful for us to understand, whereas the time of the deliveries would be very helpful in terms of the condition itself. Also the number of visitors that may come and go, the times of visitations as opposed to set to meal time would also be helpful. Just some greater elaboration on what would be taking place and how that would translate into a

condition.

I don't think that there's anything else that, oh, also the number of staffing. I want to be clear on the staffing that will be there to the extent that there will be, and I do think we, visits. I wasn't clear as to whether they're going to be full time three people there or just partially or how that would happen. Certainly given the patient mix it would matter how much coverage is there. I'd be just curious to know just so we have a sense of the number of bodies that would be in that facility, you know, over 24/7, et cetera.

So those are the kind of things I would just like to be clear on in addition to the specific conditions which would follow that. And we could do a continued hearing to allow for the elaboration or we can just have a written statement which explains it so that, you know, the dots would connect for us a little better.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Well, actually now that you brought this up I think the continued hearing is not such a bad idea because we can then talk about, actually I don't know when another one of these is coming up from this Applicant. Like, we could be talking about that at that time too. But I guess, you know, and I could do the thing, like, I'm not looking at this as if even though they have these many applications coming in, like, I'm not looking at it as a bunch necessarily.

Like, some things I am just because as you kind of go

through this you think of things and what your concerns may be but, you know, like there's two of these now in a 500 foot radius, right? That's the thing that also makes this more specific to what I'm kind of trying to figure out. Like, that one that's stand alone that doesn't have the, I might look at that differently, right? So I'm just throwing that out.

2.

But I think we should come back for a continued hearing I suppose. On the 4th I think Madam Secretary said that it was easier so we could do a continued hearing on this one and then I guess put the other one on decision so that we just have one continued hearing. But, okay.

So I'm going to sum up. Okay? Oh, this is another thing kind of for the community in terms of some of the stuff that we heard about. Like, I looked at the diagrams and I looked at how many people are in the rooms and everything and, like, you know, a different agency will determine whether or not how many people can be in a room and what's appropriate for the number. Like, the Board of Zoning says, you know, you can do a cap of 16 but the agency might say, you know, you can only do this many, right?

And then I'm just kind of sharing with my Board members the difficulty I've been having with this a little bit is that who am I to say if, like, the best case thing you have is sharing a small room with somebody, you know, that may be better than not having a small room with somebody. So I'm very conflicted

on this one, right? From a personal standpoint, right? But 2. that's not really what we're here for. Again, we're here for, you know, traffic, you know, adverse impacts to the neighborhood. 3 I'm just kind of sharing things which is that those are things 4 5 that are outside the Board's jurisdiction but I also thought 6 about it. Okay. 7 So then to the Applicant, we would want new proposed conditions and, Madam Secretary, I'm going to look here. I guess 8 9 the submissions would be by May 21st and responses from anybody 10 would be on May 28th and then we'd come back for a continued hearing on June 4th. Is that accurate? 11 12 MS. MEHLERT: Yes. That would work. 13 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. 14 So then what we would need from the Applicant by June 15 5th, oh, sorry, by May 21st is these updated conditions that seem 16 to address some of the concerns of the Board. 17 And No. 1, the facility shall be a healthcare facility 18 which will be capped at 16 beds. There seems to be a lot of discussion about waste 19

There seems to be a lot of discussion about waste management. You know, how is it actually going to be happening? When is it going to be picked up? Daily, what time? I don't know what specificity you need to try to get into to make the Board feel comfortable.

20

21

22

23

24

25

Then, where is the trash going to be placed, as well as where are the parking spaces going to be on the plat? There's

four parking spaces, how are they going to be used. Two for visitors, two for staff? You know, you need to kind of figure that out and how you want to present that to the Board before we come back here again.

I guess the large gatherings is not something that was of a concern. However, there was a concern about staff and how they would supervise outdoor activities and there would be no amplified sound.

The housekeeping visits, like, again, when are they going to happen? How is it going to happen by, and whether or not six to ten is really feasible because I would not want to get in a situation where it makes the residents suffer if they can't get this done by ten and they have to, like, you know, push it off to the next day or the next day. I mean, this is where I'm a little bit confused about the conditions that we're putting forward to mitigate our concerns of the adverse impacts to the community. Okay?

Waste management, parking, times of visitation, staff, and I guess that's it. Am I missing anything?

(Pause.)

2.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Nobody's saying anything so I'm not missing anything.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Mr. Chair, I think the large gatherings, the issue was to better define large gatherings and also to better define quiet, the quiet time I think it was. What

exactly that meant and, you know, the hours and what that meant exactly.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Smith, any further clarification on anything I said? Okay.

So I mean this is just now a process and I'm not even talking to the Applicant. Like, again, I don't know where I am with this, right? So I don't know if the votes are here. But I am sharing with, like, as Mr. Blake shared, if this were eight there would be no criteria other than what's in the regulations and how to operate these facilities. There wouldn't be anything new that would be placed on them in terms of when they can do things or how they can do things, right?

So I don't know if that bed number is ten, or fourteen that gets me more comfortable or maybe the votes are there for the eighteen. You know, I'm sorry, the 16. So, I don't know. Anyway, I think I've made myself as clear as I can be at this time and I think the Board has made its concerns known and so then if the Applicant puts all the submissions in by May 21st, the ANC responses by May 28th and then we'll come back for a continued hearing on June 4th.

Is that it from everybody? Okay. Madam Secretary, is that good?

MS. MEHLERT: Yes.

2.2

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.

Then we will come back on June 4th for the continued

1	hearing. So I'm closing this portion of the hearing. Thank you.
2	Is Dr. Imamura with us for the day?
3	ZC COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I am.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
5	ZC COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: For as long as you'll have
6	me.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yeah, well unfortunately I have my
8	own problems today. Okay.
9	Then I think this next one will go pretty much, like,
10	it'll be a let's do ditto and so, but I don't think we'll need
11	to have a continued hearing necessarily. But let's go ahead and
12	go through this next one, then let's take a break. Okay?
13	Mr. Smith, are you with us?
14	(No response.)
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Madam Secretary, if you can call our
16	next case.
17	MS. MEHLERT: Next in the Board's meeting session is
18	Application No. 21249 of 4231 Clay ST NE, LLC.
19	This is a self-certified application pursuant to
20	Subtitle X, Section 901.2 for a special exception under Subtitle
21	U, Section 203.1(J) to allow a healthcare facility for 16 persons.
22	This is a new 16 bed healthcare facility in an existing building
23	located in the R-2 zone at 4231 Clay Street, Northeast, Square
0.4	I
24	5888, Lots 45 and 46.

but was postponed at the ANC's request and on April 23rd the Board heard the merits and scheduled the application for decision. Participating are Chairman Hill, Vice Chair Blake, Mr. Smith and Dr. Imamura.

2.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Okay. All right.

Let's see. Okay.

So we had a lot of discussion about case 21240 and during that discussion we decided that we were going to come back for a continued hearing on June 4th. So what I would suggest is, Dr. Imamura, do you have any additional items to add about any of the things we talked about?

ZC COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I do not, Mr. Chairman. I would then ditto.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Very good.

So, all right. So then if the Applicant would like to submit whatever they plan on submitting for case No. 21240 on May 21st and the responses by the ANC are due on May 28th, and we will actually come back for a decision on this case. And Madam Secretary, I'm looking at my fellow Board members because we can do the continued hearing on the previous one first and then whatever we end up discussing with that one, we can probably carry over to the next one in terms of a decision because I don't think we need a continued hearing on both cases because it'll just make the day longer for no reason.

So that would be my suggestion. Okay. So I see some

hesitation but let's just try, okay, and if you guys want to reopen it later, we can. So May 21st, responses due by the Applicant. May 28th, response due by the ANC and we're going to come back for a decision on this on 6/4. Okay. And then what we'll do, Madam Secretary, is we'll do that other continued hearing first before we come back for a decision on this. Okay? Any questions? Okay.

2.

Let's have a quick break. Let's do ten minutes and come back. Thank you.

(Whereupon, there was a brief recess.)

MS. MEHLERT: The Board is back from a quick break and is now returning to its hearing session.

The next case is Application No. 21279 of ARP Morse, LLC. As amended, this is a self-certified application for a special exception pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 901.2 under the eating and drinking establishment requirements of Subtitle U, Section 802.1(c) and pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 1000 for an area variance from the live performance nightclub or dance venue location requirements of Subtitle U, Section 802.1(c)(3).

This is for a new eating and drinking establishment with live performance in an existing detached building. It's located in the PDR-1 zone at 400 Morse Street, Northeast, Square 3589, Lot 29. As a preliminary matter, the Applicant has submitted a request to waive the 30 day deadline for filing supplemental submissions and modification of the application to

that variance relief, and I will also note that ANC 5D submitted 1 2. their official report in support last night. CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. 3 If the Applicant can hear me, if they could they please 4 5 introduce themselves for the record. 6 MR. FERRIS: Good morning. Lawrence Ferris with the 7 law firm of Goulston & Storrs here on behalf of the Applicant. 8 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great. Welcome, Mr. Ferris. 9 Let's see. So, Mr. Ferris, you're trying to get what 10 into the record, again? 11 MR. FERRIS: Yes. So we'd like to designate our 12 architect, Bruce Carlson, as an expert witness and then we've 13 also requested a waiver for our supplemental submission to add 14 the variance to the case just due to the timing of when we received the Zoning Administrator's guidance to add the variance, 15 16 we weren't able to file it any earlier. 17 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. And then what you did, and 18 I'm looking at the report now, you presented the variance to the 19 ANC? 20 MR. FERRIS: Correct. We reached out to them obviously 21 when we filed the supplemental submission and asked if we could 22 have some more of their time. So they were generous enough to have us to their meeting last night and then took a vote 23 24 unanimously in support of the variance in addition to voting 25 unanimously in support of the special exception last month.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thanks.

Unless the Board has any issues, I'll go ahead and grant the waiver because of the timing from the information from the ZA as well as the fact that they already have spoken to the ANC about this, I feel the notice has been somewhat properly done. So I'm going to go ahead and do that unless my Board has any problems and if so, please speak up. Okay. Great. All right.

Mr. Ferris, if you want to go ahead and walk us through your client's application and why you believe they're meeting the criteria for us to grant the relief requested. I'm going to put 15 minutes on the clock just so I know where you are, and you can begin whenever you like.

MR. FERRIS: Well, thank you, and, Mr. Young, you can feel free to pull up our presentation when you have a moment.

Again, good morning, Chair Hill and members of the Board. Lawrence Ferris with the law firm of Goulston & Storrs. Also with me from Goulston is my colleague, Jeff Utz, and joining us today is Scott Shaw of Alexandria Restaurant Partners, that's the property owner, as well as Dan Daley from Ten Five Hospitality which will be the operator of this new restaurant and live performance venue that we're requesting approval for, and then the project architect, Bruce Carlson, is also on with us today.

We're here today for the property, again, located at 400 Morse Street, Northeast. This is at the corner of 4th and

Morse Street on the south end of the Union Market district. This is one of the historic buildings along 4th Street that was constructed as a wholesale building back in the 1930s. The Applicant acquired the building a couple of years ago and put a great deal of effort into restoring the historic structure to adapt it to a restaurant use which it is, was recently until a couple of months ago the prior restaurant was closed down.

2.

So we can walk through that detail more shortly. The site is zoned PDR-1 like much of the Union Market neighborhood, or it is part of the Union Market and it's also located in the Union Market historic district and the building is considered a contributing structure in the historic district. Next slide, please.

So our application requests two areas of relief. First we're requesting a special exception to allow an eating and drinking establishment with a live performance venue pursuant to Subtitle U, Section 802.1(c) to allow the Applicant to pursue a new dining concept for the building that we're including live musical performances on a portion of the first floor and then second, as discussed, since our initial filing we've added an area variance relief from the requirement under U-802.1(c)(3) that there be no other live performance, nightclub or dance venue within 1,000 feet of the property.

So currently there are no other entertainment uses within 1,000 feet of the site. Our request was precipitated by

another application that was filed, that's BZA 21292, that was filed about three or four weeks after we filed our application requesting approval for an entertainment assembly use at 405 Morse Street, which is within 1,000 feet of our site.

2.

We learned about that application when we were meeting with the ANC Zoning Committee and reached out to the Zoning Administrator quickly thereafter to discuss the two applications being processed so closely together. The ZA ultimately recommended that we preemptively request a variance from the 1,000 foot restriction just as a precautionary measure. So we added that to our application out of an abundance of caution just to avoid any potential issues during permitting.

You also saw, as we know, the waivers which we already discussed and then lastly there have been a couple of minor tweaks to the floor plan since our initial submission, primarily just reconfiguring some small demising walls and doors around one of the entrances and the kitchen area. So we would like to request that in the order approving the application reference the updated plans representing today, that's Exhibit 27, as the approved plans rather than plans in our original submission.

So before I hand it over to Mr. Shaw just to provide a little more background on the property, I would just note that we have a report in support from the Office of Planning. That's at Exhibit 25. OP recommends approval of both the special exception for the use and the area variance, and OP's report also

includes a note from DDOT that they reviewed the application and have no objection.

As I noted we also met with ANC 5D to present the proposed use and the requested relief and we presented to the ANC Zoning Committee on March 20th and then to the full ANC at their regular monthly public meeting on April 8, and the ANC voted unanimously in support of our special exception request at that meeting and, again, as I noted before we reached back out to the ANC about the additional request for a variance and we presented to the full ANC at their monthly meeting last night and the ANC voted again unanimously to support with the variance included. So the ANC was kind enough to file their report late last night right after our meeting so that would be in the record for today's hearing and that is at Exhibits 28 and 28A.

So with that quick overview, I will ask --

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Ferris?

MR. FERRIS: Yes.

2.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Real quick. Right. You're asking for the area variance because you don't know which one might come first?

MR. FERRIS: Right. I think that was essentially how the Zoning Administrator figured it was the best way to deal with the situation.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Do you know if 21292 is also asking for an area variance?

1	MR. FERRIS: They are, yeah. They also added that to
2	their application.
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Please go ahead and continue.
4	MR. FERRIS: So with that I will pass it over to Scott
5	Shaw here from the ownership team just to provide a little more
6	background on the property.
7	MR. SHAW: Thank you.
8	So is there some reason my camera's not on, Lawrence?
9	I've got it turned on on my side.
10	MR. FERRIS: Scott, you may be able, at the bottom of
11	your Webex app.
12	MR. SHAW: I've got it. Okay.
13	MR. FERRIS: Yes. There you go.
14	MR. SHAW: Sorry about that.
15	I'll make mine very short. First off, thank you all
16	for taking the time here. I just want to cover three points here
17	very briefly.
18	First off, kind of who we are. So I'm one of three
19	owners of Alexandria Restaurant Partners. So we're a locally
20	owned restaurant company. We have seven restaurants in Northern
21	Virginia plus this location in Union Market, and all of our
22	restaurants are different concepts by the way, full service, one
23	of a kind restaurants.
24	Just two more points on the company. We're very, you
25	know, by choice we're an employee first company. So 100 percent

of employee healthcare. We have a 401K for all of our employees and when we chose to close down the restaurant in anticipation of this change in February, we made sure to offer every single employee in our D.C. restaurant a transfer to one of our other restaurants. So we're kind of invested in the community of our people too.

2.

A quick couple of points about the building itself. So my partners and I bought the building from the Kolker family and Bruce Pascal. They'd owned it since 1932 and we knew going in that this is a signature gateway building, subject to historic guidelines. So, you know, we wanted to do it right and we wanted to do more than the guidelines required. We engaged historic preservation consultants, two sets of architects and engineers, and we worked with both the D.C. Historic Preservation Office and the National Park Service.

The project was also approved for historic tax credits which, as you all know, is a really high standard. So we love this building. We love the neighborhood and we went to great lengths, everything from matching the bricks to the flag poles on top. We wanted to restore it to its glory and be that great gateway building.

The work required now to kind of flip the concept from Palett 22 to Desert 5 to incorporate the performance stage, it's not very expensive. There's nothing on the outside except for a new sign. Inside the only real significant modification is to

the interior wall along historic columns to return it to kind of its original storefront. So, if anything, we're making it even more historic. But we did go back to the HPO and the National Park Service to get these smaller modifications approved too. So we're dotting all the Is and crossing all the Ts.

2.

And my last comment is just about sort of why we're doing this. So we are very long term investors in the Union Market. We own the building. We love the area, and the area, like, welcomed Palette 22. I mean, if you think about it's concentric circles, there's the neighborhood, there's D.C., there's the DMV. The neighborhood really embraced Palette. A lot of them came to our closing week parties and stuff. But we struggled to draw people from the wider metro area, partly because we're not as kind of food forward as some of the other people like Stephen Starr, but also then we learned you've got to have something, you know, a bigger draw to get people in and from our time in the neighborhood we realized what's kind of a missing element in the neighborhood is some sort of entertainment to go kind of hand in hand with the food.

You know, we think that's the right place for this location and not just for us, but for the neighborhood because there's a lot of restaurants and creating something else to do when you're in Union Market would benefit all of us and the neighborhood.

We've known Dan for a while. I love his Desert 5

concept. I've been up to it a couple of times in Brookland where 1 2. it's in a very similar neighborhood and it's treated as a cool neighborhood institution so it's a fun place to go on Monday, 3 4 Tuesday, Wednesday, not just Friday, Saturday. So we reached out 5 to him and we're partnering. We're going to be, we're both the 6 landlords and 50 percent owners of the business and we're excited 7 to get open as soon as we can. 8 So, thank you. 9 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great. Thank you, Mr. Shaw. 10 Mr. Ferris, when you all presented in front of the ANC, did they have any concerns about noise or anything like that, or 11 12 soundproofing or anything like that? 13 MR. FERRIS: They didn't. They did ask about noise but 14 because all of the performance is going to be inside the building and on the first floor and we're not permitted to have any 15 16 external performances or amplification. They didn't see any 17 issue with it. 18 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thank you. 19 And, Mr. Shaw, since I got the mike I don't mean to 20 be --21 MR. SHAW: Yes. CHAIRPERSON HILL: -- I don't mean to be sarcastic about 22 this and I hope it's doing very well. Theismann's is still 23 24 around?

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY
Court Reporting and Litigation Support
Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia
410-766-HUNT (4868)
1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

Yeah.

Theismann's is doing great. 1985

25

MR. SHAW:

called it one of the restaurant facts (phonetic). So when we bought it we spent a million and a half doing a, you know, a makeover to kind of update it.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. At least Theismann's is still around. Okay. All right. Cool. All right.

Mr. Ferris, you can continue, please.

MR. FERRIS: Thank you.

2.

We're going to pass it over to Dan Daley from Ten Five Hospitality.

MR. DALEY: Hi, everyone. I'm Dan Daley. I'm the managing partner at Ten Five Hospitality. Thanks to all the Commissioners for being present today and we appreciate your consideration on the matter.

I'm a D.C. local. Went to college here. I started a boutique hospitality firm about five years ago including (indiscernible). This is our first project in what's my hometown and we're incredibly excited about it. Desert 5 is a really vibrant restaurant and live music venue that was inspired by sort of the American southwest and it's located at sort of this intersection of dining and entertainment which is what we found guests in our purview really want.

It operates as a full service restaurant and the concept is also rooted in supporting emerging talent in the country music scene with obviously a strong emphasis on local artists. So this is sort of both a stage and a platform for

1	amazing songwriter nights and special showcases that ideally
2	highlight the depth of musical talent that exists in this part
3	of the world. It's our third location. We have one in Los
4	Angeles and New York and we think it has the opportunity to be a
5	really awesome cultural hub that celebrates hospitality, music
6	and community all in equal measure and, yeah, can't wait to bring
7	it to this part of the country.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great. Thank you, Mr. Daley.
9	Welcome back home. Mr. Ferris, you can continue.
10	MR. FERRIS: Thank you.
11	And then last up is Bruce Carlson, our architect.
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Ferris, you need Mr. Carlson in
13	our book; is that correct?
14	MR. FERRIS: Yes, please.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Where is his resume?
16	MR. FERRIS: I am sorry. He is not in the Board's
17	book.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Right.
19	MR. FERRIS: It's his first time presenting.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I see. Hold on.
21	MR. FERRIS: His resume
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I got it. I see it. Okay.
23	Unless the Board has any issues, I don't have any issue
24	with Mr. Carlson being admitted as an expert in architecture, as
25	he is an architect. Does the Board have any issues and if so,

please let me know. Okay. Even though we have an architect with us today. All right.

Go ahead, Mr. Carlson.

2.

MR. CARLSON: Yes. Bruce Carlson of Miami, Florida. Bruce Carlson AIA is the name of the firm. I've been in business for over 40 years. I've been doing architecture ever since I've graduated and it's my livelihood and love doing it.

The building, as everybody has mentioned the historic aspect of it, we're doing very minor modification, basically introducing a stage for entertainment and reducing the kitchen so that the volume of people of occupants basically will not change and, you know, allowing for the stage and the occupant load to maintain itself.

We then needed to be able to open up that first floor which brought the building back to its original storefront which was basically where the occupants sold their ware with a covered canopy at the front and so that was, we introduced that to the Park Service to review showing them the old historic photographs and got their approval on it. And basically that's what we're doing, is just keeping the building the same.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great.

Mr. Carlson, let me interrupt you one second. Mr. Ferris, I know that the Board has some timing issues later on today so I'm just trying to move as efficiently as possible.

Mr. Young, could you drop that slide deck?

1	And I know we have Dr. Imamura here with us. Dr.
2	Imamura, do you have any questions of anybody?
3	ZC COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I do not.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
5	I'm going to turn to the Office of Planning.
6	MS. MYERS: Good morning. Crystal Myers with the Office
7	of Planning.
8	The Office of Planning recommends approval of the
9	special exception and approval of the variance relief and can
10	stand on the record of the staff report, but of course here for
11	questions.
12	Thank you.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great. Thank you.
14	Does the Board have any questions for the Applicant or
15	the Office of Planning?
16	(Pause.)
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
18	Mr. Young, is there anyone here wishing to speak?
19	MR. YOUNG: We do not.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Ferris, would you like to add
21	anything at the end?
22	MR. FERRIS: No. Thank you for your time.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
24	You guys, it was nice to see you all and good luck, and
25	Mr. Young, if you could please close the hearing and the record

and excuse everyone. 2 (Pause.) CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. 3 Thanks. have any particular 4 didn't issues with this I appreciate the, all of the effort that the 5 application. 6 Applicant has gone through to the outreach to the community and 7 also going back to them after they added the area variance. 8 do believe that they're meeting the criteria for us to grant this particular relief. I will also rely on the Office of Planning's 9 10 analysis and also the comments of the ANC, and so I'm going to 11 be voting in favor of this application. 12 Mr. Smith, do you have anything you'd like to add? 13 COMMISSIONER SMITH: I have nothing to add. I agree 14 with your assessment of this case and will vote in support. 15 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. 16 Vice Chair Blake? 17 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: I have nothing to add. I'm 18 in support. 19 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Dr. Imamura? 20 ZC COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. from 21 in agreement with you and iust I'm an 22 architectural point of view I appreciate the, and because we're 23 time sensitive here, appreciate the time and effort they put into their preservation work for adaptive re-use. I think that's 24 25 going to be successful project and appreciate the work that they

1	did.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thanks.
3	I graduated high school in 1986 from this area. Joe
4	Theismann's is still around. That's just amazing. All right.
5	Okay.
6	I'm going to make a motion to approve Application No.
7	21279 as captioned and read by the secretary, oh, I'm sorry, not
8	as captioned. I will approve Application 21279 as read by the
9	secretary and ask for a second. Mr. Blake?
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Second.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Madam Secretary
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Make sure we mention the plans
13	and the exhibit.
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Oh, thanks. I appreciate that.
15	So let me do that again. I'm going to make a motion
16	to approve Application No. 21279 as captioned, including the
17	updated plans that are in Exhibit 27, and ask for a second. Mr.
18	Blake?
19	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Second.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.
21	Madam Secretary, if you could please take a roll call.
22	MS. MEHLERT: Please respond to the Chair's motion to
23	approve the application.
24	Chairman Hill?
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.

1	MS. MEHLERT: Vice Chair Blake?
2	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Yes.
3	MS. MEHLERT: Mr. Smith?
4	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Yes.
5	MS. MEHLERT: And Dr. Imamura?
6	ZC COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.
7	MS. MEHLERT: Staff would record the vote as four to
8	zero to one to approve Application No. 21279 on the motion made
9	by Chairman Hill and seconded by Vice Chair Blake.
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.
11	Madam Secretary, could you call our next one, please.
12	MS. MEHLERT: Next is Application No. 21281 of Matthew
13	Littleton and Christine Rocchio. This is an application pursuant
14	to Subtitle X, Section 901.2 for a special exception under
15	Subtitle D, Section 5201, from the lot occupancy requirements of
16	Subtitle D, Section 210.1, from the building area requirements
17	for an accessory building under Subtitle D, Section 5002.1, and
18	from the location requirements of Subtitle D, Section 5004.1(a)
19	to allow an accessory building in a required rear yard.
20	This is for a new accessory building in the required
21	rear yard of an existing detached principal dwelling. It is
22	located in the R1-B zone at 4525 River Road, Northwest, Square
23	1574, Lot 18, and as a preliminary matter the Applicant has
24	requested to waive the filing deadline for updated plans as well
_ 1	I reduce to warve the riving academic for apacted plans as well

25 as an updated letter of authorization. These are already in the

1	record.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great. Thank you.
3	If the Applicant can hear me, if they could please
4	introduce themselves for the record.
5	MR. LITTLETON: Good morning everyone. This is Matt
6	Littleton. I'm the homeowner at 4525 River Road. I'm here with
7	my wife, Christine.
8	MS. ROCCHIO: Hi.
9	MR. LITTLETON: And then, Christine Kelly, our
10	architect is actually on the line as well.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thank you. Welcome
12	to you both.
13	MR. LITTLETON: Thank you.
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Ms. Kelly, I'm sorry. Ms. Kelly,
15	are you presenting to us? You're on mute, Ms. Kelly.
16	MS. KELLY: Can you hear me now?
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
18	MS. KELLY: Okay.
19	I do have the PowerPoint. I can do the presentation.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
21	It'll have to, it'll have to be the one from the record.
22	MS. KELLY: That's correct, yes.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: And if you can please, again, walk
24	us through your client's application and I'll put 15 minutes on
25	the clock so I know where we are and you can begin whenever you

like.

MS. KELLY: Okay.

Good morning. I'm Christine Kelly. I'm the architect for the detached garage design at 4525 River Road, Northwest, and may I have the next slide, please.

My clients, as they have introduced themselves, Matthew and Christine are here as well and we are proposing replacing an existing one car detached garage which is shown on the plat on the left with a new more usable two car detached garage that is 517 square feet. We started this process after we discovered that a new garage could not meet the 25 foot rear yard setback from the existing house. So since we knew we had to ask for a special exception we wanted to request a larger garage that would be a lot more useful for two cars as well as storage and be architecturally pleasing from both the house and the alley. And may I have the next slide, please?

There's several photos of the existing front of the house and the next slide showing the rear and existing garage. You can go ahead. Showing the rear of the existing house and then the next slide shows the garage, the existing garage. This is what we're replacing with the new garage. The alley has, there are several detached garages on the alley which you can see in the next photo and with the design of our garage we wanted to match the existing fabric of the alley and by keeping the garage as a one-story garage, we're not, we didn't want to impede the

1 natural light and air flow for not only our house, but also the 2. neighboring homes. And the next two slides have the plan and elevations 3 4 of the garage. The next slide, please. 5 You can see the footprint of the garage as well as the 6 one-story design. We have some clerestory windows added into a 7 lot of architectural, just an appealing architectural view from the alley and from the house. We have support of the neighbors 8 as well as the ANC and welcome your questions and comments today. 9 10 Thank you. CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Ms. Kelly. 11 12 I'm going to, before I turn to my Board, turn to the 13 Office of Planning. 14 MR. BRADFORD: Good morning, Chairman Hill, members of For the record, my name is Philip Bradford, 15 the Board. 16 Development Review Specialist with the Office of Planning. 17 Office of Planning is recommending approval of the requested 18 special exception relief and stands on the record of the report in Exhibit 32. 19 20 Thank you, and I'm available for any questions. Thank you. 21 CHAIRPERSON HILL: 22 Mr. Young, is there anyone here wishing to speak? 23 MR. YOUNG: We do not. 24 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. 25 Does my Board have any questions for the Office of

1	Planning or the Applicant? Okay. Thanks.
2	I just want to make one note that it is 5201, it's
3	under 5201, but I believe it's under 5201.2 and not 5201.1.
4	However, this is all under 5201 so I think we're fine moving
5	forward with the way things are.
6	And so, Ms. Kelly, thank you for your time and Mr. and
7	Mrs. Littleton, I hope you guys enjoy your day. So I'm going to
8	go ahead and close the hearing and the record.
9	Thank you so much.
10	MS. KELLY: Thank you.
11	(Pause.)
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
13	Again, this is one that I thought was pretty well tidy
14	and straightforward in that I believe they're meeting the
15	criteria for us to grant this particular relief. I will cite
16	and rely on the Office of Planning's recommendation as well as
17	that the ANC has weighed in and is in favor. I'm going to be
18	voting in favor of this application.
19	Mr. Smith, do you have anything you'd like to add?
20	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Nothing to add. I'm in support.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.
22	Vice Chair Blake?
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: I'm in support. Nothing to
24	add, sir.
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.

1	Commissioner Imamura?
2	ZC COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: This is straightforward,
3	nothing to add.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. I'm going
5	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Mr. Chair?
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Mr. Chair, there's one thing
8	I forgot. There is, in the ANC report I believe there is a
9	provision, a request to have an inclusion of a rain barrel as a
10	condition. I'm not in support of that. I think that was the
11	only thing I would add.
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I appreciate that. Thank you so
13	much, Mr. Blake.
14	And also, to the Applicant. As I understand, they have
15	agreed to the ANC's condition about the rain barrel and that is
16	something that I believe that they will continue to honor. But
17	it is something that is not really something we can put as a
18	condition because it doesn't necessarily relate to the
19	regulations.
20	But I do appreciate that the ANC puts that particular
21	item forward and that the Applicant has agreed to it. So thank
22	you, Vice Chair Blake.
23	So I'll again continue to make a motion to approve
24	
	Application No. 21281 as captioned and read by the secretary, and

1	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Second.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Motion made and seconded. Madam
3	Secretary, if you can take a roll call, please.
4	MS. MEHLERT: Please respond to the Chair's motion to
5	approve the application.
6	Chairman Hill?
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
8	MS. MEHLERT: Vice Chair Blake?
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Yes.
10	MS. MEHLERT: Mr. Smith?
11	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Yes.
12	MS. MEHLERT: Dr. Imamura?
13	ZC COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.
14	MS. MEHLERT: Staff would record the vote as four to
15	zero to one to approve Application No. 21281 on the motion made
16	by Chairman Hill and seconded by Vice Chair Blake.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.
18	Madam Secretary, could you please call the next case.
19	MS. MEHLERT: Next is Application No. 21289 of Saam
20	Jahanbeen. This is a self-certified application for a special
21	exception pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 901.2 under Subtitle
22	D, Section 207.5 to allow the rear wall of a row dwelling to
23	extend farther than ten feet beyond the farthest rear wall of any
24	adjoining principal residential building on any adjacent
25	property.

This is for a one-story cellar and rear addition to a 1 2 principal row dwelling and is located in the R-3/GT zone at 4405 Greenwich Parkway, Northwest, Square 1350, Lot 114. 3 4 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. 5 If the Applicant can hear me, if they could please 6 introduce themselves for the record. 7 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Board 8 members. Marty Sullivan with Sullivan & Barros on behalf of the 9 Applicant. CHAIRPERSON HILL: 10 Thank you, Mr. Sullivan. Mr. Sullivan, I'm in a bit of a time crunch today and 11 12 I have reviewed your file and the record, and I understand what 13 has brought you here for the .67 feet. And so, but if you could 14 please summarize your client's application for us. 15 MR. SULLIVAN: Sure. 16 I can, do you want me to bring up the PowerPoint or 17 summarize quicker than that? 18 CHAIRPERSON HILL: I think if you just summarize, Mr. Sullivan. 19 20 MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. 21 So we're asking for .67 relief past the ten foot rule because of an error done with the foundation. It's already mostly 22 built. On wall check this was discovered, so it's basically less 23 than a foot of relief from the ten foot rule. We have the support 24 25 of the ANC as well.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great. Thank you, Mr. Sullivan.
2	I'm going to turn to the Office of Planning, please.
3	MR. BARRON: I apologize. This is not actually my case
4	but I believe this is Shepard Beamon's case. He should be the
5	one being pulled up.
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Sure. Let's see.
7	MR. BARRON: Apologies for the confusion.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yeah, yeah. There we go. Hello,
9	Mr. Beamon. If you could introduce yourself.
10	MR. BEAMON: Yes. Good afternoon. Shepard Beamon for
11	the record.
12	Let's see. This is relief for the rear yard, rear
13	addition requirements and OP finds that the request meets the
14	criteria for Subtitles D and X, and recommend approval. Open for
15	any questions.
16	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.
17	Mr. Young, do we have anyone here wishing to speak?
18	MR. YOUNG: We do not.
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right.
20	Mr. Sullivan, do you have anything at the end?
21	MR. SULLIVAN: No, I do not. Thank you.
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
23	I didn't ask, but my Board doesn't have any questions,
24	correct?
25	(Pause.)

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. 1 2 Mr. Young, if you could please close the hearing and the record. 3 4 (Pause.) 5 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. 6 This is more for the client of the attorney. Like, you 7 had to go through this process. Like, you were past the ten feet 8 so you're past the ten feet, so this is the process that you had 9 to go through but I do understand how you got here and I do think 10 that I can approve the .67, that it's not going to cause any additional shadowing, harm, et cetera, and I will agree with the 11 12 Office of Planning's report recommendation as well as thankfully 13 they did go through the entire process and go to the ANC, and 14 the ANC was also in support. I'll be voting in support of this 15 application. 16 Mr. Smith, do you have anything you'd like to add? 17 COMMISSIONER SMITH: Nothing to add. 18 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. Vice Chair Blake? 19 20 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Mr. Chair, I agree with your 21 analysis. I believe the Applicant has met the burden of proof. 22

This is a very modest increase and unfortunately does not fall under the minor deviation allowance by 8304 for the Zoning Administrator. So it's in front of us and I do believe that it meets the standards for approval.

23

24

25

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.
2	Chairman, Commissioner Imamura?
3	ZC COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you for the promotion,
4	sir. I agree with Vice Chair Blake this is a modest eight inches
5	and I think pretty straightforward to me, and I'm guessing this
6	is probably the fastest case that Mr. Sullivan's had.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. It's been quite quick. Okay.
8	I'm going to go ahead and make a motion to approve
9	Application No. 21289 as captioned and read by the secretary, and
10	ask for a second. Mr. Blake?
11	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Second.
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Motion made and seconded. If you
13	could take a roll call, Madam Secretary.
14	MS. MEHLERT: Please respond to the Chair's motion to
15	approve the application.
16	Chairman Hill?
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
18	MS. MEHLERT: Vice Chair Blake?
19	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Yes.
20	MS. MEHLERT: Mr. Smith?
21	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Yes.
22	MS. MEHLERT: And Dr. Imamura?
23	ZC COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.
24	MS. MEHLERT: Staff would record the vote as four to
25	zero to one to approve Application No. 21289 on the motion made

by Chairman Hill and seconded by Vice Chair Blake.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you. All right.

You guys, as I mentioned I'm the one who has the problem and I basically have to be done at 1:45, and so if we could take a quick ten minute break just to like snack on something and then we'll come back. Or as quick as you can snack on something and then come back.

Thank you.

(Whereupon, there was a brief recess.)

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you everyone.

And Vice Chair Blake has been so kind, that if I get completely stuck, he will continue.

Madam Secretary, if you could please call us back and our next case.

MS. MEHLERT: The Board is back from another quick break and returning to its hearing session.

The next application is case No. 21151 of Dinesh Tandon and Nidhi Tandon. As amended, this is a self-certified application pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 901.2 for a special exception under Subtitle C, Section 204.9 to allow a change from one nonconforming use to another nonconforming use and pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 1000 for an area variance or alternatively a use variance from Subtitle C, Section 204.9(c) to allow a non-residential use and the use variance from Subtitle C, Section 204.1 to expand a nonconforming use.

1	This is for the conversion of a first floor and cellar
2	of an existing two-story attached building from an existing
3	nonconforming use currently a retail convenience store to a new
4	nonconforming use as a restaurant and is located in the RF-1 zone
5	at 2324 North Capitol Street, Northwest, Square 3124, Lot 143.
6	This hearing was originally scheduled for July 24th, 2024 and has
7	been postponed several times since. The Board has also previously
8	granted party status in opposition to Evelyn Brown, Richard
9	Smith, Malini Tolat, and Maya Kavaler, and the merits have not
10	been heard yet.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thank you.
12	Let's see. Could you repeat again the party status
13	people in opposition people for me? Oh, I see. Never mind. I
14	see it. I see it. Okay. Great. Thank you.
15	If the Applicant can hear me, if they could introduce
16	themselves for the record.
17	MS. GIORDANO: Yes. Hello. This is Cynthia Giordano
18	with Saul Ewing law firm representing the Applicant.
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Hi, Ms. Giordano. Welcome back.
20	MS. GIORDANO: Thank you.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
22	Can Ms. Evelyn Brown hear me?
23	MS. BROWN: Here.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Could you please introduce yourself
25	for the record.

1	MS. BROWN: My name is Evelyn Brown. I am a 200 footer,
2	60 feet from the Applicant's property.
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great.
4	Ms. Brown, is your camera working?
5	MS. BROWN: Yes, it is. I'm trying to figure out what's
6	going on.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Well, while you're trying to
8	figure that out, let me. Is Mr. Richard Smith here?
9	MR. SMITH: I am, and I'm trying to start my video.
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great.
11	Could you introduce yourself?
12	MR. SMITH: My name is Richard Smith. I live at 19
13	Bryant Street, Northwest, 71 feet approximately from Hillview
14	Market, well within the 200 feet and I have advanced party status.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great.
16	MR. SMITH: Thank you.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: You're welcome. May I hear from,
18	is it Ms. Tolat?
19	MS. TOLAT: Yes. Hello. I'm Malini Tolat. I live in
20	15 Bryant Street, Northwest. I'm within 200 feet for sure, about
21	50 feet I would think and I have advanced party status.
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. And Ms. Kavaler, if
23	you could introduce yourself as well.
24	MS. KAVALER: Hi. My name is Maya Kavaler. I live at
25	8 Bryant Street, so next to the property approximately 21 feet

and I also have advanced party status.

2.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thank you.

You guys, this happened so long ago that I don't even remember doing the party status thing, right? So if I can just, I just want to mention something. Just because you're 200 feet doesn't mean you automatically get party status. You guys got party status because when we determined, when we did the party status we determined that you qualified, right?

MS. BROWN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: So I can't remember. Was somebody going to speak on behalf of you guys or are you all speaking individually?

MS. KAVALER: So I have a presentation that essentially represents all of us and then I was going to pass off to the remainder of the party status members to offer a brief statement or call on witnesses.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Got it. That sounds perfect. Thank you. All right.

Then, Ms. Giordano, what I'd like to ask for you is I guess I'm a little confused in that you kind of have an either/or and we don't really do an either/or. Like, you kind of have to -- at least unless I'm wrong and now I have to, I might want to talk to legal -- people come and they tell us what they want. They don't tell us whether they can get this or that. Do you know if you would be able to argue one or the other?

1	MS. GIORDANO: Well, my understanding was that the
2	Office of Planning possibly in consultation with the Zoning
3	Administrator had determined that a use variance was the
4	appropriate form of relief. Maybe the Office of Planning can
5	clarify that. So that's why I added use variance to the area
6	variance.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I see. Because
8	MS. GIORDANO: And I can, I'm certainly prepared to
9	argue that.
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
11	Can you all give me, you all give me just two minutes.
12	Okay? I'll be right back.
13	(Pause.)
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. I'm sorry. Thank you.
15	Ms. Giordano, are you back with us?
16	MS. GIORDANO: Yes.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Perfect.
18	So, right. So you're going to argue for a use variance
19	and also the special exception. So if you want to go and walk
20	us through your client's application.
21	MS. GIORDANO: Okay.
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: And what's going to happen go
23	ahead, Mr. Blake.
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Mr. Chair, I was just going
25	to ask is Ms. Giordano going to withdraw her request for the area

variance? 1 MS. GIORDANO: I guess so, if need be. I mean, the 2 area variance and the use variance are similar to more of a matter 3 of degree. So I think if we meet the use variance we'll meet 4 5 the area variance. But that's fine. Just to kind of simplify 6 things, I'm happy to do that. 7 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So we're withdrawing your 8 request for an area variance and we're going to go and hear the 9 argument for a use variance. Okay. Let's see. 10 So, Ms. Giordano, again, if you want to go ahead and 11 walk us through your client's presentation --12 MS. GIORDANO: Okay. CHAIRPERSON HILL: -- and, Ms. Kavaler, what's going to 13 14 happen is you will get your opportunity to also give your testimony and then basically everyone has a chance to ask 15 16 questions of everybody and we do this in the most efficient way possible and trying to be as civil as possible, just to let you 17 18 all know, and let's go ahead and hear from the Applicant. So

MS. GIORDANO: Okay.

Ms. Giordano, you can begin whenever you like.

19

20

23

24

25

Can we also bring up the project architect, Olivia
Akinsan?

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Olivia Akinsan. Okay. Mr. --

MS. GIORDANO: She should be signed up.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. I'll just let Mr. Young see

if he can find her.

MR. YOUNG: I do not see her on so I'll have staff reach out to her.

MS. GIORDANO: Thank you so much.

Okay. And also if Mr. Young could pull up the PowerPoint. The PowerPoint is brief. We've submitted two pretty lengthy statements in the record with exhibits so I'm hoping that will also be something that the Board has had an opportunity to review.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: We have, Ms. Giordano.

MS. GIORDANO: Okay. Thank you. All right. Next slide, please.

Okay. So not to be too cute but, you know, sometimes a picture is worth a thousand words and this is an ad from the 1920s for the Sun Beam Market which was here at this property for quite a long time up until the last I think five years, and as you can see it was a full on grocery store. Next slide, please.

This is sort of where they ended which is fairly typical of a lot of these bodegas in the city and there may be successful ones. I know the opposition has put some in the record. But the fact of the matter is this particular market, this is, you know, how it went and there were numerous C of Os in the record, I think 23 in all. This property just kept changing hands and eventually the last ownership gave up and could not really make

the economics work here.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So the Applicant purchased it in 2022. He had planned to open up more of an upscale market and felt if he could sell spirits, he could make it work. He went to the ABCA Board and unfortunately he was denied. So then he reverted to this restaurant concept and he has a very well respected highly acclaimed restaurant in NoMa which is 1.7 miles from this site and he knows how to run a restaurant. He thinks he can make this restaurant work here in this very small space. It would be the first floor and the basement. The first floor would be for dining. The basement would be mainly for support and preparation of meals, and that is what the proposal is. Right now it's a nonconforming use, basically a retail convenience store. So the, I'd like to pull up the next slide, please.

This is the requested relief. The special exception allows you to convert one nonconforming use to an other but the special exception also indicates that in this zone it should be residential. So we're seeking a variance, a use variance, from that provision of the special exception. Next slide, please.

This is an overview of the application. So theoretically, the way the nonconforming use regulations work, you have to basically have the same nonconforming use or, as I indicated, one that you can convert to legally under the regulations. So theoretically maybe it would be possible to convert this under the nonconforming use regulations to another

type retail use. But our feeling is that that is not feasible due to the very, very small size of the non-residential space in this building and the fact that there are alternative retail venues, very competitive, in the planned McMillan Reservoir Project and nearby.

2.

The property has been in use, as I indicated, for a convenience store since the 1920s. It's not a sustainable use. The previous store was grocery is obsolete as a number of these convenience stores may be. The conversion to residential use is not feasible. It's inconsistent with the Bloomingdale historic district due to the building design which is commercial in nature and historic. These are the large show windows. The chamfered entrance from the corner, and we have submitted a report from Traceries which is, you know, a well known historic firm in the city, to basically review that issue. Next slide, please.

The Applicant is proposing to use the first and basement floor for the restaurant. The second floor will be residential. He is in the process of building out that space and has approved permits for that residential use. As I indicated, he has a successful and highly rated restaurant called Indigo in NoMa. He wants to re-use and rehabilitate this dilapidated property to create a restaurant with similar cuisine to Indigo.

Due to his established track record at Indigo, the proposed use in our opinion has the best chance of success as

1	compared to potential other retail uses or a continued
2	convenience store use. The proposed use is not expected to have
3	adverse external effects due to parking, traffic congestion,
4	noise, trash, and will be a substantial improvement over the
5	previous use and our supplemental submission goes into great
6	detail in terms of those external effects and I can go over those
7	if you like.
8	If not, I would like to turn to our architect if she
9	is available now to just walk through the plans and some photos
10	of the property.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great. Mr. Young
12	MS. AKINSAN: Good afternoon.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Oh. Great. Could you introduce
14	yourself for the record.
15	MS. AKINSAN: Yes. Good afternoon members of the Board.
16	My name is Olivia Akinsan. I am designer of the property located
17	at 2324 North Capitol Street.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Do you need another slide?
19	MS. AKINSAN: I'm sorry. I wasn't sure
20	MS. GIORDANO: I'm sorry. Her photos are in the record
21	128A.
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. You want Mr. Young to pull
23	up 128A?
24	MS. GIORDANO: Please.
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.

1	MS. GIORDANO: And we'll follow that with 128B.
2	MS. AKINSAN: Okay.
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Ms. Giordano, just to let you
4	know, I mean, Ms. Akinsan, if you could please be a little
5	efficient with your presentation.
6	MS. AKINSAN: Oh, okay.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: There seems to be photos basically
8	kind of showing a lot of the same thing.
9	MS. AKINSAN: Sure. No problem. I have just one
10	sentence for what each photo is about.
11	Okay. So the subject is located in the Bloomingdale
12	neighborhood. The zone for the property is RF-1. The scope of
13	the project is to convert an existing two-story and basement
14	corner convenience store into a restaurant. The first floor,
15	basement floor and a three bedroom residential unit on the second
16	floor. The intent is to use the space as is. There will be no
17	expansions to the structure. This first slide shows the subject
18	property. Next slide, please.
19	This shows the subject property again in comparison to
20	North Capitol and Bryant Street. Next slide, please.
21	This shows an east view of the property from North
22	Capitol Street before improvements. Next slide, please.
23	This shows a more northern view of the property from
24	North Capitol Street with improvements. Next slide, please.
25	Showing a northern view of the property from North

1	Capitol Street with improvements. Next slide, please.
2	Shows an eastern view of the property from Bryant
3	Street prior to improvements. Next slide, please.
4	Shows another eastern view of the property from Bryant
5	Street with improvements. Next slide, please.
6	Shows a western view of the property from the alley
7	prior to improvements. Next slide, please.
8	Next slide.
9	So, the next slide.
10	Shows another western view of the property from the
11	alley prior to improvements. Next slide.
12	Shows a view of the subject from Bryant Street
13	including the rear alley. Next slide.
14	Shows a direct rear view of the subject property from
15	the alley prior to improvements. Next slide.
16	Shows a northern-eastern view of the property where the
17	proposed sidewalk café will be located. Next slide.
18	Shows an eastern view of the property where the
19	sidewalk café will be along Bryant Street. Next slide.
20	Shows a view along the side from North Capitol Street.
21	Next slide.
22	Last slide shows the intersection from the subject
23	property across. Okay. Okay. So, please next slide.
24	So this shows the proposal for the sidewalk café. The
25	intended occupancy is 23 seats. Umbrellas and guard rails will

be included. The guard rail will act as a buffer between pedestrian traffic, creating an inner aisle for the sidewalk patrons. Next slide, please.

This plan shows the proposed site plan in comparison to the adjacent properties on North Capitol Street. Next slide.

This slide shows a location map and different vantage points of the property. Next slide.

So these next two slides show the demolition that will occur on the basement and first floor. So we can go to the next slide.

And then go to the next slide.

So this slide shows the kitchen utility stairs and bathroom for the proposed restaurant. Next slide.

This slide shows the proposed bar steps and ADA bathroom for the proposed restaurant. We are aiming for a total of 73 occupants. The breakdown is as follows; 15 occupants standing, 40 occupants at tables and chairs and ten occupants at the bar. These numbers do not include the sidewalk café occupants. Next slide.

This slide shows the existing elevations. Next slide, please.

Okay. The next three slides show the building façade almost (audio interference) existing facades. This is rather handsome row building built in 1920. The architecture is typical of the neighborhood and in line with (audio interference)

commercial row house style prevalent in Washington, D.C. This property's intent or niche (phonetic) was and always has been for commercial use. Due to some current updates, the building is even more striking. These updates include (audio interference) power washing, new windows and doors and (audio interference) and glass store fronts on the first floor. And for the sidewalk café, the proposed chairs and umbrellas are also shown. So if we go to the next two slides, please.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Okay. So the next slide. This plan shows the section of the building with the internal stairs. Next slide.

This last slide shows more vantage points of the subject property and lastly, we wanted to address the noise levels in the area.

I first want to acknowledge that I am not a sound According to the D.C.M.R the maximum noise level expert. specified is 70 decibels for residential and 80 decibels for commercial. I took several readings with an app on my phone called a Decibel Meter. The average sound around 6:34 p.m., while traffic was moving remained from about 80 decibels to 100 decibels as is. Thus, the sound in the neighborhood is already over the allowed maximum noise (audio interference.) It should however be noted that the proposed umbrellas, (audio interference) plantings and wood benches would greatly help diffuse any additional sound from the sidewalk café. As I took readings in the evening after about 9 p.m., and the sound levels

were even higher reaching about 102 decibels at times which included sirens.

That's the end of the presentation.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Ms. Akinsan.

MS. AKINSAN: You're welcome.

MS. GIORDANO: Okay.

2.

2.2

If we could circle back to the PowerPoint, I would appreciate that, Mr. Young. Where we left off.

Okay. So as an overview, final Office of Planning position is pending but DDOT has advised in a written report submitted in the record that the proposed use will have no adverse impact on the District's transportation network. ANC 5E has taken no position on the application. They split basically. There are numerous letters in the record, both in support and opposition. I think I lost count at some point. So, next slide, please.

Again, the proposed use. Let me just run through a few details about it. The restaurant will abide by the following conditions. Pursuant to its ABCA license, they went back to ABCA after the spirits license as a retail license was denied, and applied for a restaurant license to sell spirits, and it was approved.

The ABCA Board instituted a number of conditions including the following maximum hours for the interior, 7 to midnight, outdoor café 10 to 10 p.m. on weekdays and 10 to 11 on

weekends and I would just note we submitted in the supplemental submission that these are maximum hours for no one further to be on the premises and the actual hours in terms of the kitchen are much earlier. They will stop serving about 10:30 p.m., bar and food. After that there will be cleaning staff on the site and everyone will leave by midnight.

2.

Regarding deliveries. This has been an issue that has been raised by a number of people in the community. Their current location at Indigo actually started out as primarily a take-out and delivery venue. But as it became more successful, became more of a sit down restaurant. This particular location will be focused on sit down dining.

As far as take-out and delivery from this location, the proprietor will direct as much as feasible that traffic to Indigo which is just located down North Capitol Street into the area near Union Station and only a seven to eight minute drive. I think I posted the Google map on that. In addition, a single delivery platform will be utilized. In other words, he will work with one delivery platform so he can have better control over that service.

Trash collection. Trash will be fully enclosed in a receptacle at the rear and picked up five to six times weekly.

Regarding noise. Generally noise from North Capitol Street is more significant. Bryant Street is a 90 foot right-of-way, so these are not narrow residential streets. The noise

from North Capitol Street really just travels right down through the Bryant Street block and some of the surrounding blocks and I will post the readings that the architect took in the next slide.

2.

Parking. Parking is available on North Capitol Street especially during non-rush hours. The traffic flow is going south down North Capitol Street in front of the subject property and it is, parking is restricted during the morning rush hour but it's available the rest of the time. The neighboring properties have residential permit parking but the neighboring properties also have adequate parking on site. We provided some photos of the properties on Bryant Street in particular, and also a base atlas map that just shows how long these lots are, how deep they are and there's room on the lots for parking and, indeed, many of the residents have more than ample parking space on site. So we do not believe that they will be adversely impacted by parking for the restaurant. Next slide.

Special exception criteria. Just generally, that the proposed use is consistent with the intent of the regulations. The intent of the special exception regulation which allows for some transitioning of nonconforming uses to other uses is to encourage actually the phasing out of the nonconforming uses and transitioning to more appropriate ones. In addition, special exception criteria also speak to no adverse impacts due to trash, noise, parking availability and I think we just covered those issues. Next slide, please.

Variance criteria. We can skip this but I just want to mention that the exceptional condition is more detailed here and that exceptional condition is the same for the area variance as the use variance. So I'm going to go ahead --

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yeah, that's great. Ms. Giordano, please. This is what I'm most interested in.

MS. GIORDANO: Okay.

2.4

So the exceptional condition is the contributing historic designation of the property which presents a hardship for residential use because of the very large show windows on a very busy North Capitol Street and on Bryant Street large windows continue. The chamfered corner entrance basically funnels you right into the space. There's no real residential transition entering the space and in terms of substantial detriment, we kind of went through that already. Next slide.

The use variance. Okay. So the elements of proof for the use variance are similar to the area variance including the exceptional condition which I just went over. The property is historic. It's also very small. It has been operated as a mixed use property with the first floor being a commercial space since at least 1920 and the cellar space since 1979. By small I mean the usable square footage of the ground floor is approximately 1,000 feet which is not a lot of space for a store or even a restaurant.

The exceptional hardship is a matter of degree. Again,

you know, conversion to residential use is infeasible because of the historic characteristics of the property leaving the Applicant with untenable limited options for other types of uses in this very small space and, again, the nonconforming use regulations basically say you have to continue the use of the property as is. That is, you know, what it was before and what it was before was a convenience store which, in our view, is an obsolete use here. It's very small. There is, you know, very limited ability to expand offerings that have been traditional to a lot of bodegas in the city and they tend to revert over time to cigarettes, alcohol, lottery tickets, ATM machines, and generally are not very desirable uses in the neighborhood.

2.

So we don't believe that the continuation of that use is in conformance with the intent of the regulations which allow for some conversion of the nonconforming use to other uses, and we believe that the restaurant use operated by an experienced restaurateur is an improvement. Next slide, please.

This is, these slides really go to the architect's presentation. The Noise Control Act. Next slide.

These are the maximum noise regulations in terms of decibels for commercial and residential uses and the next slide are the readings that the architect took in the various locations. I think she's already gone over this but she's certainly available for questions.

And that concludes our presentation.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Ms. Giordano. Okay

Let me do this. Before I turn to my Board, I'm going to just go to the Office of Planning next and then we're going to hear from the party in opposition.

MR. BARRON: Good afternoon, Chairman Hill, Commissioners. For the record my name is Ron Barron, Development Review Specialist with the D.C. Office of Planning.

The Office of Planning filed a report at Exhibit 152 recommending denial of the requested relief. In our report OP found that the Applicant had not provided sufficient justification for the amount and type of relief requested. Subsequently, the Applicant provided additional information to the record including a response to OP concerns raised in the original report. Given the time frame OP was not able to provide a supplemental report to the record. OP has also listened to the Applicant presentation in the hearing today.

Despite this additional information, OP is not able to change our initial recommendation. OP is strongly supportive of the appropriate re-use of existing buildings and of the provisions of new commercial uses in that sort of neighborhoods. OP brought forward the corner store provisions as part of ZR16 to help facilitate this. However, maintaining the integrity of the zoning regulations and the integrity of the existing and often (phonetic) struggling neighborhood areas is also critical.

OP continues to find that the Applicant has not met the

very high standards of a use variance for the intensity of the 2. use proposed, restaurant, bar, outdoor seating, delivery and take-out service, analysis of which is detailed in our report. 3 In the interest of time, I conclude my testimony here 4 5 and I'm happy to answer whatever questions the Board or the 6 Applicant may have. 7 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Mr. Barron. 8 just wanted to clarify. There was additional 9 information that the Office of Planning received, however that 10 matches the same information that you just heard from the Applicant and that hasn't changed the Office of Planning's 11 12 recommendation, correct? 13 MR. BARRON: Correct, yes. 14 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you. All right. Ms. Kavaler, how do you say it? 15 16 MS. KAVALER: [Kav-aler]. 17 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. 18 So, Ms. Kavaler, they basically used up 15 minutes and 19 you get basically the same amount of time and so, again, I know you're not a zoning attorney, or I think you're not a zoning 20 21 attorney. No. I feel like one now though. 22 MS. KAVALER: CHAIRPERSON HILL: Right. But, I mean, you know, we're 23 here for really the criteria for the relief that's being 24

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY
Court Reporting and Litigation Support
Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia
410-766-HUNT (4868)
1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

requested, but I'll go ahead and let you go through your

25

presentation as you have put it together, and you can begin 1 2. whenever you like. Sure, and I will try to go through this 3 MS. KAVALER: 4 as speedily as I can. I think we were anticipating a bit more 5 time than 15 minutes so I will just kind of skip as 6 (indiscernible). 7 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Ms. Kavaler, which exhibit is your 8 presentation in again? 9 Oh, gosh. It is, let me look it up, MS. KAVALER: 10 The updated presentation, I think it's 166, updated PowerPoint presentation from (indiscernible). 11 12 CHAIRPERSON HILL: That's perfect. 13 MS. KAVALER: Does that sound okay? 14 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes. I mean, go ahead and walk us 15 through this as best you can. You know, if you go 15, 20 minutes, 16 it's okay. It sounds like, you know, I don't want to get you 17 too much out of your rhythm. 18 MS. KAVALER: Okay. Sounds good. I can just get started and then as it pulls up I'll just match it. 19 20 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Young, or yeah, or you can begin. 21 MS. KAVALER: All right. Thank you Chairman Hill, Mr. 22 Blake, Mr. Smith, Dr. Imamura. Thank you for hearing me today. 23 I own, live at and work remotely, entirely remotely 24 from the property directly next to 2324 North Capitol Street at 25 8 Bryant Street, Northwest. I'm starting this presentation on

behalf of our parties and then I'll continue on to my fellow neighbors, if there's time.

2.

I will skip the next slide, and then the next slide.

The application on page 6 of Exhibit 147 incorrectly asserts the external impacts of the proposed restaurant use will be no greater than the existing convenience store use. This argument is based on the concept that they are changing from one commercial use to another commercial use so nothing changes. It fails to address how the change in use from store to restaurant changes the character of the neighborhood. And we can skip to the next slide, and skip to the next slide, slide 5.

The present character of the houses across the street and down the block would be forever changed if the property were to change from a store to a restaurant as they would lose their privacy, peaceful enjoyment of their front yards and their homes because of the huge increase in patrons as well as the huge increase in operational hours. And we can skip to the next slide.

The request does not meet the burden of proof and satisfy the questions what is exceptional or unique about the property, how is that uniqueness causing practical difficulty or undue hardship if the zoning were applied? What are the potential adverse impacts on the neighbors and the zoning plan and how does this impair the intent, purpose and integrity of the zoning plan.

It's extremely important for us to establish that the neighbors want a business at this corner. We were on board with

the original proposal. I am a first time home buyer and I was so excited to have that original plan right next door to me. However, the proposed restaurant would lead to significant harm and that's why we are objecting to this change of use request and do not support a restaurant in any form. Next slide, please.

2.

The supplemental documentation most recently filed asserts that the property is "exceedingly small" which prevents it from being operated as it's currently zoned. However, the property has over a century's worth of experience being operated as a retail store and it's in fact bigger than many other corner stores in Bloomingdale. The Certificate of Occupancy request is for 81 people indoors and a property that can comfortably accommodate 81 guests is not exceedingly small and this is in stark contrast to the houses on the block that are for single families or two family plats consistent with RF-1 zoning. Next slide, please.

We wish to agree with the report by the Office of Planning that the request does not meet the test for a variance. In fact, the news is full of restaurant closures in Washington, D.C. He has not addressed the higher failure rate of restaurants as compared to grocery stores, especially in this time of economic challenge. The Applicant provided nothing to substantiate the claim that it's not economically viable to run a store at this location. I have several examples to refute that claim including a new upscale corner shop with market and café that's forthcoming

from Lost Sock Market and it will occupy similar looking space very soon on 4th Street, Northeast. This is a very similar model to the Applicant's original plan which aligns with the current zoning rules and received neighborhood support, and which he claims is not economically viable. Next slide, please.

Another example is Odd Provisions which opened in 2016 and was one of several in that generation of small markets catering to the local crowd, such as Union Kitchen Grocery, the Old City Market and Oven, Each Peach Market and Nido Market, among others. Incidentally, Odd Provisions is within two blocks of a Giant Supermarket and at 11th and Lamont Street is in a neighborhood that's in similar character to Bloomingdale without any high rises. The Applicant claimed that the store found in his initial plans in 2022 is unviable but he never performed any feasibility analysis or an economic study of what could be possible at this location. He ignores the successful 100 year history of store operation here. In fact, it's only been vacant since he bought it. Next slide, please.

Regarding the exceptional hardship related to the historic claims, there are no physical qualities to the structure that prevent it from being used as it's currently zoned. Here the above picture is an example of how he could execute a 100 percent residential design. McMillan Development was long in the works before the Applicant purchased the property, therefore fears of competition from the McMillan Development should not be

considered relevant.

The Applicant references a plan for a large grocery store with additional large retail component in the nearby McMillan Reservoir site as part of his rationale for the non-viability of this plan. However, a small grocery store will be situated several blocks from Bryant Street and we have just received notice that the developers are negotiating to reduce the size of the McMillan store down to a minimum of 10,000 square feet when the average size grocery store in D.C. is 40,000 square feet. There's no guarantee that this grocery store will exist at all and the Applicant's actual location of the proposed store is farther from the Applicant's property than what is stated in Exhibit 128H. Next slide, please.

Here is a second example of the store that was successfully converted to residential use and this agrees with the Office of Planning's report statement that it would appear that other uses, some of which the Applicant previously examined, exist for reasonable use of this property. Next slide, please.

Again, the Applicant conducted no economic feasibility study or viability study of the original plan that had zoning regulation and neighborhood approval and because there's no proof or research supporting the non-viability of this original plan, which is the impetus for the new restaurant plan, we are simply expected to just accept his statement. And after the Applicant claimed at various ANC 5E and Bloomingdale Civic Association

meetings to be a successful business person, however we would expect a successful business person to conduct a market analysis of a proposed business before spending over \$1 million on a property. And I find it irrational to insist that a restaurant will be successful when RAMW reported the survey that found that 44 percent of full service actual dining restaurants in D.C. expect to close in 2025. Next slide, please.

2.

The Applicant sites the K Street location as proof that this location will be successful. Yet Bryant Street is a very different neighborhood than K Street and this proposed location is an entirely different business model. Bryant Street has no high rise buildings like K Street, and K Street provides no experience to running a bar and full service restaurant. If the Applicant's restaurant failed, the zoning relief remains and what replaces it and thus impacts the community is unpredictable. This is relevant because the Applicant has expressed concern of competition from McMillan as a rationale for this relief. What would happen if an Indian restaurant opens at McMillan when he claims that his business cannot survive competition? Next slide, please.

In order for the area variance to be approved, the Applicant must meet the burden of proof and this slide here details reasons for why his application fails to meet that standard. Next slide.

The proposal is not consistent with zoning or the

comprehensive plan. Unlike Red Hen or Big Bear which are either adjacent to or in MU-4 zoned areas which have often been compared to this property, 2324 is the blue dot you see here in a sea of RF-1 zone blocks with the closest MU-4 district being 0.4 or five blocks away. Additionally, granting this variance and special exception will introduce a liquor license on a 100 percent residential block with no commercial zoning within five blocks. Next slide, please.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The Office of Planning reports that the regulations are intended to discourage the expansion of existing nonconforming use, particularly where other options exist. According to the plan, the application would expand on existing nonconforming and we ask that the Board discourage the change. The Office of Planning report recognized that the Applicant is proposing a full bar and outdoor seating as well as a pick-up delivery window which would anticipate delivery drivers as well as other local patrons and they said that these impacts to the immediate neighbors should be more fully addressed. However, I wish to point out that the Applicant cannot change or control or address the impacts of a commercial restaurant on an RF-1 zoned residential neighborhood. For example, he cannot make a parking lot, he cannot establish a loading zone for meal delivery drivers and he cannot be a traffic cop to facilitate shared ride dropoff. Next slide, please.

The Applicant has highlighted the success of the

original Indigo location as a rationale for why an additional location should be developed in our community. Again, Bryant Street is a very different location. It's RF-1 zoned with two and three-story rowhouses with front gardens. There's no commercial parking lot. We're not close to a metro and there are no current businesses that provide delivery/pick-ups. His business would introduce such to our street and thus change its character. Next slide, please.

2.

I don't need to repeat the requirements of Title 11, Section 204.9, however the Applicant claims that the proposed restaurant use will not create any deleterious external effects and is not likely to generate any external noise, illumination, vibration, odor, design or siting effects. And this is categorically false and impossible. In fact, the Office of Planning report said, and I quote, "The Applicant argues that a change from a retail corner store use to a restaurant and bar use would not create substantial new detrimental conditions on the subject property. However, the Applicant's statement does not explain how the hours of operation, the handling of noise, trash, parking, and other potential adverse impacts would be handled."

Throughout the numerous meetings over the past many, many months, the Applicant has invited us to visit his K Street location as a way for us to see the way, to see what his restaurant is like so we have a better idea of what we could expect living

next to an additional location. Unfortunately, we found many of 2. the concerns we have for our community to be occurring there already and as you can see from this photo here above, there's 3 4 an Indigo patron illegally parked blocking the alley. Next slide, please. So here we have a video, yes, sorry, next slide. One 7 more. 8 And this, I believe this video is saved as a separate 9

exhibit and that's Exhibit 153.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. I got that one. Thank you.

And I can just keep going while you set 11 MS. KAVALER: 12 that up.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Just when you're finished through this we'll see if Mr. Young can get to 153.

MS. KAVALER: Okay. Cool.

5

6

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

And here you'll just hear the noise emanating from the patio of their K Street location and you'll see that even the enclosures around the patio do nothing to prevent the noise from emanating. In the supplemental information, the Applicant only lists the patio as a source of noise. He doesn't take into consideration all the other sources of noise that we have laid out.

The proposed change in use would create adverse external effects because the ambient noise level of the unit block of Bryant will be irrevocably changed by several factors

1	including new noise from the music and patrons' voices dining
2	outside on the patio similar to what you're about to hear in this
3	video. The music and patrons' voices inside each time the door
4	opens, the many vehicles that will transport patrons, restaurant
5	delivery trucks, food delivery vehicles especially with the
6	motorcycles that tend to drive the wrong way down our one-way
7	street, daily garbage truck visits that are appropriate for a
8	commercial district, not a residential street, and continuous
9	dumping of garbage including loud glass bottles.
10	I can pause to see if that video is ready.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
12	(Pause.)
13	MS. KAVALER: I can also continue while that keeps
14	going.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yeah. Mr. Young, why don't you, I
16	mean, Ms. Kavaler, I think the Board can understand what I
17	appreciate the video, like, I hundred percent believe and
18	understand what you're going to show us in the video.
19	MS. KAVALER: Okay.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: You know?
21	MS. KAVALER: We'll be on the same page. It's fine.
22	All right.
23	Furthermore, the Applicant suggests in his supplemental
24	information that the noise
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Young, if you could you bring

up where Ms. Kavaler is.

MS. KAVALER: Oh, sorry. I have it up on my screen.
I apologize.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: I think you were on traffic.

MS. KAVALER: Yes. Noise. The Applicant suggests in his supplemental information that the noise will only be a problem for the house that is 90 feet away which is currently for sale. This is illogical as I am only 21 feet away and this will certainly impact me. I can currently hear when it's just one person on their patio speaking, so I can only --

CHAIRPERSON HILL: One more back, Mr. Young. Sorry.

MS. KAVALER: One more back. Sorry.

So I can only imagine what it will be like if there's 33 seated guests on their patio which will be in concert with all the other noises I've listed earlier. And while the Applicant may only be interested in the impacts of this business, of the noise of this business on one home, I'm here representing the interests of those who live within 200 feet, the standard set by the BZA, who will be negatively impacted by the noise created by the restaurant and it's not just about one house, it's about our whole community.

Lastly, the Applicant states that North Capitol is always noisy and this is not true. It certainly does have periods where it is noisy such as during rush hour and then it quiets down. We would anticipate that the restaurant's dinner service

to be its busiest and therefore the loudest period of the day. This period would extend much beyond rush hour when the traffic has subsided and the neighborhood has returned to quiet. The noise coming from the restaurant at this time would represent a distinct change to our neighborhood and make it impossible to live peacefully in our homes. Next slide, please.

2.

Air pollution and traffic incidents are expected to increase with the increase of motorcycles and food delivery trucks. Unlike K Street, we only have one lane of traffic on Bryant, so double parked vehicles will create back-ups and honking from impatient people stuck behind them. The delivery vehicles are expected to block and frequent the alley behind the restaurant as this is where the pick-up orders will be given. The alley often has children playing and families walking through it such as myself and my dog.

The closest alley, neighbors need to access their vehicles using this alley as well. The Applicant claims that he will be able to control the frequency of deliveries and thus reduce traffic by limiting it to a single platform and focusing the company's delivery requests from the rented K Street location. Because K Street is a rented property, we have no way of knowing how long that lease will last and once it ends it could be reasonably assumed that more deliveries will be taken from this location. Furthermore, limiting deliveries to any number of platforms is irrelevant to zoning and is not an area

that the BZA can haver any oversight. Next slide, please.

There's no parking plan. The current and proposed use includes only two parking spots and that's located more than a mile from any metro station. Parking on North Capitol is prevented during rush hour and is otherwise dangerous and this will force drivers to naturally look to Bryant Street. There's no loading area for trucks or shared transport and more restaurant customers will need to park here than a store because the restaurant occupancy is high and customers will stay longer in a restaurant than they would with a corner store. Families walk through this alley with their children and dogs and children play here, so increased traffic would be dangerous.

In his supplemental information, the Applicant states that the neighboring properties all have one or more spaces. However, not all houses have parking and many houses have more vehicles than parking spaces and thus rely on street parking. Furthermore, even houses with parking spaces rely on street parking to accommodate visitors.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Ms. Kavaler? I know, how do you say it again?

MS. KAVALER: [Kav-aler]. No worries.

22 CHAIRPERSON HILL: I don't know. Ms. Kavaler, you're

23 past your 15 minutes --

MS. KAVALER: Okay.

25 CHAIRPERSON HILL: -- and I mean, by the way, you're

doing a lovely job. Are you an attorney? 2 MS. KAVALER: No. But honestly I've done a lot of research. 3 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. You've had six months. 4 5 So I think that, you know, I mean we're here for a lot 6 of the issues that you're speaking of and your slide deck is very 7 easy to go through. 8 MS. KAVALER: Okay. 9 CHAIRPERSON HILL: I went through it before and I've 10 gone through it as you're actually, you know, walking through your presentation so I understand everything that you have going 11 12 If I could just bring you to the conclusion slide and then 13 you said other people would like to talk. 14 MS. KAVALER: Sure. Of course. No, totally. Ι 15 appreciate your (indiscernible). 16 CHAIRPERSON HILL: It's slide 31, Mr. Young. 17 MS. KAVALER: Yes. There we go. That's fine. 18 We find it concerning that the Applicant tells people 19 that it matters if many people, most of whom don't live within 20 200 feet of the site, testify that they want a restaurant on this 21 block of Bryant Street. I also find it interesting that some of 22 this restaurant's greatest supporters were also the greatest 23 opponents to the proposal to change the bus line to 1st Street

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY
Court Reporting and Litigation Support
Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia
410-766-HUNT (4868)
1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

The Applicant does not meet the standards required of

because of how it would impact their lives and their homes.

24

25

area or use variance, including proving undue hardship and not creating deleterious effects to the neighbors. The proposed use does not conform with the comprehensive plan for the District of Columbia. We believe that Zoning Board would act in the best interest of the city and the neighbors to deny the requested relief, especially when a person has purchased a property with the intent to change the zoning of the whole neighborhood for his own financial gain.

We appreciate the time and attention the BZA has paid to this case as well as the ANC Commissioners who supported the concerns of nearby neighbors and we are grateful for the consideration of how the proposed restaurant would impact our quality of life.

Thank you so much.

2.

2.2

15 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, and thank you for your 16 presentation.

Let's see. You said your other members would like to say something?

MS. KAVALER: Yes. So we have Evelyn, we have Rich and we have Malini all have party status and then Evelyn also has Shaun Manning and Sylvia as witnesses. So we had it in order of ourselves to go to Rich first, Richard.

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

MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman and members of the Board.

Thank you for hearing my testimony today. My name is Richard

Smith. I live at 19 Bryant Street, Northwest, approximately 71 feet from Hillview Market.

2.

I am in full support of a corner store and coffee shop as originally presented and frequent a place called Aurora Market which coffee shop, market and has take away sandwiches and prepared foods at 500 Irving Street, near the hospital. I most strongly opposed a restaurant use at Hillview for which the zoning adjustment seemed to be required.

The Applicant contends there's no adverse impacts on our quiet residential neighborhood in terms of parking, traffic and noise and we've addressed that a great deal. I submitted Exhibit 149 and one of those photos was used in Maya's presentation. You may have seen them all before. What it shows is that there are Uber Eats cars and there are mopeds that are parked illegally and the Applicant has no way to control that. That's not his responsibility. However, that exhibit I put out to show that, you know, D.C. parking and D.C. traffic parks a certain way and that will be coming to our neighborhood.

I also was there for an extra, I was there for an hour and ten minutes. The Applicant states there will be a single delivery service going through the K Street location, however how is that going to be enforced? I don't think that's enforceable in any way after the Board rules and makes a decision and if I was a businessman I'd make use of both locations to maximize my delivery service, but even though he says it'll be just one

location.

The Applicant submitted a supplemental statement last week in which he states, hey, there's parking spots and garages behind your homes so there's adequate parking. Well, I've lived here for 13 years and myself, my wife, my neighbors, my tenants, my guests, all have lived a certain way with parking the way that it is, whether I park in my garage which is actually a shop or park on my patio, which is my back yard, the suggestion that there's adequate parking doesn't take into account how the neighborhood has been living this way and parking this way since I've lived here for 13 years.

So it's ludicrous to suggest that, oh, by the way there's a lot of parking spots, so there won't be any parking problems. We have renters moving in on Sunday. They're going to be bringing two extra cars so that'll be four of us, four for our house alone. So what have we got for parking?

So during my visit I went down and took those pictures in exhibit, I think it was 149, and while I was there I noticed 91 people walking into the restaurant in the course of an hour and ten minutes. So that's 11 people walking in and walk back out, they're carrying bags. So let's say that there were 80 people walking in over the course of an hour and ten minutes and seven of those came by Uber. That leaves 73 people over the course of an hour and ten minutes.

How are they going to get here? This is not a walkable

neighborhood like the other neighborhood is which is adjacent H 1 Street and also has the large residential apartment complexes. 2. They're going to drive here and that will cause noise. It'll 3 cause parking problems. Will cause traffic and there's just no 4 5 way about that and that was over the course of an hour. So let's 6 step away from that for a second --7 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Smith? Can I interrupt you for 8 one second? I'm sorry. I appreciate, I mean, Ms. Kavaler, she 9 did a good job in general with the presentation. The way the, 10 well, the way the hearing runs is that the amount of time that the Applicant got is the amount of time that the opposition gets. 11 12 MR. SMITH: Okay. 13 CHAIRPERSON HILL: And so you've already kind of gotten 14 to where their time was, and so I just want to --15 MR. SMITH: Want to let me close? 16 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yeah. If you wouldn't mind because 17 then Ms. Brown says she has witnesses too and so I don't know 18 what that means. 19 MR. SMITH: Well, we all would welcome a corner market and coffee shop. That would be ecstatic. A restaurant would 20 21 have an extremely large adverse impact on the nature of our 22 neighborhood, that's why I'm in opposition. 23 Thank you for your time. 24 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Mr. Smith. 25 Ms. Kavaler, is Ms. Brown the last one to testify?

MS. KAVALER: There is also Malini as well, but I'm not sure, yeah. If Malini wants to skip or can speak briefly and then we can go to Evelyn.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Ms. Brown, how --

MR. SMITH: Would like Malini for her audio.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.

Ms. Tolat, can you hear me?

MS. TOLAT: Yeah. I can hear you and I can be very, very brief.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Go ahead.

MS. TOLAT: I just want to compliment everything that Maya has said and Richard has said but specifically for me I just wanted to point out, I have submitted a video which totally refutes the so-called evidence provided by the architect. She must have taken it on the North Capitol side. Bryant Street is very different. We don't get the noise as much. Yes, North Capitol is noisy but on our side it is much quieter. Please do review my video and see how it goes.

We all tend to use the outdoors a lot because this is kind of a community neighborhood. We meet on the street. We sit on our front stoop and we interact as a community, and all of that will change with the restaurant. I am diagonally across from it and I will totally lose any privacy seven days a week, going into late nights on weekends and, you know, weekdays as well as the fact that I sit outside but I also work from home

and both of my, you know, studios, my husband and I both work 2. from home. They are street facing. We see a huge impact on our life and our lifestyle moving forward. 3 And I just want to say that, again, as Richard mentioned 4 5 we welcome Mr. Tandon to consider a business opportunity that is 6 in compliance with current zoning and the character of this 7 neighborhood, but I really cannot accept that his business should 8 be at the cost of mine and my neighbors' quality of life. 9 That's all I want to say, and I hope that, yeah, the 10 Board will take into consideration all of our concerns and I'll 11 hand over to Evelyn from here. 12 Thanks. 13 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. Ms. Brown, how much time 14 do you think you need? 15 MS. BROWN: Shaun, you can have two minutes. Sylvia, 16 two minutes, and I'll just do my closing statement if that's 17 okay. 18 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thank you. MS. BROWN: So, Shaun, you have two minutes and Sylvia, 19 20 you have two and I'll do my closing remarks. 21 Shaun? Are you there? 22 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Ms. Brown, I'm sorry. I'm just 23 trying to make sure. These are witnesses to your testimony --24 MS. BROWN: Yes. 25 CHAIRPERSON HILL: -- and what are their names again?

MS. BROWN: Shaun Manning and Sylvia Baffour.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. I just got, Mr. Young is bringing them up.

MS. BROWN: Shaun Manning.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Manning, can you hear me?

MR. MANNING: Can you hear me?

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.

MR. MANNING: Okay. I'll be very quick and very brief because I think Maya and the other neighbors have covered everything that I was going to say.

I have been a resident at 36 Bryant Street, my wife and I, for over 20 years and I'm a property owner right next door to Maya as well. You know, years ago we petitioned, my wife and our neighbor who doesn't exist anymore, petitioned. We've grown up in this neighborhood for the past 20 years. We've watched it grow and improve.

I'm a little confused by the law speak that Mr. Tandon's lawyer just because, just like the lady said a second ago, Bryant Street is not affected by the noise as North Capitol and that noise does subside after rush hour. So, but we are also we are a one lane, one way in neighborhood. Delivery trucks, pick-up vehicles, taxis, so for all of those will back up traffic even more and as Maya pointed out, the honking from people who are disrespectful will only increase the noise level in this neighborhood. The rodent population is going to increase.

1	There's nothing he can say or do about that. If you put
2	commercial garbage cans in, we will have a greater rodent
3	population.
4	I ask that you vote no and thank you for your time.
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.
6	MS. BROWN: Sylvia Baffour.
7	MS. BAFFOUR: Okay. Can everyone hear me?
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
9	MS. BROWN: Yes.
10	MS. BAFFOUR: Okay. I'll be very brief.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Now you're on mute, Ms. Baffour.
12	MS. BAFFOUR: It keeps doing that. That's weird. Okay.
13	You can hear me now?
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yeah. Just don't touch anything.
15	MS. BAFFOUR: Yes, real quick.
16	So I echo everything that has already been said. I
17	don't want to be redundant. I've been in my property for 23
18	years and I'm sort of across North Capitol and within the 200
19	feet of the establishment, and I think that it's unfair that the
20	answers to the Office of Planning's objection about parking comes
21	down to insulting us and what we should be doing with garages.
22	My husband and I don't have a garage. We have a back
23	yard with a fire pit, and I know other neighbors who don't use
24	their back yard for parking. The reality is in 23 years I've
25	never really had a problem with parking unless maybe someone's

having a big party, but I've had two or three, two cars personally smashed on North Capitol Street. My twin brother visiting had his car smashed. It's pretty dangerous for us to just rely on that as our sole parking and I think it's unfair for him to assume that, you know, at his benefit we get to then figure out what we're doing with our parking.

That to me is not a solution to the problem. He can't build a parking lot and therefore he's not really introducing a practical solution and I can foresee myself at night having to park three blocks away and endanger myself walking home when before I had no problems parking. So I echo everyone else and I hope the Board will consider how much this is going to impact us adversely along the way.

Thank you for your time.

2.

MS. BROWN: Thank you, Sylvia.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.

MS. BROWN: And my name is Evelyn Brown. I'm a 200 footer. I'm approximately 60 feet from the Applicant's property. I am south of the 2324 location.

I won't duplicate. But I went door knocking. I've talked to people in the neighborhood. That's how I met Sylvia, Malini, Richard and all the other folks. So that's how we got all of this started. But I knocked on doors. I shared flyers. I listened to people talk and I shared my position and theirs.

The property, and so I really have no one-on-one

contact with the Applicant in terms of outreach but I can say that we in this neighborhood, we conducted a lot of outreach. I don't see the benefit for the community. The business, converting the property, I don't deem it appropriate for the health and present character of the neighborhood.

2.

And I wanted to point out one item in the Applicant's response about the ABC license and to make sure that the distinction and the context in which it's stated in here, that they state it that it had no adverse impacts. The restaurant had no adverse impact on the neighborhood. That was not a zoning case, that was a Class D liquor license case. So I just wanted to make sure that the context was clear.

The response completely neglects to recognize all of the issues that we have basically raised. My personal safety, I come in and out of my home through the back, through the alley. My property is directly across from the Skaplars (phonetic) so we share the alley.

The exhaust fumes. Nothing has been talked about in terms of a full kitchen. Well, I'm concerned that those exhaust fumes, the cooking, the smells and so forth will certainly be coming into my home. We do not have sophisticated exhaust systems and one of the Applicant's witnesses stated that he loved waking up at 6 a.m. to the smell of curry. I responded I don't want to smell curry. The other reason, I visited India, I was sick every day until 1 o'clock in the morning and I stayed in the bathroom

with my head over the trashcan for two weeks, and I also suffer Lupus, so I'm just stating that.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The other one is that lack of loading, unloading, that's been addressed. Food and increased traffic, the restaurant, and finally the high levels of the background noise. I hear the noise directly from North Capitol and I would never object to a business owner seeking a reasonable profit, but not at the expense of the neighborhood's charm and ambience.

As mentioned, I am a long time resident. My family moved here in 1959 so we're going on 66 years. The original corner store, while it was a tolerable nuisance, it did not infringe upon my rights. I cannot say the same for the Applicant's plans and the adverse impacts identified. Applicant states that he believes the proposed use is a viable and he's willing to make a substantial investment to rehabilitate dilapidated property for a new commercial use that is consistent with the Le Droit Park historic district. My understanding, this BZA case is not about the willingness to make a substantial Because we too, the residents of this investment. Why? neighborhood, have already made substantial judicious investments and that have rebounded to our benefit up to this point. The siting of Indigo, these are two different operating environments and --

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.

MS. BROWN: -- a judicious investment was made by the

1	Applicant, hopefully at the expense of successful senior citizens
2	who made a good investment in their homes. These upstanding
3	accomplished seniors, resident investors, tax paying residents,
4	incoming property tax payers, are now being asked to pay a price
5	for someone else's bad decisions. Caveat emptor, buyer beware.
6	The Applicant should have reviewed the zoning before
7	he made the purchase. So, and I also believe and I was taught,
8	he has a right to operate a business but his rights end where my
9	rights begin, and my quality of life will certainly be affected
10	if that restaurant with the outside dining and all of the other
11	adverse impacts that have been addressed go into effect.
12	So I thank you for the opportunity to testify, and I
13	sincerely ask that you not approve the Applicant's request, BZA
14	case 21151.
15	Thank you very much.
16	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Brown. All
17	right.
18	Thank you all for your testimony. Mr. Young, do we
19	have anybody here wishing to speak?
20	MR. YOUNG: Yes, we do. We have a number of people.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
22	MR. YOUNG: How many do you want me to bring at one
23	time?
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Do we have support and opposition,
25	or is it just opposition?

1	MR. YOUNG: We have both.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Let's do support first.
3	MR. YOUNG: Support first?
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: You can bring them four at a time.
5	I mean, how many do you have?
6	MR. YOUNG: We have a lot. I'm not sure everyone is
7	here but
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
9	MR. YOUNG: there's at least ten.
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right. Well, go ahead and give
11	me the names as they come forward. Go ahead. You can do four
12	at a time.
13	MR. YOUNG: How many do you want me to bring? Four?
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: You can bring four at a time, yeah.
15	MR. YOUNG: And the first is Huma Imtiaz. Kyle
16	Gardiner.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: You broke up, Mr. Young. I heard
18	you say Kyle I think. I don't see a Kyle.
19	MR. YOUNG: The fourth is Lola Peres.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Hold on. Lola Peres. Okay.
21	And I guess it's Mark Stern. Okay. Great. Okay.
22	Everybody, I'm going to call you basically in the way
23	that you were brought up, and as a member of the public you'll
24	have three minutes to give you testimony and I'm going to be
25	pretty tight on the time because we have a lot of people and we

1	have a lot of stuff to do, and I'm trying to get to a graduation
2	and it doesn't look like that's going to happen exactly as I
3	thought. But that's okay because Mr. Blake's going to take over
4	for me.
5	So, let's go ahead and see, Ms. Imtiaz?
6	ANC COMMISSIONER IMTIAZ: Imtiaz. Thank you.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Imtiaz.
8	ANC COMMISSIONER IMTIAZ: Members of the Committee, and
9	I hope you get to graduation on time. I'll be brief.
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: It's okay. It's cool. It's fine.
11	I was just kind of teasing. Mr. Blake is going to take over for
12	me so it's okay.
13	Ms. Imtiaz, could you introduce yourself for the
14	record, and if everybody can mute unless you're testifying that'd
15	be helpful please. And go ahead and introduce yourself for the
16	record, and then you'll have three minutes.
17	ANC COMMISSIONER IMTIAZ: Sure. My name is Huma Imtiaz
18	H-U-M-A I-M-T-I-A-Z. I am the Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner
19	for 5E04 and am also the Chair of ANC 5E. I am testifying in my
20	individual capacity as the Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner for
21	5E04 which is located next to 5E05 which is what Hillview Market,
22	2324 North Capitol Street is in.
23	I'm here to express my support for this application and
24	hoping that the BZA today will approve it. I would also want to
25	echo the residents of my Single Member District. We're incredibly

enthusiastic and supportive of this restaurant coming to the neighborhood and have been so for many years.

2.

Here are the benefits that we see if the variance is granted. A restaurant is an amenity and beneficial to the neighborhood as well as for Ward 5's economic growth and the District at large. Having a restaurant serves an additional gathering space for residents and will further help create an inclusive diverse and welcoming space that we want our neighborhood to be known for.

We have already seen this to be true for the existing restaurants that exist in Bloomingdale. Right now residents including myself walk to nearby establishments of which we have a fair number and more foot traffic also helps our neighborhood feel livelier and safer.

Indigo 2, if granted the application, would also serve existing residents but also the new residents to the Park and the Reservoir District as well as the new housing that is coming in the Reservoir District parcel, also known popularly as the McMillan District. And similar to the K Street location, this Indigo will also have the benefit of serving an increased population.

I also want to add that we heard in community meetings from neighbors who live next to the Indigo on K Street, their other location, who had nothing but good things to say about the Applicants and their investment in the community. I also want

to just commend the Applicants. They have been active participants in community meetings for years. They have come to neighborhood events like Taste of Bloomingdale at the Bloomingdale Community Day and they've been very open and receptive to feedback from residents for years about what they have wanted.

I also just want to point out a couple of other things. We have already seen the closure of one corner market recently. We have seen store fronts on North Capitol that are either vacant or become cannabis stores that are operating illegally. I know ABCA is cracking down on those. Opening another corner store when one exists 44 feet away, literally across the street and we're going to get a new grocery store at Reservoir District does not make it seem like another corner store will be sustainable here.

And so this building has been vacant. The Applicants have done a lot of work at making this building look better. The sidewalk improvements are great and we're really hoping that this building, instead of staying vacant for longer, could be put to better use.

I also just want to say that as a community we should be encouraging more businesses to invest in Bloomingdale, especially in the long vacant spaces and really hoping that, you know, the concerns about rodents and trash, again. We have talked to the Applicants over and over again and I am fully satisfied

with their commitment to ensure that some of these concerns are addressed.

2.

But thank you for your time. I'm happy to take any questions.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you so much, and thank you, Commissioner, for your service. Let's see. I'll see if my Board has anything in a minute.

Mr. [Gardian]? Is there [Gardian]? Oh, Gardiner. Mr. Gardiner, if you could introduce yourself for the record and you'll have three minute to give your testimony.

ANC COMMISSIONER GARDINER: Great. Thank you, Chairperson Hill, and thank you to the rest of the BZA as well.

My name is Kyle Gardiner. I am an ANC Commissioner as well, also for 5E. I'm the Single Member District representative for 5E01. I'm similarly speaking in my personal capacity today as a Commissioner because 5E as a whole did not take a stance on this matter.

I wish I were here to make all the obvious appeals to why the BZA should unquestionably approve the use for this property as a restaurant. At a time when there are near weekly articles about popular restaurants closing across the District, here is a neighbor who already operates a successful restaurant who seeks to open a walkable, small scale eatery along a major arterial which is in desperate need for investment.

If the Applicant is granted this exception, it's

materially obvious that this will benefit the neighborhood, the ANC and the District as a whole. Nobody reasonable contends today that restaurants like Republic Cantina, Big Bear Café or Red Hen, all restaurants in 5E which are immediately approximate to RF-1 residential homes, are not huge boons to Truxton Circle and Bloomingdale. Certainly in terms of property value and tax revenue, but much more importantly because of the vibrancy and dynamism (audio interference) to our shared spaces and to probably the almost 100 neighbors who have submitted public comment or attended ABCA, BZA, ANC or civic associated meetings to speak in favor of Indigo 2, the future benefit of this restaurant and the lack of adverse impact are materially obvious.

2.

But I'm also keenly aware that a small minority of neighbors, and to the Chairperson I really do want to emphasize this. The folks that you heard from today who are speaking in opposition are almost the only ones across all of 5E who have spoken in opposition across literally dozens of meetings, should not have veto authority over whether or not this vacant property can be used to turn into a successful restaurant and I'm particularly concerned by the Office of Planning's recommendation of denial and so I want to use the remainder of my time to rebut some of the concerns raised both by protestants and the Office of Planning.

Principally, the Office of Planning argued that they have not demonstrated that there are no other available uses

under the current market conditions for allowable uses for this property. I'll note that in 2025 at least two developers have come before the ANC because they needed to request changes to their current uses because they could no longer sustain a projected first floor retail that they had originally desired to place. I similarly have three retailers in my SMD who cannot staff corner stores because they cannot find tenants willing to take on such risks right now. The market for this just does not exist.

I recognize my time is coming low, but I certainly hope you allot some additional time for the points that I have to make here. The notion that they should have to submit some type of market analysis to sustain the notion that a restaurant is the only available use here is simply not something that's present in the Code and something that I would recommend against expecting of anyone seeking some type of special exception like this.

I'd also argue that the general notion that this is going to present adverse impacts relative to the status quo is spatially not true. The status quo is a neglected property that if this Applicant cannot convert into a restaurant, is likely to continue to change hands and continue to become more neglected as it's taken over by property owners who are not invested similarly in this community.

I am really concerned to think about what happens if you all vote to not approve this application today and one year

1	or three years down the line we are facing a property that is
2	further neglected, further vandalized, has traffic, noise,
3	garbage issues related to the fact that it's either
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Mr. Gardiner? Mr. Gardiner?
5	You've got to wrap it up. Sorry.
6	ANC COMMISSIONER GARDINER: Okay. Well, I would just
7	close out by saying here that the standard which the Office of
8	Planning is holding this against is fictional. It's holding it
9	against an Applicant that does not exist. The reality is that
10	this is a restaurant that's going to have incredible boon for the
11	local area as well as the ANC as a whole
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
13	ANC COMMISSIONER GARDINER: and if it's not used for
14	this use, it's likely to become neglected and present greater
15	adverse impacts than what is currently being proposed by the
16	Applicant.
17	Thank you.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. All right. You guys,
19	by the way I've got ten other people on the line here.
20	So is it Ms. [Pu-rose]? Oh, Peres.
21	MS. PERES: Peres, yes. Lola Peres.
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great.
23	Ms. Peres, could you go ahead and introduce yourself
24	for the record and then you'll have three minutes to present your
25	testimony as a member of the public, and you can begin whenever

you like.

MS. PERES: Thank you.

My name is Lola Peres. I live one block from the proposed restaurant. I'm at 100 Bryant Street at 1st Street at the corner there and I don't want to be redundant because Huma and Kyle made excellent points and that's exactly what I support about this restaurant coming here.

I know the risks of change is something that people have a hard time with as we listened to from the opposition, but I think what we heard from the opposition were all worst case scenarios of the worst order and some of them were just grossly exaggerated, and I'll give you an example.

Bryant Street is a quiet street for the most part but we do have a good deal of traffic already and we don't have the walkability of south Bloomingdale in the north end. The idea of a restaurant at the corner of North Capitol and Bryant Street being such an adverse impact on us just does not seem to be true and I think it was offensive to mention that people who opposed a bus line change are now supporting this restaurant. There's no connection between the two.

The other impact I feel that would be great is that I've walked to the South Bloomingdale area where the restaurants are at dinner time because I have been listening to the opposition and I wanted to be open to what they were concerned about and I believe these concerns are not fully founded because Mr. Tandon

has committed himself to address those concerns as best as possible.

I strongly support this restaurant and my concern is also what will be here if the restaurant is not, and that's what I'd like to say. We really strongly support his presence there.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Ms. Peres.

Mr. Stern, can you hear me?

MR. STERN: Can you hear me?

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.

MR. STERN: Great.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: If you could introduce yourself for the record and you will also have three minutes to give your testimony.

MR. STERN: I am Mark Stern M-A-R-K S-T-E-R-N. I am a resident of Bloomingdale. I live on North Capitol Street, directly facing North Capitol Street about two blocks down from the location and I just cannot support strongly enough the Commission granting this variance.

In my view, the current zoning for this building reflects the past and the variance that has been requested here reflects the future. We see many, many new townhomes being constructed at McMillan every day. We have a huge apartment complex coming to McMillan in the near future. We, as a neighborhood, are poised to invite hundreds of new people to

share Bloomingdale with us. They deserve a world class place to eat and that is what the Applicants are offering here and trying to provide to us.

2.

As someone who lives on North Cap I can tell you two things. First, it is really noisy already. That's just life on North Cap, but second it's changing. We're excited. We just got new street lights and crosswalks. It's becoming more residential. It's becoming more walkable. We deserve, like South Bloomingdale has already, a place where neighbors can congregate and eat and see each other and create a sense of community. Those hundreds of people who are moving in, they will already have a grocery store at their disposal.

Sorry, Lola, I think you need to mute?

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes, Mr. Stern. Yeah, Ms. Peres, go ahead and mute. Go ahead, Mr. Stern.

MR. STERN: Thank you, Lola.

Those residents, they will already have a grocery store available to them. We are now hearing that it may well be a smaller grocery store, one with organic and farmer's market style offerings, exactly what the handful of objectors here are seeking for this location. It's not going to happen. As others have said, there is already a corner store directly across the street from this site. Another corner store in the neighborhood a few blocks away recently closed and no one has come in to replace it to offer a substitute. We do not have a commercial real estate

market in Bloomingdale that can support what the objectors are looking for here.

2.

There is no need for any kind of corner store here. What we need is a restaurant where we can have community and so I am saying on behalf, not just of current Bloomingdale residents, but of the many hundreds of residents who will be joining us in the near future, please do not allow a handful of objectors to veto this wonderful opportunity for our neighborhood, an opportunity for community, an opportunity for our local economy, something that so many of us have really flooded you with support for. I think you've seen all of the letters. Everyone I speak to about this is overjoyed and extremely enthusiastic it.

I understand a handful of people oppose it. That is always going to happen. They should not be allowed to weald a veto against overwhelming neighborhood and community support.

16 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Stern. All right.

Mr. Young, who are the next, you have others in support?

MR. YOUNG: We do.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Before you let these guys go, actually go ahead and let them go and bring up the other ones, please, Mr. Young, and give me their names.

MR. YOUNG: Okay. So next is Andrew Maloney, and then Chris Curry, Shen Yun is calling in by phone, and next is Meghan Robins. That's four.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you.

And just so everybody knows, like, it's not a handful of people that are opposed or not opposed and there is no veto thing going on. Like, we're taking testimony. There's a lot of people that are in support. The record is pretty clear that there is people in support, there's people in opposition. We're just trying to understand the regulations, right? I mean, we're not here again as a popularity thing and so just to let you all know, there is no veto thing going on.

Mr. Maloney, can you hear me?

MR. MALONEY: Yes, I can.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great.

If you could introduce yourself for the record and then you'll have three minutes to give your testimony and you can begin whenever you like.

MR. MALONEY: Absolutely. I appreciate it.

My name is Andrew Maloney. I am resident at 301 K Street, that is directly across from the current Indigo location and I cannot express how much I support Dinesh and Nidhi's efforts to try and open up a second location.

Based on my direct experience from living across for the last five years, I see Dinesh to be a dear friend, a great member of the community. He has been a wonderful person to reach out to. He has been kind and sharing and involved. Very amenable, very receptive to any comments, questions or concerns

with regards to his business.

2.

With regard to some of my direct experience having lived for the last five years here at this location, part of the allure of actually buying this place five years ago was because it was across from a really well renowned restaurant. From as far as the experiences for some of the testimony that has been provided today, I can talk to a couple of different points.

The first would be traffic, both pedestrian and motor. From my experience I have seen minimal motor and pedestrian traffic, if at all, disruptions from a residential standpoint. I would like to add based on the testimony I've heard from folks who have been against this effort that there is actually a construction project at one end of the street and there's been another construction project on the other end of the street as well, in addition to another restaurant as well as operating across the street. But my experience with that in mind has been absolutely wonderful, as both as somebody who walks daily around the block, as somebody who's also driven as well around the restaurant, as somebody who's seen delivery drivers come and go, the disruptions have been incredibly minimal, if at all.

The second point, noise and pollution or, you know, noxious fumes that have been talked about. I have experienced, again, minimal to no disruptions. If anything, I have heard minimal noise in within reasonable hours. I've actually been quite surprised at the consistency at which the restaurant closes

and folks have actually departed and it has kept noise pollution to a minimal and incredibly undisruptive to my daily life, having been directly across the street for the last five years.

2.

As far as smells, I have never experienced any sort of noxious issues while I have lived here. If anything, it's been rare and on occasion and it's actually been quite pleasant. I think it's a far cry to suggest that there is a disruption on the level of living in an entire immersive Indian environment as opposed to having an Indian restaurant just across the street.

As far as what we can consider or what I, you know, what I would like to add is it's just been a wonderful part of the community and a wonderful facet to have a restaurant like itself to provide and I cannot support this effort enough and have nothing but great things to say.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Mr. Maloney, and thank you for keeping to time.

Mr. Curry, can you hear me?

MR. CURRY: Yes, I can hear you.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great. If you could introduce yourself for the record and then you'll have three minutes to give your testimony, and you can begin whenever you like.

MR. CURRY: Sure.

My name is Chris Curry. I've lived in Bloomingdale for several years, about three blocks from the proposed location. I also walk my dog past this exact location almost daily, up and

down Bryant Street.

This morning actually as I walked by I was reminded of two things. The first thing is that there is plenty of street parking available on Bryant Street. Typically, at least recently I've been counting the number of spaces that are available and this morning I counted 25 available parking spots. It may also be worth reminding folks that everyone who lives on Bryant Street also has private parking behind their homes. These are very deep lots with plenty of room to park multiple cars as well as having a fire pit or other personal private space. So I don't see parking as a huge issue there.

The second thing that I was reminded of this morning was that this corner where Indigo was proposed is already incredibly loud. There's traffic noise, beeping, screeching tires, radios blaring and the notion that this small Indian restaurant would disrupt this corner is just wrong. So I appreciate the opportunity to speak but I hope that the BZA understands what exactly this proposed restaurant location currently looks and actually sounds like.

I'm also in the somewhat unique position in that I used to live directly across the street from the original Indigo location in NoMa. It's far from the raucous and chaotic business that some would have you believe. Similar to the person who previously spoke my experience is that it was very well run, neighborly, peaceful restaurant that had an extremely positive

impact on the residential area that it was located in.

So I support allowing Dinesh to move forward with this proposed restaurant as the alternative will likely be either an abandoned building or another failed corner store that sells cigarettes and beer.

So thanks for your time. Appreciate it.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Mr. Curry.

Mr. Yun, can you hear me, meaning the one on the phone?

I think you hit star 6 to unmute.

MR. YUN: Is that better?

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.

MR. YUN: Yes. Okay. Perfect.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Could you introduce yourself for the record and then you'll have three minutes to give your testimony, and I'll let you know when you're getting close to the three minutes, and you can begin whenever you like.

MR. YUN: Right. Thank you, sir. My name is Shen Yun.

I, likewise, this morning counted. I live 251 steps from the front of the proposed site. I'm not sure how many feet that is. I think I qualify for the 200 foot party provision, but very, very close on Adams Street and I know you had asked about, you know, you're focused on the criteria and one of the ones I'd like to highlight is what they highlighted in the PowerPoint of transition of obsolete and unfeasible uses and that's an impairment.

I walk my dog by this site every morning. I walk up and down Bryant Street. I think it's a beautiful street and, you know, me and my partner live on Adams Street. We park in our garage. We also park on the street. We have two cars. We're not concerned with the parking provision. We're not concerned about the trash. Trash was picked up this morning. Outside of the ten minutes the garbage truck comes through you don't notice the trash being picked up.

2.2

So I think these, you know, I understand the concerns of those who live right across the alley but it just doesn't, it seems like the benefits here of transitioning and obsolete in (indiscernible) use of a building to a, what is a highly rated and well loved restaurant is just, it's a no brainer.

And also the question that I suppose is, you know, they were, at first everyone was on board because it was a coffee shop and little bodega, and then the concerns were that there was a, you know, it would bring riff raff and crime because of the alcohol license. Well now it's, now we've moved beyond the riff raff and crime to, well, now there's noise and trash. It seems like every step of the way Mr. Tandon has talked to the neighborhood and they find a new excuse, another new excuse, and a new excuse.

I have not talked to anyone via door knocking or flyers and I live right around the corner. However, I've had more communication with Mr. Tandon than anyone who has spoken so far

and that includes my Commissioner. So I think that we have a great opportunity to welcome a new restaurant, an opportunity that is only going to amplify with the McMillan project and I just don't see how this property gets better than this opportunity now.

I understand that it's a zoning use thing and that this is, this would change the neighborhood but our neighborhood is changing. We've been here for a couple of years, it continues to change for the better. This will make it better and I really hope that you, the Board, realizes that and takes a look at all the information. That is very, very apparent that everyone submitted a lot of information and there's some good information there. Take a look at it and help us change our neighborhood for the better.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Mr. Yun.

Is it Mr. [Robing], oh, Robins? Ms. Robins?

MS. ROBINS: Can you hear me?

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes. Could you introduce yourself for the record, and then you'll also have three minutes to give your testimony.

MS. ROBINS: Hey. My name's Meghan Robins. I live at 20 Bryant Street on the unit block of Bryant Street with my wife and one, soon to be two children.

I've also been asked to speak on behalf of my neighbors

at 2319 North Capitol, directly across the street within 200 feet. I myself --

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Ms. Robins?

MS. ROBINS: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: I'm sorry. You can't speak for somebody else unless there's something in the record in writing, so just go ahead and give your testimony.

MS. ROBINS: We can axe that part.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: That's okay.

MS. ROBINS: Speaking on behalf of myself and within 300 feet of the building. Agreeing that this isn't a popularity contest, that the Board is tasked with applying specific regulations, I wanted to speak to the neighbor's perspective, as a neighbor, perspective on the adverse effects and the detriment to the public good.

And I would encourage the Board to consider a question which is compared to what? I think some of the neighbors in opposition are holding this impossible standard that there should be net zero impact in order for this to go through but what it should really be compared to is what the use would be without a zoning variance which may well be a corner store or it may not because it seems these corner stores really aren't economically viable these days and maybe it would just be a vacant abandoned building that's going to change hands again maybe multiple times or it seems the corner stores that are economically viable are

focused on cigarettes, booze, vapes.

2.

I believe that a restaurant, especially one run by Mr. Tandon who has just made such a commitment to working with the neighbors and has this established track record of an existing very similar restaurant in a very similar neighborhood. I think that use would have far fewer adverse impacts and detriment to the public good than another corner store selling vapes, booze, lotto tickets. There's one just a block up on Channing. That corner is notorious for garbage and loitering. I don't see anyone bidding to buy this building and run this sort of bougie posh corner store that my neighbors seem to envision. I don't see them signing up to buy it and run that business. I'm not signing up to buy it and run that business.

And Mr. Tandon has a track record here. We have a direct comparison and this is such a wonderful opportunity for our neighborhood to have a walkable restaurant that we can meet our friends at, meet our neighbors at and enjoy the food.

I think that parking really isn't that big of an issue. There's plenty of space within our neighborhood and I just note that, like, residential parking is 50 bucks a year and it entitles us to park in our parking zone, but it certainly doesn't entitle us to the public street directly in front of our house. If you want a spot directly at your house that's what our parking spots behind our house are for and if we choose not to use them, that's up to us.

1	But I really don't think that these horrible adverse
2	effects that some of the neighbors are noting are grounded in
3	reality and the reality is that I just don't think it's viable
4	for another corner store to open up there so I think we're looking
5	at just a worse option keeping it with the status quo.
6	So I would ask that the Board consider transitioning
7	away from an obsolete unfeasible use and allows this restaurant.
8	Thank you guys so much for your time.
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Ms. Robins.
10	Thank you all for your testimony. Mr. Young, how many
11	more do we have in support?
12	MR. YOUNG: I think we just have one more group of
13	support.
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: How many people in the group?
15	MR. YOUNG: Three.
16	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Give me a second actually.
16 17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Give me a second actually.  Can you, I want to talk to the Office of Planning and I want to
17	Can you, I want to talk to the Office of Planning and I want to
17 18	Can you, I want to talk to the Office of Planning and I want to talk to everybody because I'm going to have to leave, and we're
17 18 19	Can you, I want to talk to the Office of Planning and I want to talk to everybody because I'm going to have to leave, and we're going to take a break before we come back because I need to take
17 18 19 20	Can you, I want to talk to the Office of Planning and I want to talk to everybody because I'm going to have to leave, and we're going to take a break before we come back because I need to take a break before you all come back.
17 18 19 20 21	Can you, I want to talk to the Office of Planning and I want to talk to everybody because I'm going to have to leave, and we're going to take a break before we come back because I need to take a break before you all come back.  So, yeah, Mr. Barron, so what I think's going to happen
17 18 19 20 21 22	Can you, I want to talk to the Office of Planning and I want to talk to everybody because I'm going to have to leave, and we're going to take a break before we come back because I need to take a break before you all come back.  So, yeah, Mr. Barron, so what I think's going to happen for me is I'm going to have to watch the end of this, okay? And

able to participate in a vote on June 4th.

2.

But, Mr. Barron, I guess I'm kind of hearing a little bit about, like, there's a corner store across the street and there's other. I mean, we all know, we've been here a long time, that the use variance is very difficult to overcome and you guys did have a lot of discussions with the Applicant in that, you know, they were talking about this, or you mentioned this was somewhat of a compelling case.

I don't think you're going to change anything that you're about to say, but I just wanted to hear your opinion on a couple of things. Just so even the people who are providing testimony, as well as the people in opposition, if this ever got to a place where there was a, you know, a restaurant there what this restaurant might look like is nothing possibly like what's being proposed. There might be different things that are put in terms of conditions that we were trying to do to, you know, keep adverse impacts from actually being adverse impacts.

But beyond that, they are trying to get over a pretty high bar, okay? The use variance is a very high bar to get over and I also want to say this since I do have a couple of minutes before I have to go, you know, I know the other restaurant also. Indigo, and it's a lovely restaurant and it sounds like the owner is a lovely owner and he's a very good member of the community but that's zoned for that. Like, that's why you guys are here. Like, this is something that is not within this zone.

1	So, you know, I'm sure the, you know, I'm sure the
2	restaurateur is a great restaurateur. So, but my question I
3	guess to the Office of Planning is that given this, you know,
4	all this different information about corner stores and whether,
5	what is another thing that, again, the Office of Planning, that
6	this could become again? Can you clarify again what this could
7	become? Residential obviously. It works for residential.
8	MR. BARRON: Under the, because it's in the RF-1 zone,
9	the only avenue for having non-commercial uses on that or the
10	most viable one would be the corner store regulations and under
11	those regulations, they are principally by matter-of-right
12	focused on grocery uses, the kind of convenience stores that the
13	Applicant and other people have talked about.
14	But there are also other special exception uses that
15	can be allowed that include things like coffee shops or other
16	types of retail, or things that are not specifically just bodegas,
17	those types of corner stores. So there are definitely, it's a
18	small number of retail uses that could be done here
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Right.
20	MR. BARRON: (indiscernible) uses that could be done.
21	There are, it's more than just a bodega.
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Right. And you can go from
23	nonconformity to nonconformity?
24	MR. BARRON: Correct, provided that the intensity is
25	not greater than what the use was before. So it's possible to

1	use the original path that the Applicant had looked at with the
2	special exception. I forget the chapter number that was cited
3	off the top of my head. But there is a way that you can go from
4	a nonconforming use to another nonconforming use. An example was
5	there was a bank that we had done that had transferred to a
6	clothing store. So there are ways that you can do it provided
7	that the intensity is not greater than the original use that was
8	there.
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Got it. Okay.
10	Dr. Imamura?
11	ZC COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
12	Mr. Barron, you had mentioned coffee shop as a
13	permissible use. What about a café? Is that too a permissible
13 14	permissible use. What about a café? Is that too a permissible use?
14	use?
14 15	use?  MR. BARRON: There is a certain amount, there is a,
14 15 16	use?  MR. BARRON: There is a certain amount, there is a, what's the word I'm looking for, eating and drinking
14 15 16 17	use?  MR. BARRON: There is a certain amount, there is a, what's the word I'm looking for, eating and drinking establishment provision that's in the corner store regulations
14 15 16 17 18	use?  MR. BARRON: There is a certain amount, there is a, what's the word I'm looking for, eating and drinking establishment provision that's in the corner store regulations that would allow for a very limited kind of café. Really the
14 15 16 17 18	MR. BARRON: There is a certain amount, there is a, what's the word I'm looking for, eating and drinking establishment provision that's in the corner store regulations that would allow for a very limited kind of café. Really the limitation is on what kind of food is prepared on-site.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. BARRON: There is a certain amount, there is a, what's the word I'm looking for, eating and drinking establishment provision that's in the corner store regulations that would allow for a very limited kind of café. Really the limitation is on what kind of food is prepared on-site.  However, if there was outdoor seating, again, that
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. BARRON: There is a certain amount, there is a, what's the word I'm looking for, eating and drinking establishment provision that's in the corner store regulations that would allow for a very limited kind of café. Really the limitation is on what kind of food is prepared on-site.  However, if there was outdoor seating, again, that would be, that could be potentially still considered an expansion

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY
Court Reporting and Litigation Support
Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia
410-766-HUNT (4868)
1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

I'm curious. I've heard café being used and curious

25

what that threshold is where it tips the scales from café to, you know, full service restaurant, so.

2.

MR. BARRON: Typically it's whether or not there is food being prepared on-site. So with the eating and drinking establishment rules under the corner store regulations, you are allowed to prepare cold food, you are allowed to reheat food, but you are not allowed to cook food on-site. So having a full service kitchen downstairs or ovens for baking, you would not be allowed to do that as a matter-of-right or special exception under those regulations.

ZC COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: All right. Very good. Thank you, Mr. Barron. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your indulgence.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. Okay.

What I'm going to do now is take a break and let's say we'll take a ten minute break, okay, come back at 2:10. But I just wanted to let the people in opposition as well as the Applicant know what will now happen.

You're going to continue to take testimony from those in support and opposition. Then there will be a chance for the party in opposition to ask questions of the Applicant and/or the Office of Planning and what I wanted to kind of, I mentioned this ahead of time so that the person who is in Ms. Kavaler, since she's kind of the organizer, if you could get her your questions, if they could all just come from Ms. Kavaler, and the questions kind of -- we're trying to keep them to zoning questions. I

mean, you guys aren't zoning experts, but we're here for the criteria that we're looking at within the zoning code and so that's what we're kind of trying to look at.

2.

2.2

So try to do the best that you can and I know that Mr. Blake will guide you along, and we're going to try to be civil about it as what I would also try to point out because everybody just has a different opinion and we're here to just kind of process the regulations.

And then the Applicant will have the same opportunity to ask questions of the opposition and Office of Planning, and also ask the Applicant to be civil and try to move forward as best as we can, and then there will be a small conclusion from the party in opposition which I would hope Ms. Kavaler would please do, and then a small conclusion from the Applicant and then we'll see what happens.

And so with that, I wish you all the best. Thank you all very much for taking all this time. I know it's been, like, six months and a long way to go and so, and thank you, Mr. Blake, for covering for me. So we'll see you guys in about ten minutes.

(Whereupon, there was a brief recess.)

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: All right, Mr. Young. Can you call, let's see. Let's see.

Madam Secretary, are you there?

MS. MEHLERT: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SMITH: Okay. Let's call us back into

session.

MS. MEHLERT: Okay. The Board is returning from its break and is returning to its hearing session with Application No. 21151 of Dinesh Tandon and Nidhi Tandon.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. All right.

We're going to start off kind of where we left off. We're going to continue taking testimony from the public. I think we have three or four more people who are going to speak in support. Then we're going to take testimony from the public in opposition. After that we're going to have the parties in opposition ask questions of the Applicant. This is our cross-examination session, and we're also going to have parties in opposition, any other, Ms. Kavaler, and others speak to any questions they have for the Office of Planning or the Applicant. The Applicant will then have an opportunity to ask questions of the Office of Planning as well as the parties in opposition.

After that the Board should feel free at any point to ask any a questions of anybody as it moves them. What I think is important, and I want to remind everybody as we go through this cross-examination session and finish this, we want to hear what you have to say and we want to make sure that you get your questions asked and answered. But ultimately your goal is for the Board to hear and understand the legally relevant facts of the case and it's our responsibility to apply those regulations. We're tasked with making that decision.

_	50, as we go chrough this if at some point, again, i
2	want to hear what you have to say so we're going to hear them.
3	But at some point if we go into an area that was not helpful, I
4	will probably step in and ask just, and to redirect.
5	So, that said, let's continue, Mr. Young, if you can
6	bring the next three or four folks in from in support from the
7	public witnesses.
8	MR. YOUNG: Yeah. We have four left for support. The
9	first is Joya Banerjee, and then we have Christina Cautericci.
10	Next is Judy Fung, and the last one in support is Jessica Lovejoy.
11	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. So we'll begin to take
12	testimony in that order. So I guess the first one would be, let
13	me see. Ms. Banerjee? Okay. Would you please state your name
14	and your address. You have three minutes to provide your public
15	testimony, and you may begin when you like.
16	MS. BANERJEE: Okay. Thank you.
17	My name is Joya Banerjee and my address is 46 V Street,
18	Northwest.
19	I'm actually in the hospital in the emergency room
20	right now with my toddler but I heard what some of the opponents
21	of Indigo were saying and I was so appalled that I had to join.
22	I'm an Indian American homeowner, mother and business
23	owner in Bloomingdale. I live two blocks away from the Indigo 2
24	proposed site and I was so happy to find out that one of the only
25	two good Indian restaurants in D.C. was opening around the corner

from my family's home in this veritable food desert.

Some of the naysayers who are testifying here have suggested that the Dinesh and Nidhi Tandon should open a convenience store instead of a restaurant which is patently absurd. A new supermarket will open one block away in the Reservoir District complex shortly and the neighborhood already has enough stores. The current bodegas are already hot beds of crime and gun point robberies. The low profit margins for a corner store make it highly unlikely that this property will find a new owner, in fact it will probably stay vacant for another five years. That will only serve to keep this part of North Capitol as it is as a blighted location.

We're talking about a desolate stretch of North Capitol with nothing but empty homes and run down buildings. While there are also homes there that are occupied, I'm sorry, I don't mean to suggest that, but I think what's most shocking to me is Ms. Evelyn Brown's comment that she doesn't want her home to smell like curry and that she has travelled to India and (audio interference). In 2025, that kind of racism is completely unacceptable. I've been to Jam Doung on North Capitol and got diarrhea. Does that mean that a Jamaican restaurant would make everybody sick? No.

I think that Indigo 2 would revitalize and reinvigorate the neighborhood, drawing important foot traffic. Just look at what the Red Hen, Big Bear and Boundary Stone have done to nourish

and revitalize our neighborhood. Opponents have also said by approving this opening it would open the floodgates for other businesses to operate here but they're ignoring the obvious.

It's residentially zoned and this ridiculously long and bureaucratic process shows how difficult it would be for any future businesses to open up here.

To be honest, I have yet to hear any meaningful argument against Indigo 2's opening. All I have heard is selfish claims about people who are going to lose their street parking right in front of their house even though street parking is abundant in our neighborhood as well as public transport with no regard for the best interest of our community. Bloomingdale can only stand to benefit from Indigo opening here and I think we should be proud that an award winning restaurant wants to open up in our neighborhood.

Let me conclude there. Thank you.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Thank you very much for your testimony. Could we now have the testimony from Ms. Cauterucci. Is that right?

MS. CAUTERUCCI: Can you hear me?

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Yeah. Would you please give your name and address for the record, and you have three minutes to provide your testimony.

MS. CAUTERUCCI: Thank you your time. My name is Christina Cauterucci. I live at 128 Bryant Street, Northwest.

I've been a Bloomingdale resident for the past 15 years and I purchased my home with my wife five years ago and we felt like the one downside of this beautiful part of our neighborhood was the lack of a good restaurant. We did have an abundance of convenience stores. There's about four or five within a quick walk from my home. So we were ecstatic to hear that just one block from our house, Indigo, a second location of one of our favorite restaurants in D.C. was going to be opening up something that the neighborhood sorely need as opposed to a convenience store which, as I mentioned, it seemed almost absurd that there would be two convenience stores right across the street from each other on North Capitol.

The opposition presented at this meeting. That doesn't seem to me to hold any water. Parking, street parking is so abundant in this part of Bloomingdale. Several blocks around the proposed location for the restaurant including my own only have houses on one side of the street so we're actually less densely populated than almost any other part of the neighborhood or the city which means that there's always a lot of empty parking spots around. We are also very well connected to public transit.

I also think a restaurant would be an incredible compliment to the vibrant new Reservoir District that's being built as opposed to a convenience store which, not only do we have so many of, but it's going to end up, it would end up being redundant with the grocery store that's planned as well.

When I think about the future of this neighborhood and the future of the life of my family, I love thinking about an area of North Capitol that feels safer because of the increase in presence and foot traffic and it would make me feel a lot safer around there at night if there were a restaurant there versus a convenience store, and I, you know, it's something that the neighborhood just doesn't have and we really need. So thank you so much for your consideration and I'll end there. 10 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Thank you very much for 11 your testimony. 12 Ms. Fung? Would you please, Ms. Fung, yes. Would you 13 please introduce yourself for the record and you have three 14 minutes to provide your testimony. 15 MS. FUNG: Awesome. My name is Judy Fung. I am a 16 homeowner and I have lived near the corner of V Street and North Capitol for several years. I plan to stay in Bloomingdale long 17 18

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

term and I hope to raise my future children here.

I love this neighborhood and I care very deeply about the value of my home and the character of the Bloomingdale neighborhood and I only see the addition of Indigo, an incredibly popular and affordable Indian restaurant to be a value added to my neighborhood.

As a homeowner I do not think parking seems to be much of an issue. As has been mentioned by others, most houses have

parking in the back. So, for example, our condo can fit five cars in our back yard space. We don't need it, but it can. I just don't think it would have much more of an impact parking-wise than any other type of business and personally I think if I were going to eat at Indigo and lived outside the neighborhood I would take public transit considering how busy North Capitol is.

2.

Even though Bloomingdale is not near a metro stop it is a walkable neighborhood. I personally do not travel by car for my everyday life. I travel by bus, bike, scooter or I walk and I don't think that it's true that most people would drive to Indigo, especially when it's accessible via multiple bus lines. So, for example, most people take public transit or they walk when going to the Bloomingdale farmer's market or Boundary Stone, just due to parking constraints. And I also want to echo what my fellow supporters said, we are not entitled to street parking as homeowners and our visitors are not entitled to street parking.

And second, I understand that the alternative to Indigo would be a convenience store that would sell alcohol, preserved foods. I don't see how this adds any value at all to our neighborhood. With all due respect we already have a plethora of stores like this in our neighborhood as referenced by the opposition's presentation earlier.

We will also have a grocery store that is soon to be opened in the Reservoir District, so we're not going to need another convenience store if we have easy access to a grocery

store and other similar businesses. I don't feel like another convenience store would succeed as a business and we could end up in a place where the lot is periodically vacant which does not look good for our neighborhood.

We're going to have to have something on this property. It's not conducive to a residential property. I personally do not want it to be a liquor store or a convenience store for the reasons I mentioned, so let's just make sure it's the best possible business there is which is Indigo, a Michelin Guide honored restaurant.

And then finally just as a woman, feeling safe in my neighborhood is very important to me and I feel like having a reputable restaurant with consistent foot traffic that is well lit and well maintained would only contribute to a safer environment.

So with that I'll just mention that I know this is during work hours, but I have talked to at least a dozen of my neighbors who have hoped to speak in support or are unable to join. Based on everything I've seen and heard, the majority of residents within two to three blocks of this establishment support it becoming a restaurant.

Thank you.

2.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Thank you very much for your testimony. We appreciate that.

Next we'll hear from Ms. Lovejoy. Would you --

MS. LOVEJOY: Hi. Thank you, Commissioner Blake, and sorry I'm (indiscernible).

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Okay.

Would you please state your name for the record, and you have three minutes to give your testimony.

MS. LOVEJOY: Excellent. Thank you.

Good afternoon. My name is Jessica Lovejoy and I'm here today in strong support of Indigo's application. My partner and I have lived in Bloomingdale for the past few years and we're now in nearby NoMa. We love this part of the city and are actively looking to buy a home in Bloomingdale, but a real major consideration for us and for many others as we've heard today is the lack of restaurants and vibrant public gathering spaces, especially north of Rhode Island.

You know, the South Bloomingdale, I love how somebody called it that, you know, has Big Bear and Red Hen and while we love these establishments there is so much need for investment activation north of Rhode Island and I think that it's a real, real, real consideration for us as we're looking to buy and set down roots here.

This is a thriving neighborhood with incredible potential, but too many store fronts remain empty or underutilized. Bloomingdale has a number of small bodegas and markets, like many others have mentioned, and those are struggling to survive as it is. I think that the opposition's push for yet

another market does not reflect what this community really actually needs and it would only create more pressure on these existing small businesses that are already fighting to stay open.

I know the woman that runs the bodega on 1st and U. We have gotten to know her really well and she comes all the way in by bus from Bethesda to work at her store every day and, like, I would hate to see another market open to be competition for her. We need her in this neighborhood and this community and pushing for yet another market does not make any sense in my opinion. It just puts that pressure on and it's bad planning and bad economics.

Indigo is a proven community rooted business. Their first location is beloved, not just because of the food but because of the space they've created. That's really important to me, these third spaces. It's welcoming, it's diverse, it's full of life. It's exactly the kind of energy that North Cap needs and let's be clear, this is a major commercial corridor. People who choose to buy homes there, which we're considering doing should also have reasonable expectation that it'll be noisy, active, dynamic. That's what you get when you live in a city and it's part of what makes urban life so great.

So I just want to second what Joya has said about this process being kind of arduous and difficult, and what Christina said about this actually improving walkability and safety of the neighborhood, those things are also very important to me.

1	So I would hate to miss the opportunity to bring back
2	life into this vacant space and support a small local business
3	with a track record of success, building the kind of neighborhood
4	that us residents new and long time can really enjoy.
5	So thank you for your time. Please approve this
6	proposal.
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Thank you very much for your
8	testimony.
9	Mr. Young, if you could dismiss those witnesses and if
10	you would invite the next, I think we're now to the public
11	witnesses in opposition, if you would invite those to the dais.
12	We have, I guess one to four. Four would be fine at a time.
13	Mr. Young, do you have four witnesses for me on the
14	MR. YOUNG: We have six total. Do you want me to do
15	three and three?
16	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: That'd be great. Thank you.
17	MR. YOUNG: Okay. The first is Kirby Vining. Next is
18	Janice Smith.
19	MR. SMITH: I'm sorry. My wife, Janice Smith, will not
20	be able to testify today. We thought it was going to be earlier
21	today in the morning. She has an appointment that she's at so I
22	apologize.
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Thank you.
24	MR. YOUNG: Okay. So the next is Joseph Levesque.
25	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Let's kick it off with

these two. Mr. Vining, would you like to introduce yourself for the record and your address, and you have three minutes to provide your testimony.

ANC COMMISSIONER VINING: Thank you.

2.

I'm Kirby Vining, ANC 5E06, Commissioner for Stronghold. My personal address is 16 Franklin Street but it's not relevant for these purposes because I'm speaking about a consensus of my constituents directly opposite the location.

That area directly across the street in Northeast is the 2300 and 2400 block of North Capitol Street and unit block of Bryant Street, Northeast, dead end street, and my remarks are a brief summary of the main points of my testimony, written testimony, which is Exhibit No. 134.

ANC Commissioner's responsibility, arguably our only responsibility, is to represent the concerns of residents on a broad range of issues. Not being clairvoyant the only way to find out my constituents' response to this proposed zoning use change, nonconforming use change, was to ask them. I distributed a flyer announcing both that the Applicant was requesting a zoning permissions change to open a restaurant/bar at the property and that I would be conducting a door-to-door survey of the Stronghold residents in the area directly impacted by this change as defined by the BZA.

The flyer, which is Exhibit A, asked the question. The owner of the property has applied for zoning permission to operate

a restaurant/bar at that location and zoning permissions must be changed to do so. Do residents support the proposed change and if so, why, or oppose the change and, if so, why? Two thirds of the residents who responded to the survey spoke about aggravated traffic, trash and rodents which they see as the same thing and parking problems the proposed restaurant or bar use would cause in the neighborhood substantially worse than conditions with the predecessor convenience store, which is the meat of this case. One nonconforming use to another, are there any adverse impacts? Details of that are in my written testimony, Exhibit 134 with the Exhibits A to D.

2.

The Applicant's statement makes the following claims concerning the proposed restaurant/bar use of the property which is the points of the Applicant's statement addressing 204.9 about the impacts being no greater or adverse than the existing convenience store use. This is contrary, the Applicant said there would be no adverse effects beyond that of the predecessor convenience store which is contrary to what two thirds of the survey residents responded, indicating that the proposed change would indeed have deleterious effects greater than those of the predecessor store with a negative impact on the quality of their life and neighborhood ordinance (phonetic).

The proposed use is appropriate for an MU-3 commercial area, but would be incompatible with this existing RF-1 where the Applicant's location is, R-3 directly across the street in the

Stronghold. This should be considered grounds for denying this application because, in fact, the nonconforming use change is the whole essence of this application.

The Applicant claims as a hardship that the property cannot be used for anything but the residential use or predecessor convenience store similar use. Any hardship here is self-inflicted or imaginary as the Applicant has no experience running anything at all at this location and does not cite evidence of what caused the predecessor store to close. The Applicant previously sought permission to open a liquor store and had an application before the Public Space Committee, ESC Case 10970771, to run a coffee and prepared food shop using the side patio for seating. These are two examples contrary to the Applicant's assertion that the location cannot be used for anything different. These grounds support denial of the hardship claim.

Finally, Stronghold and the entire surrounding area, both sides of North Capitol Street, is designated as a neighborhood conservation area and the generalized policy map for the comprehensive plan, the guiding philosophy for such areas states, this is a quote from the comprehensive plan. "To conserve and enhance established neighborhoods, alterations should be compatible with the character of each area. By law decisions of the Zoning Commission and the BZA are not to be inconsistent with the comprehensive plan."

That's my remarks. Thank you.

1	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Thank you.
2	I have one quick question for you, Commissioner.
3	Obviously, what was your experience with the ANC? Obviously the
4	ANC was unable to come up with a position on this. Can you give
5	me a sense of what transpired there?
6	ANC COMMISSIONER VINING: It was a tie vote. It's as
7	simple as that. There was discussion but it was a tie vote which
8	means the vote failed so the ANC as a whole took no position on
9	the matter.
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay.
11	But before the ANC was a recommendation from you; is
12	that right?
13	ANC COMMISSIONER VINING: That was from ANC
14	Commissioner Alice Thompson 5E05 who I don't think is here with
15	us today. But that's the Commissioner and the SMD where the
16	property is located.
17	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: And you're the adjacent SMD;
18	is that right?
19	ANC COMMISSIONER VINING: Pardon?
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: You're adjacent to that? Is
21	that right?
22	ANC COMMISSIONER VINING: Adjacent. Between 5E05 and
23	5E06 are all the 200 footers. I have a significant number but
24	they're (indiscernible) 5E05.
25	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Okay. Okay. Thank you

Thank you very

1 very much. 2 I guess the question, one more time just to clarify The reason for the split vote, was there, obviously the 3 this. 4 issues came up just as they are today and we see that the 5 community is relatively split in these public testimonies. 6 you, that's the same experience that you had at the ANC level, 7 correct? 8 ANC COMMISSIONER VINING: It was a split vote and I'm 9 not sure it would be fair of me to characterize what was behind 10 each of those votes. 11 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. 12 ANC COMMISSIONER VINING: I explained to the ANC the 13 results of the survey there and I encouraged the Commission to 14 support what we found among the 200 footers, but their decision 15 is their decision. 16 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Thank you very much. 17 Thank you very much, and thank you for your service as ANC SMD. 18 All right. Mr. Young, would you call, the next would 19 be Ms., let's see. 20 MR. YOUNG: Joseph Levesque is the next one. 21 CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Joseph Levesque (audio VICE 2.2 interference). MR. LEVESQUE: Thank you (audio interference). 23

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY
Court Reporting and Litigation Support
Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia
410-766-HUNT (4868)
1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

Would you please give your name for the record and your

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: All right.

24

25

much.

address, and you have three minutes to provide your testimony.

MR. LEVESQUE: Okay. Thank you.

My name is Joseph Levesque and I've lived in Bloomingdale for 44 years at 111 W Street, Northwest. I'm the recording secretary for the Bloomingdale Civic Association and then I'd like to report that in June, 2024 Mr. Dinesh had made a presentation. That meeting was well publicized. He had actually made another presentation much earlier and we had a question and answer period after the presentation. There was a vote and it was not to support the zoning relief, as opposed, in opposition.

I've been living here 44 years. I've seen corner stores. I live half a block away from (audio interference). They've all been successful except for one. They come and go, as with owners. I've seen a lot of restaurants have closed. You know, they close, they re-open, they close, re-open. I was on the founding board of the North Capitol Main Street and we advocated, this is 30 years ago, we advocated for revitalizing the Bloomingdale historic district which is across from Rhode Island. But it was only for areas that were zoned commercial, not for areas that were zoned residential. We wouldn't have done that, I don't believe.

As far as the use variance goes, there's a landmark building. It's an old school, it's Gates School. It had huge windows and it became, it's a condo now and those large windows are a big bonus. People love them. They put an addition on and

made huge windows and are actually below ground so people can look in, and so the argument that there's, the windows are going to be a problem for residential use of conversion, I just don't get it. I don't support that.

2.

A couple of people have mentioned that there's a grocery store is going to open a block away. McMillan Development starts a block away. The grocery store is more like a corner (audio interference) up by Michigan Avenue. It's not a block away and Commissioner Imtiaz mentioned that there's a corner store 44 feet away. It's, this is on the 2300 block. That corner store is up on the 2500 block and these are long blocks. It's in Northeast. It's not 44 feet away, it's more like 400 plus feet away and I'd just like to point out these inconsistent, these statements that are not accurate.

The zoning relief, priority should be given to, greater weight should be given to the people with party status. They're the ones that have to deal with the consequences of the noise and all the other issues that are going to be associated with opening a restaurant. Not someone that lives blocks away or someone that would like to have a restaurant. You know, okay, I'd like to have a restaurant too there, but there's a lot of restaurants in Bloomingdale and they're not far away. And there'd be some restaurants up at, hopefully, up in McMillan right next to the grocery store. It's only one area that would be commercial and it's at the very north end. Everything else would be

residential (indiscernible) the Park. 1 2 I don't have a whole lot other than to say that, you know, most of the people who have opposed this variance 3 4 relief, zoning relief, have really dealt with the issues at hand 5 and that is the zoning problems. I think the reviewer got it 6 right. It shouldn't be approved. I support that. I hope you 7 also do support that recommendation and I have a few other things to say but I just can't seem to remember what they all are. 8 9 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Mr. Levesque, your time is up 10 now, but I thank you very much for your testimony. MR. LEVESQUE: Thank you. 11 12 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: It's been very helpful. 13 MR. LEVESQUE: Thank you. 14 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Mr. Young, would you please 15 call our next witnesses. 16 MR. YOUNG: Next we have Betsy McDaniel who's calling 17 in by phone, Pam Mendelson, and the last person is Alice Thompson. 18 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. We'll take them in that 19 order then. We'll start out with Ms. McDaniel. Are you there? 20 Ms. McDaniel, you're on the phone, correct? MR. YOUNG: Yes, she is. There she is. 21 22 MS. MCDANIEL: Yes, yes, yes, Vice Chair Blake. 23 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Thank you very much.

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY
Court Reporting and Litigation Support
Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia
410-766-HUNT (4868)
1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

Would you please identify yourself and your address, and you have

three minutes to provide your testimony. We'll let you know if

24

25

you're getting close.

MS. MCDANIEL: Okay. Thank you.

My name is Betsy McDaniel. I live on the 1700 block of 1st Street, kind of between Big Bear and Red Hen and I bought my house in 2008 and I've seen the neighborhood change a lot. But I've always felt like we were able to respect the current zoning, and right now there are, let's see, I think I counted 27, we have 27 squares in the Bloomingdale historic district and within those 27 squares we have at least 15 prepared food establishments. That's one for almost every two squares and some of our squares are very small and the remainder of our ANC have counted at least seven more. So I don't think you can say we're unfriendly to restaurants because we have quite a few I think that are walkable.

As the Chair pointed out earlier, this is not a popularity contest. He also pointed out that we, our neighbors, we're not zoning experts. But the Office of Planning reviewer is the zoning expert in this case and I would ask that the Board respect the zoning report and vote to deny this application.

And conditions have been mentioned in this case and the earlier cases today, and I can tell you conditions don't work. I've seen many examples of where conditions do not work and one of the things I'm most concerned about is the cellar use. They want to build a kitchen, a full restaurant kitchen in the cellar and their plans show that there was one already existing and I

1	don't think there was. The last C of O showed that the basement
2	was not used and the plans that are in the file are, they show
3	it says existing on basically a full kitchen down there, and
4	that's just not true, and there's not one now and I don't think
5	there was before.
6	So I just think that needs a little extra review too,
7	even though the Office of Planning has already denied this
8	application. And I think I've covered the rest of those things
9	in my testimony, and I hope that the people are reading all the
10	testimony that has been submitted, and thank you very much.
11	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Great. Thank you very much.
12	Yes, we definitely go through each of the testimony and there's
13	a substantial amount in this case, and we look at the entire
14	record to assess this.
15	So the next we have is Ms. Mendelson. Ms. Mendelson,
16	are you there?
17	MS. MENDELSON: Now you can hear me?
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Ms. Mendelson, would
19	you please introduce yourself for the record, and you'll have
20	three minutes to present your testimony. Thank you.
21	MS. MENDELSON: Thank you, Mr. Blake, and thank you
22	rest of the Board. My name is Pam Mendelson. I live at 61 Bryant
23	Street, just down the street.
24	I submitted a small video that demonstrates the current

25 status of noise and parking availability on Bryant Street. I

took that video on Monday. I don't know, I know we won't play it now but as you can see in that, it's so quiet that I can walk down the middle of the street, not the sidewalk, middle of the street listening to the birds and looking at all the parked cars. I did not see a single vacant spot to park my car on that walk.

2.

I submitted the video to refute unfounded assertions made in recent supplemental documentation that adding a commercial restaurant would not change the character of the neighborhood, and to refute the notion that the street has capacity to absorb use by 81 restaurant patrons, an unknown number of employees and temporary visitors, and also to refute the idea that the noise of commercial deliveries, daily garbage collection, engine noise from scooter deliveries, would not be a change of life to this peaceful RF-1 zoned neighborhood.

There are several deleterious effects that Maya didn't get a chance to address. One is the illumination that she's experiencing now from the current site before the patio is even put into place. In our PowerPoint presentation we also have a picture of the current Indigo. It's highly illuminated and this, and Maya provided the view from her bedroom window which is shockingly bright.

The other thing is with the design and siting problems. We're not going to be allowed to put a fence up for any kind of privacy because that patio abuts the alley and DDOT's not going to allow for any kind of condition to satisfy privacy issues, not

to mention the fact that there's never been a commercial kitchen on site and we can't even imagine what the zoning issues are going to be for that.

2.

And then finally, on property values. I just want to say that some of the neighbors who rent their basement, their English basements have actually surveyed their prior renters and found that renters were taking a look at Google Maps to see if the properties they wanted to rent had proximity to businesses, just like this one because it was a condition that they wouldn't rent.

I want to say that Hillview Market proprietors wish to change the zoning of the built structure that they acquired knowing it was zoned and permitted for one use when they purchased the property and now requesting to do something else with it. I also want an Indian restaurant, just in an MU-4 zoned location. On this block I would like a café with a store, or any other business that's consistent with the current zoning for this site.

Approving the Applicant to go forward with a restaurant in an RF zone sets a precedent that any restaurateur need not search for a property where the activity is permitted, but rather a quiet one where the activity is not permitted, renovate the property for the purpose of the non-permitted activity and then claim the renovation investment justifies amending the zoning. This is not a precedent we want to set. Please, do not approve these zoning changes.

1	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Thank you very much, Ms.
2	Mendelson, for your testimony.
3	Ms. Thompson. You're on mute, Ms. Thompson. Would you
4	please introduce yourself for the record, and you'll have three
5	minutes to present your testimony. Thank you. Welcome back.
6	ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: Yes. My name is Alice
7	Thompson and I'm the Single Member District ANC for 5E05, and I
8	have a PowerPoint and it's in Exhibit 136. I would like for it
9	to be shown.
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Not sure if we have enough
11	time to do a whole PowerPoint.
12	ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: Oh, but I have been here
13	since 9 o'clock.
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: We have to.
14 15	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: We have to.  ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: Please.
15	ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: Please.
15 16	ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: Please.  VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Let's see. How long
15 16 17	ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: Please.  VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Let's see. How long  ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: It's important for my
15 16 17 18	ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: Please.  VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Let's see. How long  ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: It's important for my  PowerPoint to be shown.
15 16 17 18 19	ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: Please.  VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Let's see. How long  ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: It's important for my  PowerPoint to be shown.  VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: You know what? You know what?
15 16 17 18 19 20	ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: Please.  VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Let's see. How long  ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: It's important for my  PowerPoint to be shown.  VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: You know what? You know what?  Okay. Okay. Give me two seconds.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: Please.  VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Let's see. How long  ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: It's important for my  PowerPoint to be shown.  VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: You know what? You know what?  Okay. Okay. Give me two seconds.  Board members, Chrishaun Smith, what do you think?
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: Please.  VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Let's see. How long  ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: It's important for my  PowerPoint to be shown.  VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: You know what? You know what?  Okay. Okay. Give me two seconds.  Board members, Chrishaun Smith, what do you think?  COMMISSIONER SMITH: Vice Chair Blake, we haven't
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: Please.  VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Let's see. How long  ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: It's important for my  PowerPoint to be shown.  VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: You know what? You know what?  Okay. Okay. Give me two seconds.  Board members, Chrishaun Smith, what do you think?  COMMISSIONER SMITH: Vice Chair Blake, we haven't traditionally done PowerPoints for this type of discussion. So

1	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. I'm going, let's see.
2	Let's see. I'm going to go with that unless Dr. Imamura, you
3	have an objection for that?
4	ZC COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I have no objection and
5	concur with Board member Smith.
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay.
7	So, Ms. Thompson, I'm going to ask that you diligently
8	go through your summary of what your slides would tell us and
9	we'll pay close attention, and are your slides in the they are
10	in the presentation on the record?
11	ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: Yes.
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. So what we'll do is
13	I'll take a very close look at your slides.
14	ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: In 136.
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: I'll very closely go through
16	your slides and I'll encourage the other Board members to do so
17	immediately, and you can go ahead and give your presentation.
18	Thank you.
19	ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: All right. Oh, so the
20	slides are not coming up?
21	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: We're not going to pull up the
22	slides but we're going to listen very carefully and we are going
23	to look at them.
24	ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: Unfair. Okay.
25	So I am in opposition to this variance. My position

on this matter aligns with and is in support of the residents that live within 200 feet radius of the subjective property. As an ANC, it is my responsibility to support the people that live within this 200 foot radius and so I am very disappointed that so many people are saying that they're being selfish, that they're only thinking of themselves and that is not the case.

2.

I think it's going to impact parking availability on the block because please keep in mind that this is a RPP neighborhood. I live in the 2300 block of 1st Street. Do you know where my car is parked right now? On Bryant Street. So it means that that block on Bryant Street is not strictly for people that live on Bryant Street. It's for anybody that has a RPP permit and we feel sure that there's going to be double parking because the street is very narrow.

I heard somebody say that Bryant Street was so wide. I measured it. Bryant Street is roughly about 24 feet wide. So, you know, because it only carries one lane of traffic so it's not that wide, so when people stop or try to go to this restaurant they're going to be double parked. And we feel sure that it's going to be excessive trash and increasing rodent activity and I know any time a restaurant puts fresh food in a dumpster, this is what rats love. I was neighborhood service for Agent 50. I've seen it and I know that it's going to take place.

Noise and pollution. If you have an outdoor café, people going to be talking. So you got 33 people sitting out

there, they're going to be talking, they're drinking. Plus there's traffic from cars, so their voices going to rise and if you walk down the street people's voices rise when they're talking, so the conversation is going to get loud even though they may not have intended for it to get loud. But it's going to get louder.

2.

The exception should be denied because of the potential precedent it would set for other future businesses. Right across on North Capitol and Channing Street, Northeast, there's also a little market and if this gentleman gets his exception, what's going to prevent the other people from getting it. Everybody knows Bloomingdale is a very small community. We are very small and I also feel that he should not be asking for an exception because he's a businessman and this is an RF-1 community. He knew it was a RF-1 community and so now he wants for it to be changed.

Now, just like everybody's familiar with 16th Street, 16th Street is RF-1. I'm disappointed that zoning is even considering this. I'm disappointed that ABRA gave him a permit to open up a liquor store because RF-1 means RF-1. 16th Street, Ward 4 starts at the 3900 block of 16th Street. It goes all the way up to the District line. There's not one single liquor store, little grocery store, little sandwich shop, there's nothing. So all I'm saying is if you all can keep that consideration to 16th Street, then this consideration should be kept to us. We should,

if we are RF-1, that's what we are, RF-1.

So there was also surveys done and quite a few people were opposed to this taking place. Now, as you can see, I measured the alley. The alley row is about ten and a half feet from the grassy little slope to No. 8 resident. That's unfortunate for her because her privacy has been invaded and I would say how would you like it if a restaurant was next door to you?

Now, people ask me why I was not supporting this restaurant. I voted against this establishment because I would not want to live next door to a restaurant. I feel that more people should have supported the residents in the 200 foot radius because it's the right thing to do and we talked about, I heard somebody make mention of the bus coming on 1st Street. I live on the 2300 block of 1st Street. All of the people on 1st Street signed a petition, opposed the bus coming. Why did they oppose it? Because it would affect the way they would live. No one wanted that bus stop to be in front of their house, so what's the difference in these folks not wanting a restaurant that's going to affect how they live. We have to be fair. Now, I feel like it's pure selfishness on their part.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay, Commissioner --

ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: Hold on. One second. I'm not finished, sir.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: All right.

1	ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: So now, if you can look and
2	see the restaurant and No. 8's house, it's ten feet. How would
3	you like to live that close to a restaurant? And he's going to
4	have 33 people sitting out on a patio. When people start
5	drinking, they drop food. Okay? Now, I'm opposed to any kind
6	of restaurant that's out on the street because drop food? Rats.
7	I've been working with the rats in Bloomingdale ever since I
8	became an ANC. We have rats. We have rats really bad.
9	So Mr. Tandon says they're going to clean up, but the
10	truth of the matter is when people are eating and they drop food,
11	that food stays to the next day. Those rats will grab that food
12	so fast it won't be funny, and I just think it's unfair that we
13	are in this type of environment that it doesn't matter what people
14	that are closest to the establishments say because other people
15	want it. But they don't live there and really zoning should say,
16	hey, this is nice for you to say this but where do you live and
17	(indiscernible)
18	ZC COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Mr. Vice Chair, time has
19	expired for Ms. Thompson.
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: I agree it has. But one of
21	the things I'd like to do is this. I appreciate your comments
22	ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: Yes.
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: and I notice in this
24	proceeding we've had four ANC Commissioners of the
25	ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: They were, they supported

1	it. I opposed it.
2	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: But
3	ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: Okay? So I'm the one that
4	should be speaking. This is my Single Member District.
5	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: I appreciate that and that's
6	why I'm about to explain to
7	ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: Yes.
8	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Dr. Imamura that we have had
9	four members from the District and that one of the questions I
10	asked earlier was what transpired at that meeting? We also had
11	the Chairman of the ANC on the call earlier as in support.
12	ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: Right.
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: So clearly we see there's some
14	differences and I do want to have your opinion and
15	ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: Can I say something, sir?
16	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: to have that. So I'm going
17	to give you a couple more minutes
18	ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: Let me say this.
19	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: (indiscernible) was very
20	attractive.
21	ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: Let me say this, please.
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Would you please let me say
23	this?
24	ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: Yes.
25	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: With all due respect. I do,

I appreciate you. You've done a very good job, a very attractive slide show. I did look at it and I would love to have you finish your comments, but I want to make it very brief because we have a lot more to hear. We've had some tremendous testimony from the, everyone today -
ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: Yes.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: -- and it's, the record is very

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: -- and it's, the record is very full. So if you're going to recommend and say things that we've already heard that's redundant. It's helpful but it's not (indiscernible). So I just want to make sure we continue to move forward.

ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: Okay.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay?

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

20

21

22

23

24

25

ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: Let me just say this.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: And I'm going to let you finish up with your statements.

17 ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: Okay.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: (Indiscernible) and we do hear you loud and clear.

ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: All right.

To hear me loud and clear. The Chairman of the ANC, she supported it. This is my Single Member District. I opposed it. So I should have been called first. I have been sending emails -- hold on, sir -- I've been sending emails to Mr. Reid and Mr. Young. I think they forgot about me. Okay? Now, maybe

1 you're saying no but I came and unlock my computer so that I 2. could say, hey, I'm here. VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Just to address that 3 4 point. ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: Okay. So let me finish up, 5 6 sir. 7 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: No. Let me, ma'am, let me 8 just finish. Talking over me is not going to help. What I was 9 going to say is this. We have a procedure and the ANC has a 10 representative which can be the Chair or Vice Chair and they can speak. That's not the perspective that he presented himself. He 11 12 did not speak in that perspective. He spoke from the perspective 13 as a member of the community in support. 14 The way our order of presentation goes, the people in 15 support speak before the people in opposition. So that's why, 16 as a member of the public, they did not speak as representatives, 17 they spoke as a member of the public as you are doing as well. It's done in that order. So it's not an issue of, you know, you 18 19 should have been preferenced, it's just the way that the procedure 20 is done and the Chairman does have some leeway in that but that's 21 kind of what it is. Okay? So I 'm going to leave it at that. 22 Board member Smith, did you have something you wanted 23 to say?

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY
Court Reporting and Litigation Support
Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia
410-766-HUNT (4868)
1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: Can I finish one thing

24

25

about the --

1	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Let's do this. Can you
2	finish in about two or three minutes, a minute or so? Would
3	that
4	ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: Yes, thank you.
5	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Thank you.
6	ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: So anyway, I wanted to say
7	that Bryant Street is a very long block and there are a lot of
8	cars on there, but all of those cars are not the residents that
9	live on Bryant Street. They're from different parts of
10	Bloomingdale and so I'm just saying that we need to seriously
11	consider the people that live closest to it because they're the
12	ones that are going to be affected the most by it. My neighbor
13	across the street she says, Alice, I heard that you said no. I
14	said, let me ask you a question. How would you like to live next
15	to the restaurant? Would you like that? You know what she told
16	me? She said no.
17	So I have to just say that if it's not close to you,
18	of course you want it. But if it's very close to you, you're
19	not going to want it.
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Are you, is that it,
21	Ms.?
22	ANC COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: Yes.
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Thank you so much for your
24	testimony.
25	Mr. Young, do we have anyone else who wishes to testify?

MR. YOUNG: No, that's it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay.

Let me see if I can see. Okay. So the next part, I appreciate all the testimony that's provided. Ms. Thompson, I appreciate your testimony as well as the others. It is very helpful for us to have this information. It helps us to understand the issues and concerns that underly the decisions. But, again, we focus on the key legally relevant issues and the Board has a lot of experience with this matter, so we're going through and sorting through this as well as everything else to get a feel for it, and we do definitely understand the issues and concerns that were raised. I think we have a pretty good idea of it from the testimony that was provided of the issues and concerns that have been raised.

Now, what we're going to do now is move into, believe it or not, the cross-examination section. The Chair did things a little bit out of order here but I'm going to continue that and we're going to do the cross-examination. What I'd like to do is have the parties in opposition ask any questions they have of the Applicant or the Office of Planning.

Now, and as to these questions again. The goal is to help the board deal with the legally relevant issues, not to convince yourself that it's right or wrong, but to help the Board look at its issues and make a decision. So if you want, in clarifying these questions back and forth, that's fantastic,

that's what we'd like you to do.

So with that, Ms. Kavaler?

MS. KAVALER: Hi.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: I'd like to have you ask any questions you have of the Board, of the Applicant, or the Office of Planning and I'd also, I think to some extent the Chair had said you were going to act as kind of a spokesperson.

MS. KAVALER: Yes.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: But the other members, people in opposition should also feel free to ask a question. If you want to direct something to them, that'd be fine. But I'd like to have you guys now address any questions you have to the Applicant and the Office of Planning.

MS. KAVALER: Sure.

Yeah. I have a list of questions. I think that might be more relevant for questions for us because I might individually not have all the answers that might need to be dispersed if they have questions for us.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay.

MS. KAVALER: We don't have any questions for the Office of Planning. Just for the sake of time we can skip that. We're in full agreement with the Office of Planning so that can be skipped. We do have a few questions for the Applicant, if that's okay, and, again, I'm not a lawyer so I don't, these questions might not be super specific to zoning so please feel free to

interrupt me if it's no a a question that should be asked. 1 I 2. would appreciate any guidance on that front. VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. And don't forget our 3 questions deal primarily with the criteria that you saw for the 4 5 variance that we saw. So those are our criteria, right? 6 MS. KAVALER: Okay. I'll do my best. 7 Were you, or was your client aware of the zoning of the 8 property when it was purchased and was Indigo 2 part of the vision 9 for this building at some point in the property's lifetime when 10 it was purchased? 11 MS. GIORDANO: I don't know. How will the Applicant prevent the 12 MS. KAVALER: 13 impacts of a restaurant in an RF-1 zone to the closest neighbors, 14 such as myself who is directly next door? 15 MS. GIORDANO: I think our document speaks for itself. 16 We have tried to limit deliveries. As far as trash is concerned, 17 there is trash all along that alley that's left out for trash 18 vehicles to pick up. It's really not much different. The idea 19 with more frequent trash pick-up was that it would be small and 20 similar to a residential size. But if more frequent is a problem, 21 I'm sure the Applicant would be willing to do less. 22 MS. KAVALER: And can I ask, just going back to my 23 earlier question, my first one. If you are not aware of the answer, can the Applicant himself answer the question? 24

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY
Court Reporting and Litigation Support
Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia
410-766-HUNT (4868)
1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

MS. GIORDANO: He's not, he has not testified today so

25

1	he's not subject to cross-examination.
2	MS. KAVALER: Okay. And I apologize if I'm not super
3	familiar with the specifics of the processes.
4	How can it be argued that the property is exceedingly
5	small for a retail business if it has over a century's experience
6	history of being a retail and it's bigger than other corner shops
7	in Bloomingdale?
8	MS. GIORDANO: As I indicated, the ground floor is
9	approximately 1,000 square feet. I think that speaks for itself.
10	I don't know many retail outlets that are 1,000 square feet and
11	as far as the ones that were listed in the PowerPoint, they were
12	all 1,700 square feet and more. What's really relevant is what
13	works here and it hasn't worked.
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Ms. Kavaler, how many more
15	questions do you have?
16	MS. KAVALER: Me?
17	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Yeah.
18	MS. KAVALER: I have one, two, three, four, five, six.
19	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Okay.
20	MS. KAVALER: I can try to skip some.
21	Was any work done on this to create a restaurant or to
22	develop a restaurant before it came to the BZ Adjustment?
23	MS. GIORDANO: No.
24	MS. KAVALER: What was in the cellar at the time of the
25	purchase?

1	MS. GIORDANO: It was part of the Hillview Market. I
2	think it was storage but I don't know. The C of O says, I think
3	it says storage.
4	MS. AKINSAN: I would like to elaborate on that a little
5	bit. There was some kitchen equipment down there initially.
6	MS. KAVALER: Sorry. I totally missed that.
7	MS. AKINSAN: There was some kitchen equipment in the
8	basement originally.
9	MS. KAVALER: Okay. That's not what the C of O showed.
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: She didn't say it was
11	essentially operating. She said there was kitchen equipment
12	there.
13	MS. AKINSAN: Yes.
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: And that's the architect who
15	observed it.
16	MS. KAVALER: What work has been done on the basement
17	since purchasing the property?
18	MS. GIORDANO: Olivia, can you answer that?
19	MS. AKINSAN: Very minor work. There was a lot of
20	rubbish down there initially so he did a lot of demo. There
21	might be some storage of equipment down there, but as far as
22	construction not that much. There has been an internal stair
23	that's going down from the first floor to the cellar floor.
24	MS. KAVALER: And did he build those stairs to the
25	exterior?

1	MS. AKINSAN: What stair are you referring to?
2	MS. KAVALER: Sorry. The stairs that you just described
3	in the exterior going down to the basement, did he build those
4	stairs?
5	MS. AKINSAN: Yes, he did.
6	MS. KAVALER: And
7	MS. GIORDANO: She said they were interior stairs. You
8	asked about exterior.
9	MS. AKINSAN: Yes.
10	MS. KAVALER: Sorry. I'm asking about exterior. Was
11	that built as part of this?
12	MS. AKINSAN: No, no. I was referring to the interior
13	stairs.
14	MS. KAVALER: And did the Applicant construct any
15	stairs to the exterior in the back alley?
16	MS. AKINSAN: Yes, he did.
17	MS. KAVALER: And what is the permit number associated
18	with that?
19	MS. AKINSAN: I am not aware.
20	MS. KAVALER: Is there a permit number associated with
21	that?
22	MS. AKINSAN: I am not aware.
23	MS. KAVALER: Okay.
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. So they have no, she
25	has no answer to that question.

1	Yes, sir. Mr. Smith.
2	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Yeah. I'm trying to understand
3	the line of questioning about (indiscernible).
4	MS. KAVALER: The point is that it was, there was no,
5	this was done without any permit and that construction is supposed
6	to have a permit. So he has a history of doing work that is not
7	permitted.
8	COMMISSIONER SMITH: And I understand that but that's
9	not the subject of the zoning concern before us.
10	MS. KAVALER: Okay. No, I appreciate, no I appreciate
11	you
12	COMMISSIONER SMITH: I just want to steer your line of
13	questioning to
14	MS. KAVALER: No.
15	COMMISSIONER SMITH: (indiscernible).
16	MS. KAVALER: No, I appreciate that. I'll move on.
17	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Okay.
18	MS. KAVALER: Thank you.
19	I guess just our final question. Is, if you could just
20	please describe the current condition of each floor and their
21	proposed use.
22	MS. GIORDANO: Olivia?
22 23	MS. GIORDANO: Olivia?  MS. AKINSAN: The proposed use for the cellar aka the

1	first floor is going to have a bar with restrooms and a stair as
2	well and that would be leading down, and another stair that would
3	be leading upstairs to the second floor. Currently, I mean
4	construction is no longer in progress.
5	MS. KAVALER: Okay. And just for context, we see a
6	construction worker there daily.
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Is that your last question?
8	MS. KAVALER: Yes.
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Great. Thank you.
10	Let's see.
11	Do any of the Board members have questions for the
12	Applicant at this point?
13	(Pause.)
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. I'm going to now have
15	the Applicant, if they have any questions for the, have any of
16	the parties in opposition, actually if they did have any questions
17	for the Applicant?
18	MS. KAVALER: Sorry, if we have any questions for the
19	Applicant?
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Are there any other members,
21	are they satisfied? Okay.
22	Then I'm going to turn now to
23	MS. KAVALER: Sorry. I see Evelyn has her hand up.
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Go ahead, Ms. Brown.
25	MS. BROWN: I have a question and I have to kind of

preface my remarks.

2.

I was reading the zoning regulations. I would like to know why the Applicant purchased a piece of property for \$1.2 million without researching the zoning requirements and when specifically I read that prior to your purchasing property there's a caution in the regulations. I don't know exactly where it is. It says if you anticipate purchasing a property and making a change in order to finalize a project, they caution you to make sure that you try to execute the outcome without requesting a zoning adjustment.

So expending \$1.2 million, what was the rationale, I'm just curious. It just has been bothering me as to why the Applicant, he did not do the homework prior to purchasing the property because it was RF-1 zoned.

MS. GIORDANO: There was a history that was included in our statement that the Applicant had originally envisioned an expanded kind of market that would include spirit sales and had gone to the ABRA Board to get that approved. It was denied. At that point he felt that the only other alternative use that was viable there was a restaurant and I don't think the regulations include the provision that you're talking about, but I could be wrong.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Thank you. Do you have any other questions?

MR. SMITH: Hi. Richard Smith. I have one or two.

1	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay.
2	MS. SMITH: Yes, thank you. Richard Smith.
3	When, can you confirm or deny that when the Applicant
4	purchased the store, he allowed Sun Beam Market to continue to
5	rent the space and operate as a store for an additional year?
6	MS. GIORDANO: I'm not aware. No.
7	MR. SMITH: Okay. That was told to me by the store
8	owners themselves and they said that when they left, they left
9	because the Applicant raised his rent.
10	MS. GIORDANO: That's hearsay.
11	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay.
12	MR. SMITH: Just hearsay.
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: That is.
14	MR. SMITH: Thank you.
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Do you have any other
16	questions?
17	MR. SMITH: No, that was it. Thank you.
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay.
19	Ms. Giordano, I'm going to ask you. Do you have any
20	questions for the parties in opposition?
21	MS. GIORDANO: I do not.
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. So what we're going to
23	do now is I'm going to ask my Board
24	MS. GIORDANO: I have a question for the Office of
25	Planning. Is that

1	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Yes, please. Go ahead.
2	Absolutely.
3	MS. GIORDANO: So can you cite to any, so what in your
4	view are the alternatives here besides what is proposed and the
5	existing convenience store use?
6	MR. BARRON: We are not proposing or recommending any
7	alternative use. That's not
8	MS. GIORDANO: I just mean under the, right, under the
9	regulations or as the regulations permit.
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Mr. Barron
11	MR. BARRON: They permit numerous, they do permit quite
12	a few different types of businesses. There are different types
13	of retail that would be permitted by special exception. There
14	are different types of cafes
15	MS. GIORDANO: I can't, could you point to where those
16	are in the zoning regulations?
17	MR. BARRON: Under the corner store regulations there
18	are matter-of-right uses that are allowed and special exception
19	uses that would be allowed that are not specifically a bodega
20	use.
21	MS. GIORDANO: Okay. So under the corner store
22	regulations?
23	MR. BARRON: Yes.
24	MS. GIORDANO: Would it be appropriate to pull those
25	up? Section 255.

COMMISSIONER SMITH: No. We're not (indiscernible) to do that.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Mr. Smith, go ahead. You can say it.

COMMISSIONER SMITH: (Indiscernible) not party (phonetic) to this hearing.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: I mean, I think a good point to make is that there are a lot of things that can be done under the corner store regulations. It's a fairly flexible regulation. For example, we mentioned that a kitchen could, actually a kitchen could actually be in a corner store. It's just a question the magnitude of it, the scale of it may be different. The intent for a corner store is to serve the community. That's the overriding part of the corner store. So within the context of that there are a number of functions that can take place in the context of that corner store. So I don't think it's that limited.

But if we go through the regulations you can find that and if the Applicant wishes to pursue, we don't know the outcome of this proceeding first of all. But to the extent that this Applicant decided to pursue other alternatives in the context of that, that's fine. It's also not our responsibility to provide the highest and best use for the property, you know. They should get a reasonable return.

So there are a lot of different ways we could look at this but I do think there are options under the corner store

provisions to do things which may or may not have been explored. 2 Mr. Smith, do you have another comment or, Dr. Imamura? MS. GIORDANO: Can I just respond? The reason I asked 3 is because, you know, what we're dealing with here under the 4 5 regulations is whether there are any other viable uses and the 6 corner store provisions are very narrow. They only, the only 7 kitchen that you're allowed to have is one, is a microwave 8 basically to re-heat food or to put sandwiches together. 9 can't cook any food on the premises under the corner store 10 regulations. They're extremely limited and I would just ask the 11 12 Office of Planning if he's aware of the usage of those corner 13 store provisions? I'm not aware of them being used. I've been 14 doing zoning for 40 years in the city. Mr. Barron, you don't have to 15 COMMISSIONER SMITH: 16 answer that question. There are a number of corner store special 17 exceptions that we have approved and very recently at 203. But, 18 again, if, I'll just leave it at that. We've approved them but 19 that's not for deliberation at this particular time. Our point 20 is to deliberate what is before us now, which is not a corner 21 store. 22 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Smith, for clarifying that. 23

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY
Court Reporting and Litigation Support
Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia
410-766-HUNT (4868)
1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

to take a very close look at the regulations in the recent cases

24

25

But, again, there are, I would encourage Ms. Giordano

that we've looked at and some of the things that we've done. I 2. do think there's some, there is substantial leeway in that for applications. I'm going to leave it at that. As Mr. Smith 3 4 pointed out, you're here for a use variance and special exception. 5 So that's where we are right now. 6 Well, at this point we're going to have, do you have 7 any other questions, Ms. Giordano? 8 MS. GIORDANO: No. Thank you. 9 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Thank you very much. 10 At this point I'm going to have closing statements, brief closing statements from the parties in opposition. 11 12 is just any last comment, brief comment, that the parties in 13 opposition might want to make with regard to this hearing. 14 MS. KAVALER: Sure thing. Let me just pull up a couple 15 of sentences. 16 Thank you to the BZA for allowing us the time and space 17 to voice our concerns. We urge you to consider that the ANC took 18 no stance on this proposal. The Bloomingdale Civic Association 19 recommended, voted to deny, sorry, the BCA voted to deny this 20 request and the OP recommended to deny this request. 21 The idea that a restaurant is the only viable option 22 for this property is unsubstantiated and we have many other

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY
Court Reporting and Litigation Support
Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia
410-766-HUNT (4868)
1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

examples to suggest otherwise. It is not our responsibility to

provide the Applicant with a business model for his property. A

restaurant would represent an extreme change of use and

23

24

25

fundamentally change the way we live in our homes and threatens our property values.

While there are many who support this restaurant, they don't live close enough for the impacts to change how they live in their own homes. Unfortunately, I cannot say the same for myself or my neighbors with party status. Ultimately this is a zoning issue and not a popularity contest and we support a business at this property but not at the expense of our peace and the business must meet the standards set by the BZA.

The Applicant has not met the burden of proof that a restaurant does not create impacts greater than what it is currently zoned for and we urge the BZA to support the Office of Planning and the neighbors who would be most severely impacted by this change of use and to oppose this request, and maintain the RF-1 character of Bryant Street.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Thank you very much.

Ms. Giordano, would you like closing remarks, please?

MS. GIORDANO: Yes. Thank you.

The nonconforming use regulations are designed to basically phase out nonconforming uses that are not compatible with zoning and I would submit that this convenience store use is one such use. There is a reason. I don't think you need a market study to figure it out why a number of these stores start to rely on lottery tickets, alcohol, cigarettes and, you know,

other, vape, I don't know, cannabis, whatever it is, type sales that are not necessarily conducive to community compatibility and the ABRA record that was part of the case that denied the Applicant's request to start selling spirits as part of the convenience store is full of complaints by a number of these very same people about that market and markets like that including the one a block away that are conducive to loitering, rodents, trash and unsavory activities that the community doesn't want.

2.

So, again, in terms of phasing out this use, we don't think that a market study is necessary to determine that a 1,000 square foot ground floor space, non=residential space, is conducive to a lot of other uses that might be permitted under the zoning regulations. The corner store uses don't permit any kind of cooking, any sales of spirits. It's, you know, it's 1,000 square feet. I don't know why anybody thinks that someone can make a go of that kind of space, particularly in a community like this where, you know, there isn't, it's not embedded within a residential neighborhood. It's right on North Capitol Street and you really need a destination like a restaurant to make that space work.

So that is what's before the Zoning Board in terms of external effects. I think we've addressed all of them, like the Office of Planning it asked us to and there has been, you know testimony from people who have direct experience with the availability of parking on the neighboring streets and to the

1	fact that, you know, there are problems now in the community and
2	that this would be an asset.
3	That concludes my closing remarks.
4	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Thank you very much.
5	Before I dismiss everyone I'll just check with my Board
6	members to see if there's anything that you guys need before we
7	go into the next phase of this hearing.
8	Mr. Smith?
9	COMMISSIONER SMITH: No.
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Dr. Imamura?
11	ZC COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Sure, Vice Chair.
12	No, there's nothing additional but I would like to just
13	take a minute and let everybody know, whether you're in opposition
14	or for a special exception here, thank you for your participation
15	in the public process. This has been a long hearing. I also
16	want to thank Vice Chair Blake for his leadership here to carry
17	on after Chair Hill had to step out. But this is important and
18	we take this very seriously. It's, you know, zoning isn't perfect
19	and we appreciate your point of view.
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Thank you, Dr. Imamura. All
21	right.
22	I'm going to close the hearing and I'm going to close
23	the record. You can dismiss the witnesses, Mr. Young.
24	(Pause.)
25	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: I am certain that the Chairman

1	would love to participate in this activity and in respect for
2	that we will delay our deliberations and schedule a decision vote
3	at a meeting session on June 4th.
4	Would that be fine, Madam Secretary?
5	MS. MEHLERT: Yes. Decision for June 4th is fine.
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: So there we have it. We'll
7	reschedule the decision meeting on June 4th.
8	Is there anything else that we need to address today?
9	MS. MEHLERT: Nothing from staff.
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: This meeting is adjourned.
11	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
12	record at 3:34 p.m.)
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

## CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Public Hearing

Before: DC BZA

Date: 05-14-25

Place: Via Webex

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

Ildiko Nyari