## GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY

MAY 21, 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, Carl H. Blake, Vice Chairperson, presiding.

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT MEMBERS PRESENT:

CARL H. BLAKE, Vice Chairperson CHRISHAUN SMITH, Commissioner ANTHONY J. HOOD, Zoning Commission Chairperson

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 21, 2025.

## TABLEOFCONTENTS

Application of Joseph P. Catlett, Trustee and John K. Jenkins, Trustee	7
Case 20566-A Application of TowerCo 2013, LLC	10
Case No. 21247 Application of Jewish Primary Day School of The Nation's Capitol Inc	13
Case No. 21282 Application of Pat and Cheri DeQuattro	71
Case No. 21287 Application of Tsunami Hair Studio	80
Case No. 21290 Application of Carolyn R. Millbourne-Hantz	98
Case No. 21292 Application of Oak at Morse Street, LLC and Sung H. Cho, Trustee	110

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

2 (9:30 a.m.)

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. The Board of Zoning Adjustment May 21st, 2025, public hearing will please come to order. My name is Carl Blake, Vice Chair of the District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment. Joining me today are board members Chrishaun Smith representing the National Capitol Planning Commission and Zoning Commissioner Anthony Hood.

Today's meeting and hearing agendas 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. If you experience difficulty accessing Webex or your telephone call-in then please call our OZ hotline number at 202-727-5471 to receive Webex login or call-in instructions.

Today we will begin our decision meeting session and then proceed with our public hearing session. Please be advised that we do not take any public testimony at our decision meeting session. Public testimony will be received during the public hearing session, however only parties are allowed to testify in appeals. At the conclusion of a decision meeting session the

Chair, in consultation with the Office of Zoning, will determine whether a full or summary order may be issued. A full order is required when a 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.

2.

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 then state your name and home address before providing oral 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 your microphone is no longer picking up sound or background noise. Once again, if you experience difficulty accessing Webex with your telephone call-in or you have forgotten to sign up 24 hours prior to this hearing, then please call our OZ hotline number at 202-727-5471 to sign up to testify and receive Webex login or call-in instructions.

All persons planning to testify either in favor or in opposition should have signed up in advance. They will be called by name to testify. By signing up to testify all participated completed the oath or affirmation as required by Subtitle Y,

Section 408.7. Requests to enter evidence at the time of an online virtual hearing such as written testimony or additional supporting documents other than live video which may not be presented as part of the testimony may be allowed pursuant to Subtitle Y, Section 103.13. The order of procedure for special exceptions and variances are pursuant to Subtitle Y, Section 409. The order of procedure for appeals are pursuant to Subtitle Y, Section 507. Time constraints shall be maintained pursuant to Subtitle Y, Section 408.2 and 408.3.

2.

At the conclusion of each case an individual who is unable to testify because of technical issues may file a request to leave the record open to file a written version of the planned testimony to the record within 24 hours following the conclusion of public testimony in the hearing. If additional written testimony is accepted, then the parties will be allowed a reasonable time to respond as determined by the Board. The Board will then make a decision at its next meeting, but no earlier than 48 hours after the hearing.

At the conclusion of a hearing the Board may request additional specific information to complete the record. The Board and staff will specify at the end of the hearing exactly what is expected and the date when persons submit the evidence to the Office of Zoning. No other information will be accepted by the Board.

Once again, after the Board adjourns the hearing, the

Office of Zoning, in consultation with the Chair, will determine whether a full or summary order may be issued. A full order is required when the decision it contains is adverse to 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.

2.

Finally, the District of Columbia Administrative Procedures Act requires that the public hearing on each case be held in the open before the public. However, pursuant to Sections 405(b) and 406 of that Act the Board may, consistent with its rules and procedure and the Act, enter into a closed meeting on a case for purposes of seeking legal counsel on a case pursuant to D.C. Official Code, Section 2-575(b)(4) and/or deliberate upon a case pursuant to D.C. Official Code, Section 2-575(b)(13) but only after providing the necessary public notice and in the case of an emergency closed meeting after taking a roll call vote.

Madam Secretary, do you have any preliminary matters?

MS. MEHLERT: Good morning, Mr. Vice Chair, Board member Smith, Chairman Hood. There are no scheduling changes to the agenda today. However, regarding late filings the Vice Chair has reviewed and granted waivers to allow 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.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay.

2.

Would you then please call our first case.

MS. MEHLERT: First case in the Board's meeting session is on the expedited review calendar. It's Application No. 21300 of Joseph P. Catlett, Trustee and John K. Jenkins, Trustee. This is a self-certified application pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 901.2 for a special exception under Subtitle D, Section 5201, from the rear yard requirements of Subtitle D, Section 207.1.

This is for a one-story rear porch addition to an existing two-story detached principal dwelling. It's located in the R-1A zone at 4250 Fordham Road, Northwest, Square 1467, Lot 898.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Thank you.

The Applicant proposes to construct a 408 square foot one-story screen porch addition over an existing patio that is currently partially covered by a large pergola in a rear detached principal dwelling. The property sits on an 8,600 plus square foot lot created in the early 1990s as part of a theoretical lot subdivision. This subdivision actually required a 25 foot rear yard, however the existing rear yard is nonconforming at 22.96 feet with the proposed addition required rear yard would be reduced to 4.6 feet in the area occupied by the screen porch

while the remaining portions of the yard remain at the existing nonconforming condition.

2.

To address these issues the Applicant is seeking a special exception from the rear yard requirements of Subtitle D, Section 207.1. The Board is authorized to grant the requested relief pursuant to the criteria for Subtitle D, Section 5201 and Subtitle X, Section 901.2, and also the Applicant has requested, and is eligible, for an expedited review pursuant to Chapter Y, Section 401.

As a special exception represents the permitted deviation from the matter-of-right development standard subject to certain conditions, the Applicant must demonstrate to substantial evidence presented in the record that the project shouldn't result in undue adverse impact on neighboring properties.

Given the existing site conditions including landscaping and the orientation of neighboring structures, the addition should not create a substantial shadowing or obstruct the availability of light and air to adjacent properties, and given the height of the structure the existing site condition, including the mature landscaping of fences and orientation, the addition should also not impact or compromise their privacy. The addition should not be visually intrusive as it will not be visible from Fordham Road and 49th Street, and its scaling design aligns with the existing homes and neighboring character.

1	I agree with the Office of Planning's analysis that the
2	Applicant has met the burden of proof to be granted the requested
3	relief. I give great weight to the Office of Planning's
4	recommendation for approval. I also give great weight to the
5	report of ANC 3D which is in support of the application and states
6	no issues or concerns. I will note that there is a letter of
7	support in the record from the neighbor residing directly behind
8	the subject property. I'll be voting in support of the
9	application.
10	Mr. Smith, do you have anything to add?
11	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Chairman Blake, I don't think I
12	have anything to add. I think that you have summed up the merits
13	of this case and the reasons why they meet the burden of proof
14	to be granted the special exception and I will support as well.
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay.
16	Chairman Hood?
17	ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
18	I have nothing to add and I'll be voting in favor as
19	well.
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Awesome. Okay.
21	Having deliberated, I'll make a motion to approve
22	Application No. 21300 as captioned and read by the secretary, and
23	ask for a second.
24	Mr. Smith?
25	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Second.

1	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Madam Secretary, the motion
2	has been made and seconded. Madam Secretary, would you please
3	conduct a roll call vote?
4	MS. MEHLERT: Please respond to the Vice Chair's motion
5	to approve the Application.
6	Mr. Blake?
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Yes.
8	MS. MEHLERT: Mr. Smith?
9	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Yes.
10	MS. MEHLERT: Chairman Hood?
11	ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.
12	MS. MEHLERT: Staff would record the vote as three to
13	zero to two to approve Application No. 21300 on the motion made
14	by Vice Chair Blake and seconded by Mr. Smith, with Chairman Hill
15	not participating.
16	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Thank you.
17	Madam Secretary, would you call our next application,
18	please.
19	MS. MEHLERT: Next is Application No. 20566-A of
20	Towerco 2013, LLC. This is a request pursuant to Subtitle Y,
21	Section 703 for a modification without hearing of the plans
22	approved in Application No. 20566 to allow an increase in the
23	height of an existing monopole from 84 feet to 99 feet.
24	It's located in the R-1B zone at 1800 Perry Street,
25	Northeast, Parcel 01570026 and Parcel 01570027.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Thank you.

In the original order 25066 the Board granted special exception under Subtitle C, Section 1313 to allow a new monopole with a height of 84 feet. The special exception pursuant to Subtitle X, 900.2 from Subtitle C, Section 1313.2 for an extension of the 84 foot monopole to 99 feet in height.

In this proceeding pursuant to Subtitle Y, Section 703, the Applicant is seeking modification without hearing to allow the increase in the height of the monopole from 84 to 99 feet to accommodate the co-location of another carrier's cell site which need to be re-located to the renovation or to facilitate the renovation of the Burroughs Elementary School. I believe the design and modification is appropriate as a modification without hearing pursuant to Subtitle Y, Section 703.7 as there are no additional relief required and I have no objections, and because I believe the impact on this modification can be understood without witness testimony.

I've reviewed the and I will credit the Office of Planning's analysis on how the application has met the conditions of Subtitle C, Section 1313.2 as well as the general standards of Subtitle X, Section 901.2. It is located away from residential properties. The proposed pole is necessary and will accommodate another carrier. The proposed pole will be only 15 feet taller but the Applicant's depiction suggests the visual impact will not be significantly greater.

1	I give great weight to the Office of Planning's
2	recommendation for approval. While there's no report in the
3	record from the ANC to give great weight, I will note that the
4	proper posts were made to all parties including the affected ANC
5	receive proper notice. I'll be voting in support of the
6	modification.
7	Mr. Smith, do you have anything to add?
8	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Vice Chair Blake, I don't have
9	anything to add. I agree with your assessment of this case and
10	will vote in support.
11	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Thank you.
12	Chairman Hood?
13	ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I agree with your assessment as
14	well, Mr. Chairman. I think the record reflects approval in this
15	particular case.
16	Thank you.
17	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay.
18	Having deliberated, I'll make a motion to approve
19	Application No. 20566 as captioned and read by the secretary, and
20	ask for a second. Mr. Smith?
21	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Second.
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: The motion is made and
23	seconded. Madam Secretary, would you please conduct a roll call
24	vote?
25	MS. MEHLERT: Please respond to the Vice Chair's motion

1	to approve the application.
2	Vice Chair Blake?
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Yes.
4	MS. MEHLERT: Mr. Smith?
5	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Yes.
6	MS. MEHLERT: Chairman Hood?
7	ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't hear
8	you. Yes.
9	MS. MEHLERT: Staff would record the vote as three to
10	zero to two to approve Application 20566-A on the motion made by
11	Vice Chair Blake and seconded by Mr. Smith.
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay.
13	Madam Secretary, would you please call our first public
14	hearing case?
15	MS. MEHLERT: First case in the Board's hearing session
16	is Application No. 21247 of Jewish Primary Day School of the
17	Nation's Capitol Inc. This is a self-certified application
18	pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 901.2 for special exceptions
19	under Subtitle U, Section 203.1(m) and Subtitle X, Section 104,
20	to allow expansion of an existing private school, and under
21	Subtitle C, Section 703.2 from the minimum vehicle parking
22	requirements of Subtitle C, Section 701.5.
23	This is for increases in student enrollment and staff
24	in an existing private school. It is located in the R-1B zone
25	at 4715 16th Street, Northwest, Square 2707, Lot 33. This hearing

was originally scheduled for March 19th and postponed at the Applicant's request. Also as a preliminary matter there is a request from the Applicant to waive the 30 day filing deadline to allow in an updated conditions list and existing site improvements plan, and these are in Exhibits 29 through 29B. VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Thank you very much. With the Board's indulgence, I would like to grant the motion to include the additional documentation. I think it would be very helpful for the case. 10 The Applicant, would you please introduce yourself? MS. BLOOMFIELD: Good morning. Jessica Bloomfield with 11 12 the law firm of Holland & Knight. We have a whole team here. Do 13 you want everyone to go and introduce themselves right now as 14 well, or would you like me to do that for them? 15 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: You can do it, whichever way 16 is the easiest. What I'd like to do is you introduce everyone 17 but I would like you to explain to me the format of your 18 presentation and who will be speaking and who will be available 19 for questions that are asked. But please introduce everyone. 20 MS. BLOOMFIELD: Wonderful. Deborah, I'll kick it over 21 Deborah is head of school. And you're on mute. to you. 22 MS. SKOLNICK-EINHORN: Thank you. 23 Hi everyone. I'm Deborah Skolnick-Einhorn. I'm the

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

2.4

25

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

We're a Jewish Day School, the only Jewish Day School

head of school of Milton Gottesman.

1	in the District of Columbia. We live on two campuses, both on
2	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Ms. Einhorn, I just wanted you
3	to introduce yourself at this point.
4	MS. SKOLNICK-EINHORN: I'm Deborah. I'm the head of
5	school.
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay.
7	MS. SKOLNICK-EINHORN: Thank you.
8	MS. BLOOMFIELD: Vanita?
9	MS. MILTON: Vanita Ahuja. I'm the Chief Strategy and
10	Operations Officer at Milton.
11	MS. BLOOMFIELD: Melissa? You're on mute.
12	MS. DAVIS: Apologies. I'm Melissa Davis. I've been
13	the principle of South Campus for 13 years.
14	MS. BLOOMFIELD: Duncan?
15	MR. MILLER: Yes. I'm Duncan Miller. I lead Security
16	and Facilities for Milton.
17	MS. BLOOMFIELD: And we do have a few other folks here
18	as well. I know that Nicole White from Symmetra, she's our
19	transportation consultant, she is on. We also have our
20	transportation coordinator for the school who should be, oh,
21	there's Nicole. Sorry.
22	Anyway, we're all here and I'm happy to answer your
23	first question which is, I will be doing the majority of the
24	presentation. We did file a PowerPoint. I will turn it over to
25	

and the need for the requested relief, and then our entire team 2. is here for questions. VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: I'm going to put 15 minutes 3 4 on the clock, so we can keep track of where things are and would 5 you please just go through and begin your presentation. 6 Mr. Young, could you pull up the presentation, please? 7 MS. BLOOMFIELD: Thank you. 8 Good morning. Again for the record, Jessica Bloomfield 9 from Holland & Knight. I am here this morning on behalf of the 10 Milton Gottesman Jewish Day School requesting special exception relief to increase the maximum committed number of students and 11 12 faculty permitted within the existing and approved lower school 13 campus building which is at 4715 16th Street. The application 14 also requests special exception relief to reduce the number of required on-site parking spaces. Would you go to the next slide? 15 16 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Ms. Bloomfield, could you just 17 let me interrupt you just for a second. I forgot to mention 18 something. 19 Of course. MS. BLOOMFIELD: 20 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: I've gone over the slides, 21 your prepared slides and have reviewed the proposed modification 2.2 to the conditions that are presented in Exhibit 29A. 23 MS. BLOOMFIELD: Great. 24 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: It is clear, we're effectively

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

looking at the impact of 20 additional students and 11 faculty

25

staff, and the request to reduce the minimum parking requirement. Now, this is not a modification of the prior order, but rather a new application. So if it's approved, the order will supersede the previous order and the conditions of the new order will govern. So, as you know, the conditions of the Board's orders are designed to mitigate potentially adverse impacts and I realize that some of these conditions you've listed have carried over from the original Lowell order even.

2.

So it would be helpful for me if you would provide some additional detail on the rationale for each condition, so I'm asking at the end of your presentation, your formal presentation, you go through your proposed conditions in Exhibit 29A and have the Board ask any questions they might have. I think that will expedite matters as we go forward.

MS. BLOOMFIELD: Absolutely. And I did actually email along with the PowerPoint the exhibit to the conditions to Paul Young so that he should have those at his fingertips as well, and let's turn to that after we do the presentation because I do want Deborah to speak a little bit about the history of the school and the need for the increase in the students. I do think that's important. But we can sort of skip through some of the other stuff. I'll move through it a little bit more quickly because it sounds like you've done a careful review of the case record already.

So on this slide you can see the property. It's zoned

R-1B. It's located on the east side of 16th Street with Decatur Street to the north and Piney Branch to the east. It received its private school original approval in 1989 and it has operated as a private school since then.

2.

On the next slide you can see the existing school building on the property. Other than the building, the property is just improved with a play area for students and seven surface parking spaces for faculty and staff. The application that we have before you today does not propose any construction, enlargements, nothing physical is happening to the property, just the increase in students and faculty.

The next slide I think I'm turning over to Deborah to give a little bit of color on the school's operations.

MS. SKOLNICK-EINHORN: Hi everybody. Thanks so much for having us this morning.

We really treasure our place as part of the (indiscernible) 16th Street landscape. We were founded in 1988. In my fifth year I'm the third head of school, so we're in our 37th year of operation. A dozen years already on our additional campus or small area what we call our south campus for our early elementary which is Pre-K through One. We're the only Jewish Day School in the District of Columbia and we're really a deep community as part of that, both within the Jewish community and within our D.C. community. We have an other campus also in Ward 4 which is at 16th and Fort Stevens. There are 470 students

between the two campuses and as Jessica said, we're looking to move from 130 to 150 maximum at our south campus.

2.

Students are coming from all over D.C. and Montgomery County, and also Prince George's. Almost of them arrive and leave our campuses via one of our nine buses or campus transportation and many of our staff members also live close by, including me in Ward 4, and use public transportation, very accessible by the F2 and F9 buses. We have globs of kids who come on them each morning.

We really are very proud to be a values-driven school and some of our key values are serving the community, providing support. We try to be out there and have our kids doing good deeds. It's part of our tradition, both at the school and as a spiritual community. You know, we really saw during Covid and since Covid an increased demand for the school. There's a bit of a bottleneck at our south campus which means that we can't always accept as many students as desire to come here.

Unlike many other D.C. area private schools we're really looking to get as many Jewish students and other students from the community who have come. If we're equipped to support them we want to be able to say yes. We're not a school that's looking to have a waiting list or to be an elite school. We really just want to serve any family who wants a Jewish education and we're seeing incrementally that there's one or two students a year that we're turning away because we don't have sufficient

capacity at our smaller south campus.

So what we're really seeking here today is not a revolution. If at all it's a small evolution to be able here and there to accept one student or hire an additional assistant teacher to make sure we're meeting the student's needs and making sure we can say yes to families who really want this education. In particular at the moment we're really enmeshed in the process to ensure that we're supporting our Federal workers. Thirty of our families have already experienced a layoff. We're very much a school, about 50 percent of our families have at least one person who's in the Federal workforce. We're providing emergency financial aid to make sure that our school is accessible to everyone.

In a given year we give away four and a half million dollars in aid. This year we're fundraising, recognizing we might need to, you know, give away several more millions to ensure that any family, you know, isn't losing the opportunity for the religious education that they'd like because of what's happening and the uncertainty in the Federal worker force. Again, we're not looking to suddenly fill, you know, at least 20 spots but to be able to say yes to a family who really wants this Jewish education, the only one available in D.C., we want to be able to say yes as those applications come up.

We've been here for 13 years really without incident. We always want to be good neighbors. We contacted people, as

you've seen in our presentation, and we're really eager to work with our neighbors always and to be part and part of the community and neighborhood, and very open to ways that we can continue to grow in that.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: I have a quick question for you.

MS. SKOLNICK-EINHORN: Yes.

2.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: How many students do you have in each of the grades? You have three grades there. How many students are in each one?

MS. SKOLNICK-EINHORN: So in each of the grades we have 19 in our pre-K, that's only one section. And then we have a maximum of 52 in our kindergarten and we can go up to 57 I believe in our first grade.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: And how would you, is that mix going to pretty much be the same for the prescribed increase or would that be adjusted more to the pre-K level, or how do you expect to do that?

MS. SKOLNICK-EINHORN: Yeah. I think it really depends on demand, Mr. Blake. You know, if we see increased demand in pre-K, then we might think about two smaller classes in pre-K or, you know, increased demand in kindergarten, which is our most common entry year, to make a few enlargements in that grade. Our upper campus can't accommodate more than 60 per grade, so we would never be growing any grade larger than that.

And we want to keep low, you know, teacher to student ratios of course which is why we've put in for additional teaching staff. We want to make sure we're providing learning support so students with a range of needs can come to Milton and get a Jewish education. We take pride in that. It's a big part of our value system, and just want to make sure that we can staff sufficiently to serve every student's needs.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: In the increase in faculty and staff, what amount is faculty and what amount is staff or just it could vary? What's your anticipation?

MS. SKOLNICK-EINHORN: Yeah. I mean 11, honestly 11 staff is a big leap for us financially. That would be a very slow growth for us, I think. But I would imagine, you know, ultimately if we added one additional class anywhere, we would need three additional teachers for that. We have, every class has a teacher who does our Hebrew and our Jewish studies and another who does general studies, and then also an assistant teacher. But if we were to grow by this amount we would probably add a learning specialist in there as well.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay.

And last, do you guys have any contract workers on staff and do you share faculty or staff with the upper campus (audio interference)?

MS. SKOLNICK-EINHORN: We do share a faculty and staff between the two campuses, more for the administration. So Vanita

and I, for example, we switch off days, so that we're supporting at both campuses. So there are quite a few of us, Duncan as well. Really our administration is for, we think of it as one pool, two campuses, so our security administration, our facility's administration is shared.

2.

The two contracts that we have are with our facilities team. We work with an organization called PNM. They've been our partners for some time. It's been a very good partnership. We also have a security contract which is relatively new, just since October 2nd. We've had a need for increased security at our campuses and so we do have a contract with an organization called TriCorps. We also have internally some security that we employ directly.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: And then the head count, with regard to that is not counted in your faculty's count at all?

Okay. How many people would you say are associated with that, just for those two services?

MS. SKOLNICK-EINHORN: So we hire, for our security we have one person at each campus and that would not change. We're fully staffed for the number of seats we have. That's just based on the campus, so we wouldn't add any additional security. I think for facilities at our south campus, we don't even have a full time person here. If we were to grow, we would probably just grow that role, but we most likely wouldn't have to add an additional facility as it's a small, it's a small school, but we

might add hours to that contract.

2.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Thank you. I appreciate your answers.

MS. SKOLNICK-EINHORN: Absolutely. Thank you.

MS. BLOOMFIELD: If you could go to the next slide, please, Mr. Young.

Just a brief history. We talked about this already. There have been two prior BZA applications approved originally for 125 students and 14 faculty staff, adds up to 130 students and 26 faculty and staff and the current request is for 150 students and 37 faculty and staff which, as we've discussed, also results in an increase in parking requirement which we've requested relief for. Next slide, please.

We've sort of gone over this but just to state for the record. The special exception relief is requested pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 901.2. The private school use is under Subtitle U, Section 203.1(m) and Subtitle X, Section 104. How we meet those requirements is all in our PowerPoint presentation. It's also explained in detail in the case record. I'm happy to skip through it if that is, if we want to get straight to the conditions. (Indiscernible).

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: (Indiscernible) please go through it.

MS. BLOOMFIELD: Yes, yes. Vehicle parking is pursuant to Subtitle C, 703.2. Next slide, please.

Before we get into those details I wanted to provide a quick overview for the Board members. We are pleased to have support for this application. We worked closely with our affected ANC 4E over a number of months. We received a official unanimous vote in support at their March, 2025 public meeting. That's in the case record. We also have a supportive report from the Office of Planning. It has not expressed any conditions. I hope they'll be here today to express that again.

And then we did work very closely with DDOT. DDOT's report indicates no objection and they indicated three conditions which we agreed to all three of those. The first is to continue to work with DDOT on the school bus pick-up and drop-off, and 2) to implement the TDM plan. There's one very minor change that we discussed with DDOT after they submitted their report. There was a duplicative car pooling requirement which they agreed was not necessary, and then the third is to continue to implement the TDM plans that are currently existing. So we agree with all of those conditions. Next slide, please.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: I have one question. I have one question before you go back to that.

MS. BLOOMFIELD: Okav.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: On the parking, I mean on the bus drop-off. The issue is between Decatur Street and 16th Street and as I recall from the discussion there was an issue as to whether it would be, you had historically had it on 16th Street

but DDOT wanted it to be on Decatur. Where does that stand right now? From our perspective we'd like to go one way or the other. Where are you now with that discussion?

MS. BLOOMFIELD: Sure.

2.

So we have operated successfully on 16th Street forever. There has been no concerns raised by the community. There has been no safety concerns for any of our students or faculty. It is the cleanest and clearest and safest way for students to enter and exit the building.

I will turn it over to Nicole and/or someone else from, probably Vanita, from the team to answer any specific questions you have about it. Our position is that 16th Street is the safest and most appropriate location for bus pick-up and drop-off. It does not change the status quo. DDOT has asked that it go on Decatur Street because their preference is to keep activities like this on lower flow streets. We have a number of ways that we believe that we can accommodate any of the concerns that DDOT might have about keeping it on 16th Street and I will stop there and let you ask some questions and turn it over possibly to Nicole or Vanita to answer them for you.

MS. WHITE: Let me just chime in before the questions and just say that our desire is to have that flexibility remain so that we can continue to coordinate with DDOT during the Public Space process. So we want to continue those discussions, so that would be our request at this point, to allow that flexibility to

either go on Decatur or 16th Street.

2.

2.4

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Just to quick clarify. So is it a matter of just negotiating back and forth with, to keep 16th Street or is there some particular plans you have in mind that would make 16th Street work if DDOT is in opposition to that?

MS. WHITE: Yes. So our desire is to keep 16th Street, I think the way Ms. Bloomfield started with just how robust our bus program is, helping 70 percent plus of the population and the importance of the connection between the north and south campus and the efficiencies of eight to nine buses depending on the time of day and all of the various stops. The school really desires and understands the importance of maintaining the bus pick-up and drop-off on 16th Street. There is a direct line for the pedestrians, for the students to go without conflicts with any vehicles from 16th Street whereas there is not that same opportunity from Decatur Street.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: What's the time line in which you think you'll have resolution on this with DDOT?

MS. WHITE: I think the time line is DDOT has stated its position and we'd like to continue this dialog on this part of the Public Space process and, you know, if necessary include neighborhood discussions as part of that.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. We'll probably have to come back to that.

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

COMMISSIONER SMITH: Yeah. Just to that point that Ms. White brought up.

I don't think that this Board has ever taken that approach. DDOT has been fairly explicitly clear that they would prefer to have it on Decatur Street, so has there been any type of plan that's been presented to DDOT? Is there a plan that you can provide that shows how you could make Decatur Street work, and also has there been some dialog with the neighborhood already about, you know, this particular DDOT condition of moving this to Decatur Street?

MS. WHITE: We looked at this as being separate from the BZA process of adding 20 students, that this is something that DDOT may desire to do separate from that case, and so we were just looking into maintaining that flexibility. We have submitted to DDOT a memorandum separate from the transportation statement separate from the BZA process to just our evaluation of Decatur Street versus 16th Street, and there are certainly advantages to each option. But considering the context of everything, we just stated our case for the preference of 16th Street and so that's why we wanted to continue that dialog and maintain that flexibility.

COMMISSIONER SMITH: Okay. Thank you.

And I'll just go on record and say that I do agree that this request from DDOT is separate from the increase in the number of students, but I do not think it's separate from their request

for a reduction in the vehicle parking spaces because to me this is all, you know, one discussion. So that's the reason why I do have some hesitation in just kicking this can to the Public Space Committee. Sorry.

MS. WHITE: If I could just respond to that please. So the parking space thing is separate from the pick-up/drop-off because the parking spaces are there to support staff and the parking is right across the street where the pick-up drop-off is really for the 70 percent plus students that use the bus program. So we see that as a separate --

COMMISSIONER SMITH: I completely disagree with you -- MS. WHITE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SMITH: -- because honestly with these type, you were here before on another case as well.

MS. WHITE: Sure.

2.

COMMISSIONER SMITH: It had to deal with a daycare facility and there was a big discussion about the pick-up and drop-off. So I don't know how we can say one way or the other on that particular case where it doesn't apply and this case we're going to kick it to some future date.

MS. WHITE: No. I think the difference of that, I'm very familiar and I recall that case, is that there were neighborhood concerns that were explicitly stated about the use of Peabody Street, and so that's why we had to, like, really provide all of the detailed information and then there was a

school that was a couple of blocks away and there was just concern about those cumulative impacts. But I hear what you're saying, just my initial response to that.

2.

MS. AHUJA: May I provide some color and context? So -VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Before you do that, Ms. Ahuja,
I just want to say one thing.

We have to understand that this is, we're looking also at a condition that discusses this and one of the things we want to, don't forget this is going to supersede the other order. So it's kind of like we're going to decide it one way of the other. The other order says 16th Street. The TDM plan says that DDOT wants something else. If we decide to go and say, okay, for 16th Street, then you're going to have to come back for a modification to switch it to Decatur if that happens and if you decide to, you know, so that's one issue I'm thinking about. It's not going to carry over. It's either, you know, it will supersede the last order so this is what matters to us.

So I think, and also there's a issue about delegation of authority to the extent that we allow DDOT to decide where it goes later and it's not reflected in our order. So we, I do think this is something we'd like to, we're going to have to work through it, as Board member Smith pointed out. It's not fully out of our bailiwick.

MS. WHITE: And Ms. Bloomfield has provided later in the presentation just the modification to that condition which,

again, would include some flexibility in the language there. So I guess we can continue the conversation if it makes sense at that point. But I think we're on the same page with DDOT and the actual TDM, it's just the pick-up/drop-off.

2.

MS. AHUJA: Right. If I could provide the color.

So right now we have eight school buses in the morning, nine school buses in the afternoon that transport between the two campuses about 372 children to school. And Decatur Street itself, the block that we're on is quite small and that's where our parent pick-up/drop-off procedures are. There are only seven parking spots on the property itself.

So what we would like to continue to do is to have the buses pick up and drop off on Decatur. We understand that there's a concern about standing and so we are prepared to address that. We're working with our bus company to see if we can get a radio or a schedule so that we can ensure that there's not more than one bus at a time on 16th Street when they're dropping of.

The challenge with Decatur is there's only space for one bus at a time and with the fact that that there's where our pedestrians enter, it's also where the cars enter and it's a very small block. Our concern is twofold. No. 1 is the presence of the buses and the cars going in the opposite directions could create a challenge and also everybody would need to funnel out into the neighborhood street, which we would like to avoid because we would like to try and be good neighbors and we understand that

having those buses and families and cars on those streets would not be ideal.

2.

2.2

So we would like to continue to make the case with DDOT. We've asked DDOT to come see the school and show them how our procedures work in case there are things that they think we can tighten up on 16th Street, but we maintain that 16th Street would be safer and cleaner for our neighbors and also more efficient in terms of transporting students between the two campuses because the buses that head northward start at our south campus in the afternoon, for instance, and then go to the, they start at our south campus, they go to the north campus and then they pick up the kids at north campus and then they continue north and it's the opposite in the afternoon. So the buses that head southbound start at our north campus and then go to our south campus, and then continue on their way.

We're mostly concerned about the impact to neighboring streets if we end up going on to Decatur and this didn't come up as part of our ANC presentation because we were still in negotiation with DDOT which is part of why we'd like to wait, if possible, to save it for the Public Space because we'd like to engage the ANC and make sure that whatever we decide is something that they would also be appreciative of.

ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Chairman? Mr. Chairman?

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Chair Hood.

ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh, sorry. Yeah. I appreciate

that discussion. I'm not always in favor of what DDOT proposes. 1 I don't see anything in this record which would change anything from the school to continue to do what they do on 16th Street. I understand their policies of trying to use Decatur and what they're trying to do across the city. This is one of those cases where I believe DDOT, and I don't believe they show up sometimes to the BZA, this is one of those cases where I believe DDOT should be present so we can have, so we can discuss questions with them.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But I think you, Mr. Chairman and Board member Smith, are right on target because the key was at the end of the day, Ms. Bloomfield and Ms. White, I believe DDOT has the final say so. So the problem I'm having is is exactly what my colleagues have already mentioned. If we do something you may have to come back for a modification. So to me, normally I don't have a problem moving it on to Public Space, but this time the issue is we need to kind of have some certainty I believe, having known as I've sat on this case previously in 2012, but regardless I think it's very important that that get nailed down.

But I don't see anything in this record that would go against what the school is trying to do. So that's just my two cents and I wanted to put that on the record. That's why I need to have questions, would like to have a conversation with DDOT but I know DDOT has the final say.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

You may continue your presentation.

MS. BLOOMFIELD: Thank you. I will, and just to put a pin in this plan we can absolutely come back to it, we've had a number of conversations with DDOT about this issue and we have no reason to believe that 16th Street is not the right place. These are very young kids. Kinder, you know, pre-K through 1st grade, they're very young kids and safety is really the most important piece here.

We are not aware of any concerns from the neighborhood over the past decade plus of having the buses on 16th Street. So maintaining the status quo in this situation is really our strong preference. If you could go to the next slide, please, I'll continue the presentation.

Here we have, just reference the fact that we did file an updated conditions chart. We recognize to the Chair's point that these are the new conditions that supersede the conditions in the prior order. They are mostly, and we can go through them, but they are mostly just cleaning things up to demonstrate how the school is currently operating, to make things a little bit more clear compared to what was approved in 2012/2013. There's nothing hugely different in those conditions including the above, quite frankly, which was required to be on 16th Street a decade ago. Next slide.

Here I will quickly touch on how the application meets the standards of review. First, the private school use requires

compliance with X-104 and U-203.1(m). As we have provided in our application, the private school use will be located so that it is not objectionable to adjoining or nearby properties. This use has existed for many, many years with no known impacts and the minimal increase in students and faculty will not disturb the status quo.

Given the high rate of school bus ridership that Nicole alluded to, it will not generate any meaningful traffic increases and based on the school's limitation on the number of classes that are permitted to play outside at any given time, there will be no meaningful increase in noise at the property either. There will also be no new facilities as a result of the application and therefore no impacts associated with construction or new buildings or structures.

Second, as we will discuss, there is ample parking provided for this proposed use. The seven existing parking spaces will remain on-site and we have an agreement to provide 18 additional spaces across the street at the 19th Street Baptist Church. This parking configuration has been found to adequately accommodate all students, teachers and visitors to the property.

And third on this slide, X-104.3 states that development standards are to mirror those in the underlying zone. In this case the application is not proposing any new development, so it's not applicable here. Next slide, please.

Relief was requested from 703.2, Subtitle C, 703.2 to

reduce the on-site parking space requirement. In this case 25 spaces are required. Seven spaces are on the property and we will provide 18 additional spaces across the street.

If you go to the next slide you can see where that's located. Right there is the church and we have an agreement with them to provide those spaces. Next slide.

The reduction --

2.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: I have a quick question for you on that. Go back to that last slide. Two quick questions for you on the parking.

MS. BLOOMFIELD: Sure.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Is there, there's nothing in the record that talks about the terms of the agreement. Is the short term agreement, long term agreement, how does it work? And also I wanted to know where do you currently provide the other, the off-street spaces that you have, that you're providing currently?

MS. BLOOMFIELD: Vanita or Duncan, can you answer that, please?

MR. MILLER: Yes, I can answer the terms part of that. So our agreement with 19th Street is an annual agreement, so it renews yearly. Our staff has special parking passes that we issue to them that lets the church know that they're with us and able to park on that site, and then we issue those to staff. They're numbered. The staff are able to put them on their cars

and use them.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. And the current place

you're doing it is where again?

MS. AHUJA: So I should say this is a new-ish agreement.

Prior to Covid my understanding is that we had an agreement with the church immediately across Decatur from us. We have not been able to reach, I've been here three years, we have not been successful in reaching out to them or hearing from them and so the prior agreement I think paused during Covid and we have been working to try and find a new partner. So we're pleased that within the last six months the 19th Street Baptist Church has agreed to provide us with parking and we're working for the parking. But we had a lapse during Covid and, in part, because we lost connection with the church who was providing the parking before.

Sorry, I think you're on mute, Mr. Chair.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: So you've been using street parking pretty much in the interim to fill your needs?

MS. BLOOMFIELD: Staff have, yes. Some staff have been using street parking. We do have a number of staff who take public transportation.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay.

MS. BLOOMFIELD: Yes. I believe some staff have been street parking and actually one of the, on this map and I know this is one of the conditions, you'll see on 16th Street there

is a C-shaped driveway that has existed I'm assuming as long as the building has been there, but I don't know the exact dates. We have a number of staff who sort of, you know, park behind one another. So the majority of our staff are actually parking on that C-shaped space on 16th which we know is going away as part of this agreement.

7 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. And that C is public 8 space; is that right?

MS. BLOOMFIELD: Yes.

2.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Thank you.

MS. BLOOMFIELD: Okay. Next slide.

We have demonstrated in the record that the reduction in on-site parking is proportionate to the parking demand and the reduction is limited to the number of spaces that can reasonably be provided on-site due to the configuration and the layout of the existing improvements. And then finally the relief is requested. The relief requested is limited to the number of spaces only, not their location, access, size or any other factor. Next slide, please.

Finally on the parking, we worked with DDOT to establish a mutually agreeable TDM plan. It's long. It's a couple of pages. It's included in the final TDM report at Exhibit 26 and as I mentioned, we are comfortable with every single one of those conditions other than the reference to complying with school pool. We are complying with a variety of other school

car pooly-type programs and DDOT was comfortable with us removing that one. Next slide, please.

2.

It's, again, sorry there's a lot of words, but this final slide identifies how the application meets the general special exception standards of review. That the existing private school use will be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the regulations and the zoning map, and that the modest increase in students and faculty over the years will not disturb the status quo and if approved, would allow the school to admit an additional number of students, hopefully in the Fall.

The use would not affect adversely the use of neighboring properties due to the school's proposed operations, certain limitations on outdoor use, its TDM plan, and we'll meet all of the conditions, as I've previously described. Moreover, as we noted, the ANC voted unanimously to support this application. We're happy to have their support. And the next slide, I think that's it.

Yeah. I would open it up to questions. I know we've answered a variety already and if you want to pull up the conditions chart, I'm happy go through that as well.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okav.

Let's see. Are there any more questions from the Board on the formal presentation before we move to the conditions?

MS. SKOLNICK-EINHORN: Mr. Blake, may I make a short comment about admissions?

1	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Who is this? I'm sorry.
2	MS. SKOLNICK-EINHORN: This is Deborah, head of school.
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Please. Go ahead.
4	MS. SKOLNICK-EINHORN: I just wanted to share that we
5	are not anticipating additional students in the coming year. I
6	think the combination of the Federal worker crisis that we're
7	seeing is more likely to actually suppress admissions and we're
8	seeing people moving and going abroad, you know, taking jobs
9	elsewhere. So unfortunately I don't see we're going to
10	(indiscernible) this and use it in the future, but in the
11	immediate future we're trying to just sustain our levels which
12	is a challenge in the current landscape.
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay.
14	Ms. Bloomfield, let's move on to the conditions.
15	MS. BLOOMFIELD: Sure.
16	Mr. Young, do you mind pulling up the PDF that I sent
17	you. It's also Exhibit 29A. Thank you.
18	Great. I'm not sure how well you can all see that but
19	I also have it on my screen so I'll be able to talk about it.
20	Condition No. 1 is identifying a new number of students
21	at 150 and I will just say before I get into this, we, the three
22	columns, the first column is what was approved. The second column
23	is what's being proposed. The third column is our rationale sort
24	of to explain for the record why we were making that change. So,
25	
	No. 1 is increasing the number of students.

 $$\operatorname{No.}$\ 2$  is increasing the number of faculty and staff, which is what we're here for.

No. 3 describes the hours of operation. We've sort of jiggered these a little bit because the, just to identify the actual school hours that are being operated today, 7:45 a.m. to 4:45 Monday through Friday and then we've noted that there are, and we can speak to this if it's necessary, there are about 20 weekend and/or evening or late afternoon days per year where there are additional academic activities. These are open houses, back to school nights, orientations, that sort of thing and so we, that wasn't previously identified in the order conditions so we've included those here just for clarity.

MS. SKOLNICK-EINHORN: Jessica?

MS. BLOOMFIELD: Yes.

MS. SKOLNICK-EINHORN: Just want to say we do have after school activities that we've, that's our, we bused the students as part of those nine buses. The young students come over to our north campus which is where we host really all of our after school activities or after care, et cetera, which goes until 6 o'clock. But, again, that's only on our north campus. It's concentrated there.

MS. BLOOMFIELD: Thank you.

No. 4 is about using the play area. So what we've done here is we've gotten a little bit more specific to rather than saying small groups of children only, we're now identifying that

the number of students is equivalent to one grade to be more specific on the number of students that are allowed to play outside at a given time, and then we do have, we've noted here, again, just to be consistent with current operations that about twice a month there are some additional holidays and/or curricular needs where larger groups may play outside.

MS. AHUJA: For the group, if you go to the next page.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: I have --

2.

2.4

MS. BLOOMFIELD: Thank you. It's on the next page.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: On this particular one -- please go, you can go to the next one -- but I want to talk a little bit about that particular condition.

I think that one of the things that we in there is the small number is a little bit vague about approximately one class size. We talked about a few minutes ago what the class size looks like, so if we'd be comfortable I'd just like to have a number specifically around 60 if that accommodates the playground as opposed to in the classes. I realize that when the pre-K guys are out it's not going to be anywhere near that but certainly if you did a larger one that would, 60 would more than cover that.

MS. BLOOMFIELD: So maximum 60 students at a time?

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Yeah. For those, for that, in that particular sense we put the small groups instead of, just to have a more definitive number.

MS. AHUJA: Thank you. That makes sense.

1	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: The second thing is with
2	regard to the students up to twice a month to celebrate Jewish
3	holidays or other curricular needs. Because this will travel
4	with the land, it would probably be good not to single it out to
5	this specific use. So I'd be inclined to just, I'm not going to
6	change anything, but I would move the celebrate Jewish holidays
7	and just have you have twice a month for other curricular needs,
8	which you do at this time but I don't think you need to put that
9	into it, pretty much limit it to. Like, before you rented to
10	Latin, you know, the other schools and then they would, you know,
11	not have that flexibility.
12	So if you want flexibility I think it would be best to
13	remove that.
14	MS. BLOOMFIELD: So it would say the playground may be
15	utilized by larger groups of students up to twice a month for
16	other curricular needs?
17	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Yes.
18	MS. BLOOMFIELD: Is that all right, team?
19	MS. SKOLNICK-EINHORN: That's great. We appreciate
20	that adjustment.
21	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Board member Smith? Chairman
22	Hood? Any issues with that? Okay.
23	MS. BLOOMFIELD: Thank you. I think that's a very good
24	point.
25	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Go to the next one.

MS. BLOOMFIELD: Next is No. 5. All we've done here is identify the number of off-site parking spaces that are required. I would note that this language does not require that the off-site parking spaces be located at the specific church or in a specific location. It just requires that off-site parking spaces be located within a half mile. It allows for flexibility. If that agreement with the church ends we can relocate the off-site parking spaces somewhere else.

No. 6. This is the item that we talked about where we have written it so that it is flexible for us to work with DDOT to either put the bus parking on 16th or Decatur. As we've mentioned, it is our strong preference to keep the bus pick-up/drop-off on 16th Street. Decatur simply cannot handle it.

MS. AHUJA: May I add one other note, which is, this is for pick-up and drop-off. For field trips we usually do have the buses pick up on Decatur so I don't know that that matters for the purposes of this but I did want to just name that as a element that there will be buses on Decator occasionally for field trip pick-up.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: All right. We've had a lot of discussion about this, as you said, and I'm trying to figure out how to provide you with the flexibility but not to push our position. I think that we could potentially just say something that the pick-up operations may take place from either Decatur, 16th Street or Decatur and we can remove as coordinated with

DDOT. 1 2 I'd like to ask my Board members their thoughts on that. 3 Mr. Smith? 4 COMMISSIONER SMITH: (Audio interference). 5 6 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: I can hear you now. 7 COMMISSIONER SMITH: If it's the pleasure of the Board 8 to, you know, allow this flexibility I think it's worded is fine 9 but instead of saying may, say shall. So it either shall be 10 either 16th or Decatur and wherever DDOT lands on where they are going to go, whether DDOT demands that it be on Decatur, the 11 12 condition gives them that flexibility. So I don't think we need 13 to re-word it. 14 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Right. 15 I would, would you remove the as coordinated with, or 16 you're fine with that? 17 COMMISSIONER SMITH: No. Keep it as coordinated with 18 if we're, if it's the pleasure of the Board to not nail this down 19 and will, and allow them to continue to have the conversation 20 with DDOT at a future date. I think the condition works for what 21 they're trying to do. 2.2 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. 23 So the other question I'd say though is the word or appropriate, because what if they come up with a combination of 24

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

Decatur and 16th Street? Because we're kind of either/or with

25

what we have there.

ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I think either/or would work, Mr. Chairman. But, again, for the life of me I cannot see anything in this record why the, you know, Decatur Street to begin with other than for field trips. Because what would the Board be creating, because when it's all said and done, the community's not going to say DDOT, they're going to say the BZA approved it.

So I just did not see anything in this record that puts it on Decatur, but I would agree with the way you're going, Mr. Chairman, because the whole goal for me was not to have them come back in front of us, and I'll leave it at that point.

COMMISSIONER SMITH: And I agree with Chairman Hood. I think I'm fine with keeping the condition, if the Applicant wants to keep that condition, that's fine but I think in order for us to be more comfortable to what Mr. Hood is saying, we need to see some type of plan that if it is on Decatur. So I think it needs o be both. You need to, you have a plan that shows on 16th Street with them operating it from 16th Street now. What we have on record is DDOT is pretty adamant about moving this to Decatur, so I think there needs to be some type of plan that shows it on 16th and Decatur.

MS. BLOOMFIELD: I believe that we have that in the case record already, the Decatur plan.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Let's pull that up and maybe we can reference that so that we'll have something to work with.

Where would that be, Ms. Bloomfield?

MS. BLOOMFIELD: That would be in our transportation statement at Exhibit 22B. Nicole, you know this report better than I do and maybe can walk through it a little bit.

Is Mr. Young able to pull that up on the screen or do you all have it in front of you?

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Mr. Young, please pull that up so that we can see, the two exhibits.

9 MS. WHITE: Let's start with figure 2, which is on page 10 5.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Hang on a second. Mr. Young, do you have that?

MS. WHITE: There we go. Okay.

So this is showing existing operations on 16th Street. This is showing where students would get off the bus and that pink zone on 16th Street is where the buses currently pick up and drop off, and this is showing where students would be able to directly access the school without any conflicts with vehicles.

And then later in the report, so this would accommodate the 16th Street option. And then later in the report on page 8, which is figure 4, we are showing what the pink zone, which is the primary zone for pick-up/drop-off if it occurs on Decatur Street. The green zone is the contingency space that we've designated so that in case by chance more than one bus comes,

the bus could use the green area, the second bus could use the green area so to not back up traffic on 16th Street or Decatur. So this would be the Decatur pick-up/drop-off option.

2.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Is this consistent with what DDOT is proposing?

MS. WHITE: Yes. DDOT has, this is in the transportation statement. DDOT has approved this as part of their report. DDOT has also said that it could assist with signage to further assist the zones on Decatur Street. So I think between the two exhibits we have that, we've shown that flexibility that's desired in both pick-up/drop=off zones.

MS. BLOOMFIELD: And I think if we're talking about language in the order because I know you were just sort of wordsmithing it, we could use, I can't remember, maybe Board member Smith said it, may be located on Decatur or 16th Street or and/or 16th Street. You know, we do want the flexibility. We have proven I believe to do that, that their policy to not have things like bus pick-up/drop-off on 16th Street is sort of like they apply this policy no matter where you are or what the context is.

In this context Decatur Street is not the right place for it. The neighborhood would, I don't want to ever speak for the neighborhood but it would be a detriment to the neighborhood. There'd be a lot more large buses and vehicles on the smaller streets. So while we would love the Board to make a decision,

1	to Commissioner Hood's point we don't want to have to come back
2	here to change it if DDOT absolutely says no and while we hope
3	that doesn't happen, that's the position we don't want to be in.
4	So I think the flexibility in the order would be our first
5	preference.
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: So if you're reading that
7	sentence you said you'd just replace the word operations may take
8	place from 16th Street or Decatur Street? Is that the way you're
9	saying it?
10	MS. BLOOMFIELD: Correct.
11	Operations, and I have it on my screen. I don't know
12	if Mr. Young has that up.
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: No (indiscernible).
14	MS. BLOOMFIELD: Yeah
15	MS. WHITE: I thought we said and/or also, just
16	MS. BLOOMFIELD: I have it. Operations, we could say
17	operations may take place from either 16th Street or Decatur
18	Street.
19	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Board member Smith, Chairman
20	Hood? What are your thoughts on that?
21	COMMISSIONER SMITH: I personally
22	ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Go ahead Board member Smith.
23	COMMISSIONER SMITH: (Indiscernible).
24	ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I can just go last.
25	COMMISSIONER SMITH: I'm not comfortable with removing

the term shall. I think there was some batting around of removing 1 2. shall and saying may --MS. BLOOMFIELD: Shall. 3 COMMISSIONER SMITH: -- for it to be definitive. 4 5 would say shall, so I wouldn't change that term. If you wanted 6 to add and/or Decatur Street I'm comfortable with that. But, 7 yeah, I wouldn't change it to may. 8 MS. BLOOMFIELD: That's fine with me. I'm looking at 9 my colleagues, Vanita and Deborah, is that language okay with 10 I think the shall and the may, I'm comfortable with either 11 one. 12 MS. SKOLNICK-EINHORN: Yeah. And I think --13 MS. BLOOMFIELD: (Indiscernible) that process? 14 MS. SKOLNICK-EINHORN: And we always like to be creative. So if we come up with something creative with DDOT 15 16 which is some combination of Decatur and 16th Street, this leaves 17 us the possibility to just have a little more creativity for what 18 works for DDOT, for the neighborhood, for the safety of our kids 19 and I really appreciate the way this is being discussed and having 20 There was, DDOT did have some internal the optionality. 21 disagreement about it so I don't think it was as cut and dried as the ultimate document makes it seem. 2.2 23 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: So are we, Board member Smith, 24 Chairman Hood, are we in the same place with this? 25 ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.

1 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Either/or. 2 ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I believe we are, Mr. Chairman. But, again, I want to make sure I put this on the record that I 3 4 don't understand why we're doing Decatur Street when we don't 5 have anything in this record. Because I know when it goes awry, 6 don't nobody mention DDOT. They're going to mention the Board 7 of Zoning Adjustment and I'll just leave it at that. 8 Thank you. 9 Mr. Young, if you could pull up the MS. BLOOMFIELD: 10 conditions chart again, please. We're on No. 7. If you scroll 11 down a bit. 12 No. 7. There's no change. This is about parking for 13 extra curricular events that would happen at Carter Barron with 14 shuttle service. So that --15 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: I have a question for you on 16 that. 17 MS. BLOOMFIELD: Absolutely. 18 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Is there an agreement in place 19 for that and how is this born out in practice? 20 MS. BLOOMFIELD: Vanita? 21 MS. AHUJA: I can speak to that. So what happens is 22 when we have a few events where we would reach out to Parks team 23 to ask if we can use parking there and then we have buses, the same buses that bring our students, we have buses that go back 24

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

and forth. So, for instance, we, for grandparents day, have a

25

number of families. We encourage them to park there and we have a bus that goes back and forth. We have a staff member who meets them at the bus stop so that they know we're there and when the bus is coming.

MS. SKOLNICK-EINHORN: I will add that we're seeing a lot more. We are encouraging for those type of events people are of course using public transportation or ride share which, I think with Uber and Lyft being so much more accessible, that's a very common solution for people for those. So we're not seeing a huge amount of use on that option but we like to provide obviously off-site parking for major events. And we also obviously because of parking, we don't do very many large events at school. It's just very complicated to get that many people there so we try to do smaller events.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Thank you.

Any questions on that otherwise? Okay. Let's go to the next one.

MS. BLOOMFIELD: Sure.

2.

The next one was brought to our attention actually by BZA staff. The plan that is referenced in the current condition is sort of out of the date and so what we did here was we filed a copy of the landscape plan that was approved. The building permit number is referenced there that approved it. The plan that we filed in the case record is, you know, stamped by DOB from 2013. So what we've just done here is say that the

landscaping will be maintained consistent with the current conditions.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay.

2.

2.2

Is the current conditions, were they implemented consistent with that plan and I know you have the term generally in accordance, so I want to get a sense of what exists today is what is on that plan or, and if it's generally different, how different is it?

MS. BLOOMFIELD: Yeah. It was, there are, and Vanita walked me through the very, very small things that are not quite exactly the same. There's like a dead tree stump. It is about 95 percent exactly what is shown on the approved stamped plan but because plants have died and new ones have been planted, it's not 100 percent exactly the same but we felt comfortable that filing that approved plan, we would maintain it generally consistent. If you'd like more details on that I'm going to turn it over to Vanita, and we can pull that up if you'd like to look at it.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: The other thing I would mention is that the initial intent for the landscaping in part at the Lowell School order was to provide a buffer for the residential community. At this point I suspect there's a sufficient buffer there. You may want to elaborate on that.

MS. BLOOMFIELD: Would you like us to pull up the plan or do you want us just to talk about it?

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: You can talk about it. I

mean, we're familiar with the plans. 2 MS. SKOLNICK-EINHORN: Maybe Duncan can talk about it? MS. AHUJA: I've looked more closely at the plans. 3 4 you don't mind I'll take it and then Duncan can add it. 5 So we have some large half-grown trees that are, I 6 think they're Everbrite, Vichay (phonetic), and I don't remember 7 exactly, I don't know. I don't know the exact name, but there's 8 a large cluster of trees on the inside of the fence along the 9 yard and then there are along the fence line we have also some 10 of the other trees that are there. There's some modifications to the landscaping plan itself. 11 There were some 12 garden boxes that, they're moved slightly from where they were. 13 There were some stumps that had monkey bars in them. The stumps 14 rotted so they were replaced with a metal monkey bar set. So 15 they're very minor changes. 16 In terms of the landscaping that is there. 17 here three years. We haven't changed it so my assumption is it's 18 the same landscaping that was installed in 2013. I will, we are 19 always happy to revisit and make sure. I haven't done an 20 assessment of the trees that are there. 21 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. So the other 22

questions --

(Indiscernible) haven't been changed. MS. AHUJA:

23

24

25

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: -- the context, in the context landscaping, the intent was to provide a buffer to the

residential properties. Is that a buffer, is there a sufficient 1 2. buffer there today? MS. BLOOMFIELD: So I'll answer this. So separately 3 4 we have put up a fence, maybe a year ago or so that is a complete 5 buffer between the direct abutting neighbors to the south. There have been some issues with that fence because it was installed 6 according to the permit granted by DOB but the permit granted a 7 8 fence at a taller height than is actually permitted. So we have 9 been working with DOB very closely on getting a Code modification 10 to bring the height of the fence down to a matter-of-right fence height. 11 12 So to answer your direct question about whether there's 13 a buffer, in addition to the landscaping there's also a fence 14 that abuts the direct neighbors and also a portion of the public 15 street surrounding the property. 16 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. All right. 17 I think in that case I'd like to keep that provision 18 in the, the way you've written it in the conditions. 19 Mr. Smith, would you have any comment on that? 20 COMMISSIONER SMITH: No. I agree with your approach 21 to that. 22 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. The next one. 23 MS. BLOOMFIELD: The next one allows faculty and staff 2.4 to ride school buses for free. We've not changed this. 25 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. And then, let's see.

We go to number --2. MS. BLOOMFIELD: Next page, No. 10. Originally required that the school do a performance monitoring plan. DDOT's 3 4 report agreed with us that that is no longer necessary so we've 5 just deleted, propose to delete that condition entirely. 6 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Comments on that, Mr. Smith? 7 Chairman Hood, any comments on that last one? 8 ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No comments. 9 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Okay. 10 So I think that gets us pretty much through the 11 conditions. 12 MS. BLOOMFIELD: There's one more which is a new 13 condition, No. 11, and this one is simply to require that we 14 comply with the TDM plan shown in the DDOT report, other than the school pool item. 15 16 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. 17 The only thing that's significantly different I think 18 about this is that in the original condition there was a time 19 period considered and the time period was not put in place because 20 there was going to be a review or a monitoring program. In this 21 case we are removing the monitoring program and certainly we're not talking about a time limit. So it's a little bit of a, let's 22 23 say, a naked commitment but I'm comfortable with it. 24 Mr. Smith?

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

COMMISSIONER SMITH: With adding a time limit?

25

1	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: No, no, no. I'm saying,
2	initially this term had a, there was a proposed time limit. They
3	removed the time limit and they had a monitoring program. The
4	monitoring program was a relatively short period of time. It
5	essentially expired and at this point we could either maintain
6	it the way it is. I don't think, it doesn't have a monitoring
7	component to it I guess is what I'm saying. Do you think that's
8	necessary? If not, I'm comfortable with it the way it is.
9	COMMISSIONER SMITH: No, I'm comfortable with it the
10	way it is now.
11	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Chairman Hood, I'm
12	going to assume you agree with that?
13	ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, I do.
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Then I do think that
15	concludes the conditions. All right.
16	Are there any other questions from the Board for the
17	Applicant?
18	(Pause.)
19	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Then I will now ask the
20	Office of Planning to present their report.
21	ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Chairman, I do have
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Yes, sir.
23	ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: and I might have missed this.
24	The only blemish I saw in this record, Ms. Bloomfield, and I know
25	it has nothing to do with us. The good neighbor policy I call

1	it, about the fence. Can we get the fence situation straightened
2	out, about the fence? I forgot the gentleman's name but I don't
3	know. What's the status? Are you all working on that?
4	MS. BLOOMFIELD: Yes.
5	ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Or are you all
6	MS. BLOOMFIELD: Yes, yes. Of course. Sure.
7	I'm happy to address the fence. I talked about it a
8	little bit a minute ago. The fence was, if you go by the property
9	there is a very tall fence there. That fence was installed
10	according to an approved permit from DOB. Whomever installed
11	that fence, the contractor for the school, did not realize that
12	that fence was well over what Code allows for.
13	So they installed it, and then it was found out that
14	it was way over Code. The school didn't know either. And we
15	have been working with DOB for months and months and months now
16	to try to bring that fence into compliance with what is required.
17	ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.
18	MS. BLOOMFIELD: And then
19	ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You don't have to explain no
19 20	ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You don't have to explain no more. I've worked with DOB myself
20	more. I've worked with DOB myself
20 21	more. I've worked with DOB myself  MS. BLOOMFIELD: Okay.
20 21 22	more. I've worked with DOB myself  MS. BLOOMFIELD: Okay.  ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: so I get it, trust me. Thank

1	security concerns and we would like to keep the fence taller than
2	is permitted and we have not been granted that ability to do
3	that, and so we are going to bring it down to what's permitted
4	essentially. But that's the story.
5	ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You don't have to explain no
6	more. DOB has a hard job. I give DOB all the credit but I also
7	understand how long sometimes things can take. That's what I, I
8	missed that earlier. So thank you, Ms. Bloomfield.
9	MS. SKOLNICK-EINHORN: And, Mr. Hood, the fence work
10	is scheduled for right when the students are released because we
11	obviously don't want to do that while they're here, but the work
12	should be performed beginning in the middle of June to adjust it.
13	ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Great.
14	MS. SKOLNICK-EINHORN: And we apologize for that. It
15	was definitely, it's been a hard process but we recognize it
16	wasn't our best (phonetic).
17	ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I understand. I know all
18	about it. Thank you.
19	Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Thank you.
21	Now we're going to hear from the Office of Planning.
22	MR. MITCHUM: Yes. This is Joshua Mitchum with the
23	Office of Planning.
24	I just want to reiterate that we are in support of the
25	project and we can stand on our comments in the record, and yes,

1	I'm happy to answer any questions that you may have.
2	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Mr. Mitchum, your report did
3	not include the conditions and did not require any conditions.
4	Are you comfortable with the conditions which we've, would the
5	Office of Planning be comfortable with that?
6	MR. MITCHUM: Yes. So OP did have a chance to review
7	the conditions as presented by Ms. Bloomfield and we are in
8	agreement with them, especially with the Applicant working with
9	DDOT to resolve any lingering transportation issues.
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Thank you.
11	Does the Applicant have any questions for the Office
12	of Planning?
13	MS. BLOOMFIELD: No. Thank you.
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay.
15	Mr. Young, is there anyone who wishes to testify? Any
16	witnesses?
17	MR. YOUNG: Yes. We have one witness here.
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Would you please bring
19	them in?
20	MR. YOUNG: His name is Kirk Shickman.
21	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay.
22	Mr. Shickman, are you there? Is your camera
23	MR. SHICKMAN: Yes, sir.
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Is your camera working?
25	MR. SHICKMAN: I can, yes. Are you asking me to bring

it on?

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Sure. Okay.

Mr. Shickman, as a member of the public you have three minutes to provide your testimony. Before you begin, would you please state your name and your address. We try to get sense of the proximity to the property in relation to it. So if you do that and you have three minutes, and you can begin whenever you like.

MR. SHICKMAN: Yes, sir. Thank you.

Kirk Shickman. I'm at 1500 Decatur Street, Northwest. I'm about one house away from the property in question. And as a close neighbor, I oppose the zoning exemption unless the Applicant either provides a reasonable off-street parking plan, either to the ANC or the BZA, that mitigates the existing strain on parking and traffic or provides the required number of spots on-site or nearby for current staff load.

At current capacity or current occupancy, the school is already below the required number of spaces that are required. So looking at Table C, 701.5, that indicates that a private educational facility have two spots for every three teachers and staff and currently there are, and I didn't appreciate this before, but just in walking around the spot as a close neighbor seven spots is different than what I knew.

Currently I saw four spots in the front, at least on the Decatur Street side with room for about eight or so more cars

in that circle that fronts 15th Street. There was a total of 12 spots in my estimation which is more than I guess maybe more generous than what has been shared here today. That serves a staff of 28 folks. That's less, that's about two thirds of what's required which is 18 spots.

2.4

So this request for variance would mean that the school would be at less than half of the required spaces provided and probably less if we take the seven spots into consideration here. And since the streets immediately around the school do not require a parking permit, staff and school buses are parking on the streets. That's on Decatur, that's on Piney Branch and Decatur down to about 15th Street, and Piney Branch down to about Delafield and maybe a little bit beyond. And so this also fills the current capacity of the spots that we have within the block or so of the school and it allows for few other users.

I don't think a parking plan here, and I do appreciate what I've heard today which I didn't know, around the efforts to find off-street parking that's close by. I don't think that's an (audio interference) ask from the community. Like was mentioned before, there are private parking facilities within two blocks of the school that could provide ample space for daytime overflow parking. The school operates a large facility with more parking about a mile up the road which they mentioned, Milton, where shuttles could be run from.

I would say also pick-up and drop-off of more students

is problematic. Currently the number of cars accessing the school those transition times is overwhelming and causes back-ups on Decatur and northbound 16th Street, which we've talked about a bunch today. Adding at least a dozen more parent vehicles to this will only increase the inconvenience and risk. The school should consider staggering dismissals perhaps or some other operational changes that would make this a little bit easier, and I can see that you guys have had a lot of conversation around that today.

2.

But this facility is already operating past its capacity from a vehicle standpoint. It's a small area, small school, and I appreciate the mission but the facility doesn't necessarily allow for the vision that they have for where they want to go with it. They're already benefiting from fewer than required spaces at the expense of those of us in the community and I think this might be easily remedied with some communication with the neighbors and others that have spaces that allow for this, and it sounds like some of that's happening.

But I think that should be done before a variance here is issued and so I do appreciate your time and consideration, and hope I've met the time commitments here.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Yes, sir. Thank you very much for your testimony.

Does anyone on the Board have a question for the witness? Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Shickman, for your

1	testimony.
2	MR. SHICKMAN: Yes, sir.
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay.
4	Mr. Young, you may dismiss the witness. Is there anyone
5	else that wishes to testify? You said no, right?
6	MR. YOUNG: Correct.
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay.
8	I have a quick question for the Applicant based on
9	that.
10	I understand that you have not had the Mosaic Church
11	parking facility available and you have been using the street,
12	as you indicated, which is probably going to reflect some of the
13	burden that Mr. Shickman acknowledged. Have you been using the
14	16th Street, the 19th Street Baptist Church parking, or have you
15	been using it or are you intending to use it and when would you
16	begin?
17	MS. BLOOMFIELD: Vanita?
18	MS. AHUJA: I'm actually going to ask Duncan because
19	we've had back and forth with the church about it, so I'll ask
20	him to respond.
21	MR. MILLER: Yes. So we are currently using it. So
22	to Vanita's point, we had a block there right after Covid where
23	we lost our other partnering with the church across because they
24	had new management and we weren't able to get a hold of the, and
25	during that time our staff got a little more comfortable than we

would like parking either on-site or on the street. So we've been working over the past six months to phase them off those spots into the new off-site parking. We have a handful of staff that have adapted that. We expect to continue that push to get full compliance going into the next school year.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Chairman Hood, did you want to say something?

ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay.

2.

I would just, as you do have parking potentially we should make an effort to use that parking and continue with a good neighbor policy. It's easy to park in that street and I am familiar with the street. It is a narrow street. Piney Branch is narrow. It would be helpful to make sure that they enforce the use of the parking facility, even though it's not as convenient. Okay. I think that's that.

Any other questions we have? Ms. Bloomfield, you're going to have the opportunity to give us closing remarks if there are no other questions from the Board members. Seeing none, would you please continue with your closing remarks, if you have any.

MS. BLOOMFIELD: Thank you very much to all of you. I don't actually have a whole lot to say. I think we got a lot of really good work done and appreciate your detailed input on our conditions which is extremely helpful to us, as always. I do

appreciate the testimony that we heard from, I'm sorry, I'm forgetting his last name, Kirk's last name, who just came up. We are very sensitive to cars in the neighborhood. We have been a good neighbor for many years and believe that we've done a lot of outreach to our neighbors, particularly as it relates to this particular increase in students and faculty.

We are providing, 25 parking spaces is required under the zoning regulations and with the seven on-site and the 18 offsite, that is a total of 25, so we believe we will be meeting the requirement as it relates to pick up and drop off and the number of cars on the streets in the surrounding neighborhood. The majority of students take the bus and so the increase, the maximum increase in students which would be 20, would not actually result in 20 more pick-up and drop-off cars coming on to Decatur It would only be a couple of cars, if that. And then Street. done quite, Nicole has done quite an extensive transportation study to show that there would be no real adverse impacts that DDOT was comfortable with.

So I appreciate all of the discussion today and I will just ask that the Board support this application.

Thank you.

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. Thank you very much.

I thank you all for your time and your testimony, and I'm going to, if it's okay, close the record and the hearing session and let the witnesses go.

Thank you very much.

2 (Pause.)

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: All right.

So we can move on to our deliberation session. Okay. I'm going to kick off with this and I appreciate and look forward to your input, Mr. Smith and Chairman Hood.

Based on the information provided in the record and the testimony received today in this hearing, I do believe the Applicant has met the burden of proof to be granted the requested relief. This is based on its past performance, the current practices and proposed conditions. I believe with the additional faculty and staff, the Applicant has demonstrated that the private school use will not likely continue in a way that is objectionable to the adjoining nearby properties because of noise, traffic, number of students or other objectionable conditions.

Most of the activities will take place indoors. Use of the playground will be limited to 60 as per the condition, except for a few small gatherings. There's nothing in the record indicating that there were complaints about noise or activity levels other than the testimony received today which really focused mostly on the traffic issue, and the incremental addition of 20 students should not majorly change the current situation.

The proposed traffic increase will be monitored, as we pointed out, and the proposed conditions with the TDM plan should

not result in adverse impacts on traffic. I do believe that adequate parking will be provided for staff through the combination of on-site parking within a close proximity which is really addressing the only concerns mentioned by the ANC 4E, which is in support of the application. The Applicant, as per the parking regulation, the Applicant does not have room to provide the required spaces which is indicated as 25 by the Applicant. They only have seven. They have been parking in the public space, they've been parking on the street but recently secured parking within 600 feet.

2.

Now, the fact that it's within 600 feet is actually within the context of the regulations but I believe that out of an abundance of caution, the approval is warranted since the year-to-year agreement with some, you know, uncertainty to it, so I believe that granting approval for the additional parking within a half mile is appropriate for future flexibility.

I give great weight to the Office of Planning's recommendation for approval and note that the DDOT report is in support of the TDM which is included in the condition of approval. We've gone through the conditions. I'm not going to review them now, but I think I'm comfortable with where we ended up and the biggest issue I think there was the flexibility for the pick-up and drop-off which is a concern. So, but I do believe we've reconciled that issue adequately.

So I'll be voting in favor of the application. Mr.

Smith, do you have anything you want to add?

2.

COMMISSIONER SMITH: No, Chairman Hill, not Chairman Hill, Chairman Blake. Okay.

I have nothing to add. I think you have summed up the metrics of this case and why they have met the burden for us to grant the requested special exceptions. As you've stated before, they've been operating successfully for over a decade at this particular site and I do believe that the requested expansion and the increase in number of faculty would not, you know, have a major detrimental effect on the surrounding neighborhood.

I agree with all the conditions stated. You know, the biggest issue just, as you've stated, was about this pick-up and drop-off arrangement. There seems to be, you know, some disagreement between them and DDOT. But the Applicant has provided two different pick-up and drop-off plans that do provide them with the flexibility on wherever they land with DDOT going forward, and they will continue to have this dialog with the surrounding neighborhood. So also adding that flexibility if they get some pushback from the neighborhood about it being on Decatur, it does give them the flexibility and DDOT the flexibility to send this back to 16th Street if they so choose and agree to that arrangement.

So I do give the Office of Planning's staff report great weight and note that the ANC is in support, and I'll support the special exception request for approval as well.

1 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Smith. 2 Chairman Hood? ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I would agree with both of the 3 comments of both my colleagues, and also mention I think this was 4 5 thoroughly discussed and any objectionable views that were at 6 least potential adverse impacts that were recognized I think were 7 discussed and mitigated. And from what I see I this record is 8 that past practices, I think that if we see some of the increase 9 I believe they have been mitigated and I think this record is 10 complete, and I will be voting in favor of it. 11 Thank you. Thank you, Chairman Hood. 12 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: 13 Having deliberated, I make a motion to approve 14 Application No. 21247 as captioned and read by the secretary, 15 incorporating conditions presented in Exhibit 29A as amended in 16 the hearing, and ask for a second. Mr. Smith? 17 COMMISSIONER SMITH: Second. 18 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: The motion has been made and 19 seconded. Madam Secretary, would you please conduct a roll call 20 vote? 21 MS. MEHLERT: Please respond to the Chair's motion to 22 approve the application with conditions. 23 Vice Chair Blake? 24 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: 25 MS. MEHLERT: Mr. Smith?

1 COMMISSIONER SMITH: Yes. 2 MS. MEHLERT: Chairman Hood? ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: 3 Staff would record the vote as three to 4 MS. MEHLERT: 5 zero to two to approve Application 21247 with conditions on the 6 motion made by Vice Chair Blake and seconded by Mr. Smith. 7 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Excellent. 8 This actually took a little longer than I thought it So if you would, I'd like to take a break until, and 9 10 reconvene at 11:30. Okay? Thanks. 11 (Whereupon, there was a brief recess.) 12 MS. MEHLERT: The Board is back from a quick break and 13 is returning to its hearing session. 14 The next case is Application No. 21282 Pat and Cheri This is a self-certified application pursuant to 15 DeOuattro. 16 Subtitle X, Section 901.2 for special exceptions under Subtitle 17 E, Section 5201, from the lot occupancy requirements of Subtitle 18 E, Section 210.1, and under Subtitle U, Section 301.1(g) to allow 19 expansion of an accessory building for residential purposes. 20 This is for a second story addition for residential use 21 to an existing one-story accessory structure in the rear yard of 22 an existing two-story attached principal dwelling. It's located 23 in the RF-1 zone at 917 Constitution Avenue, Northeast, Square 940, Lot 17. 24 25 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Thank you.

1	Is the Applicant, would you please introduce yourself?
2	MR. TERAN: Good morning, Commissioners. My name is
3	Eric Teran. I'm the architect for the owners.
4	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Who else do you have
5	here with you today, Mr. Teran?
6	MR. TERAN: It's just going to be myself.
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay.
8	Mr. McCrery, you're also on the dais. What is that?
9	Is he part of your team or?
10	MR. TERAN: No, sir.
11	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Mr. McCrery, can you come off
12	mute so I can figure this out?
13	MR. MCCRERY: Sorry. I was muted, sir. I'm a neighbor.
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. What's your affiliation
15	with the project?
16	MR. MCCRERY: I'm a neighbor.
17	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: You're a neighbor?
18	MR. MCCRERY: Yes, sir.
19	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. You were not
20	recognized
21	MR. MCCRERY: I happen to also be an architect, but.
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. I understand. Okay.
23	So you're here to testify as a member of the public?
24	MR. MCCRERY: Yes.
25	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay.

Mr. Young, would you please --1 2 MR. YOUNG: I'll bring him back later. Sorry. Ι thought he was part of the team. 3 4 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Thank you very much. 5 We'll have you back in shortly. Okay. All right. 6 Okay, Mr. Teran. You have, if you would take a few 7 minutes to just go through and tell us about the project and how 8 your client is meeting the criteria for approval. I'll put 15 9 minutes on the clock so I can keep track of where we are, and 10 you can begin whenever you like. MR. TERAN: Thank you. Mr. Young, if you could bring 11 12 up the presentation that I uploaded online? 13 And so while he's doing that, we did receive full 14 support from the ANC and we do have support letters from both adjacent neighbors. 15 16 So we're requesting two reliefs. One is because we're 17 expanding the accessory structure for residential purposes and 18 the second is since we're going straight up from the existing 19 detached garage, the lot occupancy will become a little bit over 20 64 percent. Next slide, please. 21 So this is the existing garage --VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Mr. Teran, one question for 22 you while you're there. I had a couple of different measurements 23 I saw. One said it was a 422 square foot footprint existing and 24 25 the proposed structure was, like, 440 square feet, but the lot

occupancy stayed at 64.4 percent. Could you explain how that 1 2. happened? That might have been, we might not have 3 MR. TERAN: updated the new square footage because originally we were not 4 going to come to BZA and we only had a, I think it was 61 percent 5 6 lot occupancy and we were going to get the Zoning Administrator 7 relief. But then when we found out we had to come to BZA since 8 we're expanding an accessory structure, we decided to go ahead 9 and also request the additional lot occupancy. 10 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. So the existing lot occupancy is 61 percent? 11 12 MR. TERAN: No. It would be 64 percent. 13 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: So what would be the former 14 lot occupancy? 15 MR. TERAN: So that, we're basically keeping it the 16 same but we're adding the second story to the garage. 17 that second story is what would be nonconforming so we have to 18 get the BZA relief for that. 19 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Is the building 422 20 square feet or 440 square feet? 21 It would be 440 square feet. MR. TERAN: 22 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Thank you. 23 MR. TERAN: So here you can see the, you know, the two on top is from the rear yard and you can notice the garage, the 24 25 two-story accessory structure on the left side, and then the

bottom two are from the alley. And so basically we're just proposing to build straight up and keep the existing footprint of the first floor garage. Next slide, please.

2.

This is looking down the alley north, or east and west and you can see on the right hand side our garage right there that's open. Next slide, please.

This is where it's located within the block and as I mentioned before, we're keeping it the same size and the height will be similar to the building to the east. Next slide, please.

So these are the floor plans. Starting on the left with level one. We're keeping it an existing garage and then we have access to the stairs to go up to the second floor which the owners plan on using as a bonus room. And then we have stairs to the roof for access for them. Next slide, please.

Here are the elevations. You can see on the east elevation that is only going to be a little bit higher than what the existing adjacent neighbor is to the east. Next slide, please.

So here we have the left elevation which is north. That's looking back to the owner's house, and on the right that's the south looking into the alley. This was an item brought up with the ANC that they asked us to raise the sill of the south elevation of the window. Originally it was 18 inches and now we have a 36 inch sill, and that was, you know, so that it would provide a little bit more privacy looking into the houses across

the alley. Next slide, please. 2 And just the sections. Next slide, please. And the three images. This did go in front of the HPO 3 4 or HPRB and it was approved. Next slide, please. 5 And then we have some shadow studies. So really only, 6 I think as you'll see in the next six slides, only really this 7 one provides additional shading as you can see on the right side. 8 The one on the left side would be if we had kept the second floor under 60 percent lot occupancy, and that shading on the right 9 10 side basically just on top of the roof of the detached structure for the property to the west. Next slide, please. 11 12 And so here you can see on the right additional shading 13 is basically on the owner's property. Next slide, please. 14 And here there's a little additional on the property to the west at the summer solstice at 3 p.m. Next slide, please. 15 16 So here there's nothing in the winter as well as the 17 next two slides. Next slide, please. 18 And one more slide, please. And so that's why, you know, we believe there's minimal 19 20 impact to any of the neighbors. We've got the support, as I 21 mentioned, from both adjacent neighbors and from the ANC and I'm 22 happy to answer any questions. 23 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Are there any questions from 24 the Board? Okay. 25 I want to just clarify one thing, Mr. Teran. Is, this

is going to be used as a bonus room for the Applicant? 2. MR. TERAN: Yes. For the owners. VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. All right. Very good. 3 4 Okay. No more questions? Okay. 5 I'm going to call now the Office of Planning. Hello, 6 Ms. Thomas. Please. 7 MS. THOMAS: Yes. Hi. Good morning, Mr. Chair, members of the Board. Karen Thomas with the Office of Planning. 8 9 And the addition will not increase the footprint on the 10 subject property, thereby increasing the nonconforming lot occupancy nor would it add, reduce the yard and the Applicant has 11 12 provided shadow studies which we satisfied with and we do not 13 think that there would be significant impacts to any of the 14 abutting neighbors. And with that, I will refer to the record of our report. 15 16 Thank you. 17 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Thank you. Any questions for 18 the Office of Planning? Okay. 19 I have one question again for the Applicant. There was some concerns expressed by the ANC about the privacy issues. Can 20 21 you discuss how those were addressed? There was that window in the rear 22 MR. TERAN: Yes. 23 They just, one of the Commissioners didn't like that the window sill was so low so that if you were standing on the second 24 25 floor you could, you know, had a steeper angle to look into the

1	neighbors across the alley and so he just asked if we could raise
2	the sill and that's what we did. So we raised it from 18 inches
3	to 36 inches.
4	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Great.
5	And the plans reflect that alteration?
6	MR. TERAN: Correct.
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Thank you very much.
8	Does anyone else on the Board have any questions for
9	the Applicant or the Office of Planning? Okay.
10	Mr. Teran, if you have any additional closing remarks
11	you'd like to make, please do so.
12	MR. TERAN: No, sir.
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Well, then I will close
14	the hearing and the record.
15	MR. YOUNG: Mr. Blake?
16	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Yes. Oh, sorry.
17	MR. YOUNG: We did have that one witness.
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: That's right, Mr. McClery.
19	Please bring Mr. McClery in. My apologies.
20	MR. YOUNG: It looks like he dropped off so we have
21	staff reaching out to him right now.
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Let's give him a hot moment
23	to get back because I don't want to not hear his comments. I
24	apologize for missing that.
25	(Pause.)

MR. YOUNG: So staff has informed me that he has changed 1 2. his mind about testifying, so he will no longer be on. VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Thank you then. 3 close the hearing and the record, or the record and the hearing 4 and having done that we'll go on to deliberate. 5 6 I mean, this is a fairly straightforward application. 7 I believe the Applicant has met the burden of proof to be granted 8 the relief. The shadow study demonstrates there'd be no real 9 The main issue that was brought up by the ANC about 10 privacy was addressed by redesign of the windows and I believe that, I agree with the Office of Planning's analysis and give 11 12 great weight to its recommendation. I also give great weight to 13 the recommendation of ANC 6A and the record contains letters of 14 support by both agencies. The design was approved by HPRB. So therefore I'll be voting in favor of the application. 15 16 Mr. Smith, do you have anything you want to add? 17 COMMISSIONER SMITH: No. I agree with you that this 18 is a very straightforward application and I will also support the 19 requested special exception. 20 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Chairman Hood? You're on 21 mute. 22 ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will 23 vote in support of this application. Thanks. VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Having deliberated I will make 24

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

a motion to approve the application as read and captioned by the

25

1	secretary, and ask for a second. Mr. Smith?
2	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Second.
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Madam Secretary, the motion's
4	been made and seconded. Would you please conduct a roll call
5	vote?
6	MS. MEHLERT: Please respond to the Chair's motion to
7	approve the application.
8	Vice Chair Blake?
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Yes.
10	MS. MEHLERT: Mr. Smith?
11	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Yes.
12	MS. MEHLERT: Chairman Hood?
13	ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.
14	MS. MEHLERT: Staff would record the vote as three to
15	zero to two to approve Application 21282 on the motion made by
16	Vice Chair Blake and seconded by Mr. Smith.
17	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Madam Secretary, would you
18	please call our next case.
19	MS. MEHLERT: Next is Application No. 21287 of Tsunami
20	Hair Studio. This is an application pursuant to Subtitle X,
21	Section 1000 for a use variance from Subtitle U, Section 401.1
22	to allow expansion of a nonconforming use and the area variances
23	from the maximum floor area ratio requirements of Subtitle F,
24	Section 201.1, and the lot occupancy requirements of Subtitle F,
25	Section 210.1.

1	This is for the expansion of a nonconforming use in a
2	new accessory structure in the rear yard of an existing two-story
3	building. It's located in the RA-1 zone at 4248 Benning Road,
4	Northeast, Square 5087, Lot 856.
5	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay.
6	Is the Applicant with us? Who's the agent presenting
7	for the Applicant?
8	MR. ODUROE: Agent John Oduroe from Big Tent Design
9	Studio.
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Mr. Oduroe, you're the agent.
11	Is there anyone else here with you?
12	MR. ODUROE: LaToya, Ms., are you on? I guess not.
13	It's just me.
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Well, if she comes in
15	later we'll let her in.
16	So if you, Mr. Oduroe, if you would please tell us
17	about the project and how you think your client is meeting the
18	criteria for approval. I'll put 15 minutes on the clock so we
19	can keep track of where we are, and you can begin whenever you
20	like.
21	Thank you.
22	MR. ODUROE: Yes. Mr. Young, can you bring up my
23	presentation, please? Excellent. Okay.
24	Good morning, Mr. Chairperson and members of the Board.
25	My name is John Oduroe. I am principal of Big Tent Design Studio.

My address is 54 Hawthorne Court, Northeast and I'm here on behalf of the Applicant, LaToya Liles-Walker, owner of 4248 Benning Road, LLC and the Tsunami Hair Studio. We're requesting use and area variance relief for a modest rear yard improvement that will allow this neighborhood serving business to remain viable and cocompliant. Next slide, please.

2.

Very quickly, the presentation table will go as follows. We'll provide a brief overview of the property and the proposed improvements. We're going to review the exceptional conditions that affect the site. We're going to explain some of the undue hardships that the conditions have created and we're going to demonstrate that granting relief will not harm the public or the zoning plan. Next slide, please.

Project overview. Next slide.

Tsunami Hair Studio is located at 4248 Benning Road, Northeast on a 2,040 square foot lot, zoned RA or RA-1. While the corridor is primarily lined with residential apartments, it includes a mix of mixed use nonconforming structures as well. There are an MU-7 zone just a few blocks in either direction and several long standing nonconforming commercial uses are scattered along this stretch of Benning Road.

To the east there's a vacant parking lot and to the west there's a building with a history of commercial occupancy. The building covers more than half the lot and has, sorry, the building on our lot covers more than half the lot and has housed

commercial tenants since at least the early '50s. The current salon use was formally approved in 1964 under BZA order No. 8021 and it continues to this day. Next slide.

To comply with D.C. Health Codes, specifically Title 17, Section 3718 and Title 25E, Section 500, the salon has added sanitation sinks, storage for sterilized supplies and other mandated upgrades over time. These additions, while necessary, have reduced the interior space available for staff, clients and core operations of the salon. To restore operational balance, we propose installing two small conditioned story units in the rear of the yard where equipment and supplies will be stored in a conditioned environment. This would allow the interior to focus on service delivery, maintaining clients, you know, providing services to the community.

To do this we, again, request a use variance that will allow accessory structures in support of the legally approved nonconforming commercial use that's happening in the principal building. We request an area variance for FAR proposing 1.12 while .9 is allowed on the site, and we also request an area variance for lot occupancy proposing 72 percent where 40 percent is currently permitted on the site. Next slide, please.

Next slide, please.

Under Subtitle X, Section 1000.1 of the D.C. zoning regulations, the BZA may grant variances if the following tests are met. The Applicant must prove an exceptional condition

1	inherent to the property. The Applicant must show a resulting
2	undue hardship for use variances or practical difficulty for area
3	variances and finally, the Applicant must show that no harm to
4	the public good or the zoning plan will arise from the relief.
5	In this case we're requesting both a use variance and two area
5	variances.
7	The tests are nearly the same with one key difference.
3	The use variance or for the use variance the hardship must be
9	significant enough that the property can't reasonably be used for
10	any conforming purpose under the current zoning. That's the
11	standard we're addressing today and because it's a higher bar
12	than what's required for the area variance, showing that we meet
13	this standard also will satisfy the standard for the area
14	variance. Next slide, please.
15	So test one, exceptional condition to the property.
16	Next slide.
17	The site is affected by three interconnected
18	exceptional conditions. One, next slide.
19	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Mr. Oduroe, is your picture
20	available? I just noticed your picture's not. Can you put that
21	up?
22	MR. ODUROE: Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't realize that it
23	didn't come on automatically. Hold on. Do you see me?
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: I can now. Thank you.

MR. ODUROE: Okay. Apologies for that.

25

So, yes. Next slide, please.

So first, there's a zoning mismatch between the building's approved use and the yard's residential restriction. The building has a BZA approved nonconforming commercial use. The zoning regulations apply that only, sorry, zoning regulations apply that approval only to the building itself and not to the entire lot. Zoning does not extend nonconforming use rights to the rear yard or to new accessory improvements.

So even in a modest change, like adding a storage unit, requires BZA relief. Of course this isn't any kind of flaw in the Code, it's just how zoning works. But in this case it creates an exceptional condition. The owner is legally barred from making a simple functional upgrade that supports the use that the BZA has already approved in the past. Next slide, please.

Exceptional condition two. The rear yard no longer serves its zoning purpose. So RA-1 zoning assumes that the rear yard serves residential units by providing light, air and outdoor space. But this property hasn't housed residents since at least 1950s and adjacent properties to the east and the west are not residential either. In fact, the property to the east is a parking lot currently. Without the zoning relief, the owner is forced to design to residential standards that simply don't apply to the property now and how it's currently being used and how it's historically been used for the last several decades. Next slide, please.

This disconnect makes it impossible to repurpose the yard in any meaningful way. The space remains under-utilized, unmonitored and, as you can imagine, vulnerable to nuisance activity. So a few images of the current space right now in its kind of unutilized capacity. Next slide, please.

The third condition is the site is incredibly narrow, so it's a much smaller site than typical. The site is just eighteen and a half feet wide and occupies a 2,040 square foot parcel, barely above the minimum lot size allowed for RA-1. The building spans the full width of this lot and more than 50 percent the depth leaving no usable outdoor space besides the rear yard for operational support or any kind of expansion that might support the business. Next slide, please.

As you can see from the photos here, the tight footprint poses challenges. Those challenges got significantly more difficult in 2021 when D.C. modernized its health and safety standards for salons requiring more sinks, stricter sanitation areas and tighter plumbing compliance. Meeting those rules in such a small space has been difficult and it's forced tough tradeoffs. Next slide, please.

The salon does its best to adapt but, as you can see, every available inch is used for work stations, for sanitation or for circulation. There's no room for dedicated storage, no room for, you know, staff rest and no flexibility to rearrange functions without cutting into the essential services that they

offer. Next slide, please.

There's no room to build inward and, again, zoning is limiting our ability to move outward. The rear yard is the only viable area that could potentially support additional space that will support the long standing commercial use. Without relief that space remains off-limits, and you can see these are additional storage units and sanitary stations, hand washing stations, a makeshift break area, that are all piled on top of each other in order to make the space work currently. Next slide, please.

In our view, this is the essence of the exceptional condition. A site that's so constrained it can no longer reasonably support the BZA approved nonconforming use and without at least some modest relief to regain some of its functionality, the business, you know, simply won't be able to survive here. Next slide.

The owner has tried a variety of solutions including off-site storage. She attempted locating a facility that was approximately four miles away which created, you know, roughly an eight mile trip each day that had to be made in order to, you know, get supplies and materials and bring them back. There were some incidents where the climate couldn't be controlled within the storage facility and the owner, you know, lost material, lost supplies that spoiled. The trip as you can imagine is a great inconvenience that creates a lot of operational challenges in

terms of her managing her staff, managing her clientele and kind of toting back and forth between here, you know, the storage facility. Next slide, please.

2.

In summary, these three conditions create a circumstance where there's kind of a confluence of exceptional situations making the ability to maximize the use of the site under the current zoning effectively impossible. Next slide, please.

And this of course leads to undue hardship on the owner. Next slide.

Strict application of the zoning regulations prevents the owner from making reasonable use of the full site to support the property's long standing legally approved commercial use. The interior is fully bid out and cannot accommodate the sanitation and storage upgrades now required by the Health Code. Zoning restrictions prohibit even modest improvements to the yard leaving no path to maintain a safe and compliant operation.

Reverting back to the original RA-1 residential use is also not feasible. As you can imagine after decades of plumbing, electrical changes, layout modifications to the existing structure, the cost and effort to undo that work to go back to a traditional residential structure would be incredibly prohibitive for the owner or, you know, a potential buyer of the property.

You know, in summary without zoning relief strictly applying current zoning rules would severely limit operations and

impose excessive cost and ultimately jeopardize the future of the long standing legally approved neighborhood business. Next slide, please.

The third condition we're going to discuss is no harm to the public or to the zoning ordinance. Next slide, please.

The commercial use of this site is not an anomaly. Again, there are mixed use zoning districts located to a few blocks up Benning Road and a few blocks down Benning Road and several other longstanding nonconforming commercial uses already exist along this corridor and have historically. This proposal aligns naturally with the historic, you know, use of this property as well as the existing character and the expectations of this neighborhood. We're not doing anything that hasn't existed already. This property has existed for quite a while in this location in this current state. Next slide, please.

From the street level the proposed improvements will almost be completely invisible, preserving the existing visual character of Benning Road. The storage units are set at the rear of the property and fully screened by the existing building when approaching from the east. As you can see, you can't see the rear area. Next slide, please.

When you're in front of the building you can obviously see a little bit of the site behind it. Next slide, please.

When approaching from the west, it's similarly hidden from view along Benning Road as it's positioned well back to the

rear of the site. Next slide, please.

Additionally, a fence is proposed to basically conceal anything that would be visible across the opening, you know, creating no visual intrusion or disruption to the street façade or the character of the neighborhood as you walk up and down Benning Road. Next slide, please.

As noted by the Office of Planning report, both the Office of Planning and DDOT have indicated their support. There's also widespread support from the community. Next slide, please.

We submitted into the record that the ANC 7F has unanimously supported the application. Additionally, neighbors, clients and Ward 7 residents have provided enthusiastic endorsement as evidenced by multiple letters of support that have been submitted and entered into the record. Next slide, please.

Quotes and letters from the community consistently highlight the Applicant's role as more than just a local business owner. Beyond providing valued haircare services, the Applicant is recognized as a meaningful civic partner and a valued neighborhood asset. Granting this relief supports not only a business but a cherished community resource. Next slide, please.

Next slide.

In summary, this is a modest request designed to preserve a longstanding nonconforming commercial use as well as the ongoing operations of a valued member of the community. The property clearly faces multiple exceptional conditions. The

requested relief is necessary to avoid undue hardship. It causes no public harm and has widespread support from both the community, the Office of Planning as well. Next slide.

As you can see this is a rendering of what the units will look like, again, from the east side of Benning Road looking west. Relief is necessary for the business to meet required standards and codes. The proposed storage structure is small scale, discreet and practical offering a simple and minimally impactful solution.

We respectfully request the Board's approval of this variance relief.

Thank you.

2.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: I thought this was a very thoughtful and detailed presentation. Thank you very much.

Do we have any questions from the Board or the Applicant?

COMMISSIONER SMITH: I just have one question. It's a clarifying question because this has come up before and I just, I don't see anything in the record. The variance relief is typically tied to the property itself and I just want to verify that the Applicant is the owner of the property as well as the business, and not just the business.

MR. ODUROE: That is correct. The Applicant owns a holding company called 4248 Benning Road, LLC and she also owns the business Tsunami Studios.

1	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Okay. That was the only question
2	I had.
3	MR. ODUROE: Uh-huh.
4	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Thank you.
5	Chairman Hood, any questions from you?
6	ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No, I don't have any questions.
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Thank you.
8	We'd like to hear next from the Office of Planning.
9	Ms. Maxine Brown-Roberts.
10	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and
11	members of the BZA. I'm Maxine Brown-Roberts from the Office of
12	Planning.
13	The Office of Planning recommends approval of the use
14	and area variances to expand a nonconforming use, FAR and lot
15	occupancy. As detailed in the OP report, the Applicant has
16	demonstrated an extraordinarily or exceptional situation
17	resulting in undue hardship to the owner due to the history of
18	the commercial use on the site and limitations on the use due to
19	changes in operational requirements resulting in undue hardship,
20	and a practical difficulty in maintaining business and meeting
21	the regulations.
22	The proposed containers for storage should not
23	substantially affect the public good in that they would not be
24	visible from Benning Road and would be one-story and would be

25 behind a fence, and vegetation would help to block visibility

from the residences to the south, actually to the north.

Trash containers would also be provided at the rear of the building. The proposal would not be contrary to the intent of the zoning regulations as the Applicant has demonstrated a uniqueness and exceptional situation of the property which has led to a unique hardship and practical difficulty to the owner. Furthermore, the integrity of the zoning regulations would not be eroded if the relief were granted as it has met more, a more matter-of-right option would place a significant financial burden on a small business owner and could remove a business that has served the neighborhood for decades.

12 Again, OP recommends approval of the requested 13 variances. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I'm available for 14 questions.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Thank you, Ms. Maxine BrownRoberts. Let's see.

Do we have any questions from any members of the Board for the Office of Planning?

(Pause.)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Do we have any questions from the Applicant for the Office of Planning?

MR. ODUROE: We do not.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay.

Mr. Young, is there anyone that wishes to testify?

MR. YOUNG: We do not.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay.

If you had any additional closing remarks, we would look forward to them, Mr. Oduroe. Please go ahead.

MR. ODUROE: I do not. I think I've said enough.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Okay.

I'm going to close the hearing and the record then.

Mr. Young, would you please excuse everyone.

(Pause.)

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay.

First of all, I say at the beginning of the deliberation I really did appreciate the information provided by the Applicant. I found it helpful. I also found that the Applicant's presentation was very thorough and instructive, and I really appreciate the pictures of the internal space. Sometimes you can't get a real grasp of what's going on until you see that.

I think these proposed structures will be modest in scale and discreetly placed in the rear yard, minimizing impact on neighboring properties and I don't think that granting relief will allow the continued operations of a trusted and valued business.

You know, when I looked through the prongs of the variance test, the use and area variance which the use test is a very high standard and I'm going to agree with the Office of Planning's analysis of how the variance test was met. I'm going to give great weight to the Office of Planning's recommendation

for approval. I note that DDOT has no objection. I will also note that there are several letters in support for the record including the adjacent property owner and that there is no testimony presented in opposition. Mr. Smith, I welcome your comments on the variance. COMMISSIONER SMITH: I agree with your assessment and looking at the various variance tests. As you've stated a use variance is a very high hurdle and I do, I agree with the Office of Planning's assessment of how they meet that high level of 10 criteria given the size of the space, given that they have to meet other regulatory standards that have reduced the amount of 11 12 space that be dedicated to the business and I do believe that 13 the proposed storage units will be fairly small and with the 14 additional fence and the trees in the rear yard, it wouldn't have an objectionable --15 16 (Audio interference). 17 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: You froze there online and I 18 can't quite hear what you're saying. 19 COMMISSIONER SMITH: Impact. 20 (Audio interference).

21 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Mr. Smith, we've lost you.

(Audio interference).

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

22

23

24

25

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Yeah. I didn't hear the last part of what you said. Did everyone else hear that or it was just me?

1	ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I didn't hear it either, Mr.
2	Chair.
3	COMMISSIONER SMITH: It was, I probably froze.
4	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Can you maybe take your camera
5	off and then try again with that section?
6	(Pause.)
7	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Okay. Let's try this again.
8	I agree with the Office of Planning's assessment on the
9	reasons why they have met the burden of proof for us to grant
10	the use variance, given the size of the existing building and how
11	much space now has to be dedicated to other, to meet other
12	regulatory requirements for the District of Columbia.
13	I believe that the proposed accessory structures in the
14	rear of the yard would not have a detrimental impact on the
15	surrounding community and I will support the variance request.
16	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Excellent. Thank you very
17	much, Mr. Smith.
18	Chairman Hood?
19	ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I too will
20	be supporting this application. I really appreciate the
21	presentation and I think that it meets the relief requested, and
22	I think it was very thought out and very thorough in this
23	presentation, advocation as well.
24	Thank you. That's all I have on this.
25	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Thank you.

1	Having deliberated, I'll make a motion to approve
2	Application No. 21287 as captioned and read by the secretary, and
3	ask for a second. Mr. Smith?
4	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Second.
5	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Motion has been made and
б	seconded. Madam Secretary, would you please conduct a roll call
7	vote?
8	MS. MEHLERT: Please respond to the Chair's motion to
9	approve the application.
10	Vice Chair Blake?
11	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Yes.
12	MS. MEHLERT: Mr. Smith?
13	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Yes.
14	MS. MEHLERT: Chairman Hood?
15	ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.
16	MS. MEHLERT: Staff would record the vote as three to
17	zero to two to approve Application No. 21287 on the motion made
18	by Vice Chair Blake and seconded by Mr. Smith.
19	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Thank you.
20	Would you please call our next case, Madam Secretary?
21	ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Chairman, I need one minute
22	to log off and log back on so I can get things reacclimated, so.
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Well, let's do this.
24	Let's take a ten minute break, because we do, I think we have
25	two more cases, correct? Yes. Let's take a ten minute break

and everybody get their computer situated, and let's get back 2. here at 12:20. ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. 3 Thank you. (Whereupon, there was a brief recess.) 4 5 MS. MEHLERT: The Board is back from another quick 6 break and returning to its hearing session. 7 The next case is Application No. 21290 of Carolyn R. 8 Millbourne Hantz. This is an application pursuant to Subtitle 9 X, Section 901.2 for a special exception under Subtitle D, Section 10 207.5 to allow the rear wall of a semi-detached building to extend farther then ten feet beyond the farthest rear wall of any 11 12 adjoining principal residential building on any adjacent 13 property. 14 This is for a two-story rear addition to an existing two-story semi-detached principal dwelling. It's located in the 15 16 R-2 zone at 28 46th Place, Northeast, Square 5138, Lot 77, and 17 as a preliminary matter there is a request from the Applicant to 18 waive the 30 day filing deadline to provide additional information on communications with DOB which is in the record. 19 20 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: I'm comfortable with waiving 21 that if the Board has no objection. I'd like to have that information. 2.2 23 Is the Applicant here? If so, would you please 24 introduce yourself and anyone who might be with you joining us

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

25

today?

MS. MILLBOURNE HANTZ: Good afternoon. 1 I'm Carolyn Millbourne Hantz. I'm the owner at 28 46th Place, Northeast. My husband's here with me as well and I've got my contractor, Melvin Taylor of MT Builders, and I believe our architect, Olufemi Sokoya, is supposed to be here as well. VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Will they be doing the presentation or will you be, and they'll be available for questions, or how do you want do the presentation today? 9 MS. MILLBOURNE HANTZ: I'll be doing the presentation 10 and they'll be available for questions. 11 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Well, I'm going to turn 12 it over to you. You have 15 minutes to present your case. Please tell us about your project and we'll ask you any questions that 13 14 we have. Go ahead when you like. 15 MS. MILLBOURNE HANTZ: Okay. 16 Again, I'm the owner at 28 46th Place, Northeast. 17 did provide my oral testimony in writing for the record. 18 Also in terms of background, on March 13, 2022 our

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

architect submitted our application to the Department of Consumer & Regulatory Affairs for approval of our house addition including, and it included nine required permits. On August 1, 2022 we submitted the signed plan for certification in order to receive approval of the construction drawings.

We received zoning approval of the building permit B2205045 for the addition, alternation and repair of our home

from Ms. Brittany Bullock on March 20, 2023 and that's documented in ProjectDox at Exhibit 26. On June 9, 2023 we had a mandatory meeting with Ms. Ashley Delgado with the Office of Construction & Building Standards and on August 31, 2023 Ms. Delgado provided some feedback on our updated drawings and approved it on December 8, 2023. I paid \$5,743.1 for the permit on March 12, 2024, so the approval process basically took two years and on March 13, 2024 Mr. Sokoya received the approved plans via ProjectDox.

2.

On December 20, 2024 when the project was about 80 percent complete and we were awaiting final approval for the interior work, we were notified by Department of Buildings, I believe it was Stephania (phonetic) Richardson notified our contractor that there was a zoning issue related to the rear extension. All of the extension is on the rear of the property. And, again, we did this, we started construction April, 2024 relying on the approved permit.

But the Department of Buildings with the information they provided our contractor was that the permit application was issued in error. The addition is not in compliance with Sub. B, 207.4. The Board of Zoning relief is required and the addition extends more than ten feet beyond the adjacent rear building wall because the property is attached on one side. Okay. Okay.

In terms of the zoning harmony and neighborhood impact, we feel the proposed extension is consistent with 11 D.C.M.R. Subtitle X, 901.2. It is in harmony with the zoning restrictions

and maps and it would not adversely affect use of neighboring properties including the adjoining property at 30 46th Place, Northeast. Our architect carefully designed our addition to minimize any visual or structural impact on surrounding homes and that's reflective of the thoughtful and modern development.

In terms of community support, on February 18, 2025 I testified before the ANC 7F Commission and received their support for completing the construction including the 15 foot extension across all three levels, and we have the pictures of the property at Exhibit 5, and the plat map is at Exhibit 13. At no point during the two year approval process were we told that further zoning reviews and approvals would be required or that the extension at 15 feet would require a zoning variance through the Board of Zoning Adjustment. The addition from start to finish has always been 15 feet.

In terms of, we relied in good faith on the zoning approval that we got in March, 2023 and the approval was granted for the 15 foot addition. In terms of other delays we've experienced in relation to this project, there were two clerical errors in the BZA memorandum that we had to get fixed before we could proceed. One was the incorrect square number and the other was it originally described another project that was not ours.

In terms of the integrity of the permit system, we are concerned as tax paying citizens that, you know, the permit approval process was issued through the Department of Buildings

and we relied on that and made significant investments in upgrading our property. The addition itself is pretty much already built. All of the construction is 80 percent complete. We're waiting to finish the inside of the home.

2.

Over the last nine months we've had to relocate three times incurring \$3,000 in leasing costs and the last two relocations have been due to the construction delays associated with the zoning issues. This hardship continues and is compounded by the fact that we are unable to live in our primary residence which remains in limbo pending the outcome of this review. Also we've had to move three times, again, with our adult son and our adult son is non-verbal and autistic and requires 24/7 supervision. Each relocation has been traumatic for him as changes in routine severely affect his wellbeing. Autistic people tend to rely on routine, so it's been quite stressful him not being in the home that he was born and raised in for the past 27 years.

Representatives from the Department of Buildings and D.C. Zoning also articulated additional requirements that we had to go through in terms of getting pictures of other properties and neighbor's statements which we have done and they're included in the record, and this additional need just seems unfair and misguided at this stage given that we were at 80 percent, the 15 foot addition is already built and all of the plumbing, electrical, everything was to specification of 15 feet.

The people we spoke to in relation to these requirements, these additional requirements including Gregory Garland, Sara Bardin and Robert Reid. And my family and I, we reasonably relied upon the original zoning review approval by Ms. Bullock. Applying additional factors now is puzzling and seems unfair, unjust and detrimental to my family's financial and emotional wellbeing.

Requiring us to now justify previously approved work after we spent years of time and effort and extensive financial investment seems punitive to me. The proposed additional justification also undermines the integrity of the permitting process and creates undue hardship for us.

Just to give you some background on my home. I purchased our home in 1993 from my grandfather to keep the family homestead in the family for four generations and beyond. Our home is the same home in which my maternal grandparents raised my mother and her 12 siblings. I am a lifelong Washingtonian and have children to remain in the District of Columbia, even after the tragic loss of my first husband in 2007. After retiring from 46 years of Federal service, I hoped to enjoy my retirement in this newly renovated home starting January 3rd of this year when I retired and that hope remains unrealized.

I'm requesting relief given the facts that I've presented and I respectfully request relief in the form of a waiver, a special exception to allow the completion of our home

alteration and repair including our already built 15 foot addition. Again, we were 80 percent complete when this issue was raised to our attention. We relied on the zoning review approval March 20, 2023. There was even an additional year of additional requirements that we jumped in order to get the permit approved completely in March, 2024 and we started construction acting in good faith in compliance with, you know, the permit as issued.

2.

We also request extension or renewal of the now expired permit because, due to the work stoppage based on the zoning issues, the permits have in the interim expired, at least the plumbing and electrical have expired. I also again authorized Melvin Taylor, our contractor, to speak as a witness if you have any questions and our contractor, Olufemi Sokoya, who has now joined us if you have any questions.

In conclusion I'm committed to preserving and enhancing my family home of four generations and continuing to contribute positively to my neighborhood of the past 32 years. I acted in good faith on the March, 2023 zoning review and approval and have faced unnecessary hardship over the past six months and continue to do so. I respectfully ask the Board to approve my request for zoning relief so that my family may finally return home. We've been out of our home since August 15 of last year. And that concludes my testimony subject to your questions.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Thank you very much. I'm sorry that you've had to go through so much unnecessary burdens.

1 Does anyone from the Board have any questions for the 2 Applicant? 3 (Pause.) VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: I'll take that as no. Can we 4 5 hear from the Office of Planning? Mr. Shephard, no, Mr. Beamon, 6 are you there? Okay. Would you please walk through the approval specifically and give us the conditions for D-5201 and X-901.2, 7 8 please? 9 Give me one second, if you don't mind. MR. BEAMON: 10 I'm just trying to get my camera turned on here. There we go. So OP did review this application. As the 11 So, yes. Applicant mentioned there was a building permit issued, I'm 12 13 sorry. For the record, Shepard Beamon with the Office of 14 Planning. 15 But, yes. A permit was issued in error. We did do a 16 review of the criteria pursuant to Subtitles D and X. 17 ultimately found the proposed addition as built should not 18 interfere on have impacts on the adjacent property owners in 19 terms of privacy, light and air. When viewed from the street it 20 should visually obstruct or negatively impact the character or 21 appearance of the neighborhood. And then lastly, the addition 22 as built should not, or should be in harmony with the zoning 23 regulations and the intent of the zone district. So with that, OP is in support of the special exception 24

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

and recommends approval and I can take any other questions.

25

1	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Beamon.
2	Does anyone on the Board have any questions for the
3	Office of Planning?
4	(Pause.)
5	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. All right. I don't
6	have any questions either. Thank you very much, Mr. Beamon.
7	Mr. Young, is anyone there who wishes to testify?
8	MR. YOUNG: We have one witness signed up. Diane
9	McDuffie.
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Sure. Would you please admit
11	Ms. McDuffie?
12	MS. MCDUFFIE: Yes.
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Ms. McDuffie, is your camera
14	working?
15	MS. MCDUFFIE: I don't know how to work it. Let's see.
16	I don't know where to push to get the camera.
17	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Well, we can hear you.
18	As a member of the public you've got three minutes to
19	provide your testimony. We look forward to hearing to what you
20	have to say. I'm going to put three minutes on the clock, if
21	you go over I'll let you know. So you can begin at any point
22	you'd like. Thank you.
23	MS. MCDUFFIE: No. I've been Carolyn's neighbor for
24	the past 32 years as well and
25	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: I'm sorry. Ms., would you

1	please, I'm sorry, would you please tell me your location, your
2	address? I'm sorry.
3	MS. MCDUFFIE: 20 46th Place, Northeast, Washington,
4	D.C.
5	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay.
6	MS. MCDUFFIE: Yes. We've been their neighbors for the
7	past 32 years and we would like them to have their addition put
8	on to their home as well. We have no objection to them having
9	their new addition and we understand about their son, and I
10	understand that he needs to be back in this home as well. So we
11	have no objection to anything that they're doing.
12	So that's all I wanted to say basically. You know,
13	just for them to go here and finish what they've go to do, and I
14	think, you know, it's something that they need for their family
15	and it's been a while. It's been a year.
16	So that's all I have to say for right now, and I thank
17	you.
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: All right. Thank you, Ms.
19	McDuffie. Appreciate your testimony.
20	Did anyone have any questions for the witness? Okay.
21	Mr. Young, you can dismiss the witness. All right.
22	Are there any other questions we have for the
23	Applicant? Okay. I am going to close, or sorry, Ms., I'm sorry.
24	Do you have any other closing remarks you'd like to make?
25	MS. MILLBOURNE HANTZ: Okay.

1	Just for your information, Diane, Ms. McDuffie is the
2	person who lives to the one side of the house. She's the person
3	with the house that's beside ours but not attached. Just to give
4	you some context in terms of who she is.
5	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Is there anything else you'd
6	like to add?
7	MS. MILLBOURNE HANTZ: Do you want to add anything?
8	MR. HANTZ: Ron Hantz, 28 46th Place. My wife has laid
9	out what the challenges have been and I'm hoping that if the
10	Board approves our moving forward with the construction on our
11	property and that, yes, we do need to be back home. Thank you.
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Thank you very much,
13	Mr. and Mrs. Hantz, and I look forward to hoping things work out
14	for you. I'm sorry that you've had to go through what you've
15	had to endure. I definitely appreciate what you're going through.
16	Thank you very much.
17	Okay. I'm going to close the hearing and the record.
18	Mr. Young, if you could please excuse everyone.
19	(Pause.)
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay.
21	You know, based on the information in the record as
22	well as the testimony received today, I do believe the Applicant
23	has met the burden of proof to be granted the requested relief.
24	I agree with the Office of Planning's analysis on how
25	the Applicant met the criteria. I would also give great weight

to the Office of Planning's recommendation for approval. I note that the ANC 7F is in support with no issues or concerns, and DDOT also informed OP that they had no objection to the proposal and there are a number of persons in support including the adjacent neighbor, as we heard testimony today. It's unfortunate the Applicant had to experience this. I mean, you know, it's a special exception but it had some very significant implications in terms of the severity of it and I sincerely apologize for that implication.

If you have any other comments, Mr. Smith, I'd welcome them.

COMMISSIONER SMITH: I have no further comments. I do understand what the Applicant has gone through. This was as (indiscernible). I do apologize that this has taken as long as it has and I'm happy to, you know, say that the light is at the end of the tunnel. I do believe that they have met the burden of proof for us to grant the special exception and will support the special exception, and hopefully there aren't any more delays going forward.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Smith.

Chairman Hood?

2.

ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I would agree with my colleague. I'm hoping that the Hantz family does not have to deal with any more delays. Government should be predictable. I've always said that. So I'm ready to move forward and I don't want to delay

1	this case any longer. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.							
2	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay.							
3	Having deliberated I'm making a motion to approve							
4	Application No. 21290 as written and captioned by the secretary,							
5	and ask for a second. Mr. Smith?							
6	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Second.							
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: The motion has been made and							
8	seconded. Madam Secretary, would you please conduct a roll call							
9	vote?							
10	MS. MEHLERT: Please respond to the Chair's motion to							
11	approve the application.							
12	Vice Chair Blake?							
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Yes.							
14	MS. MEHLERT: Mr. Smith?							
15	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Yes.							
16	MS. MEHLERT: Chairman Hood?							
17	ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.							
18	MS. MEHLERT: Staff would record the vote as three to							
19	zero to two to approve Application 21290 on the motion made by							
20	Vice Chair Blake and seconded by Mr. Smith.							
21	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Great. Okay.							
22	Madam Secretary, would you please call our last case,							
23	I believe our last case for the day.							
24	MS. MEHLERT: The last case is Application No. 21292							
25	of Oak at Morse Street, LLC and Sung H. Cho, Trustee. As amended,							

this is a self-certified application pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 901.2 for a special exception under Subtitle U, Section 802.1(e) to allow entertainment, assembly and performing arts use and pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 1000 for an area variance from Subtitle U, Section 802.1(e)(3) to allow any portion of a property with entertainment, assembly and performing arts uses to be in the same square or within a radius of 1,000 feet of another property containing a live performance nightclub or dance venue.

2.

This is for a new entertainment, assembly and performance arts use in two existing two-story attached buildings on contiguous lots. The project is located in PDR-1 zone at 405 and 407 Morse Street, Northeast, Square 3588, Lots 15 and 16, and there is as a preliminary matter a request to waive the filing deadline for a response to ANC 5D, updated photographs and an updated self-certification form.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: If the Board is comfortable with it, I'll waive the motion, I'll accept the motion to accept the late filings.

Welcome, Ms. Moldenhauer. Would you please introduce yourself for the record and anyone who will be joining you today.

MS. MOLDENHAUER: Good evening, Chair and Board members, Meredith Moldenhauer from the law firm of Cozen O'Connor, here on behalf of the Applicant. I also have the Applicant's representative, Mazen, who is, I see him on the

attendee list, if someone could move him to a panelist (phonetic), that would be lovely.

I thank the Board for granting us the waiver for the late filling. I'll allow my client to introduce himself.

MR. ZAATARI: Good afternoon, everyone. This is Mazen Zaatari speaking here.

MS. MOLDENHAUER: And if Mr. Young could pull up our PowerPoint presentation. Great. Thank you so much. Next slide, please.

So the property you see here is located off of Morse Street and is both in a PDR-1 zone and it's two lots. Next slide.

You can see here just to kind of help orient the Board. Lot 407 is in red and 405 is in blue. You can see both the front elevation and the rear elevation on both of these properties. The property at 405 is also currently being renovated for a macaroon store on a retail space on the front level. Next slide.

Proposed use here is to request a special exception relief, variance relief, for an entertainment event space and music venue. The proposal would be to have the two structures connected and joined through openings in the façade and create one venue on the second floor for an open floor plan. The proposed use will take place fully within the building. This use is distinct from some other cases you've had. There's no proposal for a restaurant or dining use as that would interfere with the below retail use such as having a hood or other type of uses.

Next slide.

You can see here a rendering of how the proposed use would interact and be seen from the alley. The property is very close to the corner of the alley access and the primary access for the use would be to the alley. Next slide.

As indicated, the entire proposal would be all on the second floor. On the right hand side of the image is the first floor. This shows in the blue box where you would access off the alley in the rear. The purpose of this is to maintain and to allow for a continued use of the first floor for retail as it says the property to your left is being renovated right now for a macaroon store and the property to the right currently has a first floor use.

So the intent would be to renovate the second floor and to propose this use on the second floor. There has been some back and forth conversations and additional prior design. The DJ booth was moved to the interior of the layout to try and pull all the noise down away from any edges of the property wall. Next slide.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Ms. Moldenhauer, could you go back to that slide for a second?

MS. MOLDENHAUER: Absolutely, yes.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Could you just orient us for that slide? So I think that where it says second floor would be facing Morse Street; is that right?

1	MS. MOLDENHAUER: Yes, that is correct. The second								
2	floor is facing Morse Street and the back half of the blue box								
3	on the first floor is facing the alley.								
4	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. And there, the proposed								
5	deck would be on the Morse Street side of the property?								
6	MS. MOLDENHAUER: Correct. Yes.								
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Okay. Thank you. I								
8	just wanted to make sure.								
9	COMMISSIONER SMITH: I have one additional question.								
10	MS. MOLDENHAUER: Board member Smith.								
11	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: (Indiscernible) Mr. Smith.								
12	COMMISSIONER SMITH: That second floor that you're								
13	speaking of at the top of the graphic. Is that enclosed? Is								
14	that deck going to be enclosed in some way, shape or form?								
15	MS. MOLDENHAUER: So everything is enclosed. If we can								
16	go back to the two slides prior. One more slide. Sorry.								
17	So you can see here they're not changing, the historic								
18	façade is not changing. So all of the interior area where any								
19	music would play is behind that historic Morse Street façade.								
20	There would be an outdoor area that would have no music and no								
21	amplification on an outdoor deck in front of that façade, but								
22	everything else is internal. So does that make sense?								
23	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Yes, that makes sense.								
24	MS. MOLDENHAUER: Okay. Thank you.								
25	So we can go back to the slide that we were on. Next								

slide. Here.

We did engage with the ANC in two zoning subcommittee meetings and one full ANC committee and the question that they had revolved around proposed security and operational plans. So we did provide information to them and did include information regarding the fact that the operation would include a CBE certified independent security company. There would be personnel on-site before, during and after all events. Staff would be positioned at the entrance inside the venue and in the alley, and we also provide information on both security cameras and lighting and would communicate and coordinate regarding multimodal transportation. Next slide.

We did include images of where those potential security cameras would be located. Again, this is not as much to the specific zoning standard but it was something that the ANC asked for and so we are providing that to the Board. Next slide.

Next slide.

Next slide.

We believe that the Applicant here satisfies the special exception relief to permit an entertainment, assembly and performing arts use in the PDR-1 zone. The proposed use is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the zone plan and will not adversely impact the use of neighboring properties. The property is a vibrant mixed use community made up as the Union Market area. The property is not abutting or touching any

residential or residential uses. The proposed use is to (indiscernible) would be anticipated to have little impact and provide the benefits to those in the neighborhood. Next slide.

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 proposed use does comply with the additional special conditions pursuant to the subsection, including the fact that the proposed use would not have objectionable aspects or impacts on neighboring properties as to noise, traffic, parking, loading or number of attendees, or waste. We, there's no parking requirement as to this proposed project but we obviously, the project is within a transit rich community as well as the majority of those individuals that would be coming to this facility would potentially be attending or going to a restaurant venue because there is no food provided at this place. For other locations in Union Market it might be getting to this project via walking or potentially via other uses that would not require parking. The property which will not be abutting a residential use residential zone. This property, it does not abut any residential uses or zone and is separated from an alley. Next slide.

We did, wanted to provide there is no impact on noise as that is part of that special condition, how the project is addressing sound management, sound proofing the interior such as using a floating floor and rubber underlays to reduce any base vibrations that can be transmitted. There is also a solid-core door with weather stripping and a double glaze window acoustics to reduce any window or noise vibrations at the windows.

We are providing an entryway design that will actually have a vestibule so that way when anybody is entering or exiting the project, that entry and exiting will not allow for noise to escape during that period of time. And then in addition to that, the speakers are placed in a location in the center of the room, as I showed you in the plans, to reduce any vibrations or noise along the walls and they'll also be compliant in conducting sound checks throughout the operation of the site to ensure that they are compliant with all D.C. Code requirements as far as noise and sound. Next slide.

The proposed use complies with the special conditions. We are asking under No. 3 for a variance from the 1,000 feet requirement for other venues. As I think the Board is aware in their review of 21279 last week, there is an application that did get approved in regards to requesting the initial variance relief that we'll address in the next slide.

No. 4, there will be no external performances or amplifications. As indicating, everything will occur indoors on the site and we are also willing to accept any additional conditions. Next slide.

So we are asking for a variance from the 1,000 foot requirement for other uses. The Board is aware that there's the unique condition of the fact that when we filed the application there were no other venues currently, based on our research of Certificates of Occupancy but three weeks prior we became aware

at our March ANC meeting when the Applicants for Palette 22 did present their project. We do believe that that permitting history and timing history is unique. We also believe that the use venues are very different. Their facility is a restaurant that is going to be a country and western themed and restaurant. It'll be operated on specific time periods with live music whereas ours will be a music venue or a venue that will be rented out based on potential availability or desire including potentially obviously music, DJ opportunities as well as family parties, office parties, art venues, bar mitzvahs, and any other type of event that would potentially occur. And so we believe based on that there is a practical difficulty that's compliant with this requirement and that there would be no detrimental impact to the public good or to the zone plan by permitting this use. Next slide.

2.

We, as I indicated, did present to the Zoning and Planning Committee for ANC 5D twice, both in March and April, then supplemented the information to them and then presented before them on May 13th. On May 13th they voted four to two to two to support the application based on a conditional support. The conditional support was that the Applicant comply with their conditional support and we supplement the record to include images of the alley. There were express concerns about the fact that the alley, having access of the alley and if the alley was not yet improved in a way that would be conducive to this use.

We indicated that and the SMD for this project, Commissioner Arbuckle, was very adamant about supporting the project and indicated that obviously this would allow for this improvement, and so we provided a narrative to the ANC regarding, and to the Board, about how the Applicant intends to continue to improve the alley such as cleaning, washing, reviewing and confirming that there's no illegal dumping occurring in the alley and I would also be providing both the Board and the ANC copies of how they are cleaning the alley, and then also consent to attending an ANC meeting prior to opening the facility.

2.

And so based on that, I do know that the ANC had not yet filed their resolution in the record but I am happy to answer any questions. I believe the next slide is the conclusion of our presentation.

Oh, sorry. Here are images of the Applicant working to, you know, improve and ensure that the alley is, you know, continually, even before they open up for business it's, you know, in a condition that is improved from its current condition. Next slide.

Now I've completed our presentation and am available for any questions.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: I have a quick administrative question (indiscernible).

MS. MOLDENHAUER: I think our client got kicked off for a second. If he can be brought back in.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Ms. Moldenhauer, I've got a quick administrative question on this just to clarify.

On your recently submitted self-certification, I think the request, it was cut off in the variance thing. You might want to take a look at that and see if you need to re-submit

that.

MS. MOLDENHAUER: I think we did re-submit it. Are you talking about 22B?

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Yeah, I am. I'm looking at 22B now and it looks like, and maybe I'm misreading it, it looks like it's cut off under the, could you ask for a variance under 802.1. Under a little bit more than that specific, the specific 1(e)(3), that should be a little bit more there I think.

MS. MOLDENHAUER: Yes. I mean, it should be, sorry, I guess.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Just look at that, it's updated but it's just, it just isn't saying what it should. So it's a minor thing. I just thought maybe, just brought it to your attention. You might want to correct that. So we're asking for the, what exactly what we're asking for. What you're saying is, saying that is just inconsistent with that.

The second question I wanted to ask you about was the ANC. Do you anticipate that the ANC is going to submit a report to the record? Did they express that? I understand your representation but I was curious to know, do you anticipate. We

1	don't have anyone from the ANC here so I'm trying to just get a							
2	sense for that.							
3	MS. MOLDENHAUER: I will say that there was some							
4	confusion between the Chair and the SMD about whether the SMD's							
5	vote counted that night because he was not there during roll							
6	call, and I don't know, you know, if I'll have you know the							
7	SMD is very supportive but if this is required to the Chair,							
8	there may be some delay I would say in getting a formal resolution							
9	in the record.							
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: But you represent that they							
11	did approve, they approved and are in support and the issues and							
12	concerns they raised you addressed?							
13	MS. MOLDENHAUER: Correct. And it was a four vote in							
14	support, two, one abstaining, one absent, and two in opposition.							
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Thank you.							
16	Any other members of the Board have questions?							
17	COMMISSIONER SMITH: (Audio interference.)							
18	MS. MOLDENHAUER: I'm having a hard time hearing you.							
19	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Oh. Can you hear me? Are you							
20	proposing to construct a retractable roof?							
21	MS. MOLDENHAUER: The roof is glass.							
22	COMMISSIONER SMITH: And the roof will be glass on top							
23	of the historic second floor?							
24	MS. MOLDENHAUER: Correct. Yes.							
<ul><li>24</li><li>25</li></ul>	MS. MOLDENHAUER: Correct. Yes.  MR. ZAATARI: I can jump in here. So there's two types.							

We have some sort (audio interference). 2 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Would you quys mute yourselves? You're echoing, Mr. Zaatari. Please go ahead. 3 4 MR. ZAATARI: Oh, can you hear me better now? 5 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Much better. 6 ZAATARI: Amazing. And I'm sorry it cut off 7 earlier. I'm not sure what happened. 8 But it's mostly a two type of roof. There's a portion 9 of it that would be the glass and the other one that would be 10 the louver. This does not, it does not cover or open up further from the historic wall so it's not going to be seen from the 11 12 public alley and the front side of Morse Street. 13 COMMISSIONER SMITH: Okay. And I have one additional 14 question. In your floor plans (audio interference). As a matter of fact we have two sets of floor plans. We got one that's in 15 16 the record that's just the second floor. The first floor is not all that clear. But (audio interference) actual floor plans of 17 18 what's in your (audio interference)? 19 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: You're breaking up, Mr. Smith. The floor plan is different from those in Exhibit 5 which you 20 21 did address earlier that said that you had had to make some alterations moving back the DJ booth. 2.2 The question is do you have, the plans that you showed 23 us that are in the slide deck, do you have those plans in the 24 25 record other than in that slide deck?

1 MS. MOLDENHAUER: They are just part of the PowerPoint 2 presentation which is part of the record at Exhibit 23. COMMISSIONER SMITH: Is there any way that the floor 3 4 plan with, the stamped plans can be submitted within the record, 5 and we're not referencing the PowerPoint? 6 MS. MOLDENHAUER: We can definitely supplement the 7 record and submit, I mean do we have to have the stamped plans 8 or just plans that are on our architectural sheet? 9 MR. ZAATARI: We have stamped plans from the architect, 10 not from DOB yet, but this conversation for the retractable rooftop we've already had with the Historic Preservation and they 11 So we've kind of consulted with them before 12 approved it. 13 submission to DOB. 14 MS. MOLDENHAUER: We're happy to supplement the record, Commissioner Smith. 15 16 COMMISSIONER SMITH: Okay. And my next question is 17 that deck and on both sets of plans it shows nothing on the deck. Are you proposing to put in seats? Are there going to be 18 different, is there going to be a different layout arrangement 19 20 depending on different nights? What's going to be on that deck? 21 MR. ZAATARI: Correct. So there will be different 22 layout organizations based on the different events we host. mean, during the day as a, and maybe outside to that, during the 23 24 day maybe we'll just have regular furniture for people to sit 25 down, grab a coffee from Olivia Macaron and just have their normal

1	day up there, and then based on the event that we'd be hosting								
2	in the afternoon or at night it would change.								
3	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Okay. Do you have that in								
4	different sets of plans that show the layouts that you propose								
5	because I think the only thing that we have to go on is that								
6	you're just going to put whatever in there up to 240 people based								
7	on the occupancy?								
8	MR. ZAATARI: We don't have the layouts for, like, the								
9	different events. It's usually based on the event that we end								
10	up doing. So usually we do the layout based on the event or								
11	whoever is doing the event would have kind of a proposal of how								
12	they would want it positioned.								
13	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Okay. But are you going to have								
14	permanent seating on the deck?								
15	MS. MOLDENHAUER: No. I think there'd be no permanent								
16	seating. It would be flex based on the potential user.								
17	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Okay. But no amplified sounds								
18	beyond that? Okay.								
19	MS. MOLDENHAUER: Correct. No amplified sound.								
20	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Okay. And can you speak to how								
21	you're going to, again, maybe this was in the testimony, how								
22	you're going to control noise or have any type of materials for								
23	noise attenuation?								
24	MR. ZAATARI: For sure. That No. 1 for the entrances								
25	and the exits there's already space between how we're doing it.								

So people entering from the back there's a double, there's two double doors before you get to the venue itself which prevents sounds from opening up and we are already doing that.

2.

The second thing would be the acoustic ceilings, acoustic, I'm not sure, I'm sorry, I forgot the word. But it's mainly like the acoustic dry wall that you would hang to the sides of the building as well as having a vestibule to prevent sounds from entering, from exiting as people exit the venue.

COMMISSIONER SMITH: Well, how do you control with that on the second floor because that seems like that'll be your main event space?

MR. ZAATARI: Correct. So the idea of having the acoustic ceiling, acoustic dry wall around the venue which prevents sounds from travelling outside and then for the doors up to the deck we would have a vestibule, and there would usually be one security guard that opens the doors and closes it so that as people are entering and exiting we're making sure that no two doors are being open at the same time.

COMMISSIONER SMITH: Okay. I'm not seeing a vestibule on your plans on the second floor. It just looks to be like a door.

MS. MOLDENHAUER: Oh, the vestibule is on the first floor as you enter.

MR. ZAATARI: There's a vestibule --

COMMISSIONER SMITH: Okay. So no vestibule on the

second floor to control the sound?

2.

MR. ZAATARI: For sure. For exiting to the deck, sometimes you might have an event where they're not using the deck so it's not a permanent vestibule, it's the ones that you can put up and down. They usually use them at a lot of venues down in New York and many different spaces. We're using one, actually our architect proposed one vestibule that you can buy and it's like you just put it up and down as needed.

COMMISSIONER SMITH: Okay.

MR. ZAATARI: So it's not a permanent one because sometimes you might have an event where there's very little music and you're going to be allowing people up outside and inside. For like a corporate event, let's say for example, you're not blasting sound so you won't need it. So that's going to be up taking space from the venue, so we won't put up the vestibule. But if there's like a night where there might be amplified sound on the inside, then we make sure that we put it up.

COMMISSIONER SMITH: Okay. And I think the only question that I had, and this one is to Ms. Moldenhauer. The two people that voted to not support it, did they state the reasons why?

MS. MOLDENHAUER: They did. It was the Chair and his concerns were that, yeah, the area wasn't right yet or wasn't, you know, ready yet for having alley access. His concern really was that, you know, the current, you know, condition isn't

1	conducive for an alley access and our position and the Single							
2	Member District, Commissioner Arbuckle, countered to that which							
3	he didn't say that night, was that, you know, if you don't approve							
4	it and you don't allow this project to be developed, then the							
5	alley will not ever get better and that, and this will obviously							
6	allow for improvement, but the Commissioner just expressed his							
7	statement that he thought, you know, not yet.							
8	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Okay.							
9	MR. ZAATARI: If you don't mind adding here that there's							
10	already restaurants in Union Market that's just started							
11	establishing their alley entrances and that's improved a lot of							
12	the alleys that we're in. But you just have to start, as Meredith							
13	mentioned, that the perfect example is Minetta Tavern, La'							
14	Shukran shares the same alley like we do which already has alley							
15	access as well as there's a small bakery that does alley access.							
16	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Okay. Okay. Thank you.							
17	Chairman Blake, I don't have any further questions.							
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay.							
19	Chairman Hood, do you have any questions for the							
20	Applicant?							
21	ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm just curious. Ms.							
22	Moldenhauer, was the Chair of the ANC, was that Chair Guzman?							
23	MS. MOLDENHAUER: Guzman, yes.							
24	ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right. That's all.							

25 I was just curious. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Thank you.

Okay. We can hear from, if we can just hear from the Office of Planning? Ms. Myers, I'd ask you please go through your analysis of the variance for me. Thank you.

MS. MYERS: Sure. Crystal Myers with the Office of Planning.

The Office of Planning is in support of this case of both the special exception and the area variance. You have requested that I go over the area variance arguments. I shall do so. Just zoom down to the last section here.

So with the area variance, the Applicant has to identify, well I should first say, this is the variance and the requirement that they be more than 1,000 feet away from a venue that has live performances. In this case they are less than that which is why they need a variance, and the variance argument the primary exceptional situation argument, is that they were unaware of the property across the street essentially having a live performance aspect because of the timing of when they applied for this case.

Prior to filing the Applicant made a good faith effort to determine the type of relief needed for the proposed use. This effort included directly communicating with the Zoning Administrator's office on February 10th, 2025. Based on the information available at the time the Zoning Administrator's office confirmed that only special exception relief is necessary

in this case for the proposed entertainment space and this venue. But three days later BZA case 21729, which was the case that was last week's case, that case was for an eating and drinking establishment with live performances was officially accepted by the Office of Zoning.

2.

The Applicant relied on the Zoning Administrator's office's accurate at the time's confirmation, that only special exception relief is necessary. Consequently, they moved forward with their plans for this use as a special exception. So the key thing here being is that timing and reliance on Zoning Administrator's office's guidance led them to make decisions that were just for a special exception case when in fact they actually needed to do a variance. But they were unaware of that at the time.

Strict application of the regulations would result in a practical difficulty. If this owner had a difficult time securing a viable tenant or I should say the owner of the property has had a difficult time securing a viable tenant to use the space, consequently the property has been vacant for an extended period of time. Now that the owner has found a tenant who is prepared to rent the space if the proposed use is approved, denying the relief would mean the owner would lose the tenant and the space would remain vacant.

As for there being substantial detriment to the public good, we do not think that there would be a substantial detriment

to the public good. Granting the requested area variance would result in, actually it would be beneficial to the public. The proposed use would add to the vibrant mixed use and entertainment activity in the Florida Avenue market district, is what we also can call the Union Market area. It would serve as a private event space, so it would only be booked for discreet events on an irregular or limited schedule.

As such, it should not regularly be operating at the same time as the establishment across the street at 400 Morse Street, Northeast and we thought that granting the requested area variance should not result in substantial impairment to the zoning plan or regulations. The zone PDR-1 allows the proposed use as a special exception. Besides the location requirement, this proposal satisfies the special exception.

If the proposal is permitted to exist across the street from an eating and drinking establishment with live performances at Morse Street which last week was approved, so that continues to move in the direction it's going. If it does come to fruition, it should not significantly disturb the neighboring locations, so this particular use should not be disruptive to the across the street use and that you should not be disruptive to this use.

They operate a little differently so we don't think that there would be direct impacts by their two operations. The Florida Avenue Market area is a growing commercial and entertainment location and the adjacent property is a warehouse.

1	The surrounding uses are compatible with the properties. So,							
2	again, Office of Planning feels that the area variance has been							
3	met in this case.							
4	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Thank you.							
5	Does anyone have any questions for the Office of							
6	Planning?							
7	(Pause.)							
8	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: I have one. Ms. Myers, can							
9	you tell me what the intent of that regulation is, that zoning							
10	regulation for the 1,000 foot?							
11	MS. MYERS: Well, this regulation predates my time at							
12	Office of Planning. But to my best understanding of what I							
13	believe is the intent of it, the distance requirement seems to							
14	be trying to prevent an over-concentration of these types of							
15	uses, near low to moderate density, a residential neighborhoods.							
16	In this case we don't feel that there is an over-concentration.							
17	There are no low to moderate density residences nearby so we							
18	think that these two existing in these locations would not be							
19	disruptive in the area.							
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Thank you.							
21	Does anyone else have any questions? Chairman Hood,							
22	you wouldn't want to shed some light on that intent, would you?							
23	ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Are you speaking of the 1,000?							
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Yes.							
25	ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah. I tell you I think Ms.							

1	Myers is correct, but I recall it, and I'm trying to think. It							
2	was just as I was coming on the Board so I think it had, actually							
3	I think that had something to do with it maybe 300 or 1,000,							
4	I can't remember but it had a lot to do with trash transfer							
5	stations and I'll just leave it at that. But I do know that what							
6	Ms. Myers said about the over-concentration is exactly what they							
7	were trying to achieve. But, Ms. Myers, I just remember going							
8	back to the mid '90s with trash transfer stations and I may be							
9	totally wrong, but I know they all line up some kind of way.							
10	I'll just leave it at that.							
11	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. There we have it. All							
12	right.							
13	Are there any other questions that we have for the							
14	Office of Planning either from the Applicant or from the Board?							
15	(Pause.)							
16	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Let's see.							
17	Mr. Young, is there anyone that wishes to speak?							
18	MR. YOUNG: We do not.							
19	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay.							
20	Ms. Moldenhauer, do you have any additional comments							
21	you'd like to make in closing?							
22	MS. MOLDENHAUER: No additional comments. We thank the							
23	Board for their time. We're happy to supplement the record and							
24	obviously are looking forward to the Board's deliberation.							
25	Thank you very much.							

1	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay.							
2	So before you go and before we turn to deliberations,							
3	I want to ask our Board members if there's anything that they							
4	need to help them make their decisions?							
5	Mr. Smith, I'll go to you first.							
6	COMMISSIONER SMITH: I think it's important to get the							
7	correct set of plans into the record, so I would request the							
8	Applicant to submit the plans into the record that were							
9	supplemented.							
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay.							
11	And correct set of plans meaning the ones stamped, the							
12	architecturally stamped plans that we mentioned earlier?							
13	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Ms. Moldenhauer illustrated within							
14	her PowerPoint.							
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay.							
16	And is there anything else you need? Do you want to							
17	hold out for an ANC report or are you comfortable with that, what							
18	we asked?							
19	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Yes. Yeah, I think it would be							
20	helpful since we're waiting on a set of plans to get a letter							
21	from the ANC. Hopefully they can provide that relatively short,							
22	in short order.							
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Okay.							
24	Chairman Hood, would you like anything else?							
25	ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm just glad to know that we're							

going to wait on that ANC. I'd kind of like to examine that a 1 2. little more. I do know ANC 5D is, they're very thoughtful. know they, Ms. Moldenhauer mentioned they may be differing but I 3 would like to see that as well. 4 5 Thank you. 6 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Great. All right. 7 And I would personally appreciate anything you could 8 submit to the record that reflected that HPRB input. I think 9 you said that Historical looked at it and opined on the design. 10 If you could submit something to the record just to reflect that, I'd appreciate it. I think that would be it. 11 12 So, based on that I'd like to, let's see. Madam 13 Secretary, we'd like to have those two pieces, the record closed 14 and open for those two pieces of information, three pieces of 15 information. The additional information on the layout, the ANC 16 report if they should submit one, and I'd like to have some 17 information on the HPRB whatever they might have. It could be 18 emails, could be a full report, I don't care. 19 Yes. Go ahead, Ms. Moldenhauer. 20 MS. MOLDENHAUER: Also just to add the (c)(3) to the 21 135, I think got cut off. Please. 22 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Okay. 23 And I think that would be it. So, Madam Secretary,

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

MS. MEHLERT: For decision you could put this on, well

could you give us a date for that decision?

24

25

1	it depends on when the Applicant can submit these items. I mean,						
2	if you can get it in by this Friday the ANC could have until next						
3	Friday and we could, you can put it on for a decision for June						
4	the 4th. I don't know if that's too soon.						
5	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Ms. Moldenhauer, do you think						
6	you can do June 4th?						
7	MS. MOLDENHAUER: We'd be happy if it was the 28th or						
8	the 4th, yes.						
9	MS. MEHLERT: We don't have a hearing next week.						
10	MS. MOLDENHAUER: Oh, you don't have a hearing. Then						
11	the 4th it is.						
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: That sounds good. Okay. Thank						
13	you very much.						
14	Then I'm going to close the hearing and the record will						
15	remain open for those pieces of information we requested. Okay?						
16	And we'll have a decision on June 4th? Excuse me?						
17	MS. MOLDENHAUER: Thank you. I was saying thank you						
18	for your time.						
19	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Thank you.						
20	MR. ZAATARI: Thank you all for your time.						
21	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay.						
22	Mr. Young, you can excuse the witnesses. Madam						
23	Secretary, is there anything else we need to cover today?						
24	MS. MEHLERT: Nothing else from staff.						
25	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay.						

1		This meeting	j is a	adjourned.	Bye.				
2	ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you.								
3		(Whereupon,	the	above-enti	tled	matter	went	off	the
4	record at	1:21 p.m.)							
5									
6									
7									
8									
9									
10									
11									
12									
13									
14									
15									
16									
17									
18									
19									
20									
21									
22									
23									
24									
25									

## ${\tt C E R T I F I C A T I O N}$

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Public Hearing

Before: DC BZA

Date: 05-21-25

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.

Cecilia Baptiste