GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY

JUNE 4, 2025

+ + + + +

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

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT MEMBERS PRESENT:

FREDERICK L. HILL, Chairperson CHRISHAUN SMITH, Commissioner CARL H. BLAKE, Commissioner ANTHONY J. HOOD, Zoning Commission Chairperson ROBERT E. MILLER, Zoning Commission Vice Chair TAMMY STIDHAM, Zoning Commissioner

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT STAFF PRESENT:

KEARA MEHLERT, Secretary PAUL YOUNG, A/V Operations

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Regular Public Hearing held on June 4, 2025.

TABLEOFCONTENTS

Case No. 21292	
Application of Oak at Morse Street, LLC and Sung H. Cho Trustee	6
Case No. 20915-A Application of Takoma Lot 5, LLC	13
Case No. 21306 Application of Helen Jackson and Zakiya Jackson	16
Case No. 21151 Application of Dinesh Tandon and Nidhi Tandon	18
Case No. 21240 Application of 71 Florida Ave LLC	26
Case No. 21237 Application of Yasmin Khan	82
Case No. 21280 Application of Matthew Bosserman	L02
Case No. 21293 Application of Square Fifteen Development, LLC 1	L11
Case No. 21294 Application of Brynn and Robert Kurtzman	L19
Case No. 21249 Application of 4231 Clay Street NE. LLC	125

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

2 (9:30 a.m.)

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen, to the Board of Zoning Adjustment. Today is 6/4/2025. This public hearing will please come to order. My name is Fred Hill, Chairman of the District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment. Today joining me are Board members Chrishaun Smith, Vice Chair Carl Blake, Chairman Anthony Hood, Vice Chair Rob Miller and Zoning Commissioner Tammy Stidham.

Today's meeting and hearing agenda are available on the Office of Zoning's website. Please be advised that this proceeding is being recorded by a court reporter and is also webcast live via Webex and YouTube Live. The video of the webcast will be available on the Office of Zoning's website after today's hearing. Accordingly, everyone who is present listening on Webex or by telephone will be muted during the hearing. Also please be advised that we do not take any public testimony at our decision meeting sessions. If you're experiencing difficulty accessing Webex or with your telephone call-in, then please call our OZ hotline number at 202-727-5471 to receive Webex login or call-in instructions.

At the conclusion of a decision meeting session I shall, in consultation with the Office of Zoning, determine whether a full or summary order may be issued. A full order is required when the decision it contains is adverse to a party

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

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In today's hearing session everyone who is listening by Webex or by telephone will be muted during the hearing and only persons who have signed up to participate or testify will be unmuted at the appropriate time. Please state your name and address before providing oral testimony or presentation. Oral presentations should be limited to a summary of your most important points. When you're finished speaking please mute your audio so that you microphone is no longer picking up sound or background noise. All persons planning to testify either in favor or in opposition should have signed up in advance. They'll be called by name to testify. If this is an appeal, only parties are allowed to testify. By signing up to testify, all participants completed the oath or affirmation as required by Y-408.7.

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

good cause justifies allowing the exhibit into the record including an explanation of why the requester did not file the exhibit prior to the hearing pursuant to Y-206, and how the proposed exhibit would not unreasonably prejudice any parties. The order for special exceptions and variances are in Y-409.

2.

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

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

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

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

2.

Madam Secretary, do we have any preliminary matters?

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

There is just one change to the schedule today. Application No. 21209 of 304, 306, 308 K Street, LLC has been postponed to September 10th, 2025. Regarding late filings, the Chairman has reviewed and granted waivers to allow late filings into the applicable case records pursuant to Subtitle Y, Section 206.7 and Section 103.13. Any other late filings during the course of today's live hearing should be presented before the Board by the Applicant parties or witnesses after the case is called. Any other preliminary matters will be noted when the case is called.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thank you.

Good morning everyone. I am actually not on the first decision so I will go ahead and turn this over to Vice Chair Blake and I will pop back on afterwards. Thank you.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Yes. Madam Secretary, would you call the first case for us now?

MS. MEHLERT: The first case in the Board's meeting session is Application No. 21292 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 an 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 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 performing arts use in two existing two-story attached buildings on contiguous lots. It's located in the PDR-1 zone at 405 and 407 Morse Street, Northeast, Square 3588, Lots 15 and 16. This case was heard on May 21st and the Board requested additional submissions from the Applicant and the ANC and closed the record.

Participating are Vice Chair Blake, Mr. Smith, and Chairman Hood.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Thank you, Madam Secretary.

This application proposes to construct and operate a new entertainment event space and music venue on the second floors of two existing buildings on contiguous lots located in a PDR-1 zone Union Market. When I first looked at this case it was a little bit confusing based on the information we had. But I found the testimony provided by the Applicant as well as the supplemental information which contained more complete diagrams

and renderings, gave me a much better understanding of the project and what's being asked of us.

2.

The Applicant submitted some additional information which is primarily renderings, some information from the HPRB and also we had asked the ANC if they wished to add any additional commentary to provide us to fill out the record. The ANC did not provide that additional information, however we know that they were notified by the Zoning Office and for whatever reason they did not respond.

That said I want to just go through this a little bit and talk about this particular case. The PDR-1 zone allows eating and drinking establishments to have live performances that comply with the special exception criteria in Subtitle U, Section 802. Among other things, Section 802 requires that the Applicant demonstrate that the use shall be located and designed so that it is not likely to become objectionable to the neighboring property because of noise, traffic, parking, loading, the number of attendees, waste collection or other objectionable conditions. In this case I believe the property generally complies with all the criteria of Subtitle U, Section 802 except for location requirement which is the reason for the variance request.

I want to just go through a couple of things because, again, it clarified for me some of the things that I saw in this. For example, the subject property will serve as a private event space so only be booked for discreet events on a regular unlimited

schedule. There'll be a maximum capacity of 240 people. This venue will only operate on the second floors of the two abutting buildings.

2.

2.4

Access will only be provided from the rear alley. There will be an open deck facing Morse Street and a 16 foot louvered roof system covering the venue that will be hidden behind a parapet wall and will not be visible from the streets. All performances will occur inside the building and no external amplification is proposed. During live performances, all windows and exterior doors will be kept closed to minimize noise spills.

Importantly, the subject property is not abutting a residential use or residential zone. There are generally warehouses near and the closest residential use is across the alley which is south of the subject property. Considering these factors, as I said before, I believe the proposal complies with the criteria, all the criteria of Subtitle U, Section 802 except the location requirement.

So in looking at the area variance, this is a difficult variance to meet to some extent because it's a little bit complicated in the sense of how it came about and last participants did so based on an abundance of caution. But I'm going to credit the Office of Planning's analysis on how the Applicant has met the first prong of the area variance test, that is the critical factor here.

But also in looking at this I tried to evaluate the

second and third prongs of the area variance test and I tried to consider the intent of the PDR zone as well as the intent of the location requirement and I thought about the cumulative effect of the two venues on neighboring properties. The production distribution repair zones are primarily for heavy commercial and light manufacturing activities, however the regulations allow for the development of compatible uses such as office and retail. It also allows for the development of entertainment venues so long as they comply with the special exception criteria of Subtitle U, Section 802, and both venues generally comply with the criteria.

2.

While the legislative history of the location requirement isn't completely clear, it is reasonable to interpret the intent of that regulation to protect PDR and residential zones and to avoid undue concentration of live of performance and nightclub or dance venues.

The establishment at 400 Morse will be designed primarily as a restaurant with a live music component, designed to enhance the dining experience. The restaurant will have regular business hours. In contrast the subject property will serve as a private event space so it will only be booked for discreet events on an irregular or limited schedule. So it should not regularly be operating at the same time as the establishment at 400 Morse Street. These operational difficulties between the two uses should mitigate the potential noise or crowding or

traffic impacts.

Well, I also looked at the maximum number of attendees, on 400 Morse Street it's only 295 and the maximum capacity of the subject property is slightly, it's slightly lower at 240 people. That brings a total capacity or total potential for about 535. And you put that in context, that's less than half the capacity of the Lincoln Theater, the 9:30 Club or for that matter the ballroom at the Ritz Carlton. So it's not a particularly large venue even when you aggregate them.

So considering these factors I believe the relief can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and without substantially impairing the intent, purpose and integrity of the zoning plan. I give great weight to the Office of Planning's recommendation for approval. Unfortunately, as I said there is no report from ANC 5D to accord great weight, however I know the ANC is well aware of the venue and the proposal and the Applicant has testified that they have presented to the Zoning Subcommittee at least in 5D and the ANC has been duly notified. So I'll be voting in support of the application.

Mr. Smith, do you have anything you want to add?

COMMISSIONER SMITH: Vice Chair Blake, you have provided a very, very thorough analysis on the merits of this particular case and the reasons why I also support granting them the special exception and the area variance. I do believe they've met all the prongs and the special exception criteria to be able

1	to grant both, so I will support as well.
2	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Thank you.
3	Chairman Hood?
4	ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Vice Chair and Board
5	member Smith.
6	I agree with everything you say. You definitely have
7	recapped it very well and I will just say I appreciate the
8	additional submissions as you've already stated from the
9	Applicant. They helped me understand this case better and I will
10	be voting in support of this application. Thank you.
11	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Thank you, Vice Chair, I mean
12	Chairman Hood.
13	Madam Secretary, okay. So having completed
14	deliberations I'd like to make a motion to approve the application
15	as read and captioned by the Secretary, and ask for a second.
16	Mr. Smith?
17	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Second.
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Madam Secretary, we've
19	deliberated and the motion's been made. Would you please conduct
20	a roll call vote?
21	MS. MEHLERT: Please respond to the Vice Chair's motion
22	to approve the application.
23	Vice Chair Blake?
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Yes.
25	MS. MEHLERT: Mr. Smith?

1	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Yes.
2	MS. MEHLERT: And Chairman Hood?
3	ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.
4	MS. MEHLERT: Staff would record the vote as three to
5	zero to two to approve Application 21292 on the motion made by
6	Vice Chair Blake and seconded by Mr. Smith.
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Thank you, Madam Secretary.
8	Mr. Chair, please come back.
9	ZC CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. You all have a good
10	day.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great.
12	Vice Chair Miller, welcome.
13	ZC VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Good morning.
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Good morning. Okay.
15	Madam Secretary, if you can call our next order of
16	business, please.
17	MS. MEHLERT: Next in the meeting session is
18	Application No. 20915-A of Takoma Lot 5, LLC. This is a request
19	pursuant to Subtitle Y, Section 705.2 for a two year extension
20	of the validity of the order in Application 20915. This project
21	is for a nine unit apartment house in a new three-story detached
22	building. It's located in the RA-1 zone at 6905 Willow Street,
23	Northwest, Square 3359, Lot 52, and I'll just note that the ANC
24	Chair submitted a resolution in support yesterday in Exhibit 11.
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great. Thank you, Madam Secretary.

1	So I've had a chance to review the record and I didn't
2	really have any issues with this particular time extension
3	request. I would agree with the Applicant's reasoning that is
4	also summarized in the Office of Planning's report under C, and
5	then also am glad that they had an opportunity to meet with the
6	ANC and the ANC had a chance to submit something into the record.
7	I also would note that there's no substantial change to this
8	application, so I'll be voting to approve.
9	Mr. Smith, do you have anything you'd like to add?
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: I have nothing to add. I
11	agree with your assessment and the Office of Planning's
12	assessment in this case, and will support.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.
14	Vice Chair Blake?
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Mr. Chair, I'm in support of
16	the two year time extension.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.
18	Vice Chair Miller?
19	ZC VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I agree that good cause
20	has been demonstrated for this time extension.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thank you.
22	I'm going to go ahead and make a motion to approve
23	Application No. 20915-A as captioned and read by the secretary,
24	and ask for a second. Mr. Blake?
25	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Second, Mr. Chair. I want to

1	make sure that the, we're extending the validity ending June
2	21st, 2027; is that correct?
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: It is June 21st, 2027, yes. Thank
4	you so much. That is correct.
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: And ask for a second.
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Second.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great. Thank you, Mr. Blake.
8	Madam Secretary, if you could go ahead and take a roll
9	call.
10	MS. MEHLERT: Please respond to the Chair's motion to
11	approve the application.
12	Chairman Hill?
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
14	MS. MEHLERT: Vice Chair Blake?
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Yes.
16	MS. MEHLERT: Mr. Smith?
17	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Yes.
18	MS. MEHLERT: And Commissioner Miller?
19	ZC VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yes.
20	MS. MEHLERT: Staff would record the vote as four to
21	zero to, yeah, four to zero to one. Sorry. To approve
22	Application No. 20915-A on the motion made by Chairman Hill and
23	seconded by Vice Chair Blake.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great. Thank you.
25	Madam Secretary, you can call our next order of

business, please, when you get a chance.

2.

MS. MEHLERT: Next is an application pursuant to Subtitle X, Section, or sorry, Application No. 21306 of Helen Jackson and Zakiya Jackson. This is on the expedited review calendar. It's an application pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 901.2 for a special exception under Subtitle D, Section 5201 from the location requirements of Subtitle D, Section 5004.1(a) to allow an accessory building in a required rear yard.

This is for a rear addition to an existing two-story detached principal dwelling with two existing accessory structures in the rear yard. It's located in the R1-B zone at 1142 44th Place, Southeast, Square 5361, Lot 841, and there were two late filings that included an additional letter in support from the ANC SMD Aarron Harris and a letter from the Applicant discussing their outreach to the neighbors.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thank you.

I'm just reading the new submissions. Okay. All right.

I've had a chance again to review the record and in general I didn't have any main concerns about this particular application or (indiscernible) I should say. I did agree with the, I will agree with the Office of Planning's analysis and the comments that they have given. We did get a letter from the SMD but not the ANC because it seems as though, according to the SMD, the ANC did not take a formal position on this.

There is something in the record that has been put

forward from the Applicant concerning their neighbor notification 1 2. outreach in which they seem to be indicating, again, how much outreach they have put forward, and so I didn't have any issues 3 4 with this, and I'm going to be voting to approve the application. 5 Mr. Smith, do you have anything you'd like to add? 6 COMMISSIONER SMITH: Nothing to add. I will vote in 7 support. 8 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Blake? 9 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Yeah. I'm going to vote in 10 support of this application, Mr. Chair. I believe that we can, given the information in the record, the plat, the plans, I 11 12 believe we can understand the impact of the requested relief 13 without testimony and it's appropriate for the hearing consent 14 calendar. 15 The fact that the ANC has not weighed in I think, again, 16 they explained it by saying that they were not able, did not meet 17 and I think the SMD Harris's input at Exhibits 22 and 29 really 18 substantiate that and as you pointed out as well, the input from 19 the Applicant about their neighborhood outreach does allay some 20 concerns I don't have about that. I would be voting in favor of 21 the application. 22

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.

Vice Chair Miller?

23

24 ZC VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yes. Thank you, Mr.

25 Chairman. I concur with my colleagues and am prepared to support

1	the application.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. All right.
3	I'm going to make a motion to approve Application No.
4	21306 as captioned and read by the secretary, and ask for a
5	second. Mr. Blake?
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Second.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Motion is made and seconded. Madam
8	Secretary, take a roll call.
9	MS. MEHLERT: Please respond to the Chair's motion to
10	approve the application.
11	Chairman Hill?
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
13	MS. MEHLERT: Vice Chair Blake?
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Yes.
15	MS. MEHLERT: Mr. Smith?
16	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Yes.
17	MS. MEHLERT: Commissioner Miller?
18	ZC VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yes.
19	MS. MEHLERT: Staff would record the vote as four to
20	zero to one to approve Application 21306 on the motion made by
21	Chairman Hill and seconded by Vice Chair Blake.
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great.
23	Madam Secretary, can you tell me which case is next?
24	MS. MEHLERT: Next I believe is Application 21151 in
25	the Board's meeting session.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Give me a minute. Oh, yeah.
2	Okay.
3	Go ahead if you want to call our next case again, Madam
4	Secretary, and I think Commissioner Miller, you're not on this
5	one.
6	ZC VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I'm not sure.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: 21151.
8	ZC VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I'd be happy not to be on
9	it.
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I think it's Dr. Imamura.
11	ZC VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Dr. Imamura, but he's not with us
13	so we'll see how this goes.
14	MS. MEHLERT: So next is Application No. 21151 of Dinesh
15	Tandon and Nidhi Tandon. As amended, this is a self-certified
16	application pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 901.2 for a special
17	exception under Subtitle C, Section 204.9 to allow a change from
18	one nonconforming use to another nonconforming use, and pursuant
19	to Subtitle X, Section 1000 for a use variance from Subtitle C,
20	Section 204.9(b) to allow a non-residential use.
21	This is for the conversion of the first floor and cellar
22	in an existing two-story attached building from an existing
23	nonconforming use as a retail convenience store to a new
24	nonconforming use as a restaurant. It's located in the RF-1 zone

25 at 2324 North Capitol Street, Northwest, Square 3124, Lot 143.

This public hearing was originally scheduled for July 24th, 2024. It was postponed several times and heard on May 14th, 2025. The Board closed the record and scheduled for decision on that date, and participating are Chairman Hill, Vice Chair Blake, Mr. Smith and Dr. Imamura, however Dr. Imamura is not participating today.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thank you.

There's been some construction here so if you all hear some noise, I apologize for it. So I left at the very end of this hearing and I went back and watched the end of the hearing so I've seen all of it and am prepared to continue to discuss and deliberate on this.

Unfortunately, I just don't think the Applicant has made the case in order to meet the high standard, or sorry, the high bar I guess for which to, the three prongs for the use variance. I didn't see anything necessarily exceptional about the property that they can't make use of the property within the confines of the regulations that they find themselves in and so, and also the special exception as it kind of is so much tied to the use variance, I wasn't able to also agree with their argument concerning the special exception.

So I am unfortunately, well, I shouldn't say unfortunately. I'm not going to be able to vote for it because I don't think that they were able to meet the criteria of, again, I mean, use variance is the highest standard that we basically

have and I think that they are going to be able to make use of the property without it needing to be this type of a intensity in terms of a restaurant.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I would like to make a couple of comments however. I quess that I do, I went back again and watched the testimony and for the Applicant and the, yeah, the Applicant, I guess. Like, you know, I apologize that some of the testimony got a little bit, you know, oddly out of line in terms of what zoning requirements kind of have to say. I mean, what the community has kind of said in terms of the overall type of restaurant and the Applicant, or the restaurant that was proposed here it sounds like they're a very nice restaurant, a very good neighbor in the current place that they are and that I apologize if there was some, again, odd commentary to the testimony that came forward. In fact, my mother is from a country called Sikkim, or a state of India, and so it was kind of interesting some of the comments concerning the type of restaurant that was going to be put into that neighborhood.

However, as I said, I don't think that they meet the criteria for us to grant this variance. I do think that there is perhaps a corner store alternative that they might be able to do, however, I don't know if that would be something that would still meet the needs of this particular Applicant. I think under U-254.14 there are special exceptions that might be able to allow for some type of eating and drinking establishment but that would

really have to be neighborhood serving. It wouldn't be something that would be like a destination type of place. I mean, the whole point of the corner store that also can be, again, under special exception some eating and drinking establishment, it has to be kind of serving the neighborhood as something that we, as a Board, have also focused upon when we're going through the special exceptions.

2.

However, I'm not giving any type of advice to necessarily do that because I don't necessarily know, again, as all of the applications go, I don't know if that would pass either but that's just another type of thought process as I was going through and hearing about this. And so, I guess with that, again, I think that the, you know, I think the restaurant where it is currently now is serving the community well and they're an upstanding member of the community and they seem to be doing very well, and I know the restaurant and I think it's a nice restaurant but it's just not something that I think would work out in terms of meeting the criteria for us, for me, to vote in favor of the use variance or the special exception. So with that I'm going to voting to deny the application.

Mr. Smith, may I hear your thoughts?

COMMISSIONER SMITH: Sure. So I too, I want to preface this conversation in that I agree with you, and you listened back to the hearing, there was a lot of colorful conversation that occurred amongst some of the residents, well one resident I think

made a very enlightened comment that honestly went viral to be completely transparent about it, across the District and I do want to say and to reiterate what she said that I'm very aware the restaurant seems to be they are very, you know, upstanding community member where they're located now, very popular restaurant and there was just a lot of cultural language about the type of restaurant that would be located here, and that is beyond the scope of zoning. That's not something that we would even touch to evaluate, so I apologize for some of those comments that was received or was heard at that hearing.

2.

But nonetheless, and also and cognizant of a lot of the comments that we received from the broader neighborhood that they feel that this area is a restaurant desert of sorts and they greatly value having some form of a restaurant relatively within walking distance or in close distance to them. But unfortunately that's not necessarily a zoning evaluation either. What we're tasked with is this is a use variance. It is the highest level of relief that this Board can grant so we have strict criteria on how we would evaluate a variance to allow this type of use and a food desert is not one of them.

I do not believe that the Applicant has met the burden of proof for us to grant the variances based on the testimony provided by the Applicant regarding the three prongs and I won't belabor it beyond that. I think Chairman Hill, you have expounded on the reasons why and I thankfully agree with your testimony on

that. There are additional options for the owner of the building to be able to use the building. It may not be an eating and drinking establishment of this particular scale. There was an evaluation of the corner store provisions and they can utilize the corner store provisions but maybe not for an eating and drinking establishment of this particular scale. I do believe there are other options within the zoning ordinance where they can use the building.

So I do not believe they've met the use variance test and, as you stated, the special exception request that heavily ties to the use variance, so I will also recommend denial for the use variance as well as the special exception.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.

Vice Chair Blake?

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Mr. Chair, I agree with the comments made in your assessment as well as that of Board member Smith, and I would just echo that while the zoning compliant uses may be limited, the Applicant really has not made a compelling or comprehensive argument that even when taken together these constitute an extraordinary or exceptional situation or condition and with respect to the property that meets the test for a variance as an undue hardship or for that matter as a practical difficulty if it were the lower standard for an area variance and it pretty much, as stated in the Office of Planning report, the nature of the proposed use, a full service restaurant with a bar

1	and dedicated delivery window would potentially create
2	significant external effects that are not anticipated for this
3	zone, particularly with regard to noise, traffic, parking, and
4	loading.
5	So for that reason I too will be in support of denying
6	the application for both the, the request for both the variance
7	and the special exception.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. All right.
9	I'm going to make a motion then to deny Application No.
10	21151 as captioned and read by the secretary, and ask for a
11	second. Mr. Blake?
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Second.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: The motion is made and seconded.
14	Madam Secretary, take a roll call, please.
15	MS. MEHLERT: Please respond to the Chair's motion to
16	deny the action.
17	Chairman Hill?
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
19	MS. MEHLERT: Vice Chair Blake?
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Yes.
21	MS. MEHLERT: Mr. Smith?
22	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Yes.
23	MS. MEHLERT: Staff would record the vote as three to
24	zero to two to deny Application 21151 on the motion made by
25	Chairman Hill and seconded by Vice Chair Blake.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great. Let's see now. Okay.
2	Madam Secretary, I think we have another Commissioner
3	joining us for the next one. I believe, is Commissioner Stidham
4	around?
5	MS. MEHLERT: Commissioner Stidham is joining for the
6	next case. She said she would be here at 10:15. I don't know if
7	you want to take like a break?
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Yeah, yeah. Let's take a
9	quick break. We'll come back at 10:15.
10	MS. MEHLERT: Okay.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you very much.
12	(Whereupon, there was a brief resume.)
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right, Madam Secretary. If you
14	can please call our next case.
15	MS. MEHLERT: The Board is back from a quick break and
16	is going into its hearing session for the next case.
17	This is Application No. 21240 of 71 Florida Ave 39,
18	LLC. This is a self-certified application pursuant to Subtitle
19	X, Section 901.2 for a special exception under Subtitle U, Section
20	203.1(J) to allow a healthcare facility use for 16 persons. This
21	is a new 16 bed healthcare facility in an existing detached
22	building Located in the R-2 zone at 4237 Eads Street, Northeast,
23	Square 5085, Lot 72.
24	This hearing began on March 26th and was continued to
25	April 23rd. The decision meeting began on April 30th and it was

1	continued to May 14th when the Board re-opened the hearing and
2	requested additional submissions. Participating are Chairman
3	Hill, Vice Chair Blake, Mr. Smith and Commissioner Stidham.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thank you.
5	If the Applicant can hear me, if they could please
6	introduce themselves for the record.
7	MS. WILSON: Hi. Alex Wilson from Sullivan & Barros
8	on behalf of the Applicant in this case.
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great. Thank you. Good morning,
10	Ms. Wilson.
11	Commissioner, is it Orendoff? Can you hear me?
12	ANC COMMISSIONER ORENDOFF: Yes.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great.
14	Could you introduce yourself for the record?
15	ANC COMMISSIONER ORENDOFF: Yes. Kimory Orendoff, ANC
16	Commissioner 7F03, and I'm trying to get my camera to boot up.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thank you,
18	Commissioner.
19	Commissioner, are you the only one with us today? There
20	was another Commissioner.
21	ANC COMMISSIONER ORENDOFF: I believe Commissioner
22	Nelson is trying to chime in, but I do know she's running in
23	between meetings. She said she would try to jump in once the
24	case was called.
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. So we'll see.

So, and, Commissioner, I'm sorry. What was the other Commissioner's name again?

ANC COMMISSIONER ORENDOFF: Commissioner Nelson, 7F 04.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great. Mr. Young, if you want to

5 keep an eye out for that Commissioner if she happens to pop in.

Ms. Wilson, so I'm sure you've been following all of us in terms of the deliberation and everything we did and I saw the things that have been put in the record. But could you just summarize what has happened since the last time you were with us?

MS. WILSON: Absolutely.

So as requested by the Board we submitted a more detailed set of conditions in Exhibit 56. The thought process behind the conditions was, first, let's take into consideration what the Board said at the last meeting, update those accordingly and then also go through the record again to see the concerns raised by the ANC and neighbors, directly address those to the extent possible within the special exception criteria while keeping in mind that some of those concerns could or would be present in a by-right scenario with eight beds or even a single family home. And so how do we balance these community concerns with quality of life for the residents and I think the conditions reflect that and they're focused on items that are legally relevant and present in the standards for approval.

I did have a chance to review the ANC's updated resolution. We truly appreciate the ANC has reconsidered the

proposal and moved to a position of conditional support with a majority of our conditions proposed being referenced in the resolution. There are a couple of different points. The resident limit being the main point. The ANC requests a limit of ten residents where we are continuing to request 16. We believe this is not materially different, given the extensive controls in place. For example, there are four parking spaces on-site. There are only three staff members present at a time with one visitor vehicle maximum at a time. Therefore, visitors and staff will park entirely on the site.

2.

And then in terms of housekeeping and meal service, this would be present whether we had eight, ten or sixteen residents and at the same intensity once a day. So we were happy to provide conditions restricting when the services must occur but they would occur whether we had eight, ten or sixteen. So even a by-right scenario would have the same housekeeping and meal service, for example, but with no conditions.

And then the other point. The ANC sought a five year time limit and we respectfully request a seven year term should the Board feel a time limit is appropriate and it's a modest difference but it reflects the investment and operational continuity required for this type of facility and it still preserves the same oversight that the Board would have for future renewal.

And so, again, grateful for the ANC. I believe we're

much closer to consensus than where we started and hopefully 2. these conditions have been refined, they're enforceable and that have demonstrated our good faith efforts to address concerns 3 4 while still providing needed housing and quality of life for 5 these residents. 6 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you. Let's see. 7 I'm going to kind of go around and do some of this. 8 Mr. Young, is someone from the Office of Planning with us? Oh, 9 I see. 10 MR. YOUNG: I see Ms. Brown-Roberts on the witness list but she is not on, so we're having staff contact her. 11 12 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thanks. 13 Commissioner Orendoff? 14 ANC COMMISSIONER ORENDOFF: Yes, sir. 15 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Do you want to summarize also? Ι mean, I see the things that you guys, and thanks for taking all 16 17 the time that you have taken for this, but do you want to 18 summarize what you have put in the record or is there anything 19 you'd like to add? 20 ANC COMMISSIONER ORENDOFF: I just want to put in the 21 record that we are on a standstill with the ten beds and the reason that we are on a standstill with the ten beds because the 22 23 Applicant has not proven that they have maximized the facility

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

We're looking at the ten beds and we're looking at the

that they're using at this present day.

24

25

1	five years that gives them enough time to come back to the Zoning
2	or to be considered for an upgrade of 16 beds or if they reach
3	the threshold for that maximum. So we're looking at five years
4	and a ten bed max. That's just where we stand.
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thank you,
6	Commissioner.
7	I guess we'll still look for the Office of Planning.
8	So what I was going to try to do is, Mr. Young, were there
9	witnesses here?
10	MR. YOUNG: Yes, we do.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
12	Before if I could, and I saw your hand up, Mr. Blake,
13	can I just real quick I want to go through the witnesses and see
14	what questions you all may or may not have, and then we may
15	actually do an emergency closed meeting so I can speak to legal
16	and then that's my plan.
17	Mr. Young, can you tell me who the witnesses are?
18	MR. YOUNG: Yes. We have Yolanda Sorto, and I'm not
19	sure if Senai Medhani is with the Applicant or not.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Ms. Wilson, Senai Medhani's with
21	you?
22	MS. WILSON: Yes, correct. He's with us.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So I guess it's just Ms.
24	Sorta then?
25	MR. YOUNG: One more. Makeda Okolo. And that's it.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Okay.

Ms. Sorto, can you hear me?

MS. SORTO: Yes. Can you hear me?

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes. If you could do me a favor and please introduce yourself and then as a member of the public you'll have three minutes to give your testimony, and you can begin whenever you like. I think, Mr. Young, do you have a clock on there somewhere? Oh, there we go. Great. So now there's a clock on the screen there, Ms. Sorto, and please go ahead.

MS. SORTO: Thank you. Good morning members of the Board, Commissioners, and community.

My name is Yolanda Sorto and I live at 4236 Eads Street. I bought my house two years ago. I live directly across the street from the property where they are proposing to open these facilities and I'm here today to speak in opposition to this application. I didn't have the opportunity last time because I forgot I had to sign up to testify so I didn't want to miss this time to share my thoughts and my feelings about this proposal.

And I just moved here because the area is quiet and peaceful and felt like a family neighborhood where we can raise a family and let our children play outside. I want to highlight that on the right side of my house there is already a transitional home operated under Project Nehemiah and it's less than 300 feet away. There is a similar healthcare facility on Clay Street and this doesn't feel like a neighborhood anymore. It's turning into

something commercial. They are saturating our block and I'm very concerned about the reality of this higher frequency of parking and traffic and a safety risk because we cannot predict the behavior of all the visitors. Visitors can be disrespectful and facilities like this will bring more foot traffic and possibly (audio interference) and littering.

2.

In fact, my driveway has been blocked more than once by visitors from the transitional home. If another facility opens across the street this issue will only get worse and this type of facility impacts the character of our neighborhood. As homeowners and residents we submitted several letters in opposition because we are the ones who will deal with more cars, more strangers and noise and the daily disruptions.

And this isn't about saying no to the healthcare facility, it's about how many are being allowed so close together in a residential zone. These (indiscernible) will create an over=concentration of such facilities. Please consider the impact on the people who actually live here and I respectfully ask the Board to deny this application and help us protect and preserve the residential character of our neighborhood.

Thank you for your time.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Ms. Sorto. Let's see.

23 Ms. Okolo, is it Okolo? Okolo. Do you hear me?

MS. OKOLO: I can hear you. Can you hear me okay?

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes, I can. Perfectly. Thank you.

Do you want to go ahead and introduce yourself for the record and then you'll also have three minutes as a member of the public and you can begin whenever you like.

MS. OKOLO: Sure. Thank you. Good morning everyone.

My name is Makeda Okolo and I'm a owner resident of 4247 Eads Street, Northeast. I have lived in the neighborhood for the past eight years and I live just three doors down on the same side of the street as the property that we're discussing.

I remain opposed to the application 21240 as currently submitted. I will say that while I continue to remain opposed to the Applicant's request for 16 beds I do support ANC 7F's resolution which calls for ten beds. As you all know we've labored this quite a bit but the developer currently owns another facility which is 500 feet away with only four residents and I continue to be concerned about their inability to demonstrate a capacity to operate at a threshold within their reach and, you know, for me it really calls into question whether or not they can even foresee the potential impacts with the request for Eads Street.

As previously stated I remain concerned about increased traffic, hazardous waste disposal, increased emergency activity as well as a change in the culture and the nature of our neighborhood, as Ms. Sorto mentioned. With respect to parking, I read through their responses and continue to find it really hard to believe that they'll sufficiently manage visitor parking

assuming that all hypothetical 16 patients had residence at the same time. What happens if someone just drives up? They're going to park on the street. They're not going to go through the alley and park in the back and that's going to directly impact me.

2.

I've personally visited this type of facility in a neighborhood before and I've been a part of larger groups where we went in to wish our loved ones happy birthday, so I speak from personal experience as I share what I anticipate being risks associated with visitor use and while I would prefer that this property not be used for this use at all, I would envision that ten beds is more likely to be sufficiently managed. I continue to be concerned about the cumulative impacts associated with two properties within 500 feet of each other plus the halfway house that's across the street and there's just going to be a lot happening.

So I also request that the Applicant receive the shortest possible renewal length to allow the community another opportunity to weigh back in and I hope that anyone who's listening that can have a voice and a say in ensuring enforcement of whatever terms are rendered at the end of this, do that and don't just turn their backs on this and on us, and so I hope that the Commission hears the concerns of the community, the concerns of the ANC and takes it seriously and works to protect us to the maximum extent of your power and your purview.

1	Thank you.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Ms. Okolo.
3	Ms. Sorto, that transitional home is across the street
4	from you?
5	MS. SORTO: It's right on, it's on my right side and
6	4237 is in front of my house.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Okay. Thanks.
8	MS. SORTO: And I just want to add that Ms. Nelson is
9	on the line.
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
11	MS. SORTO: Yes.
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thanks, Ms. Sorto.
13	Does the Board or the Applicant have any questions for
14	the witnesses?
15	(Pause.)
16	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right.
17	I'm going to let the witnesses go. Thank you all for
18	taking the time to be with us.
19	Commissioner Nelson, can you hear me?
20	ANC COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yes, I can. How are you
21	today?
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I'm doing well, thank you. How
23	about yourself?
24	ANC COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'm doing all right.
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Good. You want to just

ANC COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'm in between appointments so I apologize for my tardiness.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: That's all right, Ms. Nelson, I mean Commissioner. I think Commissioner Orendoff and all the stuff that you've put in the record is substantial and enough. But do you want to introduce yourself for the record?

ANC COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yes, I can. My name is Commissioner Nelson and the two proposed applications are bordering my SMD which greatly impacts my residents, and so I'm here to continue to advocate on behalf of our community.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great. Thank you.

All right, Commissioner. And, Commissioner, also if you've got to pop off to another meeting, like, again, I think, you know, we have another Commissioner with us and there's a lot of stuff in the record but you're more than welcome obviously to be with us, even if you go on mute and you need to say something just, you know, unmute yourself and let me know. All right.

So what I'd like to do with my Board members is I wanted to go into an emergency meeting because I wanted to ask legal some advice. However, before I do that I think, Mr. Blake, did you have a question now?

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Mr. Chair, there are a couple of things that I just wanted to get clarification on from an operational perspective at the facility. That could be done after but it would be, for me it would be helpful just to get a

1 sense --CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes. Go ahead, sure. Ask your 2 questions. Please. 3 4 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. The question for the Applicant is could you just 5 6 explain a little bit more about the housekeeping perspective and 7 times, in terms of the timing they'll come and where they'll park 8 and so forth and will they park on the street and enter from 9 that? How many vehicles would you anticipate for that? How many 10 people? Just to get a sense of it, of how the housekeeping would 11 be conducted. 12 MS. WILSON: Sure. 13 Mr. Eyob is on the attendee's list. I can answer part 14 of that question but he would have the most information since the 15 housekeeping already occurs on Clay Street. It's my 16 understanding that yes, a vehicle parks directly in front of the 17 property and then goes in through the front, so it would be street 18 parking. I don't --19 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Young? Is Mr. Eyob around there 20 somewhere? Oh, there we got, I got him. 21 Mr. Eyob, can you hear me and if so, could you introduce 2.2 yourself for the record? 23 MR. EYOB: Good morning. My name is Aaron Eyob. I'm

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

the owner and the Applicant of this case number.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great.

24

25

Mr. Blake, I'm sorry. Did you get your answer from Ms. Wilson?

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: In part, yes. If you could just elaborate a little bit on how that is conducted in terms of housekeeping. Where the housekeeper is parked? The number of vehicles and so forth, how long they're there? I think, as one of the witnesses pointed out you're only at about 50 percent capacity there now. If you could elaborate how that might be different with the scenario of the larger number of residents.

MR. EYOB: So now we have on Clay Street it's actively working. We have parking in the back so we usually use the parking in the morning. So usually the housekeeping come between 6 and 7:30, so they use that spot. Then after that we use that spot for the, the same spot for the visitors. So technically they don't park in the front of the street so we use the parking of the spot for the parking in the back.

And regarding having the four, it's various because we work with Medicare/Medicaid and the hospitals and so it sometimes could be eight, sometimes could be seven, sometimes could be four but it does depend on how short the people stay, how concise. It cannot be dependent on the Applicant or (indiscernible) because it's four today. A couple of months ago a day was eight, nowadays for some of the residents they choose to go to hospital or choose to go to the family member, so it's different. So it cannot be because today we have four, it can be maybe (indiscernible) so

that depend on because we work with the hospitals and some of, we have people. So technically we don't use the street parking.

All of the parking is in the back of the house.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay.

2.

And with regard to the meal delivery services, you don't have a loading zone so I suspect you do, again, come from the front of the building or would that also come from the rear and how would that change, I guess how would that change if it were a larger, would that be sufficient with a larger number of people?

MR. EYOB: No. It's the same because we put them on the schedule timing. They all come also in the back, even the meals and it's almost like getting mail like from UPS or USPS. It would not take a second to drop off the meal and to go, maybe take like ten to fifteen minutes.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Thank you very much.

Those are the questions I had.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thanks, Mr. Blake, and actually now that you mentioned I do have a couple of questions. Okay.

Mr. Eyob, so in the property that you guys are talking about right now, is there any -- you don't have this set up as a facility now, correct? There's not the eight beds or any beds there, correct?

MR. EYOB: It's set up already for 16 beds right now.

1 CHAIRPERSON HILL: No. But I'm saying you're not 2 operating it in any --MR. EYOB: No. 3 CHAIRPERSON HILL: -- way, right? Because the other 4 5 property, it is already operating with eight beds, correct? 6 MR. EYOB: Correct. 7 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So the other property is 8 already, okay. Okay. Sure, hold on one second. 9 Go ahead, Commissioner Orendoff. You're on mute. 10 ANC COMMISSIONER ORENDOFF: Yes. To the Board. asked the developer and the gentleman that's speaking now to just 11 12 give us a tour. So we were denied the tour. We walked around 13 the property before we had our last meeting in May, before our 14 meeting and, you know, I had walked up on the property just a little bit just to look around it. The next day, next couple of 15 16 days we've got a sign up saying no trespassing because when I 17 walked on the property somebody had came out and I knew it was 18 the property because they said it was empty, but when I walked 19 on the property somebody came out. This was supposed to be empty 20 vacant property. But this property had somebody in it. 21 So they came out. They didn't say, and I think they 22 knew it was me because I let them know. I said it's the 23 Commissioner walking around. I told them I'm with the Commission. I even put my face on the ring cam so they could know it was me. 24

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

But they still have yet to let us walk around just to see the

25

set up with the 16 beds. 2 CHAIRPERSON HILL: I got you. I got you, Commissioner. I mean, they don't have to give you a tour of the inside if they 3 don't want to and so, again, like, they're just trying to do 4 5 whatever they're trying to do with their property and so, you 6 know. But I hear you. 7 ANC COMMISSIONER NELSON: Commissioner Hill, can I, I'm 8 sorry. Let me, can I interject real quick? 9 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure. 10 ANC COMMISSIONER NELSON: I don't think the issue is, the issue, I mean it would have been nice to be able to see but 11 12 if you just heard the testimony, they said that it's empty. When 13 they received correspondence from us, they said that there's 14 somebody living there --15 CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right. And --16 ANC COMMISSIONER NELSON: -- that is why we could not see it. 17 18 CHAIRPERSON HILL: That's right. 19 Commissioner Nelson, all I was trying to figure out is 20 whether they're operating currently as this type of facility, and 21 the answer is no. If there's somebody in the house, then there's 22 somebody in the house. But I appreciate it. 23 Mr. Lawson, can you hear me from the Office of Planning, 24 and I saw other people's hands up. Give me a second. 25 (Pause.)

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Lawson? Can he hear me?
2	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Hello?
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Hi. Is this Ms. Brown-Roberts?
4	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: This is Ms. Brown-Roberts.
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Oh, great. Can you introduce
6	yourself Ms. Brown-Roberts?
7	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Hi. This is Maxine Brown-Roberts
8	from the Office of Planning.
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thanks, Ms. Brown-Roberts.
10	Ms. Brown-Roberts, I'm having kind of a lot of trouble
11	with this one. I'm trying to figure out where I am with it,
12	right? And so, you know, you all are recommending approval. You
13	don't think that it's going to meet the issues of adverse impact
14	enough that you guys think that we should deny this. There's
15	the transitional home that's nearby, right? I mean, you guys
16	looked at the transitional home as well, correct? Or thought
17	about it?
18	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: We were informed about the
19	transitional home.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Okay.
21	And so you guys took that into account when you were
22	making your analysis?
23	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. So that's it.
25	Does anybody

1	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: It's a different type of facility.			
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: No, I got it. I 'm just trying to			
3	figure out whether or not the Office of Planning took that into			
4	consideration and you did. Does, I thought Commissioner Stidham,			
5	you had your hand up?			
6	ZC COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: I just wanted to ask the			
7	Applicant a little bit more on the deliveries. That it really			
8	is just housekeeping and food? What about medical supplies and			
9	medications, visits by other doctors that are personal to the			
10	patients?			
11	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Are you talking to me?			
12	ZC COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: No. I'm sorry, Ms. Brown-			
13	Roberts. I was speaking to the Applicant. Apologies.			
14	MR. EYOB: Yes. This residents what we have in place.			
15	They are like anybody else. They still go to the doctor office.			
16	They can still pick up medication their way in the pharmacy so			
17	there is not any impact that somebody would make special visit			
18	for them. So they still make an appointment, they go to dentist,			
19	doctor office or (indiscernible). Just like everybody else that			
20	would ever go to this facility.			
21	ZC COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Okay. Thank you.			
22	MR. EYOB: Thank you.			
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Along those lines, clarify for			
24	me. When a patient is, when a resident is picked up to go to			
25	the facility, do you transport them or do they have some type of			

service that picks them up and if so, is that done in the front and how does that work exactly with the comings and goings of the residents?

2.

MR. EYOB: So they have a made to access for anyone with special need. So they come in the back. We have a handicapped ramp in the back and the parking spot for them, so they access in the back. Every activity is done inside of the property.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Thank you very much.

I have a question for the ANC Commissioner as well and this question is, you arrived at the number of ten. The Applicant is seeking permission for 16. Can you talk a little bit about how you determine the number ten would mitigate the impact versus sixteen? I just (indiscernible) how you determined ten is the right number.

ANC COMMISSIONER NELSON: Commissioner Orendoff, do you want me to or do you want to talk about that?

ANC COMMISSIONER ORENDOFF: Defer to you, Commissioner

19 Nelson.

ANC COMMISSIONER NELSON: Okay

So we've had some long discussions with the community members as well as kind of just reviewed some of the discussions that you all had as a Commission about this situation. So recognizing that the Applicant is entitled to eight beds legally, without our consent or your, you know, any type of zoning

requirements, they're going to operate whether we agree with it or not, right?

2.

2.2

I think that the conversations that we had to have with the community and also just requesting the information the Board has shared through their questioning is what is something that, how do we compromise with also being fair to the current character of the community and not overwhelming them with commercialized spaces in their community in a residential area?

And so with the granting of two per resident we felt like, 1) it is giving you beyond the eight that you're, you know, entitled to but also staying true to the residential feel of the space and also being able to have a conversation with, you know, coming up with what kind of operation procedures and parking. We can have a voice about with, you know, the Applicant and their representatives where we've had some difficulty being able to build a rapport with them.

The other piece is that, you know, I know you didn't ask about this but I do want to reiterate. They're asking for ten years. I think that's a little obsessive and we're asking for five to, you know, just be able to build rapport and relations for them to show us that they are actually a part of the community and not just coming in and commercializing our community.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Thank you.

I do believe, Commissioner, that the Applicant in today's hearing said seven years and I did reference the ten

initially. But Ms. Wilson did say seven in today's session which is closer to your five.

2.

2.2

I have one last question for the Applicant. That question is, can you please tell me, again, and I know we've talked about this a little before, the process by whereby you the licensing and the authorization to have 16 beds as and to the extent where you stand currently in that process for approval and the likelihood of the permission for 16 beds. Have you seen that structure previously and is that something that the Department of Health typically authorizes?

MR. EYOB: Correct. So we have a meeting with the DOB and the Department of Health, DOH, so they are informed of understanding having 16 beds and they did all the work doing the property to determine if that's a fit with the neighborhood also. So they are waiting for approval from BZA zoning.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Sorry. You're saying they have reviewed it and they're waiting for BZA approval?

MR. EYOB: Yes. Because we have, we can get a license as a matter-of-right for eight but since they make initial visit in our discussion and meeting with them, we are intending to apply for 16. So they know that the process to go to the BZA, so they are waiting for this process to happen.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Do you know that, did you get an indication of their comfort level with 16, either DOB or DOH?

MR. EYOB: Correct.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: You've got a, they did say if we approve it they feel, they would be comfortable with that?

MR. EYOB: Correct.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Do you have anything that documents that or explains that or anything like that?

MR. EYOB: We did a walkthrough with them. Before you sign the initial application, you can request a walkthrough with them. They will come, they will send an inspector. They measure the (indiscernible), they see the ability (phonetic), so that's why from our initial meeting. But I don't know if we can specifically ask them to provide us document.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Commissioner Stidham?

ZC COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Sorry. Another question for the Applicant related to parking, and I know we've, like, been talking to death about four parking spaces but the math isn't really adding up for me.

So you have three staff people. You're going to use one of those spaces for visitors during the visitor hours. However, you're also going to use that space for meal deliveries, housekeeping, and for pick-up of individuals who need to go to doctor's appointments. So all of that could coalesce at the same time, leaving the fact that you need more than four parking spaces because of that fact. I mean, you could have two individuals

who are going to the doctor at the same time and you already have a conflict with also a visitor coming in.

2.

So help me better understand how you've thought this through to make four parking spaces work without impacting the neighborhood.

MR. EYOB: So per the DOB requirement or the DOH requirement is only need two staff on-site all the time for 16 residents. So the third staff is as a back-up, so it could be flexible, it could be part time, could be on and off. So that space is still going to be available to use to anybody the access ability, whoever want to go to the doctor's office or want to deliver or any other, so the two is maximum to have two staff all the time but the third one is an extra person.

MS. WILSON: And then two. So I don't think it would be an adverse impact if housekeeping services and meal delivery services had to park on the street for a very limited amount of time, as specified in the conditions. The conditions don't specify where housekeeping and meal delivery services are going to take place, but the housekeeping services and meal delivery services could be part of a single family home. It could be part of an eight residents facility or a ten residents facility.

And so I think what Mr. Eyob is saying is likely in the course of things they'll have an extra spot there but I don't think that should be a condition that the meal delivery and housekeeping services have to park there. Just adding that in.

I don't think it's an adverse impact compared to the by-right scenario, I guess.

ZC COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: And putting in, you know, also I believe you said trash pick-up daily from six to something which is also the same time frame for the meal delivery and the housekeeping. So having, that's a lot happening all about the same time period.

MS. WILSON: Right. I think the trash pick-up would occur at a similar time frame that typical trash pick-up would and we can reduce the trash pick-up if you think it's too much going on. We just heard concerns about trash so that was to mitigate trash.

ZC COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: No, I'm just --

MS. WILSON: Yeah.

2.

ZC COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: -- I'm not suggesting, I mean you're going to need daily trash pick-up because you can't have it hanging out in the alley. But what I'm trying to better understand is that a lot of these things you have timed off to be at the same time or within the same time period.

MS. WILSON: Sure.

ZC COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: So I'm just trying to understand how you thought this business through and being able to accommodate all of that around the same period of time in addition to the other things that are happening in the house, the housekeeping, meal delivery, the trash pick-up, the visitation,

people going to the doctor, et cetera.

MS. WILSON: Sure.

2.

So we have a visitor policy and I'll defer to Mr. Eyob to talk about how this actually occurs because there's pretty big windows here. The housekeeping services shall take place in the morning between the hours of 6 a.m. and 11 a.m., and, again, we're happy to more narrowly tailor it. We had a condition that said 7 a.m. to 9 a.m. and then we can have the meal delivery service before 7 a.m. But when we put that into the last set of conditions it was deemed too narrow.

So we're happy to revise the conditions so that the meal delivery service and housekeeping won't overlap, although I don't think that's likely to occur and, again, Aaron, does that often happen where you have the meal delivery service, trash and housekeeping services taking place at the exact same time? Like at 7:15 a.m.?

MR. EYOB: No. The meals would take, like, between ten to fifteen minutes between drop-off so would not take any time. The housekeeping will follow but everybody's on a schedule to come on that day so they know what exactly the time is.

ZC COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Okay. I'm just, I was just trying to understand the choreography and how you approach this. So, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great.

Mr. Eyob, I have just one final question. You guys,

the other facility is functioning with eight people, correct? 2 MR. EYOB: Correct. CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. And there's, I think there's 3 4 a bunch of other applications that you have coming down with us. 5 Is that the only property that you're currently operating is this 6 type of facility, or are some of the others also being operated 7 at the eight person level? 8 MR. EYOB: No, that's the only one. 9 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So all the other ones haven't 10 been opened yet? MR. EYOB: Not yet. 11 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Okay. Okay. 12 13 Anybody have any final questions before I do a little 14 emergency meeting here? 15 Go ahead, Mr. Blake. 16 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: I just want to make sure I can 17 confirm your site selection process. What exactly is the criteria 18 that you use to determine the sites that you want to put these facilities in? 19 20 MR. EYOB: This site. We owned this site for a couple 21 of years and we've been developing them to this level slowly but 22 it's not like right away we got them. They've been existing with Actually we, Clay Street since 2018 and Eads Street 2017, 23 24 so we've been holding these properties building them slowly to 25 this level.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: So they're purchased as, they're being repurposed for this and it's not like you chose these particular neighborhoods because it fit well with particular criteria for your -- it just happened to be the places that you have?

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

MR. EYOB: Initially we had a meeting with the Health Department. There's а meeting there between those (indiscernible) assisted living for resident and most of the residents have been pushing back to another state. So that's our initially discussion with the Health Department. We reached out to them. We asked them where is the need, so they forecast this area is more need and more resident need help to be close to their family members, to if they go out their colleague they can be able to visit them. For example, for Clay Street the resident they have visitors and their family members which is evident to assisting with time (phonetic) of life.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. Okay.

As Chairperson for the Board of Adjustment for the District of Columbia in accordance with Section 407 of the District of Columbia Administrative Procedures Act, I move that the Board of Zoning Adjustment hold a closed emergency meeting on 6/4/2025 for the purposes of seeking legal advice from our counsel on case No. 21240 and/or deliberate upon but not vote on case No. 21240 for the reasons cited in D.C. Official Code Section

1	2-575(b)(13).		
2	Is there a second? Mr. Blake?		
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Second.		
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Madam Secretary, could you please		
5	take a roll call?		
6	MS. MEHLERT: Please respond to the Chair's motion to		
7	hold an emergency closed meeting with legal counsel.		
8	Chairman Hill?		
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Oh, yes. I'm sorry.		
10	MS. MEHLERT: Vice Chair Blake?		
11	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Yes.		
12	MS. MEHLERT: Mr. Smith?		
13	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Yes.		
14	MS. MEHLERT: Commissioner Stidham?		
15	ZC COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.		
16	MS. MEHLERT: Motion passes four to zero to one.		
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.		
18	I hereby give notice that the Board of Zoning		
19	Adjustment will recess this proceeding on this date at 10:59 a.m.		
20	to hold a closed meeting pursuant to District of Columbia		
21	Administrative Procedures Act. A written copy of this notice		
22	will be posted in the Jerrily R. Kress Memorial Hearing Room at		
23	this time.		
24	Okay. You guys, we're going to jump on to another call		
25	and we'll come back. Thank you.		

1	(Whereupon, there was a recess for an emergency closed		
2	meeting with legal counsel.)		
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Madam Secretary, want to call		
4	us back in.		
5	MS. MEHLERT: The Board is back from its emergency		
6	closed meeting with legal counsel and is returning to Application		
7	No. 21240.		
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great.		
9	Does the Board have any final, what I'm going to ask		
10	do we still have Commissioner Orendoff?		
11	(Pause.)		
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Or then Commissioner Nelson maybe?		
13	ANC COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'm here.		
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great.		
15	ANC COMMISSIONER ORENDOFF: I'm here also. Sorry, I		
16	was on a conference call but I told them I'll call you guys back.		
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.		
18	So real quick, Commissioner Orendoff and Commissioner		
19	Nelson, I'm just going to ask for a summary. I mean, do you all		
20	have anything that you'd like to leave us with at the end here?		
21	ANC COMMISSIONER ORENDOFF: Well, my concerns (audio		
22	interference)		
23	(Pause.)		
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I lost Commissioner Orendoff.		
25	Commissioner Nelson		

ANC COMMISSIONER ORENDOFF: -- and that's because, again, as the ANC Commissioner, oh. Am I back in?

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yeah, you're back in.

ANC COMMISSIONER ORENDOFF: Okay.

No I stand with my constituents against this but because it's already on the table and it's been going through the motions with the city and Department of Health and all that, I know where we are. But just the fact that some of the constituents have come on and their concerns, just the young lady just talking about somebody blocking her parking, like with just the one that's there already, I hope you guys consider the constituents. That's all my heart is about, my people.

I love Clay Street. AME Church is there where I grew up at and to see that turn into anything but a nice residential cluster of streets from 42nd to 44th the way they've always been, you know, I would just like -- I will be walking through as these facilities start to operate and I can do my Commissioner report because, again, the same concerns that you guys were having as a Commission in reference to delivery, parking, just everything that they just proposed on the table that, to me, on that street is just going to be a problem with 16 beds, okay?

Bringing it down to ten beds, I think that should be the threshold and the five year is where I stand with my colleagues.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Nelson? Anything else?

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

ANC COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yeah. I just echo what Commissioner Orendoff said. I think that having our residents come in, our constituents come in every single meeting to show that they're very passionate about, you know, what happens in our community. We really hope that you take that into account as well as the resolution that we submitted in response to the Applicant and their representatives.

I do want to also just note a comment that was made earlier by the, through the Planning Office, the woman, I'm sorry I missed her name. But she came in and she said took in consideration that the halfway house was there but you can go back into the previous recordings and listen and they did not take that halfway house into consideration when they made their recommendation initially because they testified and said that it wasn't required because it's two different facilities.

So I do want to, you know, just again reiterate that, know, this is а residential community and the you commercialization of it is becoming over-saturated in that space, and whatever considerations you all take into account appreciate you all taking the time out of your schedules to, you know, continue to ask important questions to the Applicant as well as us and the community members and, you know, reiterating it.

If you do decide to grant we're going to ask for no

more than ten beds in each residence and for five years. I know there was a discussion for seven years, you know, my stance is no more than five years, just to kind of really see if this, you know, (audio interference) model is fit for our community.

Thank you for your time.

2.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. All right.

Ms. Wilson, do you have anything you'd like to add at the end?

MS. WILSON: I do have something brief.

The main thing I'd like to address is we've heard a lot about this being a commercial use and the use is residential in nature. Even in the zoning regulations it's a residential use category. It's permitted for up to eight by-right. It's intended to benefit the neighborhood and the residents. We want it to feel like a home for the residents and the residents in the area so that they can continue to attend their own churches and doctors in the area that they currently live, but just with some help and not have to move out of the District as not everyone can afford to stay here, you know, as they become seniors in a market rate apartment.

And I'll add that the home will appear to be a home. It's not going to be changed. It's not going to appear to be a commercial facility. The intent is not to bring a business to the neighborhood but to address a need, as Mr. Eyob testified to.

Thank you for all of your time and for all of your work

1	on this. We	e really appreciate it.
2	CH	HAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. Okay.
3	Cc	ommissioner Stidham, I forget. You've got to leave
4	at noon?	
5	ZC	C COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: I have some flexibility. I'm
6	good.	
7	CH	HAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
8	Sc	what I want to do is I want to take a five minute
9	break and t	hen we'll come back. Okay? So I'm closing this
10	hearing. I	'm closing the record and we're going to come back
11	and delibera	ate in five minutes.
12	Th	nank you.
13	(W	Whereupon, there was a brief recess.)
14	CH	HAIRPERSON HILL: Madam Secretary can you call us back
15	in when you	get a chance and the case and wherever we are.
16	MS	S. MEHLERT: The Board is returning from a quick break
17	and is retur	rning to Application No. 21240.
18	CH	HAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thanks. Okay.
19	Sc	I appreciate the opportunity to have been able to
20	talk with (OZLD about some of the legal issues around this
21	particular o	case. I'm going to kind of talk through some of my
22	thoughts and	d then turn it over to you all and see where you all
23	are.	
24	Ar	nd some of the things that have been brought up are
25	suggestions	that, or things that we had kind of thought about
	1	

when we were talking to Legal and so if I take credit for some of the suggestions, please you guys let me know if it was your suggestion and you all can take credit for it.

2.

I'm referring back to the conditions page that is in Exhibit 56. So, again, to summarize we had a lot of hearing, a lot of testimony. I appreciate the ANC coming forward and participating to the level that they've participated in. I appreciate the community actually taking so much interest in this case and I hope that the community understands that we're doing our best to take into consideration all of the things that are being put before us and, you know, we're District residents, volunteers more or less as well and so, you know, we're just trying to do our civic duty, if you will, to kind of work through these cases.

So I was kind of, I didn't know where I was, right? And I was even maybe more a no than anything and just saying go ahead and do your eight beds by-right. But what some of my colleagues had mentioned in previous parts of the hearing was that if this were an eight bed facility by-right there is no conditions that would be there. They would do whatever they wanted to do and could do whatever they wanted to do. So there was some benefit to having conditions so that the community would have some kind of input on what was going on there, right?

So the application that is before us is for a 16 bed facility, right? I don't think that the Board necessarily, it

can, but I don't think we necessarily have a place -- I don't feel comfortable messing with what's before us. You either vote it up or you vote it down, right, in terms of the number of beds, right? So we're kind of talking about, at least in my mind, we're talking about the 16 beds and whether or not we think the 16 beds are going to have an adverse impact to the point that it should be denied or are conditions possible that could possibly make it palatable and we can see what happens in terms of the adverse impact under zoning.

2.

I'm going to cut to the chase which is going to kind of make me able to vote in favor of this if we get to all this. There was the time limit that got thrown out there, right? At one point it was ten years, at one point it was seven years, at one point the ANC wanted five years. I think it was Vice Chair Blake who also suggested a community liaison.

So a community liaison would be somebody who would be, somebody who is a representative of the Applicant and they would go once a quarter to an ANC meeting. So they would have to come once a quarter, check in, hear what the ANC has to say and see how things are going if this were to pass and then they would get feedback, right? If there was a time limit then the Applicant would have to come back before the BZA and the community would also get a chance to then see how it was going, right?

Again, this is something that I will agree with what the Applicant put forward. It's a residential use, right? The

hope is that these are people that are in the community that now have a place to stay, right, and age there in the community. That is what is the thought and you all can talk about it as much as you want to talk about it because I didn't think I was going to talk this long and I still have a lot more things to say.

So I've been conflicted with all of this because, again, the point is people need a place to go and supposedly this is a need that the Health Department or whatever it is that determine whether or not it's the right size for things or whether things are, you know, kept up to date, you know, that is with experts that are in a different area that should be looking out for the health and wellbeing of the people that are there and so if they think that two people fit in one of those rooms as opposed to one person being out on the street or somewhere else, I don't know. Right? That's beyond me. And so that's something that DOB will determine, again, whether or not the facility is capable of handling the 18 people. We're trying to think whether or not the adverse impacts of the 18 people are outside of zoning.

While I continue to struggle with this and I think it was Commissioner Stidham who pointed out, again, there's a transitional home, there will be this facility and then there will be another facility that is what is the next deliberation all within 500 feet. So that's where, again, I'm kind of torn, right? You have the Office of Planning that has done their analysis. DDOT, Transportation Department, has done their

analysis. DDOT has said this is fine. There's not going to be any adverse impacts to the transportation. DDOT has blessed this. So supposedly the experts with transportation have said yes. This is fine, right? You got the four parking spaces, all that stuff, right? So DDOT, Office of Planning, they've given us their expertise as to why they think this works and we're now trying to figure out if we're comfortable with it and what conditions we might put in place that make it something we're comfortable with.

2.

So to me, again, the community liaison puts something on the Applicant to have to deal with the ANC, right, and give feedback. Then it's the term, right? The term, I mean I'm kind of torn on the term to be quite honest. I mean, I think, you know, if the ANC is going to get their 16 beds and if the 16 beds go to the other one as well and if these conditions kind of go down I think the five years, which some discussion has been, it may sit more difficult for the Applicant but they I guess could go back to eight beds if they wanted to and not even do the --so I'm stuck between five and seven years, whether it's six years, five years, seven years. I mean, to me, the ANC asked for five years, I guess we can go ahead and see if that's something that they were suggesting.

I say that again because the hope is, is if they come back in five years and this thing gets up and running in five years and the Applicant proves that this is a community benefit,

people are there, they're, you know, providing benefit to the people that need this, the ANC should be in support and there would be no time limit after that. You know, they've established themselves, right?

2.

So now to go through the conditions, and I'm going to turn it over to Mr. Smith, then Mr. Blake, then Commissioner Stidham to add anything else. For me, it seems the conditions 1, 2 and 3 that are in Exhibit 56 are understandable and I can get behind. Condition No. 4 I found to be difficult to understand how that is creating really an adverse impact for the community meaning also, you know, who gets to come, when they get to come.

I think there was some discussion about, you know, if a church group comes, you know, and wants to have caroling or something in the winter, you know, do we really want to be putting ourselves in a situation where we're trying to get into the minutia of how this business is being operated to best serve their patients, right?

So I'm of the, you know, just strike the visitor policy all together because they're going to have to meet with the ANC every, four times a year and there's going to be a five year time limit. So they're going to have to figure out this visitor policy stuff and it seems to me, again, that I don't want to, again, want to get involved in whether or not somebody has their family member coming over and how many times. I mean, it just sounds way too institutionalized for me to kind of figure that out. But

we'll see how that one goes for you guys.

Conditions 5 and 6 seem reasonable and understandable. So I will be fine with 5 and 6.

No. 7, and I do appreciate the Office of Zoning if this order does get written helping us determine how to word this, but No. 7 having some kind of, I guess it was flexibility with the trash because this has to be somehow, what's the word, adhered to, right? There has to be, somebody has to watch this if this would actually to take place so I mean it seems a little, the window seems a little bit tight and so, you know, maybe you go from seven to nine, seven to ten, I don't know. We can kind of talk about that if that's where we get with this discussion, what some of (indiscernible), or maybe six to ten, I'm sorry, six to ten window for the trash.

No. 8. You know, there's a fence that I think we need more specificity on in terms of if, you know, what kind of fence. So, like, you know, we could say it's a solid fence six feet in the rear so that that was as per zoning, so to protect the privacy of the rear yard. So that's, again, something that you all can talk me through as we go through this if we get to where we get to.

No. 9. I think as was kind of suggested, like, daylight hours might be for outdoor activities, right? I mean, again, these are people that are supposedly in their final years, you know, and so if they want to hang out until sunset, I mean that

sounds like, anyway. So I thought the daily, the light thing, the daylight was a nice suggestion and, again, I don't think the signs are necessary because, you know, people if they want to smoke, I guess they, you know, if they're 85-years-old smoke a cigarette, you know. And so, you know, anyway. So I have a little bit of a problem with that and so that's with the daylight hours and then, right.

2.

2.2

Then the community liaison, so the community liaison would be another thing and then the term limit. So that's kind of where some of the sticking points that maybe we can walk through and/or at least I've expressed my thoughts as to how I've gotten here and I want to, again, specify to the community, like, you know, we're here tasked here to see whether it fits within zoning and what the adverse impacts are, and the struggle that I've continued to have with this is that, again, this is supposedly a community facility that's helping the community with people that need a place to go at market rate, and so that's how this thing is even kind of working out. I mean, obviously it's a business but also it's supposed to be a business helping people. So that's where I get kind of confused as to what my expertise is and somebody else's expertise. So I think I've finished talking.

Mr. Smith, may I turn it to you?

COMMISSIONER SMITH: Yeah, that was a lot.

You know, I agree with most of what you said regarding

this. We've been discussing this for a couple of weeks regarding the special exception nature of this particular case. I am comfortable with the application with reasonable conditions to mitigate some of the adverse zoning impacts and it sounds like while I understand that the ANC is uncomfortable with it, they have changed their position and said that they would support it with the conditions given that this use can operate as a matter-of-right, it is considered a residential use. It can operate as a matter-of-right with eight individuals. I think the requested special exception would give them some material control on affecting some of these adverse impacts that they would get regardless, such as, you know, the additional traffic that would occur.

2.

I, like you, and, again, I think we need to tie this down with conditions, I, like you, am comfortable with in Exhibit 56 conditions 1, 2 and 3. The property owner, the Applicant is proposing four parking spaces and they're proposing that those parking spaces will be dedicated in a particular way three to staff, one to a visitor. I do think that that attempt to control, you know, some of the traffic impacts and as you stated, DDOT is comfortable with this application that it would, as presented, mitigate some of these traffic impacts that would occur.

So I'm comfortable with those three conditions. One of the sticky wickets is this fourth condition that talks about the visitor policy and parking. I, like you, am comfortable with

adjusting that condition to probably dawn to dusk, sun up, sun down, however we want to word that and as opposed to hours because the type of sunlight changes throughout the year. So I think I'm comfortable with modifying the condition to speak to sun up to sundown. I think that was the recommendation.

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

I'm fine with the condition about housekeeping which The condition about meal delivery. The condition is No. 5. regard, No. 7 regarding trash pick-up. I'm mostly comfortable with that condition trash pick-up shall occur six times per week Monday through Saturday within the enclosure as specified within the plat in Exhibit 26A. I'm fine with that particular condition. No. 8, I think we probably need to adjust that. I think we just need to state, and this is regarding the privacy fence, we just need to state that the Applicant shall construct and maintain a six foot solid privacy fence enclosing the rear yard. Not tie it to Exhibit 21G because I don't think they give that level of specificity. That just says the color and type of fence that it is, not necessarily the height. So I think we don't need to tie it to an exhibit, just say they shall maintain a six foot solid fence enclosing the rear yard.

The question about daily activities. I think that we, and I welcome hearing from the rest of my Board members, some of this I think does not address adverse zoning impacts, I think it's too broad in scope. But I do think the first part of the condition that speaks to daily activities occurring between

certain hours, that is a reasonable condition and maybe we should tie that to the visiting hours. Maybe that should be also dawn to dusk in some way, shape or form.

The term limit. I am comfortable with the recommendation of the ANC to have a five year term. I believe they'll be able to get this up and running within that time frame and they can come back and we can modify the condition and leave within five years. But I want to acknowledge the concerns of the neighborhood by recommending their five year condition.

I also support adding a condition that you stated that would require a liaison attend ANC meetings or have regular dialog with the City League and the neighborhood, not the City League, the ANC. Sorry, wrong jurisdiction. The ANC, going forward the concerns or questions that the ANC may have going forward. So I am comfortable with that condition as well.

And with those conditions where we land I will support the application.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Mr. Smith.

Vice Chair Blake?

2.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: I largely agree with the comments that both you and Board member Smith made on this issue. I do support the application with conditions because I believe the Applicant has met the burden of proof. I'm not sure about the internal functioning of this facility is within the purview of the Board, as you pointed out, and I would leave that to the

expert bodies such as DOB and DOH to sort through those matters.

Our concern, like you said, is really with the potential impact on neighboring properties and I generally agree with the Office of Planning's analysis and conclusion, but I believe additional conditions are necessary to avoid the adverse impacts but most importantly to make sure of the compatibility with the surrounding residential environment and that kind of meets the overriding thing to ensure the compatibility with the surrounding residential environment. And I acknowledge the fact that the regulations do not necessarily fully capture the institutional impact of other properties that are uses, that do not fall within this exact category and I do think that is something that, you know, for future reference could be addressed.

But I do think that the Applicant has met the burden that with the proper conditions and time frame will give the Applicant an opportunity to refine the business model such that with the community input such that it is a palatable solution for the community and a good business strategy. So I think together given the fact that the Chairman mentioned if this is a needed service, we just got to figure out how to make it work within the context of the community and be sensitive to community needs.

So the ANC has identified a bunch of issues, the traffic, density, parking, commercialization, hazardous waste, facility's operating conditions, all those sorts of things and

he heard opposition from express traffic, issues about traffic noise, loitering and safety and risk, and I do think that, you know, we've addressed all those issues. As you pointed out, you know, the Applicant's asking for 16, a capacity of 16. Again, expert bodies can determine if that's right or not. I do believe, and I understand the ANC's desire for ten, but I don't think the ANC really did provide any evidence to really support that reduction to that number. So, you know, I too have some concerns but I'm going to have to leave it up to DOB and DOH to determine what's right and appropriate for that.

2.

I agree with all the conditions that we talked about. On the visitor policy I think, Mr. Chairman, you talked about striking that provision completely and, Mr. Smith, I think you had talked about the dawn to dusk approach similar to the outside, you said outside properties. I believe a good balance here is to allow for visiting hours maybe a little, maybe a different window for visiting hours, you know, after the minutia of the day, the trash collection, all that kind of stuff, and service is done maybe extending into early evening.

So I am comfortable that maybe it's, I don't know, we can talk about it, service ten to or eleven to nine or something like that. But at some type of window that allows for visitors and I definitely have issues with limiting the number of visitors that come because I think it's important that, you know, people have a life and in you're in a convalescing situation it's nice

to have family visit, and I see (indiscernible) to restrict that.

I have no issues with the housekeeping. Meal delivery provisions nor the trash pick-up. I do believe that there is screening that's provided for that with the roll down track in the garage door at the back and, again, the window for that could be, you know, at any point during the course of the morning. But I do think it's important that all the activities are staged in such a way that they really don't substantially conflict.

With regard to the privacy fence, I agree that more specificity on that is appropriate and Board member Smith, I think you completely suggested the exact measurements for that and the surrounding rear yard. Obviously the fence should be consistent with a residential appearance so as not to distract.

There was also an issue that the ANC actually brought up about hazard material waste, hazard material disposal. Again, I would leave that up to the appropriate agencies to deal with that. But to the extent that that is on the front porch, perhaps maybe provide some type of screening to, again, create more of a residential (indiscernible) for the residential character.

Condition 9. Again, I would agree with your assessment that during daylight hours is appropriate given the fact that daylight hours vary substantially and who would not want to have the opportunity to be outside during, you know, the summer hours when the sun's out for a little longer. I would be hard pressed to limit that to eight to five.

So, and then the signage. You know, to me actually the signage I think it's an interesting approach. Maybe there could be a policy that the facility suggest that the residents (audio interference), but as far as signage having signs around that says don't sit, don't do, don't do, does not feel residential to me. If I had posted signs all over the place it would seem like I'm in an institutional environment and I think that signs like that are probably not that attractive unless they're hidden, but if they're hidden you can't see them. So I think that that's, you know, I'm not in big support of having signage all over the place. And, again, I am very much supportive of the liaison. I believe that this will allow us to have the relationship, the interaction between the community and the facility to try to come up with a, ultimately come up with a solution that makes sense.

Now, we talked about the term being, you know, five, seven, ten years. The more I think about it I like the idea of the liaison and I like the idea of a short term because I do think that this can be resolved in a way but you need to be interacting to do it and I think the liaison meeting quarterly does that, facilitates the interaction and the fact that we have a relatively short time limit of five years means we'll get this figured out sooner rather than later. There's no reason to drag out bad practices for seven or ten years. Let's get this thing on track so that, as the Chairman pointed out, we can just be done with a time limit and we can come up with conditions that

really do apply because frankly we haven't had these things to deal with in the past.

And with that I would, again, be in support of the application.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.

Commissioner Stidham?

2.

ZC COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: So that's been a lot and I generally agree with the comments of all the other Board members have made. And I too am prepared to support with conditions and to ensure compatibility with the neighborhood.

I will say that I was not supportive of this at all and really felt that it should be denied. But I think that the conditions and the reasons that Chairman Hill brought up related to ensuring the compatibility with the neighborhood and that these conditions are a much better way of ensuring that than denying it and allowing for the matter-of-right use without any conditions around it. I don't feel that provides sufficient protections for the neighborhood and truly does not give a sense of compatibility.

Moving through them, you know, I agree that the capacity is, that's not our decision to make, that another body makes that decision and then hoping that they make the right decision based on the size of this particular residential unit and will make the right decisions there.

And I'm good with 2 in the parking spaces, 2 and 3

related to parking spaces. I completely agree about 4 with Board member Blake making them more hospitable hours to allow for visitation and to let the rest go. Something, sort of visiting hours between ten and nine or eleven and nine to allow family members to after their daily work and ensuring that people that are residents here do get the visitation as they are living here. This is where they live.

2.

2.2

I'm fine with housekeeping. I'm fine with meal deliveries, trash collection. As to the fence I completely agree with Board member Smith's recommendations for language around the fence, to be very explicit about the expectations and not depend on what is currently there. And also agree with Board member Blake in relation to the outdoor activities and the daily hours to be compatible with the summer and the change of time frankly throughout the year when it's daylight at different hours of the day to allow that time.

And then wholeheartedly agree with the idea of having, requiring a liaison and for the term limit five years to give the facility time to get up and going and to be in working with the community to ensure it's compatible and that issues are dealt with in a timely fashion and not allowed to fester and become a problem for the neighborhood.

So I think that is everything and prepared to support with those added conditions.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.

I'm going to try to make a motion and work through the conditions and you all can help me if I get, and we can decide as we go along. I again mention that this has been I think a very difficult decision for the Board and so the Applicant should realize that this actually has taken us a lot of time and so the fact that they're even here at this point, I want to reiterate that a few of us, myself included, and I guess Commissioner Stidham was going to vote no and so the Applicant can decide whether they want to move forward with the application the way it is with the conditions or do what they need to do as a matter-of-right.

So, yeah. And then to the ANC, again, you know, hopefully the five years you all come back with a positive report the next time they're here, right, and it's working out and it is actually a community benefit, so there we go. All right.

I'm going to make a motion to approve Application No. 21240 as captioned and read by the secretary, including the conditions that are in Exhibit 56 as I'm about to go through them.

Conditions 1, 2 and 3 are fine the way they are.

Condition 4, what I would propose and I appreciate OZLD kind of following me along on this one because we're going to have a little bit of a discussion here. I'm still kind of stuck on the, I was going to strike it, right? And then because, and I kind of like the same thing that we're going to do with the

outdoor activities which is dawn to dusk. I mean, I understand 1 what you guys are saying as, like, the services that are going on with housekeeping and meal delivery and all that that's happening in the morning, but to me what if people can't come until, like, you know, when it's sunrise to see your loved one. I mean, it's not like there's going to be a ton of people there every day, right? And so they just come at seven, they see their loved one and then leave, right, before work. And so my vote 9 would be, again, that dawn to dusk is the visiting hours. 10

Is everyone okay with that?

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ZC COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: I just, for those who can only visit after working hours I worry that dusk, you know, in the winter dusk is 5:30.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: True. So then you want to do 7 a.m. 14 15 to 9 p.m.?

> ZC COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes

That's fine. COMMISSIONER SMITH:

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Visiting hours will be 7 a.m. to 9 p.m. and all the other stuff they're just going to have to figure out during the liaison part and the time limit. So visiting hours would 7 a.m. to 9 p.m. Okay.

Then Nos. 5 and 6 seem fine.

No. 7 is about the trash and when trash should be picked up and I think we're going to mention, 1) that the hazardous materials, if they are to be placed outside, will be screened,

1	and then the trash pick-up hours will be from, like, I don't want
2	to say six to eleven. I have to be realistic. My trash doesn't
3	get picked up until, like, noon, right, some days, right? And
4	so, you know, just so they're compliant I would say, you want to
5	say six to eleven or what do you all think about the hours? I
6	mean, I'm kind of making a joke. Like, literally my trash gets
7	picked up sometimes at one, two, I mean I don't have any control
8	as to when the trash gets picked up, right?
9	ZC COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Well, they're hiring a
10	private company, right? I don't know if that changes the control.
11	But anyway, I would agree to give it a little bit more flexibility
12	to ensure that it's happening.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Let's do six to eleven is the trash
14	window. Okay? And the hazardous material will be screened.
15	No. 8. They will have a solid six foot fence in the
16	rear yard to enclose the rear yard, and that's No. 8.
17	ZC COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: I would just add solid, six
18	foot solid.
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Right. Six foot solid fence
20	enclosing the rear yard. So what I understand it's rear yard,
21	that means if it's the rear yard. It's not the front yard, it's
22	the rear yard, right, and that means whenever, you know, it kind
23	of encircles the rear yard, correct? That's what we're saying?
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Would it include the side

yard?

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yeah. It would be the side yards,
2	like the front of the rear yard, the side of the rear yard and
3	the back of the rear yard.
4	Is that what you were saying, Mr. Smith?
5	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Yes.
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Right.
7	So there will be an enclosure. There will be a six
8	foot high solid fence enclosing the rear yard which means, again,
9	from the front of the rear yard, the sides of the rear yard and
10	the back of the rear yard. The front yard is the front yard,
11	but the rear yard. Okay? Okay. So that's that one.
12	No. 9.
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Mr. Chairman?
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Would that include the side
16	yards as well?
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yeah. The side yards of the rear
18	yard if that is clear. I don't know.
19	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: So not the side yard?
20	COMMISSIONER SMITH: You're saying we probably need to
21	play with the wording on that. But I think OZLD, I think they
22	get our point on that one. Enclosing the side yard, the rear
23	and side yard behind the front façade.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yeah. Whatever, like, I think OZLD
25	will be able to hopefully figure I'm just saying, like, again,

1	I don't think they need to have side yard fencing all the way up
2	and down the side yards. We're trying to enclose the rear yard
3	is what I understood the thing to be. So, like, whatever the
4	rear yard ends up being, that needs to be enclosed with a six
5	foot solid fence.
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. (Indiscernible)
7	certainty, absolutely.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Then the daily outdoor activities
9	will be from sun up to sundown, okay? That's daily outdoor
10	activities which are different than the visiting hours.
11	There will be a community liaison that will meet once
12	a quarter with the ANC to report on activities and get feedback.
13	And then the final condition is that there would be a
14	five year term. Am I missing anything? Okay. I'm then going
15	to ask for a second.
16	Mr. Blake?
17	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Second.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. The motion has been made and
19	seconded. Madam Secretary, take a roll call, please.
20	MS. MEHLERT: Please respond to the Chair's motion to
21	approve the application with conditions.
22	Chairman Hill?
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
24	MS. MEHLERT: Vice Chair Blake?
25	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Yes.

1	MS. MEHLERT: Mr. Smith?
2	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Yes.
3	MS. MEHLERT: Commissioner Stidham?
4	ZC COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.
5	MS. MEHLERT: Staff would record the vote as four to
6	zero to one to approve Application 21240 with conditions, on the
7	motion made by Chairman Hill and seconded by Vice Chair Blake.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.
9	Commissioner Stidham, I didn't think there was any way
10	we were going to get to 12:30.
11	ZC COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: No worries, no worries. I
12	built in some flexibility. Thank you.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. Okay.
14	See you later, Commissioner Stidham.
15	ZC COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: All right. Bye bye. You
16	guys have a good day.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right. And Commissioner Miller
18	is there. So now I'm looking to what you all want to do. I
19	mean, I'd love to just get through this as quickly as we can but
20	maybe we take a little snack break and try to eat a snack, or do
21	you just want to go and take, like, I was going to say let's take
22	a 15 minute break. If you've got some crackers, go eat some
23	crackers and then we'll come back. Is that relatively okay?
24	What do you all want to do?
25	(Pause.)

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Sorry, Commissioner Miller.
2	Is that okay with you?
3	ZC VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yes.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. I didn't know you'd be here
5	this long, Commissioner Miller. Okay.
6	ZC VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I didn't either.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes, sorry. Okay. We'll come back
8	in 15 minutes.
9	(Whereupon, there was a brief recess.)
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Madam Secretary, could you
11	call us back in, please.
12	MS. MEHLERT: The Board is back from its quick break,
13	and which case would you like me to call next? I believe
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes, yes. What I'd like to do, and
15	if the Board doesn't mind, I'm going to go ahead and move the
16	next case which was involving Dr. Imamura, to the end of the day,
17	and also I've asked OZLD, I'm sorry, I've asked the Zoning people
18	to go ahead and write up a summary of the conditions that we
19	talked about on the previous case and at the end of the day
20	actually we can even decide whether we want to kick it down the
21	road until next week where Dr. Imamura might join us, or just go
22	ahead and work through.
23	So in that case, let's go ahead and move that 21249 to
24	the end of the day and I think the next one is 21237, I believe,
25	Madam Secretary.

MS. MEHLERT: Yes. Next is in the Board's hearing session. It's Application No. 21237 of Yasmin Khan. As amended, this is a self-certified application pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 901.2 for special exceptions under Subtitle E, Section 204.4 from the rooftop or upper floor element requirements of Subtitle E, Section 204.1 to allow removal of rooftop architectural elements original to the building.

Also under Subtitle E, Section 207.5 to allow the rear wall of a row building to extend farther than ten feet beyond the farthest rear wall of any adjoining principal residential building on any adjacent property and under Subtitle E, Section 5201 from the rear yard requirements of Subtitle E, Section 207.1 and from the lot occupancy requirements of Subtitle E, Section 210.1, under Subtitle E, Section 320.2 to allow expansion of an existing apartment house and pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 1000 for a variance from Subtitle C, Section 303.4 to allow operation of a new lot with street frontage less than 30 feet to be used and occupied by an apartment house.

This project is a third-story addition to an existing two-story attached building, currently a four unit apartment house. It's located in the RF-1 zone at 1311 6th Street, Northwest, Square 480, Lot 833, and as a preliminary matter the Applicant has requested to allow a late filing submitted less than 30 days. This would just submit a description of the changes to their revised plans in Exhibit 33.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you. 1 2 If the Applicant can hear me, if they could please introduce themselves for the record. 3 MR. TERAN: My name is Eric Teran and I'm the architect 4 5 for the owner. 6 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. 7 Mr. Teran, why are your plans late? MR. TERAN: We had some modifications that we did in 8 9 May because we were trying to get a hold of both neighbors and 10 we tried and tried through email and knocking on the door but they wouldn't allow us to determine what the roof structure was 11 12 and if we do a third party addition, we have to confirm that, 13 you know, our addition is not impacting any snow loads on to their roof. 14 15 And because we couldn't get hold of them, we decided 16 to re-do the third floor and that, you know, when we go through 17 the plans you'll see how the third floor there's some inventions 18 and that's to, you know, to fix that snow load calculations and 19 make sure everything's fine. 20 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. 21 I'm going to go ahead and allow the plans into the 22 record and, Mr. Teran, I guess your application is the reason why 23 I asked the secretary to read all into the stuff instead of me, because you've got a lot of stuff that you're asking for. 24 25 So go ahead and walk us through your application and

1	why you believe we should grant the relief requested. I'm going
2	to put 15 minutes on the clock so I know where we are and you
3	can begin whenever you like.
4	MR. TERAN: Thank you. Yes, it's the most I've ever
5	asked for so it's exciting. Paul, (indiscernible) the
6	presentation, I don't know if you can bring that up or I could
7	give you the exhibit numbers.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Is it in the record or you don't
9	know?
10	MR. TERAN: I just emailed it to him, so it's just a
11	combination of the exhibits. Exhibit 5, 11, 33 and 34.
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Okay.
13	Madam Secretary, can you drop that into the record for
14	the Board, but I'm going to ask you to go ahead and continue,
15	Mr. Teran?
16	MR. TERAN: Thank you.
17	So as the secretary just mentioned, all the relief
18	we're requesting and I will go over them again. As we go through
19	the presentation I'll point some of this out.
20	So the main thing, you know, is it's an existing four
21	unit and we're requesting it to remain four unit even though it's
22	in the RF-1 zone and since we're expanding it, that's why we're
23	here for this exception. Next slide, please.
24	So here is the, you know, the neighborhood plan. The
25	first and second floors the areas are remaining intact and we're

building a third floor, and that third floor, as we will see through the plans, we are proposing it to be farther than the ten feet allowed which does reduce the rear yard setback and does have a lot occupancy of 69.2 percent rather than 60 percent. Next slide, please.

2.

So here are the site photos. The building in question is the one in the middle in white and the two on each side are the adjacent buildings. There's only three buildings in this row. Next slide, please.

And this is looking at it from the alley. The white building there on the top left, that's the existing two-story structure. (Indiscernible) see it on the right and in the bottom two you can see it more from, on the south side. And so those walls are remaining intact. Next slide, please.

And this is just more of the back yard just so you can see the condition it's in. The previous owner did not do a good job. It's in very bad condition and I know that was one of the concerns of the neighbor to the north. Next slide, please.

And just some more, just so you can see how it's deteriorating. Next slide, please.

And so here are the existing plans. The cellar, that's a small mechanical room. Also originally that (indiscernible) but in the original application we had an entire basement or cellar that was under the existing first floor. However, talking to contractors, you know, like the cost, and the noise and

disturbance that it caused to the neighbor to the north, we decided to just keep the existing cellar as is. On the first floor it was two units originally so you can see it's a full gut. Next slide, please.

2.

And this is the second floor where the other two units were located and once again, it's a full gut. Next slide, please.

So these are the floor plans. So that's going to be the cellar. It's going to be a laundry area and a storage area. Next slide, please.

So this would be the first floor, or the ground floor which is comprised of unit A and it will also have a parking space in the back. So it's a three bedroom. Next slide, please.

The second floor is basically the same as the first floor and this is unit B. You can see here in the bottom left there's a weird cut-out right behind the kitchen. That, I don't know how that happened or when it happened but the neighbors actually built into that space. So we're keeping it and we're just going to have a fire wall going around that. So it's the first time I've seen that. Next slide, please.

Unit C. So here you can see there's two inventions, one on the south side is the front invention and the one on the south side is the front and the one on the north is in the middle. So basically they're less than around 15 feet or less you don't have to provide snow load calculations. Anything more than 15 feet you do and since we couldn't get that information from the

neighbors we had to adjust these plans. And here now we have Unit C is a one bedroom unit and unit D is a studio unit. And then here you can see at the back the property, you know, it's at an angle at the back so at one side we are within the 20 foot limit, which is 14 foot 7. However, on the north side, you know, it's over the 20 feet. Next slide, please.

2.

And this is just the roof plan. Next slide, please.

So here are the elevations. This is another request we had to remove that rooftop element. The ANC is actually very happy that we're doing that and not doing one of those, you know, one of those, you know, ones that are three feet back with typical siding. They prefer this look so we're matching the, you know, the style of the windows and the brick and we're taking that all the way to the top. And then the one on the right is a rear elevation. Next slide, please.

So this is the site elevation on the north side. You can see that, you know, we are pushing back that third floor past the ten feet but they're, and (indiscernible) on the second floor is not really that much more but they don't have a third floor. Next slide, please.

And then this is the one to the south where we are lining the party walls and then that's everything you see there with the windows, that's about ten feet from the property line. Next slide, please.

Here are just some sections. You can see that we're

keeping the existing cellar and where the units, how they line up. Next slide, please.

And there's just another section. Next slide, please.

And so here are some 3D elevations. The two on the top and the bottom left are from the front and I believe we're still in keeping within the same scale of the buildings to the left and to the right. We have the architectural feature at the top that we're moving from where it is now and just moving it to the top of the roof and then we have the review on the bottom right which is the back where you can se we're keeping the existing two stories. And then you see the third floor, it'll push the shoulder (phonetic) further back. Next slide, please.

Just more views from the back. I think probably the one on the bottom right you can see a little bit how we're extending past the existing second floor of the neighbor to the north. I guess the top right gives a good view as well. Next side, please.

So here's some shadow studies where we do the summer/winter solstice. This is at 9 a.m. in summer. Our building is in the middle. So on the right is what could be proposed by matter-of-right and the left would be what we're proposing. So you see on the top left there there's a little red square, so that would be the initial shading which is actually on the rooftop. So they don't have access to that so I don't really see that as being an issue. Next slide, please.

So at twelve where there's minimal impact once again on the roof. Next slide, please.

And this is at 3 p.m. where once again there's shading. However, it's all on the roof of the neighbor to the south as well. Next slide, please.

So this is at winter. So the sun is very low at 9 a.m., there is no additional shadowing from the matter-of-right and the proposed. Next slide, please.

And here again 12 p.m., no additional shading. Next slide please.

And once again, just because of the angle of the sun from what's matter-of-right to proposed not causing any additional shadows to the properties to the north and the south, and I think that's it. Right, Paul? Is there one more slide? I think that's it.

So, you know, we've received unanimous support from the ANC. Unfortunately, we have not been able to reach our neighbors, the neighbor to the south. We emailed back and forth a couple of times, myself and the owner. However, he seems to disappear. The neighbor to the north, you know, we knocked on his door. He was upset we were disturbing him, so the ANC member, Ms. Berry, reached out to him I believe but we haven't really been able to, you know, speak to him directly.

So we agreed, you know, we're not going to have any windows, we're not affecting any lights or shadows to either

1	property and, you know, it's a four unit building. I think it
2	would be bad to make it from the four to two. I know D.C. doesn't
3	want to lose housing and I think we are making these units much
4	better than what they were before.
5	And that's basically it. I'm happy to present and I'm
6	happy to answer any questions.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thanks.
8	Mr. Teran, maybe I got a little confused. You presented
9	before the ANC before you decided that you needed a variance; is
10	that correct?
11	MR. TERAN: Yes. Oh, yes, the front yard. That one.
12	Yes.
13	So the 30 feet is required and now we only have, you
14	know, it's only 24 feet. You know, it's been like that always
15	so it's an existing condition.
16	CHAIRPERSON HILL: But when you presented to the ANC
17	you presented it in this design?
18	MR. TERAN: Correct.
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
20	Can I, before I turn to my Board can I hear from the
21	Office of Planning?
22	MR. BEAMON: Good afternoon. Shepard Beamon with the
23	Office of Planning.
24	OP has reviewed the application for the requested
25	special exception and variance relief to construct a third-story

1	on the attached four unit apartment house but not to increase the
2	number of units and find the request meets the criteria for
3	Subtitles E, U and X. OP finds that the additional should not
4	have adverse impacts on the adjacent property and the property
5	presents pre-existing conditions that result in an exceptional
6	condition that would prohibit the site from being compliant with
7	the zoning regulations.
8	Therefore, OP recommends approval of the special
9	exception and the area variance relief as stated in our report
10	in Exhibit 23, and I can take any questions.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.
12	Once again, before I turn to my Board, Mr. Young, is
13	there anyone here wishing to speak?
14	MR. YOUNG: Yes. We have one witness.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Could you give me that person's
16	name, please.
17	MR. YOUNG: Yes. John Robinson.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great.
19	Mr. Robinson, can you hear me?
20	(Pause.)
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Robinson, can you hear me?
22	MR. ROBINSON: Can you hear me?
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes, yes. Thank you.
24	MR. ROBINSON: Okay.
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.

MR. ROBINSON: I couldn't get my camera on, but anyway.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: That's all right, Mr. Robinson.

MR. ROBINSON: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Robinson, if you want to go ahead and introduce yourself and give us your home address, and then as a member of the public you'll have three minutes to give your testimony, and you can begin whenever you like.

MR. ROBINSON: Okay.

My name is John Robinson. I grew up at the property on the north end of this proposed construction. My family owns Robinson Funeral Home. We've been here, we've been the owners here since 1942 when my dad and mom purchased it. We operate a funeral home here and we are concerned about the added weight to the adjoining walls going up two floors or three floors, and we're wondering about the safety of adding that weight to that proposal to add another floor onto the building, and how will they prevent the weakening of the adjoining walls with this new structure.

And they talk about accessing. I talked to the owner and he called me and he wanted to come in but it was inconvenient. We were having funerals at that time. But I wanted to know, they said something about they needed access to see how venting system was coming from gas and what they would have to do to the adjoining wall.

And I just wanted to, I saw some of the plans and I

1	was wondering about the parking for the additional people that
2	are going to be living here. He mentioned in the plan one parking
3	space and how many additional people will be living there. There
4	are no current parking spaces there on the lot, and everyone in
5	the alley has parking there, and I was wondering about during the
6	construction phase how will workers drop things off. They can't
7	park in this alley behind the buildings because everybody's, it's
8	a dead end alley. And I was wondering about construction workers.
9	Where will they park? There's limited parking on both sides of
10	the street, the east side of 6th Street and the west side of 6th
11	Street.
12	These are my concerns about the construction and what
13	I've seen about it. I haven't had an opportunity to examine the
14	plans or let my engineer architect look at them and reference the
15	structural effect on our property. But basically that's my
16	concern.
17	Thank you for allowing me to speak.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure. Thanks, Mr. Robinson. Thanks
19	for joining us and for how long you all have been in the city.
20	Mr. Teran, are you working on this project until the
21	end?
22	MR. TERAN: Yes. I'm with the owner during construction
23	as construction administration.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Have you ever been in touch
25	with Mr. Robinson yet?

1	MR. TERAN: I haven't been able to get a hold of him
2	yet.
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Do you have contact
4	information for Mr. Robinson?
5	MR. TERAN: The owner does.
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Pardon?
7	MR. TERAN: I believe he has his phone number.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So a couple of things.
9	One, I think, Mr. Robinson, the building code is what
10	is going to be protecting your building in terms of any kind of,
11	you know, how they do things, right? And so I think that's
12	something that maybe Mr. Teran can give you a little bit more,
13	as the architect, information on during construction.
14	What I would ask though, Mr. Teran, is, again, if you
15	work with Mr. Robinson if this were to move forward in terms of,
16	again, construction, times, how deliveries will take place, make
17	sure it doesn't interrupt his family's business and any other
18	questions he may have. Are you able to do that, Mr. Teran?
19	MR. TERAN: Definitely. Right now we're looking at
20	some contractors so one of the stipulations will be that they
21	have to be able to work with Mr. Robinson and I think, you know,
22	if Mr. Robinson is having a funeral procession, you know, we
23	can't do deliveries or have, you know, workers parking there
24	taking up all the spaces. And also, you know, definitely can't
25	deliver to the back. I agree with him, that would be a mess.

1	So that will be definitely something we work with the
2	contractor and we can bring in Mr. Robinson within that
3	conversation.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Robinson, do you have Mr.
5	Teran's contact information?
6	MR. ROBINSON: No, I don't. I welcome to get it though.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
8	Madam Secretary, can you put Mr. Robinson in touch with
9	Mr. Teran?
10	MS. MEHLERT: Yes.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
12	Mr. Robinson, the Office of Zoning will reach out to
13	you and put you in contact with Mr. Teran and he'll be able to
14	answer your questions and work with you during construction.
15	MR. ROBINSON: Sounds good.
16	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Mr. Robinson. Thank you
17	for joining us today. All right. I'm going to excuse Mr.
18	Robinson. All right.
19	Now I'm back to the Board. Do you guys have any
20	questions for the Applicant and/or the Office of Planning? I see
21	Mr. Blake's hand up. I'll go ahead and go to you first, Mr.
22	Blake.
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: One quick question for the
24	Applicant, actually two. First question is to clarify. He said
25	there are no parking spaces? There is one parking space, correct?

MR. TERAN: Currently there's none I guess legally shown. So we are proposing to have one in the back.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. But there is, there will be a space? Okay. Cool.

Second question is can you tell me how we got here? I

Second question is can you tell me how we got here? I understand that this preceded the zoning regulations, but I don't quite see any indication. I mean, the C of O you have here does state it's, you know, it's a four unit building but that was a C of O from 2020 which, my indication is that it's before. Can you just tell me how we kind of, how you believe we got here?

MR. TERAN: The owner came to me. You know, he showed me that C of O, that it's existing four units and that he wanted to expand the building and as I informed him if we did that, you know, we'd have to go through the special exception process, you know, since we're expanding the four units and that's not by matter-of-right anymore.

I think he bought the property in 2023 so I think it's been basically, I think, 2024 I'm sorry. He had the tenants move out, so I don't think he's gone through the process of obtaining another C of O.

VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. But do we know how we got to the four unit? What time that actually took place? Were there any records for construction or anything that gives me an indication that we got here appropriately?

MR. TERAN: I don't know. I looked. I know the owner

looked as well at the history. He just knows that we just have 1 2. that C of O for four. But I don't, I couldn't find anything. VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: You looked in the DOB records 3 and you could not find anything, any permits for construction, 4 5 nothing, ever? 6 MR. TERAN: Not, I mean I could try again. But I didn't 7 find anything the first time around. 8 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Thank you. 9 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Mr. Blake. Does anyone 10 else have any questions? 11 Vice Chair Miller? 12 ZC VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, 13 and thank you, Mr. Beamon, for the Office of Planning report and, 14 Mr. Teran, for your presentation today in bringing this 15 application forward. 16 So the building currently has four units and it's going 17 to, and you're proposing to have four units. Are they occupied 18 right now, or no? 19 MR. TERAN: No. When the new owner bought it, my 20 client, they removed all the tenants I believe, or I don't know 21 if he bought it vacant. 22 ZC VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And the four units that are there existing, how many bedrooms? You're proposing three 23 bedrooms for first floor, three bedroom unit on the second floor 24 25 and then on the third floor a one bedroom unit and a studio, so

1	that's
2	MR. TERAN: About eight.
3	ZC VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I guess that's eight
4	bedrooms.
5	MR. TERAN: Yes.
6	ZC VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Or seven and a half if you
7	call the studio a half. How many bedrooms are there currently
8	in these units?
9	MR. TERAN: I want to say it's probably about five.
10	We'd have to look back at the demo plans.
11	ZC VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: So there won't be an
12	increase
13	MR. TERAN: It's about five.
14	ZC VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: there won't be an
15	increase in the
16	MR. TERAN: Yes.
17	ZC VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: occupancy beyond even
18	the third floor addition, there will be an increase in the
19	occupancy?
20	MR. TERAN: Correct.
21	ZC VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. All right. Thank
22	you very much.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Anyone else? Okay.
24	Mr. Teran, do you have anything to add at the end?
25	MR. TERAN: No. Thank you allowing me to present.

Hopefully we can, this one was quicker than the last one. 1 2. CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. All right. I'm going to go ahead and close the hearing and the 3 4 record. Please excuse everyone. Thank you, Mr. Young. 5 (Pause.) 6 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. 7 Even though it was a little bit of a unique application in terms of all of the relief that had also been requested, I 8 9 understand how they're kind of getting here. I understand how 10 they have the four units. They're trying to keep it the four units and then all of the relief needed to be able to do this 11 and move forward. 12 13 Т have any issues necessarily with 14 shadowing. I appreciate the shadow studies as they were helpful and the additional shadowing being to the rooftops. 15 I didn't 16 have any issues with, I think it was, like, I'm not exactly sure 17 how much beyond the third, let's see. Right. I didn't have any 18 problems with the additional extension beyond the ten feet as, again, because of the shadow study that was put forward. I 19 20 appreciate the analysis of the Office of Planning has put forward 21 and their report and their recommendation as well as that of the 2.2 ANC, and I 'll be voting to approve this application. Mr. Smith, do you have anything you'd like to add? 23 COMMISSIONER SMITH: Nothing to add. I agree with your 24 25 statements on this case and will vote to support.

1	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Thank you.
2	Mr. Blake?
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Mr. Chairman, I agree with
4	your analysis in this application. The only thing that I would
5	add to the confluence of factors and the extraordinary or
6	exceptional condition is the zoning history which I believe may
7	have contained I would just add the zoning history to that.
8	Thank you.
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Mr. Blake.
10	Vice Chair Miller?
11	ZC VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
12	and I concur with your comments and all the comments of my
13	colleagues. And I appreciate your dialog with Mr. Robinson.
14	Thank you.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Vice Chair Miller.
16	And I also will note that if the Office of Zoning could
17	please contact Mr. Robinson and make sure that Mr. Robinson and
18	Mr. Teran work together and since we do see Mr. Teran often, I
19	hope that he continues with his good reputation in order to work
20	with Mr. Robinson.
21	So all that being said, I'm going to make a motion to
22	approve Application No. 21237 as captioned and read by the
23	secretary, and ask for a second. Mr. Blake?
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Second.
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Motion made and seconded. Madam

1	Secretary, take a roll call, please.
2	MS. MEHLERT: Please respond to the Chair's motion to
3	approve the application.
4	Chairman Hill?
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
6	MS. MEHLERT: Vice Chair Blake?
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Yes.
8	MS. MEHLERT: Mr. Smith?
9	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Yes.
10	MS. MEHLERT: Commissioner Miller?
11	ZC VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yes.
12	MS. MEHLERT: Staff would record the vote as four to
13	zero to one to approve Application No. 21237 on the motion made
14	by Chairman Hill and seconded by Vice Chair Blake.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.
16	Madam Secretary, could you call our next case?
17	MS. MEHLERT: Next in the Board's hearing session is
18	Application No. 21280 of Matthew Bosserman. This is an
19	application pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 901.2 for a special
20	exception under Subtitle E, Section 5201 from the lot occupancy
21	requirements of Subtitle E, Section 210.1.
22	This is for a second floor rear deck addition with
23	spiral stair to grade to an existing two-story attached building.
24	It's located in the RF-1 zone at 903 R Street, Northwest, Unit
25	2, Square 363, Lot 2010.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great. Thank you.
2	If the Applicant can hear me, if they could please
3	introduce themselves for the record.
4	MR. BOSSERMAN: Can you hear me?
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
6	MR. BOSSERMAN: We also have (audio interference) on
7	the line. I think she's going to be a part of the presentation
8	as well.
9	MS. DAVIS: Yes. My presentation should be in the
10	record. Matt, why don't you go ahead and introduce yourself and
11	then I'll introduce myself.
12	MR. BOSSERMAN: Good afternoon everyone, and apologies
13	for my background. I've had to join in between meetings. I'm
14	Matthew Bosserman. I'm the resident of the property in question.
15	I've been the property owner for the last two and a half years
16	and a resident of D.C. for much longer than that and I'm excited
17	to answer any questions that you all might have today.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great. Thank you.
19	Ms. Davis, can you introduce yourself for the record?
20	MS. DAVIS: Absolutely. My name is Beth Davis. I am
21	here on behalf of Mr. Bosserman.
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great.
23	MS. DAVIS: And, I'm sorry. Go ahead.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: That's okay. Ms. Davis, you're an
25	expeditor?

1	MS. DAVIS: I'm a permit consultant and I work with a
2	lot of different clients in a lot of different capacities. I
3	act as owner's agent on this project.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
5	And you have a request to, Madam Secretary, am I on the
6	right case? There's a request for an untimely filing?
7	MS. DAVIS: Yes. It was my presentation and also the
8	staff requested some additional information on the ownership of
9	the property, and I requested to be able to upload that as well.
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
11	Yeah. We were a little confused on the ownership as
12	to whether or not
13	MS. DAVIS: I completely understand. Yes. Would you
14	like me to explain that first?
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: No, no.
16	MS. DAVIS: Okay.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Go ahead and go through your
18	presentation and then during your presentation you can just
19	explain the situation.
20	MS. DAVIS: Absolutely. Not a problem.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Young, if you want to pull that
22	up. Thank you. Go ahead, Ms. Davis.
23	MS. DAVIS: Again, my name is Beth Davis. I'm here on
24	behalf of the Applicant, Matthew Bosserman, regarding a special
25	exception request for 903 R Street, Unit 2, and we can go to the

next page.

This is an owner occupied primary residence and the proposal is to demolish the existing rear deck and construct a new 14 by 12 foot Trex composite deck with a spiral staircase for yard access. The request includes a minor three percent increase over the by-right occupancy and the deck will remain within the existing footprint of the previously existing rear access stair. Next slide.

As shown here, the previous structure is minimal. It is also outdated and it provides limited utility for ongoing use for the resident. Next slide.

This is the proposed plat showing the proposed layout. The new deck and spiral stair are fully contained within the rear yard. They don't encroach on adjacent properties or alleys. Next slide.

This is the elevation of the proposed deck. It's designed to be durable, visually appealing and also to be mindful of the neighbor below. As we were discussing this is a two unit building. The upstairs is owned by Mr. Bosserman. The lower unit is owned by Ms. Dawn Junk who has provided a letter of support in the record.

The building is called The Leonard Condominium but the full ownership of the entire building and the parking spaces are equally divided between Ms. Junk and Mr. Bosserman. So just for ownership purposes, this is how it's set up. The upstairs belongs

to Mr. Bosserman, the downstairs belongs to Ms. Junk and I think when they initially did the condo documents, they named it The Leonard Condominium but there is no entity with that name in the District. We can go to the next slide.

2.

These photos show a similar rear deck existing on a neighboring home. Our design as these are fully in keeping with the neighborhood character and will allow for light and air for all of the neighbors as well as most specifically the downstairs neighborhood. Next slide.

And this is just another photo of that rear deck on the neighbor's property. As I mentioned, there's no loss light, air or privacy for adjacent residents including the basement unit and we can move to the next slide.

You can go to the next slide, sorry. That was just what I said.

I did want to note that the ANC did vote to unanimously approve this project but I did not see their paperwork in the record, so I'm including this screenshot of the official minutes of the April ANC meeting. They did vote six to zero to support the project. And we can go to the next slide.

This is the current condition of the property. Before signing on with his current designer and contractor, Mr. Bosserman had contracted with a different team who did begin work without correct approvals as the ANC raised this as a question, not necessarily a concern, but a question during our meetings.

1	I did want to ensure we were fully transparent. And last slide.
2	In summary, this is a small enhancement to Mr.
3	Bosserman's primary residence. It is designed in harmony with
4	the zoning intent, has no adverse impacts and has the support of
5	the closest neighbor, being the lower unit owner.
6	And please ask any questions you might have, and we
7	thank you for your time.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Davis.
9	Yes. I see that the person in support who is the
10	downstairs neighbor is in Exhibit 25 and the ANC 2G did give
11	their report in Exhibit 20. However, thank you for the
12	screenshot.
13	Before I turn to my Board, may I turn to the Office of
14	Planning?
15	MR. JESICK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the
16	Board. My name is Matt Jesick, presenting OP's testimony in this
17	case, and the Office of Planning is happy to rest on the record
18	in support of the application. I'm happy to take any questions.
19	Thank you.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Mr. Jesick. Mr. Young,
21	is there anyone here wishing to speak?
22	MR. YOUNG: (Audio interference).
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. I think you said no.
24	MR. YOUNG: Sorry. I said yes, we do not.
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thank you. All right.

1	Does my Board have any questions for the Applicant
2	and/or the Office of Planning?
3	(Pause.)
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right, Ms. Davis, you
5	seem to be humming along here.
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: I have one quick question, Mr.
7	Chairman, one quick question.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure. Go ahead.
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Did we miss the ownership
10	issue? I just want to make sure you clarified that. I just
11	wanted to make sure we clarified that. I want to make sure we
12	clarify that to your satisfaction. Are you good with that?
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Are you talking to me? Oh, Ms.
14	Davis?
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Yes.
16	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Ms. Davis, I think you clarified
17	how the ownership is conveyed; is that correct?
18	MS. DAVIS: It's a, I'm sure you're all familiar with
19	PropertyQuest. There's a screenshot from PropertyQuest that I
20	believe is the last exhibit in the record and it shows how the
21	property is broken up into units and parking spaces, and the two
22	primary owners are Mr. Bosserman and Ms. Junk. This is applied
23	for on Lot 2 which is the general larger or the full lot itself,
24	not the condominium lots because it does affect shared space.
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.

1	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay.
2	A quick question for you in that context. Now, I
3	noticed that in the letter from Ms. Junk, the address is wrong
4	and it appears it's a Pennsylvania telephone number. Is this,
5	could you just kind of just explain to me a little bit. Maybe
6	it's no big deal. I just want to make sure I'm clear to what
7	that (indiscernible).
8	MS. DAVIS: Matt, can you speak to that? I wasn't the
9	one
10	MR. BOSSERMAN: Yes.
11	MS. DAVIS: who (indiscernible) the letter so I'm
12	going to let him speak to that.
13	MR. BOSSERMAN: I certainly can. I think your question
14	was in regards to Ms. Junk's residency. She does have a
15	Pennsylvania phone number. She owns property in Pennsylvania.
16	She also owns several properties in D.C., but she's the primary
17	owner and resident of Unit No. 1 below me.
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. And did, who submitted
19	that letter to the record from her?
20	MS. DAVIS: I believe I submitted the letter. It came
21	directly forwarded from her.
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Okay. Thank you very much.
23	MS. DAVIS: Yes. I just looked in my record. I was
24	the one that submitted that.

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

25

1 Anyone else? Okay. Ms. Davis, I'm going to go ahead 2 and close the record, close the hearing and excuse everyone 3 please, Mr. Young. 4 (Pause.) 5 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you. 6 has been discussed, there was some questions 7 concerning ownership and then also waiting for some kind of 8 feedback from the ANC. I will also, I appreciate the report that 9 the Office of Planning has put forward and I will agree with 10 their analysis of it. I do appreciate the ANC which oddly enough is my ANC but not my SMD, is in favor of this application. 11 12 don't have any issues or concern with this. I believe they're 13 meeting the criteria for us to grant this and I will be voting 14 in favor. 15 Is there anything else you'd like to add, Mr. Smith? 16 COMMISSIONER SMITH: Nothing to add. 17 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Vice Chair Blake? 18 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: I'm in support of the 19 application, Mr. Chair. 20 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. Vice Chair Miller? 21 22 ZC VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I concur with your 23 comments and agree with the Applicant that this is really minimal minor relief, and appreciate the OP and ANC 2G unanimous support 24 25 which existed in the last case as well, 21280.

1	So, thank you.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great. Thank you. All right.
3	Then I'm going to go ahead and make a motion to approve
4	Application No. 21280 as captioned and read by the secretary, and
5	ask for a second. Mr. Blake?
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Second.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Motion made and seconded. Madam
8	Chair, if you could please, Madam Secretary, if you could please
9	go ahead and take a roll call.
10	MS. MEHLERT: Please respond to the Chair's motion to
11	approve the application.
12	Chairman Hill?
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
14	MS. MEHLERT: Vice Chair Blake?
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Yes.
16	MS. MEHLERT: Mr. Smith?
17	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Yes.
18	MS. MEHLERT: Commissioner Miller?
19	ZC VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yes.
20	MS. MEHLERT: Staff would record the vote as four to
21	zero to one to approve Application No. 21280 on the motion made
22	by Chairman Hill and seconded by Vice Chair Blake.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Madam Secretary, if you want to call
24	our next one?
25	MS. MEHLERT: Next is Application No. 21293 of Square

1	Fifteen Development, LLC. This is a self-certified application
2	pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 901.2 for a special exception
3	under Subtitle E, Section 5201 from the side yard requirements
4	of Subtitle E, Section 208. It's for a new third floor and three-
5	story rear addition to an existing two-story semi-detached
6	principal dwelling.
7	It's located in the RF-1 zone at 1109 4th Street,
8	Northeast, Square 805, Lots 21 and 800, and I'll note that the
9	ANC 6C submitted their report supporting the application
10	yesterday which is in Exhibit 24.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great. Thank you.
12	If the Aplicant can hear me, if they could please
13	introduce themselves for the record.
14	MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Board
15	members, Marty Sullivan with Sullivan & Barros on behalf of the
16	Applicant.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great.
18	And it looks like Commissioner Eckenwiler is with us
19	as well. Commissioner, could you introduce yourself for the
20	record?
21	ANC COMMISSIONER ECKENWILER: Good afternoon, Mr.
22	Chairman. Can you hear me okay?
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes, I can. Thank you.
24	ANC COMMISSIONER ECKENWILER: Excellent. Mark
25	Eckenwiler, Vice Chair, ANC 6C appearing on behalf of the ANC.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Well, welcome back.

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

MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you. If we could load the PowerPoint presentation, please.

The property is 1109 4th Street, Northeast. Next slide, please.

The property is in the RF-1 zone. It is improved with a single family row dwelling, well it's actually semi-detached now. It was originally a row dwelling. The Applicant seeks approval for a third-story addition on top and a three-story rear addition.

The addition was under construction pursuant to permit approval as a matter-of-right addition. It was believed that it was straddling each of two side property lines but upon a later wall check inspection a faulty survey was discovered and the footprint of the addition has been actually constructed, and the existing building was two feet off of the south property line and also two feet over the north property line.

To solve the north property line issue, the Applicant has acquired a two foot wide tax lot that existed on the north side and is seeking this relief. So special exception relief is

for a foot of side yard relief for the extension up and back where three feet is required for an extension of a nonconforming side yard, this provides two feet. Next slide, please.

2.

Office of Planning recommending approval. You'll hear from Commissioner Eckenwiler, ANC 6C is in support and we have letters of support from both adjacent neighbors. Next slide, please.

So here you can see there's a very thin lot, Lot 800. The current lot is record lot 21. These lots are going to be consolidated into a new record lot. Next slide, please.

This is the rear of the property. The rear addition goes just ten feet past the furthest rear wall of these two buildings or the shortest rear wall of these two buildings so there's no relief from the ten foot rule. Next slide, please.

Here is the plat again and you can see Lot 800 there, the two foot strip. The effect of the mistake in the survey and it lines up, the building lines up actually with what we're proposing now. So their consolidation will actually bring the existing building into alignment with its property lines. Next slide, please.

Next slide, please.

Or actually if you could go back one slide. Sorry, Mr. Young. You see how far the addition goes past the neighboring property to the south which actually isn't adjoining but it's just ten feet past. Next slide, please.

1	Next slide, please.
2	Next slide.
3	Next slide, please.
4	This is the existing elevations. Next slide, please.
5	And here's the proposed elevations. It's set back on
6	the front so there's no impact on the architecture elements of
7	the corners and in the back you can see the addition from the
8	side section there. Next slide, please.
9	So the request is just for a foot of relief. So we're
10	compliant with the special exception criteria. Next slide,
11	please.
12	Light and air being extended with just an extra foot.
13	The adjacent property has no windows facing the addition and the
14	addition complies with the ten foot rule so for these reasons,
15	there's no undue impact on neighboring light and air and the
16	addition does not have north or south facing windows also so no
17	impact on privacy and the rear addition is modest in scale
18	complying with the ten foot rule, and so from the street and the
19	alley the addition will read as a cohesive extension of the
20	original dwelling and preserving the character, scale and pattern
21	along the streetscape. Next slide, please.
22	I think that's probably it. Yes. Thank you.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you.
24	Commissioner Eckenwiler, can you hear me?
25	ANC COMMISSIONER ECKENWILER: I can, Mr. Chairman.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Would you like to give us the ANC's
2	testimony?
3	ANC COMMISSIONER ECKENWILER: Sure, Mr. Chairman.
4	Very briefly, you have our letter in support in the
5	record at Exhibit 24. I don't see any reason to dwell on it.
6	Frankly for a unopposed case like this normally we wouldn't even
7	have a witness, but this case has such unusual facts that I
8	thought I would show up just in case the Board has any questions.
9	With that, I have no additional testimony.
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thanks, Commissioner,
11	and thanks for taking the time to show up. Let's see.
12	Does the Board have any questions of the Applicant
13	and/or the ANC? Okay. We'll see how this goes.
14	May I hear from the Office of Planning, please.
15	MR. MITCHUM: Hi. This is Joshua Mitchum with the
16	Office of Planning.
17	We are in agreement with the Applicant's statements and
18	we are in support of the application, and we can rest on our
19	submitted staff report and I'm available for any questions.
20	Thank you.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you.
22	Mr. Young, is there anyone here wishing to speak?
23	MR. YOUNG: We do not.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
25	Does the Board have any questions of the Office of

1	Planning?
2	(Pause.)
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
4	Mr. Sullivan, do you have anything you'd like to add
5	at the end?
6	MR. SULLIVAN: No. Thank you, Mr. Chair and Board
7	members.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right.
9	Thank you, Commissioner, for joining us. If you could
10	please close the hearing and the record. Bye, Commissioner
11	Eckenwiler.
12	(Pause.)
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
14	Even though some of this was a little odd in trying to
15	follow along and figure out how what was being requested and
16	asked of and why, I actually understand now where we were, or
17	are I should say, and am in agreement with the analysis the Office
18	of Planning has put forward as well as that of the ANC and the
19	testimony of the Applicant, and I will be voting in favor of this
20	application.
21	May I turn to Mr. Smith?
22	COMMISSIONER SMITH: I agree with the Office of
23	Planning's analysis. It's a fairly straightforward case and
24	noting that the adjacent property owners that would be most
25	affected by this addition are in support of the application so

1	that, you k	know, no (indiscernible) or concerns that I may have.
2	So I will b	pe in support of the application as well.
3	C	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.
4	M	Mr. Blake?
5	V	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Mr. Chair, I have nothing to
6	add. I'm i	n support of the application.
7	С	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.
8	V	ice Chair Miller?
9	Z	CC VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
10	Y	Yes, I concur with your comments and Board member, the
11	other Board	members and I'm prepared to support the application.
12	I appreciat	te the Applicant's community outreach.
13	C	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Vice Chair Miller. All
14	right.	
15	I	I'm going to go ahead and make a motion to approve
16	Application	No. 21293 as captioned and read by the secretary, and
17	ask for a s	second. Mr. Blake?
18	V	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Second.
19	C	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Motion is made and seconded. Madam
20	Secretary,	can you take a roll call, please?
21	M	MS. MEHLERT: Please respond to the Chair's motion to
22	approve the	e application.
23	C	Chairman Hill?
24	C	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
25	M	MS. MEHLERT: Vice Chair Blake?

1	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Yes.
2	MS. MEHLERT: Mr. Smith?
3	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Yes.
4	MS. MEHLERT: Commissioner Miller?
5	ZC VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yes.
6	MS. MEHLERT: Staff would record the vote as four to
7	zero to one to approve Application No. 21293 on the motion made
8	by Chairman Hill and seconded by Vice Chair Blake.
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. If you could call our next
10	case, please.
11	MS. MEHLERT: Next is Application No. 21294 of Brynn
12	and Robert Kurtzman. This is a self-certified application
13	pursuant to Substitle X, Section 901.2 for a special exception
14	under Subtitle D, Section 207.5 to allow the rear wall of an
15	attached building to extend more than ten feet beyond the farthest
16	rear wall of an adjoining principal residential building on an
17	adjacent property.
18	This is for a two-story rear addition plus rear deck
19	to an existing two-story attached principal dwelling. It's
20	located in the R-3/GT zone at 2219 Observatory Place, Northwest,
21	Square 1301, Lot 946.
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.
23	Can the Applicant hear me and if so, if they could
24	introduce themselves for the record.
25	MR. WILSON: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman. My name's

Paul Wilson. I'm the architect and agent for the owners.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, Mr. Wilson. I assume you're going to be presenting to us?

MR. WILSON: Yes, I am.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. If you want to go ahead and walk us through your client's application, why you believe they're meeting the criteria for us to grant the relief. I'm going to put 15 minutes on the clock so I know where we are, and you can begin whenever you like.

MR. WILSON: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Members of the Board. If I could have the slide presentation, please.

This is a really straightforward application. If I could have the next slide, please.

What we're proposing is a 12 and a half foot two-story rear addition on this property. It's located on Observatory Place. Actually the, we're going to remove an existing rear deck, construct a two-story addition and the site actually drops off in the rear so it's actually a three-story addition on the rear. If I could have the next slide, please.

The building plans. The genesis of the project was to add a bedroom to the basement level, expand the first floor so we have a kitchen and a separate dining room and then on the top story adding a primary suite to the rear of the house, the bedroom and a bath and to do that we have to extend beyond the ten foot envelope of the house, the houses that are adjoining. If I could

have the next slide, please.

2.2

Okay. The only relief requested here is from D-207.5 to exceed the maximum allowable ten foot extension. We are going to 12 and a half feet so it's an additional 2.5 feet beyond the allowable and here are the special exception criteria. If I could have the next slide, please.

We've included shadow studies for the record showing the increased shadow from the proposed addition. I think it's pretty minimal, especially considering the fact there's already a deck on the property and the difference between a matter-of-right ten foot addition and the proposed 12 and a half feet is pretty minor. If I could have the next slide, please.

And the next slide.

Next slide, please.

So as far as privacy, use and enjoyment of the neighboring property shall not be unduly compromised or have side windows as a zero setback situation. My clients have been in contact with the neighbor at 2221 and there's an email of support in the record. They've also spoken to their neighbors at 2217. They have contacted, really didn't voice any objection. The property is currently listed for sale, so that's the neighbor outreach. Next slide, please.

And then the proposed addition or accessory structure shall not substantially visually intrude upon the character, scale and pattern of the houses. This is a rear view of the

alley. It's a little hard to see 2221 because there's a fence and a large tree. But these houses were all built at the same pattern and scale and we do not believe another two and a half feet beyond what we can build as a matter-of-right is a major intrusion on the neighborhood. Next slide, please.

For support, like I said, we have emails from the immediate neighbor to the north. Outreached to the property owner to the south. ANC 3B is in support and Office of Planning recommends approval.

10 And that's all I have I think. I'd be happy to answer 11 any questions.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. All right.

Before I turn to the Board could I hear from the Office of Planning?

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

The Office of Planning recommends approval of the requested special exception. The proposed two-story addition would be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the R-3/GT zone and it would be unlikely to affect adversely the use and privacy of neighboring properties. We're happy to rest on our report submitted to the record at Exhibit 29 and I'm available to answer any questions you may have.

Thank you.

2.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.
2	Mr. Young, is there anyone here wishing to speak?
3	MR. YOUNG: We do not.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
5	Does the Board have any questions of the Applicant
6	and/or the Office of Planning?
7	(Pause.)
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right.
9	Mr. Wilson, I'm going to excuse you. I hope you have
10	a nice day.
11	MR. WILSON: Thank you very much.
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.
13	MR. WILSON: Good afternoon.
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Good afternoon. I'm going to close
15	the hearing and the record. Mr. Young, if you could please let
16	everyone go. Okay.
17	I hate using the thing straightforward again but this
18	looked very straightforward to me. I mean, it's two and a half
19	past. They provided shadow studies that I don't think are going
20	to affect anyone adversely and I also appreciate all of the
21	community outreach that they have done including reaching out to
22	the neighbors and also then the ANC. I will agree with the Office
23	of Planning's report and their analysis as well as that of the
24	ANC and vote in support.
25	Mr. Smith, do you have anything you'd like to add?

1		COMMISSIONER SMITH: I agree with your statements and
2	will vote	in support.
3		CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.
4		Vice Chair Blake?
5		VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Support as well, and don't
6	have anyth	ing else to add.
7		CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.
8	,	Vice Chair Miller?
9		ZC VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I concur. Thank you.
10		CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you.
11		I'm going to make a motion to approve Application No.
12	21294 as	captioned and read by the secretary, and ask for a
13	second. M	r. Blake?
14	,	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Second.
15		CHAIRPERSON HILL: Motion is made and seconded. Madam
16	Secretary,	take a roll call.
17]	MS. MEHLERT: Please respond to the Chair's motion to
18	approve th	e application.
19		Chairman Hill?
20	,	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
21]	MS. MEHLERT: Vice Chair Blake?
22		VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Yes.
23]	MS. MEHLERT: Mr. Smith?
24	,	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Yes.
25	,	MS. MEHLERT: Commissioner Miller?

1	ZC VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yes.
2	MS. MEHLERT: Staff would record the vote as four to
3	zero to one to approve Application 21294 on the motion made by
4	Chairman Hill and seconded by Vice Chair Blake.
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thank you.
6	Commissioner Miller, I believe you are off the hook.
7	ZC VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I am. Thank you. Have a
8	good rest of the day.
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. You as well.
10	ZC VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Thank you.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Bye bye. All right.
12	We have one more case and I think actually though,
13	Madam Secretary, you have, or I'm sorry, we have a decision before
14	us and I had asked if staff had an opportunity to write up the
15	discussions that we had from a similar case, I can't remember the
16	number that's before us right now, but is staff able to email
17	that to us?
18	MS. MEHLERT: I believe the conditions were sent to the
19	Board. The list of conditions.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. You are correct. Thank you.
21	All right.
22	Do you want to go ahead and call our decision case,
23	please.
24	MS. MEHLERT: Sure. This is in the Board's meeting
25	session. It's Application No. 21249 of 4231 Clay Street NE, LLC.

This is a self-certified application pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 901.2 for a special exception under Subtitle U, Section 203.1(J) to allow a healthcare facility use for 16 persons. This is for a new 16 bed healthcare facility in an existing building. It's located in the R-2 zone at 4231 Clay Street, Northeast, Square 5088, Lots 45 and 46.

This was heard on April 23rd and the Board scheduled for a decision on May 14th. The Board re-scheduled the decision and requested updated conditions from the Applicant as well as any ANC response. Participating are Chairman Hill, Vice Chair Blake, Mr. Smith and Dr. Imamura.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.

2.

So just to be clear, I was speaking about some of the work that the Board had done earlier today on Case 21240 that is a similar case with the same Applicant and we, the Board, had gone through extensive deliberations in order to understand what we thought what might be some conditions that work around anything that might be of an adverse impact for this particular project given that there are, there's another healthcare facility within 500 feet that is something that the Office of Planning had also taken into consideration when they were given their report.

I will also again note as in the previous deliberation that we had heard from DDOT in terms of what they thought about any kind of adverse impact on the traffic that might happen or the parking from this type of a facility and they were also in

favor of the application.

Also I remember, as we were deliberating before, that we, the Board, was deferring to DOB and also the healthcare experts as to how many people really would be allowed to be in this facility, even if the Board were to say it is able to do 16 and the healthcare people in D.C. might say that maybe there's less that should be in this facility.

The ANC was wanting, I believe on the last one and also probably on this one, they were looking for maybe ten residents rather than sixteen and I had stated in the last discussion that the application before us is the application that is before us. I mean, the Board can also work through different conditions and criteria, however in this case I think it was more either vote 16 up or just vote it down and then you go to the eight by-right number.

The other thing that the Board had mentioned was that whether it was ten or eight, if it were eight, there are no conditions that would be put forward and then the community would live with whatever it is that the property owner was able to do within, you know, the regulations they have to go under a matter-of-right situation. There was a lot of different conditions that we put forward and I believe the Office of Zoning has sent those conditions to the Board to be able to look through together.

The one question I actually had for, actually Madam Secretary, if you can just help me on the one thing. Is the four

1	parking spaces, is that what was in plat in Exhibit 26A as you
2	all have referred to it, because I'm just trying to pull it up?
3	Do you know if it was 26A? If my fellow Board members even know.
4	Let me look here.
5	MS. MEHLERT: The updated plat is in Exhibit 26A.
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thank you.
7	So the items that you all mentioned in this
8	informational email that you were sending to the Board, those are
9	all referencing the case record in 21249, correct?
10	MS. MEHLERT: No. Those were from 21240. So if you,
11	I can look at the current case for those. That looks like it's
12	in 21A for 21249.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Give me a second. Sorry.
14	(Pause.)
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: So my fellow Board members, it's
16	been a long day for me, so you all can tell me what you think in
17	terms of I just want to make sure, I get a little confused.
18	It is, oh, yeah, 21A, 21A is where the plat is. Okay. So the
19	plat's in 21A and then the I don't think, is there anything
20	that shows the hazardous material should be shown in a screen
20 21	that shows the hazardous material should be shown in a screen enclosure? Is that also 21A?
21	enclosure? Is that also 21A?
21 22	enclosure? Is that also 21A? VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: That was it.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Right. No, but they're referring
2	to a plat somewhere and so I don't know, there's no plat in 21249
3	that shows the screening of the material. I think there's just
4	no plat for this one that shows. We can just say the hazardous
5	material. Okay.
6	So these are the conditions as I understand them, and
7	I'm going to read through them before we, and just so we're
8	discussing this.
9	It is, again, the healthcare facility shall have a
10	maximum capacity of 16 residents.
11	Four parking spaces shall be maintained at the rear of
12	the property and screened, as shown in plat Exhibit 21A. Three
13	of the four parking spaces shall be reserved for staff members.
14	One space shall be reserved for visitor parking.
15	Visiting hours shall be from 7 a.m. to 9 p.m.
16	Housekeeping services shall take place in the morning
17	between 6 a.m. and 11 a.m.
18	Meal delivery services shall take place in the morning
19	and drop-off shall be completed by 9 a.m.
20	The Applicant shall hire a private trash contractor to
21	collect trash from the property from the outside. Trash pick-up
22	shall occur six times a week, Monday through Saturday, and shall
23	be collected between the hours of 6 a.m. and 11 a.m.
24	Hazardous material shall be stored in the screened-in
25	enclosure at the rear of the property.

The Applicant shall maintain a six foot solid privacy 1 2 fence enclosing the yards behind the front façade of the building. Daily outdoor activities in the rear yard area and deck 3 shall not begin before sun up and shall be concluded at sundown. 4 5 The Applicant shall designate a community liaison that 6 shall attend ANC meetings on a quarterly basis. 7 The order shall be valid for five years. 8 Am I missing anything in terms of our discussions for 9 this particular case? 10 COMMISSIONER SMITH: No. But I do agree with you that the exhibit that they referenced doesn't show a fence or the 11 12 screening. This is an old plat. 13 CHAIRPERSON HILL: I understand. I understand. just saying we're going to, I'm going to, you know, shall be at 14 15 the rear of the property, period. Meaning, again, we're talking them what the condition is. 16 COMMISSIONER SMITH: Well, I wasn't making necessarily 17 18 reference to the fence thing. I think it was more so a question 19 about Condition 2, four parking spaces shall be maintained at the 20 rear of the property and screened. The question about screened 21 as shown on the plat. 22 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Oh, okay. 23 The thing, the screening VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: though related to the gate, the metal gate that comes down. 24 25 That's the screening that they're actually talking about.

COMMISSIONER SMITH: Okay. And that's what they --1 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: (Indiscernible). 2 COMMISSIONER SMITH: -- make reference to in the 3 I'm fine with the condition. 4 pictures? Okay. 5 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yeah. And maybe we'll take, you 6 know, when we're reviewing the order if we have any questions 7 about it, but the screening is the metal gate you're saying, 8 right? It's just, the metal gate's going to come down. Is that 9 correct, Mr. Blake? 10 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Yes. That's my understanding. CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. And then I'm not going to 11 12 reference a plat or anything concerning the screening of the 13 trash or the hazardous material. 14 I was a little confused about this meal delivery Was it shall be completed by 9 a.m.? Is that what we 15 service. 16 had talked about on the previous one? Is that, okay. 17 that's what the Applicant, is that what the Applicant had put 18 forward in the last one? I'm just trying to figure out if 9 a.m. 19 is feasible and I would assume it could be, or would be. Or do 20 you all want to give them until 10 a.m.? I don't remember what 21 the previous conditions had or let me look. Do they have suggestions conditions in this one also? Give me a moment. 22 They had the same condition, sorry. Yeah. 23 They say by 9 a.m. okay. So that's fine. All right. 24 25 Does anybody have anything else to add? Okay. So I'm

going to repeat the conditions one more time for the OZLD and they can help us if, and staff, if we're somewhat confused.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

I'm going to make a motion to approve Application No. 21249 as captioned including the conditions that are:

- 1. The healthcare facility shall have a maximum capacity of 16 residents.
- 2. More parking spaces shall be maintained at the rear of the property and screened with a garage door or a door, that's what the screening is, as shown in Exhibit 21A.
- 3. Three of the four parking spaces shall be reserved for staff members. One space shall be reserved for visitor parking.
 - 4. Visitor hours shall be from 7 to 9 p.m.
- 5. Housekeeping services shall take place in the morning between the hours of 6 a.m. and 11 a.m.
- 6. Meal delivery services shall take place in the morning and the drop-off shall be completed by 9 a.m.
- 7. The Applicant shall hire a private trash contractor to collect trash from the property from the alley side. Trash pick-up shall occur six times a week, Monday through Saturday, and shall be collected between the hours of 6 a.m. and 11 a.m. Hazardous material shall be stored in a screened-in enclosure at the rear of the property.
- 8. The Applicant shall maintain a six foot solid privacy fence enclosing the rear yards behind the front façade

1	of the building.
2	9. Daily outdoor activities in the rear yard area and
3	deck shall not begin before sun up and shall be completed at
4	sundown.
5	10. The Applicant shall designate a community liaison
6	that shall attend ANC meetings on a quarterly basis; and,
7	11. The order shall be valid for five years.
8	Do I get a second, Mr. Blake?
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Second.
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Motion made and seconded. Madam
11	Secretary, take a roll call.
12	MS. MEHLERT: Please respond to the Chair's motion to
13	approve the application with conditions.
14	Chairman Hill?
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
16	MS. MEHLERT: Vice Chair Blake?
17	VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Yes.
18	MS. MEHLERT: And Mr. Smith?
19	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Yes.
20	MS. MEHLERT: Staff would record the vote as three to
21	zero to two to approve Application 21249 with conditions, on the
22	motion made by Chairman Hill and seconded by Vice Chair Blake,
23	with Dr. Imamura not participating.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thank you.
25	Madam Secretary, do we have anything before the Board?

1	MS. MEHLERT: There is nothing else from staff.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you very much. I hope
3	you have a good day and we are adjourned.
4	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
5	record at 2:00 p.m.)
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Public Hearing

Before: DC BZA

Date: 06-04-25

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.

Cassandra Holland

Cassandra B. Holland