GOVERNMENT
OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY OCTOBER 11, 2017

+ + + + +

The Regular Public Hearing convened in the Jerrily R. Kress Memorial Hearing Room, Room 220 South, 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001, pursuant to notice at 9:30 a.m., Frederick Hill, Chairperson, presiding.

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT MEMBERS PRESENT:

FREDERICK L. HILL, Chairperson LESYLLEE M. WHITE, Board Member CARLTON HART, Board Member (NCPC)

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBER[S] PRESENT:

MICHAEL TURNBULL, FAIA, Commissioner (AOC)

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

CLIFFORD MOY, Secretary

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

CHRISTOPHER COHEN, ESQ.

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

STEPHEN MORDFIN KAREN THOMAS

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Hearing held on October 11, 2017.

## CONTENTS

Appeal of Carl and Hallie Smith, Appeal Number				
19571		•	•	3
Reference to OAG matter		•	•	6
Amended Application of Leonard and Sheryl Bennett, Application Number 19585	•		•	7
Application of Florida, LLC, Application Number 19594				18
Adjourn	,		•	76

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

2	(10:24 a.m.)
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right, Mr. Moy, let's do
4	the appeal first actually if we could, the last case here
5	just kind of we might be able to move this along fairly
6	quickly, so that's why.
7	MR. MOY: Yes, very good, Mr. Chairman. So in the
8	hearing session then the Board will be addressing Appeal
9	Number 19571 of Carl and Hallie Smith, captioned and
10	subtitled the Appeal from a decision made on May 5, 2017, by
11	the Zoning Administrator, Department of Consumer Regulatory
12	Affairs, to issue Building Permit Number B-1708004 extending
13	the Retaining Wall Permit RW-1600005 to construct a new
14	retaining wall in the R-1-A Zone at premises 5019 Lowell, L-
15	O-W-E-L-L, Street, NW, Square 1436, Lot 46.
16	As you are aware, Mr. Chairman, there is a filing
17	of a joint Motion to Dismiss in the record file under Exhibit
18	17.
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Moy.
20	Could you just introduce yourself, please?
21	MS. CROOKS: Yes. Good morning. Kristina Crooks
22	of Holland and Knight on behalf of the Appellants.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. You can sit down,
24	thanks. Did you fill out your witness cards?
25	MS. CROOKS: No, Your Honor, we don't have any

1	witnesses.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: No, I'm sorry, just for you.
3	I thought that you had to fill it out, but I don't know, I
4	guess not.
5	MS. CROOKS: Oh.
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So, and I Well, DCRA
7	was here
8	MR. MOY: Yes, he must have stepped out.
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, all right.
10	MR. MOY: But that's fine.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: So, again, and I'm just kind
12	of turning to the Board because this, again, was both the
13	Appellant and DCRA has filed a joint Motion to Dismiss as
14	moot, so because the permits have been revoked. Revoked?
15	And so I don't see Or surrendered, I should say, I'm
16	sorry.
17	And I am inclined to agree with that. Do you have
18	anything to add, Ms. Crooks?
19	MS. CROOKS: No.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Does the Board have
21	anything to add?
22	MEMBER WHITE: I would agree with your assessment
23	as well.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Then I am going to go
25	ahead and make a motion Do you have to make a motion, Mr.

1	Moy or how Okay. So I am going to make a motion to
2	dismiss Appeal Number 19571 as moot and ask for a second.
3	MEMBER HART: Second.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Motion has been made and
5	seconded. All those in favor?
6	(Chorus of ayes)
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All those opposed?
8	(No response)
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: The motion passes. Mr. Moy.
10	Oh, sorry.
11	MR. COHEN: Sorry. Mr. Chair, you would have to
12	address the joint motion that was entered into the record by
13	both DCRA and the Appellant.
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
15	MR. COHEN: So the Board Forgive me.
16	CHAIRPERSON HILL: No, please.
17	MR. COHEN: The Board doesn't have to make its own
18	motion. The Board would be deciding whether or not to grant
19	the joint motion or deny the joint motion that was filed by
20	the parties.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: No, I appreciate that. Okay.
22	So then the motion that I, that would be a more accurate
23	motion to make is, again, to approve the joint Motion to
24	Dismiss as moot, and so that would be on Appeal Number 19571,
25	and I ask for a second.

1	MEMBER HART: Second.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Motion has been made and
3	seconded. All those in favor of the corrected accurate
4	motion that I just made?
5	(Chorus of ayes)
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All those opposed?
7	(No response)
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
9	MR. MOY: And then staff we record the vote as 4
10	to 0 to 1. This is on the motion of Chairman Hill to grant
11	the joint Motion to Dismiss the appeal as moot, seconded the
12	motion, Vice Chair Hart.
13	Also in support of the motion, Mr. Turnbull and
14	Ms. White, the fourth seat vacant. Motion carries, sir.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. For OAG, now I am
16	just curious, since we started to make the first motion do
17	I have to do anything with that first motion? We didn't take
18	a vote or anything.
19	MR. COHEN: You didn't take a vote, I believe it's
20	okay.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, all right.
22	MR. COHEN: I think we can continue.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Well, Vice Chair Hart just
24	wanted to make sure that, you know, I didn't get all crossed
25	up in

1	MR. COHEN: Understood.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you so much.
3	MS. CROOKS: Thank you.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right, so now we're back
5	to the top, Mr. Moy. We only have two.
6	MR. MOY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So the first
7	of the two is Application Number 19585 of Leonard and Sheryl
8	Bennett as amended. This is an amended application for a
9	special exception under Subtitle D, Section 5201, from the
10	rear yard requirements of Subtitle D, Section 306.3, and for
11	non-conforming structure provisions under Subtitle C, Section
12	202, to construct a three-story rear addition to an existing
13	one-family dwelling in the R-3 Zone at premises 1644 U
14	Street, SE, Square 5765, Lot 855.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great, thank you, Mr.
16	Moy. Could you please introduce yourselves?
17	MR. BENNETT: Good morning. Leonard Bennett.
18	MS. BENNETT: Good morning. Sheryl Bennett.
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Good morning. Okay, all
20	right, so I saw that you guys got sworn in because you're
21	like one of the only two people that stood up to get sworn
22	in, so you're easy to point out.
23	I guess you could go ahead and go through your
24	presentation, whoever is going to present to us, in terms of
25	the relief that you are requesting and how you are meeting

the criteria for us to grant the relief.

I guess there was some question, and we can get to that, also, that we had some question in terms of the C-202 in terms of the non-conformity that you guys just added. I'm kind of trying to understand what exactly was the non-conformity that you are requesting relief from.

And so I don't know if either one of you are land use people or what happened, so we'll just -- If not, we can get the Office of Planning and they can help us walk through that as well, but you are the ones that requested that C-202.

And so -- But first why don't you go ahead and walk us through, again, your presentation in terms of what you are trying to do and how you believe you are meeting the criteria for us to grant the relief requested.

And I'll just go ahead and put ten minutes on the clock so that I know how long you are going and you can begin whenever you like.

MS. BENNETT: Okay, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't think that it will take that long, at least from our perspective.

We purchased a home in 2016, in June of 2016. We started the permitting process, as you know the house is in a Historic District so we had to go through a number of, back and forth emails with the Historic Preservation Office and also the ANC 8A to ensure that the plans that we had for the

home, which would include extending it to the back, to the rear of the home, would be agreeable to them.

We began that process in I believe November or December of 2016. The Historic Preservation Office approved our plans with some recommendations regarding materials to be used and whatnot for the rear extension of the home in January of 2017.

So at that point we had our architect and structural engineer start working on permit sets. As you know that takes quite some time, or at least for us it took some time, and so we submitted our application for permits on March 31st, which was just five days, or four days, actually, after a new rule on extensions that go beyond, that go ten feet beyond your nearest neighbors were approved.

And so that's why we are going through the special exception process now because the permit sets were rejected based on that fact. In fact, I think we met Mr. Turnbull last month when we came for a, there was a hearing on the vesting period for that ruling, or that new rule.

Unfortunately, we weren't vested because we were four days later. But in any event, we believe that we have complied with the requirements for the special exception. We have spoken with the neighbors, the adjacent neighbors, they have supplied letters in support of our project.

We have met with the ANC 8A. All ANC members that

were present at the meeting were in support of our project, there is a letter that was submitted in our materials. Letters were also submitted by each of our neighbors, each of our adjacent neighbors in the record.

The Office of Planning has also submitted a report in support, or a recommendation to approve our application.

I believe the Department of Transportation has also done the same.

I believe that part of what you are looking at in determining whether these applications should be approved or not is whether these additions, and our addition is a 19-1/2 foot addition, so going 9-1/2 feet beyond what the ruling now allows, or what we need for a special exception, I believe you look at whether the light, air, and enjoyment of the adjacent properties will be affected.

You can see from the Office of Planning's report that they don't believe that it will be. Our neighbors, again, are really probably looking forward to us living there even more than we are at this point.

And so that's kind of where we stand with that and I am happy to answer any questions. Unfortunately, you know, we are not, this is not something that we do regularly and we're not -- so I'm not sure what information you need, but I'm happy to answer any questions to help alleviate any concerns that you might have with respect to the project.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great. Thank you. It's
2	so funny, I remember watching the, I saw the ZC hearing when
3	you guys came down I think. Didn't you come down? Yes, you
4	testified in front of the Zoning Commission?
5	(Off microphone comment)
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes. So you all are tired.
7	(Laughter)
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes, okay, all right. I need
9	a particular
10	(Off microphone comment)
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Well, yes, sorry. Go ahead,
12	Mr. Hart.
13	MEMBER HART: Yes, I just wanted to let you know
14	that you did a fantastic job. This is not easy to go, not
15	just come in front of us, but to talk about the project and
16	the process that you've gone through.
17	I know it's not easy because there are so many
18	kind of moving parts, so I was just commending you on it
19	because your presentation was very straightforward, was very
20	simple, and I know you probably are tired, so I didn't want
21	to keep you too long, but I do appreciate the information
22	that you have provided and I think it's sufficient for us,
23	but we can go ahead and talk to the Office of Planning.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great. Does anyone have
25	any other questions or kudos for the Applicant?

1 MEMBER WHITE: I will give a half of kudo, how's 2 that? Okay, all right. 3 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Go ahead, 4 sure. No, you know, just echoing what my 5 MEMBER WHITE: colleague said, but can you just give a little bit more 6 7 detail about the conversations you've had with your adjacent neighbor about the project, just to add, you know, 8 support with respect to the criteria that you have to meet 9 under, as part of the special exception application? 10 11 MS. BENNETT: Sure. 12 BENNETT: We, of course, have two adjacent MR. neighbors, one of which is a more seasoned gentleman. 13 14 with him on a number of occasions, one of which, you know, 15 I gave him a full set of plans and he indicated, you know, 16 I should meet with him in a few days to go over it, and a few days later we met and went over the plans. 17 18 He asked a few questions, none of which were concerns for him in terms of -- he wasn't concerned that it 19 20 was going to hinder his property or his enjoyment, but he had 21 a few questions that I answered, and after that meeting he 22 provided us with a letter of approval. He did first ask if we were investors and I let 23 him know that we can't wait to move into the home, so that 24 25 was our one neighbor. and I believe my wife spoke with our

1 other neighbor more extensively. 2 MS. Yes, So mγ husband is BENNETT: we -referring to the neighbor at 1646, which we share a wall 3 with, and then I spoke with our neighbors at 1642 U Street, 4 and, again, we provided them with the plans and walked them 5 6 through exactly what it would look like. 7 I was in their -- They were in our In fact, backyard and I showed them where the extension would end and 8 what it would look like and just described the project in as 9 much detail as we could, or as I could given my knowledge. 10 11 I think that they understand, one, that whatever impact it will have on them in terms of the construction 12 phase, but then, also, obviously, once it is constructed, and 13 14 they are still very much in support of it. 15 Okay. Thank you. MEMBER WHITE: And if I could just add, we did this MS. BENNETT: 16 17 actually twice because we met with them originally when we 18 were going through the historic back in January or December 19 and then again as part of this special exception process. 20 MEMBER TURNBULL: Ouestion, "seasoned" neighbor, 21 does that mean elderly or just had to do with how he talks 22 or language or --23 MR. BENNETT: He has --That's a loaded question. 24 MEMBER WHITE: 25 MR. BENNETT: -- wonderful life experiences that

1 I have, that I have learned from. 2 TURNBULL: Oh, okay, all right. I was going to say if it had to do age I could be called a seasoned 3 4 5 MEMBER WHITE: Seasoned. It kind of sounds like that. 6 THOMAS: 7 interesting. CHAIRPERSON HILL: In the native community we call 8 you elders. 9 MEMBER TURNBULL: You know, when you first stood 10 11 up I'm looking and I thought like I know these people and I'm thinking, I'm looking, we haven't had -- This case hasn't 12 been before and I'm like, oh, and then I suddenly realized 13 14 I was at a zoning hearing and you were looking to get 15 grandfathered in under the -- but I think I am glad you did 16 come back through this and we can get this over with. 17 It does, for the process of the Zoning Commission, 18 shows that you've contacted your neighbors and they are in 19 favor of it and so they have no argument, so I think it 20 fulfills the premise that we originally set up to allow for 21 a special exception but to meet with your neighbors and make 22 sure that everything is in sync and that you have addressed any issues that they might have had. 2.3 24 So, again, I applaud you for doing that and I

think we're ready to vote on this then.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So I am going to turn
2	to the Office of Planning.
3	MS. THOMAS: Good morning, Mr. Chair, Members of
4	the Board, Karen Thomas with the Office of Planning, and we
5	will stand on the record of our report in support of this
6	application.
7	The Applicant made clear their intent and with
8	respect to also meeting with the neighbors, which is one of
9	the criteria that we look at. And what I would like to do
10	also is to and the fact that the Applicant amended the
11	application to include C-202 we would support that as well
12	out of an abundance of caution because the property is non-
13	conforming due to lot area and lot width, so we would support
14	that amendment.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great, thanks. That's
16	the question that I had for the Office of planning. Does
17	anyone have any questions for the Office of Planning?
18	(No response)
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Does the Applicant have any
20	questions for the Office of Planning?
21	(No response)
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Is there anybody here
23	from the ANC wishing to speak?
24	(No response)
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Is there anyone here who wishes
Į.	ı

	16
1	to speak in support?
2	(No answer)
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Is there anyone here who wishes
4	to speak in opposition?
5	(No response)
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right. With that then I'll
7	turn back to you. Is there anything else you would like to
8	add?
9	(No response)
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, all right, okay. All
11	right, so I am going to go ahead and close the hearing. Is
12	the Board ready to deliberate?
13	MEMBER HART: Mr. Chairman, I think that the
14	Applicant has provided us with information, sufficient
15	information, as well as the Office of Planning report and the
16	ANC, the support of the case that and the Applicant has
17	shown that they are meeting the criteria set forth in the
18	zoning regulations for their case and I would make a motion
19	to approve Application 19585 of Leonard and Sheryl Bennett
20	as read by the Secretary and including I guess the subtitle
21	
22	MR. MOY: Yes.
23	MEMBER HART: Okay. I couldn't remember if we did
24	or didn't, so
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes, he did. Okay, a motion

1	has been made. Second. Motion has been made and seconded.
2	All those in favor?
3	(Chorus of ayes)
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All those opposed?
5	(No response)
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Motion passes. Mr. Moy.
7	MR. MOY: The Staff would record the vote as 4 to
8	0 to 1. This is on the motion of Vice Chair Hart to approve
9	the application for the relief requested, seconded the
10	motion, Chairman Hill, also in support, Mr. Michael Turnbull
11	and Ms. White. We have a Board seat vacant. The motion
12	carries.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Is that a summary order?
14	MR. MOY: Yes, sir.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. Thank you all very
16	much.
17	MS. BENNETT: Thank you.
18	MEMBER TURNBULL: Hopefully your contractor is
19	ready to start.
20	MS. BENNETT: Yes, he is. Thank you.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Actually we're going to take
22	a quick three-minute break.
23	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
24	record at 10:43 a.m. and resumed at 10:52 a.m.)
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right, Mr. Moy, whenever

_	you get an opportunity.
2	MR. MOY: Yes, sir. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
3	Yes, I'm ready now, and I see the parties are at the table.
4	This is Application Number 19594 of 1469 Florida Avenue, or,
5	rather, Florida, LLC, captioned advertised for a special
6	exception relief under Subtitle F, Section 5201, from the
7	rear yard requirements, Subtitle F, Section 305.1, which
8	would construct an eight-unit rear addition to an existing
9	three-unit apartment house, RA-2 Zone, the premises is 1469
LO	Florida Avenue, NW, Square 2660, Lot 864.
L1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great. Thank you, Mr. Moy.
L2	If you could please introduce yourselves from my right to
L3	left.
L4	MR. BLOOMFIELD: My name is Patrick Bloomfield and
L5	I am with PT Building Development.
L6	MR. KADLECEK: Cary Kadlecek from Goulston &
L7	Storrs, land use counsel for the Applicant.
L8	MR. KUHN: Jonathan Kuhn of Jonathan Kuhn
L9	Architect, architect for the project.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: How come the developers are
21	never wearing ties? You know, it's like everybody else is
22	wearing a tie, you know, but the developers they just kind
23	of cruise in.
24	Okay. So, Mr. Kadlecek, are you going to be
25	presenting to us?

Yes, we'll give you a 1 MR. KADLECEK: 2 presentation. CHAIRPERSON HILL: 3 Okay. So, I mean take your I think there is some questions that we might have or 4 some issues that might get brought up when we go through the 5 process, but please go ahead. If you would just -- I don't 6 7 have anything specific I am looking for. I mean I quess there was an issue or a condition 8 that was listed that we can get into later. 9 Then there was 10 also -- Yes, I quess that's it for now though. I quess maybe 11 go ahead and -- You can just go ahead and start 12 presentation. I will put ten minutes on the clock just so I know 13 14 where we are and if you go through what you are trying to do 15 in terms of the relief requested and how you are meeting the 16 standard for it that would be great. MR. KADLECEK: Thank you, again. 17 Sure. CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. 18 19 MR. KADLECEK: Good morning, again. Cary Kadlecek 20 from Goulston & Storrs on behalf of the Applicant. The application before you is for a request for special exception 21 from the read yard requirement. 22 The proposed rear yard is ten feet, ten inches. 23 The requirement is 15 feet, so the relief is for four feet, 24 25 two inches. The Applicant is pleased to report that they

have the support of both the ANC and the Office of Planning. 1 They have had extensive conversations with both 2 immediately adjacent both of 3 neighbors, whom supportive, and one of whom is here today. With that, I will 4 let the architect give you more specifics about the project. 5 MR. KUHN: Good morning again, this is Jonathan 6 7 The package that I just handed off to Mr. Moy are the Kuhn. same ones that are in the slideshow that I have up on the 8 screen here for everyone. 9 10 intent So the here, to elaborate the description of the project that was read to us, 11 existing building is a three-story plus cellar structure with 12 a small two-story what I would call a dog leg at the back and 13 14 it is currently a three-unit structure. 15 And so for the proposed we are going from a threeunit structure to an eight-unit building. 16 The addition at the rear will take over where the existing addition is and 17 18 provide additional space to get to the eight-unit building. 19 The scale, proportions, and the proposed addition 20 at the back are in keeping with the neighboring buildings. 21 As you can see from the first drawing, diagram, we are, you 22 know, maintaining, you know, a consistent rear setback to the building, you know, as it aligns down Florida Avenue. 23 24 Additionally, the addition is also a three-story

so from a massing standpoint, architecturally

structure,

speaking, it's more consistent. We have one thing else to note, that the owners of the building also worked with Historic, correct, with Ann Brockett --

(Off microphone comment)

MR. KUHN: Yes. And received approval through Historic also for the project, so that's worth noting on the record.

The existing, that front building, again, that I was referring to was built around 1900. There is some speculation that maybe it was moved to this location and sits on a rather large stone foundation, but we are going to be maintaining the character of that building, that's not going to change.

The addition at the back, we're adding, we're maintaining the side yard setback to get to the rear yard area and that rear yard area is going to be comprised of patios that are really going to be kind of sunk into the topography.

If you've looked at the drawings before there is a very steep slope to the back, so these are really going to be sunken patios, and because of the GAR requirements for the property there will be planter boxes that will soften the space, maintain, you know, a green feel to it as well as having a green roof on the penthouse roof and planter boxes on the proposed roof deck as well.

1	And the front yard, again, kind of continuing
2	this, a very steep slope topography is also, you know, slated
3	to be, you know, fully landscaped. What would be the sixth
4	page in your document, the drawings, the proposed north
5	elevation kind of demonstrates a little bit more of the
6	sunken patio as well as the following sheet, Page 7.
7	And these, again, are to and provide,
8	obviously, some outdoor living space to the occupants of the
9	building, but, again, also meeting, you know, green space and
10	landscaping space for the property.
11	And the last page, sorry, Page Number 9, shows a
12	good perspective of the rear view of the building in showing
13	the scale proximity relationship and context with the
14	immediate neighbors.
15	MR. KADLECEK: With that, we're available for
16	questions. Thank you.
17	MEMBER HART: Could you talk a little bit about
18	the ANC discussion that you had?
19	MR. BLOOMFIELD: Our priority was working with our
20	abutting neighbors. We did satisfy multiple requests. Our
21	neighbor to the west of us is actually here today as a
22	proponent of the project. We sat aside numerous concerns
23	related to design, removal of the tree, et cetera.
24	The neighbor to the east of us conceded to she

had multiple requests listing out, you know, basically to not

1 have dumpsters in front of her property, put up parking 2 signs, et cetera. We have agreed to satisfy that and get it written 3 4 up into a formal agreement. She issued an email kind of documenting that and that was shown to the ANC Commissioner. 5 The neighbor that's not directly abutting, but is 6 7 one more house over at 1465 had a concern that there would hiah visibility from the roof deck from how 8 it's positioned, so we have agreed to clip the corner of the roof 9 deck to kind of pull back that viewpoint, that vantage point 10 11 from the roof, so he could be afforded a little bit more And if we got --12 privacy. MEMBER TURNBULL: Could you show that on the plan 13 14 for us? 15 If you go to Sheet Number 5 in MR. KUHN: Sorry. your packet, which is the proposed site plan, what's not 16 indicated here, and this was --17 18 MEMBER HART: You mean A-100? Yes, Sheet A-100. 19 MR. KUHN: The corner that Pat 20 is referring to isn't shown clipped here only out of it being 21 consistent of the drawings and information that was provided up to this date. 22 But where you can see the dimensions, the four 23 feet and the four feet, that corner has been chamfered, so 24 25 it 45 angle. provided additional was а degree We

documentation showing what are called camera views in the software that we used for the drawing program and showing that anyone up there you wouldn't be able to see into the rear yard, which is actually the property three doors down, two doors down.

MR. BLOOMFIELD: Two doors down.

MR. KUHN: Two doors down.

MEMBER HART: And we also received some letters in opposition yesterday and this morning. I am assuming you've actually, one of the team has seen them, if you could kind of talk about that as well.

MR. KADLECEK: Yes, we saw them this morning. I'll let the architect speak to this a little bit more. As far as I understand, well, two of them didn't even, sorry, one of them didn't even have an address so we're not even sure where that person is coming from, but two of them are from a building that's on 15th Street.

I will let Jonathan speak to it a little more. It's a property that's probably 100 or more feet away from this property. I think it would be difficult to make the argument that a special exception for four feet, four inches of rear yard relief has any perceptible impact on a property that's, or a building, rather, that's 100 feet away.

Jonathan, can you maybe show where that property is, at least the property that we believe it is?

2.3

MR. KUHN: So Sheet A-001, which is the second page in the packet you have before you, if you look at the zoning map, from our quick look I believe it is where you see the "233," so it's on the lefthand side, it's an irregular-shaped lot, kind of almost like a skeleton key to some degree shape. Again, you can see the outline of their building and the distance from our property.

And I believe one of the comments was about, you know, patio noise, the -- A couple things on that front, one, the patio that we are proposing is actually smaller than the one that is existing, and, two, again, as I pointed out before, the GAR requirements, we have to have landscaping in those patio areas, so there is going to be planter boxes that are going to be, it will soften the sound and also provide, you know, a softer look, meaning, you know, there is going to be landscaping.

And, again, to reiterate, you know, the patio is sunken in so it's actually going to be shielded more than the existing.

MEMBER HART: And you said that the existing condition on the back is just grass or --

MR. KUHN: I'm sorry. If you go to the next page and if you look at the bottom right-hand corner, that photograph, you can see the existing conditions of the existing patio.

2.3

1	MEMBER HART: And that image is looking
2	MR. KUHN: That's looking north. So if you were
3	at the back of the building
4	MEMBER HART: Okay, looking Okay, yes.
5	MEMBER WHITE: I had a question. I'm just I
6	see the letters that were submitted form others opposing at
7	least part of the project, but did you get any specific
8	comments from the adjacent neighbors and what were their
9	positions?
10	I am looking at Page A-001, so you noted that the
11	neighbor at 233 submitted opposition, but what about 213,
12	849, 862, did they submit anything?
13	MR. KUHN: Yes, 213 and 849 are the immediate
14	neighbors which Cary and Pat both spoke of. One of them is
15	here today. Both of them have provided letters of support
16	in this through the ANC process.
17	MEMBER WHITE: Okay.
18	MEMBER TURNBULL: Well, are they submitted in our
19	records?
20	MR. KADLECEK: Sorry. The person who He can
21	speak for himself. The person at 213, the adjacent neighbor
22	at Lot 213, that's also the ANC SMD, so the Applicant had
23	extensive conversations with him.
24	There is no put-together letter from him, but I
25	believe he is going to testify in support, but that was all
ļ	

1	basically funneled through the ANC process, the conversations
2	with those neighbors.
3	MR. KUHN: Correct.
4	MR. KADLECEK: And as you can see in Exhibit 38
5	the ANC voted unanimously to support the project, and that's
6	the result of the conversations with those two immediately
7	adjacent neighbors. With respect to Lot 862, that's actually
8	a landlocked lot. No one lives there, it's undevelopable.
9	MEMBER WHITE: Okay.
LO	MR. KADLECEK: And we actually describe part of
L1	that in the application about how effectively that provides
L2	more open space.
L3	It's an undevelopable lot, it can never be built
L4	on, so even though it's not part of this property, if it were
L5	to be part of this property effectively, if you considered
L6	that, the rear yard would actually be conforming. So that
L7	will always remain open space.
L8	MEMBER WHITE: And, I'm sorry, 849, what was your
L9	response with respect to that one, was
20	MR. BLOOMFIELD: That was the email exchange that
21	I showed today, and the ANC Commissioner is here today.
22	MEMBER WHITE: Okay.
23	MR. BLOOMFIELD: And that was basically where we
24	outlined, you know, where we're going to put our dumpster and
25	putting up parking signs, and just kind of adhering to the
ı	I and the state of

1	construction noise requirements for the District and stuff
2	like that.
3	MEMBER WHITE: Okay. Is that in the record?
4	MR. BLOOMFIELD: I've just shown him the email,
5	that's all I've done. I can put it in record.
6	MEMBER WHITE: Okay. It would be nice to see.
7	MEMBER HART: And you said 862, Mr. Kadlecek, that
8	is landlocked, but who owns that?
9	MR. BLOOMFIELD: The neighbor above.
10	MEMBER HART: The neighbor to the north?
11	MR. BLOOMFIELD: The neighbor to the north, yes.
12	And I should say the topography is, I mean there is almost
13	a 60-foot differential, so how we effect that
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Can you maybe speak into the
15	microphone, I'm sorry.
16	MR. BLOOMFIELD: There is almost a 60-foot
17	differential from that hill, because that's the bottom of
18	Meridian Hill. So like even if we were to max out, right now
19	we're at about 35 feet of grade, which is 15 below of what
20	is allowed for in RA-2, so even if we went up to 50 by right
21	we would still be 40 feet below, you know, the bottom of his
22	house.
23	MEMBER HART: Thank you.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Kadlecek, I'm curious of
25	one thing. So you had mentioned it was four feet two inches

1	or four feet four inches back?
2	MR. KADLECEK: It's relief of 4 feet two inches.
3	So the requirement is 15 feet, the proposed rear yard is ten
4	feet ten inches.
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Right. So the request is for
6	four feet
7	MR. KADLECEK: Two inches.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: two inches. So just out of
9	curiosity though, why didn't If you didn't do it you
10	wouldn't be here then, if it weren't for the four feet two
11	inches you wouldn't need to be here?
12	MR. KADLECEK: Yes, correct.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
14	MR. KADLECEK: So if it weren't for the rear yard
15	relief then the project would not be here, correct.
16	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Right. So then what would that
17	You would just kind of lose I'm just curious if you
18	decided not to do the four feet two inches what would you
19	lose?
20	MR. KADLECEK: I'll let the architect address
21	that.
22	MR. KUHN: We'd lose living space essentially.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Living space from those units?
24	MR. KUHN: Yes, and potentially, you know, imagine
25	lopping off, you know, four feet off the back of the

1	building.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Right.
3	MR. KUHN: It would go from two bedroom units
4	probably to one bedroom, if not less.
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Got it.
6	MR. KUHN: I mean it becomes It cramps the
7	footprint.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, all right. Okay, does
9	the Board have any more questions for the Applicant?
10	MEMBER TURNBULL: Yes, just a couple, Mr. Chair.
11	The existing retaining wall, you're removing the existing
12	retaining to the back of the property, right, I see on your
13	drawing?
14	MR. KUHN: That's correct.
15	MEMBER TURNBULL: And so, what, it's bumping back,
16	it's going to be at the end of your property, do you still
17	need a retaining because you're going to need a retaining
18	wall at the back then still?
19	MR. KUHN: That's correct, yes, there will still
20	be a retaining wall that will be at the rear property line.
21	MEMBER TURNBULL: Okay, and then
22	MR. KUHN: So if you look at A-100
23	MEMBER TURNBULL: Yes.
24	MR. KUHN: which is Sheet Number 5 in there
25	MEMBER TURNBULL: Right.

1 MR. KUHN: -- you can see the new retaining wall 2 sits at the property line. 3 MEMBER TURNBULL: Okay. The other thing is the 4 west elevation which faces your neighbor to the west or whatever, I guess it's really the east elevation or whatever 5 you want to call it, but it's the existing structure has like 6 7 a shiplap siding on the existing house or --It's a lap siding. 8 MR. KUHN: It's a lap siding. 9 MEMBER TURNBULL: But what's 10 the new siding? I see just a blank wall. 11 MR. KUHN: Yes, we're exploring materials right We have talked about wood siding, we've talked about 12 corrugated metal, we've talked about a Hardie panel with a 13 14 smooth surface. 15 As you can see the addition is more of a modern stylistically speaking, 16 so from material standpoint we're looking at that same approach. 17 MEMBER TURNBULL: Yes, it looks kind of like stark 18 19 right now. I'm just, it's -- I mean it's at risk. 20 the wall is at risk. It's on the property line, right? No, along the east side it is not at 21 MR. KUHN: We are off the property line four feet --22 MEMBER TURNBULL: No, not that elevation, on the 23 other side, I'm sorry. Maybe I --24 25 MR. KUHN: Oh, okay, sorry. On the west?

1	MEMBER TURNBULL: Yes.
2	MR. KUHN: We don't have any windows in the west
3	elevation.
4	MEMBER TURNBULL: Right, there is none.
5	MR. KUHN: Yes.
6	MEMBER TURNBULL: But I mean I was just curious
7	what that material would be.
8	MR. BLOOMFIELD: Let me speak to that.
9	MR. KUHN: Sure.
10	MEMBER TURNBULL: I mean you can still it from the
11	street, right?
12	MR. BLOOMFIELD: No.
13	MEMBER TURNBULL: You can't see it at all from the
14	street?
15	MR. BLOOMFIELD: No. No, but the reason that's
16	kind of left open, too, is because we have agreed with the
17	neighbor that we would kind of integrate some green screen
18	walls into it that would kind of break up the monotony of the
19	wall.
20	MEMBER TURNBULL: Okay.
21	MR. BLOOMFIELD: So there will probably be, you
22	know, some degree, it will either be like a, you know, a flat
23	panel, a Hardie panel or something like that on the rear
24	addition, and then we are going to continue the lap around
25	from the existing facade around the side on the existing

1 addition on the west wall. 2 MEMBER TURNBULL: Okay. OP in the report also pointed out that you may need penthouse relief, which you are 3 4 not requesting, but I don't know if you want to comment on 5 that? Yes, I'll --MR. KADLECEK: 6 7 Because of the unequal height? MEMBER TURNBULL: MR. KADLECEK: Yes, I'll comment on that, and I'll 8 let the architect and Patrick address it a little more 9 10 thoroughly. They actually met with a zoning technician at 11 DCRA and at PDRM to discuss this very particular issue. He did not express concern with it, but I think 12 ultimately it is a self-certified application and if during 13 14 permit the zoning administrator's office eventually says that 15 the roof needs to be leveled then it can be leveled at that time. 16 MEMBER TURNBULL: 17 Yes. MR. KADLECEK: But they did actually discuss it 18 19 with DCRA and it was not raised as a concern with them at 20 that --The recommended it, actually. 21 MR. BLOOMFIELD: 22 MEMBER TURNBULL: The only other concern Okay. I have is that we don't really have a correct set of drawings 2.3 24 then that reflect exactly what you are proposing with the

clipped angle at the back there, do we?

1	MR. BLOOMFIELD: We have it, you know, on a
2	computer at home. I mean it's not
3	MEMBER TURNBULL: Well, I would just think that
4	for our records here for the BZA that
5	MR. BLOOMFIELD: Sure, absolutely.
6	MEMBER TURNBULL: we should have a current set
7	of drawings showing exactly what you are proposing.
8	MR. KUHN: Yes, the clipped piece, just to
9	elaborate, is just at the roof deck itself.
10	MEMBER TURNBULL: Just at the roof deck?
11	MR. KUHN: The roof deck. It's not the building,
12	it's only at the roof deck.
13	MR. BLOOMFIELD: It's where the handrail occurs.
14	MR. KUHN: If you go Sheet A-100, which is the
15	fifth page in the packet, again, on like the bottom right-
16	hand corner where you see the two 4-foot dimension strings
17	at that rear corner of the building
18	MEMBER TURNBULL: Yes.
19	MR. KUHN: so that 4-foot setback is for the
20	railing of the roof deck and what I am saying is that corner
21	is being chamfered there. Again
22	MEMBER TURNBULL: Oh, the railing of the roof
23	deck, not the actual roof itself?
24	MR. KUHN: Not the roof itself, no, because what
25	the concern of the neighbor two doors down was people
ı	

1	standing at the roof deck specifically at that corner at that
2	railing could then look beyond our building, beyond our
3	neighboring building, and into their rear yard, and that's
4	what we were trying to address.
5	So by chamfering the corner of the railing and
6	pulling it back it therefore pulled back the sight line of
7	anybody standing there of being able to see to their rear
8	yard.
9	MEMBER TURNBULL: Okay. Well, for the sake of
10	argument, I don't know what my colleagues think, but we don't
11	have a record of that, but I'll let them comment on whether
12	we need it or not. Thank you.
13	MR. KUHN: You're welcome.
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Can you just put your cursor
15	over what you are talking about?
16	MR. KUHN: Sure. So right here, this area.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Huh?
18	MR. KUHN: So, that
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: You're pulling it back.
20	MR. KUHN: Right now where I am showing it's a
21	right, you know, 90 degree angle
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
23	MR. KUHN: we're going to clip it
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Right.
25	MR. KUHN: the way that little hand cursor is

1	showing and pull it back.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, okay.
3	MR. KUHN: And, again, it was a request of two
4	doors down from us. You'd
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure, I understand. Okay,
6	that's fine, I was just curious. Thank you so much.
7	MR. KUHN: Okay, yes.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Does anybody else have any more
9	questions?
10	MEMBER HART: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure.
12	MEMBER HART: Did you also say that you had
13	conversations with HPRB or had conversations with the HPO,
14	and is there something that I am just missing in our exhibits
15	that you could let us know?
16	MR. BLOOMFIELD: Originally we went through HPRB
17	and we have received full approval. During that timeframe
18	we didn't have a boundary survey back that we were clarifying
19	the location of the lot lines, so we didn't know we needed
20	the relief at the time.
21	Otherwise, we would have handled the BZA process
22	simultaneously. So we received approval for HPRB and the
23	building was three feet further back than we anticipated so
24	that's why we had to ask for relief to go into the setback.
25	MEMBER HART: Okay. And just did we, did you

1	Do we have an exhibit that has the HPRB approval, that's what
2	I'm trying to
3	MR. KADLECEK: Oh, no, we haven't filed anything,
4	but they did receive concept approval.
5	MEMBER HART: Okay.
6	MR. KADLECEK: I believe I can give you the I
7	can put the
8	(Simultaneous speaking)
9	MEMBER HART: I was just I didn't know if they
10	had any comments. I was just trying to understand where they
11	were with it.
12	MR. KADLECEK: Oh.
13	MEMBER HART: It's just, yes, an approval is one
14	thing, but approval with, oh, well we would like for you to
15	do X, Y, Z. I'm just interested to understand what it is
16	that they actually described.
17	MR. BLOOMFIELD: I don't have a copy of it. I
18	don't believe there was any comments.
19	MR. KADLECEK: Yes, the final approval was
20	delegated to HPO staff. So that's one of the reasons we
21	asked for flexibility to address comments from HPO staff in
22	development of final drawings.
23	MEMBER HART: And did you do any like shade
24	studies or anything, sun studies?
25	MR. KADLECEK: We did not. Just for the record

1 the HPA number was 17-245, that was the concept approval for 2 the project. CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Kadlecek, the condition 3 4 that, again, the Office of Planning has, I'm just kind of reading it and making sure that I am correct, "The Applicant 5 shall have flexibility to make minor changes to the final 6 7 of the project in response to the request instructions from the Historic Preservation Office and/or the 8 Historic Preservation Review Board, " and I am going to add 9 this, "so long as no new relief is needed." 10 11 MR. KADLECEK: That's fine. 12 CHAIRPERSON HILL: You're in agreement with that? MR. KADLECEK: 13 Yes. 14 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right, does the Board have any other questions for the Applicant at this 15 16 point? 17 (No response) CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. I am going to turn to 18 the Office of Planning. 19 20 MR. MORDFIN: Good morning, Chair and Members of 21 the Board, I am Stephen Mordfin, and the Office of Planning 22 recommends approval of this application finding it's conformance with the required special exception criteria. 23 OP did note that there may be additional relief 24 25 or -- OP finds that additional relief would be needed for the

sloped roof. However, the Applicant did state that if that does become an issue at permitting they could level the roof and there would not be additional relief required for this application.

So the Office of Planning does recommend approval of this application.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right. Mr. Mordfin, since there are people here that are probably in opposition and support could you just walk us through a little bit more in detail your report in terms of, in your analysis as to how this is meeting the criteria to grant the relief?

The first one, that light and MR. MORDFIN: Yes. air to neighboring properties shall not be unduly affected. There is a lot at the rear that is undevelopable so there will not be any adverse impact on that, and then there is the approximately 60-foot grade differential between property and the property to the north as it goes up and that also minimizes the impact that this will have properties to the north because it's so much lower than that.

The privacy, use, and enjoyment to neighboring properties shall not be unduly compromised, you know, between the grade separation between that property and to the north. We don't think that this reduced rear setback would really have a significant impact on them just because of the unusual topography in that area.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

This addition, under sea, would not be visible from the street. There is no alley to the rear, so there is no alley for this building to be seen from, and then it's also difficult to see it from, you go one block north it's difficult to see it from there, again, because of the grade.

The Applicant did submit plans and photographs and

elevation section drawings so that we could analyze this appropriately, and, also, the proposed lot occupancy you can see is 59.8 percent, which is less than the 60 percent permitted with the ARIE 2 as a matter of right.

The Office of Planning makes no recommendations application special treatment and this would not introduce or expand an existing non-conforming use. And. lastly, the section shall not be used to permit the introduction or expansion of non-conforming height, and it's not.

The building is in conformance with the maximum height that is permitted, which is 50 feet. The proposed building is 35.5 feet.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you for that further clarification. Does the Board have any questions for the Office of Planning?

MEMBER WHITE: Just for my own understanding, you know, the properties are really close together, I mean it's in the city so it's not unusual, but for this type of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

development I am just curious why you would not ask for a sun study or look at a sun study?

You said you did not believe that, you know, the light would, you know, the development would not have a negative impact on neighboring properties, so I'm just trying to understand that aspect of it.

But at the same time I know they have gotten letters from the adjacent property owners, we're still waiting to get maybe one copy as part of the record, but I just wanted to get your feedback on that to help me with how you came to that conclusion.

MR. MORDFIN: Okay. Well, this application is to reduce the rear yard, and so that's primarily what we looked at is how does it impact the rear yard and impact the properties to the rear, because usually you have the separation which provides privacy and light and air between them.

The unusual topography here, which is very steep as you go up from Florida Avenue, does have an effect on this property and the way it impacts any properties to the north. Those properties are set up much higher than this property and building back, you know, it reduces any visibility that they are going to have of this building addition, and that's why we didn't ask for any impacts.

We don't see that it's going to adversely impact

1	light and air. You still have the separation between the
2	buildings which will allow air. You know, whether or not it
3	put any It says "light," so I don't see where this is
4	going to adversely impact light.
5	Anything that you construct is going to cause
6	shadowing somewhere. You can't build anything without
7	resulting in that, but we don't see that that's going to
8	significantly impact any of the surrounding properties.
9	MEMBER WHITE: Okay. Thank you.
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Anyone else for the Office of
11	Planning?
12	(No response)
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Does the Applicant have
14	any questions for the Office of Planning?
15	MR. KADLECEK: No. Thank you.
16	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Is there anyone here
17	from the ANC wishing to speak?
18	(Off microphone comment)
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Oh, please, come forward.
20	(Off microphone comment)
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: You can just give me a second,
22	you have to speak into the microphone.
23	(Off microphone comment)
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: That's all right. And did you
25	fill out your witness cards?

1	MR. ACKERMAN: I did.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: And did you get sworn in?
3	MR. ACKERMAN: I did not.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Mr. Moy, if you could
5	swear in the witness, please, and anyone else who is here if
6	they haven't been sworn if you could just stand and take the
7	oath. Thank you.
8	MR. MOY: Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the
9	testimony you are about to present is the truth, the whole
10	truth, and nothing but the truth?
11	MR. ACKERMAN: I do.
12	MR. MOY: Thank you.
13	MR. ACKERMAN: I came here today just basically
14	to quickly reiterate what the ANC's process in this, role in
15	this process was. We extensively met with the Applicant of
16	this exception through our committee process.
17	We did have the neighbors, the concerns that were
18	raised by the neighbors were I believe accurately represented
19	in the testimony today. I believe that they were amenable
20	to the changes and the requests that I am aware of that were
21	made through the ANC.
22	Certainly, there were concerns about the impact
23	of the roof deck and privacy, and those were addressed, I
24	believe, in the plans, and they weren't just from the
25	neighbors to the east, they were also, I am also an abutter

to the west, so I am the property that's right next to this, I own the property at 1471 Florida, so I'm not sure what the parcel number is there, but we have that fan lot, so it's actually a private, kind of a backyard area that we had requested that part of this plan would be to setback significantly the edge of the roof deck so people couldn't be looking down into our yard.

And through our attorneys, my attorney, and their attorneys, we were able to kind of hammer out an agreement that was amenable to all parties. They pushed back that roof deck line on that west side as well, which was helpful.

Yes, I've been in the neighborhood for 20 years. I was always told that that property was relocated from another place. It was a building that was transplanted to that spot and had a lot of engineering challenges in the past, which my understanding is that this development will address those issues.

It was kind of a leaning building on our block for many, many years, so in that sense this should be an improvement to that structure which we are looking forward to.

There were also some negotiated community amenities which they agreed to and which we are very happy that they did that for us and I think it will -- including supporting some of the community cultural programming events,

1 helping out and maintaining some of the tree boxes in the area that have been neglected for a long time, working on 2 some beautification issues around the front of that property, 3 4 which are sorely needed. So our view is that this four and some inches 5 exception should be granted if all of the other requirements 6 7 have been met, and we believe that the line of communication has been open and they have been very cooperative from our 8 standpoint in terms of addressing all of the questions that 9 10 we had. 11 So that's why I wanted to speak from my ANC Commissioner's hat and I can also speak as an abutter if 12 there are any questions that you have as well. 13 14 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great. Well, 15 Commissioner Ackerman, thanks for coming down. I mean it's 16 really helpful for us to hear from the ANC and particularly the SMD in terms of any projects that are kind 17 18 of -- I was just curious, how long have you been an ANC Commissioner? 19 20 About a year and a half. MR. ACKERMAN: CHAIRPERSON HILL: 21 Oh, so not that long, 22 still. 23 MR. ACKERMAN: Still new. CHAIRPERSON HILL: 24 Yes. 25 MR. ACKERMAN: Still learning, actually.

1 CHAIRPERSON HILL: No, but still, that's -- I'm 2 sure you've learned a lot in a year and a half. Okay, do you 3 have some questions for the Commissioner? 4 MEMBER HART: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Ackerman, thank you very much also for coming down. 5 MR. ACKERMAN: Sure. 6 You talked about some community 7 MEMBER HART: amenities, which are fine, did you happen 8 to discussion about the kind of, it looks like actually on this 9 image there is some bike parking, bikes are kind of located 10 11 in this area, that they are going to be actually putting in a new entrance for some of the housing? 12 Do you have any issue about having, you know, bike 13 14 parking at the front of this building or is there any issue 15 with -- It looks like they are putting these, I guess it's the image to the bottom left, the two images just kind of 16 show where this narrow, you know, space is --17 18 MR. ACKERMAN: Sure. -- and they have, you know, folks 19 MEMBER HART: 20 are riding bikes and they are putting them there because they 21 don't want them out kind of, you know, somewhere. So I don't 22 know where they're going to go once this building gets constructed, and maybe the Applicant --23 MR. KUHN: Mr. Hart, if I could respond to that. 24 25 MEMBER HART: -- could be able to kind of deal

1 with that, but I just -- That's kind of one question, and I 2 do have another question for you. 3 MR. ACKERMAN: Would you like me to respond or 4 would you like the architect to respond? Yes, actually if you could that 5 MEMBER HART: would be fine. 6 7 MR. ACKERMAN: Okay, sure. The other question is about the 8 MEMBER HART: whole, this is a larger addition that is being put on from 9 what was being put on, what exists, could you talk a little 10 11 bit about any impact that you might find, too, of kind of the light to the back of your property because it is adjoining 12 this and it's likely that, you know, you are now going to 13 14 have a larger space, a larger wall, like wall, like Mr. 15 Turnbull was talking about earlier that's going to be next to your property? 16 I know I have asked a couple of questions, about 17 18 bikes and then the shade issue. If you could respond to 19 that. I mean I don't know 20 MR. ACKERMAN: Sure, yes. 21 that anyone is pleased when they see, you know, a structure that takes away or creates shadow. 22 I think we looked at this as a tradeoff and I 23 think that the sum total of what the developers have offered 24 25 in terms of concessions put us into a situation where it was,

you know, we see it as a positive contribution to the community.

The question about, you know, the shade studies, these weren't, you know, that's not something that we discussed in detail. I will say that to the point that the gentleman from the Office of Planning made, because the light issue is somewhat reduced form a usual condition because of the fact that there is quite a steep hillside behind us, so that does actually, you know, the light issues is only relevant from a few different, I would say fewer directions than in the normal circumstances, so it's not as big of an impact.

In terms of what the neighbors have told me, you know, have raised for questions, you know, there wasn't a great deal of negative response to this project at all. It wasn't the kind of matter where you had a lot of contentious meetings and it was more of an amicable discussion and I think it was an open process.

And every issue I was made aware of has been dealt with directly and I was present with the developers just to verify that they had contacted the other direct abutter and they had showed me evidence through email exchanges with the owner exactly what her requests were, and it was, you know, not just limited not putting, you know, being careful about the dumpster blocking parking and things like that, but she

2.3

also wanted to be assured that if there was damage to her property that they would take responsibility for it and my understanding was that they have.

And so I think that it was, her requests were reasonable and the developer I believe acquiesced to all of those.

Now in terms of the bike issue, I guess this is just an existing condition. There are several rent tenants that are in the property and maybe that's why they put their bikes there.

You know, I can't speak to what the plans are with how they are going to handle bikes. Our concern was about the garbage for all those additional units being confined and some sort of a system set up so that with all that additional trash they either could seal off or come up with a solution for the garbage which will also be stored there that won't impact the neighboring community, and that was our concern.

We have bike racks in the area. We have a shared bike station right across the street. So I will let them address the bike issue.

MR. KUHN: We are providing interior bike storage space at the lowest level to address this as one of the things, again, that was touched on, you know, as kind of a, even though it's for the tenants, but thinking more broadly to the community rather than having kind of the circumstance

1 that you see in the photos. Thank you for all of that, for the 2 MEMBER HART: clarification on both of those issues. Thank you. 3 I did have one further comment if 4 MR. ACKERMAN: possible to Turnbull's observation about 5 Mr. the monolithic nature of that wall facing to the west, that is 6 7 facing my backyard and I certainly expressed concern about how that would be handled in terms of materials and what it 8 would like and my hope is that through this process that the 9 developer will make good on what they have said, which is to 10 11 work with us on the materials and a greening approach, which Pat had mentioned and which he was receptive to and I think, 12 in fact, actually suggested it. 13 We talked about how to make that look a little bit 14 15 more of an organic wall rather than just, you know, a white 16 wall against our backyard. So I think they have been amenable and open to solutions on that. 17 18 think that if any -- If the pass Τ is any 19 indication we'll be able to get through that no problem 20 moving forward. 21 Okav. Mr. Turnbull? CHAIRPERSON HILL: 22 Commissioner, did they talk to MEMBER TURNBULL: you anything about lighting on the deck, what's the plans for 23 lighting on the deck? 24

MR. ACKERMAN:

25

I don't believe that had come up

1	in our discussions, to be honest with you. I don't remember.
2	Do you remember that being an issue?
3	MEMBER TURNBULL: I mean normally there would
4	downlighting or something that's not going to be intrusive
5	and to
6	MR. ACKERMAN: Yes.
7	MEMBER TURNBULL: make it like a glowing
8	MR. ACKERMAN: Could the architect speak to that
9	plan?
10	MR. KUHN: Right now the intent is just providing
11	lighting at the penthouse, so the roof deck access, so there
12	would be light on the surface wall. I'll go to the
13	elevation, Sheet A-201, which is Page 6 in your packet, and
14	A-202.
15	So specifically on A-202 where you see the larger
16	overhang, which is where you will come out of the penthouse
17	onto the roof deck, I mean by code we have to have lighting
18	there, but as of right now, you know, we're not doing any
19	building lighting as I would call it.
20	MEMBER TURNBULL: Yes okay. I think it might be
21	good to clarify that just for the concerns of the neighbors
22	that there is a privacy issue for them and that they're not
23	looking up at a well-lighted
24	MR. KUHN: A beacon, sure.
25	MEMBER TURNBULL: Yes.

1	MR. KUHN: Yes.
2	MEMBER TURNBULL: Okay.
3	MR. ACKERMAN: And one other comment about just
4	in terms of because we don't for some reason have the plans
5	that should reflect some of the changes that we had discussed
6	I would just ask that the plans that do get submitted at the
7	final stage of this reflect that we did negotiate a setback
8	of the roof deck, which was I believe we had eight feet or
9	nine feet off of the west wall, is that correct, Patrick?
10	MR. BLOOMFIELD: To align with the back side of
11	the penthouse.
12	MR. ACKERMAN: To align with the back side of the
13	penthouse, so that alleviates our concerns with regard to the
14	space on the roof deck.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Commissioner Ackerman,
16	again, or I should actually say, Mr. Kuhn, you're talking
17	about that railing, right, he's talking about the railing
18	there?
19	MR. KUHN: There were two things, the railing is
20	set back four feet
21	(Simultaneous speaking)
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes, can you show me from that
23	
	overview I guess of where
24	overview I guess of where  MR. KUHN: Yes. If you look at the slide that I
24 25	

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
2	MR. KUHN: you can see the penthouse at the
3	top. We're actually off both sidewalls a total of nine feet.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, so that one is already
5	reflected in the drawings?
б	MR. KUHN: Correct.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: The only thing that is not
8	reflected on the drawings is the railing?
9	MR. KUHN: And just that clipped corner that we
10	went through before talking
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: With the railing?
12	MR. BLOOMFIELD: Well, there is also
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: You have to speak into the mic.
14	MR. BLOOMFIELD: I believe what Nathan is
15	referring to is we have agreed on that roof deck on the right
16	side of that elevation we have agreed to align that with the
17	right side of the penthouse.
18	So it's actually a full nine feet off the right,
19	off the west wall of the property, off that west property
20	line.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So that's not reflected
22	on the drawings now?
23	MR. BLOOMFIELD: It's not.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So I mean I don't know
25	where we are going to get to this at end. We're probably

1 going to have to see drawings before we're going to be able 2 to take a vote, regardless, and so just kind of something to keep in mind as we kind of go through this process. 3 4 Another thing, and I don't know how the other Board Members feel, but I'd like to see some kind of a 5 condition maybe, Mr. Kadlecek, that you could work in with 6 7 Commissioner Ackerman in terms of what you are agreeing to do for the wall there in some kind of way that, you know, it 8 would make the Board feel comfortable that you all have 9 something in the record in terms of what you've agreed to do. 10 11 So that's another thought there. So, okay, is that it, Mr. Commissioner? 12 (Off microphone comment) 13 14 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, thanks so much. Allright, is there anybody wishing to speak in support? 15 (No response) 16 Is there anybody here wishing 17 CHAIRPERSON HILL: to speak in opposition? 18 How about I'm sort of just --19 MR. MURRAY: 20 That's okay, sure, whoever CHAIRPERSON HILL: (Simultaneous speaking) 21 22 CHAIRPERSON HILL: No, no, no, please No, no, take your time. And you need to speak into 23 forward. the microphone and then also you did get sworn in earlier? 24 25 MR. MURRAY: I did.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. And there is no one else
2	here to speak in opposition?
3	(Off microphone comment)
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Oh, no, you have to turn on the
5	microphone, push on the button there.
6	MR. MURRAY: Yes, it says red oh, there it
7	goes, okay. Yes, I am Paul
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure. You can tell us your
9	name, please, sir.
10	MR. MURRAY: Yes, Paul Murray. I wrote in
11	opposition this morning just to kind of try to be heard and
12	then I decided best to come down and see what was actually
13	up because it's hard to kind follow what's going on until you
14	study these things.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: And, Mr. Murray, just to let
16	you know
17	MR. MURRAY: Yes?
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: parties in opposition are
19	given three minutes to speak, so I was just letting you know.
20	MR. MURRAY: Oh, okay.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
22	MR. MURRAY: Well, so I really came to listen and
23	hear what people had to say, including the neighbors, which
24	I thought was important to hear.
25	So I live in 2307 15th Street which is the keyhole
I	I

lot, or the key lot that was referred to. I am directly to the west, but I'm on 15th. So all I know about the backyard, and it's true, it's much lower than where I am, is that all the backyards in there are very green right now and people often have parties back there, which is fine, and my main concern was with the green space, not the unduly limited, and I was also concerned about density in the neighborhood and what was happening to Florida Avenue.

Now I don't live on Florida Avenue, but it is a unique street given the way it angles there and it's elevation. So I was really -- basically wanted to hear what the process what, what a special exception was, how much you actually deal with green space in your consideration and what's to be done there.

So, as I said, backyard considerations, green space, increasing the density, and the other thing is what does this mean for development of neighborhood properties and taking out more green space back there.

I know we heard from the neighbor, so that didn't, he didn't seem to indicate that he was interested in kind of expanding back there and taking away that green space, too, but I just really wanted to come here and hear what your questions were, to hear what the proposal was, and to hear what the neighbors had to say, and I am not familiar with all the processes and where people have weighed in and the

1 planning committee has weighed in, so I did want to hear all 2 that. So that's really why I am here, and it sounds like 3 you are asking questions about all these things. 4 The back space would go from, instead of being 15 feet it's going to 5 or some version of that, close to that, 6 7 whatever the length of the backyard is. So there will be space taken out, but people 8 already use that space for parties I know. 9 So I'm not sure I have anything else to add other than not wanting to 10 significantly change the character of the neighborhood, and 11 once you go from a three unit to 11 units or eight units, 12 maybe I misunderstood it, maybe it's --13 (Off microphone comment) 14 15 MR. MURRAY: Go from three to eight. I just don't know, there is development going 16 You neighborhood all the time and I just wanted to follow what's 17 18 going on and what this does for other developments, cetera, et cetera. 19 Okay. 20 CHAIRPERSON HILL: So, Mr. Murray, I am just trying to -- I mean it sounds as though this was 21 22 informative for you in terms of like our process. It was and I know the two other 23 MR. MURRAY: commenters, who are neighbors of mine, same building, and so 24

just --

1	(Simultaneous speaking)
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes. Okay, no, I appreciate
3	that. I am just curious, are you still in opposition or you
4	don't know exactly?
5	MR. MURRAY: I am not sure I am in opposition
6	because the scope of the building is clear. It's within the
7	ceiling, I mean the height, and so I'm not so sure.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
9	MR. MURRAY: I just wanted to report back to the
10	other two people and tell them what I heard and I wanted to
11	understand and listen to what was being proposed here.
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
13	MR. MURRAY: And I know you are expanding a lot
14	of buildings in the neighborhood, I was just trying to figure
15	out what you guys do when you are expanding a building, in
16	other words.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure.
18	MR. MURRAY: Because it will change that
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure, I understand. I
20	understand. What was I going to say?
21	MR. MURRAY: So I don't know how to handle it from
22	here.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: It's okay. Well, I mean I am
24	glad that you have seen the process in terms of, you know,
25	the different types of analysis and reporting that we get

1	from the Office of Planning, the information we receive from
2	your ANC and all the different ANCs, and then also then going
3	through the presentation as to how the Applicant meets the
4	criteria, so that's one comment I guess.
5	Does the Board Members have any questions for the
6	witness?
7	MEMBER TURNBULL: No, I don't have a question.
8	I think he's in that new category. We have proponents,
9	opposed, and then there is an undetermined. I think there's
10	a I can't think of the real name, but there is a third
11	category which says that you are neither one nor the other.
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Is there really? You added
13	that?
14	MEMBER TURNBULL: We added that new category for
15	someone who is neither for nor against.
16	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, all right.
17	MEMBER TURNBULL: But for the life of me I can't
18	remember what it
19	MR. MURRAY: It's undeclared on the witness card.
20	MEMBER TURNBULL: Undeclared, that's it.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
22	MR. MURRAY: But I think
23	MEMBER TURNBULL: We've never had that before.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, all right.
25	MEMBER TURNBULL: I think we put that
Į.	·

1	MR. MURRAY: I'm not sure I had that on the, I'm
2	sorry, the online
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, that's all right.
4	MR. MURRAY: It may not have had that, but
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Does the Board have any
6	more questions for Mr. Murray?
7	(No response)
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, all right. I see the
9	Commissioner wants to say something. I don't know if,
10	Commissioner, we have any questions for you necessarily. I
11	mean is there something you really If you have to say
12	anything you have to come forward and speak into the
13	microphone.
14	MR. ACKERMAN: And I am happy to meet
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: You're welcome to Just speak
16	into the microphone, Mr. Ackerman.
17	MR. ACKERMAN: Sure. It's really to address Mr.
18	Murray's observation about the green space issue. I don't
19	know how long you have lived there, but just to sort of give
20	a little quick snippet of history
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Oh, sure.
22	MR. ACKERMAN: I remember when your building
23	was being built and the area where you are parking is it was
24	also green space and it was green space that directly abutted
25	my properties and that green space which I think occupies far

1 more space than this proposed special exception would occupy 2 was turned into parking. So it's one of those situations I think where a 3 4 little bit of history helps to change the perspective of what's come before because your property actually basically 5 did the same thing in order to create those parking spaces 6 7 back there. So I just wanted to let people know kind of what 8 the real background of what happened to that area was because 9 10 it's helpful. 11 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, okay. All right, let's 12 All right, does the Board have any other further see. comments or questions for anyone? 13 14 MEMBER TURNBULL: No, Mr. Chair. I would just say then after -- I would say that Mr. Ackerman, Commissioner 15 16 Ackerman, is a seasoned resident of --CHAIRPERSON HILL: 17 I see, seasoned. I don't know 18 if he's a -- I think he is a seasoned resident, I'll give you 19 that he is a seasoned resident. All right, let's see. Murray, just out of curiosity, do you face 15th Street or do 20 21 you face the back? That building is a four-unit condo 22 MR. MURRAY: and each unit, there is one unit on each floor, so we face 23 15th south and west. 24 25 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, okay. So do you hear the

1	drum circles from your window?
2	MR. MURRAY: I have learned to tune them out, but,
3	yes, I do.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, just curious. You
5	learned to tune them out, okay. All right, let's see, so
6	support, opposition, I think that's it, right, we don't have
7	any other questions?
8	(No response)
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes, I was just again, I was
10	mildly curious, but, again, no one else is here to speak in
11	support and no one else is here to speak in opposition?
12	(No response)
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. There's just two people
14	hanging out in the back and I haven't figured out exactly
15	what all right. So, okay.
16	All right, okay, so let's see, I think that I do
17	want to get some more information from the Applicant, I think
18	the Board does, in terms of before we can possibly vote.
19	I think, you know, I don't really have a lot of
20	questions and I'll let the Applicant speak at the end here.
21	I do think that, you know, as has been our protocol, you
22	know, we want to see whatever the drawings are that is
23	actually being proposed.
24	So we would need to see, you know, whatever it is,
25	the final drawings, okay, and then at least as far as those
ļ	

1 two issues that they are discussing, the setback with the 2 penthouse and then also the railing. I guess you could also put in the email from, it 3 was Lot 849, I think that you got, if you could just put that 4 into the record as well as then if you could, Mr. Kadlecek, 5 just submit something in terms of something that we could add 6 7 as either a condition or an agreement with your neighbor there in Lot 213 in terms of what you agreed to for the wall. 8 Does the Board have any other things they would 9 like to see or hear from the Applicant before we were able 10 to make a decision? 11 MEMBER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair, I'll just add I think 12 Ms. White had asked for letters of the neighbors and you've 13 14 got the proposal, and we talked about the revised deck 15 I wouldn't mind just seeing something on the deck drawings. lighting that clarified exactly what the lighting is. 16 And maybe we should have something that just shows 17 18 where the bike storage is and where the trash is being stored, just so we have a clear understanding that that's all 19 being addressed for the neighbors. 20 Okay, that's fine with me. 21 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Anyone else? 22 MEMBER HART: Mr. Chair, the Exhibit 30, I think, 23 which are floor plans, for Mr. Turnbull, they do actually 24

have the bike storage on the proposed cellar plan.

1	know about the
2	MEMBER TURNBULL: Which drawing is that?
3	MEMBER HART: This is Page A-101 on I want to say
4	it's 30. Yes, it's the revised architectural plans. They
5	actually show the bike storage. After we had this
6	conversation about where the bikes were going to be and Mr.
7	Kuhn described that there was bike storage in there I had to
8	now look for where the plans were, and the floor plans, the
9	proposed floor plans, indicate where that bike storage is
10	going to be located.
11	MEMBER TURNBULL: You said on A-101?
12	MEMBER HART: A-101, I don't know what page it is.
13	MEMBER TURNBULL: Okay, I do see it.
14	MEMBER HART: Page 15 of 23.
15	MEMBER TURNBULL: Okay. And what about trash
16	storage, do we see
17	MEMBER HART: I don't know. I don't know if it's
18	the utility that's There is a utility room that is
19	associated with that as well. I don't know if it's there or
20	if there is another place that's and if the architect
21	could, Mr. Kuhn, could
22	MR. KUHN: Yes, the trash is going to be located
23	near where that entrance is into the bike storage, so along
24	that side away from, so it's going to be tucked back from the
25	front of the building.

1	MEMBER HART: And it's going to be in a room or
2	is it going to be some other location, I mean like next to
3	the building?
4	MR. KUHN: Yes, it's going to be against the
5	building but not internal.
6	MEMBER HART: Okay.
7	MEMBER TURNBULL: Well, if you could just indicate
8	that then on a drawing.
9	MR. KUHN: I will.
10	MEMBER HART: And I don't know if we've, if the
11	Chairman actually discussed this, but the roof deck, you said
12	you were going to
13	(Simultaneous speaking)
14	MR. KUHN: Yes, to show the plans, yes.
15	MEMBER HART: And I was just, kind of humor me for
16	
10	a minute, in the elevations on page, what you have on the
17	a minute, in the elevations on page, what you have on the screen here, A-201, I don't know what page that is
17	screen here, A-201, I don't know what page that is
17 18	screen here, A-201, I don't know what page that is MR. KUHN: They got it.
17 18 19	screen here, A-201, I don't know what page that is  MR. KUHN: They got it.  MEMBER HART: Oh. Is the property, Mr. Ackerman's
17 18 19 20	screen here, A-201, I don't know what page that is  MR. KUHN: They got it.  MEMBER HART: Oh. Is the property, Mr. Ackerman's property, is the I am looking at the image on the right,
17 18 19 20 21	screen here, A-201, I don't know what page that is  MR. KUHN: They got it.  MEMBER HART: Oh. Is the property, Mr. Ackerman's  property, is the I am looking at the image on the right, is that accurate, like is there an actual, the ground level
17 18 19 20 21 22	screen here, A-201, I don't know what page that is  MR. KUHN: They got it.  MEMBER HART: Oh. Is the property, Mr. Ackerman's  property, is the I am looking at the image on the right,  is that accurate, like is there an actual, the ground level  on the western side is that actually that low? I mean it
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	screen here, A-201, I don't know what page that is  MR. KUHN: They got it.  MEMBER HART: Oh. Is the property, Mr. Ackerman's  property, is the I am looking at the image on the right, is that accurate, like is there an actual, the ground level  on the western side is that actually that low? I mean it looks really low, that's why I was having a hard time trying

1	it's not graphically where that shows basically L'ing down
2	there on the right-hand side, which would be Mr. Ackerman's
3	property.
4	MEMBER HART: And so then A-203 is that the, is
5	that what we're, is that what it's supposed to be looking
6	like? Is that more the
7	MR. KUHN: 203.
8	MEMBER HART: Because this is supposed to be the
9	grade for, you know, and the elevation for the west side, so
10	
11	MR. KUHN: Correct.
12	MEMBER HART: try to make sure that that's
13	what, that's supposed to
14	MR. KUHN: Yes, the elevation is more correct on
15	A-203 than A-201.
16	MEMBER HART: And it as funny because the
17	photograph that you showed, which was the north wall, I was
18	thinking about that being the retaining wall, and then I was
19	thinking, well, is there a retaining wall on the west, and
20	then I couldn't figure out if that was the case.
21	MR. KUHN: Right, yes.
22	MEMBER HART: But there isn't a retaining wall on
23	the west-hand side because there is nothing to retain?
24	MR. KUHN: Correct, right.
25	MEMBER HART: So if you could just clean that up
J	I

1	a little bit that would be helpful.
2	MR. KUHN: Yes.
3	MEMBER HART: Again, that's not a huge thing, it's
4	more of a minor thing, but it was just consistency sake
5	trying to understand the elevations versus that.
6	MR. KUHN: Yes.
7	MEMBER HART: And I don't know if Mr. Turnbull
8	said this, but what is happening on the, just on the addition
9	in terms of the material, if you could just include that on
10	that on the, or in the, actually all of the elevations
11	MR. KUHN: Yes.
12	MEMBER HART: because we have kind of an
13	understanding what's going on in the existing building, but
14	that one is not, it's just unknown.
15	MR. KUHN: Okay. Yes, those will be included.
16	MR. KADLECEK: Just one point on the materials,
17	I believe that's still being worked out with HPRB or HPO, so
18	that's why we would actually still request the flexibility
19	to make changes to that if it was something that was
20	requested by HPO.
21	MEMBER HART: And Mr. Ackerman brought up
22	
	something about the western wall being green or something,
23	something about the western wall being green or something, so that's the part that I'm trying to understand.
23	so that's the part that I'm trying to understand.

1	attached to that western wall? Maybe it's the rest of the
2	walls you are still working out, but that one it seems like
3	there could be something that's different that we don't
4	really know what that is so it would be helpful to understand
5	that.
6	MR. BLOOMFIELD: So right now we have a
7	construction agreement that basically dictates 400 square
8	feet of green area. The reason we have left it like that is
9	because we want to, you know, Nathan is going to be
10	coordinating landscaping and he wants to put it in certain
11	areas and then we can figure out what square footage would
12	kind of fit in those empty spaces.
13	So we have left it in our construction agreement,
14	which is drafted up, that outlines pretty much everything
15	with what we have agreed to for that side of the property.
16	MEMBER HART: For 400 square feet of the wall
17	surface you are talking about?
18	MR. BLOOMFIELD: Correct.
19	MEMBER HART: Okay.
20	MR. BLOOMFIELD: And that would be of the new
21	addition which consists of about 1200, so it's about a third
22	of that wall we have agreed to cover in green screens.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Mr. Kadlecek, again,
24	MR. KADLECEK: Yes, so
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: that's what I'm talking
ļ	I and the state of

1	about, just give us something that shows whatever it was that
2	was agreed with the Commissioner, who is back at the table
3	again.
4	MR. KADLECEK: Yes.
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Commissioner?
6	MR. ACKERMAN: Sorry.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: That's all right.
8	MR. ACKERMAN: Yes, there is one important piece
9	I think that probably should be included in these additional
10	materials that are supplied, and that is that there was a
11	concern about the sound that all these eight, these condenser
12	units would be making on the rooftop since they are close to
13	the yards of the neighbors and we had negotiated a language
14	that basically specifies that sound mitigation would be
15	followed for, or to deal with that issue and that concern,
16	which they agreed to.
17	So it would be great to specify that in the
18	materials that are provided, please.
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Mr. Kadlecek, okay?
20	MR. KADLECEK: That's fine.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
22	MR. KADLECEK: We can include that.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes. No, we're just trying to
24	get stuff so that we're all comfortable, that we're all on
25	the same page, and we

1	MR. KADLECEK: Yes, sure.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: It sounds like you guys have
3	done It looks like a lovely project to me. I know the
4	area, I don't participate in the drum circle, but I know the
5	area, and so like, you know, so just so we're all on the same
6	page, okay, so if you can give us the drawings so we can move
7	forward on that.
8	MR. KADLECEK: Sure.
9	MEMBER TURNBULL: I just have one quick, Mr.
10	Chair.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes, sure.
12	MEMBER TURNBULL: You've already had sort of a
13	draft review or a staff review at HPRB?
14	MR. KADLECEK: Concept approval, yes.
15	MEMBER TURNBULL: Concept approval. Have they
16	agreed in concept to the green wall aspect or does that come
17	into play or it's back I have a feeling that they wouldn't
18	want to weigh in. I don't know, maybe they will.
19	MR. BLOOMFIELD: You know, we should be able to
20	review that at HPO level and the permitting process, but it's
21	not visible from the street, so I couldn't imagine them
22	having
23	MEMBER TURNBULL: I was just going to say because
24	if they didn't approve it then you're back to square one with
25	Commissioner Ackerman.

1	MR. BLOOMFIELD: I don't think they are going to
2	have an issue with it. I mean the approved the finishes at
3	the rear of the property on how we intended to design that,
4	which is more of a modern feel.
5	MEMBER TURNBULL: Okay.
6	MR. BLOOMFIELD: So I can't imagine them having
7	an issue with, you know, adding more greenery.
8	MEMBER TURNBULL: Okay, I just wanted to bring it
9	up.
10	MR. BLOOMFIELD: I appreciate it, thanks.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right, does the
12	Board have anything else they'd like to see form the
13	Applicant before we were able to make a decision?
14	(No answer)
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. I mean it's a lot of
16	stuff, but or not a lot of stuff, it's easy for you to get
17	it together. When do you think you'd be able to get all this
18	stuff together?
19	MR. KADLECEK: I mean we can do it within a day
20	or two.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
22	MR. KADLECEK: So
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I was afraid you were going to
24	say that.
25	MR. KADLECEK: So, you know, as soon as the Board

1	can take it up
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure.
3	MR. KADLECEK: we can probably have it in
4	tomorrow or Friday.
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure. Tomorrow is Friday? No,
6	tomorrow is Thursday. Well, I am Mr. Moy, I mean we just
7	add it to the meeting hearing, correct?
8	(Off microphone comment)
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: For the 18th, right. I think
10	the 18th is thick, that's the only reason why I'm But it's
11	not
12	MR. MOY: The I think it depends. If this is
13	for a decision meeting then you could always slide this one
14	in
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Right.
16	MR. MOY: but if it's a hearing I would
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: No, it would be a decision.
18	What is the one after the 18th?
19	MR. MOY: It would be October 25th.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: The 25th. Is the 25th a little
21	lighter?
22	MR. MOY: Yes, a little bit lighter.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Does the one week do
24	anything for you guys one way or the other?
25	MR. BLOOMFIELD: If you could get it in on the

1	18th we would very much appreciate it. We're trying to
2	submit for a permit soon, so
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. I'm just, I'm asking the
4	one week, I don't mind, I can get it in there. If you So
5	the one week is going to mess with your timing a little bit?
6	MR. BLOOMFIELD: A little bit, yes.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Only a little bit.
8	MR. BLOOMFIELD: I mean we can deal with the 25th,
9	but
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, then I'm just going to
11	move you to the 25th. I mean I got a lot on the docket on
12	the 18th.
13	MR. BLOOMFIELD: Okay.
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Even though it will be thick
15	it gives you I'm sorry, even though it is a decision
16	meeting it will still take time and we have a lot of things
17	going on on the 18th.
18	It will give you a little bit more time to get
19	your stuff into us, and so and I appreciate it, so I'll
20	remember you the next time if you come back, you know, for
21	a summer, that extra week you gave us.
22	MR. BLOOMFIELD: Okay.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. But if it were really,
24	I mean if it were going to hurt any of your finances or
25	anything like that, but I think the one week you can, you'll
J	I

1	be okay.
2	MR. BLOOMFIELD: I think so.
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
4	MR. BLOOMFIELD: I know we were planning on
5	submitting I think like the 26th, so that should be all
6	right.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right, okay, great.
8	So then, Mr. Kadlecek, when would you like to or, have Mr.
9	Moy with you, ask for when do you want to ask for what we
10	need?
11	MR. KADLECEK: Yes, I mean we can do it as soon
12	as you need it, so whatever works.
13	MR. MOY: I would say the latest would be October
14	18th.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, so that's good, you know
16	what you need to get us by that time and then we'll put on
17	the decision for the 25th?
18	MR. KADLECEK: Yes. Maybe it will be helpful if
19	I just ran through the list. I'm sure a lot of things
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure, yes, please. No, please.
21	MR. KADLECEK: I just want to make sure that we're
22	all in agreement so that we get everything in.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes, please.
24	MR. KADLECEK: Ms. White asked for the
25	email/letter from the adjacent neighbor to the east. Mr.

1 Turnbull asked for some clarification for the lighting on the 2 roof deck penthouse. Mr. Hill, you asked for a condition regarding the 3 4 wall, the western facing wall, an additional drawing showing the proposed condition for the roof deck railing, a plan 5 showing where the trash and bike storage will be, updated 6 7 elevations showing more accurately the grade on the west side of the property, some description of the materials on the 8 addition, and the condition regarding sound mitigation for 9 the HVAC units. 10 11 (Off microphone comment) 12 MR. KADLECEK: I did, yes. If I missed anything please let me know, but I think that was everything. 13 14 yes, did you want us to submit the HPRB concept approval into 15 the record as well? CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes. Mr. Turnbull is nodding. 16 Okay. Great, thank you. 17 MR. KADLECEK: CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great. So with that 18 19 being the case we have done everything. I am going to close 20 the hearing and we will see you on the, or not, on the 25th. 21 MEMBER HART: One more, sorry, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRPERSON HILL: 22 Sure. MEMBER HART: Trash cans? 23 Yes, I mentioned that. 24 MR. KADLECEK: 25 MEMBER HART: I was actually having a little

1	conversation.
2	MR. KADLECEK: No problem.
3	MEMBER HART: I just wanted to make sure, that's
4	all.
5	MR. KADLECEK: Yes, thank you.
6	MEMBER WHITE: And just one more, double check,
7	sound mitigation?
8	MR. KADLECEK: Yes.
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Oh, the sound mitigation.
10	MR. KADLECEK: Yes, got that one.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right, well, I'm
12	glad you actually have until the 25th. All right, so the
13	hearing is closed. Okay, thank you, gentlemen.
14	MR. KADLECEK: Thank you.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Moy, do we have anything
16	else for the Board today?
17	MR. MOY: Nothing from the staff, Mr. Chairman.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Then we stand adjourned.
19	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
20	record at 11:59 a.m.)
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	