GOVERNMENT
OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY APRIL 18, 2018

+ + + + +

The Regular Public Meeting 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 CARLTON HART, Vice Chairperson (NCPC) LORNA JOHN, Board Member LESYLLEE WHITE, Board Member MARCEL ACOSTA, NCPC

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBER PRESENT:

PETER MAY, Member

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

CLIFFORD MOY, Secretary

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

HILLARY LOVICK, ESQ.

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Hearing or held on April 18, 2018.

A-G-E-N-D-A

Application	19134A	of	the	Embassy	of	Zambia	•	•	•	•	•	•	3
Application	18701C	of	1247	7 ESE LLO	Ξ.							•	12
Application State Medica													15

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	9:42 a.m.
3	CHAIR HILL: Good morning, everybody. The hearing
4	will please come to order.
5	We're located in the Jerrily R. Kress Memorial
6	Hearing Room at 441 4th Street NW. This is the April 18th
7	public meeting of the Board of Zoning Adjustment, District
8	of Columbia.
9	We are convening to act on a chancery application
LO	pursuant to the Foreign Missions Act 22 USC 4301-4316 and
L1	chapter 10 of the zoning regulations.
L2	My name is Fred Hill, chairperson. Joining me
L3	today are mayoral appointees Lesyllee White and Lorna John.
L4	The federal representatives are Marcel Acosta representing
L5	the National Capital Planning Commission and Peter May
L6	representing the U.S. National Park Service.
L7	Copies of today's meeting agenda are available to
L8	you and located to my left in the wall bin near the entrance
L9	door.
20	Please be advised this proceeding is being
21	recorded by a court reporter and is also webcast live.
22	We must ask you to refrain from any disruptive
23	noises or actions in the hearing room.
24	When presenting information to the Board please

turn on and speak into the microphone first stating your name

and home address. When you're finished speaking please turn your microphone off so that your microphone is no longer picking up sound or background noise.

All persons planning to testify either in support or opposition are to fill out two witness cards. These cards are located to my left on the table near the entrance door and on the witness table.

Upon coming forward to speak to the Board please give both cards to the reporter sitting to my right.

Also if you wish to file written testimony or additional supporting documents today please submit 12 copies to the secretary for distribution.

If you do not have the requisite number of copies you can reproduce copies on a machine in the Office of Zoning located across the hall.

The order of procedure for Foreign Mission cases, statement of witness to the applicant, government reporting including U.S. Secretary of State, District of Columbia planning on behalf of the Mayor, reports and recommendations by public agencies, report of advisory neighborhood commissions, persons in support, persons in opposition.

Due to time constraints we are going to try to maintain those and further restrictions on time might be placed by the Board.

Because this is a rulemaking procedure no parties

2.0

and therefore no cross examination.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

The decision of the Board in this legislative proceeding must be based exclusively on the public record. To avoid any appearance to the contrary the Board requests that persons not present engage the members of the Board in conversation.

Please turn off all beepers and cell phones at this time so as not to disrupt the proceeding.

At this time the Board will consider any preliminary matters as to whether a case should or shouldn't be heard today. Mr. Secretary, do we have any preliminary matters?

MR. MOY: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board.

My understanding is we're going to start off with the Foreign Missions portion of the BZA but since I have the microphone for today's I'm going to say regular docket there are three cases that originally were scheduled for April 18.

They've been postponed and rescheduled to May 30, 2018 and the three cases are case application number 19728 of Patrick and Becky McGeehan, 19735 of Mi Casa Incorporated, 19736 of Mi Casa Incorporated. So those are the three cases rescheduled to May 30.

And other preliminary matters can be addressed by the Board when that particular case application is called.

1 CHAIR HILL: All right, thank you, Mr. Secretary. So do you want to go ahead and call -- do you need to call 2 the decision in front of us? 3 This would be a request for 4 MR. MOY: Yes. modification of consequence to case application number 19134A 5 6 as in alpha of the Embassy of Zambia. 7 This request for modification of consequence is to the time limit condition of BZA order number 19134 which 8 9 would allow the temporary location of a chancery in the R-3 zone at premises 2200 R Street NW, square 2512, lot 808. 10 11 And participating of course is yourself, Mr. 12 Chairman, Ms. White, Ms. John, Mr. Peter May and Mr. Marcel 13 Acosta. 14 CHAIR HILL: Okay, thank you, Mr. Moy. Is the 15 Board ready to deliberate? Okay. I can go ahead and start. 16 I thought that this was relatively straightforward 17 in terms of what the applicant the Embassy of Zambia is 18 trying to accomplish. They need a modification of consequence to the 19 time limit so that they can finish their permanent chancery 2.0 address and continue to use this location. 21 The Office of Planning submitted a report and I 22 thought it was pretty detailed in terms of their thoughts as 2.3 to how to continue the operation of the embassy there. 24

The ANC was served and we hadn't received any

reports from the ANC at this time.

2.0

DDOT is not required to be served on modifications of consequence and therefore we don't have any from DDOT.

The modification again is for an additional two years. So as I mentioned to allow them to complete their permanent chancery at 2419 Mass Ave.

I didn't really have a lot of thoughts. If anyone wanted to join. I thought that the embassy or the Zambian government had provided a statement to us.

And I also thought that the statement was very thorough. They again continued to mention the United States and Zambia has a successful relationship and when the U.S. wanted to expand its chancery's diplomatic compound in their capital Lusaka the Zambian government was generous and helpful and presented no obstacles for the American concept for altering and growing their embassy location.

I would also not want to be in the way of their being able to do this. So does the Board have anything else to add?

MEMBER WHITE: No, I agree with you, Mr. Chair. I think the point that they needed additional time in order to put together their financing for construction financing was a good line in terms of why they needed the additional time. So I would be in support of the application to not disapprove the modification.

	8
1	CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. So I'm going to go
2	ahead and make a motion not to disapprove the application
3	number 19134A of the Embassy of Zambia as captioned and read
4	by the secretary and ask for a second.
5	MEMBER WHITE: Second.
6	CHAIR HILL: The motion made and seconded. All
7	those in favor aye.
8	(Chorus of ayes)
9	CHAIR HILL: All those opposed? The motion
10	passes, Mr. Moy.
11	MR. MOY: Staff would record the vote as 5-0-0.
12	This is on your motion, Chairman Hill, to not disapprove the
13	modification of consequence. Seconding the motion is Ms.
14	White. Also in support Mr. Peter May, Mr. Marcel Acosta and
15	Ms. Lorna John. The motion carries.
16	CHAIR HILL: Is summary order I don't remember
17	if we do a summary order.
18	MR. MOY: It's an order. This is a rulemaking.
19	CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right, thank you. Mr.
20	Acosta, thank you for coming in. We're going to switch you
21	out now for Vice Chair Hart and get on with the normal day.
22	I have to read this again, right? That's okay,
23	I'll read it again.
24	So the first thing was the Foreign Missions and
25	the embassy and now we're going back to our regular business.

But you get to hear all this again.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

The hearing will please come to order. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. It's a little different.

We're located in the Jerrily R. Kress Memorial Hearing Room at 441 4th Street NW. This is the April 18th public hearing of the Board of Zoning Adjustment, District of Columbia.

My name is Fred Hill, chairperson. Joining me today is Carlton Hart, vice chair, Lesyllee White and Lorna John, Board members. Representing the Zoning Commission is Peter May.

Copies of today's hearing and agenda are available to you and located in the wall bin near the door.

Please be advised this proceeding is being recorded by a court reporter and also webcast live.

Accordingly we must ask you to refrain from any disruptive noises or actions in the hearing room.

When presenting information to the Board please turn on and speak into the microphone first stating your name and home address. When you're finished speaking please turn your microphone off so that your microphone is no longer picking up sound or background noise.

All persons planning to testify either in favor or opposition must have raised their hand and been sworn in by the secretary.

1 Also each witness must fill out two witness cards. 2 These cards are located on the table near the door and on the 3 witness table. Upon coming forward to speak to the Board please 4 give both cards to the reporter sitting to the table at my 5 right. 6 7 file written Ιf you wish to testimony or additional supporting documents today please 8 submit 9 original and 12 copies to the secretary for distribution. If you do not have the requisite number of copies 10 11 you can reproduce copies on a office printer in the Office of Zoning located across the hall. 12 The order of procedures for special exceptions and 13 14 variances as well as appeals is also located in the bin as 15 you enter the door. The record shall be closed at the conclusion of 16 17 each case except for any material specifically requested by 18 the Board. The Board and the staff will specify at the end 19 of the hearing exactly what is expected and the date when the 2.0 persons must submit the evidence to the Office of Zoning. 21 After the record is closed no other information 22 23 shall be accepted by the Board. The District of Columbia Administrative Procedures 24

Act requires that the public hearing on each case be held in

the open before the public pursuant to section 405(b) and 406 1 2 of that act. The Board may consistent with its rules 3 4 procedures and the act enter into a closed meeting on a case for purposes of seeking legal counsel pursuant to 5 Official Code 2-575(b)(4) and/or deliberating on a 6 7 pursuant to D.C. Official Code 2-575(b)(13) but only after providing the necessary public notice and in the case of an 8 9 emergency closed meeting after taking a roll call vote. The decision of the Board in cases must 10 be 11 exclusively based on the public record. To avoid appearance to the contrary the Board requests that persons 12 present not engage the members of the Board in conversation. 13 14 Please turn off all beepers and cell phones at this time so as not to disrupt the proceedings. 15 Preliminary matters are those which relate to 16 17 whether a case will or should be heard today such as requests 18 for postponement, continuance, or withdrawal, or whether 19 proper and adequate notice of the hearing has been given. If you're not prepared to go forward with the case 2.0 21 today or if you believe that the Board should not proceed now is the time to raise such a matter. 22 Mr. Secretary, I think you already went through 23 the preliminary matters, correct? 24

Yes, I did, sir.

MR. MOY:

1 CHAIR HILL: So if anyone is here wishing to -whether or not we do take testimony or not, if you're wishing 2 to testify either in support or in opposition if you could 3 4 stand and raise your hand and take the oath 5 administered by the secretary to my left. (Whereupon, the witnesses were sworn) 6 7 All right, just so everyone knows CHAIR HILL: here we are going to go in the order in terms of the agenda 8 9 that was in the bin. We're not changing anything in terms 10 of the order today. 11 Mr. Moy, whenever you like you can call our first decision case. 12 All right. This is the second of three 13 MR. MOY: 14 decision cases this morning. 15 This is case application number 18701C of 1247 ESE 16 LLC. 17 This is a request for a two-year time extension 18 of BZA order number 18701A approving a variance from the use 19 provisions to operate a restaurant in the first floor space within an existing apartment house under section 330.5 in the 2.0 21 R-4 district. This is at 1247 E Street SE square 1019 lot 22 43. The Board's decision was originally scheduled for 23

2018 but was postponed to today's date at

applicant's request.

24

1 CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. Thank you, Mr. Moy. Is the Board ready to deliberate? Okay. 2 I can start if you like. 3 reading through the record 4 After I did not particularly have an issue in terms of the time extension. 5 The applicant had stated that they have an inability to 6 7 locate a restaurant tenant yet in that area, but that several new residential developments are under construction in one 8 9 of the exhibits. And they also mentioned in one of the exhibits 10 11 that there's like 700 units that might be coming online in 12 the next two to three years. From OP's report the application cites intense 13 14 residential development within the surrounding neighborhood 15 as potentially improving market conditions to better enable 16 the applicant to find a tenant. 17 The space was originally designed and continues 18 to be designed for commercial use. It was never used residentially and the space is not designed for such use. 19 The applicant has endeavored to rent the space and 2.0 will continue to do so. 21 22 Again Ι thought that the argument that applicant had made was justified. I was comfortable with the 2.3 24 time extension. One of the items that OP noted and I would also 25

1	agree with was that this I think this is their second time
2	extension. I can't remember.
3	So they've had numerous time extensions. So this
4	would be, thank you, the third. But if there are or could
5	be possible extensions in the future they're going to have
6	to really kind of provide extensive documentation as to how
7	I think we could get to the point where we would approve
8	that.
9	So does the Board have anything else they would
10	like to add?
11	MEMBER JOHN: No, Mr. Chairman.
12	CHAIR HILL: I'm all alone up here today. All
13	right. I'm going to go ahead and then make a motion to
14	approve application number 18701C as captioned and read by
15	the secretary and ask for a second.
16	MEMBER WHITE: Second.
17	CHAIR HILL: Motion has been made and seconded.
18	All those in favor?
19	(Chorus of ayes)
20	CHAIR HILL: All those opposed? Motion passes,
21	Mr. Moy.
22	MR. MOY: Staff would record the vote as 5-0-0.
23	This is on the motion of Chairman Hill to approve the request
24	for the two-year time extension.
25	Seconding the motion is Ms. White. Also in

support is Mr. Peter May, Ms. Lorna John and Vice Chair Hart.

The motion carries.

CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Summary order.

MR. MOY: Yes, sir. The third case application for decision in this meeting session is case application number 19659 of the Federation of State Medical Boards. And this application as amended for special exception from the use provisions under subtitle U section 203.1(n) to use the existing residential building as an office building for a non-profit organization in the R-3 zone at premises 2118 Leroy Place NW square 2531, lot 49.

This was last heard by the Board on February 21, 2018. The Board closed the record and requested proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law from the parties as well as proffered conditions from the parties and the Office of Planning's response to the filings.

And those are in your case records, the draft findings of fact and conclusions of law from the applicant under exhibit 150. Also from the Sheridan-Kalorama Neighborhood Council and the Sheridan-Kalorama Historical Association under exhibit 152 and OP supplemental report under exhibit 153.

CHAIR HILL: Okay. Is the Board ready to deliberate? Okay. I don't think I'll be alone on this conversation, right?

2.0

1 COMMISSIONER MAY: You practically took yesterday off. 2 Yes, I was. The vice chair was the 3 CHAIR HILL: 4 chair yesterday. We had a long day yesterday. Let's see. Okay. So we're again just so everyone 5 knows we're here for a decision case. We're not going to be 6 7 taking any testimony or hearing from anyone. I quess I'd start -- it took a long time to even 8 get kind of caught back up again in this for me meaning it 9 was kind of like three hours of reviewing everything to get 10 11 back to the point where I was able to kind of like process 12 or continue to process. I'd like to start by saying again that this was 13 14 very contentious. It had a lot of community opposition and 15 the ANC was opposed. I again thought -- the ANC, there's two members 16 17 But they were opposed to the application. of the ANC. 18 I can understand why the community would want to try and oppose this because they I quess might have a perfect 19 or I shouldn't say perfect. They have an idea as to how this 2.0 21 property could be used and who they might want to be there in terms of adverse impact to the neighborhood. 22 23 And so I was kind of just -- I continued to go 24 back to the regulations in terms of how I was trying to 25 process this.

And I guess what I was thinking was that we could kind of get through, or if we could get through kind of the threshold questions and issues and then see if we get to where we might be talking about whatever further discussion or deliberations in terms of the conditions.

And just again for the record Ms. John is not on this. She wasn't here at the very beginning so it's just the four of us here.

I guess the first threshold question was is it a non-profit organization. And I thought, I mean this was hours and hours of testimony that we took and the threshold issues were things that we focused a lot on.

And I thought that the applicant through the record and the testimony had shown that they were a non-profit organization. They provided their articles of incorporation, the testimony of the mission statement, and that FSMB is a 501(c)(6) organization and there's nothing within our zoning regulations that say that the non-profit had to be a 501(c)(3).

Even under the ZR '16 definition of the non-profits I wouldn't want us to now kind of lock ourselves into a 501(c)(3) definition. So I was comfortable with that first threshold question in terms of whether or not they were a non-profit.

The next was whether or not the building was over

2.0

10,000 square feet. I again thought that in the record and through the testimony the applicant had shown that they're meeting the 10,000 square feet requirement and that was also in exhibit 138A was showing how they're meeting the 10,000 square feet.

And then in addition OP testified that the materials that they presented demonstrated how they're meeting the 10,000 square feet minimum, that threshold issue.

Then the other was that the zoning administrator at the end of the day will also determine whether or not they're over the 10,000 square feet and if not then they'll be back before us for a variance which turned this into a whole 'nother thing in terms of whether or not you get past that issue.

The third was is the building -- the residential property. I thought again through the record and the testimony that the applicant has proved the building is an existing residential property because it is in a residential zone.

So those were the three issues in terms of just the threshold questions in terms of whether or not we can get to the next round of deliberations.

And so does anyone want to participate in the threshold questions?

MEMBER WHITE: Thanks, Mr. Chair. I would concur

2.0

with your assessment. I'm not going to just rapidly repeat what you just said, but I would like to note that this was a case that we put a lot of time into.

I think the testimony was like five hours altogether because it was a number of days. So I think we were very methodical, thoughtful, gave everyone a chance to be heard.

There were two party status requests in opposition. There were also a number of neighbors in that block that had serious concerns about having a non-profit organization work out of that building.

But one thing I would note also is that that particular building had been used as a chancery and an office for many years, but that doesn't erase the fact that the neighbors and the community had a right to weigh in on what comes in.

We also reviewed a number of the conditions so I won't get into that. I think you just wanted to kind of get a sense of whether or not from my perspective that they were able to meet the special exception criteria as a non-profit use in an existing residential building under subtitle U 203.1(n). It's also 203.1.

And I do concur that I believe that the Federation of State Medical Boards provided ample testimony to show that they were indeed meeting that threshold.

2.0

2.3

I would also note that the ANC submitted some opposition. I gave it weight, but they didn't really get into specific issues I believe that they had some concerns with. So obviously we give ANCs great weight but they have to state specific issues of concerns that they have and I did not pick up in the record unless I'm mistaken that they expressed some specific things in writing that they had concerns with.

They just had concerns about the project overall.

I have other comments regarding the conditions but I'll just stop here just with respect to the threshold special exception criteria.

CHAIR HILL: I appreciate that. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MAY: So just on the threshold question I agree with your conclusion that it's a residential building for the purposes of this case because it's in a residential zone.

With regard to the non-profit status I would also agree with that conclusion. I think there are parallels between the IRS regulations and the zoning regulations that could give the impression that it really should just be 501(c)(3) but it is not in the regulations that way and I think that for the purposes of zoning I think that this organization does meet the standard for being a non-profit.

It is a valid question about whether the zoning

2.0

regulations should be tightened up a little bit to make sure that the use is appropriately limited and to maybe address the question of whether it should be 501(c)(3) but of course the BZA is not the Zoning Commission and BZA has to go by what the Zoning Commission has written and I think that this meets that standard.

And I agree on the square footage issue. That seems pretty clear to me and ultimately is up to the zoning administrator to concur so we leave that. We can accept that what's been certified to us and then for the applicant's sake they'll have to make sure that they're right, that the zoning administrator agrees with that. So that's it.

CHAIR HILL: Mr. Hart.

VICE CHAIR HART: Just to add my two cents. I have also thought that these were threshold questions and I thought both parties laid out their cases for each one of them.

After reading through all of it I would also concur that the applicant has met the -- they have met the burden to prove that they are a non-profit, that the building does have 10,000 square feet and that it is an existing residential building.

Because you all have actually already discussed the things I was going to discuss I won't continue any further.

2.0

CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. And I appreciate some of the comments that just got brought up in terms of I thought that both parties have spent a tremendous amount of time and energy in getting us to this point in terms of the findings of fact and conclusions of law, in terms of all the testimony and both again parties I thought put together a good case.

Again what Commissioner May mentions is that we're not the Zoning Commission and so we follow what the Zoning Commission does and what the regulations state.

And so whether or not we personally would want something like this to happen in our neighborhood is really kind of not at issue here. It's the analysis of the standards within the regulations.

So we've gotten through the threshold questions and now I kind of wanted to talk about the conditions I suppose in terms of there was a big list of conditions and there were some discrepancies in terms of what the applicant had provided and also what the party in opposition had provided and then also what the Office of Planning had provided.

I thought that again for the party in opposition this is where kind of the rubber met the road for me in terms of what they as a community could possibly hope to help alleviate any adverse impact that they might see in terms of

2.0

this application.

2.0

To your point, Ms. White, again that this was a chancery before and there was a lot of discussion as to how actually -- how at use that chancery was, like how many people actually came in and out of there and I think there was some testimony that like 40 people or something, I can't remember, I think something like that.

But it was just testimony and it didn't sound to me also that like there was 40 people there all the time or anything like that at least from the community standpoint.

So I'm going to kind of walk through I guess these conditions just because I want to make sure we're all on the same page and hear what your all's thoughts are.

I basically thought that -- well, cutting to the chase for me all the conditions we can kind of walk through and they seemed more or less similar except for kind of what I had always been curious about was how many employees are actually going to be able to be there onsite.

The applicant had asked for 15 I think and then 5 temporary. And the temporary people as we were going through the testimony how do you know they're temporary. Somebody might be there for a three-month period and then that person gets replaced so ultimately you're still going to have maybe 20 people there.

And then the party in opposition, the answer to

the Office of Planning, they were requesting or put a maximum at 15.

Now, as we were going through the testimony itself how the applicant got to 15 seemed somewhat random I guess. They said that they had so many people that they were trying to bring in to this location from their I think offices in Texas I think.

But again what I was trying to figure out was the adverse impact. And since there are people here and we're basically walking through this together that street -- the street is a one-way street. It's a narrow one-way street and so it's kind of like -- I'm sorry.

And then the other thing that I was trying to figure out was meetings and receptions and things that might take up in the evening or what have you. People kind of coming and going.

And that one-way street, people parking, getting out and making that kind of congested.

Again in terms of my thoughts as far as adverse impact I kind of just thought about who might have moved into that property also at another time. If this actually was a single family and they were able to use up the amount of space, 10,000 square foot home they might have receptions or fundraisers and those things actually have the valet parking out front. And then you're going to have even maybe more

2.0

lissues.

2.0

I guess I'm going to kind of offer it up. I'm kind of torn between the 15-20 people. I don't think 20 is necessary because the applicant said that 15 was appropriate at one point.

And whether or not they had -- and I don't know whether an additional five people is really going to -- I'm going to wait to hear what the Board has to say, what you guys think as far as that issue.

I was kind of like 15 people and then 3 temporary, and then the temporary actually could be temporary. Somebody's microphone is on so someone else can go next.

And then the receptions at the end and the meetings. And I wasn't a big fan of the receptions. The thing in the evening. If they're going to get an opportunity to use this office, I'm sorry, this non-profit here then there's the hotel at the end of the block that they can rent space at.

And as has been testified this is a good thing for the organization if they can occupy this space. And I think they will be -- hopefully they will be a good neighbor because of all these things.

So I'm stuck on those two big issues and let anyone else go next.

COMMISSIONER MAY: So Mr. Chairman, having

absorbed all the different testimony about the number of 1 people who might be working there I am quite comfortable with 2 the notion that there would be a limit of 20 people. 3 The difference between 15 and 20 4 isn't that It's a 10,000 square foot building which is an 5 significant. extremely generous amount of space for that number of people 6 I won't go into other 7 working in an office environment. commentary on this but that's 500 square feet per person, 20 8 9 people. They're not exactly overburdening the building and 10 11 I can't believe that they would overburden the street. I think that having people coming and going provided they are 12 not all coming and going by car and blocking up the street 13 and things like that I don't think it's really an issue. 14 15 Certainly the difference between 15 and 20 is not going to be a really huge difference. 16 17 So I'm very comfortable granting the applicant 18 their request for 20. I think they started at 25 and then 19 in the various discussions went to the 15 plus 5 temporary. I think sorting out who's temporary and who's not 2.0 21 is a challenging thing as a condition so I'm okay with 20. Now, you want to talk about the receptions? 22 CHAIR HILL: No, let's do the number first. Okay. 23 I still am stuck on the number but okay. 24 25 MEMBER WHITE: I mean I was actually willing to

1 kind of go down on the number but that's not an issue I think that I could go either way because the building is so large. 2 Obviously the community wants to have the number 3 4 15. OP also weighed in and recommended the 15 number. So I was kind of stuck on 15 but I'll see what my other fellow 5 Board members have to say about it. 6 7 Mr. May, what do you think of 18? CHAIR HILL: Eighteen and a half. 8 MEMBER WHITE: 9 CHAIR HILL: Okay. 10 VICE CHAIR HART: I did not have a strong feeling I'm sorry to be -- not to be definitive but I 11 on 15 or 20. 12 didn't think that 20 was an outrageous number. I'd be 13 supportive of 20. I mean it took four hours just for 14 CHAIR HILL: me to get to this point. I'm just saying I think that's 15 We're having this deliberation and this took hours 16 17 and hours and hours of all of our lives. 18 And so I feel as though I'm more comfortable with like -- I know even though we're splitting hairs just an 18 19 number only because the -- I quess there's a variety of 2.0 21 reasons. How they got to 15 was down from 25 and so I feel 22 as though the community has put in a lot of time. 2.3 24 concerned about a lot of things. And again whether or not 25 people does anything, does anyone have an opinion

1	strongly?
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, I don't know. I forget,
3	is the applicant going to not do the project if it's only 15?
4	They're going to live with 15?
5	CHAIR HILL: Yes. I don't mind 18.
б	COMMISSIONER MAY: I don't mind 18 either.
7	CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. So we're fine with
8	18? Okay.
9	So now if somebody wants to talk about the
10	receptions and the meetings and stuff then we can go there.
11	MEMBER WHITE: So there were some conditions that
12	were set with respect to the meetings and events that they're
13	having. And obviously there are concerns.
14	The community doesn't want to have parties going
15	on there every day. That's understandable.
16	But I think based upon the testimony it doesn't
17	appear that this non-profit is that kind of organization.
18	This is a Federation of State Medical Boards.
19	So OP, the applicant as well as the opposition
20	party weighed in on a condition with respect to annual
21	meetings and events it read will not be held at the subject
22	property and will be held offsite. Annual meetings and
23	events will not be held at the subject property and will be
24	held offsite.

The premises will not be rented out or used by

anyone other than the Federation of State Medical Boards for any types of parties or similar events. Fundraisers are also prohibited.

They can hold a maximum of 3 committee meetings per quarter during business hours not to exceed more than 15 invitees per meeting.

One of these meetings per quarter may include a reception for the 15 invitees that will end by 8 p.m.

For me I thought that -- I'm pretty flexible on it but I still understand why the community wants to have some restrictions with respect to the level of meetings and events that are going on.

And if it was something on a larger scale then the applicant would be required to hold the event offsite.

I thought the opposition party's language was also good. It was a little bit more restrictive. But I was leaning towards the Office of Planning's language.

COMMISSIONER MAY: So the difference between the Office of Planning's language and the applicant's request seems to be for the quarterly meetings the applicant wanted 25 invitees versus 15 and they wanted to have a reception. The same restrictions on reception except that Office of Planning wanted to limit it to the 15 invitees to the quarterly business meeting and they wanted the reception to be limited to no more than 50 guests.

2.0

MEMBER WHITE: So I guess the question is if that 50 number. I had some issues with the 50 number but I'm willing to listen to your --

COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, I don't recall specifically what the idea was behind the 50 but it seems like it has to do with spouses or guests or things like that that would be in town for the meetings as well.

It seems like it's potentially a lot, that there would be one meeting per quarter that would have a reception with 50 people. So that means every three months there's potentially a big party that could be blocking up the street with valet parking and everything else. So I think that's problematic.

But I'm not sure that there should never be a meeting of that size. So I mean one reception per quarter, maybe the way to do it is to keep with the Office of Planning's conditions but allow them to have one reception per year that goes up to 50.

CHAIR HILL: So again -- and normally we don't go through this to this level. And again we're going through it to this level because we've been involved in this for quite some time.

I don't necessarily think the receptions are something that I would want to get involved in. The Office of Planning -- and 15 to me sounds like kind of a low number

2.0

in terms of having your quarterly meetings. Like they could do the quarterly meetings at 25 people and do the reception for 25 people that ends at 8 p.m. and I don't think that -- if you're going to have a reception for 25 people if you really want to have a reception you're going to go offsite anyway then and have it.

And again I'm kind of looking at this that it's a great benefit for the non-profit to be there in the first place. As testimony was provided there was like commercial buildings and commercial things.

So again we're kind of getting to a splitting hair type of situation. But I even think that as the community was really talking about the adverse impact the evening stuff with the -- again that narrow one-way street with the valet parking and all that, that's really where I'm -- I don't want to do the evening stuff. At least I can't get onBoard necessarily with it so I could do 25.

If we did 25 people rather than 15 for just their committee meetings then I don't know what your all's thoughts are.

COMMISSIONER MAY: And then no evening receptions.

CHAIR HILL: No evening receptions.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Again I have to ask the question is the applicant going to live with that.

I mean I could go to 25 invitees per meeting and

2.0

1 no receptions. But it seems a shame that they would not be 2 able to take advantage of that house to be able to use it for 3 that purpose. If they can live with it in order to get the 4 approval then I could live with that. 5 I look at it like this. VICE CHAIR HART: 6 7 residents were very vocal about having traffic impacts that were associated with this building. This is one of them. 8 And I would think that we would be looking at this 9 to be more restrictive. But -- more restrictive in terms of 10 11 -- more restrictive in many ways but understanding that there 12 may be once a year. And I'm kind of okay with the once a year. 13 The 14 once a quarter seems a little bit frequent to me. So I would 15 be more supportive of this if there were an annual meeting 16 that they could have. I don't know if you want to go to the 17 50 that's fine that will end by 8 p.m. 18 But it seems as though they could do that and the understand neighborhood would 19 at least that 2.0 happening once a year as opposed to once every three months. That's where I am. 21 -- of the 25. 22 CHAIR HILL: Twenty-five is fine. 2.3 VICE CHAIR HART: What do you all think of the 25? 24 CHAIR HILL:

COMMISSIONER MAY:

25

That's

I'm fine with 25.

1 basically, that's the OP condition but change 15 to 25. 2 CHAIR HILL: Yes. And then an annual meeting once 3 per year with 50 people. 4 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. Ending by 8 p.m. Ending by 8 p.m. 5 CHAIR HILL: Okay. Then the next one is the non-profit use will be approved for a period 6 7 of five years. The applicant was requesting that if we did --8 well, they don't want it to happen at all actually, but if 9 10 the time limit did happen. And we were here yesterday for 11 that time limit thing and like the time limit was the people 12 -- well, anyway, it's good to be represented. That's what 13 I'll say. 14 So the applicant was saying if the five years which I'm in favor of the five years so they have to come 15 16 back and we can see how it happened, but if it happens that the request would run from the date of issuance of the C of 17 18 O, the certificate of occupancy and so I'm fine with that. I think this is COMMISSIONER MAY: Absolutely. 19 the true test. The federation has to prove they're going to 2.0 21 be a good neighbor in that five years. It sounds like a Star Trek episode. 22 CHAIR HILL: Then after that we get into 23 Okav. All right. 24 kind of -- I don't even really know in terms of. 25 talk about lighting. Ι don't really understand the

1 difference in terms of what the applicant had proposed. Well, I think if there was 2 COMMISSIONER MAY: 3 lighting, security and window treatments under the opponents 4 as opposed to FSMB will maintain security lighting at the 5 rear of the property. Lighting, security, window treatments shall be 6 7 consistent with the style customary. Window treatments I just think is a little bit much. Security, lighting 8 9 sorry. It says FSMB will maintain security lighting in 10 11 the rear of the property and the neighbors are saying any lighting security and window treatments at the property shall 12 be consistent with the style. 13 I mean, I think I'm okay with sort of combining 14 15 those two because the one requirement is that they shall 16 maintain security lighting in the rear of the property. 17 And I think that we can just add to that exterior 18 lighting and security equipment will be consistent with the 19 style customary for the neighborhood and leave it at that. I mean I just think window treatments are a little bit too 2.0 much. 21 Does that make sense? 22 23 Say that again. CHAIR HILL: 24 COMMISSIONER MAY: So essentially taking 25 condition as the applicant had suggested it and adding to

1	that exterior lighting where it says exterior lighting in
2	the second sentence add also and security equipment.
3	Exterior lighting and security equipment will be consistent
4	with the style customary to Sheridan-Kalorama and will be
5	selected with neighborhood liaison.
6	Security equipment can be ugly. That's all I'm
7	saying.
8	VICE CHAIR HART: Do we know style customary.
9	Do we know what customary is?
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: Again it's going to be selected
11	with the cooperation of the neighborhood liaison. I think
12	that we'll get advice on customary.
13	VICE CHAIR HART: It's fine I just wanted to make
14	sure that that was, you know.
15	CHAIR HILL: Okay. So the next one.
16	MEMBER WHITE: Obviously the whole issue of
17	maintaining yes, we weren't going to do that, having a 24-
18	hour person living in the house.
19	CHAIR HILL: So we're going with the applicant on
20	number 11.
21	MEMBER WHITE: Yes, where they have 24-hour
22	contact.
23	CHAIR HILL: All right. So number 12. Number 12
24	seems the same.
25	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, highly similar.

1	CHAIR HILL: So we'll go with the opposition on
2	number 12. It's just more language.
3	MEMBER WHITE: Well, the question is are you
4	adding in the transportation demand management plan as part
5	of a condition.
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: I think the TDM plan is already
7	part is already a condition.
8	CHAIR HILL: Yes, I think it is. Okay, so what
9	are we going with? The applicant, opposition?
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: Actually the opposition party
11	is a little bit more flexible in that it doesn't state
12	specifically that it has to be in the lower basement or the
13	garage, it just has to be covered.
14	I mean I don't think it really matters.
15	VICE CHAIR HART: I don't have an opinion either
16	way.
17	CHAIR HILL: All right, so then go with the
18	opposition. I'm just going to read through all these at the
19	end anyway. So number 13.
20	The opposition just want notices posted in the
21	front and rear of the building. I would think that that
22	looks bad. I would say the applicant's number 13.
23	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right. And they also
24	they're saying smokers have to smoke on Connecticut Avenue
25	which I think is problematic.
	·

1	CHAIR HILL: Well, they're medical Boards. They
2	shouldn't be smoking anyway. I would think that that would
3	be frowned upon.
4	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
5	CHAIR HILL: You would be shunned. All right, is
6	that all of them?
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: There's a condition 14 about
8	giving notice of plans to the ANC SK, SKHA and the two
9	abutting properties. That's the applicant's condition.
10	CHAIR HILL: I thought the 14 from the applicant
11	covered everything.
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
13	CHAIR HILL: Okay.
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: It covers 15. There's a
15	different number 14 under the opposition party which says
16	that they'll be prohibited from administering any
17	examinations on the property.
18	I don't think that's really necessary to include
19	that prohibition. I mean I don't know if that's what the
20	intention is.
21	CHAIR HILL: Okay. So are we just sticking with
22	14 from the applicant?
23	COMMISSIONER MAY: Fourteen from the applicant and
24	not 14 or 15 from the opposition.
25	CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. All right, we're

going to take a quick break.

2.0

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 10:33 a.m. and resumed at 10:42 a.m.)

CHAIR HILL: Okay, let's get started again. So where we were was -- so to kind of recap in terms of the deliberations here. And I'm repeating myself to a certain extent but there are standards that we use to examine whether or not cases should or shouldn't be approved.

And we are all in agreement that this applicant has met the standards with which to approve this agreement -- I'm sorry, this application. And we've gone through some of those standards in detail in terms of how we believe that they meet the criteria.

And I clearly think they meet the criteria and we all seem to agree with that.

And now we're kind of going through the conditions. And I think the places where we are kind of changing some of those conditions, where -- and again this was trying to mitigate adverse impact on the community which also I think -- again the difference between 20 and 18 or 15 I don't really think also is necessarily going to be a big difference.

However, we're trying to make sure that we can mitigate any possible issues that might happen there with the community as this project were it to move forward.

And I do also want to clarify in terms of kind of my position with the 15 that there was -- there was something about the Office of Planning and I thought there was even 25 at one point on the table that the Office of Planning was approved.

In any case we're at 18 people for full-time employees onsite. Then the evening events or I should say the quarterly during business hour meetings are going to be the 25 invitees, 25 from 15.

And then there's going to be an annual evening reception that's going to end at 8 p.m. that the 25 people can bring a friend. And so there's going to be 50 people for their annual meeting once a year, or they can use it once a year.

And then also there's all of the discussions that's going to take place between the applicant and the community to make sure that all of this takes place.

There's also then the -- in terms of when -- and this is also good for the community to know that they're going to come back to us again in five years where we'll know whether or not -- whoever's here on the Board in five years. And we'll know if this actually was successful in terms of -- and I don't see why FSMB wouldn't be successful in living up to the expectations that they are a good neighbor. It sounds like they're going to definitely do their best.

2.0

And I think that was it. Okay. 1 Then I'm going to read through the conditions so that Mr. Moy you can know 2 3 what we're doing. 4 And I guess I can read through the conditions first and then make a motion. 5 So the first condition again was we're going with 6 7 the Office of Planning and I'm going to read through all of them. 8 There is to be no expansion of the existing 9 10 building footprint and other external alterations are subject to approval by the D.C. Historic Preservation Office. 11 second condition is the office hours of 12 operation will be 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. Monday through Friday. 13 14 Staff and visitor parking will be in nearby garages only and on-street parking will not be allowed. 15 FSMB shall memorialize the restriction on street 16 17 parking in the employee handbook. FSMB may utilize the two 18 spaces in its own garage accessed from the rear of the property for its senior staff from time to time. 19 Condition number 4, a maximum of 18 people may 2.0 work onsite. 21 Condition number 5, all deliveries 22 restricted to weekday office hours. 23 Condition number 6, loading will be restricted to 24 25 the alley.

Condition number 7, annual meetings and events will not be held on the subject property and will be held The premises will not be rented out or used by anyone other than FSMB for any type of party or similar event. Fundraisers are also prohibited. FSMB may hold a maximum of three committee meetings per quarter during business hours not to exceed more than 25 invitees per meeting. There will be an annual meeting or reception, whatever you want to call it, where it will end by 8 p.m. and will not exceed 50 quests. Condition number 8, the applicant and the ANC shall establish a neighborhood liaison to provide a forum for concerns and provide information about activities to property owners within 200 feet of the subject property. And the applicant shall designate one of executive officers as its liaison to the forum which shall convene no less frequently than on a quarterly basis. The proposed non-profit office use -- condition number 9. The proposed non-profit office use shall be approved for a period of five years. However, the Board requests that this run from the date of issuance of the certificate of occupancy.

Number 10, FSMB will maintain security lighting

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

in the rear of the property. Exterior lighting and security equipment will be consistent with the style customary to Sheridan-Kalorama and will be selected with the neighborhood liaison.

Condition number 11, FSMB shall maintain a 24-hour emergency response service and provide contact numbers to the ANC neighborhood liaison and to all neighbors within 200 feet

Condition number 12, FSMB agrees to provide a dedicated space for at least three bicycles in the garage or lower basement area of the building.

Condition number 13, no smoking will be allowed anywhere on the premises and employees will be subject to the smoking policies contained in the FSMB employee handbook.

Condition number 14, applicant shall give notice and a copy of plans to the liaison, ANC, the SKNC, the SKHA and the two abutting neighbors whose properties abut the site, and to Mr. Guinee. And to Mr. Guinee.

So those are all the conditions. Okay. All right. So that being the case then I'm going to make a motion to approve application number 19659 as captioned and read by the secretary including all of the conditions that I just read and ask for a second.

VICE CHAIR HART: Second.

CHAIR HILL: The motion made and seconded. All

2.0

of the property.

1	those in favor?
2	(Chorus of ayes)
3	CHAIR HILL: All those opposed? The motion
4	passes, Mr. Moy.
5	MR. MOY: Staff would record the vote as 4-0-1.
6	This is on the motion of Chairman Hill to approve the
7	application for the relief requested along with the
8	conditions as cited in your motion.
9	Seconding the motion is Vice Chair Hart. Also in
10	support Mr. Peter May, Ms. Lesyllee White. No other member
11	participating. The motion carries 4-0-1.
12	CHAIR HILL: Okay. Full order, Mr. Moy.
13	MR. MOY: Yes, sir.
14	CHAIR HILL: Thank you.
15	COMMISSIONER MAY: So, Mr. Chairman, the one thing
16	that was not totally clear to me is the reference to the TDM
17	plan as a condition. I mean it's referenced in one of the
18	conditions but I thought that we had isn't adherence to
19	the TDM plan, shouldn't that be a condition?
20	CHAIR HILL: All right. So do I need to remake
21	the motion, Mr. Moy? We're going to add the TDM plan as one
22	of the conditions.
23	MR. MOY: Mr. May can make a friendly amendment
24	to that motion.
25	CHAIR HILL: All right, Mr. May.

	44
1	COMMISSIONER MAY: I would make a friendly
2	amendment to include the TDM plan as an additional condition
3	of the order.
4	CHAIR HILL: All right, second?
5	VICE CHAIR HART: Second.
6	CHAIR HILL: All those in favor?
7	(Chorus of ayes)
8	CHAIR HILL: All those opposed? All right, Mr.
9	Moy, if you'd add that to the conditions.
10	MR. MOY: Thank you, sir.
11	CHAIR HILL: And then still a full order.
12	MR. MOY: Yes, sir.
13	CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Thank you.
14	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
15	record at 10:51 a.m.)
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

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

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Public Meeting

Before: DC BZA

Date: 04-18-18

Place: Washington, DC

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

Court Reporter

near Nous &