

GOVERNMENT
OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY

MARCH 6, 2019

+ + + + +

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 L. Hill, Chairperson, presiding.

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBER PRESENT:

ROB MILLER, Zoning Commission Member

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

CLIFFORD MOY, Secretary

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

MARY NAGELHOUT, ESQ.

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Meeting held on March 6, 2019.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

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

(9:44 a.m.)

1
2
3 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Please come to order. We're
4 located in the Jerrily R. Kress Memorial Hearing Room at 441
5 4th Street, N.W. This is the March 6th, 2019, public hearing
6 of the Board of Zoning Adjustment for the District of
7 Columbia.

8 My name is Fred L. Hill, Chairperson. Joining me
9 today is Lorna John and Lesyllee White, Board Members.
10 Carlton Hart will be here later as the Vice-Chair. Rob
11 Miller is sitting in on a decision for the Zoning Commission,
12 and then later on in the day we'll have Commissioner Peter
13 May.

14 Copies of today's hearing agenda are available to
15 you and located on the Web and near the door. Please be
16 advised that this proceeding is being recorded by a court
17 reporter and is also Webcast live. Accordingly, we must ask
18 you to refrain from any disruptive noises or actions in the
19 hearing room.

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

25 All persons planning to testify either in favor

1 or in opposition must have raised their hand and been sworn
2 in by the Secretary. Also each witness must fill out two
3 witness cards. These cards are located on the table near the
4 door and on the witness table. Upon coming forward to speak
5 to the Board, please give both cards to the reporter sitting
6 at the table to my right.

7 If you wish to file written testimony or
8 additional supporting documents today, please submit one
9 original and 12 copies to the Secretary for distribution.
10 If you do not have the requisite number of copies, you can
11 reproduce copies on an office printer in the Office of Zoning
12 located across the hall. Please remember to collate your set
13 of copies.

14 The order of procedures for special exceptions and
15 variances, as well as an appeal is also listed as you come
16 walking into the door. The record shall be closed at the
17 completion of each case, except for any materials
18 specifically requested by the Board.

19 The Board and the staff will specify at the end
20 of the hearing exactly what is expected and the date when the
21 persons must submit the evidence to the Office of Zoning.
22 After the record is closed, no other information shall be
23 accepted by the Board.

24 The Board's agenda includes cases set for
25 decision. After the Board adjourns, the Office of Zoning in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 consultation with myself will determine whether a full or
2 summary order may be issued. A formal order is required when
3 the decision it contains is adverse to a party, including an
4 affected ANC. A full order may also be needed if the Board's
5 decision differs from the Office of Planning's
6 recommendation.

7 Although the Board favors the use of summary
8 orders whenever possible, an applicant may not request the
9 Board to issue such an order. The District of Columbia
10 Administrative Procedures Act requires that the public
11 hearing on each case be held in the open before the public
12 pursuant to Section 405(b) and 406 of that Act.

13 The Board may, consistent with its Rules of
14 Procedures and the Act, enter into a closed meeting on a case
15 for purposes of seeking legal counsel on a case, pursuant to
16 the DC Official Code, Section 2-575(b)(4), and/or deliberate
17 on a case pursuant to DC Official Code, Section 2-575(b)(13),
18 but only after providing the necessary public notice, and in
19 the case of an emergency closed meeting after taking a roll
20 call vote.

21 The decision of the Board in cases must be based
22 exclusively on the public record. To avoid any appearance
23 to the contrary, the Board requests that persons present not
24 engage the members of the Board in conversation. Please turn
25 off all beepers and cell phones at this time so as not to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 disrupt these proceedings.

2 Preliminary matters are those which relate to
3 whether a case will or should be heard today, such as
4 requests for postponement, continuance or withdrawal, or
5 whether proper and adequate notice of the hearing has been
6 given.

7 If you're not prepared to move forward with the
8 case today or you believe that the Board should not proceed,
9 now is the time to raise such a matter. Mr. Secretary, do
10 we have any preliminary matters?

11 MR. MOY: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members
12 of the Board. Just a very quick announcement as to today's
13 docket. We do have one application that has been withdrawn
14 by the applicant, and that is case application No. 19-851 of
15 Rupsha, R-U-P-S-H-A, 2011 LLC.

16 Other than that, there is several preliminary
17 matters regarding requests for postponements, but staff would
18 suggest that the Board address those when I call the case.

19 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thank you. All
20 right. Good morning, everyone. We're going to basically
21 follow the meeting agenda and the hearing agenda the way that
22 you see it as you kind of walk into the meeting here.

23 However, we are going to mix up the decision
24 agenda. We're going to take the first one -- I'm just going
25 to switch them around, I forget what comes first but we're

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 going to do the Giuseppe first, followed by The VIP Room
2 preliminary matter meeting.

3 We're going to do application 19886 first,
4 followed by 12799 A. In terms of the hearing agenda, we're
5 going to follow the order in which you see in the bin as you
6 came in. Anyone who's planning on testifying either in favor
7 or in opposition, if you wouldn't mind standing and taking
8 the oath administered by the Secretary to my left.

9 MR. MOY: Good morning. Do you solemnly swear or
10 affirm that the testimony you're about to present in this
11 proceeding is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the
12 truth? Ladies and gentlemen, you may consider yourselves
13 under oath.

14 Okay, with that, Mr. Chairman, the first of the
15 two cases for decision in the meeting session portion of
16 today's hearing is Case Application No. 19886 of Giuseppe and
17 Teresa Farruggio, as amended for special exception under
18 Subtitle D, Section 1206.4 and 5201 from the rear addition
19 requirements of Subtitle D, Section 1206.3, and under
20 Subtitle C, Section 1504 from the penthouse setback
21 requirements of Subtitle C, Section 1502.1(b), and pursuant
22 to Subtitle X, Chapter 10, for variances from the front
23 setback requirements of Subtitle B, Section 315.1(c) and
24 Subtitle D, Section 1205.2, and from the non-conforming
25 structure requirements of Subtitle C, Section 202.2.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 This would construct a rear addition to an
2 existing attached principal dwelling unit, R-20 zone at
3 premises 3602 Prospect Street Northwest, Square 1202, Lot
4 838.

5 Although this is before the Board for decision
6 making, Mr. Chairman, there is in the record a request for
7 the Board to postpone or delay its decision from the party
8 in opposition. That's in your case file record under Exhibit
9 83.

10 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Is the Board ready to
11 deliberate on the issues? Okay. I guess, just so the
12 audience knows, during the decision meetings we're just
13 deliberating up here, so we don't take any testimony, we
14 don't ask any questions, and there isn't any participation.
15 So there you go.

16 There's the preliminary matter -- well, as the
17 Board remembers, we took a lot of testimony. The case went
18 on quite a bit in terms of what the applicant was trying to
19 do and the relief that, and the standards that they believe
20 that they met in order for us to grant the relief.

21 At the end of the hearing, or near the end of the
22 hearing, it seemed as though there could be some movement
23 between the applicant and the party in opposition in terms
24 of the design.

25 And so we asked if the applicant had wanted to go

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 back and see if there was a possibility of working with the
2 party in opposition to see if they could come to a design
3 that would be more, you know, the party in opposition might
4 have considered. All right?

5 And so if the Board will recall, the Office of
6 Planning had submitted a report and was in favor of the
7 application in terms of that the applicant had met the
8 criteria for which us to grant the application.

9 And the ANC had basically submitted a report
10 asking us to take into account the light and air from the
11 neighboring properties, which is what we do anyway in terms
12 of within the standards. And they didn't make a decision one
13 way or the other, whether they were in favor or in opposition
14 to the application.

15 Since that time, since the hearing there was a
16 revised drawings in terms of, I think it was the third floor
17 now, they came, they're not going as far back, I think it was
18 24.4 feet was what they were doing there in the third floor.
19 And then they needed additional relief, however, from the
20 one-to-one setback from the penthouse level for a bannister.

21 And so the couple of things that are before us --
22 and then in addition to that, as Mr. Moy had mentioned, there
23 is now a request for a postponement from the party in
24 opposition so that they could have a better opportunity to
25 look at the plans that have been submitted.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I'm kind of -- and I'm just sharing now with the
2 Board -- I'm kind of on the fence in terms of the
3 postponement. Like, I think I have enough information to
4 render a decision.

5 However, part of this postponement -- I mean,
6 again, since we don't take any additional testimony, there's
7 nothing we're going to be necessarily taking from the party
8 in opposition in terms of delaying this decision.

9 I suppose if there was anything that might have
10 happened from delaying this decision is that perhaps the
11 party in opposition and the applicant could actually come
12 together to the point where the party in opposition might,
13 you know, withdraw their opposition and then, therefore, the
14 project could move forward at a more speedy rate. You know,
15 if it were to, again, get approved.

16 So the postponement was asked for because of, I
17 think, the party in opposition unfortunately had gone through
18 some health issues and hadn't had an opportunity to really
19 take a look at the plans.

20 So, again, we're not asking for anything from the
21 party in opposition, so that's why I didn't necessarily take,
22 but I would also -- the other thing that possibly leads me
23 towards a little bit of a postponement is that I don't think
24 that there's any additional notice that needs to be done in
25 terms of the one-to-one setback because that was already

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 something that the ANC had had an opportunity to kind of look
2 at.

3 And I don't think that there's anything that now
4 the ANC or the Office of Planning would need further time
5 for. However, it would be helpful, I suppose, that the
6 applicant could revise their burden of proof for the one-to-
7 one setback.

8 And so there's nothing there right now for the
9 one-to-one setback. The Office of Planning Supplemental
10 Report, also from the additional -- the new design is also
11 in support of that design, as they were in support of the
12 design that had more relief, or I should say it was a larger
13 design.

14 So that being said, I can kind of go either way.
15 And so I'm just going to let it up to, in terms of the
16 postponement, I mean, we can deliberate now or if you think
17 that, you know, and I don't know, Mr. Moy, was there an
18 actual request for how long the postponement request was for?
19 I can't remember in the record.

20 MR. MOY: Yes. No earlier than April 17th. So
21 any time after the 17th of April.

22 CHAIRPERSON HILL: So that's like six weeks away.

23 MR. MOY: April 17th. Yes.

24 CHAIRPERSON HILL: And I can see people raise
25 their hands. If I took testimony then I'd be reopening the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 hearing, and it gets me into a whole other thing.

2 I've been here long enough now that I tried to do,
3 or I thought we could do it in the beginning and then I was
4 corrected by the Office of the Attorney General again that,
5 you know, we're basically reopening a hearing and so I
6 shouldn't be doing that.

7 And so, otherwise, it makes a whole lot of sense
8 in terms of being efficient to me, but so April. So that's
9 like a month, I mean, it just seems like it's a long time
10 away, for me, just to, you know, have somebody have the
11 ability to look at plans.

12 But I don't know what the other -- like I said,
13 I can deliberate today, or I can postpone it a little bit
14 longer so that the person -- I don't know what April 17th is
15 all about. So does anybody have any thoughts?

16 MS. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, in the staff notes I saw
17 that the Board requested party responses. I don't know if
18 that is an error. So if party in opposition is saying that
19 he hasn't been able to look at the plans and to respond that
20 might be a basis for granting the postponement.

21 MEMBER WHITE: Mr. Chair, I could probably go
22 either way as well, but as Ms. John just stated, I think it
23 is reasonable to give the opposition party some opportunity
24 to weigh in on the revised drawings. But I believe that the
25 Office of Planning is still supporting the application.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 But in terms of the postponement, I would like to
2 maybe give a little leeway. I don't think the case
3 necessarily needs to be re-noticed because the neighbors have
4 been actively engaged in the issues. Perhaps we could give
5 additional time, but not necessarily six weeks.

6 MR. MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I support
7 the request for postponement. I think it's a reasonable
8 request, and I look at it also in conjunction with the fact
9 that the special exception relief for the penthouse setback
10 was not noticed, even though the plans always showed that
11 guardrail where it is without being set back one-to-one.

12 So I look at the postponement as an opportunity
13 to correct that lack of notice. And if the April 17th date
14 is less than what the normal notice is, then I think that
15 that's fine. We can grant, we can waive whatever the normal
16 notice would be for that special exception.

17 But I think it's an opportunity to correct that
18 notice deficiency and also an opportunity for the applicant
19 to submit a burden of proof statement as to why the special
20 exception for the penthouse setback is needed. And also an
21 opportunity for the applicant to continue to work with the
22 party in opposition.

23 I'm appreciative that they did revise the design
24 to make it less extensive than it previously was, I think by
25 about ten feet. But there's some confusion. I think that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the party in opposition has about the actual number of, how
2 far it does extend back.

3 The Office of Planning had one number of 24-
4 something, and I think the opposition saw 22 on one of the
5 plans. So maybe it's an opportunity for the applicant to
6 clarify with OPM, with the party in opposition exactly how
7 far back it would go, and maybe come to some agreement where
8 the party in opposition would withdraw.

9 So having said all that, I am supportive of both
10 the postponement to April 17, and to noticing the special
11 exception relief required and having the applicant submit a
12 revised burden of proof -- not a revised burden of proof --
13 a burden of proof statement that hasn't been submitted yet
14 for that special exception relief and maybe have some further
15 dialogue with OP and the applicant to reach agreement all
16 around. So that's where I am.

17 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. When are you with us
18 again, Commissioner Miller?

19 MR. MILLER: I don't know, but I always complicate
20 your schedule.

21 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Right. No, I understand. I
22 appreciate that.

23 MR. MILLER: Or usually.

24 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Do you know when you're -- I
25 mean, I don't think with the postponement, I just think it's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 pretty far out there. I mean, and so, you know, I don't
2 know, you know, I mean, that's still another six weeks out.

3 MR. MILLER: I don't know my schedule.

4 CHAIRPERSON HILL: And --

5 MR. MILLER: I don't know my schedule, but I'll
6 come whenever you schedule it.

7 MR. MOY: I don't have any listing for the
8 Commissioners after the end of April.

9 MR. MILLER: I'll be here whenever you schedule
10 it, or I'll be here to deliberate today if you're ready to
11 do that.

12 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Then what's on the table here
13 again is just -- and, I mean, and I don't, we can, and this
14 is why I don't think this is particularly efficient for us
15 at times. I mean, the parties are here and so, you know, I
16 could have a discussion with the parties, but we are unable
17 to do that right now.

18 In terms of if the parties have any questions
19 about anything they can check with the Office of Zoning
20 across the hall and/or reach out to Mr. Moy in terms of any
21 questions you might have about what's been going on in terms
22 of deliberations.

23 And, again, the only thing that I was struggling
24 with right now was just when to come back. Like, I don't
25 understand why the April 17th date was put forward. If

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Commissioner Miller knew that he was back here before then,
2 that's the date that I wouldn't necessarily have scheduled
3 this deliberation.

4 I do think that the applicant has made a very good
5 faith effort to change the design in a way that is more
6 accommodating to the neighbors, and, you know, I mean, I was
7 ready to deliberate on the original application. And so,
8 yes, so then I guess we'll go.

9 I mean, Commissioner Miller is offering up the
10 17th, and so does anyone have any comments? We'll go with
11 the 17th?

12 MS. WHITE: Mr. Chairman, I thought I heard the
13 Commissioner say that he could accommodate our schedule, so
14 if we thought maybe an earlier date would move the case along
15 then we would accommodate that. I don't know if I'm
16 misquoting the Commissioner?

17 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Yes. I mean,
18 Commissioner Miller is accurate. And I guess now my
19 continued discussion with this is that if the party in
20 opposition actually thought that they needed until that time
21 to look at whatever they needed to look at -- because, again,
22 I don't know, I guess I don't know what the health issues are
23 -- and that there could be a possibility that if the party
24 in opposition were able to withdraw their opposition, it
25 would allow the applicant to possibly get a summary order

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 rather than a full order.

2 And so the ability to get a summary order is a
3 matter of days, whereas the ability to get a full order is
4 however long that seems to be running, which is substantial.
5 However, Mr. Moy, do you have a suggestion?

6 MR. MOY: Well, I was going to add, segueing on
7 Ms. John's comment, not knowing anything beginning with May,
8 Mr. Miller is back on April the 3rd, which would be a couple
9 of weeks earlier. I know I messed you up just now.

10 CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right. Okay. So listen,
11 yes. So let's go with April the 3rd. Okay? And let's allow
12 time for the applicant to try and work with the party in
13 opposition, see if they can satisfy any questions.

14 Again, as I've mentioned before, I think that the
15 applicant has made a good faith effort to change this design
16 in a way that could be more accommodating to the neighbors.

17 The original design that we had gone through was,
18 you know, the analysis that the Office of Planning had
19 provided that -- I'm not saying we necessarily vote with the
20 Office of Planning -- but that it did support the original
21 application. Right?

22 And so at the end of that testimony -- and it was
23 a long hearing -- at the end of that hearing, the applicant
24 and the party in opposition seemed to be able to work
25 together.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So if, you know, again, if the applicant could
2 work with the party in opposition and see if they could get,
3 you know, clarity on what's going on, and if they could get
4 the party in opposition to, you know, whatever, if the party
5 in opposition was satisfied and withdrew their opposition,
6 then they could possibly get a summary order.

7 So at least that's something that it could be
8 helpful if we were to approve this. So, Mr. Moy, all that
9 then, I guess the Board seems satisfied with April 3rd?

10 MR. MOY: April 3rd.

11 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. And Mr. Miller,
12 you'll be back here on April 3rd, and so that way we don't
13 have to keep bringing you back and forth, back and forth.
14 So we'll go ahead and postpone it until April 3rd. OAG has
15 a comment?

16 MS. NAGELHOUT: I just wanted to clarify. Are you
17 doing additional notice or not?

18 CHAIRPERSON HILL: I don't think that -- it seems
19 as though the Board is satisfied with the amount of notice
20 that has gone on for the one-to-one setback, and so we're not
21 requiring additional notice. Okay. All right?

22 Okay. All right, Mr. Moy, so that's it. So we're
23 doing that April 3rd. And Mr. Miller, you're done with us.
24 Correct?

25 MR. MILLER: Yes.

1 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. All right, Mr. Moy,
2 if you could call our next decision case.

3 MR. MOY: Yes, sir. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
4 This is the last in this session. This goes to Case
5 Application No. 12799 A, of The VIP Room. Let me read this
6 caption advertised for modification of significance to
7 Condition No. 1 in the BZA Order No. 12799, in order to
8 permit the sale and storage of alcohol at the commercial
9 establishment in the MU-3 zone. This is at premises 6201 3rd
10 Street Northwest, Square 3342, Lot 813.

11 This is before the Board because a preliminary
12 matter where the applicant is requesting prior to noticing
13 of the case, the Board waived the standard time line for a
14 hearing date to allow the case to be heard on March the 20th,
15 2019. And that is according to the filing under Exhibit 36.
16 So that's what is before the Board.

17 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Is the Board ready to
18 deliberate? Okay. I can start. This particular case has
19 gone on for a little while in terms of it started as a
20 modification of consequence, which we then thought should be
21 a modification of significance.

22 I'm in favor of waiving the time period. I mean,
23 I think that all the different parties have been notified.
24 I mean, the record, we have a lot of information from the
25 community.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 This particular applicant has been to two
2 different ANC bodies. It was once before the ANC before an
3 election, and then it went back again before the ANC for the
4 second election.

5 And I also believe that the applicant has shown
6 good cause for use to grant the waiver, and I'm ready to
7 schedule the hearing. What does anyone else think?

8 MEMBER WHITE: Yes, Mr. Chair. Yes. I agree with
9 your comments that this has been kind of a lengthy case and
10 that I did agree that it needed to be reclassified as a
11 modification of significance.

12 They've asked to waive the noticing for the case
13 to be heard on March 20th. I don't know if that works, but
14 under Subtitle Y204.5, the time periods can be reduced or
15 extended by the Board for good cause with a notice to all
16 parties or announcement on the record.

17 So I think they've met that standard, and the
18 record, even though we're not really getting into the merits
19 of the case, the community and the ANC have been noticed
20 regarding the underlying modification request.

21 And I recommend that we waive the timing
22 requirement based on good cause and set this for a hearing,
23 hopefully sometime this month.

24 MEMBER MAY: So I'm sorry. When would the notice
25 actually be made public? I mean, if we said, yes, let's set

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 it on the 20th, when would there actually be public notice?

2 MR. MOY: I'm trying to remember. I think the
3 public notice -- I need to check the record. I'm thinking
4 it probably would have to go out today.

5 MEMBER MAY: It would go out today?

6 MR. MOY: Yes.

7 MEMBER MAY: Okay. I mean, today would be
8 marginally acceptable if it were two weeks' notice. I mean,
9 I would think it would need to be more than that.

10 And I would prefer that it be at least 30 days,
11 because even though there are people who are well aware of
12 it, I'm not sure that everybody in the neighborhood is fully
13 aware of it because it was never required that they be fully
14 notified. So I think 30 days would be appropriate.

15 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So you're in opposition
16 to waiving the --

17 MEMBER MAY: No. It's normally a 40-day notice
18 requirement.

19 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.

20 MEMBER MAY: So, I mean, I'd be okay with going
21 to down to 30 or something that approximates that.

22 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.

23 MEMBER MAY: But I wouldn't be ready to go down
24 to what could maybe be 14 days.

25 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So, all right, what does

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 everyone else think?

2 MS. WHITE: Mr. Chairman, 30 days is acceptable.

3 MEMBER HART: I think we need some notice, but two
4 weeks or 30 days, either one is fine.

5 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Mr. May, when are you
6 here again?

7 MEMBER MAY: I'm not actually here until April
8 17th.

9 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So that's more than
10 that. So if we did 30 days' notice -- well, let's back up.
11 What was the first, how did we get to the 20th? Was that
12 what was requested?

13 MR. MOY: My understanding was the attempt was to
14 schedule a hearing before the end of March. Otherwise, we're
15 getting closer to the 40 days, which would take us into
16 April, this case would be April the 10th, which give us the
17 40 days.

18 If we do a 30, then we're looking at April the
19 3rd. Or if you want to do a little bit shorter than 30 days,
20 then we're looking at March 27. But for the 30 days, I would
21 think to include 30 days plus, it would be April 3rd. I'm
22 sorry. Did I muddle that?

23 CHAIRPERSON HILL: No, no. That's all right. I
24 was just thinking. So you're at 30 days. Right? And you're
25 -- I mean, I think that, I mean, again, now this is where

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we're going back to the scheduling. I think that the parties
2 have been, I think everybody's been noticed. I'm fine with
3 whatever day that we do now.

4 Commissioner May is speaking again of 30 days for
5 the notice that would take us to April 3rd. Is that correct,
6 Mr. Moy?

7 MR. MOY: Well, it would be -- if we go 30 days
8 it would be April the 6th. So it would be a little bit
9 shorter than the 30 days if we do April 3rd. If we do the
10 full 30 days, then we're looking at April 10th.

11 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So Commissioner May, at
12 least, seems to be okay with the April 3rd date. At least
13 that's what I see from his reaction. So let's go ahead.
14 It's only a week after what was originally kind of thought
15 we were going to do. So let's do April 3rd. Okay?

16 MR. MOY: Done.

17 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.

18 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
19 record at 10:16 a.m.)
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Public Meeting

Before: DC BZA

Date: 03-06-19

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

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701