

**Advisory Neighborhood Commission (ANC) 6A  
Economic Development & Zoning Committee**

7- 9 PM, Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Sherwood Recreation Center (640 Tenth (10<sup>th</sup>) Street NE, Second (2<sup>nd</sup>) Floor Community Room)

**Present (7:06 pm call to order)**

*Committee Members:* Dan Golden (Chairman), Laura Gentile, Michael Hoenig, Missy Boyette, Charmaine Josiah, Justin Thornton, Stephanie Frang

*Commissioners:* David Holmes

**Community Comments**

No community comments

**Status Reports**

*1511 A Street NE*

Nearby residents were successful in gaining access to review the permit submittal plans on file at DCRA, which confirmed that the zoning issues identified in the plans provided by the developer are also present in the plans that are on file. Currently, the DC government has scheduled a hearing to revoke the license of the engineer of record.

*819 D Street NE*

The owner received approval from the Historic Preservation Review Board (HPRB).

**Presentation**

*1301 North Carolina Avenue NE (HPA 13-545)*

Representatives from Donahue & Stearns, gave a brief presentation regarding their updated proposal to install cellular antennae atop the existing church. The development team has reduced the number of antennae from 12 to 6 and removed the back-up generator. Additionally, the developer sent a letter to the residents surrounding the project approximately two weeks prior, informing them of the installation of the antennae, and has had no response. On April 25, 2014, the DC State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), provided a letter stating that the project would have no adverse affects, on the conditions that: 1) the Sector 1 antennae be pushed back as far from North Carolina Avenue as possible; 2) the Sectors 1 and 2 antennae be painted to match the walls to which they are attached; 3) the wall-mounted antennae be installed through mortar joints only, causing no damage to the bricks; 4) the stealth screen for the Sector 3 antennae be designed to match the brick of the church; and 5) the property owner be informed that additional antennae from another cellular provider would not be appropriate on the rooftop of the church.

- Chairman Golden summarized for the Committee an email from Shauna Holmes, indicating that the Capitol Hill Restoration Society (CHRS) had requested that the developer provide evidence in DC where “stealth concealment” antennae are currently being used, and the developer did not, and that, as a result CHRS could not support the project. However, Ms. Holmes stated that, while CHRS did not agree with the determination of SHPO, it did strongly support the five conditions on which SHPO’s concurrence was based.
  - The developer was unable to find current examples of “stealth concealed” antennae in the District, but was confident it has been used in the past.
- SHPO Requests:
  - Push faux chimney and antennae as far back as possible.
    - Applicant will comply.
  - Work with the church to find a paint color for the antennae that makes sense.

- Applicant will comply.
- Try to use anchors in the mortar joints for the antennae.
  - Applicant states that this makes the most sense and will comply
- Match the stealth screen to the brick of the church
  - Applicant agreed to do this.
- Try to restrict additional carriers or other antennae at this location
  - Applicant agreed and indicated additional antennae may interfere with the signal from the antennae that already are present.
  - Moreover, there potentially is no space for additional antennae.
- Committee questions:
  - How long will it take to complete this project?
    - One month of construction after all approvals have been acquired.
- Motion:
  - Chairman Golden made a motion to recommend that the ANC write a letter in support of the project to HPRB on the condition that the applicant complies with the five (5) requests stated in the letter from SHPO.
    - 5 aye
    - 1 no

#### *1122 East Capitol Street NE*

Request: Applicant seeks Bureau of Zoning Authority (BZA) approval for a special exception from lot occupancy requirements and for a variance from court width requirements, as well as HPRB approval for design of a two-story addition to the rear of existing rowhouse.

The owner and his architect presented first regarding the special exception and variance.

- The majority of the square in question contains houses that are at or above 69% lot occupancy. The applicant is proposing 69% lot occupancy which is 9% above the current 60% that the house currently occupies.
- Committee questions:
  - Are both neighbors supportive of the proposed project?
    - Neighbor to the west is in support.
    - Neighbor to the east has concerns about light and air being affected by the proposed addition. However, the committee noted that the light and air of that neighbor appeared unlikely to be materially affected by the addition.
  - Is the court width typically an issue with the BZA?
    - Commissioner Holmes stated that this is typically not an issue.
    - Committee member Missy Boyette noted that the new court would actually be narrower than the existing court by a small margin. She and Chairman Golden agreed that this did not appear to be an issue in this case, but, in a future case, it may be appropriate to limit the proposed narrowing of an existing court.
- Motion:
  - Chairman Golden made a motion to recommend the ANC write a letter to the BZA recommending approval, on the condition that the plans submitted with the BZA application do not deviate materially from the plans reviewed by the Committee.
    - 6 aye
    - 0 no

The owner and his architect's second presentation focused on the HPRB.

- Chairman Golden read comments from Shauna Holmes on behalf of CHRS noting:
  - The applicant is proposing a modest addition.
  - However, there are concerns related to the view from Twelfth (12<sup>th</sup>) Street through the alley.
    - Most homes have a brick rear façade.
    - The new two-story addition proposes to use hardi-board or another type of siding. CHRS urged that the homeowner consider using brick.
- Committee questions:
  - What is the economic difference between siding and brick?
    - The homeowner's architect thought there could be a material difference. However, he did not have any specific numbers, as the applicant had not thought about using brick.
    - Using brick would create less usable space in the interior of the addition.
    - Committee determined that this was not a large issue, but urged the applicant to be mindful of color choice and to use a darker color of hardi-board siding, so that the spirit of CHRS's comments could be honored and the addition not be visually obtrusive.
- Motion:
  - Chairman Golden made a motion to recommend that the ANC send a letter in support of the project to HPRB on the condition that the applicant address CHRS concerns by using a darker color for the siding.
    - 6 aye
    - 0 no

#### **Historic Alley Dwellings in the Historic District**

Committee member Michael Hoenig provided a brief update on the meeting he attended regarding Historic Alley Dwellings

- The District has undertaken a survey of existing alley dwellings in historic districts (Capitol Hill). Questions to be addressed by the District include: Are these dwellings contributing to the historic district? Are they adaptable?
- Currently there are 635 such dwellings on Capitol Hill.

**Adjourn: 8:07 pm**