

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Board of Zoning Adjustment



Application No. 18325 of Renaissance Centro Third Street LLC, pursuant to 11 DCMR §§ 3104.1 and 3103.2, for a variance from the lot occupancy requirements under § 772, a variance from the rear yard requirements under § 774, a variance from the off-street parking requirements under § 2101.1, and a special exception to allow a roof structure with walls of unequal heights under § 411.11, to allow an addition to an existing building in the DD/C-2-C District at premises 704 3rd Street, N W. (Square 529, Lots 802, 803, 845, and 847)

HEARING DATE: March 20, 2012
DECISION DATE: March 20, 2012 (Bench Decision)

SUMMARY ORDER

SELF-CERTIFIED

The zoning relief requested in this case was self-certified, pursuant to 11 DCMR § 3113.2. (Exhibit 6.)

The Board of Zoning Adjustment (“Board” or “BZA”) provided proper and timely notice of the public hearing on this application by publication in the *D.C. Register* and by mail to the Applicant, Advisory Neighborhood Commission (“ANC”) 6C, and to all owners of property within 200 feet of the property that is the subject of this application. The subject property is located within the jurisdiction of ANC 6C, which is automatically a party to this application. ANC 6C submitted a report, dated December 19, 2011, in support of the application. The ANC indicated that at a duly noticed and regularly scheduled public meeting on December 15, 2011, with a quorum of six out of nine Commissioners present, the ANC voted unanimously (6.0) to support the application. (Exhibit 26.)

The Office of Planning (“OP”) submitted a timely report recommending approval of two of the three area variances requested as well as the special exception request, to allow the adaptive reuse and expansion of an existing historic structure in the DD/C-2-C Zone into a hotel and/or residential building. Specifically, OP recommended approval of the requests for special exception relief under § 411.11 and variance relief from the minimum rear yard requirements under § 774.1 and the maximum lot occupancy requirements under § 772.1. OP stated that it could not recommend approval for a variance from minimum off-street parking relief under

441 4th Street, N W , Suite 200/210-S, Washington, D C 20001

Telephone (202) 727-6311

Facsimile (202) 727-6072

E-Mail dcoz@dc.gov

Web Site www.dcoz.dc.gov

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT
District of Columbia

CASE NO. 18325

EXHIBIT NO. 36

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO.18325
EXHIBIT NO.36

§2101.1 due to a lack of information.¹ (Exhibit 29.) The District's Department of Transportation ("DDOT") submitted a report recommending approval of the Applicant's request for a variance from the off-street parking requirements under § 2101.1. In its report DDOT recommended that the Applicant provide pre-loaded SmartTrip cards to new residents and/or hotel visitors and encourage the use of nearby public transportation options. (Exhibit 28)

Variance Relief

As directed by 11 DCMR § 3119.2, the Board has required the Applicant to satisfy the burden of proving the elements that are necessary to establish the case, pursuant to § 3103.2, for area variances from §§ 772, 774, and 2101.1 of the Zoning Regulations. No parties appeared at the public hearing in opposition to this application. Accordingly, a decision by the Board to grant this application would not be adverse to any party.

Based upon the record before the Board and having given great weight to the OP and ANC reports filed in this case, the Board concludes that in seeking area variances from the requirements of §§ 772, 774, and 2101.1, the Applicant has met the burden of proving under 11 DCMR § 3103.2, that there exists an exceptional or extraordinary situation or condition related to the property that creates a practical difficulty for the owner in complying with the Zoning Regulations, and that the relief can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and without substantially impairing the intent, purpose, and integrity of the zone plan as embodied in the Zoning Regulations and Map.

Special Exception

As directed by 11 DCMR § 3119.2, the Board required the Applicant to satisfy the burden of proving the elements that are necessary to establish the case for a special exception under § 3104.1 from the strict application of the requirements for a roof structure with enclosing walls of unequal heights under § 411.11. No parties appeared at the public hearing in opposition to the application. Accordingly, a decision by the Board to grant this application would not be adverse to any party.

The Board concludes that the Applicant has met the burden of proof for special exception relief, pursuant to 11 DCMR §§ 3104.1 and 411.11, that the requested relief can be granted as being in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Zoning Regulations and Map. The Board further concludes that granting the requested relief will not tend to affect adversely the use of neighboring property in accordance with the Zoning Regulations and Map.

¹ On March 20, 2012, the Applicant submitted supplemental information to respond to OP's concerns (Exhibit 30) as well as revised plans that removed a previously proposed parking level (Exhibit 31). At the hearing, the Board granted expert witness status to Sacha Rosen for architecture and design. The Board approved the application subject to the revised plans in Exhibit 31.

BZA APPLICATION NO. 18325

PAGE NO. 3


Pursuant to 11 DCMR § 3100.5, the Board has determined to waive the requirements of 11 DCMR § 3125.3, that the order of the Board be accompanied by findings of fact and conclusions of law. The waiver will not prejudice the rights of any party and is appropriate in this case. It is therefore **ORDERED** that the application is hereby **GRANTED, pursuant to Revised Plans – Exhibit 31.**

VOTE: **4-1-0** (Lloyd L. Jordan, Nicole C. Sorg, Jeffrey L. Hinkle, Anthony J. Hood to Approve; Rashida Y.V. MacMurray opposed)

BY ORDER OF THE D.C. BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

A majority of the Board members approved the issuance of this order.

ATTESTED BY:


SARA A. BARDEN
Director, Office of Zoning

FINAL DATE OF ORDER: **MAR 28 2012**

PURSUANT TO 11 DCMR § 3125.9, NO ORDER OF THE BOARD SHALL TAKE EFFECT UNTIL TEN (10) DAYS AFTER IT BECOMES FINAL PURSUANT TO § 3125.6.

PURSUANT TO 11 DCMR § 3130, THIS ORDER SHALL NOT BE VALID FOR MORE THAN TWO YEARS AFTER IT BECOMES EFFECTIVE UNLESS, WITHIN SUCH TWO-YEAR PERIOD, THE APPLICANT FILES PLANS FOR THE PROPOSED STRUCTURE WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS FOR THE PURPOSE OF SECURING A BUILDING PERMIT, OR THE APPLICANT FILES A REQUEST FOR A TIME EXTENSION PURSUANT TO § 3130.6 AT LEAST 30 DAYS PRIOR TO THE EXPIRATION OF THE TWO-YEAR PERIOD AND THAT SUCH REQUEST IS GRANTED. NO OTHER ACTION, INCLUDING THE FILING OR GRANTING OF AN APPLICATION FOR A MODIFICATION PURSUANT TO §§ 3129.2 OR 3129.7, SHALL EXTEND THE TIME PERIOD.

PURSUANT TO 11 DCMR § 3125, APPROVAL OF AN APPLICATION SHALL INCLUDE APPROVAL OF THE PLANS SUBMITTED WITH THE APPLICATION FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A BUILDING OR STRUCTURE (OR ADDITION THERETO) OR THE RENOVATION OR ALTERATION OF AN EXISTING BUILDING OR STRUCTURE. AN APPLICANT SHALL CARRY OUT THE CONSTRUCTION, RENOVATION, OR ALTERATION ONLY IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PLANS APPROVED BY THE BOARD AS THE SAME MAY BE AMENDED AND/OR MODIFIED FROM TIME TO TIME BY THE BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT.

IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE D.C. HUMAN RIGHTS ACT OF 1977, AS AMENDED, D.C. OFFICIAL CODE § 2-1401.01 ET SEQ. (ACT), THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DOES NOT

DISCRIMINATE ON THE BASIS OF ACTUAL OR PERCEIVED: RACE, COLOR, RELIGION, NATIONAL ORIGIN, SEX, AGE, MARITAL STATUS, PERSONAL APPEARANCE, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, GENDER IDENTITY OR EXPRESSION, FAMILIAL STATUS, FAMILY RESPONSIBILITIES, MATRICULATION, POLITICAL AFFILIATION, GENETIC INFORMATION, DISABILITY, SOURCE OF INCOME, OR PLACE OF RESIDENCE OR BUSINESS. SEXUAL HARASSMENT IS A FORM OF SEX DISCRIMINATION WHICH IS PROHIBITED BY THE ACT. IN ADDITION, HARASSMENT BASED ON ANY OF THE ABOVE PROTECTED CATEGORIES IS PROHIBITED BY THE ACT. DISCRIMINATION IN VIOLATION OF THE ACT WILL NOT BE TOLERATED VIOLATORS WILL BE SUBJECT TO DISCIPLINARY ACTION