LAW OFFICES

GRIFFIN, MURPHY, MOLDENHAUER & WIGGINS, LLP

MARK G GRIFFIN (DC, MD)
BRIAN P MURPHY (DC, MD)
ASHLEY E WIGGINS (DC, MD, VA)
MERIDITH H MOLDENHAUER (DC, MD, VA)
ERIC M DANIEL (MD, DC)

RECEIVED
D.C. OFFICE OF ZONING
2013 APR 23 PM 4:11

DIRECT DIAL: (202) 530-1482
EMAIL: MMOLDENHAUER@WASHLAW.COM

April 23, 2013

Via Hand Delivery

Board of Zoning Adjustment
for the District of Columbia
441 4th Street, N.W., Suite 210S
Washington, DC 20001

Re: BZA Application No. 18511 of Alleyoop, LLC/1018 Irving Street, NW
Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Dear Board Members:

On behalf of Alleyoop LLC, enclosed please find ten copies of the proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law for the above-referenced zoning application.

At the April 2nd hearing, the Board left the record open to allow the Applicant to supplement the record with documentation from banks that would support the Applicant's testimony regarding the available loan terms for a project of this type. The Party in Opposition made a number of statements questioning the reasonableness of the Applicant's loan terms and financials submitted to the Board. The Applicant submits two letters, one from the Bank of Georgetown and one from Cardinal Bank, supporting the Applicant's loan terms and loan-to-value ratio presented by the Applicant. *See* Exhibit A.

In the Supplemental Submission under Exhibit I, the Applicant referenced a Construction Budget that was not included in the Supplemental Submission. While the Board has not specifically requested that this Construction Budget be included, the Applicant has provided a copy in the enclosed submission. *See* Exhibit B.

Respectfully submitted,

GRIFFIN, MURPHY,
MOLDENHAUER & WIGGINS, LLP

By: Meridith H. Moldenhauer

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT
District of Columbia
CASE NO. 18511
EXHIBIT NO. 41

Enclosures:

Cc: Ms. Jennifer Steingasser, Office of Planning (via email)
Mr. Joel Lawson, Office of Planning (via email)
Mr. Paul Goldstein, Office of Planning (via email)
Advisory Neighborhood Commission 1A, c/o Commissioner Thomas Boisvert, Chair (via email)
Mr. Adetokunbo Ladejobi (via email)

Application No. 18511 of Alleyoop LLC, pursuant to 11 DCMR § 3103.2, for a variance from the use provisions under §330.4, a variance from the nonconforming structure provisions under §2001.3, and a variance from the building on alley lot provisions under §2507, to allow the use and alteration of an alley lot to construct an addition to an existing structure for a mixed-use (office and a five residential apartments) in the R-4 District at premises rear 1018 Irving Street, NW (Square 2851, Lot 837).

HEARING DATE: March 5, 2013; April 2, 2013
DECISION DATE: April 30, 2013

DECISION AND ORDER
On December 17, 2012, Alleyoop, LLC (the "Applicant"), the owner of 1018 Irving Street NW (the "Property"), filed an application with the Board of Zoning Adjustment (the "Board") for zoning relief. The Board held a public hearing on the application on March 5, 2013. The Board held a second public hearing on the application on April 2, 2013 to allow the Applicant to supplement the record.

PRELIMINARY MATTERS

Self-Certification. The zoning relief requested in this case was self-certified pursuant to 11 DCMR § 3114.2.

Notice of Public Hearing. Pursuant to 11 DCMR § 3113.1, notice of the hearing was sent to the Applicant, all individuals and entities owning property within 200 feet of the Property, Advisory Neighborhood Commission ("ANC") 1A, and the Office of Planning ("OP"). The Applicant posted placards at the subject property regarding the application and public hearing and submitted an affidavit to the Board to this effect.

The Applicant's Case. The Applicant was represented by Meridith H. Moldenhauer Esq., of Griffin, Murphy, Moldenhauer & Wiggins, LLP. Greg Gardner testified on behalf of the Applicant.

ANC 1A. The Property is located within the area served by ANC 1A, which is automatically a party to this application. ANC 1A filed a letter and resolution, dated January 8, 2013 indicating that ANC 1A, at its regularly scheduled meeting on January 13, 2013, which was properly advertised and where a quorum was present, voted 8-0-2 in support of the application. *See* Exhibit No. 23. Commissioner Kent Boese, on behalf of ANC 1A, testified in support of the application.

Office of Planning (OP) Report. OP submitted a report on February 26, 2013, recommending approval in part and denial in part.

Party in Opposition. Mr. Adetokunbo Ladejobi, a resident of the property at 3029 11th Street, NW, which abuts the entryway of an alley that leads to the Property, submitted a request for party status. *See* Exhibit No. 27.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Background on Applicant and Property

1. The Property is a large alley lot with approximately 5,901 square feet of land area and a width of roughly 52.7 ft.[1] The lot is the largest on the Square.
2. The Property is bounded on three sides (east, west, and south) by public alleys.
3. The north side of the Property was historically abutted by a public alley as well. However, that segment of public alley was subsequently deeded to properties abutting Irving Street NW.
4. The existing structure has a footprint of roughly 4,072 square feet occupying 67% of the lot.
5. The remainder of the lot is an open yard. The open yard allows for 24.8 feet of separation between the structure and the northern property line.
6. The Property consists of a one-story, 18.5 foot tall, automotive repair shop that has been in use since at least 1928 and remained in use and operation until September 2012.
7. The Property is contaminated by oils, solvents and chemicals due to the extended use as an automotive repair shop. Environmental remediation may include excavation and removal of contaminated soil as well as hauling and dumping fees.
8. The roof structure on the Property suffers from substantial fire and water damage. To ensure safety, the entire roof structure, including the cast-in-place concrete roof structure, must be removed.
9. Following acquisition of the Property, the Applicant discovered extensive unrepaired fire damage covered by ceiling drywall as well as substantial unanticipated water damage.
10. The Applicant neither knew nor should have known the degree of the environmental contamination and extent of costs associated with proper clean-up at the time of acquisition.
11. Moreover, the Applicant did not anticipate the costs associated with providing public amenities such as an improved alley, an additional fire hydrant to address accessibility, protection such as bollards to protect neighboring properties, and other measures to enhance the surrounding area.
12. The Property is approximately 2½ blocks east of the Columbia Heights Metro Station.
13. The Property is not located within any historic district, and the existing building on the Property is not listed on the D.C. Inventory of Historic Sites.

---

[1] The Deed references two lot numbers for purposes of identification. The lots were combined into one lot well before the purchase of the lot by the Applicant.

Zoning Relief Requested

Addition to a Nonconforming Structure (§2001.3)

14. The permitted lot occupancy is 60%.

15. The existing structure has a lot occupancy of 67%.

16. While the Applicant will leave lot occupancy unchanged, variance relief from §2001.3 is required for an addition to a structure that is nonconforming as to lot occupancy.

17. The Applicant has limited lot occupancy to 54% on the second floor and 36% on the third floor.

18. Compliance with the nonconforming structure requirements would require demolition of a significant portion of the existing building.

Office use on an alley lot in the R-4 District (§330.4)

19. While the amount of commercial space is being substantially reduced, and a less intensive use is taking its place, use variance relief is required from §330.4 to allow office use in an R-4 District.

Apartment use in an alley structure (§2003)

20. Pursuant to §§2003.1 and 2003.5, an apartment use is permitted as a special exception if approved by the Board of Zoning Adjustment.

21. Under the special exception standard, a nonconforming use may be changed to a use permitted in a less restrictive Zone District under §2003.1.

22. In the context of a Residential District, the regulations specifically state that the proposed use must be a dwelling, flat, **apartment house**, or a neighborhood facility. 11 DCMR §2003.5.

23. In this instance, the automotive repair use is permitted in the C-M-1 Zone, a heavier intensity zone that allows heavy commercial and light manufacturing.

24. Multifamily residential use is first permitted as a matter of right in the Residential Districts, deemed a more restrictive district under §2003.6.

25. Section 2003.1 refers to any existing nonconforming use on all lots and in no way distinguishes alley lots or otherwise excludes review of alley lots pursuant to the special exception standard.

Height requirement for an alley structure (§2507)

26. Area variance relief is required regarding the height permitted on an alley lot.

27. Under §2507.4, the height of an alley structure may not be greater than the distance from the opposite side of the abutting alley to the outside wall of the structure nearest the alley.

28. When all three alleys are considered, the most restrictive allows for a height of 12.4 feet.

29. The automotive repair shop has an existing height of 18.5 feet.

30. The Applicant proposes to increase the height of the structure requiring variance relief from §2507.4.

31. The Applicant proposes a height of 39'-6''and three stories which, if not on an alley lot, would be permitted as a matter of right in the R-4 District.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Exceptional Circumstance

1. The Board, agreeing with the Office of Planning, concludes that based on a confluence of factors an exceptional circumstance exists at the Property.

2. At 5,901 square feet, the Property is unusually large. The Property is roughly 3 times larger than some of the bigger lots and 8½ times larger than the lots in the southeast corner of the Square.

3. Moreover, the lot is an irregular octagon shape. The existing structure follows the awkward shape of the lot creating a bay and many angular walls.

4. The Applicant has presented substantive evidence proving the exceptional existing physically deteriorated condition of the Property and necessity for substantial renovation.

    i. The roof structure is partially wood framed and partially cast-in-place concrete. Both portions of the roof and exterior walls of the building are compromised due to significant water filtration, lack of maintenance over time, and unrepaired fire damage.

    ii. The roof is affected by previously hidden fire damage unknown to the Applicant at the time of acquisition requiring significant structural repair.

    iii. The northern cast-in-concrete portion of the roof structure is in a deteriorated condition and the tar and gravel roof membrane is almost entirely eroded. This erosion has allowed water to enter the concrete deck, rusting the reinforcing bars and compromising the structural integrity of the concrete roof structure. To ensure safety, the entire roof structure, including the cast-in-place concrete roof structure, must be removed.

iv. Structural roofing repairs, including the cost to demolish and rebuild, will cost the Applicant $65,000. Roofing, gutter, and downspouts will cost the Applicant $46,000. Moreover, because of the lack of a proper gutter and downspout system, water runoff has eroded the mortar and caused movement in the masonry wall. Masonry repointing and repair as a result of these deficiencies at the building will cost the Applicant $25,000 and exterior doors and window replacement will cost $13,000.

v. In addition to the above, in order to bring the building to a base level of repair the Applicant must spend $20,000 in electrical upgrades and $50,000 in plumbing upgrades as a result of deficiencies at the building. *See* Total Investment Summary, Exhibit F of Applicant's Supplemental Submission (Exhibit 34).

5. The Property is contaminated resulting in potential clean-up costs and a significant risk of future liability. The Applicant has commissioned a Phase I and Phase II environmental study at a cost of $13,000. Due to extensive prior use as an automotive repair shop, petroleum and solvents leaking onto the ground have resulted in the potential need for remediation. Environmental remediation, which would cost the Applicant $25,000, includes excavation and removal of contaminated soil from the site as well as hauling and dumping fees. Remediation also includes topping or removal of the concrete slab in the interior of the existing structure. The ground floor slab and insulation will cost the Applicant $15,000. *See* Exhibit F of Applicant's Supplemental Submission (Exhibit 34). In addition, for any permitted use the Applicant is obligated to prevent off gassing.

Practical Difficulty and Undue Hardship

<u>Addition to a Nonconforming Structure (§2001.3)</u>

6. The Board, agreeing with the Office of Planning, concludes that strict application of the nonconforming structure requirements would impose a practical difficulty on the Applicant.

7. The existing structure, at 67% lot occupancy, is beyond the permitted 60% lot occupancy. While the Applicant will leave lot occupancy unchanged, variance relief from §2001.3 is required for an addition to a structure that is nonconforming as to lot occupancy.

8. Because the Applicant has limited lot occupancy to 54% on the second floor and 36% on the third floor, the additional floors comply with the lot occupancy requirement.

9. The Board finds the Applicant has satisfied the requirements for relief from 2001.3.

<u>Office Use in on an Alley Lot in an R-4 District (§330.4)</u>

10. The Board agrees with the Office of Planning and concludes that strict application of the use provisions with respect to office use on an alley lot in the R-4 District would impose an undue hardship on the Applicant.

11. While the amount of commercial space is being substantially reduced, and a less intensive use is taking its place, use variance relief is required from §330.4 to allow office use in an R-4 District.

12. The unique history of the building, operating as a nonconforming automotive repair shop since well before 1958, and the substantial remediation and renovation costs justify the use variance for the office use.

13. The Board is persuaded by the Applicant's reasonable reluctance to build and sell a residential dwelling unit on the ground floor due the environmental conditions at the Property. Therefore, strict application of the use provision in an R-4 District preventing office use would impose an undue hardship on the Applicant.

Zoning Relief Regarding Apartment Use in an Alley Structure

14. Apartment use may be permitted by a special exception if approved by the Board of Zoning Adjustment subject to the provisions of §§ 2003.2 - 2003.4.

15. The Board disagrees with the Office of Planning's interpretation that the special exception provision in §2003 does not apply to alley lots. Section 2003.1 refers to any existing nonconforming use and in no way distinguishes between an alley lot and street lot.[2] The residential use starts on the existing first floor, providing a lobby and residential parking, and continues on the second and third floors.

i. Analysis under Special Exception Review (§2003.1)

16. The Board concludes that the Applicant meets the following applicable standards for special exception:

    §2003.2. The proposed use shall not adversely affect the present character or future development of the surrounding area in accordance with this title. The surrounding area shall be deemed to encompass the existing uses and structures within at least three hundred feet (300 ft.) in all directions from the nonconforming use. The proposed use does not adversely affect the present character or future development of the surrounding area. The present character of the surrounding area is primarily residential with an automotive repair shop on a large alley lot. The proposed 5-unit residential use on the alley lot is more appropriate for an R-4 District than automotive repair. The ANC's recommendation of approval and several letters of support from surrounding neighbors indicate neighborhood support for the change in use. The five units proposed are permitted as a matter of right in an R-4 District, where conversion to an apartment use is permitted as long as there are 900 square feet of lot area per unit.

[2] The Office of Planning supported its recommendation that the application be reviewed under the variance standard by citing BZA Case No. 16815. However, simply because a prior, self-certified application sought relief under the use variance standard, and the Board contemplated the relief requested under the standard requested, does not provide a definitive answer as to whether such relief could have been obtained under the special exception provision in §2003 if requested.

§ 2003.3 - The proposed use shall not create any deleterious external effects, including but not limited to noise, traffic, parking and loading considerations, illumination, vibration, odor, and design and siting effects. The proposed use does not create any deleterious external affects. Noise, traffic, parking, odor, and design and siting effects have been carefully addressed in the Pedestrian Plan, Traffic Plan, and Waste management Plan submitted to and approved by DDOT. *See* Exhibit G of Applicant's Supplemental Submission (Exhibit 34).

a. Noise:

The Board is unpersuaded by the Party in Opposition's contention that noise in the alley will increase. Residential use is far quieter than an automotive repair shop. The Party in Opposition, who purchased his home in October 2010, lacks personal knowledge of noise created by the automotive repair shop during its full operation. The Party in Opposition lived near the auto repair shop only after its operation had substantially decreased and notices of foreclosure sale were recorded in April 2009 and again in December 2010.

b. Parking and Traffic

The Board is also unpersuaded by the Party in Opposition's argument that the proposal negatively affects parking and traffic. An automotive repair garage requires 4 parking spaces plus 1 space for every 200 square feet of gross floor area. The existing automotive repair garage has 4,072 square feet resulting in a parking requirement of 24 off-street parking spaces. In contrast, the proposed structure requires only 3 parking spaces and the Applicant has provided 6 off-street parking spaces. Furthermore, an automotive repair shop would generate far more traffic than residential and light office use which is confirmed by the differential in required parking under the Zoning Regulations.

c. Lighting

The Applicant has proffered to improve the lighting in the alley by replacing harsh utility pole fixture lighting with more appropriate down-lighting. The lighting improvements will better control the light for its intended use and prevent disturbance of neighbors.

§2003.4 - When an existing nonconforming use has been changed to a conforming or more restrictive use, it shall not be changed back to a nonconforming use or less restrictive use. The existing nonconforming use has not been changed to a conforming or more restrictive use. The automotive repair shop had been in use since at least 1928 and remained in use and operation until September 2012.

ii. Analysis Under Use Variance Standard

17. While a use variance standard does not need to be met here, the Board concludes that the Applicant, based on the evidence in the record, satisfies this standard as well. The

Applicant would suffer an undue hardship if the requested relief for apartment use is not granted.

18. Matter of right uses permitted by the Zoning Regulations on an alley lot include a single family dwelling (§2507.1) or an artist studio if certain conditions are met (§2507.5).

19. By special exception, uses permitted include continued use as an automotive repair shop (§2000.4) or parking and storage (§333). As a result of the substantial financial investment required to repair the structure, these matter-of-right uses are not financially viable options as indicated by the Profit and Loss Analysis included in the record.

20. More specifically, use of the Property as one single-family dwelling would not be financially feasible creating an undue hardship. Such a project would require either wasteful demolition or costly renovation of the existing structure, in addition to the environmental remediation required at the Property. Furthermore, a single-family home on a nearly 6,000 square foot lot would not be marketable.[3]

21. Pursuant to the lot area requirement in an R-4 District, the lot could be subdivided into multiple lots and ranch-style, single-family dwellings could be built. This option would require the demolition of the existing building and, again, would not allow the Applicant to recoup the costs of renovation and remediation required for the Property to be habitable.

22. Use of the Property as an artist studio would also not be financially feasible. Given the financial investment required at the Property, the rental income from artist studios would not be sufficient.[4]

23. Various other alternative special exception uses, including continuation as an automotive repair, automotive storage use, and office use, are also not financially feasible. As indicated by the detailed financial documentation provided by the Applicant, each alternative use would result in a net monthly loss.

24. Maintaining the structure for automotive use is not a financially viable option. Largely due to substantial repairs to the roof, site remediation, and low rental rate, the Applicant would suffer a net monthly loss of $1,134. The Applicant also suffers a net monthly loss if the property is used for an artist studio use ($2,907 loss/month), parking or storage use ($3,269 loss/month), or exclusively office use ($1,078 loss/month).

25. The Board concludes that the Applicant's hardship was not self-created. Significant costs associated with the project were hidden at the time of purchase and unknown to the Applicant until after acquisition, including but not limited to extensive unrepaired fire

---

[3] *See* BZA Case No. 18017 in which the Board recognized the infeasibility of constructing a single-family home on an alley lot due to financial infeasibility and unmarketability (Chairman Loud states, "[T]he sheer size of the property, it's over 5,000 square feet, maybe close to 6,000 square feet and the cost of rehabbing it as a single-family for a market that may not be there on an ally lot at that price . . . I think it would be an undue hardship.").

[4] *See* BZA Case No.18406, in which the Board, in approving an application for variance relief on an alley lot to allow use of the lot as a multiunit dwelling, acknowledged that artist studio use would not generate sufficient rental income to justify the renovations on an alley lot required at the property.

damage, water damage, and environmental contamination and clean-up. Furthermore, costs to the Applicant associated with improvement to the alley, protection of neighboring properties, and other measures to enhance the surrounding area were not anticipated.

26. The Board finds the Party in Opposition's challenges to the Applicant's financial data speculative, biased, and inaccurate.[5] The Party in Opposition suggested a number of alternative assumptions that may alter the predicted return on investment presented by the Applicant including a different management fee, vacancy rate, loan term, or interest rate.[6] The Board disagrees with the Party in Opposition's Profit and Loss Analysis, which assumes a 50% equity down payment and a 30 year loan term. *See* Exhibit 36. 50% equity down is not the industry standard and is an unreasonable assumption. A 30-year term is typical for residential loans but not commercial loans.

27. The Board finds that the Applicant's letters from the Bank of Georgetown and Cardinal Bank further support the Applicant's financial documentation, attached hereto as <u>Exhibit A</u>. As indicated by the Applicant and supported by these letters, a loan to value ratio of 70%-75% and a 20-25 year term is typical for a project of this size and type. Thus the Party in Opposition's statements regarding the relative costs and benefits of alternative debt-equity ratios are inaccurate.

28. Having found the Applicant's Profit and Loss Analysis and other financial documentation to be accurate and reasonable, the Board rejects the Party in Opposition's request that the Board dictate loan-to-value ratios and other financial terms to an applicant.

29. In this instance, the Applicant has demonstrated that without the requested zoning relief the Property will not generate a fair and reasonable return on investment. *Palmer v. Bd. of Zoning Adjustment for the District of Columbia*, 287 A.2d 535 (D.C. 1972); *Russell v. District of Columbia Bd. of Zoning Adjustment*, 402 A.2d 1231 (D.C. 1979); *Tyler v. District of Columbia Bd. of Zoning Adjustment*, 606 A.2d 1362 (D.C. 1992). It is not simply that using the structure as a matter of right or by special exception would produce less of a profit for the Applicant. Rather, *any* renovation and remediation of the existing structure as a matter of right or by special exception would result in an economically infeasible project. Furthermore, the longstanding, undesirable, existing nonconforming use and substantial liability associated with remediating potential environmental hazards further demonstrate the undue hardship and practical difficulty associated with the exceptional circumstances at the Property.

---

[5] The Party in Opposition presented no hard evidence or documentation to support his statements and was not qualified by the Board as an expert.

[6] The Party in Opposition later retracted its opposition to the vacancy rate assumption on cross examination when asked specifically about vacancy rates in the context of an alley dwelling stating "I don't believe that the vacancy rate is necessarily reasonable or unreasonable. If you guys want to use a 7 percent vacancy rate, we're talking small numbers there." Hearing Transcript, p192.

Height Requirement for an Alley Structure (§2507.4)

30. The Board concludes that the property owner would suffer a practical difficulty if the requested relief from the height requirement for an alley structure is not granted.

31. The Applicant proposes to increase the height of the structure requiring variance relief from §2507.4. While the Applicant requested a fairly substantial degree of relief from the height requirement, the Applicant has provided sufficient evidence in support of its request. The Board acknowledges that the height and number of stories proposed by the Applicant, if not on an alley lot, would be permitted as a matter of right in the R-4 District.

32. The Applicant has demonstrated that the lot size is large, that multiple alleys abut the Property rather than one, that the existing nonconforming structure is not suitable for residential use due to damage to the roof and other aspects of the structure as well as the environmental condition at the Property, and that DDOT supports the Pedestrian Plan, Traffic Plan, and Waste Management Plan.

33. The Board is persuaded by its similar conclusions in BZA Case No. 16815. In that case, the Board approved variance relief on an alley lot with respect to height, among other relief, based on the large lot size, the presence of multiple abutting alleys rather than one, that the existing nonconforming structure was not suitable for residential use, and testimony from DDOT. The facts and circumstances of this case are very similar and the Board seeks to maintain consistency.

34. Furthermore, the Board was encouraged by the ANC support and the Applicant's careful design, which creates setbacks and a visual break in the building's massing. The proposed structure limits any impact on the light and air of neighbors. The 24.8 foot yard on the northern side of the existing structure will be retained. Moreover, the building massing steps back like a wedding cake on all three sides abutting an alley. In this way, the portions greater than one-story have been set back from nearly every property line. *See* Building Height Study, Exhibit J of Applicant's Supplemental Submission (Exhibit 34).

35. The Applicant submitted Line of Sight Diagrams and a Sun Study to demonstrate that the structure will not be visible from any of the surrounding public streets or otherwise impact light and air. *See* Exhibit H of Applicant's Supplemental Submission (Exhibit 34).

36. The Board is not persuaded by the Party in Opposition's concern that the height of the project would obstruct his view from the rear of his Property. The Board confirms that no owner has a right to a view and the project is 6 houses away creating no direct line of sight issue. The Party in Opposition has a rear yard of roughly 20 feet. Hearing Transcript, p197.

37. Reducing the height of the project to two stories, by removing the top floor from the proposed structure, is not financially feasible for this project. Spreading the exorbitant

costs of the project, including considerable constructions costs, alley improvements, and necessary environmental remediation, over the sale of only three units as opposed to five units creates a nonviable project. *See* Profit and Loss Analysis, Exhibit K of Applicant's Supplemental Submission (Exhibit 34).

38. A two-story, three-unit structure results in a substantial net loss of $108,121.75 due to the extraordinary costs resulting from the exceptional conditions of the Property. Furthermore, unpredictable liability associated with this project makes the endeavor riskier financially and contributes to financial infeasibility.[7]

39. A five-unit structure results in a reasonable return relative to the development costs. Furthermore, the estimated returns are potentially inflated because the proforma provides for an optimistically high sale value relative to comparable, non-alley lot two bedroom units referenced in the Applicant's list of comparable properties. *See* Comparables, Exhibit L of Applicant's Supplemental Submission (Exhibit 34).

No Substantial Detriment to the Public Good or Zone Plan

40. There will be no substantial detriment to the public good or impairment to the intent, purpose, and integrity of the zone plan by approving the zoning relief.

41. Section 13(b)(d) of the Advisory Neighborhood Commission Act of 1975, effective March 26, 1976 (D.C. Law 1-21; D.C. Code § 1-309.10(d)(A)), requires that the Board's written orders give "great weight" to the issues and concerns raised in the recommendations of the affected ANC. In this case, ANC 1A recommended approval of the requested relief subject to the conditions enumerated herein. *See* Exhibit 23. The Board accords the ANC recommendation the great weight to which it is entitled and concurs in its recommendation.

42. Commissioner Kent Boese, on behalf of ANC 1A, testified in support of the application at the hearing. Mr. Boese first commended the Applicant for his open communication with the ANC and extensive outreach to the community. He then pointed out that parking and traffic congestion would decrease relative to the historical uses at the Property. He also stated that because neighbors are not entitled to preserve their views, the ANC had no concern regarding height. Mr. Boese supported the additional residential units to help alleviate housing demand and resulting increase in prices for units in the neighborhood. Finally, he supported the project stating that the height and proximity of the proposed structure to nearby houses was normal for the area and that the project created no adverse impact on the neighborhood.

---

[7] *See* BZA Case No. 17431, in which the Board granted variance relief finding that "the unexpected discovery of the soil contamination and the expense of foundation stabilization and soil remediation" contributed to the financial infeasibility of the project without zoning relief. *See also* BZA Case No. 16931, in which the Board granted variance relief finding, in the context of petroleum contaminated soil, that the additional cost of testing, removal, legal disposal made the project financially infeasible without zoning relief.

43. The requested variance is in furtherance of the public good and zoning regulations. The zoning relief will permit renovation of a dilapidated automotive repair shop. An automotive repair shop, which relies upon a significant number of unscheduled daily visitors and the use of combustible chemicals and solvents, is incompatible with a residential district.

44. The Applicant is expending considerable resources to resolve environmental and health related hazards at the Property as a result of the prior use. The office and residential uses proposed by the Applicant are far more in keeping with that which was intended for the R-4 District.

45. The Applicant has also carefully considered how best to manage waste, traffic patterns, and pedestrian friendliness, and safety. As demonstrated in the Waste Management Plan, all garbage containers will be kept within the building or rear yard so as not to impeded circulation of traffic and will be easily serviceable by a commercial waste disposal company form the northwest alley entrance. *See* Exhibit G of Applicant's Supplemental Submission (Exhibit 34). The Pedestrian Plan and Traffic Plan will promote safety, improve lighting, and ensure a functional traffic plan. *Id.* These plans implement measures such as the installation of light fixtures, a pedestrian zone in the northwest alley, and a crosswalk. By replacing harsh utility pole fixture lighting with more appropriate down-lighting will better control the light for its intended use and prevent disturbance of neighbors. In addition, the Applicant's project will improve the alley conditions including but not limited to spending $40,000 towards replacing and improving the alley surface surrounding the structure. *See* Profit and Loss Analysis, Exhibit K of Applicant's Supplemental Submission (Exhibit 34).

46. The Office of Planning has indicated a clear goal that alley lots, once dirty and crime-ridden, are now a key component to the District's planning efforts. *See Alleys: DC's Other Streets Are Attracting Attention*, Exhibit M of Applicant's Supplemental Submission (Exhibit 34). The Applicant's proposal will enhance and improve the underutilized alley and existing structure.

47. Moreover, residents that live in the immediate area have proffered 10 letters in support of this application. *See* Exhibit No. 37 and Additional Neighbor Letters of Support, Exhibit N of Applicant's Supplemental Submission (Exhibit 34).

CONCLUSION

Based upon the record before the Board, and having given great weight to the ANC and OP reports filed in this case, the Board concludes that the Applicant has met the burden of proof variance relief pursuant to 11 DCMR § 3103.2 from the nonconforming structure requirements (§2001), the use provisions in an R-4 District (§330.4), and the requirements for an alley structure (§2507), and for special exception relief pursuant to 11 DCMR §§ 3104.1from the changing uses within structures provision (§2003) to allow the Applicant to convert an existing automotive repair to a mixed-use office/residential building in the R-4 District on an alley lot at premises 1018 (Rear) Irving Street NW (Square 2851, Lot 837).

Accordingly, it is therefore **ORDERED** that the application is hereby **GRANTED:**

VOTE: __-__-__ (________________________________)

BY ORDER OF THE D.C. BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT
Each concurring Board member has approved the issuance of this order.

ATTESTED BY: ____________________

SARA BARDIN
Director, Office of Zoning

FINAL DATE OF ORDER:____________________

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.

PURSUANT TO 11 DCMR § 3205, THE PERSON WHO OWNS, CONTROLS, OCCUPIES, MAINTAINS, OR USES THE SUBJECT PROPERTY, OR ANY PART THERETO, SHALL COMPLY WITH THE CONDITIONS IN THIS ORDER, AS THE SAME MAY BE AMENDED AND/OR MODIFIED FROM TIME TO TIME BY THE BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT. FAILURE TO ABIDE BY THE CONDITIONS IN THIS ORDER, IN WHOLE OR IN PART SHALL BE GROUNDS FOR THE REVOCATION OF ANY BUILDING PERMIT OR CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY ISSUED PURSUANT TO THIS ORDER.

IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE D.C. HUMAN RIGHTS ACT OF 1977, AS AMENDED, D.C. OFFICIAL CODE § 2-1401.01 *ETSEQ,* (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.

BZA APPLICATION NO. 18511

As Director of the Office of Zoning, I hereby certify and attest that on ______________, a copy of the order entered on that date in this matter was mailed first class, postage prepaid or delivered via inter-agency mail, or delivered by electronic mail in the case of those ANCs and SMDs that have opted to receive notices thusly, to each party and public agency who appeared and participated in the public hearing concerning the matter, and who is listed below:

Meridith H. Moldenhauer, Esq.
Griffin, Murphy, Moldenhauer & Wiggins, LLP
1912 Sunderland Place, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Commissioner Thomas Boisver, Chair
Advisory Neighborhood Commission 1A
3516 10th Street NW
Washington, DC 20010

Commissioner Dotti Love Wade
Single Member District Commissioner
Advisory Neighborhood Commission 1A11
1116 Columbia Road NW
Washington DC 20009

Jim Graham, Councilmember
Ward One
1350 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Suite 105
Washington, DC 20004

Melinda Bolling, Esq.
General Counsel
Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs
1100 4 1/2 Street, S.W., 5th Floor
Washington, DC 20024

Adetokunbo Ladejobi
3029 11th Street NW
Washington, DC 20001

ATTESTED BY: ________________________________

SARA BARDIN
DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF ZONING

EXHIBIT A

CARDINAL

Bank

April 18th, 2013

Greg Gardner
Seven Five Three Development

Re. 1018 Irving Street NW Washington DC 20010

Greg,

This letter shall attest that 'Seven Five Three Development' seeks to obtain financing for the 'alley lot' project located at 1018 Irving Street NW Washington DC 20010. At this time, while having not reviewed any information and/or documentation pertaining to the project including proposed designs, development cost budgets, and pro-forma analysis, as well as any information pertaining to the sponsors which would be required to offer a personal guaranty, the Bank hereby acknowledges that if the scope and feasibility of the project, as well as the financial condition of the sponsors meets the underwriting requirements of the Bank, then there is consideration for permanent financing. The approximate loan/equity ratio for permanent financing on projects such as this would be 70/30 respectively and payments may be based on a 20-25 year amortization schedule. The terms above are subject to full underwriting of all project and sponsor related documentation and may be subject to change after review of those items. The information above is not intended to be a commitment to lend or even an expression of Cardinal Bank's interest in the project, but rather an acknowledgement that there is permanent financing opportunities available for general projects such as this that allow for loan/equity ratios in this range as well as loan payment requirements based on this schedule of amortization if all Bank requirements and conditions are met, subject to the Bank's full discretion.

Sincerely,

Jason McDonough
AVP, Real Estate Loan Officer
Cardinal Bank

BANK OF GEORGETOWN

1054 31st Street, NW
Suite 18
Washington, DC 20007
P 202.355.1200
F 202 355.1201
bankofgeorgetown.com

April 17, 2013

Mr Greg Gardner
Seven Five Three Development
753 Fairmont Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001

Re: 1018 Irving Street, NW DC 20001

Greg

Pursuant to our conversation, this letter is to represent that we have discussed the possibility of Bank of Georgetown financing the above referenced project. This letter is to represent that the Bank has had a relationship with the principals since March of 2011 and everything has been handled as agreed.

While the Bank cannot represent what an approved loan structure and pricing would look like at this point, as we have not been presented with a formal credit request and as such have not presented this in a formal loan committee, based on general underwriting parameters for similar type deals, it is reasonable to use the following the terms of a potential loan as general pro forma parameters:

1.) LTV: for the acquisition, we can lend 75% of the lesser of contract price or "as is" appraised value, with the total loan commitment not to exceed 75% of the "when completed" appraised value based on plans/specs/budget.
2.) A stabilized loan would have an amortization schedule of no more than 25 years.

Please let us know what other information might be helpful to those involved as you navigate through this process. Thank you.

Josh Phillips
Vice President Commercial Lending
Bank of Georgetown

EXHIBIT B

1018 Irving Street NW (3 Units)

Construction Estimate

Updated 19 March 2013

Subcontractor

Self Performed

QTY	UNIT	DESCRIPTION	UNIT COST			TOTAL

GENERAL PROJECT COSTS (DEVELOPMEN'

QTY	UNIT	DESCRIPTION		UNIT COST		TOTAL
		GENERAL				
1	LS	Developers Fee	$	47,823.00	$	47,823.00
1	EA	Architecture Fees	$	65,000.00	$	65,000.00
1	EA	Variance/Legal Fees	$	18,000.00	$	18,000.00
1032	MH	Project Management	$	50.00	$	51,600.00
1	LS	Building Permit & Acquisition	$	4,000.00	$	4,000.00
1	LS	Environmental Study (Phase I & II)	$	13,000.00	$	13,000.00
45	MH	Bookkeeping	$	50.00	$	2,250.00
1	LS	Accountant	$	1,000.00	$	1,000.00
1	LS	Condo Document Fees	$	10,000.00	$	10,000.00
1	LS	Condo Warranty Bond	$	98,000.00	$	98,000.00
1	LS	Surveyor Fees - Condo Plats	$	5,000.00	$	5,000.00
1	LS	Partnership/Investment Legal Fees	$	3,000.00	$	3,000.00
				SUB-TOTAL	$	318,673.00

CONSTRUCTION COSTS

QTY	UNIT	DESCRIPTION		UNIT COST		TOTAL
		DIV 1: GENERAL				
34	WK	Site Superintendent/Lead Carpenter	$	1,200.00	$	41,280.00
2	EA	Public Space Permit	$	350.00	$	700.00
8	EA	Building Inspections (Third Party)	$	500.00	$	4,000.00
		DIV 2: SITE WORK				
1	LS	General Demolition	$	7,000.00	$	7,000.00
37	LS	Contaminated Soil Excavation & Disposal	$	600.00	$	22,200.00
15	LS	Clean Soil Delivery (per cubic yard)	$	150.00	$	2,250.00
1	LS	Remove Existing roof (inc Crane)	$	20,000.00	$	20,000.00
7	MH	On-site Equipment - Scissor/Man Lift	$	2,000.00	$	14,000.00
10	EA	Dumpsters	$	650.00	$	6,500.00
1	LS	Wood Fence (Side Yard)	$	4,500.00	$	4,500.00
1	LS	Landscaping	$	3,500.00	$	3,500.00
1	LS	Site Protection and Neighbor concessions	$	5,000.00	$	5,000.00
1	LS	Private Fire Hydrant	$	30,000.00	$	30,000.00
1	LS	Alley Surface Partial Replacement/Improve	$	40,000.00	$	40,000.00
		DIV 3: MASONRY				
3	EA	Alter/Enlarge Masonry Openings	$	1,500.00	$	4,500.00
20	EA	Pier Footings/Foundation	$	300.00	$	6,000.00
1	LS	Wall Capping & Window Sill	$	8,000.00	$	8,000.00
1	LS	Repointing & Brick Infill as necessary @ Exis	$	20,000.00	$	20,000.00
3000	SF	New Brick Veneer	$	20.00	$	60,000.00
24	CF	Parking Pad & sidewalk/aprons	$	200.00	$	4,800.00
1000	SF	Patio Pavers & Pedestals	$	11.00	$	11,000.00
60	CF	Ground Floor Slab & Insulation	$	250.00	$	15,000.00
		DIV 5: METALS				

1	LS	Second Floor Steel & Columns	$	31,000.00	$	31,000.00
5	EA	Interior Railings & Grabrails	$	1,500.00	$	7,500.00
1	LS	Exterior Detail & Decoration	$	8,000.00	$	8,000.00
1	EA	Exterior Siding	$	10,000.00	$	10,000.00
		DIV 6: CARPENTRY & MILLWORK				
1	LS	Wood Framing	$	50,000.00	$	50,000.00
3	EA	Kitchen Cabinetry S&I	$	9,000.00	$	27,000.00
6	EA	Bathroom Vanity S&I	$	1,000.00	$	6,000.00
40	EA	Interior Doors S&I	$	400.00	$	16,000.00
3	EA	Interior Trim	$	6,000.00	$	18,000.00
2	EA	Egress Staircase (Common Circulation)	$	3,000.00	$	6,000.00
2	EA	Interior Staircase (Loft w/ rail)	$	3,000.00	$	6,000.00
					$	-
		DIV 7: THERMAL & MOISTURE PROTECTION			$	-
6360	SF	Wall Insulation (Fiberglass Batt)	$	2.00	$	12,720.00
4100	SF	Roof Insulation	$	2.50	$	10,250.00
4000	SF	Sound Insulation	$	1.00	$	4,000.00
3	EA	Shower Doors	$	1,500.00	$	4,500.00
3	EA	Tub doors	$	600.00	$	1,800.00
45	SQ	Flat roofing	$	850.00	$	38,250.00
400	LF	Flashing & Capping	$	15.00	$	6,000.00
6	EA	Skylight	$	400.00	$	2,400.00
		DIV 8: DOORS & WINDOWS				
11	EA	Triple Casements	$	2,300.00	$	25,300.00
6	EA	Single Douple Hung w/ Transoms	$	1,200.00	$	7,200.00
3	EA	Single Casements	$	850.00	$	2,550.00
7	EA	Triple Fixed (Loft Level)	$	1,400.00	$	9,800.00
2	EA	Triple Exterior Door w/ transoms	$	6,250.00	$	12,500.00
4	EA	Exterior Steel Door	$	1,000.00	$	4,000.00
1	EA	Aluminum Storefront	$	12,000.00	$	12,000.00
3	EA	Roll-up Garage Doors	$	2,500.00	$	7,500.00
		DIV 9: FINISHES				
1200	ST	Drywall	$	45.00	$	54,000.00
6	EA	Bath Tile Material (Per Bath)	$	1,500.00	$	9,000.00
6	EA	Bath Tile Install (Per Bath)	$	1,500.00	$	9,000.00
3	EA	Kitchen Countertop S&I	$	4,000.00	$	12,000.00
6	EA	Bathroom Countertop S&I	$	1,000.00	$	6,000.00
3	EA	Backsplash Material (Per Unit)	$	700.00	$	2,100.00
3	EA	Backsplash Install (Per Unit)	$	600.00	$	1,800.00
3550	SF	Wood Flooring S&I	$	9.00	$	31,950.00
400	SF	Lobby/Hallway Tile	$	16.00	$	6,400.00
1	EA	Interior/Exterior Painting	$	35,000.00	$	35,000.00
1	EA	Building Signage	$	1,000.00	$	1,000.00
		DIV 11: EQUIPMENT				
3	EA	Appliances	$	10,000.00	$	30,000.00
		DIV 12: FURNISHINGS				
1	EA				$	-

		DIV 15a: PLUMBING				
24	EA	Rough/Trim per location	$	850.00	$	20,400.00
6	EA	Bath Fixtures (per Bath)	$	1,500.00	$	9,000.00
3	EA	Bath Fixtures (per 1/2 bath)	$	700.00	$	2,100.00
1	LS	Site Work Utilities (Water & Sewer Line)	$	15,000.00	$	15,000.00
8000	SF	Fire Sprinkler System	$	2.00	$	16,000.00
		DIV 15b: HVAC				
4	EA	Ducted Heat Pump	$	15,000.00	$	60,000.00
		DIV 16: ELECTRICAL				
3700	SF	Rough/Trim per sf	$	7.00	$	25,900.00
3	EA	Fixtures (per unit)	$	1,600.00	$	4,800.00
6	EA	Bath Fans	$	150.00	$	900.00
1	LS	Electrical Service Heavy-up & Meter Box	$	4,000.00	$	4,000.00
3	LS	Audio Wiring	$	2,000.00	$	6,000.00
15	LS	Exterior Light Fixtures	$	250.00	$	3,750.00
1	LS	Building Entry System & Security	$	3,500.00	$	3,500.00
3	EA	Unit Security Systems	$	1,000.00	$	3,000.00
				SUB-TOTAL	$	1,049,100.00
				CATEGORY TOTAL	$	**1,367,773.00**
				8% CONTINGENCY	$	109,421.84
				TOTAL	$	1,477,194.84

1018 Irving Street NW (5 Units)

Updated 19 March 2013

Construction Estimate

Subcontractor

Self Performed

QTY	UNIT	DESCRIPTION	UNIT COST		TOTAL	
		GENERAL PROJECT COSTS (DEVELOPMEN'				
		GENERAL				
1	LS	Developers Fee	$	58,374.60	$	58,374.60
1	EA	Architecture Fees	$	85,000.00	$	85,000.00
1	EA	Variance/Legal Fees	$	18,000.00	$	18,000.00
1032	MH	Project Management	$	50.00	$	51,600.00
1	LS	Building Permit & Acquisition	$	5,000.00	$	5,000.00
1	LS	Environmental Study (Phase I & II)	$	13,000.00	$	13,000.00
45	MH	Bookkeeping	$	50.00	$	2,250.00
1	LS	Accountant	$	1,000.00	$	1,000.00
1	LS	Condo Document Fees	$	10,000.00	$	10,000.00
1	LS	Condo Warranty Bond	$	131,000.00	$	131,000.00
1	LS	Surveyor Fees - Condo Plats	$	6,000.00	$	6,000.00
1	LS	Partnership/Investment Legal Fees	$	3,000.00	$	3,000.00
			SUB-TOTAL		$	384,224.60
		CONSTRUCTION COSTS				
		DIV 1: GENERAL				
34	WK	Site Superintendent/Lead Carpenter	$	1,200.00	$	41,280.00
3	EA	Public Space Permit	$	350.00	$	1,050.00
10	EA	Building Inspections (Third Party)	$	500.00	$	5,000.00
		DIV 2: SITE WORK				
1	LS	General Demolition	$	7,000.00	$	7,000.00
37	EA	Contaminated Soil Excavation & Disposal	$	600.00	$	22,200.00
15	EA	Clean Soil Delivery (per cubic yard)	$	150.00	$	2,250.00
1	LS	Remove Existing roof (inc Crane)	$	20,000.00	$	20,000.00
7	MH	On-site Equipment - Scissor/Man Lift	$	2,000.00	$	14,000.00
14	EA	Dumpsters	$	650.00	$	9,100.00
1	LS	Wood Fence (Side Yard)	$	4,500.00	$	4,500.00
1	LS	Landscaping	$	3,500.00	$	3,500.00
1	LS	Site Protection and Neighbor concessions	$	5,000.00	$	5,000.00
1	LS	Private Fire Hydrant	$	30,000.00	$	30,000.00
1	LS	Alley Surface Partial Replacement/Improve	$	40,000.00	$	40,000.00
		DIV 3: MASONRY				
3	EA	Alter/Enlarge Masonry Openings	$	1,500.00	$	4,500.00
20	EA	Pier Footings/Foundation	$	300.00	$	6,000.00
1	LS	Wall Capping & Window Sill	$	12,000.00	$	12,000.00
1	LS	Repointing & Brick Infill as necessary @ Exis	$	20,000.00	$	20,000.00
4000	SF	New Brick Veneer	$	20.00	$	80,000.00
24	CF	Parking Pad & sidewalk/aprons	$	200.00	$	4,800.00
1485	SF	Patio Pavers & Pedestals	$	11.00	$	16,335.00
60	CF	Ground Floor Slab & Insulation	$	250.00	$	15,000.00
		DIV 5: METALS				

1	LS	Second Floor Steel & Columns	$	31,000 00	$	31,000 00
5	EA	Interior Railings & Grabrails	$	1,500 00	$	7,500 00
1	LS	Exterior Detail & Decoration	$	10,000 00	$	10,000 00
1	EA	Exterior Siding	$	10,000 00	$	10,000 00
		DIV 6: CARPENTRY & MILLWORK				
1	LS	Wood Framing	$	79,200 00	$	79,200.00
5	EA	Kitchen Cabinetry S&I	$	9,000 00	$	45,000 00
10	EA	Bathroom Vanity S&I	$	1,000 00	$	10,000 00
66	EA	Interior Doors S&I	$	400 00	$	26,400 00
5	EA	Interior Trim	$	6,000 00	$	30,000.00
4	EA	Egress Staircase (Common Circulation)	$	3,000 00	$	12,000 00
2	EA	Interior Staircase (Loft w/ rail)	$	3,000 00	$	6,000 00
					$	-
		DIV 7: THERMAL & MOISTURE PROTECTION			$	-
10600	SF	Wall Insulation (Fiberglass Batt)	$	2 00	$	21,200 00
4100	SF	Roof Insulation	$	2 50	$	10,250 00
6100	SF	Sound Insulation	$	1 00	$	6,100 00
5	EA	Shower Doors	$	1,500 00	$	7,500 00
5	EA	Tub doors	$	600 00	$	3,000 00
45	SQ	Flat roofing	$	850 00	$	38,250 00
665	LF	Flashing & Capping	$	15 00	$	9,975.00
6	EA	Skylight	$	400 00	$	2,400 00
		DIV 8: DOORS & WINDOWS				
14	EA	Triple Casements	$	2,300 00	$	32,200 00
6	EA	Single Douple Hung w/ Transoms	$	1,200 00	$	7,200 00
7	EA	Single Casements	$	850 00	$	5,950 00
7	EA	Triple Fixed (Loft Level)	$	1,400 00	$	9,800 00
11	EA	Triple Exterior Door w/ transoms	$	6,250 00	$	68,750 00
4	EA	Exterior Steel Door	$	1,000 00	$	4,000 00
1	EA	Aluminum Storefront	$	12,000 00	$	12,000 00
3	EA	Roll-up Garage Doors	$	2,500 00	$	7,500 00
		DIV 9: FINISHES				
1400	ST	Drywall	$	45 00	$	63,000 00
10	EA	Bath Tile Material (Per Bath)	$	1,500 00	$	15,000 00
10	EA	Bath Tile Install (Per Bath)	$	1,500 00	$	15,000 00
5	EA	Kitchen Countertop S&I	$	4,000 00	$	20,000 00
10	EA	Bathroom Countertop S&I	$	1,000 00	$	10,000 00
5	EA	Backsplash Material (Per Unit)	$	700 00	$	3,500 00
5	EA	Backsplash Install (Per Unit)	$	600 00	$	3,000 00
4250	SF	Wood Flooring S&I	$	9 00	$	38,250 00
600	SF	Lobby/Hallway Tile	$	16 00	$	9,600 00
1	EA	Interior/Exterior Painting	$	45,000 00	$	45,000 00
1	EA	Building Signage	$	1,000 00	$	1,000 00
		DIV 11: EQUIPMENT				
5	EA	Appliances	$	10,000 00	$	50,000 00
		DIV 12: FURNISHINGS				
1	EA				$	-

		DIV 15a: PLUMBING				
42	EA	Rough/Tnm per location	$	850 00	$	35,700 00
10	EA	Bath Fixtures (per Bath)	$	1,500 00	$	15,000 00
0	EA	Bath Fixtures (per 1/2 bath)	$	700 00	$	-
1	LS	Site Work Utilities (Water & Sewer Line)	$	15,000 00	$	15,000 00
10000	SF	Fire Sprinkler System	$	2 00	$	20,000 00
		DIV 15b: HVAC				
6	EA	Ducted Heat Pump	$	15,000 00	$	90,000 00
		DIV 16: ELECTRICAL				
5390	SF	Rough/Tnm per sf	$	7 00	$	37,730 00
6	EA	Fixtures (per unit)	$	1,600 00	$	9,600 00
10	EA	Bath Fans	$	150 00	$	1,500 00
1	LS	Electrical Service Heavy-up & Meter Box	$	4,000 00	$	4,000 00
5	LS	Audio Wiring	$	2,000 00	$	10,000 00
15	LS	Exterior Light Fixtures	$	250 00	$	3,750 00
1	LS	Building Entry System & Security	$	3,500 00	$	3,500 00
5	EA	Unit Security Systems	$	1,000 00	$	5,000 00
				SUB-TOTAL	$	1,400,820.00
				CATEGORY TOTAL	$	**1,785,044 60**
				8% CONTINGENCY	$	142,803 57
				TOTAL	$	1,927,848 17