

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL ACTION

March 29, 2013



RECEIVED
D.C. OFFICE OF ZONING
2013 MAR 29 PM 1:01

CAPITOL (CAP) INTEREST OVERLAY

AOC File No. 13-01

Submission of

The Heritage Foundation for Variance and Special Exception relief:

Pursuant to DCMR 11, §§ 771, 2001.3, 2303.1, 1203.2(b) and 214, to allow a multi-faceted commercial and residential project with below-grade parking. This property is located at 208, 214 & 236 Massachusetts Avenue, NE and 426-430 3rd Street, NE (Square 755, Lots 3, 26, 36, 836, 838 & 849) Washington, D.C. 20002, in the CAP/CHC/C-2-A and CAP/R-4 zone districts. (§3103.2)

Hearing Date: April 2013

BZA Application No. **18531**

Architect of the Capitol Action requested by the Board

Review and report on building plans pursuant to DCMR 11, § 1202

**Board of Zoning Adjustment for the
District of Columbia
2nd Floor Suite 210 441 4th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20001**

Chair and Members of the Board:

Pursuant to its authority granted under DCMR 11 § 1202 and, in particular §§ 1202.1 and 1202.3 to review and report on Special Exceptions in the Capitol (CAP) Interest Overlay District, the **Architect of the Capitol** has found that the proposed below grade accessory parking for 208 and 214 Massachusetts Avenue NE and located almost entirely in the R-4 zone is **not inconsistent** with the intent of the CAP/R4 District (Overlay); **however**, the **Architect of the Capitol** cannot adequately assess whether or not the increased parking will adversely affect the health, safety, and general welfare of the U.S. Capitol precinct and area adjacent to this jurisdiction based upon the materials submitted by the Applicant at this time.

Page 1 of 2

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT
District of Columbia

CASE NO. 18531

EXHIBIT NO. 30

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO. 18531
EXHIBIT NO. 30

The Applicant has stated on page 15 of its pre-hearing statement that *"the cars that will park in this facility already drive to the neighborhood; they just park on the street and in other locations. This parking will eliminate the pressure to use on-street parking and will not generate any new traffic."* It would be naïve to assume, **without supporting documentation**, that this will happen and that those residents/tenants/occupants who will rent/own or work on the Applicant's property will only park in the underground garage and not take advantage of parking opportunities on adjacent streets (second cars, less costly, etc.) and deprive residents on those streets of parking in front of their homes.

The Architect of the Capitol believes that the addition of an underground parking facility significantly changes the operation of the Applicant's property and raises the burden of oversight required for this property. Although the Applicant's stated intentions for relieving existing parking issues are to be lauded, the **Architect of the Capitol** respectfully requests that the Applicant provide to the Board some form of a **Traffic Management Plan**, approved by DDOT, that clearly determines the nature of who will park in the new underground garage (i.e. applicable fees, subletting of parking spaces, restrictions, etc.), impacts on streets, and whether or not residents of their property on Massachusetts Avenue are eligible for RPP on adjacent streets. There should be a complete breakdown of eligibility of parking, and traffic analysis based upon counts of cars, not just a guess based upon assumptions. The **Architect of the Capitol** would also like the Applicant to address the issue of bicycle parking in the underground garage and above grade at its buildings.

At this time the Architect of the Capitol cannot be assured that the Applicant is fully compliant with the goals and mandates of DCMR 11 § 1200.1 and as per its responsibilities under 1202.3 the Architect of the Capitol recommends additional material be provided regarding parking in the underground facility.

Summary:

The Applicant, is responsible for meeting the burden of proof associated with the relief requested and consistency with general intent of the Zoning Regulations and should provide the Board with adequate testimony and definitive supporting evidence that the requested additional on-site parking will not have an adverse effect on the neighborhood and that the underground parking is taking care of all of their on-site parking requirements; and what steps the Applicant is prepared to implement to prevent on-street parking (related to occupants/tenants/owners on their property) in adjacent residential areas.

Sincerely,



Michael G. Turnbull, FAIA
Assistant Architect of the Capitol