



SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT

2013 APR 30 PM 3: 57

TO: District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment
FROM: Brandice Elliott, AICP, Case Manager
Joel Lawson, Associate Director Development Review
DATE: May 7, 2013

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT
District of Columbia

CASE NO. 18533

EXHIBIT NO. 39

SUBJECT: BZA Case 18533 – request for variance relief under § 2101 for number of parking spaces and special exception relief under § 411 for roof structures for the development of a new four-story mixed-use building located at 1827 Adams Mill Road, N.W.

At the hearing of April 9, 2013, the Board requested additional information from the applicant regarding the need for a rear setback variance and continued the hearing to May 7, 2013. This supplemental OP report is being provided in response to the additional information provided by the applicant

The Office of Planning is generally supportive of the application that has been presented for the property located at 1827 Adams Mill Road, N W As indicated in OP's report, dated April 2, 2013, the Office of Planning recommends approval of the request for a variance under § 2101 for the number of parking spaces, and for the request for a special exception under § 411 for the roof structures The Office of Planning did not present a recommendation concerning rear yard relief because it had not been requested by the applicant, although the Zoning Administrator had indicated that such relief would be required

The information provided by the applicant indicates that the Zoning Administrator has now confirmed that a variance would be required for the rear setback.

The supplemental information provided by the applicant discusses whether relief from the rear yard requirement is needed and provides several examples of how the rear setback has been interpreted in other instances However, it requests that if the Board determines that a rear setback is required, that the Board waive its rules pursuant to § 3100.5 to consider for the requested amendment to the application for the rear yard relief at the continued public hearing

The submission also provides analysis for the requested rear yard relief against the relevant zoning regulation test. As indicated in the submission by the applicant, the property is a unique shape, which is an exceptional condition that impacts efficient site design of the property. Adherence to the rear setback along the east property line, extending from Lanier Place to the public alley, would result in a broken streetscape along Lanier Place that would be out of character for this street frontage As noted by the applicant, it would also result in a less efficient circulation core, impacting the livable floors and the parking level, or would require additional relief from the rooftop structure requirement. A reduced rear setback would result in development that would be in character with the abutting row dwellings and would facilitate better use of the public space adjacent to Lanier Place As such, OP is supportive of the requested rear yard relief

Board of Zoning Adjustment

District of Columbia

CASE NO. 18533

EXHIBIT NO. 39



Finally, for clarification, the submission notes the requirement for a rear yard as being the Office of Planning interpretation. However, this is the Zoning Administrator's interpretation, not that of OP. It is not the role of the OP to provide such interpretations of the zoning regulations.