

**GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**  
**Board of Zoning Adjustment**



**Application No. 18927 of Nickolas Rodriguez**, pursuant to 11 DCMR § 3104.1, for a special exception under § 223, not meeting the lot occupancy requirements under § 403.2, the rear yard requirements under § 404.1, the open court requirements under § 406.1, and the nonconforming structure requirements under § 2001.3, to allow the construction of a two-story rear addition to an existing single-family dwelling in the R-4 District at premises 815 8th Street, N.E. (Square 911, Lot 73).

**HEARING DATES:** March 3, 2015, April 7, 2015, and April 28, 2015  
**DECISION DATE:** April 28, 2015

**SUMMARY ORDER**

**SELF-CERTIFIED**

The zoning relief requested in this case was self-certified, pursuant to 11 DCMR § 3113.2. (Exhibit 5.)

The Board of Zoning Adjustment (the “Board”) provided proper and timely notice of the public hearing on this application by publication in the *D.C. Register* and by mail to Advisory Neighborhood Commission (“ANC”) 6A, and to owners of property within 200 feet of the site. The site of this application is located within the jurisdiction of ANC 6A, which is automatically a party to this application. The ANC submitted a report indicating that at a regularly scheduled and properly noticed meeting on January 8, 2015, at which a quorum was in attendance, ANC 6A voted 7-0-0 to take no position on the application.<sup>1</sup> (Exhibit 24.)

The Office of Planning (“OP”) submitted a timely report and testified at the hearing in support of the application. (Exhibit 30.) The District’s Department of Transportation (“DDOT”) submitted a timely report indicating it had no objection to the approval of the application. (Exhibit 32.) The Capitol Hill Restoration Society submitted a letter in support of the application. (Exhibit 27.) Eight neighbors submitted letters of opposition to the record. (Exhibits 28, 29, 37, 38, 39, 40, and 41.)

---

<sup>1</sup> The ANC report stated that the ANC believes that the Applicant has not requested sufficient relief and expressed the view that additional zoning relief would be required in this case including a variance from the accessory building height limit set forth in § 2500.4. (Exhibit 24.)

**BZA APPLICATION NO. 18927**  
**PAGE NO. 2**

At the Board's public hearing on March 3, 2015, the Board asked the Applicant to clarify whether the proposed trellis would connect the main structure to the addition, as the architectural plans were unclear in this regard. The Applicant's architect indicated that the trellis would connect the main structure and the proposed addition. Accordingly, the Board requested that the Applicant submit revised architectural plans to clarify the connection. In addition, two neighbors, David Sanok and Tianeka Arno, testified in opposition during the public hearing.

On March 24, 2015, the Applicant submitted for the record revised plans that addressed the Board's concern regarding the trellis connection. (Exhibit 43.) The revised plans also reflected changes made by the Applicant to address neighbors' privacy concerns. Based on the plan revisions, one neighbor submitted a letter withdrawing her opposition to the application. (Exhibit 46.) Three neighbors submitted letters to maintain their opposition to the application despite the Applicant's revisions. (Exhibits 47, 48, and 58.) At the Board's public hearing on April 7, 2015, three neighbors, David Sanok, Mark Cruce, and Geocinda Cruce, testified in opposition. During its deliberations, the Board found that the project, as revised, would not have a substantial impact on neighboring properties.

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 § 3104.1, for a special exception under §§ 223, 403.2, 404.1, 406.1, and 2001.3. The parties to the application were the Applicant and ANC. Although neighbors testified in opposition to this application, the Board received no requests for party status in opposition. Accordingly, no parties appeared at the public hearing in opposition to this application. Thus, 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, the Board concludes that the Applicant has met the burden of proof, pursuant to 11 DCMR §§ 3104.1, 223, 403.2, 404.1, 406.1, and 2001.3, 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 the accordance with the Zoning Regulations and Map.

Pursuant to 11 DCMR § 3100.5, the Board has determined to waive the requirement of 11 DCMR § 3125.3, that the order of the Board be accompanied by findings of fact and conclusions of law. It is therefore **ORDERED** that this application is hereby **GRANTED, SUBJECT TO THE APPROVED PLANS AT EXHIBIT 43.**

**VOTE: 4-0-1** (Lloyd J. Jordan, Marnique Y. Heath, Jeffrey L. Hinkle, and Michael G. Turnbull to APPROVE; one Board seat vacant.)

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

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

**ATTESTED BY:**

  
**SARA A. BARDIN**  
**Director, Office of Zoning**

**FINAL DATE OF ORDER:** May 7, 2015

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.