

MEMORANDUM

TO: District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment
FROM: Stephen J. Mordfin, AICP, Case Manager
Joel Lawson, Associate Director Development Review
DATE: June 16, 2015
SUBJECT: BZA Case 19020, 1011 K Street, N.W.

I. OFFICE OF PLANNING RECOMMENDATION

The Office of Planning (OP) recommends **approval** of the following area variances:

- § 776, Closed Court (32.5-foot width required, 6-foot width proposed);
- § 2101.1, Off-Street Parking (65 spaces required, none proposed); and
- § 2201.1, Loading (one 20-foot service/delivery space required, none proposed).

OP recommends **approval** of the following special exception:

- § 774; Rear Yard (26.2 feet from alley centerline; 6 feet from alley centerline).

Subject to the following conditions proposed by the applicant:

1. That no banquet facilities be provided.
2. To ensure hotel guests are aware that no on-site parking would be available, the following shall be provided:
 - a. Indicate on the hotel website that no parking would be available;
 - b. Encourage alternative modes of transportation;
 - c. Inform users of the locations of off-street parking;
 - d. Hotel reservation confirmations would state that no on-site parking would be available;
 - d. Provide a staff member to direct guests arriving by car at the door to nearby parking garages to ensure no illegal parking occurs in front of the hotel; and
 - e. Work with nearby parking garages to provide overnight parking for hotel patrons.
3. The applicant shall provide a Transportation Development Plan to include the following:
 - a. A Transportation Management Coordinator as a point of contact for coordinating, implementing and monitoring TMP strategies.
 - b. A TransitScreen in the lobby with real time updates and provide print copies of transportation options.
 - c. Brochures detailing a marketing program promoting walking, cycling and transit.
 - d. Capital Bikeshare passes to guests as a part of Capital Bike-share's Bulk Membership program for hotels upon request, not to exceed \$5,000 per year.

- e. Secure on-site bicycle parking spaces for employees, including brochures and links to website on bicycling in the District and for Capital Bikeshare.
- f. A Ride-Matching/Ride-Sharing program for employees with detailed carpooling information and refer interested employees to other carpool matching services sponsored by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments.

II. LOCATION AND SITE DESCRIPTION

Address	1011 K Street, N.W.
Legal Description	Square 342, Lots 3, 4, 5, 53 and 809
Ward	2C
Lot Characteristics	Narrow “L”-shaped corner lot
Zoning	DD/C-3-C - DD: Downtown Development Overlay District - C-3-C: High density commercial
Existing Development	Four-story vacant structures and a surface parking lot
Adjacent Properties	North: Hostel, apartment and office buildings South: Across K Street, a hotel and an office building East: Office buildings West: Across 11 th Street, office buildings
Surrounding Neighborhood Character	Generally high-rise office and apartment buildings with some ground floor commercial.

The subject property is located within Housing Priority Area B. Pursuant to § 1706.5(b) of the Zoning Regulations the applicant is required to devote a minimum 3.50 FAR for residential use. The applicant proposes to satisfy this requirement off-site through combined lot development in conjunction with Catholic Charities.

III. APPLICATION IN BRIEF

The applicant proposes to construct a thirteen-story hotel with two-hundred guest rooms atop an existing parking lot. Incorporated into the hotel would be four-story late 19th century brick buildings at the corner of 11th and K streets. The applicant applied for closure of a three-foot wide north/south public alley located between the parking lot and the brick buildings (Case No. S.O. 14-21629).

Common areas within the new building include a bar, a lounge, an exercise room and two conference rooms. Support services for the operation of the hotel would be located within the basement, including office space, laundry, and mechanical utility rooms. Restaurant and retail space would be occupy the lower two floors of the renovated structures. Loading would be accessed directly off the east/west alley directly to the north of the new building. No parking would be provided.

IV. ZONING REQUIREMENTS and RELIEF REQUESTED

DD/C-3-C Zone	Regulation	Existing	Proposed	Relief
Lot Width	None prescribed	124.75 feet	124.75feet	None required
Lot Area	None prescribed	7,311sq. ft.	7,311 sq. ft.	None required
Height § 770	130-foot max.	--	130 feet	None required
Floor Area Ratio § 1706.5	9.50 max.	--	9.48	None required
Lot Occupancy § 772	100% max.	--	100%	None required
Rear Yard § 774	26.2-foot min.	--	6 feet	Required
Court § 776	32.5-foot min.	--	6 feet	Required
Parking § 2101	64 spaces	--	None	Required
Loading § 2201				
-Berth	1 at 30 sq. ft.	--	30 sq. ft.	None Required
-Platform	1 at 100 sq. ft.	--	100 sq. ft.	None Required
-Service Delivery	1 at 20 ft. deep	--	None	Required
Green Area Ratio § 3401	0.200 min.	--	0.204	None Required

V. OFFICE OF PLANNING ANALYSIS

a. Variance Relief from § 776, Closed Court

i. Exceptional Situation Resulting in a Practical Difficulty

The subject property and the proposed building are fifty feet wide, and three inches of court width are required for every foot of building height. As a result closed courts for the building would be required to be 27 feet in depth, or 54 percent of the width of the proposed building. Increasing the width of the closed courts would reduce the width of the fifty-foot wide portion of the building for Court 2 on the east side of the structure, and the width of Court 1 near the center of the structure where the lot is not quite 31 feet wide, eliminating the ability of the applicant to provide an efficient design with a double-loaded corridor within the new structure.

ii. No Substantial Detriment to the Public Good

The two proposed six-foot closed courts width would allow for light and air to the guest rooms. To the east of the building on the adjacent property is a small two-story structure, located between the subject property and an eight-story office building to the east of that structure that would allow for additional light and air into the guest rooms. Court 1, near the center of the building, would face the rear yard of the hostel next door, from which light and air would be available.

iii. No Substantial Harm to the Zoning Regulations

Reduced court widths allow the applicant to design the building with a double-loaded corridor, while still allowing for light and air into all guest rooms.

b. Variance Relief from § 2101, Off-Street Parking

i. Exceptional Situation Resulting in a Practical Difficulty

The subject property is unusually shaped and narrow. Approximately thirty percent of the subject property is occupied by the 130-year old buildings, under which the applicant cannot dig. The remainder of the lot is fifty feet wide, too narrow to allow for the design of an efficient below-grade garage. Only five parking spaces would be possible per level.

ii. No Substantial Detriment to the Public Good

The hotel would be designed for business travelers, most of whom would be expected to arrive at the hotel other than by private automobile. At approximately 150 square feet, the rooms would be too small to accommodate families, those more likely to come by car. The site is also well served by public transportation, located approximately one-quarter of a mile from all five subway lines, and three blocks from the convention center. For the restaurant, the transportation study submitted by the applicant concluded that 75 percent of the restaurant patrons would arrive by modes other than private automobile. Bicycle parking would be provided within the building to serve the needs of employees. For patrons that arrive by automobile the hotel would offer valet services at nearby garages.

To ensure hotel guests are aware of the parking situation, the applicant proposes the following:

1. Indicate on the hotel website that no parking would be available;
2. Encourage alternative modes of transportation;
3. Inform users of the locations of off-street parking;
4. Hotel reservation confirmations would state that no on-site parking is available;
5. A staff member would direct guests arriving by car at the door to nearby parking garages to ensure no illegal parking occurs in front of the hotel; and
6. Work with nearby parking garages to provide overnight parking for hotel patrons.

The applicant also proposes a Transportation Development Plan that would include the following:

1. Provide a Transportation Management Coordinator as a point of contact for coordinating, implementing and monitoring TMP strategies;
2. Install a TransitScreen in the lobby with real time updates and provide print copies of transportation options;
3. Compile a brochure detailing a marketing program promoting walking, cycling and transit;
4. Provide Capital Bikeshare passes as a part of Capital Bike-share's Bulk Membership program for hotels upon request to guests, not to exceed \$5,000 per year;
5. Provide secure on-site bicycle parking spaces for employees, including brochures and links to website on bicycling in the District and for Capital Bikeshare; and

6. Provide a Ride-Matching/Ride-Sharing program for employees with detailed carpooling information and refer interested employees to other carpool matching services sponsored by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments.

iii. No Substantial Harm to the Zoning Regulations

Most guests would not be expected to arrive at the hotel by private automobile, as the hotel would be designed to accommodate business travels arriving in Washington by plane, train or bus and at the hotel by a form of on-demand transportation, such as taxis. Located within a neighborhood with a Walkscore of 95 and a Transitscore of 100¹, guests would less likely need to park on-site.

c. Variance Relief from § 2201, Loading

i. Exceptional Situation Resulting in a Practical Difficulty

The applicant is required to provide one 30-foot loading berth, one 100-square foot loading platform and one 20-foot service/delivery space. Due to the width of the lot, the applicant is only able to provide the loading berth and the loading platform, in addition to other required facilities, such as an emergency exit at the rear. The applicant cannot relocate the loading facilities further into the building without affecting core functions of the building, such as the lobby and elevators.

ii. No Substantial Detriment to the Public Good

The transportation study submitted by the applicant and dated June 9, 2015, concluded that the loading activity anticipated for the use would be adequately serviced by the proposed loading facility.

iii. No Substantial Harm to the Zoning Regulations

As adequate loading would be provided to serve the needs of the building, no additional loading need be accommodate on-site. Demands on the loading at this site would also be minimized by the lack of banquet facilities to be provided.

d. Special Exception Relief pursuant to § 774, Rear Yards

- i. *774.3 Apartment and office windows shall be separated from other buildings that contain facing windows a distance sufficient to provide light and air and to protect the privacy of building occupants.*

The north wall of the proposed building, proposed to be approximately 50 feet in width, would be located along a twelve-foot wide east/west alley that was functionally widened from twelve feet to twenty feet through the dedication of an easement, as shown on Drawing 1 below. The proposed building is also located directly across from where the north/south alley within the square intersects with the east/west alley. As a result approximately 41 percent of the rear of the building would be across an alley, and not an office or apartment building. In

¹ Walkscore.com

combination with the side yards provided for office building and residential building from the east/west alley, the impact of the reduced rear yard would be minimized, allowing for the provision of light and air and protecting the privacy of the occupants of those buildings.

Drawing 1²



774.4 In determining distances between windows in buildings facing each other, the angle of sight lines and the distance of penetration of sight lines into habitable rooms shall be sufficient to provide adequate light and privacy to the rooms.

The windows along the back of the building facing the alley are located on the west side of the rear wall, facing the alley and the alley easement, and not the windows of another building, allowing for adequate light and privacy.

774.5 The building plan shall include provisions for adequate off-street service functions, including parking and loading areas and access points.

The application includes an area variance to modify the loading to that required by the applicant to meet its needs. As a hotel designed to cater to the business traveler, no parking is proposed as most of guests are expected to arrive by public transportation or on-demand transportation services, such as taxi cabs, to arrive at or leave the hotel. Guests are expected to take advantage of the variety transportation options, other than private automobile, during their stay.

² Source: Sheet A001 of applicant's submission, "Project Information", prepared by Peter Fillat Architects, dated April 1, 2015.

774.6 Upon receiving an application for an approval under § 774.2, the Board shall submit the application to the D.C. Office of Planning for coordination review, report, and impact assessment, along with reviews in writing of all relevant District of Columbia departments and agencies including the Departments of Transportation and Housing and Community Development and, if a historic district or historic landmark is involved, the State Historic Preservation Officer.

The subject report is the Office of Planning's review of the application. DDOT is expected to file a separate report. No historic landmark or district is involved.

i. Is the proposal in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Zoning Regulations and Zoning Maps?

Although the minimum rear yard as required would not be provided, the siting of other buildings within the square, the use of easements to widen the alley system and the juxtaposition of the proposed building to the alley system result the provision of privacy at the rear for the proposed hotel, the residential building and the office building.

ii. Would the proposal appear to tend to affect adversely, the use of neighboring property?

Development on the north side of the east/west alley is set back off the alley to the east and west of the subject property. In addition, across much of the subject property to the north is a north/south alley that dead-ends into the subject property. This alley, the width of which was widened as a result of an easement, results in no building across more than forty percent of the proposed hotel's alley frontage. In combination with the applicant's proposal to minimize the number of windows facing the alley, use of neighboring property should not be adversely affected.

VI. COMMENTS OF OTHER DISTRICT AGENCIES

No comments were received from other District agencies.

VII. COMMUNITY COMMENTS

ANC 2C, at its regularly scheduled meeting of May 11, 2015, voted to support the application.

Four letters were submitted to the file, three in support and one requesting clarification.

Two applications for party status were submitted to the file noting parking concerns.

Attachment: Location Map

