Law Offices
HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP

2099 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Suite 100
Washington, D.C. 20006-6801

202-955-3000
FAX 202-955-5564
www.hklaw.com

Annapolis
Atlanta
Bethesda
Boston
Bradenton
Chicago
Fort Lauderdale
Jacksonville
Lakeland
Los Angeles
Melbourne
Miami
New York
Northern Virginia
Orlando
Providence
St. Petersburg
San Antonio
San Francisco
Seattle
Tallahassee
Tampa
Washington, D.C.
West Palm Beach

International Offices:
Caracas*
Mexico City
Rio de Janeiro
São Paulo
Tel Aviv*
Tokyo

*Representative Office

LISA L. JACKSON
202/419-2559
lljackso@hklaw.com

November 9, 2001

VIA HAND DELIVERY

Members of the Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia Office of Zoning
441 4th Street, N.W., Suite 210S
Washington, D.C. 20001
Attention: Richard S. Nero, Jr.

Re: BZA Case No. 16778

Dear Members of the Board:

Enclosed please find the Applicant's post-hearing submission in the above-referenced case.

The submission includes:

(1) an agreement between the Applicant and Asbury United Methodist Church, a party to this case, regarding management of the construction of the proposed hotel. The terms of the Agreement have been agreed to by both parties. However, the Agreement is not executed, due to the unavailability late on Friday afternoon, November 9, 2001 of one of the signatories; and

(2) the Applicant's proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law.

BZA
Case No. 16778
Exhibit No. 35

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO.16778
EXHIBIT NO.35

Should you have any questions regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me at (202) 419-2559.

Sincerely,

Lisa L. Jackson

cc: Rudolph Williams
Marshall Purnell
Norman M. Glasgow, Jr.
Steven E. Sher

WAS1 #1031039 v1

AGREEMENT

THIS AGREEMENT is made and entered into this ____ day of November, 2001 by and between ASBURY UNITED METHODIST CHURCH ("Church") and 1108 K STREET LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY ("1108").

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS, the Church and 1108 are abutting property owners within Square 317 in the District of Columbia, with the Church owning Lot 22 in Square 317 (the "Church Property") and with 1108 owning Lot 25 in Square 317 (the "1108 Property"); with the Church owning Lot 22 in Square 317 improved with an historic landmark church structure and adjacent education center (the "Church Property").

WHEREAS, 1108 has submitted an application to the District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment ("BZA") in Application No. 16778 (the "BZA Case") for the development and construction of a hotel (the "Hotel Project") with certain variance and special exception relief;

WHEREAS, the Church is concerned that the Church Property, particularly its historic structure, including the leaded stained glass windows, not be damaged by or an account of evacuation and/or construction and related activities undertaken by 1108 in connection with the Hotel Project;".

WHEREAS, as adjoining land owners, and in the context of proceeding forward with the BZA-approved Hotel Project with the Church's approval, 1108 and the Church have reached certain agreements and understandings, all as more particularly set forth herein.

NOW, THEREFORE, for and in consideration of the foregoing, the mutual covenants and agreements herein contained, and for other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which is hereby acknowledged, the parties hereto, intending to be legally bound, hereby agree as follows:

1. 1108 hereby agrees that there will be no exterior construction activities involving the Hotel Project on Sundays.

2. During funerals conducted by the Church and on the annual "Good Friday" observations, all noise generating construction activities relating to the Hotel Project will cease, provided that the Church has given at least 48 hours prior notice to 1108 of the funeral event either by telephone, fax and/or e-mail.

3. The parties agree that 1108 will perform a structural and photographic survey of the existing Church conditions as follows:

"(a) 1108 shall perform a structural and photographic survey of the existing condition of the Church Property in manner and extent reasonably acceptable to the Church as

soon as practicable but in any event not less than 10 days prior to commencement of excavation for the Hotel Project. 1108 shall provide a copy of all survey materials to the Church within three (3) business days of receipt thereof from its engineers or consultants.

(b) Within 7 days after notice from the Church, 1108 shall install such monitoring equipment and devices in such locations upon the Church Property as reasonably directed by the Church to detect any vibration or change in the existing condition. 1108 shall cause the monitoring equipment to be checked by an independent testing firm reasonably acceptable to the Church (i) on a daily basis during installation of the foundation system when vibration activities are occurring (including excavation support system) and perimeter walls to grade level at K Street, and (ii) on a mutually agreeable schedule during the balance of the construction period."

4. 1108 agrees that there shall be no blasting activities undertaken on the 1108 Property.

5. 1108 shall provide to the Church, within three (3) business days after completion and receipt, any report prepared by 1108's structural engineer concerning the Church Property.

6. 1108 shall be responsible for any repairs to the Church brought about solely as a direct and proximate result of any of 1108's construction activities relating to the Hotel Project as follows:

"(a) 1108 shall pay for the full cost to correct and/or repair any and all damage the Church Property directly or proximately caused by, arising out of or in any way relating to excavation and/or construction activities undertaken by 1108, or by any person, firm or entity on its behalf, in connection with the Hotel Project.

(b) In the event that measurable change in the existing condition of the Church Property is detected, the party discovering such change shall immediately notify the other thereof. The parties shall meet as soon as possible (but in any event within 24 hours) to discuss the matter and to agree upon the means, methods and timing of further testing, repairs or other corrective action to be taken. The cost of any such tests and studies shall be borne by 1108.

(c) All work to be performed upon the Church Property by 1108 pursuant to this Agreement shall be performed in such manner as to restore the Church Property to the condition existing on the date of the pre-construction survey. All such work shall be performed by qualified persons or firms and in accordance with a schedule acceptable to the Church."

7. 1108 shall be responsible for any environmental remediation of the 1108 Property required by any governmental agency or department.

8. All parking during the construction phase of the Hotel Project by 1108 and its contractors shall be either on the 1108 Property or available on or off-street parking as permitted by District of Columbia law; provided, however, that employees of 1108 shall not be permitted to park in front of the Church building along its 11th or K Street frontages. 1108 also hereby agrees to use reasonable efforts to ensure that the employees of its contractors do not park in front of the Church building along its 11th or K Street frontages. 1108 shall by contract direct its

contractors, subcontractors, suppliers and similar persons and firms that no construction or delivery vehicles shall be parked in front of the Church Property along its K Street or 11th Street frontages, nor shall any of their employees park in those locations.

9. All notices, demands or other communications to be given by any party hereunder shall be in writing and shall be sent by overnight or local courier (and evidenced by a signed receipt), or by registered or certified first-class mail, postage prepaid, addressed as follows:

If to the Church:
Rev. Eugene W. Matthews, Senior Pastor
Asbury United Methodist Church
926 – 11th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20001
Phone: (202) 628-0009

Michael A. Cain, Esq.
Hamilton & Hamilton, LLP
1775 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20006
Phone: (202) 463-8282

If to 1108:

Ron Walton
7401 Wisconsin Ave., Suite 300
Bethesda, MD 20814
Phone: (301) 907-4370

Lawrence Roscher
7401 Wisconsin Ave., Suite 300
Bethesda, MD 20814
Phone: (301) 907-4370

Norman M. Glasgow, Jr., Esq.
Holland & Knight LLP
2099 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Suite 100
Washington, DC 20006
Phone: (202) 419-2460

Any change in the above-referenced addresses shall be made by giving notice to the other party hereto in a writing delivered to the address of such other party. All notices shall be deemed given on the earlier to occur of (i) the date of actual receipt of such notice, or (ii) one (1) day after deposit of the same with a nationally recognized overnight delivery service, or (iii) three (3) days after deposit of the same with the U.S. Postal Service.

10. All reports or surveys given to the Church by 1108 relating to the 1108 Property, and/or the Hotel Project, shall be used solely by the Church, and shall be held in confidence by

the Church and its employees and representatives and shall not be distributed to the Church membership except on a need to know basis or to any third party.

11. This Agreement shall be binding upon and shall inure to the benefit of the parties hereto and to their respective heirs, executors, personal representatives, successors and assigns, and shall be binding upon all employees, partners, members, officers, directors, attorneys, affiliates, subsidiaries, parent, and any other person or entity acting or purporting to act on the behalf of any party hereto.

12. The south side of K Street between 11th and 12th Streets shall have a pedestrian passageway.

13. Access to the Church property from the alleys shall not be permanently blocked or impeded, and 1108 agrees to use commercially reasonable efforts to minimize any disruption to the Church's use of the alley.

14. Time shall be of the essence with regard to all matters contained within this agreement.

15. This Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the District of Columbia.

16. If any term, covenant or condition of this Agreement is held to be invalid or unenforceable in any respect, such invalidity or unenforceability shall not effect any other provision hereof, and the remainder of this Agreement shall be construed as if such invalid or unenforceable provision had never been contained herein and shall be valid and enforceable to the fullest extent permitted by law.

17. This Agreement constitutes the entire agreement between the parties pertaining to the subject matter hereof and supersedes all other prior and/or contemporaneous agreements, understandings, negotiations and discussions, whether oral or written, of the parties, and there are no other agreements between the parties in connection with the subject matter hereof except as specifically set forth herein. Any waiver of or modification or amendment to this Agreement shall not be binding unless set forth in an instrument executed by all of the parties hereto, and no course of conduct by any party or among the parties shall be deemed to amend the terms and conditions hereof except if such is reduced to writing and executed by all parties hereto. No waiver of any provision of this Agreement shall be deemed or shall constitute a waiver of any other provision hereof (whether or not similar), nor shall such waiver constitute a continuing waiver unless otherwise specifically provided.

18. This Agreement may be executed in any number of counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original and all of which shall constitute one and the same agreement. This Agreement shall not be binding against any party hereto, however, until the same has been executed by each and every party to this Agreement.

19. In the event that any party hereto commences litigation against any other party hereto in connection with or in any way related to this Agreement and the subject matter hereof, the party substantially prevailing in such action shall be entitled to recover from the non-

prevailing party all of such prevailing party's reasonable attorneys fees and costs incurred in connection therewith.

20. The parties hereby agree to execute and deliver any other documents or instruments reasonably requested by any other party hereto in order to implement, consummate or effectuate any of the terms and conditions hereof or any of the transactions contemplated hereunder, including, but not limited to, any reasonable underpinning and crane swing agreement presented by 1108 to Church.

21. This Agreement is made for the sole benefit of the parties hereto, and no other person or entity shall have any benefits, rights or remedies under or by reason of this Agreement. Neither the terms of this Agreement, nor any act or omission by any party hereto shall be deemed to create any third-party beneficiary status or recognition for any other person or entity not a party hereto.

22. The recitals set forth above are incorporated herein in full by this reference.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have executed and delivered this Agreement under seal as of the date first hereinabove written.

ASBURY UNITED METHODIST CHURCH

By: _____
Title: _____

1108 K STREET LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY

By: _____
Title: _____

Applicant's Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Application No. 16778 of 1108 K Street LLC, pursuant to 11 DCMR §§ 3103.2 and 3104.1 for a special exception under §411.11 of the Zoning Regulations to allow for a roof structure not meeting the normal setback requirements, and for variances from the requirements of §§ 1706.13, 1708.1(f), 2201.1, and 2115.9 of the Zoning Regulations. The requested relief is necessary to permit the construction of a limited service hotel (inn) in the DD/C-3-C District in Square 317 located in the southeast corner of 12th and K Streets, Northwest.

Hearing Date: October 30, 2001
Decision Date: November 13, 2001

DECISION AND ORDER

Preliminary Matters:

1. The Board, pursuant to its rules, provided proper and timely notice of the public hearing on this application by publication in the District of Columbia Register and by mail to ANC 2F and to owners of property within 200 feet of the site. The application was also referred to the Office of Planning for review and report.

2. Prior to the hearing, the Applicant withdrew its request for a variance from the provisions of §§ 1706.13 and 1708.1 of the Regulations.

3. The site of this application is located within the jurisdiction of ANC 2F, which is automatically a party to this application, and which submitted a letter dated October 19, 2001 in support of the application with one condition, which is discussed in more detail further herein.

4. 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 for special exception relief pursuant to 11 DCMR § 3104.1 and the case for variance relief pursuant to § 3103.2. The parties to the proceeding were the Applicant, ANC 2F and Asbury United Methodist Church.

5. At the hearing, the Board waived the requirement of § 3114.2 of the Regulations and accepted the late filing of the Office of Planning report. The report recommended approval of the special exception and the remaining variance requests.

6. Three witnesses testified in full support of the Application, including the Applicant, a qualified expert in architecture, and a qualified expert in land use and urban planning.

7. Reverend Eugene Matthews of Asbury United Methodist Church testified in support of the application while noting the Church's concerns regarding the impact the construction of the hotel (inn) will have on the structure of the Church as well as the impact the resulting operation of the hotel (inn) will have on parking in the surrounding area.

8. Vernon Johnson testified on behalf of the Hotel & Restaurant Employees Local 25, AFL-CIO in opposition to the application. Mr. Johnson did not request party status for the organization nor was party status accorded.

9. At the conclusion of the hearing, the record was left open until November 9, 2001 for a post-hearing submission by the Applicant, which was timely filed.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. The property that is the subject of this application is located in Lot 25 in Square 317.

2. The property is located in the southeast quadrant of the intersection of 12th and K Streets, N.W between Mt. Vernon Square and Franklin Square, approximately one block from the new Convention Center.

3. The property has approximately 125 linear feet of frontage on K Street and approximately 122 linear feet of frontage on 12th Street.

4. Asbury United Methodist Church abuts the property to the east.

5. The southeast portion of the site abuts a north-south public alley that connects to I Street on the south.

6. The southeast portion of the site abuts a north-south public alley that connects to I Street on the south and which ranges in width from 10 feet on the south where it connects to I Street and 15 feet where it abuts the subject property.

7. The total site area is approximately 14,395 square feet.

8. The property is improved with an approximately four story building currently known as the Kabob House which is owned by another party and will remain on the site.

9. The existing building on the site reduces the developable land area by approximately 2,500 square feet to 11,895 square feet and the width available on K Street by twenty-five feet to approximately 100 feet.

10. The property is located in the DD/C-3-C District and Housing Priority Area B.

11. Under the current DD/C-3-C zoning, new construction may rise to a maximum height of 130 feet and provide a density up to a maximum FAR of 9.5; an additional .5 FAR is available through the purchase of transferable development rights. The DD/C-3-C District requires all new construction to provide a minimum of 3.5 FAR devoted to residential uses either on-site or through combined lot development.

12. A hotel (inn) use is permitted as a matter-of-right in the C-3-C District.

13. The Applicant will fulfill its housing requirements through a combined lot development on another square in Housing Priority Area B.

14. For a hotel use, the Regulations require the provision of a minimum of one parking space for each four rooms usable for sleeping plus one space for 300 square feet of floor area in the largest function room or exhibit space. Based on the Applicant's proposal to construct approximately 270 hotel rooms, the Applicant must provide at least 71 parking spaces.

15. The Regulations also allow attended parking if there is a requirement to provide a minimum of 75 spaces.

16. The Applicant proposes to provide at least 72 spaces—one more than the number required under the Regulations—under an attended parking scheme.

17. The Regulations require a hotel with more than 200 rooms usable for sleeping to provide one thirty foot loading berth, one fifty-five foot loading berth and one service/delivery loading space.

18. The Applicant proposes to provide one 10 x 20 feet service/delivery space and two 12 x 30 feet loading berths, stacking one of the thirty feet loading berths onto the 20 feet service/delivery space.

19. The proposed roof structure does not meet the setback requirements for roof structures from the southern exterior wall.

20. The Applicant satisfies the standards for special exception relief under § 411.11 of the Zoning Regulations regarding the location of roof structures. A special exception is necessary due to the irregular shape of the southern property line and the resulting irregular shape of the footprint of the main portion of the proposed building. Due to those irregular shapes and the most practical placement of the elevator and its penthouse at the juncture of the two wings of the building, the proposed roof structure will be in an upside down L-shape, following the shape of the building. That irregular shape allows for a setback of only 11 feet 8 inches of a small portion of the roof structure from the southern exterior wall. The setback requirements will be met at all other portions of the building. The location of the roof structure will have no adverse effect on any of the surrounding buildings because even at the point where penthouse will be less than the required setback from the southern exterior wall, the penthouse will be setback more than 50 feet from the southern property line where it adjoins an alley. In addition, the penthouse will be setback at least 70 feet from the building to the south. This portion of the penthouse will not be visible from any street.

21. The application satisfies the requirements for variance relief from the loading berth requirements and stacked parking limitations of the Regulations. The property is unique and affected by an exceptional and extraordinary condition; the strict application of the Regulations would create a practical difficulty for the construction of the hotel (inn), and the requested variances will not cause substantial detriment to the public good and may be granted without substantially impairing the intent, purpose and integrity of the zone plan as embodied in the Zoning Regulations and Map.

22. The property is extraordinarily small with a site area of only approximately 14,395 feet and a developable area of fewer than 12,000 square feet due to the existence of an improved four story structure not owned by the Applicant which exists and will remain on the site. The small size of the lot makes it a difficult size for hotel (inn) development. The site also is landlocked by properties the Applicant is unable to incorporate into its site.

23. The size of the hotel is further impacted by the narrow 10 foot width of the entrance to the alley leading to the site.

24. The Applicant would suffer a peculiar and practical difficulty if the loading berth requirements of the Zoning Regulations are strictly applied. The requirement to provide two loading berths would consume a substantial amount of ground floor space and would require relocation of the required exit stairs which are located to comply with building code requirements.

25. The Applicant also would suffer a peculiar and practical difficulty if it is unable to use the stacked parking requirements of the Regulations. The proposed

parking garage already occupies all of the developable footprint. In addition, additional parking would require deeper excavation at a substantial and impracticable extra cost to the Applicant.

26. The requested relief can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and without substantially impairing the intent, purpose and integrity of the zone plan as embodied in the zoning regulations and map.

27. The Applicant's proposes a flexible loading configuration so that the requirements of the Regulations will be effectively met. The Applicant proposes to provide one 10 x 20 feet service/delivery space and two 12 x 30 feet loading berths. The Applicant proposes to stack the 20 foot loading berth in front of one of the 12 x 30 feet loading berths. The total depth of the resulting loading area will be approximately 55 feet from the property line to the rear wall. The Applicant proposes to construct a limited service hotel (inn) that will not likely generate a need for a larger loading area and the configuration of the loading area is nonetheless flexible so that it could accommodate both smaller service/delivery vehicles and, when combined, could effectively serve as a 12 x 55 feet loading berth that could accommodate large trucks.

28. An attended parking regime will allow the Applicant to park far more than the required 71 spaces within the garage, thereby lessening competition for the on-street parking spaces in the area. In addition, attended valet parking is customary in a hotel operation and is often an expectation of many hotel guests.

Contested Issues

29. Vernon Johnson testified on behalf of Local 25 of the Hotel & Restaurant Employees Union, AFL-CIO as a person in opposition to the application.

30. Mr. Johnson testified that the Union is located at 1003 K Street, N.W.

31. Mr. Johnson testified that the Subject Property is not an appropriate site for a hotel (inn) development. He further testified that the site is too small to accommodate a hotel (inn) as evidenced by the Applicant's need for special exception and variance relief and that the granting of the requested relief would have a chilling effect on hotel development in a more appropriate location.

32. The Board finds that, since a hotel (inn) use is permitted as a matter-of-right in the C-3-C District, an objection to the application based on its proposed use is not relevant to this proceeding. In addition,, as set forth above, the Board finds that the Applicant has met its burden of proof regarding the requested special exception and variances by providing sufficient evidence for the Board to find that it is entitled to be granted the relief requested.

Other Issues

31. Reverend Matthews of Asbury United Methodist Church testified in support of the Application but noted the Church's concern regarding the impact the construction of the hotel (inn) will have on the structure of the Church as well as the impact the resulting operation of the hotel (inn) will have on parking in the surrounding area.

32. The Applicant testified that it will work with the Church to develop a construction management plan.

33. A copy of the construction management plan was a permitted post-hearing submission.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND OPINION:

Based on the foregoing findings of fact, the Board concludes that the Applicant is seeking a special exception under § 411.11, and variances under §§ 2115.9 and 2201.1.

A special exception is a use deemed compatible with other uses permitted in that particular zoning classification provided that the specific regulatory requirements are met. In reviewing Applications for a special exception, the Board's discretion is limited to determining whether the proposed exception satisfies the requirements set forth in the appropriate section. If the applicant meets its burden, the Board must ordinarily grant the Application. Under § 411.11 of the Zoning Regulations, the Board may approve the location, design, number or any other aspect of a roof structure even if it does not comply with the setback requirements of § 770.6, where it would be impractical because of operating difficulties, size of building lot or other conditions relating to the building or surrounding area that would make full compliance unduly restrictive, prohibitively costly or unreasonable. The Board has the power to approve a roof structure under § 411.11, provided that the intent and purpose of the chapter and title of the Zoning Regulations are not materially impaired by the structure, and the light and air of adjacent buildings are not adversely affected.

The Board concurs with the Applicant, ANC, and the Office of Planning that the proposed location of the roof structure will not adversely affect the intent and purpose of the zone plan and that light and air to adjacent buildings will not be adversely affected by the proposed location of the structure. Based on the findings herein, the Board concludes that the Applicant has met all of the specific criteria for

approval of a roof structure which does not meet the setback requirements of the Regulations on a small segment on the south side of the roof.

The Board further concludes based on its findings that the requested variances are all area variances, since the each relates to the ability of the Applicant to meet the requirements of the zoning regulations based the physical condition of the Property. The granting of an area variance requires proof of a practical difficulty upon the owner arising out of some unique and exceptional or extraordinary condition of the property. The Board must further find that the relief requested can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and that it will not substantially impair the intent of the zone plan.

The Board concludes based on the findings herein and agrees with the Applicant and the ANC that the Applicant has met the respective burdens of proof for the requested variances. The Board further concludes that the site is unique and affected by the exceptional condition of its small size and the presence of an improved property on the lot which further reduces the developable area of the Lot. The Board further concludes that, as to the variance request from the provisions of the Regulations regarding size of the required loading berths, the Applicant will suffer a practical difficulty if the Regulations are strictly applied because compliance with the requirement would consume a substantial amount of ground floor space and would require reconfiguration of the interior space. Reconfiguration of the interior space would further reduce the amount of developable space. The Board also concludes that, as to the variance request from the stacked parking limitations of the Regulations, the Applicant will suffer a practical difficulty if the Regulations are strictly applied because compliance would require deeper excavation into the ground at considerable and impracticable expense to the Applicant.

The Board also concludes that granting of the Application will not substantially detriment the public good nor will it substantially impair the intent, purpose and integrity of the zone plan. The Applicant will configure the loading area in a manner that will allow it to accommodate larger trucks when necessary. Stacked parking will allow the hotel (inn) to provide far more than the 71 spaces it is required to provide, thereby reducing competition for the limited on-street parking spaces in the area. In addition, stacked parking is an appropriate and customary service for a hotel and one that is expected by many hotel guests.

The Board concludes that it has accorded to Advisory Neighborhood Commission 2F the great weight to which it is entitled. It is hereby ORDERED that this application be GRANTED.

VOTE:

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

ATTESTED BY:_____
Jerrily R. Kress, FAIA
Director

FINAL DATE OF ORDER:_____

PURSUANT TO D.C. CODE SEC. 2-1402.67 (2001), SECTION 267 OF D.C. LAW 2-38, THE HUMAN RIGHTS ACT OF 1977, THE APPLICANT IS REQUIRED TO COMPLY FULLY WITH THE PROVISIONS OF D.C. LAW 2-38, AS AMENDED, CODIFIED AS D.C. CODE, TITLE 2, CHAPTER 14 (2001), AND THIS ORDER IS CONDITIONED UPON FULL COMPLIANCE WITH THOSE PROVISIONS. THE FAILURE OR REFUSAL OF APPLICANT TO COMPLY WITH ANY PROVISIONS OF D.C. LAW 2-38, AS AMENDED, SHALL BE A PROPER BASIS FOR THE REVOCATION OF THIS ORDER.

UNDER 11 DCMR 3103.1, "NO DECISION OR ORDER OF THE BOARD SHALL TAKE EFFECT UNTIL TEN DAYS AFTER HAVING BECOME FINAL PURSUANT TO THE SUPPLEMENTAL RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURES FOR THE BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT."

THIS ORDER OF THE BOARD IS VALID FOR A PERIOD OF TWO YEARS AFTER THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF THIS ORDER, UNLESS WITHIN SUCH PERIOD AN APPLICATION FOR A BUILDING PERMIT OR CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY IS FILED WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS.