MIKE MEIER
Attorney-at-Law
5324 43rd Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20015, USA
Phone: (202) 265-6711, Fax: (202) 265-6712
Email: mikemeier@internationallawgroup.com, http://www.internationallawgroup.com

30 December 2002

FAXED 12-30-02

RECEIVED
D.C. OFFICE OF ZONING
2003 JAN -6 PM 4:10

Board of Zoning Adjustment
441 4th Street, N.W., Suite 210-S
Washington, D.C. 20001
By facsimile and first-class mail with delivery confirmation
COPIES TO:
- Mr. Stephen Mordfin, D.C. Office of Planning
By facsimile and first-class mail with delivery confirmation
- Ms. June McCloud (neighbor at 4719 Georgia Avenue)
By first-class mail with delivery confirmation

RE: Application Number 16919 (4517 Georgia Avenue, N.W.)

Dear Sir or Madam:

Please find attached the additional submission as to the financial feasibility of the proposal, as requested by the Board:

(1) A memorandum from Mr. Poul Johansen about the cost factors affected construction at 4517 Georgia Avenue, N.W.
(2) Resume of Mr. Poul Johansen.
(3) Copy of Letter of support from ANC Commissioner-elect Ms. Karen Archer (the original was sent directly to the Board by Ms. Archer).

Very truly yours,

Mike Meier

- Attachments

BZA
Case No. 16919
Exhibit No. 42

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO.16919
EXHIBIT NO.42

29 December 2002

4517 Georgia Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20011

Feasibility of various options and cost factors, prepared by Poul Johansen

Dear Mr. Meier:

You asked me to prepare a cost comparison of the following options for the building lot at 4517 Georgia Avenue, which are:

(1) two single family homes (presumably after a sub-division of the lot);
(2) two duplexes, meaning 4 apartments, after a sub-division of the lot (this is the option suggested by the D.C. Office of Planning);
(3) the current proposal with 5 units in one building, based on the architectural drawings of the architect Mr. Walker.

I personally favor the five units, as I advised you from the outset, because costs can be reduced (as explained below), and cost factors would be divided among 5, rather than 4 or only 2 units.

I would like to note about Option 2, as proposed by the D.C. Office of Planning, that it would result in a most akward building. The D.C. Office of Planning suggested a length-wise sub-division of the lot. This would result in two lots, each only 20 feet wide. Apart of the problem whether that meets the minimum width requirements for building lots in D.C. and the fact that you are generally required to have an 8-foot side yard, each building would be at best 20 feet wide, with interior room only about 17 feet wide because of the required retainer wall and the outside walls. However, it would seem to me that an 8 foot side yard is required, leaving a building

with an interior width of about 10 feet. This proposal raises serious questions about the quality of such living space, if it is at all feasible. For example, if you entered the building from the front on Georgia Avenue, you could reach the rear only through the building, not through the outside yard. This proposal appears bizarre, to say the least.

I have inspected the site on several occasions, and previously discussed with you the cost factors that affect the construction costs. I cannot provide you with definitive costs of construction at this point, because several of these factors are yet undetermined, including the options and special equipment (such as kitchens, bathrooms, flooring, quality of bricks, etc.). Also, the ground condition is as of yet unknown, and will require at least 3 test holes at different locations at the site.

Note on environmental hazards

Before I go into the costs, I would like to note for the record that I do not believe that the remainder of the previous building underground contains any hazardous materials such as asbestos or an underground storage tank. The adjacent buildings appear to have been built around 1920. During that time, asbestos was not widely used for construction purposes. In fact, most buildings of that period did not have insulation where asbestos could have been applied. I do not believe that there is any underground storage tank, because I did not observe any on the adjacent properties. It would be highly unlikely that one would be on this property, and presumably it would have been removed by Washington, D.C., when they took down the building.

In any case, we will have to conduct at least 3 test drills before any construction starts, and that will show us –

- Whether there are any any environmental hazards underground;
- How much work will be required to remove the remainder of the previous building at that site.

Cost factors

Here are the cost factors that significantly affect the construction of any structure on that lot:

(1) The previous building at that site was condemned by the City of Washington, D.C. and most of the structure was removed. According to the property records, the previous building was rather large and occupied approximately 1,800 sf. The building However, it appears from my preliminary investigation that the basement, the foundation, filled with debris, is still there. Thus, there are additional costs for:

- The removal of the remainder of the building and the debris, such as the rental of machinery and the transport of the debris. This will also add several days to the construction schedule. These additional costs are estimated at $10,000 to $20,000, depending on the degree of difficulty.
- During the removal, you have the problem that the lot is only about 5,300 sf, and other buildings and fences are nearby. The lot is only about 40 feet wide. Thus, the size of the machinery that we can bring in is limited, and will create additional costs. I estimate the cost of using smaller construction equipment in this case will add 25% to the cost of removal and site preparation.
- The cost of removal, which will be relatively high, because the lot is accessible only through a narrow driveway. This requires that the trucks be of a small size in order to access throught the driveway, be loaded, and turn around. By the way, each truck load of construction debris costs approximately $200 to remove.
- The cost of disposal. Each truck load of construction debris, rather than soil, to be disposed costs approximately from $0 to $100, depending on the disposal site.

Thus, you have additional costs for any construction of approximately $25,000 to $35,000 because of the remainder of the building, the necessity to remove, the additional cost for using small construction equipment and smaller trucks, and the additional cost for disposing of construction debris.

(2) The lot is sloped towards Georgia Avenue, and the portion facing Georgia Avenue has a very steep inclination. Any of the building proposals would extend to this steep

inclination, and an additional foundation and reinforcements will be required. The engineering requirement is that the inclination from the street level to the foundation is 45 degrees upward. Thus, the additional foundation reinforcement has to be significantly deeper into the ground. The additional cost for this foundation at the inclination is estimated at $10,000.

(3) The retainer wall at Georgia Avenue is in acceptable condition, but may have to be removed for the installation for utility lines (water, sewage, gas, and possibly electricity and telephone) coming up the slope from Georgia Avenue. If utilities for only one structure have to be installed, we may be able to leave the retainer wall in place and lay the utilities underneath. If you subdivide the lot, and would have to break the wall in two separate places, I would assume that the entire retainer wall would have to be redone at that point. The difficulty with the retainer wall is the steep slope, requiring the retainer wall to be built in separation sections to prevent the entire slope from sagging. Also, note that according to current building requirements the foundation underneath must extend 30 inches to each side (I don't believe the current retainer wall was built to those specifications). Thus, I estimate the total cost of the retainer wall to be approximately $20,000.

(4) I know that there are certain costs associated if you decide to sub-divide the lot as a matter of right, but do not know exactly what the costs of sub-dividing the lot are. You would have to consult the Architect Mr. Walker on the requirements and costs for that. Thus, I am not in a position to give you an estimate for these costs and expenses, which you would have to factor in if you go ahead and sub-divide the lot.

(5) If you sub-divide the lot, you have additional expenses for installing at least two sets of utility lines (water, sewage, gas, and possibly electricity and telephone), for a length of approximately 40 feet, going uphill. The cost for the underground utility installation would be approximately $25,000 per unit coming up from Georgia Avenue. Thus, if you chose to sub-divide the lot, you would have an additional

cost factor of approximately $25,000 by virtue of the duplication of utility connections.

(6) If you subdivide the lot, you would of course have additional expenses for the 2 separate entrances (door elements can cost, according to quality, up to several thousand dollars), the additional walkways, the additional inspection and licensing costs of Washington, D.C. These additional costs depend on the quality of the construction, among many other factors, and can impact you from a few thousand dollars to ten thousands of dollars.

(7) If you sub-divide the lot, either for 2 single family homes or for 2 duplexes, you would have additional construction costs for the retainer and fire retardant walls between the two buildings, which must be self-supporting. Also, the concrete foundation would have to be built in two separate parts. The additional costs for separating the foundation and the two additional retainer walls would probably be in the range of $40,000 for material and work hours. Also, please note that the buildings (either the family homes or the duplexes) would be differently situated on the lot, and construction costs and appearance will differ for each structure because of the sloping.

(8) Finally, the kind of option you chose, either 2 single family homes, 2 duplexes, or 5 apartments, will have severe cost implications. For example, for a single family home, it is commonly expected to have 2 or more bathrooms, which add several thousand dollars to the construction costs. In comparison, an apartment with only one bathroom is perfectly acceptable in the marketplace.

SUMMARY

Because I am not in a position to calculate the exact construction costs at this point, I am summarizing the cost factors.

Cost Factor	Option 1: 2 Single Family Homes after sub-dividing the lot	Option 2: 2 duplexes (4 apartments) after sub-dividing the lot	Option 3: 5 apartments in a single building (no sub-division)
Cost of sub-dividing the lot (including architect, application and surveyor fees)	Applies (costs have not yet been determined)	Applies (costs have not yet been determined)	Does not apply.
Removal of remainder of previous building	Applies. Total cost estimated at $25,000 to $35,000.	Applies. Total cost estimated at $25,000 to $35,000.	Applies. Total cost estimated at $25,000 to $35,000.
Use of smaller construction equipment because of width and storage limitations of the lot	Applies, adding approximately 25% to costs involving heavy machinery.	Applies, adding approximately 25% to costs involving heavy machinery.	Applies, adding approximately 25% to costs involving heavy machinery.
Cost of additional re-inforcement and/or special foundation at slope	Applies, adding approximately $10,000 to the construction costs.	Applies, adding approximately $10,000 to the construction costs.	Applies, adding approximately $10,000 to the construction costs.
Cost of retainer wall at Georgia Avenue	Applies, wall will most likely have to be removed for utilities and rebuilt. Additional cost estimated at $20,000.	Applies, wall will most likely have to be removed for utilities and rebuilt. Additional cost estimated at $20,000.	Most likely will not apply, since we may be able to install one set of utilities without having to rebuild the entire wall. Thus, this option saves

			approximately $20,000.
Cost of installation of utilities from Georgia Avenue (at least water, sewage and gas; possibly also electricity, cable TV, and telephone)	Applies, and 2 sets of utilities are required, estimated at $25,000 each, totalling approximately $40,000 for 2 sets.	Applies, and 2 sets of utilities are required, estimated at $25,000 each, totalling approximately $40,000 for 2 sets.	Applies, but one set of utilities suffices, thus saving approximately $15,000.
Additional construction elements such as entrance door elements, meters, outside walkway, etc.	Applies, but are required twice. Cost depends on quality and material, but will be in the thousands.	Applies, but are required twice. Cost depends on quality and material, but will be in the thousands.	Applies, but only one set is required. Thus, cost is approximately half compared to the 2 other options. Exact cost savings cannot be determined at this point.
Additional construction cost because of nature of home	Will require at least 2 bathrooms per home, at approximately $6,000 cost for additional bathroom.	Will require at least 2 bathrooms per home, at approximately $6,000 cost for additional bathroom.	Depending on choices, will likely not apply.
Other factors	Will require separate weight-bearing wall between buildings, estimated	Will require separate weight-bearing wall between buildings, estimated	Saves weight-bearing separation wall, thus saving approximately $40,000.

	at$40,000 total.	at$40,000 total.	
Usable space of the building inside/outside	Reduced because of 2 stairwalls that are required, as well as separate entrances, and retainer walls between buildings. Outside green area limited because of additional walkways.	Reduced because of 2 stairwalls that are required, as well as separate entrances, and retainer walls between buildings. Outside green area limited because of additional walkways.	Maximized because only one entrance area, no retainer walls (weight borne by outside walls only). As much outside green preserved as possible, since occupied space is used more efficiently, and only 1 walkway is required.
TOTAL ADDITIONAL COST/SAVINGS PER OPTION	Total additional costs of $106,000, to be divided between 2 units.	Total additional costs of $106,000, to be divided among 4 units.	Total reduction of at least $81,000, meaning savings of approximately $16,200 per unit, thus rendering the five units more affordable.

As you can see, several of the cost factors apply to all three options, but again you would have the advantage with Option 3 (5-unit building) that the costs can be divided among 5 parties rather than 4 or 2.

Hypothetical Costs per Unit

For the sake of argument, let's say the cost of building a structure this size usually costs $500,000. It would mean that:

(1) Option 1 (2 units with subdivision) would hypothetically cost more than $606,000 ($500,000 plus $106,000 in cost factors), resulting in a hypothetical cost of $303,000 per unit.

(2) For option 2 (4 units with subdivision), the resulting hypothetical cost would be at least $151,500 per unit ($500,000 plus $106,000 in cost factors divided by 4).
(3) For option 3 (5 units in one building), the resulting hypothetical cost would be approximately $105,000 per unit ($500,000 plus $106,000 cost factors minus $81,000 savings, thus $105,000 per unit).

Finally, these cost factors are more significant in this area of Washington, D.C., where property prices are significantly lower than in other parts of Washington, D.C. Thus, the additional costs of about $53,000 per unit for option 1, and $26,500 for option 2, this is a significant factor in light of the comparatively low property values in that area. Therefore, option 3 (with 5 units in one building) will result significantly more affordable.

Poul E. Johansen
Certified Concrete Specialist and Master Mason
10710 Harding Road
Laurel, MD 20723
Phone: (240) 568-6147

Nationality: Danish

Certified Expert for Reinforced Concrete Construction & Master Mason (certified by German Vocational Trade Association) with more than 20 years of supervisory and practical experience in design, construction, building materials, masonry and concrete work.

PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

Certified by the German Vocational Trade Chamber (Duesseldorf) in masonry, concrete and steel-reinforced concrete construction (1997). Recognized as equivalent to German Master Mason and Construction Supervisor.

Apprenticeship as Mason, 1976-1979, in Denmark at Ahrendt Lauritzen Construction Business, Guderup. Successfully completed and passed exams to become "fellow mason."

High School Diploma received in Denmark in 1976.

WORK EXPERIENCE

Since 1999 *Construction Superintendent* for *Manganaro Corporation*, a major U.S. construction company and government contractor based in Beltsville, MD. Primary duties include: supervision of construction assignments in the metric system as required by specifications for U.S. federal government projects; quality control and compliance with building specifications; "punch out" quality assurance. Has supervised construction at, for example, the University of Maryland Arts Center (Maryland), the FBI Laboratory in Quantico (Virginia), and the Red Cross Building (Washington, D.C.).

1979-1999 independent construction company in Denmark and Germany. Projects completed include:

- 1994-1999 various projects as subcontractor to major construction company "Bast-Bau." The objects were residential buildings in solid state construction (concrete, steel-reinforced concrete, masonry, prefabricated concrete elements). Fully completed residential buildings according to architects' specifications, including choice of building materials, cost calculation, quality control, and compliance with construction rules and regulations.

- Contractor for restoration of Castle "Eurasburg," a historical monument in Wolfratshausen, Germany, from 1991-1993. This was an investment restoration project of an old German castle involving more than 50 investors and users. Under direction of supervisory engineer,

- Drew preparatory planning documents for remodeling of the castle in cooperation with architects and public authorities.
- Revised statics of the structure, sectional underpinning and draining of basements.
- Completed the Castle's concrete foundations according to HDI Soil-Crete procedures.
- Environmental compliance of the construction site.
- Construction site quality management in compliance with ISO 9000.

- 1989-1999 subcontractor to large German construction company "Hochtief," in the areas of construction cost calculation, solid construction according to architects' specifications, and quality control. The company Hochtief particular commended Mr. Johansen for the completion of a brick facade at a commercial building in Munich.

Karen W. Archer
4426 9th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011
(202) 882-2934
kaw777@aol.com

December 22, 2002

Mr. Geofrey H. Griffis, Chairperson
Board of Zoning Adjustment
441 4th Street, NW Suite 210
Washington, DC 20001

Re: Application 16919

Dear Mr. Griffis:

I am the ANC elect for Single Member District 4C07 which boundaries take in the location of 4517 Georgia Avenue, NW. The community has been actively involved in trying to improve this property but the site continues to be plagued with the discarding of abandoned or stolen cars, drug dealers and garbage dumping. It is for these reasons that I write in support of Mr. Mike Meier's request for a variance from the use provisions to allow the construction of a new apartment building under subsection 330.5, in an R-4 District.

The house at 4517 Georgia Avenue, NW was falling down, attracting drug dealers and acting as a dump for abandoned and stolen cars. The residents living in the 800 block of Allison Street, NW and the 4500 block of 9th Street, NW became concerned for their safety and requested through the Petworth Neighborhood Civic Association (PeNCA) that the District government take action. As a result, the property was condemned, raised and sold at a tax sale to Mr. Meier.

Development of 4517 Georgia Avenue, NW is significantly needed to help combat the blight brought on by its barrenness. Mr. Meier's project is considerate of the existing neighborhood architecture and the community, it will eventually end the drug dealing, and car and garbage dumping that continues on the property today. I encourage the Board to approve Mr. Meier's request for a variance from use.

Sincerely,

Karen W. Archer

cc: Adrian Fenty, Council member Ward 4
Mike Meier

Burleith Citizens Association

3525 S Street, NW
Washington, DC 200007

phone 333-5762
fax 333-5807

January 06, 2003

Ms. Carol Mitten, Chair
Zoning Commission
441 Fourth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001

RECEIVED
D.C. OFFICE OF ZONING
2003 JAN -6 PM 5:36

RE: Party Status Request: Case 16566 (02-32), Georgetown University Performing Arts Center

Madame Chair:

This is to supplement our letter of January 2, 2003 requesting party status in the above referenced application. It has come to our attention that more information is required. With this letter we hope to fulfill that obligation.

The Burleith neighborhood is located just north of historic Georgetown. We are a small community made up of approximately 550 townhouses with the Hillandale and Glover Park communities to our west and north; Wisconsin Avenue on the east and Georgetown University on the south. Over the years, the Burleith Citizens Association, which was organized over 75 years ago, has represented the community with issues dealing with quality of life and the stability of our neighborhood. Without question, the greatest impact on our neighborhood has come from Georgetown University. Because of our proximity to the campus, we are particularly impacted by both University activities and by the large number of students who live in our neighborhood. Burleith has always housed approximately 500 undergraduate students which does not include the non-traditional undergraduates and the graduate students. In the Burleith Citizens Association's most recent history, we participated in a residential overlay district process with the Zoning Commission and with the Board of Zoning Adjustment, we had party status in the University campus plan process of 2000-2010. Also, our past two presidents, Bonnie Hardy and Patricia Scolaro have represented the Burleith Citizens Association in the ALI. meetings which deal with town/gown relations.

As stated in our January 2nd letter, the University's lack of compliance with Condition 14 is what we want to address. This condition, which deals with out of state cars, was the

Board of Zoning Adjustment's response to Burleith's testimony that our community was changing from single family homes with a one car garage and being replaced by group houses with parking pads housing three to four out of state cars. It was concern about large numbers of out-of-state cars brought in by students that led to the Council passing the special exception that eliminated the student eligibility for reciprocity in ANC 2E. Responding to widespread public concern the police have a special initiative to combat the problem of out-of-state scofflaws in our area. The police have limited their activity, however, to vehicles parked in public space. The BZA recognized that the University had the ability to go beyond that and called on them in condition 14 to insist on responsible behavior by their students which we feel has not taken place.

As stated before, Burleith Citizens Association will not be represented by counsel. Instead, Bonnie Hardy will be presenting the testimony with evidence from the minutes of the ALL meetings and her own neighborhood out of state car tabulation. We do hope that party status will be granted.

Again, thank you for your attention and consideration and for allowing Burleith to file this supplemental letter.

Sincerely,

Ed Solomon
President, Burleith Citizens Association