between 6:30 p.m. (instead of 5:30 p.m.) and 8:30 p.m. for evening tours, so as to minimize conflicts with the peak traffic hour in the area. (Exhibit 91.) The Office of Planning endorsed approving the subject application without implementing the DDOT recommendation.

22. ~~20.~~ The United States Department of Interior – National Park Service submitted a report supporting the approval of the subject application in harmony with the surrounding community. The National Park Service's report stated that in order for the Applicant to have continued success in maintaining and interpreting the historic resource that the Property is, the Applicant must retain a professional staff knowledgeable in the Department of Interior's Historic Preservation Standards, and as a non-profit organization, funding the requisite staff will continue to pose a challenge to the Applicant. The National Park Service also indicated that the Applicant has endeavored to meets its financial obligations through continued museum tours and limited special events. (Exhibit 62.)

23. ~~21.~~ The Board received over 35 letters of support of the application from persons living in the community. (Exhibits 27, 28, 34, 35, 36, 41, 54, 64, 77, 78 and 85.)

24. ~~22.~~ Another letter in support of the application was filed by Jack Evans, member of the Council of the District of Columbia, stating that the requested special exception, as limited by the proposed operating conditions, would have no adverse impact on the surrounding residential neighborhood. (Exhibit 52.)

25. ~~23.~~ At the April 15, 2003 hearing, the Applicant offered the testimony of its executive director, Leslie Buhler. (T15, at 51-58; and Exhibit 67.)

26. ~~24.~~ Mr. John Moore represented the Office of Planning at the hearing, and testified in support of the subject application on April 15, 2003. Mr. Moore stated that the Office of Planning is of the opinion that the Applicant has satisfactorily met the conditions of 11 DCMR 3104 and 11 DCMR 217, and recommended that the Board approve the subject application. (T15, at 126-128.)

27. ~~25.~~ Mr. Tom Birch represented the ANC 2E at the hearing, and testified in support of the subject application on April 22, 2003. Mr. Birch stated that, in approving the application, the ANC supports the premise that the Applicant, like other non-profit museums and historic houses around the country, should have the flexibility to develop funding from a variety of resources including the rental of space for special events. He also stated that the ANC was satisfied that the Applicant's current management had consulted with neighbors in addressing issues of noise, traffic and parking when preparing the subject application. Finally, the ANC representative stated that the ANC was persuaded by the Applicant's efforts to concentrate activities on the preservation and presentation of the

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO. 16974
EXHIBIT NO. 145A2

property and not be consumed with developing special events, which are merely ancillary to the Applicant's purpose, with in turn is the interpretation of the historic property. (T22, at 104-108.) Mr. Birch was also cross-examined by the parties. (T22, at 109-~~114~~**114.**) **On cross-examination by Mr. Crockett, Mr. Birch confirmed that the ANC 2E felt that the Applicant had made accommodations to address issues of noise, traffic and parking, and accordingly ANC 2E did not make any further recommendations with respect to these issues (*See* T22, at 109).**

28. ~~26.~~ In addition, at the April 22, 2003 hearing, 14 persons testified in support the subject application. Among these individuals were long time residents of properties nearby the subject Property, and many testified that they consider themselves privileged to enjoy the cultural enhancement and enrichment that the Applicant provides for the community. These individuals also indicated that Georgetown's mix of commerce, entertainment, tourism, educational institutions, and residences have made noise, traffic and parking problems inescapable. However, any parking inconveniences caused by the occasional evening functions at the Property were outweighed by the year-round availability of over ~~30~~**28** parking spaces along the Property, and the bucolic silence that the Property provides morning, day and night to surrounding neighbors. (T22, at 117-153.)

29. ~~27.~~ The president of the Citizens Association of Georgetown ("CAG") testified in favor of the application, but proposed the imposition of additional restrictive conditions to the operation of the Property. (T22, at 130-132.) These proposals focused on the collective impact on the neighborhood of all Great Houses and non-profit organizations, and not on the Applicant's operation in particular. (Exhibit 63.) The additional conditions proposed by CAG were:

1. The reduction of the number of functions unrelated to the Applicant's program involving up to 500 persons, to four per year, with no more than one per month.

2. The limitation of the number of functions unrelated to the Applicant's program involving up to 200 persons, to four per year, with no more than one per month.

3. The limitation of the number of evening functions unrelated to the Applicant's program involving 30 to 75 persons, to two per month.

4. A request for an action by the Board to address the absence of designated tour-bus parking areas.

30. ~~28.~~ Fifteen **(15)** CAG members signed and submitted a letter to the Board repudiating CAG's proposals and questioning the authorization of the president of CAG to speak on this matter on behalf of CAG. (Exhibit 78.) Outerbridge Horsey, Georgetown resident,

architect, and one of the signatories of the letter contesting the position of the president of CAG, testified as a person in support of the subject application as submitted. (T22, at 137-144.)

31. ~~29.~~ The parties in opposition to the subject application offered the testimony of 8 persons, including the three individuals that are parties of record **and their spouses**. Each of these local residents testified on April 22 and/or 29 to problems they had observed from special events at the subject property such as noise, traffic and parking difficulties. Almost all the problems that these witnesses described related to a single event, the Glickman wedding approximately three years ago, and the witnesses agreed that no problems had been observed in the past few years.

32. ~~30.~~ The Board received over 70 letters in opposition to the subject application. Of these, at least 56 were form letters that had been solicited by the parties in opposition to the application under the letterhead of "Friends and Neighbors of Tudor Place~~.~~" **and which stated support for Tudor Place in a number of paragraphs with a final statement in opposition to the application.** The Applicant presented evidence that these form letters were misleading, and had the effect of generating signatures from neighbors who did not oppose the subject application. (T15, at 55-57.) In support of this position, the Applicant submitted to the Board additional letters from a signatory of the opponents' form letter, and provided to the Board the names of other signatories of the opponents' form letter who expressly supported the subject application. (Exhibits 64 and 66; and T15, at 57.)

33. **At the request of the Board pursuant to an order dated June 3, 2003, on July 14, 2003 the Applicant submitted a Traffic and Parking Management Plan ("TPMP") prepared by O.R. George & Associates, Inc. in consultation with DDOT and the party opponents. DDOT submitted a letter on July 31, 2003 that generally supported the TPMP. In addition to the measures originally proposed by the Applicant in Paragraph 12 above, the Applicant proposed additional restrictive conditions in the TPMP that were further developed in subsequent submissions by the Applicant and Mr. George, a summary of which is as follows:**

A. **In general: (i) Provide advance information to attendees of scheduled tours and events regarding parking policies, (ii) Provide general monitoring and oversight of visitor arrival modes and parking patterns, (iii) Hold semi-annual discussions with DDOT Policy and Planning Staff, ANC 2-E and Liaison Committee to review issues and concerns, and make adjustments as may be necessary; and (iv) provide notification to, and make reasonable efforts at coordination with, other area institutions to avoid scheduling of simultaneous events for more than 50 attendees.**

B. **For Evening Events Involving 100 to 200 Persons: (i) Valet parking service using satellite lots for parking and using the Chevy Chase Bank lot (at Wisconsin Avenue and Q Street) for stacking of vehicles as necessary during peak arrival times (with the Tudor Place driveway serving as a backup location if necessary); (ii) Notify DDOT Policy and Planning Administration Staff, ANC 2-E and Emergency Management Administration regarding event for monitoring and feedback; and (iii) Work with Emergency Management Administration to obtain emergency parking restriction within a 4 to 6 vehicle space area adjacent to the 31st Street entrance to the main house and.**

C. **For Evening Events Involving More than 200 Persons: Same measures as in paragraph B. except that (i) instead of items (i) and (iii) described in Paragraph B. guests will be instructed to bring vehicles directly to a satellite parking location from which the Applicant will arrange for shuttle bus service to the Property and (b) the Applicant will arrange for one or two uniformed security personnel to enforce traffic and parking regulations around Tudor Place during the event.**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Based on the evidence of record the Board finds as follows:

1. The Board finds that the Applicant is a non-profit organization within the meaning of 11 DCMR 217. (Exhibit 8, at 3 and 4.)

2. The Board found in Orders No. 14729 and 15744, and confirmed in Order No. 16477, that the main house of the Property contains more than 10,000 square feet of floor area. Based on the evidence in the current proceeding, the Board again finds that the 10,000 square feet requirement set forth in Section 217.1(b) is satisfied. (Exhibit 8, at 4.)

3. The Board finds that the Applicant contributes to the surrounding community in many ways by providing tours of the main house and gardens, hosting events for charitable groups at no charge, and providing ~~free~~ tours and educational programs for school groups. The extensive and historically protected open space on the Property is an important amenity to the community. Visually, the Property creates a park-like setting for nearby residences. From a parking standpoint, the large site generates little demand for parking on **its street frontage of approximately 28 vehicle spaces or on** the surrounding street system the majority of the time.

4. The Board finds that ~~many~~**a large number of** neighbors of the Property support the Applicant and its events.

5. The Board finds that as a result of extensive communications with members of the surrounding community, the Applicant and several neighbors discussed and agreed to certain changes to the already restrictive conditions under which the Applicant was operating pursuant to Order No. 16477. These changes concern the term of the special exception, the Applicant's operating hours, immaterial changes to the accessory non-profit use of the Dower House, a reduction in the number of large evening functions, minor changes to certain conditions relating to parking arrangements, notice of Liaison Committee meetings, amplified music, and clean-up following evening functions. **During the proceedings, the Applicant offered (1) additional restrictions on large evening events and on all rental functions involving more than 50 people and (2) a new traffic and parking management plan with enhanced protections for the neighborhood.**

6. The Board finds that one of the most significant issues associated with the continuation of the museum use is the parking and operational situation during large special events, and that the Applicant's proposed operating conditions provide for the appropriate efforts to mitigate the possible adverse impact that large special events may cause to the neighbors of the Property. ~~The~~**Among the other conditions contained in the TPMP, the** Applicant has agreed to provide valet parking for all evening events involving more than 75 guests in the case of evening rentals, and 100 guests or more in the case of any other evening events. For any such evening events, the Applicant has also agreed to maximize the use of the rear entrance to the Property on 32nd Street for service and related functions.

7. The Board finds that the Applicant has reaffirmed its longstanding practice of using Atlantic Valet for its valet parking needs by entering into a written contract directly with Atlantic Valet. The Applicant has secured written commitments from off-site locations that are commercially zoned or are otherwise permitted to accommodate the cars associated with special events. (Exhibit 85, Applicant's Submission at Hearing on April 22, 2003.)

8. The Board finds that there is ample on-street parking in the vicinity of the Property**, and that the area around Tudor Place has more favorable parking conditions than other areas of Georgetown (*See* Exhibit 129, Crockett August 26, 2003 testimony, at 5)**. The Property generates little demand for parking on the surrounding streets the majority of the time, and is large enough to accommodate **on its property** service vehicles associated with special events. (Exhibit 12, Order No. 16477, at 10.)

9. The Board finds that the ~~modifications~~**conditions** proposed ~~by~~**in** the ~~Applicant~~**Traffic and Parking Management Plan are sufficient** to ~~the measures addressing parking for evening events will not cause~~**prevent** adverse **traffic and parking** effects to the neighboring properties.

10. The Board finds that the Applicant does not create, exchange, or sell any goods, chattel, wares or merchandise on the premises, except for the sale of publications, materials, and other items related to the Applicant. The small museum shop located on the Property is engaged in the sale of items related to the purposes of the Applicant as permitted under Section 217.4. (Exhibit 8, at 6.)

11. The Board finds that the accessory use of the Dower House is within the authority of the Board under 11 DCMR 3104.1 and 11 DCMR 217. The use of Dower House will be limited to functions accessory to the operation of a house museum.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND OPINION:

The Applicant is seeking a special exception to continue a previously approved operation of a house museum by a nonprofit organization.

The granting of such a special exception requires a showing of substantial evidence that the application can be granted as being in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Zoning Regulations and Map and that the proposed use will not tend to affect adversely the use of neighboring property. **In particular, the Zoning Regulations require "that the applicant demonstrate that it is not likely that the proposed site will become objectionable to neighboring properties." Georgetown Residents Alliance v. District of Columbia Bd. of Zoning Adjustment, 802 A.2d 359, 363 (D.C. 2002) (citing Glennbrook Rd. Ass'n v. District of Columbia Bd. of Zoning Adjustment, 605 A.2d 22, 32 (D.C. 1992)).** The Applicant must also meet the requirements of 11 DCMR 217. **Based upon the testimony and evidence of record, the Board concludes that the Applicant has met its burden of proof.**

The Board concludes that the applicable sections of 11 DCMR are Sections 217 and 3104.1. The party opponents argue that Section 200 requires that the Application be denied, but that Section 200 is merely precatory and does not contain the standards by which the subject application is to be judged. This very issue was raised by the opponents in their appeal of Order No. 16477, and was rejected by the District of Columbia Court of Appeals. See Georgetown Residents Alliance ~~v. District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment~~, 802 A.2d 359, 365, ~~*fn.*~~ 6 (D.C. 2002).

~~Based upon the testimony and evidence of record, the Board concludes that the Applicant has met its burden of proof.~~

The Board concludes that Tudor Place, including its grounds, is a National Historic Landmark and is listed in the District's Inventory of Historic Sites, and that the main building consists of more than 10,000 square feet of gross floor area. The Board concludes that under Section 217, only the main building, not every building on the property (all of which is located is the Georgetown Historic District) must meet the 10,000 square foot threshold. The party opponents argue that, when considered alone, the Dower House does not meet the requirements for a special exception under 11 DCMR 217. (Exhibits 96 and 97.) However, the 10,000 square foot requirement pertains only to the Tudor Place main house. The regulations cannot reasonably be interpreted to preclude the use of other buildings of less than 10,000 square feet on the site for purposes related to the museum. The regulations clearly contemplate that a site *may* contain more than one building. Section 217.1(b) specifically states that the "building in question not including other buildings on the lot" must be 10,000 square feet or greater **(emphasis added)**. The Tudor Place main house, an individually designated landmark, is the "building in question."

In at least two previous applications that were granted under the predecessor section to Section 217, the Board approved non-profit use for an entire site when only the main building on the site satisfied the 10,000 square foot threshold. In Application No. 12420, involving the Youth For Understanding site, the Board approved non-profit use of three buildings based on the satisfaction of the 10,000 square feet requirement by only the main building. (*See also* Application No. 13419 involving the Watterston House and its two-story carriage house.)

The Board concludes that the museum use approval can be extended to the Dower House as part of the main building use because it is on the same lot (835) as Tudor Place and that the Applicant's inability to subdivide a record lot is not an impediment to such use. The party opponents argue that the Dower House may not be used for an accessory use because, notwithstanding its location on the same tax lot as the main building, it is not on the same "lot" as the main house as such term us defined in 11 DCMR 199. (Exhibit 97.) However, ~~the definition of "lot" in the Zoning Regulations specifically states that "a lot may or may not be" a record lot, therefore, the term "lot" includes assessment and taxation lots. Under the Zoning Regulations, the Dower House simply needs to be located on the same lot as the main house in order to be part~~**this is one of the very arguments that was rejected by the Court** of ~~the special exception approval~~**Appeals in Georgetown Residents Alliance, 802 A.2d 359 (D**~~. The regulations do not specify~~**C. 2002). In** that ~~a record lot is required. (Exhibit 12, Order No. 16477.) The Board concludes that the Dower House may be used for uses accessory to the non-profit museum use of Tudor Place. The Board's interpretation of the Zoning Regulations is consistent with existing precedent. The~~**case the** District of Columbia Court of Appeals ~~has~~ specifically recognized the distinction between the terms "lot" and "lot of record," and explained that while a "lot" is a general term ~~of~~ used to describe any plot of land **that includes assessment and tax lots**, a "lot of

record" is a lot platted and recorded by the District of Columbia Surveyor. The Court of Appeals further held that while the Dower House, an adjacent property, must be located on the same "lot" as the principal property, it *need not be located on the same "lot of record,"* and that, therefore, the BZA did not exceed its authority by extending the special exception to the adjacent Dower House. (Exhibit 11, Georgetown Residents Alliance ~~v. District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment, supra~~, 802 A.2d at ~~366,~~ **366 (D.C. 2002) (**citing Sagalyn v. Foundation for the Pres. of Historic Georgetown, 691 A.2d 107, 112, n.7 (D.C. 1997)~~.~~**). Accordingly, the Board declines to adopt a new interpretation of the Zoning Regulations that contradicts specific decisions of the Court of Appeals, and concludes that the Dower House may be used for uses accessory to the non-profit museum use of Tudor Place.**

The ~~Board finds that the use of the Dower House as an accessory to the non-profit operation of the Tudor Place main house does not violate §2500.4 of the Zoning Regulations, which imposes a fifteen-foot height limit on accessory buildings. The~~ party opponents **also** argue that the use of the Dower House as an accessory to the non-profit operation of the Tudor Place main house ~~would violate~~ **violates** §2500.4 of the Zoning Regulations**, which imposes a fifteen-foot height limit on accessory buildings**. ~~This~~**However, this** section addresses the construction of an "accessory buildings" and not the "accessory use" of an existing building, which is what the subject application seeks. The case on which the party opponents rely, Davidson v. District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment, 617 A.2d 977 (D.C. 1992), involved a building permit sought for the construction of a poolhouse ~~in~~**as an accessory building to** a single family dwelling**. Unlike Davidson**, ~~unlike the present case, in which~~ no approval is being sought **in the present application** for the construction of a new accessory building. (Exhibits 96 and 97.) ~~Therefore, the~~**The** Board concludes that ~~the height limitations in 11 DCMR §2500.4 are inapplicable to the proposed accessory use of Dower House. The Board concludes that~~ nothing in the Zoning Regulations imposes any limit on the size of an existing building that may be used as an accessory to a permitted use. See National Cathedral Neighborhood ~~Association~~**Ass'n** v. District of Columbia ~~Board~~**Bd.** of Zoning Adjustment, 753 A.2d 984 (D.C. 2000) (holding that nothing in 11 DCMR 199 (defining "accessory use") implies that a facility loses its adjunct character when it reaches a certain size.)**. Therefore, the Board concludes that the height limitations in 11 DCMR §2500.4 are inapplicable to the proposed accessory use of Dower House.**

The Board concludes that the extension of the museum use to the Dower House does not trigger Section 217.5, because there is no addition to Tudor Place or major modification of the site or buildings thereon.

The Board concludes that the proposed non-profit use of Dower House, subject to the conditions of this Decision and Order, which were agreed to by the Applicant, will have only minimal impact on the neighborhood and, on balance, will have no greater impact than a single-family home. **In many cases the Dower House is the only location on the Property that is**

suitable for the Applicant's educational programs, administrative functions, small indoor fundraising functions and indoor rentals accessory to the Applicant's operation as a non-profit house museum. Such usage also serves the presentation mission of the Applicant with respect to the main building. Given the nature and small size of the activities proposed to be conducted by the Applicant at Dower House, and the lack of any showing of adverse impact associated with these activities in the past, the Board concludes that the Applicant has demonstrated that it is unlikely that the proposed uses of Dower House will become objectionable to neighboring properties. The party opponents' suggestion that Dower House should be rented for private use is not relevant to a special exception application. The only issue is the effect of what is proposed, not the desirability of alternative uses.

The Board concludes that the Applicant is a non-profit organization within the meaning of 11 DCMR 217.

The Board is satisfied that there will be no goods, chattel, ware or merchandise commercially created, exchanged or sold at the Property, except for the sale of publication, materials, or other items related to the purpose of the non-profit organization.

The Board concludes that the Applicant operates without adverse impacts on the neighborhood but **recognizes** that the large special events have resulted in noise and parking impacts. The Board concludes, contrary to the assertions of the party opponents, that these special events are not a new development but, rather, have been conducted at Tudor Place since the museum use was established in 1988 and prior to that time under the ownership of Armistead Peter III. The Board further concludes that the restrictions imposed by the Board in Order No. 16477 have been successful in minimizing the effects of such events, and that the additional restrictions imposed in this present Order will help ensure the continued success of the previous Order.

Based upon the evidence presented, including the intensive discussions between the Applicant and its neighbors, the support of ANC 2E, and the recommendation of the Office of Planning, the Board concludes that the proposed use, as conditioned, will not adversely affect the use of the neighboring properties.

The Board concludes that the limited number of special events at the Property are not commercial in nature and do not result in the commercial use of the site. They are accessory to the museum use. The use of house museums as venues for special events is a common practice in the District of Columbia and, accordingly, is customarily incidental to the principal museum use.

The Board concludes that generally there is ample on-street parking in the vicinity of the Property, which results, in part, from the low-density use of the Property. The Board notes that the site is large enough to accommodate all service vehicles associated with its events**, has street**

frontage that provides parking for approximately 28 vehicles, and can accommodate approximately 25 vehicles on the Property without the use of a valet service stacking the vehicles. In light of the Applicant's contract for valet parking that will be used for evening rentals involving 75 or more guests and for any other evening events involving 100 or more guests, the arrangement for off-street parking, the effects of the limited number of special events will be addressed and there will be no adverse traffic impact on the adjacent neighborhood. The Board has reached this conclusion after balancing the numerous benefits afforded by this nationally recognized house museum with the periodic inconvenience caused by the use.

The Board concludes that the additional limitations proposed by the Applicant during the hearing**,** including the **Traffic and Parking Management Plan, the** reduction of the maximum number of large ~~special~~**evening (rental or non-rental)** events per year at the Property from 10 to ~~6~~**6,** and the ~~limitation~~**new limitations** on ~~the number of~~ evening rental functions ~~to 10 per year in the case of functions~~ involving ~~100 to~~ **between 50 and** 200 guests ~~at the site and 15 per year to functions involving 50 to 100 guests at the site~~**, when** combined with the other proposed conditions, will **further** minimize ~~further~~ any adverse impacts associated with the Property**. The Board recognizes and appreciates the cooperative efforts of the Applicant in proposing such additional conditions that go beyond those required by the ANC or the Office of Planning**.

The Board acknowledges the complaints of certain of the Applicant's neighbors about noise, traffic and parking, and concludes that neither the party opponents nor any opposing witness provided any evidence that there is any aspect of the subject application that needs to be changed to protect the neighborhood. **In particular, the Board recognizes that the strict limitations proposed for rental events provides assurances that, notwithstanding the economic incentives associated with such rental events, the level of activity conducted by the Applicant will be consistent with its location in a residential neighborhood. The Board notes that such focus on rental events is consistent with the approach endorsed in the CAG letter that focuses on the number of "functions unrelated to the Applicant's program". (Exhibit 63)** The Board concludes that the Applicant reasonably accommodated the concerns of its neighbors in a manner that does not interfere with the neighbors' legitimate interests. Upon careful deliberation, the Board concludes that the complaints expressed by the party opponents, CAG and certain neighbors of the Applicant during this proceeding ~~are not persuasive and are outweighed by evidence presented in support of~~**fail to demonstrate that** the ~~subject application~~**Applicant made an unreasonable accommodation**.

In reaching this conclusion, the Board has accorded the recommendation of ANC 2E the "great weight" to which it is entitled. The ANC supports the subject application ~~as~~**with the conditions that were set forth in the Application as originally** submitted **by the Applicant**. In addition, the ANC was instrumental in developing many of the conditions relating to the operation of the Property, and the Board has incorporated these conditions**, as well as the**

additional restrictions offered by the Applicant during the proceeding, in its Decision and Order.

The Board has also accorded "great weight" to the Office of Planning. The Office of Planning considers that the subject application satisfactorily addressed the requirements of 11 DCMR 217 and met the burden of proof under 11 DCMR 3104, and thus recommends that the subject application be approved as submitted **with the 16 conditions supported by the ANC**. (Exhibit 48, Office of Planning Report, at 9.) The DDOT supported the subject application and recommended amended hours of operation for tours during the day and in the evening (Exhibit 91), ~~but the Office of Planning endorsed approving the subject application without implementing the DDOT recommendation~~. As stated above, great weight was accorded to the Office of Planning's recommendation**. Similarly, the Board is mindful of the legal precedent established by this Board and the Court of Appeals in relation to the use of Dower House**.

The Board concludes that granting the application will be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Zoning Regulations and Zoning Maps, and will not tend to affect adversely the use of neighboring property.

In light of the foregoing, the Board concludes that the application is hereby GRANTED, SUBJECT to the following CONDITIONS:

1. Approval shall be for a period of FIVE YEARS from the effective date of the requested special exception.

2. Admission for group tours shall be by appointment only.

3. The hours of operation for tours shall be limited to between 9:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Saturday, between 12:00 noon and 4:30 p.m. on Sunday. In addition, tours shall be permitted between 5:30 p.m. and 8:30 p.m. on Mondays, Tuesdays or Wednesdays, but not more than one day per week. To the extent such evening tours are offered, they shall take place on the same day of each week, which day shall initially be determined by the Applicant, with any changes to be made in consultation with the Liaison Committee.

4. The number of regularly scheduled tours shall not exceed ten per day. Non-group tours shall be limited to a maximum of 20 persons.

5. The Applicant shall instruct the drivers of all buses and vans not to idle the engines of their vehicles longer than is necessary to allow passengers to embark or disembark Buses bringing group tours to the site shall park in legal bus parking

areas within the District of Columbia. There shall be no bus parking on the subject site.

6. Large evening functions (functions involving 200 or more guests) at the subject site shall be limited to a maximum of 500 guests at any one event.

7. The number of large evening functions involving 200 to 500 guests at the site shall be limited to 6 per year, with (i) no more than two of such functions being rental functions, and (ii) no more than one of such functions taking place at the site in any one calendar month. The number of evening rental functions (i) involving 100 to 200 guests at the site shall be limited to 10 per year, and (ii) involving 50 to 100 guests at the site shall be limited to 15 per year. In no event shall rental functions for the purpose of weddings be permitted for 75 or more guests.

8. All functions shall end no later than 10:30 p.m.

9. ~~For all evening functions with (i) in the case of rental events, 75 or more attendees at the site and (ii) in the case of any other events, 100 or more attendees at the site, the~~**The** Applicant shall minimize traffic and noise impacts by employing the following measures:

   ~~(a) making valet parking services that utilize off-site parking lots available to visitors and taking other measures as appropriate to minimize congestion and control traffic flow; and~~

   ~~(b) maximizing~~**A. In general: (i) Provide advance information to attendees of scheduled tours and events regarding parking policies, (ii) Provide general monitoring and oversight of visitor arrival modes and parking patterns, (iii) Hold semi-annual discussions with DDOT Policy and Planning Staff, ANC 2-E and Liaison Committee to review issues and concerns, and make adjustments as may be necessary; (iv) provide notification to, and make reasonable efforts at coordination with, other area institutions to avoid scheduling of simultaneous events for more than 50 attendees and (v) maximize** the use of the rear entrance to the site on 32nd Street for service and related functions.

   B. For Evening Events Involving 100 (75 in the case of a rental function) to 200 Persons: (i) Valet parking service using satellite lots for parking and using the Chevy Chase Bank lot (at Wisconsin Avenue and Q Street) for stacking of vehicles as necessary during peak arrival times (with the Tudor Place driveway serving as a backup location if necessary); (ii) Notify DDOT Policy and Planning Administration Staff, ANC 2-E and

Emergency Management Administration regarding event for monitoring and feedback; and (iii) Work with Emergency Management Administration to obtain emergency parking restriction within a 4 to 6 vehicle space area adjacent to the 31st Street entrance to the main house.

C. For Evening Events Involving More than 200 Persons: Same measures as in Paragraph B. except that (i) instead of items (i) and (iii) described in Paragraph B. guests will be instructed to bring vehicles directly to a satellite parking location from which the Applicant will arrange for shuttle bus service to the Property and (b) the Applicant will arrange for one or two uniformed security personnel to enforce traffic and parking regulations around Tudor Place during the event.

10. The Applicant shall notify affected area residents not less than 60 days in advance of any scheduled evening functions of 75 or more attendees by delivering a calendar of such events to affected residents.

11. The Applicant shall appoint a staff member as a community liaison person who will be responsible for addressing any issues and concerns raised by neighbors with respect to the operation of the facility.

12. The Applicant shall designate a "Tudor Place Duty Officer" to be in charge of each event including handling any problems that may arise during the course of an event.

13. The Applicant shall convene a Liaison Committee, to include two representatives of the Tudor Place Foundation, two representatives of ANC 2E, and two representatives of the community at large. The Applicant shall convene the Liaison Committee semi-annually. The Liaison Committee shall address any issues that arise relating to the operations of Tudor Place. Notice of such meetings will be (i) posted on the Applicant's property, (ii) sent or delivered to immediate neighbors of the Applicant and (iii) published on the Applicant's web site.

14. There shall be no amplified music or amplified singing voices played on Applicant's Property during any outdoor function. If indoor, amplified music may be played with all doors and windows closed. In any event, the Applicant shall adhere to the District of Columbia noise regulations.

15. Following a function which ends at the 10:30 p.m. curfew, there shall be no heavy clean-up that night. All heavy clean-up shall be done the morning after the function not earlier than 7:30 a.m.

16. In addition to matter-of-right uses, the Dower House may be used for purposes accessory to the non-profit museum use of Tudor Place. These uses shall be limited to: **(1)** a location for ~~meetings~~**the following functions and programs involving not more than 50 people: (a)administrative functions** (including Board of Trustees' meetings, volunteer meetings, etc.); ~~a location for~~**(b) educational programs (lectures, workshops, etc.); (c)** small ~~Tudor Place~~**fundraising** functions ~~of~~**(donor cultivation activities, etc.) and (d) indoor rentals (but in** no ~~more than 50 people; a location for no~~**event** more than 4 ~~rental functions~~**rentals** per ~~calendar~~ month ~~that do not exceed 50 guests~~**)**; and **(2)** a location for offices of no more than 7 members of the Tudor Place staff who do not utilize on-street parking. Any evening functions at the Dower House will conclude no later than 10:00 p.m. For purposes of the restrictions set forth in the other paragraphs above, any use of Dower House shall constitute use of the Tudor Place site (meaning that, for example, an evening function at Dower House with 25 people taking place at the same time as a function at Tudor Place with 75 people would constitute a function at the site with 100 or more attendees for the purpose of Paragraph 9).

The Board concludes that the applicant has met the provisions of Section 217 and that the special exception can be granted as being in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Zoning Regulations and Map.

In the light of the foregoing, the Board hereby **ORDERS** that the application be **GRANTED.**

VOTE:

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

Each concurring member has approved the issuance of this Decision and Order and authorized the undersigned to execute the Decision and Order on his or her behalf.

ATTESTED BY: _____
JERRILY R. KRESS, FAIA
Director

FINAL DATE OF ORDER: _____

PURSUANT TO D.C. CODE SEC. 1-2531 (1987), 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 I, CHAPTER 25 (1987), AND THIS ORDER IS CONDITIONED UPON FULL COMPLIANCE WITH THOSE PROVISIONS. THE FAILURE OR REFUSAL OF THE APPLICANT TO COMPLY WITH ANY PROVISION OF CHAPTER 25 SHALL BE A PROPER BASIS FOR REVOCATION OF THIS ORDER.

UNDER 11 DCMR 3125.6 "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 PROCEDURE BEFORE THE BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT."