Government of the District of Columbia
Advisory Neighborhood Commission 1A
3511 14th Street, NW, 2nd Floor
WASHINGTON, DC 20010
(202) 588-7278

March 12, 2003

D.C. OFFICE OF ZONING
2003 MAR 20 PM 3:49

Christopher Donatelli
Columbia Heights Ventures
c/o Donatelli & Klein, Inc.
7200 Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 310
Bethesda, MD 20814

RE: Board of Zoning Adjustment Application
Donatelli & Klein Development in Square 2672
All or Portions of Lots 6, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 720, 721, 879, 835, 837, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866 and 876 and the Alley Proposed to be Closed

Dear Mr Donatelli:

This letter is to advise that ANC 1A, at its regularly scheduled public meeting, held March 12, 2003, at which a quorum was present, voted to support the above-referenced application for special exception and variance relief. The relief is requested by RLA Revitalization Corporation and Donatelli & Klein, owner and developer of the property respectively, to permit the development of the property with residential and retail uses.

The Applicant is requesting a variance from Section 770.1 of the Zoning Regulations to permit a building with a height of eighty-five (85) feet. The property is affected by several exceptional situations and conditions which result in the requested variance relief. Due to the set backs needed to accommodate the Metro facilities and the complex foundation issues related to the below-grade Metro facilities, the project cannot accommodate the permitted gross floor area within the permitted height, creating a practical difficulty for the proposed development. Thus, in order to create a viable project, the additional height is necessary. The Commission finds that the variance relief can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good or the District's Zone Plan.

The Applicant is also requesting a special exception pursuant to Section 2514.2 of the Zoning Regulations to extend the C-3-A zoning into the R-5-B zoned portion of

BZA
Case No. 17029
Exhibit No. 11

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO. 17029
EXHIBIT NO. 11

the property. The Commission concludes that the criteria set forth in Section 2514.2(a) through (d) are satisfied. Furthermore, the Commission agrees that the special exception would be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Zoning Regulations and Zoning Map and would not tend to affect adversely the use of neighboring properties.

In addition, the Applicant requests a special exception pursuant to Section 2108 of the Zoning Regulations to reduce the required parking for the retail portion of the building. The project provides more parking than is required for the project as a whole. However, the Applicant requests a twenty-five percent reduction in the number of parking spaces required for the retail portion because the additional parking is not necessary at this development. The Commission believes that the retail portions of this building will be community serving retail and, as such, will be accessed primarily by local pedestrian traffic. In addition, the project's adjacency to Metro will significantly reduce the amount of vehicular traffic at the site. The Commission supports this special exception and believes that the project satisfies the requirements of Section 2108.3(a) through (e).

Furthermore, the Commission supports the Applicant's request for a special exception from Sections 770.6(a) and 411.3, which requires the penthouse and mechanical equipment to be placed in one enclosure. The Commission believes that the proposed design of the penthouse in multiple, smaller enclosures minimizes the impact and visibility of the penthouse, is consistent with the intent and purpose of Chapter 400 and the Zoning Regulations, and does not adversely affect the light and air of adjacent buildings. Moreover, the Commission finds that compliance with the setback requirement is impractical because of operating difficulties and that full compliance would unduly restrictive, prohibitively costly, or unreasonable. In addition, the Commission determined that granting the special exception would not materially impair the intent and purpose of Chapter 400 and the Zoning Regulations and that the light and air of adjacent buildings would not be adversely affected.

Finally, to the extent that a variance from Section 773 of the Zoning Regulations relating to the amount of residential recreation space provided is needed, the Commission supports such a variance. The property is affected by several exceptional situations and conditions which result in the requested variance relief. Specifically, due to the utilization of space for Metro facilities on the property, the project may not be able to accommodate the required amount of residential recreation space. The space within the building and on the roof has been maximized while exterior ground floor space is limited due to the location of the Metro facilities. The Commission finds that the variance relief can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good or the District's Zone Plan.

ANC 1A supports the Applicant's requests for special exception and variance relief. The development of this property for residential and retail uses is important to the community and the District as a whole.

Sincerely,

Charles E. Maticlla
Chair

Jenna Moheyer
Secretary