GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
OFFICE OF PLANNING

★ ★ ★

Office of the Director

RECEIVED
D.C. OFFICE OF ZONING
2005 MAY 17 PM 1:11

MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Zoning Adjustment

FROM: Ellen McCarthy
Director

DATE: May 16, 2005

SUBJECT: BZA Application 17304 – WMATA/CSOSA - **SUPPLEMENTAL**

This supplemental statement is intended to further clarify OP's position regarding the applicant's proposed development of a parking lot on Parcel 2 described in the applicant's submission. OP determined that the applicant's development of a parking lot was more appropriately reviewed under Section 213, instead of Section 214 as advertised. The applicant has provided supplemental information to the pre-hearing statement addressing this Section.

Section 214 is intended to allow off-site parking for principal R-1 uses. It is OP's opinion that the development of the subject property within the R-2 zone cannot provide accessory parking spaces under Section 214, since the office building is not a permitted use in the residential R-2 Zone District.

Therefore, the following corrections apply to OP's April 4, 2005 report:

- Page 3 - 4th line, first sentence: A special exception is required to allow ~~off-site accessory parking~~ on Parcel 2… should read… A special exception is required to allow **a parking lot** on Parcel 2
- Page 3 - Table 1: 6th item - **Parking on-site Proposed** ~~65~~ **15**
- Page 5 - **Additional Requirements** , delete 2nd and 3rd paragraphs – Section 2116 does not apply, since it refers to the location of parking spaces accessory to a building, which may be located elsewhere.
- Page 6 - The title of Section 213, "~~**Accessory Parking Spaces**~~" should read "**Parking Lot**"

BZA
Case No. 17304
Exhibit No. 48

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO. 17304
EXHIBIT NO. 48

Section 213

213.1 Use as a parking lot shall be permitted as a special exception in an R-1 District if approved by the Board of Zoning Adjustment under §3104, subject to the provisions of this section…

The development of the lot as a "stand alone" parking lot would meet requirements of Section 213, since a parking lot could exist within the R-2 Zone, subject to the dimensional requirements included in the regulations. As outlined in OP's April 4, 2005 report, the proposed development of the parking lot in the R-2 Zone meets the dimensional requirements of Section 213. OP believes its approval would reduce potential overspill parking on neighborhood streets and will not be detrimental to the integrity of the Zone Regulations.

Further, OP supports approval of the reduction from the number of required parking spaces (65) to 15 as submitted by the applicant and supported by **Section 2107.1**, which states that:

> **The Board of Zoning Adjustment is hereby authorized to reduce or eliminate the amount of required parking spaces for non-residential buildings or structures located outside the Central Employment Area in accordance with the requirements of §3104 for special exceptions; provided that the building or structure is provided with a direct connection to a Metrorail station currently in operation or for which a construction contract has been awarded.**

The physical site constraints of WMATA's properties site prohibit the applicant from providing all of its required on-site parking.

The applicant informed OP that a traffic analysis is being prepared in response to community concerns expressed at the April 19, 2005 Board hearing.

District Department of Transportation (DDOT's) Comments:

OP understands that the applicant has addressed DDOT's concerns outlined in its April 6, 2005 report, which are restated in part as follows:

- The driveway into the main parking lot at the front entrance should be realigned at a 90-degree angle from Benning Road…
- The driveway ramp must be designed flush with the sidewalk grade and the proposed handicap ramps must be removed.

In addition, for the proposed parking lot located across the alley, the report stated that:

- The lot must provide a 42" high masonry wall or hedges along the perimeter as required by §2117.12,
- Four parking spaces must be removed to provide a turnaround area on the lot, and
- The entire parking lot should be shifted to the south to accommodate a buffer from the abutting residence.

Updated plans were presented at the April 19, 2005 hearing reflecting the above-mentioned requirements.

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION

Therefore, OP's recommendation is amended to read as follows:

The Office of Planning recommends approval of the request to permit the office building construction, including approval to:

- Reduce the parking requirement under Section 2107 **from 65 to 15**
- Permit the requested roof structure setback at a distance less than the required 1:1 setback from the edge of the roof, and
- **Permit development of a parking lot on Parcel 2 under Section 213.**