24. The Applicant testified that the proposed bed and breakfast use would not create a large demand for on-street parking in the neighborhood, because the majority of guests would arrive by taxi or public transportation rather than by private vehicle, or would park in an off-street facility arranged by the Applicant for the duration of their visit. According to the Applicant, additional off-street parking would be made available to guests by contract with a nearby commercial parking facility, while parking for events would be provided off-site by contract with a commercial parking garage or valet parking company, or both. Guests would be expected to drive directly to the off-site parking facility and walk or ride in a taxi to the subject property.

25. DDOT testified that the subject property has the physical configuration and capacity to accommodate the vehicles likely to require access to a bed and breakfast, such as guest arrivals and departures and deliveries of breakfast supplies, provided that the Applicant properly coordinated the use of the garage. However, DDOT also testified that the subject property probably lacks sufficient capacity to handle the number of vehicles likely associated with the proposed special events without generating traffic congestion in the neighborhood. According to DDOT, valet systems are prevalent and work well in other cities to provide for the safe storage of vehicles in congested urban areas where guests are unfamiliar with the available parking alternatives.

Zoning

26. The subject property is located in the Dupont Circle Overlay District (DC)/R-5-D zone. The Dupont Circle overlay is intended to preserve and enhance "a unique resource to the District of Columbia" through retention of "its low scale, predominately residential character, independent small retail businesses, human scale streetscapes, and historic character, given the high-density development pressures caused by the proximity of the Central Employment Area and Dupont Circle Metrorail Station." 11 DCMR § 1501.1. Purposes of the Dupont Circle Overlay District include:

(a) to protect the integrity of "contributing buildings" in historic districts; to require compatibility of development with the purposes of the Historic District Protection Act of 1978, effective March 3, 1979 (D.C. Law 2-144, as amended; D.C. Code, 2001 Ed. §§ 6-1101 to 6-1115; and to preclude demolitions or partial demolitions that would lead to an increase in height and floor area ratio inappropriate to the area;

(b) to enhance the residential character of the area by maintaining existing residential uses and controlling the scale, location, and density of commercial and residential development;

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO. 17392
EXHIBIT NO. 32A2

(c) to preserve areas planned as open gardens and backyards and protect the light, air, and privacy that they provide;

(d) to enhance the streetscape by maintaining the public space in front of buildings as landscaped green spaces; and

(e) to encourage greater use of public transportation and the free circulation of vehicles through public streets and alleys.

*See* 11 DCMR § 1501.4.

27. The Applicant's proposed bed and breakfast use would not alter the height or bulk of the subject property. The Office of Planning, noting that the subject property has been "part of the neighborhood for over 100 years," testified that its height and floor area ratio are "appropriate for the area."

28. The Office of Planning testified that the Applicant's proposal "meets the applicable purposes" of the Dupont Circle overlay district "by preserving the existing historic structure," including much of the interior and "existing gardens, walls and fences that have added to the character of this historic structure."

Requested Variance

29. The Applicant stated that variance relief was needed from two provisions of § 203 to permit 10 guest rooms and to increase the number of employees. The Applicant noted that variance relief might also be necessary from the limitation on the number of clients, guests, or customers permitted as a matter of right (*i.e.* eight), but asserted that the limitation seemed inapposite in the case of a matter-of-right bed and breakfast with four or six rooms.

30. According to the Applicant, the requested variance would merely increase the intensity of a permitted use, rather than introduce a use not permitted by right or by special exception in the R-5-D zone, and therefore was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and would not impair the zone plan or the intentions of the zoning regulations.

31. The Applicant stated that the variance was warranted because of the unique nature of the historic property, which was too large and expensive to serve as a single-family dwelling, and because the proposed 10-room bed and breakfast operation was the sole means to avoid conversion of the building to condominiums or other use that would not preserve the ornate historic interior of the building. The Applicant also asserted that, as a contributing building in a historic district, the building could not be demolished and replaced without "extraordinary

justification," and that the Dupont Circle overlay district further restricted permitted uses of the subject property.

32. According to the Applicant, the serious hardship that would result from the strict application of the Zoning Regulations to the subject property was not self-imposed; instead, a unique and exceptional condition that created undue hardship arose from the exceptionally large nature of the structure and the quality and integrity of its interior. The Applicant testified that the subject property was on the market for almost four years without selling as a single-family residence, embassy, or other use; and that the property did not attract single-family buyers due to its large size, high cost to maintain, and cost of needed repairs, but finally attracted investors interested in turning the subject property into condominiums, which would destroy the historic integrity of the building. The Applicant asserted that it was not economically feasible to maintain the property without the requested variance.

33. The Applicant asserted that the requested variance would not have an adverse impact on neighboring property due to traffic, because the number of trips generated by the proposed bed and breakfast use would not add appreciably to the traffic on 16th Street, and because parking for the occasional events taking place at the subject property would be subject to restrictions implemented by the Applicant.

34. The Applicant stated that the requested variance would provide benefits including employment, preservation of the historic integrity of the property, and restoration of the building that would beautify the block and community and give the community a home feel. According to the Applicant, operation of a bed and breakfast subject to the proffered conditions would make the subject property a quieter and more manageable place than it would be as a single-family residence, rooming house, embassy, organization, or condominiums.

35. The Office of Planning testified that the extraordinary or exceptional situation of the subject property resulting in an undue hardship arose from the fact that the "existing historic mansion is extraordinarily large for a single-family home and the upkeep and maintenance of such a large structure would be a significant financial burden to a single family," and because the "unique, historic interior of the structure is worthy of preservation" but "[m]any of the other uses allowable in the zone would require extensive remodeling of the interior of the structure" and "would require extensive changes to the yard areas of the building altering the historic landscape of the property." According to OP, "these situations along with the character of the neighborhood combine to create an exceptional situation" of the subject property, and the proposed bed and breakfast use was the best means to preserve the interior.

36. According to OP, the requested variance could be granted without causing substantial detriment to the public good and without impairing the intent, purpose, and integrity of the zone plan. OP noted that the proposed bed and breakfast use of the subject property would involve minimal exterior improvements, that the Applicant had proffered conditions regarding parking, employee transportation, and limitations on special events, and that the proximity of institutional and high-density residential uses to the subject property and 16th Street, a major arterial, established more intense use to the south and east in the vicinity of the subject property.

37. OP testified that the proposed bed and breakfast use would further the Comprehensive Plan goals of encouraging the renovation and adaptive reuse of existing structures rather than demolition. According to OP, the requested use variance would allow preservation and restoration of a historic interior that might not otherwise be preserved, thereby maintaining continued productive use of the historic building. OP also noted that the interior would be more accessible to the public through use of the subject property as a bed and breakfast than as apartments.

## CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Under the Zoning Regulations, home occupations are permitted as accessory uses to residential uses provided that they are compatible with the residential neighborhood in which they are located. 11 DCMR § 203.1. The intent of the home-occupation provisions of the Zoning Regulations is to protect residential areas from adverse effects of activities associated with home occupations, while permitting residents of the community the opportunity to use the home as a workplace and source of livelihood under specific regulatory conditions. *Id.* Permitted home occupations include bed and breakfast facilities, so that the owner of a dwelling may operate a bed and breakfast facility offering rooms and breakfast to guests on a daily basis, subject to certain conditions. *See* 11 DCMR § 203.8.

For purposes of the relevant provisions of the Zoning Regulations, a "home occupation" is a "business, profession, or other economic activity conducted full-time or part-time in a dwelling unit that serves as the principal residence of the practitioner of the home occupation." 11 DCMR § 203.2. The home occupation must be "clearly secondary to the use of the dwelling unit for residential purposes." 11 DCMR § 203.4(a). The parties in opposition argue that the planned bed and breakfast operation would not be secondary to the use of the subject property for residential purposes because the Applicant plans to use only about 15 percent of the interior space as his residence.

The Board does not agree. The subject property was built as a single-family dwelling and has been used for residential purposes throughout most of its existence. The Applicant plans to live in the subject property, albeit in a relatively small portion of a large

dwelling, and does not plan to make any renovations to the exterior of the subject property that would alter its residential appearance or character. Bed and breakfast home occupations are specifically exempted from floor area limitations that would otherwise restrict the space that may be utilized in a home occupation. *See* 11 DCMR §§ 203.4(b), 203.8(d). Under the Zoning Regulations, "home occupations such as bed and breakfasts are considered accessory uses; the principal use is deemed to be the residential use." *See Dupont Circle Citizens Association v. D.C. Board of Zoning Adjustment*, 749 A.2d 1258 at 1261 (D.C. 2000). The term "principal use," as used in the Zoning Regulations, "distinguish[es] the accessory use from the more dominant use to which it is 'customarily incidental and subordinate,' without further intending that the more dominant use necessarily and in every case must be the predominant use of the property in question." *Id.* at 1263. The Board concludes the Applicant has satisfied the burden of proof with respect to 11 DCMR §§ 203.2 and 203.4(a).

However, the bed and breakfast operation planned by the Applicant does not conform to the requirements of the Zoning Regulations in several respects. First, the Applicant proposes to offer 10 guest rooms. A home-occupation bed and breakfast may have two sleeping rooms as a matter of right, or as many as six if approved by the Board as a special exception in the case of a home-occupation bed and breakfast operated in a dwelling located in a historic district and certified as contributing to the character of that historic district.[1] 11 DCMR § 203.8(c)(1). Secondly, the proposed bed-and-breakfast operation would have six full-time and two part-time employees, with at most four non-resident employees on the subject property at any given time. The Zoning Regulations specify that no more than one person who is not a resident of the dwelling unit shall be engaged or employed in the home occupation. 11 DCMR §§ 203.4(d), 203.8(h). In addition to requirements set forth in 11 DCMR § 203.8 specific to bed and breakfast home occupations, the Applicant's proposed use of the subject property must also comply with certain requirements applicable to home occupations generally. *See* 11 DCMR § 203.8(h). These requirements include that vehicular trips to the premises by visitors, customers, and delivery persons shall not exceed eight trips daily on a regular and continuing basis, 11 DCMR § 203.4(l); and that the practitioner shall have no more than eight clients or customers on the premises in any one-hour period, 11 DCMR § 203.4(m).

---

[1] The Board notes the Applicant's assertion that the subject property is permitted to have six sleeping rooms as a matter of right since the subject property contributes to a historic district. However, the maximum number of sleeping rooms permitted as a matter of right in a home occupation bed and breakfast is two. 11 DCMR § 203.8(c). A dwelling owner may be permitted to increase the number of sleeping rooms to four with Board approval as a special exception pursuant to 11 DCMR § 203.10(b). *See* 11 DCMR § 203.8(c)(1). In the case of "a dwelling that is an historic landmark, or that is located in a historic district and certified by the State Historic Preservation Officer as contributing to the character of that historic district," the dwelling owner may be permitted to increase the number of sleeping rooms to six with Board approval as a special exception pursuant to § 203.10(b). *Id.* Thus, a home occupation bed and breakfast operated on the subject property is permitted two sleeping rooms as a matter of right, and up to six sleeping rooms if approved by the Board as a special exception pursuant to 11 DCMR §§ 203.10.(b) and 3104.

The Applicant requested zoning relief from two requirements – pertaining to the number of guest rooms and to the number of non-resident employees – but later noted a need for relief with respect to the number of guests on the premises as well.[2] A home occupation that does not satisfy all requirements of § 203 may be permitted by special exception, provided that the requested zoning relief can be granted without modification of more than two of the applicable requirements consistent with the general purposes and intent of the home occupation provisions. A request to modify more than two of the requirements is deemed a request for a variance. 11 DCMR § 203.10. The Board concludes that variance relief pursuant to 11 DCMR § 203.10(d) is necessary because the Applicant's proposed use would require modification of more than two of the requirements found in §§ 203.4 through 203.8.

The Board is authorized to grant a variance from the strict application of the zoning regulations where, by reason of exceptional narrowness, shallowness, or shape of a specific piece of property or by reason of exceptional topographical conditions or other extraordinary or exceptional situation or condition of the property, the strict application of any zoning regulation would result in peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties to or exceptional and undue hardship upon the owner of the property, provided that 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. D.C. Official Code § 6-641.07(g)(3) (2001); 11 DCMR § 3103.2.

The Zoning Regulations do not specify whether a variance from the provisions of § 203 should be considered an area variance or a use variance. The Board concurs with the Applicant that the difference between a use variance and an area variance may be "one of degree." *See Wolf v. D.C. Board of Zoning Adjustment*, 397 A.2d 936, 941 (D.C. 1979). Unlike the Applicant, however, the Board concludes that the variance sought by the Application is properly considered in the nature of a use variance, because approval of the zoning relief requested by the Applicant would introduce a use into the zone district under conditions other than those allowed as a matter of right or required for special exception approval, and the proposed use of the subject property could potentially alter the character of the zone district. The Application seeks approval for a home occupation bed and breakfast facility that would be larger in terms of number of guest rooms, employees, and customers than is permitted as a matter of right or by special exception;

---

[2] The Applicant's submission of proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law states that variance relief is needed with respect to the number of guest rooms, the number of employees, and the number of clients or customers on the premises in any one-hour period. The submission asserts, without elaboration, that "[n]o more than two vehicles will be used in the home occupation and vehicular trips to the premises by visitors, customers and delivery persons will not exceed 8 trips daily on a regular and continuing basis." (*See* Exhibit No. 107). The Office of Planning had earlier concluded that the Application should be considered a request for a use variance from 11 DCMR § 350.4, concerning uses permitted as a matter of right in the R-5 zone, rather than a variance from § 203, because § 203 imposes "many restrictions" on home occupations, and several of the § 203 provisions "are problematic" for the Applicant's proposed use. The "problematic" provisions identified by OP were § 203.4(a), (d), (g), (l), and (m). *See* OP Report (May 21, 2002).

the more intensive use of the subject property, even for the same type of use that is permitted as a matter of right on a smaller scale, could potentially have adverse effects incompatible with the residential neighborhood in which it would be located.[3]

The purpose of the home occupation provisions – to protect residential areas from adverse effects of activities associated with home occupations – also suggests that the relief sought by the Applicant should be deemed a use variance, with the Board's inquiry focused on the proposed use of the subject property relative to a smaller home occupation bed and breakfast permitted as a matter of right or by special exception in the Residence zone district. ANC 2B raised concerns about potential adverse effects of the Applicant's proposed bed and breakfast operation on the surrounding residential neighborhood, and the parties in opposition argued that the Applicant's proposal would alter the residential character surrounding the subject property through the introduction of a large bed and breakfast business on the site, causing noise and other negative impacts on the quality of life in the neighborhood. These contentions suggest that the Applicant's proposed use could potentially alter the character of the zone district, and therefore that the requested zoning relief should be deemed a use variance. *See, e.g.*, 1 E. Ziegler, Rathkopf's The Law of Zoning and Planning § 58:4, p. 58-17 (4th ed. 2001) ("If the variance will permit a use of the land that changes the character of the neighborhood, then it is more likely that the variance will be held to be a use variance").

The Board notes that both the Applicant and the parties in opposition made arguments regarding undue hardship, the standard applicable to a request for a use variance. *Palmer*, 287 A.2d at 541.

In deciding to apply the more stringent "undue hardship" standard applicable to a use variance, the Board notes that the requested zoning relief is not in the nature of an area variance, because the Applicant's proposed use does not entail any addition to or modification of the subject property that would require relief from applicable area requirements. *See Palmer v. D.C. Board of Zoning Adjustment*, 287 A.2d 535, 541 (D.C. 1972) (an area variance, relating to restrictions such as side yard, rear yard, frontage, setback or minimum lot requirements, does not alter the character of the zoned district, whereas a use variance seeks a use ordinarily prohibited in the particular district). The Applicant's proposal to operate a 10-room bed and breakfast, where two guest rooms are permitted as a matter of right, is one factor that distinguishes the Application from the regulation at issue in *Monaco v. D.C. Board of Zoning Adjustment*, 461 A.2d 1049 (D.C. 1983), cited by the Applicant. That case concerned a request for a deviation from a minimum area requirement under a regulation that authorized office use by special

---

[3] The Board notes that the Zoning Regulations specify a *use* variance under analogous circumstances pertaining to the addition of an accessory apartment to a single-family detached dwelling, 11 DCMR § 202. The Board may modify or waive not more than two of the applicable requirements, which concern generally the minimum lot area, gross floor area of the dwelling and the accessory apartment, configuration of the accessory apartment, owner occupancy, and aggregate number of persons living on the premises. *See* 11 DCMR § 202.10. A request to modify or waive more than two requirements is "deemed a request for a use variance." 11 DCMR § 202.10(i)(3).

exception in certain circumstances; by contrast, the Applicant's proposed bed and breakfast operation seeks to use the subject property, without deviation from any applicable area requirement, in a manner that would be significantly more intensive than permitted as a matter of right or by special exception[4].

The Board's initial inquiry in a request for a variance considers whether the subject property exhibits exceptional narrowness, shallowness, or shape, or exceptional topographical conditions or other extraordinary or exceptional situation or condition of the property. The District of Columbia Court of Appeals has held that "existing structures on the land are part of the 'property' and may be 'exceptional conditions' for variance purposes." *Draude v. D.C. Board of Zoning Adjustment*, 527 A.2d 1242, 1255 (D.C. 1987), *citing Clerics of Saint Viator, Inc. v. D.C. Board of Zoning Adjustment*, 320 A.2d 291, 293-294 (D.C. 1974).

Based on the testimony and evidence in the record and the Findings of Fact, the Board concludes that the subject property exhibits an "extraordinary or exceptional situation or condition." The existing building on the subject property was constructed and initially used as a single-family dwelling, but has not been used solely as a single-family residence since 1923 and is not likely to be used again as a single-family dwelling due to its large size. The former mansion is architecturally and historically significant, and has been designated a contributing building to the 16th Street historic district, which restricts the owner's ability to demolish the building and redevelop the subject property.

A use variance cannot be granted absent a showing that the strict application of the Zoning Regulations would result in "exceptional and undue hardship upon the owner of the property," because a use variance "seeks a use ordinarily prohibited in the particular district" and thus would "alter the character" of that zone district. *Palmer*, 287 A.2d at 541. "The Board generally cannot grant a variance just because the property makes it difficult for the owner to construct a particular building or to pursue a particular use without a variance if the owner could use or improve the land in other ways compatible with zoning restrictions." *Draude*, 527 A.2d at 1255, *citing Palmer*, 287 A.2d at 540 (use variance cannot be granted unless reasonable use cannot be made of the property in manner consistent with the Zoning Regulations; an inability to put property to more profitable use or loss of economic advantage is not sufficient to constitute hardship). To be granted a variance, the Applicant must show that strict application of the Zoning Regulations would preclude the use of the property for any purpose to which it may reasonably be adapted. *Bernstein v. D.C. Board of Zoning Adjustment*, 376 A.2d 816, 819 (D.C. 1979). A mere desire to use property in a given manner, or in a manner designed to return a greater profit, does not constitute a showing of an undue hardship that will support the granting of a use variance. *Bernstein*, 376 A.2d 816, 820. *See also Taylor v. D.C. Board of Zoning Adjustment*, 308 A.2d 230, 236; *Silverstone v. D.C. Board of Zoning Adjustment*, 396 A.2d 992 (D.C. 1979); and *Capitol Hill Restoration Society, Inc.*

*v. D.C. Board of Zoning Adjustment*, 398 A.2d 13 (D.C. 1979) (unique circumstances of property, not owner's personal circumstances, provide basis for granting variance).

The Applicant claims that undue hardship will result from the strict application of the Zoning Regulations to the subject property because the existing building is too large and costly to serve as a single-family residence, because maintenance of the subject property without the requested variance would be economically infeasible, and because the historic integrity of the mansion, including its ornate interior, would be destroyed if the building is not used as a bed and breakfast facility but is converted to another potential use such as condominiums. The Office of Planning testified that hardship arose from the significant financial burden associated with subject property if used as a single-family dwelling and from the fact that the interior of the building is worth preserving, but many uses permitted on the subject property as a matter of right would require extensive changes to the property whereas the proposed bed and breakfast is the best means to preserve the interior. However, the parties in opposition presented testimony that the Zoning Regulations permit several uses of the subject property besides a home occupation bed and breakfast, and contended that the interior of the building could be preserved through those other uses, as has been done in other large, historic mansions in the vicinity of the subject property.

The Board is not persuaded that the strict application of the Zoning Regulations will result in undue hardship upon the owner of the subject property. The Applicant has not demonstrated that the building could not be put to an alternative use permitted under the Zoning Regulations that would be economically feasible. The Zoning Regulations facilitate the adaptation of historic properties to new uses by offering certain relief from otherwise applicable requirements, such as a waiver of the parking requirement, and by permitting, as a special exception, certain uses not otherwise allowed in a Residence zone, such as the use of residential buildings by nonprofit organizations, 11 DCMR § 217, and a greater number of guest rooms in a home occupation bed and breakfast, 11 DCMR § 203.8(c)(1). This flexibility recognizes constraints potentially associated with the use of historic properties and enlarges the scope of their potential uses consistent with the Zoning Regulations.

The Board credits the testimony of OP that the ornate interior of the subject property is significant and worthy of preservation. However, the Applicant has not adequately demonstrated that the proposed bed and breakfast use is the sole means to preserve the building's interior, or that an alternative use of the subject property consistent with the Zoning Regulations would require its destruction. Nor would a grant of the requested variance ensure the preservation of the building's interior in the future. The Applicant has indicated an intent to seek federal historic preservation tax incentives for the certified rehabilitation of the subject property, which would require preservation of the interior for five years after completing the rehabilitation; however, the Applicant has not sought designation of the interior by the Historic Preservation Review Board or undertaken other

possible means of ensuring the long-term preservation of the historic interior of the building.

The Board further concludes that any hardship on the Applicant does not arise from the strict application of the Zoning Regulations to the subject property but is self-created. The Applicant failed to demonstrate that no reasonable use could be made of the property in a manner consistent with the Zoning Regulations, or that preservation of the building's interior required or warranted the grant of the requested variance. Rather, the Applicant claims undue hardship arising from a desire to use the property in a manner inconsistent in several respects with a home occupation bed and breakfast permitted as a matter of right or by special exception.

The "self-created hardship" rule precludes the grant of a use variance when "the peculiar circumstances which render the property incapable of being used in accordance with the restrictions contained in the [zoning regulations] have themselves been caused or created by the property owner, [because] the essential basis of a variance – that is, that the hardship be caused solely through the manner of operation of the [zoning regulations] upon the particular property – is lacking." *Foxhall Community Citizens Ass'n v. D.C. Board of Zoning Adjustment*, 524 A.2d 759, 761, citing 3 A. Rathkopf and D. Rathkopf, THE LAW OF ZONING AND PLANNING, § 39-01 (4th ed. 1986); (citations in accord omitted). The self-created hardship rules applies to owners who purchase property with actual or constructive knowledge of zoning restrictions from which they intend to seek administrative relief. *Foxhall*, 524 A.2d at 761, citing 3 R. Anderson, AMERICAN LAW OF ZONING § 20.44, -45. See also *Dwyer v. D.C. Board of Zoning Adjustment*, 320 A.2d 306 (D.C. 1974), citing *Clouser v. David*, 114 U.S.App.D.C. 12, 13, 309 F.2d 233, 234 (1962) (hardship must result from location, situation, or condition of property, and not solely from owner's appropriation of it for commercial purposes without first having obtained necessary change in zoning).

With respect to the need to afford great weight to the issues and concerns raised by the affected ANC, the Board notes that ANC 2B's opposition to the application stemmed from concerns about potential adverse effects of the home occupation bed and breakfast on the surrounding residential neighborhood. Since, the Board's denial of this application results from the applicant's failure to demonstrate undue hardship, the Board does not reach the issue of whether the application can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and without substantially impairing the intent, purpose, and integrity of the zone plan. Therefore, the BZA need not address the specific issues and concerns raised by the affected ANC, which pertain exclusively to that portion of the variance inquiry.

Based on the findings of fact, and having given great weight to the recommendations of the Office of Planning and to the issues and concerns of ANC 2B, the Board concludes that the Applicant has not satisfied the burden of proof for a variance from the provisions of § 203 to allow a home occupation bed and breakfast with 10 sleeping rooms and more

than one non-resident employee in the DCOD/R-5-D District at premises 1720 16th Street, N.W. (Square 178, Lot 800).[5] For the reasons stated above, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the application be **DENIED**.

**VOTE** (January 7, 2003): **3-2-0** (Anne M. Renshaw, Carol J. Mitten, and David A. Zaidain to deny the application; Geoffrey H. Griffis and Curtis L. Etherly, Jr., opposed)

Because the term of Board member Anne M. Renshaw expired before issuance of this Order, the Board conducted a second decision meeting on February 3, 2004 and voted to **ADOPT** this **ORDER** as the decision of the Board as follows:

**VOTE** (February 3, 2003): **4-0-1** (Curtis L. Etherly, Jr., David A. Zaidain and Geoffrey H. Griffis to adopt the order; Carol J. Mitten to adopt the order by proxy: Ruthanne G. Miller not voting, not having participated in the case).

**BY ORDER OF THE D.C. BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT**
Each concurring Board member has approved the issuance of this Order.

**ATTESTED BY:** _____
**JERRILY R. KRESS, FAIA**
**Director, Office of Zoning**

**FINAL DATE OF ORDER:** FEB - 9 2004

PURSUANT TO 11 DCMR § 3125.6, THIS ORDER WILL BECOME FINAL UPON ITS FILING IN THE RECORD AND SERVICE UPON THE PARTIES. UNDER 11 DCMR § 3125.9, THIS ORDER WILL BECOME EFFECTIVE TEN DAYS AFTER IT BECOMES FINAL. MN/rsn

[5] Based on the testimony and evidence in the record, the Board is unable to determine whether the Applicant's proposed use of the subject property would comply with applicable home-occupation limits on the number of vehicular trips to the premises by visitors, customers, and delivery persons, 11 DCMR § 203.4(l), and on the number of clients or customers on the premises, 11 DCMR § 203.4(m). Nor has the Applicant justified the grant of a variance from those requirements. The Board concludes that the Applicant has not met the burden of proof with respect to either compliance with or variance relief from zoning requirements pertaining to the number of daily vehicular trips to the premises by visitors, customers, and delivery persons or to the number of eight clients or customers on the premises in any one-hour period.