GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA **Board of Zoning Adjustment**



Application No. 17600-A of Dakota Square LLC, pursuant to 11 DCMR §3103.2, for a variance from the loading berth requirements under subsection 2201.1, to allow the construction of a mix-use (commercial/residential) building in the C-2-A District at premises 300-320 Riggs Road, N.E. (Square 3748, Lot 52).

Hearing Date: March 20, 2007 **Decision Date:** March 20, 2007 Final Date of Order: March 21, 2007 **Decision on Motion to Extend Order:** March 24, 2009

ORDER ON MOTION TO EXTEND THE VALIDITY OF BZA ORDER 17600

The Underlying BZA Order

On March 20, 2007, the Board approved the Applicant's request for a variance from the loading berth requirements under subsection 2201.1 of the Zoning Regulations. Given that there were no opposing parties, the Board authorized a bench decision and summary order, which was issued on March 21, 2007 (BZA Order 17600).

Under the Summary Order, and pursuant to § 3130.1 of the Zoning Regulations, the Order was valid for two years from the time it was issued – until March 21, 2009.

Section 3130.1 states:

No order [of the Board] authorizing the erection or alteration of a structure shall be valid for a period longer than two (2) years, or one (1) year for an Electronic Equipment Facility(EEF), unless within such period, the plans for the erection or alteration are filed for the purposes of securing a building permit.

(11 DCMR § 3130.1)

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT District of Columbia

CASE NO. 17600 - A
EXHIBIT NO. 31

EXHIBIT NO.37

BZA APPLICATION NO. 17600-A PAGE NO. 2

Motion to Extend

On March 6, 2009, the Board received a letter from the Applicant indicating that it had not yet applied for a building permit, and that it would not be able to do so prior to March 21, 2009 when the Order was set to expire. According to the Applicant, despite strong efforts, "the Property Owners ha[d] not been able to a[cquire] financing which would allow the preparation of construction plans and the filing of their building permit applications." The Applicant asserted that this was due to the unprecedented negative economic circumstances impacting development in the District of Columbia in general.

Accordingly, the Applicant requested that:

- A. Pursuant to § 3100.5 of the Regulations, the Board waive the provisions of § 3130.1, which limits the validity of the underlying Order to two years from the date of its issuance, thereby allowing the Applicant additional time to apply for a building permit; or,
- B. The Board extend the underlying Order for a period of two years from March 21, 2009.
- C. The Board toll the expiration date for the underlying Order from the date the motion to extend was filed.

Criteria for Evaluating Motion to Extend

Section 3100.5 of the Regulations states in full:

Except for §§ 3100 through 3105, 3121.5 and 3125.4, the Board may, for good cause shown, waive any of the provisions of this chapter if, in the judgment of the Board, the waiver will not prejudice the rights of any party and is not otherwise prohibited by law.

(11 DCMR § 3100.5)

The Board finds that the Applicant has met the criteria set forth in this provision. The Applicant's inability to secure financing and the poor economic conditions in the District constitutes the "good cause" required under § 3100.5 The Board also finds that a waiver in this case would not prejudice the rights of any party and is not otherwise prohibited by law. Neither the ANC nor any nearby property owners objected to an extension of the Order; and as noted above, there were no opposing parties at the time the underlying Order was decided. Since granting the initial request for relief did not prejudice the rights of any party, the Board concludes that the extension of that relief, likewise, will not be prejudicial.

Regarding the Applicant's request to toll the expiration of the underlying Order, the Board finds that the expiration was tolled at the time the Applicant's motion was filed.

BZA APPLICATION NO. 17600-A PAGE NO. 3

Accordingly, the Board hereby waives the limitation in § 3130.1 of the Regulations and extends the validity of the underlying Order for a period not to exceed two years from the current expiration date, thereby establishing a new expiration date of March 21, 2011.

Pursuant to 11 DCMR § 3101.6, the Board has determined to waive the requirement of 11 DCMR § 3125.3, that the order of the Board be accompanied by findings of fact and conclusions of law. It is therefore **ORDERED** that this request for extension of time be **GRANTED** until March 21, 2011.

VOTE:

4-0-1 (Ruthanne G. Miller, Marc D. Loud, and Shane L. Dettman to approve; Michael G. Turnbull to approve by absentee ballot; Mary Oates Walker not participating, not voting)

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

Each concurring member approved the issuance of this order.

ATTESTED BY:

RICHARD S. NERO, JR.
Acting Director, Office of Zoning

Acting Director, Office of Zoning

APR 07 2009

FINAL DATE OF ORDER:

PURSUANT TO 11 DCMR § 3125.9, NO ORDER OF THE BOARD SHALL TAKE EFFECT UNTIL TEN (10) DAYS AFTER IT BECOMES FINAL PURSUANT TO § 3125.6.

PURSUANT TO 11 DCMR § 3125 APPROVAL OF AN APPLICATION SHALL INCLUDE APPROVAL OF THE PLANS SUBMITTED WITH THE APPLICATION FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A BUILDING OR STRUCTURE (OR ADDITION THERETO) OR THE RENOVATION OR ALTERATION OF AN EXISTING BUILDING OR STRUCTURE, UNLESS THE BOARD ORDERS OTHERWISE. AN APPLICANT SHALL CARRY OUT THE CONSTRUCTION, RENOVATION, OR ALTERATION ONLY IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PLANS APPROVED BY THE BOARD.

IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE D.C. HUMAN RIGHTS ACT OF 1977, AS AMENDED, D.C. OFFICIAL CODE §§ 2-1401.01 <u>ET SEQ.</u> (ACT), THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DOES NOT DISCRIMINATE ON THE BASIS OF ACTUAL OR PERCEIVED: RACE, COLOR, RELIGION, NATIONAL ORIGIN, SEX, AGE, MARITAL STATUS, PERSONAL APPEARANCE, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, GENDER IDENTITY OR EXPRESSION,

BZA APPLICATION NO. 17600-A PAGE NO. 4

FAMILIAL STATUS, FAMILY RESPONSIBILITIES, MATRICULATION, POLITICAL AFFILIATION, GENETIC INFORMATION, DISABILITY, SOURCE OF INCOME, OR PLACE OF RESIDENCE OR BUSINESS. SEXUAL HARASSMENT IS A FORM OF SEX DISCRIMINATION WHICH IS PROHIBITED BY THE ACT. IN ADDITION, HARASSMENT BASED ON ANY OF THE ABOVE PROTECTED CATEGORIES IS PROHIBITED BY THE ACT. DISCRIMINATION IN VIOLATION OF THE ACT WILL NOT BE TOLERATED. VIOLATORS WILL BE SUBJECT TO DISCIPLINARY ACTION.

SG/TWR