

MEMORANDUM

TO: District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment
FROM: Maxine Brown-Roberts, Project Manager
 Joel Lawson, Associate Director Development Review
DATE: February 2, 2016
SUBJECT: BZA Case 19216, 1375 Mt. Olivet Road, NE

I. OFFICE OF PLANNING RECOMMENDATION

The Office of Planning (OP) recommends approval of the requested special exception pursuant to § 411.11:

- § 411.3, Roof Structures (mechanical equipment shall be placed in one (1) enclosure; not provided)

II. LOCATION AND SITE DESCRIPTION

Address	1375 Mt. Olivet Road, NE
Legal Description	Square 69, Lot 800
Ward/ANC	5, 5D
Lot Characteristics	The nearly square lot is located at the intersection of Mt. Olivet Road and Holbrook Street, NE. The lot is 222,979 square feet (5.11 acres) in area.
Zoning	R-4 –areas developed primarily with row dwellings and flats. Schools are permitted as a matter-of-right in this zone.
Existing Development	The lot is currently developed with the Kipp Webb Public Charter School.
Adjacent Properties	To the east and west are row dwellings; to the north is the Mt. Olivet Cemetery, and to the south is the Trinidad Recreation Center all in the R-4 zone.
Surrounding Neighborhood Character	The surrounding neighborhood character is predominantly row dwellings.

III. APPLICATION IN BRIEF

The District of Columbia, Applicant, has modernized the existing building and has added a two story portion to accommodate an auditorium, cafeteria and warming kitchen. Mechanical equipment to serve the building is located on the roof. However, the screen wall does not enclose the entirety of the mechanical equipment. The Applicant has requested relief from the requirement that mechanical equipment shall be placed in one enclosure.



Site Location



Roof Structure

IV. OFFICE OF PLANNING ANALYSIS

Special Exception review pursuant to § 411, Roof Structures.

Where impracticable because of operating difficulties, size of building lot, or other conditions relating to the building or surrounding area that would tend to make full compliance unduly restrictive, prohibitively costly, or unreasonable, the Board of Zoning Adjustment shall be empowered to approve, as a special exception under § 3104, the location, design, number, and all other aspects of such structure regulated under §§ 411.3 through 411.6, even if such structures do not meet the normal setback requirements of §§ 400.7, 530.4, 630.4, 770.6, 840.3, or 930.3, when applicable, and to approve the material of enclosing construction used if not in accordance with §§

411.3 and 411.5; provided, that the intent and purpose of this chapter and this title shall not be materially impaired by the structure, and the light and air of adjacent buildings shall not be affected adversely.

The enclosure is greater than eight feet high and has a greater setback from the roof's edge. The vents which were not within the enclosure have a height of seven feet. No screen wall is proposed around the vents. The Applicant states that extending the enclosure around the vents would be prohibitively expensive for the project.

The Applicant has provided drawings and photographs showing that the enclosure meets the setback requirements and would be visible from only limited locations. However, the vents which are not within the enclosure, the subject of the special exception, would not be visible from the adjacent streets or from the ground on any of the adjacent properties.

i. Is the proposal in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Zoning Regulations and Zoning Maps?

The public school building and its new addition is permitted as a matter-of-right within the R-4 zone. Not including the vents in the enclosure would not affect the intent of the Zoning Regulations and Map and the school would continue to operate as required.

ii. Would the proposal appear to tend to affect adversely, the use of neighboring property?

The proposal would not adversely affect the surrounding neighborhood as the vents are not visible from the surrounding area.

IV. COMMENTS OF OTHER DISTRICT AGENCIES

As of the date of this writing, comments from other District agencies have not been received.

V. COMMUNITY COMMENTS

The property is within ANC-5D. The Applicant presented the proposal to the ANC on January 12, 2016 at which time the ANC voted to recommend approval of proposal.