Exhibit A
-epartment of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs
Permit Operations Division
1100 4th Street SW
Washington DC 20024
Tel. (202) 442-4589 Fax (202) 442-4862

## BUILDING PERMIT

THIS PERMIT MUST ALWAYS BE CONSPICUOUSLY DISPLAYED AT THE ADDRESS OF WORK UNTIL WORK IS COMPLETED AND APPROVED

## PERMIT NO. B1504361

Expiration Date: 02/12/2016

| Address of Project: | Zone: | Ward: | Square: | Suffix: | Lot: |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 452 NEWTON PL NW | R-4 | 1 | 3036 |  | $\mathbf{0 0 8 9}$ |

## Description Of Work:

Interior Renovation of existing structure. Including electrical, mechanical, plumbing, fixtures, finishes, and fittings.


All construction done according to the current building codes and zoning regulations. Approved as per plans. Interior Work Only - Non Structural Demo Only. Separate electric, plumbing \& mechanical installation permits are required. Demo or repair of roof, floor joists, inside steps and any other load bearing structural is not permitted under this permit. This permit allows for renovation of basement / cellar to be used as recreation room, study or storage. No kitchen allowed (stove) in the basement/ cellar. Use of land / house to remain as a single family dwelling, two units nor requested or approved on alteration permit. Kitchen \& Bathroom to have GFIC at every 2 feet. All receptacles shall be AFCI type per NEC.

This Permit Expires if no Construction is Started Within 1 Year or if the Inspection is Over 1 Year.
All Construction Done According To The Current Building Codes And Zoning Regulations;
As a condition precedent to the issuance of this permit, the owner agrees to conform with all conditions set forth herein, and to perform the work authorized hereby in accordance with the approved application and plans on file with the District Government and in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations of the District of Columbia. The District of Columbia has the right to enter upon the property and to inspect all work authorized by this permit and to require any change in construction which may be necessary to ensure compliance with the permit and with all the applicable regulations of the District of Columbia. Work authorized under this Permit must start within one(1) year of the date appearing on this permit or the permit is automatically void. If work is started, any application for partial refund must be made within six months of the date appearing on this permit.
Lead Paint Abatement
Whenever any such work related to this Permit could result in the disturbance of lead based paint,the permit holder shall abide by all applicable paint activities provisions of the 'Lead Hazard Prevention and Elimination Act of 2008' and the EPA 'Lead Renovation, Repair and Painting rule' regarding lead-based include adherence to lead-safe work practices. For more information, go to http:I/ddoe.dc.gov, Lead and Healthy Housing
Interim Director:
Melinda Bolling

TO REPORT WASTE, FRAUD OR ABUSE BY ANY DC GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL, CALL THE DC INSPECTOR GENERAL AT 1-800-521-1639
FOR CONSTRUCTION INSPECTION INQUIRIES CALL (202) 442-9557
TO SCHEDULE INSPECTIONS PLEASE CALL (202) 442-9557.

## Exhibit B

## AFFIDAVIT OF SERHAT AKIN

I, Serhat Akin, am of sound mind and over the age of 18 years.

1. I am authorized by the Applicant to provide the statements in this Affidavit on its behalf.
2. 425 Newton Place, NW (the "Subject Property") was purchased on July 31, 2014 with the intent to convert it to at least three (3) residential units.
3. The original building permit, B1504361, misstates that the approved plans were for renovations to an existing single-family dwelling.
4. The building was already configured as a flat when it was purchased in 2014 and was never used as a single-family dwelling.
5. The plans submitted to obtain B1504361 were plans for a three-unit building.
6. The three-unit plans submitted to obtain the second building permit, B1500315, were the same plans associated with the original building permit.
7. The Applicant obtained minor flexibility approval from the Zoning Administrator and a building permit from DCRA in order to do the proposed 3-unit conversion (the "Project"). DCRA later determined that it had an issued the permit in error and moved to revoke the permit via a Stop Work Order in December 2015.
8. At the time the Stop Work Order was issued, the Project was $99 \%$ complete.
9. The lower two units were combined into one large unit. That unit was put on the market two separate times between February 2016 and September 2016 but never received an offer.

## AFFIANT:

By:


Name: Serhat Akin


Title:

## DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA )

Serhat Akin personally appeared/or is personally known to me, subscribed an /d swat testimony in this Affidavit to me on September I, 2018.


My Commission expires: Notary Registration No. BRYANLEE MANNING NOTARY PUUBUC STATE OF MAFMLND My Commision Eupires Hacth 31, 2021

## AFFIDAVIT OF BRYAN MANNING

I, Bryan Manning, am of sound mind and over the age of 18 years.
1 I am authorized by the Applicant to provide the statements in this Affidavit on its behalf.
2425 Newton Place, NW (the "Subject Property") was purchased on July 31, 2014 with the intent to convert it to at least three (3) residential units.
3 The original building permit, B1504361, misstates that the approved plans were for renovations to an existing single-family dwelling.
4 The building was already configured as a flat when it was purchased in 2014 and was never used as a single-family dwelling.
5 The plans submitted to obtain B1504361 were plans for a three-unit building.
6 The three-unit plans submitted to obtain the second building permit, B1500315, were the same plans associated with the original building permit.
7 The Applicant obtained minor flexibility approval from the Zoning Administrator and a building permit from DCRA in order to do the proposed 3-unit conversion (the "Project"). DCRA later determined that it had an issued the permit in error and moved to revoke the permit via a Stop Work Order in December 2015.
8 At the time the Stop Work Order was issued, the Project was $99 \%$ complete.
9 The lower two units were combined into one large unit. That unit was put on the market two separate times between February 2016 and September 2016 but never received an offer.


SERHAT AKIN:
Notary Public
Howard County, Maryland:-


## DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA )

Bryan Manning personally appeared/or is personally known to me, subscribed and swore out the testimony in this Affidavit to me on September 17, 2018.


Notary Public
(SEAL)

My Commission expires: $\qquad$ Notary Registration No. $\qquad$

SERHAT AKIN
c

1. land
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## 452 Newton Place, NW

LeGrant, Matt (DCRA) [matthew.legrant@dc.gov](mailto:matthew.legrant@dc.gov)
To: KC Price [kc@kcdcstudios.com](mailto:kc@kcdcstudios.com)
Mon, Apr 6, 2015 at 5:32 PM

## KC Price-

After reviewing your email and attachments asking for minor flexibility under 11 DCMR 407.1 for a lot that is $2,660 \mathrm{SqFt}$ which is 40 SqFt less than the normal standard of $2,700 \mathrm{SqFt}$ necessary for a three unit apartment building, based on the 900 square feet per dwelling unit standard, I will grant the request as this would constitute a $1.5 \%$ deviation of the lot size requirement, which is within the flexibility that can be granted. Based on the information you provided I agree that this is unlikely to adversely affect adjacent properties, and all other zoning requirements will be met by the proposed plans.

## Please let me know if you have any further questions.

Best Regards,

## Matthew Le Grant

Zoning Administrator
Dept of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs
Government of the District of Columbia
1100 4th St SW - Room 3100
Washington, DC 20024
Phone: 202 442-4652
Email: matt.legrant@dc.gov
Web: http://dcra.dc.gov/service/zoning-dcra

DCRAIOFFICE OF THE ZONING ADMINISTRATOR/COMPLIES WITH THE REQUIREMPLIES DC ZONING REGULATIONS (11 DCMR)


## Exhibit D

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




#### Abstract

Appeal No. 18991 of John Stokes, pursuant to 11 DCMR §§ 3100 and 3101, from a decision of the Zoning Administrator ("ZA"), Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs ("DCRA"), made December 31, 2014, to issue Building Permit B1503050 ("the permit"), allowing an addition to a one-family dwelling located at 1521 Varnum Street, N.W., and the conversion of the dwelling to a seven-unit apartment building in the R-4 District (Square 2698, Lot 817).


## HEARING DATES: May 5, 2015, June 30, 2015, and September 15, 2015

DECISION DATE: September 29,2015

## ORDER DENYING APPEAL

This appeal was submitted to the Board of Zoning Adjustment ("Board") by John Stokes. Mr. Stokes (the "Appellant") challenged the decision of the ZA to approve an addition to an existing one-family dwelling in the R-4 zone, thereby allowing the conversion of the dwelling to a sevenunit apartment house. The Appellant claims that the permit was unlawful for several reasons, the primary one being that the ZA erred in his determination to allow a minor deviation from the lot area requirements under § 407.1 of the Zoning Regulations. Following a public hearing during which the Board considered all of the grounds alleged by the Appellant, the Board voted to deny the appeal.

## PRELIMINARY MATTERS

## Notice of Public Hearing

The Office of Zoning scheduled a hearing on May 5, 2015. In accordance with 11 DCMR §§ 3112.13 and 3112.14 , the Office of Zoning mailed notice of the hearing to the Appellant, to Advisory Neighborhood Commission ("ANC") 4C, to DCRA, and to the owner of the subject property, Varnum Holdings LLC (the "Owner").

## Parties

Appellant
The Appellant in this case is John Stokes. Mr. Stokes resides at 1519 Varnum Street, N.W., adjacent to the subject property.
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## DCRA

The Appellee, DCRA, is the agency of the government of the District of Columbia that is authorized, among other things, to issue building permits. DCRA was represented by its Office of the General Counsel, Maximilian Tondro, Esq. The Zoning Division of DCRA is headed by the Zoning Administrator ("ZA"), Matthew LeGrant, and is charged with administering the Zoning Regulations. Mr. LeGrant testified at the public hearing on behalf of DCRA.

## Property Owner

As the owner of the subject property, Varnum Holdings LLC is automatically a party under 11 DCMR § 3199.1, and will hereafter be referred to as the Owner. The Owner was represented by Sullivan \& Barros, LLP, Martin B. Sullivan, Esq.

## The Affected ANC

ANC 4C, as the affected ANC, was automatically a party to the appeal by virtue of 11 DCMR § 3199.1(a).

## ANC Report

The ANC submitted two reports in this matter. In a resolution dated March 11, 2015, issued after a regularly scheduled monthly meeting with a quorum present, the ANC voted to support the appeal. (Exhibit 18.) In a separate motion, the ANC authorized Mr. John Stokes to present the ANC report before the Board, and to have Mr. Stokes represent the ANC before the Board. (Exhibit 18.) In its initial report, the ANC alleged that the permit unlawfully allowed violations of the Zoning Regulations regarding height and density, rear and side yard requirements, overcrowding, parking lot requirements, and roof structure requirements. (Exhibit 18.) In a later submission, dated August 12, 2015, after a regularly scheduled monthly meeting with a quorum present, the ANC voted to submit a "Letter of Support" further detailing its support of the appeal (Exhibits 71 and 72.) Among other things, the ANC stated in its report that the ZA erred in approving the permit because: (1) The proposal was not a "conversion" of one building, but a proposal to construct two separate buildings; and, (2) When exercising its discretion to allow a minor deviation of the lot area requirements, the ZA failed to take into account the preamble language pertaining to the R-4 Regulations, such as the fact that "apartment houses are specifically discouraged" in the R-4 District. Ms. Elisa Irwin, the Commissioner for Single Member District ANC 4C03, testified on behalf of the ANC at the public hearing on the appeal.

## Requests to Participate as a Party

Several neighbors filed Requests for Party Status and/or Requests to Intervene in support of the Appeal. (See Exhibits 55, 56, 58, 66, 67, and 73, filed during the period of time between August 30 and September 1, 2015.) The Board treated these requests as requests to participate as a party under § 3106.2. Subsection 3106.2 requires that such requests be filed not less than 14 days prior
to the date set for the hearing. Because the hearing was initially set for May 5, 2015, all of the requests to participate as a party were untimely, and were therefore denied. However, the Board afforded the neighbors an opportunity to testify in support of the appeal.

## Persons in Support of the Appeal

The Board also received written submissions from neighboring property owners in support of the appeal. (See, for example, Exhibits 19, 27, and 34-39.)

## Motions and Continuances

The May 5, 2015 hearing date. As stated, the public hearing was first scheduled for May 5, 2015, and the Board heard testimony from the Appellant and Henrik Weng (a neighbor in support of the appeal) on that date. However, the Board also noted the lack of specificity in the Appellant's pleading (the Statement on Appeal), and in Appellant's testimony. Following extended colloquy between the Board and the Appellant, the Appellant requested a continuance. The Board continued the hearing to June 30, 2015 to allow Appellant to file a revised appeal that contained more particularized claims. The Board also allowed responses to Appellant's filing from DCRA and the Owner, and a reply by the Appellant to said responses. The Board set a timetable for all filings.

The June 30, 2015 hearing date. The Appellant filed a revised Statement of Appeal (Exhibit 42) in accordance with the Board's directive. DCRA and the Owner filed late responses to the revised Statement, and requested that the Board accept the late responses, claiming there had been a good faith misunderstanding of the due date that was set by the Board on May 5. The Appellant requested a second continuance, partly so he could "reply" to the late responses from the Owner and DCRA, and partly so he could retain an architect to review plans and elevations that had been provided by DCRA. The Board granted the requests by DCRA and the Owner to accept their late filings. The Board also granted the Appellant's second request for a continuance, and scheduled a continued hearing for September 15, 2016.

The September 15, 2015 hearing date. Prior to the September 15 hearing date, the Board received a third request for a continuance from the Appellant (Exhibit 57), and responses in opposition to this request from DCRA and the Owner (Exhibits 62 and 64.) The Appellant withdrew the continuance request. As discussed previously, the Board also received and ruled on the Requests for Party Status from various neighbors. During the September 15 hearing, the Board focused on the merits of the appeal. The Board heard further testimony from the Appellant, and also heard testimony from DCRA, the Owner, a representative of ANC 4C, and four neighbors who testified in support of the appeal.

## Scope of the Hearing

The Board requested clarification from the Appellant regarding the alleged violations of the Zoning Regulations. Based upon the testimony of the Appellant and his revised Statement on
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Appeal, the Board clarified that this appeal was based upon alleged violations of the following Zoning Regulations:

- §2500 Impermissible second building,
- §407 ZA flexibility rule,
- §101 Purpose of the Zoning Regulations,
- §330 Purpose of the R-4 zone district,
- §199 Definitions of the terms "basement" and "cellar,"
- §403 Lot occupancy requirements,
- §402 FAR (floor area ratio) requirements,
- §404 Rear yard requirements,
- §405 Side yard requirements, and
- §411 Rooftop structure requirement.

The ANC representative testified that the ANC's claims of alleged violations were the same as those raised by the Appellant. (Hearing Transcript ("Tr."), September 15, 2015, p.149-152.)

## Closing of the Record

The Board closed the record at the end of the public hearing on September 15, 2015 and set the case for decision on September 29, 2015.

## FINDINGS OF FACT

## The Property

1. The subject property is located at 152 Varnum Street, N.W. (Square 2698, Lot 817) in the R-4 zone district.
2. The property is currently improved with a one-family dwelling that was constructed prior to May 12, 1958.
3. The property has a land area of 6,279 square feet.

## The Proposed Project

## Proposed Conversion to Apartment House

4. Prior to June 26, 2015, it was permissible to convert a pre-1958 structure into an apartment house, provided the lot occupancy requirements were met under § 403, and provided there
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was at least 900 square feet of land area for each apartment unit (11 DCMR § 330.5(e). $)^{1}$
5. The Owner proposed converting the structure to a seven unit apartment house, a proposal that required 6,300 square feet of land area under § 330.5(e).
6. The property was approximately 21 square feet short of the minimum required amount of land area, or $0.33 \%$ short of the minimum required amount.

## ZA Flexibility

7. Subsection 407.1 of the Zoning Regulations allows minor flexibility to the ZA to permit a deviation from the lot area requirements, subject to specified criteria, where the deviation does not exceed two percent of the minimum area requirements.
8. On August 11, 2014, the ZA issued a Determination Letter which granted minor flexibility pursuant to $\S 407.1$ for the lot area deviation to allow the proposal for a matter-of-right addition and conversion to a seven-unit apartment house. (Exhibit 24.)
9. The Determination Letter noted that the deviation from § 401.3 is the only deviation required, and that the requested deviation of $0.33 \%$ (a third of one-percent) satisfied the "quantitative" requirement of § 407.1(a).
10. The Determination Letter concluded that the deviation would also satisfy the "qualitative" requirements of $\S 407.1$ (b) because it would not "impair the purpose of the otherwise applicable regulations".
11. The Determination Letter noted that the degree of deviation requested is only one-third of one percent, which will have no apparent impact on adjacent properties. The Determination Letter noted the purpose of the R-4 District is to stabilize remaining onefamily dwellings, but also noted the uniquely large size of this property compared to surrounding properties and the fact the conversion to an apartment house was already permitted as a matter-of-right. The Determination Letter noted that granting the deviation would allow seven units at market size for an apartment house in the District, rather than six slightly larger units. Despite the additional unit, the ZA noted that the lot occupancy, height, density, and other aspects of the property would not be increased as a result of the requested deviation. (Exhibit 24.)

## Building Permit Application and Plans

12. On August 18, 2014, shortly after the Determination Letter was issued, the Owner

[^1]submitted proposed plans for the project, and applied for a building permit for the proposed conversion.
13. The application was for an addition to an existing building, where three of the four structural walls would be retained and an addition would be built to the rear of the existing building. (Exhibit 45.)
14. The approved plans depict one proposed building which shares the same stairwell, walls, and roof. (Exhibit 43A, at 10-13 (Sheets A202-205).)
15. The approved plans specify a total height of 39 feet and 11 inches, as measured from the existing grade at the midpoint of the main façade of the proposed building closest to the street line, up to the highest part of the roof. (Exhibit 22, Sheet A204, "Building Elevations", \#1 Front Elevation.)
16. The approved plans specify three stories and a cellar. The height of the cellar is three feet and seven inches above the adjacent finished grade. The adjacent finished grade was measured from the existing grade at the midpoint of the main façade of the building (Exhibit 22, Sheet A204, "Building Elevations", \#1 Front Elevations.)
17. The approved plans depict the proposed lot occupancy, including façade balconies, at $50 \%$. (Exhibit 22, Sheet A000, "Cover Sheet" and Sheet A001, "Existing and New Work Site Plans".)
18. The approved plans show one side yard of 16 feet.
19. The approved plans provide for a rear yard of approximately $211 / 2$ feet. (Exhibit 22, Sheet A001, "Existing and New Work Site Plans".)
20. The approved plans show that the proposed air conditioning units on the rooftop rise three feet above the rooftop deck. (Exhibit 43A, Sheet A205.) Other rooftop mechanical equipment - aside from the air conditioning units - is located inside of an enclosure.

## The Building Permit

21. On December 23, 2014, DCRA issued Building Permit No. B1411058 (Exhibit 81), which authorized the conversion of a one-family dwelling into two flats.
22. On December 31, 2014, DCRA issued a revised permit, Building Permit No. B1503050, which corrected the work description of the earlier permit to reflect the conversion of a one-family dwelling into a multi-family dwelling.
23. At the time of the public hearing, construction had not begun. However, DCRA had issued two stop work orders: one for a stairway penthouse setback deficiency, and the other for a failure to include all applicable plans with a neighbor notification form.
24. According to DCRA and the Owner, both of these deficiencies were corrected, and the stop work orders were lifted.
25. On June 25, 2015, DCRA issued Building Permit No. B1506170 to reflect these corrections.

## The Appeal

26. This appeal was filed on February 27, 2015.
27. One side of the building to be converted shares and will continue to share an existing party wall with Appellant's residence. (Exhibit 30, Written Testimony of Appellant.)

## CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Board is authorized by § 8 of the Zoning Act of 1938, D.C. Official Code § 6-641.07(g)(1) (2008 Repl.), to hear and decide appeals where it is alleged that there is error in any decision made by an administrative officer in the administration of the Zoning Regulations. The decision in this case is DCRA's issuance of the building permit. The alleged zoning errors were the ZA's determinations that: the proposal was for a conversion of one building and not the construction of two separate buildings; the height/story requirements were met; there was no violation of the FAR requirements; the minimum rear yard requirements were met; the side yard requirements were met; the rooftop structure requirements were met; and the requested minor deviation for lot area requirements could be granted. As will be explained below, the Board concludes that, the ZA did not err in any of the above determinations. The following will examine each claim of error.

## The Claim of Two Separate Buildings

The Appellant's position is that the proposal includes an impermissible second building at the property in violation of § 2500 of the Zoning Regulations. ${ }^{2}$ Appellant alleges that "over $90 \%$ of the original house ... will be removed" and "there will be two buildings, the first of which will consist of four apartments .... The second building will have three apartments on three floors...". (Exhibit 42, Appellant's Revised Statement on Appeal.) Appellant is incorrect. As indicated in the approved plans, there is only one proposed building at the property, and this building shares the same stairwell, walls, and roof. (Finding of Fact 14.)

The Zoning Regulations define a building as not "separated [i.e., connected] from the ground up or from the lowest floor up." (11 DCMR §199.1, "Building".) The Board has held that

[^2]
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The definition of "building" under §199.1 permit separate portions of a structure to be considered as a single building for zoning purposes provided that a communication exists between those separate portions at or above the main floor.
(BZA Application No. 18263-B of Stephanie and John Lester (2011).)
As the approved plans demonstrate, this definition has been met and a single building was approved.

## The Claim Regarding the Minor Deviation for Lot Area Requirements

Subsection 407.1 of the Zoning Regulations authorizes the ZA to allow a minor deviation from up to two area requirements, including a deviation up to two percent from the lot area requirements of § 401 .

In Appeal No. 18108 of Advisory Neighborhood Commission 3C (2011), the Board stated that the application of § 407.1 requires a two-part standard: not merely a quantitative or numerical exercise to calculate a permitted deviation, but also a qualitative analysis regarding whether a deviation would impair the purpose of the otherwise applicable regulations. In this case, the ZA engaged in both a quantitative and qualitative analysis.

## Quantitative Analysis

As explained previously, the Owner sought one minor deviation from the lot area requirements so that it could convert a structure to seven apartment units instead of six apartment units. ${ }^{3}$ Because the Zoning Regulations require a minimum lot area of 900 square feet for each apartment unit, a total of 6,300 square feet of land area was required for the project. The subject property consists of 6,279 square feet of land area, and is therefore 21 feet short of the minimum required amount, or $0.33 \%$. The ZA's Determination Letter states that only one request for a deviation was made, and that this request was for only a $0.33 \%$ deviation from the lot area requirements. (Finding of Fact 9.)

## Qualitative Analysis

The ZA also conducted a qualitative analysis and determined that the deviation would not impair the purpose of the otherwise applicable regulations. It is this portion of the analysis which the Appellant contests and it will be examined more closely.

As described in Findings of Fact 10 and 11, the ZA considered several qualitative factors in his analysis, for example: the extremely small amount of the deviation required, the uniquely large size of the lot, the fact that conversions to apartment houses were allowed as a matter-of-right, the relative consistency in character between a six-unit building and a seven-unit building, the fact

[^3]
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that the seven-unit configuration provides fairly large living units (1,350 square feet) for an apartment in the District, and the fact that this decision does not allow for any increase in the overall density or bulk of the proposed project.

Appellant argues that a qualitative analysis should have included:

1. An analysis of § 101 of Title 11, particularly § 101.1 (b), which provides that in "their interpretation and application, the provisions of this title shall be held to be the minimum requirements ... to $\ldots$ [p]revent undue concentration of population and the overcrowding of land" and $\S 102.1$ (b), which states that the "regulations in this title $\ldots$ are designed with consideration of the $\ldots$ [c]haracter of the respective districts ... ; and
2. Further analysis of the purpose of the R-4 zone district (stating the R-4 zone is not an apartment house district, and the purpose of the R-4 is to stabilize the remaining one-family dwellings.)

As explained above, the ZA did consider the purpose of the R-4 zone, but also noted that conversions to apartment houses were allowed as a matter-of-right. With respect to $\S 101$, the Board concluded in Appeal 18108, that $\S 101$ is not pertinent because it contains statements about the nature of the Zoning Regulations in general. The Board believes that the ZA correctly identified the pertinent regulations and properly analyzed the impact of the deviation on their intended purposes.

In sum, the Board is not persuaded by the Appellant that an error occurred in the decision of the ZA, pursuant to § 407.1, to approve a minor deviation in the minimum lot area required so as to allow a seventh apartment unit.

## The Claim of Excessive Height/Number of Stories

The Appellant also alleges that the proposed building violates the requirements of § 400 in that it exceeds the maximum allowable height ( 40 feet) and the maximum number of stories (three). This claim is incorrect.

Regarding the building height, the approved plans indicate that the total height of the building is 39 feet and 11 inches. (Finding of Fact 15.) This height is within the maximum height of 40 feet which is allowed in the R-4 zone district. (11 DCMR § 400.1.) ${ }^{4}$ Moreover, the ZA utilized the measuring process specified by $\S \S 400.15-400.17$, by measuring the height from the existing grade at the midpoint of the main façade of the proposed building up to the highest part of the roof. (Finding of Fact 15.)

[^4]
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Regarding the number of stories, § 400.1 limits buildings in an R-4 zone district to three stories in height. The definition of "story" excludes cellars and stairways or other rooftop structures. (11 DCMR § 199.1.) The term "cellar" is defined as space with a ceiling less than four feet above the adjacent finished grade. The approved plans specify three stories and a cellar, and that the floor of the first floor is three feet and seven inches above the adjacent finished grade. (Finding of Fact 16.)

The Appellant disputes the measurements regarding the height and the number of stories, claiming that the building height and lower level cellar should be measured from the window well on the west wall. However, the ZA testified that it was longstanding practice to treat window wells as exceptions to grade, and that the correct practice was to measure from the adjacent grade. ( Tr ., September 15, 2015, p. 173.) The Board finds this interpretation to be reasonable. Moreover, under § 400.1, maximum height is measured in terms of feet and in terms of stories. In residential zones, the building height and number of stories are both measured from the center of the front of the building, not the side of the building, where the window wells are. (See, 11 DCMR §§ 400.15 and 400.16.)

## The Claim of Excessive FAR

The Appellant has alleged that the permit approval violates § 402, which governs floor area ratio ("FAR") requirements in residential districts. However, there is no FAR requirement in the R-4 zone district, where the subject property is located. (See, 11 DCMR § 402.4.) The FAR requirement is first prescribed in the R-5 zone district, where it is 0.9. (Id.) The Appellant acknowledges that no FAR requirement is prescribed in the R-4 zone. However, he asserts that the proposed building has a FAR of 1.5 , an amount that exceeds the allowable FAR in the R-5 zone. As such, Appellant argues that the R-4 Zoning Regulations should not be interpreted to permit an amount of density that would be disallowed in the R-5 zone. Even assuming that the Appellant's calculations are correct ${ }^{5}$, any anomaly between the densities permitted within more and less restrictive zone districts can only be rectified by the Zoning Commission through a text amendment, not by the ZA or this Board. (See, D.C. Official Code § 6-651.07(e) ("The Board ... shall not have the power to amend any regulation or map."))

## The Claim of an Insufficient Rear Yard

The Appellant alleges that the proposed building does not meet the requirements of § 404.1 which requires a minimum rear yard of 20 feet. However, the Board finds no evidence of this claim. The approved plans show a rear yard of approximately $211 / 2$ feet. (Finding of Fact 19.)

The Claim of Insufficient Side Yards

[^5]
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The Appellant claims that what he refers to as the second apartment building is proposed up to the lot line abutting his property. He also claims that under § 405 of the Regulations, a side yard is required on each free standing side of this purported second building. (Exhibit 42, p. 4.) However, as explained earlier, the Appellant erroneously treats the proposed rear addition as a second building. For zoning purposes, there is only one building. Subsection 405.6 of the Regulations states that if a side yard is provided, it must be a minimum of eight feet. In this case, there is one side yard provided that is 16 feet in width. (Finding of Fact 18.) Thus, the side yard requirement has been met.

Moreover, the Appellant's reliance on $\S 405.3$ is misplaced. Subsection 405.3 only applies to buildings that do "not share a common division wall" with another building. As the Appellant states, the building to be converted shares a party wall with the Appellant's residence. (Finding of Fact 26.)

## The Rooftop Structure Claim

The Appellant contends that the presence of rooftop air conditioners on two separate locations violates § 411.3 of the Regulations, requiring that all mechanical equipment be housed in a single enclosure. ${ }^{6}$ However, the approved plans show air conditioning units on the rooftop that rise three feet above the rooftop deck. (Finding of Fact 20.) Under § 411.17, rooftop structures less than four feet above a roof are exempt from other requirements of § 411 governing roof structures. Thus, this claim also lacks merit.

ANC

The Board is required to give "great weight" to the issues and concerns raised by the affected ANC D.C. (Official Code $\S 1-309.10$ (d) (1012 Repl.).) As noted, ANC 4C voted to support Mr. Stokes’ appeal and participated fully in the proceedings before the Board. As also noted, the ANC raised the same issues and concerns that were raised by the Appellant in his appeal. Therefore, for the reasons explained above, the Board finds the ANC's advice not to be persuasive.

## CONCLUSION

For reasons discussed above, it is hereby ORDERED that the appeal is DENIED.

VOTE: 3-1-1 (Lloyd J. Jordan, Jeffrey L. Hinkle, and Frederick L. Hill voting to DENY the appeal, affirming the Zoning Administrator; Anthony J. Hood opposed to the motion; Marnique Y. Heath, not participating.)
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PAGE NO. 12

BY ORDER OF THE D.C. BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT
A majority of the Board members approved the issuance of this order.


FINAL DATE OF ORDER: August 19, 2016

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.

## Exhibit E

## GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA



DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER \&REGULATORY AFFAIRS Inspections \& Compliance Administration $11004^{\text {th }}$ Street, SW - Fourth Floor Washington, DC 20024

## STOP WORK ORDER

## -

(Address)
You are hereby ordered to IMMEDIATELY STOP all work at this building or structure.You are performing work that violates the Construction Code:You are performing work in an unsafe and dangerous manner:

| Code Section (s) | Violation (s) | What You Must Do to Correct the Violation (s) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| RADCMRIOF.I EXCEFDINGTHESCOPEOFPERMIT OBTAIN REWIRED PERMIT |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Do NOT work at this address until you:
$\square$ Correct the violation (s)
$\square$ Pay the fine amount
$\square$ Obtain and post the required permits)Electrical $\square$ Plumbing $\square$ Construction
Receive approval from the Code Official to remove the Stop Work Order.

## WARNING

Unauthorized removal of a posted Stop Work Order is a Construction Code violation, subject to penalties and injunctive relief under DC Official Code §6-1406 and §6-1407 and 12A DCMR §114.3.

A Stop Work Order for illegal construction under 12A DCMR §113.7 and §114.6 requires you to stop all work at the building or structure, whether or not the work requires building permits.

It is a Stop Work Order violation for an owner or agent to enter the site for any reason without the Code Official's approval. (The Building Official may allow temporary access to ensure the property's security and safety, under 12A DCMR §114.6.1.)

Anyone who continues any work in or around a structure posted with a Stop Work Order - except to do work that the Building Official approves to remove a violation or unsafe condition - is subject to penalties and injunctive relief under DC Official Code §61406 and 12A DCMR §105.8 and 12A DCMR §114.10.

## RIGHT TO APPEAL

You have the right to appeal this Order to the Reviewing Official (Rabbiah Sabbakhan, Chief Building Code Official, Inspections and Compliance Administration) within 15 days of its posting, under 12A DCMR §114.11.1. You may call the Reviewing Official at (202) 442-7867. You may obtain a Stop Work Order Appeal Request Form at the address above or at dcra.dc.gov. If the Reviewing Official denies your appeal or takes no action within 10 working days of receiving it, you may appeal to the DC Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH). You may deliver your written request for a hearing to OAH at $4414^{\text {th }}$ Street, NW, Suite 1040S, Washington, DC 20002 or mail it to PO Box 77718, Washington, DC 200138713.

Signature of Issuing Official $\qquad$ Date $\qquad$ Time $\qquad$ Badge Number $\qquad$ Phone Number $\qquad$ 4427867

Exhibit F

## 452 NEWTON PLACE, NW
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Exhibit G

Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs<br>Permit Operations Division<br>1100 4th Street SW<br>Washington DC 20024

Tel. (202) 442-4589 Fax (202) 442-4862

## BUILDING PERMIT

THIS PERMIT MUST ALWAYS BE CONSPICUOUSLY DISPLAYED AT THE ADDRESS OF WORK UNTIL WORK IS COMPLETED AND APPROVED

PERMIT NO. B1500315
Expiration Date: $10 / 22 / 2016$

| Address of Project: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 452 NEWTON PL NW | Zone: | Ward: | Square: | Suffix: | Lot: |
| R-4 | 1 | 3036 |  | 0089 |  |

Description Of Work:
USE CHANGE FROM TWO FAMILY FLAT TO THREE UNIT CONDO BUILDING. ALTERATION OF EXISTING FRONTY PORCH TO ACCOMODATE 2ND FLOOR ACCESS.

| Permission is Hereby Granted To: Estella M Rosales |  | Owner Address: <br> 452 NEWTON PL NW WASHINGTON, DC 20010-1716 |  |  | PERMIT FEE:$\$ 1,204.50$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Permit Type: <br> Addition Alteration Repair | Existing Us <br> Two-Family | lat - R-3 |  | posed Use: <br> tifamily (> 2 units) |  | Plans: <br> Yes |
| Agent Name: <br> Samnang | Agent Address: $20024$ |  | Existing Dwell Units: <br> 2 | Proposed Dwell Units: $3$ | No. of Stories: <br> 2 | Floor(s) Involved. All |

Conditions/ Restrictions:

This Permit Expires if no Construction is Started Within 1 Year or if the Inspection is Over 1 Year.
All Construction Done According To The Current Building Codes And Zoning Regulations;
As a condition precedent to the issuance of this permit, the owner agrees to conform with all conditions set forth herein, and to perform the work authorized hereby in accordance with the approved application and plans on file with the District Government and in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations of the District of Columbia. The District of Columbia has the right to enter upon the property and to inspect all work authorized by this permit and to require any change in construction which may be necessary to ensure compliance with the permit and with all the applicable regulations of the District of Columbia. Work authorized under this Permit must start within one(1) year of the date appearing on this permit or the permit is automatically void. If work is started, any application for partial refund must be made within six months of the date appearing on this permit.

## Lead Paint Abatement

Whenever any such work related to this Permit could result in the disturbance of lead based paint,the permit holder shall abide by all applicable paint activities provisions of the 'Lead Hazard Prevention and Elimination Act of 2008' and the EPA 'Lead Renovation, Repair and Painting rule' regarding lead-based include adherence to lead-safe work practices. For more Information, go to http://ddoe.dc.gov, Lead and Healthy Housing.


TO REPORT WASTE, FRAUD OR ABUSE BY ANY DC GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL, CALL THE DC INSPEGFOR GENERAL नT 1-800-521-1099 FOR CONSTRUCTION INSPECTION INQUIRIES CALL (202) 442-9557 TO SCHEDULE INSPECTIONS PLEASE CALL (202) 442-9557.

Exhibit H

## STOP WORK ORDER

(Address)
You are hereby ordered to IMMEDIATELY STOP all work at this building or structure.
V You are performing work that violates the Construction Code:You are performing work in an unsafe and dangerous manner:

| Code Section (s) | Violation (s) | What You Must Do to Correct the Violation (s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\angle A$ DCMR 105.6 | REVOCatron of PcRMit | OBtain ORRECT Premit By |
|  |  | Ontmictus Zonins AnO |
|  |  | Buloun Dequatrient |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Do NOT work at this address until you:
$\square$ Correct the violation(s)Pay the fine amountObtain and post the required permit(s)Electrical $\square$ Plumbing $\square$ Construction $\square$ Boiler $\square$ Fire $\square$ Elevator $\square$ Other $\qquad$Receive approval from the Code Official to remove the Stop Work Order.

## WARNING

Unauthorized removal of a posted Stop Work Order is a Construction Code violation, subject to penalties and injunctive relief under DC Official Code §6-1406 and §6-1407 and 12A DCMR §114.3.

A Stop Work Order for illegal construction under 12A DCMR $\S 113.7$ and $\S 114.6$ requires you to stop all work at the building or structure, whether or not the work requires building permits.

It is a Stop Work Order violation for an owner or agent to enter the site for any reason without the Code Official's approval. (The Building Official may allow temporary access to ensure the property's security and safety, under 12A DCMR §114.6.1.)

Anyone who continues any work in or around a structure posted with a Stop Work Order - except to do work that the Building Official approves to remove a violation or unsafe condition - is subject to penalties and injunctive relief under DC Official Code §61406 and 12A DCMR §105.8 and 12A DCMR §114.10.

## RIGHT TO APPEAL

You have the right to appeal this Order to the Reviewing Official (Rabbiah Sabbakhan, Chief Building Code Official, Inspections and Compliance Administration) within 15 days of its posting, under 12A DCMR §114.11.1. You may call the Reviewing Official at (202) 442-7867. You may obtain a Stop Work Order Appeal Request Form at the address above or at dcra.dc.gov. If the Reviewing Official denies your appeal or takes no action within 10 working days of receiving it, you may appeal to the DC Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH). You may deliver your written request for a hearing to OAH at $4414^{\text {th }}$ Street, NW, Suite 1040S, Washington, DC 20002 or mail it to PO Box 77718, Washington, DC 200138713.

Signature of Issuing Official $\qquad$ Date $\qquad$ Time $\qquad$
$\qquad$

## Exhibit I

September 10, 2018
via IZIS
Board of Zoning Adjustment $4414^{\text {th }}$ Street, NW
Suite 200S
Washington, DC 20001

## Re: Application No. 19712; 452 Newton Place, NW.

Dear Members of the Board:
I have been a real estate agent in the DC Area for 17 years. I worked with the Applicant in the above-referenced case to sell the upper unit at 452 Newton Place, NW. That unit sold for $\$ 620,000$ in April 2017. Before the Applicant hired me, a previous real estate agent attempted to sell the lower unit and listed it for $\$ 899,900$, then $\$ 872,900$, then $\$ 849,900$ and lastly $\$ 799,900$. The property was on the market for 84 days before being taken off the market.

The Applicant is now faced with a scenario where they must sell the unit as-is or renovate the unit to make it more marketable. Currently, there are no comps for the existing fourbedroom, four-bathroom layout. The unit is difficult to market because it has two kitchens and the bedrooms are on two different floors. With a unit of this size, it is typical that a family would be the potential buyer. However, although the size is ideal, the floor plan is not. Typically, parents do not like to be on a different floor than their children. Thus, homes where the bedrooms are all on one floor, specifically the upper floor tend to be more marketable. Although there are no four-bedroom comps in the area, I estimate the lower unit could sell in its current condition for $\$ 635,000$. Market conditions have changed substantially, with an increase in inventory and an increase in interest rates, demand is lower than when these units were originally on the market. My experience tells me that the prospective buyer would most likely use the lower level as an income-producing rental property if they are able to obtain the necessary licensing from the District.

The other option would be for the Applicant to renovate the unit and change its current configuration. It may be more marketable if the bedrooms were on the lowest level and the living spaces were expanded on the first floor. The lower level kitchen would need to be removed and one bedroom on the main floor could remain. This is still not an ideal floor plan because of the lack of light on the lower level. However, it is more marketable than the current floor plan. If this reconfiguration were to occur, it would appeal to a wider range of buyers. Other three-bedroom units in Columbia Heights (20010) sell for $\$ 675,000$, but since the bedrooms would be in the basement and receive less light, it would likely sell for slightly less, at $\$ 600,000$. Please note that all these sales prices are estimates and actual prices would vary depending on the market conditions and the actual square footage of the units.

Had the Applicant had the option to start over knowing that they could only do two units on three floors, the most marketable and standard approach would be to create a two-story unit with living space on the first floor and bedrooms on the second story, and a separate onebedroom basement unit. In this scenario, the upper unit could sell for $\$ 760,000$ and the lower
unit could sell for $\$ 500,000$. Again, the actual prices would be determined by square footage of each unit and market conditions.

Were the Applicant to obtain BZA Approval, it could split the larger unit into two units and sell the first-floor unit for approximately $\$ 550,000$ and the basement unit for $\$ 500,000$.

Sincerely,


Candy Miles-Crocker, GRI
Associate Broker
Long and Foster Real Estate

Exhibit J

## 2-Unit Scenario

Purchase Price ..... (\$680,000)
Construction Costs ..... (\$410,000)
Sale Price- Upper Unit ..... \$760,000
Sale Price- Lower Unit ..... \$500,000
TOTAL ..... \$170,000
BZA Denied
Purchase Price ..... (\$680,000)
Construction Costs ..... $(\$ 525,000)$
Sales Price - Upper Unit ..... \$620,000
Sales Price- Lower 4BR Unit ..... \$635,000
TOTAL ..... \$50,000
BZA Approved
Purchase Price ..... (\$680,000)
Construction Costs ..... $(\$ 525,000)$
Sales Price- Upper Unit ..... \$620,000
Sales Price-1st floor ..... \$550,000
Sales Price- basement ..... \$500,000
TOTAL ..... \$465,000

Exhibit K

## 452 Newton Place, NW, Washington, DC Master Budget <br> Kaim Development Corp., LLC/Serhat Akin

## 2 - Unit Budget

| Description | Budget |
| :--- | ---: |
| Soft Costs |  |
| Permits \& Fees | $\$ 4,000$ |
| Architectural \& Engineering | $\$ 18,000$ |
|  | $\$ 22,000$ |
| Subtotal Soft Costs |  |
|  | $\$ 500$ |
| Hard Costs | $\$ 15,000$ |
| Site Work | $\$ 10,500$ |
| Demolition | $\$ 6,500$ |
| Excavation | $\$ 5,000$ |
| Concrete | $\$ 30,500$ |
| Waterproofing | $\$ 27,000$ |
| Framing Materials | $\$ 6,500$ |
| Framing Labor | $\$ 3,200$ |
| Siding | $\$ 19,700$ |
| Sheet Metal | $\$ 25,200$ |
| Plumbing | $\$ 36,800$ |
| Electrical |  |
| Heating \& Cooling | $\$ 2,600$ |
| Low Voltage, Audio, Video, | $\$ 988,000$ |
| Central Vac | $\$ 410,000$ |
| Roofing Roof Deck |  |
| Masonry | $\$ 10,300$ |
| Fireplace | $\$ 2,800$ |
| Exterior Windows \& Doors | $\$ 20,300$ |
| Painting | $\$ 19,300$ |
| Drywall | $\$ 10,500$ |
| Stucco | $\$ 1,700$ |
| Flooring | $\$ 31,000$ |
| Millwork | $\$ 11,400$ |
| Finish Carpentry | $\$ 20,300$ |
| Hardware | $\$ 3,500$ |
| Countertops | $\$ 14,000$ |
| Cabinets \& Closets | $\$ 10,800$ |
| Appliances | $\$ 6,600$ |
| Construction Support | $\$ 1,000$ |
| Landscape \& Irrigation | $\$ 500$ |
| Exterior Structures |  |
| Contingencies |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| Subtotal Hard Costs |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

3 - Unit Budget

| Description $\quad$ - | Budget ${ }^{-}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Soft Costs |  |
| Permits \& Fees | \$4,000 |
| Architectural \& Engineering | \$18,000 |
|  |  |
| Subtotal Soft Costs | \$22,000 |
|  |  |
| Hard Costs |  |
| Site Work | \$500 |
| Demolition | \$15,000 |
| Excavation | \$10,500 |
| Concrete | \$6,500 |
| Waterproofing | \$5,000 |
| Framing Materials | \$40,700 |
| Framing Labor | \$31,500 |
| Siding | \$6,500 |
| Sheet Metal | \$3,200 |
| Plumbing | \$26,200 |
| Electrical | \$37,600 |
| Heating \& Cooling | \$38,900 |
| Low Voltage, Audio, Video, Central Vac | \$3,600 |
| Roofing Roof Deck | \$9,000 |
| Masonry | \$10,300 |
| Fireplace | \$4,500 |
| Exterior Windows \& Doors | \$20,300 |
| Painting | \$24,500 |
| Drywall | \$18,900 |
| Stucco | \$2,600 |
| Flooring | \$38,000 |
| Millwork | \$29,400 |
| Finish Carpentry | \$28,800 |
| Hardware | \$4,800 |
| Countertops | \$18,000 |
| Cabinets \& Closets | \$14,000 |
| Appliances | \$16,300 |
| Construction Support | \$2,000 |
| Landscape \& Irrigation | \$4,900 |
| Exterior Structures | \$21,000 |
| Contingencies | \$10,000 |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| Subtotal Hard Costs | \$503,000 |
|  |  |
| Total Construction Costs | \$525,000 |

## Exhibit L

452 Newton Place, NW, Washington, DC Renovation to Make Lower Unit More Marketable

Kaim Development Corp., LLC/Serhat Akin

| Description | Budget |
| :---: | :---: |
| Soft Costs |  |
| Permits \& Fees | \$4,000 |
| Architectural \& Engineering | \$6,000 |
| Subtotal Soft Costs | \$10,000 |
| Hard Costs |  |
| Site Work | \$500 |
| Demolition | \$5,000 |
| Excavation | \$0 |
| Concrete | \$0 |
| Waterproofing | \$2,500 |
| Framing Materials | \$6,500 |
| Framing Labor | \$10,000 |
| Siding | \$0 |
| Sheet Metal | \$0 |
| Plumbing | \$7,500 |
| Electrical | \$8,800 |
| Heating \& Cooling | \$1,800 |
| Low Voltage, Audio, Video, Central Vac | \$1,000 |
| Roofing Roof Deck | \$0 |
| Masonry | \$0 |
| Fireplace | \$0 |
| Exterior Windows \& Doors | \$0 |
| Painting | \$9,500 |
| Drywall | \$8,500 |
| Stucco | \$0 |
| Flooring | \$15,000 |
| Millwork | \$6,000 |
| Finish Carpentry | \$10,900 |
| Hardware | \$1,500 |
| Countertops | \$14,000 |
| Cabinets \& Closets | \$5,000 |
| Appliances | \$0 |
| Construction Support | \$1,000 |
| Landscape \& Irrigation | \$0 |
| Exterior Structures | \$0 |
| Contingencies | \$5,000 |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| Subtotal Hard Costs | \$120,000 |
|  |  |
| Total Construction Costs | \$120,000 |


[^0]:    $4414^{\text {th }}$ Street, N.W., Suite 200/210-S, Washington, D.C. 2000
    Facsimile: (202) 727-6072 E-Mail: dcoz@dc.gov

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ As was discussed during the proceedings, § 330.5 has since been amended and such conversions became more restrictive, and $\S 407.1$ was also amended to disallow the ZA from applying its minor deviations when determining the minimum lot area needed for such conversions (Z.C. Order No. 14-11.) However, the amended regulation went into effect on June 26, 2015, after the permit in this case was issued. Therefore, the amended regulation is not relevant to this appeal.

[^2]:    ${ }^{2}$ The citation to $\S 2500$ assumes that the second of the two alleged buildings is an accessory building that exceeds the matter of right limits of that section. The section of the Zoning Regulation that limits the number of principal building on a lot is a residence zone is $\S 2516$, which permits more than on principal building by special exception.

[^3]:    ${ }^{3}$ As proposed, six of the units will comply with the 900 square feet minimum and the seventh unit will be 879 square feet.

[^4]:    ${ }^{4}$ The amendments referred to earlier in this Order also reduced matter of right height for this type of development to 35 feet, subject to up to five additional feet by special exception.

[^5]:    ${ }^{5}$ The Appellant would count the lower level "basement" as building area toward the FAR. (Tr., September 15, 2015, p. 155.) As discussed above, the Board has concluded that the lower level is a "cellar", which does not count as building area toward FAR. Thus, the Appellant's FAR calculation of 1.5 may be inaccurate.

[^6]:    ${ }^{6}$ As a result of an amendment to $\S 411$ occurring after the issuance of the building permit, this exemption was moved to $\S 411.2$ and reworded. Other claims regarding the rooftop structures were not pressed by Appellant because permit revisions occurred to correct discrepancies with respect to equal height and rooftop setbacks.

[^7]:    
    P0102

