



MEMORANDUM

TO: District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment

FROM: MRJ Matt Jesick, Case Manager

DATE: January 30, 2026

SUBJECT: BZA #21410 – 2318 Nicholson Street, SE – Request for relief to construct an apartment building

I. RECOMMENDATION

The Office of Planning (OP) recommends **approval** of the following requested special exceptions:

- C § 701, pursuant to C § 703.2 and X § 900 – Vehicle Parking (19 vehicular parking spaces required; 11 provided);
- C § 901, pursuant to C § 909.2 and X § 900 – Loading (1 loading berth and 1 delivery space required; 1 delivery space and 0 loading spaces provided).

II. LOCATION AND SITE DESCRIPTION

Applicant	Nicholson St. Holdings, LLC
Address	2318, 2322 and 2324 Nicholson Street, SE
Legal Description	Square 5560, Lots 7, 8 and 819
Ward / ANC	Ward 7, ANC 7B
Zone	RA-2 – Moderate density apartments
Historic District / Resource	None
Lot Characteristics and Existing Development	Site is comprised of three rectangular lots that will be consolidated; Total dimensions are 120' wide x 150' deep; Lots each have a single family dwelling that will be demolished; 20' public alley at the rear.
Adjacent Properties and Neighborhood Character	Single family dwellings to the east and west; Medium density apartment building to the rear, which fronts on Pennsylvania Avenue; Buildings across the street appear to be two-family dwellings; Diagonally across the street is a new moderate density apartment building.
Proposal	Construct a 62-unit apartment building.

III. ZONING REQUIREMENTS AND RELIEF REQUESTED

Standard	Requirement	Existing	Proposed	Relief
FAR F 201	2.16	n/a	2.15	Conforming

Standard	Requirement	Existing	Proposed	Relief
Lot Width n/a	n/a	120'	No change	Conforming
Lot Depth n/a	n/a	150'	No change	Conforming
Lot Area F 202	n/a	18,000	No change	Conforming
Height F 203	50'	n/a	48.6'	Conforming
Rear Yard F 207	4 in./ft. of height = 16.2' min.	n/a	25'	Conforming
Side Yard F 208	4' min.	n/a	4.7' each side	Conforming
Lot Occupancy F 210	60%	n/a	53%	Conforming
Vehicle Parking C 701	19	n/a	11 (7 actual spaces, 2 of which are car-share spaces, which count as 3 each)	Requested
Loading C 901	1 loading berth 1 delivery space	n/a	1 delivery space, 0 loading spaces	Requested

IV. ANALYSIS

Special Exception from Vehicle Parking Requirements – Subtitle C § 701, pursuant to C § 703.2

703.2 The Board of Zoning Adjustment may grant a full or partial reduction in the number of required parking spaces, as a special exception pursuant to Subtitle X, Chapter 9, and subject to the applicant's demonstration to the Board's satisfaction of at least one (1) of the following:

- (b) The use or structure is particularly well served by mass transit, shared vehicle, or bicycle facilities;*
- (c) Land use or transportation characteristics of the neighborhood minimize the need for required parking spaces;*
- (f) All or a significant proportion of dwelling units are dedicated as affordable housing units;*

Background – The applicant seeks relief from the total number of vehicular parking spaces, to provide 11 where 19 are required. There would be seven actual parking spaces, though the applicant is counting two of them as car-share spaces, which under the Regulations can count as three spaces each (C § 708.2). At this time, however, the plans (Exhibit 6) label the two parking spaces in question as “EV” spaces. While OP supports the provision of EV charging equipment, EV spaces do not qualify for the same 3-for-1 parking ratio that car-share spaces do. The applicant should submit a corrected site plan that identifies the two parking spaces as car-share spaces.

OP would also support the further removal of one parking space to allow for realistic access to the trash receptacles, as well as the provision of a realistic number of trash receptacles for a 62-unit building.

Also, C § 703.4 states the following:

703.4 Any request for a reduction of more than four (4) spaces from the required number of parking spaces shall include a transportation demand management plan approved by the District Department of Transportation, the implementation of which shall be a condition of the Board of Zoning Adjustment's approval.

On January 27, 2026 a TDM plan was submitted as part of Exhibit 19. Following discussions with DDOT, it is OP's understanding that the applicant has discussed the TDM plan with that agency. OP defers to DDOT as to the adequacy of the transportation statement and TDM plan. As stated above, implementation of the TDM plan shall be a condition of approval.

Analysis – OP finds that the property would meet criteria (b) and (c) of C § 703.2. The subject property is within half a block or a block of several high-frequency or medium-frequency bus lines on Pennsylvania Avenue and Minnesota Avenue. The bus service provides access to metro stations such as Anacostia and Minnesota Avenue, as well as direct access to areas such as Capitol Hill, Navy Yard, and Federal Triangle, major employment areas. There is also a Capital Bikeshare station at the corner of 25th Street and Minnesota Avenue, about a block away. The neighborhood is also walkable, with retail, service, institutional and civic uses, including an elementary school, nearby.

The use could also meet criterion (f); According to page 3 of Exhibit 12, the Burden of Proof, "All of the units provided as part of this proposed project will be affordable rental units, including a significant number of family-size units, available to tenants earning up to 50% of the local Area Median Income (AMI)." If the applicant wants to qualify for the relief under this subparagraph, they should provide evidence that they are committed to making this an all-affordable building.

Special Exception from Loading Requirements – Subtitle C § 901, pursuant to C § 909.2

909.2 The Board of Zoning Adjustment may grant full or partial relief from the number of loading berths or service/delivery spaces required by Subtitle C § 901.1, or from the size and layout requirements of Subtitle C § 905, as a special exception under Subtitle X, Chapter 9, and under the applicant's demonstrations to the Board's satisfaction that:

- (a) The use or structure will generate a lower loading demand than the minimum loading standards of Subtitle C §§ 901 and 905 require, as a result of:*
 - (1) The nature of the use or structure; or*
 - (2) A loading demand management plan filed in the case record in accordance with Subtitle Y § 300.14 and approved by District Department of*

Transportation, the implementation of which shall be a condition of the Board of Zoning Adjustment's approval, that will result in a lower loading demand than the minimum loading standards of Subtitle C §§ 901 and 905 require; or

Page 4 of Exhibit 12, the applicant's burden of proof, states that "the Applicant is seeking a special exception for relief from this requirement due to the limited size of the Property and the fact that the loading demand for this project is not expected to require a full-size loading berth."

It goes on to state that "The proposed service and delivery space is expected to accommodate the vast majority of loading activities associated with the building, including package deliveries, small move-ins, and service vehicles."

On January 27, 2026, a Loading Management Plan (LMP) was submitted as part of Exhibit 19. Following discussions with DDOT, it is OP's understanding that the applicant has discussed the LMP with that agency. OP defers to DDOT as to the adequacy of the transportation statement and the LMP. OP notes that the transportation statement concludes on p. 34:

"The requested relief from the requirement to provide one (1) loading berth is not expected to have a detrimental impact on the neighborhood as the proposed delivery space is expected to accommodate the vast majority of loading activities associated with the site. The proposed project will establish an LMP that will ensure efficient operation of the service/delivery space and all loading operations, trash collection, and move in/move out activities;"

It can be concluded, therefore, that "the use or structure will generate a lower loading demand than the standards of Subtitle C §§ 901 and 905 require" (C § 909.2(a)). As stated above, implementation of the LMP shall be a condition of approval.

While OP recommends approval of this area of relief, OP does not accept the applicant's argument that the size of the property is "limited" and therefore cannot accommodate loading. The property, which will be vacant after the existing buildings are removed, is 120 feet wide by 150 feet deep, which is more than enough room to provide a loading berth.

(b) *The only means by which a motor vehicle could access the lot is from a public street, and provision of a curb cut or driveway on the street would violate any regulation in this chapter, or in Chapters 6 or 11 of Title 24 DCMR; or*

N/A

(c) *The loading berths or service/delivery spaces are required for an addition to a Historic Resource, and providing the required loading facilities in compliance with the requirements of Subtitle C §§ 901 and 905 would result in significant architectural or structural difficulty in maintaining the integrity and appearance of the Historic Resource.*

N/A

General Special Exception Criteria – Subtitle X § 901.2

901.2 (a) [Granting the special exception] Will be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Zoning Regulations and Zoning Maps;

Based on the conclusions of the transportation statement (Exhibit 19), granting the requested relief should not impair the intent of the Regulations. The statement concludes that the surrounding transit and bicycle options should be sufficient to meet the transportation demands of future residents. It also states that the single delivery space should be sufficient for most loading activities at the site, and that the LMP should minimize impacts to public space.

901.2(b) [Granting the special exception] Will not tend to affect adversely, the use of neighboring property in accordance with the Zoning Regulations and Zoning Maps;

As addressed in the above analysis, the requested special exceptions should not unduly affect the use of neighboring property. There should not be undue traffic impacts, or impacts to the operations of public spaces such as the alley.

V. COMMENTS OF OTHER DISTRICT AGENCIES

As of this writing there are no comments from other District agencies in the record.

VI. ANC COMMENTS

As of this writing there are no comments in the record from the ANC.

VII. COMMUNITY COMMENTS

As of this writing there are no comments in the record from the community.

VIII. VICINITY MAP

