

**GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
Zoning Commission**



**ZONING COMMISSION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
ZONING COMMISSION ORDER NO. 14-24**

**Z.C. Case No. 14-24**

**1900 11<sup>th</sup> Street NW, LLC**

**(Map Amendment @ Square 2848, Lots 39, 40, 72, and 838 and Variance Relief from the  
Required Size of Parking Spaces @ Lots 39 and 40)**

**March 14, 2016**

Pursuant to public notice, the Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia (the “Commission”) held a public hearing on December 7, 2015, pursuant to its authority under § 1 of the Zoning Act of 1938, approved June 20, 1938 (52 Stat. 787; D.C. Official Code § 6-641.01), and § 102 of Title 11 of the District of Columbia Municipal Regulations (“DCMR”), to consider an application from 1900 11<sup>th</sup> Street NW, LLC (the “Applicant”). The Applicant requested approval of an amendment to the Zoning Map to rezone property located on Lots 39, 40, 72, and 838 in Square 2848 from the R-4 Zone District to the R-5-B Zone District and variance relief from the required size of parking spaces (on Lots 39 and 40) in order to construct a five story apartment building with eight apartments on Lots 39 and 40 (“Property”). The public hearing was conducted in accordance with the provisions of 11 DCMR § 3022.

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

**Procedural Information, Hearing, and Post-Hearing Submissions**

1. On December 23, 2014, the Office of Zoning received an application from the Applicant requesting that the Commission rezone the Property from R-4 to R-5-B. (Exhibits [“Ex.”] 1-4G.)
2. The Office of Planning (“OP”) provided its setdown report on January 30, 2015 recommending the Commission set the case down for a public hearing. (Ex. 12.)
3. The Commission set the case down for a public hearing at its February 9, 2015 public meeting as a contested case.
4. On July 13, 2015, the Applicant requested to amend the application to include variance relief from the required size of parking spaces required under 11 DCMR § 2115.1. (Ex. 13-13C.)
5. The Commission considered the request at its July 27, 2015 public meeting and voted to grant permission to amend the application to include the variance relief.

---

441 4<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Suite 200-S, Washington, D.C. 20001

Telephone: (202) 727-6311

Facsimile: (202) 727-6072

E-Mail: [dcoz@dc.gov](mailto:dcoz@dc.gov)

Web Site: [www.ZONING.COMMISSION](http://www.ZONING.COMMISSION)

District of Columbia  
CASE NO.14-24  
EXHIBIT NO.56

6. Notice of the public hearing was provided in accordance with the provisions of 11 DCMR §§ 3014 and 3015.
7. Advisory Neighborhood Commission (“ANC”) 1A, the ANC in which the Property is located, submitted a report indicating that the ANC has no official position. (Ex. 34.)
8. The Applicant provided its prehearing statement on October 1, 2015 and a supplemental prehearing statement on November 17, 2015. (Ex. 16-17H, 30-30E.)
9. On December 7, 2015, the Commission held a public hearing on the application. The Applicant provided testimony by both Dr. Sahr Bockai and Mr. Dan Snook, of McAllister Architects, P.C.
10. Mr. Snook presented a PowerPoint to explain the proposed plan for development and the request for variance relief from the width of the parking spaces. (Ex. 38.) He also testified and provided sunlight studies demonstrating the improved light, air, and privacy for the existing adjacent Kenyon Coop building created by the proposed “open court” compared to conditions that would result from a matter-of-right R-4 row dwelling structure with no side yard or open court.
11. OP reviewed the Applicant’s proposal and, in its report dated November 25, 2015 and through testimony at the December 7, 2015 public hearing, recommended approval of the proposed map amendment from the R-4 Zone District to the R-5-B Zone District and variance relief from the requirements of § 2115.1, the required dimensions of four parking spaces. OP found that the proposed map amendment from the R-4 to the R-5-B Zone District is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan designation for moderate density residential and as being within a Neighborhood Conservation Area. The proposed development meets all the requirements of the R-5-B Zone District except for a small reduction in the parking space dimension which should have no impact on the surrounding neighborhood. The design of the building would not be incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood and would not substantially negatively impact the light, air, and privacy of the adjacent properties. (Ex. 33.)
12. The D.C. Department of Transportation (“DDOT”) filed a report stating they have no objection to the approval of the requested map amendment and variance. The report stated that based on the information provided, the proposed project will have no adverse impacts on the travel conditions of the District’s transportation network. The proposed project may lead to a minor increase in vehicular, transit, pedestrian, and bicycle trips. In addition, the project has the potential to generate minor impacts to on-street parking conditions in the area. Vehicle parking demand may increase slightly as a result of the project, inducing a higher level of parking utilization in the immediate area. The report further stated that its review pertained only to the zoning issues and did not consider potential impacts to District owned public space, and that DDOT’s lack of objection to the zoning action should not be viewed as an approval of public space elements. (Ex. 32.)

13. The Commission heard testimony from Reverend Dr. George Holmes, a person in support, who testified that the Applicant recognized the need for residential housing on the Property.
14. Kenyon Street Yes We Can Cooperative (“Co-op”) filed a party status request in opposition on November 20, 2015 and submitted a statement in opposition. (Ex. 31, 36.) The Commission granted the party status request.
15. The Commission accepted the Co-op’s architectural consultant, Mr. Nicholas Mroczkowski, of Stoiber and Associates Architects, an expert in the field of architecture.
16. The Co-op provided testimony by Ms. Luzmila Tivey, President of the Board of Directors of the Co-op, who expressed concern with the proposed building height and its direct impact on the quality of life of the Co-op residents. Ms. Tivey also testified about her concern that there will not be enough parking. Mr. Darryl Foster, son of Ms. Tivey, testified about his concern with privacy, noise pollution, the loss of both natural light and fresh air flow to the Co-op. Ms. Janet Stephanie Bersch testified regarding concern over light, privacy, noise, and increased demand for street parking.
17. The Co-op testified that the requested zone change to R-5-B allows for a density and design that is different from the rest of the neighborhood.
18. Following the public hearing, the Commission requested additional clarification from OP and the Applicant, in consultation with the DC Zoning Administrator, on whether the plans show a court or a side yard. OP submitted a supplemental report into the record confirming it is an “open court” that complies with the applicable width requirements in the R-5-B Zone District. (Ex. 46.) The Applicant also submitted information on the open court. (Ex. 47.)
19. On January 8, 2016, the Applicant submitted a Supplemental Post-Hearing Submission in response to a question posed by the Commission’s Secretary. (Ex. 49.) The Applicant stated that it believed the Commission lacked the authority to require the Applicant to record a covenant limiting development on the site, but that the objective of limiting the size and impact of development on the site could be achieved by imposing conditions on the Map amendment and/or variance tied to the plans submitted in the record.
20. On January 11, the Applicant submitted draft findings of fact and conclusions of law (Ex. 50.) The draft included a condition limiting development on “Lots 39 and 40 to development in accordance with the site plan, roof plan, massing and building envelope and open court shown in the Applicant’s Power Point Presentation at the hearing (Exhibit 38).”
21. The Co-op submitted draft findings of fact and conclusions of law. (Ex. 51.) In its draft, the Co-op stated that approval of the map amendment and variance was appropriate with conditions limiting development of the site with a structure consistent with the

Applicant's proposed plans, limiting the height and requiring minimum setbacks of the proposed structure, limits on the fenestration and balconies of the structure, a requirement of continued coordination between the Applicant and the Co-op, and a requirement that the Applicant follow Board of Zoning Adjustment ("BZA") modification procedures.

22. The Commission took proposed action to approve the map amendment at its regularly scheduled meeting held on February 8, 2016.
23. Pursuant to § 492(b)(2) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act, approved Dec. 24, 1973 (87 Stat. 810; D.C. Official Code § 6-641.05), the Commission referred the map amendment application to the National Capital Planning Commission ("NCPC") for review and comment on February 9, 2016. (Ex. 52.) By letter dated February 11, 2016, NCPC's Executive Director stated that by Delegated Action dated January 29, 2016, he found that the proposed map amendment was not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital. (Ex. 53.)
24. The Commission took final action to approve the map amendment and variance at its regularly scheduled meeting held on March 14, 2016.

*The Subject Property and Surrounding Area*

25. The Property consists of 19,768 square feet of land area currently configured as four separate lots and is located at 1368 Kenyon Street, N.W. (Lot 39: currently vacant property), 1370 Kenyon Street, N.W. (Lot 40: currently vacant property) (the "Vacant Lots"), 1372 Kenyon Street, N.W. (Lot 838), and 1361 Irving Street, N.W. (Lot 72).
26. The Property is situated between Kenyon and Irving Street, N.W. east of 14<sup>th</sup> Street and the Columbia Heights Metro Station. The Property is also located immediately adjacent to the 14<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor/Columbia Heights Focus Area within the Mid-City Area Element of the Comprehensive Plan. The Property is not located within a historic district. The area immediately west of the Property is zoned C-3-A, which permits a 4.0 FAR with a 65-foot height, and is improved with mixed-use retail and multi-story residential buildings and the three-level DC USA shopping mall (Target, Best Buy, Bed, Bath & Beyond, and Staples) above the Columbia Heights Metro Station.
27. Lot 72 (7,413 square feet) is improved with a four-story, 16-unit apartment building with 2.7 FAR, 70% lot occupancy, 50 foot/four stories in height, and no parking (Irving Station Condominium) built in 1918 at 1361 Irving Street, N.W. Lot 838 (7,413 square feet) is improved with a four-story 18-unit apartment building with 2.9 FAR, 74% lot occupancy, 50 foot/four stories in height and no parking (The Kenyon Street Yes We Can Cooperative) built in 1910 at 1372 Kenyon Street, N.W. The Vacant Lots are approximately 800 feet from the Columbia Heights Metro Station and will be subdivided into a single Record Lot of approximately 4,942 square feet for development purposes.

### Current and Proposed Zoning and Comprehensive Plan

28. The Property is currently zoned R-4. The R-4 Zone District does not permit new multi-family residential development as a matter of right. The maximum permitted height for new construction of a row dwelling in the R-4 Zone District is 35 feet/three stories with a minimum lot area of 1,800 square feet and minimum lot width of 18 feet for a row dwelling or flat. (11 DCMR § 400.1, 401.3.)
29. For a row dwelling or flat, lot occupancy is limited to 60%. (11 DCMR § 403.2.) A rear yard with a minimum depth of 20 feet is required for each structure in the R-4 Zone District. (11 DCMR § 404.1.)
30. The Applicant is requesting a map amendment to rezone the Property to the R-5-B Zone District. The R-5-B Zone District, in contrast to the R-4 Zone District, is designed to serve multi-family residential functions with moderate-density residential, which is consistent with the Property's designation on the Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan. (11 DCMR §350.1.)
31. The maximum permitted matter-of-right height in the R-5-B Zone District is 50 feet with no limit on the number of stories. (11 DCMR § 400.1.) The maximum FAR in the R-5-B Zone District is 1.8, for all other structures, except 2.0 for public libraries. (11 DCMR § 402.4.) In the R-5-B Zone District, the maximum percentage of lot occupancy is 60%. (11 DCMR §403.2.) There are no minimum lot area or lot width requirements, except for a public library. (11 DCMR 401.3.) A rear yard of four inches per foot of vertical distance from the main finished grade at the middle of the rear of the structure to the highest point of main roof or parapet wall, but not less than 15 feet is required. (11 DCMR § 404.1.) Side yards generally are not required in the R-5-B Zone District. (11 DCMR § 405.9.) However, if a side yard is provided, it must be at least three inches wide per foot of building height, but not less than eight feet. (11 DCMR §405.6.)
32. The R-5-B zoning would bring the existing buildings on Lots 72 and 838 into greater zoning conformity while accommodating a small multifamily building on the now vacant lots.
33. The Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan designates the Property for Moderate-Density Residential use. Moderate-Density Residential areas are intended to include row house neighborhoods which also include a mix of housing types (two- to four-unit buildings, row houses, and low-rise apartment buildings). The Property is designated within a Neighborhood Conservation Area on the Generalized Policy Map.

### Proposed Project

34. The Applicant intends to combine Lots 39 and 40 into a single record lot of approximately 4,942 square feet to construct a five-story, eight-unit apartment building less than 50 feet in height. The Applicant has carved out an "open court" area on the west

side of the building to provide additional light, air, and privacy to the adjacent Kenyon Coop building.

35. At the hearing, the Applicant presented a PowerPoint presentation showing the site plan, roof plan, massing, building envelope, and “open court” of the project. (Ex. 38.)

#### Variance Request

36. A new apartment house in the R-5-B Zone District is required to have one parking space for each two dwelling units and since the apartment building will consist of eight units, four spaces are required. While the Applicant will be providing the required number of spaces, the spaces cannot meet the required dimensions. The Zoning Regulations require each parking space to be a minimum of nine feet in width and 19 feet in length whereas the Applicant proposes the width of each space to be eight feet, two inches in. while the length of 19 feet will be in compliance. While the proposed dimensions (8 ft. 2 in. by 19 ft.) exceed the minimum dimension for compact spaces (8 ft. by 16 ft.) (11 DCMR § 2115.3), compact spaces cannot be counted toward required spaces. Therefore, the Applicant requests a 10-inch area variance from the width of each of the four parking spaces.

#### Exceptional Conditions of the Property

37. The width of the combined Lots 39 and 40 is 33.33 feet. The narrow width of combined Lots 39 and 40 presents an exceptional situation as it cannot be enlarged to a minimum of 36 feet to accommodate the required width of nine feet for each of the four required parking spaces.

#### Practical Difficulties

38. The proposed parking spaces in the rear of the Property cannot be reconfigured due to the narrowness and depth of the lots. To rearrange the spaces at their required sizes and have direct access to the alley would require a drive aisle and a turnaround area to provide each space with direct access to the alley.

#### No substantial Detriment to the Public Good or Impairment of Zone Plan

39. The small reduction of the parking space width would not adversely affect neighboring property.
40. The reduction in the width of the parking spaces would not cause any substantial harm to the Zoning Regulations as the required number of spaces would be provided on-site. The spaces provided at a dimension of 8.16 feet by 19 feet are larger than the minimum dimensions of eight feet by 16 feet for compact spaces.
41. The Commission finds that the proposed map amendment is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan.



### Contested Issues

42. The Co-op contended that approval of the map amendment and variance would permit development that would result in overcrowding, impact on parking, and a loss of light and air. However, the Co-op believed that these impacts could be adequately mitigated if the approval of the map amendment and variance included conditions limiting development of the site with a structure consistent with the Applicant's proposed plans, limiting the height and requiring minimum setbacks of the proposed structure, limits on the fenestration and balconies of the structure, a requirement of continued coordination between the Application with the Co-op, and a requirement that the Applicant follow BZA and planned unit development ("PUD") modification procedures.
43. The Commission finds that the conditions included in this Order are adequate to mitigate the adverse impacts identified by the Co-op.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

#### Map Amendment:

The Commission's authority to amend the Zoning Map derives from the Zoning Act of 1938, effective June 20, 1938 (52 Stat. 797, D.C. Official Code § 6-641.01 et seq.) ("Zoning Act"). Section 1 of the Zoning Act authorizes the Commission to regulate the uses of property in order to "promote the health, safety, morals, convenience, order, prosperity, or general welfare of the District of Columbia and its planning and orderly development as the national capital." (D.C. Official Code § 6-641.01.)

Section 2 of the Zoning Act provides that the

"zoning regulations shall be designed to lessen congestion on the street, to secure safety from fire, panic, and other dangers to promote health and the general welfare, to provide adequate light and air, to prevent the undue concentration and the overcrowding of land, and to promote such distribution of population and of the uses of land as would tend to create conditions favorable to health, safety, transportation, prosperity, protection of property, civic activity, and recreational, educational, and cultural opportunities, and as would tend to further economy and efficiency in the supply of public services. Such regulations shall be made with reasonable consideration, among other things, of the character of the respective districts and their suitability for the uses provided in the regulations, and with a view to encouraging stability for the uses provided in the regulations, and with a view to encouraging stability of districts and of land values therein."

(D.C. Official Code § 6-641.02.)

Section 3 of the Zoning Act, among other things, authorizes the Commission to amend the zoning regulations and maps. (D.C. Official Code § 6-641.03.)

The Commission concludes that approval of an amendment to the R-5-B Zone District is consistent with the purposes of the Zoning Act. The rezoning creates a transition from the C-3-A Zone District in the medium-density mixed-use corridor along 14<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., to the west, to the R-4 Zone District in the moderate-density residential neighborhood to the east. The R-5-B Zone District is designed to be located in moderate-density residential areas. (11 DCMR § 350.2.) Further, the Commission finds that the proposed R-5-B zoning is more appropriate for the buildings on the Property, and that rezoning the Property to R-5-B will bring the existing buildings into greater conformance with their zone district.

In amending the Zoning Map, the Commission is constrained by the limitation in the District Charter that the Zoning Map be “not inconsistent” with the Comprehensive Plan. (§ 492(b)(1) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act; DC. Official Code § 6-641.02.) The Commission concludes that approval of the requested map amendment is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The requested map amendment furthers the goals of the Comprehensive Plan, and promotes orderly development in conformity with the Zone Plan as embodied in the Zoning Regulations and Map.

The Commission concludes that the requested map amendment is in the best interests of the District of Columbia and will benefit the community in which the Property is located.

The Commission declines to adopt conditions on the map amendment because it believes the R-5-B Zone District most appropriate for the site for the reasons stated above. The majority of the possible adverse impacts identified by the Co-op could also occur with development under the existing matter-of-right zoning.

Variance:

Section 8 of the Zoning Act of 1938 authorizes the grant of variances from the strict application of the Zoning Regulations to relieve difficulties or hardship 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 the Zoning Regulations would “result in particular and exceptional practical difficulties to or exceptional or undue hardship upon the owner of the property . . .” (D.C. Official Code § 6-641.07(g)(3).) Relief can be granted only 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.” *Id.*

A showing of “practical difficulties” must be made for an area variance, while the more difficult showing of “undue hardship,” must be made for a use variance. *Palmer v. D.C. Board of Zoning Adjustment*, 287 A.2d 535, 541 (D.C. 1972). The Applicant in this case is requesting an area variance; therefore, it had to demonstrate an exceptional situation or condition of the property and that such exceptional condition results in a practical difficulty in complying with the Zoning Regulations. Lastly, the Applicant had to show that the granting of the variance would not substantially impair the public good or the intent or integrity of the Zone Plan and Regulations.



The Commission concluded that the Applicant fully complies with the applicable variance test by having shown that the narrow width of the Property is an exceptional condition that prevents the Applicant from providing the required minimum width for the four parking spaces, the proposed parking spaces in the rear of the Property cannot be reconfigured due to the narrowness and depth of the lots, and the reduction of the mandatory width is minor and will not adversely affect neighboring property or the Zoning Regulations.

#### Contested issues

The Commission has imposed conditions on the variance intended to mitigate the adverse effects of development of the site identified by the Co-op. The Commission believes the condition requiring development in accordance with the site plan, roof plan, massing, and building envelope and “open court” shown in the Applicant’s PowerPoint Presentation at the hearing is adequate to address the Co-op’s concerns related to the height of development on the site. (Ex. 38.) The Commission declines to include conditions related to the fenestration and balconies, and continued coordination between the Applicant and the Co-op because these would impose burdens greater than what would be required under the existing matter-of-right zoning, and are wholly unrelated to the requested relief. The Commission nonetheless encourages the Applicant to coordinate with the Co-op as it moves forward with the project. The Commission believes that it is both inappropriate and unnecessary to require the Applicant to follow either the BZA or PUD rules should it seek a modification of this Order. Any modification will require a hearing before the Commission unless it is so minor as to permit the use of the Consent Calendar procedures set forth at 11 DCMR § 3030. Further, the revisions to Title 11 adopted in Z.C. Case No. 08-06A create identical modification procedures for both the BZA and the Commission. These will become effective of September 6<sup>th</sup> of this year.

The Commission disagrees with the Applicant’s position that it lacks the power to enforce these conditions through a covenant. The BZA has in the past required covenants to establish easements. See *BZA Appeal No. 9975 Helen J. Barnes* (1969) (condition to variance requiring covenant to be provided to neighbors for accessory uses) and *BZA Appeal No. 9926 Francis W. Kraemer, Jr* (1968) (“condition to variance requiring a covenant establishing an easement for parking). The BZA has also required covenants to effectuate residential parking permit restrictions. See *Application No. 18891 of 14 & H, LLC* (2015) and *Application No. 19145 of Linden Court Partners LLC* (2015). However, the only substantive condition in this Order is that the property be developed in accordance with the revised plans subject to certain flexibility granted. That condition is consistent with the BZA regulation requiring that construction of a building must be in accordance with approved plans and no covenant is required to enforce that requirement. The Commission therefore will not require a covenant here. Like any other variance, the conditions of this order run with the land and are binding upon both present and future property owners.

#### Great Weight:

The Commission is required under § 13(d) of the Advisory Neighborhood Commissions Act of 1975, effective March 26, 1976 (D.C. Law 1-21; D.C. Official Code § 1-309.10(d)) to give great

weight to the affected ANC's written recommendation. ANC 1A took no official position in this case.

The Commission is required under § 5 of the Office of Zoning Independence Act of 1990, effective September 20, 1990 (D.C. Law 8-163, D.C. Official Code § 6-623.04) to give great weight to OP's recommendations. The Commission concurs with OP's recommendation to rezone the Property to the R-5-B Zone District and grant the variance for the width of the parking spaces and has given its recommendation the great weight to which it is entitled.

### **DECISION**

In consideration of the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law contained in this Order, the Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia hereby **ORDERS APPROVAL** of the application for an amendment of the Zoning Map to change the zoning of Lots 39, 40, 72, and 838 in Square 2848 from R-4 to R-5-B and variance relief from the required size of parking spaces in Lots 39 and 40. The variance is subject to the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall develop Lots 39 and 40 in accordance with the site plan labeled as "Plat with proposed improvements" on Sheet A1.0 of Exhibit 38; the roof plan labeled as "Roof plan" on Sheet A1.7 of Exhibit 38; and with the building massing, building envelope and "open court" shown in the "Front elevation" "Rear Elevation" and "West elevation" on Sheets A2.1 and A2.2 of the portion of Exhibit 38 ("Building Dimension Sheets"). The Applicant shall have flexibility to modify all other aspects of the Revised Plans included in Exhibit 38, including, but not limited to materials, design elements, interior configuration, and layout of the dwelling units, provided that the structure does not exceed the dimensions shown in the Building Dimension Sheets.
2. The variance granted by this Order shall be valid for a period of no longer than two years from its effective date unless, within such period, the plans for the erection or alteration are filed for the purposes of securing a building permit, except as stated in this condition. Any permit approved shall be issued within a period of six months after the date of the filing of an application for the permit. The erection or alteration approved in the permit shall be started within six months after the date of the issuance of the permit, and shall proceed to completion in accordance with its terms. If the work is not started within such period, the permit shall expire and shall not be renewed. In the event an appeal is filed in a court of competent jurisdiction from an order of the Commission, all time limitations in this section shall commence to run from the decision date of the court's final determination of the appeal. Unless stayed by the Commission or a court of competent jurisdiction, an appellant or applicant may proceed pursuant to the order of the Commission prior to the court's final determination.
3. The Commission may extend the time period of validity of the variance granted by this Order for good cause shown upon the filing of a written request by the Applicant before the expiration of the approval; provided, that the Commission determines that the following requirements are met:

- (a) The extension request is served on all parties to the application by the applicant, and all parties are allowed 30 days to respond;
  - (b) There is no substantial change in any of the material facts upon which the Commission based its original approval of the application that would undermine the Commission's justification for approving the original application; and
  - (c) The Applicant demonstrates that there is good cause for such extension, with substantial evidence of one or more of the following criteria:
    - (1) An inability to obtain sufficient project financing due to economic and market conditions beyond the applicant's reasonable control;
    - (2) An inability to secure all required governmental agency approvals by the expiration date of the Commission's order because of delays that are beyond the applicant's reasonable control; or
    - (3) The existence of pending litigation or such other condition, circumstance, or factor beyond the applicant's reasonable control.
4. The time extension shall not exceed two years. The Commission's decision on the request shall be in writing and shall become final and effective upon its filing in the record and service upon the parties. A request for a time extension shall toll the expiration date for the sole purpose of allowing the Commission to consider the request. If the request is not decided prior to this Order's expiration date, no application for a building permit may be filed pursuant to this Order unless and until a decision granting the request becomes final and effective.
5. The Applicant is required to comply fully with the provisions of the Human Rights Act of 1977, D.C. Law 2-38, as amended, and this Order is conditioned upon full compliance with those provisions. In accordance with the D.C. Human Rights Act of 1977, as amended, D.C. Official Code § 2-1401.01 et seq., ("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, 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 that is also prohibited by the Act. In addition, harassment based on any of the above protected categories is also prohibited by the Act. Discrimination in violation of the Act will not be tolerated. Violators will be subject to disciplinary action.

On February 8, 2016, upon a motion of Commissioner Miller, as seconded by Vice Chairperson Cohen, the Zoning Commission **APPROVED** the application at its public meeting by a vote of

**5-0-0** (Anthony J. Hood, Marcie I. Cohen, Robert E. Miller, Peter G. May, and Michael G. Turnbull to approve).

On March 14, 2016, upon a motion of Commissioner Miller, as seconded by Commissioner Turnbull, the Zoning Commission **ADOPTED** this Order at its public meeting by a vote of **5-0-0** (Marcie I. Cohen, Robert E. Miller, Peter G. May, and Michael G. Turnbull to adopt; Anthony J. Hood to adopt by absentee ballot).

In accordance with the provisions of 11 DCMR § 3028, this Order shall become final and effective upon publication in the *D.C. Register* on April 15, 2016.



---

**ANTHONY J. HOOD**  
**CHAIRMAN**  
**ZONING COMMISSION**



---

**SARA A. BARDIN**  
**DIRECTOR**  
**OFFICE OF ZONING**