

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT



**Application No. 16801 of Martin E. Hardy**, pursuant to 11 DCMR § 3103.2 for a variance from the number of stories under section 400, variances from the lot area and lot width requirements under section 401, a variance from the rear yard requirements under section 404, and variances from the lot occupancy requirements under section 403, to allow the construction of a flat in the R-4 District at premises 1000 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W. (Square 337, Lot 19).

**Note:** The Board amended the application and approved variance relief from subsection 2101.1, required parking spaces. The Board also approved the construction of the flat on the premises to have four stories, not to exceed 40 feet in height.

**HEARING DATE:** December 11, 2001  
**DECISION DATE:** December 11, 2001 (Bench Decision)

**SUMMARY ORDER**

**SELF-CERTIFIED**

The zoning relief requested in this case was self-certified, pursuant to 11 DCMR § 3113.2.

The Board provided proper and timely notice of public hearing on this application, by publication in the D.C. Register, and by mail to Advisory Neighborhood Commission (ANC) 2F, the Office of Planning (OP) and to owners of property within 200 feet of the site. The site of the application is located within the jurisdiction of ANC 2F. ANC 2F submitted a letter in support of the application. The OP submitted a report in opposition to the variance from the number of stories, and in support of the other variances sought.

As directed by 11 DCMR § 3119.2, the Board required the applicant to satisfy the burden of proving the elements that are necessary to establish the case for a variance pursuant to 11 DCMR §§ 3103.2. No person or entity appearing as a party to this case testified in opposition to the application. Accordingly, a decision by the Board to grant this application would not be adverse to any party.

Based upon the record before the Board and having given great weight to the ANC and Office of Planning reports filed in this case, the Board concludes that the

applicant has met the burden of proving under 11 DCMR §§ 3103.2, 400, 401, 403, 404, and 2101.1, that there exists an exceptional or extraordinary situation or condition related to the property that creates a practical difficulty for the owner in complying with the Zoning Regulations, and that the relief can be granted 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. It is therefore **ORDERED** that this application be **GRANTED**.

Pursuant to 11 DCMR § 3101.6, the Board has determined to waive the requirement of 11 DCMR § 3125.3 that the order of the Board be accompanied by findings of fact and conclusions of law. The waiver will not prejudice the rights of any party, and is not prohibited by law.

**VOTE:**        **4 – 0 – 1**        (David W. Levy, Anne M. Renshaw, Geoffrey H. Griffis and Anthony J. Hood to Approve, the third Mayoral Appointee not present, not voting)

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

Each concurring Board member has approved the issuance of this order.

**ATTESTED BY:**

  
**Jerrily R. Kress, FAIA**  
**Director**  
**Office of Zoning**

**FINAL DATE OF ORDER:**        DEC 13 2001

PURSUANT TO 11 DCMR § 3125.6, THIS ORDER WILL BECOME FINAL UPON ITS FILING IN THE RECORD AND SERVICE UPON THE PARTIES. UNDER 11 DCMR § 3125.9, THIS ORDER WILL BECOME EFFECTIVE TEN DAYS AFTER IT BECOMES FINAL.

PURSUANT TO 11 DCMR § 3130, THIS ORDER SHALL NOT BE VALID FOR MORE THAN TWO YEARS AFTER IT BECOMES EFFECTIVE UNLESS, WITHIN SUCH TWO-YEAR PERIOD, THE APPLICANT FILES PLANS FOR THE PROPOSED STRUCTURE WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS FOR THE PURPOSES OF SECURING A BUILDING PERMIT.

THE APPLICANT SHALL COMPLY FULLY WITH THE PROVISIONS OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS ACT OF 1977, D.C. LAW 2-38, AS AMENDED, CODIFIED AS CHAPTER 25 IN TITLE 1 OF THE D.C. CODE. SEE D.C. CODE § 1-2531 (1999). THIS ORDER IS CONDITIONED UPON FULL COMPLIANCE WITH THE HUMAN RIGHTS ACT. THE FAILURE OR REFUSAL OF THE APPLICANT TO COMPLY SHALL BE A PROPER BASIS FOR THE REVOCATION OF THIS ORDER.

rsn