

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



**Application No. 18865 of Kevin Latner**, as amended, pursuant to 11 DCMR § 3103.2, for variances from lot occupancy, nonconforming structure, alley setback and rear yard coverage requirements under sections 403, 2001.3, 2300, 2301, 2500, to allow the construction of a new two car garage serving a flat in the R-4 District at premises 21 Quincy Place, N.W. (Square 3101, Lot 104).<sup>1</sup>

**HEARING DATES:** December 16, 2014 and February 10, 2015

**DECISION DATE:** February 10, 2015

**SUMMARY ORDER**

**SELF-CERTIFIED**

The zoning relief requested in this case was self-certified, pursuant to 11 DCMR § 3113.2. (Exhibit 5.)

The Board of Zoning Adjustment (“Board”) provided proper and timely notice of the public hearing on this application by publication in the *D.C. Register* and by mail to Advisory Neighborhood Commission (“ANC”) 5E and to owners of property within 200 feet of the site. The site of this application is located within the jurisdiction of ANC 5E, which is automatically a party to this application. ANC 5E submitted a report in support of the application. In its report the ANC indicated that at a regularly scheduled and properly noticed public meeting on November 18, 2014, at which a quorum was present, the ANC voted 6-0-0 to support the application. (Exhibit 31.)

The Office of Planning (“OP”) submitted a timely report indicating that it cannot support the variance relief requested and finding that the Applicant did not establish a nexus between the uniqueness of the property and a practical difficulty. (Exhibit 32.) Additionally, in response to a supplemental filing from the Applicant, OP submitted a supplemental report indicating that it remained unable to support the variance relief requested in this application. (Exhibit 35.) The District Department of Transportation (“DDOT”) submitted a timely report of “no objection” to the application. (Exhibit 27.)

---

<sup>1</sup> The Applicant amended the application at the public hearing to remove his request for relief from the accessory building height requirements under § 2500.4. The caption has been changed accordingly.

**BZA APPLICATION NO. 18865**  
**PAGE NO. 2**

A petition in support signed by three neighbors was submitted to the record. (Exhibits 29-30.)

Variance Relief

As directed by 11 DCMR § 3119.2, the Board has required the Applicant to satisfy the burden of proving the elements that are necessary to establish the case pursuant to § 3103.2 for a variance from the alley setback requirement of § 2300.2. No parties appeared at the public hearing in opposition to the application. Accordingly, a decision by the Board to grant this application would not be adverse to any party.

The Board is required to give “great weight” to the recommendation of the Office of Planning. (D.C. Official Code § 6-623.04 (2012 Repl.)) In this case, OP did not recommend that the Board grant the relief requested. OP based its recommendation on the finding that the property exhibits no exceptional characteristics that create a practical difficulty. The Board, however, finds that the Applicant’s right to rebuild a one-car carriage house coupled with the narrowness of the lot creates an exceptional situation that leads to a practical difficulty. Further, the Board finds that the variance relief requested in this case is *de minimis* in nature and, accordingly, a lesser burden of proof rests on the Applicant. *See Gilmartin v. D.C. Bd. of Zoning Adjustment*, 579 A.2d 1164, 1171 (D.C. 1990) (Holding that “the severity of the variance(s) requested” is among the proper factors for the Board’s consideration).

The Board closed the record at the conclusion of the hearing. Based upon the record before the Board, and having given great weight to the ANC and OP reports, the Board concludes that the Applicant has met the burden of proof under 11 DCMR § 3103.2, 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 Zoning Regulations, and that the requested relief can be created 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.

Pursuant to 11 DCMR § 3100.5, the Board has determined to waive the requirements 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 appropriate in this case.

It is therefore **ORDERED** that the application is hereby **GRANTED SUBJECT TO THE APPROVED PLANS AT EXHIBIT 7**.

**VOTE: 4-0-1** (Jeffrey L. Hinkle, Marnique Y. Heath, Lloyd J. Jordan, and Robert E. Miller, to Approve; one Board seat vacant.)

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

ATTESTED BY:   
**SARA A. BARDIN**  
**Director, Office of Zoning**

**FINAL DATE OF ORDER:** February 20, 2015

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.

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 PURPOSE OF SECURING A BUILDING PERMIT, OR THE APPLICANT FILES A REQUEST FOR A TIME EXTENSION PURSUANT TO § 3130.6 AT LEAST 30 DAYS PRIOR TO THE EXPIRATION OF THE TWO-YEAR PERIOD AND THAT SUCH REQUEST IS GRANTED. NO OTHER ACTION, INCLUDING THE FILING OR GRANTING OF AN APPLICATION FOR A MODIFICATION PURSUANT TO §§ 3129.2 OR 3129.7, SHALL EXTEND THE TIME PERIOD.

PURSUANT TO 11 DCMR § 3125, APPROVAL OF AN APPLICATION SHALL INCLUDE APPROVAL OF THE PLANS SUBMITTED WITH THE APPLICATION FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A BUILDING OR STRUCTURE (OR ADDITION THERETO) OR THE RENOVATION OR ALTERATION OF AN EXISTING BUILDING OR STRUCTURE. AN APPLICANT SHALL CARRY OUT THE CONSTRUCTION, RENOVATION, OR ALTERATION ONLY IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PLANS APPROVED BY THE BOARD AS THE SAME MAY BE AMENDED AND/OR MODIFIED FROM TIME TO TIME BY THE BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT.

PURSUANT TO 11 DCMR § 3205, THE PERSON WHO OWNS, CONTROLS, OCCUPIES, MAINTAINS, OR USES THE SUBJECT PROPERTY, OR ANY PART THERETO, SHALL COMPLY WITH THE CONDITIONS IN THIS ORDER, AS THE SAME MAY BE AMENDED AND/OR MODIFIED FROM TIME TO TIME BY THE BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT. FAILURE TO ABIDE BY THE CONDITIONS IN THIS ORDER, IN WHOLE OR IN PART SHALL BE GROUNDS FOR THE REVOCATION OF ANY BUILDING PERMIT OR CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY ISSUED PURSUANT TO THIS ORDER.

**BZA APPLICATION NO. 18865**

**PAGE NO. 4**

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 WHICH IS PROHIBITED BY THE ACT. IN ADDITION, HARASSMENT BASED ON ANY OF THE ABOVE PROTECTED CATEGORIES IS PROHIBITED BY THE ACT. DISCRIMINATION IN VIOLATION OF THE ACT WILL NOT BE TOLERATED. VIOLATORS WILL BE SUBJECT TO DISCIPLINARY ACTION.