

Before the Board of Zoning Adjustment, D. C.

PUBLIC HEARING--Jan. 13, 1965

Appeal #8050 Paul Shaffer and Mildred Shaffer Davis, appellants.

The Zoning Administrator District of Columbia, appellee.

On motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried the following Order was entered on January 13, 1965:

ORDERED:

That the appeal for permission to erect a one-story side addition to existing automobile repair shop at 924 - 4th Street, N.W., lot 887, square 516, be granted conditionally.

From the records and the evidence adduced at the hearing, the Board finds the following facts:

(1) Appellant's lot, which is located in the C-3-B District, has a frontage of fifty-five feet on 4th Street with depths of 100 feet and 80 feet. The lot contains an area of 5040 square feet of land. The southern portion of this lot abuts a 20 foot wide public alley which extends to 30 feet in width immediately south of appellant's land.

(2) Appellant's lot is improved with a one-story brick building which is utilized for automobile repairing, i.e. front end alignment. Appellant proposes to erect a one-story addition on the north side of the building 40 x 19 feet in size to enlarge the facilities of this repair shop. There is a fourteen foot wide driveway from 4th Street into an open area approximately 45 x 35 feet in size which will be utilized for parking cars awaiting and after being repaired.

(3) Property across K Street and 4th Street is all located in the C-3-B District and south of Eye Street property is zoned SP.

(4) The Department of Highways and Traffic offers no objection to the granting of this appeal.

(5) The building is not within 25 feet of a residential district as all surrounding property is located in the C-3-B District.

(6) Appellant has met all requirements relative to a repair garage contained in Section 7403 paragraphs 7403.11, 7403.12 and 7403.13 of the Zoning Regulations.

(7) There was one person in opposition representing property at 402-04-06-08-11 K Street being lots 859 thru 863, square 516 immediately north of and abutting appellant's property. The objection was that appellant proposes to close her alley to erect the proposed addition. The records of the District of Columbia indicate that there is no alley to be closed by appellant.

OPINION:

We are of the opinion that the erection of this addition will not tend to create dangerous or other objectionable traffic conditions as applicant has ample access through the street or through the 20 foot wide public alley. Further, he provides a parking area in front which is ample to park automobiles and to maneuver the cars coming in and out of the premises.

We are of the further opinion that no requirements are necessary to protect adjacent or nearby property.

This Order shall be subject to the following condition:

- (a) All grease pits or hoists hereafter constructed or established as part of this use shall be within a building.