

PUBLIC HEARING—June 16, 1965

Appeal #8231 Louise Pinckernell, appellant.

The Zoning Administrator District of Columbia, appellee.

On motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried the following Order was entered on June 22, 1965:

ORDERED:

That the appeal to continue operation of a parking lot at 2500 East Place, N.W., part of lot 857, square E-1264, be conditionally granted.

As the result of an inspection of the property by the Board, and from the records and the evidence adduced at the hearing, the Board finds the following facts:

(1) This parking lot was originally approved by the Board in November of 1949 appeal #2541. Thereafter the use was extended for 1 year on March 25, 1953, appeal #3505 and was extended for 1 year on Nov. 22, 1954, appeal #3987, and was extended for three years on May 28, 1957, appeal #4759 and again it was extended for a period of ten years on June 22, 1960, in appeal #5934.

(2) Appellant now requests an extension of time on her parking lot for ten years. The Board, however, feels that this is too long a period and that the lot needs certain improvements which are set forth below.

(3) There was limited opposition to the granting of this appeal registered at the hearing, as to the front gate being removed and the rear fence not being in place as required in a previous order of the Board. The Board also noticed that there are now bumper stops alongside the buildings on either side of the lot.

(4) An inspection of the lot indicated that it is in a well kept condition, but that the gate is removed and there is no fence at the rear of the lot as required. The Board therefore makes these conditions prior to issuance of a permit:

- (a) Permit shall issue for a period of five years, but shall be subject to renewal in the discretion of the Board upon the filing of a new appeal in the manner prescribed by the Zoning Regulations.
- (b) Appellant shall provide 8 inch high concrete copings at least three feet from the walls of the buildings on either side of the parking lot.
- (c) Appellant shall provide or rebuild the fence, similar to the one on the front of the lot, along the rear of the parking lot.
- (d) The Board finds that the gate on the front of the parking lot is unnecessary and therefore does not require its renewal.

OPINION:

In view of the above facts and the conditions imposed the Board is of the

opinion that the continued use of this property, subject to conditions heretofore set forth, will create no dangerous or otherwise objectionable traffic conditions; that the present character and future development of the neighborhood will not be affected adversely by the continued use of this property for the parking of automobiles, and that the lot is reasonably necessary and convenient to other uses in the vicinity. In this connection, the Department of Highways and Traffic offers no objection to the granting of this appeal.

Occupancy permit shall not issue until all conditions of this Order are met and complied with. Further, the Board reserves the right to direct revocation of the occupancy permit upon a proper showing that any terms or conditions of this Order have been violated.