

PUBLIC HEARING—July 14, 1965

Appeal #8273 George Basiliko, appellant.

The Zoning Administrator District of Columbia, appellee.

On motion duly made, seconded and carried with Messrs. Harps and Davis dissenting, the following Order was entered on September 28, 1965:

**ORDERED:**

That the appeal to permit a non-profit organization known as Association of Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia to utilize as a variance from the use provisions of the R-5-C District, premises 1732 - 16th St. N.W., lot 64, square 178, be denied.

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) Appellant's lot, which is located in the R-5-C District, has a frontage of 22 twenty-two feet on 16th Street, a depth of 100 feet to a fifteen foot wide public alley in the rear. The lot contains an area of 2200 square feet of land.

(2) The property is improved with a three-story row brick house used as a dwelling. The building was demolished by fire over a year ago.

(3) Statements of two architects state that because of the fire and water damage, it is economically impossible to rebuild the old structure and that the old structure must be razed completely and a new building erected. Appellant bases his hardship on the fact that it would be economically unfeasible to restore the property; that the area is not one for single-family dwellings, and that the smallness of the lot, required parking, the permitted FAR and the grade and requisite elevator would make the cost of construction likewise economically impractical.

(4) A review of the plat books indicates that there are approximately 50 lots in this square with frontages of twenty feet or less and are located mostly in the R-5-B District.

(5) There was no objection to the granting of this appeal registered at the public hearing.

**OPINION:**

It is our opinion that appellant has failed to prove a case of hardship within the provisions of Section 8207.11 of the Zoning Regulations. The lot in question compares favorably in size and area to the majority of lots in this and other nearby squares. There is no exceptional topography, narrowness, shallowness or shape of the specific piece of property, nor other exceptional situation or condition which would not apply to many properties in this and surrounding squares.

In view of the above it is our opinion that this relief cannot 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.