

PUBLIC HEARING -- September 22, 1965

Appeal No. #8356 Peter C. Laganas, Appellant.

The Zoning Administrator District of Columbia, Appellee.

On motion duly made, seconded and carried, the following Order was entered at the meeting of the Board on October 19, 1965 with Mr. Samuel Scrivener, Jr. and Mr. William F. McIntosh not voting.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF THIS ORDER -- March 1, 1966

ORDERED:

That the appeal for a variance from the FAR requirements of the R-4 District to permit use of the basement for apartments in existing apartment building at 604 and 610 Longfellow Street, NW., lots 85 and 86, square 3207, be granted.

From the records and evidence adduced at the public hearing, the Board finds that:

(1) Appellant's lots, which are located in the R-4 District have a frontage of 100 feet on Longfellow Street and depths of 142.50 feet and contain 14,250 square feet each.

(2) Appellant provides off-street parking spaces at the rear of the lots.

(3) Appellant's lots are improved with two apartment buildings containing 21 units each.

(4) Appellant states in Exhibit 6 that the apartment buildings have been subject to attacks from vandals. Further, "there is a vast open and unoccupied space in the basement and these buildings had to be built this way because of the drop in grade of about twelve feet from the street in front to the rear."

(5) Appellant requests permission to use 1,500 square feet in the basement, thereby obtaining an 11% increase in FAR.

(6) The permissible FAR for the R-4 District is 0.9.

(7) Appellant asserts that the increased FAR is necessary to preserve and protect the buildings, which are new, from detrimental forces operating in the neighborhood.

(8) Appellant proposes to make basement apartments which will be occupied by someone who will manage the property and furnish some protection from further vandalism.

(9) Pursuant to a request from the Board, the appellant says the present FAR of each of his buildings is .899 and the new FAR will be 1.004.

(10) There was objection to the granting of this appeal reflected in Exhibit 3, a statement of Neighbors, Inc.

OPINION:

The Board is of the opinion that the appellant has shown exceptional situation and condition that warrants a variance from the FAR requirements of the R-4 District. This relief can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and without substantially impairing the intent, purpose, and integrity of the Zoning Regulations and Map. Since the granting of this variance will not affect the size of the existing buildings, the Board concludes that a denial of this request would result in peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties and undue hardship upon the owner of the property.