

PUBLIC HEARING—Nov. 17, 1965

Appeal #8428 James L. Karrick, appellant.

The Zoning Administrator District of Columbia, appellee.

On motion duly made and unanimously carried the following Order was entered on November 24, 1965:

ORDERED:

That the appeal to provide accessory automobile parking on lot 828, square 2037 at the rear of 4707 Connecticut Ave. N.W., for the apartment building located on lot 15, premises 4707 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., be 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) Appellant's lot, which is located in the R-1-A District, has a frontage of 61.95 feet on Davenport Street and a depth of 183.40 feet narrowing down to 28.52 feet in the rear. The lot abuts a 20 foot wide public alley on its west and south boundaries and the lot contains an area of 11, 254 square feet of land.

(2) The proposed parking area will contain twenty automobiles and will provide added parking spaces for the 88 unit apartment building across the alley on Connecticut Avenue.

(3) Appellant will utilize the 20 foot wide public alley as access to the lot and will provide a 20 foot wide space in which to park the cars. The balance of the lot to the east will be landscaped.

(4) Appellant states that the lot is blacktopped and has been used since 1957 and has been in existence since 1932.

(5) There was no objection to the granting of this appeal registered at the public hearing. However, there is one letter on file in opposition at 3218 Davenport Street.

(6) The Department of Highways and Traffic offers no objection to the granting of this appeal and they state that experience with this existing parking lot indicates that no adverse effects upon traffic will result.

OPINION

It is the opinion of this Board that it is economically impracticable to locate this parking within the principal building or on the same lot on which such building is located due to substantial improvements on the lot and due to the restricted size of the lot caused by adverse adjoining ownership.

We are further of the opinion that these parking spaces are so located and all facilities in relation thereto are so designed that they are not likely to become objectionable to adjoining or nearby property because of noise, traffic or other objectionable conditions.