

Before the Board of Zoning Adjustment, D. C.

PUBLIC HEARING -- March 23, 1966

Appeal No. 8651 Joseph Shuman, appellant

The Zoning Administrator of the District of Columbia, appellee

On motion duly made, seconded and carried, with Mr. Arthur B. Hatton dissenting, the following Order was entered by the Board at its meeting on March 30, 1966.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF ORDER: August 8, 1966

ORDERED:

That the appeal for permission to change nonconforming use from laundry-dry cleaning pickup, tailor's shop to coin operated laundry with maximum of 20 machines at 236 E Street, N.E., lot 807, Sq. 754, be denied.

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

- (1) Appellant's property is located in an R-4 District.
- (2) Lot 807 is improved with a two story brick building. The first floor has a store front. The second floor is used as a residence. The first floor has been used as a dry cleaning pick-up station.
- (3) Appellant proposes to use the first floor as a self-service laundry, with no more than twenty (20) machines.
- (4) The laundry would be open during the hours 7:00 a.m. to 12:00 midnight, seven days a week.
- (5) Appellant states that there are other commercial uses in the immediate vicinity and there is no landry located within six (6) blocks of the property.
- (6) The Capitol Hill Restoration Society opposes the granting of the appeal. "The Society believes that this property could be put to better use than a laundry since, if allowed to be established, it would possibly continue for a long period of time and would be a deterrent to restoration in that particular neighborhood." It is stated that the property one block east of the proposed laundry is now in the process of improvement.

(7) The Capitol Hill Southeast Citizens Association opposes the granting of this appeal. The Association says: "Such a change would tend to deteriorate a portion of the Capitol Hill area that is now under restoration. The property is a dignified flat front house that can be restored as a residence for a single family. If properly done, it could contain large apartments."

(8) There was objection from residents of the neighborhood on the grounds that the proposed use would detract from the residential character and encourage loitering. The record contains the signatures of 39 persons residing in the neighborhood who oppose granting this appeal.

OPINION:

We are of the opinion that the changing of this nonconforming use to a laundry would have an adverse effect upon the present character and the future development of the neighborhood. The laundry would be in operation beyond the ordinary work day and may have increasingly adverse impact upon this residential neighborhood.

Appellant admits the existence of such facilities within six (6) blocks of the proposed use. Therefore, it cannot be concluded that this proposed use is a neighborhood facility that is reasonably necessary and convenient to the residents that it is designed to serve.