

Before the Board of Zoning Adjustment, D. C.

PUBLIC HEARING -- May 18, 1966

Appeal No. 8736 William Lewis, appellant

The Zoning Administrator of the District of Columbia, appellee

On motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, the following Order was entered by the Board at its meeting on May 31, 1966.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF ORDER: July 5, 1966

ORDERED:

That the appeal for a variance from the provisions of Sections 7201.3 and 7204.1 to permit open parking spaces less than 9' x 19' and less than 10 feet from the building at 1711 - 18th St., N.W., lot 125, Square 153, be granted.

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-5-B District.
- (2) The lot is improved with a three story brick row structure with an English basement, bordering a 12 foot public alley.
- (3) The subject property has a width of 18.75 feet and a depth of 85 feet, and contains 1593.75 square feet of land.
- (4) The building was formerly a rooming house with 9 rental rooms but is now vacant and appellant proposes to remodel it into six apartments and a medical office.
- (5) Section 7202.1 requires that all apartment houses in the R-5-B District shall be provided with one off-street parking space for each two dwelling units.
- (6) Appellant claims credit for two spaces from the prior use and now needs one space. The space provided measures 9 x 18.75 feet whereas the regulations require it to measure 9 x 19 feet. The space will be located 6' 3" from the building whereas it should be at least 10 feet from the building. The window sill opening to the parking space is 8' 10" above the parking ground level.
- (7) No opposition to the granting of this appeal was registered at the public hearing.

OPINION:

We are of the opinion that appellant has proved a hardship within the meaning of the variance clause of the Zoning Regulations, and that a denial of the requested relief will result in peculiar and practical difficulties and undue hardship upon the owner.

Further, we conclude that the relief can 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.