

Before the Board of Zoning Adjustment, D.C.

PUBLIC HEARING -- June 14, 1967 and  
December 13, 1967

Appeal No. 9258 Redevelopment Land Agency of the District of  
Columbia, appellant.

The Zoning Administrator of the District of Columbia, appellee.

On motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried,  
the following Order was entered at the meeting of the Board on  
December 13, 1967.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF ORDER - Dec. 29, 1967

ORDERED:

That the appeal for a variance from the FAR requirements of the R-4 District to permit construction of apartment buildings with an FAR of approximately 0.935 in a housing development at First and M Streets, NW., lots 123 through 125 inclusive, part of 126, 170 through 172 inclusive, 202 through 204 inclusive, part of 205, 238 through 241 inclusive, 245, 246, 841, 842, 863 and 866, square 620, be denied, with Mr. William F. McIntosh not voting.

That the amended appeal for a variance from Section 3307.2 of the Regulations to permit the erection of groups of apartment buildings with division walls from the ground up as single buildings on the above stated lots, be granted.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

(1) All of the subject property is located in the R-4 District and within Northwest No. 1 Urban Renewal Project area, which calls for the development of moderate income housing.

(2) SURSUM CORDA, Inc. is a non-profit mutual aid housing enterprise joining local poor families and locally involved sponsors in the erection of a community of 199 housing units. The sponsoring institutions are Gonzaga High School, St. Aloysius Church, Notre Dame Academy, two units of Georgetown University and other groups. The project will be developed under the legislation termed 221-D-3.

(3) The subject property consists of three (3) tracts of land to be developed as a whole but separated by public streets (First Place, First Terrace, L Place and two 40-foot pedestrian paths). This division of property adversely affects its development because of the shape and configuration of the resulting three development sites. There is a drop in grade along the First Street property line of 28 feet from M Street to L Street and a similar drop in grade from M Street to L Street on a diagonal from northwest to southeast across the site of 34 feet. Also, from M Street to L Street on a diagonal from northeast to southwest, there is a change in grade of approximately 20 feet.

(4) The Board originally heard this appeal at its public hearing on June 14, 1967. The variance requested was denied on the grounds that no hardship existed relating to the subject property to support the requested relief. This action was taken at the meeting on June 20, 1967 but the Order was not issued at that time.

(5) The appeal was amended on December 13, 1967 at the request of the appellant.

(6) The overall project contains a land area of 244,870.87 square feet.

(7) Under the Urban Renewal Plan, the subject development must be accomplished as a unit with the existing adverse topographic conditions and the resulting varying levels of grade at the property lines and across the site. This results in significant practical difficulties.

(8) The land use map for this Urban Renewal Project area shows a proposal for low, medium and high density apartment development. The subject project is compatible with the further development proposed and will meet a market demand for the kinds of units in the moderate income category.

(9) The proposed project will include 23 buildings containing 30 efficiencies, 14 one-bedroom units, 30 two-bedroom units, 14 three-bedroom units, 39 three-bedroom units of two types, 46 four-bedroom units, 20 five-bedroom units and 20 six-bedroom units, for a total of 199 dwelling units. These units can be constructed within all of the requirements of the R-4 District.

(10) The projected rental for the dwelling units ranges from \$90.00 for efficiencies to six bedroom townhouses at \$177.00 per month.

(11) By letter dated December 19, 1967, the Executive Director of the Redevelopment Land Agency advises that the plans submitted to the Board on December 13, 1967 have been reviewed by that agency and approved. "The amendment application conforms in all respects to the provisions of the Northwest Urban Renewal Project No. 1".

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

OPINION:

This Board is of the opinion that the applicant has proved a hardship within the meaning of the variance clause of the Zoning Regulations by reason of the adverse topographic conditions of the site. The requested relief should be granted to relieve the applicant from this hardship.

The Board is further of the opinion that this variance may be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and without impairing the intent, purpose and integrity of the zone plan as embodied in the Zoning Regulations and map.

---