Before the Board of Zoning Adjustment, D.C.

PUBLIC HEARING - November 22, 1967

Appeal No. 9396 Mary Pritchard, 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 November 30, 1967.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF ORDER - July 1, 1968

ORDERED:

That the appeal for variance of the floor area ratio requirements of the R-5-C District and for permission to provide underground parking access on lot 801 for the proposed Holiday Inn to be located at the northwest corner of Connecticut Avenue and Leroy Place, NW., lots 65,66,800,801, Square 2530, be partially granted conditionally.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. The subject property is located partially in an R-5-C District and partially located in an R-3 District.

2. Appellant proposes to construct a 9-story, 143 room hotel on this site.

3. The site measures approximately 110 feet on Connecticut Avenue, NW. and 125 feet in depth along Leroy Place, NW.

4. Appellant amends this appeal to withdraw the request for a service garage over Lot 801 which is located in the R-3 District.

5. Appellant now proposes to use Lot 801 which has a 25 foot width for a portion of a proposed service drive. Additionally, appellant seeks permission to install two (2) underground vault levels, and include in one end of those vaults on each level a parking area for two (2) cars. The primary purpose is to allow a turn-around for automobile entrance into the garage, the main entrance which will be on the north end of Connecticut Avenue, NW. The entrance will go underground in the pool area to the end of Lot 801 to provide a turn-around which will come back under the proposed building. This will be

(Fact No. 5 cont'd)

done on both levels to provide access to parking areas. Seventy-two (72) spaces are required.

6. The area in Lot 801 shall not be utilized for storage or mechanical equipment. No part of the vault shall be visible from the exterior and the surface is to be landscaped.

7. Appellant seeks a variance of permissible FAR 3.5 to in excess of 3.7. As designed, the building contains 51,618 square feet or approximately 3.500 feet more than permissible. Lot coverage is less than 50 percent.

8. It is urged that the lot as it presently exists has an elevation from 145 to 172 from the corner of Leroy Place and Connecticut Avenue to the northwest corner of the lot. Appellant states that test borings indicate that it is not practical or economically feasible to go lower than .135. To do so would require blasting and considerable hand excavation, and would cause the need for shoring and sheathing to underpin adjacent apartment buildings as well as Leroy Place itself.

9. Additionally, appellant seeks an increased FAR to obtain "a sufficient number of rooms of a minimum size required by the tenants to make it practical to construct."

10. Appellant asserts that service areas for laundry and linen facilities, mechanical equipment and trash room will have to be located in an area to be computed in the FAR, creating undue hardship.

11. The Department of HIghways and Traffic offers no objection to the granting of this appeal but does "object to the loading dock proposed for Leroy Place. This is a narrow (28 foot wide) residential street which is one way eastbound. It can only be reached by traveling over other narrow residential streets. It is recommended that this building be redesigned to provide a loading dock that can be reached from the Connecticut Avenue entrance to this building.

The vaults as shown on the prints are acceptable from our standpoint."

12. Opposition to the granting of this appeal was registered at the public hearing based on excessive traffic, both truck and passenger car on Leroy Place.

OPINION:

We are of the opinion that the appellant has proven a hardship within the meaning of the variance clause of the Zoning Regulations with regard to underground parking access under Lot 801, and that the denial of this portion of this appeal will result in peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties and undue hardship upon the owner. Further, this requested 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.

However, that portion of this appeal to vary the FAR requirements of the R-5-C District is hereby denied in that the appellant has not shown, at this time, a hardship within the meaning of the variance clause of the Zoning Regulations.

This Order shall be subject to the following conditions:

(a) The Board denies a FAR variance.

(b) The Board approves the use of the R-3 lot for underground access to the underground parking.

(c) The upper portion of Lot 801 shall be landscaped.

(d) Motorists on Leroy Place will be prohibited from turning into the driveway on Leroy Place.

(e) Motorists leaving via either of the two driveways on Connecticut Avenue will be required to turn right and proceed south on Connecticut Avenue.

BY ORDER OF THE D.C. BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

ATTESTED:

By: Charles E. Morgan
CHARLES E. MORGAN, Secretary of the Board

Before the Board of Zoning Adjustment, D.C.

PUBLIC HEARING - November 22, 1967

Appeal No. 9396 Mary Pritchard, appellant.

THE ZONING ADMINISTRATOR OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, appellee.

On motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, the following amendment was entered at the meeting of the Board on February 14, 1968.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF AMENDMENT - July 1, 1968

ORDERED:

That the appeal for a variance of the floor area ratio requirements of the R-5- C District and for permission to provide underground parking access on Lot 801 for the proposed Holiday Inn to be located at the northwest corner of Connecticut Avenue and Leroy Place, NW., lots 65,66,800,801, Square 2530, be reconsidered and that the requested variance to permit an FAR not in excess of 3.8 be granted.

That the OPINION be changed to read:

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 exceptional practical difficulties and undue hardship upon the owner.

Further, we hold that the requested 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.

BY ORDER OF THE D.C. BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

ATTESTED:

By: Charles E. Morgan
CHARLES E. MORGAN
Secretary of the Board