

## ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE REGULATION ADMINISTRATION

## NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

Posting Date: February 20, 2009  
Petition Date: April 6, 2009  
Hearing Date: April 20, 2009

License No.: ABRA-081385  
Licensee: Impulse Entertainment Inc  
Trade Name: Blu Lounge & Grill  
License Class: Retailer Class "C" Tavern  
Address: 1805-1807 14<sup>th</sup> Street, NW  
Contact Information: Carol Bolding 202.487.1085

WARD 1                      ANC 1B                      SMD 1B02

Notice is hereby given that this applicant has applied for a license under the D.C. Alcoholic Beverage Control Act and that the objectors are entitled to be heard before the granting of such license on the hearing date at 10:00 am, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor, Suite 7200, 941 North Capitol Street, NE, Washington, DC 20002. Petition and/or request to appear before the Board must be filed on or before the petition date.

NATURE OF OPERATION

New Tavern with 1-4 piece band, DJ, dancing, and light food. Occupancy Load is 250. Summer Garden.

HOURS OF OPERATION AND ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE SALES FOR THE TAVERN AND SUMMER GARDEN

Sunday, 10 am – 2 am; Monday through Thursday, 8 am – 2 am; Friday and Saturday, 8 am – 3 am

HOURS OF ENTERTAINMENT FOR THE TAVERN AND SUMMER GARDEN

Sunday through Thursday, 6 pm – 2 am; Friday and Saturday, 6 pm – 3 am

## ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE REGULATION ADMINISTRATION

## NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

Posting Date: February 20, 2009

Petition Date: April 6, 2009

Hearing Date: April 20, 2009

License No.: ABRA-081330

Licensee: ACS Liquor Holding Company, LLC

Trade Name: 18<sup>th</sup> Street Wine & Spirits

License Class: Retailer's Class "A"

Address: 1917 18<sup>th</sup> Street, NW

Contact: Candace Fitch 202.625.7700

WARD2

ANC 2B

SMD 2B08

Notice is hereby given that this applicant has applied for a license under the D.C. Alcoholic Beverage Control Act and that the objectors are entitled to be heard before the granting of such on the hearing date at 10:00 am, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor, Suite 7200, 941 North Capitol Street, NE, Washington, DC 20002. Petition and/or request to appear before the Board must be filed on or before the petition date.

NATURE OF OPERATION

New full service liquor store with tasting endorsement.

HOURS OF OPERATION, SALES, AND TASTING

Monday – Saturday 9 am – 10 pm

**ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE REGULATION ADMINISTRATION****NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING**

Posting Date: February 20, 2009

Petition Date: April 6, 2009

Hearing Date: April 20, 2009

License No.: ABRA -081091

Licensee: One Stop, Inc.

Trade Name: Saba One Stop Delicatessen Convenience Store

License Class: Retailer Class "B"

Address: 1364 Florida Ave., NE

Contact: Simon M. Osnos 703.356.8233

WARD 5

ANC 5B

SMD 5B08

Notice is hereby given that this applicant has applied for a license under the D.C. Alcoholic Beverage Control Act and that the objectors are entitled to be heard before the granting of such license on the hearing date at 10:00 am, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor, Suite 7200, 941 North Capitol Street, NE, Washington, DC 20002. Petitions and/or requests to appear before the Board must be filed on or before the petition date.

**NATURE OF OPERATION**

Delicatessen/Convenient Store

Transfer with sale to new location

**HOURS OF OPERATION**

Sunday through Saturday: 9 am – 9 pm

**SALE, SERVICE AND CONSUMPTION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES HOURS**

Sunday through Saturday: 9 am – 9 pm

## ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE REGULATION ADMINISTRATION

## NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

Posting Date: February 20, 2009  
Petition Date: April 6, 2009  
Hearing Date: April 20, 2009

License No.: ABRA-081308  
Licensee: Dafney Crews  
Trade Name: Dee's Convenient Store  
License Class: Retailer Class "A"  
Address: 1406 H Street, NE  
Contact Information: Dafney Crews 202-388-4545

WARD 6

ANC 6A

SMD 6A06

Notice is hereby given that this applicant has applied for a license under the D.C. Alcoholic Beverage Control Act and that the objectors are entitled to be heard before the granting of such license on the hearing date at 10:00 am, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor, Suite 7200, 941 North Capitol Street, NE, Washington, DC 20002. Petition and/or request to appear before the Board must be filed on or before the petition date.

NATURE OF OPERATION

New Liquor Store.

HOURS OF OPERATION

Sunday Closed

Monday through Saturday, 9 am – 10 pm

HOURS OF SALES OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES

Sunday Closed

Monday through Saturday, 9 am – 10 pm

## ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE REGULATION ADMINISTRATION

## NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

Posting Date: February 20, 2009  
Petition Date: April 6, 2009  
Hearing Date: April 20, 2009

License No.: ABRA-081162  
Licensee: Castle Noell Group Inc  
Trade Name: t/a Hogates  
License Class: Retailer Class "C" Restaurant  
Address: 800 Water Street, SW  
Contact Information: Karl W. Carter 202.955.1010/Kristina Noell 202.484.6300

WARD 6                      ANC 6D                      SMD 6D01

Notice is hereby given that this applicant has applied for a license under the D.C. Alcoholic Beverage Control Act and that the objectors are entitled to be heard before the granting of such license on the hearing date at 10:00 am, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor, Suite 7200, 941 North Capitol Street, NE, Washington, DC 20002. Petition and/or request to appear before the Board must be filed on or before the petition date.

NATURE OF OPERATION

New Restaurant with Live Entertainment and DJ consisting of R&B, Jazz, Country, Pop, Latin music and Dancing in a Lounge/Supper Club setting for adult patrons in a sophisticated relaxed atmosphere. Occupancy Load is 913. Summer Garden

HOURS OF OPERATION

Sunday through Thursday, 9 am – 2 am; Friday and Saturday, 6 am – 3 am

HOURS OF SALES/SERVICE AND CONSUMPTION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES

Sunday through Thursday, 11 am – 2 am; Friday and Saturday, 11am – 3 am

HOURS OF OPERATION FOR SUMMER GARDEN

Sunday through Wednesday, 9 am – 11 pm; Thursday through Saturday; 9 am – 12 am

HOURS OF SALES/SERVICE AND CONSUMPTION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES FOR THE SUMMER GARDEN

Sunday through Wednesday, 11 am – 11 pm; Thursday through Saturday, 11 am – 12 am

HOURS FOR ENTERTAINMENT

Thursday, 6 pm – 2 am; Friday and Saturday, 6 pm – 3 am

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION REVIEW BOARD****NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING**

The D.C. Historic Preservation Review Board will hold a public hearing to consider applications to designate the following properties as historic landmarks in the D.C. Inventory of Historic Sites. The Board will also consider the nomination of the properties to the National Register of Historic Places:

**Case No. 09-03: The Kennedy-Warren Apartments, amendment of nomination to include portions of the interior  
3131-3133 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Square 2214, Lots 806 and 807 (former Lot 801)**

The hearing will take place at **10:00 a.m. on Thursday, March 26, 2009**, at 441 Fourth Street, NW (One Judiciary Square), in Room 220 South. It will be conducted in accordance with the Review Board's Rules of Procedure (10 DCMR 26). A copy of the rules can be obtained from the Historic Preservation Office at 801 North Capitol Street, NE, Room 3000, Washington, DC 20002, or by phone at (202) 442-8800.

The Board's hearing is open to all interested parties or persons. Public and governmental agencies, Advisory Neighborhood Commissions, property owners, and interested organizations or individuals are invited to testify before the Board. Written testimony may also be submitted prior to the hearing. All submissions should be sent to the address above.

For each property, a copy of the historic landmark application is currently on file and available for inspection by the public at the Historic Preservation Office. A copy of the staff report and recommendation will be available at the office five days prior to the hearing. The office also provides information on the D.C. Inventory of Historic Sites, the National Register of Historic Places, and Federal tax provisions affecting historic property.

If the Historic Preservation Review Board designates the property, it will be included in the D.C. Inventory of Historic Sites, and will be protected by the D.C. Historic Landmark and Historic District Protection Act of 1978. The Review Board will simultaneously consider the nomination of the property to the National Register of Historic Places. The National Register is the Federal government's official list of prehistoric and historic properties worthy of preservation. Listing in the National Register provides recognition and assists in preserving our nation's heritage. Listing provides recognition of the historic importance of properties and assures review of Federal undertakings that might affect the character of such properties. If a property is listed in the Register, certain Federal rehabilitation tax credits for rehabilitation and other provisions may apply. Public visitation rights are not required of owners. The results of listing in the National Register are as follows:

Consideration in Planning for Federal, Federally Licensed, and Federally Assisted Projects: Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 requires that Federal agencies allow the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation an opportunity to comment on all projects affecting historic properties listed in the National Register. For further information, please refer to 36 CFR 800.

Eligibility for Federal Tax Provisions: If a property is listed in the National Register, certain Federal tax provisions may apply. The Tax Reform Act of 1986 (which revised the historic preservation tax incentives authorized by Congress in the Tax Reform Act of 1976, the Revenue Act of 1978, the Tax Treatment Extension Act of 1980, the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981, and the Tax Reform Act of 1984) provides, as of January 1, 1987, for a 20% investment tax credit with a full adjustment to basis for rehabilitating historic commercial, industrial, and rental residential buildings. The former 15% and 20% Investment Tax Credits (ITCs) for rehabilitation of older commercial buildings are combined into a single 10% ITC for commercial and industrial buildings built before 1936. The Tax Treatment Extension Act of 1980 provides Federal tax deductions for charitable contributions for conservation purposes of partial interests in historically important land areas or structures. Whether these provisions are advantageous to a property owner is dependent upon the particular circumstances of the property and the owner. Because the tax aspects outlined above are complex, individuals should consult legal counsel or the appropriate local Internal Revenue Service office for assistance in determining the tax consequences of the above provisions. For further information on certification requirements, please refer to 36 CFR 67.

Qualification for Federal Grants for Historic Preservation When Funds Are Available: The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to grant matching funds to the States (and the District of Columbia) for, among other things, the preservation and protection of properties listed in the National Register.

Owners of private properties nominated to the National Register have an opportunity to concur with or object to listing in accord with the National Historic Preservation Act and 36 CFR 60. Any owner or partial owner of private property who chooses to object to listing must submit to the State Historic Preservation Officer a notarized statement certifying that the party is the sole or partial owner of the private property, and objects to the listing. Each owner or partial owner of private property has one vote regardless of the portion of the property that the party owns. If a majority of private property owners object, a property will not be listed. However, the State Historic Preservation Officer shall submit the nomination to the Keeper of the National Register of Historic Places for a determination of eligibility for listing in the National Register. If the property is then determined eligible for listing, although not formally listed, Federal agencies will be required to allow the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation an opportunity to comment before the agency may fund, license, or assist a project which will affect the property. If an owner chooses to object to the listing of the property, the notarized objection must be submitted to the above address by the date of the Review Board meeting.

For further information, contact Tim Dennee, Landmarks Coordinator, at 202-442-8847.

**GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

**Notice of Public Hearing  
on the**

**“Draft Fiscal Year 2010 Consolidated Annual Action Plan for the District of Columbia”**

**Tuesday, March 24, 2009 \* 6:30 p.m.**

**441 4<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Old Council Chamber  
Washington, D.C. 20002**

The Department of Housing and Community Development (Department), announces a Public Hearing on the “*Draft Fiscal Year 2010 Consolidated Annual Action Plan for the District of Columbia*” (“the Plan”). The hearing will begin at 6:30 p.m., on Tuesday, March 24, 2009, at 441 4<sup>th</sup> Street, NW, Washington, D.C., in the Old Council Chamber. The purpose of the hearing is to provide the public with an opportunity to express its views on the Plan and budgets to be submitted to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for the following federal entitlement programs:

- **Community Development Block Grant Program**
- **HOME Investment Partnerships Program**
- **Emergency Shelter Grant Program**
- **Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS Program (HOPWA)**

The Department will utilize this input from the public, consistent with the District’s economic development strategy, citywide strategic plan, and identified strategic target areas, to finalize the Plan for submission to the Council and HUD. Also available is DHCD’s *Citizen Participation Plan (CPP) for FY 2010*. The CPP outlines the Department’s processes for ensuring that residents are a part of the planning process in the development of the Annual Action Plan.

Both documents will be available for review after Friday, February 20, 2009, at the Department (3<sup>rd</sup> Floor), all public library branches, ANC offices, and the following community-based organizations:

Housing Counseling Services, Inc. 2410 17th Street, NW Suite 100 - (202) 667-7006	Lydia’s House 3939 South Capitol St., SW (202) 373-1050	Central American Resources Center 1460 Columbia Road, NW (202) 328-9799	Latino Economic Dev. Corp 2316 18 <sup>th</sup> Street, NW. (202) 588-5102
University Legal Services 220 I Street, NE, Suite 130 - (202) 547-4747	University Legal Services 3220 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE, Suite 4 - (202) 645-7175	Marshall Heights CDO 3939 Benning Road, NE 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor - (202) 396-1200	

If you wish to present oral testimony, you are encouraged to call (202) 442-7215, or register by email at [DHCDEVENTS@DC.GOV](mailto:DHCDEVENTS@DC.GOV), not later than close of business Monday, March 23, 2009. Please provide your name, address, telephone number, and organizational affiliation, if any. Telecommunications Device for the Deaf (TDD) relay service is available by calling (800) 201-7165. A sign language interpreter will be provided upon request by calling (202) 442-7215. If you require language interpretation, please specify which language (Spanish, Vietnamese, Chinese-Mandarin/Cantonese, Amharic, or French). Interpretation services will be provided to pre-registered persons only. Deadline for requiring services of an interpreter is Monday, March 16, 2009. Bilingual staff will provide services on an availability basis to walk-ins without registration.

Written statements may be submitted for the record at the hearing or until close of business, Friday, March 27, 2009. Written statements may be mailed to: Leila Finucane Edmonds, Director, DHCD, Attention: Office of Strategy and Communications, 1800 MLK Jr., Ave., SE, Washington, DC 20020.

Adrian M. Fenty, Mayor  
Leila Finucane Edmonds, Director, Department of Housing and Community Development  
[www.dhcd.dc.gov](http://www.dhcd.dc.gov)

**ZONING COMMISSION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING**

**TIME AND PLACE:**            **Thursday, April 9, 2009, @ 6:30 p.m.**  
   **Office of Zoning Hearing Room**  
   **441 4<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Suite 220**  
   **Washington, D.C. 2001**

**FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONSIDERING THE FOLLOWING:**

**CASE NO. 08-06-8 (Comprehensive Zoning Regulations Rewrite: Low/Moderate Density Residential)**

**THIS CASE IS OF INTEREST TO ALL ANCs**

This Notice of Public Hearing announces the eighth of several proposed subject areas the Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia (the "Commission") will consider under this docket. All recommendations offered by the Office of Planning ("OP") under this docket have been reviewed by a working group and a subject matter task force as part of a process designed to ensure full public participation. Nevertheless, this process cannot replace or limit the public hearing process required in the Zoning Act or the Commission's responsibility to consider the merits of each proposal submitted.

This hearing will consider general recommendations for changes to the Zoning Regulations in relation to low and moderate density residential zones. The proposal recommends changes to the system for organizing residential zones on a local basis. It proposes changes to the measurement of height, yards, and lot occupancy. The first recommendation lays out the proposed organizational structure, while recommendations two through eight represent customizable requirements within each zone.

This hearing, like all others under this case number, is being scheduled without adherence to the set-down requirements stated at 11 DCMR § 3011 because the Commission waived the requirement at its public meeting held April 14, 2008. The Commission also waived the requirement that a pre-hearing statement be submitted before hearing notices can be published.

It is not expected that the Commission will take proposed action with respect to these recommendations, but that it will make determinations at a public meeting that will serve as guidance for drafting revisions to the zoning regulations pertaining to residential uses and other relevant subject matters.

More detailed information, including detailed explanation of recommendations in this notice, can be found in the OP recommendation document at <http://www.dczoningupdate.org/lowmoderatedensity.asp>.

**Z.C. NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING****Z.C. CASE NO. 08-06-8****PAGE 2**

Title 11 DCMR (Zoning) is proposed to be amended as follows:

**Recommendations**

- 1. Create a general template to establish area and use requirements, and use performance requirements, applicable to all Low Density (i.e. detached and semi-detached dwelling) zones and another for Moderate Density (i.e. row dwelling) zones.**

**Approve text for specific optional tools to add protections, such as tree and slope, or incentives for such uses as arts or residential.**

**After the effective date of the general template provisions, individual neighborhoods may petition the Zoning Commission for the creation of a customized zone that would consist of either:**

- A. Customized modifications to the general template; or**
- B. Adding one or more specific tools to the general template; or**
- C. A combination of the two.**

**Each customized zone would be a residential stand-alone district.**

Reason: The existing system of overlays is often confusing to interpret and apply. Users of the ordinance must reference and compare multiple chapters in the regulations to determine the applicable standards for a property. More importantly, the process for creating overlays for local zoning control is long, unclear, and ad hoc. Each overlay is designed from scratch, usually creating new tools or new lists of uses, and often having minimal organizational or functional relationship to other overlays or the rest of the ordinance.

The Comprehensive Plan recognizes the variety of neighborhoods throughout the District and calls for maintaining that variety (Policy LU-2.1.1). The Plan further recognizes the importance of “an emphasis on conservation in some neighborhoods and revitalization in others” (Policy LU-2.1.3), and expresses a need to “provide a better match between zoning and existing land uses in the city’s residential areas” (Action LU-2.1.C). The Plan also calls for exploration of “changes which would facilitate development of accessory apartments, English basements, and single room occupancy housing units” (Action H-1.5.B).

The Working Group discussions revealed a consensus that the existing regulations are inadequate to accomplish these objectives. Working group members recognized that the existing zoning creates confusion and frustration for both property owners and neighbors, and that it was inadvisable to establish “one-size-fits-all” solutions for the entire city. Several working group members expressed satisfaction with the intent and focus of the current use of overlays to achieve a “micro-zoning” framework, but also recognized that

Z.C. NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING  
Z.C. CASE NO. 08-06-8  
PAGE 3

current methods of applying overlays to base zone districts can be an additional source of confusion.

The proposed solution to this complication and confusion is a system where zone districts are customizable directly rather than through the use of overlays. This would allow the same types of changes achievable through an overlay, but through a standardized system that allows faster, more specific, and more targeted changes to the zoning in residential neighborhoods.

A system of customizable local zones would not involve any immediate changes to the bulk or density limitations or the remapping of particular neighborhoods. The bulk and density standards of each existing zone (i.e. R-1-A, R-1-B, R-2, etc.) will remain the same. Existing overlays would be transferred into the system with their unique bulk and density standards. The template would therefore not necessitate any change to the standards of particular neighborhoods, but would allow for easier local input into the existing process.

- 2. **Height maximums should continue to be measured in feet; however, measurement should be to the top of a flat roof or the mid-point of a sloped roof as shown below. This would remove the need for a separate measure of stories.**



Reason: This recommendation would simplify the measurement of height in low and moderate density residential areas. Currently, height in these zones is measured to the ceiling of the top story. In the diagram above, each of these houses could have different heights based on where the ceiling was placed. Moreover, the two houses on the right would be subject to determinations of whether the tops of the buildings were “attics,” “mezzanines,” or “stories,” which would have further impact on the height measurement while having nothing to do with the actual height as seen from the street. The OP

**Z.C. NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING****Z.C. CASE NO. 08-06-8****PAGE 4**

recommendation would measure height to the top of the building with allowance for roof features or peaked roofs. This proposal would allow for simplified height measurement in a way that is most meaningful to the character of surrounding properties, and when accompanied by a removal of story designations, would greatly simplify administration and enforcement.

**3. Front yard setbacks should be available as tools for local neighborhood zones.**

**Front yard setbacks for new buildings would start no further forward or back than any existing building on the same block face based upon on the characteristics of existing buildings.**

While front yards are often a neighborhood defining element, there is no current mechanism for ensuring their maintenance. Unlike other characteristics, which can often be uniform for several blocks or a large neighborhood area, front yard setbacks are more variable and often change from block to block or on different faces of the same block.

Front yard setbacks in the context of this discussion refer to the distance between the property line and the building line. As noted, there is often an area of “public parking” between the house and the sidewalk that is in public space, but maintained by the property owner. Such public parking may constitute all or part of a front lawn. These areas are not regulated by zoning and would not be counted in any measurement of front yard as defined in zoning.

Office of Planning research has shown while there is general consistency of front yard setback within block faces, the majority of residential buildings in D.C. are *not* built to the front lot line. Based on OP’s citywide study of residential neighborhoods, approximately 80% of the single family residential structures are setback from the property line. Two thirds of rowhouses (66%) and the vast majority of detached homes (92%) are setback. With no current regulation of front yards, there are many areas where a new house could extend forward further than the surrounding group or, conversely, the home could be setback significantly more than its neighbors. Either situation could detract from the character of a residential neighborhood.

Based on OP analysis of existing conditions throughout the city, the most equitable way to regulate front yards would be to base the setback or build-to line on the setbacks of existing buildings on the same block face. This would mean that new buildings could start no further forward or back than any existing building on the same block face.


**4. Side Yards**

- a) **For detached homes, the standard should change from a side yard measure to a measure of the ratio of building width to lot width (shown below). It would still be**

Z.C. NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING  
Z.C. CASE NO. 08-06-8  
PAGE 5

appropriate to maintain an absolute minimum width on each side, but the two side yards could be of a different width as long as the aggregate ratio is met.

- b) Allow buildings to expand along the line of existing non-conforming side yards of any width.
- c) In historic districts, do not allow the elimination of side yards below the minimum standard, even to create an otherwise allowed rowhouse.



Reason: A thorough study of residential side yards around the city showed that there is no regularity to the separation of buildings from one another or to the width of their side lot lines. A standard eight foot requirement for side yards does not promote building location on infill lots that would complement the character of most existing neighborhoods. One method of establishing complementary side yards between new construction and established character would be to allow side yard requirements to vary by local area, however this could be too localized and area-specific to effectively regulate.

The study of side yards performed by OP showed that there is a high degree of regularity across the city in the ratio of a building's width to the width of its lot. These results indicate that compatible infill houses may be more simply and effectively assured through regulation of a maximum Building to Lot Width Ratio (BLWR). Such a standard would ensure that infill structures would be relatively consistent in their placement on their lots compared to similarly situated buildings.

The study shows a consistent average across the city of 70% BLWR with a very low deviation. Adoption of this standard, for example, would assure that R-1-A lots maintained

**Z.C. NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING****Z.C. CASE NO. 08-06-8****PAGE 6**

two side yards that added up to 22.5 feet and R-1-B had two side yards that added up to 15 feet even if both sides were not equal.

To assure a minimum level of compliance in terms of separation from lot lines it is also recommended that a minimum standard for side-yards be established. This standard would ensure a minimum separation for passage and maintenance regardless of where the building is located between the maximum BLWR. The minimum yard should be adequate for human passage and proper building maintenance.

Recommendations 4b and 4c are the result of discussions in the Historic Preservation Working Group. Recommendation 4b would allow for the expansion of all residential structures along non-conforming side yards. The current regulations include side yards less than five feet in the lot occupancy calculations and do not recognize these small open areas as open space. The current regulations also prohibit the matter-of-right extension of side yards less than five feet. This has resulted in property owners choosing to fill in the areas rather than apply for zoning relief. Recommendation 4b would remove the incentive to fill in non-conforming side yards as a way to avoid zoning relief.

Recommendation 4c would protect existing side yards along historic detached and semi-detached structures from being filled in to create row structures. Rowhouses, by definition do not have side yards, thus by converting a structure from a detached or semi-detached structure, a property owner can avoid the necessity of zoning relief due to a non-conforming side yard. However, these definitional conversions to rowhouses often conflict with the historic character and fabric of a neighborhood or the structure itself. The recommendation of 4c to restrict the unnatural removal of side yards in historic districts is an important clarification for the protection of the existing character of certain historic neighborhoods.

In non-historic districts, a series of BZA cases has provided inconsistent precedent as to whether a detached or semi detached dwelling may be converted to a row dwelling. Its most recent order suggests that such a conversion is not permissible. OP recommends that such conversion should be permitted as a matter of right in any residential districts where side yards are not required.

**5. Repeal current court width and area requirements. Courts would no longer be regulated.**

Reason: The existing court requirements were created in 1958 as a light and air standard. The majority of residential courts created prior to that time did not meet the area and width standards and are considered non-conforming. Since the date of the original regulations, building code standards have evolved to provide light, air, and fire protection standards for all buildings. Since the original purpose of the court requirements has been supplanted by modern building codes, and the main impact of the requirements is to force variances on

**Z.C. NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING****Z.C. CASE NO. 08-06-8****PAGE 7**

court expansions, OP recommends removing the requirement. Counter-intuitively, this would lead to more retention of existing non-conforming courts by removing the incentive to fill them in to avoid a variance procedure.

6.
  - a) **Each low to moderate residential zone should have a minimum matter-of-right building footprint regardless of lot size. Lot occupancy limits would continue to apply for buildings larger than the minimum matter-of-right standard.**
  - b) **Exclude narrow courts and narrow side yards from footprint and lot occupancy calculations.**

Reason: A very noticeable impact of the current use of lot occupancy is the number of variance requests for construction or addition on smaller lots. Almost 20% of all variance requests are for lot occupancy on low and moderate density residential lots and the majority of those are on substandard lots. Generally, these are cases of buildings that fit exactly with the pattern of the neighborhood, but because of the variation in lot size, cannot build what their neighbors have as a matter of right.

A solution to this problem is to allow a minimum building footprint for any house in the neighborhood based on the characteristics of the homes in the area. For example, in an area where the building footprints are generally 1200 square feet, a lot would be entitled to a 1200 square foot building footprint even if the lot was smaller than the standard lot size due to the layout of the block.

The minimum footprint proposal would not limit the right of anyone with a larger lot from developing a larger building based on the existing lot occupancy standard. The maximum footprint of buildings would be the greater of the allowable footprint or the lot occupancy.

Based on the Lewis Plan, lot occupancy limits were originally implemented to preserve open space in residential areas. They are still useful and should be maintained for that reason. The proposal would only impact the smallest lots where open space is minimal and is outweighed by character issues and the number of created variances.

Recommendation 6b would remove narrow side yards and courts from the calculation of lot occupancy. As discussed in Recommendation 4 above, there is an incentive in the existing regulations for homeowners to fill in existing side yards and courts since they already count as lot occupancy by definition and would not therefore require a variance to add space to the building.

7. **Rowhouses should have a matter-of-right depth by which they may extend into a lot, even if it would result in the reduction or elimination of a required rear yard.**

## Z.C. NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

Z.C. CASE NO. 08-06-8

PAGE 8

**If an area remains between the rear of a rowhouse and the rear property line that is less than the minimum rear requirement, it shall be deemed to satisfy the rear yard requirement.**

Reason: As with lot occupancy, there is a demonstrated need in row house areas for a minimum standard size for a building when the lots are cut short by diagonal streets or odd alley layouts. OP recommends a similar solution to the one for lot occupancy. Row house buildings should have an allowable building depth based on the local building form that is achievable regardless of lot depth. This would allow infill to match the existing building characteristics and avoid unnecessary variances.

Also as with lot occupancy, for lots deeper than standard the allowable building depth would not limit development up to the existing required rear yard. Each building would be limited to the greater of the allowable building depth or the rear yard measurement.

- 8. Maintain the existing limits on number of dwelling units per lot, but permit customization of the standard for new customized Low and Moderate Density residential districts that are not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan.**

Reason: Protection of existing neighborhood character in the city is hampered by the lack of flexibility in the existing moderate apartment zones. In many cases, rowhouse areas zoned R-5-B should appropriately be limited to four or six units, while many areas zoned R-5-A have a single family detached character that is threatened by the unlimited unit count. Many R-4 areas of the city have the room and the desire for three unit buildings. Current regulations provide no ability to customize the zones R-4 and below while also providing no density protection to areas zoned R-5-B that have well established rowhouse character.

This recommendation would result in the ability to customize low and moderate residential zones that more easily bridge the transition from the one- and two-unit zones to the unlimited units permitted in the R-5 apartment zones. It would allow future planning processes to base unit density on the characteristics of a neighborhood rather than the limited choices that now exist.

- 9. a) Continue to regulate lot area and width standards by type of structure for the creation of new lots.**
- b) Allow minimum matter-of-right construction of residential uses on existing sub-standard lots that are not being further subdivided.**

Reason: The current regulations establish the allowable lot size on the type of building. OP would recommend maintaining existing standards and consolidating into one section for ease of use in the creation of new lots.

**Z.C. NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING****Z.C. CASE NO. 08-06-8****PAGE 9**

There are many legally existing lots that do not meet the minimum lot size standards for their applicable zone districts. OP recommends that minimum matter-of-right construction be allowed on existing lots that do not meet current standards. All new or changed lots would continue to be subject to existing lot size standards.

- 10. Provide a matter-of-right square footage allowance for accessory structures on substandard lots. Structures above the matter-of-right standard would be subject to lot occupancy limits meaning that property owners could build larger accessory structures by transferring unused footprint allowance from the primary structure.**

Reason: OP recommends that each residential lot utilizing the building footprint allowance rather than lot occupancy (see Recommendation 6) should be provided with a matter-of-right square footage allowance for accessory structures separate from lot occupancy. To exceed this allowance, both the main building and the accessory structure would have to meet the lot occupancy limitation in the traditional way.

Under this recommendation each lot would either have 1) a total lot occupancy limit for all buildings; or 2) two footprint allowances, one for the main building and one for an accessory building.

- 11. In shifting to a system of use control by general category rather than use lists, control the establishment of retail, service, institutional, and office uses (including home occupations) through performance measures. Within general limits, performance measures that apply to each category could be customizable to meet the needs of particular neighborhoods (i.e. hours of operation, maximum GFA, etc.)**

Reason: Many areas of the city were historically built with a strong presence of neighborhood retail and service uses. As the city strives to promote more local food availability, walkable neighborhoods, reduced reliance on the automobile, and healthy urban environments there will be increased demand for corner stores and home businesses that allow for sustainable living.

Moreover, the existing home occupation regulations have a very limited list of possible home occupation uses. As traffic increases and technology evolves, there will be increased pressure and opportunities to telecommute and to do an increasing amount of work from home. There will be a need to allow and promote a wide variety of home occupations and allow some local customization of the standards.

OP recommends that local residential neighborhoods have the flexibility through the planning process to allow for limited commercial uses. These uses would be controlled and regulated by impact through performance measures as described in the broader discussion of uses as part of the Retail subject area.

Z.C. NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING  
Z.C. CASE NO. 08-06-8  
PAGE 10

The appropriateness of an area for such neighborhood uses would be determined on a local basis by small area plan, with reference to the Comprehensive Plan and historic preservation constraints.

- 12. Expand types of uses for adaptive reuse of historic institutional buildings. Conditions would be put on the impacts of new uses in these buildings that would allow development as either matter-of-right or special exception.**

Reason: Historic institutional buildings should not be left in disuse if the use closes. The regulations should allow, through special exception or matter-of-right, the opportunity to reuse the buildings for government offices uses and other uses that are compatible with residential neighborhoods. Approval of this recommendation would simplify the path for adaptive reuse of these buildings and encourage limitation of negative impacts by offering a matter-of-right option.

- 13. Allow a second residential structure on the same lot in those zones that allow two or more dwelling units per building, where the lot is served by an alley of suitable width.**

Reason: As a matter-of-right or special exception as appropriate, OP recommends allowing the establishment of accessory residential units with appropriate alley access. This will allow for the adaptive reuse of existing carriage houses while also providing a source of affordable housing. These units would count against the total number of units allowed on the lot the same as any accessory unit.

- 14. Update loading standards for additions to historic structures to match parking standards in all zone districts.**

Reason: OP recommends that there be a similar threshold test for the requirement of loading for additions to historic structures as was adopted for parking requirements. This would mean that additions to historic structures that are over 50% the gross floor area of the original structure would have loading requirements based on the area of the addition. The requirement would only apply to the addition; the original structure would never have a loading requirement regardless of use change.

## **PROCEDURES**

The public hearing on this part of Case No. 08-06 will be conducted as a rulemaking in accordance with the provisions of § 3021 of the District of Columbia Municipal Regulations, Title 11, Zoning. The Commission will impose time limits on testimony presented to it at the public hearing.

**Z.C. NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING****Z.C. CASE NO. 08-06-8****PAGE 11**

All individuals, organizations, or associations wishing to testify in this case should file their intention to testify in writing. Written statements, in lieu of personal appearances or oral presentations, may be submitted for inclusion in the record.

Information should be forwarded to the Secretary of the Zoning Commission, Office of Zoning, Suite 210, 441 4<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001. Please include the number of the particular case and your daytime telephone number. **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, YOU MAY CONTACT THE OFFICE OF ZONING AT (202) 727-6311.**

**ANTHONY J. HOOD, GREGORY N. JEFFRIES, WILLIAM W. KEATING, III, PETER G. MAY, AND MICHAEL G. TURNBULL ----- ZONING COMMISSION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, BY RICHARD S. NERO, JR., ACTING DIRECTOR, AND BY SHARON S. SCHELLIN, SECRETARY TO THE ZONING COMMISSION.**