

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT

TO: District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment
FROM: Stephen J. Mordfin, AICP, Case Manager
Joel Lawson, Associate Director Development Review
DATE: May 28, 2013
SUBJECT: MODIFICATION REQUEST - BZA Case No. 18453

I. RECOMMENDATION

The Office of Planning recommends that the Board approve the modifications as requested by the applicant. The modification is primarily to correct an error in calculation that would not have impacted OP's original analysis of the application.

II. BACKGROUND

In BZA Order 18453, dated December 6, 2012, the Board approved:

- Variance relief to § 2101.1, Parking, to reduce the off-street parking requirement from 56 to 4.

III. PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS

The proposed modification requests to:

- Increase the square footage of the cellar by 108 square feet to 1,992 square feet;
- Include the square footage of the cellar in the total square footage of the building; and
- Amend the parking reduction from 56 to 4 to from 62 to 4.

IV. OP ANALYSIS OF THE MODIFICATIONS

The applicant revised the application to correct an error in the calculation of the square footage of the building. The original application did not count the cellar space toward the amount of parking required, as required pursuant to § 2101.1. In addition, the cellar was redesigned to accommodate the historic structure to the south to prevent any adverse impacts on what has since been determined by the applicant to be a fragile historic structure. That reconfiguration resulted in the reversal of the stairway leading down to the cellar, increasing the floor area of the cellar by 108 square feet. The cellar, which was not previously included in the parking calculation, would now consist of 1,992 square feet, increasing the parking requirement by six.

No change to the use of the upper floors of the building or the cellar would result, and the three development scenarios presented by the applicant would remain otherwise unchanged. The cellar would continue to be proposed to accommodate utility and storage areas only. The parking reduction from 62 to 4 would be the maximum necessary to accommodate any of the three development scenarios proposed by the applicant.