

**GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS
OFFICE OF THE ZONING ADMINISTRATOR**

September 29, 2014



Via Emailed PDF and US Mail

Martin P. Sullivan
Sullivan & Barros, LLP
1990 M Street, NW, Suite 200
Washington, DC 20036

Re: 82 P Street, NW – Square 616, Lot 827

Dear Mr. Sullivan:

Pursuant to our meeting on August 21, 2014, you have asked for my determination regarding the proposed partial demolition of, and addition to, the existing building (the “Building”) located at 82 P Street, NW (the “Property”). The owner of the Property is proposing to convert the existing building to an apartment house, pursuant to § 330.5(e) of the Zoning Regulations. In order to consider this a conversion of an existing building, I must first determine that the proposed work would not be considered a full demolition of the existing building. I have made such determinations in the past based on the totality of information available; in particular regarding the location and configuration of the existing walls of the existing structure and the nature and rationale for removal of existing walls.

You have represented that you would be retaining the entire party wall on the east side of the Building, as well as at least four feet (4 ft.) of the entire original front façade of the Building (not including the small addition on the west side of the Building). I understand that, pursuant to the documents attached as Exhibit A-1 and A-2, the amount of wall from previous structures being retained represents about 54% of the perimeter of the original Building (A-1), and about 48% of the total Building, including the addition (A-2).

The south and east walls of the existing Building will be taken down and expanded southward and eastward. A general depiction of the existing building and proposed addition/renovation is included herein as Exhibit B.

Based on the proposal you have presented to me, and as represented in this letter, I confirm that if you present building permit plans which are in agreement with this proposed concept of retaining the entire party wall and at least four feet of the front façade of the original Building

(excluding the small addition), my office would view such a proposal as an addition to an existing building constructed prior to May 12, 1958, and not a full raze of a building, for purposes of § 330.5(e). Please note that if the actual demolition departs from the representations in this letter, as represented in the building permit application, then the owner runs the risk of having the project being later considered a full raze, with the consequences attendant thereto, including the possibility of a stop work order and the need to have Board of Zoning Adjustment [BZA] approval.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely, 
Matthew Le Grant
Zoning Administrator

Enclosures: A-1 Percentage of Perimeter Wall Retention
A-2 Percentage of Perimeter Wall Retention, including Addition
B-1 Street Elevations, Before and After