GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

Application No. 12631 of Antonio Gerreiro, Jr., pursuant to Paragraph 8207.11 of the Zoning Regulations, for a variance from the rear yard requirements (Sub-section 3304.1) to permit a rear addition to a rooming house in the R-5-B District at the premises 1731 Euclid Street, N. W., (Square 2565, Lot 44).

HEARING DATE: April 19, 1978
DECISION DATE: May 3, 1978

FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. The subject property is located at the northeast corner of the intersection of Ontario Road and Euclid Street, N. W., and is known as 1731 Euclid Street, N. W. It is in an R-5-B District.

2. The site is improved with a brick building which is three stories at the front and two stories at the rear. It is used as a rooming house for seven roomers.

3. The applicant proposes to tear down a brick wall attached to the rear two stories and add an addition to the existing rear two stories. At street level the applicant would add a garage, on the first floor level, one apartment and on the second floor level, one bedroom.

4. Sub-section 3304.1 of the Zoning Regulations require a fifteen foot rear yard. The applicant proposes a rear yard of 9.58 feet requiring a variance of 10.42 feet (sixty-nine per cent.)

5. The applicant does not intend to increase the number of roomers through the proposed addition.

6. The applicant has received many complaints from his neighbors about the messy condition of the rear brick wall which serves no purpose.

7. In planning to tear down the rear brick wall, the applicant would like to improve the property by the proposed addition.

8. There is nothing exceptional, extraordinary or unique about this property to qualify it for a variance.

9. The applicant did not demonstrate any practical difficulty relating to the property.

10. There was no opposition to the application.

11. ANC-1C filed no recommendation on the application.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The applicant seeks an area variance the granting of which requires a showing of a practical difficulty arising from the property itself. The board concludes that the applicant has failed to meet the burden of proof in this regard. In addition, the board concludes that there is nothing exceptional, extraordinary or unique about the property to qualify it for a variance. Accordingly, it is ORDERED that the application is DENIED.

VOTE: 4-0 (Chloethiel Woodard Smith, Charles R. Norris, Leonard L. McCants and William F. McIntosh to Deny the application.)

ATTESTED: Steven E. Sher
STEVEN E. SHER
Executive Director

FINAL DATE OF ORDER: 1 JUN 1978