

Before the Board of Zoning Adjustment, D. C.

PUBLIC HEARING--Dec. 16, 1964

Appeal #8025 Roy N. Brown, appellant.

The Zoning Administrator District of Columbia, appellee.

On motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried the following Order was entered on December 22, 1964:

ORDERED:

That the appeal for a variance from the open court requirements of the R-4 District to permit erection of one-story closed porch on rear of dwelling at 600 Irving St. N.W., lot 128, square 3052, be granted.

From the records and the evidence adduced at the hearing, the Board finds the following facts:

(1) Appellant's lot has a frontage of 15.93 feet on Irving St. and a depth of 109.68 feet to a twenty foot wide public alley in the rear. The lot contains an area of approximately 1747 square feet of land. The property is improved with a row dwelling which has a 3.93 foot wide open court which is nonconforming both under present and prior regulations.

(2) Appellant proposes to erect a one-story closed porch on the rear of the dwelling in lieu of an existing open porch. This addition will be ten feet in depth and 11.5 feet width and will leave a rear yard of 42.4. The addition will occupy the existing foundation and will consist of glass jalousie windows and will provide an open court of approximately 5 feet in width. The lot occupancy for the R-4 District will not be exceeded by the erection of this addition.

(3) There was no objection to the granting of this appeal registered at the public hearing.

OPINION:

We are of the opinion that appellant has proven a case of hardship within the meaning of Section 8207.11 of the Zoning Regulations and that a denial of this request will result in peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties to or exceptional and undue hardship upon the owner. We are further of the opinion that this 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. We are also of the opinion that the erection of this type addition will not affect adversely conditions of light and air to adjoining properties.