

PUBLIC HEARING--January 13, 1965

Appeal #8040 Jesse Glover, appellant.

The Zoning Administrator District of Columbia, appellee.

On motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried the following Order was entered on January 13, 1965:

ORDERED:

That the appeal for a variance from the side yard requirements of the R-1-B District to permit a one-story rear addition to the existing dwelling at 4221 Marne St. N.E., lot 46 and 47, square 5100, be granted.

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

- (1) Appellant's lots have frontage of forty feet on Marne Place and a depth of ninety-two feet. The lots contain an area of 3668 square feet of land. There are public alleys to the rear and on the east side of the lots.
- (2) The property is improved with a one-story detached building 30 feet in width, with an eight foot side yard on the west and a two foot wide side yard on the east which adjoins a sixteen foot wide public alley. The building was erected under Old Zoning Regulations which permitted the use of half of the public alley as side yard.
- (3) The proposed addition is 30 feet in width and 5.5 feet in depth on the west side and 12 feet on the east side. The addition will be in line with the rear of the original building. Appellant proposes a two foot wide side yard on the east side of the building which conforms to the existing side yard, but which does not meet the requirements under the 1958 revised zoning regulations.
- (4) The existing building together with the proposed addition will not over-occupy the lot.
- (5) 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 hardship within the meaning of Section 8207.11 of the Zoning Regulations, and therefore the 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 and map. We are further of the opinion that the addition as proposed will not affect adversely conditions of light and air to adjoining properties.
