

PUBLIC HEARING—May 12, 1965

Appeal #8172 Charles W. Solson, appellant.

The Zoning Administrator District of Columbia, appellee.

On motion duly made, seconded and carried with Mr. Davis dissenting, the following Order was entered on June 22, 1965:

ORDERED:

That the appeal for a variance from the lot occupancy requirements, ~~and~~ FAR and rear yard requirements of the R-4 District to permit enlargement and addition to nonconforming building at 105 - 6th Street, N.E., lot 812, square 867, be denied.

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

(1) Appellant's lot has a frontage of 30 feet on 6th Street and a depth of 101 feet to a 25 foot wide public alley which dead stops after extending 12 ~~from~~ feet from the north at the rear of the lot. The lot contains an area of 3030 square feet of land.

(2) The existing building on the front of the lot is now used as a six unit apartment building. The rear garage building which is now vacant is a brick structure two stories in height.

(3) Appellant intends to erect a connecting porch between the two buildings and the rear building would become an integral part of the main building and convert into a one bedroom dwelling unit with a garage. Both of the buildings are nonconforming.

(4) The rear building would have access to the street by a passage on the north side of the property which is ten feet three inches wide for most of its length and five feet ten inches wide for a distance of fourteen feet one inch.

(5) Appellant would decrease the FAR from 1.54 to 1.5 by removal of 184 square feet of floor area in the rear building and the addition of 62 square feet in the connection, thus giving a net reduction of 122 square feet of floor area.

(6) There was no objection to the granting of this appeal registered at the public hearing. The Capitol Hill Southeast Citizens Association and the Capitol Hill Restoration Society voted in favor of the granting of the appeal.

OPINION:

The Board finds that there is no grounds for the granting of a variance by reason of exceptional narrowness shallowness or shape of the specific piece of property, or other extraordinary or exceptional situation or condition of the property. The existence of the carriage house is not, in the opinion of this Board, an extraordinary or exceptional situation which would justify a variance since there are numerous such carriage houses in the city. In conclusion, therefore, the Board is of the opinion that the circumstances related to this property are sufficiently common that if the renovation of carriage houses for residential use is considered a desirable form of development, provisions for such development should become a part of the Zoning Regulations.