

PUBLIC HEARING--June 16, 1965

Appeal #8205 Elizabeth Parker, appellant.

The Zoning Administrator District of Columbia, appellee

On motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried the following Order was entered on June 22, 1965:

ORDERED:

That the appeal for a variance from the side yard requirements of the R-1-B District to permit erection of a one-story rear addition to the dwelling at 6713 - 13th Place, N.W., lot 74, square 2947, 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 38.6 feet on 13th Place, a depth of 120 feet on the north side of the lot and 155.8 feet on the south side the lot being irregularly shaped at the rear with a 15.49 foot step-in on the north side of the property. The lot contains 5456 square feet of land.

(2) Appellant's lot is improved with a detached single-family dwelling with two side yards of 5.3 feet each. These yards met the requirements of zoning prior to adoption of new regulations in 1958 which now requires two eight foot wide side yards.

(3) Appellant proposes to erect an addition on the rear of the dwelling being seven feet six inches in depth and twelve feet wide. She requests permission to erect this addition in line with the existing side yard on the north side so as to continue the the use of the room without a set back which she states will cut up the rooms too badly.

(4) There are letters on file from her abutting property owners favoring the granting of this appeal. There are also letters from other property owners in the block protesting the granting of the appeal. These letters in opposition state that they do not want any variance from the regulations granted.

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. It is our opinion that appellant's request is reasonable and that the granting of this addition on line with the existing side yard will provide a much more livable residence and will do not harm to adjoining or other properties in the area. We further are of the opinion that light and air to adjoining properties will not be affected adversely, as those parties adjoining do not protest the appeal.

In view of the above it is our further 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 and map.