

PUBLIC HEARING—June 16, 1965

Appeal #8253 J. Julian and Leon A. Tashof, Sofia Kahn and Mrs. Rae Tashof, appellants.

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 provisions of Section 3301.1 of the Zoning Regulations requiring 900 square feet of land area per unit to permit conversion of buildings into three units each at 132 and 134 E Street, 435 and 437 - 2nd Street, S.E., lots 17, 18, 59 and 60, square 735, be granted.

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

(1) Appellant's lots have frontages of 17 feet each on E St. and 2nd Street. Lot 17 contains 1359 square feet, lot 18 contains 1313 square feet, lot 59 contains 1373 square feet and lot 60 contains 1445 square feet.

(2) These properties consist of three story row buildings and appellant desires to convert the four buildings into three units each and therefore needs a waiver of the land area requirements said lots requiring 2700 square feet of land area for the three units in each building.

(3) These lots compare favorably in width and area to other lots in this immediate area.

(4) These proposed units will consist of living and dining room, kitchen, bath and one bedroom.

(5) There were several people at the hearing in opposition to the granting of this appeal, whereas there was a large petition, letters, and the Capitol Hill Southeast Citizens Association in favor of the granting of this appeal.

OPINION:

We are of the opinion that appellant has proven a hardship within the meaning of the variance clause of the statute, and that a denial of the request will result in peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties and 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 and map. We are further of the opinion that the area and arrangement of, and light to these units is satisfactory.