

Before the Board of Zoning Adjustment, D. C.

PUBLIC HEARING -- May 18, 1966

Appeal No. 8719 W. Frank Ford, appellant

The Zoning Administrator of the District of Columbia, appellee

On motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, the following Order was entered by the Board at its meeting on May 31, 1966.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF ORDER: July 5, 1966

ORDERED:

That the appeal for a variance from the minimum lot width requirements of the R-1-B District to permit erection of single family dwelling adjoining 2966 Carlton Ave., N.E., lot 855, Square 4318, be granted.

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

(1) Appellant's lot is irregularly shaped, having an east lot line 243.29 feet, a north lot line of 39.75 feet, a west lot line consisting of a part 80 feet in length, then westerly 18.98 feet, then south 124.98 feet, and a south lot line of 38.4 feet.

(2) Appellant proposes to erect a single family detached dwelling with the house fronting on Carlton Avenue. The frontage would be 38.4 feet. The back of the lot will border a 15 foot public alley. The lot contains 9,067.42 square feet of land.

(3) Appellant states that the lot was purchased approximately 10 years ago.

(4) The lots on either side of appellant's lot are improved with single family dwellings. One lot has a frontage of 41.5 feet and the other a frontage of 40 feet.

(5) Minimum lot dimensions for dwellings in the R-1-B District are 5000 square feet in lot area and 50 feet in width.

(6) Opposition to the granting of this appeal was registered at the public hearing. In addition, the record contains petitions opposing the appeal signed by 70 residents of the area in which the subject property is located. The Woodridge Civic Association registered opposition to the granting of this appeal.

OPINION:

Although the appellant's lot deviates from the requirements for lots in the R-1-B District, the Board concludes that the granting of this appeal would not be detrimental to the surrounding area, as appellant's lot is consistent with other existing improved lots in the area.

The Board is of the opinion that appellant has proved a hardship within the meaning of the variance clause of the Zoning Regulations. Failure to grant the relief requested will prevent a reasonable use of the property as zoned. Granting of the appeal will not adversely affect the use of neighboring property nor impair the intent, purpose and integrity of the zone plan.