

Before the Board of Zoning Adjustment, D. C.

PUBLIC HEARING -- May 18, 1966

Appeal No. 8724 W. E. Joyce et ux, appellants

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 14, 1966

ORDERED:

That the appeal for a variance from the rear yard and lot occupancy requirements of the R-3 District to permit erection of one story side addition to dwelling at 1605 Caton Pl., N.W., lot 87, Square 1280, be granted.

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

(1) Appellants' property is improved with a detached two-story brick dwelling.

(2) The lot has an area of 2015.92 square feet and the existing structure occupies 801 square feet of the lot.

(3) Appellant states that the existing lot occupancy is 39.8 percent.

(4) Appellant proposes to add a 13' x 16' screen porch on the north side and a bay window on the front of the house.

(5) Appellant now has no rear yard.

(6) Appellant states that the proposed lot occupancy is 50.3 percent.

(7) Since the proposed porch will come to the property line, appellant proposes a solid wall to provide privacy for the rear yards of abutting property owners.

(8) No opposition was registered at the public hearing to the granting of this appeal. The Citizen Association of Georgetown expressed opposition to the granting of this appeal on the grounds that the granting of the appeal would increase the already serious overcrowding in Georgetown as to both space and population. There are five letters in the record from neighboring property owners who favor the granting of this appeal.

OPINION:

We are of the opinion that appellant has proved a hardship within the meaning of the variance clause of the Zoning Regulations and that the denial of this request would prevent a reasonable use of the property. The erection of this proposed porch and bay window will result in an increased lot occupancy, but we take note of the fact that row dwellings are permitted as a matter of right in the R-3 District in which case appellant would be allowed to occupy sixty percent of the lot.

We hold that appellant's proposal will have no adverse affect upon nearby or adjoining property and will not substantially impair the purpose, intent, and integrity of the Zone plan as embodied in the Zoning Regulations and Map.