

Before the Board of Zoning Adjustment, D.C.

PUBLIC HEARING -- September 14, 1966

Appeal No. 8898 Evelyn C. Greabes, appellant.

The Zoning Administrator of the District of Columbia, appellee.

On motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, the following Order was entered at the meeting of the Board on September 20, 1966.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF ORDER -- Nov. 23, 1966

ORDERED:

That the appeal for a variance from the rear yard and lot occupancy requirements of the R-4 District to permit first floor addition to dwelling at 1627 First Street, NE., lot 50, square 3522, be granted.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

- (1) Appellant's property is located in an R-4 District.
- (2) The property has a 14-foot frontage on R Street, NE., a depth of 90 feet and contains 1,260 square feet of land. The lot is improved with a single family dwelling.
- (3) At the public hearing the appeal was amended to include a request for the waiver of one off-street parking space.
- (4) Appellant proposes to erect a 2.5 foot addition to the existing rear porch. In addition, an existing garage in the rear yard will be razed.
- (5) The existing rear yard is 19 feet and after the proposed addition the rear yard will be 16.5 feet.
- (6) Section 3304.1 provides that there be a 20 foot rear yard for dwellings in the R-4 District. The regulations also require 19 feet for a parking space and that such space shall be 10 feet from the building.
- (7) No opposition to the granting of this appeal was registered at the public hearing.

OPINION:

The Board holds that the granting of this appeal will not substantially increase the prescribed lot occupancy for the R-4 District and that the erection of this rear addition to this dwelling not be inconsistent with the present use and occupancy of the lot and will have no adverse affect upon adjacent and nearby property.

Further, the waiver of one parking space will have no adverse affect upon neighboring property. Appellant's property is such that parking cannot be provided on the site and denial of the waiver would prevent a reasonable use of the property.

We conclude that the requested relief can be granted without substantially impairing the intent, purpose, and integrity of the zone plan as embodied in the Zoning REgulations and Map.