

Before the Board of Zoning Adjustment, D.C.

PUBLIC HEARING -- November 16, 1966

Appeal No. 8999 Mrs. Samuel J. Lanahan, appellant.

The Zoning Administrator of the District of Columbia, appellee.

On motion duly made, seconded and carried, with Mr. William F. McIntosh not voting, the following Order was entered at the meeting of the Board on November 29, 1966.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF ORDER -- March 20, 1967

ORDERED:

That the appeal for a variance from the side yard requirements of the R-1-B District to permit a one-story rear addition to dwelling at 3235 R Street, NW., lot 18, square 2154, be granted.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

(1) Appellant's property is located in an R-1-B District and is improved with a two story single family detached frame dwelling with less than eight (8) foot side yards, and contains approximately 8,750 square feet.

(2) The west side yard varies from 4 feet 6 inches to 5 feet 2 inches in width.

(3) The lot has a 50 foot frontage on R Street and a depth of 175 feet.

(4) Appellant proposes to raze the existing rear porch and replace it with a 9.62' one story rear addition. This would provide a dining alcove off the kitchen.

(5) The residence to the west of the subject property is eighteen (18) feet from the property line and is three (3) feet higher than the subject structure.

(6) Appellant states that to move the addition back eight (8) feet from the lot line would make it too small to be usable. There will be no doors or windows in the addition.

(7) Section 3305.1 provides that there be an eight (8) foot side yard for dwellings in the R-1-B District.

(8) Appellant's west side yard after the addition will be the same as the existing side yard.

(9) The Citizens Association of Georgetown supports the granting of this appeal. No opposition to the granting of this appeal was registered at the public hearing.

OPINION:

The Board holds that as the granting of this appeal will not result in substantial increase of the prescribed lot occupancy for the R-1-B District, the rear addition will be consistent with the existing side yard on the lot and will have no adverse affect upon adjacent and nearby property.

Further, we are of the opinion 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 Maps.