

Before the Board of Zoning Adjustment, D.C.

PUBLIC HEARING -- November 16, 1966

Appeal No. 9024      Richard N. Wolf et ux, appellants.

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 - August 14, 1967

ORDERED:

That the appeal for a variance from the open court requirements of the R-4 District to permit a third story rear addition to dwelling at 146 - 11th Street, SE., lot 27, square 989, be granted.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

(1) The subject property is located in an R-4 District and is improved with a three story brick row dwelling, with a five (5) foot area way at the south lot line.

(2) The property has an 18 foot frontage on 11th Street, SE. and a depth of 117.50 feet. The lot contains 2,115 square feet of land.

(3) The existing dwelling has a two story rear addition. Appellants propose to add a third story to the rear addition for use as a bedroom. The addition will attach to the existing rear wall of the three-story front portion of the dwelling and to the existing third story party wall of the abutting house.

(4) The addition will not protrude over any area not already covered by existing construction. The height of the addition will be no higher than the existing walls of the building.

(5) After the addition, the court will be same as it now is.

(6) The Capitol Hill Southeast Citizens Association and the Capitol Hill Restoration Society support the granting of this appeal. No opposition was registered at the public hearing.

OPINION:

We are of the opinion that the erection of this rear addition will be consistent with the present use and occupancy of the subject property. There will be no increase in the lot occupancy by the addition. Also, there will be no change in the size of the existing court. We find that the addition will have no adverse affect upon neighboring or adjoining property.

Further, the appellant has shown a hardship within the meaning of the Zoning Regulations and a denial of the requested relief would result in the prohibition of 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 Maps.