

January 7, 2016

RE: BZA 19156 - 1723 Swann Street NW

To whom it may concern:

I am writing in regards to a proposed project at 1723 Swann Street, NW. It is our understanding that if the overall lot occupancy is 70% or less, we are able to apply for a § 223 special exception. In this letter, we intend to address the following items:

1. That the light and air available to neighboring properties shall not be unduly affected;
2. That privacy of use and enjoyment of neighboring properties shall not be unduly compromised;
3. That the addition or accessory structure, together with the original building, as viewed from the street, alley, and other public way, shall not substantially visually intrude upon the character, scale and pattern of houses along the subject street frontage; and

We have modified our proposal to address all of these items so that the structure will have no adverse impact on our neighbors.

To discover any concerns our neighbor might have, we held an informal meeting on December 16th at 6:00 pm to discuss the proposed plans to construct a deck extending out from the rear of the second floor at 1723 Swann Street, NW. Meeting attendees included Nicole Mann, Commissioner & Vice Chair, ANC 2B08, Jeff Francer, the neighbor at 1725 Swann Street, Brad Edwards, the Owner of 1723 Swann Street and myself, Michael O'Hearn of Case Design/ Remodeling. During this meeting, Mr. Francer raised concerns regarding the plans as proposed. The primary concerns were privacy, reduction of natural light, security and noise.

In response to these concerns, we have reduced the size of the proposed deck by more than half, and eliminated 5 linear feet on the 1725 side. Thus the center of this smaller deck is closer the eastern side of the rear second floor room in our row house, where a small courtyard separates our house from 1721 Swann.

- The reduction in size and the shift away from 1725 addresses the noise problem because it is farther removed from the 1725 rear windows and the smaller size can only accommodate 2 chairs, so it is not capable of being occupied by a large group of people.
- The reduction in the depth of the deck and the shift to the east, away from 1725, addresses the privacy problem because it makes it very difficult to see into their rear bedroom from the deck, even when positioned at the deck's northwestern corner.

- The shift to the east also addresses the concern about light. Because the rear exposures of 1723 and 1725 face north, no sunlight currently enters either kitchen on the first floor. With the revised deck plan, there will be essentially no reduction in diffused light for the 1725 kitchen.
- The shift to the east also addresses the security concern, because it would be very difficult for a home invader to move from the revised deck at 1723 across the 5 feet to the closest window on the second floor of 1725.

In conclusion, we feel that the substantial changes we've made to the size, shape and location of the deck should satisfy any reasonable concerns regarding privacy, security, noise, or availability to light and air.

Respectfully,

Michael O'Hearn
Director of Project Development
Case Design/ Remodeling, Inc.