February 28, 2000

'00 MAR -3 A11:28
OFFICE OF ZONING
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Board of Zoning Adjustment
for the District of Columbia
441 Fourth Street NW
Suite 210
Washington, DC 20001

To Whom it May Concern:

I am submitting the enclosed application for a special exception to increase the lot occupancy of my home at 3114 N St, NW. There are 2 design proposals at issue. The first involves refurbishing an existing rear deck and partially enclosing a portion of it to use as a sunroom/screened porch. The second change involves renovating an existing second floor bathroom and enlarging it. Enclosed please find a copy of the plat, photographs, and a complete set of architectural documents.

I do not anticipate any objections to this project. The renovation of the second floor bathroom is necessary. It is a shoddily constructed structure that sits on the second floor deck. The structure leaks, the wood is dilapidated and it is obviously unsightly. The renovation will involve enlarging the bathroom but it would not extend past the already existing deck and should not be readily visible. The neighbor to the east-- where the bathroom is located -- has only a solid brick wall on that side of his house.

With respect to the rear deck refurbishing, the enclosed structure has been designed to be as unobtrusive and transparent as possible. As is the case with the bathroom, the deck is in terrible condition. The wood is dilapidated and ridden with termites. The proposed design rebuilds the existing rear deck-, which also serves as the only entry point to the house from the rear and garage- and adds an open glass structure onto the western part of the deck. The addition is not visible from either the front or the rear public areas.

Additionally, the current structure does not allow me or my family to enjoy and appreciate the backyard from the house. As is common in this neighborhood, because of the noise and traffic on N Street, you must retreat to the back of the house. The current rear facade is brick and has a fireplace

BZA
Case No. 16580
Exhibit No. 3

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO.16580
EXHIBIT NO.3

in the center that prevents views and light. By partially enclosing the deck with a windowed porch (sunroom) I will be able to gain light and view the back area. This is obviously a common solution as both adjacent neighbors have also added large glass openings on their rear facades. I would also point out that the Old Georgetown Board recognized this problem and allowed another window to be added to the second floor of my house for this same reason.

I have enclosed a winter sun/shade chart that demonstrates the impact of the proposed addition on the adjacent property will be minimal. There is currently an existing 12'0" high brick wall that runs down the property line for over 18'- over 5'beyond the deck. The proposed sunroom would be built on the inside of this wall on my property. We would not be adding to the height of this wall. Additionally, the neighbor has tall trees running the length of the fence line. Finally, there is evidence that this wall, which is currently extremely unsightly, was at some time part of an enclosed structure in the same location.

I would also like to note that my architects have been extra diligent in ensuring that the neighbors would not be unduly impacted by this proposal. He personally met with the neighbors several times and made revisions to the original design to address any potential issues or concerns. I believe the proposed design is a modest addition, which enhances the beauty and value of my property as well as my neighbors'.

The situation is somewhat confusing, because the plat was approved by the Zoning division on August 19, 1999. I guess the lot occupancy issue was overlooked- probably because the work is mostly refurbishing existing structures. This project was submitted and approved in concept by the Old Georgetown Board of the Fine Arts Commission on December 17, 1999. Since the approval in August, we have done extensive design and construction document development- involving lots of time and money. It was not until the final drawings were submitted for review on February 9, 2000 were we told of this issue and that we would have to apply for this exception.

In sum, because the proposed work—renovating and enlarging the existing bathroom and refurbishing and partially enclosing the rear deck—will not unduly affect the light, privacy or enjoyment of adjacent properties I am extremely hopeful that you will grant this special exception.

Thank you for your time and thoughtful consideration. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me or my architect Russell Sears at 202-265-0600.

Sincerely,

Holidae H. Hayes