FILE COPY

Mr. Lyle R. Schauer
Capitol Hill Restoration Society
P.O. Box 15264
Washington, D.C. 20002-0264

OCT -1 1 2000

OCT 24 P 3:27

Mailed: Certified Mail - Return Receipt Requested

Dear Mr. Schauer:

I am writing in response to your recent October 2, 2000 opposition letter opposing my Board of Zoning and Adjustment (BZA) variance and special exception request. Unfortunately, I was not aware of your organization and did not realize that I should have consulted with your committee prior to submitting my request to the BZA. I am new to this process and thought, at the time, that I had sought all interested parties' comments. It was a mere omission on my part and for this I ask that you please excuse the oversight. An additional misfortune was that I received your opposition letter only two business days prior to my hearing. I received the letter on Wednesday evening (11 pm) after returning from my evening classes and only had Thursday, Friday and Monday to attempt to address your concerns prior to my Tuesday, October 10th hearing. I tried phoning your office on each of these days.

In light of the fact that the hearing has come and gone, I would still like to make every attempt to meet with your committee and address any concerns that you may have after reconsidering this request for support. I have enclosed copies of the support letter offered by the Office of Planning, the Advisory Neighborhood Commission, Zoning and Licensing Subcommittee and several of the neighbors in my immediate vicinity. I am offering these letters to hopeful fill the gaps in any areas of concern that you may have regarding my proposed project.

In your letter you mentioned that I fell short of the uniqueness prong that is required to receive relief. I may have not done an adequate job of highlighting the following facts:

- The property in itself is unique because it was a commercial property that is now being brought back into a residential use. Conversion of the store and apartment building into one livable family dwelling supports the historic nature and character of the homes in the area and brings the property back in line with the District of Columbia's plan for improving and rehabilitating vacant properties. The property had been vacant and rodent infested for over a year prior to my purchase.

- In addition you have highlighted several issues regarding the size of my corner property. My property is actually smaller than several corner properties on Capital Hill. The addition I am proposing does not take any space away from the property that would adversely affect the measure of openness that the property currently has nor would it negatively impact on my surrounding neighbors. In fact, the addition I am proposing offers a continuous wall in line with the building's appearance which is similar to several homes on Capitol Hill. I have offered the BZA, Office of Planning and the ANC a list of similar homes complete with color photos and would like to present this same information to your committee for consideration.

BZA
Case No. 16606
Exhibit No. 30

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO.16606
EXHIBIT NO.30

- My property lot width is currently 16 feet which is a substandard lot. The zoning regulations allow for the property to occupy as much as 18 feet. The proposed addition would allow me to fully occupy the standard lot size allowed without adversely affecting the property or the outside historic appearance of the home.

- My lot occupancy is currently 881.6 sq. ft. and my addition would add 96.0 sq. ft. for a total of 977.6 square ft. (94%). This represents a variance of only 34%. This is a very modest and small variance comparatively speaking and represents nothing new on Capitol Hill. There are several other homes in the Capitol Hill area with similar additions added subsequent to variance ordinances. These homes occupy the same amount of space or more space than what I am proposing for my property (600 A Street, S.E. and 150 12th Street, N.E. are just two examples).

- The open 6 foot space is a unique attribute to my property because no other building has this unused open space. Other properties are completely sealed from side and rear entries to my immediate left and right. The property directly across from me (401 11th Street) continues until it meets the next building which gives the appearance of a continuous wall and their property still offers a measure of open space with a side yard similar to what my property has.

- Approval of this modest variance would not change anything regarding the rear yard of the property. The space proposed to be enclosed is currently used by societies' undesirables to conduct drug transactions, hide, illegally dump discarded items and to break into the property and steal the building contents. An addition would completely seal this unused portion of the property and would not take way the 4 foot space allowed for the garage entry nor would it affect the dimension of openness that the remaining side yard offers the property.

In closing, I would like to request a meeting or conference call to further discuss the issues that your organization is concerned about with my request. I can be reached at (202) 260-8487 during business hours and after 10 p.m. at (301) 362-3994 at my temporary home address (while renovations are being completed). Unfortunately I am unavailable Monday through Friday between 5 p.m. and 9:30 p.m. because I am in night school. Should you need to reach me in route, please feel free to call me at (202) 716-9745 on my cell phone. Thank you again in advance for the opportunity to discuss this proposal.

Sincerely,

Traci Brown

Enclosures

cc: BZA application file # 16606
1032 D Street, N.E.
Sq. 0962/Lot 66