1. Special Exception (Section 223.1) R-5-B Zone (Section 3104.1)

By providing a special exception to the 15 foot requirement of my rear yard the following will be maintained:

- Harmony will be maintained to the current structures of the Biltmore and Calvert alleyway **(ref. Photos document-A and document-B)**

- The property is shallow and the granting of this exception will allow the property to be utilized as others in the area to its' fullest extent **(ref. Photo document-B)**

- Altering the property via this exception will not impact the neighbors that are on either side of my property line, or other in the area ; for example it will not impact access to their yards, and will not compete with any future plans that they may have with their properties **(ref. Neighborhood support/no objection document-C and ANC no objection document-D)**

BZA
Case No. 16639
Exhibit No. 21

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO.16639
EXHIBIT NO.21

2. Special Exception (Section 223.1) R-5-B Zone (Section 3104.1)

By providing a special exception to the six foot boundary requirement for an open court width, the following will be accomplished:

- A sufficient amount of space will be made available to construct a proper deck
- The non-conforming width will not adversely affect the access and use of the neighboring properties **(ref. Neighborhood support document-C ; ANC support document-D)**
- The non-conforming width for the proposed deck is similar and in some cases mirrors structures found on the neighboring properties **(ref. Photos document-A and document-B)**

3.Variance (Section 2001.3 (a) (b) and (c) R-5-B Zone (Section 3103.2)

- The current original request is already in non compliance to the current lot occupancy requirement of 60%

- The original property included a brick garage as illustrated by the next-door sister property at 1925 Biltmore **(ref. Photo document-E)** that has its garage in tact and in use. Had the original garage been in place at 1927; the lot occupancy request would be 170 sq ft (7.4 x 23) versus 506 sq ft.

- The property provide practical difficulties by being shallow and containing a narrow courtyard to the basement. This current arrangement does not allow the space to be safely utilized and enjoyed. The land in its' current condition provides two off street parking spaces, and encourages theft to the vehicles and property.

- The full use of the property outside space is exceptionally limited, as the front yard is a very public space to the road and the rear is only functional as car parking.

By providing a variance to the lot occupancy the following will be accomplished:

- The rear yard, with the addition of a wooden deck with covered doors that face the alley will transform the yard into a safety space providing full coverage and protection to the owners vehicles and first floor entry points.

- The deck will also prevent full safety access from the main living area of the second floor. The rear yard has a full northern exposure, and will provide comfortable use of the deck during all hours of the day.

- The second floor rear entrance to the deck will provide more readily available safety exit for the home.

- The second floor rear entrance to the deck will solve the impossible difficulties of many furniture and appliances in and out of the house.

NEIGHBORHOOD SUPPORT

We the undersigned have no objection to the outside wooden deck with covered doors as proposed by Larry Origlio of 1927 Biltmore Street. The illustrative materials in support of his BZA application number 16639 served as the basis of his discussion.

Name (printed)	Signature	Address	Date
HARLOW CASE	Harlow Case	1925 Biltmore	1/1/01
James Riedy	James Riedy	1923 Biltmore	1-1-01
George Lyon & Kara Hufstedler	I was not able to meet again for signature I discussed the details with them in their home.	1929 Biltmore	12/22/00
Marlou Lykins	NO OBJECTION	1921 Biltmore	12/23/00
Richard Green	NO OBJECTION	1915 Biltmore	12/15/00
TED KNELL	NO OBJECTION	1938 Calvert	12/18/00

ANC no objection/support Document-D

Andy Miscuk
ANC Commissioner
SMD 1C-03
202-667-1488
info@thecommish.org

Sep 30 – Andy called and informed me that he received and had reviewed my application. He said the deck proposal did not warrant that I present it at a community meeting. I advised him that I was an active KCA member that regularly attended meetings, and would present it if he changed his mind. He also said that he was familiar with the property location, and did not forsee any negative impact with my plans.

Dec – I spoke with Andy during the beginning of Dec, and third week to see if he had received any objections to my proposed deck. He stated that the file was clear of any objections, and I explained how I had informed neighbors. He offered to write a letter on my behalf if it became necessary. Andy said that he had no objections to my proposal.

Peter Schott
ANC Commissioner
Greater Adams Morgan
202-483-6492 or 202-669-4921

Dec 1st wk. – Peter called to discuss my application, and asked for an appointment to see my property, and the details of my deck proposal. He came over on Sat. the 11th, and I walked him through the plans, and then inspected the outside rear yard. He expressed that he could not imagine any impact to the neighbors, and verbalized that the area must not receive any sun with the full northern exposure.

Peter said that this was not the type of project that the full ANC committee would vote or write a letter on. He also said that this was not the type of project that would be presented at the KCA meeting. He also offered to write a letter on my behalf if it became necessary to do so. He said that he had no objections to my proposal.

Document-E

1927 and 1925 BILTMORE ST. "sister houses" front and rear





EXHIBIT 21

FROM

CASE 16639

HAS AN OVERSIZED DOCUMENT

PLEASE SEE AT OFFICE