STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF APPLICATION
OF MR. & MRS. CHARLES HOLLIDAY

The Proposal; Executive Summary. The Applicant, Mr. and Mrs. Charles Holliday, propose to build a new home, with a one-car garage, for use as their personal residence. The building will also contain a basement rental apartment. The project is very similar to, but requires less zoning relief than, a project on the subject property approved by the Board of Zoning Adjustment in Application Number 15476 upon the request of the prior owner. (See Exhibit "A".) A building permit (No. B408909) was issued under the BZA order to the prior owners, David and Barbara Scheuer, by D.C.R.A. on June 25, 1997, and building permit (No. B436470) was issued for the current project to Mr. and Mrs. Holliday by D.C.R.A. on April 20, 2001. (See Exhibit "B".) The Historic Preservation Review Board (HPRB) approved the project submitted by the prior owner. (See Exhibit "C".)

RECEIVED
D.C. OFFICE OF ZONING
2002 JAN 24 AM 9:59

The Site. The subject site, Lot 35 in Square 787, is sixteen (16) feet in width and one hundred twenty-eight (128) feet in depth. As such, it is extraordinarily narrow and deep.

The site is known as 315 E. Capitol Street, S.E. and is located in a CAP/R-4 zone district. The site is vacant.

The Project. Mr. and Mrs. Holliday propose to build a three story brick structure with basement. The building, together with the new garage to be constructed, will occupy 76.7% of the lot and will

BZA
Case No. 16854
Exhibit No. 4

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO.16854
EXHIBIT NO.4

have a floor area ratio ("FAR") of 1.7. One parking space will be provided within the new garage. A forty-nine (49) foot rear yard will be provided.

The conceptual design of the project was first approved by the Historic Preservation Review Board on June 20, 1990 in response to an application submitted by the prior owner ("1990-91 Application"). In its report, the HPRB stated: "The side elevation is noteworthy for its massing, carefully modulated so as not to overwhelm the smaller frame structure across the alley." A copy of the HPRB staff report and recommendation, as adopted by the Board, is attached as Exhibit "C".

Because the width of the lot is narrower than the required lot width in the R-4 zone district and the lot cannot not be widened due to an existing row dwelling to the west and a public alley to the east (i.e., conditions over which the owner has no control), the prior owner submitted an application to the BZA for approval of a project similar to the one currently proposed by Mr. and Mrs. Holliday. [For a comparison of the prior and current projects, see Zoning Summary below.]

ZONING SUMMARY

	Project Approved by BZA in No. 15476	**Current Proposal**
Number of Stories	3	3
Height	40	37
Use	Flat (2-Family)	Flat (2-Family)
G.F.A./F.A.R.	3,867 sq. ft./1.88	3,499 sq. ft./1.71
Lot Occupancy	77.5%	76.7%
Lot Width	16 feet	16 feet
Rear Yard	49 feet	49 feet
Deck	Above Garage	3rd Floor (rear)
Parking	1 space (in garage)	1 space (in garage)
Variances	3 (lot width, lot occupancy, FAR)	2 (lot width, lot occupancy)

In Application No. 15476, the prior owner proposed a flat that required three (3) variances (i.e., lot width, lot occupancy and floor area ratio). THE 1990-91 APPLICATION RECEIVED THE UNANIMOUS SUPPORT OF THE OFFICE OF PLANNING, THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL AND NUMEROUS NEIGHBORS; THERE WAS NO OPPOSITION TO THE 1990-91 B.Z.A. APPLICATION.

The Office of Planning, by report dated March 13, 1991, recommended approval of Application No. 15476 without condition. [See O.P. Report, Exhibit "D"]. The Architect of the Capitol, George M. White, FAIA, by letter dated February 28, 1991, stated he had "no objection to the variances sought in this application." [See Letter, Exhibit "E"].

Neighbors who were the closest neighbors on either side of the Property, Roy Mason (313 E. Capitol Street) and James and Olivia Jones, (317 E. Capitol Street) supported the 1991 Application. [See Letters attached as Exhibits "F" and "G".]

On March 20, 1991, the BZA by a 4-0 vote approved the application submitted by the prior owner for the three (3) variances. See BZA Order No. 15476 attached as Exhibit "A".

The Variance Relief Requested by Mr. and Mrs. Holliday. Variance relief is sought from the lot width and lot occupancy requirements of the Zoning Regulations. Unlike the 1990-91 Application approved by the BZA in 1991, which required three (3) variances, the application submitted by Mr. and Mrs. Holliday only requires two (2) variances.

The two variances requested by Mr. and Mrs. Holliday are from width and lot occupancy requirements. The lot width is sixteen (16) feet, whereas eighteen (18) feet is required. Therefore, this variance is for two (2) feet. The lot occupancy is proposed to be 76.7% whereas 60% is permitted as a matter-of-right. This variance is 342.19 square feet.

Justification for Variances. The subject site, which is only sixteen (16) feet wide, is exceptionally narrow and deep.

The other lots fronting on East Capitol Street in the same square by contrast, are 51.72, 23.98, 22.26, 18.25, 28.33, 20.88, 22.00,

22.00, 22.90, 21.60 and 19.50 feet wide respectively. Of the twelve (12) lots in this square fronting on East Capitol Street, only two (2) are as deep (i.e, long) as the subject site.

Lot 35 is bordered on the east by a 15-foot public alley and on the west by a residential structure. Thus, it is not possible for the owner to acquire additional land in order to "widen" the subject site.

As a result of the exceptionally narrow site and in order to construct a one-car garage [as was proposed in the 1990-91 Application], Mr. and Mrs. Holliday have no choice but to design a residential structure which occupies a greater percentage of the lot. However, unlike the design of the residence submitted by the prior owner, Mr. and Mrs. Holliday have reduced the gross floor area of their residence, thus eliminating the FAR variance sought by the prior owner (and approved by the BZA). Since the building loses living space because of the narrowness of the lot, the owners have extended the building toward the rear property line as was done by the owners (but without requiring a rear yard variance).

The variances can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and without substantially impairing the intent, purpose and integrity of the zoning plan.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____
Jacques B. DePuy

By: _____
Lyle M. Blanchard

174965