Burden of Proof for Area Variance for a Single Family Residence
5519 Carolina Place, NW (Lot 98, Square 1449)

The trapezoidal shape of the property at 5519 Carolina Place, NW (Lot 98, Square 1449) makes it difficult for the owner to use his property in compliance with the area zoning regulations, a problem exacerbated by the existing building shape and its placement on the lot.

The existing single family residence, built in the early 1930's did not take advantage of its potential square footage:

1. It occupies merely 27.2% of its lot, way under the allowable 40%.
2. Although there is only a 5 foot building restriction line at the front yard, the existing front porch is set back 21.7 feet from the property line on Carolina Place, NW.
3. Although the minimum side yard requirement is 8 feet, 12 feet and 11.8 feet are provided on each side (with two minor 6" pier projections).

The owners, with two teenage sons, wish to add a family room, preferably relating to the kitchen and yard. The existing house is tightly organized, relatively narrow and with relatively small rooms.

1. It is inadvisable to add to the front of the house because of the existing configuration of spaces (porch, entry and stairwell up front). Additionally, it would be detrimental to the streetscape to violate the established building line of homes along Carolina Place.
2. It is difficult to take advantage of the approximately 230 square feet of buildable property on either side of the existing house because these strips of unused space in the side yard are only about 4 feet wide. The side frame walls are two stories tall and structural and are therefore difficult to alter. The organization of the existing spaces is such that kitchen, stairway and bathroom take up a considerable portion of the sides of the house. Because of these three reasons, it is very difficult to expand to the sides of the house, let alone add a room. The house would basically have to be entirely rebuilt to take full advantage of its allowable square footage, unless the home was extended into the rear yard.
3. The only practical place to locate an addition is at the rear of the house in lieu of the existing deck. This addition would still render the lot occupancy well under the maximum allowable (33.2% vs. 40%). A variance is required as the proposed addition projects between 3 feet and 9 feet into the required rear yard (occupying approximately 12% of the required rear yard). The projection varies because of the trapezoidal shape of the lot in which the required rear yard is not parallel to the rear of the rectangular house.
4. A garage/accessory building, which is totally allowable within the Zoning Regulations, could take up 30% of the required rear yard (vs. the 12%

RECEIVED
D.C. OFFICE OF ZONING
2004 FEB -9 AM 10:30

BZA
Case No. 17144
Exhibit No. 3

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO. 17144
EXHIBIT NO. 3

proposed with this addition). As a matter of fact, there are many such garages on the surrounding properties.

In summary, this addition, as wide as the existing home, will not create any detrimental conditions to the public good. The proposed addition is only one story tall (surrounded by two and three story homes), is flanked by extra wide side yards, and occupies space allowed by a garage structure. Furthermore, its architectural style and detailing will be consistent with the existing shingle style home which is award winning and has been widely published in architectural journals.

Granting this application will not be inconsistent with the general intent and purpose of the Zoning Regulations and Map.