Ned Ertel
Jennifer Squires
924 G Street, SE
Washington, DC 20003

RECEIVED
D.C. OFFICE OF ZONING
2005 APR 28 PM 1:16

April 27, 2005

The District of Columbia Office of Zoning
441 4th Street, N.W.
Ste 210-2
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 727-6311

Re: BZA Case No. 17313

Dear Sir or Madam:

At our hearing in front of the Zoning Board on Tuesday, April 26, 2005, the Board stated that we could include in the Record a brief summation of our arguments for our requested variance. The three main areas that we must make showings are:

1) **The uniqueness of the property involved;**
2) **The practical difficulties that arise from the uniqueness of the property for us; and**
3) **The variance will not impair the public good or the zoning plan.**

1) **<u>924 G Street, SE is a Truly Unique Property when the Totality of the Circumstances are Viewed</u>**

Our property is unique not from a single characteristic but from a totality of the characteristics of the property. These characteristics include:

- **The lot is only 1452 square feet and 65 feet deep, which is significantly smaller and shorter than the 1800 square feet minimum required in the zoning regulations for an R-4 zone;**
- **It is a corner lot with two structures on it and no alley access leaving the lot landlocked;**
- **It is in a historic district which in our case precludes us from adding a third story and the tearing down of the carriage house because it is a contributing structure to the area;**
- **The addition that we seek to build will affect no neighbors; and**

BZA
Case No. 17313
Exhibit No. 28

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO. 17313
EXHIBIT NO. 28

- We have not encountered in our five years of living on Capitol Hill another house with the same characteristics.

2) **The Current lot Configuration with two Separate Structures Make it Practically Difficult to Utilize the Space in the Structures**

- The existence of the carriage house separated by a courtyard has made it impossible for us with two small children to use it in an efficient manner as additional living space;

- A connection to the carriage house is not feasible since there would be no way to make the flow of the house work and to monitor our children;

- The historic preservation regulations prevent us from tearing down the carriage house and building an addition that would conform to the lot occupancy regulations; and

- The historic preservation regulations also prevent us from building a third story on the main house; and

- The existing nursery in the main house is too small for a regular bedroom.

3) **Our Variance would Enhance the Public Good and Not Affect the Integrity of the Zoning Plan**

- Our addition would beautify the streetscape with more windows and a architectural facade facing the street; instead of huge blank walls and more windows means more eyes on the street, thus increasing public safety;

- Our addition would also continue the street edge, which is important for the urban character of the neighborhood; and

- Many other corner lots, including the other three on our square, have 100 percent or nearly 100 percent lot occupancy, thus granting this variance will not set any precedent.

As we have illustrated above, granting our variance will be an asset to the community and allow us to actually use our house and property to accommodate our growing family. Once again, thank you for taking the time to consider our application.

Best Regards,

Ned Ertel
Jennifer Squires