

RECEIVED
DC BOARD OF ZONING
2006 MAR 1 PM 4:12

1723 Riggs Place NW
Washington, DC 20009-1693
28 March 2006

Government of the District of Columbia
Board of Zoning Adjustment
Attention: Mr. Geoffrey H. Griffis
441 Fourth Street NW
Suite 210-S
Washington, DC 20001

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT
District of Columbia
CASE NO. 17319
EXHIBIT NO. 43

Dear Mr. Griffis:

I am writing in reference to application number 17319 in my name. This application was originally filed in spring 2005. It stated:

Application No. 17319 of William J. McKeever, pursuant to 11 DCMR § 3104.1, for a special exception to allow a rear addition to an existing single-family row dwelling under section 223, not meeting the court (section 406) requirement in the DC/R-5-B District at premises 1723 Riggs Place, N.W. (Square 153, Lot 104).¹

¹ The caption previously used for this application indicated that the subject property did not meet the requirements applicable to side yards (§405) or courts (§406). However, no side yard is required in the R-5-B zone, and none is provided at the subject property, which is improved with a row dwelling. Accordingly, no relief from the side yard requirement was necessary in this case.

The Board adjudicated the case in May and June 2005 (Hearing Date: May 10, 2005; Decision Date: June 7, 2005). The Board's vote was 4-1-0 to approve the application. The Final Date of Order was February 1, 2006, and the controlling Building Permit (number 90029) was issued on March 17, 2006.

In accordance with District of Columbia Municipal Regulations, Sections 3129.1 to 3129.7, I respectfully request to make a minor modification to the plans previously approved by the Board.

The approved plans call for a 23.94 square feet kitchen extension (the approved structure being 5.7 feet wide by 4.2 feet in depth). I now seek a modification to extend the depth of the structure by an extra two feet in an area that is 4.2 feet wide: an additional 8.4 square feet. This modification would increase the total size of the project to 32.34 square feet. This increased depth would reduce the 14' x 4.2' space remaining in the "dog leg" or court to 12' x 4.2'. This planned modification will not cause lot occupancy to exceed the seventy percent permitted pursuant to 11 DCMR § 223.3. Likewise, the F.A.R. will not be exceeded.

I seek this modification for the following reasons:

I filed these plans almost a year ago, and only recently received final approval. Fees to my architect and to the District in association with this project have already cost me several thousand dollars, and the actual erection of the structure will cost over \$50,000. In this ensuing period I have given much thought to the approximately 24 square feet of added kitchen space the approved expansion would provide and I have concluded that the space is simply too small to be

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO. 17319
EXHIBIT NO. 43

very useful—and not worth the almost \$60,000 it will have cost me upon its completion. I deeply regret that I did not originally seek the dimensions I now seek in this modification petition. The requested modification of the approved plans adds a mere 8.4 square feet, but that additional footage will allow furniture placement and enjoyment of the structure that was not possible in the original plan.

As I opined in my comments to the Board in June 2005, the originally-approved addition would not be noticeable to a person positioned in the alley who is not purposely looking for it. This proposed two-foot modification toward the alley does not alter that opinion. Moreover, the fence separating my property from the alley (from where any such viewing would have to take place) is seven feet tall and blocks any sighting of that part of my residence both *now and after* the proposed expansion. In essence, the approved expansion and the modified one I seek will be invisible to all, except those within my fence and the confines of my property.

The Board, in its opinion, stated:

The addition will not be visible from the row dwelling to the west of the subject property and, due to its small size and lack of windows facing east, will have only a minimal impact on the row dwelling to the east. The addition will not be easily visible from the alley due to the fence at the rear of the property.

The Board continued:

The planned addition will not unduly affect the availability of light or air to neighboring properties, given its small size and its location on the first floor at the interior edge of a court at the rear of the subject property. The addition will not compromise the privacy of use and enjoyment of neighboring properties, in part because the addition will be barely visible from any neighboring dwelling or from the alley at the rear of the subject property. Similarly, the addition will not visually intrude on the character, scale, or pattern of houses along the street frontage. The one-story addition will enclose a portion of a court at the rear of the existing dwelling, and will not be visible from the street.

These sets of facts will not be altered by my proposed modification of the approved plan. I, therefore, respectfully request the Board's approval of my proposal.

Sincerely,



William J. McKeever

Enclosure: Revised drawings

Copy to: Norma Zane Chaplain; Robert Murphy; Ralph Redford; Margaret Roggensack;
Monica Yin; Volker Zinser; Rob Halligan, ANC



