

**GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**  
**Board of Zoning Adjustment**



**Application No. 19633-A of VI 3629 T Street LLC**, pursuant to 11 DCMR Subtitle Y § 704, for a modification of significance to the relief approved by BZA Order No. 19633 to include a special exception under Subtitle D § 5201 from the front setback requirements of Subtitle D § 1205.2, to construct a three-story rear addition to an existing principal dwelling unit in the R-20 zone at premises 3629 T Street, N.W. (Square 1296, Lot 804) (the “Subject Property”).

<b>HEARING DATE</b> (Case No 19633):	December 6, 2017
<b>DECISION DATE</b> (Case No. 19633):	December 13, 2017
<b>ORDER ISSUANCE DATE</b> (Case No. 19633):	December 14, 2017

<b>MODIFICATION HEARING DATE:</b>	May 9, 2018
<b>MODIFICATION DECISION DATE</b>	May 9, 2018

**DECISION AND ORDER**

On March 1, 2018, the Applicant submitted an application for a minor modification to the relief approved by BZA Order No. 19633. On March 15, 2018, the request was changed to a request for a modification of significance (the “Modification of Significance”, “Modification” or the “Application”). Following a public hearing, the Board of Zoning Adjustment (“Board” or “BZA”) voted to approve the Application for a modification of significance.

The original application (No. 19633) (the “Original Application”) was granted pursuant to 11 DCMR Subtitle X, Chapter 9, for a special exception under Subtitle D § 5201 from the rear addition requirements of Subtitle D § 1206.4, to construct a three-story rear addition (the “Addition”) to an existing principal dwelling unit in the R-20 zone at premises 3629 T Street, N.W. (Square 1296, Lot 804).

**BACKGROUND**

On December 13, 2017 in Application No. 19633, the Board approved the self-certified request by VI 3629 T Street LLC (the “Applicant”) for a special exception pursuant to Subtitle D § 5201 from the rear addition requirements of Subtitle D § 1206.4, to construct a three-story rear addition. The Board issued a Summary Order No. 19633 (the “Original Order” or the “Summary Order”) on

**BZA APPLICATION NO. 19633-A**  
**PAGE NO. 2**

December 14, 2017, granting approval pursuant to the approved plans (the “Approved Plans”) in Exhibits 41A and 42 in Case No. 19633.

After the Summary Order was issued, the Applicant was informed by Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs (“DCRA”) that the front vestibule — which was included in the BZA-Approved Plans — required front setback relief. Subtitle D § 1205.2 states: “a front setback consistent with at least one (1) of the immediately adjacent properties on either side shall be provided in the R-20 zone.” The Subject Property and the adjacent property have the same setback and the proposed vestibule slightly decreases the Subject Property’s front setback by approximately four feet; accordingly, the Applicant needed additional relief as the proposed front setback would be inconsistent with the only adjacent property.

The Applicant originally requested a minor modification to the Summary Order pursuant to 11-Y DCMR § 703.3. However, the Office of Zoning advised the Applicant to apply instead for a Modification of Significance pursuant to Subtitle Y § 704 because the Applicant sought additional relief from that granted.

**MODIFICATION OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Application. On March 15, 2018, the Applicant submitted its Application for a Modification of Significance to the relief approved by Summary Order No. 19633 to include a special exception under Subtitle D § 5201 from the front setback requirements of Subtitle D § 1205.2. The Applicant is not proposing to alter the Approved Plans, only adding an area of relief that was not included in the Original Application. The Application indicated that the proposed Modification of Significance meets the burden of proof for both the modification and the associated special exception relief.

Notice of Application and Notice of Public Hearing. By memoranda dated March 22, 2018, the Office of Zoning sent notice of the application to the Office of Planning (“OP”); the District Department of Transportation; the Councilmember for Ward 2; Advisory Neighborhood Commission (“ANC”) 2E, the ANC for the area within which the Subject Property is located; and the single-member district ANC 2E-01, and the owners of all property within 200 feet of the Subject Property. The public hearing took place on May 9, 2018.

Party Status

The Applicant and ANC 2E were automatically parties in this proceeding. There were no additional requests for party status.

Applicant’s Case. The Applicant provided evidence and testimony that the proposed Modification to include front setback relief satisfied the applicable requirements of the Zoning Regulations under 11-Y DCMR § 704 and 11-D DCMR § 5201.

OP Report. In its memoranda dated April 27, 2017, the Office of Planning recommended approval of the requested relief. In its report, OP determined that the Modification request met the standards

**BZA APPLICATION NO. 19633-A**  
**PAGE NO. 3**

of Subtitle D § 5201 as the light and air available to the only adjacent property at 3627 T Street would not be affected with any significant shadowing, the privacy and use of enjoyment of the only adjacent property would not be unduly compromised, and the issue of the altered front façade was discussed at the public hearing for the project as a whole. Specifically, that the Board discussed that the plans would not be out of character with the residential street and acknowledged that the changes the Applicant made in the Original Application made it more compatible with the street frontage.

DDOT Report. By memoranda dated April 26, 2018, DDOT indicated it had no objection to the approval of the Modification, noting that the proposal will have no adverse impacts on travel conditions of the District's transportation network.

ANC Report. ANC 2E, an automatic party to this proceeding, submitted a report. In its report, dated May 8, 2018, the ANC voted 8-0-0 to advise the Board of Zoning Adjustment to deny the requested Modification because it does not support vestibules. The Applicant presented the same plans to the ANC during the first hearing. The ANC chose to neither support nor deny the Original Application.

Persons in Support. The Board received a letter in support from Sarah Lamb, the owner of the only adjacent property at 3627 T Street, N.W.

Persons in Opposition. The Board received seven letters in opposition. None of the letters were from owners within a 200 foot ("ft.") radius of the Subject Property.

## **FINDINGS OF FACT**

### **The Subject Property and Nearby Properties**

1. The Subject Property is located at 3629 T Street, N.W. (Square 1296, Lot 395).
2. The Subject Property is a small rectangular record lot measuring 2,300 square feet in land area.
3. The Subject Property is located in the R-20 zone district.
4. The Subject Property is currently improved with an attached row dwelling which houses a principal dwelling unit (the "Building").
5. Abutting the Subject Property to the east is a row dwelling.
6. Abutting the Subject Property to the north and west are improved public alleys.
7. Abutting the Subject Property to the south is T Street, N.W.

**The Requested Modification and Special Exception**

8. The Application originally requested minor modification in order to modify the Original Order.
9. The Applicant amended the requested relief and applied for a modification of significance pursuant to Y § 704.
10. The scope of a hearing for a modification of significance is limited to the impact of the modification on the subject of the original application and does not permit the Board to revisit its original decision.
11. The Applicant did not alter the original—and existing—plans in any way and requested the Modification in order to construct what was previously approved by the Board in the original hearing. At that hearing, the Board determined that the project, which included the vestibule that is the subject of this modification, would not substantially visually intrude upon the character, scale, and pattern of houses along T Street.
12. As part of the modification, the Applicant demonstrated how the proposal continued to meet the standards of Subtitle X, Chapter 9 and the criteria of Subtitle E §§ 5201.3 through 5201.6.
13. The Applicant is permitted to request special exception relief for “yards” pursuant to Subtitle D § 5201.
14. The Original Application was reviewed under the same standards (Subtitle D § 5201) as the special exception relief requested in the Modification, as the Applicant was requesting relief for “yards” in the Original Application (rear yard setback).
15. The Applicant proposes to construct a small entryway vestibule which was included in the Approved Plans in the Original Application.
16. The zoning regulations (Subtitle D § 1205.2) require the front setback to match one of the immediately adjacent properties. The entryway vestibule alters the front setback from 26 ft. 2.4 in., to 21 ft. 10.4 in. As the only adjacent property has a front setback of 26 ft. 2.4 in., the Applicant must ask for relief for the four ft. four in. deviation.
17. The requested Modification and vestibule will not alter the light and air available to the only neighboring property at 3627 T Street, N.W. The vestibule is only on a portion of the Building on the side closest to the alley, not the adjacent property.

**BZA APPLICATION NO. 19633-A**  
**PAGE NO. 5**

18. The Applicant provided evidence in the form of testimony, plans, and elevations demonstrating that because the vestibule would have no windows facing the only adjacent property, the privacy and use of enjoyment of neighboring properties shall not be unduly compromised.
19. The Addition together with the original building as viewed from the street, alley, and other public way, will not substantially visually intrude upon the character, scale, and pattern of houses along T Street.
20. The Applicant provided photographs demonstrating the diversity of character, scale, pattern, and setbacks in the surrounding area.
21. The lot occupancy of the proposed building is 45%, which is less than 70% lot occupancy permitted by special exception.
22. The Applicant provided ample graphical representations such as plans, photographs, elevations, shadow studies, and section drawings sufficient to represent the relationship of the proposed addition or accessory structure to adjacent buildings and views from public ways. (See Exhibits 5A1-5A2, 27A, and 41.)
23. The R-20 zone is intended to retain and reinforce the unique mix of housing types, including detached, semi-detached, and attached dwellings, and permit attached row houses on small lots and includes areas where attached houses are mingled with detached houses and semi-detached houses. Accordingly, the proposal is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the zoning regulations and zoning maps, as the Applicant is providing an addition to an existing row dwelling in a neighborhood with a mix of dwelling types.
24. The difference in impact between the existing front façade and what is proposed is only four feet and four inches, and is only on the side of the Subject Property closest to the alley, not the adjacent property. Accordingly, the proposal does not tend to affect adversely, the use of neighboring property.

**CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND OPINION**

The Applicant requests a modification of significance pursuant to Subtitle Y § 704. Pursuant to Subtitle Y § 704.1, any request for a modification that does not meet the criteria for a minor modification or modification of consequence requires a public hearing and is a modification of significance. The Applicant's request complies with 11 DCMR Subtitle Y § 704, which provides the Board's procedures for considering requests for modifications of significance.

In the current case, the Applicant submitted a Modification request for an additional area of special exception relief under Subtitle D § 5201—from the front setback requirements of Subtitle D §

**BZA APPLICATION NO. 19633-A**  
**PAGE NO. 6**

1205.2. Since additional relief was requested, the Board finds that it meets the definition of a modification of significance.

Pursuant to Subtitle Y § 704.6, a public hearing on a request for a modification of significance shall be focused on the relevant evidentiary issues requested for modification and any condition impacted by the requested modification. Pursuant to Subtitle Y § 704.7, the scope of a hearing conducted pursuant to Subtitle Y § 704.1 is limited to the impact of the modification on the subject of the original application and does not permit the Board to revisit its original decision. Pursuant to Subtitle Y § 704.8, a decision on a request for modification of plans shall be made by the Board on the basis of the written request, the plans submitted therewith, and any responses thereto from other parties to the original application. Finally, pursuant to Subtitle Y § 704.9, the filing of any modification request under this section does not act to toll the expiration of the underlying order and the grant of any such modification does not extend the validity of any such order.

As part of the Modification, the Applicant requests special exception relief pursuant to Subtitle D § 5201 from the front setback requirements of Subtitle D § 1205.2.

The Board is authorized under § 8 of the Zoning Act, D.C. Official Code § 6-641.07(g)(2) (2008) to grant applications for modifications of significance and special exceptions, as provided in the Zoning Regulations, where, in the judgment of the Board, the special exception will be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Zoning Regulations and Zoning Maps and will not tend to affect adversely the use of neighboring property in accordance with the Zoning Regulations and Zoning Map, subject to specific conditions. (*See* 11-Y DCMR § 704 and 11-X DCMR § 901.2.)

*Burden of Proof*

Pursuant to Subtitle D § 5201 a special exception from the front setback requirements may be granted if the Application meets both the general and specific special exception requirements.

The specific requirements of Subtitle D §§ 5201.3-5201.6 are as follows:

5201.3 (a) The light and air available to neighboring properties shall not be unduly affected

The Applicant presented evidence in the form of elevations, renderings, and shadow studies. The evidence demonstrated that the proposed vestibule and related relief would not unduly affect the light and air available to the neighboring property. (Fact 17.)

The only adjacent neighbor, Sarah Lamb, owner of 3627 T Street, N.W., submitted a letter in support of the Project and Modification. The letter indicated that the proposed front vestibule would not impact the light and air available to her property. (Exhibit 8.)

The ANC report did not specifically address whether the vestibule would unduly affect the light and air available to the neighboring property. (Exhibit 40.)

**BZA APPLICATION NO. 19633-A**  
**PAGE NO. 7**

In its report, the Office of Planning found that the light and air available to neighboring properties would not be unduly affected by the requested modification and relief as the proposed vestibule would be located closest to the alley and not the abutting residence. (Exhibit 34.)

The Board credits the report provided by the Office of Planning, the shadow study, and renderings provided by the Applicant and finds that the proposed vestibule will not unduly affect the light and air available to neighboring properties.

5201.3 (b) The privacy of use and enjoyment of neighboring properties shall not be unduly compromised

The Applicant provided evidence in the form of testimony, plans, and elevations demonstrating that because the vestibule would have no windows facing the only adjacent property, the privacy of use and enjoyment of neighboring properties will not be unduly compromised. (Facts 17-18.)

The only adjacent neighbor, Sarah Lamb, owner of 3627 T Street, N.W., submitted a letter in support of the Project and modification. The letter indicated that the proposed front vestibule would not impact the light and air available to her property. (Exhibit 8.)

The ANC report did not specifically address whether the privacy and use of enjoyment of neighboring properties would be unduly compromised. (Exhibit 40.)

In its report, the Office of Planning found that the privacy of use and enjoyment of adjacent neighbors should not be unduly compromised by the front vestibule and related front setback relief. (Exhibit 34.)

The Board credits the testimony of the Applicant and the Office of Planning and finds that the privacy of use and enjoyment of neighboring properties will not be compromised by the proposed vestibule and front setback relief.

5201.3(c) The addition or accessory structure, together with the original building, as viewed from the street, alley, and other public way, shall not substantially visually intrude upon the character, scale, and pattern of houses along the subject street frontage

This requirement was discussed at length at the Original Hearing where the Board determined that the Approved Plans and project, which included the vestibule that is the subject of this modification, would not substantially visually intrude upon the character, scale, and pattern of houses along T Street. (Facts 11-15.)

The ANC Report noted that the ANC did not support a vestibule but it provided no explanation as to how the requested relief failed to meet the requirements of Subtitle D § 5201. The ANC Commissioner testified that all vestibules constructed after the 2016 Zoning Regulations went into

**BZA APPLICATION NO. 19633-A**  
**PAGE NO. 8**

effect were illegal. (Fact 28). The Board disagrees with this point, as vestibules are not prohibited pursuant to the Zoning Regulations, only front additions not meeting the front setback requirements of the applicable zone.

Ms. Juppenlatz who testified in opposition asserted that the proposed vestibule would be out of character with the neighborhood. (Fact 29.)

The OP Report found that the proposed vestibule would not visually intrude upon the character, scale, and pattern of houses along T Street.

The Board credits the Applicant's photographic evidence as well as the ANC report in its determination that the proposed vestibule and related relief will not substantially visually intrude upon the character, scale, and pattern of houses along T Street. As demonstrated by the photographs, there is a variety of front setbacks and entryway vestibules on this block of T Street and the surrounding blocks. (Fact 21, Exhibit 41, pp. 9, 15-19, 22-24.)

5201.3 (d) In demonstrating compliance with paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) of this subsection, the applicant shall use graphical representations such as plans, photographs, or elevation and section drawings sufficient to represent the relationship of the proposed addition or accessory structure to adjacent buildings and views from public ways

The Applicant provided graphical representations such as plans, photographs, elevations, and shadow studies, and section drawings sufficient to represent the relationship of the proposed addition to adjacent buildings and views from public ways. (Fact 23; Exhibits 5A1-5A2, 27A, and 41.)

5201.3 (e) The Board of Zoning Adjustment may approve lot occupancy of all new and existing structures on the lot up to a maximum of seventy percent (70%)

The lot occupancy of the proposed building is 45%, which is less than 70% lot occupancy. (Fact 22.)

Neither the ANC, nor the persons in opposition asserted that the lot occupancy was more than 70%.

5201.4 The Board of Zoning Adjustment may require special treatment in the way of design, screening, exterior or interior lighting, building materials, or other features for the protection of adjacent and nearby properties.

The Board is not requiring any special treatment.

5201.5 This section shall not be used to permit the introduction or expansion of a nonconforming use as a special exception.



The Applicant did not request the introduction or expansion of a nonconforming use as a special exception.

5201.6 This section shall not be used to permit the introduction or expansion of nonconforming height or number of stories as a special exception.

The Applicant did not request the introduction or expansion of nonconforming height or number of stories as a special exception.

***General Special Exception Requirements***

The Application must also satisfy the general special exception criteria of Subtitle X § 901.2 which states that the Board is authorized to grant special exception relief where, in the judgement of the Board, the special exception “will be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Zoning Regulations and Zoning Maps;” and “will not tend to affect adversely, the use of neighboring property in accordance with the Zoning Regulations and Zoning Maps.”

As discussed below, the Application meets the general special exception criteria.

In harmony with the general purpose and intent of the zoning regulations

The R-20 zone is intended to retain and reinforce the unique mix of housing types, including detached, semi-detached, and attached dwellings, and permit attached row houses on small lots and includes areas where attached houses are mingled with detached houses and semi-detached houses. (Fact 24.)

The Board finds that the zoning regulations specifically permit special exceptions and the purpose of the Board is to review such cases. The Applicant is proposing a modest update to a row dwelling. There are a variety of entryways and front setbacks in the area and on this block of T Street. Accordingly, the proposal is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the zoning regulations and zoning maps, as the Applicant is providing an addition to an existing row dwelling in a neighborhood with a mix of dwelling types.

Will not tend to affect adversely the use of neighboring property.

The second prong of the general special exception requirements is that the requested relief will not tend to affect adversely the use of neighboring property.

The only directly adjacent property is 3627 T Street, N.W. The owner of that property provided a letter in support of the Original Application and the Modification of Significance. (Exhibit 8.) All other properties are separated from the Subject Property by streets or alleys. Accordingly, the Board finds that the proposed vestibule will not affect adversely the use of neighboring properties.

**BZA APPLICATION NO. 19633-A**  
**PAGE NO. 10**

The Board is required to give “great weight” to the recommendation of the Office of Planning. (D.C. Official Code § 6-623.04 (2001).) In this case, as discussed above, the Board concurs with OP’s recommendation that the application should be approved.

The Board is also required to give “great weight” to the issues and concerns raised by the affected ANC. (Section 13(d) of the Advisory Neighborhood Commissions Act of 1975, effective March 26, 1976 (D.C. Law 1-21; D.C. Official Code § 1-309.10(d) (2001).) The District of Columbia Court of Appeals has interpreted the phrase “issues and concerns” to “encompass only legally relevant issues and concerns.” *Wheeler v. District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment*, 395 A.2d 85, 91 n.10 (1978) (citation omitted). In this case, ANC 2E submitted a resolution in opposition to the modification. However, the resolution did not address the legal issues related to the requested Modification and special exception relief.

Based on the case record, the testimony at the hearing, the additional submissions by the Applicant, and the findings of fact and conclusion of law, the Board concludes that the Applicant has satisfied the burden of proof with respect to the request for a Modification of Significance to the Original Order to include special exception relief pursuant to 11-D DCMR § 5201, for relief from the front setback requirements of 11-D DCMR § 1205.2

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that the Application for modification of significance is **GRANTED AND, PURSUANT TO SUBTITLE Y § 604.10, SUBJECT TO THE APPROVED PLANS AT EXHIBITS 5A1-5A2, and 27A – APPROVED ARCHITECTURAL PLANS – NO CHANGE REQUESTED (PART 1), APPROVED RENDERINGS – NO CHANGE REQUESTED (PART 2), AND SUPPLEMENTAL DRAWINGS.**

**VOTE:**        **4-1-0**        (Carlton E. Hart, Lorna L. John, Lesylleé M. White, and Peter G. May to APPROVE; Frederick L. Hill to deny).

**BY ORDER OF THE D.C. BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT**

A majority of the Board members approved the issuance of this order.

**ATTESTED BY:**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**SARA A. BARDIN**  
Director, Office of Zoning

**FINAL DATE OF ORDER:** September 26, 2018

**BZA APPLICATION NO. 19633-A**  
**PAGE NO. 11**

PURSUANT TO 11 DCMR SUBTITLE Y § 604.11, NO ORDER OF THE BOARD SHALL TAKE EFFECT UNTIL TEN (10) DAYS AFTER IT BECOMES FINAL PURSUANT TO SUBTITLE Y § 604.7.

PURSUANT TO 11 DCMR SUBTITLE Y § 604, APPROVAL OF AN APPLICATION SHALL INCLUDE APPROVAL OF THE PLANS SUBMITTED WITH THE APPLICATION FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A BUILDING OR STRUCTURE (OR ADDITION THERETO) OR THE RENOVATION OR ALTERATION OF AN EXISTING BUILDING OR STRUCTURE. AN APPLICANT SHALL CARRY OUT THE CONSTRUCTION, RENOVATION, OR ALTERATION ONLY IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PLANS APPROVED BY THE BOARD AS THE SAME MAY BE AMENDED AND/OR MODIFIED FROM TIME TO TIME BY THE BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT.

IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE D.C. HUMAN RIGHTS ACT OF 1977, AS AMENDED, D.C. OFFICIAL CODE § 2-1401.01 ET SEQ. (ACT), THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DOES NOT DISCRIMINATE ON THE BASIS OF ACTUAL OR PERCEIVED: RACE, COLOR, RELIGION, NATIONAL ORIGIN, SEX, AGE, MARITAL STATUS, PERSONAL APPEARANCE, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, GENDER IDENTITY OR EXPRESSION, FAMILIAL STATUS, FAMILY RESPONSIBILITIES, MATRICULATION, POLITICAL AFFILIATION, GENETIC INFORMATION, DISABILITY, SOURCE OF INCOME, OR PLACE OF RESIDENCE OR BUSINESS. SEXUAL HARASSMENT IS A FORM OF SEX DISCRIMINATION WHICH IS PROHIBITED BY THE ACT. IN ADDITION, HARASSMENT BASED ON ANY OF THE ABOVE PROTECTED CATEGORIES IS PROHIBITED BY THE ACT. DISCRIMINATION IN VIOLATION OF THE ACT WILL NOT BE TOLERATED. VIOLATORS WILL BE SUBJECT TO DISCIPLINARY ACTION.