

May 24, 2018

via IZIS

Board of Zoning Adjustment
441 4th Street, NW
Suite 210S
Washington, DC 20001

Re: BZA Application No. 19771- Prehearing Materials

Dear Mr. Chairman and Members of the Board:

On May 23, 2018, the Applicant submitted a cover letter with six exhibits as part of its prehearing package. After submitting the materials, it was noticed that the architect for the garage (a different architect than the Applicant's expert witness) incorrectly labeled a couple dimensions on the plans. The garage itself was correctly drawn. The plans indicated the lot occupancy was 65%, but it is actually 66%.¹ The plans indicated the garage footprint was 356 square feet, but it is actually 375 square feet. These measurements were included in two other exhibits: Exhibit B (summary of special exception relief) and Exhibit D (self-certification). Accordingly, the Applicant is requesting to submit revised exhibits to the record.

Enclosed are the following materials:

1. **Revised Exhibit B**- Summary demonstrating that special exception relief from the rear yard requirements of E § 5004.2 is expressly permitted by the Zoning Regulations. Also included is a memo from the Zoning Administrator for indicating that relief is permitted via special exception (Case No. 19747). *This was included in the original prehearing submission and has been revised to indicate the correct footprint of 375 square feet. Nothing else has been updated except that measurement.*
2. **Revised Exhibit C**- Updated Plans showing two minor revisions- a reduced garage footprint and additional pervious surface at the front of the property- in order to ensure we meet the 20% pervious surface requirement. *The plans have now been correctly labeled. The garage, which measures 20 ft. x 18.75 ft., was correctly drawn on the original Exhibit C.*
3. **Revised Exhibit D**- Self-certification form. *The Applicant is submitting the original self-certification form, which showed the correct lot occupancy of 66%.*

¹ There is another lot occupancy figure on the plans, the "69%"—that is not the proposed lot occupancy. It is the lot occupancy of the property IF porch relief is not granted but relief for the garage is granted. It was included to prove that the porch relief is not related to the lot occupancy relief.

4. **Motion to File**- The Applicant is also submitting a motion to file additional materials past the 21-day filing requirements of 11-Y DCMR § 300.15.

Sincerely,

Martin P Sullivan

Martin P. Sullivan, Esq.
Sullivan & Barros, LLP
Date: May 24, 2018

Cc: Karen Thomas, Office of Planning
ANC 1C