

July 5, 2018

via IZIS

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

**Re: Prehearing Materials; BZA Case No. 19803 of 1151 Oates St NE LLC; 1151 Oates St., NE**

Dear Members of the Board:

Enclosed are additional materials/information, as requested by the Office of Planning:

1. Updated Plans and Relief- After discussions with the Office of Planning, the Applicant has agreed to eliminate the need for a waiver from the prohibition against removing architectural elements. Enclosed are updated plans showing the retention of the cornice element. In addition, the third story will be setback three feet (3 ft.) from the front façade of the building. The Applicant has also provided a rendering of the proposed building in context with the adjacent properties.
2. Shadow Studies- Enclosed are shadow studies demonstrating the difference in impact between a ten-foot (10 ft.) matter-of-right addition and the proposed fifteen-foot (15 ft.). In general, either addition will have only a very slight impact on the light and air available to the adjacent properties. As demonstrated by the studies, in the fall, spring, and summer, the difference in impact between the matter-of-right addition and proposed addition is imperceptible. In the winter, there is a very small amount of additional shadow on the property at 1149 Oates Street but only during the morning. Any additional impact is gone by 12pm.
3. Updated Self-Certification Form- The original self-certification form stated the relief for the conversion as “E-320.2” rather than “U-320.2.” That has been corrected.
4. Side Yard Relief- The Applicant’s statement did not specify which side yard required relief. Each side yard has varying widths; however, at their respective smallest points, each side yard only measures one foot and seven inches (1 ft. 7 in.). Accordingly, the Applicant requested side yard relief for both side yards as well as relief for increasing an existing nonconformity.
5. Roof Plan- The updated plans also include a roof plan. The Applicant is providing a roof deck which will be accessed via a hatch that less than four feet (4 ft.). The Applicant is providing a parapet wall in lieu of deck railings on the sides of the building. The parapet wall is not required to have a setback. The deck railings at the front and rear of the deck meet the 1:1 front and rear setback requirements.

Board of Zoning Adjustment  
District of Columbia  
CASE NO. 19803

Sincerely,

*Martin P Sullivan*

---

Martin P. Sullivan, Esq.  
Sullivan & Barros, LLP  
Date: July 5, 2018