
Fwd: 1832 15th street - new drawings and considerations

2 messages

louise levathes <llevathes@comcast.net>
To: brittanybepler@gmail.com

Wed, Dec 11, 2019 at 5:43 PM

Begin forwarded message:

From: louise levathes <llevathes@comcast.net>
Subject: 1832 15th street - new drawings and considerations
Date: December 11, 2019 at 5:37:29 PM EST
To: Beverly Schwartz <bevschwartzdc@gmail.com>, Edward Hanlon <ed.hanlon.3@gmail.com>, Kari Cunningham <2B07@anc.dc.gov>, Mike Silverstein <2B06@anc.dc.gov>, Aaron Landry <reply-2xfd6=77ce2996-4a50-45cc-a372-f5faa2319122@tinyletter.com>, Randy Downs <2B05@anc.dc.gov>, Daniel Warwick <2B02.ANC@dc.gov>
Cc: Michael Lee Beidler <michael@troutdesign.com>, Jeffrey Alan Rueckgauer <jardupontanc@gmail.com>, Christopher Davis <davis.w.christopher@gmail.com>, Brian Knudsen <knudsenbb@gmail.com>

To the ANC 2B Commissioners and fellow committee members,

At our request, the applicant requesting zoning variance on this house extension sent us **axonometric views of the block** to show the **full impact of the project**. (Page 17 or 17) I have pulled out one here that I think is particularly helpful to our discussion. Here it is (below).

As you can see, the new two-story garage addition and full 13.25 foot extension to the original main house footprint will have a profound impact on this open, interior area of the block. Notice the exterior staircase and landing raised above fence height. It virtually divides the open interior space between the townhouses in two, drastically cutting down the light and air flow on both sides. The aggressive use of the lot, close to 70% coverage, would have a strong impact WITHOUT THE 3.25 FEET OF ADDITIONAL FOOTAGE THE OWNER IS REQUESTING, if he stayed with what was allowable by right.

However, **WITHOUT the additional 3.25 feet — the owner gets virtually everything he wanted in his plans**. (See below, second drawing). On the first floor, the opening living room, kitchen, dining room is still spacious; on the second floor, the master bedroom and large sitting room is still intact with perhaps some space taken out of the sitting room. He still has two additional bedrooms for his children.

My conclusion:

(1) I don't believe there owner of has really made the case that 3.25 foot zoning variance is necessary for his plans or, if denied, would have a negative impact on his plans in any way.

(2) 3.25 feet seems to be a **fairly arbitrary number**. 3.50 feet would have pushed the applicant over 70% occupancy rate. It seems to me he is just pushing — without any real reason — for whatever he thinks he can get.

And although other projects have granted 3.25 feet, I doubt that they were in this tight context with such adverse consequences for the property's neighbors.

(3) By turning down the applicant's request, the ANC will be affording the neighbors **some** relief to impact of this aggressive plan. Not much, but some. Let the owner of 1832 build out his lot to the max allowed by current zoning. Not more, given the level of opposition to the project.

Louise Levathes

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO.20144
EXHIBIT NO.76