

Advisory Neighborhood Commission 3D

Government of the District of Columbia



March 5, 2025

Mr. Frederick Hill
Chairman
District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment
441 Fourth Street NW, Room 200-S
Washington, DC 20001

RE: BZA Case 21263, 4632 Charleston Place NW

Dear Chairman Hill:

Advisory Neighborhood Commission 3D at its duly noticed, regularly scheduled public meeting on March 5, 2025, with a quorum (4) present-at-all-times, voted 6-0-0 to transmit this letter regarding the special exceptions in the above-referenced case.

ANC3D could not come to a consensus on whether to support or oppose this project. After a lengthy discussion and hearing testimony from the applicant and neighbor, both votes to support and oppose this application came out with a 3-3-0 decision. Instead, we unanimously voted to send this letter to the BZA to transmit the arguments in support and opposition to case. We thought it would be helpful to the BZA to hear our arguments.

Opposition Argument

While the BZA is authorized to grant the three separate requests for relief (lot occupancy, location of the Accessory Structure and the size the structure), this does not mean that the BZA should do so. In combination, these three deviations from normal zoning constitute a massive over-use of the backyard and an abuse of the applicant's neighbors. The addition of the roof to the deck, making it an accessory structure, greatly increases the impact of the proposed addition. In particular, the light available to the apartment building to the rear would be restricted, as would the air for the yard of the next-door neighbors. Moreover, there is a reasonable alternative which would serve the stated needs of the applicant for protection from the sun—namely, a deck without a roof, together with the use of sun umbrellas or a retractable awning attached to the house that would provide sun protection for the applicant when needed but would greatly reduce the impact on the neighbors.

Support Argument

The three special exception requests meet the relevant special exception criteria, namely there is no undue impact on any neighbor's light and air. One neighbor's concern involved her view of the proposed structure, but neighbors are not entitled to a view in the context of the special exception test and the arguments were not persuasive enough to oppose the

project as a whole. The shadow study shows that there is minimal impact on neighboring properties. When comparing the existing deck with the proposed configuration the privacy of the neighbors will not be duly compromised. The concern about the lot coverage and how it may affect storm water runoff is being addressed with proper drainage and capture of all storm water from this structure on site.

On March 5, 2025 at a duly-noticed monthly meeting, ANC3D voted unanimously to submit this letter to the record for BZA Case No. 21263.

Sincerely,


Bernie Horn, Chair