### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

### Applicant's Statement of Paul Pike 1818 15th Street, NW (Square 0191, Lot 0063)

### I. <u>Introduction</u>.

This Statement is submitted on behalf of Paul Pike (the "Applicant"), owner of 1818 15th Street, NW (Square 191, Lot 63) (the "Property"). The Property is located in the RF-1/DC zone and is improved with a three-story single-family row dwelling (the "Building"). The Applicant is proposing a carport (the "Addition")<sup>1</sup> at the rear of the Property. The proposed Addition will increase the Property's total lot occupancy to 70%, Accordingly, the Applicant is requesting special exception relief for the additional 10% lot occupancy over the 60% requirement of the RF-1/DC Zone.

### II. JURISDICTION OF THE BOARD.

The Board has jurisdiction to grant the special exception relief pursuant to X-901.2, and E-5201.

### III. BACKGROUND.

The Property is an interior lot measuring 1,700 square feet in land area. Abutting the Property to the east is 15th Street. Abutting the Property to the west is the alley. Abutting the Property to the south is 1816 15th Street, NW, which consists of a flat. The adjacent flat has an accessory structure. Abutting the Property to the north is the rear of 1508 Swann Street, NW and the rear of 1506 Swann Street, NW, a flat. These properties are built to 100% lot occupancy, and the rear wall of 1508 Swann Street, NW directly abuts the subject property's parking area. The Applicant is proposing a 17 ft. by 10 ft. (170 sq. ft.) carport at the rear of the property. The Addition will increase the total lot occupancy to 70%.

#### IV. THE APPLICATION MEETS THE REQUIREMENTS FOR SPECIAL EXCEPTION RELIEF.

#### A. General Special Exception Requirements of Subtitle X § 901.2.

Pursuant to Subtitle X-901.2 of the Zoning Regulations, the Board is authorized to grant special exception relief 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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The carport is already constructed, and would be reduced in the event of approval, or removed entirely in the event of a denial.

will not tend to affect adversely the use of neighboring property, subject also, in this case, to the specific requirements for relief under E-5201 of the Zoning Regulations.

# 1. Granting of the Special Exception will be in Harmony with the General Purpose and Intent of the Zoning Regulations and Zoning Maps.

The granting of the special exception will be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Zoning Regulations and Zoning Maps. The purpose of the RF-1 zone is "to provide for areas predominantly developed with residential row buildings on small lots within which no more than two (2) principal dwelling units are permitted." The Property will remain a single-family row dwelling. Accordingly, the proposed Addition will be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Zoning Regulations and Zoning Maps.

# 2. The granting of the special exception will not tend to affect adversely the use of neighboring property in accordance with the Zoning Regulations and Zoning Maps.

The granting of the special exception will also not tend to adversely affect the use of neighboring properties as described more fully below.

### B. Specific Special Exception Requirements of Subtitle E-5201.

In reviewing applications for a special exception under the Zoning Regulations, the Board's discretion is limited to determining whether the proposed exception satisfies the relevant zoning requirements. If the prerequisites are satisfied, the Board ordinarily must grant the application. See, e.g., *Nat'l Cathedral Neighborhood Ass'n. v. D.C. Board of Zoning Adjustment*, 753 A.2d 984, 986 (D.C. 2000).

The Applicant is seeking relief from lot occupancy, which is available up to 70%, pursuant to E-5201.1(a).

5201.4: An application for special exception relief under this section shall demonstrate that the proposed addition, new principal building, or accessory structure shall not have a substantially adverse effect on the use or enjoyment of any abutting or adjacent dwelling or property, specifically:

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

The Addition shall not unduly affect the light and air available to neighboring properties as it is located toward the rear of the property and is only 6 ft. 10 in. in height. Because the adjacent lot already occupies 100% of its land area, including to the rear, the Addition will be set against the bulk of an existing residential structure — not open yard. As a result, the structure will not introduce new shadows, massing, or obstruction beyond what is already present. The carport

merely infills a visually compatible and structurally subordinate element. The neighbor at 1508 Swaan has an at-risk window facing the Applicant's parking area. Regardless of the at-risk window implications, the proposed structure has no material impact on light and air to the at-risk window.

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

The proposed Addition shall not unduly compromise the privacy of use and enjoyment of neighboring properties. The structure is located at the rear of the property and oriented toward the alley, minimizing direct views into adjacent private spaces. The party-opponent argues that *her* privacy is impacted by way of her at-risk window looking out onto the Applicant's Property. In fact, it is her at-risk window which looks out onto the *Applicant's* Property, and so it is the *Applicant's* privacy which is impacted by the at-risk window. The Applicant is exercising his right to special exception relief in order to protect his automobile from damage from the party-opponent's un-permitted rooftop deck overlooking his parking space (see attached photo). If the Board found that the party-opponent enjoyed some type of property right to restrict the Applicant's use of his property, then the obvious solution would be to pay for the party-opponent to glaze her at-risk window, thereby solving her privacy concerns while still allowing light into the at-risk window.<sup>2</sup>

(c) The proposed addition or accessory structure, together with the original building, or the new principal 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 street or alley frontage;

The Addition is not visible from 15th Street and therefore will not alter the character of the streetscape. Other adjacent properties have accessory structures along the alley, and the proposal will contribute to a consistent alley profile.

(d) In demonstrating compliance with paragraph (a-c), the applicant shall use graphical representations such as plans, photographs, or elevation and section drawings sufficient to represent the relationship of the proposed construction to adjacent buildings and views from public ways;

(Hefazi v Stiglitz, 862 A.2d 901;911).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The frequent statement by the Board that nobody is entitled to a view, and its position on at-risk windows, was initially prompted by the Court of Appeals rulings in Hefazi v. Stiglitz, specifically: "This rule flows from the basic principle that the "actual enjoyment of the air and light by the owner of the house is upon his own land only," and that "the owner of the adjoining lands has submitted to nothing which actually encroached upon his rights..." Thus, "[o]ne may obstruct his neighbor's windows at any time" and [n]o action can be maintained for obstructing a view..."

Applicant's Statement 1818 15<sup>th</sup> Street, NW

### V. <u>Conclusion</u>.

For the reasons stated above, this application meets the requirements for special exception relief by the Board, and the Applicant respectfully requests that the Board grant the requested relief.

Respectfully submitted,

Martin P. Sullivan

Sullivan & Barros, LLP Date: September 22, 2025

Martin P Sullivan