

February 4, 2026

Via JZIS

Board of Zoning Adjustment
441 4th Street, N.W.
Suite 210S
Washington, DC 20001

Re: Prehearing Submission & Updated Plan Summary - BZA Case No. 21396 – 932 Shepherd Street, NW

Dear Chairperson Blake and Members of the Board:

The Applicant has been engaged in discussions with the adjacent neighbors and is submitting updated plans, an updated plat, and an updated Form 135 as a result.

Background:

The Applicant originally applied for ten-foot rule relief and relief to convert the building from a single-family home to three units. The neighboring property at 930 Shepherd has a building attached to the subject property and that property is the subject of the 10 ft. rule. The other adjacent property at 934 Shepherd is separated by its own side yard. The Applicant originally proposed a full third story addition and rear addition extending about 20 feet past the neighboring property at 930 Shepherd. While the originally proposed addition was generally consistent in length with other rear extensions on this block, the adjacent neighbors expressed concerns about the length of the addition and the massing of the third floor. After the ANC meeting, the Applicant revised the plans to address these concerns. The updated changes include:

- The Applicant is significantly reducing the third floor, to only ~417 square feet and is setting the third story back from the adjoining property at 930 Shepherd by 5.5 feet to mitigate concerns over new solar panels;
- The Applicant reduced the proposed rear addition to only 15 feet past the adjoining rear wall of 930 Shepherd Street, the only adjoining property;
- The Applicant is providing a shade study demonstrating the lack of undue impact on light and air between a by-right addition of 10 feet past and one 15 feet past 930 Shepherd. It demonstrates that there is a minimal impact, only a few feet of additional shade in the afternoon; and
- The Applicant is proposing a conforming accessory building to accommodate some of the lost space from the significant reduction in the original proposal.

The Applicant continues to seek the same originally requested special exceptions: first, for the conversion, for which the requirements are easily met in terms of having enough land area to convert to three units, and second for the ten-foot rule, now with a smaller degree of relief requested.

With respect to the ten-foot rule, the regulations require the Applicant to demonstrate that the light and air available to neighboring properties is not unduly affected, privacy of use and enjoyment of neighboring properties is not unduly compromised, and that the addition shall not substantially visually intrude upon the character, scale, and pattern of houses along the street and alley frontage. The Applicant is meeting its burden of proof for the ten-foot rule in the following ways:

- As demonstrated by the shadow studies, there is a very limited amount of additional shade cast by the proposed addition (15 ft.) vs. the matter-of-right addition (10 ft.) - only a few feet and only during the afternoon for an hour or two. Accordingly, the proposed addition does not create an undue or excessive impact on light and air relative to a matter-of-right addition, especially with the reduction of the third level. With the privacy fences between properties, this impact may be even less.
- Regarding privacy, the Applicant is providing screening on the sides of the rear balconies to satisfy any concerns over privacy. This was a mitigation suggested by the Board in a recent ten-foot rule case (Case no. 21326).
- In terms of the design, the Applicant is not seeking any architectural element relief and will maintain the existing façade and architectural elements original to the building. The third-floor addition will be set back. In terms of impact on the alley, there are existing garages and accessory buildings along the alley, as well as rear additions. Further, there is already an existing garage on site and the replacement with a new accessory building will not have a substantial visual intrusion, and the accessory building is conforming in nature with respect to the size and height.

Respectfully Submitted,

Alexandra Wilson

Alexandra Wilson
Sullivan & Barros, LLP

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on February 4, 2026, an electronic copy of this submission was served to the following:

D.C. Office of Planning
planning@dc.gov

Advisory Neighborhood Commission 4C

ANC Office
4C@anc.dc.gov

Mike Warburton, Chairperson
4C03@anc.dc.gov

Antoine M. Kirby, SMD
4C02@anc.dc.gov

Respectfully Submitted,

Sarah Harkcom
Sarah Harkcom, Case Manager
Sullivan & Barros, LLP