

RECEIVED  
J.C. OFFICE OF ZONING  
Date: 1/29/2015  
Attn: Donna  
Chairman Anthony Hood  
District of Columbia Zoning Commission  
441 4<sup>th</sup> St., NW, Suite 2105  
Washington, DC. 20001  
FAX (202) 727-6072  
Re: ZC Case No 14-11

RECEIVED  
D.C. OFFICE OF ZONING  
2015 JAN 29 PM 12: 47

Dear Chairman Hood and Members of the Commission

**This is in fervent support of ZC Case No 14-11** Even more I would like to see a regulations to stop those awful "pop ups" and "pop backs "

As a born and bred Dc Resident of 60 years, and I live in an R-4 District in Ward 6 I am in support for your proposal to change the zoning regulations to limit pop-up developments in R-4 Districts I generally support the proposal, However

**Amendments Pertaining to Maximum Height**

I support the proposal to reduce the maximum height in R-4 from 40 feet to 35 feet as a matter-of-right Many pop-up developments are taller than existing homes in the neighborhood. This height differential reduces adjoining properties I personally know the issues this can cause for Solar Panels An adjoining property owner should be permitted to present evidence to the Board of Zoning Adjustment if such owner believes the upper addition would have a substantially adverse impact on the use, value and enjoyment of his property

**Amendments Pertaining to Conversion of Structures in R-4 Districts to Apartment Houses** of §330 5(e) should be the repealed to prevent residential structures in R-4 Districts from being converted to apartment houses Property owners flexibility is all for the good but, the result of retaining this provision would be a continuation of developers pop-up construction in rowhouse neighborhoods The current loophole goes beyond a homeowner setting up an in-law suite or a basement apartment by allowing conversions of residential structures to apartment houses in R-4 There should be inclusion of new §336 stating the prohibition of converting a rowhome to an apartment house (§336 2) The conversion is out of character with other rowhomes on the block, could result in structural and other damage to adjoining properties and are often totally out of character in the neighborhood There should be consideration of the effect any addition would have on abutting or adjacent properties (§336 4). These Pop-up developments are unfair and damaging to nearby residents and have a negative impact on property values and the value and characters of neighborhoods Adjoining property owner should be permitted to present evidence to the Board of Zoning Adjustment if such owner believes the addition would have a substantially adverse impact on the use, enjoyment and value of his property

Two changes can be made to §336 Add a requirement that any addition must not restrict an adjoining property owner from full access to his property. Then reduce the lot occupancy requirement in §336 6 from 70% to no more than 60% A maximum lot occupancy of 70% would result in little pervious and permeable surfaces on the property It is important to retain

ZONING COMMISSION  
District of Columbia  
CASE NO 14-11  
EXHIBIT NO 170  
ZONING COMMISSION  
District of Columbia  
CASE NO. 14-11  
EXHIBIT NO. 170

pervious and permeable surfaces to reduce pollution and storm water run-off in the District The proposal allows special exception relief from the minimum requirement of 900 square feet per dwelling unit. This would provide an incentive for developers to seek maximum profit by crowding multiple, small units into an apartment house on a lot too small to accommodate them This would further reduce parking in many neighborhoods and increase density. Under no circumstances should OP and ZC permit a residential structure to be converted to an apartment house, especially if the minimum of 900 square feet per unit can be waived by special exception

### **Special Exception Relief**

I strongly recommend that any relief sought by special exception require input from adjoining property owners, the ANC and the community

### **In conclusion**

I am distraught by the number and scale of pop-up houses in the District Developers of these pop-ups only are interested in financial gain and have no concern for the neighborhoods and residents or long-term impact of their development on attractiveness of neighborhoods The existing zoning regulations did not intend for R-4 Districts to be apartment house districts. Yet, this is exactly the effect pop-up developments are having on R-4 neighborhoods

I commend OP and ZC for this effort to limit pop-up developments and urge you to act quickly and make the decision that no more permits for POP-ups and conversion from rowhouse into apartment will be possible until the zoning commission issues its final ruling on this matter Every day of delay results in more POP-ups and substantial negative consequences to property owners

Robert Bresnahan  
314 8<sup>th</sup> St SE Washington, DC 20003  
202 210 4147

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert K. Bresnahan", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.