

I have studied the 14-13 proposal and would like to comments as follows 2015 MAY 11 PM 4:46

I strongly endorse

The 10 foot height limit, which is in sync with the comprehensive plan's discouragement of roof structures on rowhouses

Front, back and alleyside setback requirements

R-4 prohibition on human occupancy in penthouses

However, I object to provisions that.

Are inconsistent with the comprehensive plan Proposed penthouse rule changes for R-5-B are largely out of character with the Comprehensive Plan in terms of setbacks on common walls and maintenance of the inventory and integrity of residential row house neighborhoods

Allow penthouse space to be habitable

Exclude penthouse space, which can now be habitable, from Floor Area Ratio calculations This rule change further diminishes the purpose of FAR, which is to put a cap on maximum square footage in a building With the current and often-abused loophole with the lower level exemption of so-called "cellar" space from FAR, 50% or more of FAR square footage in an R-5-B rowhouse does not get counted This will urge more pop-ups in R-5-B.

Omit any setbacks from shared common sidewalls lack of a setback from common walls shared by row houses will create multiple problems, including

- o Structural pressure on common walls
- o Impinge upon the development rights of abutters who may wish to build penthouse structures but will be limited in doing so if existing penthouse walls occupy common wall space
- o Create potential snow load problems
- o Interfere with the functioning of abutters' chimneys
- o Create potential fire safety problems with penthouse walls

With kind regards

Katelijn van den Berg

69 V street, NW

ZONING COMMISSION
District of Columbia

CASE NO. 14-13

EXHIBIT NO. 117