

Re: case # 19672 3608 S Street NW

I am writing to oppose the special exception (SE) application for 3608 S St NW.

The application is for an addition 22' beyond the neighbor to the east and 12' beyond the neighbor to the west, including a 3rd floor and a 19' garage. The long high addition will tend to affect adversely the light and use of neighboring properties as well as be disproportionately large in volume and length compared to the Burleith neighborhood. Since all of these properties in Burleith are row houses, it is more than the abutting neighbor that will be affected by this addition.

The Regulations state that any Special Exceptions should be in **“harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Zoning Regulations.”** (X-901.2(a))

Specifically with regard to:

- Loss of Air and light to neighboring properties
- Not adversely affect the neighboring properties- privacy of use and enjoyment
- Limit ground coverage to be compatible with existing neighborhood
- Control the bulk or volume of structures
- Substantially intrude visually on the character, scale and pattern of houses as viewed from street or alley and
- Recognize and reinforce the neighborhood character, housing affordability and improvement to the overall environment

OP states the addition will not substantially visually intrude on the view from S street. In fact a 3rd floor would significantly intrude on the uniform Burleith 2 story façade heights of 27 of the 30 houses on both sides of this block that are about 20' high, not 35'. No pop ups have been built since the new Regs became law. The proposed enclosed vestibule is also out of character with 29 of the 30 neighbors who do not have any structure protruding from the front façade (the vestibule.) The vestibule is probably not permitted.

Light and air to neighboring properties:

OP and the developer believe the shadow studies show “some impact” but would “not be undue when compared to the existing and “by right” scenarios.” Actually, now, there is no shading from this house as it aligns with the neighbor on the east side and is shaded by the neighbor on the west side. I believe the neighbor to the east will be will be 80% shaded by 3:30 pm in winter, and 75% shaded at 3:30pm in summer. This is more than “unduly” impacted. Flowers need sun to grow. Blocking sun beginning about 2 pm on a long summer day is significant. The west side neighbor would not see any sun in summer until about 10 am, Half the house is shaded until after 9:30 am in winter.

This is significantly more shade than the “matter of right” 10’ addition would produce. Additionally, the studies do not show the rear yards, beyond the abutting neighbor, which will also be affected.

I question the shade studies where the “matter of right” and the proposed 22’ addition shade studies show different shading from the garage for the same time of day and season. How can the study show a different shade amount when the garage has not changed in either scenario? There is conveniently more shading from the same garage in the “matter of right” study than in the proposed 22’ addition study. Perhaps some good standardized shade studies should be provided.

Use and Privacy: The 3rd floor deck will be look down on the neighbors across the alley in their yards and their houses.

Control the Bulk or Volume of the building. The volume of the proposed house is 3 times that of the current house. This will be very visible from the neighboring yards. That does not include the new 19’x18’ garage shown in the plans. The east side neighbors will see a garage plus a 22’x35’ windowless wall from their rear yards. This addition “substantially Intrudes visually on the scale of houses” from the alley view. There are only very modest additions on houses to the east side who will be most affected. The additions to the west are not as large. This is 12’ beyond the west side neighbor’s rear addition.

Reinforce the importance of neighborhood character.

Neither the 3rd floor nor the vestibule in front is consistent with the neighborhood facades. This would set the precedence in the new Regulations for permitting a change to the look of the facades for this block of S street. There is regular uniformity to the facades on the original houses on each side of the street and in all of the original 2 story houses in Burleith. The character of the community will change from modest 2 story row houses 30 to 36' deep to 3 story houses, almost double the length of the original buildings and triple the volume. This does not meet the "affordability" criteria either.

The pervious grass area in the rear yard is reduced from 540 sq ft to 120 sq ft. The impervious surface of this property will be reduced from 52% to just 23%. Just above the absolute minimum. This denies "improvement to the "overall environment", one of the stated purposes and intents of the Zoning Regulations. I do not believe this is the goal of DOEE's RiverSmart Homes or WSSC. The goals are to reduce the rainwater runoff through trees and foliage surface area. By condoning this project, BZA is contributing to the problem.

I see the form letters of " support" are all from nonresident owners. We who live here do not want this type of development. We want to preserve the neighborhood character, not destroy it.

I believe the BZA should support a reasonable limit to lot coverage and size of additions as the Regulations intended and permit. This application is not in harmony with the requirements for a Special Exception. Please deny this application as presented.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Gail and Richard Juppenlatz

Whitehaven Pkwy, Burleith



PROPOSED - WINTER SOLSTICE - 3:30 pm

BZA 16

SOLAR STUDY - WINTER SOLSTICE



MATTER OF RIGHT - SUMMER SOLSTICE - 3:30 pm



MATTER OF RIGHT - WINTER SOLSTICE - 3:30 pm

BZA 17

SOLAR STUDY - MATTER OF RIGHT