Docket Item \# 2
BZA \#2020-00032
Board of Zoning Appeals
March 8, 2021

| ADDRESS: | 3300 ELMORE DRIVE |
| :--- | :--- |
| ZONE: | R-8, SINGLE FAMILY ZONE |
| APPLICANT: | DAVID AND JILL FORBES |

ISSUE: $\quad$ Variances to construct a shed in the required side yards.

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { CODE } \\ & \text { SECTION } \end{aligned}$ | SUBJECT | CODE <br> REQMT | APPLICANT PROPOSES | REQUESTED <br> VARIANCE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3-306(A)(2) | Side Yard (East) | 8.00 ft | 3.30 ft | 4.70 ft |
| 3-306(A)(2) | Side Yard (West) | 8.00 ft | 3.30 ft | 4.70 ft |

Planning and Zoning staff recommends denial of the requested variances because the request does not meet the criteria for a variance.

If the Board grants the requested variances, it is subject to compliance with all applicable code requirements, ordinances, and recommended conditions found in the department comments. The variance must be recorded with the property's deed in the City's Land Records Office.
I. Issue

The applicants propose to construct a 180 square foot shed in the required east and west side yards.

## II. Background

The subject property consists of one lot of record with 75.19 feet of frontage facing Elmore Drive, depths of 166.06 feet along the west side property line and 157.07 feet along the on the east side property line and 12.07 feet across the rear property line. The property contains 6,768 square feet of lot area.


Figure 1

The subject property is a substandard lot due to the requirements to provide a lot size of 8,000 square feet and a lot width of 65.00 feet for a single-family detached dwelling in the R-8 zone.

The property is developed with a two-story singlefamily dwelling unit on a triangular shaped lot. The dwelling is located 33.00 feet from the front property line facing Elmore Drive, 7.50 feet from the west property line, 7.20 feet from the east property line and 87.27 feet from the rear property line. There is an existing 80 square foot shed located approximately 6.00 feet from the rear property line, 3.70 feet from the west side property line and on the east side property line.


Figure 2: Rear Yard

The following table provide zoning analysis of the subject property.

| R-8 | Required/Permitted | Existing | Proposed |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lot Area | $8,000 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}$. | $6,768 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}$. | $6,768 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}$. |
| Lot Width | 65.00 ft | 59.00 ft. | 59.00 ft. |
| Lot Frontage | 40.00 ft. | 75.19 ft. | 75.19 ft. |
| Front Yard setback | 22.70 to 33.00 ft. | 33.00 ft. | 33.00 ft. |
| Side Yard (East-House) | $1: 2$ minimum 8.00 ft. | 7.20 ft. | 7.20 ft. |
| Side Yard (West-House) | $1: 2$ minimum 8.00 ft. | 7.50 ft. | 7.50 ft. |
| Side Yard (East-Shed) | $1: 2$ minimum 8.00 ft. | $0.00 \mathrm{ft}$. | 3.30 |
| Side Yard (West-Shed) | $1: 2$ minimum 8.00 ft. | $3.70 \mathrm{ft}$. | 3.30 |
| Rear Yard (House) | $1: 1$ minimum 8.00 ft. | 87.27 ft. | 87.27 ft. |
| Rear Yard (Shed) | $1: 1$ minimum 8.00 ft. | $6.00 \mathrm{ft}$. | 11.00 ft. |
| Floor Area Ratio (FAR) | sq. $\mathrm{ft} .(35) 2368.80$ | $1501.10 \mathrm{sq} ft$. | $1681.10 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}$. |

[^0]
## III. Description

The applicants propose to replace an existing 80 square foot shed with a larger 180 square foot shed in the required side yards. The proposed shed will measure 10.00 feet in width by 18.00 feet in length and will be 11.00 feet in height at the midpoint of the gable roof measured from average existing grade.


Figure 3

## IV. Noncomplying Structure/ Substandard Lot

The existing lot at 3300 Elmore Drive is a substandard lot developed with a noncomplying structure with respect to the following:

|  | $\underline{\text { Required }}$ |  | Existing |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lot size | $8,000 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}$ |  | Noncompliance |
| Lot width | 65.00 ft. |  | 59.00 ft. |
| Side yard (West) | 8.00 ft. | 7.50 ft. | $6.00 \mathrm{ft} . \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Side yard (East) | 8.00 ft. | 7.20 ft. | .50 ft. |
|  |  |  | .80 ft. |

## V. Master Plan/Zoning

The subject property is zoned R-8, single-family residential zone, has been so zoned since 1992, and is identified in the North Ridge Small Area Plan for single-family residential use.

## VI. Requested Variance:

3-306-(A)(2) Side yard 8.00 feet
The applicants are requesting variances of 4.70 feet from the required 8.00 foot side yard setbacks to construct a shed 3.30 feet from the east and west side property lines.

## VII. Applicant's Justification for Variance

The applicants state that the extreme triangular shaped lot that narrows towards the rear of the property leaves limited space and area to construct a larger accessory structure; thus, creating a restriction on enjoyable use of the back yard. In addition, that area behind the structure would become wasted space with no viable use.
VIII. Analysis of Variance Definition

Per Zoning Ordinance section 11-1103, the Board of Zoning Appeals shall not grant a variance unless it finds that the request meets the definition of a variance per Zoning Ordinance section 2-201.1 as follows:
a. The request is a reasonable deviation from those provisions regulating the shape, size, or area of a lot or parcel of land or the size, height, area, bulk, or location of a building or structure.

The subject property is an irregular triangular shaped lot that sits on a street where the topography slopes downward towards front and east side of the property. While the narrow shape of the rear portion of the lot makes placing a shed larger than 100 square feet and taller than $\mathbf{1 0 . 0 0}$ feet in height challenging, there are options to place the shed in compliance with Zoning Ordinance. The request is not a reasonable deviation because the Zoning Ordinance clearly identifies the


Figure 4 appropriate size and height for a shed to be located in required side and rear yards in section 7-202(C)(2)(a). The size and shape of the lot do not prevent the applicants from constructing a shed in compliance with this section.
b. Strict application of the Zoning Ordinance would unreasonably restrict the utilization of the property.

The strict application of the Zoning Ordinance would not unreasonably restrict the use of the property. The ordinance was amended in 2019 to allow an accessory structure of up to 100 square feet and $\mathbf{1 0 . 0 0}$ feet in height in any yard except a front yard. The applicant currently has an 80 square foot shed and is now petitioning for a variance to the rear and side yard to construct a shed larger than 100 square feet in in the approximately where the existing shed is located.
c. The need for a variance is not shared generally by other properties.

The adjacent property to the west, 812 Crescent Drive is also a triangular shaped lot. If that property were to propose a shed greater than 100 square feet and/or taller than $\mathbf{1 0 . 0 0}$ feet, and placed at the narrow end of the property, then it too would require a rear yard variance and potentially a side yard variance as well. Additionally, any
property in the R-8 zone wanting a shed this size would need to meet minimum side yard setbacks to construct a shed or seek the relief of variances.
d. The variance is not contrary to the purpose of the ordinance.

The requested variances are contrary to the ordinance. On March 17, 2018, City Council amended the Zoning Ordinance with Text Amendment \#2018-00003 to increase the size and height of sheds and other small accessory buildings allowed in required side and rear yards in order to keep up with industry standards and the needs of residents to store yard equipment, bicycles and other outdoor materials. Now sheds up to 100 square feet and 10 feet in height are permitted obstructions in required side and rear yards.

In the case of the subject property, there is currently an existing complying 80 square foot shed located in the required side and rear yards. The applicant can build a new larger shed in compliance with the current regulations and the structure would not need any relief from the Zoning Ordinance.
e. The variance does not include a change in use, which change shall be accomplished by a rezoning.

The variance request does not include a change in use. The property will continue to be used as residential.

## IX. Analysis of Variance Standards

Per Zoning Ordinance section 11-1103, the Board of Zoning Appeals shall not grant a variance unless it finds that the request meets the variance standards as follows:
a. The strict application of the terms of the ordinance would unreasonably restrict the utilization of the property or that the granting of the variance would alleviate a hardship due to a physical condition relating to the property or improvements thereon at the time of the effective date of the ordinance.

The strict application of the ordinance would not unreasonably restrict the utilization of the property. The applicants are proposing to construct a 180 square foot shed. The applicants currently have an existing 80 square foot shed which is a permitted obstruction in the required yards. The applicants can replace that structure with a 100 square foot shed in any required yard except the front yard per Section 7-202 (C)(2)(a) or locate a larger she in compliance with the required setbacks.
b. The property interest for which the variance is being requested was acquired in good faith and any hardship was not created by the applicants for the variance.

The applicants acquired the property in good faith. The property was constructed
around 1939 in compliance with the zoning regulations at the time. Since at least 1992, a shed or similar small accessory building at the size proposed would have required variances to be located in the required side yards.
c. The granting of the variance will not be of substantial detriment to adjacent property and nearby properties in the proximity of that geographical area.

The proposed shed would be a larger and taller structure located in close proximity to the shared property lines. Setbacks are one tool to mitigate potential impacts. This zoning ordinance has made provisions on what could be allowed in a required yard. To allow the shed to be placed in the required yard, would be contrary to the intent of the R-8 zone and would be of detriment to the adjacent property. If instead the applicants were to build the shed in compliance with the Zoning
 Ordinance based on options " $A$ " and " $B$ " shown below, while the structure may reduce the appearance of open rear yards, the required setback of $\mathbf{8 . 0 0}$ feet would prevent the shed from negatively impacting the neighboring properties to the east and west.


Figure 6: Proposed Shed Option " $A$ "


Figure 6: Proposed Shed Option " $B$ "


Figure 7: Proposed Shed
Variance Request
d. The condition or situation of the property concerned is not of so general or recurring a nature as to make reasonably practicable the formulation of a general regulation to be adopted as an amendment to the ordinance.

While the lot shape is somewhat unique, it does reoccur throughout the City in other locations. Any other R-8 zoned property wanting to construct a shed of this size would need to request a variance to locate it in required yards. If the City Council decided to allow larger sheds in required yards it would require an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance.
e. The granting of the variance does not result in a use that is not otherwise permitted on such property or a change in the zoning classification of the property.

The variance request will not change the use or zoning of the residential property.
f. The relief or remedy sought by the variance application is not available through a special exception process that is authorized in the ordinance or the process for modification of a Zoning Ordinance at the time of the filing of the variance application.

The relief sought by the variance application is not available through any other process.

## X. Staff Conclusion

Staff recommends denial of the requested variances to construct a shed in the required side yards.

Staff:
Marlo J.W. Ford, AICP, Urban Planner III, marlo.ford@alexandriava.gov
Mary Christesen, Zoning Manager, mary.christesen @alexandriava.gov
Tony LaColla, AICP, Land Use Services Division Chief, anthony.lacolla@alexandriava.gov

## DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS

Legend: C - code requirement R - recommendation S - suggestion F - finding

* The applicant is advised that if the variance is approved the following additional comments apply.


## Transportation and Environmental Services:

R1. The building permit must be approved and issued prior to the issuance of any permit for demolition, if a separate demolition permit is required. (T\&ES)

R2. Applicant shall be responsible for repairs to the adjacent city right-of-way if damaged during construction activity. (T\&ES)

R3. No permanent structure may be constructed over any existing private and/or public utility easements. It is the responsibility of the applicant to identify any and all existing easements on the plan. (T\&ES)

F1. After review of the information provided, an approved grading plan is not required at this time. Please note that if any changes are made to the plan it is suggested that T\&ES be included in the review. (T\&ES)

C-1The applicant shall comply with the City of Alexandria's Solid Waste Control, Title 5, Chapter 1 , which sets forth the requirements for the recycling of materials (Sec. 5-1-99). (T\&ES)

C-2The applicant shall comply with the City of Alexandria's Noise Control Code, Title 11, Chapter 5, which sets the maximum permissible noise level as measured at the property line. (T\&ES)

C-3Roof, surface and sub-surface drains be connected to the public storm sewer system, if available, by continuous underground pipe. Where storm sewer is not available applicant must provide a design to mitigate impact of stormwater drainage onto adjacent properties and to the satisfaction of the Director of Transportation \& Environmental Services. (Sec.5-6-224) (T\&ES)

C-4All secondary utilities serving this site shall be placed underground. (Sec. 5-3-3) (T\&ES)
C-5Any work within the right-of-way requires a separate permit from T\&ES. (Sec. 5-2) (T\&ES)
C-6All improvements to the city right-of-way such as curbing, sidewalk, driveway aprons, etc. must be city standard design. (Sec. 5-2-1) (T\&ES)

## Code Administration:

R-1 No Comments
Recreation (Arborist):
F-1 No comments

Historic Alexandria (Archaeology):
F-1 No archaeological oversight will be necessary for this undertaking.


APPLICATION
BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
VARIANCE

Section of zoning ordinance from which request for variance is made:
3-306(A)(2): Side yards. Each residential use shall provide two side yards, each based on a setback ratio of 1:2 and a minimum size of eight feet. Each other use shall provide two side yards, each based on a setback ratio of 1:1 and a minimum size of 25 feet.

## PART A

1. Applicant: $\square$ Owner $\square$ Contract Purchaser $\square$ Agent

Name David and Jill Forbes
Address 3300 Elmore Dr., Alexandria, VA 22302
Daytime Phone $\frac{703-622-4442}{\text { (circlef@yahoo.com }}$
2. Property Location 3300 Elmore Dr.
3. Assessment Map \# 14 Block 03-10 Lot 37 Zone R8
4. Legal Property Owner Name Forbes Jill Elizabeth / Forbes David Michael Address 3300 Elmore Dr. Alexandria VA 22302
$\qquad$

## OWNERSHIP AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT <br> Use additional sheets if necessary

1. Applicant. State the name, address and percent of ownership of any person or entity owning an interest in the applicant, unless the entity is a corporation or partnership, in which case identify each owner of more than three percent. The term ownership interest shall include any legal or equitable interest held at the time of the application in the real property which is the subject of the application.

| Name | Address | Percent of Ownership |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| ${ }^{1 .}$ David Michael Forbes | 3300 Elmore Dr. | 50 |
| ${ }^{2 .}$ Jill Elizabeth Forbes | 3300 Elmore Dr. | 50 |
| 3. |  |  |

2. Property. State the name, address and percent of ownership of any person or entity owning an interest in the property located at 3300 Elmore Dr. Alexandria VA 22302 (address), unless the entity is a corporation or partnership, in which case identify each owner of more than three percent. The term ownership interest shall include any legal or equitable interest held at the time of the application in the real property which is the subject of the application.

| Name | Address | Percent of Ownership |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| ${ }^{1 .}$ David Michael Forbes | 3300 Elmore Dr. | 50 |
| ${ }^{2 .}$ Jill Elizabeth Forbes | 3300 Elmore Dr. | 50 |
| 3. |  |  |

3. Business or Financial Relationships. Each person or entity listed above (1 and 2), with an ownership interest in the applicant or in the subject property is required to disclose any business or financial relationship, as defined by Section 11-350 of the Zoning Ordinance, existing at the time of this application, or within the12-month period prior to the submission of this application with any member of the Alexandria City Council, Planning Commission, Board of Zoning Appeals or either Boards of Architectural Review (OHAD and Parker-Gray). All fields must be filled out completely. Do not leave blank. (If there are no relationships please indicate each person or entity below and "NONE" in the corresponding fields.)

| Name of person or entity | Relationship as defined by <br> Section 11-350 of the Zoning <br> Ordinance | Member of the Approving <br> Body (i.e. City Council, <br> Planning Commission, etc.) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| ${ }^{\text {1. }}$ David Michael Forbes | Immediate Household | NONE |
| 2. Jill Elizabeth Forbes | Immediate Household | NONE |
| 3. |  |  |

NOTE: Business or financial relationships of the type described in Sec. 11-350 that arise after the filing of this application and before each public hearing must be disclosed prior to the public hearings.

## 5. Describe request briefly:

Request for variance from side yard setbacks for an accessory structure (shed) from 8 feet to 3 ' feet $3^{\prime \prime}$ inches, due to the unusual lot size which creates a legal hardship and unreasonable restriction on the use of the property.

## 6. If property owner or applicant is being represented by an authorized agent,

 such as an attorney, realtor or other person for which there is a form of compensation, does this agent or the business in which they are employed have a business license to operate in the City of Alexandria, Virginia?$\square$ Yes - Provide proof of current City business license.
$\square$ No - Said agent shall be required to obtain a business prior to filing application.
THE UNDERSIGNED HEREBY ATTESTS that all of the information herein provided including the site plan, building elevations, prospective drawings of the projects, etc., are true, correct and accurate. The undersigned further understands that, should such information be found incorrect, any action taken by the Board based on such information may be invalidated. The undersigned also hereby grants the City of Alexandria permission to post placard notice as required by Article XI, Division A, Section 11-301(B) of the 1992 Alexandria City Zoning Ordinance, on the property which is the subject of this application. The applicant, if other than the property owner, also attests that he/she has obtained permission from the property owner to make this application.

## APPLICANT OR AUTHORIZED AGENT:

$\checkmark$
I, as the applicant or authorized agent, note that there is a fee associated with the submittal of this application. Planning \& Zoning Department staff will be in contact with the applicant regarding payment methods. Please recognize that applications will not be processed until all fees are paid.
 I affirm that I, the applicant or authorized agent, am responsible for the processing of this application and agree to adhere to all the requirements and information herein.
Printed Name: David M. Forbes
Date:

Signature:
Pursuant to Section 13-3-2 of the City Code, the use of a document containing false information may constitute a Class 1 misdemeanor and may result in a punishment of a year in jail or $\$ 2,500$ or both. It may also constitute grounds to revoke the permit applied for with such information.

## PART B

## APPLICANT MUST EXPLAIN THE FOLLOWING:

(Please attach additional pages where necessary.)

1. Please answer A or B:
A. Explain how enforcement of the zoning ordinance would prevent reasonable use of the property.
The property lot shape is an extreme triangular/trapezoid shape on a inside corner lot with virtually no rear property line. The front property line is 70 " feet wide and the rear property line is 12 ' wide. Based on the extreme narrowing of the back yard, the imposition of 8 ' foot setbacks on the side would require the shed to be placed far out into the center of the back yard. This would create a restriction on the enjoyable use of the back yard, and also create a wasted triangle area behind the shed, further preventing reasonable use of the property.

## B. Explain how the variance, if granted, would alleviate a hardship, as

 defined above.The variance would allow the storage shed to be placed as far towards the rear of the property line as possible, while maintaining three foot 3 " inch setbacks from each of the side lot lines. This would leave the center part of the backyard open space with grass. Please see Attachment F Rear Yard Picture to gain an understanding of the severe narrowing of the lot. Please see Attachment E Shed Location Options to see how other location options do not alleviate the hardship created by the unique lot shape.
2. Is this unreasonable restriction or hardship unique to the property?
A. Explain if the restriction or hardship is shared by other properties in the neighborhood.
While there are other lots in Beverly Hills that are triangular in shape (such as the adjacent lot 821 Crescent Drive,) there does not appear to be another lot in the entire neighborhood with almost no rear lot line and therefore narrow spacing between the left and right lot lines. See Attachment B, GIS Pictures.
B. Does this situation or condition of the property (on which this application is based) generally apply to other properties in the same zone?

No. While there are other lots in Beverly Hills that are triangular in shape (such as the adjacent lot 821 Crescent Drive), there does not appear to be another lot in the entire neighborhood with almost no rear lot line and therefore narrow spacing between the left and right lot lines. See Attachment B, GIS Pictures, page 1.
3. Was the unreasonable restriction or hardship caused by the applicant?
A. Did the condition exist when the property was purchased?

Yes and no. The shape of the lot existed when the property was purchased. See the plat in Attachment A, Shed Plans. However, at the time of purchase the City's GIS system had the property lot size recorded as 8,366 sq/feet, which would have allowed for a garage up to 500 square feet, and provided greater construction possibilities with respect to the FAR ratio. See Attachment C, Appeal Digital Staff Comments.
B. Did the applicant purchase the property without knowing of this restriction or hardship?

Yes. At the time of purchase of the property in August 2019, the City's
GIS system had the property lot size recorded as $8,366 \mathrm{sq} / \mathrm{feet}$. This size would have allowed for a garage up to 500 square feet, and provided greater construction possibilities with respect to the FAR ratio. The survey received on the day
C. How and when did the condition, which created the unreasonable restriction or hardship, first occur?

The condition that creates the hardship was first created when the neighborhood and lot shapes were originally established and surveyed; or when the side yard setbacks were set at 8 feet.
D. Did the applicant create the unreasonable restriction or hardship and, if so, how was it created?

No
4. Will the variance, if granted, be harmful to others?
A. Explain if the proposed variance will be detrimental to the adjacent properties or the neighborhood in general.
No. There is currently a storage shed in the same general location less than one foot from the NE property line. The proposed shed will be larger, but will sit centered in the rear corner of the lot, three feet from the NE and SW side lot lines. The location is far from adjacent properties. Many houses in the neighborhood have sheds in backyards; see Attachment B GIS Pictures, page 2. The current shed peak is $10^{\prime} 2^{\prime \prime}$; the proposed shed peak is $13^{\prime}$ feet $(+3.875$ " for average
B. Has the applicant shown the proposed plans to the most affected property owners? Have these property owners written statements of support or opposition of the proposed variance? If so, please attach the statements or submit at the time of the hearing.
Yes. We have shared our final architectural plans with the most affected neighbors; see Attachment A, Shed Plans. We have received letters of support from three adjacent neighbors. See Attachment D, Support Letters.

## 5. Is there any other administrative or procedural remedy to relieve the hardship or unreasonable restriction?

No. The current Section 7-202(C)(2)(a) limitation of a 100 sq. ft. shed does not meet our family storage requirements as we do not have a garage.

Proposing an accessory structure that does comply with the R-8 zoning regulations with regards to side yards would result in the storage shed being in the center of our backyard. This would not only completely restrict the use of the yard, but would look terrible. Unfortunately due to our unique lot shape, there are no other unobtrusive locations in our yard where the structure can be placed. Please see Attachment E


## PART C

1. Have alternative plans or solutions been considered so that a variance would not be needed? Please explain each alternative and why it is unsatisfactory.

Alternative 1: Other locations
We have considered placing the shed in another location in accordance with the setback requirements for accessory structures. However, due to the unique shape of the lot, the other locations place the shed out into the center of the backyard where it would obstruct both the view and the reasonable use of the backyard. Please see Attachment E Shed Location Options.

## Alternative 2: Garage

We have considered the alternative of a garage. Due to the triangular lot shape we are unable to build a garage alongside the current house due to side yard setbacks. Based on the Alexandria code, we have the right to build a 250 square foot garage in the rear of our lot, within one foot of all property lines. We have considered this option but believe it is less satisfactory that the proposed variance, as the garage would be an even larger structure, it would be even closer to the lot lines, and it would entail significantly more construction and resulting disturbance to neighbors.
2. Please provide any other information you believe demonstrates that the requested variance meets the required standards.

Please see the attached shed plans which illustrate our intent to build an architecturally appropriate and high quality shed.

## ***ATTENTION APPLICANTS***

At the time of application for a Special Use Permit, Rezoning, Vacation, Encroachment, Variance, Special Exception or Subdivision, you must provide a draft of the description of your request you intend to use in the property owner's notice. You must be thorough in your description. Staff will review the draft wording to confirm its completeness.

The example illustrates a detailed description:
"Variance to construct a two-story addition in the required side yards on 823 Crescent Dr. Street."

If you fail to submit draft language at the time of the application filing deadline, the application will be determined to be incomplete and may be deferred by staff.

## A. Property Information

A1. 3300 Elmore Dr., Alexandria, VA 223
Street Address
A2. $6,768.00$
Total Lot Area
B. Existing Gross Floor Area
Existing Gross Area

| Basement | 528.00 |
| :--- | :--- |
| First Floor | 785.50 |
| Second Floor | 785.50 |

Third Floor

| Attic | 785.50 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Porches | 90.00 |

Balcony/Deck
Garage
Other***
B1. Total Gross
3,054.50
C. Proposed Gross Floor Area Proposed Gross Area

| Basement |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| First Floor |  |
| Second Floor |  |
| Third Floor |  |
| Attic |  |
| Porches |  |
| Balcony/Deck |  |
| Garage |  |
| Other*** |  |
| C1.Total Gross |  |

## D. Total Floor Area

D1. $1,501.10$
Sq. Ft.
Total Floor Area (add B3 and C3)
D2. $2,368.80$ Sq. Ft.
Total Floor Area Allowed by Zone (A2)

X
0.35 Floor Area Ratio Allowed by Zone

Allowable Exclusions**

| Basement** | 528.00 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Stairways $^{* *}$ | 72.00 |

Mechanical**
Attic less than 7*** 785.50
Porches**
Balcony/Deck**
Garage**
Other***
87.90

Other***
80.00

B2. Total Exclusions
1,553.40

R-8
Zone
2,368.80
Maximum Allowable Floor Area

## Allowable Exclusions**

| Basement** |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Stairways** |  |
| Mechanical** |  |
| Attic less than $7^{* *}$ |  |
| Porches** |  |
| Balcony/Deck** |  |
| Garage** |  |
| Other*** |  |
| Other*** | 180.00 |
| 2. Total Exclusions | 180.00 |



## Notes

*Gross floor area for residential single and two-family dwellings in the $R-20, R-12, R-8$, $R-5, R-2-5, R B$ and RA zones (not including properties located within a Historic District) is the sum of all areas under roof of a lot, measured from exterior walls.
** Refer to the Zoning Ordinance (Section 2-145(A)) and consult with Zoning Staff for information regarding allowable exclusions. Sections may also be required for some exclusions.
*** Refer to the Zoning Ordinance (Section 2-145(A)) and consult with Zoning Staff for additional allowable exclusions. Additional exclusions may include space under balconies, retractable awnings, etc.

The undersigned hereby certifies and attests that, to the best of his/her knowledge, the above computations are true and correct.
$\qquad$ Date:




PROPERTY PLAT W/ ACCESSORY STRUCTURE OPTION C

| DRAWINGS PROVIDED BY: <br> Malone Building Services 501 E. Windsor Ave Alexandria, VA 22301 703-851-6188 | Forbes Shed 3300 Elmore Drive Alexandria, VA 22302 | Property Plat Shed Location Option C |  | Cciption | BY |  | SCALE: | DATE: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $1^{\prime \prime}=25^{\prime}$ | 2/9/2021 |

## 3300 Elmore Dr. Rear Yard



Date: $\qquad$

Dear Board of Zoning Appeals,

As the owners) of:


We write to express our support for the Forbes' request for a "variance for two side-yard setbacks of 8 feet (to 3 feet), to allow construction of a $12^{\prime}$ foot wide $\times 18$ ' foot deep ( $216 \mathrm{sq} . / \mathrm{ft}$.) shed at the rear of their property" at 3300 Elmore Drive. The Forbes have shared their construction plans with us, and we believe the shed is similar in shape and style to the existing $10^{\prime}$ foot wide $\times 8$ ' feet ( $80 \mathrm{sq} . / \mathrm{ft}$.) deep shed, and appropriate for the location and neighborhood. Due to the irregular shape of the Forbes' lot, which is pieshaped and narrows to 12 feet at the rear lot line, we agree that maintaining 8 ' foot setbacks from the side yard would prevent the reasonable use of the property, as it would result in the shed being in the middle of their backyard.

The proposed shed appears to be a good balance of the existing situation and the possibilities the Forbes have for gaining additional storage. The current shed sits approximately 6 ' feet from the rear lot line, and 10 " inches from the north lot line and fence. The proposed new shed will be farther from the rear lot line (12'-16' feet) and our neighbor's fence on the north lot line ( 3.1 " feet), and centered in the space. We also understand that the Forbes family has the right to install a driveway and build a garage up to 250 sq ./ft. in the same location that would sit only two feet from the side lot lines, and feel this shed variance is a preferable option to that project. Overall, the proposed variance appears to be a minor and acceptable change to the existing shed that will provide more storage for the family's bikes and tools. We hope the Board of Zoning Appeals approves the Forbes' application.

Sincerely,
[Signatures)]


Printed Names(s) VOSE M. CALDEREÓn, SUZETE TRILLA

Ryan and Melissa Murphy
821 Crescent Drive
Alexandria, VA 22302

Board of Zoning Appeals
City of Alexandria, Virginia
301 King Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Dear Board of Zoning Appeals:

As the owners of 821 Crescent Drive, we write to express our support for the Forbes' request for a "variance for two side-yard setbacks of 8 feet (to 3 feet), to allow construction of a 12' foot wide $\times 18$ ' foot deep ( $216 \mathrm{sq} . / f \mathrm{f}$.) shed at the rear of their property" at 3300 Elmore Drive. The Forbes have shared their construction plans with us, and we believe the shed is similar in shape and style to the existing 10 ' foot wide $\times 8$ ' feet deep ( $80 \mathrm{sq} . / \mathrm{ft}$.) shed, and appropriate for the location and neighborhood. Due to the irregular shape of the Forbes' lot, which is pie-shaped and narrows to 12 feet at the rear lot line, we agree that maintaining 8 ' foot setbacks from the side yard would prevent the reasonable use of the property, as it would result in the shed being in the middle of their backyard.

The proposed shed appears to be a good balance of the existing situation and the possibilities the Forbes have for gaining additional storage. The current shed sits approximately 6 ' feet from the rear lot line, and 10 " inches from the north lot line and fence. The proposed new shed will be farther from the rear lot line ( $12^{\prime}-16^{\prime}$ feet) and our neighbor's fence on the north lot line ( $3.1^{\prime \prime}$ feet) and centered in the space. Overall, the proposed variance appears to be a minor and acceptable change to the existing shed that will provide more storage for the family's bikes and tools. We hope the Board of Zoning Appeals approves the Forbes' application.

We appreciate your consideration of this matter. Should you need to reach us about this matter, you may contact Melissa at (864) 497-4719 or Ryan at (404) 308-2397.


Date: Red. 15,2020

## Dear Board of Zoning Appeals,

As the owners) of:

$$
823 \text { CRESCENT DR, ALEX, VA } 22302
$$

We write to express our support for the Forbes' request for a "variance for two side-yard setbacks of 8 feet (to 3 feet), to allow construction of a $12^{\prime}$ foot wide $\times 18^{\prime}$ foot deep ( $216 \mathrm{sq} . / \mathrm{ft}$.) shed at the rear of their property" at 3300 Elmore Drive. The Forbes have shared their construction plans with us, and we believe the shed is similar in shape and style to the existing $10^{\prime}$ foot wide $\times 8$ ' feet ( 80 sq ./ft.) deep shed, and appropriate for the location and neighborhood. Due to the irregular shape of the Forbes' lot, which is pieshaped and narrows to 12 feet at the rear lot line, we agree that maintaining 8 ' foot setbacks from the side yard would prevent the reasonable use of the property, as it would result in the shed being in the middle of their backyard.
The proposed shed appears to be a good balance of the existing situation and the possibilities the Forbes have for gaining additional storage. The current shed sits approximately 6 ' feet from the rear lot line, and $10^{\prime \prime}$ inches from the north lot line and fence. The proposed new shed will be farther from the rear lot line ( $12^{\prime}-16^{\prime}$ feet) and our neighbor's fence on the north lot line ( $3.1^{\prime \prime}$ feet), and centered in the space. We also understand that the Forbes family has the right to install a driveway and build a garage up to 250 sq . ft . in the same location that would sit only two feet from the side lot lines, and feel this shed variance is a preferable option to that project. Overall, the proposed variance appears to be a minor and acceptable change to the existing shed that will provide more storage for the family's bikes and tools. We hope the Board of Zoning Appeals approves the Forbes' application.

## Sincerely,

[Signatur es)] Zeta 71. Broke
[Printed Names)] ZITA H. BROOKS

# OFFICE OF REAL ESTATE ASSESSMENTS <br> 2020 Request for Appeal of Assessment Staff Comments <br> Case \# 2020-061 <br> 16835500 <br> 3300 Elmore Dr. <br> Madison Larson 

Account:
Property Address:
Appraiser:
Property Description: 2-story detached single family home over a partially finished basement located in study group 0720 (Beverley Hills).

The following is a summary of the assessment change for the property:

| 2019 Assessment: | Land | Building | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $\$ 519,699$ | $\$ 328,857$ | $\$ 848,556$ |
| 2020 Assessment: | Land | Building | Total |
|  | $\$ 545,946$ | $\$ 352,086$ | $\$ 898,032$ |

Percentage of Annual Change:
Total Avg. $\triangle$ Study Group 0720
+5.83 \%
Appellant's Opinion of Value:

+ 5.30\%
\$807,592
- The City had the incorrect lot square footage (SF) of the subject. Based on the plat provided by the owner, the City corrected the lot SF to $6,768 \mathrm{SF}$ and corrected the land value for both 2020 and 2019.
- The subject was one of the 22 valid 2019 sales used in the assessment of study group 0720 . The subject sold for $\$ 980,000$ which gives a $92 \%$ assessment to sale price ratio. The three most comparable properties to sell in 2019 had sale prices between $\$ 865,000$ and $\$ 965,000$ with assessed value to sale price ratios between $93 \%$ and $98 \%$.
- The land model for study group 0720 is on a price/site not a price/SF. The study group's 2020 land value/site is $\$ 562,000$. The subject's lot is on the smaller side for the study group which is why its 2020 land value is lower than $\$ 562,000$.
- Properties in the study group with comparable lot sizes to the subject ( $6,700-6,799 \mathrm{SF}$ ) have 2020 land values between $\$ 545,665$ and $\$ 546,508$. The subject's current land value of $\$ 545,946$ is in equity.
- The study group's land values are supported by the following sales:
- 3202 Old Dominion was purchased as a land sale in August of 2019 for $\$ 650,000$. The existing home is going to be demolished and the lot size is only slightly larger than the subject at $7,490 \mathrm{SF}$.
- 810 Enderby was marketed as an "investor opportunity... with a great option for a major renovation or total tear-down." Its lot size is $7,620-\mathrm{SF}$ and was purchased in 2019 for $\$ 645,000$.
- Comparable sized properties with a Good Plus quality and in Very Good condition have 2020 building values between $\$ 308,498$ and $\$ 395,703$. The subject's current building value of
$\$ 352,086$ is in equity $\$ 352,086$ is in equity.

Recommendation: No change to the subject's current 2020 assessment value.
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## 3300 ELMORE DRIVE NEW SHED

SCOPE OF WORK:
CONSTRUCT NEW 180SF WOOD FRAME SHED WITH ASPHALT SHINGLE ROOF AND MONOLTTHIC CONCRETE SLAB AND FOOTING
general notes
THE CONTRACTOR SHALL FULLY COMPLY WITH THE 2015 VIRGINIA UNIFORM STATEWIDE BUILDING CODE (USBC) AND 2015 VIRGINIA
RESIDENTIAL CODE (VRC) AND ALL ADDITIONAL STATE AND LOCAL CODE REQUIREMENTS.
THE CONTRACTOR SHALL ASSUME FULL RESPONSIBILITY FOR ANY WORK KNOWINGLY PERFORMED CONTRARY TO SUCH LAWS,
ORDINANCES, OR REGULATIONS. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL ALSO PERFORM COORDINATION WITH ALL UTILTIES AND STATE SERVICE AUTHORITIES.
WRITTEN DIMENSIONS ON THESE DRAWINGS SHALL HAVE PRECEDENCE OVER SCALED DIMENSIONS. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL, BEFORE COMMENCING WORK, REVIEW ALL PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS AND VERIFY ALL GOVERNING DIMENSIONS AT THE SITE. THE DEPENDENT. ANY VARIATIONS OR DISCREPANCIES SHALL BE REPORTED, WITH ALL DUE EXPEDIENCY, TO OWNER PRIOR TO THE

THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DISTRIBUTION OF DRAWINGS TO ALL TRADES UNDER THEIR JURISDICTION AND FOR ALL REQUIRED PERMITS INCLUDING MECHANICAL, ELECTRICAL AND PLUMBING
THE CONTRACTOR SHALL EXERCISE GREAT CARE TO PROTECT FROM DAMAGE ALL MATERIALS EXISTING ON THE JOB. THE CONTRACTOR
SHALL AT ALL TIMES KEEP THE PREMISES FREE OF ACCUMULATION OF WASTE MATERIALS OR RUBBISH CAUSED BY THEIR OPERATIONS. ALL work shall be performed by skilled and qualified workmen and in accordance with the best practices of the TRADES INVOLVED. WORK IS TO BE PERFORMED IN ACCORDANCE WITH RULES AND REGULATIONS OF APPROPRIATE GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED, ALL MATERIALS SHALL BE NEW, UNUSED AND OF THE HIGHEST QUALITY IN EVERY RESPECT.
MANUFACTURED MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT SHALL BE INSTALLED AS PER MANUFACTURER'S RECOMMENDATIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
all work shall be erected and installed plumb, level, square and true and in proper alignment.

## STRUCTURAL NOTES:

LOADS:
ROOF $=50$ LBS/SF (20DL $+30 \mathrm{SL})$
WIND SPEED $=90$ MPH
GROUND SNOW LOAD $=30 \mathrm{LBS} / \mathrm{SF}$
BEARING VALUE OF FOUNDATION MATERIAL = 1500PSF. PRESUMED - V.I.F.
FOOTER CONCRETE COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH = MIN 3000PSI.
SEe plan for framing member Layout and engineering specs.







Wood Frame Structure w/ Fire-Resistant Materials On 3 Sides.
Monolithic Conc. Foundation Of 4" Conc. Slab,
And 16"x16" Cont. Concrete Footing.
Storage Loft w/ 3/4" Ply Deck On 2x8 Joists @ 16" O.C.

Typ. Wall Framing:
Fire-Resistance Construction per UL 263 Design BXUV.W408 On 3 Sides.


2x4 Wall Studs @ 16" O.C.
2x8 Loft Joists @ 16" O.C.
2x6 Roof Rafters @ 24" O.C.
2x8 Ridge Board
3-1/2" x 11-1/4" PSL Ridge Beam
(See 1/S-1 For Structural Report)
Typ. Wall Framing:
Fire-Resistance Construction per UL 263 Design BXUV.W408 (See S-2)

Triple Stud Post Down From Ridge Beam To Header

DBL $2 \times 10$ Header @ Door To Carry Load From Ridge Beam.

2 FRAMING PLAN
SCALE: $1 / 4^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}$

$$
1 \text { FLOOR PLAN }
$$





| No. | Description | BY | Date | SCALE: | DATE: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | S-1 |
|  |  |  |  | N.T.S. | 1/27/2021 |  |

- UL ONLINE CERULEICAIIONS DIRECTOBY Home Quick Guide Contact Us UL.com

Design No. W408 Fire Resistance Ratings - ANSI/UL 263

Design/System/Construction/Assembly Usage Disclaimer
 Authorities Having Jurisdicition should be consulted in all cases as to the particular require and use of Hal Listed or classified products, equitment, system, tevices, and materials.
Authonities Heving Jurisiciction should be consuited before construction.
 Compliance with appicabal
encentere in the fiel
When field issues firse, it
When field issues arise, it is recommended the first contact for assistance be the technical service staff provided by the



## Fire Resistance Ratings - ANSI/UL 263

See General Information for Fire Resistance Ratings - ANSIUL 263
Design No. W408
March 26, 2012
$\qquad$
Bearing Wall Rating - 1 Hr when EXPOSED TO FIRE ON EXTERIOR FACE ONLY, see Item 4 and 6 S. FInsh rating - 50 min when Exposed to fre on interior face. For Wood Studs, Finish rating - $\mathbf{1 7}$ min when EXPOSED TO FIRE ON EXTERIOR FACE Load Restricted for Canadian Applications - See Guide BxUVZ

BXUV.W408 - Fire Resistance Ratings - ANSIUL 263
Face.


6B. Exterior OSB Lap Siding - Min 7116 in. thick, osB lap siding fastened to st
Units, Item 5 , with nalls or screws, at the locations specifed by the manufacturer.

6D. Fiber Cement Siding - Fiber Cement Lap or Vertical Siding. Minimum $5 / 16$ in. thick, fastened to stuc
through the Buiding Units, Item 5 , with nails or screws, at the Iocations specified by the manufacturer. 7. Exterior Facings - Exterior Facing specified as I Item 7 is is not permitted for 1 hr Fire Resistance Rating for
fire from the Exterior Face, optional for 2 hr Fire Resistance Rating for fire from Interior face. 7A. Viny Siding - (Optional) - UL Classified exterior plastic siding (molided plastic), fastened to the building
units or wood panel sheathing with nails or screws, at the locations specified by the manufacturer. *Bearing the UL Classification Mark


The apperance of a company's name or product in this database does not in itself assure that products so identified have been manufactured under UU's. Follow-Up.Service. Only those products bearing the UL,
covered Under UL's follow-UP Service. Always look for the Mark on the procuct.
UL permits the reproduction of the material contained in the Online Certification Directory subject to the following conditions: 1. The



## Kaliah L Lewis

| From: | Marlo Ford |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Monday, March 1, 2021 10:08 AM |
| To: | ROMAN KNYSH |
| Cc: | Kaliah L Lewis |
| Subject: | RE: [EXTERNAL]3300 Elmore Drive variance |

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Good Morning:

Thank you for your response. We will ensure that your comment get routed to the Board members in their report packet.

Regards,

Marlo J.W. Ford, AICP
Land Use Services, Planning \& Zoning


From: ROMAN KNYSH [romanknysh@yahoo.com](mailto:romanknysh@yahoo.com)
Sent: Monday, March 1, 2021 10:03 AM
To: Marlo Ford [Marlo.Ford@alexandriava.gov](mailto:Marlo.Ford@alexandriava.gov)
Subject: [EXTERNAL]3300 Elmore Drive variance

Marlo,
We appreciated your time in explaining the City of Alexandria's zoning regulations.

My wife and I have thoroughly reviewed the application for a variance on setbacks at 3300 Elmore Drive for an accessory structure for storage purposes.

We do not support this zoning variance.

Many lots in this area, including ours, do not have a garage and do utilize a storage shed that is 100 sq ft or less. Solutions exist within city zoning.

Thank you,
Roman and Kate Knysh
Owners of adjacent lot
3302 Elmore Drive Alexandria, VA 22302

DISCLAIMER: This message was sent from outside the City of Alexandria email system. DO NOT CLICK any links or download attachments unless the contents are from a trusted source.



[^0]:    * Based on the contextual block face.

