

From: Pat Schaub
Sent: Jun 5, 2015 9:32 PM
To: adaly@gannett.com
Subject: FW: Blocks

Andrew,

Thank you for keeping me apprised of your construction. I am a little confused, however. When you showed me the architectural drawings (to get my support for your permit application), I asked if the architect had confirmed that the wall could support both buildings and you said yes. You also mentioned to me that my garage goes to the property boundary, but the contractor refers to encroachment – do you know what that means? If you have any documentation to support "encroachment", I'd really appreciate it if you would share that with me. No one has ever said there's a problem with the garage, when I bought the property or with various inspectors since.

I did check with an attorney today, who unfortunately cannot be here tomorrow. Your contractor cannot tear down my garage wall without my approval or a court order, regardless of whether he thinks there is encroachment (a court order would direct me to take an action). Given that the garage has been there for decades, it is very uncertain whether he can get a court order. I am guessing he knows this. If the garage is up to the property line and not in your lot, a court order becomes even more unlikely.

So for now, since he says the wall will not hold both garages, this is to rescind, in writing, my approval to use my garage wall for both your and my garage. If you decide you want to do something that involves my garage and wall, I will get my architect to confirm that it will work before agreeing to the action.

Why don't you just let me know when the contractor gets here. I should be around, but if not, decide what you are going to do and let me know. I will then call my architect, if necessary.

Finally, my thanks in advance for making sure your contractor repairs damage he does to my garage because of the construction. I see a few things but have not looked closely.

Thanks again for keeping me up to date,

Pat Schaub

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO.19092
EXHIBIT NO.28