

## Cochran, Patricia (DCOZ)

---

**From:** David Burns <dnburns@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 24, 2018 5:18 PM  
**To:** DCOZ - BZA Submissions (DCOZ)  
**Cc:** Jessica Burns  
**Subject:** BZA Case 19377: The Boundary Companies and The Missionary Society

### Re: BZA Application No. 19377: The Boundary Companies and The Missionary Society

To the Board of Zoning Adjustment:

As D.C. residents with a new baby, living nearly adjacent to the parcel of land under question in the above-referenced case, we **strongly oppose** the Application for Variance/Special Exception under which the Applicant Seller and Developer intend to erect 60 rowhouses and a new ~23,000 square foot Paulist building.

We opted to purchase our home in Edgewood in 2015 due to the prevalence of easily accessible green space in the immediate vicinity surrounding the house. Indeed, access to this green space was a major selling point of the developer from whom we purchased the home. As we began trying to expand our family, we wanted a home that would have easily accessible field space for our child to play in. Now that we finally have a new baby, we fear that the proposed plan would essentially cut-off our access to green space / play space, which was the primary reason we purchased the home. The proposed ~23,000 s.f. Paulist Residence would lie directly between our home and the proposed park, cutting off our access. During school drop-off and pick-up at the existing Paulist property, there is already such a densely packed line of traffic on the single-lane access that road that it makes accessing the existing green space dangerous. Additionally, we also worry about the lack of commitment to preserve the existing mature trees. How will the developer ensure that their root beds are properly managed during construction?

With a new baby at home, we are also extremely concerned about the resultant construction noise, pollutants, dust, and debris that would accumulate around our home (which is downhill from the proposed site). The proximity of the existing houses to each other causes noise to reverberate and echo, and construction noise from more distant projects is already extremely loud in the morning and a nuisance when we try to work from home. Additionally, given the length of construction time, we worry about safety around the construction site, and the necessity of construction equipment to access our streets (which are privately maintained and paid for via our homeowners association). As evidenced by the other ongoing construction on nearby sites, construction crews routinely violate established rules regarding the hours of construction and the movement of construction vehicles. The current proposal does not provide consequences for the violation of these rules.

Relatedly, with the expected influx of new residents should the project move forward, we are extremely concerned about the additional traffic on our road and neighboring streets. Once the two schools opened in the existing Paulist property, we have already noticed an increase in vehicular traffic, particularly during pick-up and drop-off hours. Our streets were not designed for the volume nor speed with which vehicles travel through them. Adding more cars to this already congested area will only confound the problem and make walking more dangerous, as cars roll through stop signs and drive at excessive speeds. Additionally, with parking already in short supply and not being eligible for residential parking permits on public streets less than a block away, we worry that new residents and/or their visitors will occupy available spaces. On more than one occasion, we have had elderly visitors have to walk several blocks to our house due to a lack of nearby parking.

Board of Zoning Adjustment  
District of Columbia  
CASE NO.19377  
EXHIBIT NO.128

In sum, we, the undersigned homeowners, oppose the Application for Variance No. 19377 because of the predictable detrimental effects it would have on (i) our enjoyment of our home through lack of access to green space that we reasonably assumed would be preserved given the extreme density of existing surrounding homes, (ii) exposure of our newborn baby to increased noise and pollution, and (iii) increased vehicular traffic and reduction in available parking.

Sincerely,

David Burns & Jessica Burns  
2841 Chancellors Way NE, Washington, DC 20017  
(215) 840-1700  
[dnburns@gmail.com](mailto:dnburns@gmail.com)  
4/24/2017