January 25, 2001

Board of Zoning Adjustment
441 4th Street, NW
Suite 210-S
Washington, DC 20003

RECEIVED
D.C. OFFICE OF ZONING
2001 JAN 26 AM 10:16

Re: Application #16611 -- Edmund Burke School Expansion

Dear Members:

I am writing in reference to the planned construction at Edmond Burke School. I am a resident of the District of Columbia. I do not live in the Burke school area, but I do have knowledge of the traffic congestion in DC. The construction project that Burke is planning is specifically designed to address and remedy that congestion. The plan will take traffic off Upton Street, frees the alley between Van Ness and Upton Street of Burke traffic, and does not disrupt Connecticut Avenue - - it creates a private drive for the Burke traffic.

Further, I also fully support the encouragement of schools to stay in urban areas and not have to resort to locations in the suburbs to enable them to grow and provide appropriate learning space for students. Edmund Burke is a very unique independent school. The students benefit from learning in an urban setting and the community benefits from the interactions between the students and the community. For instance, this year the eighth grade class is working with several senior citizen centers and homes. The eight graders are visiting senior citizens weekly to record their oral histories and at the conclusion of the semester preparing a book for each senior citizen that memorializes his or her life story. This is but one example of the unique tie between the Edmund Burke School and its community.

It is a fact of life that schools cause additional local traffic. I think it is laudable that Burke has taken the initiative to address that problem with their plans. The resulting traffic flow will not only make life more pleasant for the Burke neighbors, it will also make it safer and easier for children from Burke to be picked up.

Sincerely,

Sarah Clark

Sarah Clark
2400 16th Street NW #644
Washington, DC 20009

BZA
Case No. 16611
Exhibit No. 112

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO.16611
EXHIBIT NO.112