1362 East Capitol Street, NE
Washington, DC 20003
September 25, 2001

Board of Zoning Adjustment
441 4th Street, NW
Suite 210-S
Washington, DC 20001

Re: Application Number 16780 (Application of Lenard Woods)

Dear Sir or Madam,

Please accept the attached "Request for Party Status" in the case referenced above, filed on behalf of myself and my wife.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Very truly yours,

Christopher T. Corson

BZA
Case No. 16780
Exhibit No. 19

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO.16780
EXHIBIT NO.19

BEFORE THE
BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT
GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

APPLICATION NUMBER 16780
(Application of Lenard Woods for
multiple variances at premises:
1360 East Capitol St., NE (Square 1035,
Lot 82))

REQUEST FOR PARTY STATUS

Pursuant to 11 DCMR 3106.2, the undersigned Christopher T. Corson and Cheryl T. Corson, furnish the following information in support of this Request for Party Status in the case referenced above.

(a) This Request for Party Status is made by: Christopher and Cheryl Corson, 1362 East Capitol St., NE, Washington, DC 20003.

(b) We are making this Request in order to appear and participate as a party in the case reference above.

(c) We wish to appear in opposition to the application.

(d) We will not appear through counsel.

(e) In support of this Request, we would like to state the following information.

(1) We are Mr. Woods' immediate neighbors to the east, at 1362 East Capitol St., NE (Square 1035, Lot 81).

(2) Our house is owned in fee simple by Requestor Christopher Corson. His wife Cheryl enjoys the rights granted to her in marital property by District of Columbia law.

(3) There is no distance at all between our house and Mr. Woods' house. Our lots are adjacent and share a common, 135-foot lot line. Our houses share a party wall, and our garages are side-by-side.

(4) We are very concerned that if Mr. Woods is allowed to keep his two-level rear deck (already constructed without a valid permit), then we will continue to suffer serious impacts to our privacy, security, light, view, quiet, and our ability to maintain our property. We would like to summarize our reasons in this Request for Party Status and then be allowed by the Board to state them more fully at the hearing on October 30th.

i) Our house is a typical row house that has an extension at the back that contains our kitchen on the first floor and a bedroom on the second. This extension lies along one lot line but is separated from the other lot line by a side court. We have rear porches at the back of this extension on both levels.

ii) Mr. Woods' house was the mirror image of our house. Our extensions are adjacent and share a party wall. Our porches used to be side-by-side, with a wooden partition between them. As originally constructed, our two houses occupied about 61% of our lots.

iii) Mr. Woods has already enclosed the area of his rear porches with new masonry construction, thus extending his rear rooms on both floors. Then, without a valid permit, he has already constructed new rear porches that extend back about 8½ additional feet on the first floor and on the second floor. Thus, his lot coverage greatly exceeds the original 61%.

iv) Our privacy concern is due to the fact that Mr. Woods' new porches run far beyond our rear porches and sit directly on our lot line. When our houses used to end at the same point in our back yards, there was complete privacy on our rear porches and in our back rooms, even though they were adjacent. Now, someone standing on Mr. Woods' new second-story porch can look directly into the rear door and window of our back bedroom. There is no longer any privacy in that room unless shades are pulled down over the door and the window. Someone standing on Mr. Woods' new first-story porch is at the level of the top of our party fence and can look directly into our kitchen. Anyone standing on either of Mr. Woods' new porches has a commanding view of everything in our back yard.

v) Our security concern is due to the fact that someone on Mr. Woods' second-floor porch can easily step onto our second-floor porch, making us much more vulnerable to break-ins than before.

vi) Our concern about light is due to the fact that Mr. Woods' porches extend quite far into his back yard along our lot line. They cast shadow on our back yard that did not exist before.

vii) Our concern about view is that our back windows used to look into our back yard and the interior of our block without obstruction. Now, our view out the back is dominated on the left by Mr. Woods' porches.

viii) Our concern about quiet is that the old porches on our houses were (and ours still is) only large enough for a few people. Mr. Woods' new porches will easily accommodate parties of 15 or more. We are concerned that Mr. Woods built them that large in order to use them for large groups that would have the potential for creating a lot of noise just outside our rear windows.

ix) Our concern about our ability to maintain our property is due to the fact that Mr. Woods constructed his first-floor porch up against the tops of the boards of our party fence. It is now impossible to repair the fence, because those boards can no longer be removed.

x) These impacts are not hypothetical concerns about plans that have not yet been built. Mr. Woods constructed his rear porches about six months ago, and our objections are based on our having to live with them since then. We know that our privacy, security, light, and view have already been compromised. We are concerned about noise when Mr. Woods occupies his house. And we hope that the fence stays in good shape, because it cannot be repaired any more.

xi) We also would like to explain at the hearing how Mr. Woods' workers destroyed the partition that used to be the side of our second-story porch without contacting us about replacement. His workers also severed the base of the porch column on that side, which made the second-story porch railing unsafe. I have fixed it temporarily, but the column needs to be replaced.

(5) Our interests are affected much more significantly and directly than anyone else. We are next door to Mr. Woods' house. Our extensions share a party wall, and his new rear porches run out along our common lot line. Ours is the only house whose second-floor porch can be walked onto from Mr. Woods' new porch. We suffer the worst loss of privacy from someone standing on Mr. Woods' back porches, although such a person could also look into the back windows of 1358 East Capitol St. Our back yard may be the only one that is shadowed by Mr. Woods' new porches, although it may also be true for 1358 East Capitol St. His porches change and dominate our rearward view the worst. We would be the most affected by noise from a large group of people on his porches outside our rear windows. And it is our party fence that can no longer be repaired. While we think that other close neighbors have valid objections to Mr. Woods' new porches, our interests are impacted the most.

Thank you for your consideration of this Request for Party Status in Application Number 16780 (Application of Lenard Woods).

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher T. Corson

October 1, 2001
Date

Cheryl T. Corson