19"+

March 18, 2002

RE: Application No. 16824

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

RECEIVED
D.C. OFFICE OF ZONING
2002 MAR 22 PM 4:57

Dear Board,

I request that this letter be included in the file re: the BZA hearing on the application #16824. Dr. John Fernandez, Michael Rodman, Willa Humber, Jeffrey Humber, Melinda Lowery and Bill Lowery oppose the zoning variances requested by Mr. Stanley Greenberg of 816 East Capitol Street, NE, Washington, DC, 20003 to construct an enclosed screened porch. We also still oppose any plan to extend the existing deck further into their backyard as expressed in paragraph 3 below.

1. Attached is the letter from Mr. Greenberg to the neighbors stating he will not proceed with his planned porch if the neighbors object to it. Mr. Greenberg assured all parties involved that he will not go through with the plans for the porch and attached are the responses from all the neighbors thanking Mr. Greenberg for not proceeding with his plans. Because of his letter, we assume that Mr. Greenberg has withdrawn his application

2. I have attached reply letters to Mr. Greenberg' letter in reference to this case from the Lowery's of 812 East Capitol Street, from Dr. Fernandez and Michael Rodman at 818 East Capitol Street, and from the Jeff and Willa Humber at 820 East Capitol Street.

3. I have also enclosed a photograph of Mr. Greenberg's back garden and driveway with the catering truck which is always present for their Tuesday evening staff meetings and other regular affairs. The caterer's truck occupies the entire space of the back garden - clearly showing that, although the existing deck might be repaired, there is no space to extend the deck further.

The neighbors wish to thank the BZA for listening to our arguments If any photos or further documentation are required, please let us know as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Dr. John Fernandez ,Michael Rodman, et al.

BZA
Case No. 16824
Exhibit No. 27

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO.16824
EXHIBIT NO.27

3/18/02

297

OPPOSITION TO B2A
APPLICATION #16824



816 E. Capitol St., N.E.
(back driveway/garden)
See Item 3 on page 1

3/18/02 3 of 7
OPPOSITION TO BZA
APPLICATION #16821

February 26, 2002

Dr. A. Fernandez-Miranda
Michael Rodman
818 E. Capitol Street, NE
Washington, DC 20002

Dear Dr. Fernandez-Miranda and Mr. Rodman:

I wanted to send a note to follow-up the meeting of the Zoning Board. In fact, I wanted to visit personally, but unfortunately, I have found myself away most of the time since. Thus, this is too formal a note. It was good to meet you personally, though obviously not the best of circumstances.

I want to assure you that I have no intention of proceeding with a variance application without the support of my immediate neighbors. That was actually my intention before the hearing, but I had not gone the extra mile to consult with everyone. I sent the general note, had my general contractor speak with Mr. Rodman, and knocked on your door a couple of times. I intended to share the plans.

In any case, I feel badly that people had to go to the trouble of doing all the background research and preparing a submission and taking the time. Mostly, I am sorry that people did not feel they could simply raise the issue directly. I take responsibility for that.

What I intend to do is see if there is any plan that would be suitable for the neighbors on the other side. The porch could be pushed back a foot or so; the deck could be eliminated; the roof could be slanted down to minimize the amount of wall facing you; perhaps we could you materials on your side (instead of screening) that increased your privacy.

I understand that you have a legitimate set of issues. If any screened in porch is unacceptable, no matter how it is designed, then I will give up the idea. Good neighbors are important than the porch.

If my neighbors on either side remain unhappy with alternative plans, then I will give up the application for a variance. I will go ahead with a modernization and extension of the deck at the existing height or lower.

I will be abroad this week but will be in DC on Saturday and during the week of March 4th. I hope to get a chance to speak with you personally.

Best regards,

Stan

Stanley B. Greenberg

3/18/02 4 of 7

OPPOSITION TO BZA

APPLICATION # 16824

February 26, 2002

Melinda M. Lowery
Congressman William Lowery
812 E. Capitol Street, NE
Washington, DC 20002

Dear Melinda and Bill:

I wanted to send a note to follow-up the meeting of the Zoning Board. In fact, I wanted to visit personally, but unfortunately, I have found myself away most of the time since. Thus, this is too formal a note.

I want to assure you that I have no intention of proceeding with a variance application without the support of my immediate neighbors. That was actually my intention before the hearing, but I had not gone the extra mile to consult with everyone. I sent the general note, had my general contractor speak with Mr. Rodman, and knocked on your door a couple of times. I intended to share the plans. To be honest, I had not worked harder at it in your case because I sought the proposed construction had little impact. (But, of course, how would you know that?) The plan did not extend the house backward and, therefore, would not have created any tunnel on your property. I thought the screened-in porch, which followed the house line, would be barely visible from your property.

In any case, I feel badly that people had to go to the trouble of doing all the background research and preparing a submission and taking the time. Mostly, I am sorry that people did not feel they could simply raise the issue directly. I take responsibility for that.

What I intend to do is see if there is any plan that would be suitable for the neighbors on the other side. Could the porch be pushed back, roof slanted down, with some kind of materials that would increase privacy. I understand that Dr. Fernandez-Miranda and Mr. Rodman have a legitimate set of issues. If any screened in porch is unacceptable, no matter how it is designed, then I will give up the idea. Good neighbors are important than the porch.

If my neighbors on either side remain unhappy with alternative plans, then I will give up the application for a variance. I will go ahead with a modernization of the deck at the existing height or lower.

I will be abroad this week but will be in DC on Saturday and during the week of March 4th. I hope to get a chance to speak with you personally.

Best regards,

Stan

Stanley B. Greenberg

3118102 5 of 7
OPPOSITION TO BZA
APPLICATION #168

MELINDA MORRIN LOWERY
812 East Capitol Street, NE
Washington, DC 20003
Telephone: (202) 547-5292 Fax: (202) 547-4824

March 1, 2002

Mr. Stanley B. Greenberg
816 East Capitol Street, NE
Washington, DC 20003

Dear Stan:

Thank you for your letter of February 26 regarding your application for variance to build on your back lot.

I would be happy to discuss this with you, but feel fairly strongly that no roofed structure should be built in your back yard, or ours for that matter. Our row houses are built so closely that any additional building will affect our immediate neighbors. When we applied for our remodel permits, we wanted to build a small carport-like structure in our back yard and were told that our lot was nearly at the maximum percentage of build out and nothing would be approved. We settled for a deck, with which we are very happy.

There would be no problem with your adding a deck to the back of your home, and I am sorry, but no building per se would be acceptable. We were disappointed to learn that we could not add structure to our yard, however, the codes are clear to us and we accepted them as appropriate for the quality of life of the neighborhood.

Incidentally, our deck plan called for lattice work between our back yards above our existing deck. The posts were put in, as I'm sure you've noticed, but our contractor failed to complete the lattice work itself. We hope to get it completed, and that it will be attractive and provide an extra measure of privacy for both your backyard and ours (much like the lattice on your third floor deck in back).

Like you, we feel that neighbors are important and I hope that my position on this matter will not affect our cordiality.

Sincerely,

Melinda Morrin Lowery

3/21/02

Dear Stan,

Thanks you so much for your letter. We are all very glad that you have decided not to go ahead with the porch plan, but instead repair your present deck. As you know from our presentation, there are substantive reasons why the porch plan is not acceptable to us. Thanks for writing

Sincerely,

Richard Ivey

APPLICATION #16824

OPPOSITION TO B:1

3/18/02

6 of 9

4 of 7

3/18/02 1 of 1
OPPOSITION TO BZA
APPLICATION #16824

Mr. Stanley Greenberg
816 East Capitol Street, NE
Washington, DC 20003

March 20, 2002

Dear Mr. Greenberg,

I was delighted to learn that you have decided to drop your plans for a screened porch. I still have concerns about your intention to extend your present deck, since there is little space for a driveway and a small garden, much less for an extended deck.

Again, thank you for considering your neighbors wishes that share similar back gardens.

Sincerely,

Willa M. Humber
J. L. Humber Jr.

Willa and Jeff Humber
820 East Capitol Street, NE
Washington, DC 20003