Form 140
(Revised 03/15/02)

Case No. 16970

PARTY STATUS APPLICATION

Notice: See other side of party status form for instructions.

NAME: Last	First	Middle I.
Vanneman	Reeve and Jane W.	D.

ADDRESS: Street	Apt. # (if any)	City	State	Zip Code
3071 Ordway Street, NW		Washington	DC	20008

Phone No.	Fax No.	E-Mail
202 537-1853		reeve@cwmills.umd.edu

I hereby request to appear and participate as a party. Signature: Reeve Vanneman Jane W. Vanneman Date: 01/23/2003

Will you appear as a(n) ☐ Proponent ☒ Opponent

Will you appear through legal counsel ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please enter the name and address of such legal counsel.

NAME: Last	First	Middle I.
Nettler	Richard	B,

ADDRESS: Street	Ste. # (if any)	City	State	Zip Code
1801 K Street NW	1201	Washington	DC	20006

Phone No.	Fax No.	E-Mail
202 736-2720	202 223-8624	RBNettler@rkmc.com

Please answer all of the following questions referencing why the above person should be granted party status.
(If you require additional space, please attach an additional sheet.)

1). How will the property owned or occupied by such person, or in which the person has an interest be affected by the action requested of the Board?

see attached

2). What legal interest does the person have in the property? (i.e. owner, tenant, trustee, or mortgagee)

see attached Owner

3). What is the distance between the person's property and the property that is the subject of the appeal or application before the Board? (Preferably no farther than 200ft.)

approximately 20 feet

4). What are the environmental, economic or social impacts that are likely to affect the person and/or the person's property if the action requested of the Board is approved or denied?

see attached

RECEIVED
D.C. OFFICE OF ZONING
2003 JAN 23 PM 3:00

5). Describe any other relevant matters that demonstrate how the person will likely be affected or aggrieved if the action requested of the Board is approved or denied.

see attached

6). Explain how the person's interest will be more significantly, distinctively, or uniquely affected in character or kind by the proposed zoning action than that of other person's in the general public.

see attached

BZA
Case No. 16970
Exhibit No. 74

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO.16970
EXHIBIT NO.74

Reeve D. Vanneman and Jane W. Vanneman
3071 Ordway Street, NW
Washington, DC 20008

#16970 BZA

Environmental and social matters:

We live on Ordway Street, NW, directly across the street from the school property - our house faces the back of the main house, the upper playground and part of the playhouse. We have owned our home and lived in it since January 1993.

Massive Institutional Facade: If NCRC is permitted to expand the back of the main house, construct a new maintenance garage, and construct the new classroom building attached to the existing playhouse by a large wall with a fence on top, we will be looking at a massive institutional facade. With these two large new buildings and expanded main house, and the loss of trees, we will lose virtually all our air and light across the street from us as we face out the front of our house. These new and expanded structures are particularly objectionable in this residential and historic neighborhood, because the NCRC property across from us is on a hill overlooking our front yards. Our view up and down the Ordway streetscape will be an almost unbroken mass of buildings, both during the day and also at night when it is lit up.

Maintenance Garage. The new maintenance "garage", the size of a two-car garage, to replace the existing very small tricycle shed, will be especially detrimental to our property. This new maintenance building will not look like a residential garage, particularly when it is open, because it will contain various types of maintenance equipment and provide the location for daily maintenance activities, unlike garages for residences which house only cars. This will also increase the daytime noise beyond what is usually associated with a residential property. Moreover, with the exception of the neighboring property, no other garages directly back up to Ordway Street. While that existing garage was constructed well before the historic district, the addition of a new garage on the NCRC property, also almost on the property line and therefore virtually abutting the existing garage, presents an objectionable doubling of the "back yard" facade directly across the street from and looming above our front door.

Traffic and parking. Traffic and parking is also a major concern for us. NCRC is unable to handle the existing traffic and parking, which has increased in intensity over the past few years, that comes from its enrollment, ever-increasing staffing levels, conference participants, outside contractors, and support staff coming to the school. We frequently observe parents and caregivers turning around in our driveway, running up on the lawn; they also turn around in the middle of the street which creates a dangerous situation. We also observe parents and caregivers taking little children out of the car on the street side, an obvious danger. There are rarely any NCRC staffers to assist with traffic and parking. These adverse conditions are exacerbated during special events, held on weekends. There has also been an increasing amount of evening activity at the school, with the associated traffic, parking and lighting impacts upon us. If the NCRC expansion is approved, there will obviously be greater problems of this nature, associated with an institution,

in the middle of this historic, residential and quiet neighborhood.

Noise Issues. There are also noise issues associated with the existing operations at the school. On an almost daily basis during the week (and also before special weekend events), the school uses a leaf blower in the mornings to blow away chips and leaves and other matter. This is a very noisy activity, and not one normally conducted daily at a residence.

Lighting Issues. We are also uniquely affected by the lighting issues at the school. The presence of the proposed school campus, with four buildings, will mean more problems with lighting. There has been an increasing amount of evening activity, including meetings, which means that the playhouse is lit up. If the classroom building is built, with large rooms for meetings and conferences, we anticipate that there will more of these evenings activities with increased institutional lighting, which affects us uniquely.

Environmental problems relating to draining, water runoff. In addition, because NCRC's proposal involves the removal of huge amounts of dirt to build the new classroom building, there are clearly unknown potentials for drainage and water runoff problems. As it is, with the fairly steep decline of the hill on Ordway Street, water often runs in the street down the hill after a heavy rain. At a minimum, NCRC should be required to conduct a professional study of the potential effects of its proposed construction on the water runoff and drainage problems, another problem exacerbated by the institutional nature of the proposed project.

#5 -

We are also adversely affected by NCRC's breach of its 1994 agreement with a few of the Ordway Street neighbors. In the summer of 1994, NCRC, without any of the necessary permits from the HPRB or any other District government bodies, undertook a major addition to the playhouse, by paving a large part of the playground area into a concrete deck and adding a new large wood deck off the west side of the playhouse. NCRC had intended to retain a construction driveway off Ordway and a chain link fence it had built. After negotiations, NCRC agreed with us and a few other neighbors to remove the temporary driveway, construct a very low fence, with wood materials and design to which the neighbors could agree, and landscaping (which has now matured), all of which would be permanent. Now, NCRC, by its proposal, intends to undo that agreement and replace this landscaping with an institutional facade.

We concur in all of the papers statement filed by our attorney, Mr. Richard Nettler, on behalf of the Cleveland Park Neighbors, on this issue.

#6 -

As immediate neighbors across the street from NCRC, we are more directly affected by the NCRC proposal because of the loss of open space and natural light across from and above our house, the increases in traffic, additional noise, and the possibilities of more runoff and erosion in the hillside.

Rena Vanumu 01/23/2003

Jane W. Vanne