Form 140
(Revised 03/15/02)

Case No. 17106

# PARTY STATUS APPLICATION

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

| NAME: Last | First | Middle I. |
|---|---|---|
| Poindexter | Sanuel & Linda | |

| ADDRESS: Street | Apt. # (If any) | City | State | Zip Code |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6021 North Dakota Avenue, NW | | Washington, DC 20011 | | |

| Phone No. | Fax No. | E-Mail |
|---|---|---|
| (202)726-3982 | NONE | NONE |

I hereby request party status as indicated below. Signature: Samuel Linda Poindexter Date: 1-5-004

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. |
|---|---|---|
| | | |

| ADDRESS: Street | Ste. # (If any) | City | State | Zip Code |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

| Phone No. | Fax No. | E-Mail |
|---|---|---|
| | | |

**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?

Answer to All Questions are Attached.

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

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.)

(Over please)

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?

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.

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.

BZA
Case No. 17106
Exhibit No. 25

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO. 17106
EXHIBIT NO. 25

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

The existing properties are located in close proximity. The property located at 6025 is approximately 3 feet from the property line. Our property, located at 6021 is approximately 8 feet from the property line. The fence located between the two structures marks the property line. We have concerns that the new property will be too close for the following reasons:

A. The razing of the existing property elevates concerns about lead paint and asbestos. It is important to note that the home may be well over 50 years old. We have resided at 6021 since 1976, which is approximately 27 years. The property located at 6025 was the first home in the neighborhood and stood among fields and cow pastures, as indicated by the late Ms. Farr, the initial owner. Ms. Farr resided in the home until her death in the late 1980s.

   Based on these factors, we have concerns about the impact of lead poison and asbestos contamination that would affect the health and well being of our family and community if the necessary precautions are not taken to demolish the existing home.

B. The razing of the existing home and construction of the new home could bring harm and danger to our property. Specifically, we are concerned about 1) harm/destruction to the foundation and structure of our home and 2) the effects from the work at 6025 spreading to our property to include machinery, supplies, dust, dirt and debris.

C. The size of the new dwelling may negatively impact the quality of life we are accustomed to in our home. The new structure will include three stories plus a basement and the building will extend past the existing structure. While the existing properties are close, a bigger home may negatively affect the view from our home, sunlight into our home, and our privacy. For example, we sit in our breakfast room to enjoy meals and sunlight with our grandchildren, children, friends and family. With the construct of the new home, we are concerned that the bigger structure will obstruct light from the left-side of the house, the view to the street and it is possible that we will be exposed to the waste (garbage) from the back of the new house. As another example, it is highly possible that the view from our front side window will be obstructed to include site of the street and sunlight.

D. The majority of the houses in the neighborhood are located on square and/or rectangular lots in shape; however the property located at 6025 is located on a triangular shaped lot. We have concerns that placing a four story single family home (includes basement) on a triangle lot less than 3 feet from the existing fence will not be aesthetically pleasing, but will detract from the beauty and value of our home. Also, due to the proximity, in cases of accidents caused by nature

(e.g., storms, tornados), it is very likely that the new structure could cause harm/danger to our family and property.

2. What legal interest does the person have in the property? (i.e., owner, tenant, trustee, or mortgagee) We are the owners of the property located at 6021 North Dakota Avenue, N.W. We have resided in our home for almost 30 years. We reside next door to Mr. & Mrs. Abdullah, residents of 6025 North Dakota Avenue, N.W.

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 200 ft). Our home is located approximately 8 feet from the property line. The property located at 6025 is approximately 3 feet from the property line. The property line is marked by the fence, which separates both properties.

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?

In addition to the factors listed in number 1 above, we will be affected as follows:

A. The new structure will be 4 stories to include a basement. The existing structure is 3 stories to include a basement. It is highly likely that the new home will obstruct sunlight and view from four locations in our home. Specifically: 1) the breakfast room; 2) front side window in the living room; 3) front side window in the upstairs hallway, and 4) the upstairs bath. In addition, it may obstruct view to the street from our back yard.

B. As previously stated, the property at 6025 is located on a triangular lot, whereas all of the other homes on the block sit on a rectangular or square lot. Also, the existing homes are similar in size and stature and complement each other. The concept of building a new home that is likely to tower over our property is physically unappealing and may negatively affect the ability to resale our property if we choose to do so.

C. While the resale value of our property could be adversely impacted, we also have concerns that the construction of the new property could increase our property taxes. If these concerns become facts, it is unfair to us to be faced with the ability to profit from our property after being residents for almost 30 years while at the same time being faced with an added expense as the result of a property tax increase.

D. Based on A, B, & C and the responses in number 1 above, it is unfair to us as long term residents of North Dakota Avenue, NW to live beside a home which may not physically or aesthetically fit the existing lot nor blend in with the

constructs of the existing properties on the block. Also, it is unfair to ask us to reside in proximity of a property that, because of the closeness and size could potentially cause physical harm to our property and persons in the event of a natural tragedy.

E. One of the most critical factors of concern is for the health of our family. I, Mrs. Poindexter have encountered 3 procedures over the last several years which measures were taken to deter cancer. Specifically, I have experienced a full hysterectomy to avoid cancer and two breast biopsies as the result of being diagnosed with potential cancerous lumps in my breast. In addition, we are an aging couple with health issues and have young grandchildren, the proper removal of asbestos and lead is imperative.

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 No.s 1 and 4 above.

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.

It is highly possible that the razing and construction could cause a financial and health hardship on us. We would like to avoid the possibilities of health hazards, accidents, and all negative impacts that the new development may have on us. Since the new development will not be within the standard 25 feet from the property line and will only be only 3 feet from the property line, we would be the family most affected.

petition

Re: Board of Zoning Notice 17106
for Abdullah
Application No: 17106
Hear Date: January 27, 2004

---

We have also solicited the community's support as evidenced by the signatures on the enclosed petitioned Agreeing that there should be some statement of proof that there are no Environmental issues and risks to the resident's health through asbestos or lead poisoning by

(over)

Permitting razing of the Existing structure. We would also ask the A.N.C. to support us in Insuring that those issues are handled in accordance with public safety particularly in regard to the razing and removal of hazardous material by certified licensed contracts. We are A Aging community. (Homes within 300 Ft)

| | |
|---|---|
| Mr & Mrs Samuel T. Poindexter | 6021 N. Dakota Ave NW |
| Elizabeth & Rodman Tuyon | 6011 N. Dakota Ave N.W. |
| Ashley P. Hoover | 6022 N. Dakota Ave N.W. |
| Betty Grace | 6001 N. Dakota Ave N.W. |
| Elaine M. Moore | 6015 N. Dakota Ave N.W. |
| Mary E. Harris | 6020 N. Dakota Ave NW |
| | 6024 N. Dakota Ave N.W. |
| Gloria L. Rogers | 6004 N. Dakota Ave NW |
| Kimel Dixon for / Charles Allen property owner | 6016 N. Dakota Ave NW (over) |

Genevere J Johnson | 6000 [redacted] W. Virginia Ave.

[redacted]

Willie J. Brewer, Sr. Willie J. Brewer 6100 Blair Road, NW

#1

17106



Photos #1 & 2: Shows the closeness of the back of the house located at 6025. Specifically, the back porch is 3 feet from the property line (fence).

RECEIVED
D.C. OFFICE OF ZONING
2004 JAN -5 AM 10: 34

#2





Photo 3: This photo shows the back steps leading to the back porch of 6025 North Dakota Avenue, NW. The ruler in the exhibit shows that the steps are less than 3 feet from the property line.



Photo 4: Photo 4 is the Poindexter residence, located at 6025 North Dakota Avenue, NW. The photo displays the sun light and view from the side of our home. We are concerned that the four story home that is being proposed, will obstruct the view and light into our home.



Photo 5: Photo 5 shows our view from the patio of our home, located at 6021 North Dakota Avenue, NW. We are concerned that we will lose our view from the patio and breakfast room of our home. Specifically, the view is to Quackenbos Street. Also, we are concerned that the light to our home will be obstructed as a result of the proposed 4 story home, to be located at 6025 North Dakota Avenue, NW.