MEMORANDUM

TO: Districts of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment
Office of Zoning
441 4th Street, NW, Suite 210
Washington, D.C. 20001

FROM: Beneva Weintraub
3508 Northampton St., NW
Washington, D.C. 20015
Lot six, Square 1996

Beneva Weintraub
4/19/04

RE: Application of Bloom Builders, Inc.
"Broad Branch Market" property
Application Number **17147**

I am the owner and resident of the property immediately adjacent to that of the applicant. In my view, the intended uses, a market and a childcare center, will be assets to the neighborhood as a whole, despite the burden of additional traffic and parking problems that will undoubtedly ensue. I am, however, interested in ensuring that my property interests are protected.

My principal concerns are with the effects on my own property of the increased size and proximity of the proposed building. After 30 years of living "behind" the existing Broad Branch Market, I had assumed that I would be the beneficiary of the 25-foot rear yard setback in connection with any redevelopment of this property. I have since learned that the Northampton Street side of the applicant's market property has now been re-designated as the "front" of the property, causing me to become a side neighbor with an 8-foot side setback. Moreover, it is my understanding that the proposed building will extend for virtually the whole depth of my property at that distance, with a height of two stories. Since my back yard is about one-story down a slope from the market property, the proposed building is likely to loom like a battleship, cut off light, and pose a threat to privacy.

In connection with this project, Mr. Bloom has extended me every courtesy and has expressed a willingness to mitigate such problems. Mr. Bloom has expressed a willingness to move the second story part of the building farther back from my property line to minimize loss of light. Although it appears to me that the lot affords relatively little room for him to do so, consistent with the 40% footprint intended, I would appreciate whatever could be done. An attractive privacy fence, possibly supplemented by trees which would provide a visual screen from the commercial building, and strategic placement of windows on the side adjacent to my residential property, could mitigate some of the other adverse effects. It is my understanding from our conversations that Mr. Bloom is willing to undertake such steps, but would like that understanding to be made a matter of record at the zoning hearing. It is because of his representations that I have not formally opposed this petition. Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Case No. 17147
Exhibit No. 38

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO. 17147
EXHIBIT NO. 38