Form 140
(Revised 03/15/02)

Case No. 17172

PARTY STATUS APPLICATION

Notice: Click Here for Application Form Instructions

Name:*	**Lee A. Kimball and Richard Tucker Scully**				
Address:*	**1517 P Street, NW #3**	**City:*** **Wash**	**State:*** **DC**	**Zip:*** **20005**	
Phone:*	**(202)234-6264**	**Fax:**	**Email:**	**lkimball@igc.org**	
I, hereby request to appear and participate as a party.		**Signature:** Lee A. Kimball Richard Tucker Scully	**Date:*** 06/02/2004		

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:			
Address:	**City:**	**State:**	**Zip:**
Phone:	**Fax:**	**Email:**	

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?*

We believe that granting the special exception requested by the owners of 1519 P Street (BZA Application 17172) would have substantial adverse effects on the use and enjoyment of our property at 1517 P Street. Specifically, the proposed addition would expand a significant section of the existing single-family dwelling to the line between our two properties, eliminating the existing side yard there. This would create a slot canyon situation that reduces the corridor of air and light between our two buildings by about one-half. It is clear from the original footprint of both buildings that the existing corridor of air and light was meant to accommodate both houses. The bulding at 1519 P Street was constructed first, followed by our building at 1517 P Street in the 1890s. The extensive side windows and the side yard of our property were clearly built with the existing footprint of 1519 P Street in mind rather than a house that would extend to the dividing property line.

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

We are co-owners of one of the three adjacent condominium units at 1517 P Street, NW. Our unit is on the 3rd and 4th floors.

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.)*

There is no distance between the property of our condominium and the property at 1519 P Street. We share a property line.

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?*

If the Board approves the request, we are concerned that use and enjoyment of our property may be affected, and possibly the value of the property. In addition to the impact to our light and air (#1 above), removal of the large tree at the rear of the property at 1519 P Street would result in loss of an important source of shade, greenery, and enjoyment for us and for neighbors in the vicinity, including those on the north side of Church Street who view the area across the open space of the parking lot behind St. Luke's Episcopal Church. The proposed addition would seem to require removal also of the smaller maple tree between the two houses, an additional source of shade, greenery, and enjoyment. Finally, the proposed addition would seem to require relocation of the air conditioning unit (currently located on the ground), presumably to the roof, in which case we would be concerned about potential noise and visual impacts.

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.*

We are concerned that the proposal for the special exception builds on certain assumptions, reflected in the architect's letter of 29 March 2004, that we believe are inaccurate. For example, the letter dismisses the existing placement of the two buildings at 1517 and 1519 P Street as an "accident of history". On the contrary, the design of the house at 1519 P Street and its placement on the lot as a completely detached, freestanding home seems to us to be intentional. Further, the letter states that the windows on our building that open toward the house at 1519 P Street "appear to be bathrooms and the like"; in fact, they look out from dining and living space. More generally, we believe that consideration should be given to the historic nature of these properties and their yard space.

BZA
Case No. 17172
Exhibit No. 22

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO.17172
EXHIBIT NO. 22

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.*
As owners of a condominium unit in the only property adjacent to the proposed side addition, we would be directly and substantially impacted. As adjacent neighbors we would be more directly affected by the proposed special exception than the general public.