Form 140
(Revised 03/15/02)

Case No. 17208

PARTY STATUS APPLICATION

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

NAME: Last	First	Middle I.
Stofferson	Robert	D

ADDRESS: Street	Apt. # (if any)	City	State	Zip Code
1209 Clifton St, NW		Washington	DC	20009

Phone No.	Fax No.	E-Mail
202-387-4502		rstaff1@yahoo.com

I hereby request to appear and participate as a party by: Signature: Robert D. Stofferson Date: 7/27/04

Will you appear as a(n): ☐ Co-Applicant ☒ 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

BZA
Case No. 17208
Exhibit No. 26

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?

Pablo did not perform a well check to ensure his construction does not encroach on my neighboring property

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

I am Pablo's neighbor to the west we share a property line.

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.) Pablo's deck appears to ~~be~~ encroach my property.

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?

Pablo's deck negatively impacts my property economically.

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. Currently, one year after the BZA denied Pablo Martinez's initial application 16987 the deck still stands. The BZA's denial of the deck served no purpose. The BZA wasted my time last year with the multiple hearings I attended. Given that there was no enforcement of BZA's decision to deny Pablo Martinez's deck on Pablo's first attempt to have the BZA allow it to stay, ~~what's the purpose~~ what would be accomplished through my efforts this year ↓↙

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 persons in the general public.

#26

to have the deck denied a second time. Rather than have a second application for the illegal deck, efforts should be spent to ensure there is enforcement of BZA's denials. Otherwise, what purpose does a denial serve? In my opinion the BZA should order the deck to be torn down. If Pablo wants to build a new deck, he can start from scratch maybe this time he'll get permits, not exceed the city's lot occupancy rule, and not encroach on my property.