

Form 140
(Revised 03/15/02)

Case No. 17431



PARTY STATUS APPLICATION

Notice: [Click Here for Application Form Instructions](#)

Name:* Carlos Lumpuy	
Address:* 2366 Champlain Street, NW	City:* Washington State:* D.C. Zip:* 20009
Phone:* (202)265-9119	Fax: Email: clumpuy@bellsouth.net
I, hereby request to appear and participate as a party.	
Signature: <i>Carlos Lumpuy</i> Date:* 02/14/2006	
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:	City:	State:	Zip:
Address:	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?*

Any short sighted granting of height increase would adversely affect other existing Champlain Street properties, and more significantly, further cause and obligate multiple height requests from Champlain's vacant lots and undeveloped properties to the North and immediately adjacent to the subject property, 2329-2335 Champlain Street, causing us all on Champlain permanent, irreparable harm as further described herein.

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

A life-long resident of Champlain Street since July 1960, I am the owner of 2298, 2362, 2364, 2366, and 2351 Champlain Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. I own properties on both sides of Champlain Street.

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.)*

All five of my properties are well within 200 feet of the subject property. Champlain Street is a long, narrow street running North and South from Columbia Road down to Kalorama Road. Subject property is center, mid-block on Champlain Street as our mine.

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?*

Subject property and continued height increases center, mid-block on Champlain will cast a huge shadow on the street and especially upon the eight contiguous row houses which will no longer receive morning sun. The subject property will forever cast too large a shadow center, mid-block on our long, narrow street, obligate adjacent development North and further Northwest on the street to also build higher, consequently creating a condo-concrete-canyon not conducive and contrary to long term urban planning for our neighborhood, causing substantial detriment to the common good, that would be inconsistent with the general intent and purpose of the zoning regulations.

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.*

20 years ago, our Reed-Cooke area was dramatically down-zoned from C2B to R5B. Subsequently, three condominiums, The Orlovon at 2363 Champlain, The Gramercy at 2380, and The Greenwich at 2357 have all risen from former commercial properties and all built within the 40 foot height restriction and North of subject property. Approval of subject property would cause an adverse effect to these existing condominiums North, and especially dwarf the eight small row houses across the street -the few remaining original structures on Champlain dating from the early 1900's. Damage to our Street would be severe, permanent and irreparable.

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.*

Adverse affect is more significant, distinctive and unique by virtue (or disgrace) of proximity to the subject property center, mid-block on Champlain Street. The request for a 50% increase from 40 ft to 60 ft is unreasonably high and would set a bad, enduring and harmful

RECEIVED

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT
District of Columbia
17431

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO. 17431
EXHIBIT NO. 32
2/15/2006

precedent for future development on Champlain. The proximity, center, mid-block on Champlain, would be more immediately detrimental to us on Champlain as opposed to the general public. Although I believe the public good is not served by the granting of this request either, as previously stated, causing permanent, substantial detriment to the common good and being inconsistent with the general intent and purposes of urban planning and zoning regulations. We need to hold the line at 40 feet for everyone. Any increase over 40 feet will allow for another floor of residential space at subject property, and then further obligate the immediately adjacent vacant lot to the North of subject property to build the same. It's significant to note that King's Creek owns a part of this huge 14,000 square foot vacant lot and is currently in title and environmental litigation over it with another developer, Adams Investment Group. Whoever eventually wins will be obligated to develop this huge vacant lot at subject property's height, whatever it will finally become. Subject's height request is simply not conducive to our Champlain Street.

