

Melanie Pirchner
3328 Sherman Ave. NW
Unit 1
Washington, DC 20010

Dear Zoning Board Members,

I am writing regarding case number 19796, application of 3324 Sherman Ave LLC, for special exceptions. As the owner of unit 1 at 3328 Sherman Ave I am in opposition to granting the exceptions they are seeking. I am writing this letter of opposition on behalf of the owners of unit 2, Natalie and Ethan Andrews, and the renters in the building, Paul, Jane, Claire, and Harsha. I am concerned with the applicant's previous deception in regards to the submitted letter of support, the privacy issues the plans would cause, the implications to my home's structural features, and future maintenance difficulties if these exceptions are granted. I met with the owner of the property and his architect on Tuesday September 25th, to discuss my concerns, however I felt as they dismissed my concerns rather than address them so I'm still not able to support the project.

I had the opportunity to watch the hearing that occurred on September 12th, 2018. I was extremely concerned by the applicants claims. The applicant submitted a false letter of support (exhibit 47) purportedly coming from the owners of my address. The applicant repeatedly claimed that this letter was signed by the owner of my house, claiming he knocked on the door, talked to the owner, and had them sign it. As I stated in my motion to reopen the record (exhibit 48) I was never made aware of nor did I send, sign, or approve this letter. He has submitted other "attempts to contact me" into the record (exhibits 52 and 56). These exhibits were in fact submitted after I had already spoken with him on the phone and verbally given him my opposition. Although these concerns are not germane to the exemptions he is seeking, I wanted to explain how they affected me.

My opposition to these exemptions is rooted in the major disruption to the privacy of my home and impact the construction will have on the structure of my home if these exceptions were to be granted. My house was designed to be and is currently semi-detached. The applicant is proposing to attach the neighboring property to my home. As the house was designed to be detached on that side, there are features integral to the structure located on that side of the home.

1. **Ventilation:** All crawl space and ceiling area ventilation are located on that south wall. The applicant nor the architect have discussed with us how they propose to build a wall against the south side of our house and still maintain ventilation to our crawl space.
2. **Roof Flashing:** Another issue arises with the roof. With the house being detached the roof flashing obviously cups the south wall to properly deflect water and prevent penetration into the brick. If a taller building is attached to this wall that will affect my roof and the impact of rain runoff onto my roof could damage the building.
3. **Gap:** I have a roughly ten-foot addition at the rear of my house. This addition is inset about 8.5" from the south masonry wall. If they were to add the proposed addition on that wall, there would be an area, on my property, with an 8.5-inch gap between this area (vinyl siding) and the wall of their proposed addition.
4. **Maintenance:** Water penetrates brick and mortar. My house was built in 1935. 80+ year old brick and mortar is in danger of one day needing repair or at a minimum sealing. How would this be possible with a connected wall? How would the back part of my house sided in vinyl be maintained when there is only 8.5" of space between that and a proposed neighboring wall?

5. **18 ft addition:** I don't know how it is possible that a taller, longer house than mine won't obstruct light or air flow. However, I am not an expert and I cannot dispute the validity of the architect's study.
6. **Privacy:** If the building is allowed to be constructed directly abutting my house, as well as raised a story with a roof deck, this will give anybody on the deck a sightline that looks straight down to my roof. We have a skylight in the bathroom they would be looking directly into.
7. **Long Construction Noise:** Disruptions caused by the construction. I can't imagine what kind of noise will be caused while attaching the home to mine, but I assume it will be horrible.

When I brought up all these issues to the architect she claimed that these were "construction issues and not zoning issues." I may be wrong, but I can't see how these could possibly be mutually exclusive. What I interpret from that is "lets just get this through zoning and then you can fight with a contractor for the next 2 years during construction to make sure your house is protected." I don't see how this is in any way in my best interest, and again is the basis of my opposition. Additionally, as stated previously, the actions from the first hearing have made it difficult for me to trust either party.

Thank you for your time and consideration of my issues with the application.

Best,



Melanie Pirchner

Owner of Unit 1, 3328 Sherman Ave. NW

On behalf of:

Natalie and Ethan Andrews

Owner of Unit 2, 3328 Sherman Ave. NW



10/1/18