May 21, 2019

Board of Zoning Adjustment 441 4th Street NW, Suite 200S Washington, DC 20001

Re: BZA Case No. 20027 520 Groff Ct NE - Two-story Addition

To Whom It May Concern:

I request party status in this matter. Set forth below are responses to Party Status Criteria from BZA Form 140.

1. How will the property owned by such person be affected by the action requested by the Board?

We are concerned about how the proposed construction will impact the space, vehicle maneuverability, safety, and vehicle visibility of pedestrians and children that play in the alley, particularly as cars will be making a blind and tight turn. Our fence has already been hit multiple times by vehicles unable to make the turn as is and this will likely be worsened by additional limitations to access and sightlines. The space is already quite difficult for garbage trucks to maneuver and in the case of emergency, appropriate vehicles would likely find access even more difficult.

2. What legal interest does the person have in the property?

We are the residents and owners of a home at 327 F ST NE Washington D.C. Our house backs up on the corner of the alley where the construction will take place. We drive and walk through the alley on a near daily basis. I have owned my house since September 2010.

3. What is the distance between the person's property and the property that is the subject of the application before the Board?

I estimate the distance is 25 feet.

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 by the Board is approved or denied?

The current zoning restrictions on setbacks were presumably designed for modern vehicles and current safety understandings. While the historic house which once sat on the proposition Adjustment may not have met these conditions, any changes to a now vacant lot should be held**Districted Count** new safety requirements. Damage to our fence, inability of neighbors and other drices NO20027 drive safely and efficiently through the alley directly behind our house, increased risk of traffic/pedestrian accidents, increasing difficulty of exit from our back yard, loss of privacy caused by an edifice with second floor windows that would now see into our backyard, and changes to the historic look and size of the Groff Court houses would all be changes that were not anticipated when we purchased our property and which could potentially impact our property in the future.

5. Describe any other relevant factors that demonstrate how the person will likely be affected or aggrieved if the action requested of the Board is approved ordenied.

We are concerned the addition will decrease sight lines in the alley, making it difficult for vehicles to see pedestrians as they turn the corner, including children who play in the alley. In addition, I am concerned that the reduced setback would make it more difficult to drive our car in the alley and access or exit a parking pad currently under construction in our backyard (permits obtained prior to Ms. Benson's application being made public). The construction period will be particularly problematic with more traffic, construction equipment and supplies, and probably complete blockage of our backyard entrance and egress either by construction vehicles or by other drivers having difficulty maneuvering the limited access.

6. Explain how the person's interest will be more significantly, distinctly or uniquely affected in character or kind by the proposed actions than that of other persons in the general public.

Given that we live nearly directly behind the proposed project, we are uniquely interested in this project. We are also very concerned by the lack of adequate notice and time given to this project, the uneven community outreach and reporting of community concerns that has occurred, and the unfortunately potential damage to neighborhood relationships that may occur due to the way in which this project has been managed to date.

I designate Andrea Ferster to act as my legal counsel as part of the party status put forth in this matter.

Sincerely,

Anne Brodsk & Margaret

327 F St NE Washington DC 20002

> I be current coning restrictions on setbacks were presumably designed for modern rehicles and current cafety understandings. While the historic house which once sat on the property may not have met firete conditions, any changes to a now vatent lot should be hold to thes new safety requirements. Damage to our fance, inability of neighbors and other drivers to thive safety and efficiently through the aftey directly behind our house, increased risk of