

January 22, 2022

To : Board of Zoning Adjustment Commissioners and ANC 3/4 Commissioners  
From : Carol Zachary, home owner, 2832 Rittenhouse St. NW  
Re : BZA Case #20643

Thank you for considering the following requests:

1. ONE field, not two, squeezed onto 3.7 acres. Either a baseball diamond OR a football/ lacrosse/ soccer field
2. Absolutely NO commercial activity relating to or stemming from or generating out of access to or use of the field. NONE. NEVER.
  - a. No sub-leasing of the field to other sports teams or clubs
  - b. No renting the space to summer programs including holiday sports camps
  - c. No concessions of any kind operating for profit on or beside the field (e.g. food trucks, parking services, product sales, farmers' markets).
3. No artificial turf allowed anywhere\*
4. Regularly scheduled, weekly opportunities for free public play with NO exclusivity clauses\*\*
5. Requirement for lessee to hold in escrow for the life of the lease, enough indemnification insurance to cover the claims of property owners living on 28<sup>th</sup> street and the north side of Nebraska abutting the field for extreme loss in property values due to inevitable water damage and loss of view, to name two.

And if we have learned nothing else from this exercise in determining best land use for all impacted parties:

6. Going forward, any problems concerning the field MUST include early notification of, and a seat at the table for, neighbors so they can work together with ECC and/or Maret to solve those problems. This neighborhood stakeholder involvement MUST be codified in the lease.

In appreciation for the work that you do to keep our city beautiful, green, and functioning,



Carol Zachary

\*Artificial turf may not currently appear on BZA's radar but with the growing environmental and health concerns now being traced to its toxicities, progressive municipalities are paying attention, as you know.

\*\*The BZA probably doesn't engage in such regulation, but honestly, folks, who in authority may I ask to codify at least a few hours public use of this space? Maret's proposal is not for the public good. That is laughable. It serves those who feel entitled to it. It serves those who can pay for private park privilege and at the expense of the rest of us.