

## Cochran, Patricia (DCOZ)

---

**From:** Calito Keith <3300blockbrothersplse@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 3, 2025 5:39 PM  
**To:** DCOZ - BZA Submissions (DCOZ)  
**Subject:** Re: For case 21239 February 5

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the DC Government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know that the content is safe. If you believe that this email is suspicious, please forward to [phishing@dc.gov](mailto:phishing@dc.gov) for additional analysis by OCTO Security Operations Center (SOC).

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from 3300blockbrothersplse@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification> ]

Apologies 3220 Brothers PI SE

> On Feb 3, 2025, at 10:36 AM, Calito Keith <3300blockbrothersplse@gmail.com> wrote:  
>  
> I'm writing to express that I do not agree with granting an exception to the property at 3222 Brothers PI SE.  
>  
> The 5 feet rule was adopted for a reason. The original home was built before the rule but anything else should follow the new rule.  
>  
> If the addition is in anyway encroaching on the neighbors property ground or airspace then absolutely not. This should not be in question. I'm sure the architect was aware of the rule and still drew the addition as it was submitted. There had to be a way to design the addition and still remain in compliance. Where there is a will there is a way.  
>  
> With regard to the occupancy the homeowner may want to consider selling buying a larger home that can accommodate his family. The infrastructure in this area is struggling such as sewage and especially parking. Even with the parking in the back I'm sure that more than one person in the household drives and has a vehicle.  
>  
> I am not sure how this made its way from blueprint to actual structure with no one catching it. It seems that there was an administrative exception granted already. This owner is blatantly disregarding rules, regulations and policies.  
>  
> Again, I do not agree with granting the exceptions for case 21239.  
>  
> Thank you!  
>  
> C. Keith