

My name is Anthony Smith, and I am speaking in support of **Ms. Chavis Williams**, the adjacent property owner at 628 Randolph Street NW.

Ms. Williams's issue was brought to my attention at a recent ANC meeting that I was attending because of yet another developer wanting special treatment instead of building within the 'matter of right.'

The applicant is requesting approval to extend **27 feet beyond the rear wall of the adjoining rowhouse**, Ms. Chavis's family's home. Even though the zoning regulations establish **10 feet** as the limit. The record shows that the existing structure at 630 Randolph Street is **already built approximately 8 feet beyond the adjoining home**. Under the intent of the regulations, that leaves **no more than 2 additional feet** that could reasonably be considered without undermining the purpose of the rear-yard protections.

What is being requested instead is **special treatment** that would allow a more than 20 foot wall to run nearly the full length of Ms. Williams' rear yard. From that yard, the scale and mass of this proposal would be felt every day — in reduced light, diminished airflow, and a loss of openness that the zoning code is specifically designed to prevent in rowhouse neighborhoods.

There is also a **practical issue that does not appear to be addressed in the plans**. This property has **no alley access**, and the rear yard is enclosed by neighboring homes. The application does not explain how construction of a structure of this size would occur without the use of **adjacent yards for access, staging, or equipment**. For Ms. Williams and her neighbors, this creates real uncertainty about temporary but potentially significant impacts that have not been evaluated by the Board.

Ms. Williams has lived in her home for decades. She has maintained it and relied on the light, air, and privacy that rear-yard regulations are meant to preserve. At this stage of her life, she should not be asked to shoulder permanent zoning impacts or undefined construction disruptions simply because a more limited addition would be less convenient for the applicant.

I respectfully ask the Board to apply the regulations as written and not grant special treatment while both permanent impacts and construction impacts on adjacent homeowners remain unresolved.

Thank you.