

June 20, 2016

VIA IZIZ AND EMAIL

Anthony Hood, Chairperson  
D.C. Zoning Commission  
Office of Zoning  
441 4<sup>th</sup> Street, NW, Suite 210  
Washington, DC 20001

Re: Zoning Commission Case No. 15-28, Party Status Request

Dear Chairman Hood and Members of the Commission:

On behalf of the Applicant in the above-captioned case, we respectfully oppose the granting of party status to the Union Market Neighbors (For Better Planning) (“Neighbors”).

As the Commission is well aware, a person requesting party status in a contested case has to clearly demonstrate that the person’s interests would likely be more significantly, distinctively or uniquely affected by the proposed zoning action and that those interests must be distinct from those of the general public.

Neighbors does not identify any specific property interest that may be affected; nor does it even identify a particular property that may be affected. It provides no information about its membership, the boundaries of its jurisdiction nor does it provide any meaningful rationale for admission to this case as a party. Neighbors does not, with any specificity, list any impact that the proposed zoning action might have on their respective property interests.

Consequently, the Applicant does not believe that Neighbors meets the party status test set out in the Zoning Regulations and, therefore, its request should be denied.

Very truly yours,



Phil Feola



Cary Kadlecik

cc: OP  
ANC 6C

8761860.1