DENIS MICHAEL REIDY, PH.D

January 14, 2004

Mr. Geoffrey Griffis,
Chairman
Board of Zoning Adjustment
441 4th Street NW, Suite 210 South
Washington DC 20001

Dear Sir,

BZA No. 17092—Appeal of Zoning Administrator's Decision Allowing the Location of a 24-Hour Dog Boarding Kennel at premises 1412 Q Street, NW

I am a resident of 1408 Q Street NW in the District and I am writing to express my full support of the appellants in the Board of Zoning Adjustment's (BZA) case number 17092. I have not been actively involved with the discussions nor the appeal surrounding the relocation of the Wagtime Dog kennel from its former location to its present site on our block. And while that particular residence at 1412 Q Street had been a real estate office, it was so consonant with the tone of the rest of the block that it never struck me that it was a business, until the bright sky blue-and-orange façade of Wagtime went up in its place, an obvious change from its previous user. But the matter of such jarring colors on one of the prettiest streets in the District was minor to the other jarring facts that arose as the business settled in and commenced operations (all of this starting even before they were given their permit):

-that this was a business that planned on boarding up to 35 dogs over nights and weekends
-that dogs would be locked indoors or in a small cement-floored space behind the building
-that the same space would be hosed down periodically to wash dog feces into the alley.

The immediate issue that I saw, apart from how the neighborhood might feel about this, was that it was absurd to think that such a business would find adequate a building that would be small for a medium-sized family, and to be surrounded with no setback by other residences? How could anyone actually run a dog kennel out of a building or location little different than one's own home?

So, of course, naturally, I assumed that the permit would not be granted, not only for the sake of the local residents but also because of inappropriateness of the space for such a business and the obviously cruelty in confining dogs to such conditions. Therefore, I was completely taken by surprise, including; given the initial intransigence of the business to even wait for the permit to come, to find the permit granted as if this were a simple transition from a real estate office, and not into a pen for animals. It is not fair to the dogs, and it is not fair to the neighbors, neither of whom seem to have been given much choice in this affair.

I was asleep at the switch to think that this was a "no-brainer" and, obviously, someone was also asleep at the switch when they approved this request to allow multiple animals to be confined within a space smaller than some people's entire homes, and within feet of the homes of residents of the District. So, with this letter, I correct my previous oversight and state clearly my reason why this use of 1412 is inappropriate. And I am told that it's not too late for you to correct this oversight and help us preserve the peace of one of the best neighborhoods that we have.

Thank you for your consideration,

Denis Michael Reidy

Denis Michael Reidy, Ph.D.

1408 Q STREET NW, #11 • WASHINGTON, DC • 20009
PHONE: 202-667-3626 • DenisMichaelHugh@aol.com

BZA
Case No. 17092
Exhibit No. 60

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO. 17092
EXHIBIT NO. 60

01/19/04 10:00A P.001
1-202-3192808
Capital Policies Inc