

1351 LLC
3218 O Street, N W
Washington, DC 20007
robert@robertbellarchitects.com
t. 202.333.8451

March 31, 2015

Re: BZA application 18884, obstructionism with the intent to purchase for parking.

Dear Mr. Jordon, Chairman of BZA

The obstructionist tactics of neighbors are an attempt to keep the present R3 portion of this lot as potential parking for themselves and to prevent the proper R3 use of this area as residential. The four neighbors in opposition have tried to purchase the R3 portion for their personal use as parking and rear access to their properties – they have met me in my office on many occasions asking to purchase the R2 portion of lot 811 for parking. I noted in my original brief that they *“have opposed the design and have requested the owner sell them the R3 portion of the lot for parking and access to their properties.”*

The OGB limited the construction on the R3 portion of the lot to the carriage house and the exact addition put forth in this application. The BZA approval will confirm and conform with the approved OGB design and allow the proper use this R3 districts-residential. Approval will end any hopes the neighbors may still harbor to purchase the property through obstructionism for their own parking and rear access.

A brief list of the obstructionist tactics the opposition neighbors have used are as follows:

1. Claiming ownership- the opposition had themselves provided my title company proof one year earlier that this was not true and they also had surveys by two different surveyors showing their claim to be false- yet their claims under oath caused a two month delay.
2. The opposition ignoring the 14 day cutoff date and waited to meet with the planning staff until three days before the March 3rd hearing. The opposition had four months to meet with staff and submit objections, yet they waited to meet with the staff and raise unfounded objections on the eleventh hour- leaving applicant only one day to respond before the hearing. This tactic created a distinct time disadvantage to show their claims as false.
3. The four persons in opposition have threatened to have the planning staff fired for writing a report that supported the application.
4. They have parked their cars to block access to the property causing work on the permitted building to be halted.

Since the BZA hearing, I have made addition accommodations to these four neighbors by eliminating windows and agreeing to additional screening with evergreens. The appicate wants to accommodate the neighbors to make an exceptional residence in the R3 portion of his property, but not to have a parking lot.

Ultimately the necessary criterion for approval are outlined in the applicants’ original request brief. Exhibit 10 and the support of the planning staff. This application meets the BZA standards for granting the rear yard Variance and Special Exception under § 2514 based on the merits of the case.

Sincerely yours,

Robert Bell