

May 16, 2006

Carol J. Mitten  
Chairwoman, Zoning Commission  
Office of Zoning  
Government of District of Columbia  
One Judiciary Square  
441 4th Street, NW, Suite 210  
Washington, DC 20001

**ZONING COMMISSION**  
District of Columbia

Re: 2950 Tilden Street Development  
Case Number 05-26

CASE NO. 05-26

EXHIBIT NO. 54

Dear Ms. Mitten,

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed 2950 Tilden Street Development Case Number 05-26. The project has negative effects for both the owners of The Connecticut and for the entire Cleveland Park community. I urge you to visit The Connecticut and take a look at our property and the Subject Property with our opposition in mind. I assure you that you will understand our reasoning for not wanting the Tilden Street Development in it's entirety; or if it is created an altered version of Clark's present building intentions.

The zoning implications impact the community but more importantly the buildings directly surrounding the subject property. The land is currently an R-2 zone which allows for one-family semi-detached homes that can be up to three stories tall. When we purchased we were told that residential building of such stature could be built on the property. All unit owners approved this possibility and willingly purchased in The Connecticut. Now that the building is nearly 100% purchased Clark has decided to go against their disclosures and attempt to completely change the zoning of the subject property. Instead, Clark is proposing a six story, 49 unit condominium building. This type of residential building is completely different than what my entire building was initially told through a disclosure supposedly issued by Clark. Upon asking for the original disclosure documents at a recent meeting, Clark refused to distribute the documents to residents of The Connecticut. It is unfair to lead an entire building on by saying one type of structure can be built and then once the building is entirely sold try to change the zoning to implement a completely different type of structure. Also the new proposed structure type is completely different than the townhouses directly across from the Subject Property.

There is a reason why the land was originally zoned as it presently is. It should not be changed especially due to the fact that it will drastically change numerous people's lives in both The Connecticut and surrounding buildings. We will be denied our right to air and light which the District of Columbia is responsible for enforcing no matter what type of building is erected. With an estimated 20-25 feet between our property and Clark's project The Connecticut will literally be blocked by buildings in every direction

ZONING COMMISSION  
District of Columbia  
CASE NO. 05-26  
EXHIBIT NO. 54

RECEIVED

D.C. OFFICE OF ZONING

2006 MAY 22 PM 3:44

other than those facing Rock Creek Park. The 36 units facing the Subject Property will be especially impacted. We were originally told that if a building was erected it would only be three stories tall. If Clark's project is in fact three stories tall there will at least be more air and light so The Connecticut will not feel so restricted. The zoning must not change. We hope that the Zoning Commission addresses how the Developer intends to provide our building with our guaranteed right to air and light.

The Subject Property has not indicated to what extent they plan to use our private driveway. Any usage will have a negative effect on the surrounding area as well as unit owners in The Connecticut. Those of us who live in the front of the building will have to live with an excessive amount of noise that we currently do not encounter since most traffic goes straight into our underground parking garage from the driveway. The easement also states that our Association must pay all maintenance fees for the driveway. The Association has already paid for the maintenance of this driveway. Increased traffic will most definitely have a significant financial impact on our Association if the easement rights are not modified. We will be paying maintenance for not only our building but for the subject property.

If our driveway is used by the residents of the Subject Property traffic will be greatly impacted. Since the exit of our driveway does not have a stoplight (we have to turn into the flow of Connecticut Avenue) traffic on our driveway will be backed up. This will create gridlock not only on our property but add to the existing gridlock in the Cleveland Park community. As you can imagine this may have a disastrous effect on rush hour traffic and may actually bring rush hour onto our property. Making a left onto Connecticut Avenue at all times (and especially during rush hour) from our property is particularly dangerous especially since parked cars often block our view of traffic from the right direction. Having more people making this turn will only make the intersection more dangerous and overcrowded.

The driveway and parking area directly in front of The Connecticut is also frequently congested. Since there are roughly five actual guest parking spaces many cars and trucks park themselves in our loading dock area and in the non-parking space area. Although this is not allowed the rules are rarely enforced. If the new building were to use this access area our overflow of traffic would either block commuters to the new building or literally have nowhere to go. Similarly if Clark's building uses our driveway we will have limited use of our loading dock area which is regularly utilized. If trucks wanted to use our loading dock they would be blocking the driveway leading to the Clark building. It is unreasonable to create a driveway and loading dock for one building while dissolving the same for our building. If the subject property had their own driveway there wouldn't be such a negative impact on local traffic and on our building if the project is completed.

We enjoy where we live because it is peacefully set back from the congestion of Connecticut Avenue. If the Subject Property is built, whether it be with the new six story plan or the old three story plan, congestion will be relocated to the front of our building, as well as the side, and we will no longer enjoy what we were guaranteed when we

purchased our homes. We will be denied our right to light and air which already has a significant impact to those of us who live in the front of the building.

I thank you for your considering our building's opposition to the Tilden Street Development.

Sincerely,

Gregory Alexander, M.D.  
Unit 319