February 9, 2000

Office of Zoning
Board of Zoning Adjustment
441 4th St. NW Suite 210
Washington, DC 20001

'00 FEB 14 A11 :13

OFFICE OF ZONING
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Dear Sirs,

I am writing in response to a letter I received regarding Application # 16550, submitted by Stacy Humblin. Application is for granting a variance so ten single-family homes can be built on an alley lot. (Square 2699, Lot 64) The lot is currently in an R-4 District and does not abut an alley 30-feet or more in width and does not have access to a street through an alley or alleys at least 30-feet in width as put forth in 11 DCMR 3103.2, Subsection 2507.2.

My family has owned and resided at 1421 Varnum St. NW since 1963. Though families have come and gone the neighborhood has remained a good and decent place to raise a family and has not been affected by the ills of today's society. There remains a core of hardworking, honest citizens that have lived on this block for years before, and after we became a part of the neighborhood. The most noticeable changes have occurred with our parking situation. Affluence has resulted in many more multi-car families.

As for the variance request of Stacy Humblin, I am against any changes in zoning that would permit the construction of the housing. My opposition is based on the following:

1. Currently parking is at a premium and the addition of more cars would have an adverse impact.
2. Trash trucks have a hard time maneuvering for pickups from existing sites.
3. Emergency vehicles would have difficulty getting access to properties.
4. Current owners would experience difficulty parking in existing garages.
5. Character of neighborhood would change.
6. Quality of construction not compatible with existing housing.
7. Property setbacks inadequate.

After meeting with the owner and his architect, trust and confidence was not established as is needed for a project such as this. In the first meeting the plans that were presented appeared to be for low-income housing.The owner said this was just a presentation to meet the minimum requirements of the District of Columbia so zoning could be changed. At the second meeting, though the plans had changed, the property owner conveniently failed to attend leaving the unprepared, reluctant architect to leave the more important citizens' questions unanswered. This made me feel as if the owner had no regard for the property owners surrounding the lot and how they would be affected.

BZA
Case No.
Exhibit No. 37

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO.16550
EXHIBIT NO.37

Also, at the first meeting the owner said he had purchased the property to provide parking for his condominium located on Arkansas Ave., which abuts the alley, but he could not get approval for parking. If this is the case then he made a bad business decision by not researching approval for parking before obtaining property at tax sale. Perhaps a bad business decision on his part? If so, why should we pay or suffer the consequences.

Yours truly,

Delaine J. Duke
1421 Varnum St. N.W.
Washington, DC 20011