Ruth Rappaport
117 Third St. N.E.
Washington D.C. 20002

January 29. 2001

RECEIVED
D.C. OFFICE OF ZONING
2001 JAN 31 PM 3:03

Govt. of the District of Columbia
Board of Zoning Adjustment
441 4th Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20001

Dear Ms. Jerrily R. Kress:

Subject: Application No. 16619

In response to your notice of 28 September, 2000 concerning the application of Romani & Thomas D. Parry for a variance of the use provisions of the premises of 233 Constitution Ave. N. E. I am submitting the following objections to grant this variance.

1. Residential properties used as office space are generally unoccupied at night, weekends and on holidays and are generally dark structures on the street. This decreases the neighborhood security that is afforded by occupancy, activity and lights in a residential block.

2. Occupant absent during non-business hours tend not to clear sidewalks of snow unless the snowfall occurs during office hours, thus sometimes endangering pedestrians who must navigate slippery ice spots.

3. On some of the properties in residential blocks that have been granted variances, pileups of newspapers over long weekends tends to become a problem because nobody takes care of the papers.

4. Business occupants of residential properties tend to weaken neighborhood or community cohesion and endeavors:

A) Since they frequently are not registered voters in the city they cannot participate in the political process; are indifferent to city problems; as non-voters they cannot sign petitions, etc.

B. They do not participate in neighborhood activities such as Orange Hat Patrols; community policing activities; they do not attend meetings of community groups where neighborhood problems are discussed, sometimes solved or else referred elsewhere for appropriate action.

C. By not joining community groups as members these groups (based as they are in the community) lose clout because they don't represent as many residents as they could (i.e. ANC's;

BZA
Case No. 16619
Exhibit No. 27

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO.16619
EXHIBIT NO.27

Stanton Park; CHRS; etc.) Neighborhood residents participate in many volunteer activities i.e. tree plantings, spring cleaning; food collections; book sales; block parties for social or other purposes. Commercial occupants never show any interest in local functions or causes.

In essence, residents and commercial occupants of residential properties have divergent interests, and by definition the residential concerns: safety, community activities, community improvements, community volunteering and community participation in a multitude of activities are not on the calendars of commercial occupants thus if not destroying then at least inhibiting community activities through non-participation.

I sincerely hope that this application will finally be denied so that this important block on Capital Hill can regain its residential character and activities.

Sincerely yours,

Ruth Rappaport

Ruth Rappaport

P.S. I have been a resident, homeowner and registered voter at my current address since 1973.