305 Constitution Ave NE
Washington DC 20002

December 4, 2001

DC Board of Zoning Adjustment
441 4th St NW (#210-S)
Washington DC 20001

Re: 233 Constitution Ave NE **Case 16619**
Hearing December 11, 2001

Dear Board Members:

We are writing in regard to the application of **Romano Romani and Thomas D Parry**, pursuant to 11DCMR3103.2 and Section 330.5 for a variance from the use provisions to allow the premises to be used as general office space (a lobbyist group) in an R-4 District at premises 233 Constitution Ave NE (Square 758, Lot 39). **Case 16619**

We are owners and occupants of 305 Constitution Ave NE, two doors away from the subject property, and have resided there for 31 years. We are **opposed** to the application, for the following reasons:

First, and most important, is the adverse effect the granting of this appeal for variance would have on the quality of life in the neighborhood, for us in particular, and for our neighbors as well. Just to remind you, zoning regulations are designed to regulate the character of streets and neighborhoods, and residential **means residential.**

Among the benefits of a homogenous residential area:

- getting to know your neighbors
- neighbors helping each other when needed
- having people you know nearby, day and night, if an emergency occurs

On the other hand, a lobbying group generally means, during the day, more unknown people, essentially visitors in the neighborhood, and oriented toward business rather than toward dwelling/neighborly affairs; and at night, a dark house, essentially abandoned and

BZA Case No. 16619 Exhibit No. 56

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO.16619
EXHIBIT NO.56

detracting from the residential vigor of the neighborhood.

The applicants' premises are just the second house away from ours on Constitution Ave. Another location, just next door to us, is also (although unzoned and unlicensed) a commercial venture which is dark and unoccupied at night. This is 301 Constitution Ave NE. You may want to look into this as a separate matter.

Second, granting this variance would have an adverse economic effect on us, since a residential area next to commercial activities is less desirable for potential homebuyers or renters, and thus would lessen the value of our property.

Third, we think it's relevant to note that the subject property is for sale, and has been for sale for months. Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that the applicants do not intend to use the applied-for variance themselves, but only for their own potential economic gain. However, as noted in our second point above, their economic gain would be our economic loss.

In conclusion, we **strongly oppose** this application for variance, and urge you to uphold the zoning regulations which were intended to prevent what this application asks for.

Sincerely,

Sally Tassler

Alan Tassler