

DINA PASSMAN

1866 Monroe Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20010
dpassman@gmail.com
(202) 841-7288

Government of the District of Columbia
Board of Zoning Adjustment

October 26, 2017

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am a 21 year resident of 1866 Monroe Street, NW and 23 year resident of Mt. Pleasant. During the time that I have lived in the neighborhood, I have seen it change and grow, to include the development and redevelopment of lots adjacent to my property (e.g. 1865/67 Park Road, NW). I oppose granting variance relief for 1844 Monroe Street, NW, for the reason set forth below.

In their Applicant's Statement in Support of Variance Relief (Exhibit 5), B Monroe Ventures, LLC ("Applicant") requested a variance for the side yard at 1844 Monroe Street, NW, where they intend to construct a 25 foot flat sharing a common division wall with another 25 foot flat proposed for 1842 Monroe Street, NW. Zoning requires they have a side yard that's at least 5 feet wide, making this plan untenable. Hence, the Applicant has requested zoning relief.

The Applicant argues relief partially on the basis that developing two twenty-foot wide semi-detached dwellings or one twenty-five foot flat next to a twenty-foot wide semi-detached dwelling would be a completely unique design. These are just 2 options for being able to incorporate the side yard, which would allow for end unit windows (for example) at 1844 Monroe Street, NW, and nicely complement the property at 1850 Monroe Street, NW, that also has an existing side yard.

More importantly, though, the Applicant failed to explain why it did not propose reconstructing the former double house that appears to have once stood on the lots. This is what was done at 1865 Park Road, NW, a building that appears to fit in nicely with the other historic properties along the north side of Park Road, NW.

Additionally, the Applicant argues that several factors would have led the zoning administrator to interpret the side yard requirement differently. Regulations are always subject to interpretation. I agree with the zoning administrator in this case and believe they have the interests of our historic neighborhood in mind. While the improvement of the property at 1844 Monroe Street, NW is certainly in the public good. However, that does not also mean that *any* improvement is a public good. It must also meet the regulatory requirements and be acceptable to the residents of this historic district. As proposed, I oppose granting variance relief for 1844 Monroe Street, NW.

Very respectfully,



Dina Passman

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO.19614
EXHIBIT NO.34