Ms. Carol J. Mitten, Chair
The Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia, Room 210
441 Fourth Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001

Dear Madam Chair:

RE: Opposition to the change in the Watergate plan

I am a resident of Watergate South. I am strongly opposed to the proposed elimination of the Watergate Hotel.

The Hotel is an integral part of the Watergate community. It has contributed to making this one of the most attractive areas in the District. This major change from the proven plan is unnecessary, and will have a highly undesirable effect on the quality as well as the value of my residence. I urge that the present plan be preserved.

James J. Dalton
name

409
apartment

ZONING COMMISSION
District of Columbia
Case 03-16
Exhibit 68

ZONING COMMISSION
District of Columbia
CASE NO.03-16
EXHIBIT NO.68

Feb.12,2004
Washington, D.C. 2004

Neil C.Livingstone
President, Board of Directors
Watergate South Co-operative

Dear Neil,

Reluctantly, and for the first time ,after 31 years as a owner-resident in this Co-operative, I disapprove of a Board decision. It is carefully outlined in your Feb.3, 2004 memo to members of the Co-operative. Since I am leaving Washington on March 3 for five months of research in Asia it is essential that I put my disapproval on the record. My reasoning follows:

- The Watergate luxury residential-hotel complex is the only one of it's kind directly overlooking the Potomac within the District of Columbia. As a entity featuring location, ambience and convenience, Watergate is of great value to the City, the neighborhood and the owner-residents. The Board's decision, does not attach value to this unique situation. We are not just another real estate property!

- The current zoning status, permitting multiple hotel and residential apartment use, adds to the value of the entire complex. That status should not be abandoned by all three (South, East and West) of the co-operatives. Abandonment would have many economic, environmental and quality of life implications. Obviously, everything possible should be done to retain that status including vigorous exploration of hotel possibilities offering varying rate ranges. The Board's decision does not reveal whether that possibility has been thoroughly explored in a consensual mode with owners of all three co-operatives, the hotel industry and city officials responsible for promoting tourism here.

- For four decades, I have worked in Asia on matters concerning local government reforms including relationships with zoning boards, co-operatives and home owners associations. One key lesson learned is that home owners associations, co-operatives or communities of individuals who stand together usually win approval by Zoning Boards. Particularly, if they attain and maintain consensus upon resolving specific economic, environmental and quality of life issues created by proposed zoning changes. The Watergate South Board decision, does not touch upon building consensus either among the owners of Watergate South or with owners in the other two co-operatives. Instead, it outlines a unilateral deal thus weakening any possibility of identifying and creating a united stand by all three.

- Assuming the worst scenario: that of the impossibility of interesting a new hotel operator in the site, there remains the alternative of conversion to a residential co-operative as proposed by the Watergate South Board. In such case, the same issues on consensus, and the economic, environmental and quality of life factors emerge anew and apply to all three co-operatives. The Watergate South Board decision, does not touch these matters, except in technical details.

- Finally, the remarkable dedication and good work of the Watergate South President and Board is appreciated. But this is a most unusual situation. It demands help from all.

Sincerely

James J. Dalton

James J.Dalton, Apt.409
Watergate South

CC; Board Members; Ms.Grant, Mr. O'Connell, Ms.Bryan, Ms. Bailey,Ms.Holland, Mr.Krimm, Ms. Smith, Ms. Sara
D.C. Zoning Commission members: Ms, Mitten, Mr. Hood, Mr. May, Mr. Parsons