

Frederick L. Hill, Chairman
Board of Zoning Adjustment
441 4th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20002

March 20, 2018

Re: BZA Case 19629/Request for Zoning Relief for Parking Garage at 1665 Harvard Street, NW

Letter in opposition to proposal in Exhibit 77 (dated 3/14/2018)

Dear Sir

I am the owner of and resident at 1722 Hobart Street, NW in Washington, DC. I have lived in this home for over 40 years and am now retired here. I am opposed to the applicant's plans (those outlined in Exhibit 77) in Case 19629, for the same reasons stated by Jessie Brown and Christopher Faneli of 1715 Harvard Street, NW in their letter to you dated March 16, 2018. Their ability to express the points of opposition exceed my own—and I ask that you consider their statement as mine as well—in particular:

1. The applicant has submitted 3 different plans, including one for a 2-story dwelling, which appears to be the ultimate goal. Lowering the height of the building does not address neighbors' concerns. Once a structure is built, no variance would be needed to build a higher structure on the lot. The applicant attempted to build a similar structure in the same plot 10 years ago (which reinforces my view that the ultimate goal is building a higher structure), and the neighbors had the same concerns.
2. The proposed garage will reduce safety (by restricting the sightlines) along the public pass through to Harvard Street. It will adversely impact those without cars and the elderly (I fit both categories) who would otherwise need to walk a long way to get to the grocery, bank, post office, and public transportation. There is no compelling reason to build a garage that has these negative impacts, since the space is already used as a parking pad.
3. This particular area sits along a row of parking pads (behind 1701 Harvard and west)—where none have structures on them, making the structure inconsistent with the other homes. It would also create difficulty for people trying to park in their spaces as the alley is narrow and can't handle that sort of movement.
4. The applicant presents a picture of neighborly concern. For example, exhibit B makes it seem as if the applicant had responsively cleaned up the trash covering the lot. But the trash was heaped all over the lot for months and caused a serious rat problem all along the alley on the Harvard and Hobart sides. This situation shows bad faith on the part of the applicant.
5. The letter in support from the Coalition for Smarter Growth (exhibit 76) doesn't seem to address the issue here. The letter urges the Board to ease restrictions in the alley to permit "infill housing" and "less expensive housing"—neither of which are the stated goal of the proposal.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Garlick (kayjine@aol.com)

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO. 19629
EXHIBIT NO. 91