
Revised statement, to include events that happened after Dec 10th meeting

From Roblin, Anna (SMD 5D03) <5D03@anc.dc.gov>

Date Sun 2/1/2026 11:36 AM

To DCOZ - BZA Submissions (DCOZ) <DCOZ-BZASubmissions@dc.gov>

Anna Roblin
1101 West Virginia Ave NE #104
Wash DC 20002
2026510581
5D03@anc.dc.gov
Comments in Opposition

Thankyou for your time. My name is Anna Roblin, I'm the single member district ANC for this Case. I'll address a few issues here, 1) Why we opposed, 2) Ms Offreda's lack of response from Carballo, 3) Issues regarding the sun study, 4) What happened with the revised burden of proof, plans and sun study not getting into the Case file in a timely manner, causing our Commission to not have updated information at the time we voted. (No 4 is a rebuttal to Carballo's first point in response to our Commission report.) And 5) What happened in a meeting we had with Carballo, the Olayinka's, and community members.

First, I owe everyone a apology, it was my fault that we didn't get our Commission's report in until the 4th rather than the 28th. For some reason I was sure it was due on the 5th with the other items and I completely didn't remember you said the 28th for it and I told everyone it was the 5th. Im sorry for the difficulties that caused.

1) WHY WE OPPOSED

Our ANC voted to oppose, for the following reasons:

The community is unhappy with this project, neighbors are very opposed.

The 1100 and 1200 blocks of Morse St NE are in a family-oriented neighborhood. The character of the block is historically composed of small family-scale rowhomes and semi-detached homes and many people have been living in their home for 10-30 years, as has Mr. Olayinka.

As we said in our report, transforming these homes to multi-family units threatens the integrity of remaining family-sized homes, accelerates displacement pressure, and erodes architectural cohesion. The Morse St community has clearly stated their desire to maintain housing appropriate for families and long-term residents, and this development is creating more precedent in the neighborhood for high density conversions.

1253 is set to host multi-family rental units, bringing a more transient nature building to a block where a lot of neighbors have lived for many years and where new arrivals likely move in in large part because of the non-transient nature of the neighborhood. I believe long-term single family homes are a feature of the RF-1 zone that neighbors strongly want to keep on their street.

Yes there are a few other multi-family units on this street as Carballo has said but I believe many of those have been recently developed and are not longstanding. 3 Morse BZA's have been heard by our Commission, 1251, 1154 and this Case and we have opposed all of them. They are all being developed within the last 2 years. We have been trying hard to preserve the family orientation of the 11 and 1200 blocks of Morse St.

I personally feel that the BZA does not really consider this type of neighborhood transformation to be a serious problem, and yet it's a devastating process to so many neighbors who see their single family neighborhood with all the same neighbors they've known and lived next to for so many years wracked by incoming transient buildings, and more and more of them, until the nature and ambiance of their neighborhood is greatly changed. They are fighting it tooth and nail.

I believe this Board choosing not to oppose based on this kind of damage to neighborhood character is one of the biggest factors in the destruction of family-oriented neighborhoods in the District and across the country. As an ANC it's clear to me that this is what neighbors believe and want this Board to do. This has been said to me many times in many different ways, over and over.

With all due respect I don't believe that this Board is sufficiently protecting neighborhoods from this type of loss of family-orientation and character. It seems as though you support developments without regard for what this type of erosion of family orientation is doing to them, whereas, I believe that as probably the most important feature of the RF-1 Zone, it deserves full protection, and exceptions should probably only be made for a 3rd unit and not more.

Here is a AI overview of the RF-1 Zone that I googled. I know you all don't need to hear this but my point is that it seems as though the Board routinely minimizes this issue while to many residents the issue is everything to them. I apologize but I feel compelled to speak to the elephant in the room here.

"The RF-1 Zone in DC (Residential Flat-1) is for low-density, rowhouse neighborhoods, aiming to preserve historic character, promote walkability, and allow up to two dwelling units (often a main house and a cellar/accessory unit) on small lots, supporting housing affordability and aging in place. The first key purpose of RF-1 they list is to preserve character: maintain the low-scale, rowhouse aesthetic and neighborhood feel.

I hope this Board will consider shifting your orientation to being much more protective of RF-1 and similar Zones' character. Because losing the character of a neighborhood that is basically single family residences really devastates residents. This aspect of their neighborhood's character means everything to them.

I believe this is the main reason neighbors and ANCs oppose exceptions in gentrifying neighborhoods. The precedent of the 10 foot rule is an absolute nightmare for residents. The affordability of their neighborhood suffers while units are very often meager as well as unaffordable and poorly constructed, and many of these buildings go for many years without

anyone or hardly anyone buying or renting bc of the price. I think we need greater protection from these issues and this Board could help.

2)MS OFFREDA'S LACK OF RESPONSE FROM CARBALLO

Ms Offreda, who lives in 1251, noticed that after she had asked Carballo to remove the bumpout and she believed they had agreed to do that, they did not remove it. She had felt it would interfere with her light. She saw that they didn't remove it in the plans, they did not inform her of this. She also believed the shadow study did not show any details regarding the impact of the light that comes into her unit from the light well. She was unable to get an accurate picture of how much light 1251 would lose. She asked Carballo for feedback on these items and they never replied to her after both her and I had sent emails requesting they respond before we voted. This was a factor in why I recommended we oppose the project as well. Those situations may not have been the situations she thought they were but we didn't know.

3) ISSUES REGARDING THE SUN STUDY

It was very disappointing that I had to strongly ask for more thorough sun study 2 or 3 times before Carballo said they would do one. They told us they would do it while meeting to discuss issues on Nov 11th. I then asked Mr Carballo who would do the shadow study and he said he would do it.

I'm not trying to cast aspersions at all, I'm sure, as Mr Carballo said, that he would not do anything that would affect his reputation. However, a former Zoning Committee Co-Chair of ours told me that it's not best that a developer do their own shadow study, it's always best that they take it to a 3rd party professional.

Ms Martinez and Mr Karay believe that the sun study has several inaccuracies—incorrect dimensions, inconsistent modeling of adjacent buildings, and flawed shading assumptions—that render the results inconclusive. So I ask that, if possible, the Board analyze the study for whether there is reason to believe the study should not be taken at face value.

4)WHAT HAPPENED WITH ENTERING THE DOCS INTO THE CASE FILE IN A TIMELY MANNER

We had originally asked Carballo to send us their revised burden of proof, plans and sun study by Nov 12th.

They asked for a few extra days and sent them to us on the 14th. However, I didn't notice that they hadn't put them in the Case file until when, late on the evening of the 17th, the day before our vote on the 18th, Mr Keats, our Zoning Committee Co-Chair, who was going to send them to our Commissioners, said they hadn't put them in the Case file yet. So, although they did send

them to us on the 14th we could not send them to Commissioners until they were in the Case file. So Carballo's claim that we had them on the 14th was basically meaningless.

So immediately, around midnight, I sent a email to Shima asking her to put them in the Case file ASAP. She replied in the morning at 1130 am on the 17th that she would do that before the meeting. So I assumed she had put them in the file that day, but it turned out that she had not.

They did not put them in the file until sometime on the afternoon of the day of our meeting. I believe they literally uploaded their revised burden of proof at 6:30, a half hour before our meeting. You can see the emails on this in the attachments. Our meeting started at 7. I believe they must've put their other updates, the sun study and plans into the BZA case file as near as we can figure, in the late afternoon of our voting meeting on Nov 18th, possibly at about 430 or 5 pm, and the meeting was at 7. This absolutely did not allow for enough time for our Commissioners to read the material and they ended up reading the old versions before they were revised, which was I believe, basic negligence on the part of Carballo.

5) OUR JAN 9TH MEETING

On January 9th we had a meeting to see if we could come to a compromise that the ANC would support so that the neighbors would be fully supported and the Olayinka's would be able to begin construction alot earlier. I've forwarded our email chain concerning the meeting to the case file on the 31st.

Unfortunately neighbors did not feel ok about anything more than 17 ft in the back, which the Olayinka's rejected and chose to stick with 20ft, so we did not come to a agreement and I could not bring it back to the ANC for a re-vote. However, Mr Carballo did agree to support Ms Offredo And Di Pietro's request to move a window so that they would have greater privacy and I am very grateful for that.

Thankyou very much for your time and attention.