



BZA Application No. 21524, 1020 C Street NE (Square 963, Lot 29)

From Dominique Vincent Vobis <dominiquevobis@gmail.com>

Date Tue 9/15/2026 1:25 PM

To DCOZ - BZA Submissions (DCOZ) <DCOZ-BZASubmissions@dc.gov>; ATD DCOZ <dcoz@dc.gov>; Planning (OP) <Planning@dc.gov>

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the DC Government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know that the content is safe. If you believe that this email is suspicious, please forward to phishing@dc.gov for additional analysis by OCTO Security Operations Center (SOC).

Some people who received this message don't often get email from dominiquevobis@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Re: BZA Application No. 21524, 1020 C Street NE (Square 963, Lot 29)

To Whom It May Concern:

We are the owners and occupants of the property immediately adjacent to 1020 C Street NE and write to express our concerns regarding Application No. 21524 filed by Stephen Ander.

Mr. Ander shared architectural plans with us for the proposed rear addition and the associated special exception and variance requests. Based on our review of those plans, we understand that the proposal would enclose the existing second-floor rear porch to create additional interior living space. We reside in a home with an identical floor plan, and the existing second-floor rear room configuration already provides substantial usable living space by Capitol Hill standards. As a result, we are not persuaded that the requested relief is necessary.

We are also concerned that the proposed exterior design is incompatible with the character of the surrounding block. In our view, the size, materials, and overall appearance of the addition do not harmonize with the historic Victorian homes that define the streetscape. To our knowledge, there are no comparable rear additions visible on this block, and the proposed structure would represent a significant departure from the existing architectural character of the neighborhood.

When we raised concerns regarding the proposed bright white siding and suggested materials that would better complement the historic brick façades on the block, we were offered only alternative cold white siding options. We also sought clarification regarding the full scope of the planned work but have not received additional information. As neighboring property owners, we remain concerned about the overall impact of the project on the character of the block and on adjacent properties and believe this may only be the start of further additions and renovations. Approving this project will only open the door for further additions.

Board of Zoning Adjustment
Approving this
CASE NO. 21524
EXHIBIT NO. 20

Finally, many neighbors have expressed concerns regarding the practical impacts of construction. The rear alley is exceptionally narrow and is already heavily utilized for access to neighboring properties. Construction activities, deliveries, and staging could substantially interfere with alley access for nearby residents. We do not consent to the use of our property for construction access, staging, storage, or any other purpose associated with this project.

For these reasons, we oppose the application and respectfully request that the Board give careful consideration to the project's compatibility with the surrounding historic neighborhood, its impact on neighboring properties, and the practical construction burdens that it may impose on nearby residents.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Dominique Vobis