

**COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
STAFF REPORT
June 26, 2018, Meeting**

5. **COA-034571-2018** (A. Smith & S. Mullen-Smith) **3422 East Broad Street
Chimborazo Park Old and Historic District**

Project Description: **Alter two window openings
and add an opening in the rear.**

Staff Contact: **C. Jeffries**

The applicant requests approval to alter the fenestration on the rear elevation of a two story frame Queen Anne dwelling constructed ca. 1900. The applicant proposes to enlarge two existing window openings by replacing 33"x79" wood windows with 48" x 71" double casement vinyl windows and add a window opening on the first floor.

This application is the result of enforcement activity as the work was completed without approval. The work was performed within the following timeline:

- The contractor applied for a building permit December 14, 2017 for renovation including window replacement. Staff contacted the contractor January 3, 2018 advising him that the work would require CAR approval as changes to the exterior were proposed.
- On January 17, 2018 revised permit plans were submitted which removed references to the proposed exterior changes. CAR staff approved the plans for interior work only with the following condition: No changes to windows, exterior doors, or exterior walls authorized by this permit. Any exterior changes require an approved Certificate of Appropriateness from the Commission of Architectural Review.
- CAR staff met with the owners and contractor January 18th, 2018 to discuss their proposal. At this time staff informed the owners that their proposal did not meet the Commission's Guidelines.
- On March 16, 2018 staff observed exterior work being performed at the property while conducting site visits.
- A Notice of Violation was issued March 19, 2018. The window installation was completed on March 19th.

Staff recommends denial of the project.

The *Richmond Old and Historic Districts Handbook and Design Review Guidelines* state that all original windows should be retained (pg.69, #1), further noting that they should be repaired (pg. 69, #6) and only replaced when they are missing or beyond repair (pg. 69, #7). The application states that the historic wood windows were in disrepair. As the windows have already been disposed of, staff cannot determine if they were beyond repair.



February, 2018



June, 2018

The *Guidelines* also provide guidance for window replacement. They state that the number, location, size, or glazing pattern of windows should not be changed by installing replacement sash that do not fit the original window (pg. 69, #8) and changes in the sash, depth of reveal, muntin configuration, frame or glazing is strongly discouraged (pg. 69, #10). The proposed replacement windows do not match the original in size, glazing pattern, muntin configuration, sash, frame, material, or design as they are double vinyl double casement windows replacing 2/2 wood double hung windows. Staff recommends denial of the proposed window replacement.

The *Guidelines* state that replacement materials should convey the same appearance as surviving elements (pg. 59, #7), further asserting that that vinyl windows are not appropriate for historic buildings in historic districts because the material cannot be manufactured to model effectively the appearance of historic windows (pg. 69, #11). Staff recommends denial of the proposed vinyl replacement windows.

The *Guidelines* state the number of windows should not be changed by cutting new openings, however the addition of new windows along a secondary elevation will be considered by the Commission on a case-by-case basis (pg. 69, #8). Staff finds that the proposed new window opening, as well as the replacement windows, are highly visible. Due to the change of elevation along this block, the windows are visible above the rear privacy fence. The rear wall is also visible from the alley as well as 35th Street, which dead ends at the rear of the property. When new windows are approved, the *Guidelines* recommend that the architectural appearance of original windows should be used as a model for new windows (pg. 69, #10).

The proposed new window opening does not match the original windows in size, design, material, or glazing pattern. Staff recommends denial of the proposed new window opening.

In addition to the modifications listed in the application, staff has observed that openings in the first bay on the east elevation of the dwelling have also been modified. A historic 2/2 wood double hung window was replaced with the same vinyl replacement window on the second floor. In addition, a door on the first floor was converted to a window and the same vinyl replacement product was installed in this opening. Staff recommends denial of the changes to the openings on the east elevation and recommends the applicant return to the Commission with a complete application that meets the *Richmond Old and Historic Districts Handbook and Design Review Guidelines*.

It is the assessment of staff that the application is not consistent with the Standards for Rehabilitation outlined in Section 30-930.7(b) and (c) of the City Code, as well as with the *Richmond Old and Historic Districts Handbook and Design Review Guidelines*, specifically the pages cited above, adopted by the Commission for review of Certificates of Appropriateness under the same section of the code.