**ISSUE:** Alterations and Waiver of HVAC Screening Requirement

**APPLICANT:** John Savage for Bette Gorman Et Al

**LOCATION:** 400/402 Wolfe Street

**ZONE:** RM / Residential

---

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

---

**EXPIRATION OF APPROVALS NOTE:** In accordance with Sections 10-106(B) and 10-206(B) of the Zoning Ordinance, any official Board of Architectural Review approval will expire 12 months from the date of issuance if the work is not commenced and diligently and substantially pursued by the end of that 12-month period.

**BUILDING PERMIT NOTE:** Most projects approved by the Board of Architectural Review require the issuance of one or more construction permits by Building and Fire Code Administration (including signs). The applicant is responsible for obtaining all necessary construction permits after receiving Board of Architectural Review approval. Contact Code Administration, Room 4200, City Hall, 703-746-4200 for further information.
Note: The Permit to Demolish/Encapsulate (BAR Case #2009-0220) must be approved before this case can be approved.

I. ISSUE:
The applicant is requesting approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for a number of alterations at 400/402 Wolfe Street. The applicant is proposing the following changes:

- Installation of two new two-over-two, simulated divided light, double-glazed, double-hung wood windows in the proposed two new openings (requiring approximately 45 square feet of demolition) in new openings in the existing masonry wall on the east elevation;
- Replacement of five six-over-six, single-glazed, double-hung wood windows on the second story of the west elevation with two-over-two, simulated divided light, double-glazed, double-hung wood windows;
- Replacement of one two-over-two, true divided light, double-hung, wood window on the second story of the north elevation with a two-over-two, simulated divided light, double-glazed, double-hung wood window;
- Replacement of two, two-over-two, true divided light, single-glazed, double-hung wood windows on the second story of the south elevation with two-over-two, simulated divided light, double-glazed, double-hung wood windows; and
- Installation of A/C condenser unit on existing roof of enclosed porch as noted on west elevation.

The applicant has noted that the proposed two-over-two, simulated divided light, double-glazed, double-hung wood windows will match the existing two-over-two, simulated divided light, double-glazed, double-hung wood windows already installed in the house. The windows are manufactured by Weathershield. The proposed window will have a muntin width of 1 and 3/8” with an interior spacer bar and exterior applied wood muntins.

II. HISTORY:
400/402 Wolfe Street is a freestanding two-story brick and frame residential building dating from the second half of the nineteenth century and for many years was a corner grocery store and residence. Originally, there were large display windows on both the South Royal Street elevation and the Wolfe Street facade. A remodeling of the building was approved by the Board in 1973 which included the removal of these windows and the replacement with the current six-over-six window configuration (BAR Case 5/16/73). Today’s preservation philosophy would not recommend replacement of the display windows which were a character-defining feature of the use of the building.

In 2002, the Board approved a number of alterations and an addition to 400/402 Wolfe Street, including the installation of the existing replacement windows (BAR Case #’s 2002-0244/245).

III. ANALYSIS:
The proposed window replacement and rooftop A/C unit installation comply with zoning ordinance requirements.
The two proposed new windows openings on the existing masonry east elevation are appropriate and compatible changes. In fact, one of the proposed openings was recently a door opening that was filled around 2002. Regarding window type, the Design Guidelines clearly state that single-glazed, true divided light windows with interior storm sash are the preferred replacement window type. While interior storm windows are preferred, exterior storm windows are also generally appropriate. In addition, the Guidelines note that true divided light wood windows are preferred, but that “windows with fixed or applied muntins have been approved for the rear elevation of a structure which has minimal visibility from a public right of way.”

In reviewing the application materials and report from the previous window replacement case that was approved by the Board in 2002, it is unclear whether the approved windows were simulated divided light or true divided light. The applicant has noted that following the 2002 BAR approval, two-over-two, simulated divided light, double-glazed, double-hung wood windows were installed. While Staff would generally not support the use of simulated divided light windows on a historic building, particularly one dating from the late nineteenth-century, Staff recognizes that the applicant assumed that simulated divided light windows were approved by the Board in 2002.

While some of the windows proposed for replacement appear to be historic, if not original, Staff notes that they are not located on prominent or highly visible elevations. Further, because the two prominent elevations no longer have any historic windows, much of the integrity related to such a character-defining feature has already been lost. Staff cautions that a recommendation for approval of simulated divided light, double-glazed wood windows in this case in no way sets any precedence for approval of simulated divided light windows on historic buildings in future cases. As a result of the unique circumstances of this case, Staff reluctantly recommends approval of two-over-two, simulated divided light, double-glazed, double-hung wood windows.

Waiver of Rooftop HVAC Screening Requirement
Staff finds that the proposed placement of the HVAC equipment will be minimally, if at all, visible from Wolfe Street and recommends approval of the waiver.

**IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.
V. CITY DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

Legend:  C - code requirement  R - recommendation  S - suggestion  F- finding

Code Administration:
C-1 Alterations to the existing structure must comply with the 2006 edition of the Uniform Statewide Building Code (USBC).

C-2 Alterations to the existing structure and/or installation and/or altering of equipment therein requires a building permit. Five sets of plans, bearing the signature and seal of a design professional registered in the Commonwealth of Virginia, must accompany the written application. The plans must include all dimensions, construction alterations details, kitchen equipment, electrical, plumbing, and mechanical layouts and schematics.

C-3 Construction permits are required for this project. Plans shall accompany the permit application that fully details the construction as well as layouts and schematics of the mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems.

C-4 Permission from adjacent property owners is required if access to the adjacent properties is required to complete the proposed construction. Otherwise, a plan shall be submitted to demonstrate the construction techniques utilized to keep construction solely on the referenced property.

C-5 A wall location plat prepared by a land surveyor is required to be submitted to this office prior to requesting any framing inspection.

C-6 Prior to the issuance of a demolition permit or land disturbance permit, a rodent abatement plan shall be submitted to Code Enforcement that will outline the steps that will taken to prevent the spread of rodents from the construction site to the surrounding community and sewers.

Historic Alexandria:
No comments received.

Alexandria Archaeology:
F-1 There is low potential for significant archaeological resources to be disturbed by this project. No archaeological action is required.

Transportation & Environmental Services:
No comment.
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