

Docket Item # 7  
BAR CASE # 2008-0001

BAR Meeting  
February 27, 2008

**ISSUE:** After-the-fact Permit to Demolish/Encapsulate

**APPLICANT:** Scott Mitchell for Little Street, LLC

**LOCATION:** 419 North Alfred Street

**ZONE:** CL/Commercial

---

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends approval of the after-the-fact Permit to Demolish/Encapsulate as submitted.

(Insert sketch here)

**I. ISSUE:**

The applicant is requesting after-the-fact approval of a Permit to Demolish/Encapsulate in order to make alterations to the building at 419 North Alfred Street as part of a larger renovation project. The applicant demolished portions of the side and rear façade of the building's first floor without first obtaining BAR approval. The applicant intends to install new windows throughout the house and French doors on the side and rear of the house. The total area affected by the demolition is approximately 8' by 8' on both the rear and side elevations.

The area of demolition is visible from the rear alley behind 419 North Alfred Street.

**II. HISTORY:**

The two story frame duplex at 419 North Alfred Street was constructed prior to 1896, when it appears along with its twin (417 North Alfred Street) in the Sanborn map. This Italianate house has had a number of inappropriate modifications over the years, including: the addition of nine-over-nine windows on the front façade (the original two-over-two windows were there as late as 1988 when the house was surveyed for the designation of the Parker-Gray historic district); horizontal two-over-two windows on the remainder of the house; shutters; and both aluminum and particle board siding.

Staff could find only one prior Board approval for a fence at 419 North Alfred Street (BAR Case #89-0015, June 14, 1989).

Scott Mitchell of Little Street LLC purchased the subject property in July 2007 and was issued a building permit (BLD 2007-02112) on October 23, 2007 for interior work. BAR staff approved the building permit on October 5<sup>th</sup> and specifically noted that the approval was for interior work only. A subsequent revision to the building permit set showed exterior demolition and alterations; this was denied by BAR staff on October 23, 2007, because the alterations required BAR review and approval. Subsequently, on November 8, 2007, staff received a complaint that a portion of the exterior of the house had been demolished. A Stop Work Order was issued and a notice of violation was sent to the applicant. The applicant was fined \$2,000 for violating Section 10-103A and 10-103B of the Zoning Ordinance (demolition without a Permit to Demolish and altering a structure without a Certificate of Appropriateness).

To date, the applicant has not paid the fine associated with the violation which the City Attorney's office is pursuing.

**III. ANALYSIS:**

In considering a Permit to Demolish or Capsulate, the Board must consider the following criteria set forth in the Zoning Ordinance, Sec 10-205(B):

1. Is the building or structure of such architectural or historical interest that its removal would be to the detriment of the public interest?
2. Is the building or structure of such interest that it could be made into an historic shrine?
3. Is the building or structure of such old and unusual or uncommon design, texture, and material that it could not be reproduced or be reproduced only with great difficulty?

4. Would retention of the building or structure help preserve and protect an historic place or area of historic interest in the city?
5. Would retention of the building or structure promote the general welfare by maintaining and increasing real estate values, generating business, creating new positions, attracting tourists, students, writers, historians, artists, and artisans, attracting new residents, encouraging study and interest in American history, stimulating interest and study in architecture and design, educating citizens in American culture and heritage and making the city a more attractive and desirable place to live?
6. Would retention of the building or structure help maintain the scale and character of the neighborhood?

In the opinion of Staff, none of the above criteria are met. The demolition/encapsulation is located in a minimally visible area on the rear of the building where the original windows and siding have been replaced with historically inappropriate materials. Therefore staff recommends approval of the application.

**IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of the after-the-fact Permit to Demolish/Encapsulate as submitted.

CITY DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

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

Code Enforcement:

- C-1 Alterations to the existing structure must comply with the current edition of the Uniform Statewide Building Code (USBC).
- C-2 Additions and alterations to the existing structure and/or installation and/or altering of equipment therein requires a building permit (USBC 108.1). Five sets of plans, bearing the signature and seal of a design professional registered in the Commonwealth of Virginia, must accompany the written application (USBC 109.1).
- C-3 A Building permit will be required for the proposed project.
- C-4 All windows must comply with IRC section R613 (residential) or IBC section 1714.5 (commercial). Specifically they must be listed as per the requirements of AAMA/NWWDA 101/ I.S.2 and/ or AAMA/NWWDA 101/ I.S.2/ NAFS, respectively.
- C-5 Structures requiring restoration of an existing window in which the structure is deemed Historic by the BAR staff will be reviewed for compliance with the building code on an individual basis.

Historic Alexandria:

No comments received.

Alexandria Archaeology:

No comments received.