

14
12-14-24

Appeal to City Council

Request for Window Replacement at 201 Gibbon St.



(Two second floor windows on south elevation, set 12' back from the sidewalk, obscured by trees.)

December 2024

Dear Members of the City Council,

First, let us be clear that we are in no way against the principles of preservation. On the contrary, we have been making a conscientious effort to restore the beautiful old home we bought in 2021 to bring it back from a state of significant disrepair. In the process of making restorations, we have relied heavily on the expert guidance of the BAR Staff on many occasions. Unfortunately, in this instance, they have led us wildly astray.

We are appealing this BAR decision to the City Council because we do not believe it is appropriate or reasonable given the facts of this case.

1. We sought out BAR Staff guidance well before we purchased replacement windows. We were informed in writing by Staff after an in-person visit to our house that the windows were not original and could be administratively approved for replacement with a specific type of window. The replacements we purchased meet the exact specifications given by Staff and all BAR standards.
2. The reason Staff cited when they subsequently rejected our application for administrative approval – that the windows were now believed to be original - has been proven false. The existing windows ARE NOT ORIGINAL to the house nor to the part of the house where they now sit. The existing windows were only moved to their current location in 1952.
3. The BAR failed to apply the criteria set forth in the BAR Policies for Administrative Approval when making its decision. The BAR continued to treat the windows as if they are original and on a portion of an Early Building, even after Staff acknowledged that this is not the case.
4. Given the level of damage, “repairing” the windows is not a reasonable option in any case. According to multiple experts, so little of the existing wood can be salvaged that they would need to create replica windows. Not only would this be enormously expensive, it would not achieve the BAR’s stated purpose of “preserving historic material.” A replica window is still a new window.

1. We sought out BAR Staff guidance early in the planning process and acted in good faith on the advice they gave us.

As recommended in the Design Guidelines, we sought out the advice of BAR Staff early in our renovation planning process. Recognizing that windows are of particular interest to the BAR, we specifically asked the Staff to make a site visit in July 2022 to ensure we knew exactly what our options were.

- Staff conducted a site visit and sent a follow-up email (below) with clear, specific instructions. We followed the instructions, ordering exactly what Staff told us could be administratively approved.
- The extremely long lead time for ordering this type of custom wood window and uncertain start date for the renovation meant we had to order the replacements far in advance to ensure availability as construction began.
- Having already had a Staff visit and feedback, we were dumbfounded in January 2024 – just as construction was about to start - when the same Staff member rejected our application on the grounds that the windows, which she previously told us were not original, were now believed to be original.

From: Marina Novaes <Marina.Novaes@alexandriava.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 6, 2022 at 2:49 PM
Subject: RE: 201 Gibbon St
To: Nick Kalivretenos <nick.k@thewindowman.com>
Cc: Preservation <Preservation@alexandriava.gov>

Hi Nick,

As promised, I went by the property today to check the windows.

The windows on the elevations facing the street are not original and can be replaced with all wood, full frame, single pane replacements. The main building ell (portion set back from the street but part of the main building can be wood, double glazed SGL, and the last portion of the building (brick) which is a newer addition, can be SGL, double glazed, Fiberglass, or aluminum clad, not vinyl replacements.

Marina

This email was sent by BAR Staff to Nick Kalivretenos of The WindowMan, who was acting on behalf of the homeowners. It was sent from an official BAR Staff account and cc'd the official BAR Staff email address.

While the email is short, it is unequivocal. It clearly states the windows are not original, can be replaced, and what they can be replaced with. It does not say it is an informal opinion, initial impression, or preliminary finding where additional investigation would be needed. It states a finding of fact by a Staff expert, sent from an official account, leaving no reason to doubt its veracity.

2. The reason Staff rejected our application has proven false.

The BAR Staff rejected the application for Administrative Approval to replace the windows based on a reassessment that the windows are original. Not only did this contradict the earlier guidance they gave us, it is wrong.

After our window replacement request was unexpectedly moved into the BAR hearing process, we began extensively researching the history of the windows and shared our results with the Staff, who validated our findings:

- The building now known as 201 Gibbon Street was erected in the mid-1800s (likely 1860s) as two side-by-side row houses facing east toward the Potomac River with front doors on what is now South Lee Street.
- It bore the addresses of 533 and 535 South Lee Street for many years.
- The windows at issue were added to what was then the rear (west) side of the building in the early 1900s, decades after original construction.
- The windows were moved to their current location on the Gibbon Street (south) side of the house during a massive renovation in the early 1950s.
- As part of this renovation, the two houses were fully combined, and the primary entrance was moved from Lee to a new facade on Gibbon Street.

Key takeaways:

- The windows were not part of the original houses. They were added many decades later and, thus, are not original historic material.
- The windows were moved from their original location – and “heavily modified” in the process – to their current location in 1952.
- The windows are not on a portion of an Early Building. Staff determined the effective age of that portion of the building “should be considered to be 1952,” making it a portion of a Later Building.
- Staff has acknowledged that the windows do not meet the criteria for “historical or architectural significance” under the City Zoning Ordinance.

3. In its decision, the BAR cites the general principle of retaining historic material from the Design Guidelines rather than following the actual criteria set in its own policy for window replacement.

According to Staff analysis in the October hearing report: “The subject windows are integral to this southern elevation and given the level of modifications to this area, the effective date of this portion of the building should be considered to be 1952.” Once Staff officially determined that the windows were not original and not on a portion of an Early Building, the BAR should have applied the criteria for window replacements on a Later Building and approved the replacements.

- A. The BAR Administrative Approval Policy has the stated purpose of identifying “the alterations and/or repairs that may be administratively approved by BAR staff and are also used by the BAR when evaluating requests at a public hearing.” The policy makes very clear that there are different rules for Early Buildings and Later Buildings. One set of standards applies to buildings or portions of buildings constructed before 1932, and a different set applies for those constructed after.

The only stated limitations for replacing windows on a Later Building, or a portion of a Later Building, are the type/material of replacement windows that can be used. (And ours fully meet these requirements.) Considerations such as reasonable repairability are only listed for Early Buildings.

Key Criteria for Window Replacement

Type	Definition	Rules
Early Building	Buildings or portions of buildings constructed before 1932.	Windows may be replaced IF : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - They have been previously replaced, - Do not have wood-pegged mortise and tenon joinery or cylinder “wavy” glass, or - They are too deteriorated to reasonably repair, as determined by Staff.
Later Building	Buildings or portions of buildings constructed after 1931.	Windows may be replaced WITH : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Modern window materials, such as aluminum-clad wood, wood composite or fiberglass can be used. - Double-glazing may be used. - Hollow vinyl and vinyl cladding are not appropriate.

B. In its decision, the BAR also chose not to consider the City Zoning Ordinance criteria for determining “historical or architectural significance” as a factor in deliberations even though this standard features prominently in the newly adopted BAR guidelines on windows and shutters.

The ordinance, which provides the legal basis for the BAR’s authority, specifies in Article X, §10-109 that, in order for an exterior feature such as a window to have “historical or architectural significance,” it would have to be at least one of the following:

- 1) Original to the building;
- 2) Not original to the building, but of an old and unusual design;
- 3) Of high artistic value or composed of rare quality materials or detail;
- 4) Painting of a previously unpainted masonry building.

Under the zoning ordinance, exterior features lacking “historical or architectural significance” generally can be repaired or replaced with like materials without a certificate of appropriateness. (Full text of zoning ordinance §10-109 in Attachment 1.)

4. Regardless of the windows' history, the recommendation to "repair" the windows is not reasonable.

A) Staff's assessment that the windows can "reasonably" be repaired lacks foundation.

- As of the time of our hearings, the BAR and Staff admitted that they had no definition or guidelines whatsoever for determining what constitutes reasonable repair.

- Staff's description of the condition of the windows in all three hearing reports – stating only that they are "painted shut" and require "some repair" – vastly understated the clearly visible wood rot, wood fractures, and broken or cracked glass. While it is good that Staff's report for the Council now includes a fuller description, an accurate assessment of the condition of the windows was not provided by Staff to the BAR at the time of our hearings.

B) Every window repair expert we spoke with (see chart) said the windows are so deteriorated they would need to create replicas. Too much wood is damaged to simply repair and reuse as Staff suggests, and less than half of the glass can be salvaged.

- The windows were badly deteriorated when we purchased the house due to a lack of maintenance by the previous owners. The windows sustained significant additional damage when unforeseeable structural problems had to be remediated for safety during renovation. Underlying wood rot made the windows extremely vulnerable and a wall shift caused a cascade of cracks, splits, and fractures throughout both windows.

C) The cost of having replica windows made would be 3-4 times the cost of the custom wood replacements Staff originally advised would be appropriate. While there may be circumstances in which this level of cost could be considered reasonable, it does not seem appropriate to mandate replicas for windows that are not original, not unique, and not designated historically or architecturally significant.

- In fact, the BAR's newly developed window repair policy indicates that replica windows are only required for historically or architecturally significant windows.

D) A replica window is still a new window and will not achieve the BAR's stated goal of retaining the existing material.

According to the National Park Service guide *Evaluating Historic Windows for Repair or Replacement*: "While it may be possible to repair even severely deteriorated windows, repair of deterioration beyond a certain level is not practical or reasonable and replacement becomes the appropriate treatment"

Quotes from Window Repair Professionals

We contacted seven different historic window restoration companies from MD, DC, VA, and NC. We found listings for most of these through the Window Preservation Alliance, which is referenced on the BAR website. All those willing to give us an assessment concluded that the windows would need to be replicated. So much of the wood is damaged that repair or replacement of parts is not possible.

Company	Availability	Comment
Rod Ferguson Ferguson Historic Restoration Richmond, VA	Several month wait	“Project Description: Fabricate 4 New Sashes ... existing sashes are beyond repair.”
Matthew Wiley Gepetto Millworks Richmond, VA	Several month wait	“More than 50% of the parts need to be replaced and cannot be reconstructed with a dutchman. My advice is to fabricate new sashes.”
Joshua Winters Double Hung, LLC Greensboro, NC	Up to a year wait	“The sashes damaged by the shift would need to be replicated.”
Stephen Ortando Historic Structures Washington, DC	Unavailable	These sashes will disintegrate if you try to take them out whole.
Neil Mozer Mozer Works, Inc. Takoma Park, MD	Not for 1 year+	Will need “the full Monty.”
Atlantic Window Repair Columbia, MD	Not for 1 year+	
The Craftsman Group Brentwood, MD	No reply	

Levels and Costs of Window Repair

From: Joshua Winters
joshw@double-hung.com
Subject: Re: Alexandria Windows
Date: May 28, 2024 at 8:48:13 AM
To: Sarah Radt theradts@aol.com

Hi Sarah,

I hope you had an enjoyable Memorial Day weekend.

Sorry for the delay in my response. After circulating the photos you sent internally it appears that the sash damaged by the shift would need to be replicated or extremely modified (level 4) to fit the new shape/dimensions of the opening based on the drastic shift.

Best,
Josh

Levels of Repair Information

Courtesy of Double Hung, LLC

A founding member of the Window Preservation Alliance

Level 1	<i>No material repairs needed</i>	~\$1,500
Level 2	<i>Limited repairs needed, no replacement of sash elements</i>	~\$1,900
Level 3	<i>Extensive repairs and/or replacement of sash elements</i>	~\$2,400
Level 4	<i>Sash needs to be replicated, cost is per sash</i>	~\$2,500/per sash ~\$5,000/window

Excludes:

- New hardware
- Interior or exterior trim
- Onsite measurements and shop drawings
- Travel time



DOUBLE HUNG, LLC

2801 Patterson Street | Greensboro,
NC | 27407
Serving the Southeast + Beyond

The Enormous Cost of Staff Advice

The Design Guidelines recommend that homeowners seek out BAR Staff guidance as early as possible for renovation projects, suggesting that it will save “time, money, and frustration.” In this case, it has cost us all of these.

The construction delays caused by trusting Staff’s guidance has already cost us a year of frustration and thousands of dollars. If we are forced to have replica windows made, it will cost much more while achieving very little preservation.

	Based on Original Advice	Current Staff Recommendation
Owner Time Spent	~1 year to order custom replacements to coincide with renovation = Total 1 year	~1 year to order replacements + 1 year on BAR process + 18 months – 2 years to arrange and complete carpentry of replicas = Total 3-4 years
Final Install	March 2024	Spring/Summer 2026
City Time Spent	2 site visits + application processing = Less than 1 week work hours	3 Staff site visits, 3 BAR hearings, 2 Subcommittee meetings, 1 City Council hearing. Staff research and prep time for extra hearings & reports. = Total at least 1 month work hours
Window Outcome	High efficiency, solid wood, full frame, custom windows matching existing window profile and all BAR guidelines	Replica sashes with all new wood and less than 50% of existing glass. Framing rebuilt. New sills and trim. (i.e. very little of existing windows kept.) Exterior storm windows required for efficiency and protection, but also means windows can’t be appreciated by the public.
Total Cost	Custom replacement windows circa \$2500 ea. = \$5,000	Replica windows charged per sash, 4 sashes \$2500 ea. + additional charges = \$10,000+ + 2 storm windows circa \$700 ea. = \$1400 + previously purchased replacements = \$5,000 + Additional cost from construction delays = \$2500 = \$18,900

“Paint is about the only thing holding this window together.”

Contrary to the BAR Staff’s report that the windows are merely “painted shut,” this photo illustrates how nearly every piece of wood and joint is rotted, cracked, or splitting. Less visible are the numerous small cracks in the glass, especially along the glazing edges, which renders most of the panes unable to be reused.



Lack of proper maintenance by the previous owners left these windows riddled with wood rot and completely non-functional. Paint disguised the worst of it. But when hidden structural damage to the wall was discovered – requiring immediate remediation for safety concerns – the deterioration cascaded into cracks, splits, and fractures throughout both windows.

Cracked Wood Up Close



Extensive Wood Rot



Broken and Chipped Glass



Attachment 1

THE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA

ARTICLE X. - HISTORIC DISTRICTS AND BUILDINGS

Sec. 10-100 - Old and Historic Alexandria District

§ 10-109. Permitted maintenance of exterior architectural features

(A) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Article X, exterior architectural features may be the subject of ordinary maintenance, including repair and replacement with the same design, color and material, without the necessity of a certificate of appropriateness if, upon review by the director or his designee, it is found that such maintenance:

(1) Does not result in the substantial removal of an exterior feature that is considered to have historic and/or architectural significance; and

(2) Does not perpetuate a condition or treatment that is considered to be, by board of architectural review policy, inappropriate or incompatible with the historic surroundings of the Old and Historic Alexandria District.

(B) The following guidelines shall be used in the determination of historic or architectural significance pursuant to section 10-109(A):

(1) The feature is composed of materials or utilizes construction techniques which appear to be original to the building or structure.

(2) The feature is not original to the building or structure, but is of such old and unusual design that it cannot be easily duplicated or replaced, and the feature contributes to the overall historic character of the building or structure.

(3) The feature is of such high artistic value or is composed of materials of such quality or detail that the feature cannot be easily duplicated or replaced.

(4) The painting of a masonry building which was unpainted prior to such painting shall be considered to be the removal of an exterior feature having historic and/or architectural significance requiring a certificate of appropriateness.

Attachment 2

Input for Review of Zoning Ordinance Section 10-105(A)(2).

Given the central role of the City Council's review of Zoning Ordinance Section 10-105(A)(2) in deciding this appeal, we offer the following input on each point of the ordinance below. We included Staff's input in blue, and our homeowner input in red, so the Council can easily compare the answers.

(a) Overall architectural design, form, style and structure, including, but not limited to, the height, mass and scale of buildings or structures;

The proposed replacement of the two second floor windows would not alter the building's height, mass, or scale. The replacement of these windows does represent the loss of historic fabric on an elevation that has been dramatically altered from the mid twentieth century through recent work. The replacement windows being proposed, while similar in configuration, will change the character of this portion of the building.

The "historic fabric" was only added to this elevation in 1952 as part of the aforementioned mid-20th century alterations. Thus, the only "character" their removal could detract from is that of a 1952 facade. The windows were not part of this elevation prior to 1952, and do not reflect the earlier history of that part of the house which looked quite different.

Nonetheless, the proposed replacements will be the exact size, color, configuration, and material (solid wood) with very similar detailing including muntin profile and trim. Given the location on the second floor with a setback of more than 10 feet from the sidewalk, only a focused observer would notice a difference - other than the extremely deteriorated condition of the current windows.

(b) Architectural details including, but not limited to, original materials and methods of construction, the pattern, design and style of fenestration, ornamentation, lighting, signage and like decorative or functional fixtures of buildings or structures; the degree to which the distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, structure or site (including historic materials) are retained;

The Design Guidelines state that "A central tenet of the philosophy of historic preservation is that original historic material should be retained and repaired rather than replaced." They further state that "Windows are a principal character defining feature of a building..." and that "The size, location, type, and trim of windows are a defining element of historic architectural styles."

The oft-cited Design Guidelines specify "original historic material" which these windows do not represent. They are old; they are not original. And, as indicated above, the proposed replacements will very closely match the "defining elements" of "size, location, type, and trim" of the current windows. They meet all the specifications for BAR replacement windows.

As has been demonstrated by the research that the applicant has performed on the history of the structure, the subject windows are not original to this part of the building and date from a later period of the building construction. Despite this history, the existing windows are original to a portion of the building and likely date from before the 1932 cutoff date which distinguishes Early from Late buildings. The construction of these historic windows is a character defining feature and one of the few remaining

historic elements in this area of the structure. Their construction and detailing help to distinguish this as an Early building and as such their retention is important to an understanding of the history of the building.

This appears to contradict Staff's previous analysis. In the October hearing report, Staff wrote: "The subject windows are integral to this southern elevation and given the level of modifications to this area, the effective date of this portion of the building should be considered to be 1952." This very clearly makes this elevation a portion of a Later Building. Other parts of the house may be considered portions of an Early Building, but this part is not. Further, the October Staff report also states: "While these windows are old, they date from a later portion of the building and were subsequently modified in 1952." and "the subject windows ... have been heavily modified since their original construction." Following the BAR policy on dates, this would make the effective date of the windows 1952 as well, since they were significantly modified at that time.

(c) Design and arrangement of buildings and structures on the site; and the impact upon the historic setting, streetscape or environs;

The proposed window replacement does not alter the design or arrangement of buildings on the site. The removal of existing historic fabric does alter the historic setting of the building and the streetscape by making it difficult to identify the historic nature of the structure. The history of modifications to this portion of the building, including an adjacent modern addition, gives the appearance that only the eastern section of the building is historic. The presence of these old windows is a signal to the viewer that this portion of the building is in fact historic in its own right. As such, the retention of these historic windows has a positive impact on the overall historic setting of the adjacent streetscape or environs.

Based on BAR standards, this part of the building is not an Early building. As noted above, "The subject windows are integral to this southern elevation and given the level of modifications to this area, the effective date of this portion of the building should be considered to be 1952." This makes it a portion of a Later Building. Only the eastern section of the building should be considered an Early Building under BAR standards. Retaining windows that are not original to the south elevation to try to make that elevation appear to be older than it is only detracts from the rich, real history of the surrounding environs.

(d) Texture, material and color, and the extent to which any new architectural features are historically appropriate to the existing structure and adjacent existing structures;

The existing windows are historic and are constructed in a manner which cannot be achieved today.

This is false. The techniques used to build a window in the early 1900s can still be used today. It is time and labor intensive (i.e. expensive) so most people choose not to do so. While historic wood and glass materials are not ubiquitous, they can be found; there are several companies that specialize in producing historic glass, including one in Baltimore. A trained, skilled carpenter can make anything today that a similarly skilled carpenter could make in 1900.

These are not particularly unique or artistic windows and Staff has clearly stated that they do not meet the criteria for historical or architectural significance found in this Zoning Ordinance. They are 6/6, double-hung, wood windows that look like thousands of others in historic and non-historic areas of Alexandria.

As noted above, "A central tenet of the philosophy of historic preservation is that original historic material should be retained and repaired rather than replaced." Since staff has determined that the existing windows can be repaired and retained, this precludes the installation of new materials no matter their compatibility with the existing structure. The texture and material of the historic windows are unique and are more appropriate for this historic structure than a new replacement

Again, these are not "original historic material." We also dispute Staff's assessment that the windows can be repaired based on the professional opinions of multiple historic window repair experts.

(e) The relation of the features in sections 10-105(A)(2)(a) through (d) to similar features of the preexisting building or structure, if any, and to buildings and structures in the immediate surroundings;

The windows being proposed to be replaced are historic and are original to a portion of the structure. Documentary and physical evidence suggest that the windows are not from the original portion of the building and have been relocated in the middle of the twentieth century. Despite these factors, the existing windows were originally installed prior to the 1932 date that delineates Early and Late buildings. The rest of the windows on the building have been replaced, leaving these as the only remaining historic windows. As they are historic construction and material, these windows are most compatible with the historic structure and other nearby historic structures. In terms of "preexisting building or structure," these windows are the last remaining vestige of the preexisting structure at this portion of the building.

The windows were also "heavily modified" in 1952, according to Staff analysis, which POST-dates the 1932 date that delineates Early and Later buildings. Further, according to the October Staff report, they are "integral" to a portion of a Later Building, which is the standard actually cited in BAR policy. Strictly speaking, a 1952-era window would be most compatible with the rest of the south elevation. The immediately surrounding houses are a mix of 19th and 20th century structures, made of frame or brick construction, with a medley of modern wood and historic windows. Many of the older structures have modern additions. Wood 6/6 windows are extremely common, though there are some older 12/12 windows and a handful of 1/1 or 2/2 Victorian style windows. The replacement windows we propose (6/6 full frame wood meeting all BAR requirements) would blend in seamlessly, which is almost certainly why the particular brand and style are often used in the Old and Historic District.

(f) The extent to which the building or structure would be harmonious with or incongruous to the old and historic aspect of the George Washington Memorial Parkway;

Not applicable. The property is not located along Washington Street, the George Washington Memorial Parkway.

(g) The extent to which the building or structure will preserve or protect historic places and areas of historic interest in the city;

The prominent location of this property at the northwest corner of the intersection of South Lee Street and Gibbon Street allows for a high degree of scrutiny of proposed modifications. It is true that these windows are located on the second floor and behind a brick wall; however, they are clearly visible from the adjacent sidewalk. While the preservation of historic materials throughout the district are important to the "areas of historic interest," when the historic fabric in question is readily observable from the adjacent sidewalk it is particularly important. In previous approvals for this property, it was determined that the windows on the main portion of the building had previously been replaced and no historic material

remained. Given that the subject windows are the only remaining historic windows on the structure, their retention and repair is important to the understanding of this as a historic structure.

While some parts of the house are highly visible, these windows are not. In addition to being on the second floor and behind a brick wall, the window wall is set back more than 10 feet from the sidewalk, so passersby cannot get close to the windows. The setback also blocks the view of the windows from the sidewalk to the east. The windows are largely obscured by trees (as seen in the cover photo) from the street and the opposite sidewalk.

The most compelling evidence that the windows' "historic character" is not readily apparent or particularly impactful, however, is the fact that a Preservation Staff expert specifically sent to the property to look for historic windows failed to notice that these two windows were any different from the replacements nearby. A member of the BAR window subcommittee also initially thought the windows were mid-20th century until a close-up look.

Of note, we have been informed by all of the window repair experts we spoke with that exterior storm windows would be necessary for replica windows, both for protection and energy efficiency. As such, if we are required to "repair" and retain these windows, they will be hidden behind a storm window where they cannot be appreciated by the public.

(h) The extent to which the building or structure will preserve the memorial character of the George Washington Memorial Parkway;

Not applicable. The property is not located along Washington Street, the George Washington Memorial Parkway.

(i) The extent to which the building or structure will promote the general welfare of the city and all citizens by the preservation and protection of historic interest in the city and the memorial character of the George Washington Memorial Parkway;

The Design Guidelines state that "A central tenet of the philosophy of historic preservation is that original historic material should be retained and repaired rather than replaced." The preservation of historic materials in place is critical to the historic interest in the city. As noted above, this portion of the building has been heavily modified over time with much of the south elevation dating from the 1950s era renovation. The result of this construction is that this portion of the building appears to date from the middle of the twentieth century. The retention of these two historic windows helps to tell the story of this building as one that has evolved over time to the configuration that exists today. The Design Guidelines are not meant to freeze a building in time, they help to guide property owners through the renovation and maintenance of structures in a way that is compatible with the historic preservation priorities of the city. In compliance with these guidelines, the repair of the subject windows serves to further the historic integrity of the historic district.

The construction of this part of the building does date to 1952 and the goal of preservation should not include propagating false historic impressions. These materials are not original and not in their original place. Retaining the windows for the purpose of making the south elevation look older than it is would not be historically accurate. In addition, the windows cannot be repaired and creating replica windows

does not support the goal of “preserving” historic material. A replica window is still new material just made to look old.

Requiring homeowners to pay exorbitant sums to recreate windows that are not unique or special and does not substantially preserve important historic material does not promote the individual or general welfare of citizens and will not attract new residents to purchase and rehabilitate historic homes.

(i) The extent to which such preservation and protection will 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 in which to live.

This criterion is generally applied to the preservation of high-profile buildings in the historic district such as Gadsby's Tavern and the Carlyle House; however, the retention of historic fabric on buildings throughout the historic district applies to the overall integrity of the district. Like many buildings throughout both historic districts, the story of this structure is one of the original sections of the building with a variety of additions and modifications over time. Historic fabric located within these modified portions of the building makes it clear that these buildings are a product of various additions and modifications and are not simply new construction meant to look like historic buildings. While the subject building is not one of the important high profile tourist destinations in the city, it is an important part of the overall historic fabric, and the Board has repeatedly found that the retention of historic fabric in place wherever possible is critical to the understanding of the nature of the historic district.

These materials are not original and not in their original place. To the extent that the existing windows suggest that this section of the house dates to the turn of the century, it is a false impression. Propagating false historic impressions does not serve students, historians, writers or the general public.

Further, the windows cannot be repaired and creating replica windows does not support the goal of “preserving” historic material. Replicas are still new material, just made to look old. Requiring homeowners to pay exorbitant sums to recreate windows that are not unique or special and does not substantially preserve important historic material does not promote the individual or general welfare of citizens and certainly will not attract new residents to purchase and rehabilitate historic homes.

As stated above, we have been informed by all of the window repair experts we spoke with that exterior storm windows would be necessary for replica windows, both for protection and energy efficiency. As such, if we are required to “repair” and retain these windows, they will be hidden behind a storm window where they cannot be appreciated by the public.