



**Project Name/Address:** 1807 Regent  
**Application Type:** Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alteration  
**Legistar File ID #** [42800](#)  
**Prepared By:** Amy L. Scanlon, Preservation Planner, Planning Division  
**Date Prepared:** May 10, 2016

## Summary

**Project Applicant/Contact:** Eric Statz, Bay Creek Remodeling  
**Requested Action:** The Applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for an exterior alteration involving the replacement of four windows in the University Heights Historic District

## Background Information

**Parcel Location:** The subject site is located in the University Heights Historic District.

### Relevant Historic Preservation Ordinance Sections:

41.24(5) Standards for the Review of Exterior Alterations and Repairs in TR-C2 and TR-C3 and TR-C4 Zoning Districts.

- (a) Height. N/A
- (b) Second Exit Platforms and Fire Escapes. N/A
- (c) Repairs. Materials used in exterior repairs shall duplicate the original building materials in texture and appearance, unless the Landmarks Commission approves duplication of the existing building materials where the existing building materials differ from the original. Repairs using materials that exactly duplicate the original in composition are encouraged.
- (d) Restoration. Projects that will restore the appearance of a structure to its original appearance are encouraged and will be approved by the Landmarks Commission if such projects are documented by photographs, architectural or archeological research or other suitable evidence.
- (e) Re-Siding. N/A
- (f) Alterations Visible from the Street and Alterations to Street Facades. Alterations visible from the street, including alterations to the top of structures, and alterations to street facades shall be compatible with the existing structure in architectural design, scale, color, texture, proportion and rhythm of solids to voids and proportion of widths to heights of doors and windows. Materials used in such alterations shall duplicate in texture and appearance, and architectural details used therein shall duplicate in design, the materials and details used in the original construction of the existing structure or of other structures in University Heights of similar materials, age and architectural style, unless the Landmarks Commission approves duplication of the texture and appearance of materials and the design of architectural details used in the existing structure where the existing building materials and architectural details differ from the original. Alterations that exactly duplicate the original materials in composition are encouraged. Alterations that destroy significant architectural features are prohibited. Side alterations shall not detract from the design composition of the original facade.

- (g) Additions and Exterior Alterations Not Visible from the Street. Additions and exterior alterations that are not visible from any streets contiguous to the lot lines upon which the building or structure is located will be approved by the Landmarks Commission if their design is compatible with the scale of the existing building and, further, if the materials used are compatible with the existing materials in texture, color and architectural details. Additions and alterations shall harmonize with the architectural design of the building rather than contrast with it.
- (h) Roof Shape. N/A
- (i) Roof Material. N/A

## Analysis and Conclusion

The Applicant explains that some windows have already been replaced. Permits for these replacements were not obtained. The front and side elevations are visible from the street.

The photos included in the submission materials show windows that appear to have areas of dry rot and some sill damage, but the extent of this damage is unknown and repairs may be reasonable to retain the historic fabric. The Applicant is encouraged to bring additional information to the meeting to thoroughly describe the damage and the related repairs. This information should include the quantity of original or old glass lights that have waves, imperfections, and seeds; amount and location of rot present in sash; assessment of sash structure, open joints, squareness, etc.; and operation of sash weights and pulleys and locking hardware.

## Recommendation

Given the submitted information, Staff believes that the standards for granting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the window replacements are not met and recommends that the Landmarks Commission deny the request.

The Applicant may bring additional information to the meeting to thoroughly describe the condition of the windows. This information may indicate a need for window replacement. If this is the case, staff believes the standards for granting a Certificate of Appropriateness may be met and recommends that the Landmarks Commission approve the request with the following condition:

1. The Applicant shall confirm the width of the existing original muntin and use a replacement window with muntin width that is similar to the existing width. It seems the 5/8" SDL width would more closely match the existing muntin width than the proposed 7/8" SDL width that is specified.