I.C

**MONTGOMERY COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**  
**STAFF REPORT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address:</th>
<th>5605 York Ln., Bethesda</th>
<th>Meeting Date:</th>
<th>6/12/2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenwich Forest Historic District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>Kathryn Becker Revocable Trust (\text{(David Schindel, Architect)})</td>
<td>Public Notice:</td>
<td>5/29/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review:</td>
<td>HAWP</td>
<td>Tax Credit:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Number:</td>
<td>35/165-19C</td>
<td>Staff:</td>
<td>Michael Kyne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSAL:</td>
<td>Demolition and new construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends that the HPC **approve** the HAWP application.

**ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION**

SIGNIFICANCE:  Contributing Resource within the Greenwich Forest Historic District  
STYLE:          Colonial Revival  
DATE:           1938

*Fig. 1: Subject property.*
PROPOSAL:

The applicant is proposing the following work items at the subject property:

- Rehabilitation of the existing front (south) and right (east) side porch.
- Removal of all vinyl siding from the historic house.
- Masonry repointing.
- Conversion of the existing screened porch on the left (west) side of the historic house to a study.
- Replacement of an existing basement-level door and doorframe at the right (east) side of the historic house.

APPLICABLE GUIDELINES

When reviewing alterations and new construction within the Greenwich Forest Historic District several documents are to be utilized as guidelines to assist the Commission in developing their decision. These documents include the historic preservation review guidelines in the approved and adopted amendment for the Greenwich Forest Historic District (Guidelines), Montgomery County Code Chapter 24A (Chapter 24A), and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation (Standards). The pertinent information in these documents is outlined below.

Greenwich Forest Historic District Guidelines

A. PRINCIPLES

The preservation of the following essential elements of Greenwich Forest is the highest priority in making decisions concerning applications for work permits. These Principles are not meant to stop or create unreasonable obstacles to normal maintenance, reasonable modifications, and the evolving needs of residents.

A2. The houses in Greenwich Forest create an integrated fabric well-suited to its forest setting. These Guidelines are intended to preserve this environment by ensuring that approved work permits include appropriate safeguards that protect the following three essential elements of this fabric:

   c. High quality building materials and high level of craftsmanship.

B. BALANCING PRESERVATION AND FLEXIBILITY

Greenwich Forest represents a period in the evolution of Montgomery County worthy of preservation, but it has also changed in response to the needs of residents since it was created in the 1930s. These Guidelines seek a reasonable compromise between preservation and the needs of residents in several ways.

B1. Most of the houses in the Greenwich Forest Historic District are designated “contributing” because they contribute to the architectural and historic nature of the district. Contributing structures are shown in the map of the districts. These Guidelines are more specific for contributing structures.

B2. Other houses in the district are designated non-contributing either because (1) they were built more recently than contributing houses with other architectural styles (see Appendix 3) or (2) their original features have been significantly altered by subsequent modifications. Non-contributing structures are shown on the map of the District. The Guidelines provide greater flexibility for owners of non-contributing houses.
B3. These Guidelines reflect the reality that nearly all houses in Greenwich Forest have been modified since their construction. Owners are not expected to return their houses to their original configurations. The modifications they are permitted to make under these Guidelines are based on the current reality in the neighborhood, provided that those modifications are consistent with the Principles in these Guidelines.

B4. Property owners have additional flexibility under these Guidelines to make more extensive changes to the parts of their houses that are less visible from the public rights-of-way in front of their houses. The Guidelines accomplish this by stipulating different levels of review for specific elements on different parts of houses.

The Guidelines that pertain to this project are as follows:

D7. Building materials: Replacement of roofs, siding, and trim with original materials is strongly recommended and is considered maintenance that will not require an application for a work permit. Use of non-original "like materials" such as architectural asphalt shingles requires a work permit to ensure that they match the scale, texture, and detail of the original materials and are consistent with the overall design of the existing house. For example, homeowners wishing to replace slate or tile roofs may use alternative materials that match the scale, texture, and detail of the roof being replaced. If an original slate or tile roof had been replaced with non-original material before July 1, 2011, the homeowner may replace the existing roof in kind or with another material consistent with the architectural style of that house.

D10. Porches: The addition of front porches is permitted if they are compatible with the architectural style of the house. Enclosures of existing side and rear porches have occurred throughout Greenwich Forest and they are permitted, subject to the decision-making body's review of the work permit, to ensure that they are compatibly designed.

D17. Windows, dormers, & doors: Door and window replacements are acceptable, as long as the replacements are compatible with the architectural style of the house. Replacement windows with true or simulated divided lights are acceptable, but removable ("snap-in") muntins are not permitted on front-facing windows of contributing houses. Front-facing dormer additions to third floors are permitted on non-contributing houses and on contributing houses, if such additions do not involve raising the main roof ridge line (as specified in D5) and if the addition is compatible in scale, proportion, and architectural style of the original house.
According to the *Guidelines*, the three levels of review are as follows:

Limited scrutiny is the least rigorous level of review. With this level, the scope or criteria used in the review of applications for work permits is more limited and emphasizes the overall structure rather than materials and architectural details. The decision-making body should base its review on maintaining compatibility with the design, texture, scale, spacing and placement of surrounding houses and the impact of the proposed change on the streetscape.

Moderate scrutiny is a higher level of review than limited scrutiny and adds consideration of the preservation of the property to the requirements of limited scrutiny. Alterations should be designed so the altered structure does not detract from the fabric of Greenwich Forest while affording homeowners reasonable flexibility. Use of compatible new materials or materials that replicate the original, rather than original building materials, should be permitted. Planned changes should be compatible with the structure's existing architectural designs.

Strict scrutiny is the highest level of review. It adds consideration of the integrity and preservation of significant architectural or landscape features and details to the requirements of the limited and moderate scrutiny levels. Changes may be permitted if, after careful review, they do not
significantly compromise the original features of the structure or landscape.

**Sec. 24A-8. Same-Criteria for issuance.**

(b) The commission shall instruct the director to issue a permit, or issue a permit subject to such conditions as are found to be necessary to insure conformity with the purposes and requirements of this chapter, if it finds that:

1. The proposal will not substantially alter the exterior features of an historic site or historic resource within an historic district; or
2. The proposal is compatible in character and nature with the historical, archeological, architectural or cultural features of the historic site or the historic district in which an historic resource is located and would not be detrimental thereto or to the achievement of the purposes of this chapter; or
3. The proposal would enhance or aid in the protection, preservation and public or private utilization of the historic site or historic resource located within an historic district in a manner compatible with the historical, archeological, architectural or cultural value of the historic site or historic district in which an historic resource is located; or
4. The proposal is necessary in order that unsafe conditions or health hazards be remedied; or
5. The proposal is necessary in order that the owner of the subject property not be deprived of reasonable use of the property or suffer undue hardship; [emphasis added] or
6. In balancing the interests of the public in preserving the historic site or historic resource located within an historic district, with the interests of the public from the use and benefit of the alternative proposal, the general public welfare is better served by granting the permit.

(c) It is not the intent of this chapter to limit new construction, alteration or repairs to any 1 period or architectural style.

(d) In the case of an application for work on an historic resource located within an historic district, the commission shall be lenient in its judgment of plans for structures of little historical or design significance or for plans involving new construction, unless such plans would seriously impair the historic or architectural value of surrounding historic resources or would impair the character of the historic district. (Ord. No. 9-4, § 1; Ord. No. 11-59)

**Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation**

The Secretary of the Interior defines rehabilitation as “the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features, which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values.” Standards 2, 9, and 10 most directly apply to the application before the commission:

#2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

#9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

#10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.
STAFF DISCUSSION

Most of the proposed work, including the rehabilitation of the existing front (south) and right (east) side porches, removal of all vinyl siding from the historic house, and masonry repointing consists of in-kind repairs and/or rehabilitation. Generally, this type of work does not require a HAWP; however, if any materials or features require complete replacement, they should be replaced in-kind in consultation with staff.

Staff finds that the replacement of original/traditional materials with alternative materials (i.e., fiber cement/Hardie, PVC, etc.) is inconsistent with the Guidelines and Standards and would not recommend approval of such a proposal. This applies to the front (south) and right (east) side porches, as well as any original siding under the vinyl siding, which is proposed to be removed from the house. Staff has asked the applicant to revise their proposal, removing any proposal to replace traditional materials with alternative materials (aside from the basement-level door, see below), and the applicant has agreed.

Regarding the proposed masonry repointing, staff finds that this work constitutes routine maintenance, but that the applicants should ensure that the composition of the new mortar is consistent with the existing. A mortar mixture with an inappropriate (i.e., “too hard”) composition will result in significant damage to the historic house within a short period of time. The existing mortar should be tested, and the test results and composition of the proposed mortar should be shared with staff before repointing commences.

Staff is generally supportive of the applicant’s proposal to convert the existing screened porch at the left (west) side of the historic house to a study. As noted in the Guidelines, “[e]nclosures of existing side and rear porches have occurred throughout Greenwich Forest and they are permitted, subject to the decision-making body’s review of the work permit, to ensure that they are compatibly designed.” Because the porch to be altered is visible from the public right-of-way, the Guidelines indicate that the proposal should be reviewed with strict scrutiny. Staff finds that the altered porch/study is compatibly designed, and it makes use of appropriate traditional materials, including standing seam copper roofing, wood pilasters and panels, and wood SDL casement windows.

The applicant proposes to replace an existing wood basement-level door and doorframe at the right (east) side of the property with a fiberglass door and composite doorframe. The basement-level door and doorframe to be replaced are below grade, and they are not visible from the public right-of-way. Therefore, in accordance with the Guidelines, the proposed replacement should be reviewed with lenient scrutiny. Staff finds that the proposed door and doorframe replacement will not detract from the character-defining features of the subject property or the surrounding streetscape.

After full and fair consideration of the applicant’s submission staff finds the proposal, as modified by the condition, as being consistent with the Criteria for Issuance in Chapter 24A-(b) 1 and 2, having found the proposal is consistent with the Greenwich Forest Historic District Guidelines and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation outlined above.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the HAWP application under the Criteria for Issuance in Chapter 24A-8(b), having found that the proposal will not substantially impact the historic resource(s) and is compatible in character with the Greenwich Forest Historic District Guidelines and the purposes of Chapter 24A;
and with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation #2, 9, and 10;

and with the general condition that the applicant shall present the **3 permit sets of drawings, if applicable to Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) staff for review and stamping** prior to submission for the Montgomery County Department of Permitting Services (DPS) building permits;

and with the general condition that final project design details, not specifically delineated by the Commission, shall be approved by HPC staff or brought back to the Commission as a revised HAWP application at staff’s discretion;

and with the general condition that the applicant shall notify the Historic Preservation Staff if they propose to make **any alterations** to the approved plans. Once the work is completed the applicant will contact the staff person assigned to this application at 301-563-3400 or michael.kyne@montgomeryplanning.org to schedule a follow-up site visit.
APPLICATION FOR
HISTORIC AREA WORK PERMIT

Contact Email: davideschindel@gmail.com
Contact Person: David E. Schindel
Daytime Phone No.: 202/557-1149

Tax Account No.: 16 07 00496188
Name of Property Owner: Kathryn L. Becker Revocable Trust
Daytime Phone No.: 301/221-2096
Address: 5605 York Lane
City: Bethesda
Zip Code: 20814
Contractor: Pagenstecher Group, Inc.
Phone No.: 301/933-9305
Contractor Registration No.: Maryland Home Improvement License #120414; Montgomery County Contractor’s License BC2269
Agent for Owner: Not applicable
Daytime Phone No.: 

LOCATION OF BUILDING/SITES

House Number: 5605
Street: York Lane
Town/City: Bethesda
Nearest Cross Street: Westover Road
Lot: 1
Block: J
Subdivision: Greenwich Forest
Parc: District 07, Map parcel HN13

PART ONE: TYPES OF ALTERATION & ADDITIONS

1A. CHECK ALL APPLICABLE:
☐ Construct ☐ Extend ☑ Alter/Remodel ☐ A/C ☐ Slab ☐ Room Addition ☐ Porch ☐ Deck ☐ Shed
☐ Move ☐ Install ☐ Weat/Remax ☐ Solar ☐ Fireplace ☐ Woodburning Stove ☐ Single Family
☐ Revision ☐ Repair ☑ Reversible ☐ Fence/Wall (complete Section 4) ☑ Other: Repairs and porch conversion to study

1B. Construction cost estimate: $300,000

1C. If this is a revision of a previously approved active permit, see Permit #: No

PART TWO: COMPLETE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND EXTEND ADDITIONS

2A. Type of sewage disposal:
☐ 01 Septic ☐ 02 Septic ☐ 03 Other:

2B. Type of water supply:
☐ 01 Septic ☐ 02 Septic ☐ 03 Other:

PART THREE: COMPLETED ONLY FOR FENCE/RETAINING WALL

3A. Height: feet inches

3B. Indicate whether the fence or retaining wall is to be constructed on one of the following locations:
☐ On party line/property line ☐ Entirely on land of owner ☐ On public right of way/assessment

I hereby certify that I have the authority to make the foregoing application, that the application is correct, and that the construction will comply with plans approved by all agencies listed and I hereby acknowledge and accept this to be a condition for the issuance of this permit.

Signature of owner or authorized agent: 4/24/19

Approved: For Chairperson, Historic Preservation Commission

Disapproved: Signature: Date:

Applications/Permit No.: Data Filed: Date Issued:
THE FOLLOWING ITEMS MUST BE COMPLETED AND THE REQUIRED DOCUMENTS MUST ACCOMPANY THIS APPLICATION.

1. WRITTEN DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
   a. Description of existing structure(s) and environmental setting, including their historical features and significance:

      Please see attached project description

   b. General description of project and its effect on the historic resource(s), the environmental setting, and, where applicable, the historic district:

      Please see attached project description

2. SITE PLAN
   Site and environmental setting, drawn to scale. You may use your plan. Your site plan must include:
   a. the scale, north arrow, and date;
   b. dimensions of all existing and proposed structures, and
   c. site features such as walkways, driveways, fences, ponds, streams, trash dumpsters, mechanical equipment, and landscaping.

3. PLANS AND ELEVATIONS
   You must submit 7 copies of plans and elevations in a format no larger than 11" x 17". Plans on 8 1/2" x 11" paper are preferred.
   a. Schematic construction plans, with marked dimensions, indicating location, size and general type of walls, window and door openings, and other fixed features of both the existing resource(s) and the proposed work.
   b. Elevations (facades), with marked dimensions, clearly indicating proposed work in relation to existing construction and, when appropriate, context. All materials and fixtures proposed for the exterior must be noted on the elevations drawings. An existing and a proposed elevation drawing of each facade affected by the proposed work is required.

4. MATERIALS SPECIFICATIONS
   General description of materials and manufactured items proposed for incorporation as the work of the project. This information may be included on your design drawings.

5. PHOTOGRAPHS
   a. Clearly labeled photographic prints of each facade of existing resource, including details of the affected portions. All labels should be placed on the front of photographs.
   b. Clearly label photographic prints of the resource as viewed from the public right-of-way and of the adjoining properties. All labels should be placed on the front of photographs.

6. TREE SURVEY
   If you are proposing construction adjacent to or within the dripline of any tree 8" or larger in diameter (at approximately 4 feet above the ground), you must file an accurate tree survey identifying the size, location, and species of each tree of at least that dimension.

7. ADDRESSES OF ADJACENT AND CONFRONTING PROPERTY OWNERS
   For ALL projects, provide an accurate list of adjacent and confronting property owners (not tenants), including names, addresses, and zip codes. This list should include the owners of all lots or parcels which adjoin the parcel in question, as well as the owner(s) of lot(s) or parcel(s) which lie directly across the street/highway from the parcel in question.

PLEASE PRINT IN BLUE OR BLACK INK OR TYPE THIS INFORMATION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE.
PLEASE STAY WITHIN THE GUIDES OF THE TEMPLATE, AS THIS WILL BE PHOTOCOPIED DIRECTLY ONTO MAILING LABELS.
**HAWP APPLICATION: MAILING ADDRESSES FOR NOTIFYING**  
[Owner, Owner’s Agent, Adjacent and Confronting Property Owners]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner’s mailing address</th>
<th>Owner’s Agent’s mailing address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Schindel and Kate Becker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5605 York Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethesda, MD 20814</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjacent and confronting Property Owners mailing addresses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fred &amp; Diane Reinke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8005 Westover Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethesda, MD 20814</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applicant: **David E. Schindel**
Existing Property Condition Photographs (duplicate as needed)

Detail: View of front of house (southwest-facing) showing screened porch at left

Detail: View of front of porch (southwest-facing)

David E. Schindel

Applicant: _______________________________
Existing Property Condition Photographs (duplicate as needed)

Detail: View of side of porch (northwest-facing elevation)

Detail: View of east-facing elevation showing side porch and entrance to basement door

David E. Schindel

Applicant: ____________________________
Site Plan

LOCATION: Lot 1, Blk J, Greenwich Forest, Montgomery Co., MD
SURVEY: Boundary data & RP location by Joseph N. Starkey, PE & Surveyor, Silver Spring, MD 1/12/40

applicant: David E. Schindel

Diagram with labels:
- Screened porch
- Basement door
- Side porch
Site Plan

LOCATION: LOT 1, BLK 4, GREENMILE FOREST, MONTGOMERY CO., MD
SURVEY BOUNDARY DATA & PLAT LOCATION BY JOSPEH N. STANKEY, P.E.
SURVEYOR, SILVER SPRING, MD 1/6/80

Shade portion to indicate North

David E. Schindel
Applicant: __________________________
Project Description: Becker-Schindel Porches

1a. Description of existing structure(s) and environmental setting.

This application is for work on 5605 York Lane, a contributing property in the Greenwich Forest Historic District in Bethesda, MD. The home is a three story center hall Colonial that was built in 1938 (see Figure 1). It is a corner lot with nearly continuous high canopy forest cover. It was the model home for the Pennsylvania farmhouse design in Morris Cafritz’s Greenwich Forest development. The property has had no additions and the only significant changes have been conversion of the rear-facing garage into a kitchen in 1993-4 and installation of a shed dormer window in the rear-facing second floor family room in 2016 (HAWP Case # 35/165-16A).

Figure 1. 5605 York Lane, Bethesda, MD 20814

1b. General description of the project and its effect on the historic resource(s).

The owners purchased the property in 1989 and are the second owners of the home. They propose six alterations to the exterior. Only two of the six proposed alterations (#1 and 3) are visible from the public right-of-way in front of the property. Five alterations are repairs that will reverse the effects of age and changes made by the original owners. The sixth proposed alteration (#3, below) will replace a badly deteriorated side porch by constructing an enclosed study in its place. The existing porch foundation will remain so no excavation or alterations to the footprint and surrounding landscape are proposed. No trees will be disturbed. The roof and window treatments and architectural details of the new study will mimic those on the house and/or similar contributing properties in the District.

1. Renovation of the front porch (see Figure 2 and detailed photos, Appendix 1). This small porch has a concrete/masonry foundation which has fallen away from the foundation of the main house, causing tilting of the pillars and roof. Rain gutters no longer drain properly due to this tilting. Wooden pillars and fascia boards have rotted. The previous owners installed vinyl siding over all the original ship-lap on gable-ends. The proposed renovation would replace the foundation and all woodwork and roof structures found to be beyond repair. Vinyl siding would be removed and the underlying siding re-finished or replaced if found to be beyond repair. The renovated porch would have the same footprint, dimensions and architectural details as the original, including flagstone steps with stone risers and ship-lap siding on the gable end. A new slate roof and copper gutters and downspouts would be installed to match the rest of the house. Wooden exterior trim would be replaced with painted redwood and siding would be replaced with wooden clapboards milled to match the original ship-lap profile.
2. Repair of the side porch (see Figure 3; and detailed photos, Appendix 2). This small porch has a concrete/masonry foundation that has not deteriorated other than the surface of mortar joints. However, the pillar and woodwork have deteriorated beyond the point of repair. Several roofers converge above this porch and the existing copper flashing and gutters leak into the interior during heavy rains. The porch’s side gable has vinyl siding over the original wooden ship-lap siding and adjacent trim and roof flashing. Vinyl siding would be removed and necessary repairs made to flashing and trim. Until demolition begins it is impossible to know how much of the existing structure and siding cannot be repaired and must be replaced. The proposed repair would not alter the size, configuration and style of the existing porch. A new slate roof and copper gutters and downspouts would be installed to match the rest of the house. Wooden exterior trim would be replaced with painted PVC. If new siding is needed, the original ship-lap siding would be replaced with Hardie planking if available with the original ship-lap profile. If unavailable, wooden siding milled to match the original will be used.
3. **Partial replacement of the existing screened porch to convert it to a study** (See Figure 4 and detailed photos, Appendix 3). This porch has a concrete/masonry foundation that has not deteriorated, but its roof and woodwork has rotted beyond repair. The owners propose to use the existing foundation and construct a new structure that would be used as a study. The existing shed roof with slate tiles will be replaced with a hipped roof covered with standing seam copper. The replacement roof will reflect the roof of a dining room bay window on the opposite side of the house. Copper hipped rooves are found on front and side porches as well as bay windows on several other contributing properties in the Greenwich Forest Historic District (e.g., 7825 Overhill Road). Windows in the new study would be true divided light configured to be consistent in design and scale with the eight-over-eight and six-over-six windows visible from the right-of-way in front of the property. The existing doorway to the living room would be retained and a new door installed. No exterior doorways would be added. Trim and molding will be PVC that matches the existing house.

![Figure 4. Side screened porch](image)

4. **Removal of all vinyl siding.** The vinyl siding installed by the original owners will be removed to reveal the original wooden ship-lap siding (see Appendix 4). If the original siding is found to be rotted beyond repair, new Hardie Plank with the same ship-lap design would be used to replace it. If unavailable, wooden siding milled to match the original ship-lap profile will be used.

5. **Replacement of door and doorframe from exterior staircase into basement** (see detailed photos, Appendix 5). There is an exterior concrete stairwell on the east side of the house that leads down to a basement door. There was a 3" drain in the bottom landing of the stairs which frequently clogged and caused flooding in the basement. The current owners replaced the drain with a 9" X 9" catchment basin covered by a domed drain cover that avoids clogging. No significant basement flooding has occurred since this installation in 2010.

However, 70 years of basement flooding has led to serious deterioration of the bottom of the basement door and doorframe. Wood rot is extensive and the doorframe is no longer firmly attached to the surrounding masonry walls. Weatherstripping has deteriorated or been destroyed in the bottom part of the doorframe.

The basement door, doorframe and weatherstripping will be removed and replaced with synthetic material that matches originals in size, detail and color. The use of synthetic building material is permissible under the Greenwich Forest Historic Guidelines in areas not visible from the public right-of-way in front of a property.
6. **Masonry re-pointing of stone façade** (see detailed photos, Appendix 6). The front face of the house is covered with several different species of decorative stone. Some species are more porous than others and severe weathering has taken place around the more porous stones. Weathered areas around porous stones will be repointed using mortar that matches the current color of original mortar.
Appendix 1. Front porch

Failure of connection between foundations of house and porch

Deterioration of wood roof members
Appendix 2. Side porch

Convergence of roof drainage on porch

Interior water damage due to from high rain runoff  Original ship-lap siding
Deteriorating Dutchman installed at base of pillar
Appendix 3. Screened porch

Deterioration of roof members

Water damage to ceiling due to failed roof

Sagging roof causing screen framing to fail
Appendix 4. Removal of vinyl siding

Vinyl siding on and above side porch

Original ship-lap siding below vinyl siding
Appendix 5.

Replacement of door and doorframe from exterior staircase into basement

Interior of basement door at bottom of outside steps. Note discoloration at base of doorframe from repeated flooding.

Large cachement basin and dome drain cover installed by current owners to solve basement flooding problem.

Bottom of right-hand doorframe (as viewed from interior), showing patch installed over rotted door panel and deterioration of wooden doorframe and copper weatherstripping

Bottom of left-hand doorframe (as viewed from interior), showing deterioration of wood and copper weatherstripping.
Appendix 6. Masonry re-pointing of stone façade

Weathering of mortar around porous stone on front façade.
Interior Wood Trim Options

Divided Lite Options

Grilles Between the Glass

Wood Perimeter Grill

Simulated Divided Lites

Note: All dimensions are approximate. Weather Shield reserves the right to change specifications without notice.
Clear Glass Continued

Smooth-Star®

*Not recommended for use behind storm doors or to be painted dark colors, if exposed to direct sunlight.

Note: See page 261 for important product details that may help with your purchase decision.