MONTGOMERY COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT

Address: 113 Elm Avenue, Takoma Park

Meeting Date: 5/27/2020

Resource: Contributing Resource
Takoma Park Historic District

Report Date: 5/20/2020

Applicant: Brian and Catie Rowland
(Eric Saul, Architect)

Public Notice: 5/13/2020

Review: HAWP

Tax Credit: No

Case Number: 37/03-20Z

Staff: Dan Bruechert

PROPOSAL: Partial demolition, new roof, rear addition, and other alterations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the HPC approve the HAWP application.

ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

SIGNIFICANCE: Contributing Resource within the Takoma Park Historic District
STYLE: Vernacular/Eclectic
DATE: 1913

Fig. 1: 113 Elm Ave. is at the edge of the Takoma Park Historic District.
**BACKGROUND**

On April 22, 2020, the applicant presented a preliminary consultation\(^1\) for the project at 113 Elm Avenue, Takoma Park. The HPC was uniformly supportive of the work proposed for the front porch and the roof replacement and did not feel that the proposed window wells would have a significant impact on the historic character of the resource.

The HPC was divided on the appropriateness of the mixture of sash and casement windows and the fenestration pattern at the rear. However, all Commissioners agreed that as a feature on the rear elevation, at the edge of the district, more leniency should be granted to the review of these features.

**PROPOSAL**

The applicants propose to:

- Remove the existing roof and construct a new roof;
- Reconfigure the rear, non-historic addition;
- Alter the front porch; and
- Install two new window wells for basement egress.

**APPLICABLE GUIDELINES**

When reviewing alterations and new construction within the Takoma Park 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 Takoma Park 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.

**Takoma Park Historic District Guidelines**

There are two very general, broad planning and design concepts which apply to all categories. These are:

- The design review emphasis will be restricted to changes that are all visible from the public right-of-way, irrespective of landscaping or vegetation (it is expected that the majority of new additions will be reviewed for their impact on the overall district), and

- The importance of assuring that additions and other changes to existing structures act to reinforce and continue existing streetscape, landscape, and building patterns rather than to impair the character of the historic district.

A majority of structures in the Takoma Park Historic District have been assessed as being “Contributing Resources.” While these structures may not have the same level of architectural or historical significance as Outstanding Resources or may have lost some degree of integrity, collectively, they are the basic building blocks of the Takoma Park district. However, they are more important to the overall character of the district and the streetscape due to their size, scale, and architectural character, rather than for their particular architectural features.

Contributing Resources should receive a more lenient level of design review than those structures that have been classified as Outstanding. This design review should emphasize the importance of the resource to the overall streetscape and its compatibility with existing patterns rather than focusing on a close scrutiny of architectural detailing. In general, however, changes to Contributing Resources should respect the predominant architectural style of the resource.

The *Guidelines* that pertain to this project are as follows:

- All exterior alterations, including those to architectural features and details, should be generally consistent with the predominant architectural style and period of the resource and should preserve the predominant architectural features of the resource; exact replication of existing details and features is, however, not required.

- Minor alterations to areas that do not directly front on a public right-of-way such as vents, metal stovepipes, air conditioners, fences, skylights, etc. – should be allowed as a matter of course; alterations to areas that do not directly front on a public way-of-way which involve the replacement of or damaged to original ornamental or architectural features are discouraged, but may be considered and approved on a case-by-case basis.

- Some non-original building materials may be acceptable on a case-by-case basis; artificial siding on areas visible from the public right of way is discouraged where such materials would replace or damage original building materials that are in good condition.

- All changes and additions should respect existing environmental settings, landscaping, and patterns of open space.

- Alterations to features that are not visible from the public right-of-way should be allowed as a matter of course.

- While additions should be compatible, they are not required to be replicative of earlier architectural styles.

*Montgomery County Code; Chapter 24A-8*

(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 ensure 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

(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
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.” The Standards are as follows:

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

The subject property is a two-story house with a stucco first floor and a clapboard sided second floor. Over time the subject property has had several changes, including an enlarged rear addition (see below), modifications to the roof form, and other material changes. Based on the side projecting bay and the asymmetrical roof form, Staff surmises the subject property could have been constructed with some late Queen Anne details and has been heavily modified over the last century. While Staff has been unable to determine the architectural details, Staff research found that the house was constructed by local carpenter, John Raines, for his own family. Mr. Raines built many houses in the area and appears to have done so without the extensive aid of architects which could be another explanation for the subject property’s eclectic style.

The applicant proposes changes in four areas: removing the existing roof and constructing a new roof; reconfiguring the rear non-historic addition; altering the front porch; and installing two new window wells for basement egress.
Figure 2: 1927 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map showing the subject property in its original configuration.

Figure 3: 1939 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map showing the subject property with its expanded rear.
Roof Replacement
The existing roof configuration is irregular and has several idiosyncratic features including multiple dormers and flared eaves. The roof peak is offset so it is to the right of the house center. The right and rear roof elevations both have dormers with attic vents. The left side of the roof has two hip projections that create a valley that has lead to water drainage issues. These water damage issues are the primary reason the applicant proposes altering the roof form. The applicants described the issues with the current roof at the April 22nd HPC meeting.

The applicant proposes to remove the existing roof and construct a pyramidal roof with a central peak. The new roof design will retain the distinctive flared eaves. The rear shed dormer will be retained and a window is proposed in place of the existing attic vent.

The roof reconfiguration will somewhat alter the appearance of the house when viewed from the public right-of-way. However, the current roof configuration and its inability to effectively control water continue to cause damage to the house. Staff finds that the long-term survival of the historic house appears to be better served by allowing the change (per 24A-8(b)(3)). Staff finds that converting the vent to a window is an acceptable alteration as this change is at the back and appears to match the size of the existing vent. Additionally, in the Takoma Park Historic District window replacements on the rear or new construction have frequently accepted aluminum-clad wood windows as an acceptable substitute for traditional wood windows. Staff recommends the HPC approve the proposed roof replacement and dormer alteration.

Rear Addition Alteration
As shown in the Sanborn Maps, above, the rear of the house has been expanded from its original form. The exterior wall treatments on the rear addition match the house with stucco on the ground floor and siding on the second floor. The windows in the rear are a mix of sash (both two-over-two and six-over-six) and casements. The rear door is a half-lite wood door. A rear stoop was removed, but its design and materials are unknown.

The applicant proposes altering the fenestration of the rear addition to accommodate a reconfiguration of interior spaces. The door will be moved closer to the center of the elevation with a new set of wood stairs. On the first floor, the applicant proposes a pair of sash windows to the left of the door and a pair of casement windows to the right of the door. On the second floor, the applicant proposes installing a single one-over-one sash window on the left of the elevation and a pair of one-over-on sash windows on the right. On the left (east) elevation, the applicant proposes installing a casement window on each floor. All of the new windows proposed are Andersen 400 Series aluminum-clad wood windows. The applicant proposes installing a new half-lite door on the rear. The proposed door (specifications attached) has a fiberglass exterior with a smooth paintable surface. While traditional materials are preferred for replacement windows and doors, more leniency is given in new construction and areas that are not visible from the public right-of-way. Staff finds that an aluminum-clad window on the rear and fiberglass door is acceptable under the Takoma Park Historic District Design Guidelines and 24A-8(d).

The last change proposed for the rear addition is re-siding both floors of the rear of the house in fiber cement clapboard siding in a reveal that matches the existing second floor.

Staff finds that proposed fenestration reconfiguration is appropriate overall. The rear elevation has been altered from its historic configuration, so the proposed work will not significantly alter historic features. Additionally, most of the proposed work is on the rear, and will not be visible from the public right-of-way within the district, so evaluations of these changes should be judged leniently (24A-8(d)) and Design Guidelines.

The alterations to the left (east) elevation will be visible from the right-of-way. The proposal will replace
a pair of six-over-six sash windows on the first floor and two fixed single-lite windows on the second
floor, with a single-lite casement window on each floor. Staff finds that the appearance of the left
elevation, with five different window types, will only have four different windows after the proposed
work. The applicant indicated that the casement windows proposed on the first floor were selected
because they are easier to operate in a kitchen environment.

At the April 22 HPC meeting, there was a split amongst the Commissioners regarding the desirability of
the proposed fenestration and window selection. Some Commissioners expressed a desire for a more
regularized fenestration pattern while others voiced their support for sash windows throughout. However,
only one Commissioner recommended revising the fenestration at the rear. Staff finds that the comments
presented by the HPC did not state that the window and doors selected at the rear will harm the resource
or the surrounding district and recommends approval of the windows and doors under the Design
Guidelines and 24A-8(b)(2) and (d).

Staff finds that the siding replacement at the rear will not have a significant impact on the character of the
house or the surrounding district. Additionally, Staff finds that if the applicant proposed a new rear
addition, the HPC would encourage some level of differentiation between the old and the new; and as the
current appearance of the rear of the house is not its historic appearance, it would be appropriate to create
that differentiation now. Staff would recommend approval of the siding alteration under 24A-8(b)(2) and
(d).

Front Porch Alterations
The current front porch is a wood porch constructed on brick piers. The applicant proposes to excavate a
storage area under the front porch and construct a new parged solid concrete foundation under the porch.
No other alterations are proposed for the front porch.

While much of the foundation will be screened with vegetation, evaluation of the proposal is to be
considered in the absence of vegetation.

Staff finds that a parged and painted porch foundation will not significantly alter the character of the
house. The HPC concurred with this position and voiced support for this change. Staff recommends
approval of the front porch alterations under the Design Guidelines and 24A-8(b)(2) and 24A-8(d).

Egress Windows
The final alteration proposed is the introduction of two window wells on the right (west elevation). The
two window wells will be constructed adjacent to two new basement bedrooms and will be required under
the building code. The applicant had not selected a specific window well to present at the preliminary
consultation, but did have approximate dimensions and the proposed placement. No Commissioner
expressed any concerns about the proposed window wells as part of the rehabilitation.

The applicant proposes to install pre-fabricated galvanized steel window wells (specifications attached).
This feature will be installed below grade and Staff finds it will not have a significant impact on the
character of the historic resource, surrounding district, and is required by code. Staff recommends the
HPC approve the proposed window wells under the Design Guidelines and 24A-8(b)(2).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the HAWP application under the Criteria for Issuance in
Chapter 24A-8(b)(1), (2), (3), and (d) having found that the proposal, is consistent with and compatible in
character with the purposes of Chapter 24A; the Takoma Park Historic District Design Guidelines;

and with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation #2, #9, and #10;
APPLICATION FOR
HISTORIC AREA WORK PERMIT
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
301.563.3400

APPLICANT:

Name: Brian and Catie Rowland
Address: 113 Elm Avenue
Daytime Phone: 301-648-5023

E-mail: brianarowland@gmail.com
City: Takoma Park
Zip: 20912

Tax Account No.: ____________________________

AGENT/CONTACT (if applicable):

Name: Eric Saul
Address: 8114 Carroll Ave
Daytime Phone: 301-270-0395

E-mail: eric@saularchitects.com
City: Takoma Park
Zip: 20912

Contractor Registration No.: ____________________________

LOCATION OF BUILDING/PREMISE: MIHP # of Historic Property
113 Elm Ave, Takoma Park, MD 20912

Is the Property Located within an Historic District? __Yes/District Name ____________________
__No/Individual Site Name ____________________

Is there an Historic Preservation/Land Trust/Environmental Easement on the Property? If YES, include a map of the easement, and documentation from the Easement Holder supporting this application.

Building Number: 113
Street: Elm Avenue
Town/City: Takoma Park
Nearest Cross Street: Allegheny Avenue
Lot: 24
Block: 16
Subdivision: 0025
Parcel: 0000

TYPE OF WORK PROPOSED: See the checklist on Page 4 to verify that all supporting items for proposed work are submitted with this application. Incomplete Applications will not be accepted for review. Check all that apply:

☐ New Construction
☐ Addition
☐ Demolition
☐ Grading/Excavation
☐ Deck/Porch
☐ Fence
☐ Hardscape/Landscape
☐ Roof
☐ Shed/Garage/Accessory Structure
☐ Solar
☐ Tree removal/planting
☐ Window/Door
☐ Other: Alteration

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

Signature of owner or authorized agent: ____________________________________________________________
Date: 3.28.2020
Description of Property: Please describe the building and surrounding environment. Include information on significant structures, landscape features, or other significant features of the property:

House is located in the Takoma Park Historic District. Existing house and immediate neighbors have a craftsman/bungalow style character.

Description of Work Proposed: Please give an overview of the work to be undertaken:

1. Existing rear addition (non-historic) to be altered with new windows, a rear door, replace stucco with Hardie Siding, and adding a small landing with steps.
2. The Existing roof shape of the house proposed to be altered, as the current shape creates water issues
3. The front porch to have a storage area dug out underneath, chaing the pier foundation into a solid masonry wall foundation with parging.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Item 1: <strong>Existing Rear Addition</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of Current Condition:</strong> Stucco/siding mix exterior, small windows on both floors, contains a rear mudroom and powder room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Work:</strong> Remove stucco and use siding on the entire rear and driveway side. Kitchen to expand into the existing rear addition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Item 2: <strong>Roof shape</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of Current Condition:</strong> odd layout that appears to be added on over time. Existing valley on driveway side creates a water trap, and roof is leaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Work:</strong> create a more regular roof shape, elimination of the existing fireplace which is not very visible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Item 3: <strong>Front Porch</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of Current Condition:</strong> existing porch with roof deck above, built on pier foundation (open underneath)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Work:</strong> restore the existing front porch as it exists, but with a storage room built underneath the front porch (close off the underside with solid walls (parged and painted concrete block foundation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 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><strong>BRIAN &amp; CATIE ROWLAND</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113 ELM AVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAKOMA PARK, MD 20912</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAUL ARCHITECTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8114 CARROLL AVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAKOMA PARK, MD 20912</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjacent and confronting Property Owners mailing addresses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PIEROTTI, RACHEL SUSAN</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115 ELM AVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAKOMA PARK, MD 20912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHRISTOPHER &amp; ELIZABETH WILSON</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116 ELM AVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAKOMA PARK, MD 20912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SARAH BOEHM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>111 ELM AVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAKOMA PARK, MD 20912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEORGE MIDDLEMORE LISA FAMOLARE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112 ELM AVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAKOMA PARK, MD 20912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHRISTOPHER HARTLEY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>114 ELM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAKOMA PARK, MD 20912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MARTINA BARASH</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6807 ALLEGHENY AVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAKOMA PARK, MD 20912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXISTING/DEMO FIRST FLOOR PLAN

1/4" = 1'-0"
EXISTING SIDE (EAST) ELEVATION

1/4" = 1'-0"
EXISTING REAR ELEVATION

1/4" = 1'-0"
PROPOSED BASEMENT PLAN
1/4" = 1'-0"
PROPOSED ROOF PLAN

1/4" = 1'-0"
PROPOSED SIDE (WEST) ELEVATION

NEW ROOF SHAPE WITH ARCHITECTURAL ASPHALT SHINGLES

REPLACE EXISTING VENT WITH NEW FIBERGLASS WINDOW

T.O. PLATE

REPAIR EXISTING WOOD RAILING

E @ 2ND FLR.

REPAIR EXISTING WOOD COLUMN AS NECESSARY

E @ 1ST FLR.

T.O. BASEMENT SLAB

NEW SOLID MASONRY FOUNDATION WALL - PARZED AND PAINTED

NEW BASEMENT EGRESS WINDOW AND EGRESS WELL

NEW PT WOOD LANDING AND STEPS
GRILLE OPTIONS

With Andersen, you'll find grille patterns, widths and configurations to fit any architectural style or the taste of any homeowner. If you're replacing windows and doors, we can match virtually any existing grille. We'll even work with you and your customers to create custom patterns.

Note: Some grille patterns not available in all configurations and products.

Colonial  Prairie  Diamond  Tall Fractional  Tall Fractional with 2 2/3" rail  Short Fractional  Short Fractional with 2 5/8" rail

Simulated Double-Hung  Specified Equal Light* Fractional  2 x 2  Specified Equal Light*  1 x 4  Custom Patterns

Our 2 ¼-inch-wide grille can make a casement window look like a double-hung.

Contact your Andersen supplier for your custom needs.

To see all of the standard patterns available for a specific window or door, refer to the detailed sections in this book for each product or contact your Andersen supplier.

GRILLE CONFIGURATIONS

Full Divided Light
For an authentic look, full divided light grilles are permanently applied to the interior and exterior of the window with a spacer between the glass.

Simulated Divided Light
Simulated divided light offers permanent grilles on the exterior and interior with no spacer between the glass. We also offer permanent exterior grilles with removable interior grilles in natural wood or prefinished white.

Convenient Cleaning Options
Removable interior grilles come off for easy cleaning. Andersen® Finelight™ grilles are installed between the glass panes and feature a contoured 1" or ¾" profile.

Grille Widths
(actual size shown)

3/4"  7/8"  1 1/8"  2 3/4"

*Specify number of same-size rectangles across or down.
Easy Egress Well - White

Specifications
- Item #: BK-EW-563660-WHITE
- Manufacturer: Boman Kemp
- Height: 60"
- Projection: 36"
- Well Width: 56" (53" inside)
- Materials: Galvanized Steel
- Weight: 90 lbs.
- Code Compliant: Yes
- Production Time: 1-2 business days

Description
Egress window requirements don't have to be intimidating. Easy Egress window wells are easy to install and provide the space for a safe basement window escape if there's ever an emergency. In neutral white, it goes with everything so no matter what style home you have, Easy Egress Window Wells can fit in.

You May Also Like
- Egress Ladder for Easy Well
- Easy Egress Kit - White
- Grate for Easy Well
- Easy Egress Window Frame Buck - Heavy Duty
- Easy Egress Vinyl Window
Customer Reviews (4)

Click here to write your own review.

⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐ Nice
like the white color as it seems to reflect more light into the basement.

⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐ Rediculous Shipping Charges
While the quality of the well is fine, the shipping charges on the orders are ridiculous. $239 whether you order a well or a flat cover. I will have a local metal fabricator make all my wells from now on.

⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐ Egress window set
Looks great but have not used it yet

⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐ Excellent
Dear Custmers: I am ashamed to admit that I accidentally over ordered product (in other words we ordered twice from two different companies). I called egress windows and they, very professionally walked me through several options, of which I was very greatful. To make an embarrassing story short they went out of their way to help. I am very greatful for the outcome. I would not hesitate to use egress windows!
Regards, Shannon
Smooth-Star®
Half Lite 2 Panel | Style No. S206

7 Available Sizes
2'6" x 6'8"  2'8" x 6'8"  2'8" x 7'0"  2'10" x 6'8"  2'10" x 7'0"  3'0" x 6'8"  3'0" x 7'0"
THERMA-TRU VIBRANT PAINT OPTIONS

Want to see other finishing options? Visit our finishing page to view all paint and stain options available through Therma-Tru.

GLASS OPTIONS

Be Inspired by Our Community

Overview
Features

Inviting selection of door styles
Wide choice of glass designs
On-trend variety of textures
High-definition panel embossments
Weather resistance
Security and durability
High energy-efficiency R-values

Literature

- Full-Line Catalog
- Door System Brochure
- Warranty
- Tru-Defense Warranty
- Technical Manuals
- Building Codes
- Door Specifications and Data
- 3 Part Spec
- Easy Spec
- ENERGY Star
Glass Details

Clear

Clear Glass is fully transparent, delivering an unobstructed view.

Glass Privacy Rating

1 10
Flat Trim - TDS-FLTFLT

Add a beautiful, finished look to the entry with a stylish, low-maintenance door surround. Smooth Flat Trim provides a versatile look, and pairs best with Modern Prairie, Stylish Shed and Mid-Century Modern homes.
The S262-SDL is a clear glass with 9 divided lites and the S206 is a half lite clear glass with no dividing lites.

Bobby · a year ago

Difference between model S262-SDL and model S206-LHI?

Answer this Question

Therma-Tru · a year ago

The S262-SDL is a clear glass with 9 divided lites and the S206 is a half lite clear glass with no dividing lites.

Linda · 2 years ago

Could you tell me the differences between S-206 and S-2100. I could not read anything specific but the trim around the door glass looked different. Price?

Answer this Question

Therma-Tru · 2 years ago

Hi Linda,
Thank you for your interest in Smooth Star doors. Model S206 has a raised frame that surrounds the glass. Should the glass ever break the frames can be removed and the glass changed. Model S2100 is flush glazed. Doors that are flush glazed have glass that is inserted into the door during manufacturing giving the door a clean easy to maintain appearance. Unfortunately should the glass ever break, it is not removable. A new door would be needed.

Helpful?  Yes · 0  No · 0  Report

Krugenator · 2 years ago
Do any of your doors come with a double hung window? We're looking at fiberglass, colonial, 2'8", in white.

Answer this Question

Therma-Tru · 2 years ago
Good morning,

Thank you for your interest in a Therma-Tru door. Smooth Star fiberglass model S243 is a half-lite 2-panel door with a vent lite window with screen. The sash slides upward.

Helpful?  Yes · 1  No · 0  Report

mamaya16 · 2 years ago
What is this door made of

Answer this Question

Therma-Tru · 2 years ago
Good afternoon,

Thank you for considering a Therma-Tru Smooth Star door. Smooth Star doors are made of fiberglass. They have a smooth surface that you paint.

Helpful?  Yes · 0  No · 0  Report

connie · 3 months ago
Does the glass in this door have any UV protection? What amount?
More from Smooth-Star®

EXPLOR THE FULL COLLECTION

Smooth-Star®
S5705XJ-SDLF1

Smooth-Star®
S1205XE-SDLF1

Smooth-Star®
S8691XN-SDLF2

Smooth-Star®
S685LXR-SDLF2
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 dan.bruechert@montgomeryplanning.org to schedule a follow-up site visit.