MONTGOMERY COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT

Address: 7417 Maple Ave., Takoma Park
Meeting Date: 7/29/2020

Resource: Contributing Resource
Report Date: 7/22/2020
Takoma Park Historic District
Public Notice: 7/15/2020

Applicant: David Bend
Tax Credit: No

Review: HAWP
Staff: Michael Kyne

Case Number: 37/03-20CCC

PROPOSAL: Window replacement

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the HPC approve with one (1) condition the HAWP application.

1. Only the three (3) basement-level windows will be replaced. Final window specifications will be submitted to staff for review and approval.

ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

SIGNIFICANCE: Contributing Resource within the Takoma Park Historic District
STYLE: Dutch Colonial Revival
DATE: c. 1910-20s

Fig. 1: Subject property.
BACKGROUND

The applicant previously appeared before the Commission for a preliminary consultation at the March 11, 2020.1

PROPOSAL

The applicant proposes the following work items at the subject property:

- Replace 14 existing windows.

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.

• Original size and shape of window and door openings should be maintained, where feasible.

• 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.

Montgomery County Code; Chapter 24A-8

(a) The commission shall instruct the director to deny a permit if it finds, based on the evidence and information presented to or before the commission that the alteration for which the permit is sought would be inappropriate, inconsistent with or detrimental to the preservation, enhancement or ultimate protection of the historic site or historic resource within an historic district, and to the purposes of this chapter.

(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

(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; 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 the 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.” The applicable Standards in this case 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.

5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.

6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive features, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

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.

STAFF DISCUSSION

The subject property is a c. 1910-20s Dutch Colonial Revival-style Contributing Resource within the Takoma Park Historic District. The house has a gambrel roof, shed dormer, nearly full-width front porch, and six-over-six double-hung windows, which are typical of Dutch Colonial Revival architecture and character-defining features of the subject property. The house is on a corner lot with Maple Avenue to the west (front) and Valley View Avenue to the south (right).

The applicant proposes to replace 14 windows at the subject property. The windows proposed to be replaced include 11 first- and second-floor windows, and three (3) basement-level windows. All of the upper floor windows to be replaced are original to the house. 10 of these windows are six-over-six double-hung wood windows, and one window on the first floor, south (right) elevation is a paired 6-lite wood casement window.

At the basement-level, two windows are proposed to be replaced on the south (right) elevation, and one window is proposed to be replaced on the north (left) elevation. The windows to be replaced on the south (right) elevation include one six-lite wood casement window and one two-lite wood awning window. The window to be replaced on the north (left) elevation is a four-lite wood casement window. The six-lite wood casement window on the south (right) elevation is original to the house and is consistent with the style of the six-over-six double-hung windows on the upper floors. The four-lite wood casement window on the north (left) elevation also appears to be original to the house, as it is consistent with two four-lite casement windows directly above it on the first floor. The material and weathering of the two-lite awning window on the south (right) elevation is consistent with the other windows.
The applicant has stated that they are proposing to replace the existing window to address lead paint and energy efficiency issues.

The applicant previously appeared before the Commission at the March 11, 2020 HPC meeting for a preliminary consultation. At that time, the applicant only proposed to replace a nine (9) windows, including six (6) second-floor windows and three (3) basement-level windows.

In the March 11, 2020 preliminary consultation staff report, staff provided the following analysis regarding the proposed window replacement:

Staff visited the subject property on Wednesday, February 19, 2020 to assess the condition of the windows to be replaced. Staff found many of the windows had peeling paint, one basement-level window was in clear need of weatherization, one second-floor window had a cracked pane of glass, and another second-floor window had a broken sash cord. Overall, however, the windows were in good condition and repairable.

In accordance with the Standards and preservation best practices, staff recommended that the windows be repaired and provided contact information for several contractors that specialize in historic window restoration. In a later telephone conversation, the applicant informed staff that a contractor had since assessed their windows and recommended restoration and the addition of storm windows. However, the applicant prefers window replacement, due to the presence of lead-based paint on the original windows as well as issues regarding home energy performance.

The applicant had a lead test performed by LeadProbe, Inc. on February 4, 2020. The test was conducted in accordance with Housing and Urban development (HUD) Protocols Chapter 7 (1997), EPA 40 CFR 745.227, and MDE COMAR Chapter 26-16. The results indicated the presence of lead-based paint on the original woodwork throughout the entire house. While lead-based paint was present on the original windows, casings, and jambs, it was also present on the doors, door jambs, stairs, walls, cabinets, shelving, and baseboards. The test concluded that there was defective lead-based paint, constituting a lead-based paint hazard, on the following:

- **Interior:**
  - All window wells are extremely dirty, and most are chipping
  - Front left bedroom closet shelves, shelf supports, doors, door jambs and casings
  - Front right bedroom entry door, door jambs and casings
  - Basement stairs exit to exterior door jamb and casings

- **Exterior:**
  - All soffit where chipping/peeling
  - Side D basement door and door jamb

To eliminate the lead-based paint hazards, LeadProbe, Inc. recommended stabilization of the paint using an EPA RRP certified contractor.

According to Chapter 18: Lead-Based Paint and Historic Preservation of HUD’s Guidelines for the Evaluation and Control of Lead-Based Paint Hazards in Housing (2012 edition), paint stabilization is the “correction of substrate defects, specialized cleaning, temporary repairs, management and resident education programs, and ongoing LBP maintenance. Paint stabilization, an interim control that allows intact historic paint to remain in place (with topcoat of lead-free paint) is the least damaging treatment to an element. Stabilized surfaces will, however, have to be properly maintained.”
Staff concurs with LeadProbe, Inc.’s recommendation, as it is consistent with the Standards and preservation best practices, and it also complies with HUD’s recommendations. Chapter 18 of HUD’s guidelines continues:

HUD recommends that all lead-based paint professionals and housing agencies should consider interim controls on historic properties instead of abatement if feasible and permissible. For historic properties, interim controls are preferred because they preserve the original structure and are usually less costly. In some cases, however, interim controls are not technically feasible, or the condition of the affected building components is poor, which makes interim controls impractical. In all cases, decision-makers should justify and be able to document their position.

Staff would also support lead abatement/lead-based paint removal, either on- or off-site, which can be performed by a contractor specializing in historic window restoration without damaging the windows. However, staff notes that removal of lead-based paint from the windows will not eliminate the lead-based paint hazards at the subject property. As noted in LeadProbe, Inc.’s test results, lead-based paint is present on the original woodwork throughout the entire house.

The National Park Service’s Preservation Brief 37: Appropriate Methods for Reducing Lead-Paint Hazards in Historic Housing, includes a list of lead-based paint hazards that should be removed, mitigated, or managed. The list is provided in order from greatest to least health risk, with 1 being the greatest and 8 the least. The list is as follows:

1. Peeling, chipping, flaking, and chewed interior lead-based paint and surfaces
2. Lead dust on interior surfaces
3. High lead in soil levels around the house and in play areas (check state requirements)
4. Deteriorated exterior painted surfaces and features
5. Friction surfaces subject to abrasion (windows, doors, painted floors)
6. Accessible, chewable surfaces (sills, rails) if small children are present
7. Impact surfaces (baseboards and door jambs)
8. Other interior surfaces showing age or deterioration (walls and ceilings)

According to this list, the original windows are not the greatest lead-based paint hazard at the subject property. Any poorly maintained lead-based paint on the interior or exterior of the house poses a greater risk, and any chewable or impact surfaces pose a similar risk.

The applicant has cited the Montgomery County Department of Health and Human Services’ website for Childhood Lead Poisoning Case Management, which states the following regarding lead poisoning prevention:

The best way to prevent lead poisoning is to remove the source of lead. If you cannot remove peeling or chipping lead-based paint [emphasis added] right away, block the area with a heavy chair so a child cannot get to it. You can also shut the door to a room or move a crib or bed away from the wall. Remove the lead source promptly and safely. Protect your child from lead dust by wet washing the floors and wiping down your windowsills, woodwork, chairs and tables often. Be sure to wash your child’s hands, face, and toys often with soap and water. You may also use a High Efficiency Particulate Air (HEPA) vacuum cleaner with a specialized filter designed to trap virtually all of the lead dust. This prevents small particles of lead from being blown throughout the room in the exhaust of the vacuum.

Although the Department of Health and Human Services’ website states that the source of lead
should be removed promptly and safely, staff argues that the referenced source is peeling or chipping lead-based paint. This is consistent with available guidance, including the previously cited guidance from HUD and the National Park Service.

Concerning energy efficiency, staff notes that the applicant contracted Atlas Home Energy Solutions to conduct a Home Energy Audit on February 28, 2018. The resulting report states the following regarding windows and doors:

While windows and doors are commonly talked about as the one of the most important energy saving upgrades; replacing all the windows or doors in your home is often one of the least cost-effective energy improvements. However, some problems caused by old or improperly installed windows/doors can be fixed cost effectively. These include:

1. Installing weatherstripping on leaky doors.
2. Sealing leaky window frames and sashes.
3. Installing low-e films to existing windows.
4. Adding blinds and drapes to block unwanted heat from the sun.

To improve energy efficiency, the report recommended that weatherstripping be added to multiple doors around the house, specifically those at the front, rear, and basement-level.

Given the good, repairable condition of the windows, LeadProbe, Inc’s test results and recommendation, and the guidance provided by HUD and the National Park Service, staff does not support the proposal to replace the original windows at the subject property. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Standards – specifically, Standards #2, #5, #6, and #9, as cited on Page 4. Staff recommends that the applicant work with an experienced historic window restoration contractor to repair the windows and to stabilize or abate the lead-based paint, per the contractor’s recommendations.

Staff notes that window restoration (including the cost of lead abatement) is eligible for the County’s 25% Historic Preservation Tax Credit, which can help offset any cost discrepancies between window repair and replacement. Additionally, the HPC encourages the installation of storm windows, which is also eligible for the tax credit, as it can address energy efficiency problems and act as a deterrent to window replacement. The subject property is also within the National Register of Historic Places-listed Takoma Park Historic District, and window restoration would be eligible for the State’s 20% Historic Preservation Tax Credit, which is administered by the Maryland Historical Trust.

At the March 11, 2020 preliminary consultation, the Commission recommended that the applicant explore appropriate alternatives to window replacement. Specifically, the Commission recommended the following:

a. Explore the cost of window restoration and storm window installation, adjusting for the County and State historic preservation tax credits.
   i. For comparison, the cost of the proposed replacement windows and installation should also be provided.

b. Explore off-site “dipping” to strip the windows of lead-based paint.

c. Work with staff to find additional window restoration companies, which may provide the required restoration and lead-based paint abatement at a lower cost.

The Commission also advised that the applicant could return with a complete HAWP application for window replacement, if they choose to pursue the current proposal.
The applicant has returned with a HAWP application and has provided the information recommended by the Commission. Specifically, the applicant has provided a cost comparison, demonstrating an 18% to 24% higher cost for window restoration and storm window installation, as opposed to window replacement. The applicant also indicated that they contacted several window restoration firms regarding off-site “dipping.” Only one firm responded, but they did not recommend “dipping,” because dip tanks use an acid solution that can adversely affect the wood. Finally, the applicant stated that they contacted 10 window companies regarding lead paint abatement, and nine of the 10 either did not respond, indicated that they would not take on a job of that size, or stated that the subject property was outside their service area.

The applicant also provided information regarding “the public health basis for removal vs. repair.” Staff previously addressed this question in the March 11, 2020 preliminary consultation staff report, which is excerpted above.

After review of the additionally submitted information, staff continues to recommend that the existing upper floor windows be repaired (and the lead paint stabilized) rather than replaced, in accordance with the Guidelines and Standards. This recommendation is based upon staff’s observations regarding the condition of the windows proposed to be replaced during the February 19, 2020 site visit, as well as LeadProbe, Inc.’s recommendations, HUD’s Guidelines for the Evaluation and Control of Lead-Based Paint Hazards in Housing (2012 edition), and the National Park Service’s Preservation Brief 37: Appropriate Methods for Reducing Lead-Paint Hazards in Historic Housing. Staff’s recommendation is also consistent with the recommendations of the Home Energy Audit that the applicant had performed by Atlas Home Energy on February 28, 2018, although energy efficiency alone is not ground for replacement of original materials and/or features.

Staff does support the replacement of the three (3) basement-level windows, as the Commission’s practice has been to exercise greater leniency when reviewing window replacement proposals for basement-level windows. Generally, basement-level windows serve a more utilitarian function, and the replacement of basement-level windows does not substantially alter or remove character-defining features of a historic property. Staff finds that the same applies in this case. Accordingly, staff finds that the proposed basement-level window replacement is consistent with the Guidelines and Standards.

After full and fair consideration of the applicant’s submission staff finds the proposal, as modified by the one (1) condition specified on Circle 1, as being consistent with the Criteria for Issuance in Chapter 24A-8(b) 1 and 2, having found the modified proposal is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation #2, #5, #6, and #9, and Takoma Park Historic District Guidelines outlined above.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that the Commission approve with the one (1) condition specified on Circle 1 the HAWP application under the Criteria for Issuance in Chapter 24A-8(b), (1), (2) & (d) having found that the proposal, as modified by the condition, is consistent with the Takoma Park Historic District Guidelines, and therefore will not substantially alter the exterior features of the historic resource and is compatible in character with the district and the purposes of Chapter 24A;

and with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation #2, #5, #6, and #9;

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.
Update to Application (July 10, 2020)

After the initial consultation, staff advised me to look into three questions:

a. Explore the cost of window restoration and storm window installation, adjusting for the County and State historic preservation tax credits.
   i. For comparison, the cost of the proposed replacement windows and installation should also be provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Window Cost (with Installation)</th>
<th>Restoration Firm 1</th>
<th>Restoration Firm 2</th>
<th>Applicant High Quality Historically Conforming Windows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$30,800</td>
<td>$27,611.08</td>
<td>$37,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-State Tax Credits</td>
<td>$6,160</td>
<td>$5,522.16</td>
<td>7,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-County Tax Credits</td>
<td>$7,700</td>
<td>$6,902.77</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$16,940</td>
<td>$15,186</td>
<td>$29,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Window encapsulation (700/window)</td>
<td>$9,800</td>
<td>$9,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Storm Windows (with Installation)</td>
<td>$10,375</td>
<td>$10,375</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$37,115</td>
<td>$35,361</td>
<td>$29,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Premium vs. historically conforming windows</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lead abatement is very expensive, even with available tax credits. The restoration approach will cost approximately 20% more, but leave lead paint intact in the window head, apron, stool and sill.

b. Explore off-site “dipping” to strip the windows of lead-based paint.

Applicant inquired about dipping as a stripping method. Only one window rehabilitation firm answered the question (one highly regarded by staff). And the response was that dipping was
not advised because “Dip tanks are associated with a tank full of acid solution that can adversely affect the wood.”

c. Work with staff to find additional window restoration companies, which may provide the required restoration and lead-based paint abatement at a lower cost.

Applicant contacted 10 other window companies. One that was provided directly by staff and nine others that were listed in the Prince George County list of recommended providers that was also provided by staff. The one firm provided by staff responded (listed as firm #2 above). All other companies either said they would not: 1) take on a job of this size; 2) the applicant’s home was outside their service area; or 3) did not respond.

The public health basis for removal vs. repair

We have recently received test reports back (see attached) indicating our home has levels of lead above the EPA thresholds. And we have done further testing (also attached) highlighting that our windows are a source of lead.

As a result, we are seeking the window replacement under the Historic Preservation ordinance 24-A8 b(4) which clearly states: "Proposal is necessary in order that unsafe conditions or hazards be remedied."

Lead poisoning is a clear and present danger to children.\(^1\) And the county, state and federal public health community is unambiguous in its remediation recommendation: removal.

From Montgomery County’s Health Department: “The best way to prevent lead poisoning is to remove the source of lead." And also, “Remove the lead source promptly and safely.”\(^2\)

From the State of Maryland Department of the Environment, “Do replace old windows.” \(^3\)

From CDC: “the removal of lead hazards from the environment before a child is exposed – is the most effective way to ensure that children do not experience harmful long-term effects of lead exposure.”\(^4\)

HUD - found that homes where windows were replaced had >50% less window sill lead dust and >40% less floor lead dust than repaired windows.\(^5\)

Also From HUD: “Controlling lead hazards in historic buildings is a balancing act between several important objectives: childhood health, economic feasibility, and historic preservation.”

\(^1\) [https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/HHS-Program/PHS/PHSChildLeadPos-p264.html#faq](https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/HHS-Program/PHS/PHSChildLeadPos-p264.html#faq)
\(^2\) [https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/HHS-Program/PHS/PHSChildLeadPos-p264.html#faq](https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/HHS-Program/PHS/PHSChildLeadPos-p264.html#faq)
\(^3\) [https://mde.maryland.gov/programs/LAND/LeadPoisoningPrevention/Pages/parents_know.aspx](https://mde.maryland.gov/programs/LAND/LeadPoisoningPrevention/Pages/parents_know.aspx)
\(^4\) [https://www.cdc.gov/nceh/lead/prevention/default.htm](https://www.cdc.gov/nceh/lead/prevention/default.htm)
Window Survey

Two Maple Avenue windows

- Exact Dimensions of each window to be replaced
  - Jamb size - 34.50” x 53.50” / sash stiles - 2” / bottom rail= 2 3/8” / meeting rail- 1 1/8” / Visible glass - 30.25” x 23.75” / 5/8” grilles - 10” on center

- Exact Dimensions of each replacement window

- Conditions assessment
  - The window is extremely energy inefficient and leaks cold and warm air into our home. The lead paint is chipping and shows signs of substantial deterioration.

Two Kitchen Windows

- Jamb size - 34.50” x 53.50” / sash stiles - 2” / bottom rail= 2 3/8” / meeting rail- 1 1/8” / Visible glass - 30.25” x 23.75” / 5/8” grilles - 10” on center

- Exact Dimensions of each replacement window

One Kitchen French window

- Jamb size - 33” X 33”
● **Exact dimensions of each replacement window**

**PERFORMANCE:** Standard Performance


**GLASS:** Glass Thickness: Double Glazed, Solar Low-E, Mill Finish Spacer, Glass Preserve / Neat Coating: Glass Preserve without Neat Coating, Ovolo Glazing Bead

**HARDWARE-ACCESSORIES:** Multi-Point Lock, Clay (Rustic) Hardware, Bright Brass Hinges, BetterVue Fiberglass Screen

**CASING-JAMBS-TRIM:** Standard Brickmould, Standard Sill Nosing, Apply Exterior Casing/Accessories, 5 5/16" Jambs, 10 1/16" Clips


**MANUFACTURER NOTES:**
Opening(s) designated by a circled ‘E’ meet most national building codes for emergency escape and rescue requirements. Check local codes for product compliance for desired application. Number of installation clips applied is configured for a DP20 installation design pressure. Kolbe also recommends adding an additional 1/2" to the standard rough opening.

● **Conditions assessment**

○ The window is extremely energy inefficient and leaks cold and warm air into our home. The window no longer seals and when it rains water leaches into our home. The lead paint on the window is also severely cracked.

**Child’s Bedroom #1 (One Window)**

● **Exact Dimensions of each window to be replaced**

○ Jamb size- 34.50” x 53.50” / sash stiles- 2” / bottom rail= 2 3/8” / meeting rail- 1 1/8” / Visible glass- 30.25” x 23.75” / 5/8” grilles- 10” on center

● **Exact Dimensions of each proposed new window:**

**PERFORMANCE:** Standard Performance


**GLASS:** Glass Thickness: Double Glazed, Solar Low-E, Mill Finish Spacer, Glass Preserve / Neat Coating: Glass Preserve without Neat Coating, Ovolo Glazing Bead

**HARDWARE-ACCESSORIES:** Lock Style: Signature, Clay (Rustic) Hardware, Screen: Half Screen, BetterVue Fiberglass Screen, Jambliner: Beige

**CASING-JAMBS-TRIM:** Standard Brickmould, Standard Sill Nosing, Apply Exterior Casing/Accessories, 5 5/16” Jambs, Jambs Applied, 10 1/16” Clips


**MANUFACTURER NOTES:**
Number of installation clips applied is configured for a DP20 installation design pressure. Kolbe also recommends adding an additional 1/2” to the standard rough opening.

● **Conditions assessment**

○ The window is extremely energy inefficient and leaks cold and warm air into our home. The bottom of the window is severely deteriorated (photo included) which is leading to the leakiness.

**Child’s Bedroom #2 (One Window)**
● Exact Dimensions of each window to be replaced
  ○ Jamb size- 34.50” x 53.50” / sash stiles- 2” / bottom rail= 2 3/8” / meeting rail- 1 1/8” / Visible glass- 30.25” x 23.75” / 5/8” grilles- 10” on center

● Exact Dimensions of each proposed new window

PERFORMANCE: Standard Performance


HARDWARE-ACCESSORIES: Lock Style: Signature, Clay (Rustic) Hardware, Screen: Half Screen, BetterVue Fiberglass Screen, Jambliner: Beige

CASING-JAMBS-TRIM: Standard Brickmould , Standard Sill Nosing, Apply Exterior Casing/Accessories, 5 5/16” Jambs, Jambs Applied, 10 1/16” Clips


MANUFACTURER NOTES:
Number of installation clips applied is configured for a DP20 installation design pressure. Kolbe also recommends adding an additional 1/2” to the standard rough opening.

● Conditions assessment
  ○ The window is extremely energy inefficient and leaks cold and warm air into our home.
  In addition, the leakiness makes the room very noisy and since we live on a busy street it makes it difficult to sleep in the room.

Philadelphia Avenue Facing Adult Bedroom (One Window)

● Exact Dimensions of each window to be replaced
  ○ Jamb size- 34.50” x 53.50” / sash stiles- 2” / bottom rail= 2 3/8” / meeting rail- 1 1/8” / Visible glass- 30.25” x 23.75” / 5/8” grilles- 10” on center

● Exact Dimensions of each proposed new window

PERFORMANCE: Standard Performance


HARDWARE-ACCESSORIES: Lock Style: Signature, Clay (Rustic) Hardware, Screen: Half Screen, BetterVue Fiberglass Screen, Jambliner: Beige

CASING-JAMBS-TRIM: Standard Brickmould , Standard Sill Nosing, Apply Exterior Casing/Accessories, 5 5/16” Jambs, Jambs Applied, 10 1/16” Clips


MANUFACTURER NOTES:
Number of installation clips applied is configured for a DP20 installation design pressure. Kolbe also recommends adding an additional 1/2” to the standard rough opening.

● Conditions assessment
- The window is extremely energy inefficient and leaks cold and warm air into our home. In addition, the leakiness makes the room very noisy and since we live on a busy street it makes it difficult to sleep in the room.

Maple Avenue Facing Adult Bedroom (Two windows)
- Exact Dimensions of each window to be replaced
  - Jamb size- 28.50" x 53.50"/ sash stiles- 2"/ bottom rail- 2 3/8"/ meeting rail-1 1/8"/ Visible glass- 24.25" x 23.75"/ 5/8" grilles- 8" on center
- Exact Dimensions of each proposed new window

- Conditions assessment
  - The window is extremely energy inefficient and leaks cold and warm air into our home. The window is also cracked. In addition, the leakiness makes the room very noisy and since we live on a busy street it makes it difficult to sleep in the room.

Upstairs Bathroom (One window)
- Exact Dimensions of each window to be replaced
  - Exact Dimensions of each window to be replaced
    - Jamb size- 34.50" x 53.50" / sash stiles- 2"/ bottom rail= 2 3/8" / meeting rail- 1 1/8" / Visible glass- 30.25" x 23.75"/ 5/8" grilles- 10" on center
- Exact Dimensions of each proposed new window
• Conditions assessment
  ○ The window is extremely energy inefficient and leaks cold and warm air into our home. An energy audit commissioned through Pepco identified our windows as one of the biggest sources of energy loss in our home. We are very committed to doing what is in our control to limit our carbon footprint. In addition, the leakiness makes the room very noisy.

Basement facing Valley View (one Window)
  • Exact Dimensions of each window to be replaced
    ■ Jamb size- 34.50” x 34.50” / sash stiles- 2” / bottom rail= 2 3/8” / meeting rail- 1 1/8” / Visible glass- 30” x 30” / 5/8” grilles- 10” on center
  • Exact Dimensions of each proposed new window
    ○ The replacement window will have a jamb size of 34.5” X 34.50”. We will be using the premium wood Pella Architectural Series which is the highest grade window we found (several contractors were consulted) specified for historic district renovations (see attachment). The window will be prefinished white in and out with all wood interior jamb liners. There will be ⅜” traditional ILT colonial grilles with white traditional spoon locks. The contractor will also finish the perimeter with color matched stops to marry the windows to existing exterior wood trim. The ILT grilles are Simulated Divided Light which means they are applied to the interior and exterior of the window glass with a foam spacer. From our research, they are the most realistic simulated light grilles on the market. The windows contain all wood jamb liners and muntin profiles.
  • Conditions assessment
    ○ The window is extremely energy inefficient and leaks cold and warm air into our home. An energy audit commissioned through Pepco identified our windows as one of the biggest sources of energy loss in our home. We are very committed to doing what is in our control to limit our carbon footprint.

Basement facing Philadelphia (one Window)
  ○ Exact Dimensions of each window to be replaced
- **Jamb size**: 28” x 32” / **sash stiles**: 2” / **bottom rail**: 2 3/8” / **meeting rail**: 1 1/8” / **Visible glass**: 22” x 27.5” / **5/8” grilles**: 10” on center

- **Exact Dimensions of each proposed new window**
  - The replacement window will have a jamb size of 28” X 32”. We will be using the premium wood Pella Architectural Series which is the highest grade window we found (several contractors were consulted) specified for historic district renovations (see attachment). The window will be prefinished white in and out with all wood interior jamb liners. There will be ⅞” traditional ILT colonial grilles with white traditional spoon locks. The contractor will also finish the perimeter with color matched stops to marry the windows to existing exterior wood trim. The ILT grilles are Simulated Divided Light which means they are applied to the interior and exterior of the window glass with a foam spacer. From our research, they are the most realistic simulated light grilles on the market. The windows contain all wood jamb liners and muntin profiles.

- **Conditions assessment**
  - The window is extremely energy inefficient and leaks cold and warm air into our home. An energy audit commissioned through Pepco identified our windows as one of the biggest sources of energy loss in our home. We are very committed to doing what is in our control to limit our carbon footprint.

**Basement Facing Valley View Bathroom Window**

- **Exact Dimensions of each window to be replaced**
  - **Jamb size**: 30” x 16” / **sash stiles**: 2” / **bottom rail**: 2 3/8” / **meeting rail**: 1 1/8” / **Visible glass**: 25” x 12” / **5/8” grilles**: 10” on center

- **Exact Dimensions of each proposed new window**
  - The replacement window will have a jamb size of 30” X 16”. We will be using the premium wood Pella Architectural Series which is the highest grade window we found (several contractors were consulted) specified for historic district renovations (see attachment). The window will be prefinished white in and out with all wood interior jamb liners. There will be ⅞” traditional ILT colonial grilles. The contractor will also finish the perimeter with color matched stops to marry the windows to existing exterior wood trim. The ILT grilles are Simulated Divided Light which means they are applied to the interior and exterior of the window glass with a foam spacer. From our research, they are the most realistic simulated light grilles on the market. The windows contain all wood jamb liners and muntin profiles.

- **Conditions assessment**
  - The window is extremely energy inefficient and leaks cold and warm air into our home. There is a visible gap between the window and our wall which is open to the outside.
Kitchen Window #1
French Window
Child's Bedroom 1 Photos (Note, plywood nailed into the window)
Child's Bedroom 2
Maple Avenue Facing Adult Bedroom (Two Windows)
Philadelphia Avenue Facing  Adult Bedroom (One Window)
Basement facing Valley View
Basement facing Philadelphia
Basement Shower Window
Perfect touch

to Erin, David

David,

My recommendation to you as an EPA-MDE lead abatement certified company is that you replace the windows instead of encapsulating the lead paint with us.

Best,

[Signature]

perfect touch

[Logo: Fine Paints of Europe CERTIFIED PAINTER]