



Montgomery Planning

Historic Preservation

7/29/2020

Case I.J

7417 Maple Avenue, Takoma Park

Contributing Resource, Takoma Park Historic District

Dutch Colonial Revival, c. 1910 - 20s

37/03-20CCC



Background

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

Proposal

- Replace 14 existing windows.

Applicable Guidelines

- *Montgomery County Code; Chapter 24A-8*
- *Takoma Park Historic District Guidelines*
- *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*
 - 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.

Discussion

- The subject property is a corner lot with Maple Avenue to the west (front) and Valley View Avenue to the south (right).
- 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.

Discussion (cont.)

- The applicant proposes to replace 14 windows at the subject property.
- The applicant has stated that they are proposing to replace the existing window to address lead paint and energy efficiency issues.
 - 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.

Discussion (cont.)

- 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.

Discussion (cont.)

- In the March 11, 2020 preliminary consultation staff report, staff provided a full analysis regarding the proposed window replacement.
- This analysis has been included in its entirety on Circles 5 - 7 of the current (July 29, 2020) HAWP staff report.

Discussion (cont.)

- 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:
 - Explore the cost of window restoration and storm window installation, adjusting for the County and State historic preservation tax credits.
 - For comparison, the cost of the proposed replacement windows and installation should also be provided.
 - Explore off-site “dipping” to strip the windows of lead-based paint.
 - Work with staff to find additional window restoration companies, which may provide the required restoration and lead-based paint abatement at a lower cost.

Discussion (cont.)

- The applicant 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.
 - 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.

Discussion (cont.)

- After review of the additionally submitted information, staff continues to recommend that the existing upper floor windows be repaired (and the lead paint removed or 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 grounds for replacement of original materials and/or features.

Discussion (cont.)

- 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*.

Discussion (cont.)

- Staff notes that the recommended window repairs (including lead removal and/or stabilization and storm window installation) would qualify for the County's 25% Historic Preservation Tax Credit.
 - This work could be phased and still qualify for the tax credit, as the minimum to spend to qualify is only \$1,000 per year.

Recommendations

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.

Questions for staff?