MONTGOMERY COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT

Address: 3932 Prospect St., Kensington
Resource: Secondary Resource
Kensington Historic District
Applicant:
Review: HAWP
Case No.: 941701 (amended)
PROPOSAL: Window Replacement

Meeting Date: 4/14/2021
Report Date: 4/7/2021
Public Notice: 3/31/2021
Tax Credit: No
Staff: Dan Bruechert

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the HPC approve the HAWP.

ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

SIGNIFICANCE: Secondary Resource within the Kensington Historic District
STYLE: Colonial Revival
DATE: 1925

Figure 1: 3932 Prospect Street, Kensington.
I.B

PROPOSAL

The applicant proposes to remove nine (9) historic wood windows and install new wood windows.

APPLICABLE GUIDELINES

Kensington Historic District Guidelines

When reviewing alterations and new construction within the Kensington Historic District several documents are to be utilized as guidelines to assist the Commission in developing their decision. These documents include the Approved & Adopted Amendment to the Master Plan for Historic Preservation: Kensington Historic District, Atlas #31/6 (Amendment), Vision of Kensington: A Long-Range Preservation Plan (Vision), 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.

Approved & Adopted Amendment to the Master Plan for Historic Preservation: Kensington Historic District, Atlas #31/6

"In regard to the properties identified as secondary resources--that is visually contributing, but non-historic structures or vacant land within the Kensington District--the Ordinance requires the Preservation Commission to be lenient in its judgment of plans for contemporary structures or for plans involving new construction unless such plans would seriously impair the historic or architectural value of surrounding resources or impair the character of the district."

Vision of Kensington: A Long-Range Preservation Plan

The HPC formally adopted the planning study, Vision of Kensington: A Long-Range Preservation Plan, and is directed by the Executive Regulations, which were approved by the County Council, to use this plan when considering changes and alterations to the Kensington Historic District. The goal of this preservation plan "was to establish a sound database of information from, which to produce a document that would serve the HPC, M-NCPPC, their staff and the community in wrestling with the protection of historic districts amidst the pressures of life in the 21st century." (page 1). The plan provides a specific physical description of the district as it is; an analysis of character-defining features of the district; a discussion of the challenges facing the district; and a discussion of proposed strategies for maintaining the character of the district while allowing for appropriate growth and change.

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
   (4) The proposal is necessary in order that unsafe conditions or health hazards be remedied; 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
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 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.

STAFF DISCUSSION

The subject property is a two-story colonial revival house with a side gable roof, clapboard siding, and six-over-six wood windows throughout. Even though the structure retains much of its historic integrity it is identified in the district Master Plan Amendment as a Secondary Resource, which is a category frequently treated as non-contributing resources by the HPC. Kensington does not have guidelines that dictate the application of different provisions based on the category of work, like Takoma Park or Chevy Chase, however, the HPC has consistently applied a more lenient level of scrutiny to proposed alterations to these resources.1

Figure 2: The subject property is identified as a Secondary Resource.

The applicant recently acquired the property and had Accurate Analytical Testing conduct an analysis of

---

1 “In regard to the properties identified as secondary resources – that is visually contributing but non-historic structures or vacant land within the Kensington District – the Ordinance requires the Preservation Commission to be lenient in its judgment of plans for contemporary structures or for plans involving new construction unless such plans would seriously impair the historic or architectural value of the surrounding resources or impair the character of the District,” Kensington Historic District Amendment, pg. 9.
both paint chips and a wipe test of the interior of the house and found lead in all of the living spaces (findings submitted with the application materials). These results are not surprising as lead was only banned as an additive in paint in 1978, more than 50 years after the house was constructed.

Because of the presence of lead and operability issues, the applicant proposes to remove nine (9) historic wood windows. These windows are the five windows on the front elevation, two second-story windows on the left elevation, and a first and second-story window on the right elevation. These windows are all six-over-six double hung sash windows and appear to be original to the house. Detailed photos of each window unit were not included with the submission, in part because the condition of the window is not the proposed justification for their removal.

In place of these windows, the applicant proposes to undertake a full-frame replacement and install Marvin Ultimate wood windows matching the dimensions and configuration of the historic.

In order to determine the HAWP is appropriate, the HPC needs to answer two questions. First, is it appropriate to remove the identified windows; and second, is the proposed window an appropriate replacement? Staff concludes the answer to both of these questions is yes, and recommends the HPC approve this HAWP.

As to the removal of these windows, Staff notes that the subject property is identified as having secondary importance to the district and the significance of the district is that it district “conveys a strong sense of time and place, that of a Victorian garden Suburb” (Kensington Historic District Amendment). Staff’s research does not indicate why the subject property was given this category, only that this was the level of significance recommended by the HPC and adopted by the County Council. In this instance, the subject property is entitled to a lenient level of review unless the proposal would “seriously impair the historic or architectural value of the surrounding resources.” Staff finds that removing the existing wood windows and replacing them will not seriously impair the historic character of the district and removing the existing windows could be supported under 24A-8(d).

Staff’s second consideration in removing the windows is the presence of lead. While it is feasible to mitigate the lead in historic wood windows, and there are tax incentives to do so at both the County and State level, that work will not eliminate all of the lead from the wood. The CDC has found that there is no safe level for lead in children and eliminating the major sources of lead from the house is a recommended action. Removing the proposed windows can also be supported under 24A-8(b)(4). Staff finds that the combination of the resource’s lower significance and the presence of lead provide sufficient to justify the window replacement under Chater 24A of County Code and that consideration of only one of those two elements would likely not be sufficient to approve a HAWP.

Staff finds that the proposed windows are an appropriate replacement. They are an all-wood window in new frames with 7/8” grids and an interior spacer bar. The dimensions and configuration of the proposed window match the existing windows. Staff notes that repairing the windows is the preferred option, and qualifies for tax credits, too. However, Staff finds that the proposed replacement windows are the second-best option and will result in an appearance that is consistent with the existing dimensions, configuration, and material finish as the historic windows. Staff supports the replacement windows under 24A-8(b)(2) and (d).

In preparing this Staff Report, Staff undertook a brief survey of HAWP applications for window replacement due to lead concerns. The record on these cases varies by district and resource significance and, except in the case of non-contributing resources, Staff and the HPC has consistently supported repair over replacement. In recent years there have been two appeals before the Board of Appeals (BoA) on this
specific issue. In one case\textsuperscript{2}, the BoA determined that it was appropriate to remove and replace the historic wood windows under a moderate level of scrutiny and that the presence of lead at the tested level created an “unsafe condition” that allowed the windows to be removed under 24A-8(b)(4). The BoA additionally determined that replacing the windows with ones matching the dimensions and division pattern was appropriate under 24A-8(b)(1) and (2).

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends that the Commission approves the HAWP application under the Criteria for Issuance in Chapter 24A-8(b)(2), (4), and (d), and the Vision of Kensington, and the Kensington Historic District Designation, having found that the proposal 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;

and with the general condition that the applicant shall present an electronic set 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.

\textsuperscript{2} A-6402, decided on May 9, 2013.
APPLICATION FOR
HISTORIC AREA WORK PERMIT
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
301.563.3400

APPLICANT:

Name: ___________________________________ E-mail: _________________________________
Address: _________________________________ City: ________________ Zip:____________
Daytime Phone: ___________________________ Tax Account No.: _________________________

AGENT/CONTACT (if applicable):

Name: ___________________________________ E-mail: _________________________________
Address: _________________________________ City: ________________ Zip:____________
Daytime Phone: ___________________________ Contractor Registration No.: _______________

LOCATION OF BUILDING/PREMISE: MIHP # of Historic Property

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.

Are other Planning and/or Hearing Examiner Approvals /Reviews Required as part of this Application? (Conditional Use, Variance, Record Plat, etc.?) If YES, include information on these reviews as supplemental information.

Building Number: ________________ Street: ______________________________________________
Town/City: __________________________ Nearest Cross Street: __________________________________
Lot: ____________ Block: ___________ Subdivision: _______ Parcel: _____

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

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

[Signature] [Date]
Description of Property: Please describe the building and surrounding environment. Include information on significant structures, landscape features, or other significant features of the property:

This is a single family residence located in the Kensington Historic District.

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

We are looking to replace nine windows in our single family residence with windows of similar appearance. The current windows pose a safety hazard as they contain lead (we have attached a supporting document). Those windows also have problems with functionality, including difficulty with opening them. We are not sure of the current windows' installation date and composition as we have recently purchased the home from a revocable trust.

We do not believe the windows to be of historic value and the proposed replacements would not appear to change the outward appearance of the residence. We would be replacing white windows with white windows of the same size.

Separately, we are looking to place two small signs on our yard fence indicating the presence of a dog. (We were advised that we would need permission for such sign(s) by an official.) Those signs would be helpful to alert people so that they do not open the yard gate without proper attention and caution. We have attached an image of the proposed sign, which would be that sign or something similar.

We do not believe the signs would change the historic appearance of the house and would primarily be visible to people who are nearing the yard fence. We have attached images from Google Maps from the perspective of Prospect St. along with closeups of the fence to demonstrate that there would be little change in the appearance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Item 1: Windows replacement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of Current Condition: Nine windows that currently have dangerous levels of lead in them and have functionality problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Work: We would replace those nine windows with Double Hung 800 OKNA Windows through an installation that would also remove the lead. The work would be done by the company Windows on Washington.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Item 2: Dog on premises sign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of Current Condition: Fencing around the yard without any indication about the presence of a dog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Work: We would place two &quot;dog on premises&quot; signs on both entrances to our yard to alert people. The likely sign would be purchased online through a commerce site like Etsy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Item 3:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of Current Condition:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Work:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions/ Alterations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deck/Porch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fence/Wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driveway/ Parking Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading/Excavation/Landscaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Removal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siding/ Roof Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window/ Door Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masonry Repair/ Repoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments
They would be replaced and installed by Windows on Washington. They will be the same color as the current windows.

Affidavit Acknowledgement
The Homeowner is the Primary applicant
This application does not violate any covenants and deed restrictions

Primary Applicant Information
Address 3932 PROSPECT ST
KENSINGTON, MD 20895
Homeowner Hananoki (Primary)

Historic Area Work Permit Details
Work Type RESREP
Scope of Work We are planning to replace nine existing windows in our home. They would be Okna Vinyl replacement windows Double Hung 800.
**Certificate of Analysis : Lead In Dust Wipes by Modified ASTM 1644-17* and EPA Method 7000B**

**Client**: Reliable Lead Inspection Services  
6351 Red Cedar Place  
Baltimore, MD 21209

**AAT Project**: 624216  
**Sampling Date**: 01/09/2021  
**Date Received**: 01/12/2021  
**Date Analyzed**: 01/12/2021  
**Date Reported**: 1/12/2021 4:28:37PM

**Attn**: Norman Rosenzweig  
**Email**: reliableleadinspections@gmail.com

**Phone**: 410-382-4860  
**Fax**:

**Client Project**: 3932 PROSPECT ST KENSINGTON MD 20895

**Project Location**: 3932 PROSPECT ST KENSINGTON MD 20895

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lab Sample ID</th>
<th>Client Code</th>
<th>Sample Description</th>
<th>Length (in)</th>
<th>Width (in)</th>
<th>Area (Sq ft)</th>
<th>Total μg</th>
<th>Results Lead μg/ft²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6006815</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>BED RM 1 WS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>19.98</td>
<td>119.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6006816</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>BEDRM 1 F</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>8.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6006817</td>
<td>010</td>
<td>BEDRM 2 WS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>117.78</td>
<td>706.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6006818</td>
<td>011</td>
<td>BEDRM 2 F</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>30.89</td>
<td>30.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6006819</td>
<td>012</td>
<td>BEDRM 3 WS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>75.59</td>
<td>453.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6006820</td>
<td>013</td>
<td>BEDRM 3 F</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>26.03</td>
<td>26.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6006821</td>
<td>014</td>
<td>BEDRM 4 WS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6006822</td>
<td>015</td>
<td>BATH 2 F</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td>12.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6006823</td>
<td>016</td>
<td>BATH 3 WS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;30.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analyst Signature**

Daniel Spence  
Robert Limmer

~ND~ = ND Detected, N/A = Not Available, RL = Reporting Limit. Analytical Reporting Limit is 5 ug/sample. For true values assume (2) significant figures. AAT internal SOP S207. The method and batch QC are acceptable unless otherwise stated. EPA Regulatory Limits: 10 ug/ft² (Floors, Carpeted/Uncarpeted), 100 ug/ft² (Window Sill/Stools), 400 ug/ft² (Window Trough/Wall/Exterior Concrete Surfaces). EPA Lead Dust Clearance Limits: 10 ug/ft² (Floors, Carpeted/Uncarpeted), 250 ug/ft² (Window Sill/Stools), 400 ug/ft² (Window Trough/Wall/Exterior Concrete Surfaces). HUD Grantee Regulatory Limits: 10 ug/ft² (Interior Floors), 40 ug/ft² (Porch Floors), 100 ug/ft² (Window Sills), 100 ug/ft² (Window Troughs). New York City Regulatory Limits: 10 ug/ft² (Floors), 50 ug/ft² (Window Sills), 100 ug/ft² (Window Wells). The laboratory operates in accord with ISO 17025 guidelines and holds limited scopes of accreditation under AHA-LAP and NY State DOH ELAP programs. These results are submitted pursuant to AAT, LLC current terms and conditions of sale, including the company’s standard warranty and limitation of liability provisions. Analytical results relate to the samples as received by the lab. AAT will not assume any liability or responsibility for the manner in which the results are used or interpreted. All Quality Control requirements for the samples this report contains have been met. AAT does not blank correct reported values. Sample data apply only to items analyzed. Results are calculated with wipe dimensions supplied by client. Reproduction of this document other than in its entirety is not authorized by AAT, LLC. * = Validated modified method. Samples are stored for 15 days following report date.

AHA LAP - Lab ID #100986, NY State DOH ELAP - Lab ID #11564, State of Ohio - Lab ID # 10042

Date Printed: 01/12/2021 4:29PM  
AAT Project: 624216
Certificate of Analysis: Lead In Paint by EPA SW-846 Method 7000B/3050B*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lab Sample ID</th>
<th>Client Code</th>
<th>Sample Description</th>
<th>Length (inch)</th>
<th>Width (inch)</th>
<th>Area (cm²)</th>
<th>Results Lead mg/cm²</th>
<th>Total μg</th>
<th>R L mg/cm²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6006824</td>
<td>017</td>
<td>OUTSIDE PAINT CHIPS HOUSE SIDING</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.81</td>
<td>0.0067</td>
<td>173.73</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analyst Signature

Daniel Spence

Robert Limmer

ND = Not Detected, NA = Not Available, RL = Reporting Limit. For true values assume (3) significant figures. The method and batch QC are acceptable unless otherwise stated. The laboratory operates in accord with ISO 17025 guidelines and holds limited scopes of accreditation under AIHA-LAP and NY State DOH ELAP programs. AAT internal SOP S235. These results are submitted pursuant to AAT, LLC current terms and conditions of sale, including the company’s standard warranty and limitation of liability provisions. Analytical results relate to the samples as received by the lab. Results in mg/cm² are calculated based on sample area dimensions supplied by client. AAT will not assume any liability or responsibility for the manner in which the results are used or interpreted. AAT does not blank correct reported values. Reproduction of this document other than in its entirety is not authorized by AAT, LLC.

Note: Samples are stored for 15 days following report date. Sample data apply only to items analyzed. *Validated modified method.

AIHA-LAP: Lab ID #100986; NY State DOH ELAP: Lab ID #11864, State of Ohio: Lab ID # 10042

Date Printed: 01/12/2021  4:29PM
AAT Project: 624216
To: Reliable Lead Inspection Services  
6351 Red Cedar Place  
Baltimore, MD 21209  

Attn: Norman Rosenzweig  
Email: reliableleadinspections@gmail.com  
Phone: 410-382-4860  

AAT Project: 624216  
Client Project: 3932 PROSPECT ST KENSING  
Date Reported: 1/12/2021 4:28:37PM  

Project Location: 3932 PROSPECT ST KENSINGTON MD 20895

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Client Code</th>
<th>Analysis Requested</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Analyst</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6006815</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>Dust Wipe</td>
<td>01/12/2021</td>
<td>Daniel Spence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6006816</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>Dust Wipe</td>
<td>01/12/2021</td>
<td>Daniel Spence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6006817</td>
<td>010</td>
<td>Dust Wipe</td>
<td>01/12/2021</td>
<td>Daniel Spence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6006818</td>
<td>011</td>
<td>Dust Wipe</td>
<td>01/12/2021</td>
<td>Daniel Spence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6006819</td>
<td>012</td>
<td>Dust Wipe</td>
<td>01/12/2021</td>
<td>Daniel Spence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6006820</td>
<td>013</td>
<td>Dust Wipe</td>
<td>01/12/2021</td>
<td>Daniel Spence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6006821</td>
<td>014</td>
<td>Dust Wipe</td>
<td>01/12/2021</td>
<td>Daniel Spence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6006822</td>
<td>015</td>
<td>Dust Wipe</td>
<td>01/12/2021</td>
<td>Daniel Spence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6006823</td>
<td>016</td>
<td>Dust Wipe</td>
<td>01/12/2021</td>
<td>Daniel Spence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6006824</td>
<td>017</td>
<td>Lead Paint mg/cm²</td>
<td>01/12/2021</td>
<td>Robert Limmer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviewed By: Quality Assurance Coordinator - Stephen Northcott

This report is intended for use solely by the individual or entity to which it is addressed. It may contain information that is privileged, confidential and otherwise exempt by law from disclosure. If the reader of this information is not the intended recipient or an employee of its intended recipient, you are herewith notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this information in error, please notify AAT immediately. Thank you.

AHA LAP- Lab ID #100986, NY State DOH ELAP -Lab ID #11864, State of Ohio- Lab ID # 10042

Date Printed: 01/12/2021 4:29PM  
AAT Project: 624216
# LINE ITEM QUOTES

The following is a schedule of the windows and doors for this project. For additional unit details, please see Line Item Quotes. Additional charges, tax or Terms and Conditions may apply. Detail pricing is per unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #1</th>
<th>Mark Unit:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qty: 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Marvin Window Diagram]

**MARVIN**

**FS 35 5/8” X 59 3/4”**

**IO 36” X 60”**

**Performance Information**
- **U-Factor:** 0.29
- **Solar Heat Gain Coefficient:** 0.27
- **Visible Light Transmittance:** 0.46
- **Condensation Resistance:** 57
- **CPD Number:** MAR-N-364-02178-00001
- **ENERGY STAR:** NC

**Performance Grade**
- Licensee #739
- AAMA/WDMA/CSA/101/ I.S.2/A440-08
- LC-PG30 1143X1981 mm (45X78 in)
- LC-PG30 DP +30/-30
- FL15162

**Top Sash**
- Primed Pine Exterior
- Painted Interior Finish - White - Pine Interior
- IG
- Low E2 w/Argon
- Black Perimeter and Spacer Bar
- 7/8” SDL - With Spacer Bar - Black
- Rectangular - Special Cut 3W2H
- Primed Pine Ext - Painted Interior Finish - White - Pine Int
- Ovolo Exterior Glazing Profile
- Ovolo Interior Glazing Profile

**Bottom Sash**
- Primed Pine Exterior
- Painted Interior Finish - White - Pine Sash Interior
- IG
- Low E2 w/Argon
- Black Perimeter and Spacer Bar
- 7/8” SDL - With Spacer Bar - Black
- Rectangular - Special Cut 3W2H
- Primed Pine Ext - Painted Interior Finish - White - Pine Int
- Ovolo Exterior Glazing Profile
- Ovolo Interior Glazing Profile

**White Sash Lock**
- White Jamb Hardware

**Aluminum Screen**
- Stone White Surround
- Charcoal Fiberglass Mesh

**Screen/Combo Ship Loose**
- 4 9/16” Jams

***Note: Unit Availability and Price is Subject to Change***
Front of the house: five windows to be replaced.
Side of the house: two windows to be replaced.
Side of the house: two windows to be replaced.
The information shown on this map has been compiled from deeds descriptions and plats and is not a property survey. The map should not be used for legal descriptions. Users noting errors are urged to notify the Maryland Department of Planning Mapping, 301 W. Preston Street, Baltimore MD 21201.

If a plat for a property is needed, contact the local Land Records office where the property is located. Plats are also available online through the Maryland State Archives at www.plats.net (http://www.plats.net).

Property maps provided courtesy of the Maryland Department of Planning.

For more information on electronic mapping applications, visit the Maryland Department of Planning web site at http://planning.maryland.gov/Pages/OurProducts/OurProducts.aspx (http://planning.maryland.gov/Pages/OurProducts/OurProducts.aspx).
Prospect Street

Lot 20

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT I HAVE CAREFULLY SURVEYED THE ABOVE PROPERTY BY TRANSIT-TAPE SURVEY, LOCATED IMPROVEMENTS THEREON, AND HAVE FOUND IT TO BE AS SHOWN ON THIS PLAT AND THAT THERE ARE NO ENCROACHMENTS EITHER WAY ACROSS PROPERTY LINES EXCEPT AS SHOWN ON SAID PLAT.

FRANK B. LANE, REGISTERED SURVEYOR