

First of all, because of the expense of this project it is my intention to proceed in several phases as funds become available. The front elevation will be done last. The Request for Review will be amended to reflect these changes.

The “office” windows are pictured on the left side of the front elevation and on the north side picture.

None of the window sizes will change.

ISSUES

All of the following quotes are taken from the National Park Service’s document ***Replacement Windows that meet the Standards*** :

How accurate does the match need to be?

“Replacement windows on secondary elevations that have limited visibility must match the historic windows in size, configuration, and general characteristics, though finer details may not need to be duplicated and substitute materials may be considered.

How well does the new window need to match the old?

“The evaluation of the match of a replacement window depends primarily on its visual qualities. Dimensions, profiles, finish and placement are all perceived in relative terms. For example, an eighth of an inch variation in the size of an element that measures a few inches across may be imperceptible, yet it could be more noticeable on the appearance of an element that is only half an inch in size.

“The way a historic window operates is an important factor in its design and appearance. A replacement window however, need not operate in the same manner as the historic window or need not operate at all as long as the change in operation does not change the form and appearance of the window to the point that it does not match the historic window or otherwise impair the appearance and character of the building”

Glass size and divisions.

“Muntins reproduced as simulated divided lights- consisting of a three-dimensional exterior grid, between the glass spacers, and an interior grid – may provide an adequate match when the divisions and profile of the exterior grid are equivalent to the historic muntin and the grid is permanently affixed tight to the glass.”

Materials and finish.

“In addition to the surface characteristics, vinyl clad or **enameled aluminum-clad windows may have joints in the cladding that can make them look very different from a painted wood window.**”

Replacement Windows Where No Historic Windows Remain

“Recreation of the missing historic window is not required to meet the Standards.”

“.. **and must be compatible with the overall historic appearance and character of the building.**”

The appearance of the replacement windows must be consistent with the general characteristics of a historic window of the type and period, but need not replicate the missing historic window. In many cases, this may be accomplished using substitute materials. There may be some additional flexibility with regard to the details of windows on secondary elevations that are not highly visible, consistent with the approach outlined for replacing existing historic windows.”

The only Standard that the current Review Request does not conform to is the absence of real or simulated interior and exterior muntins. **The Department of Interior (National Park Service) clearly indicates that “Muntins reproduced as simulated divided lights - consisting of a three-dimensional exterior grid, between the glass spacers, and an interior grid - may provide an adequate match when the dimensions and profile of the exterior grid are equivalent to the historic muntin, and the grid is permanently affixed tight to the glass”.**

The Department of Interior further indicates that substitute materials are acceptable. However, Aluminum clad and vinyl clad windows are specifically not recommended for use as wood substitutes. It should be noted that Aluminum Clad products such Andersen Series E not available in 1953. It is a substitute just like Fibrex. However, Fibrex is composed of 40% wood.

The differences between the Series 100 and Series E measurements are basically the differences between single and double hung windows. The window facing the street on the north side of the first floor (office) and all the windows on the second floor (total 8) are intended to be double hung (later phase). In keeping with Department of Interior allowances, “Replacement windows on secondary elevations that have limited visibility must match the historic windows in size, configuration, and general characteristics, though finer details may not need to be duplicated and substitute materials may be considered.

The Historic District Color Guide Assigns Color System **C** to all Post 1940 Colonials. For some, the Historic District Color Guide has been removed from the HDC website and the Staff never mentioned or offered it as a guide or source of information. The evaluation and discussion about color are an important part of this review request. The process and the lack of objective review is troubling. HDC Staff telling me what color my house should be (white), without giving me ANY options is unacceptable. describing the current color as yellowish white is misleading.

According to the City of Detroit Color guide Index, there are seven (7) acceptable colors for window Trim on red brick Black, is one that can be used for the sash with the sash matching the trim or black. For you to say that this combination lacks contrast is simply not true. A sandtone or yellow sash and muntins with black brickmold has plenty of contrast.

Colors similar to what Andersen Windows calls Sandtone are commonly seen as trim through out Sherwood Forest, Palmer Woods and other Local Historic Districts.

Finally, the City of Detroit Ordinance states “The Historic District Commission **shall** follow the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for rehabilitation and guidelines for rehabilitating historic buildings as set forth in 36CFR Part 67