TO: Historic Landmarks Commission

THROUGH: Lisa Anderson-Ogilvie, AICP, Deputy Community Development Director and Planning Administrator

FROM: Kimberli Fitzgerald, AICP, Historic Preservation Officer

HEARING DATE: March 21, 2019

CASE NO.: Historic Design Review Case No. HIS19-05

APPLICATION SUMMARY: A proposal to reopen windows on the south façade of the Bligh Building (aka Pacific Building, 1926).

LOCATION: 508-524 State Street

REQUEST Major Historic Design Review of a proposal to reopen two windows on the south façade of the Bligh Building (aka Pacific Building, 1926), a contributing resource within the Salem Downtown Historic District, in the CB (Central Business District) zone and located at 508-524 State Street (aka 100-150 High Street SE) (Marion County Tax Assessors Map and Tax Lot Number 073W27AB02300).

APPLICANT(S): Leonard Lodder, for Studio 3 Architecture

APPROVAL CRITERIA: Salem Revised Code (SRC) Chapter 230
230.040 Standards for Historic Contributing Buildings in Commercial Historic Districts (b) Windows

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE
BACKGROUND

On February 4, 2019, the applicant submitted materials for a Major Historic Design Review for reopening windows on the south façade of the Bligh Building (aka Pacific Building, 1926). The application was deemed complete for processing on February 28, 2019.

Notice of public hearing was sent by mail to surrounding property owners pursuant to Salem Revised Code (SRC) requirements on March 1, 2019 (Attachment A). Public hearing notice was also posted on the property in accordance with the posting provision outlined in SRC 300.620.

The City of Salem Historic Landmarks Commission will hold a public hearing for the case on March 21, 2019 at 5:30 p.m., in Council Chambers, Room 240, located at 555 Liberty Street SE.

The state-mandated 120-day deadline to issue a final local decision, including any local appeals in this case is June 28, 2019, unless an extension is granted by the applicant.

PROPOSAL

The applicant is proposing to reopen two windows on the south façade of the Bligh Building which have been infilled with framing and stucco. One of the openings has been partially reopened and infilled with a slider. The applicant is proposing to reopen the original window openings and install new paintable fiberglass windows (5’8” wide x 7’0”) to fit within the original openings (Attachment C).

SUMMARY OF RECORD

The following items are submitted to the record and are available upon request: All materials submitted by the applicant and any materials and comments from public agencies, City departments, neighborhood associations, and the public; and all documents referenced in this report.

APPLICANT’S STATEMENT

A request for historic design review must be supported by proof that it conforms to all applicable criteria imposed by the Salem Revised Code. The applicants submitted a written statement, which is included in its entirety as Attachment C in this staff report.

Staff utilized the information from the applicant’s statements to evaluate the applicant’s proposal and to compose the facts and findings within the staff report. Salem Revised Code (SRC) 230.040(b) Standards for Historic Contributing Buildings in Commercial Historic Districts (b) Windows are the applicable criteria for evaluation of this proposal.
FACTS & FINDINGS

1. Historic Designation

Under Salem Revised Code (SRC) Chapter 230, no development permit for a designated historic resource shall be issued without the approval of the Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC). The HLC shall approve, conditionally approve, or deny the application on the basis of the projects conformity with the criteria. Conditions of approval, if any, shall be limited to project modifications required to meet the applicable criteria.

According to SRC 230.020(f), historic design review approval shall be granted if the application satisfies the applicable standards set forth in Chapter 230. The HLC shall render its decision supported by findings that explain conformance or lack thereof with relevant design standards, state the facts relied upon in rendering the decision, and explain justification for the decision.

2. Historic Significance

According to nomination documents the Bligh Building was constructed in 1926 with modifications in the 1960s/70s. The building is significant for its association with Frank D. Bligh, Salem hotel and theater owner (Attachment B).

This resource is historic contributing to Salem’s Downtown Commercial Historic District and retains a high degree of integrity.

3. Neighborhood and Citizen Comments

The subject property is located within the Central Area Downtown Neighborhood Association (CANDO). Notification of the public hearing was sent to the neighborhood association, all property owners within the Salem Downtown National Register District, and surrounding property owners within 250 feet of the property pursuant to Salem Revised Code (SRC) requirements on March 1, 2019. Notice of public hearing was also posted on the subject property. At the time of writing this staff report, no comments were received from the neighborhood association or from adjoining property owners.

4. City Department and Public Agency Comments

The Building and Safety Division indicates that the applicant must obtain required building permits.

5. Historic Design Review

SRC Chapter 230.040 specifies the standards applicable to this project. The applicant is proposing to reopen two windows on the south façade of the Bligh Building which have been infilled with framing and stucco (Attachment C). Historic Landmarks
Commission staff reviewed the project proposal and has the following findings for the applicable guidelines.

**FINDINGS**

**Criteria 230.040 Standards for Historic Contributing Buildings in Commercial Historic Districts.**

(b) **Windows.** Replacement of windows in historic contributing buildings shall be allowed only where the owner has attempted repair, but repair unfeasible due to poor condition of the materials. If the window is not original then every effort shall be made to replicate the original feature; the effort shall be substantiated by historic, physical, or pictorial evidence. If the feature cannot be replicated then it should be of a compatible design and material.

(1) **Materials.**

(A) Original material shall, if possible, be retained or repaired.

**Finding:** Staff recommends that the HLC find that there are no historic materials or features proposed for removal, reconstruction, or repair and that Standard 230.040 (b)(1)(A) is not applicable to the evaluation of this proposal.

(B) Replacement materials shall be, to the greatest extent practicable, of the same type, quality, design, size, finish, proportions, and configuration of the original materials in the windows.

**Finding:** The original window material is no longer extant, and there is no physical or photographic evidence of the original windows. It is likely that the original windows were either wood or metal and trimmed with wood. The applicant is proposing to install paintable fiberglass windows, which when painted have the same appearance as a metal window. Further, the applicant is proposing to trim the windows in wood. Therefore, staff recommends that the HLC find that Standard 230.040 (b)(1)(B) has been met for this proposal.

(C) Glass block or tinted, mirrored, opaque, or colored glass is not permitted, unless it is the historic glazing type.

**Finding:** The applicant is not proposing block or tinted, mirrored, opaque or colored glass, therefore staff recommends that the HLC find that Standard 230.040(b)(1)(C) has been met.

(2) **Design.**

(A) A replacement window shall, to the greatest extent feasible, match design, size, proportions, configuration, reflective qualities, and profile of the original window.

**Finding:** While the original window is no longer extant, and there is no physical or photographic evidence of the design of the original windows, the applicant is proposing to install paintable fiberglass windows trimmed that will fit within the original window opening(s). Therefore, staff recommends that the HLC find that SRC 230.040(b)(2)(A)
has been met.

**(B)** *The size and shape of original window openings should be preserved so that the configuration of the façade is not changed.*

**Finding:** The applicant is proposing to reopen the original window openings, preserving their original size and shape and retaining the configuration of the eastern façade. Staff recommends that the HLC find that SRC 230.040(b)(2)(B) has been met.

**(C)** *New window openings into the principal elevations, enlargement or reduction of original window openings and infill of original window openings are not permitted.*

**Finding:** The applicant is proposing to reopen previously infilled openings on the eastern façade. No new window openings are proposed, and the applicant is not proposing to enlarge or reduce any original window openings. Staff recommends that the HLC find that SRC 230.040(b)(2)(C) has been met.

**(D)** *Original openings that have been covered or blocked should be re-opened when feasible.*

**Finding:** The applicant is proposing to reopen original openings that have been filled in. Staff recommends that the HLC find that SRC 230.040(b)(2)(D) has been met.

**(E)** *Windows historically used on upper levels shall not be installed at storefront level, and storefront windows shall not be installed on upper levels.*

**Finding:** The applicant is not proposing to install storefront level windows on this upper story. Staff recommends that the HLC find that SRC 230.040(b)(2)(E) has been met.

**(F)** *Commercial window types shall not be substituted with residential window types.*

**Finding:** The applicant is not proposing to substitute a commercial window type with a residential window type. Staff recommends that the HLC find that there SRC 230.040(b)(2)(F) has been met.

**(G)** *Interior grilles, grilles between layers of insulating glass, or stenciled mullions in lieu of true divided lights or exterior mullions are not permitted.*

**Finding:** The applicant is not proposing new windows that have interior grilles or divided lights therefore staff recommends that the HLC find that this standard is not applicable to the evaluation of this proposal.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based upon the information presented in the application, plans submitted for review, and findings as presented in this staff report, staff recommends that the Historic
Landmarks Commission **APPROVE** the proposal.

**DECISION ALTERNATIVES**

1. **APPROVE** the proposal as submitted by the applicant and indicated on the drawings.

2. **APPROVE** the proposal with conditions to satisfy specific guideline(s).

3. **DENY** the proposal based on noncompliance with identified guidelines in SRC 230, indicating which guideline(s) is not met and the reason(s) the guideline is not met.

Attachments:  
A. Hearing Notice and Vicinity Map  
B. Excerpt from National Register Historic Resource Document  
C. Applicant’s Submittal Materials

Prepared by Kimberli Fitzgerald, AICP, Historic Preservation Officer
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE NUMBER:</th>
<th>Historic Design Review Case No. HIS19-05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMANDA APPLICATION NO:</td>
<td>19-104491-DR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEARING INFORMATION:</td>
<td>Historic Landmarks Commission, Thursday, March 21, 2019, 5:30 P.M., Council Chambers, Room 240, Civic Center, 555 Liberty Street SE, Salem, OR 97301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPERTY LOCATION:</td>
<td>100 High St SE, Salem OR 97301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWNER(S):</td>
<td>Hollymac, LLC (Richard H. McPike)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPLICANT / AGENT(S):</td>
<td>Leonard Lodder for Studio 3 Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION OF REQUEST:</td>
<td>Summary: A proposal to reopen windows on the south façade of the Bligh Building (aka Pacific Building, 1926). Request: Major Historic Design Review of a proposal to reopen two windows on the south façade of the Bligh Building (aka Pacific Building, 1926), a contributing resource within the Salem Downtown Historic District, in the CB (Central Business District) zone and located at 508-524 State Street (aka 100-150 High Street SE) (Marion County Tax Assessors Map and Tax Lot Number 073W27AB02300).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRITERIA TO BE CONSIDERED:</td>
<td>MAJOR HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Guidelines for Historic Contributing Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pursuant to SRC 230.065, an application for a Major Historic Design Review proposing changes to a contributing building or structure may be approved if the proposal conforms to the following guidelines:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) Except as otherwise provided in this Chapter, the property shall be used for its historic purpose, or for a similar purpose that will not alter street access, landscape design, entrance(s), height, footprint, fenestration, or massing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Historic materials, finishes and distinctive features shall, when possible, be preserved and repaired according to historic preservation methods, rather than restored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship significance shall be treated with sensitivity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Historic features shall be restored or reconstructed only when supported by physical or photographic evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e) Changes that have taken place to a historic resource over the course of time are evidence of the history and development of a historic resource and its environment, and should be recognized and respected. These changes may have acquired significance in their own right, and this significance should be recognized and respected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f) Additions and alterations to a historic resource shall be designed and constructed to minimize changes to the historic resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(g) Additions and alterations shall be constructed with the least possible loss of historic materials and so that significant features are not obscured, damaged, or destroyed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(h) Structural deficiencies in a historic resource shall be corrected without visually changing the composition, design, texture or other visual qualities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) Excavation or re-grading shall not be allowed adjacent to or within the site of a historic resource which could cause the foundation to settle, shift, or fail, or have a similar effect on adjacent historic resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOW TO PROVIDE TESTIMONY:
Any person wishing to speak either for or against the proposed request may do so in person or by representative at the Public Hearing. Written comments may also be submitted at the Public Hearing. Include case number with the written comments. Prior to the Public Hearing, written comments may be filed with the Salem Planning Division, Community Development Department, 555 Liberty Street SE, Room 305, Salem, Oregon 97301. Only those participating at the hearing, in person or by submission of written testimony, have the right to appeal the decision.

HEARING PROCEDURE:
The hearing will be conducted with the staff presentation first, followed by the applicant’s case, neighborhood organization comments, testimony of persons in favor or opposition, and rebuttal by the applicant, if necessary. The applicant has the burden of proof to show that the approval criteria can be satisfied by the facts. Opponents may rebut the applicant’s testimony by showing alternative facts or by showing that the evidence submitted does not satisfy the approval criteria. Any participant may request an opportunity to present additional evidence or testimony regarding the application. A ruling will then be made to either continue the Public Hearing to another date or leave the record open to receive additional written testimony.

Failure to raise an issue in person or by letter prior to the close of the Public Hearing with sufficient specificity to provide the opportunity to respond to the issue, precludes appeal to the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) on this issue. A similar failure to raise constitutional issues relating to proposed conditions of approval precludes an action for damages in circuit court.

Following the close of the Public Hearing a decision will be issued and mailed to the applicant, property owner, affected neighborhood association, anyone who participated in the hearing, either in person or in writing, and anyone who requested to receive notice of the decision.

CASE MANAGER:
Kimberli Fitzgerald, Historic Preservation Officer, City of Salem Planning Division, 555 Liberty Street SE, Room 305, Salem, Oregon 97301. Telephone: 503-540-2397; E-mail: kfitzgerald@cityofsalem.net.

NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATION:
Central Area Neighborhood Development Organization (CAN-DO), Bruce Hoffman, Land Use Chair; Phone: 503-781-8541; Email: bruhof@gmail.com.

DOCUMENTATION AND STAFF REPORT:
Copies of the application, all documents and evidence submitted by the applicant are available for inspection at no cost at the Planning Division office, City Hall, 555 Liberty Street SE, Room 305, during regular business hours. Copies can be obtained at a reasonable cost. The Staff Report will be available seven (7) days prior to the hearing, and will thereafter be posted on the Community Development website:

https://www.cityofsalem.net/Pages/planning-notices-decisions.aspx

ACCESS:
The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accommodations will be provided on request.

NOTICE MAILING DATE:
March 1, 2019
Vicinity Map
508-524 State Street
(aka 100-150 High Street)

Legend
- Outside Salem City Limits
- Urban Growth Boundary
- Parks

This product is provided as is, without warranty. In no event is the City of Salem liable for damages from the use of this product. This product is subject to license and copyright limitations and further distribution or resale is prohibited.
United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number: 7  Salem Downtown Historic District

509 - 524 State Street
Classification: Historic Contributing
Historic Name: Bligh Building
Current Name: Pacific Building
Year of Construction: 1926/1970s
Legal Description: 073W27AB02300; Salem Addition, from Lots 7 and 8 in Block 7
Owner(s): Samuel Blair
POB 1108
Salem, Oregon 97308

Description: This 21,438 square-foot concrete, white brick-faced Commercial style building occupies the southeast corner of State and High streets. The west side, second-floor fenestration is comprised of sixteen windows, some that are one-over-one, double-hung wood sash and others that are fixed. The building has a dentil cornice, a wide frieze, a terra cotta beltcourse, and lion’s head downspouts. The ground floor appears to have been altered in the 1970s and is devoted to display windows with overhanging fabric awnings. The building retains its overall historic materials and design and contributes to the historic character of the downtown district.

History and Significance: The Bligh Building, constructed in 1926, conveys a sense of the historical evolution of the Salem commercial district. Although the street-level facades have been successively altered over the years and the present awning is not historical, the original second-floor materials, fenestration, and decorative details have been recovered in recent years after remodeling in the 1960s completely covered the exterior walls with smooth vertical paneling. Rehabilitation of the second floor would be completed if the reflective single-pane glass in the second-floor windows were replaced with historically accurate double-hung sash windows. This building is also associated with the life of Frank D. Bligh, Salem hotel and theater owner.

Frank D. Bligh and his mother, Anna Bligh, bought this large corner property when the Hotel Salem (formerly the Monroe House, then, Cook’s House), a large two-story structure set back from State Street, stood on the site. Born in 1890 in Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada, Frank D. Bligh came to the United States with his parents in 1904, settling first in Portland, Oregon, and, in Salem in 1908. T.G. Bligh and his son, Frank, soon opened the Star Theater, and, later, the Liberty Theater. In 1912 the Blighs built the combined Bligh Hotel and Bligh Theater on the north side of State Street, next to the Masonic Building, between High and Liberty streets. (This complex is now gone and the site is occupied by a parking lot.) Following the death of T.G. Bligh, Frank D. Bligh took over the family hotel and theater business. In 1926 he built the Bligh Building and the adjoining (to the east) Capitol Theater of reinforced concrete. At that time, the Bligh Building had no less than ten separate shop spaces, facing State and High streets. He also opened the Salem Hotel and operated the Grand Hotel. Frank Bligh married Mildred Rhodes. They raised a daughter, Margaret Ann Schweiger.105

In 1945 Walter C. and Lottie D. Winslow bought the Bligh Building. Walter C. Winslow was born in 1882 in Polk County a short distance from Salem. After graduating from the University of Oregon in 1906 and Willamette University Law School in 1908, Winslow was admitted to the Oregon State Bar and began practicing law in the Salem offices of Oregon Senator Charles L. McNary and J.H. McNary. A highlight of his

career came in 1947 when he served as an Oregon Supreme Court justice pro tem while Justice James T. Brand was officiating at the war crimes trials in Nuremberg, Germany. Winslow was a leader in Salem's YMCA and in the First Methodist Church. He was also an avid outdoorsman. Lottie and Walter Winslow raised three children: Norman (a partner in his father's law firm), Genevieve Mickenham, and Gertrude Blanchard. Lottie died in 1961. Walter died of a heart attack in 1962. The Winslow family retained ownership of the building until 1976 when Norman Winslow sold it to S. Blair and T.K. Hazen.16

---

MEMORANDUM

To: Kimberli Fitzgerald, Senior Planner, Historic Preservation Officer
   City of Salem
   Community Development Department
   555 Liberty St SE Salem OR 97301

Date: 1/31/2019

Project: Pacific Building, 100 High St, SE
         Salem OR 97301

Architect’s Project No: 2018-137

From: Leonard Lodder, AIA, LEED AP
      Studio 3 Architecture, Inc
      275 Court Street NE Salem OR 97301

Sent Via: Email

Subject: Historic Landmarks Commission, Narrative

Comments:
The work anticipated by this application involves opening a sealed up window opening on
the second floor of the Pacific Building, located in the south elevation, which overlooks the
roof over the mezzanine spaces of the same building.

The window(s) in question were concealed from public view until the demolition of the
Capitol Theater. In the event that the site of the Capitol Theater is redeveloped, these
windows would again be concealed from view from any part of the public right-of-way.

Given the condition of the rest of the windows from this floor that face over the mezzanine
roof, it is reasonable to assume that the original windows succumbed to weather induced
deterioration, particularly since this wall is south facing, and therefore exposed to the worst
weather conditions. The wall is a board formed concrete material which is relatively
porous, and seems to take on water in rainy conditions. Given these conditions, Studio 3
Architecture cannot recommend restoration with would frame windows.

Narrative response to Criteria identified in Salem Revised Code, Section 230.040.(b)
regarding windows.

Windows. Replacement of windows in historic contributing buildings shall be allowed only
where the owner has attempted repair, but repair unfeasible due to poor condition of the
materials. If the window is not original then every effort shall be made to replicate the
original feature; the effort shall be substantiated by historic, physical, or pictorial evidence.
If the feature cannot be replicated then it should be of a compatible design and material.

(1) Materials
   (A) Original material shall, if possible, be retained or repaired.
       The Original materials for the window were removed many years ago.
(B) Replacement materials shall be, to the greatest extent practicable, of the same type, quality, design, size, finish, proportions, and configuration of the original materials in the windows. We propose installing aluminum storefront window systems, 2”x4.5” size framing, with clear Low-E insulated glass.

(2) Design
(A) A replacement window shall, to the greatest extent feasible, match design, size, proportions, configuration, reflective qualities, and profile of the original window. The replacement windows match the proportions and configuration of the original windows but use an aluminum framing system designed to ensure longevity of the window within the type of wall construction in which they are located.
(B) The size and shape of original window openings should be preserved so that the configuration of the façade is not changed. Re-opening the existing openings and placing new windows to fit these openings should result in restoring the original configuration of this façade.
(C) New window openings into the principal elevations, enlargement or reduction of original window openings and infill of original window openings are not permitted. The subject windows are not located in a principal façade of the building.
(D) Original openings that have been covered or blocked should be re-opened when feasible. This proposal involves re-opening an existing window opening which had previously been filled in.
(E) Windows historically used on upper levels shall not be installed at storefront level, and storefront windows shall not be installed on upper levels. The size of the window openings, 5’-8” wide x 7’-0” high are significantly larger than standard window unit sizes available today.
(F) Commercial window types shall not be substituted with residential window types. It would be hard to characterize the original window types as residential. Even as wood double or single hung windows, they were always a commercial sized unit.
(G) Interior grilles, grilles between layers of insulating glass, or stenciled mullions in lieu of true divided lights or exterior mullions are not permitted. The original windows were not mullioned or grilled, and neither are the new ones.

This memorandum will be included in the project file.
SECTION NOTES:

1. EXISTING WOOD DOUBLE OR SINGLE HUNG WINDOW. NOTE THESE WINDOWS ARE GENERALLY NO LONGER OPERABLE, BECAUSE THEY ARE BOTH PAINTED SHUT, AND/OR SWOLLEN BY MOISTURE PENETRATION INTO THE WOOD. GIVEN THEIR CURRENT STATE, THESE WINDOWS HAVE PRETTY MUCH REACHED "END-OF-LIFE" STATUS. PREVIOUS REPAIRS ARE VERY NOTICABLE AND FURTHER DETERIORATION HAS OCCURRED.

2. EXISTING WINDOW OPENING THAT HAS BEEN INFILLED WITH FRAMING AND STUCCO. WINDOW TO BE RE-OPENED AND RECEIVE NEW WINDOW WITH CONFIGURATION TO LOOK SIMILAR TO ORIGINAL EXISTING WINDOWS. MATERIAL TO BE EITHER PAINTABLE FIBERGLASS OR ALUMINUM.

3. EXISTING WINDOW OPENING THAT HAS BEEN INFILLED WITH FRAMING AND STUCCO, AND SUBSEQUENTLY PARTIALLY RE-OPENED. REMOVE EXISTING WINDOW AND WALL CLOSURE. AND PREPARE FOR NEW WINDOW. WITH CONFIGURATION TO LOOK SIMILAR TO ORIGINAL WINDOWS, (SAME AS NOTE 2 ABOVE). MATERIAL TO BE EITHER PAINTABLE FIBERGLASS OR ANODIZED ALUMINUM.

4. EXISTING WINDOW OPENING THAT HAS BEEN INFILLED WITH FRAMING AND STUCCO. NO ACTION AT THIS TIME.
HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION NOTES:

1. EXISTING WOOD DOUBLE OR SINGLE HUNG WINDOW. NOTE THESE WINDOWS ARE GENERALLY NO LONGER OPERABLE, BECAUSE THEY ARE BOTH PAINTED SHUT, AND/OR SWOLLEN BY MOISTURE PENETRATION INTO THE WOOD. GIVEN THEIR CURRENT STATE, THESE WINDOWS HAVE PRETTY MUCH REACHED "END-OF-LIFE" STATUS. PREVIOUS REPAIRS ARE VERY NOTICABLE AND FURTHER DETERIORATION HAS OCCURRED.

2. EXISTING WINDOW OPENING THAT HAS BEEN INFILLED WITH FRAMING AND STUCCO. WINDOW TO BE RE-OPENED AND RECIEVE NEW WINDOW WITH CONFIGURATION TO LOOK SIMILAR TO ORIGINAL AND EXISTING WINDOWS. MATERIAL TO BE EITHER PAINTABLE FIBERGLASS OR ALUMINUM.

3. EXISTING WINDOW OPENING THAT HAS BEEN INFILLED WITH FRAMING AND STUCCO, AND SUBSEQUENTLY PARTIALLY RE-OPENED. EXISTING WINDOW IS AN ALUMINUM OR VINYL HORIZONTAL SLIDER.

4. EXISTING WINDOW OPENING THAT HAS BEEN INFILLED WITH FRAMING AND STUCCO. TO BE RE-OPENED AT A LATER DATE.

5. EXISTING WINDOW OPENING THAT HAS PREVIOUSLY BEEN INFILLED WITH FRAMING AND STUCCO. SUBSEQUENTLY, PARTIALLY RE-OPENED TO PROVIDE AN EXIT DOOR. (NO CHANGE).
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 #</th>
<th>Qty:</th>
<th>Mark Unit</th>
<th>Stone White Exterior</th>
<th>Stone White Interior</th>
<th>Window Frame</th>
<th>1W2H - Rectangle Assembly</th>
<th>Assembly Rough Opening</th>
<th>68'' X 84''</th>
<th>Unit: A1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Integrity Rectangles - Direct Glaze</td>
<td>All Ultrex</td>
<td>Basic Frame 67 1/2'' X 41 1/2''</td>
<td>Rough Opening 68'' X 42''</td>
<td>IG - 1 Lite</td>
<td>Low E3 w/Argon</td>
<td>Stainless Perimeter Bar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | | | Performance Grade Mull | Licensee: #814 | AAMA/WDMA/CSA/101/I.S.2/A440-08 | LC-PG50 1854X1854 mm (73.5X73.5 in) | LC-PG50 DP +50/-50 | FL12378 |
| | | | Performance Grade Overall Assembly | Licensee: #1133 | AAMA 450-10 | LC-40 1194X2426 mm (47.75X95.5 in) | LC-40 DP 40 | 17163 |

FS 67 1/2'' X 83 1/2''

Egress Information A1, B1
No Egress Information available.
Performance Information A1, B1
U-Factor: 0.27
Solar Heat Gain Coefficient: 0.24
Visible Light Transmittance: 0.56
Condensation Resistance: 59
CPD Number: MAR-N-325-00720-00001
ENERGY STAR: N, NC, SC, S
Performance Grade A1, B1

Initials required
Seller: ______
Buyer: ______