

From: [Heiken, Emma \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Bonnie Nugent](#)
Cc: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Re: Replacement Window Debate
Date: Thursday, October 24, 2024 3:31:12 PM

Hello Bonnie,

Thank you for sharing your input. We will be sure to include it in the public record.

Sincerely,

Emma Heiken Hare

Legislative Aide

Office of Supervisor Myrna Melgar

From: Bonnie Nugent <bknugent1231@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, October 20, 2024 11:32 AM

To: Low, Jen (BOS) <jen.low@sfgov.org>; Fieber, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.fieber@sfgov.org>; Heiken, Emma (BOS) <emma.heiken@sfgov.org>; Farrah, Michael (BOS) <michael.farrah@sfgov.org>

Cc: danielle.echeverria@sfchronicle.com <danielle.echeverria@sfchronicle.com>

Subject: Replacement Window Debate

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor Melgar (by way of her staff),

I'm writing in response to the article by Danielle Echeverria in the SF Chronicle on October 20, 2024 appointing you as taking up the 'crusade' on window replacements in the city. I did read Ms. Echeverria's prior article and at the time I did not write to her to express some opposing views so I've opted to weigh in on the debate. Since you have apparently decided to take up this cause without any counterpoint being presented I have decided to take the time I should have taken before to bring another point of view to some very one-sided coverage. Let me start by saying that I am not opposed to streamlining and simplifying SF building permit issues altogether including with window replacements. However, I think you are listening to a narrow scope of people based on one man's story chronicled by Ms Echeverria with no actual investigation into the other side of the issue to have balance.

Ms. Escheverria's initial article was around Mr. Vorel's impatience with not getting his way as fast as he wanted. He bought a Victorian home in a city known for its Victorian homes. These homes are an integral part of the city's character and the charm that people find when they come to visit and choose to live. The initial rules, while admittedly are likely too complicated for the average person, were put in to protect the character of both the city and these fine homes of all styles of which we are just stewards during our time. They have been here before us and hopefully will remain after us. If Mr. Vorel did not want the responsibility of such a home, he should have purchased another style of home perhaps with newer construction and

more easy to deal with for someone in a throw away mindset.

The article states that Mr. Vogel did not have the patience to wait for the actually cheaper option of restoring the window and found windows with ogees impossible to get. I know the scarcity of ogee windows is not factual since I have replaced such in my 1934 non-victorian home in a matter of weeks. It sounds like Mr. Vorel likes to get things how he wants, when he wants. However, the rules came about because of the dearth of bad and cheap replacement windows being shoved into our city's beautiful homes ruining their character in many cases for years, the results of which can be seen around the city in all neighborhoods. All of our city carries historical significance whether it's a historical neighborhood or not.

Also not mentioned is the environmental impact of vinyl versus wood windows. I understand the energy issues but wood windows simply last longer and if maintained can have an 80 year plus life and are in fact more energy efficient according to some sources (although I grant you some sources are manufacturer biased as are they around vinyl windows). Some of the windows that homeowners can't wait to rip out are already nearing 100 years old and I'm not denying they may not have been maintained well and need replacement or care, they have lasted longer than many things in our world for a reason. The fact is that wood windows when maintained have a longer lifespan than vinyl windows which wind up in the landfill sooner and more often. I cite some articles here with some easy research for the counterpoints missing in the article:

[Wood vs. Vinyl Windows: What's the Difference?](#)

[Wood vs. Vinyl Windows: Which Are Better for Your Home?](#)

While I understand that energy efficiency is an issue, we are not talking a Dickens novel here with the mailigned 'drafty' wood windows invoked by the article while Tiny Tim sits around a coal fire. Materials and waste are also part of being part of the care of our planet and vinyl windows create more waste from chemically produced materials. They use therefore also has an environmental impact.

I also previously read Garen Checkly's Oped piece about his friend's issue with paying for quality replacement windows (where at least he did admit the article was about a friend) and I was equally appalled at his lack of counterpoint but it was an opinion piece albeit one I did not agree with. Ms. Echeverria attempts to pass her one man's issue piece as news coverage.

Finally, Ms. Echeverria cites a letter campaign asking officials to change their policy with 340 signatures. I think there are probably at least 340 people with a different opinion in a city the size of San Francisco. I urge you not to take up the mantle on a complete tear out of all rules which would not have any type of guidelines around window replacements. Building supplies are not cheap, but with older home ownership comes a responsibility for upkeep which is not always exactly how we want it. I urge you to consider the other side of this issue and not take a knee-jerk reaction to such biased reporting.

And before you ask if I'm practicing what I preach, attaching a picture of an *interior* window in my kitchen I replaced when I purchased my home which was in bad shape due to prior owners lack of upkeep. Note the dreaded ogees. I was able to get this custom sized window in 3 weeks at the time. Worth the cost to the warmth it brings my kitchen.

Thank you for your time to consider another viewpoint.

Sincerely,
Bonnie Nugent