174-17-CA

709 HINSDALE STREET
GLENWOOD-BROOKLYN HISTORIC DISTRICT (R-10)

Nature of Project:
Construct 2nd story rear addition; replace roofing; restore/replace exterior materials in kind; replace front door; restore chimney; replace mailbox and light fixture and install ceiling fan on front porch; install driveway; remove and replace shrubbery

APPLICANT:
JASON RENZAGLIA
AND KEITH LUNDAY
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – STAFF REPORT

174-17-CA  709 HINSDALE STREET
Applicant:  JASON RENZAGLIA AND KEITH LUNDAY
Received:  11/9/2017  Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days:  2/7/2018  1) 12/28/2017  2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District:  GLENWOOD-BROOKLYN HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning:  HOD-S
Nature of Project:  Construct 2nd story rear addition; replace roofing; restore/replace exterior materials in kind; replace windows and front door; restore chimney; replace mail box and light fixture, and install ceiling fan on front porch; install driveway.
Amendments:  Replacement of shrubbery in existing beds is routine maintenance and does not require a COA.
DRAC:  An application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its November 28, 2017, meeting. Members in attendance were Dan Becker, Mary Ruffin Hanbury and David Maurer; also present were the applicants, Jason Renzaglia and Keith Lunday, and their engineer John Dalrymple, as well as staff members Tania Tully and Melissa Robb.

Staff Notes:
- The applicants received approval for a minor work application (183-17-MW) to begin the rehabilitation process: Remove vinyl siding; remove ramp and replace with steps at side of front porch; remove aluminum handrails from front steps
- COAs mentioned are available for review.
- In Streetside Historic Overlay Districts additions that are taller than the existing house require a COA. In addition, changes to the first 50% of the house also require a COA. For the sake of this measurement the house runs from the front wall (not the front of the front porch) to the rear wall (also not including porches). Changes to the yard behind the front wall of the house do not require a COA.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description of Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Site Features and Plantings</td>
<td>Install driveway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Walkways, Driveways and Offstreet Parking</td>
<td>Install driveway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>Replace light fixture and install ceiling fan on front porch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
<td>Restore chimney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Roofs</td>
<td>Replace roofing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Exterior Walls</td>
<td>Restore/replace exterior materials in kind</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STAFF REPORT

Based on the information contained in the amended application and staff’s evaluation:

A. Installing a driveway is not incongruous in concept according to Guidelines 1.5.1, 1.5.3, 1.5.4, 1.5.8 and 1.5.9, and the following suggested facts:

1* The property includes an existing curb cut on the left side, although the driveway hardscape materials are no longer in place. The area is filled with grass now.

2* A wood ramp will be removed from the left side of the porch under the previously issued COA 183-17-MW.

3* The plot plan shows a 30” oak on the property line near the end of the driveway. In a Streetside HOD landscape elements are only regulated from the front wall of the house to the street, therefore no tree protection plan is required.

4* The application did not include a detailed site plan with the design and dimensions for the driveway, nor a description of materials.

B. Replacing the light fixture and installing a ceiling fan on the front porch is not incongruous in concept according to Guidelines 1.7.1, 1.7.2, 1.7.3, 1.7.9, 1.7.10, and the following suggested facts:

1* Replacing light fixtures is categorized as a Minor Work and is included here for administrative efficiency.

2* No information was provided regarding the character of the existing porch light and whether it is historic or not.

3* The applicants propose removing the porch ceiling light fixture and replacing it with either one or two fixtures, and have provided three options of replacement fixtures, but have not specified which is their preferred selection.

4* The applicants propose installing a wall-mounted porch light fixture and have provided three options, but have not specified which is their preferred selection.
5* The applicants propose installing one or two porch ceiling fans and have provided three options of fixtures, but have not specified which is their preferred selection.

C. Restoring the chimney is not incongruous in concept according to Guidelines 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.4, 2.2.5, 2.2.6, and the following suggested facts:
1* The applicants propose rebuilding the chimney on the east side of the house, as well as the installation of a cricket to provide better handling of roof water run-off.
2* No evidence was provided that the chimney needs to be rebuilt.

D. Replacing roofing is not incongruous in concept according to Guidelines 2.5.1, 2.5.5, 2.5.8, 2.5.11; however, the alteration of the roof of the gable end on the left (east) side historic addition is incongruous according to Guidelines 2.5.1, 2.5.5, and the following suggested facts:
1* The application indicates the existing roofing will be replaced with asphalt shingles and a ridge vent. There was no indication of the existing roof material, nor was the new roofing material specified.
2* A standing seam metal roof is proposed for the front porch. There was no indication of the existing porch roof material, nor were specifications and details for the proposed new roofing material provided. Metal porch roofs are common in early Raleigh historic districts.
3* New gutters and downspouts are proposed to match the house trim color. There was no indication of where the gutters and downspouts will be installed, nor were there any specifications on the material.
4* The elevation drawing shows the roof of the gable end east side historic addition has been altered to a lower pitch from what it is currently.

E. Restoring/replacing exterior materials in kind, replacing the front door, and replacing the mail box is not incongruous in concept according to Guidelines 2.6.9, 2.6.10, 2.7.4, 2.7.5, 2.7.6, 2.7.9, 2.8.1, 2.8.2, 2.8.3, 2.8.4, 2.8.5; however, wholesale replacement of the historic wood siding is incongruous according to Guidelines 2.6.1, 2.6.2, 2.6.4, 2.6.5, 2.6.6, and the following suggested facts:
1* On the drawings provided in the applications, the measurement showing the 50% line for review of changes on the house is inaccurate. The 50% line is further towards the rear of the house than is shown. Staff evidence has been provided to illustrate this.

2* Vinyl siding removal was approved in a previous minor work application (183-17-MW).

3* A previous homeowner had insulation blown into the wall cavities through holes drilled through the exterior cladding. Photographic evidence was provided.

4* The applicants propose replacing the existing wood siding if over 30% of the siding and corner boards are damaged. The material proposed is fiber cement lapped siding. They cite approval of the installation of fiber cement siding at 1008 W South St (131-13-CA). Relevant facts from that decision include:
   
   a. “The existing house is sided in fiber cement siding.”
   
   b. “Mr. Belledin asked if the house is actually clad in Hardieplank from 2005 or 2006. Ms. Tully stated that this is an example of a house that was clad in vinyl siding. When the siding was removed it was discovered that the original wood siding underneath was ruined. In this instance, the COA committee approved the first and only use of Hardieplank on a historic house.”
   
   c. One of the conditions from that case addressed the siding replacement specifically: “That should the applicant find that more than 50% of the wood siding underneath the asbestos siding needs replacing, the applicant will stop work and consult with staff to determine the appropriate next step.”

5* The existing front door will be replaced. Evidence was provided that the door is not original to the house.

6* Two replacement door options were provided, but the applicants have not specified which is their preferred selection.

7* The front door shown on the proposed elevation drawing does not match the sample doors provided.

8* The applicants propose replacing the mail box and have provided three options, but have not specified which is their preferred selection.
F. Replacement of the historic windows with new windows and the installation of a horizontal window is incongruous according to Guidelines 2.7.1, 2.7.5, and the following suggested facts:

1* The existing windows are 3-over-1, except for 1-over-1 windows on the small rear addition.

2* Evidence was not provided showing that the existing windows are deteriorated beyond repair.

3* The application states that windows on the front of the house will be replaced with windows made from components of other windows if the front units are found to be unusable, or will be replaced with Jeld-Wen double-hung windows. No information was provided regarding the replacement of the other disassembled windows.

4* Window changes show alterations to both sides of the house within the first 50%:
   a. Replacing paired windows on the left (east) side with a single window of different proportions;
   b. replacing paired windows on the right (west) side with a single window of different proportions;
   c. installing a new horizontal window for a bathroom on the right (west) side. This window form is atypical in the historic district.

5* No window elevation or section drawings were provided for the replacement windows.

G. Constructing a 2nd story rear addition is not incongruous in concept according to Guidelines 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.6, 3.2.7, 3.2.9; however, the design including the roof form and relationship of solids to voids in the exterior walls of the addition is incongruous according to Guidelines, 3.2.8, 3.2.9, 3.2.10, and the following suggested facts:

1* According to the Glenwood-Brooklyn Historic Overlay District Inventory, the house was built circa 1928 and was classified as contributing. The architectural description from the report reads: “One-story frame Craftsman bungalow with vinyl siding and an asphalt-shingled front-gable roof. The porch has tapered wood posts on brick pedestals. Other features include a brick foundation and exterior side chimney, a parged interior flue, and 3/1 windows.”
The project includes the removal of an existing ground floor rear addition, the expansion of the ground floor to the rear, and the addition of an upper level for the master bedroom and balcony on top of the expanded lower level. The addition is on the rear of the house, the side that could be deemed the least character-defining. The square footage of the addition was not included on the application.

Removal of the rear addition is not subject to a COA and is mentioned here for clarity of the project description.

The roof form on the addition is atypical of the historic district. The gable roof of the original house dives into the unusual hipped roof of the addition which only rises to full height in the last few feet of the second story. No roof plan was submitted.

The addition contains larger areas of blank wall space than on the historic portion of the house which is punctuated regularly with windows, thereby creating a notable difference in the relationship of solids to voids than on the historic house.

The applicants cite similarities in design to 708 Hinsdale Street, a contributing house with a second story addition. The Historic Research Report for the Designation of the Glenwood-Brooklyn District as a Historic Overlay District states: “Since 2001 a large two-story hipped roof with a front gable has been added. The addition is set back behind the front gable ridge of the original building thus still contributes to the district.”

The second level includes a balcony that spans the width of the rear of the house. No materials or detailed drawings of the balcony railing were provided.

The southwest corner of the lower level is designed to include an inset rear porch accessed via sliding glass doors. Staff is unaware of the commission approving sliding glass doors. French doors are approved on a regular basis in the General Historic Overlay Districts. Details and specifications for the new doors were not provided.

The application states that the addition is to be sided to match the rest of the house without clarifying whether that will be wood siding like the original siding or fiber cement siding, and if it is to be fiber cement siding then if the smooth side will face out.

Windows on the addition are of a variety of sizes and proportions including the following:

a. The proposed horizontal windows on the second level of the addition (both left and right sides) are atypical in historic districts;
b. Three large-scale single-lite windows are proposed on the upper level of the rear addition. The proportion of these windows does not correspond with any other windows on the house.

11* The addition proposed the following doors:
   a. a rear door on the second level balcony;
   b. a pair of sliding glass doors on the west side.

Staff suggests deferral to allow for a revised design to be submitted by the applicant and/or additional evidence to be submitted.

If the committee chooses to defer the application, staff suggests the following additional information be required to be submitted:

- Scaled drawings of an existing site plan and a detailed proposed site plan, each on an 11"x17" page, that includes the right-of-way, trees in the regulated areas (on site and cross boundary), planting areas, driveway, sidewalks, and any other relevant features. The site plan should indicate the location of the front wall of the house to clarify the regulated area of the yard (this may be shown as a line extended the width of the property). The site plan should also indicate the 50% line of the house indicating regulatory review of changes to the original structure.
- A roof plan.
- A description of the design and materials for the driveway.
- Evidence to support the use of fiber cement siding rather than wood should more than 50% of the siding be damaged beyond repair.
- A siding replacement plan that states: "That should the applicant find that more than 50% of the wood siding underneath the asbestos siding needs replacing, the applicant will stop work and consult with staff to determine the appropriate next step."
- Evidence that the windows in the first 50% house are deteriorated beyond repair.
- Manufacturers specifications for new windows, including elevation and section drawings.
• Evidence of the appropriateness of sliding glass doors in the historic district.

• Individual product selections for lighting, ceiling fans, front door and mail box, rather than a range of options. This can also be left as a condition of approval by staff after the application has been approved by the committee.

• Manufacturers’ specifications for new doors, including elevation and section drawings. This can also be left as a condition of approval by staff after the application has been approved by the committee.

• Evidence of the existing roof material and specifications for the new roofing material. This can also be left as a condition of approval by staff after the application has been approved by the committee.

• Drawings or marked-up photos indicating where the gutters and downspouts will be installed, as well as specifications on the material. This can also be left as a condition of approval by staff after the application has been approved by the committee.
Raleigh Historic Development Commission – Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) Application

☐ Minor Work (staff review) – 1 copy
☒ Major Work (COA Committee review) – 10 copies
☐ Additions Greater than 25% of Building Square Footage
☐ New Buildings
☐ Demo of Contributing Historic Resource
☐ All Other

☐ Post Approval Re-review of Conditions of Approval

For Office Use Only

Transaction # 535659
File # 174-17-CA
Fee $294
Amount Paid $294
Received Date 11/9/17
Received By SUMI

Property Street Address 709 Hinsdale Street, Raleigh, NC 27605

Historic District Glenwood-Brooklyn (HOD-S)

Historic Property/Landmark name (if applicable)

Owner’s Name Jason Renzaglia and Keith Lunday

Lot size 0.11 Acres (width in feet) 50 (depth in feet) 100

For applications that require review by the COA Committee (Major Work), provide addressed, stamped envelopes to owners of all properties within 100 feet (i.e. both sides, in front (across the street), and behind the property) not including the width of public streets or alleys (Label Creator).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>Property Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>705 Hinsdale Street, Raleigh, NC 27605</td>
<td>714 West Peace Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706 Hinsdale Street, Raleigh, NC 27605</td>
<td>710 West Peace Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>707 Hinsdale Street, Raleigh, NC 27605</td>
<td>706 West Peace Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708 Hinsdale Street, Raleigh, NC 27605</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710 Hinsdale Street, Raleigh, NC 27605</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>711 Hinsdale Street, Raleigh, NC 27605</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>712 Hinsdale Street, Raleigh, NC 27605</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>713 Hinsdale Street, Raleigh, NC 27605</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I understand that all applications that require review by the commission's Certificate of Appropriateness Committee must be submitted by 4:00 p.m. on the application deadline; otherwise, consideration will be delayed until the following committee meeting. An incomplete application will not be accepted.

Type or print the following:

**Applicant**  Jason Renzaglia and Keith Lunday

**Mailing Address**  709 Hinsdale Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>27605</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date**  11/9/2017  **Daytime Phone**  919-741-0946 / 919-749-7599

**Email Address**  jrenzag@gmail.com / keith.lunday@gmail.com

**Applicant Signature**

---

Will you be applying for rehabilitation tax credits for this project?  ☐ Yes  ☒ No

Did you consult with staff prior to filing the application?  ☒ Yes  ☐ No

**Office Use Only**

Type of Work

---

**Design Guidelines** - Please cite the applicable sections of the design guidelines (www.rhdc.org).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section/Page</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Brief Description of Work (attach additional sheets as needed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3 / 23</td>
<td>Site Features and Plantings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 / 25</td>
<td>Fences and Walls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 / 27</td>
<td>Walkways, Driveways, and Off-Street Parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 / 30</td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 / 43</td>
<td>Architectural Metals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 / 47</td>
<td>Roofs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 / 49</td>
<td>Exterior Walls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 / 51</td>
<td>Windows and Doors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8 / 55</td>
<td>Entrances, Porches, and Balconies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 / 66</td>
<td>Additions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Construct 2nd story rear addition; replace roofing; restore/replace exterior materials; replace front door; restore chimney; replace mail box & light fixture, & install ceiling fan on front porch; restore driveway at existing curb cut; remove and replace shrubbery.
**Minor Work Approval (office use only)**

Upon being signed and dated below by the Planning Director or designee, this application becomes the Minor Work Certificate of Appropriateness. It is valid until _________________. Please post the enclosed placard form of the certificate as indicated at the bottom of the card. Issuance of a Minor Work Certificate shall not relieve the applicant, contractor, tenant, or property owner from obtaining any other permit required by City Code or any law. Minor Works are subject to an appeals period of 30 days from the date of approval.

**Signature (City of Raleigh)_____________________________ Date__________________**

---

### TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>TO BE COMPLETED BY CITY STAFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attach 8-1/2&quot; x 11&quot; or 11&quot; x 17&quot; sheets with written descriptions and drawings, photographs, and other graphic information necessary to completely describe the project. Use the checklist below to be sure your application is complete.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minor Work (staff review) – 1 copy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Work (COA Committee review) – 10 copies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Written description.</strong> Describe clearly and in detail the nature of your project. Include exact dimensions for materials to be used (e.g. width of siding, window trim, etc.)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Description of materials</strong> (Provide samples, if appropriate)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Photographs</strong> of existing conditions are required. Minimum image size 4&quot; x 6&quot; as printed. Maximum 2 images per page.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Paint Schedule</strong> (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Plot plan</strong> (if applicable). A plot plan showing relationship of buildings, additions, sidewalks, drives, trees, property lines, etc., must be provided if your project includes any addition, demolition, fences/walls, or other landscape work. Show accurate measurements. You may also use a copy of the survey you received when you bought your property. Revise the copy as needed to show existing conditions and your proposed work.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6. **Drawings** showing existing and proposed work  
  - Plan drawings  
  - Elevation drawings showing the façade(s)  
  - Dimensions shown on drawings and/or graphic scale (required)  
  - 11" x 17" or 8-1/2" x 11" reductions of full-size drawings. If reduced size is so small as to be illegible, make 11" x 17" or 8-1/2" x 11" snap shots of individual drawings from the big sheet. | ☒  | ☒  |     |     |     |
| 7. Stamped envelopes addressed to all property owners within 100 feet of property not counting the width of public streets and alleys (required for Major Work). Use the Label Creator to determine the addresses. | ☒  | ☒  |     |     |     |
| 8. **Fee (See Development Fee Schedule)** | ☒  |     |     |     |     |
1. Remove overgrown shrubbery/plantings/ivy from the property, and replace with indigenous shrubbery and plants (i.e., similar or identical species) of appropriate scale and in same location as overgrown areas. (PHOTO #1)

2. Renovate front of existing house exterior (as viewed from Hinsdale Street).
   a. Remove the vinyl cladding and aluminum exterior trim (already submitted in a minor COA application). If more than every 4th row, or over 30%, of the existing wood siding and corner boards (underneath the existing vinyl cladding) are determined to be ruined and unusable, then all of the existing wood siding will be removed and replaced with new 4” Artisan James Hardie lap siding (see Exhibits 1 and 2) similar as was previously approved by the RHDC COA Committee for 1008 W. South Street in the Boylan Heights Historic District. The referenced photographs are representative of the existing wood siding under the vinyl siding where holes had been drilled in each stud bay at multiple height intervals to blow insulation into the walls from the exterior. It appears as though little or no care was taken when the insulation blowing was done; therefore, in effect decimating a great deal of the existing wood siding. (PHOTOS #2, #3, and #4 showing considerable damage to the existing wood siding)

   b. If determined to be ruined and unusable, the existing windows on the front of the house will be reworked from parts and pieces from units on the sides and rear of the house, or replaced with Jeld-Wen Siteline series primed wood double hung windows with primed exteriors, natural pine interiors, 7/8” Putty SDL bars (3 over 1 pattern), 4-9/16” jambs and 5/4x5 flat exterior casing.

   c. Remove the existing front door which was manufactured circa 1950 and replace with a new craftsman style door representing a style from within the period of significance (i.e., 1907 to 1940). Final design to be selected from a style similar to those provided in Figure 1. The existing door is not the original and was altered to fit in the original opening as evident by: both sides are trimmed leaving no bevel on the edge; one side is trimmed smaller than the other and uneven creating an uneven reveal; and the jamb was altered to accommodate the screen door (PHOTOS #5, #6, #7, and #8)

   d. Where possible, the existing front porch will not change. (PHOTO #9)
      i. Floor boards that are determined to be unusable will be removed and replaced with new 5/4” x 4” tongue and groove pressure treated wood pieces.
      ii. The existing brick portions of the porch columns will be cleaned, repainted, and pointed up as necessary and the angled wooden portion of the porch columns if determined to be unusable will be replaced with new wood components matching design and dimension.
      iii. The porch railings will remain in place, but will be repainted.
      iv. The porch ceiling appears to be in good shape, but we would like to replace the ceiling light fixture with one or two similar minimal light fixtures as provided in Figure 2 and move location to center it with the front door; or if two light fixtures, then centered equally above porch dimension.
      v. Install porch sconce on left side of door to be selected from a similar design as provided in Figure 3.
      vi. Install one or two ceiling fans on front porch ceiling to be selected from a similar design as provided in Figure 4.

c. Replace metal wall mount mailbox with larger metal wall mount mailbox to be selected from a similar design as provided in Figure 5. (PHOTO #5)
3. Renovate left side of existing house exterior (as viewed from Hinsdale Street).
   a. The siding, soffit, and fascia materials proposed for the front of the house will remain consistent with the materials used for the left side of the house. (PHOTO #10)

   b. The chimney bricks above the roof line will be removed and re-laid since they are starting to lean toward the roof of the house. If any new bricks are required Custom Brick will help match the existing as closely as possible with current suppliers. A “cricket” of similar design shown in Figures 6 and 7 will also be added on the roof side of the house to help disperse the water around the chimney and should have little to no visible impact from the street. (PHOTOS #11 and #12)

c. Remove the existing wooden handicap ramp (already submitted in a minor COA application). Restore driveway with gravel and/or lattice pavers using existing curb cut. (PHOTO #12)

4. Renovate right side of existing house exterior (as viewed from Hinsdale Street). The siding, soffit, and fascia materials proposed for the front of the house will remain consistent with the materials used for the right side of the house. (PHOTO #13)

5. Add a second-level on top of the existing rear of the house, of a size and massing so as not to dominate the original building, clad in siding matching that of the first story.
   a. The proposed second-level addition will include a new hipped roof designed with the following features:
      i. sets back from the front of the house and sloping away from the street to minimize sight lines so that the original house still contributes to the district;
      ii. echoes the existing hipped roof on the front porch;
      iii. positioned on top of a 6 foot wall respecting the architectural tradition of a 1.5 story bungalow; and
      iv. similar in design to the large two-story hipped roof added to 708 Hinsdale St, which was deemed a contributing resource according to the designation report for the Glenwood-Brooklyn HOD. [Note: we have also taken into consideration that 711 Hinsdale St, an adjacent neighboring home with a second-level addition, was deemed a non-contributing resource according to the designation report for the Glenwood-Brooklyn HOD.]

   b. All proposed second-level windows will be Jeld-Wen Siteline series primed wood double hung windows with primed exteriors, natural pine interiors, 7/8" Putty SDL bars (3 over 1 pattern), 4-9/16" jambs and 5/4x5 flat exterior casing. These windows are proportional in size to the existing windows and will match in grille pattern to the existing windows which are mostly 3 over 1.

6. Replace dilapidated/leaking roof of existing house, and install new asphalt shingles and ridge vent. Install new standing seam roof on the front porch. Install new gutters and downspouts to match house trim color. Replace existing attic ventilator on front gable in kind.
PHOTOGRAPHS
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RALEIGH, NC
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Staff Evidence: 709 Hinsdale Street (174-17-CA), February 2016
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