

**MINUTES**  
**Regular Meeting of the**  
**Edina Heritage Preservation Board**  
**Edina City Hall – Community Room**  
**Tuesday, January 13, 2015**  
**7:00 p.m.**

**I. CALL TO ORDER            7:00 P.M.**

**II. ROLL CALL**

Answering roll call was Chair Weber and Members, Moore, Sussman, McLellan, Christiaansen, and Student Members Druckman and Otness. Absent were Members Mellom and O'Brien. Staff present was Senior Planner, Joyce Repya.

**III. APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA**

Member Moore moved to approve the meeting agenda. Member McLellan seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

**IV. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES    December 9, 2014 and December 17, 2014**

Member Christiaansen moved approval of the minutes from the December 9<sup>th</sup> and December 17<sup>th</sup> meetings. Member Moore seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

**V. COMMUNITY COMMENT - None**

**VI. REPORTS & RECOMMENDATIONS**

**A. Certificates of Appropriateness**

**I. H-15-1    4513 Bruce Avenue - 2<sup>nd</sup> story addition to a street façade  
and changes to the front entry**

Planner Repya explained that the subject property, located on the east side of the 4500 block of Bruce Avenue consists of a Colonial Revival style home constructed in 1924.

The subject Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) request includes changes to the flat roof of the front entry canopy, and a second story bedroom addition over the single story sunroom on the south side of the home.

The plan for changes to the front entry canopy include replacing the flat roof with a gable form and new larger columns and crown molding to provide more authentic colonial character to the home.

A second story bedroom addition is proposed over the existing sunroom on the south side of the home measuring approximately 160 square feet in area. The addition has been designed to be set in from the south wall of the sunroom which does not meet the required 5 foot setback from the south property line. A hipped roof is proposed over the nonconforming portion of the sunroom thus reducing the height at the side yard.

The roof of the addition is shown to tie into the roofline of the original home, and the addition is shown to include cedar lap siding and asphalt shingles to match the home. The plans also include new windows and the removal of the existing shutters on the second story shed dormer above the front entry.

Ms. Repya explained that Preservation Consultant Robert Vogel evaluated the project and provided written comments where he determined that the proposed second story addition and changes to the front entry do not involve destruction of any of the house's major architectural features and will have minimal impact on the historic character of the district as a whole.

Based on the plans presented, the new bedroom addition over the existing sun porch on the south side of the house will be compatible in size, scale, proportion, massing, and historic character with the rest of the historic house. The new front porch and doorway are architecturally similar to those found in other colonials in the district and the historic character of the subject property will be maintained. Furthermore, the proposed work meets the Secretary of the Interior's standards for rehabilitation.

Mr. Vogel pointed out that ordinarily, it would be preferable to repair rather than replace the historic windows. However, replacement can be necessary due to advanced deterioration. If that is the case, the replacement window system referenced in the COA application meets historic preservation standards. However, historic integrity would be better maintained by repairing and reusing the original wood windows.

Mr. Vogel concluded his evaluation by recommending approval of the COA application subject to the plans presented.

Planner Repya pointed out that after receiving Mr. Vogel's comments regarding window replacement, the applicant responded by explaining that the windows are generally in poor condition, beyond reconditioning (especially on the second floor) due largely because they have not been maintained over the years. The plans call for Marvin Integrity replacement windows with divided lights. The pattern does not match the existing window pattern, but are actually more in keeping with the traditional Colonial Revival style than the Prairie inspired small squares in the corners of the existing. The applicant added that the 2 over 2 divided light pattern proposed is also more cost effective.

Ms. Repya concluded that staff is in agreement with Consultant Vogel's evaluation as well as the additional comments regarding the replacement windows provided by the applicant; noting that the plans depict changes that are compatible with the original structure and do not change the scale and character of the historic home.

Approval of the COA was recommended subject to the plans presented.

Findings supporting the recommendation included:

- The plans provided with subject request clearly illustrate the scale and scope of the project.
- The second story addition on the south side will be compatible in size, scale, proportion,

massing, and historic character with the rest of the historic house.

- The changes to the front entry and doorway are architecturally similar to those found in other colonials in the district and the historic character of the subject property will be maintained.
- The information provided supporting the subject Certificate of Appropriateness meets the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and the Country Club District Plan of Treatment.

**Applicant Representative:** Available to respond to questions -

**Christine Albertsson AIA, Albertson Hansen Architecture Ltd.  
Erin Rapallini - Owner**

**Board Member Comments:**

**Member McLellan** asked for clarification on the following items:

- Would the roof of sunroom below the addition be hipped as depicted in the drawn plans (The CAD plans look different.)? **Albertsson** - Yes, the roof will be hipped as shown on the drawn plans.
- Will the window trim be replaced? **Albertsson** - Yes the window trim will be replaced.
- Will the new windows be double hung? (Particularly the upstairs bedroom due to egress requirements.) **Albertsson** - In order to meet the egress requirements for the bedrooms, the windows may not be double hung, but from the exterior they will have the look of a double hung window.

**Public Comment: None**

A brief discussion ensued amongst the board, agreeing that the plans were well thought out and an enhancement to the home.

**Motion:**

**Member Moore moved approval of the Certification of Appropriateness application subject to the plans presented. Member Sussman seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.**

**VII. OTHER BUSINESS**

**A. Committee Report** - Policy #13 evaluation, clarifying definitions and notification policies.

Committee Chair McLellan reminded the board that a committee consisting of members Sussman, Mellom, McLellan and student member Otness was formed at the December 17<sup>th</sup> special meeting with the task of re-evaluating the most recent Policy #13 adopted that evening, as well as addressing in greater detail the meeting notification process and gaining a better understanding of the plan of treatment.

Member McLellan explained that he was appointed to chair the committee which met on Tuesday, January 6<sup>th</sup>. The issues the committee considered at that time were:

1. Amending Policy #13 or proposing a Policy #14 while considering points specifically related to Policy #13 submitted by member Sussman at the December 17<sup>th</sup> special meeting;
2. Clarifying or further defining the concepts of repair and replacement as opposed to demolition; and
3. Considering additional procedures relative to notice and communication between the HPB, the City and its Building Official as pointed out in Action 2 of Policy #13.

After evaluating how to best address the above issues, the committee agreed to the following recommendations:

1. Member Sussman agreed to take on the task of crafting an amendment to the most recent version of Policy #13 (Adopted on 12/17) to ensure that the policy not only reflect the actions recommended by Member O'Brien, but also incorporate the actions Sussman proposed at the December 17<sup>th</sup> meeting. Mr. Sussman agreed to have a copy of the amended policy available for the HPB's consideration. The committee also agreed to recommend rescinding action #4 of the adopted Policy which states, "Neither the HPB staff liaison/planner nor the preservation planning consultant for the city is authorized to deviate from this policy."
2. Consultant Robert Vogel shall provide a memorandum to the HPB where the purpose of the district's plan of treatment as well as terminology found in the plan was clarified; and
3. A revision to the notification process shall be made to the COA "Requirements & Process" information for new homes in the Country Club District that mirrors the notification area required by the city's Reconstruction Management Plan.

Addressing revisions to the notification process, Planner Repya provided the board with a copy of the COA "Requirements & Process" for new homes in the Country Club District that now provided for notification to properties within 300 feet of the perimeter of a proposed new home which is the same distance required by the city's Reconstruction Management Plan. Previously, the mailing radius had not been defined. Ms. Repya explained that if a COA is approved for a home to be removed, the same neighbors notified of the COA will be included in the mailing required for the demolition. Ms. Repya concluded that if the board was agreeable to the notification changes, she would post them on the city's web site. Board members agreed that it was good that the changes provided for a notification field that was consistent with the mailings required for the demolition of homes, and were pleased the information would be available on the city's web site.

Relative to Consultant Vogel's advice regarding the language in Policy #13, Planner Repya explained that Consultant Vogel had reviewed the work of the committee and agreed that the

direction they were taking toward clarifying the policy would do no harm. However, he did point out that the City Council makes policy, with advice of the HBP and professional staff. Staff implements city policy, subject to oversight of HPB. Policies should address goals, outcomes, and measurable results as set out in the city's comprehensive plan. The actual implementation of the policies should be about management practices, protocols and performance measures. Mr. Vogel concluded that Policy #13 addresses what is essentially a management issue, and while it is fine to be included with the "HPB Roles & Responsibilities", it should not be inserted into the Comprehensive Plan. He then recommended that in the future, rather than continuing to add more policies to the "HPB Roles and Responsibilities", the board considers creating a document of "Best Management Practices" that can define the boards management practices relative the designation and oversight of heritage landmark properties.

The board agreed that identifying HPB best management practices would be a very good idea. Planner Repya stated that she and Mr. Vogel would work on providing the board with an "HPB - Best Management Practices" document at a future meeting.

Member Sussman observed that student member Otness had done research into the demolition process for the committee and suggested that the city's demolition permit include spaces for the Heritage Preservation Board's approved COA information/review be included on the permit. Planner Repya pointed out that she took care of that request right of way; noting that the demolition permit now includes the same spaces for the HPB's COA review requirements that are provided on the city's building permit.

Member Sussman then provided the board with copies of a revised Policy #13 he crafted pointing out the first portion which restates the COA requirements from the Country Club District's plan of treatment remains unchanged from the previously adopted policy. Regarding the "Actions", Mr. Sussman pointed out that he attempted to provide clarification in the following areas:

Action #2 & 3. Where the previous December 17<sup>th</sup> policy referenced that no demolitions would be allowed "in whole or in part", the proposed change provides that there may be situations where "the selective removal of uncovered building materials unsuitable to safely remain as confirmed by the building official." Furthermore, Mr. Sussman recommended that in the event conditions occur (such as rotted framing), the corrections should be allowed without requiring the COA be revisited by the HPB.

Mr. Sussman concluded that as the committee recommended, the proposed policy revisions include deleting the action item which stated that "Neither the HPB staff liaison/planner nor the preservation planning consultant for the city is authorized to deviate from this policy." Noting that the HPB relies on the staff and consultant for guidance and to imply that they would not comply with the policy is inappropriate.

## **Board Member Comments**

**Member Moore** stated that he really appreciated Member Sussman's work - adding that initially he was concerned with some of the language in the formerly adopted policy, but he found the proposed revisions are very thorough and provide the necessary clarification.

**Member Weber** commented that he particularly liked language in action #2 which provided for recognition that the "selective removal of uncovered materials identified by the building official" may occur during a construction project.

**Student Member Otness** questioned whether the board was currently considering adopting the revised policy - pointing out that he recalled board members commenting that this issue lacked a sense of urgency and should be well thought out.

**Member Christiaansen** commented that she found the revisions to be much clearer with safer, less ambiguous language.

**Member McLellan** stated that he liked work Mr. Sussman put in to clarifying Policy #13 and believed that the revisions proposed did not change the intent of the policy adopted at the special meeting on December 17<sup>th</sup>.

General consensus from the board was that the issues identified in Policy #13 had been well vetted and now reflect the issues identified in policies proposed by both Members O'Brien and Sussman.

### **Motion:**

**Member McLellan moved for adoption of Policy #13, replacing the Policy #13 adopted on December 17, 2014. Member Moore seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.**

Member McLellan also observed that at the committee meeting, they discussed the future updating of the Country Club District's plan of treatment in 2018, and suggested that a running list be kept of suggested additions/ deletions and/or areas of concern to be considered when the update is undertaken. Planner Repya has agreed to keep the list for the board, and Mr. McLellan encouraged board members let Ms. Repya know if they had suggestions. The board agreed that was a good idea.

## **VIII. CORRESPONDENCE & PETITIONS - None**

## **IX. CHAIR AND BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS**

**Chair Weber** reported that he is working on a blog article for the city's web site clarifying the Country Club District's plan of treatment regulations regarding the criteria new construction in

the district. Prior to submitting the article for posting, Mr. Weber stated that he would like the HPB to proof it and provide input.

**Member Sussman** commended student members Joe Druckman and Peter Otness for having perfect attendance in 2014. The board agreed that they appreciated Joe's and Peter's diligence and the wonderful dimension they add to the work of the HPB.

**X. STAFF COMMENTS**

**Planner Repya** reported the following:

- The Country Club District neighborhood is planning an architectural tour for Saturday, May 9<sup>th</sup>. The district also has a committee interested in adding signage to the district entrances recognizing that the historic district is on the National Register of Historic Places. The committee sent a letter to the Mayor explaining the project and asking if the Council would support them moving forward to discuss the plans with the HPB. The Mayor and Council members voted at their January 6<sup>th</sup> meeting to authorize the HPB to work with the neighborhood on this worthy project. Ms. Repya concluded that she suggested that the committee bring their signage proposal to the HPB at the February meeting.
- The owners of the Bruce Abrahamson House, 7205 Shannon Drive received a letter recognizing that their home would be eligible for designation as an Edina Heritage Landmark; and they have responded that they would be interested in meeting to discuss the heritage landmark program. Ms. Repya and Robert Vogel will be meeting with the owners, Evan and Marilyn Anderson on January 21<sup>st</sup>, and will report back to the HPB in February regarding the outcome of the meeting.

**XI. NEXT MEETING DATE February 10, 2015**

**XII. ADJOURNMENT 8:05 p.m.**

Member Moore moved for adjournment at 8:05 pm. Member McLellan seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

**Respectfully submitted,**  
*Joyce Repya*