

MINUTES
Regular Meeting of the
Edina Heritage Preservation Board
Edina City Hall – Council Chambers
Monday, November 10, 2014
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, Mellom, Christiaansen, O'Brien, Druckman and Otness. Staff present was Senior Planner, Joyce Repya.

III. APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA

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

IV. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES **October 14, 2014**

Member Sussman asked for a clarification of his comments on page 3 during the 4625 Arden Avenue COA discussion. Member Moore moved approval of the minutes from the October 14, 2014 meeting to include the clarification requested from Member Sussman. Member McLellan seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

V. COMMUNITY COMMENT

Bill Neuendorf, Economic Development Manager - Vacant Public Works Site

Bill Neuendorf, Edina's Economic Development Manager provided the board with an update on the vacant public works site's redevelopment activities, explaining that Frauenshuh Commercial Real Estate Group was selected as the redevelopment partner for the site. Frauenshuh will work in partnership with the city to determine the best combination of public and private uses for the 3.3 acre site. He added that the site planning process will include extensive community input and will consist of several distinct stages. Mr. Neuendorf invited the board to attend the first of the public engagement events on December 4th at the Edina Community Center which will be a kick-off for the project. The board thanked Mr. Neuendorf for the update.

VI. REPORTS & RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Certificates of Appropriateness

2. H-14-10 4524 Drexel Avenue - New Detached garage

Planner Repya explained that the subject property is located on the west side of the 4500 block of Drexel Avenue. The existing home, a Colonial Revival style constructed in 1925, currently has a 2-car attached garage, one-story in height with a flat roof, accessed by a driveway on the south side of the property.

The COA request entails the construction of a new detached garage on the south side of the rear yard. The project also includes converting the attached garage to two stories of living space which is not visible from the street façade; thus not subject to the COA approval.

The proposed 572 square foot 2-car detached garage measures 22' x 26' feet in area. Access to the garage will be obtained on the east elevation from the existing driveway where two overhead doors and two windows in the gable area are proposed. A service door and window are provided on the north elevation. The rear elevation includes a gable vent and two windows. The south elevation lacks architectural detailing because that side of the proposed garage abuts a tall privacy fence.

Ms. Repya pointed out that the design of the structure is proposed to complement the Colonial Revival style of the home with hardi lap siding (existing on the home) and asphalt shingles. All dimensions proposed for the structure are consistent with the surrounding detached garages and new garages previously approved by the HPB through the COA process.

Although not subject to the COA approval, Ms. Repya shared plans for the conversion of the attached garage to living space at the rear of the home for the Board's information. The footprint of the existing 440 square foot attached garage conversion will increase to 625 square feet of living space, an additional 180 square feet; two-stories in height.

The new living space has been designed to provide a compatible use of the home while at the same time maintain the home's overall historic character, utilizing the same hardi-plank siding and asphalt shingles as the original home.

Ms. Repya explained that the neighbor to the north (4522 Drexel Avenue) submitted a comment objecting to the height and length of the proposed addition, concerned that it will block their sunlight, daylight and views. Ms. Repya pointed out that the plans for the addition provide for a second story that is inset 2.5 feet from the first floor providing the requested articulation to the design; and meeting the zoning ordinance criteria for building design and lot coverage. Furthermore, the design is similar to other projects reviewed in the district which have received COA approval.

Preservation Consultant Robert Vogel evaluated the proposed plans and provided a written opinion citing that the existing attached garage is not a significant historic, character defining architectural feature; and its removal will not result in the destruction or alteration of any important architectural element. Because the proposed new construction will be located on the back of the existing house and will match the essential architectural character of the 1925 home, it should not have an adverse effect on the historic character of the streetscape.

Furthermore, the remodeling project as demonstrated has been common throughout the Country Club Districts, is considered a historically appropriate rehabilitation treatment.

Planner Repya concluded that the proposed detached garage is consistent with new garages previously reviewed in the district and conversion of the attached garage to living space has been routinely included in COA applications previously approved, thus approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness request is recommended subject to the plans presented and a year built plaque be installed on the exterior of the new detached garage..

Findings supporting the recommendation include:

The plans provided with subject request clearly illustrate the scale and scope of the proposed projects.

The proposed detached garage will complement the architectural style of the home and not be detrimental to the adjacent historic structures.

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 -
Ryan Thuftdahl, rt Design
Zach & Kelley Burnett, owners

Zach Burnett, 4524 Drexel Avenue addressed the northerly neighbors comments regarding the height and length of the addition abutting their shared property line, stating that he had a conversation with the neighbor about his concerns, and while Mr. Burnett can empathize, the proposed plans have been vetted by two architects, meet the zoning ordinance criteria, and will not be visible from the street. Furthermore, the two-story addition meets the needs of his family, and upholds the historic integrity of the neighborhood.

Public Comments: None

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

Motion:

Member Moore moved approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness request subject to the plans presented and a year built plaque be installed on the exterior of the garage. Member O'Brien seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

2. H-14-11 4901 Bruce Avenue - Change to street facing façades

Planner Repya explained that the subject property is located on the southeast corner of Bruce Avenue and Country Club Road. The home, constructed in 1934 is a Colonial Revival style with an attached one story 2-car garage accessed from the north on Country Club Road.

The homeowners initially received a COA in 2012 for an addition to the rear of the home which faces Country Club Road. Construction of the approved plans never occurred, and they are now requesting approval of a new plan which entails changes to the Country Club Road façade on the north side; and the Bruce Avenue front facade on the west side of the property.

The plans proposed for the north side of the home call for converting a portion of the existing attached garage to living space, expanding the attached garage 12 feet to the east, and adding a second story master suite over the garage fronting Country Club Road. A new curb cut will be required east of the existing driveway due to the relocation of the garage. The previous plan approved in 2012 included an addition to the rear of the home which expanded the home's footprint and reduced the livability of the rear yard.

Changes to the front façade of the home propose removing the partial brick surrounding the front entrance and adding a flat-roofed front entry portico projecting 4 feet from the front building wall, with fluted columns and crown molding.

The plans also call for replacing the existing aluminum siding with cedar lap siding; adding flat board banding at the second story overhang on the front elevation and continuing along the mid-section of the home; and installing new windows and doors.

It is the intention of this project to address the home's issues of disrepair, provide additional living spaces to meet the needs of the homeowner, and add traditional Colonial style elements which are currently lacking.

Preservation Consultant Vogel provided a written evaluation where he pointed out that the proposed renovation project will reverse the adverse effects of physical deterioration as well as previous remodeling work while preserving those architectural elements which are important to the house's historic character. The plans also show an attempt to modify the house to give it a more "traditional" Colonial Revival character. The inappropriate aluminum siding will be replaced with wood lap siding and some relatively minor structural alterations are also proposed, including a small addition on the rear elevation. All of the existing windows will be replaced.

The applicant has strived to rehabilitate the exterior of the house in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior's standards for the treatment of historic properties. The proposed

work requires minimal alteration of the building structure and the distinguishing original qualities of the house (its two-story form, symmetrical facade, side-gabled roof, balanced pattern of fenestration, and accentuated front entry door) will not be destroyed.

No significant character defining architectural details will be removed or obscured. The proposed rear addition, new front entry, the cedar lap siding, and composition shingle roofing will not alter the essential character of the house.

The applicant proposes to slightly alter the architectural character of the façade to create a more picturesque appearance—in other words, to make the house more closely resemble Country Club colonials built in the 1920s. Mr. Vogel pointed out that one of the Secretary of the Interior’s standards for rehabilitation recommends against alterations “which seek to create an earlier appearance” however, the proposed façade changes do not rise to the level of a fundamental change to the architectural character of the house. The house is not architecturally significant; none of the distinguishing original design qualities of the house will be lost as a result of the proposed renovation; and its association with Thorpe’s original plan of development (including the design controls incorporated in the original covenants) will be preserved intact.

Planner Repya concluded that she agreed with Mr. Vogel’s evaluation of the project and recommended approval of the COA request subject to the plans presented.

Findings supporting the approval recommendation include:

- The proposed renovation project will reverse the adverse effects of physical deterioration as well as previous remodeling work while preserving those architectural elements which are important to the house’s historic character.
- No significant historic architectural features or fabric of the home will be destroyed.
- The proposed alterations are compatible with the historic character of the house.
- The plans provided clearly illustrate the scale and scope of the project.
- 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 Representatives: Available to respond to questions

- **Mark & Kristina Dietzen, 4901 Bruce Avenue**

Homeowner, Mark Dietzen explained that they were returning to the HPB with a revised plan because the 2012 approved plan included an addition to the rear yard as well as a second story addition over the garage. They determined that the green space in the rear yard was too valuable, thus preferred the addition be limited to the second story over the garage. He added that the removal of a large concrete patio in the rear yard will also enhance the green space they so value.

Public Comments: None

Board Discussion:

Student Member Otness commented that he thought the addition looked very nice and he would support the project.

Student Member Druckman agreed with Member Otness, adding that he believed the proposed changes did a good job of accentuating the Colonial style of the home.

Member McLellan wondered if the amount of deterioration of the original siding (underneath the aluminum siding) had been determined. Homeowner, Mark Dietzen responded that they have not evaluated the materials underneath the aluminum siding.

Member Mellom commented that the project was nice, but she wondered if the two front windows were going to be enlarged. Homeowner, Kristina Dietzen responded that all of the replacement windows will be the same size as the original windows.

Member Moore observed that the original home looks as though it was built in the 1950's, not 1934, and he believed the proposed plan currently under consideration was an improvement for the property.

Member Sussman stated that he sat on the HPB when the 2012 plan was approved and he found the revised plan currently under consideration to be much better suited to the property.

Member Christiaansen pointed out that she liked the summary of the project provided by the applicant - finding it to be very informative and well thought out.

Motion:

Member Sussman moved approval of the COA request for changes to the street facing façades of the home subject to the plans presented. Member Moore seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion Carried.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

A. 4505 Arden Avenue - Construction Update

Planner Repya reported that a Certificate of Appropriateness was approved for 4505 Arden Avenue on March 11, 2014. The application included the following activities and was subject to the plans dated 3-4-14:

- Building a new detached garage
- Converting the attached garage to living space; and rebuilding the substandard rear addition
- Changes to the street facing façade of the home.

As the project commenced, major problems with the existing foundation became apparent warranting an evaluation by a structural engineer and David Fisher, the city's chief building

official – both agreed that “The foundation walls were not in acceptable condition, were inadequately constructed and were performing poorly”; consequently, Mr. Fisher determined that the footing and foundation needed to be replaced due to the deficiencies.

Ms. Repya reminded that board that in 2010, Steve Kirchman, the chief building official evaluated a structural engineer’s report and determined that “I do have concerns about the structural integrity of the foundation....., but I don’t know the extent of damage to the foundation at 4505 Arden Avenue.” The most recent engineer’s report dated October 7, 2014, provided more definitive information regarding the inadequacy of the foundation that substantiated Mr. Kirchman’s concerns.

Planner Repya explained that the change in building process was not referred back to the HPB for consideration because the building plans for the home have not changed, and life-safety issues are not subject to HPB approval - the decision was collaborative between the chief building official, community development director, Planner Repya and Preservation Consultant Robert Vogel. This project would have been referred back to the HPB if the plans for the house had changed, but that is not the case. The building permit for the new home is subject to the plans approved by the HPB.

Ms. Repya concluded that from the onset, this project has been required to follow the more stringent procedures for a tear-down as outlined in the city’s new “Construction Management Plan” (CMP) because the addition that was being demolished comprised more than 50% of the home’s wall & roof area. The CMP required notification and a meeting with interested neighbors within 300 feet of the property, signage identifying the project with telephone numbers as well as more restrictive times for construction activity. Mr. Busyn also installed his company sign which is allowed.

Board Member Comments:

Board members shared their surprise and disappointment that they had not been informed about the problems which had arisen with the foundation/footings of the home at 4505 Arden Avenue. They agreed that they should have had the opportunity to review the situation prior to the tear down of the entire home. They also expressed disappointment that there was no notification to the surrounding neighbors or the HPB prior to demolition.

Member Mellom reviewed the history of the COA process for 4505 Arden Avenue dating back from 2010; and provided the board with copies of the City Council’s Resolution from April 22, 2014 denying her appeal of the HPB’s approval of the COA for changes to the home which had been approved on March 11, 2014.

Ms. Mellom pointed out that the Council did not approve a demolition of the home. She added that she had been in the basement of the home and the foundation looked just fine. Ms.

Mellom further opined that Scott Busyn is too cozy with the city planners; and she questioned the validity of the structural engineer's report - surmising that it was biased since Mr. Busyn paid for that report.

Chair Weber responded to Ms. Mellom by explaining that the problems with the home's foundation and footings surfaced once the exterior of the foundation down to the footings was unearthed. An interior inspection of the foundation would not provide enough information to evaluate the integrity of the system.

Member O'Brien questioned how the decision was made to allow for a teardown of the historic home without notifying the HPB or the surrounding neighbors. He took issue with the chief building official's letter explaining his evaluation of the structural engineer's report supporting the demolition of the home; and stated that he did not believe life safety concerns were applicable since the house was not inhabited. Mr. O'Brien concluded that he did not want the HPB to be ambushed in the future, stressing the need to address this issue properly; and move forward in a positive fashion.

Member Moore stated that he believed the HPB should have been informed that problems had arisen with the home's foundation prior to the demolition. Since it is the board members who are out in the community, they need to be equipped with up-to-date information in order to field questions from the public, such as "I thought that house wasn't going to be torn down....How could that happen?" Mr. Moore pointed out that the construction update memo provided the information that the board should have received prior to the demolition; and the issue should have been brought to the HPB. Perhaps the outcome would have been the same, but at least there would have been no surprises.

Member Christiaansen observed that HPB members aren't structural engineers and if a report is received indicating that a system is failing, there needs to be a path to deal with that information -currently there doesn't appear to be a procedure in place. She added that the COA was issued with the understanding that portions of the existing home were to remain. If the inferior foundation and footings required that none of the existing home could remain, the HPB should have been allowed to be part of the discussion.

Member McLellan agreed with Member Christiaansen, pointing out that when the scope of a COA changes, the HPB should be involved and criteria should be established to address such situations.

Student Members Druckman and Otness agreed that the HPB should have had the opportunity to discuss the problems with the foundation prior to the demolition of the home.

Member Sussman observed that a structural engineer is licensed and they are obligated to report what they find. The most recent structural engineer's report has proven that 4505 Arden Avenue has been a neglected property, and structurally it may well have been among the

worst in the district. However, the fact that the entire house was torn down without HPB or surrounding neighbors being notified is a serious issue. He suggested that the board look upon what has happened as an opportunity to establish procedures and standards to provide an open and objective evaluation of problems when they arise. Whatever is devised can become a guide for applicants, the HPB and city staff to be better prepared when dealing with an unexpected situation. Mr. Sussman concluded that the sign displayed at 4505 Arden Avenue still reads "Demolition/Renovation", and he asked that Mr. Busyn remove the word "Renovation".

Community Comment:

Dan Dulas, 4609 Bruce Avenue stated that he appreciated the concerns and comments expressed by the HPB. He added that a COA was approved for a plan that did not include the teardown of the entire historic home; and any changes to that plan should have come back to the HPB and the public should have been informed as well. He added that he looked forward to the board establishing some procedures so the teardown of 4505 Arden Avenue doesn't set an unwanted precedence in the future.

Chair Weber observed that there was a lack of communication regarding the decision to tear down the historic home because there are currently no procedures in place to address the situation. He summarized the board's request for staff to evaluate the steps that were taken in the decision to allow the demolition of the home without input from the HPB, and come back to the December meeting with suggestions to establish notification procedures and assurances the HPB will be included in the discussion before any action is taken.

B. 2014 Human Services Task Force Report - Member Mellom

Member Mellom explained that she is currently one of three community representatives serving on the 2014 Human Services Task Force who are challenged with deciding how \$86,000 of public funds should be distributed to eight requesting public service agencies. She pointed out that the task force interviewed all the agencies and she found them to be an impressive group. The total amount of funds requested was \$118,000, which created a challenge to determine how to fairly distribute the monies to make up the \$32,000 difference. She concluded that a final recommendation for funding will be provided to the City Council, and she has found the experience to be most rewarding. The board thanked Ms. Mellom for serving on the task force.

C. Election of Officer: - Vice Chair Vacancy

Chair Weber called for nominations to the office of Vice Chair. Member Mellom moved to nominate Member Christiaansen. Member Christiaansen accepted the nomination. Member Moore seconded the motion. No further nominations were received. Chair Weber then called for a vote. All voted aye. The motion carried for Member Christiaansen to serve as the Vice Chair of the HPB.

VIII. CORRESPONDENCE & PETITIONS - None

IX. CHAIR AND BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Member Sussman explained that several years ago he served on the first community working group evaluating the entire 30 acre Grandview commercial area which includes the vacant public works site Bill Neuendorf, Economic Development Manager talked about earlier in the meeting. Sussman explained that his early interest in the area centered on its rich history which includes the Dan Patch railroad line, Tupa Park which houses the Cahill School and Grange Hall, and the original homestead of the Yancey family. He pointed out that some of his interest in the area may be more related to the activities of the Historical Society than the HPB; however the public engagement sessions now being offered provide a big opportunity to get involved because after several years of discussion, things are going to start happening. Mr. Sussman concluded that he encouraged his fellow board members to become engaged in the process too.

X. STAFF COMMENTS - None

XI. NEXT MEETING DATE December 9, 2014

XII. ADJOURNMENT 8:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Joyce Repya