

end of the east and west elevations. The design of the structure is proposed to compliment the Colonial Revival style of the home. The mass and proportions of the proposed garage are well within the averages of the surrounding detached garages; and the plans demonstrate a structure that is not unlike new garages previously approved in the district through the COA process.

Ms. Repya also pointed out that a new, small front entry overhang supported by brackets is proposed to provide protection from the elements over the 17 square foot front stoop. The overhang is shown to project 3'3" from the front building wall. The roofing material will be asphalt shingles to match the house.

Concluding an explanation of the proposal, Planner Repya added that the plans for the conversion of the one-story attached garage to two stories of living space at the rear of the home were provided for the Board's information, since additions to the rear of the home not visible from the front street do not require a COA. The addition has been designed to provide a compatible use of the home while at the same time compliment the home's overall historic character - utilizing wood lap siding and asphalt shingles on the second story. The first floor of the addition, not visible from the street scape is proposed to be clad with wood-paneling and a standing seam metal roof to add interest to the rear of the home and break-up the long expanse of wood siding on the north and south elevations.

Ms. Repya pointed out that as standard practice for all COA applications, Preservation Consultant Robert Vogel reviewed the subject plans and provided a written statement where he observed that the proposed garage appears to be compatible in scale, size, and building materials with other historic homes in the neighborhood and will not detract from the district's historic character. The new front entry overhang is also appropriate to the house and its surroundings. Based on the plans presented he recommended approval of the COA for both the new detached garage and front entry overhang.

Regarding the existing attached garage which is shown to be replaced with 2 stories of living space; Mr. Vogel observed that the plans for the new addition are provided to the board as a courtesy and not subject to the COA review. He added that the addition is not an important historic character defining element of the home, and no important architectural details will be removed or obscured by any of the proposed rehabilitation treatments.

Ms. Repya concluded that staff agreed with Consultant Vogel's evaluation of the proposed improvements to the property, noting that the proposed detached garage is consistent with new garages previously reviewed in the district and the proposed front entry will blend in well with the historic façade of the home. Approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness request was recommended. Findings supporting the recommendation included:

- 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 proposed work preserves the essential character of the property and contributes to the heritage values of the district as a whole.
- The information provided supporting the subject Certificate of Appropriateness meets the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and the Country Club District Plan of Treatment.

The approval recommendation was also subject to:

1. The plans presented, and
2. The placement of a year built plaque on the exterior of the new detached garage.

Applicant Comments:

Scott Waggoner, 5619 Bernard Place, from w.b.builders, representing the property owners explained that his client was struggling with the need for more efficient living spaces for their family as well as a more functional garage. They agreed upon the proposed plan because it will not only enhance the historic home, but also provide for a more livable home for their family.

Board Comments:

Board members asked for and received clarification of the plans. After which Consultant Vogel commented that it was nice to see a clean addition - simple and elegant; the essence of the Colonial Revival style.

Member Mellom agreed with Mr. Vogel's observations adding that she was glad that changes were not proposed for the facades of the original home, other than the minor front entry overhang.

Members Birdman, O'Brien and Weber also commented that they were pleased with the plans which were very clear - depicting a good design for the home.

Motion: Member Birdman moved approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness for a new detached garage and front entry overhang subject to the plans presented and a year built plaque installed on the exterior of the new detached garage.

Member O'Brien seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

B. H-14-2 4505 Arden Avenue - Whole House Rehabilitation, Change To Street Facing Façade, and New Detached Garage

Planner Repya reported that the subject property is located on the east side of the 4500 block of Arden Avenue. The existing home, a Tudor style constructed in 1926, currently has a two story 2-car attached garage accessed by a driveway on the south side of the property.

The Certificate of Appropriateness request entails the construction of a new detached garage in the southeast corner of the rear yard. Several flat roofed additions to the rear of the original home which include a 2-stall attached garage are proposed to be removed and replaced with a new 2 story addition to increase the living space of the home.

The rehabilitation work proposes removal of all material from the original home which the applicant indicates will then be rebuilt to the exact dimensions with respect to the height, form

and mass of the 1926 home. Changes to the front façade include moving the front entry and chimney to the center of the home to provide for entry to the home from the street elevation. Also, the plan proposes more Tudor detailing with the addition of half-timbering, stonework, and natural stucco.

Providing the board with background information on this property, Planner Repya explained that on January 12, 2010, the HPB heard a request to remove the historic resource classification of this 1926 home to provide for the introduction of a COA application to build a new home on the site. At that time, information attesting to the degradation of the home's structure justifying removing its historic status was presented to the board; to include several inappropriate additions to the rear; as well potentially dangerous environmental issues. The decision of the board was that the additions to the rear of the home did detract from the original structure and could be removed, however the board concluded that information presented did not support rationale to declassify the heritage resource status of the home.

Ms. Repya added that a year later, at the January 11, 2011 HPB meeting, the applicant returned for a sketch plan review of proposed changes to the front façade of the home. The front façade plan reviewed by the HPB was identical to the subject front façade plan under consideration. At that time, the applicants explained that their goal for the renovation would be to maintain the essential form and integrity of the original home - staying true to the historic character of Arden Avenue and the district, while providing spaces that would be more compatible for their family's needs. The response of the board was favorable.

Ms. Repya then provided a breakdown of the work proposed relative to the subject COA application to include:

Front Façade Changes & Rehabilitation of Original Home

Changes proposed to the front façade include:

- Moving the front entry to the center of the front façade to provide entry on the first floor level of the home, thus eliminating an awkward step-down transition from the entryway to the living room.
- The new entry will project 5 feet from the front building wall, be constructed of stone, and will be open on the sides.
- The undersized chimney will be moved slightly to the south to accommodate the relocated entry. The rebuilt chimney will be enhanced with stone and brick, and topped off with a clay or copper chimney cap - consistent with Tudor design.

The rehabilitation of the original home entails:

- Addition of stone to the front façade and half-timbering is also proposed to replace the bare stucco areas of the original home.
- Removal of all materials from the original home.

Attached Garage Conversion to Living Space

Plans for the conversion of the flat roofed additions and attached garage to two stories of living space at the rear of the home have been provided for the Board's information. The addition has been designed to provide a compatible use of the home while at the same time compliment

the home's overall Tudor design and historic character - utilizing natural stucco siding with Miratec half-timbering, brackets, and asphalt shingles.

Detached Garage

The proposed 520 square foot, 2-car detached garage is proposed to be accessed from the existing driveway on the south side of the property. An overhead door is proposed on the west elevation from the existing driveway. A service door is also provided on the west side, and windows are shown on all elevations.

Ms. Repya observed that the design of the proposed garage is intended to compliment the Tudor style of the home with exterior finishes shown to match the house with natural stucco, Miratec half-timbering and asphalt shingles. The height and mass of the proposed structure is well within the dimensions of new detached garages previously approved in the district, and the 18' height to peak is actually 2 feet shorter than the detached garage to the north at 4503 Arden Avenue. The exterior finishes proposed for the garage are shown to match the house with natural stucco, Miratec half-timbering and asphalt shingles.

Ms. Repya provided a summary of Preservation Consultant Robert Vogel's written evaluation of the project by pointing out the following:

- The home, built in 1926 embodies some of the distinctive characteristics of the Tudor style and has been evaluated as a contributing heritage resource within the Country Club District; however, the house lacks historical distinction and is not individually eligible for designation as an Edina Heritage Landmark.
- The new garage proposed for 4505 Arden Avenue appears to be compatible with the house in scale, size, and building materials and should not detract from the neighborhood's historic character. Based on the plans presented with the COA application, he recommended approval of the COA for construction of the detached garage subject to the plans presented and a year built plaque being displayed on the exterior of the structure.
- The proposed changes to the exterior of the house (what the applicant describes as a "whole house rehabilitation") amounts to a teardown and total reconstruction of the historic structure. The argument that the house as it exists today is not worthy of preservation is not substantiated by historical, physical, or pictorial evidence.
- The house retains sufficient historic integrity to convey its historic significance in its existing condition; and is a good candidate for respectful rehabilitation, including repairs, alterations, and the removal of inappropriate structural elements, however, he struggled to see how a teardown would meet the city's heritage preservation policy objectives.
- The district plan of treatment clearly states that the primary preservation goal of the Country Club District is "preservation of the existing house facades and streetscapes" and specifies rehabilitation as "the preferred treatment for heritage preservation resources." Both the plan of treatment and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (which are, by ordinance, the required basis for COA decisions) define rehabilitation as ***the process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations and additions, while preserving those***

portions or features which convey its historical, cultural or architectural values.

Rehabilitation does not encompass demolition of a historic resource and reconstruction of the entire structure—the goal of rehabilitation is the conservation of significant historic features, not their replacement.

- To meet the standards for rehabilitation and the COA guidelines in the district plan of treatment, the applicant should be required to make a reasonable effort to preserve as much original historic fabric as possible. Therefore, unless the applicant can make a strong case for demolition of the existing house, Mr. Vogel concluded in his comments that he would recommend denial of the COA for demolition of the existing house.

Planner Repya concluded that the subject COA request includes some of the direction provided by the 2010 Heritage Preservation Board with the removal of the later additions/attached garage; and the construction of a new detached garage, and 2 stories of living space to the rear of the original home. However, the 2010 HPB also provided very clear direction to the applicant in their determination that the original structure was to remain a heritage resource in the district, and thus would not be eligible for demolition. While the plans provided attest to maintaining the original home's height, mass and setback; "removing all materials from the original home" as proposed, in essence is a demolition of the original home.

Ms. Repya then recommended a continuance of this request to the March 11th meeting affording the applicant the opportunity to provide plans that do not include demolition of the original 1926 home. Since the deadline for action on this request is prior to the March 11th meeting, the applicant should request in writing a continuance of the COA request. Ms. Repya added that if the applicant is not agreeable to a continuance to the March 11th meeting, staff would recommend denial of the COA request.

Applicant Presentation:

Scott Busyn, 4615 Wooddale Avenue of Great Neighborhood Homes, representing property owners Tim and Michele Pronley provided the board with a PowerPoint presentation in support of the COA request. The following information was provided:

- Background on the 2010 HPB review of the home.
- Cited problems including bat infestation in the front wall; strong urine smell from numerous pets; major roof leaks - Thus, don't want to remodel, but prefer rehabilitation through reconstruction.
- Explained that although original building materials are proposed to be removed, the HPB will retain the ability to control the new construction to ensure that it replicates the height, scale and mass of the original home. - Equated the process to the reconstruction of the district's streets, sewer and storm water systems in 2008.
- Recited the history of the 2008 plan of treatment update approved by the City Council, and opined that the proposal complied with the plan for the following reasons:
 - ❖ Continue Tudor design of the home
 - ❖ Street scape will be maintained
 - ❖ Deteriorated/damaged materials will be removed

- ❖ Original floor & eave heights will be maintained using GPS technology
- ❖ Structural changes will include a deeper basement allowing for taller ceilings, and better articulation on the north and south (side) facades of the home.

Mr. Busyn asked the board what they were attempting to preserve in the district - pointing out that the significance is derived from the themes of community development and planning. He pointed out that the subject application will provide the HPB maximum control of “new” construction in the district, and provide a voluntary pathway for owners who feel their homes are beyond the tipping point. He concluded that history is changing, and rather than freeze drying the neighborhood; approving this proposal will be a step toward writing a new history for the district.

Public Comments:

Jane Lonnquist, 4510 Drexel Avenue, explained that she is an interested preservationist who lives in the neighborhood, and was an active participant in the 2008 revision of the district’s plan of treatment. She thanked the Pronley’s for their desire to invest in the neighborhood; and asked the HPB to carefully consider the process the applicant is proposing - pointing out that they are using many new terms that are not clearly defined. Ms. Lonnquist added that she is also concerned about the final product, questioning at what point changes to a historic façade go the extreme of affecting the structure’s historic integrity.

Cheryl Dulas, 4609 Bruce Avenue, explained that she too was involved in the 2008 revision to the district’s plan of treatment which included a great deal of input from the residents of the neighborhood. She added that she believes it is important to maintain the front façade of the historic homes; and cautioned the board that if the plans are approved as proposed, such approval could have precedence setting ramifications for other homes in the district.

Matt Abroe, 4507 Arden Avenue, explained that he lives next door to the subject home on the south side, and expressed his support of the plans. He expressed his opinion that the existing home is completely dilapidated, and the proposed changes for the home look good. He added that just because a home is old doesn’t mean it is worthy of being preserved.

Board Comments:

Member Mellom explained that she lives across (4506 Arden Avenue) from the subject property, and while not a member of the HPB in 2010, was pleased with the board’s decision at that time to not remove the heritage resource status of the home, thus making way for demolition and construction of a new home.

She added that the 2010 reports from the environmental and engineering teams commissioned by the applicant did not present a structure that was uninhabitable and in need of demolition when reviewed by the City’s chief building official as well as the city engineer. Consequently, unless the home has deteriorated significantly since 2010, (which is questionable since there

have been renters living in the home since that time), she could not support a plan that included removal of all building materials.

Member Birdman agreed with Ms. Mellom's comment that the current status of the original home should be provided. Apparently, in 2010 the home was deemed habitable by the city's building official. If the condition of the home has changed since then, evidence to the changes in the home's habitability should be provided.

Member Moore stated that the plan as proposed should require a re-evaluation of the home's historic status since it was constructed during the district's period of significance (1924-1944) and is not eligible to be torn down unless the applicant can prove it no longer adds to the historic significance of the district- which is the process entertained and denied by the HPB in 2010. He added that he too would like to see up to date information regarding the current condition of the original home - questioning whether the entire structure was unsalvageable.

Member Weber observed that the district's plan of treatment is supported by the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, and the language in the plan of treatment is very clear, "No COA will be approved for the demolition, in whole or in part of any heritage preservation resource unless the applicant can show that the property is not a heritage resource."...that is a rule, not a suggestion. He added that it appears that the plans proposed for the original home are attempting to create a false sense of historic development.

Member Weber wondered if the new window placement proposed on the north and south elevations of the existing home, as well as the changes to the front façade weren't creating the need to remove a majority of the original building materials. Mr. Weber also asked if it is technically feasible to do the rehab work with the existing structure; and whether the house is structurally sound - questions that need to be answered. That being said, Mr. Weber indicated that he could support the proposed detached garage and addition to the rear of the home.

Member Sussman questioned whether this home is in such an extreme state of disrepair that it cannot be rehabilitated, adding that old historic homes in much worse condition than the subject property are rehabilitated without tearing them down. Mr. Sussman pointed out that he is also concerned about the broader application of the applicant's expressed need to construct the historic home to new building standards. He also opined that the additional half-timbering and stone work proposed on the front façade appeared more in keeping with the historic homes on the west side of the Country Club District, and less applicable to the homes on the Arden Avenue.

Mr. Sussman concluded that he agreed with the 2010 HPB determination that the additions to the rear of the home were not significant to the historic integrity of the original home and could be removed/replaced without having a detrimental effect on the historic home.

Member O'Brien observed that the applicant's description of the proposal as a "whole house rehabilitation" is a play on words - clearly the proposal calls for a demolition of the original historic home. Mr. O'Brien pointed out that he would be in favor of delaying a decision on this request until more information on the current condition of the home is provided, and also potentially visiting the home as well. He added that he lives in the Country Club District and knows that these historic homes need continual maintenance.

Preservation Consultant Vogel agreed with the board member's request for more information relative to the current status of the original home - stressing that it is important to evaluate all the data from the applicant relative to the amount of material that is deemed deteriorated and in need of replacement. He added that in 2010 the board visited the home, and it might be beneficial to again have the board view the property to gain a better perspective of the issues cited by the applicant.

Motion: Member Moore moved to continue this item until the March 11th meeting to afford the board the opportunity to receive an update of past information provided for the 2010 COA request; as well as a possible site visit by the board. Member O'Brien asked Member Moore if he would accept an amendment to the motion to include that "the HPB must receive a letter from the applicant requesting a 60 day continuance of the COA request - If a continuance letter is not received, the COA request shall be denied". Member Moore agreed to Member O'Brien's suggested amendment to the motion. Member O'Brien then seconded the motion. Members Mellom, Birdman, O'Brien, Sussman and Moore voted aye. Member Weber voted nay, commenting that he would prefer to separate the proposed detached garage and addition from the whole house rehabilitation that is in question. The motion carried.

C. Disaster Management Plan

Planner Repya reminded the board that their 2014 work plan included the creation of a disaster management plan for the city's historic resource properties. She pointed out that since this plan needs to dovetail with the city's existing emergency management plan it will be important to have the city's fire chief who oversees the city's plan involved with this project. Ms. Repya added that the new fire chief, Tom Schultz will begin work on February 17th; and once he has settled in, she will introduce him to this project.

In the meantime, Consultant Vogel who will be instrumental in drafting the plan presented an outline of the important components to consider with the disaster management plan. He added that the creation of the plan will be beneficial to city officials and property owners alike by focusing on procedures for emergency response and damage assessment. Interestingly, once the disaster management plan has been adopted, Edina will be the second city in Minnesota to have

such a plan for its historic properties. The board agreed that this plan will go a long way to support Edina's heritage preservation program. No formal action was taken.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Explore the History of Your Home - Committee Report

Committee member Birdman reported that since the January HPB meeting, the committee considered the board's suggestions about garnering community interest for the "Explore the History of your Home" project. To that end, the committee provided copies of a questionnaire they drafted which requested information regarding 1. Property's Address; 2. Property Owner (name, # of occupants, year purchased); 3. Property History (year built, building details, architectural style, modifications, and # of owners); and lastly 4. Owner Characteristics (how they chose their home, what they like best, etc.)

Member Birdman asked the board to consider additional information to include on the questionnaire and send those suggestions to Planner Repya who will in turn ensure that they are passed on to the committee. He added that it is their hope to finalize the questionnaire by the end of February; and then have board members and their friends, as well as our student members and their families and friends complete the questionnaire during the month of March. The hope is to engage at least 50 property owners with the goal of determining if this project is worth pursuing further. The board thanked committee members Birdman, Weber and Moore for their work on the questionnaire, and agreed that they would follow-thru with providing input, and also participating in the questionnaire.

B. Heritage Award Nominations

Planner Repya announced that nominations for the 2014 Heritage Award are now being accepted through the city's web site. She shared copies of the nomination forms and encouraged board members to submit a nomination and also invite property owners, who they feel might be likely candidates for nomination. Ms. Repya added that there will be a shout-out for nominations in the spring issue of *About Town*; and nominations will close on April 4th to afford the board sufficient time to choose a nominee and prepare the award.

C. Preservation Month (May) Planning

Due to the late hour, this item was continued to a future meeting.

VIII. CORRESPONDENCE & PETITIONS - None

IX. CHAIR AND BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Chair Moore reported that on February 3rd the Oliver Kelly Grange (OKG) held their first meeting in Edina's Minnehaha Grange Hall, and it was very well attended. Mr. Moore shared that the meeting was very interesting, and was he pleased to receive a plaque on behalf of the HPB, awarded by the OKG that acknowledged the board's good stewardship of the historic

building. The board agreed that providing space for the OKG association was a very good use of the building, and they appreciated that the group acknowledged the city's preservation efforts with the plaque which they hoped would be displayed in the Grange Hall.

Member Sussman explained to the board that at the January meeting when he was sharing the facts of the 1907 Minneapolis newspaper article which corrected the 1937 *Country Club Crier* article on the "Runaway Bridges" (i.e. Browndale & Wooddale); he meant no disrespect to the 1937 Village Recorder, Ben Moore who recounted the 1937 story for the paper - particularly considering that Mr. Moore's grandson is the current chair of the HPB. He added that it is obvious a commitment to public service is a family trait which continues to add great benefit to the community. Chair Moore thanked Member Sussman for the kind words.

X. STAFF COMMENTS

Planner Repya reported that since the January meeting she has explored ways that the HPB can educate the public about their activities and mission. The city's web site provides a section where individuals (such as the city manager or police chief), and departments (such as the park department and liquor stores) commit to writing a weekly blog on a topic of interest to the public. In addition to the individual and department blogs, there is a "shared blog" category, again with the requirement for a weekly posting.

Ms. Repya pointed out that while utilizing the blog would be a great way to communicate the heritage preservation message to the public, a weekly commitment appeared to be a bit much. She went on to explain that she asked fellow board liaisons if their groups would be interested in participating in a shared blog, and depending upon the interest level, a schedule could be created reducing each group's posting commitment to perhaps monthly. The response from the other liaisons was favorable - they agreed to run the idea past their boards and report back at the end of the month. Ms. Repya concluded that she will report back to the board once the other boards and commissions have shared their interest level. The board thanked Ms. Repya for checking into the shared blog and expressed their hopes that the other boards and commissions would find it a useful communication tool.

XI. NEXT MEETING DATE March 11, 2014

XII. ADJOURNMENT 10:15 p.m.
Member Birdman moved for adjournment at 10:15 p.m. Member Mellom seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,
Joyce Repya