



Taking into consideration board comments from the February meeting, the applicant has now chosen not to propose the “whole house rehabilitation”. However, the plans for the new detached garage and addition to the rear of the home remain unchanged from the initial submission. Relative to the front façade of the home, the proposed changes entail the following:

- Moving the front entry to the center of the front façade to provide an entrance on the first floor level of the home, thus eliminating an awkward step-down transition from the entryway to the living room, and also provide for improved accessibility into and within the home.
- The new entry will maintain a gable peak, but will be clad in stone like the proposed chimney. The plan has changed from front entry canopy open on the sides projecting 5 feet from the front building wall that was presented at the February meeting. In keeping with the plan of treatment guidance that “Entrances, porches, and other projections should relate to the pattern of existing adjacent historic homes and respect the rhythm and continuity of similar features along the street”; the front entry canopy has been removed, replaced with an entrance that remains consistent with the front setback of the homes on either side.
- The existing undersized chimney that has been deteriorating to the point that it is now pulling away from the structure. It will be rebuilt and moved slightly to the south to accommodate the relocated entry. The new chimney will be enhanced with stone and brick, and topped off with a clay or copper chimney cap - consistent with Tudor design. Also, the roof structure on the south side of the home will be slightly altered to accommodate the new chimney location.

Ms. Repya continued by explaining that the proposed 2-car detached garage, unchanged from the February meeting, measures 520 square feet in area and is consistent with the scale and massing of surrounding detached garages and other garages approved through the COA process in the district. She added that the exterior finishes proposed for the garage are shown to match the Tudor design of the house including natural stucco, Miratec half-timbering and asphalt shingles.

Ms. Repya pointed out that plans for the conversion of the flat roofed additions and attached garage to two stories of living space at the rear of the home were 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 as depicted on the proposed detached garage. Ms. Repya also pointed out that although the flat roofed additions may make up 50% or more of the total square footage of the home; in 2010 the HPB recognized that the deterioration identified in the home was predominately caused by the inferior construction of the additions, not the original historic home, thus the removal of the additions was determined to be appropriate.

Preservation Consultant Robert Vogel provided a comment on the revised plans stating that the proposed detached garage appears to be compatible with the house in scale, size, and

building materials and should not detract from the neighborhood's historic character. Furthermore, the proposed structural additions should not significantly alter the scale and character of the historic façade. Since the home would not be eligible for heritage landmark designation on its own, the changes proposed to the front façade will not have a detrimental effect on the home's historic integrity.

In Summary, Planner Repya recommended approval of the subject Certificate of Appropriateness revised to include the new detached garage and changes to the street facing facade. Findings supporting the approval recommendation included:

- The new detached garage and changes to the street facing façade are consistent with the Tudor design of the home.
- The proposed detached garage will complement the architectural style of the home and not be detrimental to the adjacent historic structures.
- The proposed changes to the front façade preserve the essential character of the property and contribute to the heritage value of the district as a whole.
- The plans provided with the subject request clearly illustrate the scale and scope of the proposed 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.

Ms. Repya added that the approval recommendation would be subject to:

- The plans dated March 4, 2014.
- A year built plaque attached to the exterior of the detached garage.

### **Applicant Presentation:**

**Scott Busyn, 4615 Wooddale Avenue** of Great Neighborhood Homes, representing property owners Tim and Michele Pronley explained the details of the proposed plans noting that the design was created using the tool box provided in the district's plan of treatment. Mr. Busyn pointed out that the proposal includes 4-sided Tudor architectural detailing, rather than an architectural emphasis on only the front façade. Addressing the changes to the plan from the February meeting, Mr. Busyn pointed out that the previous projecting front covered entry has been pulled back to the front façade of the home, now providing a concave front entry, more in keeping with the Tudor style. Mr. Busyn also added that they are no longer proposing the "whole house rehabilitation" practice of removing all of the original building materials on the historic home; rather they will leave the frame of the home and carefully evaluate the condition of the structure correcting deteriorated elements when necessary.

Mr. Busyn concluded that his firm received a COA for a project at 4620 Moorland Avenue in 2012, which the HPB has touted as being a successful rehabilitation of a home in the district. He added that the work planned for the subject home will follow the same careful rehabilitation practices. He then thanked the HPB for considering the COA application, and offered to provide additional information they may need.

**Public Comments:**

**Jane Lonnquist, 4510 Drexel Avenue** commented that she thought the proposed changes to the subject home were beautiful and well done for the replacement of a non-historic home. However she believed there were too many changes being proposed to the front façade of the historic home. Ms. Lonnquist cautioned that this decision could be precedence setting - citing that since the revised plan of treatment was adopted in 2008 only one historic home has been lost; speaking to the dedication of the volunteers. Ms. Lonnquist also asked to go on record requesting that when discussing the proposal, the board use terminology found in the district's plan of treatment; pointing out that she found the applicant's use of the term "whole house rehabilitation" for the plan reviewed in February to be a creative invention of the applicant and an oxymoron.

Ms. Lonnquist concluded by observing that while the proposed changes to the front façade may compliment the design of the home, she questioned how many changes can be made to a façade before the home no longer resembles the original historic structure.

**Edward Hancock, 4503 Arden Avenue** explained that his property is on the north side of the subject home and he considers the proposed plans to be a "dream-come-true". He stated that living next door to this home for 25 years has been depressing - the state of neglect is a shame; and he added that he couldn't say enough good things about what is being proposed. Mr. Hancock added that he liked the changes proposed for the front of the home, especially the front door being moved to the center of the front façade; pointing out that he has been concerned about children darting out of the existing front door which is very close to the property line and his driveway. Mr. Hancock concluded his comments by encouraging the HPB to approve the proposed changes to the home.

**Cheryl Dulas, 4609 Bruce Avenue** since 1998 stated that she was involved in the 2008 revision to the district's plan of treatment and is concerned about maintaining the historic character of the district. She cited that over the years she has observed changes to the street scape of homes that are identified as historic resources. Ms. Dulas then provided the board with a sheet depicting before and after photos of 4 homes where the front facades of the homes had been changed (All 4 projects were undertaken by Scott Busyn, Great Neighborhood Homes). The first 3 properties were from 2005 - 2006, prior to the revised plan of treatment in 2008 (all but the 2005 project received a COA). The fourth property at 4620 Moorland Avenue received a COA in 2012 and was subject to the 2008 plan of treatment. Ms. Dulas concluded by stating she believed the proposed changes to the front façade of the subject home do not preserve its original character, thus are not fitting in the district. She asked the board to carefully evaluate the changes proposed to the home.

**Kitty O'Dea, 4610 Bruce Avenue** asked for clarification on the foundation, roof height and scale of the front door. Mr. Busyn responded that the original foundation will remain. Depending upon what they discover relative to the roof's stability, they intend to keep the existing roof joists and tie the new roof structure onto the existing. He concluded that the

door height will not change, however it will appear somewhat larger due to it moving to the center of the home and the added stone surround. Ms. O'Dea concluded that she would encourage that they include gutters and downspouts on the home to deflect water run-off from adjacent properties.

**Board Comments:**

**Member Sussman** commented that the plans for the home are somewhat elaborate for Arden Avenue, but very handsome. Relative to the detached garage design, he observed that the gables on all elevations are symmetrical to the structure, whereas the gables found on the home are more offset. He also inquired about the materials proposed for the garage doors. Mr. Busyn responded that they plan on installing steel doors, like those installed on the new detached garage at 4620 Moorland Avenue. He added that they prefer steel because it is a sturdier product that takes well to the dark paint proposed.

**Member Christiaansen** commented that she was not at the February meeting, but found the proposed plan to be really beautiful, and very fitting for the feel of the district. She added that the HPB needs to look at the district as a whole, not each individual home, since it is the district that has the landmark designation, not each individual home.

Addressing the removal of deteriorated portions of the original home, Ms. Christiaansen stressed that with homes that have been subject to years of deferred maintenance, it is difficult to determine how much of the structure is deteriorated and in need of replacement; and there is the possibility that the amount of deterioration could add up to 50% of the original structure, which under the plan of treatment definition is considered a demolition. Mr. Busyn agreed that the amount of deterioration is an unknown, however they will be using the same approach used on the rehabilitation of 4620 Moorland Avenue, and will hopefully find minimal deterioration. He added that fortunately the infrastructure of the home is Douglas Fir which is known for its durability.

Member Christiaansen also noted that this home could become precedence setting. The question regarding how to treat a home that has fallen into a state of disrepair is an important issue. It is not good for the community to have historic homes that are "band-aided" together - that would be irresponsible. We need to look to the future, remembering that 20<sup>th</sup> century structures were not built to last forever.

**Member Mellom** commented that the plans for the home are lovely, but not in compliance with the District's plan of treatment nor the Secretary of the Interior's standards. She agreed with the comments from Jane Lonquist and Cheryl Dulas that the proposed changes to the streetscape are excessive. She asked Mr. Busyn to elaborate on the changed plans. Mr. Busyn reiterated the rehabilitation approach proposed for the home. Ms. Mellom commented that the changed plan is what should have been proposed at the February meeting. She added that she believed the home could be remodeled without making changes to the front façade - the changes proposed are too drastic, and she still considered the project a tear down.

**Member Birdman** pointed out that the focus of the February review was the demolition of the historic home. The plan currently being considered is different. It appears the question at hand is “What are acceptable changes to the front façade?” There appear to be differing opinions. Reciting the changes, Mr. Birdman noted the following:

- A 2010 environmental report indicated that the chimney needs to be replaced. Should the board require a stucco chimney in the same place; or is the proposed stone chimney moved several feet to the south to accommodate a revised front entry appropriate?
- Moving the front entry may be a bigger issue since the added stone surround alters its scale.
- Preservation of the historic homes entails maintaining the original when you can. The current condition of the home relative to deterioration is an unknown, and can't be clearly defined until the home is opened up.

**Member McDermott** explained that although she was unable to attend the February meeting, after reading the minutes from the meeting, she was very impressed with the board's thoughtful consideration of the plan. She also commended the applicant for listening to the comments from the board and providing changes to the plans reflecting the issues identified. Ms. McDermott added that she agreed with Member Christiaansen's point on rehabilitating homes which have fallen into a state of disrepair. She added that the proposed plan demonstrates good design - the changes aren't a mish-mash; and she would be in favor of approving the COA.

**Member Weber** explained that he evaluated the changes proposed to the original home and determined that less than 50% of the original materials will be removed. He pointed out that it appears that the home's foundation, studs, floors and as much of the roof as possible will remain. Mr. Busyn agreed, but pointed out that if extensive deterioration is found the responsible thing to do will be to replace those failing systems. Mr. Weber wondered if the board has ever addressed a request to move an entry; commenting that he understood from a design standpoint the reasons for wanting to move the front entry and chimney - it makes sense from a floor plan perspective.

Mr. Weber observed that the proposed design is attractive and matches the form and design of the original Tudor home. The question is “What is the purpose of the plan of treatment?” Is it strictly to preserve the existing houses as they were originally built, or is the goal to preserve the historic character of the neighborhood? If the goal is to preserve the historic character of the neighborhood, the proposed plan does a very good job of maintaining the form and basic design of the original home. Mr. Weber concluded that he believed the plan to be appropriate, noting that other homes have received COA's for changes to the front facades, and he did not consider approval of this request to be precedence setting.

**Member O'Brien** stated that he was disappointed not to receive a report regarding the current condition of the home. The difference between the February request for a “whole

house rehabilitation” versus the change in plans to a “rehabilitation” appears to be a change in vernacular. While it is the builder’s goal not to remove solid portions of the historic home, the unanticipated condition of the structure leaves a question regarding whether the project will evolve into a demolition due to the potential of excessive deterioration. This project has gone through a 4 year continuum - starting with a request to allow the demolition of the home, then a whole house rehabilitation, and now a change to the front façade and rehabilitation. Mr. O’Brien concluded that the unknown status of the structural deterioration of the home is a concern to him.

**Member McLellan** observed that this is his first meeting, and as he was reviewing the plans, some questions came to mind. Through his research he discovered that that the preservation goal in the district is to preserve its architectural integrity. Is the emphasis on each individual home or the district as a whole? Mr. McLellan pointed out that very old homes can be preserved as evidenced in areas like Williamsburg, Virginia. He also questioned what portions of the home were included in the definition of “demolition”, replacing stucco, roofing materials? Also, he wondered if the interior of the home was included within the demolition calculations.

**Student Member Brandt** stated that he thought the proposed design for the home fits the neighborhood. He added that he can see a problem with defining a point where a home has deteriorated to a level where preservation is no longer an option.

**Member Moore** commented the charge of the HPB is to determine if the proposed plan appropriately conveys the intent of the district’s design framework, and he believed this plan does just that. Mr. Moore pointed out that in January 2011; the HPB entertained a sketch plan review of the same front elevation currently being considered. At that time, comments from the board were very favorable. Taking into consideration that positive feedback, the owners proceeded to create the plan currently under consideration.

Mr. Moore added that this project is similar to the COA that was approved for the home at 4620 Moorland Avenue. As that project commenced, discoveries were made that were unanticipated, however the overall outcome was very positive for the neighborhood. We do want people to invest in their homes and for the homes to be well built so they will last for another 100 years.

#### **Board Discussion:**

Regarding the difference in the plans from last month, Member Weber observed that the biggest difference is in the process. The initial plan called for removing all of the building materials and starting over, replicating the historic home. The current plan entails a very different, deliberate process regarding the care that will be taken, evaluating the home piece by piece, and only replacing deficient materials. Member Birdman agreed that was the exact difference between the previous plan and the revised plan under consideration. Mr. Birdman added that because the plans for the home no longer include a removal of all the building materials, to the point that Member O’Brien was concerned that a report on the current

condition of the home was not provided as requested at the February meeting, he did not believe that a current evaluation of the home was needed because with the proposed process, the builder will be undertake a close evaluation of the home while under construction.

Mr. Birdman added that it appears the biggest issue with the proposal is whether or not the proposed changes for the front facade run afoul from the district's plan of treatment. He added that the last home shown in the handout provided by Ms. Dulas, 4620 Moorland Avenue is an example of a COA for changes to the front façade that was approved in 2012, after the 2008 revision to the plan of treatment. The board agreed that the quality of the design was improved from the homes changed prior to 2008, and a testimony that the revised plan of treatment is working.

**Motion: Member Christiaansen moved approval of the COA to build a new detached garage and make the proposed changes to the front façade of the home subject to the plans dated March 4, 2014 and a year built plaque be applied to the exterior of the garage. Member McDermott seconded the motion. Members Birdman, Weber, Sussman, Moore, McLennan, McDermott and Christiaansen voted aye. Members O'Brien and Mellom voted nay. The motion carried.**

## **VII. OTHER BUSINESS**

### **A. Explore the History of Your Home - Committee Report**

Committee member Birdman thanked the board members who completed the "History of Your Home" questionnaire; and explained that since the February HPB meeting, the committee has reevaluated the questionnaire and categorized the questions into categories of required information, volunteered information and requested information. Committee member Moore pointed out that the intent is to define priorities and to gain a more colorful picture of a property for the property owners.

Member McDermott observed that some of the questions appeared more demographic in nature - duplicating information such as "Why did you choose to live in Edina?" already gathered from the citywide survey. She added that it appears the questions require answers that are more narrative in nature which are difficult to quantify in a survey. She added that perhaps asking less open-ended questions would be helpful. Committee member Moore appreciated Ms. McDermott's insights suggesting that choices within each field be provided, thus making it easier to sort.

A general discussion ensued regarding ways to fine-tune the questionnaire. Responding to a question regarding the survey's goals, Committee Member Weber responded that the Heritage Preservation section of the Comprehensive Plan calls for a survey of residential properties in the city by 2030 - this questionnaire will provide data which can be utilized and expanded upon. Also, it

will provide a way to identify potential properties which may qualify to be determined eligible for heritage landmark status. The vision is to provide an interactive map on the order of Wikipedia where residents can access information and provide input as well.

Committee Member Moore suggested that the questionnaire be shared with members of the city's boards and commissions; as well as city employees that live in Edina and the City Council. The board agreed that was a very good idea. No formal action was taken.

### **B. Heritage Award Nominations**

Planner Repya reminded the board that nominations for the 2014 Heritage Award are now being accepted until Friday, April 4<sup>th</sup>. She encouraged the board to either submit a nomination for a property that they feel is worthy, or encourage an owner, builder, or architect to submit a nomination.

## **VIII. CORRESPONDENCE & PETITIONS**

### **A. Heritage Resource Survey - 2013 Update**

Ms. Repya explained that Preservation Consultant Vogel provided the board with an update of the work completed during 2013 relative to the heritage resource survey. She pointed out that the update was for the board's information and did not require action from them. The board appreciated receiving the information. No formal action was taken.

### **B. Disaster Management Plan - Background Information**

Planner Repya provided the board with a copy of a study from Preserve America entitled "Preparing to Preserve: An Action Plan to Integrate Historic Preservation into Tribal, State and Local Emergency Management Plans". Mr. Vogel asked that the board review the study in preparation for the upcoming work they will undertake creating Edina's Disaster Management Plan. No formal action was taken.

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

**Chair Moore** introduced Bruce McLellan, the newest member of the HPB; and the board members each provided Mr. McLellan with brief information about themselves.

Member Moore than provided the following upcoming events sponsored by the Edina Historical Society (EHS):

- Current exhibit "Edina Hockey" definitely worth seeing.
- April 27<sup>th</sup>, Sunday - EHS annual meeting at 2:00 p.m. - New Exhibit "Edina Subdivision" featuring great maps and information provided by long-time resident and Edina Surveyor, Frank Carderelle. Member Sussman encouraged the board to attend noting

that Frank Carderelle is a community treasure. Planner Repya agreed to send a reminder email to the board before April 27<sup>th</sup>.

- September 13<sup>th</sup>, Saturday - Annual Antique Appraisal, to be held at The Waters Senior Living - \$10 fee for 2 items.

**X. STAFF COMMENTS**

**Planner Repya** reported the following information:

- Shared Board & Commission Blog - Good interest from other boards and commissions. Liaisons will meet with the city's communication's department to discuss policies and schedule.
- Summer Walking Tour - Usually during July meeting (depending on whether a COA application is received). This year's potential area - Savory Garden's neighborhood/aka Normandale Park (large concentration of Lundgren, mid-century homes)
- April 8<sup>th</sup> - Annual Meeting and Election of officers
- Boards & Commissions Dinner - Monday, March 17<sup>th</sup>, 5:00 p.m., Centennial Lakes Hughes Pavilion

**XI. NEXT MEETING DATE                      April 8, 2014**

**XII. ADJOURNMENT                                      10:15 p.m.**

Member O'Brien moved for adjournment at 9:10 p.m. Member Weber seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

**Respectfully submitted,**  
*Joyce Repya*