

MINUTES
Rescheduled Meeting of the
Edina Heritage Preservation Board
Edina City Hall – Council Chambers
Tuesday, July 9, 2012
7:00 p.m.

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

II. ROLL CALL

Answering roll call was Chair Carr, and Members Stegner, Davis, Curran, Anger, Moore, Christiaansen, Mellom, Sussman and Ellingboe. Absent was Member Copman. Staff present was Planner Joyce Repya, and Administrative Assistant Jackie Hoogenakker. Preservation Consultant Robert Vogel was also in attendance.

III. APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA

Member Curran moved to approve the meeting agenda. Member Anger seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

IV. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES Regular meeting of June 12, 2012

Member Stegner moved approval of the minutes from the June 12, 2012, meeting of the board. Member Davis seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

V. COMMUNITY COMMENT None

VI. REPORTS/RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Certificates of Appropriateness

I. H-12-4 4624 Bruce Avenue – Final Review of a New Home with Detached Garage

Planner Repya reported that The Heritage Preservation Board (HPB) reviewed the preliminary plan for the new home and detached garage at the June 12, 2012 meeting at which time they heard comments from both the applicant as well as the public. The feedback for both the home and the detached garage was very favorable with no changes recommended for the garage; and one suggestion that on the home the applicant provide an optional window plan providing fewer muntins (panes) on the windows.

The final plan provided includes two window options as requested by the HPB. Also, responding to an email from the southerly neighbor (4626 Bruce Avenue) regarding the close proximity and height of the proposed home abutting their property, the applicant has provided a revised survey depicting the footprint of the proposed residence overlaying the existing home. The survey demonstrates a new southerly side yard setback of 7.03 feet for the proposed home, replacing an existing 5 foot setback.

Ms. Repya pointed out that Preservation Consultant Robert Vogel has opined that the proposed new home with either window pattern would be appropriate new construction in the Country Club District. She added that Staff too finds that the plans for either of the window grid options meet the conditions

outlined in the Country Club District Plan of Treatment, thus approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness for the new home and detached garage is recommended with clarification regarding the preferred window grid pattern. The approval is conditioned on the following:

1. Historical and architectural documentation of the existing house and garage is provided to include digital photographs and a written description of the house and its known history.
2. The home is built subject to the final approved plans – any changes must be brought back to the HPB.
3. A sign (not to exceed 6 sq. ft.) with a rendering of the approved home is displayed on the property.
4. A year built plaque is displayed on the home.
5. The HPB's staff liaison is provided a final inspection of the home prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.
6. Photographs of all elevations of the new construction shall be provided once the house is completed.

The following findings support the recommendation for approval:

1. The applicant has met all of the procedural requirements required for the replacement of a non-historic resource in the Country Club District.
2. The proposed plan meets the criteria set out in the design review guidelines of the Country Club District Plan of Treatment.
3. The proposed new house will be visually compatible with the historic period revival style homes in the neighborhood and should not detract from their historic character.

Public Comments/Questions:

Scott Peterson, 4626 Bruce Avenue explained that his home abuts the subject property to the south, and he shared his concerns with the HPB through an email at the preliminary review in June. His concerns center on the new 2 story home replacing the one story tandem garage next to his home. Mr. Peterson emphasized that the plan as proposed will block off daylight into his kitchen area, and wondered if the driveway which is proposed for the north side of the property could not be placed on the south side, thus increasing the new home's setback from the south property line, and affording more daylight into his yard.

The applicant, Paul Donnay of Donnay Homes responded that currently, there is a 5 foot setback provided by the existing home; the proposed plan is providing a 7 foot setback. If the driveway were to be moved to the south side of the property, an 11 foot setback would result, adding only 4 feet more to the setback. However, moving the driveway would also require the removal of mature trees in the rear yard to allow for the detached garage on the south side of the property.

Paul Runice, 4622 Bruce Avenue explained that his home abuts the subject property to the north and he had 3 comments/concerns:

1. The front setback from Bruce Avenue. The proposed plan shows a slightly taller home than what currently exists; and moves the new home forward of both the existing home and both homes to the north and south. The homes on Bruce Avenue share consistent front yard setbacks, and while the proposed setback may meet the code requirements, the slightly taller home closer to the street will make it outsize to its neighbors from the street view. Recognizing the uniformity of the front setback of homes along the street, he requested that the home be shifted further back on the lot.

2. Lot grading – The front portions of the lots to the north and south of the subject property include a sloping grade down to the subject lot. The developer has stated that there would be no regarding of the lot; however he stated that he found it difficult to imagine how the grading on the adjacent properties will not be impacted.
3. Driveway on the lot line – The plans show a driveway on the lot line, however he believed that a driveway on the lot line was only allowed where a shared driveway situation existed; otherwise some setback should be required.

Addressing Mr. Runice's comments, the following responses were provided:

1. Front setback from Bruce Avenue – The proposed setback meets the criteria established by the zoning ordinance. Moving the home further back on the lot is not possible because room required to access the detached garage would be lost.
2. Lot grading – The HPB does not oversee the grading on the lot; however as part of the permitting process, the City will require that the new home does not compromise the grade on neighboring lots.
3. Driveway on the lot line – The city code does allow driveways to be built on the property line – In fact, a majority of the driveways in the Country Club District abut the side lot line with no setback provided.

Board Member Comments/Questions:

Member Christiaansen thanked Mr. Donnay for providing the optional plan showing fewer grids on the windows, adding that she found the revised plan preferable. **Members Stegner, Davis and Sussman** also preferred the revised window plan.

Member Mellom observed that the proposed home appears to be somewhat taller than the neighboring homes, and she wondered if the rooflines shouldn't line up. Consultant Vogel responded that the homes in the District do vary somewhat in height, particularly dependent on the architectural style. Being that a Tudor style home is replacing a Colonial style, a slight increase in building height is to be expected since Tudor's typically have a steeper pitch to their rooflines.

Motion

Following a brief discussion in which members of the Board praised Mr. Donnay for providing plans for a new home that complemented the historic neighborhood. Member Stegner then moved approval of the revised plan subject to conditions recommended by Staff. Member Davis seconded the motion. Members Curran, Anger, Davis, Moore, Stegner, Carr, Sussman, and Christiaansen voted aye. Member Mellom voted nay. The motion carried.

2. H-12-5 4601 Wooddale Avenue – Addition to a Street Facing Façade

Planner Repya explained that the subject property is located on the southeast corner of Wooddale Avenue and Bridge Street. The home, constructed in 1927 is a Mediterranean style with an attached one story 3-car garage (constructed in 1973) accessed from Bridge Street. The proposed project entails constructing a new attached 3-car garage and family room on the rear of the home; which will project

approximately 7 feet beyond the existing north wall. A deck is proposed above the garage accessed from a second story master suite that is inset 9 feet from the side wall of the home on the second floor. Mediterranean style accents are proposed to enhance the home's historic architecture.

Ms. Repya pointed out that the improvements have been designed to correct structural deficiencies and safety concerns created by a poorly constructed 1973 attached garage. The design will not only improve the garage's usable space, but provide for energy efficiency, and update the living spaces that have seen no improvements for 40 years.

The materials proposed for the addition will complement those of the existing home to include:

- Stucco clad walls , and Mediterranean style accents with columns and wrought iron
- Two painted steel or wood, single garage doors,
- Brick and stone detailing to compliment the home,
- Wood overhead garage doors, and
- Clay tile shingles.

Consultant Vogel reviewed the proposed plans and opined that the existing attached garage is not a significant historic feature of the house at 4601 Wooddale; therefore, this structure is not a preservation resource. The proposed façade alterations are appropriate and compatible with the character of the historic house and the neighborhood. No significant architectural details will be destroyed or obscured. Although they will be visible when viewed from the public right-of-way, I believe the contemporary design of the garage and entryway improvements is compatible with the historic character of the house and will not detract from the integrity of nearby historic homes. The stone accents are borrowed more or less directly from other period revival style homes in the district—rusticated stonework appears on Italian Renaissance and Spanish Eclectic styled homes in the district, though much of it appears to be the result of remodeling rather than original construction. Mr. Vogel concluded that he would recommend approval of the COA subject to conditions outlined by staff.

Planner Repya observed that she too recommended approval of the COA request. The recommendation being subject to the plans presented. Findings supporting the approval recommendation include:

- 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 with the subject request 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 Comments:

Ben Baechler, 4601 Wooddale Avenue explained that his family is excited to move into this home which they recently purchased; and they are looking forward to undertaking the proposed project. Mr. Baechler pointed out that the project has been designed to correct structural deficiencies and safety issues; increase the livability of the home with an added family room and master bedroom suite; while also enhancing the home's historic architecture.

Public Comments/Questions:

Kitty O’Dea, 4610 Bruce Avenue observed that the proposed attached garage would project in front of the building wall of the home and questioned whether that was in keeping with the homes in the District.

Board Member Comments/Questions:

Member Mellom questioned whether cladding the chimney in stone was in keeping with the Mediterranean architectural style. **Members Anger and Christiaansen** echoed the concern. **Member Christiaansen** added that the trellis work at the side entry and the wooden garage doors did not appear consistent with the Mediterranean style of the home.

Mr. Baechler responded that the natural stone is proposed for the chimney, and while they have researched other homes in the District and found stone incorporated with stucco homes, they have gone back and forth whether to include it in the design.

Consultant Vogel pointed out that while the District may have Mediterranean style stucco homes with stone work, it is unlikely that the stone was part of the original design, and was more than likely added at a later date without design review.

Member Sussman observed that there appeared to be two projects going on – the expansion of the garage with master suite above; and enhancements to the façade. He added that he did not think the existing entrance or the chimney were in need of enhancements.

Member Stegner commented that the home is a classic Mediterranean style with white stucco with highlights. The proposal with the stonework, pillars and trellis work is more complicated.

Member Moore observed that the existing stucco chimney is an important architectural element of the front façade of the home, and he opined that the addition of the brick work is unnecessary.

Member Mellom commented that the home is charming and asked if the plan proposed to maintain the existing medallions over the first floor windows and twisted posts at the entry. Mr. Baechler stated that both will remain.

Motion

Member Moore moved to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness subject to the conditions recommended by staff, and requiring that the proposed stone/brick work shown along the base of the home and on the chimney is deleted from the plan. **Member Curran** seconded the motion.

Discussion ensued regarding the motion. **Member Moore** reiterated his concerns that the proposed columns or posts at the entry appeared out of place and should be flush with the front façade of the home. **Member Sussman** agreed noting that the existing front entry

was not in need of embellishment.

Member Moore withdrew the motion on the table. Member Moore then introduced a new motion approving the Certificate of Appropriateness subject to the conditions recommended by staff, adding that no brick/stone work shall be added to the base of the home or on the chimney; and if columns are used at the front entry, they shall be flush with the wall of the home. Member Curran seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried. In passing, Member Christiaansen then suggested that the columns would preferable be painted a similar color as the stucco.

3. H-12-3 4524 Bruce Avenue – Final Review of a New Home with Attached Garage

Planner Repya explained that the preliminary plan for the proposed home was reviewed at the June 12, 2012 HPB meeting at which time the applicant presented their plan and comments were provided from the Board as well as the public. Board members expressed their opinions that that the size, scale and massing of the proposed home was complimentary to the adjacent homes; and Preservation Consultant Robert Vogel opined that had this plan been presented to Samuel Thorpe during the districts period of significance, he would probably have approved of the plan. That being said, the consensus of the board was that the design was too busy creating a home that appeared to overwhelm the adjacent homes. Board members identified the following architectural elements which they believed contributed to the busyness of the design:

- Diamond grids on the windows
- Metal roofing material on the front porch
- The height of the stonework along the foundation
- The wood trim on the stucco panel seams is busy in some areas.

A revised plan has been provided that remains unchanged in size, scale and massing, as well as in the use of Hardi-plank stucco panels with Miratec wood trim and stone accents. Responding to the recommendations of the HPB, the applicant provided the following changes to the plans:

- The diamond grid pattern on the front elevation has been replaced with a 6 pane pattern.
- The copper roof on the front porch was changed to asphalt shingles to reduce the number of textures and materials visible from the front street.
- The stone work on the south elevation was lowered to reduce the stone's impact.
- The half- timbering has been reevaluated to enhance each elevation.

The final plans subject to review at this time have reduced the busyness of the design by incorporating some of the recommendations provided by the HPB during the preliminary review in June. Furthermore, Preservation Consultant Robert Vogel has determined that the proposed new home is appropriate new construction in the Country Club District.

Approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness for the new home is recommended with the following conditions:

7. Historical and architectural documentation of the existing house and garage is provided to include digital photographs and a written description of the house and its known history.

8. The home is built subject to the final approved plans – any changes must be brought back to the HPB.
9. A sign (not to exceed 6 sq. ft.) with a rendering of the approved home is displayed on the property.
10. A year built plaque is displayed on the home.
11. The HPB's staff liaison is provided a final inspection of the home prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.
12. Photographs of all elevations of the new construction shall be provided once the house is completed.

The following findings support the recommendation for approval:

4. The applicant has met all of the procedural requirements required for the replacement of a non-historic resource in the Country Club District.
5. The proposed plan meets the criteria set out in the design review guidelines of the Country Club District Plan of Treatment.
6. The proposed new house will be visually compatible with the historic period revival style homes in the neighborhood and should not detract from their historic character.

Applicant Comments:

Matt Hanish, representing JMS Custom Homes informed the Board that at their suggestions the building plans were revised. Hanish highlighted for the Board the revisions:

- Eliminate the diamond grid pattern on the front elevation by replacing it with a 6 pane pattern.
- The height of the stonework on the south elevation was lowered.
- The porch roof is no longer copper. It was changed to asphalt singles to reduce the "busy" appearance of the different textures and materials from the front street.
- The timbering has been reevaluated and reduced to enhance each elevation.

Hanish introduced Kathy Alexander, architect and Jeff Schoenwetter of JMS Custom Homes and stood for questions.

Public Comments/Questions:

Ann Wordelman, 4522 Bruce Avenue addressed the Board and requested that the Board take additional time to review samples of the proposed stucco panel boards and to review the exterior finishes of other similar historic homes in the District. Wordelman said she doesn't want the Board to feel pressured in their decision making without adequate time to study the new materials and similar housing types within the District.

Continuing, Wordelman referred to the Plan of Treatment highlighting portions of the Plan she is concerned the applicant isn't following; especially with regard to exterior materials. She said in her opinion the proposed stucco panel boards shouldn't be approved; they're not real stucco. Wordelman acknowledged that stucco panel boards have been used elsewhere in the District; however, she pointed out if JMS was allowed to use the panel boards the exterior of the new house wouldn't "match" the immediate homes surrounding it (all stucco). Wordelman pointed out that the Board's review and their decision should be on a case by case basis, adding just because this product was used elsewhere doesn't

mean it's appropriate here.

With regard to the proposed timbering Ms. Wordelman noted that in her opinion its use is excessive and not appropriate. She also noted that it was unclear to her from the plans submitted if the stone on the front façade was real or manufactured. Wordelman stated she also doesn't feel the proposed "porch" is consistent with the architecture of Tudor homes. Concluding, Wordelman introduced Steve Donnelly, of Donnelly Stucco to explain the difference between real stucco and stucco (cement) panel boards.

Mr. Donnelly briefed the Board on stucco vs. stucco panel boards. He explained that when this product is used the seams need to be covered; which may be the reason one sees so much trim board. Board Members asked Mr. Donnelly his opinion on why someone would use the stucco panel boards instead of real stucco. Donnelly responded that cost could be a factor.

Kitty O'Dea, 4610 Bruce Avenue, told the Board she had taken photos of Tudors in the District and noted as mentioned by Ms. Wordelman that Tudors traditionally don't have front porches. O'Dea also agreed with comments from Ms. Wordelman that the timbering was excessive. Continuing, O'Dea also commented on the window placement on the third floor, adding that was also untypical. Concluding, Ms. O'Dea volunteered to develop a "field guide" of all the homes in the District.

In response to comments from neighbors Mr. Hanish explained that at this time JMS Custom Homes does not use real stucco, adding that stucco has a higher failure rate and the use of this type of stucco board is common and more "green". Hanish explained their intent was to design a complementary home; not duplicate one. Hanish said the design of the proposed house emulates a Tudor Revival style.

Board Member Comments/Questions:

Member Sussman commented that it appears to him from the revised plans that on the side and rear of the house the windows no longer had subdivided light (panes). Sussman asked if that was the preference of the homeowner. Hanish responded at the previous meeting he believed that the Board felt the exterior materials created a "busy" look, adding much of that "busy look" was eliminated. Sussman said in his opinion the look of proposed home is now inconsistent; especially comparing the front elevation with the side and rear.

Mr. Hanish responded that he would be happy to add the panes and trim features.

Chair Carr asked Mr. Hanish if the proposed stone was "real" or manufactured. Hanish responded that the stone is natural. Carr questioned if stone was traditionally used on Tudor style homes. Carr asked Consultant Vogel if stone is a common element found on Tudor homes.

Consultant Vogel responded that stone is found throughout the District and was used on Tudor homes. Continuing, Vogel explained what's significant about the Country Club District was Mr. Thorpe's vision of the District; its streetscape and the layout of the 550 single family home lots. Vogel pointed out not all "styles" of homes built in the District are "text book" correct. Many of the homes were built to a client's specification with approval from Thorpe, adding Thorpe knew what he liked. Continuing, Vogel acknowledged it's easier for Boards to pinpoint massing; however, aesthetics is

another issue. Vogel noted that the Plan of Treatment doesn't dictate duplication of a specific style of house, just compatibility. The Plan of Treatment acknowledges changes could occur and guides the Board in making decisions combining these 21st century changes in a historical district. Concluding, Vogel acknowledged the process can require subjective decisions by the Board.

Member Christiaansen said she doesn't have an issue with the entrance/porch; however the stucco panel boards are a big issue for her. Member Christiaansen said in her opinion it appears they are using modern materials trying to achieve a "dated" look.

Member Stegner reminded the Board the proposed house is a brand new house; adding in viewing this application on a "case by case" basis he has no problem with the revised plans as submitted and would include in any approval Members Sussman's suggestion on the window panes and trim.

Member Curran pointed out that the homes surrounding the subject property are all stucco; not stucco panel boards, adding that she understands the position of those against the stucco panel board product and those in support.

Member Anger said he respects the sincerity of the designer; however, feels that the design could be enhanced to respect the sophistication of the street.

Jeff Schoenwetter, JMS Custom Homes addressed the Board and informed them; as mentioned previously by Mr. Hanish that he would be using stucco panel boards (Hardi Board) on the new house. Schoenwetter acknowledged that a number of surrounding homes are stucco; however, they were built in a different era and if Hardi board was available at that time it is possible that product would have been used. Schoenwetter asked the Board to look at this from a global perspective, adding building science has changed. With regard to the Plan of Treatment Schoenwetter said he views the Plan as a guide and respectfully tries to emulate the character of the existing house; not by being identical but by being complementary. Concluding Schoenwetter said his design team also works to respect the surrounding homes.

Member Mellom said she doesn't like the house in this location, adding in her opinion the proposed house doesn't match the surrounding homes. Mellom also added she can't support the 3rd floor with the oblong front window.

Member Davis said he fully respects and appreciates all the comments from the neighbors; however, believes the house as proposed is appropriate for this neighborhood and meets the criteria established in the Plan of Treatment.

Consultant Vogel said the proposed house is not a replica of an historic house and it doesn't pretend to be. He added that what the Board needs to determine is if the proposed home is an appropriate substitute that combines old world design with modern building practices and building codes, and does "no harm". Concluding, Vogel said if the Board sees measureable harm in the design of the home it should be denied. If not it should be approved.

Motion

Member Stegner moved approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness based on the revised plans dated July 2, 2012, to include the duplication of the window pane detail on all elevations, and additional timbering on the front and side to better match the front façade; as well as the conditions recommended by Staff. Member Davis seconded the motion. Ayes: Sussman, Curran, Stegner, Davis, and Carr. Nays: Mellom, Anger, Christiaansen, and Moore. Motion carried.

II. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Southdale Center – Determination of Eligibility (DOE) for Heritage Landmark Designation

Planner Repya reminded the Board that at their June meeting they considered adding Southdale Center to the list of those properties in Edina that have been determined eligible for landmark designation. Preservation Consultant Robert Vogel provided a DOE study which explained Southdale's history and significance to the community. In the study, Mr. Vogel concluded that Southdale Center has been evaluated as historically significant and should be included in the city's inventory of heritage resources worthy of consideration in community development planning.

Board members welcomed Mr. Vogel's report noting that the HPB has struggled with recognizing the significance of Southdale for decades, and a motion was made and seconded to add Southdale to the list of properties designated eligible for landmark designation. Prior to the vote, concern was raised as to how the City Council would view taking this action in lieu of the negotiations they have had with Southdale's owners as of late. It was agreed that the motion would be tabled to the July meeting, and in the meantime, Planner Repya would meet with City Manager Scott Neal to get his opinion as to whether the City Council would support adding Southdale to the list of historic resources determined eligible for landmark designation.

The meeting with Mr. Neal did take place at which time Ms. Repya shared Consultant Vogel's DOE study, the ramifications of a property being added to the list, as well as the opinions expressed by HPB members. Mr. Neal stated that it was gracious of the HPB to consider the City Council's opinion prior to making their decision. He did agree that Southdale is one of Edina's important historic resources (particularly in light of it being included on the list of "10 Buildings that Changed America"), agreeing that most people would be surprised that the HPB had not already addressed this issue. He added that in lieu of the fact that the DOE designation is a planning tool to bookmark the property for potential designation in the future with no ramifications to the property owners; he believed that the City Council would support adding Southdale Center to the list of historic resources eligible for landmark designation.

Member Stegner stated that he appreciated hearing City Manager Neal's opinion, and then moved that Southdale Center be added to the list of Edina properties determined eligible for heritage landmark

designation. Colleen Curran seconded the motion. A brief discussion ensued in which the Board agreed that by adding Southdale to the list of properties designated as eligible for landmark designations, no limitations are placed on the property. Chair Carr called for a vote. All voted aye. The motion carried.

B. Designating Properties Edina Heritage Landmarks – Process

Planner Repya provided the Board with the process for designating a property an Edina Heritage Landmark pointing out that:

1. The property owner is contacted and asked if they would be interested in having their property designated an Edina Heritage Landmark. Supporting documentation is provided focusing on the process and advantages of the designation.
2. With the consent of the owner, the HPB directs staff to prepare the necessary landmark nomination study which includes a plan of treatment for the property. The landmark nomination study identifies and describes the property being nominated, explains how it meets one or more of the Heritage Landmark eligibility criteria, and makes the case for historic significance and integrity; the plan of treatment lays out a vision for the future of the preservation resource and provides guidance for evaluating applications for Certificates of Appropriateness.
3. The homeowner meets with the Planning staff to discuss the nomination study to ensure that they approve of the plan of treatment.
4. Once the nomination study and plan of treatment have been approved by the property owner, the HPB will formally move the nomination. By Statute, the Minnesota Historical Society (SHPO) must be provided an opportunity to comment on the nomination before they are acted on by the city (the review period is 60 days); city code also requires review by the Planning Commission.
5. When the review and comment period by SHPO is over, the nomination documents may be revised to reflect agreed upon changes they recommend. The nomination is then heard first by the Planning Commission because the action entails adding a heritage landmark overlay zoning designation to the property. The Planning commission provides their opinion to the City council who ultimately holds a public hearing to approve adding the Edina Heritage Landmark designation to the property.

In addition to explaining the procedures, Ms. Repya also provided a list of the 17 properties determined eligible for designation, including the status of correspondence with the property owners. She also included samples of the letters sent to the property owners inviting them to consider adding the heritage landmark designation to their historic homes.

Board members thanked Ms. Repya for clarifying the designation process, and agreed that the letters did a good job of introducing the subject of landmark designation to the property owners. However, they agreed that because the letters have not generated a response from the recipients, the HPB should follow-up the letters with a more personal invitation.

Member Anger suggested that a letter introducing the heritage landmark designation program and inviting property owners to consider participating in the program should be sent to all of the properties on the list within the next few months. The Board agreed that would be a good idea and discussed having the HPB Chair and the Mayor sign the letters. Having members of the HPB responsible for following up with the property owners was also discussed.

Planner Repya agreed to craft Edina Heritage Landmark invitation letters to the property owners on the designated eligible list for the Board to review at their August meeting. No formal action was taken.

C. Planning for Joint Meeting with the City Council on August 6th

Planner Repya provided the Board with a tentative agenda for the joint workshop with the City Council on August 6th. Items included were those discussed at the June meeting. Ms. Repya observed that the agenda was pretty aggressive; and considering that their time with the Council will be limited to 45 minutes, suggested the Board may want to reevaluate the agenda and prioritize those items which they feel are most important to discuss. That being said, Ms. Repya pointed out that additional data can be provided as background information, such as the 2011 CLG Report to SHPO, and the current 2012 work plan.

A discussion ensued regarding the most pertinent information to share with the Council. The following items were identified with a Board member assigned to be responsible for leading the discussion:

Chair Claudia Carr will introduce the Board and recognize the following items for discussion:

1. Designating more properties Edina Heritage Landmarks – Member Stegner
2. Morningside Bungalow designations – Member Curran
3. Southdale Center – Recognizing Original Artifacts/Added to Eligible for Landmark Designation List - Member Moore
4. Mid-Century Historic Context Study CLG Grant – Member Anger

Preservation Consultant Vogel opined that the items identified were very timely and should prove for a productive discussion. Mr. Vogel added that the Council needs to hear that of the properties listed as eligible for landmark designation, there are none that are threatened to be lost due to demolition or neglect.

Board members were pleased with the items chosen - agreeing that the content showed both diversity and scope of the HPB beyond the Country Club District which has dominated the discussions in previous years.

D. Mid-Century Modern Historic Context Study – Progress Report

Planner Repya explained that the most recent progress report for the Mid-Century Modern Historic Context Study currently underway through a CLG grant was provided for the Board's information. Included was a breakdown of the research design including objectives, methodology and expected results, as well as an up-to-date list of resources consulted thus far in the project?

Board members appreciated receiving the update. Ms. Repya explained that she will be providing future updates as the research continues. No formal action was taken.

Edina Heritage Preservation Board
Minutes
July 9, 2012

VII. CORRESPONDENCE AND PETITIONS None

VIII. CHAIR AND BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS None

IX. STAFF COMMENTS None

**X. NEXT MEETING DATE – Monday, August 13, 2012
Monday, August 6, 2012 City Council Work Session**

XI. ADJOURNMENT 9:40 p.m.

Member Davis moved the meeting be adjourned at 9:40 p.m. Member Moore seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

**Respectfully submitted,
Joyce Repya & Jackie Hoogenakker**