

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
EDINA HERITAGE PRESERVATION BOARD
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2006, AT 7:00 P.M.
EDINA CITY HALL – MAYOR’S CONFERENCE ROOM
4801 WEST 50TH STREET**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Vice Chairman Bob Kojetin, Marie Thorpe, Arlene Forrest
and Chris Rofidal

MEMBERS ABSENT: Karen Ferrara, Lou Blemaster, and Ian Yue

STAFF PRESENT: Joyce Repya, Associate Planner

I. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

Member Thorpe moved for approval of the minutes from the January 10, 2006 meeting. Member Rofidal seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

II. DESIGN REVIEW AND COMPLIANCE POLICIES:

A. Frequently Asked Questions

Following up on the request of the Board at the January meeting, Planner Repya provided following list of twelve “Frequently Asked Questions” the Board might consider for inclusion in a brochure as well as on the Heritage Preservation Board’s section of the City’s website:

1. What is the Heritage Preservation Board?
2. Who are the members of the Heritage Preservation Board and how are they chosen?
3. What does the Edina Heritage Landmark designation mean?
4. How does Edina’s Heritage Landmark designation differ from the National Register of Historic Places designation?
5. Where are the Edina Heritage Landmarks in Edina?
6. What is a Plan of Treatment?

7. What is a Certificate of Appropriateness?
8. If my property is listed within a Heritage Landmark District under what circumstances must I apply for a Certificate of Appropriateness?
9. What is the process for applying for a Certificate of Appropriateness?
10. How does the Heritage Preservation Board evaluate Certificate of Appropriateness applications?
11. Are neighboring properties notified when an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness is being considered?
12. After a Certificate of Appropriateness has been issued can the plans be changed?

Board members discussed the proposed list and agreed that the questions did a good job of addressing some of the confusion expressed relative to heritage preservation in Edina.

Member Kojetin stated that he has wondered about the difference between the terms “heritage” and “historic” and wondered if that could be clarified. Consultant Vogel explained that the terms are often used interchangeably, and often it is a matter of preference.

Member Thorpe suggested adding a question that addresses the affect of a landmark designation on the property’s value. Board members agreed that would be a good addition.

Member Forrest opined that it is a good idea to define the distinction between a local and a national heritage designation, and was glad to see that included as questions #4.

Ms. Repya thanked the Board for their input and offered to work on the answers to the questions with Consultant Vogel and have them available for review at the March meeting.

B. Instructions/Requirements for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) Application

Planner Repya offered a revised instruction sheet for COA applications. The sheet provided general requirements for all applications, and added a separate listing of additional requirements for a new home, including:

- A meeting with the Planner prior to submitting the application;
- A survey of the existing home with an overlay of the proposed new home;

- An increased application fee to address the additional meetings and inspections; and
- A rendering of the new home must be made available.

Board members discussed the proposed changes and agreed that it would be clearer to have two separate instruction sheets; one for the teardown/new home scenario and another for all other situations (demolishing a garage, a new garage, or moving a garage) – not only because there are different requirements, but also due to the different fees.

Planner Repya agreed that she would draft two separate application instruction sheets and provide them at the March meeting for Board review. No formal action was taken.

C. Neighborhood Notification of a Proposed Certificate of Appropriateness (COA)

Planner Repya reminded the Board that the City Council asked them to consider ways in which the neighbors might be notified about an impending teardown in the Country Club District. Requiring a colored rendering of the new home to be posted on the property was one idea the Board had considered. Ms. Repya suggested that a notice of the upcoming meeting to consider the application for a COA could be mailed to abutting and adjacent property owners. She explained that rather than targeting the homes within a determined number of feet from the perimeter of the property as is done for public hearings, she was recommending the houses abutting and adjacent (basically next to, in front of, and behind) be notified because those are the homes most impacted.

Ms. Repya also provided a sample meeting notice that included the subject address, nature of the request, meeting date, meeting time, and meeting place. At the bottom of the notice, the neighbors are advised that the proposed plans will be available for review at the City of Edina Planning Department, with Planner Repya's phone number and email address listed if questions. Ms. Repya added that if the Board agreed to send the notices, the deadline for application submittal should be pushed back one week to allow time for the notification.

Board members agreed that sending a notice of an upcoming COA request makes sense, pointing out that the neighbors reactions to the teardowns approved thus far have been "Why didn't we know this was happening? While the notification is not required by code, the courtesy of notifying those most affected appears appropriate. A brief discussion ensued as to whether a notice should only be mailed for a teardown, or if all applications should be included in the mailing requirement. Board members agreed that all COA applications should be treated the same.

Member Thorpe moved to approve the mailing of a meeting notice to abutting and adjacent property owners for all Certificate of Appropriateness applications. Member Rofidal seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

III. HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN: Disaster Plan:

Consultant Vogel advised the Board that when drafting the City's Comprehensive Historic Preservation Plan, it is important to consider that disasters can and do happen, and the loss of significant heritage resources might result. Historic buildings are especially vulnerable to the following types of disasters:

- House and building fires
- Tornados and straight line winds
- Thunderstorms and lightning
- Winter storms
- Hazardous materials
- Flooding

Thus, it is appropriate to consider disaster management procedures as part of the plan.

Vogel pointed out that the key players in disaster planning are the city's emergency management team which includes law enforcement, fire protection, building inspection, and community development planning personnel. The objectives in the comprehensive plan will be to 1) identify the role of the HPB and its staff in existing plans, and 2) develop policies that will address disaster management responses unique to heritage resources.

Most historic property disaster management plans emphasize historic building identification, documentation, and establishing links with other emergency management agencies such as FEMA and SHPO. This will give heritage preservation a "presence" in disaster management.

Mr. Vogel suggested that the HPB focus on the following disaster management priorities:

- Provide a list of significant heritage resources to all staff with emergency management responsibilities (fire, police, building inspections, etc.);
- Compile a directory or sources of technical assistance who could be called upon to help in the event of a disaster at a heritage landmark;
- Form an Edina heritage landmark damage assessment team; and
- Adopt a damage assessment form for historic properties.

Vogel then offered the following objective, issues and strategies addressing disaster management for consideration:

Objective #11: *Be prepared to respond to disasters involving heritage resources.*

Issues:

- a) Heritage resources can be damaged or destroyed by structure fires, tornadoes, wind storms, thunderstorms, lightning, winter storms, hazardous materials, flooding and other events.
- b) Disaster management for heritage resources needs to emphasize preparedness.
- c) Emergency response procedures need to be developed to give preservationists the tools they need to respond to a disaster.
- d) Premature demolition of weakened historic buildings must be avoided.
- e) The disaster management plan needs to be shared with outside organizations.

Strategies:

- 1) Define the role of heritage preservation in disaster preparedness, response, and recovery.
- 2) Provide members of the city disaster management team with information on heritage resources and preservation priorities.
- 3) Encourage property owners to develop disaster preparedness plans.
- 4) Establish a disaster response team of experienced preservationists, architects, historians, and planners.
- 5) Perform a risk assessment to identify the types of disasters likely to occur and evaluate the vulnerability of specific heritage resources.

Board members discussed the importance of including the disaster plan in the comprehensive plan, and how various situations might be addressed. Member Rofidal asked if the disaster plan would get involved in bigger state or federal incidences. Mr. Vogel said it would as it interfaces with the City's overall disaster management plan. Board members agreed the objectives, issues and strategies presented do a good job of identifying the disaster management concerns, and would be an important part of the comprehensive plan. No formal action was taken on this piece of the plan. Once the all elements of the plan are complete, it will be brought back to the Board for action.

IV. INTERLACHEN BOULEVARD TRAIL SURVEY: Update

Consultant Vogel explained that in light of his absence from the January meeting, he wanted to update the Board on the status of the Interlachen Boulevard Trail Survey his company is conducting for the City's Engineering Department. Vogel explained that he has completed the first phase of the survey and determined that the following properties have potential historical significance and will require a further Phase II

Minutes – February 14, 2006
Edina Heritage Preservation Board

survey to determine whether they would be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places:

- 5224 Interlachen Boulevard – private residence
- 5312 Interlachen Boulevard – private residence
- 5528 Interlachen Boulevard – private residence
- 6200 Interlachen Boulevard – Interlachen Country Club

Mr. Vogel explained that while the HPB has no responsibilities to oversee this project, the information provided to the City will be very beneficial to the Board; particularly with regard to the goals and priorities identified in the Historic Context Study under Context IX. Entitled “Country Clubs and Parks”.

Mr. Vogel invited the Heritage Preservation Board to assist with some of the archival research and field survey. He pointed out that participation by the HPB will provide hands-on experiences in resource identification and evaluation. The work is proposed to take place over the next several months.

Board members discussed the project, agreeing that it would be an excellent experience. All agreed that the best time for them to participate would be in April, once the new members have been appointed to the Board. Vogel agreed that would work well with his time frame. No formal action was taken.

V. NEXT MEETING DATE: March 14, 2006

VI. ADJOURNMENT: 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joyce Repya

Minutes – February 14, 2006
Edina Heritage Preservation Board