

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
EDINA HERITAGE PRESERVATION BOARD
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 14, 2008, AT 7:00 P.M.
EDINA CITY HALL – COMMUNITY ROOM
4801 WEST 50TH STREET**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Laura Benson, Vice Chairman, Bob Kojetin, Karen Ferrara, Lou Blemaster, Arlene Forrest, Connie Fukuda, Jean Rehkamp Larson, and Elizabeth Montgomery

MEMBERS ABSENT: Chris Rofidal

STAFF PRESENT: Joyce Repya, Associate Planner
Jackie Hoogenakker, Planning Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT: Robert Vogel, Heritage Preservation Consultant
Shannon Neale, 4623 Drexel Avenue
Sarah Wildman, Lake Country Builders
Doug Johnson, Building Concepts & Design
Scott Busyn, Great Neighborhood Homes, Inc.
Sheilagh Ziegewid, 4615 Wooddale Avenue
Mickey Armstrong, Coldwell Banker Burnet Realty
John McDonald, Edina Realty
Kathy Peterson, 4617 Wooddale Avenue

I. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: September 8, 2008

Member Kojetin moved approval of the minutes from the September 8, 2008 meeting. Member Forrest seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT: None

III. COUNTRY CLUB DISTRICT :

A. Certificates of Appropriateness

1. H-08-12 4623 Drexel Avenue – New Detached Garage

Planner Repya explained that the subject property is located on the east side of the 4600 block of Drexel Avenue. The existing home, constructed in 1930, has a 2-car attached garage accessed by a driveway on the southerly side of the property.

The COA request involves building a new, 483 square foot detached garage in the rear yard, and converting the existing 2-stall attached garage into living

space. The plan illustrates the new garage will maintain 3 foot setback from the rear and side lot line, the minimum required by code. A new curb cut will not be required since the proposed garage will be accessed by the existing driveway.

The new 2-stall detached garage is proposed to measure 21' x 23' or 483 square feet in area. The design of the structure is proposed to complement the architectural style of the home with stucco clad walls, half timber trim and brackets, consistent with the Tudor architectural style. Attention to detail with windows and doors is demonstrated on the north, south, and west elevations. The east façade was intentionally void of windows since it borders a privacy fence. Asphalt shingles are proposed for the 8/12 pitch of the hip roof.

The height of the proposed garage is shown to be 16.29' at the highest peak, which is five feet less than the average height of surrounding detached garages. The height at the mid-point of the gable is shown to be 12.5', and a height of 8.8' is provided at the eave line. The ridge line is shown to be 4.9' in length due to the hip roof.

The maximum lot coverage allowed for the property is 30%. Construction of the proposed 483 sq. ft. garage will create a total lot coverage of 29.5%, within the limits allowed by city codes.

Consultant Vogel opined that the proposed detached garage qualifies as an appropriate treatment for construction of a new garage in the district. The design appears to be compatible with the size, scale, mass, and materials of the historic house and will not have an adverse visual impact on the historic character of adjacent properties or the neighborhood. The lack of decorative detailing on the east (rear) elevation is off-set by the presence of rear-yard fencing and the small setback between the garage and the fence. Vogel added that the proposed conversion of the existing attached garage to living space also appears to be consistent with historic preservation standards.

FINDINGS:

Planner Repya offered the following findings supporting the subject COA request:

- The plans provided with subject request clearly illustrate the scale and scope of the project.
- The plans demonstrate design that abides by the requirements of the Country Club District Plan of Treatment and the Secretary of the Interior's standards for rehabilitation.
- The information provided supporting the subject Certificate of Appropriateness meets the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and the Country Club District Plan of Treatment.

Planner Repya concluded that staff recommends approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness for the new garage subject to:

- The plans presented.
- The condition that a year built (2008) plaque or sign is placed on the new detached garage.

BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:

Member Rehkamp Larson commented that she liked the scale of the garage, and believed it will be a nice complement to the house. Board members expressed their agreement with Rehkamp Larson.

Member Kojetin stated that he liked the comparison elevations provided for the neighboring garages – the information was concise and demonstrated that the proposed plan was in keeping with the neighborhood.

APPLICANT COMMENTS: None to add to Staff's presentation.

MOTION & VOTE:

Following a brief discussion, Member Forrest moved approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness request subject to the plans presented and a year built sign or plaque be affixed to the garage. Member Rehkamp Larson seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

2. H-08-13 4517 Drexel Avenue – Remove Existing Detached and Construct a New Detached Garage

Planner Repya explained that the subject property, located on the east side of the 4500 block of Drexel Avenue, was constructed in 1935, and currently has a 2-car detached garage in the southeast corner of the rear yard accessed by a driveway on the southerly side of the property.

The COA request involves demolishing the existing 535 square foot detached garage and building a new, 598 square foot detached garage in its place. The plan illustrates the new garage will maintain 4 foot setback from the rear and side lot line. A new curb cut will not be required since the proposed garage will be accessed by the existing driveway. The lot coverage for the property with the new, larger garage will be 29.7% - the maximum allowed is 30%

The new 2-stall detached garage is proposed to measure 26' x 23' feet in area. The design of the structure is shown to complement the Tudor architectural style of the home with Hardi stucco siding on the walls, and trim boards around the windows and doors. Attention to detail is demonstrated with double-hung windows on the north and south elevations. The west elevation, which is visible from the front street, is shown to have carriage garage doors, a shuttered window and bracket with bead board trim in the gable peak, and a small gabled overhang

with brackets and bead board trim, projecting one foot from the building wall, over the service door on the north side of the overhead doors. The east (rear) elevation is shown to have bracket and bead board detailing in the gable end to match the west elevation. Asphalt shingles are proposed for the 6/12 pitch of the roof.

The height of the proposed garage is shown to be 15.6' at the highest peak. The height at the mid-point of the gable is shown to be 13.0', and a height of 8.25' is provided at the eave line. The ridge line is shown to be 24 feet in length.

Consultant Vogel observed that the proposed structure appears to meet the requirements of the Country Club District plan of treatment for construction of new detached garages. The garage depicted in the plans appears compatible with the character of the historic house with respect to size, scale, mass, and materials. He added that he did not believe the new garage would have an adverse visual impact on the historic character of adjacent properties or the neighborhood. The lack of decorative detailing on the east (rear) elevation is not an issue due to the fact that the new garage backs up to the existing garage on the property directly to the east of 4517 Drexel--if that adjacent garage were to be removed in the future, the visual impact of the east-facing blank wall of the subject property could be mitigated with fencing and/or vegetation.

FINDINGS:

Planner Repya offered the following findings in support of the COA request:

- The plans provided with 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.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Ms. Repya concluded that staff recommends approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness for the new garage subject to:

- The plans presented.
- The condition that a year built (2008) plaque or sign is placed on the new detached garage.

BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:

Member Rehkamp Larson questioned the use of Hardi-Board stucco siding in lieu of traditional stucco, pointing out that the product comes in panels with seams which are visible.

Member Kojetin observed that in the past the Board has approved COA's for detached garages with "non-authentic" exterior materials that match the house.

Consultant Vogel agreed.

APPLICANT COMMENTS:

Doug Johnson, Building Design & Concepts, representing the homeowner, stated that the use of Hardi-board stucco siding in lieu of traditional stucco was a cost saving measure.

MOTION & VOTE:

Following a brief discussion, Member Kojetin moved approval of the COA subject to the plans presented and a year built plaque or sign be affixed to the garage. Member Ferrara seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

**Member Blemaster complimented the applicants of both COA applications heard this evening for the clear and concise plans and supporting materials provided. She added that the required pre-application meeting with the planner, when the necessary information is discussed, appears to be providing clear direction which serves the applicant and the Board very well. Board members agreed with Ms. Blemaster.

**3. H-08-14 4615 Wooddale Avenue – Preliminary COA
Demolition of House & Garage**

Planner Repya explained that the subject property is located on the east side of the 4600 block of Wooddale Avenue. The existing 2-story American Colonial home was constructed in 1930, and is one of the smallest homes in the district with a footprint of 793 square feet in area. The original single stall detached garage is located in the middle of the rear yard, 20 feet from the lot line and 29 feet from the north lot line and 22 feet from the south lot line.

The subject request involves a preliminary review of a request to demolish the existing home and garage with the intention of building a new home/garage that meets the district's plan of treatment criteria. Because the home was constructed prior to 1944, and is considered an historic resource, the following standards from the District's Plan of Treatment apply to such requests:

- No Certificate of Appropriateness will be approved for the demolition, in whole or in part, of any heritage preservation resource in the district unless the applicant can show that the subject property is not a heritage preservation resource, or no longer contributes to the historical significance of the district because its historic integrity has been compromised by deterioration, damage, or by inappropriate additions or alterations.

Minutes – October 14, 2008
Edina Heritage Preservation Board

- Except in extraordinary circumstances involving threats to public health or safety, no Certificate of Appropriateness will be issued for the demolition of an existing heritage preservation resource in the district without an approved design plan for new construction.

The applicant, Scott Busyn, Good Neighborhood Homes, Inc. provided the Board with a detailed listing and photographs supporting his assertion that because the existing home and garage have extensive damage, deterioration, and safety/code compliance issues, demolition is warranted.

Addressing the subject request, Consultant Vogel advised the Board that they need to keep in mind the following two fundamental concepts embodied by the district Plan of Treatment:

1. The Country Club District derives its historical significance from being a unified entity, reflecting the Thorpe Bros. plan of development that was implemented in 1924-1944; and

2. The guiding design review principle is rehabilitation, which is defined as the process of returning a heritage resource to a state of utility through repair or alteration that makes possible an *efficient contemporary use* (while preserving those features which are significant to the preservation value of the landmark district).

Vogel pointed out that new construction is appropriate in heritage landmark districts when it is compatible in size, scale, and materials with historic homes and the character of the streetscape; and while it is true that heritage preservation resources are not renewable, city policy recognizes that preservation of every old building is not a responsible preservation practice. The HPB has been given the responsibility for determining the heritage preservation value of the house at 4615 Wooddale by considering its individual significance and its importance in relation to other historic homes and to the district as a whole. The challenge is to consider how the loss of this particular house will affect the character of the district and neighboring historic homes--and, if it is decided demolition of the house is justified, a strategy must be devised for mitigating the adverse effects of the teardown and ensuring that the new house will be of greater significance to the preservation of the district than the existing structures.

The findings which could support the approval of demolition include:

1. The subject property does not meet the criteria for individual designation as an Edina Heritage Landmark.
2. While it meets the minimum criteria for consideration as a contributing resource in the Country Club Heritage Landmark District, the existing house is not an outstanding example of the property type, nor is it one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the District.

3. The preliminary COA constitutes HPB approval of a concept for redevelopment of the property based on the developer mitigating the effects of the demolition of the existing house and garage by undertaking historical and architectural documentation that meets the pertinent standards established by the U.S. Department of the Interior.
4. Rehabilitation of the existing house may represent an economic hardship for the owner; and
5. It is technically feasible to design and build a replacement house and garage that will maintain the historic character of the streetscape and demonstrably contribute to the overall historical significance of the Country Club District.

Furthermore, Vogel recommended that if determined appropriate, approval of the COA should be subject to the following conditions:

1. The COA constitutes conceptual approval for a plan to redevelop the property and shall be in effect for a period of not more than 180 days. The HPB reserves the right to disapprove any COA application for demolition that does not meet the requirements of the district plan of treatment.
2. Before the HPB initiates design review of any demolition or new construction, the applicant will provide the City Planner with the following:
 - a) A report from a licensed architect or professional engineer as to the structural soundness of the existing home and its adaptability for rehabilitation;
 - b) An independent appraisal of the property's fair market value in its current condition; and
 - c) An itemized breakdown as to the economic feasibility or rehabilitation of the existing house compared with new construction, including an estimate of the costs that would need to be incurred to comply with the district plan of treatment and applicable building code and zoning regulation.
3. No COA for demolition or new construction will be approved until the applicant submits historical and architectural documentation of the existing house and garage, said documentation to consist of written information, photographs, and drawings prepared to the city's specifications and approved by the city's preservation planning consultant.

Consultant Vogel recommended that before a final decision is made on a COA for new construction, the applicant should provide the Board and its staff with

plans, drawings, written information, material samples, and other information which demonstrate that the new house and garage will substantially match the architectural style, detailing, character, and mood of typical Colonial Revival period houses constructed in the Browndale section of the Country Club District between 1924 and 1944 by adhering to the architectural requirements in the original Thorpe Bros. deed restrictions, and achieving visual consistency with the size, scale, color, and materials of adjacent historic homes and the character of the streetscape of Wooddale Avenue.

Vogel pointed out that if demolition of the existing home is approved, it is important the design of a replacement house must have the distinctive characteristics that make up the traditional Colonial Revival style house in the Country Club District, including but not limited to the two-story rectangular volume covered by a gable roof, symmetrical and balanced disposition of windows and doors, clapboard or brick wall cladding, classical detailing in the form of engaged columns, cornices, entablatures, and double-hung windows and small panes, and shutters, and a detached garage. Contemporary or Neocolonial designs, street-facing facade features, exterior finish materials, and color schemes would not be considered appropriate for either the house or garage.

HOMEOWNER COMMENTS:

Sheilagh Ziegeweid, the current owner of 4615 Wooddale Avenue explained that she has lived in the home since 1969. During the past 39+ years the Country Club neighborhood has experienced dramatic changes. Her home has served her well, but now, at the age of 73, she finds she can no longer afford to live in a home with \$8,000 per year in property taxes, not to mention the mounting home maintenance issues. Mrs. Ziegeweid stated that she has been attempting to sell her home for over a year and has not had one offer. She stated that she is desperate and in need of getting out from under this home that nobody wants.

Mickey Armstrong, realtor for Mrs. Ziegeweid advised the Board that at least five contractors have evaluated the house, and all have determined that it is not a candidate for an addition out the back, which is the only alternative available if this request is not granted.

BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:

Member Ferrara stated she has a problem with the assumption that because the house is “too small” it’s easier to just tear it down instead of remodeling it.

Member Forrest questioned the procedure for addressing a request for demolition of a home classified as a “heritage resource” – particularly since the Plan of Treatment stipulates that no COA for demolition will be issued without an approved design plan for new construction.

Planner Repya explained that this is the first COA request for demolition of a heritage resource property since the new plan of treatment was approved in April, 2008. The rationale for a preliminary COA is to first determine whether or not the property qualifies for demolition, as identified in the findings. The recommended conditions which accompany approval of the preliminary COA make it clear that no COA for demolition and new construction will be approved without meeting said conditions, which include an approved design plan.

Reflecting on the listing of building code deficiencies identified in the applicant's request, Member Rehkamp Larson commented that all homes built in the era of the subject property will have non-compliance issues with the current building codes, and she questioned whether that should be included as justification for demolition.

APPLICANT COMMENTS:

Scott Busyn, the applicant explained that as he understands the Plan of Treatment, he must first justify the demolition of the property. If and when the demolition is determined to be warranted, the design concept and ultimately the plans for the replacement home/garage will be presented for approval. To present plans for a replacement home at this time would be presumptive and putting the "cart before the horse".

Mr. Busyn explained that in the evaluation of the home he provided to the Board he highlighted the damage, deterioration, safety and issues of non-compliance with the building code, which all address the section of the Plan of Treatment which would justify the demolition of a heritage resource in the district.

Mr. Busyn added that since the Plan of Treatment was established for the district, he has worked on several homes in the neighborhood, each time with the goal of being true to the historic integrity of the area.

John McDonald, realtor for Mr. Busyn explained that he has had years of experience marketing homes in the Country Club District, and finds this home to be one of the most challenging.

OTHER COMMENTS:

Member Kojetin questioned if anyone has looked into the current "livability" of the house, pointing out there could be mitigating factors such as mold that could be documented supporting the request for a tear down. Member Ferrara agreed with Kojetin adding the Board should look at this request very carefully before a final decision is made. Ferrara pointed out the action taken this evening will be looked at and the Board will need documentation to back up our decision. Member Ferrara reiterated in her opinion the house could be remodeled.

Board member discussion ensued regarding the recommended findings and

conditions. Members Forrest and Rehkamp Larson questioned whether it would be appropriate to include finding #4 which addressed the economic hardship to the owner of the property; pointing out that the design guidelines do not address financial hardship. The Board agreed that while they sympathized with Mrs. Ziegeweid's dilemma, the decision to permit the demolition of the home should stand on the status of the structures, not the owner's economic situation. Further discussion continued focusing on procedure with members in agreement that the requested COA is preliminary, not final, and the applicant will be required to return to the Board with final plans before a Certificate of Appropriateness is considered.

Members Rehkamp Larson and Montgomery left the meeting.

MOTION & VOTE:

Member Blemaster moved to grant preliminary approval of the COA for demolition of the house and garage at 4615 Wooddale Avenue subject to the recommended findings and conditions, with the exception of item #4 which identifies an economic hardship, and also subject to all of the recommended conditions.

Member Kojetin seconded the motion. Members Forrest, Kojetin, Blemaster and Benson voted aye. Members Ferrara and Fukuda abstained. The motion carried.

IV. 2008 MN HERITAGE PRESERVATION CONFERENCE REPORT:

The annual Minnesota Historic Preservation Conference was held in Northfield, MN on Friday and Saturday, September 19th and 20th. As a Certified Local Government, it is mandatory that at least one member of Edina's HPB attend the conference. The theme for the conference centered on preserving a communities "Main Street". Members Bob Kojetin and Arlene Forrest attended both days of the conference. Kojetin observed that Edina's 44th and France Commercial area would probably most closely represent Edina's historic commercial district. Member Forrest observed that she saw a correlation between the presentations on historic main streets with Edina's more recent mixed use developments which are combining residential, commercial and office uses.

Kojetin and Forrest agreed that the conference was time well spent, and encouraged the HPB to consider attending future conferences. Board members thanked both Bob and Arlene for representing them at the conference and agreed that attending future conferences should be on their "to do" lists.

V. **COUNTRY CLUB DISTRICT LIFT STATION:** A Curious Find

Consultant Vogel shared with Board Members photo's of "life beneath the manhole". Vogel explained during Country Club District street reconstruction workers removed a manhole and found an old "lift station" dating from Thorpe's original development. Consultant Vogel said it was an unusual, but interesting find. The subterranean lift station, which was full of water, was drained, photographed, and then filled in with sand. Board members appreciated the documentation of the "find", which will be added to the history of the district.

VI. **OTHER BUSINESS:** None

VII. **CORRESPONDENCE:** None

IX. **NEXT MEETING DATE:** November 10, 2008 (MONDAY)

X. **ADJOURNMENT** 9:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Joyce Repya & Jackie Hoogenakker