

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
EDINA HERITAGE PRESERVATION BOARD
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 9, 2008, AT 7:00 P.M.
EDINA CITY HALL – COMMUNITY ROOM
4801 WEST 50TH STREET**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Chris Rofidal, Bob Kojetin, Lou Blemaster, Arlene Forrest, Laura Benson, and Connie Fukuda

MEMBERS ABSENT: Karen Ferrara, Jean Rehkamp Larson and Elizabeth Montgomery

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Robert Vogel, Heritage Preservation Consultant
Scott Busyn, Great Neighborhood Homes, Inc.
Robert Latta, 4612 Wooddale Avenue
Derek Pitt, 4616 Wooddale Avenue
Kitty O’Dea, 4610 Bruce Avenue

I. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: November 10, 2008

Member Kojetin moved approval of the minutes from the November 10, 2008 meeting. Member Benson seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

II. COUNTRY CLUB DISTRICT :

A. Certificates of Appropriateness

1. H-08-14 4615 Wooddale Avenue – Demolition of House & Garage

Planner Repya reminded the Board that at the November meeting, the applicant, Scott Busyn shared his concepts for the design objectives of a replacement home and detached garage for the subject property with the Board. Mr. Busyn has completed a plan for the replacement home and detached garage which follows the concepts previously presented, and also incorporates the suggestions made by the Board.

Applicant Presentation

Mr. Busyn thanked the Board for their consideration of his design concepts for the subject property at the November meeting which he found helpful in completing

the proposed plans for the property. He continued by providing with the following explanation of the proposed project and how it meets the recommended design guidelines in the Plan of Treatment:

1. Size, Scale, and Massing:
 - a. Home will be a two story colonial revival similar in height, width, and scale to other Colonial Revival homes on Wooddale and in the rest of the Browndale Section. By replacing an existing colonial, the new home will maintain the architectural mix of the block while improving the streetscape with a more appropriate scale. It was Thorpe's intent (per the original deed restrictions) that the homes on Wooddale be of a larger scale than those on the eastern blocks of the District.
 - b. Ridge height shall be within 10% of the average of the adjacent homes to match the streetscape of adjacent homes. The height of 4613 Wooddale is 24.5 feet. The height of 4617 Wooddale is 29.3 feet. The maximum ridge height for the new home is therefore 29.59 feet.
 - c. Threshold height will be no more than 12" above original home floor height (was 897.4) to maintain the streetscape of the adjacent homes.
 - d. 9' ceilings main and lower levels. 8' ceilings upper level to maintain the distinctive design of other colonial revival homes.
2. Design compatibility with other homes in the District and specifically the Browndale Section:
 - a. Home will be a Colonial Revival with a façade architecturally similar to exiting historic homes. Distinctive characteristics will include:
 - i. Two story rectangular volume covered by a gable roof.
 - ii. Roof pitch typical of colonial revival homes in the Browndale Section of Country Club.
 - iii. Semi-elliptical fanlight over front door. Sidelights. Covered entry with barrel ceiling to mimic fanlight. Pediment gable with crown molding on front of entry similar to other homes and reminiscent of original home.
 - iv. Symmetrical and balanced disposition of windows and doors.
 - v. Double-hung windows with 6 over 6 panes on upper level, and 6 over 9 panes on main level. 7/8" muntins for a lighter, more delicate appearance common to Adam or Federal Colonial Revival homes in the neighborhood. Windows shall be aligned horizontally and vertically in rows, 5 ranked on front façade. Brick-style molding around windows with simple entablature cap.

Minutes – December 9, 2008
Edina Heritage Preservation Board

- vi. 3 symmetric dormers on roof with 6 over 6 panes. Classic engaged columns wrapping windows. Crown molding over gable panels.
 - vii. Beveled wood siding with 6" exposure and mitered building corners.
 - viii. Detailed cornice with dental molding and corbels over frieze board. Crown molding on rakes.
 - ix. Louvered shutters on upper level, panel shutters main level. Wrought iron hinges and hold backs.
 - x. Gutters shall have copper conductor boxes and downspouts.
 - xi. Covered front entry shall relate to the pattern of existing adjacent historic homes and respect the rhythm and continuity of similar features on the street. Brick stoop.
 - xii. Sun porch on south side will maintain the historic character of the main house.
 - xiii. Home will be painted in solid colors appropriate to the District inspired from Benjamin Moore's historical colors collection.
 - xiv. Year built plaque for the house shall be inscribed into side of brick landing (so as to not be confused with address numbers).
3. Exterior finishes: Utilize traditional materials and finishes
 - a. Horizontal beveled lap siding
 - b. Imitation wood window trim, columns, soffit, fascia, garage doors and cornice material will duplicate the size, shape, color, and texture of materials used historically in the district.
 - c. Brick stoop.
 - d. Wrought iron shutter hardware.
 4. Landscaping Elements: Landscaping will enhance the character of a colonial revival home (symmetry).
 5. New Garage: The garage will match the architectural style of the new house as well as the historic character of the neighborhood.
 - a. Detached garage will be subordinate to the house in the rear left corner. This will minimize the visual impact on the adjacent homes.
 - b. Roofline at 18' is within 10" of the average heights of the garages on the block.
 - c. Sidewalls of garage will be adorned with soffit treatments, windows, and window boxes.
 - d. Year built plaque will be placed on the south side of the new garage.

Board Comments

Member Forrest

- Commended Mr. Busyn on his goal to honor the neighboring properties when he approached his design, adding that she felt the plan exhibited a nice attention to detail.
- Questioned the durability of the Fypon product proposed on the trim and dentil work. Mr. Busyn explained that Fypon is a light weight product with a much longer warranty than wood. He added that he has used it quite a bit and never had a problem.

Member Fukuda

- Asked why shutters were not proposed on the north (side) elevation windows to compliment the shutters on the front of the home. Mr. Busyn explained that due to the window placement on the north elevation, shutters would not fit. Consultant Vogel added that the lack of shutters on side elevations is not inconsistent for Colonial style homes.

Member Blemaster

- Asked if Mr. Busyn had taken into consideration the City's upcoming utility/street improvement project for his work plan. Mr. Busyn explained that the construction projects have continued in the District during the first half of the utility/street project with just a few delays, and he plans on coordinating his work with the City's project.

Member Benson

- Questioned the process, noting that this was the third meeting in which the Board was addressing this project; the first was in October with the question of whether the home, an historic resource qualified for demolition; the second was in November when Mr. Busyn presented his design objectives and received input from the Board. If the Board did not recommend any changes to the plan presented at this time, final approval of the COA could be voted on at this meeting. A brief discussion ensued.

Public Comment

Robert Latta, 4612 Wooddale Avenue –

- Expressed his approval of the project and encouraged the Board to approve the COA without delay.

Derek Pitt, 4616 Wooddale Avenue –

- Expressed his support of the project pointing out that the proposed home will be an enhancement of the neighborhood. Furthermore, if the plan is not approved, he fears the home will continue to deteriorate.

Kitty O’Dea, 4610 Bruce Avenue –

- Questioned the accuracy of the streetscape elevation which depicts the subject home and the homes on either side. Mr. Busyn explained that while the plan is not certified by a surveyor, the plan is to scale and accurately depicts the height and distance between the houses.

Chairman Rofidal asked that emails from the following residents supporting the project be added to the record:

Mark Odland, 4613 Wooddale Avenue

Trisha Hoyt, 4610 Wooddale Avenue

Karla Pitt, 4616 Wooddale Avenue

Board action

Board members continued the discussion regarding the appropriate process for addressing the subject request. Member Kojetin stated that he understood the process for the COA of a new home to be 2-steps, with the first meeting when the plan is introduced, and a month later, after the public has had an opportunity to review the plans the Board would consider final approval. He added that the review this evening is the first with completed plans before the Board.

Member Kojetin moved for preliminary approval of the COA for demolition of the existing home/garage and construction of a new home/garage. Member Forrest seconded the motion. Members Rofidal, Forrest and Kojetin voted aye. Members Benson, Blemaster and Fukuda voted nay. The motion was denied due to a tie vote.

Member Benson reiterated that this is the third meeting addressing the subject request, and while this is the first meeting when the complete design of the home has been presented, because the Board is not suggesting any changes to the plan, she did not see the rationale for delaying a final vote on the COA.

Member Blemaster agreed with Member Benson pointing out that due diligence has been done, and there is no reason for further delay.

Member Fukuda opined that Mr. Busyn has done a commendable job of providing plan that meets the District’s Plan of Treatment, and considering that no changes are proposed by the Board, she did not see the rationale for a delay in the vote.

Member Benson moved approval of the COA for demolition of the existing home/garage and construction of a new home/garage subject to the plans presented and the conditions recommended by Consultant Vogel. Members Fukuda, Blemaster and Benson voted aye. Members Kojetin, Forrest and Rofidal voted nay. The motion was defeated due to a tie vote.

Further discussion centered on process. Board members agreed that the plan as presented met the criteria of the District's Plan of Treatment, and all comments received from affected neighbors have been supportive of the plan. Members Benson, Fukuda and Blemaster stated that although the understanding has been that new homes will be reviewed in a 2-step process, if no changes are proposed, a delay in voting on the COA would create an unnecessary delay which could cause a burden for the applicant. To require the applicant to wait until the January 2009 meeting for a decision did not seem fair.

Board members discussed the idea of holding a special meeting on December 15th or 16th (depending on room availability) which would give the appropriate time for advertising a special meeting and also provide the second meeting to review the project as understood in the process guidelines. All agreed that would be an acceptable compromise. Planner Repya agreed to set the meeting date and time as soon as possible for the next week and advise the Board, applicant and those neighbors on the mailing list of the final date/time. No formal action was taken

III. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** None

IV. **CLG GRANT APPLICATION – Morningside Bungalows Multiple Property Designation**

Consultant Vogel advised the Board that he was in the process of completing the application to request a CLG grant for a multiple property designation for Morningside's bungalow properties. He added that the City of Des Moines has used the multiple property approach for landmark designations that has been very successful; and he would be reporting on their processes in the near future.

Board members expressed their interest in the project, and agreed that they looked forward to learning more about Morningside's bungalows. No formal action was taken.

V. **OTHER BUSINESS:**

A. Procedural Guideline Committee

Considering the confusion that became apparent during the earlier COA deliberations, Member Forrest suggested the formation of a committee to draft procedural guidelines outlining the

information required to be submitted with Certificate of Appropriateness applications. Board members agreed that would be an excellent idea.

Chairman Rofidal then directed the formation of a committee to provide requirement guidelines for COA applications. Members Forrest, Kojetin, Benson and Rofidal offered to serve on the committee.

VII. **CORRESPONDENCE:** None

IX. **NEXT REGULAR MEETING DATE:** January 13, 2009

X. **ADJOURNMENT** 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Jackie Hoogenakker