

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
EDINA HERITAGE PRESERVATION BOARD
TUESDAY, APRIL 8, 2008, AT 7:00 P.M.
EDINA CITY HALL – COMMUNITY ROOM
4801 WEST 50TH STREET**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chris Rofidal, Bob Kojetin, Karen Ferrara, Lou Blemaster, Laura Benson, Jean Rehkamp Larson, Connie Fukuda, Nancy Scherer, and Sara Rubin

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Joyce Repya, Associate Planner

OTHERS PRESENT: Robert Vogel, Heritage Preservation Consultant
Dan & Cheryl Dulas, 4609 Bruce Avenue
Kitty O’Dea, 4610 Bruce Avenue

I. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: March 11, 2008

Member Benson moved approval of the minutes from the March 11, 2008 meeting. Member Blemaster seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

II. COUNTRY CLUB DISTRICT :

A. Plan of Treatment

Planner Repya reported that on March 26th the Planning Commission reviewed the proposed Plan of Treatment for the Country Club District, and unanimously approved supporting the HPB in requesting adoption of the revised plan from the City Council at their upcoming April 15th meeting.

Member Scherer stated that as a Planning Commission member, she was pleased with the reception the revised plan received from her fellow commission members.

Chairman Rofidal observed that in preparation for the City Council presentation he wanted to ensure that the HPB members clearly understood and supported the proposed plan.

Consultant Vogel pointed out that since the Board agreed to revise point c) under the definition of “Demolition” to include dormers because they affect the

architectural style of the home, perhaps chimneys should also be included in the list – pointing out that the loss of a prominent chimney can have an impact on the design of a home. Board members agreed that it would be a very good idea to include “chimney” in the listing of elements to be considered when defining “demolition”.

Regarding the first paragraph of the “Design Review Guidelines” section, the question was raised that since the paragraph refers to the original Country Club District deed restrictions, perhaps the original deed restrictions should be included in the plan. Consultant Vogel explained that the design review guidelines listed in the plan were taken from the original deed restrictions, and to list them again would be redundant. Member Benson suggested that the last sentence be modified to read, “The following guidelines **generally reflect the principles of the deed restrictions, and** will be applied by the Heritage Preservation Board to design review of plans for new houses:”. Board members agreed that Member Benson’s suggestion provided more clarity to that section.

The following questions were then addressed by the Board:

- In the “Landscape” section, should the plan encourage the planting of Elm trees on the boulevard?

Consultant Vogel pointed out that the City is responsible for the boulevard area, and added that an educational brochure would be the best place to list trees to be encouraged in the district.

- In the “City Responsibilities” section, should the plan specify that heritage preservation shall not take precedence over public safety?

Consultant Vogel explained that as with the previous question, the public safety over preservation issue would be best served in an educational brochure.

Following a brief discussion, Chairman Rofidal asked for a motion to approve the Plan of Treatment reflecting the clarifications proposed. Member Scherer moved to approve the revised Plan of Treatment subject to the minor changes proposed. Member Kojetin seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

B. Certificate of Appropriateness Procedures

Consultant Vogel observed that as changes are proposed to the Plan of Treatment, the Board should also review the Certificate of Appropriateness process. Under the original Plan of Treatment, the process has been no different for the review of a new detached garage or the tear down and new construction of a home. Through experience, the Board has found that much more work is involved with the review of a new home; consequently it only makes sense that a separate and more intensive review process should be considered.

The following proposed requirements for a Certificate of Appropriateness application which would only apply to the tear down of a home were presented to the Board:

1. Increase the COA application fee to \$?00.00. (Current fee is \$175.00)
2. Increase the amount of time required for design review to two meetings: A **preliminary review** at the first meeting, and a **final approval** at the second meeting.
 1. **Preliminary Review** - Applicant demonstrates that:
 - The subject property is not a heritage preservation resource, or
 - The home 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.
 - The proposed new construction must receive preliminary approval prior to moving on to final approval.
 2. **Final Approval** – Plans must include:
 - 2 surveys – one of the existing home and one of the proposed home.
 - Detailed exterior elevations of all sides of the proposed home.
 - Exterior elevations of adjacent structures detailing grade as well as the roof and eave lines in relation to the roof and eave lines of the proposed work.
 - A narrative explaining :
 1. How the proposed home is compatible with, and will enhance the historic integrity of the district; and
 2. Details of the proposed home focusing on the following details:
 - Size, Scale and Massing
 - Exterior Finishes
 - Accessory Mechanical Equipment
 - Decks and Accessory Structures
 - Landscape Elements, and
 - Impervious Surfaces
3. Require the new home builder to hold at least one neighborhood meeting with adjacent and abutting neighbors after receiving preliminary approval.
4. Require builders of new homes to mitigate the effects of demolition of historic homes by architectural recordation to the standards and specifications of the Historic American Buildings Survey.
5. Require the city planner, building official, and engineer to certify to the HPB that the new construction has been carried out in accordance with the plans submitted.

Board members discussed the proposed revised procedures for the tear down and new construction of a home in the district. All agreed that requiring a more intensive procedure made a lot of sense. Member Rehkamp Larson recommended under item #3 requiring a neighborhood meeting, that the HPB receive notice of the date and time for the meeting. The Board agreed that would be a good idea. No formal action was taken.

III. 2008 GOALS & OBJECTIVES:

Consultant Vogel explained that the purpose of adopting annual goals and objectives is to establish priorities for dealing with special projects and other discretionary activities; they also provide handy benchmarks for use as performance measures. Generally, goals and objectives refer to activities for outcomes that are not mandated by city code section which deals with the responsibilities of the HPB. Ideally, the Board's stated goals and objectives should also dovetail with the work plan of the city staff liaison and consultant.

The proposed goals/objectives would commit the HPB to taking care of a good deal of "unfinished business" from 2005-2007 and would put the city preservation program back on track to focus on its primary mission, which is the identification and registration of significance heritage resources reflecting the broad spectrum of Edina heritage (all 10,000 years and 12 historic contexts). The goals and objectives also address important information needs and planning issues raised by the Board (when it wasn't preoccupied with the Country Club District) during the past two years. Mr. Vogel pointed out that the work plan is ambitious; however the resources are available to carry it out between now and the 2009 annual meeting.

Recommendations for 2008:

- 1) Adopt and implement the revised Plan of Treatment for the Country Club District.
- 2) Evaluate the significance of heritage resources along Minnehaha Creek and issue findings of heritage landmark eligibility.
- 3) Nominate a minimum of one building or site for designation as an Edina Heritage Landmark.
- 4) Begin to compile an inventory of buildings and sites associated with commercial and industrial development in Edina between the 1930s and 1970s and evaluate their historical, architectural, engineering, and cultural significance.
- 5) Begin work on a comprehensive heritage preservation education and outreach program aimed at property owners, realtors, developers, and others.

- 6) Work with the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District to study the feasibility of reconstructing the Edina Mill and rehabilitating heritage resources associated with Minnehaha Creek and the Mill Pond.
- 7) Develop a research design and seek funding for a thematic study of Edina heritage resources associated with women.
- 8) Establish closer ties with heritage preservation commissions in neighboring cities.

Discussion ensued regarding the proposed goals. Consultant Vogel pointed out that he provided 8 goals which total 1 per month for the remainder of the year. The Board agreed that the goals proposed were reasonable.

Board members concurred that once the Country Club District Plan of Treatment has been determined it will be important to focus on educating city staff, district residents and contractors about the district requirements. Mr. Vogel pointed out that future workshops on the “care and feeding” of older homes would serve the community well. Experts on specific topics, such as windows or landscaping could offer community education type classes for any resident in the city interested in maintaining their older home. These session would serve the Country Club District, however would be directed to anyone interested in older homes. Board members agreed with Mr. Vogel.

On the topic of education, Chairman Rofidal asked that for the May meeting, an item be added to the agenda regarding educating the Board about their responsibilities in light of the possible changes to the Plan of Treatment. Planner Repya agreed to include an education line item to the agenda.

IV. 2008 HERITAGE AWARD:

Planner Repya advised the Board that the deadline for the 2008 Heritage Award nominations is Friday, April 11th. To date, no nominations have been received. Board members were encouraged to submit a nomination.

Member Benson stated that she was interested in nominating the Edina Morningside Church, 4201 Morningside Road. Board members agreed that the church has been well cared for by its congregation, and holds a place of importance to the historic fabric of the Morningside neighborhood.

Consultant Vogel suggested that with three days remaining for nominations to be submitted, a committee should be assembled to review nominations. Board members agreed that Mr. Vogel should serve on the committee. Member Benson offered to assist Vogel to review the nominations and choose a recipient. The Board thanked Mr. Vogel and Member Benson for volunteering. Planner Repya

added that the Heritage Award announcement would be made at the May HPB meeting with the City Council awarding the plaque at one of their May meetings.

V. ANNUAL MN PRESERVATION CONFERENCE: September 19-20, 2008
Northfield, MN

Chairman Rofidal reminded the Board that the annual Minnesota Preservation Conference is scheduled for September 19 – 20th this year in Northfield, MN. Because Edina is a Certified Local Government (CLG) at least one board member is required to attend the conference. The registration materials will be sent out in several months. Board members were asked to keep the date in mind.

VI. CONCERN OF RESIDENTS:

Dan & Cheryl Dulas – 4609 Bruce Avenue

Recognizing the upcoming review of the Country Club District Plan of Treatment by the City Council; Cheryl Dulas inquired about the process for adoption of the plan. Of particular concern was what would happen if a Council member took issue with something in the plan.

Consultant Vogel explained several scenarios that could occur at the meeting... if the Council did not approve adoption of the proposed plan, the original Plan of Treatment would continue. He added that the Council could also approve adoption of the plan with changes, or they could continue the item to a future meeting.

Mr. Dulas stated that he supported the revised Plan of Treatment, but wanted to know if the Board had a policy to follow up on the construction approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness permit to ensure that what is built is true to the plan approved.

Planner Repya assured Mr. Dulas that periodic inspections are conducted by the building inspectors and planning staff to ensure compliance with the permitted plan.

Kitty O’Dea – 4610 Bruce Avenue

Ms. O’Dea thanked the Board for the work on the proposed Plan of Treatment stating that the changes provide clarity. She added that she has been researching how to best notify residents and prospective residents about the heritage landmark designation. Including a line item on the purchase agreement for a property, and a neighborhood association effort were some of the possible approaches she identified.

Minutes – April 8, 2008
Edina Heritage Preservation Board

VII. **CORRESPONDENCE:** None

VIII. **NEXT MEETING DATE:** May 13, 2008

IX. **ADJOURNMENT** 9:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Joyce Repya