

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
EDINA HERITAGE PRESERVATION BOARD  
TUESDAY, JUNE 10, 2008, AT 7:00 P.M.  
EDINA CITY HALL – COMMUNITY ROOM  
4801 WEST 50<sup>TH</sup> STREET**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Laura Benson, Vice Chairman, Karen Ferrara, Lou Blemaster, Connie Fukuda, Arlene Forrest

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Chris Rofidal, Bob Kojetin, and Jean Rehkamp Larson

**STAFF PRESENT:** Joyce Repya, Associate Planner

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Robert Vogel, Heritage Preservation Consultant  
Jim & Kathy Haymaker, 4633 Drexel Avenue  
Tom Meyer, Meyer, Scherer & Rockcastle, Ltd.  
Michael Stickley, Meyer, Scherer & Rockcastle, Ltd.  
Cheryl Dulas, 4609 Bruce Avenue  
Kitty O’Dea, 4610 Bruce Avenue

**I. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: May 13, 2008**

Following a brief discussion, Member Forrest moved approval of the minutes from the May 13, 2008 meeting. Member Blemaster seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

**II. COUNTRY CLUB DISTRICT :**

**A. Certificate of Appropriateness**

**H-08-7 4633 Drexel Avenue – New Detached Garage**

Planner Repya explained that the subject property is located on the northeast corner of Drexel Avenue and Country Club Road. The existing home was constructed in 1931 and currently has a 2-stall attached garage accessed by a driveway on the southerly side of the property off Country Club Road.

The subject request involves building a new, 500 square foot detached garage in the rear yard, and converting the existing 2-stall attached garage into living space. The plan illustrates the new structure will maintain a 5 foot setback from the rear (east) lot line, a 20 foot setback from the side street property line on Country Club road and a 24 foot setback from the northerly side lot line. A new curb cut will be required since the proposed garage is set back closer to the rear lot line.

The new 2-stall detached garage is proposed to measure 25' x 20'. The design of the structure is shown to compliment the architectural style of the home with stucco clad walls, natural stone and wood trim, 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 – however, natural stone along the base, and wood brackets at the eave line are provided. Slate or asphalt shingles are proposed for the hip roof.

The height of the proposed garage is shown to be 19' 7" at the highest peak. The new height requirement set out in the revised Plan of Treatment was considered in the design of the garage, which meets the maximum height allowed when the heights of the adjacent detached garages were taken into consideration. The height at the mid-point of the gable is shown to be 14' 5", and a height of 8' 8" is provided at the eave line. The ridge line is shown to be 7' 5.75" in length due to the hip roof.

The maximum lot coverage allowed for the property is 30%. Construction of the proposed 500 sq. ft. garage will create a total lot coverage of 28% - within the limits allowed by city code.

Planner Repya explained that Preservation Consultant Vogel reviewed the plans and opined that the proposed detached garage meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation as they are applied to new construction, and is consistent with the guidelines for detached garages in the district Plan of Treatment. The plans depict a garage that is compatible in scale, materials, and architectural character with the historic house. Mr. Vogel observed that the proposed garage would not detract from the character of the historic homes in the neighborhood, nor alter the mood of the streetscape.

While the addition, which will replace the existing attached garage on the home is not subject to the Certificate of Appropriateness application, the plans were provided for the Board to review. Consultant Vogel opined that the addition appears appropriate in scale, building materials and texture with the body of the house. The new work does not appear to require the destruction of any distinctive architectural features that give the property its essential character and value as a heritage preservation resource. The proposed skylights on the roofs of the original house and the addition will not detract from the architectural features that give the property its essential character and value as a heritage preservation resource. The skylight on the historic roof should be relatively unobtrusive from the public viewshed and could be removed without destroying architectural features important to the historic integrity of the house. The addition is readily distinguishable from the historic structure, as well as architecturally compatible with the new garage, which together form a unified architectural ensemble when viewed from either side. Mr. Vogel recommends adding a year

built plaque or other form of exterior signage to differentiate the more contemporary addition from the historic house.

Planner Repya recommended approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness request supported by the following findings:

- 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.

Ms. Repya also suggested that the approval be subject to the following conditions:

- The plans presented.
- A curb cut application for new driveway, with removal of existing driveway and curb cut.
- The condition that a year built (2008) plaque or sign is placed on the new detached garage as well as the addition to the home.

#### **BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:**

Member Forrest questioned the height of the proposed garage. It was verified that the 19' 7" height demonstrated on the plan met the provisions of the revised Plan of Treatment.

Board members shared comments regarding the excellent design of the garage; appreciating that consideration of the view from neighboring properties is obvious on all elevations.

Consultant Vogel explained that he included comments regarding the addition because it is expected that the Minnesota Legislature will soon enact a preservation tax act which may be retroactive. If that is the case, because the addition is included in the review, it may qualify for tax relief through the possible upcoming legislation.

Member Forrest observed that there is a young elm tree in the location where the new driveway is proposed, and expressed her concern regarding the potential loss of a boulevard tree.

#### **HOMEOWNER COMMENTS:**

Homeowner, Jim Haymaker explained that he is planning to transplant the young elm tree that will be displaced due to the new driveway. He added that if the tree did not survive he would be willing to replace it.

**MOTION & VOTE:**

Member Blemaster moved approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness request subject to the conditions recommended by staff and the additional condition that if the boulevard tree displaced by the new driveway does not survive being transplanted, that it be replaced. Member Ferrara seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

**B. Landmark Designation Brochure**

Planner Repya explained that at the May HPB meeting the Board discussed creating a new brochure for the historic Country Club District. Ms. Repya discussed a new brochure with the City's Communications Director, Jennifer Bennerotte who pointed out that the use of brochures has become passé in this day and age – the wide-spread use of the internet is the primary cause. Ms. Bennerotte observed that people most frequently turn to a web site to gain information. Another drawback for using a brochure is the cost. The Planning Department budget is very limited when it comes to printing costs. At this time, the funds are not available to pay for a new brochure.

Ms. Repya provided the Board with a copy of the Country Club District page from the Heritage Preservation section of the City's web site. She pointed out that the web page contains more historic information than the previous brochure. She added that Ms. Bennerotte suggests the web page be printed and used to provide public information regarding the significance of the Country Club District heritage landmark designation.

Board members observed that the web page does a good job of explaining the history of the District, however is missing important information regarding the landmark designation, plan of treatment and requirements for a certificate of appropriateness.

Planner Repya agreed that the site needed to be updated to reflect the most current status and regulations for the District. No formal action was taken.

**III. EDINA HERITAGE LANDMARK LOGO:**

Planner Repya explained that she had asked Communications Director, Jennifer Bennerotte to come up with some choices for a logo that could be used to identify Edina Heritage Landmark properties. Four choices were provided to the Board. Discussion ensued regarding the merits of each design.

A majority of the Board favored a design that closely resembled the Edina Theater marquee – The top of the logo having “Edina” shown vertically; and underneath, “Heritage Landmark” is shown horizontally.

Discussion ensued regarding how the logo would be used. Planner Repya explained that the logo could be used in the press when a property which has been designated an Edina Heritage Landmark is in the news. Also, the logo could be made available to the owner’s of designated properties. The Board agreed that would be a nice addition to the heritage landmark program. No formal action was taken.

#### **IV. PUBLIC EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES:**

Consultant Vogel provided the Board with a list of heritage preservation resources which he recommended for a future preservation library. The list included books, pamphlets and periodicals to be used for reference purposes. Mr. Vogel also suggested that the Edina Library be approached about considering including these references for public use.

Discussion ensued regarding where the funds would come from to purchase the resources for city hall. It was suggested that possibly the Edina Foundation could assist in purchasing the books.

Member Forrest commented that she knew somebody that worked at the library and would be happy to approach them regarding providing the suggested references books.

The Board thanked Mr. Vogel for the comprehensive list of resources - stressing that such an inventory would be very beneficial toward achieving the goal of public education on heritage preservation topics. No formal action was taken.

#### **V. ELIGIBLE HERITAGE PRESERVATION LANDMARK PROPERTIES:**

Consultant Vogel reviewed a list of the nine landmark designated properties and 10 recommended properties with the Board. Discussion ensued regarding prioritizing the 10 properties proposed for designation. Board members agreed that the 8 bungalow homes on the north side of West 44<sup>th</sup> Street, east of Grimes Avenue should take priority in light of recent changes which have occurred to several of the homes.

Mr. Vogel observed that the bungalow district is more complicated, and would entail research prior to approaching the property owners. Responding to a question regarding procedure, Planner Repya explained that once Mr. Vogel has completed his research, to include a sidewalk survey, the property owners would be invited to a meeting with the HPB to discuss the heritage landmark

designation process and responsibilities. If after that meeting, a majority of the owners agree, the Board could then proceed to recommend landmark designation of the bungalow district to the City Council. The Board agreed to have Mr. Vogel begin the bungalow district research.

Discussion continued regarding prioritizing the potential landmark properties. It was agreed that St. Stephen's Episcopal Church, 4439 W. 50<sup>th</sup> Street, and the original Oddfellow's Hall (Durr Building) at 4388 France Avenue should be moved to the top of the list. No formal action was taken.

VI. **OTHER BUSINESS:** None

VII. **CONCERN OF RESIDENTS:**

**Kitty O'Dea – 4610 Bruce Avenue**

Ms. O'Dea approached the Board with the following comments and questions:

1. Ms. O'Dea asked if the "Concern of Residents" portion of the meeting could be moved to the first part of the meeting's agenda? The City Council has moved public comment to the beginning of their meetings and that appears to have worked well.

The Board agreed that would be a very good idea.

2. Ms. O'Dea has written an article on the history of one of the Country Club District's homes for the monthly neighborhood magazine. She has plans to write more articles and asked if the Board would agree to include information regarding the plan of treatment process.

Board members expressed a desire to read Ms. O'Dea's articles and agreed that information regarding the plan of treatment process would be beneficial. Planner Repya stated that she receives a copy of the District's magazine and agreed to provide the Board with copies of the history articles.

3. Ms. O'Dea observed that at the last meeting when the Board was considering several Certificate of Appropriateness application, plans were approved that deviated from some portions of the new Plan of Treatment. She opined that the Board should stick to the Plan of Treatment and not set a precedence for exceptions.

Member Forrest stated that Ms. O'Dea made a good point – adding that it is important for the public to understand the expectations; when exceptions to the Plan of Treatment are made, the Board clearly explain the rationale.

Minutes – June 10, 2008  
Edina Heritage Preservation Board

Board members thanked Ms. O’Dea for her comments, noting that feedback from the public is always appreciated.

VIII. **CORRESPONDENCE:** None

IX. **NEXT MEETING DATE:** July 8, 2008 – to be cancelled if no COA’s due to Braemar Inspection Tour scheduled for the same evening.

X. **ADJOURNMENT** 8:55 p.m.

**Respectfully submitted,**  
*Joyce Repya*