



MINUTES
Regular Meeting of the
Heritage Preservation Board
Tuesday, October 12, 2010, 7:00 PM
Edina Community Room
4801 50th Street West

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Joel Stegner, Chris Rofidal, Jean Rehkamp Larson, Arlene Forrest, Claudia Carr, Colleen Curran, Ross Davis, Katherine McLellan, and Lauren Thorson

MEMBERS ABSENT: Bob Schwartzbauer

STAFF PRESENT: Joyce Repya, Associate Planner

I. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: September 14, 2010

Member Rofidal moved approval of the minutes from the September, 2010 meeting. Member Forrest seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

II. COUNTRY CLUB DISTRICT: Certificates of Appropriateness

- A. **H-10-04 4501 Casco Avenue** – Remove a detached garage and build an addition with an attached garage

Planner Repya explained that the subject property is located on the southeast corner of the Casco Avenue and Sunnyside Road. The home, constructed in 1926 is an English Cottage style with a 2-car detached garage accessed by a driveway off of Sunnyside Road. The proposed plans for the home include removal of the detached garage in the southeast corner of the rear yard and constructing an attached 3-stall garage with a master suite above.

The proposed addition of a 3-stall attached garage is planned to continue access off of Sunnyside Road. A second story master suite is designed to be constructed above the garage. Setbacks provided for the addition are shown at 56.9 feet for the rear yard (a minimum 25 feet is required), and 20 feet from the north property line which is the minimum allowed for a garage abutting a side street.

The proposed addition demonstrates a design that continues the English Cottage architectural style of the home with stucco clad walls, decorative stonework at the foundation, and designer overhead garage doors. However, the 943 square foot addition with a height 32 feet” to the peak appears to dominate the original home which has an 850 square foot footprint and a height to peak of 29.6 feet. Furthermore, the survey for the property illustrates an elevation of 910.8 feet at the south wall of the addition, while the home to the south (4503 Casco Avenue) has an elevation of 905.3 feet at their north wall – a difference of 5.5 feet. Taking into consideration the difference in grade, the peak of the subject home is currently situated 35 feet in height relative to

the southerly lot. The addition as proposed would be 37.5 feet in height when viewed from the abutting property.

Preservation Consultant Robert Vogel reviewed the proposed plans and observed that the home at 4501 Casco Avenue contributes to the historic significance of the Country Club District but is not individually eligible for designation as an Edina Heritage Landmark. The existing detached garage does not contribute to the historic significance of the house and is not considered a heritage preservation resource; therefore, demolition would be an appropriate undertaking. Regarding the proposed new construction, attached garages are common in the Country Club District, where a substantial number of houses with attached garages were constructed during the district's period of historic significance (1924-1944). The addition of living space above attached garages is also characteristic of historic homes in the district, where the earliest structural additions above attached garages probably date from the 1930s. From the perspective of the district's historic context, therefore, adding second-story living space above an attached garage would need to be considered an appropriate undertaking in the Country Club District.

Mr. Vogel added that unfortunately, the proposed addition falls short of the design requirements for new construction. While it minimizes the loss of historic fabric (the area of the house that will be altered does not meet the plan of treatment's threshold for demolition) and is compatible with the mass, texture and materials of the original house, the plans presented with the COA application depict a structure that will add approximately 2 feet to the height of the house. If allowed to be built, this would allow the addition to overpower the original house, altering the scale and character of the property and making it incompatible with the other historic homes in the neighborhood.

Mr. Vogel pointed out that although the preservation standards used in evaluating applications for COAs are neither technical nor prescriptive, they are intended to provide philosophical consistency to design review decisions. New additions need to be designed for compatibility with the character of the building and the neighborhood: the best practice, therefore, is to avoid adding new height to a building, particularly when the new work is visible from the street. There has been a tradition of enlarging homes in the Country Club District, where the most common house styles (Tudor and Colonial) typically accommodate large structural additions on their side and rear elevations without detracting from the architectural character of the houses or the integrity of the district as a whole. Although roof height is by no means uniform along any street in the district, relatively few homes have received additions that are taller than the original construction. When viewed from the public right-of-way, the facades are usually dominated by the primary roofs. In my opinion, it would be reasonable for new construction to respect this long-standing design tradition.

Mr. Vogel concluded that design review needs to recognize the special problems inherent in carrying out large structural additions to historic homes in the Country Club District. Lowering the height of the addition to 4501 Casco may require altering the shape of the roof and the height of the walls. It is important to remember that

preservation standards do not require new construction to duplicate the forms and shapes of the original building—compatibility does not mean exact reproduction of historic architectural details. It should be possible to redesign the addition so that the roof profile is not visibly higher than that of the original house when viewed from Casco or Sunnyside.

Planner Repya added that both she and Consultant Vogel recommend denial of the COA application for the new attached garage as proposed.

Findings support the denial recommendation included:

- The plans presented with the COA application depict a structure that would exceed the height of the house by 2 feet. If allowed to be built, this would allow the addition to overpower the original house, altering the scale and character of the property and making it incompatible with the other historic homes in the neighborhood.
- It is possible to redesign the addition so that the roof profile is not visibly higher than that of the original house when viewed from the street.

Homeowners, Charles and Raquel Layton, 4501 Casco Avenue Comments:

The Laytons spoke in support of their COA proposal - pointing out that their desire is to construct an addition to their home that is in keeping with its architectural details and compatible with the surrounding properties. Mr. Layton explained that they wish to create an attached garage addition that is sensitive to the mass of the home. He added that they have struggled with the design of the addition, and presented the Board with several alternative plans which they had considered, but rejected.

Jim Bizal, Bizal Construction, contractor for the Laytons explained that the restricting element driving the design is the southerly roof line on the existing home. As presented, the higher roof of the addition actually reduces the mass of the addition due to the sloping roof on the east or rear elevation. He added that the alternative plans where the roof of the addition was reduced created living spaces that did not flow with the original home.

Board Member Comments:

Member Forrest expressed agreement with the comments of staff and the consultant, and pointed out that there are many homes in the district that have reduced the height of additions by incorporating a flat roof at the peak.

Member Rehkamp Larson stated that she too shared the concerns expressed by staff. She added that she was also concerned about the south wall which is designed to be over 80 feet in length with no relief provided. Ms. Rehkamp Larson opined that the homeowner has expressed a desire for an addition that is sensitive to the mass of the home; however the plan proposed does not meet their desire. She added that there is a way to design an addition that would both meet the Laytons needs for living space, while at the same time demonstrate sensitivity to the height of the original home, and

provide some relief on the south elevation by stepping back portions of the wall area.

Members Carr, Stegner, Davis, Curran, and Rofidal agreed with the comments expressed by Member Rehkamp Larson. Member Carr asked if the homeowners would be willing to table the item until the November meeting when they could submit an alternative plan that would address the concerns expressed. Mr. and Mrs. Layton agreed that they would prefer the Board not vote on the COA as proposed, but rather come back with an alternative plan at the November meeting.

Member Rehkamp Larson moved to table the subject COA request until the November 9, 2010 meeting; affording the applicant time to research a plan that would address the concerns expressed by the HPB. Member Curran seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

B. H-10-05 4512 Casco Avenue – Construct a new detached garage and review changes to the front entry portico

Planner Repya explained that the subject property is located on the west side of the 4500 block of Casco Avenue. The existing home, constructed in 1938 had a 2-stall, tandem detached garage, measuring 14' x 43' (602 sq. ft.) in area and accessed by a driveway on the southerly side of the property. In 2008, the garage was demolished and a COA (H-08-08) was approved for a new 2-stall 576 sq.ft. garage; along with a plan to build a front entry portico, and add a shed roof with brackets over the windows on the 2nd floor.

As the project progressed, the homeowner decided that they wanted a different plan for the garage - they were advised from the start, any changes to the plans would require a new COA. The proposed plan is similar in size and mass from that which was approved in 2008, and reflects the new garage the homeowner would desire.

Ms. Repya pointed out that in 2008, changes to the front façade were completed; however unbeknownst to city staff, the plan for the front entry portico that was approved with COA (H-08-08) was modified without city inspections or the required COA review. The completed front entry portico is presented with this COA application along with plans for what had been approved.

The COA request involves two projects that are subject to review:

1. Construction of a new detached garage
2. Revisions to the front entry portico that had been approved in 2008

1. New Detached Garage

Planner Repya explained that the proposal includes construction of a new garage that

maintains a 6 foot setback from the rear (west) lot line, and a 4 foot setback from the side (southerly) property line. A new curb cut will not be required since the proposed

garage will utilize the existing driveway.

The new 2-stall detached garage measures 24' x 24' feet in area. The design of the structure is proposed to compliment the American Colonial Revival architectural style of the home with James Hardie shake and lap siding, support brackets, and a cedar shake roof to match the house. Two east facing dormers similar in character to the small eyebrow roofs at the second floor of the home with identical brackets are proposed. Attention to detail with windows and/or doors is demonstrated on the north, south and east elevations. On the west elevation, a 2.5 foot extension of the roof with brackets is proposed. Ms. Repya added that a slight revision has been requested to the west elevation with the addition of doors that will provide access to the garage from the rear.

The height of the proposed garage is shown to be 16.9 feet at the highest peak. The height at the mid-point of the gable is shown to be 11.5', and a height of 7' is provided at the eave line. The ridge line is shown to be 24.5' in length, and the roof is designed with a 9/12 pitch.

The maximum lot coverage allowed for the property is 30%. Construction of the proposed 576 sq. ft. garage will create total lot coverage of 27% - within the limits allowed by city code.

2. Revised Front Entry Portico

Addressing the front entry portico, Ms. Repya explained that in 2008, the HPB approved a change to the front entry of the home that included replacing an overhang that was added to the home sometime after 1960, with a gabled front entry canopy projecting 4.25 feet out from the front building wall. The gabled end was to be open with vertical slats – the design complimenting the gable ends of the proposed garage (that was not built). Brackets were shown to support the roof structure with no posts or pillars.

Photos were provided illustrating the front entry portico that was constructed. The gable end with vertical slats was replaced with an arched opening supported by square columns on either side with stone ledges (depicted in the 2008 plan) at the base.

Preservation Consultant Robert Vogel reviewed the subject plans for the garage as well as photographs of the built front entry portico contrasted to the plans that were approved in 2008.

Regarding the detached garage, Mr. Vogel observed that the COA application describes a building that is consistent with the design review guidelines presented in the district plan of treatment. The proposed work will not result in the loss of any historic fabric and, if built according to the plans presented, the proposed new construction would be compatible with the size, scale, material, and character of the subject property and the neighborhood.

Addressing the front entry portico, Mr. Vogel opined that although the new entry portico does not match the plans approved by the HPB with the 2008 COA, it appears to meet

the design review criteria for new construction in the Country Club District. He added that the new work is architecturally compatible with the historic character of the house and the neighborhood. Since the new construction did not meet the conditions of the original COA, it is appropriate that the city is requiring the owner to apply for a new COA.

Planner Repya concluded that she concurred with Consultant Vogel's comments and recommended approval of the COA for the new detached garage subject to the plans provided, and the front entry portico as built. She also recommended the following conditions to the approval:

- A year built (2010) plaque or sign is placed on the new detached garage.
- Any changes to the approved plan **MUST** be brought back to the Heritage Preservation Board for approval.

Ms. Repya added that findings supporting the recommendation include:

- The plans provided for the detached garage clearly illustrate the scale and scope of the project.
- The plans for the detached garage 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.
- The front entry portico as built appears to meet the design review criteria for new construction in the Country Club District, and is architecturally compatible with the historic character of the house and the neighborhood.

Homeowner, Dan Hollerman, 4512 Casco Avenue explained that the garage subject to the current COA changed from that which was approved in 2008 because they prefer the revised plan and feel it would be more complimentary with their home. Mr. Hollerman also explained the confusion that occurred in 2008 with his contractor which led to the front entry portico plan changing without the HPB's approval.

Member Rehkamp Larson commented that the doors added to the rear of the garage make sense considering the kick-out roof overhang that is planned on that elevation. Addressing the front entry portico on the home, Ms. Rehkamp Larson stated that since the structure was built without COA approval, the HPB could require that it be removed and built per the original plans; however in this case, she believes revised design is more appropriate for the home.

Board members agreed with Ms. Rehkamp Larson, but expressed concern regarding process and questioned how a project that was built to the approved COA plans could be completed without coming back to the HPB. Planner Repya explained that the need

for a new COA for revised plans is emphasized over and over to homeowners during the process. When the approved Certificate of Appropriateness is mailed to the

homeowner and provided to the contractor, the document clearly states in bold letters that **“Issuance of this Certificate of Appropriateness is subject to the plans approved. Any change in the scope of the work will require a new Certificate of Appropriateness.”** Board members agreed that the process provides sufficient notice, and noted that they do have the ability to require a structure violating a COA to be removed or brought into compliance with what was approved.

Following a brief discussion, Member Forrest moved approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness for the new detached garage subject to the plans presented and a year built plaque be displayed on the exterior of the garage; and the front entry portico as built. Member Curran seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

III. COUNTRY CLUB DISTRICT: COA Process Clarification

Planner Repya reminded the Board that at the September meeting they discussed requiring the review of an addition if it is part of a project requiring a COA, and visible from the street. Because Consultant Vogel did not attend that meeting, it was agreed that the discussion would be continued to provide Mr. Vogel an opportunity to comment.

Mr. Vogel observed that it is within the Board’s purview to require that if a project requiring a COA includes an addition to the original home, the HPB could review the addition. However, he pointed out that the design review process need not become overly complicated. He observed that in his opinion, residents have been sensitive to the district when designing additions to their homes. The greatest threat to the district comes from the potential teardown of historic resources in the district. Mr. Vogel suggested that the educating the residents and their contractors on the design goals outlined in the plan of treatment would go a long way to ensure that projects brought before the HPB uphold the historic integrity of the surroundings.

Board members agreed with Mr. Vogel. After a brief discussion, Planner Repya stated that when reviewing an application for a COA, if an addition is included in the project, she will advise the applicant that the addition will be included in the HPB’s evaluation of the project.

IV. MORNINGSIDE BUNGALOW STUDY: Draft Report Review

Consultant Robert Vogel observed that the Morningside Bungalow Study provides in-depth research into the history of the Morningside neighborhood and its built environment. The primary objective of the study was to identify the preservation value of the bungalow style homes in the Morningside neighborhood, and simplify the process for designating the historic bungalows as Edina Heritage Landmarks.

Mr. Vogel pointed out that the recommended plan of treatment (POT) on pages 32-34 of the report is proposed to serve as a template for homeowners requesting landmark

designation for their bungalow homes. With use of the recommended POT, a final plan of treatment unique to each designation would be crafted - fine tuned to the homeowner’s desires; it would become part of the overlay heritage landmark zoning for

the property.

A general discussion ensued regarding the proposed POT. Board members agreed that under the heading of “New Construction – Design of New Houses” they would like to remove statement **#2 Reproductions of historic bungalows will not be encouraged**. All agreed that the reproduction of historic bungalows in the Morningside neighborhood could be a positive for the area and should not be discouraged.

Discussing the next steps, the Board agreed that they would like Mr. Vogel to add photographs of the various bungalow style homes, a reconnaissance list of bungalow homes in the Morningside neighborhood, as well as an executive summary of the study for placement on the heritage preservation web page. All agreed that they would also like the entire study provided as a PDF on the web site.

Chairman Stegner suggested that at the November HPB meeting the Board establish a timeline to identify dates for presenting the research data to the Morningside neighborhood as well as a list of future actions. The HPB agreed with Chair Stegner’s suggestion. Consultant Vogel promised to provide the information requested. No formal action was taken.

V. COMMUNITY COMMENT: None

**VI. HISTORIC PRESERVATION CONFERENCE: September 16-17 in Winona –
Attendee Reports**

Board members Joel Stegner, Colleen Curran, Claudia Carr and Ross Davis represented the Edina Heritage Preservation Board at the Annual Historic Preservation Conference in Winona, Minnesota. The attendees reported that a highlight of the conference came from the keynote speaker who spoke of a foundation he founded which identifies, purchases, and rehabilitates vacant historic homes in North Carolina. The before and after photos he presented provided evidence that even houses in total dilapidated condition can be beautifully rehabilitated. The information provided for a good discussion of rehabilitating historic properties, begging the question “Is demolition really necessary?”

VII. OTHER BUSINESS:

1. League of Women Voters Reception for New City Manager, Scott Neal

Member Forrest referred to an invitation the board members received in their packets from the League of Women voters of Edina. She explained that at a reception to be held on Monday, November 15th from 6:00 – 8:00 p.m. at Edina City Hall, the community will have an opportunity to meet and welcome the new City Manager, Scott

Neal who will start working in Edina on November 8th. Board members appreciated receiving the invitation, and agreed that the event would be a good way to meet Mr. Neal.

Minutes
Heritage Preservation Board
October 12, 2010

- VIII. **CORRESPONDENCE:** None

- IX. **NEXT MEETING DATE:** November 9, 2010

- X. **ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting adjourned at 9:20 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Joyce Repya