



**MINUTES**  
**Annual Meeting of the**  
**Heritage Preservation Board**  
**Tuesday, March 9, 2010, 7:00 PM**  
**Edina Community Room**  
**4801 50<sup>th</sup> Street West**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chair Joel Stegner, Chris Rofidal, Arlene Forrest, Bob Schwarzbauer, Claudia Carr, Colleen Curran, and Elizabeth Montgomery

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Jean Rehkamp Larson, and Ross Davis

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

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Robert Vogel, Heritage Preservation Consultant

---

**I. ELECTION OF OFFICERS:**

**Chairperson**

Planner Repya called for nominations for the office of Chairperson. Member Rofidal moved to nominate Joel Stegner. Member Schwartzbauer seconded the motion. Member Stegner agreed that he would be willing to serve as Chairperson of the HPB. All voted aye. The motion carried.

**Vice Chairperson**

Chair Stegner called for nominations for the office of Vice Chairperson. No nominations were made. Member Carr volunteered to serve as Vice Chairperson. Member Rofidal moved to nominate Member Carr to the office of Vice Chairperson. Member Forrest seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

**II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:** February 9, 2010

Member Rofidal moved approval of the minutes from the February 9, 2010 meeting. Member Carr seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

**III. COMMUNITY COMMENT:**

**Kitty O'Dea, 4510 Bruce Avenue**

Ms. O'Dea commented that she could not find the agenda for the current meeting on the City's web site. Planner Repya apologized to Ms. O'Dea for her inability to access the agenda; explaining that the agenda was sent to the City's Communications Department on the Friday March 5<sup>th</sup> for posting on the site. She agreed to check into the situation and make sure that in the future the agenda is available.

#### IV. BYLAWS & RULES OF PROCEDURE:

Planner Repya explained that since the last meeting, the Mayor received a letter from Bob Kojetin requesting to be appointed an ex-officio member of the Heritage Preservation Board. The City's ordinances do not provide for ex-officio members for any of the advisory boards or commissions. However, the Bylaws & Rules of Procedure for the HPB does cite such a provision.

City Manager, Gordon Hughes pointed out that the provisions in the Bylaws should not go beyond what is allowed for in the city code. Mr. Hughes and Planner Repya reviewed the Bylaws for inconsistencies with city code and provided an amended copy to the board for their consideration.

As the Board discussed the revised document, several members questioned the proposed omission of "Membership". Planner Repya explained that criteria for membership on the HPB was omitted from the proposed document because that information is covered in the city code. Members Forrest, Carr and Rofidal agreed that typically, membership is addressed in a bylaws document.

Member Forrest questioned section 4.3 under "Procedures" which sets out the following provisions for a "Quorum": "A simple majority of the voting members serving five (5) shall constitute a quorum for any meeting of the HPB". Ms. Forrest pointed out that by including the number 5, it is assumed that there is a full complement of members serving on the Board; however there are times when there are fewer active board members due to an event such as a resignation, and to require at least 5 voting members could be a hardship.

Member Forrest moved to delete "five (5) serving" from the provisions for a Quorum. Member Carr seconded the motion.

A general discussion ensued. Member Schwartzbauer raised the point that if several members were to resign and only 4 members made up a quorum, a decision by so few members could be problematic. Several members agreed with Mr. Schwartzbauer.

Member Forrest amended her motion to only delete the word "serving", so the section would read "A simple majority of voting members, five (5) shall constitute a quorum for any meeting of the HPB". Member Schwartzbauer seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

Returning to the discussion about the omission of "Membership" from the document, Member Carr observed that since the proposed "Purpose" section of the bylaws was changed to read the same as the city code; likewise, it would seem appropriate to have the "Membership" section read the same as the city code. A brief discussion ensued with Board members in agreement.

Member Rofidal moved to add a "Membership" section as item "D", which should read identical to 801.5 of the code. Member Carr seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

Member Rofidal then moved to approve the new Bylaws and Rules of Procedure as amended. Member Forrest seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

Member Carr observed that the Bylaws and Rules of Procedure require the Board to vote on the meeting calendar for the year at the annual meeting. After a brief discussion, the Board agreed to address the 2010 meeting calendar later in the meeting under "Other Business."

## **V. MORNINGSIDE BUNGALOW STUDY :**

Planner Repya explained that Robert Vogel had been invited to speak to the Twin Cities Bungalow Club about bungalow style homes in the metropolitan area, and specifically about the Morningside Bungalow Study currently underway through a CLG Grant. The talk was very well received, and Ms. Repya suggested that he present the information to the HPB as an introduction for the newest board members.

Mr. Vogel's presentation centered around two main themes: First, identifying the significance of bungalow style architecture, particularly as it pertains to Morningside; and secondly, explaining why bungalow style homes are worthy of preservation.

1. Some interesting facts provided defining the bungalow style and Morningside:
  - 1887 the first bungalow style homes were constructed in Massachusetts.
  - American lifestyle became more informal – perfect for compact (< 1,000 sq. ft.) homes.
  - 1905 Morningside first platted from 3 original farmsteads (today - 700 total properties). Coincided with height of bungalow craze. Associated with the extension of the streetcar line – a means to commute to work in downtown Minneapolis.
  - Streetcar line was owned by real estate developers – provided motivation to develop housing "If you build it, they will come." Builders were the realtors too.
  - Many developers were associated with Morningside, whereas one (Samuel Thorpe) created the Country Club District.
  - Few architects designed the homes – vernacular architecture, many from mail order catalogs. Homes have many common characteristics.
  
2. Why are bungalows worthy of preservation?
  - The bungalow homes are a tangible marker for important points in American history.
  - Materials used created a standardization of millwork (nails, windows, wood floors, stained glass.)

**HPB Minutes**  
**March 9, 2010**

- Domestic engineering was employed – educated women were requiring amenities in the homes to simplify housekeeping.
- Bungalows aggressively promoted social betterment – small, comfortable homes for smaller families. Fewer persons per household - No longer the large farm families.
- Progressive style of architecture – very green structures – made from local materials; Chicago bungalows are predominately brick vs. Minneapolis which are predominantly wood.
- Furniture was created for the homes – craftsmen style “Stickley”.
- Built in cabinets, piano windows, etc.
- 1920’s – Mortgages (20 yr.) were invented to allow the average family to afford a bungalow. Up until then, only the wealthy could afford to own – the majority rented.
- 1970’s was hard on historic architecture – everyone wanted new; lack of appreciation for what we now call “vintage”.
- The close proximity of homes had controlled changes out of respect for neighbors.
- The lifespan of a typical suburban home is 85 years, whereas, a bungalow style is 300 years (tough and durable).

In closing, Mr. Vogel stressed that by means of the Morningside Bungalow Study, the HPB will prepare a pathway for the owners of bungalow homes in Morningside to designate their homes heritage landmarks - preserving an important element of history; not only for the Morningside neighborhood, but for the City of Edina, and the State of Minnesota as well.

Chairman Stegner observed that Morningside has a very different history from that of the Country Club District, thus the approach for designating the bungalow homes will be unique. Board members agreed with Stegner pointing out that with by-in from the residents of the neighborhood, and a positive attitude toward preservation, the designation process should be a smooth one.

Member Forrest recalled that the Edina Historical Society presented a Morningside exhibit in recognition of their 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary in 2005. She added that the Historical Society would be an excellent source for data on the neighborhood.

Board members suggested a “walk-about” in the Morningside neighborhood to gain a true perspective on the built environment. Consultant Vogel observed that in 2003 when the HPB initially researched the Morningside neighborhood, several walking tours on weekends were provided with the residents invited to participate. He added that a similar exercise would be particularly beneficial to the board members and residents who did not participate in 2003.

Board members agreed that when the weather warms up, to schedule a Morningside tour with the neighborhood invited to attend. All in attendance thanked Mr. Vogel for his report. No formal action was taken.

**VI. RESOLUTIONS OF APPRECIATION:**

Planner Repya prepared Resolutions of Appreciation for the three out-going members of the HPB: Bob Kojetin, Connie Fukuda, and Lou Blemaster. Board members signed each of the resolutions, as they shared their appreciation for the contributions Bob, Connie, and Lou provided toward the work of the HPB. No formal action was taken.

**VII. CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS: Procedures for Changes**

Planner Repya reminded the Board that at the February meeting, they discussed how to address changes proposed to a project once a COA has been approved. Currently, Edina's regulations require an applicant to come back to the HPB for a new COA for the review of any change to the plan approved.

Last month, the Board agreed that for some small changes, it might better serve the applicant as well as the HPB to provide for some level of administrative, or staff review, and asked staff to provide them with research on how preservation commissions from other communities deal with changes to COA's.

Responding the Board's request for information, Planner Repya provided information from the cities of Minneapolis; Fort Wayne, IN; and Raleigh, NC.

**Minneapolis, MN**

The City of Minneapolis addresses changes to an approved Certificate of Appropriateness by requiring that minor changes are reviewed by the planning staff; whereby other changes are reviewed by the HPC.

- (a) *Minor changes.* Minor changes to an approved certificate of appropriateness may be authorized by the planning director where it is determined by the planning director that the changes are not significant and are consistent with the approval made by the commission.
- (b) *Other changes.* Changes to an approved certificate of appropriateness other than changes determined by the planning director to be minor, shall require an amendment to the certificate by the commission. The requirements for application and approval of a certificate amendment shall be the same as the requirements for original approval.

A definition of minor changes was not found. It appears that the determination is left to the discretion of the planner.

### **Fort Wayne, Indiana**

This community does not address changes to an approved COA, however they do set out that an initial Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) is approved by either staff approval or commission approval, depending upon the type of work that is proposed.

### **Wake County - Raleigh, North Carolina**

This community differentiates between “Major Works” and “Minor Works” when addressing COA’s. For Major works, involving the change in the appearance of a structure, the Commission must review the COA application. For minor works, the preservation staff can review the application. Ms. Repya included a lengthy list defining both major and minor works.

Consultant Vogel commented that nationally, preservation commissions are striving to be more efficient, and providing a level of administrative review can be one step toward that goal.

Member Forrest opined that she is torn on this issue. On the one side she would like to see as efficient a process as possible; however there is an expectation for the design as approved. Perhaps not requiring the same procedures as a new COA (application fee and notification of surrounding properties), while having the HPB address and vote on the proposed change would provide for efficiency; yet keep the decision within the public record – perhaps by Staff reporting to the Board when minor changes have been approved would be sufficient.

Member Rofidal observed that the HPB has created a fair system of dealing with COA’s, and it is important that if changes are made to that process, the Board be kept in the loop.

Member Carr asked if changes to COA’s have been a problem for the Board. Board members discussed how a change to a COA is not as problematic for the Board as it is for the applicant, since the Board only meets once a month. Planner Repya explained that when a project is under construction, the delay of a change decision until the next HPB meeting can cause a hardship for the property owner.

Consultant Vogel pointed out that changes can arise when the vision an architect has presented is actually impractical from the construction standpoint. A certain level of flexibility would allow the process to flow more smoothly.

Member Curran stated that she likes the approach taken by the City of Minneapolis, however wondered if allowing the Staff to approve minor changes would be consistent with Section 850.20 of the city code that addresses the Heritage Preservation Board. She then wondered if the Board might want Staff to get the opinion of the City Attorney regarding how to address changes to COA’s.

Member Schwartzbauer stated that he would be in favor of allowing staff to evaluate a proposed change to a COA, and if it is determined to be minor, approve the change and

report the change to the Board. However, if staff determines that the change is more extensive, bring that change back to the Board for a decision.

Kitty O'Dea, 4510 Bruce Avenue, stated that she would not like to see a change in the way COA's are reviewed. She pointed out that she lives next door to a new home that received a COA. The builder wanted to make some changes which he felt were minor in nature; however they abutted her home and were not minor to her. The proposed changes were addressed in the public forum, and in her opinion, the process worked.

Following a brief discussion, the Board asked Planner Repya to gain the opinion of the City Attorney regarding whether a staff review of changes to a COA would be in keeping with the city codes, and report back to them at the April meeting. No formal action was taken.

### **VIII. OTHER BUSINESS:**

#### **A. HPB on the City's Website**

Planner Repya reminded the Board that they have long had the goal of improving the HPB presence on the City's website, and now they have the perfect opportunity to get the job done. Elizabeth Montgomery, the student member of the Board has proposed to undertake the project of upgrading the HPB web presence as her "May Term" project for school.

Member Montgomery explained the May Term program pointing out that it is offered to Edina Seniors during the last three weeks of school. The student must apply for approval of their project which may include one of the following areas: Cultural study, Service, Fine Arts, Science, Technology, Engineering, Math, or an internship.

Planner Repya pointed out that she and Ms. Montgomery discussed the criteria of the May Term program, and agreed the web page upgrade would provide an excellent opportunity for her to not only exhibit organizational and leadership skills, but to also benefit the HPB and community at large, by providing a more user-friendly web presence.

Fortunately, the May Term Committee approved Member Montgomery's project proposal. Planner Repya will supervise Ms. Montgomery who will report to City Hall daily for the three week "May Term" starting on May 19<sup>th</sup> – April 9<sup>th</sup>. The end product will be presented to the public in a "fair type" of an environment – the Board expressed an interest to attend.

In preparation for evaluating the content currently available on the website, Planner Repya explained that she will email an evaluation form for the Board to use to critique what they like about the current site, as well as what they feel is lacking. Ms. Repya

added that she has had contact with several residents who have had some suggestions regarding the HPB presence on the web, and she will ask for their input as well.

Board members applauded Ms. Montgomery on choosing such a helpful and worthwhile project. All agreed that they looked forward to providing their input. No formal action was taken.

### **B. 2010 Goals & Objectives**

Planner Repya explained that traditionally the goals and objectives for the coming year are established by the Board at the April meeting. In preparation, and because there are several new board members, Ms. Repya provided a listing of the goals and objectives annually approved by the Board since 2005.

A general discussion ensued among the Board. It was suggested that the outcome of each goal be included in the listing to include whether the goal was accomplished, pending, or deleted. All agreed that would be helpful information. Planner Repya agreed to provide that information and place the "2010 Goals and Objectives" on the April meeting agenda. No formal action was taken.

### **C. 2010 Meeting Calendar**

As pointed out earlier in the meeting, the Bylaws and Rules of Procedure for the HPB require that the meeting calendar for the year be set at the HPB's annual meeting.

Planner Repya reported that the HPB is scheduled to meet on the second Tuesday of the month with the exception of the August meeting which has been moved to the second Monday, the 9<sup>th</sup> due to political primaries which will be held on the usual meeting date. Member Schwartzbauer moved to approve the meeting schedule as proposed. Member Carr seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

### **D. 2010 Heritage Award**

Planner Repya explained that it has been advertised in the Sun Current and on the City's website that nominations are being taken for the 2010 Heritage Award. Nominations will close on Tuesday, April 6<sup>th</sup> with the HPB making a decision a decision of the winner at the regular meeting on April 13<sup>th</sup>. A plaque will be awarded to the winner by the Mayor and City Council at their May 4<sup>th</sup> meeting.

A brief explanation of the Heritage Award program and previous recipients was provided for the new board members. Consultant Vogel pointed out that while last year's winner, the owners of the Coddington House, 300 Blake Road nominated their home, typically, and nominations come from the HPB.

A brief discussion ensued regarding potential nominees. Planner Repya agreed to provide nomination forms to all the board. No formal action was taken.

- IX. **CORRESPONDENCE:** None
  
- X. **NEXT MEETING DATE:** April 13, 2010
  
- XI. **ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting adjourned at 9:05 PM

Respectfully submitted,

*Joyce Repya*