



**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE EDINA PLANNING COMMISSION
THURSDAY, MARCH 27, 2002, 7:30 P.M.
EDINA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS 4801 WEST 50TH STREET**

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chairman Johnson, Helen McClelland, John Lonsbury, Ann Swenson, Geof Workinger and David Runyan

MEMBERS ABSENT:

David Byron and Stephen Brown

STAFF PRESENT:

Craig Larsen, Joyce Repya and Jackie Hoogenakker

OTHERS PRESENT:

Robert Vogel

I. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the March 7, 2002 meeting were filed as submitted.

II. NEW BUSINESS:

**S-02-1 Homes by Michelle
 Dean Carlson**

**Preliminary Plat Approval
7204 Shannon Drive
5905 Lee Valley Circle**

Mr. Larsen addressed the Commission and informed them the proponent; Mr. Dean Carlson is proposing to subdivide two developed single dwelling lots containing an area of 139,000 square feet or 3.19 acres into 5 lots. Mr. Larsen

told the Commission the existing homes would be removed and a new public street would serve the 5 lots.

Mr. Larsen told the Commission the lots in the proposed subdivision meets and/or exceeds ordinance standards for lot width, lot depth, and lot area. Mr. Larsen concluded staff recommends Preliminary Plat approval subject to: Subdivision Dedication, Developer's Agreement, Watershed District permits and Final Plat Approval.

The proponent, Mr. Dean Carlson and Mr. Brian Johnson, of MFR were present to respond to questions.

Mr. Carlson addressed the Commission informing them he has been working on this project for a number of months resulting in the proposal before them this evening. He explained the goal of the proposal is to create new lots that are sensitive to the natural terrain and existing vegetation of the area. Mr. Carlson reported over the past few months he also attended meetings with City staff to ensure that the final product would be in complete compliance with City Ordinances. Continuing, Mr. Carlson told the Commission last Wednesday (March 20th) a neighborhood meeting was held to better communicate the proposal to neighbors.

Commissioner Swenson asked Mr. Larsen if he believes emergency vehicle access would be a problem. Mr. Larsen said the fire department believes the proposed plan would serve the new home sites well. Mr. Larsen said at the present time the fire department would have a difficult time providing emergency needs to the subject sites and reducing the grade as indicated provides better access.

Commissioner Runyan asked the grade of lots 4 & 5. Mr. Johnson responded the grade is 3 to 1 at its steepest.

Commissioner McClelland commented on her visit to the subject site she observed a number of trees with red tags on them adding she hopes the tagged trees are not diseased. Mr. Johnson said as part of the subdivision requirements all trees larger than 6" in diameter must be identified and tagged.

Commissioner McClelland noted an elevation point of 906 at the proposed cul de sac and asked what the elevation is at the street level. Mr. Johnson responded at street level the elevation is 888 with a landing area at a 2% grade.

Mr. John Elliott, 5904 Lee Valley Road asked the Commission to deny the proposal presented to them this evening. He said in his opinion the proposed 5-lot subdivision is too dense.

Mr. Cronin, 7308 Claredon Drive, told the Commission he has a concern with proposed lot #2. He said in his opinion lot 2 circumvents the ordinance. Mr. Cronin echoed Mr. Elliott's comment that a 5-lot subdivision is too dense. Mr. Cronin suggested a 3-lot subdivision.

Ms. Fevold, 7208 Shannon Drive, told the Commission she is worried about erosion and water run-off problems that could occur as a result of the proposed subdivision.

Mr. Tappen, 7306 Claredon Drive, told the Commission he has a number of concerns and one is tree loss. He stated at all costs he wants as many trees saved as possible. Continuing, Mr. Tappen said another concern is drainage, and the construction of retaining walls. He pointed out Claredon Drive is at a lower elevation and with added hard surface and retaining walls it is very possible the properties on Claredon could be negatively impacted by water run-off as a result of this subdivision.

Mr. Danhert, 7318 Claredon Drive told the Commission his concern is the tree loss and the complex retaining walls needed to develop this site.

Mr. Miller, 7305 Claredon Drive, acknowledged the proposed project is complicated adding in his opinion it is just too dense. He stated he also has a concern with the height of the proposed retaining walls. He explained to the Commission he resides in an adjacent lot (off Claredon Drive) and is concerned for the safety of his children and the possibility they could fall over a wall.

Mr. Johnson interjected and explained the natural water flow of the subject site is to the south and that will not be changed. He stated he believes after full development the water run-off would remain the same or could actually lessen. Mr. Johnson explained the rear of the proposed new lots would continue to drain south while the front of the proposed homes and driveways would drain to the cul de sac and down to Lee Valley Road and the catch basin. Mr. Johnson noted the retaining wall would also be tiered.

Commissioner Lonsbury said he understands how proposed Lots 1 and 2 would drain and asked Mr. Johnson if he could "walk" the Commission through how proposed Lot 3 would drain. With graphics Mr. Johnson pointed out how the rear yard of Lot 3 would drain to the south and how the front yard area would drain toward the cul de sac and continue down to Lee Valley Road.

Commissioner Swenson asked Mr. Carlson if he has a sense of the size of homes that could be constructed on the new lots. Mr. Carlson said all homes will be custom built homes and the indication the development team has been given is that the footprints of the homes will be in the 2400 + square foot range. Continuing, Mr. Carlson said the current profile of interested buyers indicate they desire a smaller home that offers one level living, with walkout.

Commissioner Swenson asked Mr. Carlson what he anticipates the lots would sell for. Mr. Carlson said he believes the lots will be in the 400 + thousand dollar range.

Commissioner Runyan asked Mr. Carlson if any builder could build on the proposed lots. Mr. Carlson reiterated the homes will be custom built and the lot owner will choose the builder.

Chairman Johnson commented one lot appears to be accessed by a cross easement and questioned why access for that lot isn't from Shannon Drive. Mr. Johnson explained that lot could be accessed from Shannon Drive but access from Shannon Drive would disturb more vegetation. The entrance point for all proposed lots is off Lee Valley Road.

Mr. Larsen interjected and told the Commission cross easements similar to the one indicated on the proposed plat are very common in the City of Edina. Continuing Mr. Larsen explained the proposed layouts of the new lots all have access off a cul de sac off Lee Valley Road. The proposed cul de sac access reduces impact to the area. Mr. Larsen acknowledged some of the proposed lots could also be accessed off Shannon Drive but two curb cuts and roadways would result in more disruption.

Commissioner Swenson pointed out Lot 1, if platted as indicated will always need the cross easement driveway for access. Mr. Larsen said that is correct unless in the future they reorient access off Shannon Drive.

Mr. Tappen interjected and told the Commission he has a concern that this subdivision is a "first" for the developer and reiterated he has a concern with drainage issues, and impact to the topography.

Mr. Larsen responded the City studies and reviews all developments equally whether it is a developer's first development or 100th all subdivisions are considered with the same criteria in mind. Continuing, Mr. Larsen explained when a proposal receives preliminary approval the proponent enters into a Developer's agreement with the City. This Agreement covers all street, water and sewer improvements including drainage. All conditions stipulated by the City's different departments, Planning, Building, Engineering, Public Safety, etc. must be met. The City requires a security bond and/or letter of credit for security for the improvements to the property.

Commissioner Swenson said she is concerned with the retaining walls that will be needed for this development, especially on Lot 5.

Mr. Carlson responded the existing lots were developed in the 1950's with design flaws, and presently the access roads for the subject sites are

inadequate. Continuing, Mr. Carlson said the proposal “shores up” the driveway creating better and safer access. Mr. Carlson acknowledged the need for retaining walls adding this proposal also cleans up the ridge, and the retaining wall will be tiered.

Chairman Johnson said he is worried about building size adding it has been his experience in the past that new homes usually are constructed to the max which necessitates the need to remove more vegetation and move more earth.

Mr. Carlson responded he understands the concerns expressed and explained all building pad sites are custom. Custom homes allow the consumer the ability to design a home that meets their needs. Mr. Carlson said to date most people that have expressed interest in the proposal have indicated a building footprint in the 2400 square foot range. He said the interest so far has been from empty nesters that desire one level living and are in a sense “down sizing”.

Chairman Johnson asked Mr. Carlson if he has any idea on cost per square foot. Mr. Carlson said he believes in today’s market the price is between 200 and 300 dollars per square foot.

Commissioner Swenson asked if any of the building pads depicted would require variances. Mr. Larsen said the pads indicated on the plat could be even larger, and in viewing the footprints depicted on the plans no variances are required.

Commissioner Lonsbury noted the plans indicate 14-foot high retaining walls and told Mr. Johnson he is having a difficult time visualizing 14-foot walls. Mr. Johnson explained at this time we visualize boulder walls and reiterated the retaining walls will be constructed in tiers (2 to 3 tiers) to achieve the 14-foot height.

Ms. Dorothy Lillestrand, 7104 Down Road informed the Commission she has lived in the area for a number of years and remembers years ago Rudy Tronnes tried to subdivide a larger lot in this neighborhood into 8 lots site. Ms. Lillestrand further told the Commission Mr. Tronnes only received approval for 5 lots. Ms. Lillestrand suggested reducing the amount of home sites to better suit the neighborhood. Concluding, Ms. Lillestrand told the Commission in her opinion the corner lot along Shannon Drive will be negatively impacted because it will be surrounded by roads.

Mr. Cronin asked the Commission who is responsible for the maintenance of the retaining walls. Chairman Johnson responded there are numerous lots in the City that contain retaining walls of various types and heights and

responsibility for maintenance etc. falls to the property owners. Chairman Johnson stated retaining walls “are not the City’s problem”.

Commissioner Runyan observed when completely developed tree loss will occur and asked Mr. Carlson if he proposes any new landscaping. Commissioner Runyan suggested a landscaping plan, especially to buffer the property at 7202 Shannon Drive.

Mr. Carlson said the engineers have studied the site to ensure minimal tree loss and acknowledged tree loss will occur. Mr. Carlson said he is not adverse to provide more landscaping. Concluding, Mr. Carlson pointed out a portion of the proposal provides for a 25 foot “no touch” buffer along Lots 1, 2, and 3.

Commissioner McClelland stated she is very uncomfortable with the proposal before her this evening. Commissioner McClelland said tree loss will be significant and the height and amount of retaining walls are unacceptable. Commissioner McClelland said in her opinion if the proposal proceeds as indicated the property owner at 7202 Shannon Drive will be completely isolated. She said in her opinion accessing the subject site from Lee Valley Road is unsafe. Concluding, Commissioner McClelland she can support no more than 4 lots, with one lot served from Shannon Drive.

Commissioner Swenson echoed the comments from Commissioner McClelland adding she is also uncomfortable with access for Lot 1. Commissioner Swenson said in her opinion the lot lines appear to be forced and 5 lots are too many.

Commissioner Runyan commented with slopes at 3 to 1 the site can be developed with a positive outcome at 5, but there will be impact and significant tree loss.

Mr. Carlson acknowledged the retaining walls are high, and reiterated they are tiered. Continuing, Mr. Carlson pointed out if the lots are reduced to 4 impact will be virtually the same because of the road and cul de sac. Mr. Carlson said if access were off Shannon Drive there would be even greater tree loss.

Commissioner McClelland asked Mr. Carlson if the existing bituminous could be used. Mr. Carlson said the proposed road and cul de sac are wider than the existing driveway. Commissioner McClelland reiterated in her opinion too much damage would be done to the environment if this subdivision were approved as presented.

Commissioner Lonsbury said he could agree with the point made by Mr. Carlson that a 4-lot plat is as invasive as a 5 lot plat, but Commissioner Lonsbury said he believes more work can be done on this site to reduce impact.

Commissioner Workinger said in viewing this proposal his initial reaction is if it “looks like a neck lot, it is a neck lot” adding he could only support access to Lot 1 off Shannon Drive. Continuing, Commissioner Workinger said in his opinion if this parcel is to be developed a lot of work needs to be done to ready the building pads, adding there will be much disruption. Commissioner Workinger stated because of the topography of the subject site that he also doesn’t see any way around the retaining walls, which in his opinion are extreme. Concluding, Commissioner Workinger said this proposal affects the character and symmetry of the neighborhood and he cannot support the proposal as presented.

Mr. Carlson interjected and said in response to comments regarding 7202 Shannon Drive that he is very willing to buffer that lot with additional landscaping. He informed the Commission that property owner, Mr. Elsing is out of the country at this time but has knowledge of this proposal. Mr. Carlson said Mr. Elsing would be in town when the Council considers this proposal.

Commissioner McClelland reiterated she couldn’t support the proposal as presented. She explained she is very worried about the retaining walls and is unhappy with the layout of Lot 5. Concluding, Commissioner McClelland said she would like to see a reduction in lots.

Mr. Carlson told the Commission he understands their concerns and pointed out the proposal meets and exceeds all requirements stipulated by the Ordinance.

Chairman Johnson acknowledged the proposed plat does meet city requirements, but there are other issues such as character and symmetry. Chairman Johnson told Mr. Carlson from the comments from the Commissioners he is unsure if there is total support for the proposal and asked Mr. Carlson if he would consider tabling the proposal allowing him time to digest the concerns expressed by the Commission and neighbors (i.e. retaining walls, loss of vegetation, density).

Mr. Carlson responded he would like the Commission to act on the proposal as submitted.

Commissioner Swenson moved to recommend denial of the preliminary plat. Commission McClelland seconded the motion. Ayes; Lonsbury, Swenson, McClelland, Workinger Bergman, Johnson. Nay, Runyan. Motion to deny carried 6-1.

Z-02-1

Preliminary Rezoning from POD-1, Planned Office District to PCD-2, Planned Commercial District for Walgreen's. 6500 France Avenue So.

Mr. Larsen informed the Commission the proponent is seeking a rezoning of the subject property to PCD-2 to allow the conversion of the existing building to a pharmacy for Walgreen's. The existing building contains a floor area of 12,000 square feet and provides 47 parking stalls.

Mr. Larsen concluded that staff does not support the proposed rezoning. Continuing, Mr. Larsen said a rezoning at this location would be contrary to the City's policy of limiting expansion of commercial uses west of France Avenue.

Mr. Kohler, 6332 Ryan Avenue was present representing Walgreen's.

Commissioner Runyan informed the Commission he will abstain from the vote.

Mr. Kohler addressed the Commission and explained Walgreen's is proposing to renovate the existing building and reorient the entrance to West 65th Street. Mr. Kohler explained that presently on the site there is some "standing water" issues that need to be addressed. Walgreen's is proposing to grade the site to better accommodate water run-off. The site will be graded to drain water out to West 65th Street to tie into the storm sewer. The impervious surface of the site will be reduced and additional landscaping will be planted. Continuing, Mr. Kohler explained the entire exterior would also be renovated to compliment the new Southdale Hospital addition and parking ramp. Concluding, Mr. Kohler said he believes the proposed rezoning would not negatively impact the area. He said the use is complimentary to the hospital with no "peak time" traffic flow. Mr. Kohler added residents of the Point of France and the proposed 100-unit apartment building off West 65th Street will be able to use the new facility as pedestrians.

Chairman Johnson commented that the proposed Walgreen's is very close to an existing Walgreen's on West 70th Street and asked Mr. Kohler if he believes there is enough business in the area to support two stores.

Mr. Kohler said they believe the proposed Walgreen's will minimally reduce traffic at the West 70th Street location.

Commissioner Workinger asked Mr. Kohler if the proposed facility would be similar in operation to all other Walgreen stores. Mr. Kohler responded the proposed store would offer the same services as all other Walgreen's. Most Walgreen's operate at a 60/40 ratio. 60% pharmacy - 40% retail.

Ms. JoEllen Dever, 5101 West 70th Street told the Commission in her opinion if this use is permitted there will be too many pharmacies in the immediate area. She told the Commission the hospital and the medial building directly across from the proposed Walgreen's have pharmacies, plus there is another Walgreen's on West 70th and another at West 50th Street/France. Continuing, Ms. Dever said traffic is a huge concern for her especially in this area. Concluding, Ms. Dever asked the Commission to deny the rezoning proposal submitted by Walgreen's.

Commissioner Workinger told the Commission he is not in favor of commercial establishments west of France Avenue and supports the staff recommendation for denial. Continuing, Commissioner Workinger said the proposed pharmacy and retail use of a Walgreen's store, in his opinion is too much. He added the present traffic situation is difficult at best and once the hospital is at "full speed" traffic on West 65th Street will increase. Concluding, Commissioner Workinger said if it is felt there is a need in the area for an additional pharmacy, he might consider allowing just that use, but no retail amenities would be allowed.

Chairman Johnson said there was a time when he would agree the strict enforcement of no retail west of France had merit, but at this time he is not too sure. Continuing, Chairman Johnson said France Avenue has changed over the last 20 years and it might be a good time for the City to reconsider it's position, or at least acknowledge that changes have occurred and develop an overall plan for the area.

Commissioner McClelland stated she agrees with the comments from Commissioner Workinger. She pointed out the present two Walgreen's in the City always appear to be busy, adding there is no reason to believe this location won't be as busy or busier. Continuing, Commissioner McClelland said the parking deficit that will exist if this is allowed would only add more congestion to an already congested area. She noted no parking is permitted on West 65th Street if the lot would become full.

A discussion ensued with the majority of Commissioners expressing concern in allowing a retail use at this location.

Chairman Johnson told the proponent from the comments thus far it appears the Commission cannot support the request as presented and asked the proponent if he wants time to reconsider his request.

Mr. Kohler asked if the Commission would consider a pharmacy use only on this site as mentioned by Commissioner Workinger.

Chairman Johnson said that could be a possibility and reiterated to Mr. Kohler that he has the option of asking for a continuance allowing more time to study if a pharmacy only use is a viable option for Walgreen's. Continuing, Chairman Johnson said there is a 60-day rule that can be waived if further study is needed.

Mr. Kohler agreed to waive the 60-day rule. Mr. Larsen interjected and explained if it is indefinitely tabled Walgreen's can reinstate their request at a time of their choice.

Commissioner Lonsbury stated in light of the proponent waiving the 60-day rule the Commission is recommending tabling Z-02-1 until a time of their choice. Commissioner Swenson seconded the motion. Aye; Lonsbury, Swenson, McClelland, Bergman, Workinger, Johnson. Abstain, Runyan. Motion carried.

Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan for Frauenshuh Companies West 77th Street and France Avenue

Mr. Larsen informed the Commission Frauenshuh Companies is requesting to locate restaurants in the Planned Office District at the corner of 77th and France Avenue South. Mr. Larsen said currently the zoning ordinance does not permit "stand alone" restaurants in the Planned Office District. Continuing, Mr. Larsen said there are three options available to the Commission at this time, one is to refuse the request, another is to direct the proponent to rezoning the site from office to commercial, or lastly to amend the ordinance as it relates to planned office district to permit such a use.

Mr. Larsen said at this time staff acknowledges this co-use is common in other cities, but is new to Edina. Years ago the Southdale Office Center site was rezoned to office from commercial, and at that time the site contained Marc's Big Boy restaurant, that is now Pizzeria Uno, with the change the restaurant use was technically "grandfathered", but that is an isolated situation. Continuing, Mr. Larsen said the only other similar office/restaurant comparison he can think of is the new Centennial Lakes Office complex that contains Macaroni Grille, but he noted that site is zoned MDD which permits a combined use. Mr. Larsen introduced Mr. McKay from Frauenshuh to address their request.

Mr. McKay, 5615 Schaefer Road told the Commission Frauenshuh is a company that works closely with the community and they want to be part of the solution, not a problem. Continuing, Mr. McKay said it may be premature on their part but over the past few months they have been considering adding a restaurant element to their office site. Mr. McKay said he understands the reluctance of the Commission to consider commercial west of France Avenue and will abide by the City's decision, but would request that the City review or reconsider their stance on mixing the two.

Mr. McKay said high quality restaurants have approached them to co-locate with their office. The two restaurants that expressed interest are Flemmings and Roys Polynesian. Mr. McKay explained that currently there is a cafeteria on site so a restaurant use already exists on site.

Commissioner Workinger said in his opinion he believes in this situation the City needs to be open-minded. Continuing, Commissioner Workinger said there is much potential in this area for a "co-use" of sites. Commissioner Workinger stated at this time he is not against rethinking the ordinance to accommodate the request. He pointed out the Kincaid's scenario appears to work well in Bloomington and could also work well here. Commissioner Workinger acknowledged an office complex might have to be a certain size in order to support a co-use such as the one suggested.

Mr. McKay interjected that France Avenue is becoming a very competitive corridor, and with graphics pointed out the renovation of the office complex including the proposed restaurants.

Mr. Larsen told the Commission what is presently happening is the City is considering and studying the future of France Avenue, and in a sense trying to decide what "the box can handle".

Commissioner McClelland agreed there have been changes along France Avenue, but questioned if France Avenue can handle that many eating establishments. Mr. Larsen responded that is the question, "what will the market dictate", and at this time we are unsure.

Mr. Larsen explained the proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan is more of a directional question, adding the City needs to work with other players along this corridor for input on what the future could hold, and the direction the City should take.

Chairman Johnson asked if Vision 20/20 addresses this issue. Mr. Larsen responded 20/20 suggested that the City look at further options in this area.

Commissioner Swenson asked if the Commission should hold this over, acknowledging the topic has been brought to our attention, but before the Commission can act on a request such as this we need more direction and discussion.

Commissioner Workinger agreed, he pointed out the previous request from Walgreen's is similar, commercial west of France, and in his opinion both issues should be further studied.

Mr. McKay agreed. He said Frauenshuh wanted City Staff and the Commission to be aware that market amenities for office buildings has changed, with commercial elements being introduced by developers, potential tenants and owners.

Commissioner Workinger moved to table the discussion to allow time to study an amendment to the comprehensive plan to an indefinite time. Commissioner Swenson seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried.

Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance – Heritage Preservation Board

Mr. Larsen told the Commission the Heritage Preservation Board has been working since last spring to revise the Heritage Preservation sections of the City Code. Continuing, Mr. Larsen said the Heritage Preservation Board has found that the existing code is not keeping up with the demands that are being placed on heritage preservation in the City of Edina. Mr. Larsen said at present there is a moratorium on teardowns in the Country Club District and that moratorium expires in June 2002. Continuing, Mr. Larsen said the amendment to the ordinance needs to be approved and when approved the Heritage Preservation Board will nominate the Country Club District as an Edina Heritage Landmark District.

Mr. Robert Vogel, consultant to the Heritage Preservation Board was present to respond to questions from the Commission.

Mr. Vogel told the Commission in the past problems have been raised by the old code and the proposed changes to the code should better prevent future problems, while clarifying the language. Continuing, Mr. Vogel said the proposed new language makes the code easier to understand and lays out a regulatory form that can be adopted to better serve the Edina Heritage Landmark program.

Mr. Vogel said the intent of the code changes is to provide enforcement while being less intrusive. Mr. Vogel added one way to accomplish enforcement is to educate the property owners on the history of their property thereby preventing future conflicts. Mr. Vogel explained the new code language

recommends that a Planning Commission member be appointed as an ex-officio member of the Heritage Preservation Board. Mr. Vogel said it is possible in the future that the Heritage Preservation Board will also have a student member.

Mr. Vogel explained to the Commission the major changes to the new code:

1. Owners of the properties designated as “Landmarks” need to receive approval from the Heritage Preservation Board when applying for a building permit or a permit to raze a home located in the Landmark District.
2. Building permits for the construction of new homes in the Landmark District will require a “certificate of appropriateness” and;
3. Heritage Preservation Board approval will not be required for remodeling work and additions to designated landmarks.

Mr. Vogel said it is the hope that these changes to the ordinance will bring the code into step with the remainder of the City’s codes and to also provide a more “user friendly” approach to preservation. Mr. Vogel concluded the new ordinance would also make it easier for staff to administer.

Commissioner Lonsbury commended Mr. Vogel on all his work and asked Mr. Vogel why it was decided that a Planning Commission member should be an ex-officio member. Mr. Vogel responded in many instances a member of the Commission might not be a resident of the District so an ex-officio status is more effective.

Commissioner Swenson asked if a resident of the district submits a plan that is not “liked” will the City Council hear it. Mr. Vogel said there would be specific guidelines that should prevent such action. Mr. Vogel said the proposed ordinance changes will complement the ordinance not detract from it, or create problems.

Commissioner Swenson pointed out along Bruce Avenue within the District there are some modern homes, and she asked if those homes are also protected. Mr. Vogel said for each home there would be guidelines. Mr. Vogel said the intent of the ordinance is not to “embalm Edina”, but to provide useful preservation guidelines.

Commissioner McClelland said in her opinion the Heritage Preservation Board and the Planning Commission have worked well in the past and the proposed ordinance change is just adding another layer of governmental involvement. Commissioner McClelland said she doesn’t believe there is a point in having another layer of the board when what is already in place appears to work.

Mr. Vogel said it is not the intention of the ordinance amendment to create a less friendly ordinance. The intention is to create a user-friendlier ordinance for both the property owners and the City. The intent is not to make it more difficult for a Landmark homeowner to remodel their home the intent is to speed up the process by having guidelines already in place. Mr. Vogel said the “certificate of appropriateness” would only be used when a homeowner decides to raze an existing home in the Landmark district.

Commissioner McClelland said she still has a problem with the proposed changes. She reiterated the Planning Commission and Heritage Preservation Board, at least in her opinion, has always had a good relationship. Continuing, Commissioner McClelland said, as she understands the ordinance changes it appears to her more staff time and money will be needed to implement the proposed changes.

Mr. Larsen interjected indicating it is the goal of the changes to minimize staff time and involvement with regard to the District by creating a more user-friendly code.

Commissioner Lonsbury asked Mr. Larsen what he wants the Commission to do. Mr. Larsen responded staff at some point would like the Commission to recommend amending the ordinance to reflect the proposed changes.

Chairman Johnson said it appears the Commission may not be ready to recommend approval for changes to the ordinance and may need more time to digest the proposed ordinance changes.

Commissioner Swenson agreed, and stated she would like to skip the focus on the Country Club District and address the Edina Theatre Marquee. She asked if that marquee could be considered a landmark. Mr. Vogel responded the marquee could be designated as a landmark and thereby protected.

Commissioner Runyan suggested that the Commission take an additional 30 days to re-read and further study the proposed ordinance changes. Ms. Repya of the Planning Department suggested that members of the Commission might want to attend a Heritage Preservation Board meeting in the interim to obtain more information and to have clarified for them the proposed changes to the Ordinance.

Chairman Johnson interjected and said that makes sense, and asked Ms. Repya if she knows the date of the Heritage Preservation Board’s next meeting. Ms. Repya said the Board meets on April 23rd and she would be more than happy to invite members of the Commission to the meeting to help clarify the proposed ordinance changes.

Chairman Johnson directed planning staff to invite the Commission to a joint meeting with the Heritage Preservation Board. Chairman Johnson noted the Commission meets again on May 1, 2002 and Commission Members would like to meet before that date so the moratorium can be addressed before it lapses.

III. ADJOURNMENT:

Commissioner Lonsbury adjourned the meeting at 9:30 p.m.

Jackie Hoogenakker