

City of Excelsior
Hennepin County, Minnesota

Minutes
Heritage Preservation Commission

Tuesday, May 19, 2020

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Chair Macpherson called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Commissioners Present: Macpherson, Bolles, Caron, Finch, Brabec, Reece

Commissioners Absent: Salita

Also Present: City Planner Becker

2. AGENDA APPROVAL

Motion by Bolles, seconded by Caron to approve the agenda as amended. Motion carried 6/0.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a) April 21, 2020

Commissioner Caron moved, Commissioner Bolles seconded, to approve the minutes for the April 21, 2020 meeting as amended. Motion carried 6/0.

4. CITIZEN COMMENTS OR REPORTS

None.

5. DISCUSSION ITEMS

a) 366 Water Street Demolition and Remodel (HPC No. 20-10)

The applicant indicated that he felt that the shed was not the same shed as the as the one that is currently there. He pointed out that the whole back side of the property is deteriorating and was poorly built. Bolles commented that the windows on the front elevation were a little bit narrower and taller. He was fond of the current doors that are on the shed and that it can be updated to be a better material, as that is what restoration is all about, making things structurally sound. Brabec is trying to find the existing building as it is today. She sees that a second story was added, and that it seems that the building has been turned into a pseudo-Victorian house. She wanted to see some delineation between what is original and what is new. Caron answered that this building had been through alterations before the City had a Heritage Preservation Commission was in existence. He sees the character-defining features as the roof element with the exception of the two higher ridges/gables that were added and the original porch that has been removed. He doesn't believe that anything further should be lost on this structure, and the way that it is presented would result in the structure being a non-contributing structure. He understands that there have been a number of insensitive changes to the structure and that he does not see that this proposal meets the residential additions guidelines within the Historic Preservation Manual. He went on to list them: additions shall be located at the rear of the historic structure, they shall be of compatible design, additions shall be distinguishable from the building, character-defining architectural features shall not be hidden by new additions. Macpherson believes that the small windows on the front elevation is showing as being removed and is a significant structure. He asked if all the windows are being replaced and said that they should retain the character-defining characteristics of the original building. It was clarified that the proposed siding was cedar and that the windows would be double hung.

Macpherson doesn't believe that the sets of plans are complete, as it doesn't show what is new construction and what is original. Brabec is struggling with the east second floor addition, as she feels it dwarfs the house. Finch said that it was difficult for him to understand if this is a contributing structure. His understanding that what was being dealt

with was the removal of the shed and that the proposal for a new addition. He suggested forming a subcommittee to assist the applicant with understand what needs to be submitted in order to be considered having a complete application.

Harrington wants to know as soon as possible when the subcommittee would like to meet so that project can begin as soon as possible. Finch questioned if it was imperative that the HPC approve rear demolition so that the water main may be repaired. Bolles believes that the water can be repaired without removing the rear deck and shed and that because the house is not being lived in and is not under construction, water is not needed.

Motion by Finch to form a three-person subcommittee to assist the applicant in preparation of application submittals and that the commission be open to scheduling a special meeting to re-review and approve the resubmitted plans, seconded by Brabec. Motion carried 6-0.

b) 234 Water Street Window Replacement

Becker explained that the applicant has granted the City an additional 60-day extension, moving the deadline for approval to July 11, 2020.

c) 340 Water Street Signage Update

Becker let the commission know that the applicant for the proposed signage at 340 Water Street has withdrawn the application, and so no further action is needed by the commission.

e) 2020 Preservation Award

Macpherson commented that the preservation awards had lapsed from the commission's memory and that it has not been pursued by the commission for a number of years. Finch suggested that three commissioners form a subcommittee to do a writeup to make a recommendation to the commission. Brabec recommended that there be two categories.

Motion by Macpherson, seconded by Bolles, to form a subcommittee to work with staff to determine an outline for the awards and determine if there should be two levels of the award: major and minor levels. Caron felt that we should go back and determine who was given the award in the past. Motion carried 6-0. The committee would be made up of Caron, Brabec and Reece, who volunteered to craft the design of the award. Becker said that an agenda could be drafted for the annual meeting, and Caron said that he was starting a calendar that would be a reminder of the annual requirements.

f) 2020 Goals

Macpherson thought the third and last goals of 2020 should be combined. Bolles wanted the goals numbered. Finch wanted the edited goals brought back to a future meeting. Bolles suggested scheduling special meetings, and Macpherson suggested putting off special meetings until the goals are finalized.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Caron, seconded by Bolles, to adjourn at 8:04 p.m. Motion carried 6/0.

Respectfully submitted,

Emily Becker
City Planner