

City of Excelsior
Hennepin County, Minnesota

Minutes
Heritage Preservation Commission

Monday, April 13, 2020

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Chair Macpherson called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m.

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

Commissioners Absent: Reece

Also Present: City Planner Becker

2. AGENDA APPROVAL

Motion by Finch, seconded by Bolles to approve the agenda. Motion carried 5/0
(Brabec not yet present).

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a) February 25, 2020

Commissioner Finch moved, Commissioner Bolles seconded, to approve the minutes for the February 25, 2020 meeting as amended. Motion carried 5/0
(Brabec not yet present).

4. CITIZEN COMMENTS OR REPORTS

None.

5. DISCUSSION ITEMS

a) 234 Water Street Window Replacement (HPC No. 20-1)

Becker presented the report. Bolles wanted the horizontal mullion on the lower windows to be up higher to more closely match the historic photo and felt that the mullions should be heavier than what is presented. He also would prefer to not have storm windows on the upper level windows. He would support new windows on the second floor and moving the horizontal mullion up on the first floor. Brabec agrees and wanted to clarify what kind of doors there would be, and the applicant, Tyler Nelson, clarified that the doors would be mahogany. Caron felt that there should be either a window or a panel on the bottom of the windows on the first floor as opposed to brick. He doesn't feel that the upper floor windows should be replaced, since the Commission has required other applicants in the past to restore rather than replace windows. He understands from the last evaluation done that the windows can in fact be restored. Nelson is concerned about the safety of keeping the windows as well as the acoustics. Caron asked if there was room to put a storm window on the inside, and Nelson felt that it would not be possible with the historic casings. Nelson said that he spoke to the window vendor and had in a request to make the horizontal mullions on the first-floor windows thicker as well as move them up higher. Finch is in agreement with moving the horizontal mullions and the

requirement for an increased thickness. He has observed that most buildings near the subject property have wood paneling underneath the first-floor windows and would prefer wood paneling over brick. He also wanted to make sure that it is not possible to replace the glass on the original windows with double-paned glass, and Nelson confirmed that it was not. Salita wanted to confirm if the upper story windows were original, and Nelson confirmed that they were. Macpherson wanted to clarify if the four arched windows would be restored if the others were replaced, and Nelson said that all of the windows on the upper floors would either need to be replaced or restored. Nelson also clarified that the windows on the sides have already been fairly recently replaced with Marvin Windows. Macpherson recommended that a separate Site Alteration Permit application be submitted for the side and rear windows' replacements. Finch suggested that the item be brought back to a future meeting and it be presented what is being done with the bottom of the lower level windows. Finch suggested that the applicant look at 266 Water Street and what was done on the bottom of those windows. A subcommittee of Finch, Macpherson, and Bolles were appointed to review samples of brick before the next meeting. The Commission was generally in agreement that the windows on the upper level needed to be restored a that the lower levels windows need to be replaced as well as the windows on the sides and rear.

Motion by Finch, seconded by Caron to continue the item the next meeting in order for the applicant to provide further information on what windows are being replaced and to provide further clarification on what is being proposed on the lower half of the lower level windows. Motion carried 6/0.

b) 287 Water Street Storefront Door (HPC No. 20-4)

Becker presented the report. Finch questioned why the door opening was being proposed for Sweet Nauticals, as the proposed door opening does not seem to open up into this tenant's space, and the applicant, Brett Loftesness, clarified that the tenant was planning to take over additional space, to which the proposed door would open up. Caron and Finch were concerned that the proposed door opening was not symmetrical and had concern that the door would open up into the sidewalk. Salita and Brabec did not feel that the building needed to be symmetrical, as other buildings in the downtown area are not all symmetrical. Brabec wanted to know why the door was not proposed to be on the left side of the other door and did not have issue given that the building is non-conforming and non-contributing. Loftesness clarified that the vestibule would remain as is for now. Macpherson did not feel that the placement of the door would be very prevalent provided that it is recessed three feet.

Motion by Bolles, seconded by Finch, to approve the Site Alteration Permit for 287 Water Street. Motion carried 5/1 with Finch dissenting.

c) 40 Water Street Awning (HPC No. 20-5)

Becker presented the report. Salita was generally approving of the proposal but wanted to ensure that the hardware would remain. Caron does not see a problem with the awning but feels that the signage needs to be on the valance as guidelines require. Brabec and Bolles concurred.

Motion by Finch, seconded by Bolles, to approve the Site Alteration Permit with the condition that the original hardware be utilized and that the wording be limited to the valance. Motion carried 6/0.

d) 6 Third Street Sketch Plan (HPC No. 20-2)

Becker presented the report. The applicant, Dan Brattland, clarified that the house would need to be lifted 12 inches in order to pour the foundation. He also clarified that Scott McGinnis of the Excelsior-Lake Minnetonka Historical Society walked the property and communicated to the applicant that the limestone was brought from St. Paul as opposed to from the lake as previously communicated to the applicant. Macpherson said unless applicant has an invoice showing where it came from, it could have come from anywhere. Applicant agreed but said the one thing for sure is that it did not come from the bottom of the lake. Macpherson felt that the limestone most likely has aged and applicant should try to replace with similar stone. Applicant agreed.

Andy Johnsrud, representative of the applicant and the applicant's builder, explained how the chimney would be preserved. Macpherson suggested that a portion of the chimney that would likely be damaged during the movement of the building will need to be rebuilt. Applicant agreed. He also wanted more historical investigation done to see if the chimney today is representative of what it historically was.

Caron wanted to know how much historical material is being retained and which material is being replaced. The applicant showed pictures of what was to be retained as he had done on previous meetings. He also wanted to ensure that it would be clear that the addition was an addition and not part of the original house and roofline facing the lake. The applicant agreed and showed a picture from a previous rendering showing how the roofline would clearly be separated. Caron said that should work.

Johnsrud said that the windows would be double hung windows. There is a lack of photos that provide history of what the windows used to look like from certain viewpoints. Caron wanted clarification on if the windows would need to be custom, and Johnsrud explained that he believed very few would be required to be custom made and that the new windows would be placed into the existing openings. Applicant pointed out the large picture windows on the lake side will be custom; no one objected. Bolles wanted to know what type of foundation would be used, and Johnsrud explained that it would be a poured foundation. Bolles also stated that a brick or stone ledge needs to be formed into the entire new perimeter of the poured foundation above grade for the limestone veneer to cover the newly poured foundation. The Commission expressed gratitude to the applicant for presenting his sketch plan and soliciting feedback. They felt that the applicant was headed in the right direction but wanted more information on what materials are being used and where and for the addition to be more clearly delineated as an addition as opposed to part of the original house as applicant showed in the original rendering.

e) 7 George Street Structure (HPC No. 20-6)

Becker presented the report. Dan Brattland, applicant, explained that his intent was to move the house in order to have a carriage house and explained the hardships with the current lot. Caron commended the applicant on entertaining the idea to salvage and move the house currently located at 200 Lake Street to a new location. He was concerned with the potential of the structure being torn down in the future if there were no protections placed on the property. Brattland replied that the Commission has his word that he will commit to applying for designation so that this house may not be torn down. Bolles wanted to make it a condition that if the proposed house could not be moved that no other variances should be granted for the property. Finch did not believe that the designation of the lot should be removed and believed that it would make sense to continue the designation rather than remove the designation from the property and then go back and designate the house. Brabec felt that the Commission should be supportive of relocating the proposed structure to this lot. Caron suggested that the item be tabled to the next meeting in order for the Commission to think of ways and options to accomplish the goals of both the Commission and applicant. Salita asked the applicant about his timeline. Brattland clarified that the owners of 200 Lake Street are trying to begin construction by June but that ideally the house would be moved in the fall.

Motion by Finch, seconded by Brabec, to continue the item to the next meeting.
Motion carried 6/0.

f) 340 Water Street Signage (HPC No, 20-3)

Staff provided an update on the status of the application that was previously reviewed by the Commission and has extended the application deadline to June. No action by the Commission was required.

g) 366 Water Street Partial Demolition (HPC No, 20-7)

Becker presented the report. The applicant, Bill Ziegler, clarified that there are a number of improvements that need to be made that will require removal of the exterior deck. Bolles does not believe that it is necessary to remove the existing deck and shed in order to replace the broken water main. The Commission wanted to see more detail on what was going to replace the deck, shed, porch and stairs before they would approve any demolition.

Motion by Brabec, seconded by Finch, to continue the item to a future meeting. Motion failed, as there was thought that the applicant should instead withdraw the application and start with a fresh application in order to for the timeline on the application to start over once a new application is received. Motion withdrawn by Brabec and Finch. Applicant to withdraw the application.

h) Clarification on Commission Review Policy

The Commission clarified that they wanted to review only substantial changes to the size and scale and relocation of playground equipment.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Caron, seconded by Salita, to adjourn at 9:55 p.m. Motion carried 6/0.

Minutes

Heritage Preservation Commission

4/13/20

Page 9 of 9

Respectfully submitted,

Emily Becker

City Planner