

City of Excelsior
Hennepin County, Minnesota

Minutes
Heritage Preservation Commission

Tuesday, August 20, 2019

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

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

Commissioners Present: Bolles, Chair Macpherson, Finch, Caron, Reece, Salita

Commissioners Absent: Brabec

Also Present: City Planner Becker

2. AGENDA APPROVAL

Bolles moved, Salita seconded, to approve the agenda as amended. Motion carried 6/0.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a) July 16, 2019

b) July 31, 2019

Commissioner Bolles moved, Commissioner Caron seconded, to approve the minutes for the July 16, 2019 and July 31, 2019 meeting as amended. Motion carried 6/0.

4. CITIZEN COMMENTS OR REPORTS

Andrew Punch, 561 Third Street, asked the Commission that they re-review the process of approving the Site Alteration Permit and landmark process, requiring a 4/5 vote majority. Macpherson clarified that the process has been re-reviewed about three years ago.

5. DISCUSSION ITEMS

a) 420 Second Street SAP – HPC No. 19-26

Becker presented the report. Tim Brandow, owner of 420 Second Street, explained that the sign was erected as a gift prior to a site alteration or sign permit being issued. Caron clarified if Brandow understood that the sign required a site alteration and sign permit prior to being erected. Brandow said that he understood. Macpherson also clarified that there wasn't a complete package of how the sign was going up and how it was being installed and that the application inaccurately stated that it was a preapproved sign. His inclination would be to issue the site alteration permit with the penalties set forth for erecting a sign without a permit. Motion by Caron, seconded by Salita, to approve a site alteration permit for the erected sign provided the applicant submit a new application to staff and pay the double permit fee. Motion carried 6/0.

b) 217 First Street – Site Alteration Permit – HPC No. 19-26

Minutes

Heritage Preservation Commission

8/20/2019

Page 2 of 3

Kara and Rob Tyler, 217 First Street, clarified that they plan to replace the windows with wood instead of aluminum should it turn out that the windows have been removed. Macpherson suggested that if the windows need to be replaced that the applicant return to a future meeting. Finch suggested that the Commission form a subcommittee or provide a sheet to Staff if the windows have been removed that can be circulated to the Commission. Caron motioned to approve the Site Alteration Permit for the four alterations identified and ask that if the back windows are not salvageable or have been removed that further information on the window replacement be brought to staff to circulate as appropriate. Bolles seconded. Motion carried 6/0.

c) 340 Water Street Siding and Re-roof SAP – HPC No. 19-19

Finch was concerned that the siding would not be painted in a timely manner. Caron felt that the color rendering showed that the shingles would be dark, which was previously a concern of the Commission. Motion by Finch, seconded by Caron, to approve the Site Alteration Permit with the condition that the siding be painted the same color of the existing building within 30 days of approval. Motion carried 6/0.

d) 249 Water Street Mason Lodge Window Replacement and Condenser and Lines Installation – HPC No. 19-23

Ron Wagner, applicant, spoke. Bolles clarified the location of the condensers and lines. Finch clarified if the condenser lines would be the same color as the side of the building. It was communicated that the applicant has received one quote for the repair of the windows, and no other window restoration companies were willing to come out and give a quote. The Commission asked the applicant what his thoughts were on restoration of the new windows. The applicant clarified that it would cost around \$18,000 to install new windows, whereas restoration would cost approximately \$18,000 plus adding a storm window (which cost about \$5,000). Caron asked if the applicants were willing to get a second quote from a window restoration specialist. Motion by Caron, seconded by Salita, to approve the Site Alteration Permit for the installation of the condenser and lines as well as for restoration of the existing windows by a window restoration specialist. The request for replacement of the windows was denied. Motion carried 6/0. Reece felt that the Commission should define undue burden.

e) 200 Lake Street Landmark Designation – HPC No. 19-27

John Breyer, Attorney with Kutak Rock, explained that the property owner opposes the application. He explained that the applicant has submitted the application because he had heard that the structure is planned to be demolished and rebuilt. He does not agree that the criteria have been met to designate this property as a landmark property. He believes that the designation of the property as a landmark would be considered a taking. He does not believe that it possesses the architecture or history required to designate the property as a landmark property.

Peter Kizilos-Clift, 200 Lake Street, spoke and explained his reasoning for not directly notifying the applicant. The Commission reviewed the criteria and analyzed how the house meets the landmark designation criteria. Motion by Finch to direct staff to conduct a designation study and forward to SHPO for review, seconded by Bolles. Motion carried 6/0.

Minutes

Heritage Preservation Commission

8/20/2019

Page 3 of 3

f) Water Street Tree Committee

Motion by Salita, seconded by Reece to nominate Bolles as the HPC representative for the Water Street Tree Committee.

g) Preserve Minnesota Conference

There was discussion of who was going to attend Preserve Minnesota. It was decided that Finch and Macpherson would attend.

6. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Bolles wants Community for the Commons to be required to hold their meetings public. It was explained that they could not be required to hold their meetings public.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Salita, seconded by Reece to adjourn at 8:59 p.m. Motion carried 6/0.

Respectfully submitted,

Emily Becker
City Planner