

**MEETING MINUTES**  
**Public Works Site Small Area Guide Process**  
**Refinement Meeting**  
**Tuesday, April 27, 2010 6:00 pm**  
**Edina City Hall Council Chambers**

---

**City Staff Present**

Heather Worthington

**CAT Members Present**

Kevin Staunton

Gene Persha

Mike Platteter

Josh Sprague

Sue Davison

Andy Brown

Larry Chestler

Greg Domke

Steve Buss

Bob Shaddock

Brian Hedberg

Nancy Grazzini-Olson

Lisa Diehl

**Design Team Present**

Michael Schroeder

Scott Davidson

Peter Sussman

**Council Members Present**

Mayor Hovland

Joni Bennett

Mary Brindle

**Others Present**

Linda Lorenz

Richard Borland

Robb Gruman

**Introduction**

Chair Staunton opened the meeting and referred to the Agenda Topics; 1. Review Principles and Visual and Finalize and 2. Approval of the Minutes.

Mr. Davidson said what the group needs to remember is that the Principles are intended to be broad without too many details.

Chair Staunton asked the group to discuss/comment on each of the Guiding Principles:

### **Comments/discussion Principle 1.**

Guiding Principle 1.

**“Leverage publicly-owned parcels and civic presence to create a vibrant and connected public realm that serves as a catalyst for high quality, integrated private development.”**

Chair Staunton asked if there are any changes that need to be made on Principle 1.

Ms. Montgomery said in her opinion the words “public and” should be added after “integrated” and before “private development”. Ms. Montgomery suggested that Principle 1 read: “Leverage publicly-owned parcels and civic presence to create a vibrant and connected public realm that serves as a catalyst for high quality, integrated *public and* private development. She said it is important to note that this area includes public spaces. The group agreed noting redevelopment of both the private/public properties opens up the opportunities for both.

A brief discussion further continued on the use of the words “public realm” with the group recommending that public realm be changed to read “*district*”.

Chair Staunton read back corrected Principle 1.

**“Leverage publicly-owned parcels and civic presence to create a vibrant and connected district that serves as a catalyst for high quality, integrated public and private development.”** Members agreed with those changes.

### **Comments/discussion Principle 2.**

Guiding Principle 2

**“Enhance the District’s economic viability as a neighborhood center with regional connections recognizing that meeting the needs of both businesses and residents will make the district a good place to do business.”**

A discussion ensued with the group in general consensus that this principle could be divided into two separate statements; an a and b.

Chair Staunton read back corrected Principle 2 as Principle 2. a & b.

**2.**

**a. Enhance the District's economic viability as a neighborhood center with regional connections.**

**b. Recognize that meeting the needs of both businesses and residents will make the district a good place to do business.** Members agreed with those changes.

### **Comments/discussion Principle 3.**

Guiding Principle 3

**“Turn perceived barriers into opportunities by layering development over supporting infrastructure and taking advantage of the natural topography of the area.”**

A lengthy discussion ensued on Principle 3; specifically on the words *layering* and *barriers* and on what those two words represent/indicate/mean to people reading this principle. It was suggested that if CAT members are worried about varying interpretations or that people may read too much into each principle that maybe a brief statement/annotation from each CAT member on what each principle means to them could be added under each principle. No further action was taken on including statements/annotation under each principle. After further discussion it was suggested that the word *by*, be removed and replaced with *consider*.

Chair Staunton read back corrected Principle 3.

**“Turn perceived barriers into opportunities. Consider layering development over supporting infrastructure and taking advantage of the natural topography of the area.”**

### **Comments/discussion Principle 4.**

Guiding Principle 4

**“Design for the present and the future by pursuing logical increments of change using key parcels as stepping stones to a more vibrant, walkable, functional, attractive, and life-filled place.”**

No changes were made to Principle 4.

Chair Staunton read back Principle 4 as submitted:

**“Design for the present and the future by pursuing logical increments of change using key parcels as stepping stones to a more vibrant, walkable, functional, attractive, and life-filled place.”**

#### **Comments/discussion Principle 5.**

Guiding Principle 5

**“Organize parking as an effective resource for the district by linking community parking to public and private destinations while also providing parking that is convenient for businesses and customers.”**

A discussion ensued with suggestions of changes to the phrasing of the sentence; however no changes were recommended to Principle 5.

Chair Staunton read back Principle 5 as submitted:

**“Organize parking as an effective resource for the district by linking community parking to public and private destinations while also providing parking that is convenient for businesses and customers.”**

#### **Comments/discussion Principle 6.**

Guiding Principle 6

**“Improve movement within and access to the district for people of all ages by facilitating multiple modes of transportation.”**

A discussion ensued focusing on the importance of the rail line and how to ensure that people reading these principles would know that “multiple modes” of transportation includes the rail line. It was suggested that *an access to* be removed and that language pertaining to the rail corridor be added.

Commissioner Staunton read back corrected Principle 6.

**“Improve movement within the district for people of all ages by facilitating multiple modes of transportation, and preserve future opportunities provided by the existing rail corridor.”**

#### **Comments/discussion Principle 7.**

Guiding Principle 7.

**“Create an identity and unique sense of place that incorporates natural spaces into a high quality and sustainable development reflecting Edina’s progressive and innovative development heritage.”**

A discussion ensued on the word progressive and how that word is understood. It was suggested that the words "*progressive and*" be eliminated.

Chair Staunton read back corrected Principle 7.

**"Create an identity and unique sense of place that incorporates natural spaces into a high quality and sustainable development reflecting Edina's innovative development heritage."**

It was noted that the 7 Principles are conceptual and subject to change as time goes on.

Chair Staunton called for a vote to approve the changes to the 7 Guiding Principles.

**Mr. Hedberg moved to accept and approve the Seven Guiding Principles of the Public Works Site Small Area Guide. Mr. Persha seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried.**

#### **Approval of the minutes:**

The minutes of the April 12, 2010 Public Works Site Small Area Guide Process were approved (m/Diehl s/Brown) and filed with the following changes/additions noted:

- Eliminate using the word "Commissioner" when referring to members of the Planning Commission.
- Correct the spelling of Larry Chestler's name.
- Add to the attendance Gene Persha, Nancy Grazzini-Olson, Linda Odell and Bob Shaddock.
- Add pg. 1. Developers introduced themselves and noted that they are Edina residents who work in the development field.
- Add pg. 2. Mr. Beard stated that the railroad track divides area. It is hard to make connections. Light rail will likely change everything. It will create greater traffic at the beginning and end of the day. Parking should be incorporated into the development. Topography is a real challenge. If the City is going to make the site a commercial entity, it is going to take a high level of public support; this site is going to take a significant amount of dollars to give incentive to developers.
- Add pg. 2. Ms. Montgomery asked about studying traffic in the area and the potential impact of light rail on traffic.
- Add pg. 2., Mr. Beard stated that rail doesn't generally traffic but allows more in. Traffic must be dealt with; maybe infrastructure must be upgraded to accommodate uses. He said that parking is always a limiter; citizens are still married to cars. You can't squeeze parking. The main

considerations are; A. parking B. density, if you go 4-stories, why not go 10? If you put in medical office space you need to make sure that you have 5-stalls per 1000 square feet of building space.

- Add pg. 2. Mr. Nanne stated that housing and medical may work. The bigger picture is to rework the traffic pattern.
- Add pg. 3. Mr. Beard stated that this site should be used as a catalyst for future development. He cited the Hopkins Bike Trail next to the railroad line as being a highly successful example of a similar situation. He said we should leverage this property to build our strengths. He also said that developers looking at the property think 1 to 3 years out only reacting to the market today. They do not look out at the long-term for property like this.
- Add pg. 3. Ms. Odell cautioned that in any decision making they should be mindful of the existing businesses. She further stated that Edina Family Physicians has enjoyed a competitive advantage because they are not linked to any hospital or specialty group and can refer to anyone.
- Add pg. 3. Mr. Brown suggested that the City take advantage of the assets it already has. He said that whatever we can do to leverage the rail lines will help area businesses.
- Add pg. 4. A sentence. Mr. Williamson asked what market value the City sees for development of the public works site and what is the time frame?
- Add pg. 4. Ms. Montgomery said that she believes a study was done by the League of Women's voters that found that the City lacked indoor recreational space. Mr. Sprague noted that it was conducted by the Park and Recreation Department, not the League of Women Voters.

The minutes of the April 14, 2010 Public Works Site Small Area Guide Process were approved (m/Odell s/Hedberg) and filed with the following changes/additions noted:

- Correct the spelling of Nancy Grazzini-Olson.
- Change Brian H. to Brian Hedberg.
- Include Greg Domke as attending.
- Add pg. 2. Ms. Odell said their major issue is that they are landlocked, and parking and circulation, for both sites, is problematic.
- Add pg. 2. End of paragraph beginning with Jim Baisch: He said that he would like to see a parking in at least a portion of the current public works space.
- Add pg. 2. End of paragraph beginning with Eric Bredeson: Downtown Excelsior where they have a second location is much more pedestrian friendly.
- Pg. 2. Spell out OLG: Our Lady of Grace. Add in same paragraph He would like to see the area as a town center.
- Pg. 2. Identify Washburn McReavy as a Funeral Home.
- Pg. 3. Add after Create more...Parking is an issue for some area merchants at this time.

- Add pg. 3. After Acknowledge that....create a park in the current public works space.
- Add pf. 3. After Peyton Robb, Mr. Robb stated that the school district asked if it could be a co-owner on the Con-Agra site. He said that although it hadn't been formally studied, he thought the bus garage the bus garage could have moved to the southwest quadrant without a transportation problem. Ms. Worthington responded that it didn't work out to have the City share that facility, but that the City had approached the school district on numerous occasions and the school district did not want to fund a relocation of the facility. The City moved forward with the Con-Agra site because it needed to move the facilities, but that site was not large enough to accommodate both facilities (public works./bus garage).
- Pg. 5. Change Mr. Rofidal questioned to inquire about.
- Pg. 6. Add the following: Ms. Montgomery asked about having the City Council connected to the small area guide process to ensure that they are fully informed. Mr. Staunton responded that there was a conscious plan to keep the two separate as having members of the Council in the meetings could change the tenor of the process.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 pm