

MEETING NOTES
Grandview Small Area Guide Plan Process
Thursday, August 18, 2011, 6:00 – 9:00 PM
Edina Senior Center

Staff Present:

Cary Teague
Kris Aaker

Steering Committee Present:

Sue Davison
Andy Brown
Peter Susman
Britt Dornblaser
David Davison
Dick Crockett
Jim Smith
Richard Borland
Thomas Raeuchle
Peter Susman
Greg Domke
Terry Ahlstrom
Bernie Beaver
Joni Bennett
Ellen Jones

Executive Committee Present:

Kevin Staunton
Chris Rofidal
Lisa Deihl
Larry Chestler
Collin Bredeson

Consultants Present:

Mike Lamb/Cunningham
Jack Broz/HR Green
Antonio Rosell/Cmtty Design
Bruce Jacobson/Close
Tony Schertler/Springsted

I. Welcome

Kevin Staunton welcomed everyone and had everyone introduce themselves.

Mr. Staunton explained that over the past couple of weeks the Executive Committee has interviewed and chosen area consultants to collaborate on the Grandview Small Area Plan. Upon choosing the “Team” Mr. Staunton indicated that the Executive Committee worked with the team to devise a work plan that is the topic of review for this evenings’ Steering Committee meeting. Mr. Staunton went on to introduce Bruce

Jacobson and Mike Lamb with Close and Cunningham groups who will lead with the Land Use, Community Needs and Public Realm piece. Jack Broz with WSB and Antonio Rosell with the Community Design Group were introduced and will lead in the Transportation realm. Anthony Schertler with Springsted will lead the Finance and Market Analysis piece.

II. Introduce Team

Mr. Staunton had each of the consultants introduce themselves and indicate background information.

Mike Lamb with the Cunningham group stated that currently Grandview is a collection of parking lots and buildings with public and private players that need to be engaged to assess opportunities and redevelopment targets. He indicated that it is good to have Tony Schertler on board to maintain a sense of reality in what can be done given a cost benefit analysis. Mr. Lamb is impressed with the community based planning that has been occurring and believes the team will be able to work well with the Steering Committee and stake holders for the future vision of Grandview.

Bruce Jacobson with Close Landscape Architecture appreciates the amount of community engagement thus far and is excited to continue this engagement. He believes that the process has been a brilliant way to get things done. He indicated that all players on the team know each other and have competed against but have also worked with each other. Mr. Jacobson stated that the community process is not a foreign language to this group and that Grandview will truly be an example of community based planning. Mr. Jacobson stated that the team appreciates the role of the Steering Committee and it's the team's job to keep the momentum going as a partner to the Committee.

Mr. Jacobson commented that he has heard a lot of people say that they use Grandview for goods and services, that people stop in for their needs, but don't stay in Grandview. Mr. Jacobson wants to know what would compel someone to stay in Grandview.

Mr. Antonio Rosell with Community Design Group indicated that he has enjoyed the unique approach that was taken for application, interviews and the scoping session process. He believes that the approach is very engaging. Mr. Rosell sees great potential for the Grandview area regarding the possibilities for connectivity within a civic and cultural core.

Tony Schertler with Springsted stated that he is an attorney that works for the public sector side of the equation. He indicated that the group will need to go through a cost benefit analysis of the seven guiding principles. The Grandview area will need to be identified from a city stand point, if the community is a "buyer" or "seller" in the area. Is the community prepared for and do they have the resources to entice and attract the kind of development desired. Will the city/community provide financial incentives to

develop in the way planned, or is the area so attractive that a business desires to locate in the area and developers want to redevelop in the plan area without the need for incentives? Is the plan, the area and the city so attractive that it's a draw without the need for community incentives? Mr. Schertler stated that part of his role is to determine how a plan affects a city financially in an environment of diminishing resources. His role will be to look at the cost/benefits of proposed community assets. Mr. Schertler stated that the group will need to find a way to measure success of their goals. He went on to add that any proposed community and civic resource for the area must be measured. It will need to be determined if public resources proposed generate a net benefit given the added costs carried by the city and if so will these new amenities accomplish a public good.

Jack Broz with HR Green indicated that the transportation piece needs to be context sensitive and meshed with land use, community needs and the public realm. Mr. Broz tapped into some of what Mr. Schertler was saying by indicating that the plan needs to be irresistible in order to attract private investment. He shared that the area holds many challenges in terms of barriers and topography.

III. Approval of proposed Work Plan

Kevin Staunton stated that the Steering Committee still owns the process and that they are handing a baton, so to speak, to the consultants to grab and run along with them to finish the process together. Mr. Staunton indicated that the Steering Committee needs to determine how they make the "baton" their work plan to work together. Mr. Staunton further stated that the Committee must decide how they make sure everyone who wants to, can participate. Mr. Staunton also mentioned that the Steering Committee needs to identify what the deliverable will be. Mr. Staunton stressed that some form of written document is necessary so that it may be adopted as part of the Comprehensive Plan.

Discussion went on regarding what product will be produced in the process. What form will the product take? It was indicated that it should not just be a document that sits on the shelf. It was discussed as a vision piece, something that perhaps could be fluid and change. The possibility of a computer generated three dimensional model was discussed and/or a summary for the community, a pull-out brochure piece or a video that can be viewed on cable TV.

Discussion went on regarding how the group can get the right people at the table. It was indicated that help will be needed with priorities. It was stated that there is a need for constant collaboration. The guide plan needs to be a vision piece that captures the imagination of Edinians and represents to the community and provides a sense of place.

Mr. Staunton referenced an e-mail received by the Committee members from Kim Montgomery, one of the Executive Committee members who was not able to attend the meeting. Mr. Staunton acknowledged three concerns that Ms. Montgomery raised for Committee comment. The first concern was regarding the possibility of a mix of day and night meetings. Meeting schedule times were discussed by the group and it was stressed that the workshop meeting days will be open for focus group meeting times and public meeting times. It was indicated that possibly a number of public meetings could be held on the same day, sort of a looping meeting that can have earlier and then later start times. The consultants indicated that they are relying on the Steering Committee to get the word out about the meetings and that they will need to assemble the focus groups to be interviewed by the Consultants and Steering Committee members.

Mr. Staunton stated that another concern of Ms. Montgomery was the participation of developers and when they should be allowed into the process. In response, the consultants indicated that they wouldn't be asking anything more or less of developers than they would of any other focus group. The consultants want the Steering Committee to benefit from all perspectives from all focus groups and to ask developers what has worked for them in other communities and what hasn't worked for them as well and why. The developers would simply be another focus group to gain insight on their perspective on projects they have done in other communities. The goal wouldn't be to find out what they think should be put in Grandview, but to ask what has worked in other communities and why it has or for that matter if it hasn't worked well, why it hasn't. The consultants stated that the Steering Committee should have the up-front benefit of hearing from as many stake holders and interested parties as possible and not conduct the process in any sort of vacuum. It will then be up to the Steering Committee to discuss, weigh and decide how the input from focus groups and stake holders apply to and become integrated into the plan.

Mr. Staunton indicated that Ms. Montgomery also had concerns regarding the wording in Part II, Draft Plan Summary and Part III, Plan Summary and that wording should be replaced with "Public Realm". The consultants agreed that it would be an appropriate change given the Comprehensive Plan Language and how things have been referred to in the past.

It was mentioned that the Sun Current is the most widely used source to find local information by Edina residents. The Sun Current will be used more heavily going forward.

Mr. Greg Domke moved approval of the work plan as proposed. Mr. Richard Borland seconded the motion. All members of the Steering Committee voted aye.

Concluding, Staunton said the Executive Committee will be meeting with City Council at a workshop session on August 30, 2011, to discuss the work plan and progress since the last time they met with them. The work plan will be on the City Council agenda on Sept. 6, 2011 for their official approval.

VII. Adjournment.

The meeting adjourned at 9:23 PM

Kris Aaker
Respectfully submitted