



## REPORT/RECOMMENDATION

<b>To:</b> MAYOR AND COUNCIL	<b>Agenda Item</b> <u>IX. A.</u>
<b>From:</b> DEBRA MANGEN CITY CLERK	<input type="checkbox"/> Action
<b>Date:</b> APRIL 17, 2012	<input type="checkbox"/> Discussion
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information
<b>Subject:</b> CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED AFTER PACKETS	

**INFORMATION/BACKGROUND:** Attached is correspondence received after the packets were delivered to you.

April 15, 2012

Mr. Wayne Houle  
4801 W. 50<sup>th</sup> Street  
Edina, MN 55424

Dear Mr. Houle,

I had composed a very detailed letter that suggested you consider an alternative to the newly-approved sidewalk on the south side of Creek Valley School property. However, I've recently watched a TV replay of the April 3rd City Council meeting and am now sending you a different letter.

The suggestion had to do with considering a "cut-out" on Creek Valley Road similar to the one on Valley View Road at the high school and middle school that is heavily used for student drop-off or pick-up. That cut-out does keep parked cars off of Valley View Road so that cars can pass by, and I thought something similar might be beneficial to the traffic issues on Creek Valley Road.

However, after watching the replay of the Council meeting when the Creek Valley sidewalk was approved, I have a different view. Council members made good-to-hear comments about how parking on public streets for student drop-off or pick-up is not approved and should surely be discouraged.....with signage or public information or other means available. I realized that my suggestion about a "cut-out" instead of a sidewalk would, in fact, only facilitate and encourage improper behavior.

That improper behavior has existed and continues to exist on Creek Valley Road, particularly at the close of school days. As it is now, two cars going in opposite directions cannot pass each other when other cars are dropping off or waiting for Creek Valley students. If, however, the Council truly means to do everything possible to prevent cars from stopping or parking in the street on the south side of Creek Valley School, that would be good. It might even diminish dangers to bikers using the Gleason Road sidewalk to get to school by eliminating cars for them to maneuver through.

Those student bikers who use the Gleason Road sidewalk to get to school have, for many years, AVOIDED the intersection of Gleason and Creek Valley by cutting across private property on the corner and going down the street to the large concrete area on school property that leads to bike racks. It can probably safely be assumed that this pattern of behavior will continue, despite the existence of a sidewalk. I don't believe any accidents have occurred, but many do see this situation as an accident waiting to happen. And, if bikers and walkers DO intermix on the new sidewalk (either going to or leaving school), that might become problematic. Time will tell.

I'd also like to point out that there are a number of large events that take place at Creek Valley School yearly that create a traffic nightmare for our neighborhood, at least for drivers exiting or entering on Creek Valley Rd. During those large events, cars are

parked on both sides of the street and, again, no two cars going in opposite directions could pass each other. It is sometimes necessary for one car to pull into someone's driveway on the south side of the street in order to allow the other car to proceed in one direction before returning to the street to get home. I don't know if this situation exists because the school parking lots are full (my guess would be no) or if it's done for simple convenience (my guess is yes) which, of course, causes inconvenience for others. It is true that this scenario happens only a few times a year, but it is a problem - about which, I suspect, nothing could be done.

I'm reasonably confident that people in Valley Estates would greatly appreciate any and all means the City would use to stop the inappropriate parking of cars on Creek Valley Road south of Creek Valley School, and I'd guess they'd agree that the most direct, clear, and permanent method would be to install signage on that side of the street. I'd also be reasonably confident that everyone would hope that action will be approved very soon and, subsequently, be included in the street reconstruction project itself.

Sincerely,



Mrs. Eugene Nord  
6425 Nordic Circle  
Edina, MN 55439

cc: City Council Members  
Mayor James B. Hovland  
Joni Bennett  
Mary Brindle  
Josh Sprague  
Ann Swenson

1/5/12

5008 W. 56<sup>th</sup> St.  
Edina, MN 55436

Edina City Council;

Enclosed is a copy of the letter I sent to you on 6/6/11.

I had and still have the expectation of a reply.

I am requesting that you read and respond to my concerns outlined in the 6/6/11 letter.

Sincerely,

Jill Emanuel

4/12/12

5008 W. 56<sup>th</sup> St.  
Edina, MN 55436

Ms. Bennett;

Enclosed is a copy of the letter which I have submitted twice to the City Council. As of yet, I have had no response. I was informed by a neighbor recently that you had addressed my letter at a recent City Council meeting.

I am currently awaiting a response to my original concern.

Thank you for attention to this matter.

Jill Emanuel

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Jill Emanuel". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "J" and a long, sweeping underline.

6/6/11

5008 W. 56<sup>th</sup> St  
Edina, MN 55436

Edina City Council  
James Hovland  
Joni Bennett  
Mary Brindle  
Josh Sprague  
Ann Swenson

Edina City Hall  
4801 W. 50<sup>th</sup> St.  
Edina, MN 55424

This past Sunday, 6/5/11, several cars on the street where I live were cited in violation of City Code:

Section 1400.10  
Subd. 7 **Limited Parking Zones.**

B. Six Hour Parking. No person in charge of any vehicle shall park or permit the vehicle to stand upon any street or highway for more than six consecutive hours, unless otherwise designated on erected and installed signs. This paragraph shall not apply to vehicles used by persons while such persons are present and actively engaged in services performed on the premises of others, such as painting, home construction or repair, installation of appliances, cleaning, or fumigating.

D. Shifting of Parked Vehicle. To regulate limited parking, any vehicle moved a distance of not more than three tenths of a mile during the limited parking period shall be deemed to have remained stationary.

The majority of the cars cited belong to the homeowners. We were all surprised as not a single neighbor I talked to was aware of this regulation. I have lived in Edina for a total of 36 years, and most of my neighbors are also long time residents.

My concern over this issue is that the city of Edina has not made it known to the majority of residents about the 6 hour limited parking. Why does the city choose to enforce such a little known regulation without first informing home owners if they are in violation and give them the chance to correct it and/or learn the regulation, as is done when a home owner is in violation of a city code involving "nuisances" on their property?

The officer writing out the "tickets" explained that the cars on our block were being ticketed as a complaint had been issued. It is very hard for us residents to understand that cars, less than ¼ block away, can park for a length of time longer than 6 hours. My neighbors and myself are being required to follow a set of rules that the majority of Edina residents do not have to.

Along with responding to the above stated concerns, I would also like to have you respond to the following questions.

At times in the future, I will be having family members, (along with my 2 children who are home from college and have their own cars), staying at my house. They will be overnight guests, and there will be more cars at my home that can not fit in my driveway. What are practical solutions for this, as this is a common occurrence for many of the families living on my block?

As cited in the code, for a car to be considered "moved" it has to be moved a distance of more than 3/10 of a mile. On Sunday, my brother-in-law's car was parked on the street in front of my house and his tires had been marked. Around noon, he took his car and ran several errands. He returned home about an hour later. He observed the officer ticketing cars, so he spoke briefly with the officer. He questioned if he would receive a ticket as he had moved his car, yet he was planning on parking his car on the street directly in front of my house where it had been when the tires were marked. The officer recommended that he park in the driveway. My question is, could he have been ticketed as he had moved the car, and had been gone for at least an hour, and he had moved it for a total of much more than the 3/10 mile. Would he have received a ticket if he had returned to the same general area and the police officer did not know that that car had been driven? Also, does the "clock" start again after the first 6 hours? After that first 6-hour violation, can the car be parked on the street...does the "clock" start again at that time for a 6-hour time frame?

In conclusion, I feel as if my neighbors and I are being targeted/harassed by a neighbor. If only a specific area is being held accountable, and it is only due to one complaining neighbor, I view this as a form of harassment.

Thank you for attention to this matter and I look forward to hearing your response to my questions and concerns.

Sincerely,

Jill Emanuel

April 17, 2012

Mayor Hovland  
City Council Members

The attached Position Paper was developed by a group of property owners who, with the assistance of Wayne Houle, have participated in discussions re the many facets of this project. Several members of the group will be in attendance tonight to answer any questions.

Some of the property owners who participated in the Position Paper include:

Jim & Tom Nelson (Edina Realty Bldg)  
Jenifer Kent (Lund's Properties)  
Richard Curtin (Salut)  
Klaus Freyinger (Chico's)  
Shelly Englesma & Mitch Worley (Spalon Montage)  
Gene Haugland (5000 France)

## POSITION\_PAPER

Deliver To:

Mayor Hovland  
City Council Members

**We concur** with the recommendations of Staff on the need for Parking Structure and Streetscape Improvements. Specifically, we support:

- The vehicle counting and guidance system in all three ramps
- The need for rebuilding the Middle Ramp
- The upgrading and restoration of the South Ramp as outlined in the staff recommendation
- The Streetscape Improvements

**Our concerns are:**

The details of the financing and cost to the owners, tenants and customers at 50<sup>th</sup> and France. We do not object to an assessment that is paid over a 20 year period and which averages \$2.00 per square foot per year. We are concerned about the timing of the payments. We suggest:

- The first assessment payment should not be due until one year after construction is completed
- To achieve the average per year assessment of \$2.00 per square foot, the assessment payments should not be level or decreasing, but rather increasing. We suggest that the first assessment payment is 50% of the average per square foot assessment and the last assessment is 150% of the average (\$1.00/SF the first year; \$3.00/SF the last year)
- The \$2.00 per square foot average assessment is based on a Total Project Cost of \$11,969,858. If the Total Project Cost is less than \$12,000,000, we believe the assessment should be reduced by a proportionate amount.

Timing of construction, availability of alternative parking and traffic management during construction are issues critical to the sustainability of businesses at 50<sup>th</sup>& France. We are particularly concerned about any negative impact during the October-January time period and during the Art Fair. We prefer disruption to be confined to the months January – May. We would like to work with the City to achieve this goal

The design details on the façade are of concern and we would like the opportunity to work with the City on achieving the best possible appearance

The new Middle Ramp is higher than the existing ramp. This increased height requires particular attention to how it can be designed to minimize any negative impact on surrounding properties. We would like the opportunity to work with the City on this issue.

April 12, 2012

To: James Hovland, Mayor

Scott Neal, City Manager

Edina City Council Members

Carey Teague, City Planning Department

Floyd Grabel, Edina Planning Commission

John Keprios, Edina Parks & Recreation Department

From: Linda and Bill Roberts

7420 Edinborough Way #6306

Edina, MN 55435

(952) 221-2155

[lindatroberts@gmail.com](mailto:lindatroberts@gmail.com)

Re: Edinborough Park

We are residents of the Village Homes at Centennial Lakes. We're very concerned that the City is considering converting Edinborough Park's pool, track, and fitness center into a space exclusively for very young children and families. Please consider our thoughts on this issue:

- We support maintaining the Park as a mixed-use and mixed-age facility. City Council member, Mary Brindle, recently said "A big mistake is departing from the park's original purpose" (a mixed-use area). The creation of a long-term vision and strategic plan for the space is critical.
- We would like to see the Park do a better job of "living within their means" by reducing operating expenses, including salaries & benefits, rather than taxpayers having to pay higher property taxes. We object to a public facility, sustained largely by taxpayer dollars, being forced to break even or, worse, generate a profit. Perhaps the park should be renamed "Edinborough Profit Center."
- We object to the City ripping up beautiful mature trees and plants that, after all, make it a "park," to make way for hard surfaces.

- We strongly support privatizing of all aspects of the Park's operations.
- The Park is in serious need of more aggressive marketing to reach potential users, who either are unaware of the facility or misunderstand what it has to offer. With a degree in marketing and 30+ years of experience, I (Linda) have witnessed for years the "non-marketing" of this wonderful facility. Again, privatization may take care of this.
- Like other communities and businesses in Centennial Lakes, we have been fortunate to utilize Edinborough Park facilities with no extra charges. However, in addition to property taxes paid by the 250 units in our condominium community, we pay a \$15.00 Park Service Fee each and every month, as part of our Association dues. For us, this translates into \$2,340 to-date for our condo alone. Should the facilities we enjoy be lost, can we assume our monthly Park Service Fee will go away as well?
- We're in favor of free park access for Edina residents and a per visit fee for non-Edina residents.
- Nowhere has it been mentioned whether Ballard King/ATS&R has a winning track record for this specific park "solution." A solution that has increased park utilization, revenue flow and has received positive community feedback. This is Due Diligence 101. The consultants need to show the City balance sheets of their successes. Have you checked their references (talked to the residents/ users of those projects)?

This is more than just a financial issue. It's about the quality of life and health. It's about showing respect for the diversity of ages and lifestyles in our community. It's about ethics: the City breaking its commitment to its citizens by altering public space that excludes a large segment of people. And it's about the loss of a re-sale benefit, i.e. promoting Park amenities to potential buyers.

We would appreciate a prompt resolution to this issue and strongly encourage you to consider our position and abandon the Ballard King/ATS&R recommendations. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Linda and William Roberts

Dear City Council and Mayor,

I write to you tonight that we have been informed through several conversations that Steve Devich planned informational session at Oak Grove Lutren Church will not include Pillsbury Commons housing project. Why we dropped these packages on your door way is several reasons.

The Obtainable Housing Committee (OHC) which has ties with the Richfield Community Council, which is sanctioned by Richfield city council to advise Richfield city council, and is an activist organization that meets at that church. We are in a section 42 housing dispute that is being built by Ron Clark Construction. Ron Clark has several people from OHC claiming he is doing right for the people of Richfield by building a 100% Section 42 housing unit with 21 units possible used for Section 8. Hope you had some time to read the package I left with you about this impact it would have on Richfield.

We see this as a bigger picture. We see that the city of Richfield is the door mat for your work force. What Richfield has become is a bed room community for your workforce. Ron Clark is a great citizen of your community, after all you named a GIFT Shop after him and his wife. You see I can not find one Home less shelter named after him nor one other section 42 building he is profiting from.

As I said we are now Looking at Edina about Richfield housing issues. We would like to work with you. Trust me when we say we are looking out side of this box as why Richfield is becoming a bed room community of your poverty. The next time you interface with Ron Clark ask him to donate, on his next section 42 project, 100% of the profit to the residents children tuition at Normandale College or Fish and Loafs.

Thank You and Best Regards,  
Barry LeBlanc

P.S. Richfield went on U Tube with the last special session: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9AsvxxvgnGU>  
You might want to watch the other follow  
on: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cbCUqYBicqU&feature=relmfu>

On Sun, Apr 8, 2012 at 11:22 PM, Richfield Minnesota <[richfieldminnesota@gmail.com](mailto:richfieldminnesota@gmail.com)> wrote:  
Happy Easter,

Please allow me to introduce myself and also Richfield Commoners United (RCU). I am sorry to have disturbed your Easter Sunday with a package that was left on your door step today. It was getting late and the package was not delivered to Ms. Brindel and we hope one will be delivered on Monday.

In this package is a history of the past fliers we have and are circulating in Richfield. We are hoping to start a dialog with you the city elected about Section 42 housing- LIHTC. We have been forced-as a group to start informing churches as what RCU and a overwhelming amount of Richfield citizens want, because the city of Richfield has sanctioned City Manager Steve Devich to speak at Oak Grove Lutheran church next Sunday at 930AM. Steve Devich will be talking about Pillsbury Commons as the church was informed today during EASTER morning mass.

The package I dropped off is one of the examples of what we are about to go region wide in the near future. We decided to drop this package off just in case you start receiving phone calls and can respond to whom we are.

One thing you will find about RCU is all we want is a open and honest conversation. We will inform you when we drop our leaflets. We want to be fact responsible so we will start asking questions. We have met with Steve Elkins, the Metropolitan Council Rep for our district. He also brought along two other people; Phyllis Hill Lead Organizer for ISAIAH a National faith based coalition for working on economic and racial equity; Chip Halbach, Executive Director, Minnesota Housing Partnership. You were in our thoughts.

I can honesty tell you we are fans of your on line council meetings that are posted. You have an excellent web site to engage EDINA citizens. <http://edinacitizenengagement.org/grandview/>.

We lack this in Richfield. For reasons I am told. I want to thank you and we look forward to our next conversation.

Best Regards

Barry LeBlanc  
Member of RCU

4/13/12

To: Mayor Hovland and Edina City Council Members

From: Jackie Whitbeck

6128 Brookview Ave

Edina, MN 55424

Re: Proposed subdivision of 6120 Brookview Avenue.

I wish to state my respectful opposition to the proposed subdivision of 6120 Brookview Avenue, and to the associated request for a variance. Dividing this property will not create affordable housing, will have a negative impact on the neighborhood, is not in harmony with the current 75 foot minimum lot size and does not comply with Minnesota statutes and Edina city ordinances.

Minnesota Statute section 462.375, sub division 6 (2) states “Variances may be granted when the applicant for the variance establishes that there are practical difficulties in complying with the zoning ordinance. ‘Practical difficulties’ as used in connection with the granting of a variance means that the property owner proposes to use the property in a reasonable manor not permitted by the zoning ordinance; the plight of the landowner is due to circumstances unique to the property not created by the land owner; and the variance will not alter the essential character of the locality.”

Cary Teague in his opposition to a recent subdivision on Brookview Ave, stated “The action or request by the applicant to subdivide the property causes the practical difficulty. The request to subdivide the lot causes the need for variances therefore, the practical difficulties are self - created.” The situation here is similar. The applicant’s need for a variance from the 75 foot frontage requirement has arisen solely because the applicant proposes to subdivide an already conforming lot and create two nonconforming lots. I cannot conceive of a clearer example of a self-created hardship. For this reason alone I believe the applicant’s request for variance, and associated subdivision should be denied.

If the property is subdivided as proposed, a very drastic change will be wrought upon the essential character of the neighborhood. The applicant’s representatives have stated to others that the existing home at 6120 Brookview Ave (which was apparently sold for \$849,000) is a model for the new construction. This is a very large home. This neighborhood currently consists of more modest cottage style homes of one and a half story, located in a wooded setting, and selling in the 200 - 300 thousand dollar range. This will alter the essential character of the neighborhood. The home this applicant already built on the property is a poster child for poor development.

The very nature of a variance is that each property is unique in its characteristics and that the application of the zoning ordinance should be reviewed in light of the unique characteristics of that property. That is, each variance is by nature a de novo review. Precedent has no bearing in a variance case, except in the helpful guidance a prior example may provide. The council is not bound by prior precedent. The question is not what has the City done before, but rather what is unique about this property that requires the commission to waive the usual application of our development code and create two nonconforming lots from one conforming lot. I see no such uniqueness in this property.

The planning commission has previously stated that a similar request for subdivision would restore the neighborhood to its original intent of 50 foot plots. Whose intent would this be? Not the City’s! I would like to draw your attention to city ordinance 850 .07 subdivision 20 B. 4, which states that: “If a non - conforming lot or parcel is, or at any time since October 22, 1951, has been, held in common ownership with all or part of an adjoining

or abutting parcel or lot which together comply with, or come close to complying with the minimum width, depth, area, and lot width to perimeter ratio, requirements of this Section, then such non-conforming lot or parcel and such adjoining or abutting parcel or lot shall be considered as one lot and **shall not be decreased in size below such minimum requirements.**” It is the City's policy, indeed requirement, to create conforming lots out of nonconforming lots. Indeed, in the 350 foot radius surrounding the proposed subdivision, 25% of the lots are greater than 50 feet (our own home, which predates subdivision, consists of three lots). The City’s intent is for there to be 75 foot lots, and where possible to combine nonconforming lots into conforming lots. The applicant however, proposes the opposite, he would create nonconforming lots out of a conforming lot. This is turning prior City policy on its head.

At a recent meeting of the planning commission, it was pointed out by Commissioner Forrest that the 850.07 sub 20 B,4 ordinance had not previously been a part of their discussion. And when considering this code, it is a clear statement of intent with very strong wording as to what the city wants. Also noted was the fact that "code trumps plat".

The severe negative impact a subdivision would have on our us and our neighbors who have owned our properties for decades is beyond comprehension. We and others purchased our property in good faith based on city codes at the time. We deserve the utmost consideration. As neighbors to the property in question, we do not want this subdivision. This subdivision and variance will not be for the greater good, but will only put more money in one developer’s pocket. Edina city ordinance 850.04 subd. 2 paragraph F basically says that the applicant must have a favorable finding on all criteria for approval. This simply cannot be done in this case. No special benefits should be given to this applicant. In compliance with Minnesota statutes and Edina ordinances this application should be denied.

Respectfully,

Jackie Whitbeck

April 16, 2012

Mayor and Edina City Council Members  
4801 West 50<sup>th</sup> Street  
Edina, MN 55424

Re: 50<sup>th</sup> and France Parking Structures

Dear Mayor and Council Members

Parasole Restaurant Holdings, Inc. owns and operates four restaurants and employs more than 300 people in the city of Edina. We have been doing business in Edina since 1978. We have been involved in some but not all of the "owners" meetings relating to parking ramp projects and thought it might be useful to state our position on the projects. We agree that there is a need and support the efforts to create additional parking and upgrade the parking ramps although we have some serious concerns.

- We support the concept of tearing down the middle ramp and reconstructing it with six levels of parking and dedicating the top level as contract parking
- We support refurbishing the south ramp including repairs to the parking deck, lighting upgrades, painting, reconstruction of the northeast and center stair and installation of two elevators, one in the northeast corner and one in the center of the ramp to connect to the pedestrian walkway between the Salut building and the Haugland building. This should be the primary pedestrian access to France Avenue and can be enhanced to create an aesthetically pleasing meander between the parking facility and France Avenue. The walkway proposed off of the northeast elevator/stair through the Haugland property does not provide access to France Avenue except by using a service driveway which is not a safe or desirable method of access
- The 100% cost pass through to owners (and their tenants) continues to be a concern. While some leases for smaller spaces may be "gross" leases, we suspect that most of the commercial leases are "net" leases and the assessment will pass immediately and directly to the tenants. It is fair for the 23 property owners (and their tenants) comprising the special services district to pay a portion of the cost of the parking ramp improvements; it is unfair for them to bear the full burden. A robust and healthy 50<sup>th</sup> and France commercial district is an asset and benefit to the entire city. A meaningful portion of the cost should be paid by the city and disbursed over a wider tax base
- It will require a significant increase in sales and revenue to offset the increased occupancy cost resulting from the assessment pass through. At best, the parking improvements will only incrementally increase sales, if at all. The benefit really needs to be viewed as sustaining and maintaining existing sales volumes. This will be further aggravated by the loss of customers due to diminished parking and chaos during the construction process. Disrupted customer habits could take as long as two years to reestablish after completion of the projects
- Given the foregoing, we suggest the assessment be deferred and not start until 12 months after completion of the last phase and that the assessment escalates during the first 10 years. The deferral will allow some time for the impacted businesses to rebuild sales after the project and

parking disruptions. The escalating assessment will afford the opportunity for tenants to negotiate lease terms reflecting the increased occupancy cost either at lease renewals, option periods or first lease negotiations. We would propose a flat \$0.50 per square foot assessment for the first five years, increasing in steps to a maximum of \$1.00 per square foot in year 10

- A significant, thoughtful and well directed effort must be put into creating, communicating and implementing a mitigation plan. It is not clear that the city or the business association has the capacity to create and execute the promotional campaign needed to minimize the impact of the project during construction, maintain guest habits during the process and expedite the return to business as usual at the conclusion of the project
- The work needs to be segregated into two projects. The middle ramp should start January of one year and the south ramp January the following year. In all cases, there can be no diminution of parking during the fourth quarter at anytime

We respectfully request to be a full participant in future meetings and planning sessions related to the design, implementation and execution of the project. We are available to meet and discuss in further detail.

Thank you.

Parasole Restaurant Holdings, Inc.

  
Alan Ackenberg

Susan Howl

---

**From:** Lynette Biunno on behalf of Edina Mail  
**Sent:** Monday, April 16, 2012 8:50 AM  
**To:** Susan Faus; Scott Neal  
**Cc:** Susan Howl; Ann Kattreh; John Keprios  
**Subject:** FW: Edinborough Park

Good morning,

I have forwarded this message to the Mayor and Council members, Scott Neal, Susan Faus, Ann Kattreh and John Keprios.



**Lynette Biunno, Receptionist**

952-927-8861 | Fax 952-826-0389  
[lbiunno@EdinaMN.gov](mailto:lbiunno@EdinaMN.gov) | [www.EdinaMN.gov](http://www.EdinaMN.gov)

...For Living, Learning, Raising Families & Doing Business

---

Please make note of my new email address.

We're a *do.town* ... working to make the healthy choice the easy choice!

**From:** Kate Cassell [[mailto:Kate\\_Cassell@Dell.com](mailto:Kate_Cassell@Dell.com)]

**Sent:** Monday, April 16, 2012 7:47 AM

**To:** Edina Mail

**Subject:** Edinborough Park

But like lots of other public amenities out there – in America, not just in Edina – the cost of maintaining that amenity is borne by a much wider group of people than the people who enjoy the amenity.” — from Scott Neill’s blog

Scott’s statement is true of many services for which all residents of a community pay — whether they use the services or not. Edina seniors no longer have children in school, but these seniors still pay for schools through their property taxes. The children of Edina seniors are by now too old for the swings and slides used by younger children, but these seniors still pay for playground equipment through their property taxes.

To have a valuable and affordable senior resource taken away is not only ageist, it is unfair to those who cannot afford the Y or Lifetime fitness.

From his article, it reads like Scott has already decided on his view of the park’s future. I hope that rest of the Edina decision makers are more open-minded.

Mary Cassell

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to you on behalf of Earth Day Network. I am contacting your city's office, because I see your mayor passed an Earth Day proclamation last year, and I wanted to know if Mayor Hovland would be interested in passing one this year as well!

Throughout the month of April and on Earth Day (April 22nd), Earth Day Network and its wide range of partners will organize and promote Earth Day events around the world. The theme for Earth Day 2012 is 'Mobilize the Earth', which aims to provide people with the opportunity to unite voices in a call for a sustainable future and guide them towards achieving quantifiable outcomes. This year, we are also encouraging every Earth Day event to involve a local leader or an elected official. We have some resources you might find useful, accessible at [www.earthday.org/elected](http://www.earthday.org/elected).

For every Earth Day event this year, we would love if a local leader or elected official could take part in it, by either attending and taking part in the event(s) and/or passing a proclamation. We also ask participating cities and towns to provide us with pictures/video footage of their event, along with a green "best practice" for a report we'll be producing after Earth Day.

We also have other campaigns for this Earth Day, which can provide great ideas on how to get your community further engaged by involving libraries, schools, universities, athletes and artists.

If you have any questions or if you are interested in learning more about our campaigns please feel free to contact me!

I look forward to hearing from you,

Sincerely,

Sophie Labaste



earth day 2012  
EARTH DAY NETWORK

Sophie E. Labaste  
*Earth Day Associate*  
Earth Day Network  
[labaste@earthday.org](mailto:labaste@earthday.org)

1616 P Street N.W.  
Washington D.C., 20036  
(202)-518-0044  
[www.earthday.org](http://www.earthday.org)

Susan Howl

---

**From:** Lynette Biunno on behalf of Edina Mail  
**Sent:** Monday, April 16, 2012 3:28 PM  
**To:** Cary Teague; Arlene Forrest; Floyd Grabiell; Jeffrey Carpenter; Ken Potts; Kevin Staunton; matt rock; Melissa Stefanik; Michael Fischer; Michael Platteter (platteters@comcast.net); Michael Schroeder; Nancy N. Scherer  
**Cc:** Susan Howl  
**Subject:** FW: Grandview Development

Good afternoon,

This message has been forwarded to the Mayor and Council members, Cary Teague and the Planning Commission members.



**Lynette Biunno, Receptionist**

952-927-8861 | Fax 952-826-0389  
[lbiunno@EdinaMN.gov](mailto:lbiunno@EdinaMN.gov) | [www.EdinaMN.gov](http://www.EdinaMN.gov)

...For Living, Learning, Raising Families & Doing Business

---

Please make note of my new email address.  
We're a *do.town* ... working to make the healthy choice the easy choice!

**From:** Jack Abrahamson [<mailto:twoabes@hotmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Monday, April 16, 2012 2:49 PM  
**To:** Edina Mail  
**Subject:** Grandview Development

To City Council Members;

Having lived in the Richmond Hills area for over twenty years we oppose many of the proposed items being considered. #1. We oppose the closing of Sherwood Road/Eden Ave for the additional parking for the Library, our access for homes, deliveries, busses, emergency vehicles must remain open. #2. building height should be restricted to four stories or less. #3. affordable housing should not be part of the plan. #4. density can be controlled by building height.

So many of these issues were dis-approved during previous area developments, those promises should be kept and respected for a residential area that has existed since the early 1950's.

Your consideration will be appreciated.

With all due respect; Jack & Eileen Abrahamson 5209 richwood Drive.  
952 927 8200

Susan Howl

---

**From:** Lynette Biunno on behalf of Edina Mail  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2012 9:29 AM  
**Cc:** Susan Howl  
**Subject:** FW: Simon Properties

Lynette Biunno, Receptionist  
952-927-8861 | Fax 952-826-0389  
[lbiunno@EdinaMN.gov](mailto:lbiunno@EdinaMN.gov) | [www.EdinaMN.gov](http://www.EdinaMN.gov)

...For Living, Learning, Raising Families & Doing Business -----Original Message-----

**From:** Ann Compton [<mailto:anncompton@comcast.net>]

**Sent:** Monday, April 16, 2012 7:21 PM

**To:** Edina Mail

**Subject:** Simon Properties

Dear Mayor Hovland and Members of the City Council,

When will you quit giving out money at no interest (Simon Properties) that isn't yours? I hope you are all enjoying your last terms as representatives of Edina.

Kendall and AnnCompton

5201 Lochloy Dr.

Edina, MN 55436

To: Edina City Council

From: Pat Olk, 5315 Pinewood Trail, Edina , MN

Subject: Grandview District Development

I have lived in the Richmond Hills neighborhood since 1990. When Grandview Square was developed, we as a neighborhood went to many Planning Commission and City Council meetings. We were disappointed in the density and height of the Grandview Square development. We were also disappointed that the development took about 1/3 of the park for condominium construction. There were other projects proposed that were less invasive, but the city decided to go with the Grandview Square Development that exists today. The neighborhood was frustrated to say the least.

At that time, the city assured us that they had done their homework with respect to traffic and parking studies and that no additional parking was needed. We were also told that Eden Ave / Sherwood Road would not be changed and would remain our only exit / entrance for our neighborhood. The development also made a point to plant trees on both sides of Eden Ave / Sherwood Road to replace the larger trees that were cut down to make room for the library and condominium building. Every year the exit / entrance for our neighborhood looks nicer as these trees get bigger.

Page 65 in the appendix of the Grandview District Development Framework offers 4 design alternatives for Eden Ave / Sherwood Road. I strongly support Alternative 3: Streetscape improvements. This design continues to enhance our entrance / exit for our neighborhood with additional landscaping.

I strongly oppose any of the other options that turn Eden Ave / Sherwood Road into a parking lot for the library and senior center. I believe that changing the entrance and exit for our neighborhood like these designs do, would have a negative impact to the property values in our neighborhood.

As I mentioned previously, a parking study was done when the library was built and we were told that there would be ample parking. We as a family, drive by the library multiple times each day and I can tell you that the library does not need more parking. There always appears to be parking available for patrons of the library and senior center. I can also tell you that the 20 parking spaces on Eden Ave / Sherwood Road in front of the library are filled by 8:00 am by commuters catching the bus and employees of Edina Family Physicians. If parking signs were put up on that street that limited parking to about 4 hours, I believe 20 more spots would be available in addition to the excess capacity that already exists for patrons of the library and senior center. Members of our neighborhood have also been told by employees of the library that the library doesn't need more parking. If that is the case, why is there a proposal to turn this street into a parking lot?

With respect to the rest of the Grandview District Development Framework, I recommend that the City of Edina be sensitive to the surrounding neighborhoods by not allowing tall buildings and developments with high density. If a building is built on the bus garage site it should be no higher than the office building across the street in Grandview Square which I believe is 3 stories high. A building on the public works site could be higher because of the lower elevation. The highest building on the public works site should be no more than 4 stories high.

I also oppose any kind of affordable housing for this area. Edina already has sufficient affordable housing.

Thank you for your consideration.

Susan Howl

---

**From:** Lynette Biunno on behalf of Edina Mail  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2012 9:40 AM  
**Cc:** Susan Howl  
**Subject:** FW: Simon Property no-interest loan



**Lynette Biunno, Receptionist**

952-927-8861 | Fax 952-826-0389  
[lbiunno@EdinaMN.gov](mailto:lbiunno@EdinaMN.gov) | [www.EdinaMN.gov](http://www.EdinaMN.gov)

...For Living, Learning, Raising Families & Doing Business

---

Please make note of my new email address.

We're a *do.town* ... working to make the healthy choice the easy choice!

**From:** Susan [<mailto:spetersen55436@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2012 5:45 AM

**To:** Edina Mail

**Subject:** Simon Property no-interest loan

Please forward to City Council

In regards to the \$5 million no-interest loan--- Instead of edina taxpayers paying 100 percent assessment for our roads, lets use this money to help out taxpayers in edina, so we dont have to pay the tab. I have never heard of having to pay \$12,000.00 to fix our roads. It is quite a financial burden for edina residents which include young families. Vote to help out edina residents

Jeff and Susan Petersen

Susan Howl

---

**From:** Lynette Biunno on behalf of Edina Mail  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2012 9:43 AM  
**Cc:** Susan Howl  
**Subject:** FW: Thank you.

Lynette Biunno, Receptionist  
952-927-8861 | Fax 952-826-0389  
[lbiunno@EdinaMN.gov](mailto:lbiunno@EdinaMN.gov) | [www.EdinaMN.gov](http://www.EdinaMN.gov)  
...For Living, Learning, Raising Families & Doing Business

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Rosemary Larson [<mailto:rptlarson@comcast.net>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2012 9:18 AM  
**To:** Edina Mail  
**Subject:** Thank you.

Dear Mayor Hovland:

I am writing to thank you for your wonderful leadership as mayor of Edina. I have watched over the years how you have been on the forefront of diversity issues and am so impressed with and grateful for your emphasis on inclusivity, equality, diversity and recognition of differences (i.e. religious beliefs) in our community.

I hope your leadership on these issues will be a model for other communities. I hope that other leaders in our state and country will take notice of your understanding and acceptance of ALL people and will work towards your same kind of empathy and desire to unify the community.

Thank you again.

Rose Larson  
5524 Glengarry Pkwy  
Edina, MN 55436

**From:** [john.rieger@usbank.com](mailto:john.rieger@usbank.com) [mailto:[john.rieger@usbank.com](mailto:john.rieger@usbank.com)]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2012 9:46 AM  
**To:** Edina Mail  
**Subject:** Regarding \$5 million interest free loan to Simon Properties for Southdale

I understand a vote is coming up today regarding the \$5 million loan. There have been some community comments as to why we would need to provide this interest free loan to a profitable company when it could be better used to fix some of our aging infrastructure. As a resident of Edina, already paying my share of the hefty real estate taxes of this community, there is always a balance and a tension on how to allocate funds.

Southdale Shopping Center is an important asset of the Edina community and it has been showing its age. I have seen what happens when a shopping center is neglected and does not receive the required "refresh". I also know that Simon Properties has a choice as to where they put their resources. An interest free loan is more of a symbol of the community's commitment to the center than it is a need of cash for Simon Properties.

I don't know the terms of the loan but perhaps as a compromise, I suggest the following:

1. Approve the \$5 million loan with no interest for Southdale Shopping Center.
2. As the \$5 million is repaid back to the city, commit that the repaid funds would be placed into a fund to be used only for city infrastructure improvements.

This way the funds are used for the aging roads but they are also used to show our support for the Shopping Center.

Regards,

John R. Rieger  
Accounting Policy  
US Bank  
800 Nicollet-Mall BC-MN-H19Q  
Minneapolis MN 55402  
612-303-4389  
612-710-7630 fax  
[john.rieger@usbank.com](mailto:john.rieger@usbank.com)

# Eberhardt

PROPERTIES, INC.

Commercial Real Estate

April 17, 2012

Mayor James B. Hovland &  
Members of the City Council  
Edina City Hall  
4801 West 50<sup>th</sup> Street  
Edina MN 55424

VIA EMAIL TO: [edinamail@ci.edina.mn.us](mailto:edinamail@ci.edina.mn.us)

RE: 50<sup>th</sup> & France Parking Ramps  
April 17, 2012 Public Hearing

Dear Mayor Hovland & Members of the Council:

We own the property at 3930 W. 49 ½ Street commonly known as "The Edina Realty Building." We have been lead participants in the analysis of the improvement, expansion and financing of the 50<sup>th</sup> & France parking ramps and streetscape and are writing to express general support for City Staff recommendations and note our concerns and suggested parameters for moving forward.

We support the following improvements:

1. Vehicle count and guidance system in all three ramps.
2. Streetscape improvements.
3. Upgrade and restoration of the South Ramp with two (2) pedestrian elevators.
4. The need to rebuild the Middle Ramp and expand its parking capacity in a manner that meets the Shared Parking Model Study recommended new stall range of 140-247 yet is more mindful of its impact on surrounding buildings and streetscape than the 6-story, 252 additional stall concept proposed in the Staff Report. Further discussion and recommendations below.

We support a financing plan that would:

1. Begin assessment payments one year after completion of construction.
2. Have assessment payments *increase* over a 20-year period averaging \$2.00 per square foot per year. We suggest that the first payment is 50% of the average and the last is 150% of the average, for example \$1.00/SF in year one and \$3.00/SF in the last year.
3. Reduce the assessment proportionately if after full design, approvals, bidding and construction the Total Project Cost is less than the currently recommended \$11,969,858.

Mayor James B. Hovland &  
Members of the City Council  
April 17, 2012  
Page 2

We support a project plan that:

1. Takes in to account construction timing attempting to focus disruption in the months of January thru May, manage traffic as best as possible and provide viable alternative parking during construction as these issues are critical to the sustainability of businesses at 50<sup>th</sup> & France.
2. Offers input on the design details of the new ramp facades. We would like to continue to work with the City on achieving the best possible appearance.
3. **Includes further study of the design and height of the proposed new Middle Ramp, recognizing the need to add 140 - 247 stalls to the district while being mindful of the impact on surrounding buildings and streetscape.** Attached are shadow impact renderings based on the 6-story conceptual schematic adding 252 stalls showing noon on the equinox. We note that from approximately November 1 to February 1 our building would be completely shaded during daylight hours. We would look forward to researching possible solutions including lowering the first level, reducing the number of levels and/or offsetting the top levels, exploring the height difference of post tension versus pre-cast construction as well as facade and streetscape softening concepts.

We propose that the City Council approve a resolution to move forward taking in to account the parameters noted above.

Respectfully,



Thomas M. Nelson  
President



James W. Nelson  
Owner

Attachments – Middle Ramp Shadow Impact Renderings







