



MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING OF THE EDINA PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 2006, 7:00 PM
EDINA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS
4801 WEST 50TH STREET

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chair Byron, Michael Schroeder, Michael Fischer, John Lonsbury, Stephen Brown, Floyd Grabel and Basima Tewfik

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Geof Workinger

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Craig Larsen, Jackie Hoogenakker

I. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

The minutes of the January 4, 2006, Planning Commission meeting were approved with corrections from Commissioner Lonsbury.

II. NEW BUSINES:

Z-06-1	Preliminary Rezoning and
C-06-2	Conditional Use Permit
	Edina Gateway, LLC
	4930 77th St West

Mr. Larsen informed the Commission a similar proposal was presented to the Commission last year and since that meeting the proponents have met with immediate neighbors and have revised their plan. Previously the proponents requested a rezoning to an MDD District, but after further study it was determined a rezoning to PCD-2 is the best fit, especially as it relates to the isolation of this piece of property.

Mr. Larsen concluded staff recommends changing the land use designation to Commercial, and Preliminary Rezoning to PCD-2 conditioned on Final Rezoning and Watershed District Permits.

Mr. James Nelson, along with the development team was present representing the property owners of 4930 77th Street West.

Mr. Nelson addressed the Commission and informed them after their previous meeting with the Planning Commission they sat down and “re-worked” their proposal, adding he appreciated their comments with the end result what is before them this evening. Mr. Nelson added he also spoke with representatives of the Edina Affordable Housing Committee and conducted a neighborhood meeting. Mr. Nelson said from their talks with neighbors the “revised” design concept attempts to address concerns expressed by neighbors, and the Commission; however, Mr. Nelson acknowledged there are neighbors who do not support the project.

Mr. Paul May, told the Commission this is a unique site. Mr. May said urban space is evolving whereby people want to live and work in the same area. This enables people to achieve a high quality of life, adding the proposal before you this evening represents that changing need. Mr. May explained the commercial aspect of the proposed development will be located to the south and the more passive side would be north toward the residential neighborhood. Mr. May said the goal is to create a more calming area on the north, adding this has been an ongoing process to achieve the best development possible. Concluding, Mr. May said the fence would be moved and replaced and the fire lane along the north property line would be depressed, and additional landscaping would also be added along that north boundary line.

Mr. Dan Green with graphics pointed out the proposed “green roof”, and the 1st floor retail component of the project. Addressing the north side Mr. Green further explained the recessing of the fire lane, adding the reason the lane was recessed is to prevent headlights from shining into the rear yards of the residential properties. Mr. Green concluded by pointing out the angular shape of the building, it’s balconies and pedestrian areas.

Public Comment

Mr. Joe Hulbert, 7507 West Shore Drive, thanked Mr. Nelson for holding a public meeting and explaining the proposal to neighbors, adding he cannot support the proposal as submitted. Mr. Hulbert stated if this proposal is constructed as proposed it would take away his privacy. Mr. Hulbert told the Commission his property is the property that directly abuts the subject site. Continuing, Mr. Hulbert said in his opinion there is the potential for the market to cool towards condos, and if that were to occur what would happen to this development. He added he also doesn’t like the idea of people on their balconies being able to look down into his yard. Concluding, Mr. Hulbert stated he opposes the project as submitted.

Mr. Lee, 4909 Poppy Lane, told the Commission in his opinion the proposal is too aggressive. He said the site is too small to accommodate the proposed density. Concluding, Mr. Lee said the developer should be commended for their attractive amenities like the green roof, additional

landscaping to the north etc, reiterating he believes the site is too small to accommodate what is proposed, and requesting that the Commission deny the proposal as submitted.

Ms. Betty Connors, 7504 West Shore Drive told the Commission in her opinion a project like the one proposed does not address the needs of children. She pointed out there is virtually no place for them to play

Ms. Sullivan, 4512 Hibiscus, told the Commission she agrees with the comments from Ms. Connors and pointed out this proposal could increase the elementary school population, adding our schools are already too full.

Mr. John Helling, 5616 Woodcrest, told the Commission he loves this community, adding the City needs a plan for the future that addresses the needs of everyone. Mr. Helling said he would like the Commission to provide different housing styles so everyone that desires to live in Edina has that opportunity. He added this proposal creates more choices, and more life cycle housing for the 20 something's, single people and the empty nesters. Mr. Helling said this proposal is also offering affordable housing options that benefit the entire community. Concluding, Mr. Helling pointed out the price of homes in Edina today make it very difficult for young families to afford, reiterating this proposal creates options.

Ms. Cappy Moore, 6568 Valley View Road, told the Commission she appreciates that this proposal includes the option of creating affordable units.

Mr. Mayo, 6041 Kellogg Avenue, told the Commission he represents the Edina Affordable Housing Committee and faith based groups. Mr. Mayo said Edina is a fabulous community to live in, but the high property values of homes in Edina continue to increase so dramatically that it becomes difficult for teachers, fire fighters and support staff to purchase a home here. Mr. Mayo stated this developer has made a commitment to affordable housing and that should be encouraged.

Chair Byron asked for clarification on the affordable housing aspect of the project.

Mr. Nelson explained he recently spoke with Ms. Repya of the Planning Staff and discussed with her the option of providing some form of down payment assistance for potential homeowners similar to what occurred at Edinborough. Mr. Nelson said he is not sure how many potential residents would be able be served, but they are requesting around \$350,000 in assistance.

Mr. Hugget, 4008 Wood End, told the Commission he supports the proposal presented this evening. He said he likes the mixed use aspect of the project and believes that a zoning designation that provides a mix of uses

generally minimizes traffic impact. Mr. Hugget asked the Commission to look favorably on this project.

Ms. Sharon Ming, 1103 Coventry Place, told the Commission one of the great strengths of Edina is its schools and it is an important goal that our schools are available to everyone. Ms. Ming said it is also important to her that the City finds ways to create more moderate housing. Concluding, Ms. Ming encouraged the Commission to support this project.

Commissioner Lonsbury closed the public hearing.

Chair Byron questioned why the rezoning request is for a PCD-2 district and not PCD-1. Mr. Larsen explained a PCD-1 zoning is more of a neighborhood zoning.

Commissioner Brown said he understands the potential for affordable funding is similar to what the City accomplished at Edinborough and asked Mr. Nelson if one would have to “own” their home to qualify for assistance. Mr. Nelson responded in the affirmative. He said anyone who qualifies for down payment assistance would have to reside in the building, it is their home and ownership is a qualifier. Mr. Nelson stated this proposal is for homeowners, it is not a rental project.

Commissioner Grabiell asked if there will be a “report” presented to the Commission to help guide developments with regard to affordable housing. Mr. Mayo responded at this time a report is being drafted and is in the final editing stages. Continuing, Mr. Mayo said the goal is to complete the “guide” by the end of February and present the “final draft” at a public forum sometime in April.

Commissioner Schroeder asked Mr. Nelson if he knows what shape the present building is in. Mr. Nelson responded the building as it exists today needs some renovations.

Chair Byron asked Mr. Nelson if he knows the age of the subject building. Mr. Nelson responded the subject building was constructed shortly after the main tower, adding he isn’t sure of the exact year.

Commissioner Fischer pointed out the site appears to have a three car parking deficiency for retail and asked if the three missing spaces would be missed. Mr. Green responded future residents and employees may walk to work or may walk to the Caribou, etc. so it is hoped the deficiency would not be noticed. Mr. Green said the goal was to retain and maintain as much green space as possible. Commissioner Fischer questioned if the proposed restaurant or deli would offer liquor. Mr. Nelson responded he believes no liquor license would be requested.

Chair Byron commented in his opinion this proposal is the same proposal the Commission reviewed in December, adding at that time he didn't feel the proposal "fit" the area, and he still feels that way. Chair Byron stated he can not support the project. He said it isn't fair to the residential neighbors to bring retail uses into their rear yards. Continuing, Chair Byron pointed out for years this site was zoned for office use, and he believes it should stay that way. Chair Byron noted a residential property owner would actually have to get into their car and drive 2 miles to gain access to this site. Chair Byron said this proposal doesn't serve the nearby residential property owners. Concluding Chair Byron pointed out whatever is done on this site could set a precedent, reiterating he can not support the proposal as submitted.

Commissioner Brown said he struggles with this because this proposal improves the site and offers affordable housing, and is a good project. Commissioner Brown asked Mr. Larsen if this site is "separated" from the rest of the Pentagon office properties. Mr. Larsen responded in the affirmative, this site is isolated from the rest of the Pentagon properties.

Commissioner Lonsbury said in his opinion this concept is maybe a little more urban than what he would like to see here, adding he is also struggling. Continuing, Commissioner Lonsbury said he worries about the parking and in his opinion there will be a parking shortage for the condo units. Continuing, Commissioner Lonsbury said he likes the design, but believes what the immediate neighbors say has merit. Concluding, Commissioner Lonsbury cautioned neighbors to be "careful what they wish for", adding they have a wonderful project before them designed with their properties in mind, noting a new office building may not be as considerate. Commissioner Lonsbury stated in this instance he is persuaded to side with the neighbors because an office use is usually limited to daytime hours, not evenings and weekends. That is when you are home to enjoy your backyards.

Commissioner Schroeder stated there are good points out there on both sides. He added it appears to him this site is "tired" and the Pentagon people need to reinvest in not only this structure but many of their structures. Continuing, Commissioner Schroeder said he is carefully weighing what the immediate neighbors say; however, the proposal before them this evening is really very good, and it was designed keeping the adjoining residential properties in mind. Commissioner Schroeder said it appears to him as he sits on this body that cities don't evolve in grand steps, but in smaller steps. He said in his opinion this area needs to be revitalized and the City should move forward in a positive way with a grand idea on what the community may become. He suggested that a similar study be done in this area of Edina, similar to the recently completed Southdale study. He pointed out if properties get too tired they can not demand higher rents which can create smaller office suites where the tenants move in and out rather quickly. Concluding, Commissioner Schroeder said he supports the proposal as submitted.

Commissioner Fischer said in listening to the comments this evening it appears one concern is with privacy, and what is interesting to him is, if this was a green field site the typical transitional land use buffer for R-1 residential properties is multi-residential, and that is what is proposed in this case. Commissioner Fischer pointed out most of us have neighbors to our sides and rear and all that that brings. We do live in neighborhoods and if this is developed as proposed you will have neighbors. Continuing, Commissioner Fischer agreed with Commissioner Schroeder that the Commission doesn't often get to look at a big plan, but the job of the Commission is to review plans with a look to the entire community, adding the Commission can't always say no because the big plan hasn't been done. Continuing, Commissioner Fischer commented in his opinion this doesn't seem to be a place where couples with young children would choose to live, adding he believes a proposal like this would attract young professionals, single people, and empty nesters. Commissioner Fischer pointed out in the Edina School District between 800 and 1000 out of district students participate in the open enrollment program and if couples with children choose to make this development their home these children are Edina students. Commissioner Fischer stated the proposed use in this area, at least in his opinion, provides an unparalleled opportunity because traffic impact is minimal. Residents can possibly walk to work and access to the freeway, and major streets, is right out "their door". Commissioner Fischer said he sympathizes with the neighbors; however, the Commission must look at the community as a whole. Commissioner Fischer concluded in his opinion the subject site is a great location for this type of development.

Commissioner Grabiell moved to recommend preliminary rezoning and Conditional Use Permit approval subject to efforts by Mr. Nelson to secure not less than three (3) affordable housing units and contingent on a landscaping plan that screens the property from the neighbors directly behind, adding he knows that can be accomplished. Approval is also conditioned on Final Rezoning and Watershed District Permits. Commissioner Schroeder seconded the motion. Ayes; Schroeder, Fischer, Brown and Grabiell. Nays, Lonsbury and Byron. Motion carried.

P-06-2 **Final Development Plan**
 Rink Properties
 7300 Bush Lake Road

Mr. Larsen told the Commission the applicant is requesting final development plan approval to allow the existing Northwest Tennis Club site and building, at 7300 Bush Lake Road, to be remodeled and converted for use as two hockey rinks and required support facilities.

Mr. Larsen concluded the proposed ice rinks/hockey training facilities are permitted uses in the Industrial Zoning District. The proposed additions require no variances. The parking lot that was sized for the church proposal will provide more than adequate parking for this user. Staff recommends approval of the proposed Final Development Plan.

The proponent Mr. Mike Palm and Mr. Dennis Batty were present.

With graphics Mr. Batty, pointed out to Commissioners the facility and support facility.

Chair Byron asked if the “facility” would be operated as a for profit venture. Mr. Palm responded in the affirmative.

Commissioner Brown questioned whether Mr. John Keprios, Edina Park and Recreation Director is aware of this proposal. Mr. Larsen responded at this time Mr. Keprios hasn’t commented on this specific project; however from speaking with Mr. Keprios he learned Edina athletes need more ice time. Mr. Palm interjected and told the Commission Mr. Keprios is aware of this proposal.

Commissioner Brown asked how this facility benefits EAA. Mr. Palm responded in speaking with members of the community who share an avid interest in skating and hockey that Edina is short on ice time; with many more hours needed. Mr. Palm pointed out at present many Edina associations have to buy ice time at other facilities (out of the City), and with the extreme success of girls’ hockey and figure skating there is an even greater demand out there for quality ice time.

Commissioner Fischer commented there appears to be no bleachers or spectator area; questioning the fan base that always surrounds ice sports. Mr. Palm said at this time bleachers are not proposed, but at some time in the future a request may be made to allow bleachers.

Commissioner Brown commented in his opinion this site has a great potential for redevelopment, adding in his opinion this is an underdeveloped area.

Commissioner Lonsbury moved Final Development Plan approval. Commissioner Schroeder seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried.

S-06-3

**Preliminary Plat
Loring Manor 2nd Addition
Robert Engstrom Companies
6621 Normandale Road**

Mr. Larsen informed the Commission the subject property is a developed single dwelling lot containing an area of 60,044 square feet. The existing home is located in approximately mid lot. The property is accessed by Normandale Road adjacent to Highway 100. The home would be removed to allow the construction of two new homes on two separate lots.

Mr. Larsen concluded while the proposed lots generally have a lesser width than other lots fronting Normandale, the lots are as wide as or wider than the lots fronting on Brittany Road. Also the lots have an area twice that of the Neighborhood average. Staff would submit that at a width of 185 feet, the current lot is not in character with the neighborhood. The proposed lots would provide building site more in character with existing lots.

Staff recommends Preliminary Plat approval, including lot width variances, conditioned on:

1. Final Plat approval
2. Subdivision Dedication

The proponent, Mr. Engstrom was present to respond to questions.

Mr. Engstrom informed the Commission the house as it exists today is in very poor condition and in need of major repairs, adding removing the house seemed the best solution. Continuing, Mr. Engstrom said he would exercise architectural control over the two new homes to ensure the new homes meet the character of the neighborhood.

Ms. Sheila Rzepecki, 6617 Normandale Rd, immediate neighbor to the south, told the Commission she supports the request to subdivide the subject property.

Commissioner Brown moved to recommend preliminary plat approval, including lot width variances and subject to Final Plat approval and Subdivision Dedication. Commissioner Lonsbury seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried.

LD-06-1

**Chad Kerrison
6112-6114 France Avenue
Party Wall Lot Division**

Mr. Larsen informed the Commission the property does not have the required separate utility connections. The owner has applied to the Construction Board of Appeals to gain a waiver from this requirement.

Mr. Larsen concluded staff recommends approval of the division subject to an executed waiver.

Commissioner Lonsbury moved to recommend lot division approval subject to an executed waiver. Commissioner Fischer seconded the motion. Chair Byron noted for the record that he abstains. Ayes; Schroeder, Fischer, Lonsbury, Brown, Grabel, motion carried.

Receipt of the Greater Southdale Area ad Land Use and Transportation Study

Mr. Larsen told the Commission in August of 2004 the City Council directed a study of the greater Southdale area. The focus of the study was land use and transportation. The Hoisington, Koehler Group was retained to conduct the study. The study consisted of community meetings, a technical advisory committee, a citizen advisory committee, all with input from staff and various commissions. The final "leg" of the study is to present the draft to the Transportation Commission, Planning Commission and finally Council for public hearing and adoption. Mr. Larsen informed the Commission this evening the Commission is asked to receive the final draft of the study and forward the study to the Council for public testimony and adoption.

Chair Byron stated at this time the Commission will acknowledge receipt of the Greater Southdale Area Land Use and Transportation Study.

Commissioner Lonsbury moved to receive the Greater Southdale Area Land Use and Transportation Study and file the study with the Commission minutes. Commissioner Schroeder seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried.

Chair Byron informed the Commission the City Council will conduct a public hearing on February 7, 2006. This hearing is for public testimony. The Council will again hear the study on February 21, 2006.

Amendment to the PCD-3 section of Zoning Ordinance 850.

Mr. Larsen told the Commission before them is an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance PCD-3. The proposed changes in the ordinance address the Greater Southdale Area Land Use and Transportation Study. Key elements of the proposed amendment are:

- Reduce building setback from 50 to 35 feet
- buildings exceeding 50 feet 1/3 foot setback for each foot of height over 50 feet
- increase FAR from 0.5 to 1.0. Floor area over 0.75 must be residential
- maximum building height between France and York Avenues is 20 stories
- maximum building height west of France and east of York Avenues is 8 stories
- Conditional Uses – Office as a principal use
- TDM required for new office buildings

Chair Byron asked Mr. Larsen when the PCD-3 zoning district was amended to include residential. Mr. Larsen reminded the Commission the ordinance change occurred about one year ago. The code change allows residential development above retail.

Commissioner Schroeder questioned if the proposed changes also include no residential at street level. Mr. Larsen responded in the affirmative.

Chair Byron asked for clarification on the PCD boundary the proposed amendment would impact. Mr. Larsen said everything north of the theatre site, south of West 66th Street and between France and York Avenues.

Public Comment

Mr. John Bohan 800 Coventry Place, told the Commission he would like to clarify for them the Edina water tower on the Southdale site is 209 feet. He stated he believes it was mentioned that the proposed Westin/Condo tower is 236 feet tall. Mr. Bohan reminded the Commission there are other sites in the area that have redevelopment potential including the Marshall Fields Home Store site. Mr. Bohan asked the Commission to decline approval.

Mr. Gene Persha, 6917 Cornelia Drive, told the Commission he believes the residents have been left out of the process, adding he is not happy about that.

Ms. Victoria Blythe, 412 Coventry Lane, questioned the process and the public hearing. Chair Byron clarified to the best of his knowledge the Commission will pass along to the Council their comments on the proposed amendment changes and the City Council will hear the proposed amendment change at their February 21, 2006, public hearing.

Mr. Bohan suggested that a sign should be posted (around the area in question) alerting the residents changes are proposed to the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

Commissioner Losnbury moved to close public comments.

Transcription Begins:

Commissioner Lonsbury: it has fallen to each of us individually to imagine a vision for this area, but the study didn't give us anything conclusive. It's hard to envision what this is going to look like - and what we think this is going to mean. It is difficult to draft an ordinance when you are looking at words on a piece of paper. So, I'm going to suggest that the Planning Commission provide some leadership and some vision because we need to at least have some sort of an idea of what we want to accomplish in this area - and our recommendation to the Council for an ordinance change should include an explanation of what that vision might be. So, if you will bare with me, I will say for the record my thoughts, and I welcome challenges, amendments or whatever, but we need a place to start talking - and envision what this would look like - I struggled a great deal with the transition from suburban to urban and that we are no longer an outer ring suburb, now all of a sudden we are the inner ring, but I'm also not quite sure what we are. Especially in this area that's unique in our City in terms of its location, access to highways and the rest. So for me, as I look at this, I think of the wonderful development at 50th and France and I think the 50th and France model is a great model - and with more scale, um, by that I mean, I think we are in an urban situation, more urban then suburban, and I think we have the opportunity for higher buildings and for more density, but I think we also need to create a world class area that has common space, and parkways, and sidewalks, and amenities like that, and so as I have reviewed the ordinance changes, and as we look forward to these individual items that we are addressing, we need to have that vision, and I intend as we go through each of these items, and kind of reflect again on my vision for an urban landscape with retail, and businesses that front the street, probably closer to the street, then farther away, that we have opportunity for higher buildings, and that we need to create open spaces, so that the higher buildings, with less lot coverage, and things like that, because that fits my vision. I encourage you to comment as well as to where you are coming from, so that we can try to shape a collaborated vision for this area, and forward our recommendations and/or changes to the ordinance along to the City Council with a vision for them to consider

Commissioner Brown: I would say that I essentially agree with 100% of what you are saying, but I might have a little different opinion on the vision urban vs. suburban etc. - As I read the report that was submitted and the request for the amendment changes - I would make a couple comments as it relates to the plan, I agree with a lot of the concepts they are incorporating, however, It's a very detailed document and my feeling is that the devil's in the detail and there is a lot of work from my perspective that needs to be done. I will be the person that will push patience. I think we need to be patient here, we have taken a lot of right steps, and I, for some reason, don't have the sense of urgency others do to get this issue resolved right now, it is far to critical an issue to rush, and not do correctly, and I am going to really push hard to be patient and to go through this process thoroughly to come out with a good project. I agree with the concept of additional density, but with that come parking and traffic issues. I believe we have issues that woefully need to be addressed before we begin the job of adding additional density into the area - with me, I do a lot of analogies and this puts the cart before the horse and I will put it out there as it relates to the request for amendment changes, and I would guess, I'm going to vote to reject the amendment change, I believe, it is premature, and we should take our time and step back and follow the process and the course we have been on.

Chair Byron - do others wish to offer comments?

Commissioner Grabiell - Mr. Char, with respect with the urban suburban paradigm my guess is Southdale is never going to be 50th and France and never will be Uptown and it's gonna remain suburban-ish any way, - can we make it more urban? We probably can - and the idea to reduce the street setbacks - it is probably a good idea - but you go to Uptown and 50th and France where buildings come up to the sidewalk - and that's what make an urban thing, we aren't going to do that in this area, I don't believe, - these aren't in any particular order - they're random thoughts I have on this issue - Craig - we need more green space, need more walking areas, I was on the way to work this morning and I was driving across the bridge on France across 494 and there was somebody walking across the bridge and I was just thinking how this 1/4 mile open space that this guy has to walk across - and I was thinking about how uninviting it is to walk across big open spaces - like parking in the south east corner of Southdale to go to Marshall Fields - too much open space - maybe need to concentrate and intensify the uses of the land in that area, to make it a little more attractive to walk - so open space by itself isn't the answer - and I think the ordinance addresses the issue of more intense development - and I think that is good - I also agree with what Commissioner Brown said about this rush to act, why are we heading pell-mell -and I think frankly the City is making a strategic and political error the way it is handling the whole issue of redevelopment of the Southdale area - I think redevelopment of Southdale is a good thing - there are a lot of property owners who own the real estate in the Southdale area and they are concerned with their property values - and they want to preserve their values - and there isn't anything wrong with that - and I doubt anyone in this room would

say there is something wrong with that - there are a lot of people who live in the area, in Richfield, east of Southdale and the Cornelia neighborhood west of the Southdale development - who have to live there - and I am also concerned about my property values - and everyone who lives there that owns a house is concerned about their values as well - this doesn't have to become a situation where someone else's property values diminish where someone else's increase - if we do it right at Southdale - we can also increase the value of the commercial and we can also increase the residential property west of Southdale - but, the impression is at least from the letters I get, and the calls I get, that the people, and from the comments made by people in these meetings, that the residents of the Cornelia area don't feel they are being listened too- or that their view points are being considered, traffic is a big part of that - and what happens along 70th Street - and I have mentioned this before - a development at Southdale creates traffic problems and that is a big problem for the people in the neighborhood. The City has to address this somehow - and to push through a change in zoning without also pushing through a change in talking about traffic and some of the other issues that the residents are concerned about is a mistake -so, Its not like the people on this Commission or the people on the City Council are not concerned about the people in the neighborhood, because for the most part we are the people in the neighborhood, but by the same token, we got a political process here - and you got to pay attention to what all the voters think - and what the people in the neighborhood think - to repeat myself we can do this - and increase the value of the property in the neighborhoods and the value of the property of the Southdale area - and that's a win win for everybody. That is what I would like to see whether or not it happens as quickly as some might want - that is open for debate - we got to work and work hard to make sure we find the best way to do this thing.

Chair Byron - Jackie - will you hand me the piece of paper sitting on the table. On my left Mr. Schroeder.

Commissioner Schroeder - I guess I'm of the belief that we need a place to begin, and we actually need to begin - and I think - if we can build on what John is saying - and we begin to articulate our sense of what this place could become - it might give us ideas how this continues and to step back all the way to the beginnings of Southdale and the Dayton's vision - and the place of corn fields - what they intended to create wasn't about creating only a shopping center it was creating a place for social interaction -that was the genesis - and look at what the City did many years later at Centennial Lakes - it was the same sense of creating a great public space and a great space for interaction, and social mingling that allowed Centennial Lakes to become the kind of development it is today - and really if we think about a place to begin as we think about the evolution of Southdale I think we need to think about how we begin to shape a vibrant interactive public realm - I don't think the Southdale study deals enough about what that is - and how that is framed- but I think the origins of the success of the area it's a logical place to begin - and the City sometime ago set

aside a ribbon of land that actually connects the two that could become what the study also suggests as a spine street or promenade - and that seems to be the point we have the least agreement on - and I'm not sure as a street that actually does it for me, the idea that it is shaped as a vibrant place connecting Southdale to Centennial Lakes is a critical component and if I were to step further into this vision I would see along that connective piece exterior spaces that are privately developed but publicly accessible - but there are all these things that attach on to it to create more vibrancy, more interaction, to really begin to shape this as a dramatic public place that I think is shaped in part by the buildings attached to it - we can talk more about how we begin to frame directions for height against that - but I think we need to think about how the buildings are actually a critical piece of that - when we get down to defining is it suburban or is it urban I guess I put to this body that it isn't either - it will be something completely different because we are starting with a different set of parameters. It will never be the kind of urban area we have in Uptown - but at the same time I don't want our legacy to be that we left Southdale as a suburban shopping mall and the area surrounding it having a very suburban attitude when everyone else is thinking about a different kind of a place or some evolution of it - and I will take it back to here before I hand it off to whomever is next - that I think this community has charged us with the responsibility of beginning to reshape the community - that is the charge of the Planning Commission - we sit and we react to a lot of proposals, but this is an opportunity we have to step forward and begin giving direction to the fabric of our community - I think we have the need to begin that tonight - I don't think we will get all the way there - not with a few bullet points or any suggested changes we have - but we have to look at this in a very evolutionary way allowing ourselves more time to think about it - but at least to begin to draw the line in the sand that suggests that the current zoning we have for this area it isn't getting us where we want to be - if we don't take action those are the rules that will prevail and if we can take even incremental steps toward a better direction we will have done something - at least in the near interim - but we need to allow ourselves the ability to continue to shape that - and probably not only in this zoning district but for others across the City as well.

Commissioner Fischer – I think I won't have to say as much because Michael really covered a great deal of it - but it is really important to repeat and very interesting to hear what other individuals vision is or thoughts are for the area - and I would say again that this is a very unique place - and it's not going to be, but there will be elements of it that maybe are like 50th and France with a more pedestrian feel - but this is really a place that can only be described as the Southdale area - it will be a very unique model - as it has been in its history – I have a particular vision that the promenade and public realm is everything - and the continuation of that legacy is very important - the first way to start is the public realm south and north and my personal vision is the east west streets become more people oriented - France and York are regional movers of traffic and I don't really see these streets as being overly pedestrian oriented –but my personal view is that I think the most important thing that is needed is an overall

vision - and that has to happen - once the vision is established and agreed upon I think you do a traffic model of the entire area that takes into account 70th Street, 70th and France - and all impacts go out from there - then there is the urban design study, how does the "built form" take place around that public realm - and of course public input is part of that - with that said - we never seem to have the luxury to actually do that because life doesn't stand still - it just doesn't- but I believe we are being asked to provide some form of guidance on a more short term basis, and I guess the question I have is maybe we need to decide as a Commission if the majority of us don't feel that way - and if so the discussion is a much shorter discussion- I personally feel that we can perhaps give some short term guidance to the Council or some immediate guidance in terms of this zoning change, but I would want to come back to it in the future and take the longer view - I would want to look at all the things I mentioned and put into that context some elements I feel comfortable with - say for instance to get the public realm that has to happen here that I believe we will need more intensity of development- we will need more building height, we will need many of the things that are in here - where do you stop , how much is too much, is it going far enough - is the question not the height thing but sort of the setback thing - and some of the finer details some of you mentioned - the question some of us would make is to make those types of guidance decisions tonight and pass them along to the council or the public to discuss or do we could choose to say no we don't have enough time, do we do that - I would be ready to have that discussion tonight and add my pieces, but I would also like part of it to be that I'd like it to come back to us for a longer term to study the changes for the big picture to get to the vision we all want and work on it step by step.

Commissioner Brown - as I understand from what you saying is we are at the fork in the road - do we dig in and make recommendations- or do we say we just want right now to make amendments - my personal opinion is it doesn't make sense to do it twice - we have started a dialogue, had a good meeting, good feedback - but I don't understand the urgency, granted there are some zoning areas that we have that doesn't do what we want it to do - but to do it twice - this is a very complicated subject - there is a lot that has to go into it - we don't even have public input and we want to make amendment changes - that seems completely backwards to me - we need feedback and we have to have a broader understanding before we make amendment changes - I don't take amendment changes lightly and for whatever reason - we had a great meeting last week, very productive discussion, very good feedback on all key elements - and yet we are sitting here again about an amendment change- I just truly believe it is premature and that we need to slow down and take this in a procedural manner that gets the right end product I don't understand why we are rushing so much.

Commissioner Byron - we have the proposed amendment in front of us for and for whatever reasons including the feeling of being rushed, the cart before the horse, whatever you may feel -we can recommend against approving this -

or we can discuss it and see if we can find a common ground on areas where we want to recommend approval - at this time whatever your reasons or visions are I think our choices tonight are either to send this on with a recommendation or not, and I go either way, you know we can continue to try to work through what has been presented to us as a proposed amendment to see if we get to the point where with conditions or whatever we would want to recommend approval or a motion to recommend denial - again, for whatever reasons – it is in order if someone wants to make that and if that carries the day

Commissioner Grabel - seems to me just from the tenure of the conversation that the Commission is in favor of amending the ordinance, um - because we have said we don't like the way that Southdale is zoned right now, the rub is we aren't sure exactly what we want the amendment to say and Mr. Persha mentioned he was disturbed by the way that this thing was proposed by the City Manager, well, someone has to propose something, - it seems to me there is no reason why we as a Commission cannot decide that amongst ourselves that we are going to come up with an ordinance and propose it, but do we have that authority - to institute and initiate matters like it, we haven't done it before but there is no reason why we couldn't find the time to get together and sit down and throw the ideas up on the wall – we like this, we don't like that, blah blah- so I know we could take this ordinance amendment and say to the City Council - yeah we think we need an ordinance change and we are going to closet ourselves and come up with our own ordinance for you and you can do what you want with this one but we can change the zoning.

Chair Byron – I'd like to clarify there is a third choice - we can after dialogue and discussion if we reach common ground - otherwise our choices are to recommend approval, or we can recommend denial, for whatever reasons- or we can pass this forward without recommendation, only comments, and the City Council can come back and ask us and the reason we are forwarding this without recommendation is because we don't feel we have had adequate time, or whatever may move you.

Commissioner Brown – I'm in support of John and Mike's comments about the Planning Commission taking a leadership role and feel like passing it forward without a recommendation would be to not take that kind of leadership role and I personally would like to be involved on that - I also feel that this document is not adequate, not enough information, not enough detail and far too important an issue to say let's talk at 10:30 at night and come up with a recommendation to the City Council – **I'm going to go out on a limb and make a motion to deny the changes as proposed and have a discussion at a later date**

Chair Byron - is there a second – **Chair Byron seconded for discussion.**

Commissioner Fischer - you know one thought I have- and we talk about sort of the feeling the public input side hasn't been there – but I try to remind

myself, and it just occurred to me- part of our role is to help the Council make these decisions, we aren't actually making the decision for them - we are sending along a recommendation - and this will be heard by the Council one way or another with or without our input - so one thought -and there will be public hearings involved at the Council level, so one thought is that whatever we can add to this, we are really here for our technical expertise, and hopefully our experience on this Commission helps us to add value from what the staff has done up to this point - so to add whatever value we can tonight - and send it on to the Council - whether we ultimately say no or say yes but we are sending this on with these additions or subtractions - it seems to me it would add value to the public comment that is going to come at the Council level and I think that even if we don't like the position we're in, in fact I really dislike the position - and would love to have the next year or the next six months to consider everything, but it seems that we still could make it a more valuable process to pass this on -

Commissioner Brown – the only comment I have is this is far too detailed a document - we are dealing with everything from transportation, parking, building height, density, setback, this is not a simple proposed building it is a complicated detailed discussion - and personally I believe it is for a special session to talk about it -, I'm sounding like a broken record I don't understand the urgency and that situation there is so much devil in the detail - we know people will come in and they will say they evaluated the amendment and this fits and we meet all other requirements so we get to do all this project - I don't believe - I can't read this and determine I have covered all the issues that need to be covered - I don't believe anyone can - maybe I am not the smart one here - but it is a situation that is too complicated and too detailed to rush.

Chair Byron - motion to recommend against adoption I believe, and a second on the table. Further discussion on that or any proposed amendments.

Commissioner Grabel - no comments or further amendment comments - I don't want to sit here tonight to try to solve the things I like or don't like - too late to do that - I think it deserves a better effort than that – I'm not opposed, and here is some lawyer speak – I'm not opposed to the motion – but I don't want the council to think we are shirking our responsibility because I think we are prepared to accept greater responsibilities and really take initiative and move this forward - have some more meetings, have some sessions where we are talking about the proposed amendment to zoning as illuminated by the Southsdale study - I would support the motion- subject to everyone knowing it is because we are going to take more time to take to draft an ordinance.

Commissioner Lonsbury - I'm going to disagree with the last two speakers only because I appreciate how late it is – and I can imagine we can be here awhile yet if we pick this up tonight –but I have two thoughts on why we should do this tonight -the first is that the record will show that we are doing this under a little bit of protest and that we would like more time, and that this is an

incremental attempt to make improvements to the existing ordinance, and that we want more time and that this is not the end, even if we take action tonight and even if we come up with an amendment even if we approve it and recommend it to the City Council before this actually becomes an ordinance there is quite a long period of time between now and the first reading and second readings, public comment, etc. - but we have to get the ball rolling -, while I am not under any pressure or urgency to get started - but I'm a little disappointed in the lack of vision and the lack of leadership - and I think we need to step up and do that we have the opportunity to do –and continue to comment, continue to study what the City Council is doing and participate in those hearings and discussions at the City Council level as well - so I am going to vote against the motion so that we can at least begin because I don't think what we have now is really what we want - but it is important that we start that process.

Commissioner Schroeder - if Commissioner Browns motion passes will we have the opportunity pass along to the City Council our thoughts about how this might go, because I think they came to us for direction and if we say no we are not going to look at this - they are still looking to us for direction - and I have some thoughts I want to pass to the council based on my years of experience - and I think it would be of value to discuss those now instead of having the City Council taking up the ordinance without the input not just from me- but from our body.

Chair Byron - we can still take the opportunity to offer those comments tonight even if the motion has been acted on

Commissioner Brown - that is part of the reason I want to take the time - I want to make sure the experience I have is passed on - I don't think there is anything wrong sending a message to them unless there is some reason no one is telling us, but do we have to have our track shoes on here - this is a process that requires a little more time, not a year, but it is far to important an issue to rush through - so if the Commissions decision is that we are going to sit here and scrawl it out I think I believe we will be here for a long time because there is a lot of detail to be addressed.

Chair Byron - I don't expect to sit here as a Commission to draft an ordinance ever, we aren't anymore prepared than any other six people in this community to draft an ordinance, one needs staff input, consultant input, so I don't necessarily put us in some favored element as to just give us time and we will draft the ordinance, ah -if anybody charges us to draft an ordinance I hope they give us plenty of staff and consultant support if necessary then we can do the job.

Commissioner Brown – I'm not suggesting we draft it - various things are involved, parking, we are increasing the density, not a simple thing.

Chair Byron – I have a couple comments, one to me it is compelling to act on the motion to deny suggestions that somehow if we do forward it that we are acting under protest that isn't a sound basis to go forward, by any stretch - so to me - if there is that feeling here I am in favor of this motion. The other comment made, don't know who it was directed to - lack of vision, I don't sense any need for finger pointing, no lack of vision on any aspect of this thing at this point - we all know everyone has worked hard on this including City Council, Planning staff, Transportation, etc. , so I don't hold myself out as being or having any basis that someone else lacks a vision on this process I have. I will call the vote -.

Chair Byron motion to deny/ recommend against approval

Schroeder, Nay

Fischer, Nay

Lonsbury, Nay

Commissioner Brown what does Nay mean (laughter) Chair Byron - no means you want to keep going

Commissioner Brown – no I don't what to keep going – I'm in favor of my motion it's late

Grabiell Aye

Byron, Aye;

Motion failed 3-3 lack of majority

Chair Byron - what's your pleasure folks.

Commissioner Grabiell – it seems to me what we want to come up with is a motion to refer the ordinance to City Council - but with the proviso that the Commission at some point would come up with a wish list or demand list of items that need to be considered for these kinds of ordinances.

Chair Byron - I wonder if amongst the group that voted against it if they could give us some direction on how they would like this one to go or to get a fourth vote either way.

Commissioner Lonsbury – I'd like to see the lists of key elements that Craig put on the overhead and those would be the items that we would be recommending to the City Council for inclusion in the ordinance - clearly the City Attorney will draft the ordinance - our effort is that we give them those elements and act on those elements that we want included in the ordinance that is going to be drafted.

Commissioner Grabiell - those are in there.

Commissioner Losnbury – we can forward the list of items to the City Council they can make the appropriate changes – we can't sit here and come up

with the language to the actual ordinance itself - but instead if we address these issues in those key elements that are in the proposed amendment and make comments of recommendation to those key elements or revisions to those key elements that's in front of us right now is what I think we can act on and forward to the City Council.

Commissioner Brown I'm going to convert one of these guys over here – (laughter) process wise, the amendment change is an end product and it basically identifies the things you are trying to clarify -what you want to do in this - we have talked about vision and talked about things we want and to have all of the pieces makes sense - this is the end product - but we don't have all the information yet - so what I don't understand is why we want to rush - and say let us get an amendment quick this is the end product - we have done all this good work its kind of like all of a sudden we are jumping to the end of the line prematurely, if this requires that, I'll entertain the discussion - but I just don't understand why we are trying to circumvent the process - this is an end product recommendation.

Chair Byron - the three of us have spoken unless there is a motion someone can put on the table reasonably promptly and get a second and it can be voted on to whatever end -I hope you are moving in that direction.

Commissioner Fischer – May I make a suggestion, not in the form of a motion but to throw this out - I understand the lack of desire to start into this at 10 to 11 and go through it item to item because even if we started at 10 to 5 we couldn't work through it all in one session - would it be reasonable to not take action on the document itself but to sort of make statements and have it go along with it that we essentially agree with the idea that we need intensification in the area and that there will be more density to make the public realm more, that we agree on some core essential concepts, because ultimately the Council will be making the decision one way or another over the next couple months but that this body agrees with the direction - but we need time to get the specifics to come to them - I don't know if that again, I am trying to be helpful in helping set a direction of where we would be going given the time to go there.

Commissioner Brown -all in support of that - but isn't that what we did on Saturday.

Commissioner Lonsbury - I guess Mr. Chair I guess I am thinking we did do that on Saturday now we need to take the next step - which is to try to define that more specifically in a form that they can put into an ordinance - and so as I look at these key elements in front of us I think that there are things that we might want to change.

Chair Byron - make a motion centered on those elements

Commissioner Lonsbury - discuss each of these elements and when we are done with the discussion forward our comments -

Commissioner Brown - before you do that how about if we make a motion that basically says to the City Council that we will have recommended changes to the amendment within 30 days for the March meeting. It is all an issue of speed.

Commissioner Losnbury - Mr. Chair, Mr. Larsen what is - where are we at in terms of being able - in terms of having a special Planning Commission meeting , now much notification needs to be given and all that - can we continue this to another day and not adjourn but,

Mr. Larsen - I think it is within your proagative to call a special meeting of your own body -there may need to be a three day posting requirement. I know that' it for City Council meetings, but I'm not sure if that applies to your group, but I think, what I hear you saying is there seems to be general agreement on where we want to go - but the details? There is no reason the Commission can't revisit any zoning ordinance whenever you choose to - and this would be no exception - but I think you need to be fair and move it on, with some type of caveat that if you choose you want to keep revisiting it and work out some of these details.

Commissioner Lonsbury - trying something in a motion I'm not sure of the correct words.

Commissioner Lonsbury - I would move that we suspend discussion until Saturday morning at some particular time and that we aren't really adjourning or stopping this meeting only suspending discussion until three days from now whenever that might be so that we have some additional time to put our thoughts together regarding these key elements and to be able to discuss and put together a recommendation for the council.

Commissioner Schroeder – Is Saturday the day? Don't know if that will work for me.

Commissioner Brown - I agree with the concept but Saturday doesn't work.

Commissioner Lonsbury - I don't know the rules, just don't want to violate anything. How about, Monday at 5:30 that give us more time then starting at 11 in the evening – it would give us additional time to put our thoughts together and have some type of word processing documentation to see changes in the document as we do it.

Commissioner Brown - works for me.

Commissioner Fischer – are we in the middle of a motion.

Commissioner Brown yes, but no second.

Commissioner Fischer - where are we going to be in three days where we aren't right now - granted being an architect totally screwed up my clock - but I am just getting heated up at 11:00 discussing it because we are already here and trying to set another day I don't really know know if we aren't going to be in the same spot - but if that is what it takes I will do it - no problem - but I am not sure that we will be in a different place, lets just charge into it and see if there, if there is anything that we can agree on and send that forward - aren't we in a better spot, aren't we giving them more information then nothing, if one of these things is something we agree on and that came out of this discussion wouldn't that be a positive step.

Commissioner Brown - I realize you are a night owl (laughter) - but I would rather, I feel this is a project that for me that requires more thought and I would feel more comfortable meeting on Monday , personally.

Chair Byron - at a certain point it is OK to acknowledge we don't have much to recommend to them right now - so we tell them that - and for whatever reasons - but I agree with those that say what are we going to know Monday what we don't know now – I'm not very excited about reconvening - this is a public meeting that was noticed - this is an important subject and if it takes four people that we can offer greater enlightenment to the council - I say lets say now is the fact that for a variety of reasons we are not in the position to offer any significant advise and tell them so

Commissioner Lonsbury - I think we are in that position, just trying to accommodate other members

Chair Byron - John you got the floor.

Commissioner Lonsbury – lets do one point at a time.....

Commissioner Lonsbury with regard to building setback - not quite sure we have gone far enough on the reduction in building setback - I would like to see it say that in addition to reducing the 50' to 35' setbacks that buildings 50 feet or less between France and York Avenues would be eligible for reduced setback requirements for appropriate uses that connect the building to the site - especially along the promenade street and the east west streets, and an example might be an outside restaurant.

Commissioner Schroeder – I'd like to add on to that - I think that one of the things we have to get straight is with what the setback means and it means a building can be no closer but it also means it can be anywhere behind that and I think that what you are suggesting is that a building be set at that line to

encourage that kind of interaction to the street and I think if I were to make a friendly amendment I would substitute build to line for your word setback – but I have more discussion -if you would indulge me –I think that in certain cases there is an opportunity to frame even connect to the street that allows certain things to happen at some distance greater than 35' say may 80 to 100 foot range where you can get a bay of parking in there that doesn't preclude some of the things that are happening but it doesn't push the building back several hundred feet - from those numbered streets. So I guess - if I was to amend your motion, I would say that the buildings would be set at 35' or that they would be set at 100' or some number close to 100 feet along those numbered streets east west streets between France and York.

Chair Byron - 100 foot for the setback

Commissioner Schroeder - if you set - what I am trying to get to is that if you set it at a 35 foot setback then the building can also be anywhere behind there -then we haven't gained anything John is talking about Chair Byron – you mean a build to line - Commissioner Schroeder a built at 35 feet or built at 100 feet then we could do something with that space.

Commissioner Lonsbury - next point not on the list at all is parking and parking ramps and I didn't think we wanted parking and/or ramps built on the street and so my next point is going to be is that the parking and ramps be interior to the site - especially along promenade and east west streets - so I am not sure I like the 100 foot build-to line because I am afraid they will stick parking between the building and the east west streets - I'd rather have them build at 35' and put the parking behind the buildings instead of between the street and the buildings especially along promenade.

Commissioner Schroeder - I guess that my point is we have to expect something different with parking set between the building and the street that we can't set the same thing we have seen in most places in the area - there is no good example in Southdale area buildings that address the street with parking between and I think we could probably frame some direction for that that to whom how that can happen one of the elements has to do with how sidewalks across that space to connect building to public streets and that has to be somehow tied into this as well.

Commissioner Lonsbury – I know the comment was made earlier that we can't expect this area to be 50th and France of uptown and I will grant you Southdale will not be redeveloped like that but along promenade street we can try to draft the ordinance such that the building that face promenade street are of that nature and that we look at like 50 th and France that we have parking behind the buildings and the retail spaces front 50th and France – and that is what I am thinking we should do in this area.

Commissioner Schroeder - the promenade I think in my mind is different in that case you won't want any setback except unless it is for the purposes of public space- the building would be at the right of way line and the only instances when you could pull away from that is if you would provide a publicly accessible exterior space.

Commissioner Lonsbury – I like that

Chair Bryan - if I may ask you if I am following dialogue between the two of you - we are told that the proposed ordinance also provides that the City would consider exceptions to the setback requirements in order to encourage a closer relationship between store fronts and streetscapes, does that not satisfy you on this point.

Commissioner Schroeder – no, because that language says it encourages it - and I think what John and I are saying is we want to get there - we don't only want to encourage it - we want to get there.

Chair Byron – I'm not the urbanist some of you guys are, just so you know - I have seen urban zoning in the City of Minneapolis and its... well, for every good example of urbanism I can point too out there - there is a very poor example of what urbanist zoning has done in terms of requiring buildings to be built right up so close to the street so that you can't even have a plaza area of your restaurant in front of your restaurant because that sets your building back 15 feet or whatever – so and I don't know whether I like the urbanism or not - but it will be awfully late tonight before we draft an urbanist ordinance I'm am afraid. (laughter)

Commissioner Fischer – Mr. Chair – Monday is looking better all the time (laughter) – but I think I agree with the 35 foot building line - and I think what I was hearing is that if there is a creative proposal to move the building up farther that that would be a positive thing - but we're not as opposed to what you are describing in forcing the building up there, the plaza thing you are proposing is an acceptable use in that 35 foot area - I would add just one thing about the parking ramp - and I agree completely I would like to see them all in the interior - but there may be instances where there may need to be that type of parking on an exterior and I am wondering if maybe there should be a provision that says for the building is the exception would be if the building was designed with mixed use in it- in other words at grade or the building were designed not as parking ramp but literally designed to look like another building- and I don't know if that's too much flexibility in there or not for what your are thinking.

Commissioner Byron - let me ask this - what if we took these key elements one by one and went right down the panel and let everyone express their views and let that go into the minutes and then to the Council.

Commissioner Lonsbury - that's where I thought we were going....my intent -

Chair Byron - you aren't trying to get a collective motion. Commissioner Lonsbury, no not needed.

The following dialogue centered on the graphic below:

KEY ELEMENTS OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT

Building Setback:	Reduce from 50 to 35 feet
Setback for buildings exceeding 50 feet	1/3 setback for each foot of height over 50 feet
Floor Area Ratio (FAR):	increase from 0.5 to 1.0 floor area over 0.75 must be residential
Maximum height:	20 stories between France and York 8 stories west of France east of York
Conditional Uses:	Office as a principal use
TDM requirement:	Required for new office buildings

Chair Byron – Let's take Number 1 building setbacks - Mr. Schroeder -

Commissioner Schroeder - I'll stand with what I said with Commissioner Lonsbury -

Commissioner Fischer – if you stand there - is there just a simpler way to say what you said – (laughter)

Commissioner Schroeder – I think when we are trying to create something different then what's been done before and I am afraid that under/with the current format of zoning there is no simple way to get there - if we are to look at alternative new ways to look at zoning there is probably more effective ways to get where we want to be – but under the current way we write our zoning ordinance – I don't think we are going to get there in a simple way.

Mr. Larsen – may ask a question speaking to this 35 feet vs. the pedestrian relationship - in essence isn't there a way to take whatever that setback is which is now under suburban zoning, landscaping , screening, you

know separation, and maybe that's for future discussions, - take whatever that setback is – where we think this use be closer or if the 35 feet is appropriate - but to look at that distance whatever that is - and make that more of a public space - whether it is used for whatever purpose but to encourage that use between you - that if we require a separation that it be more accessible to the public , useable by the public as opposed to just something that's distance.

Commissioner Schroeder - my concern with simply saying 35 feet from along those cross streets - if you take the proposal that we expect is coming from Target they might put their building 35 feet from the right of way line and it will be the blank sidewall of a Target which I think would be worse than having 1 bay of parking put in there with storefronts along that side. Not a simple yes or no - 35 feet yes or no, I think it is a much more complicated issue.

Commissioner Fischer – for this matter I will say I think there are some options with the parking ramp - but will let Commissioners Lonsbury and Schroeder make their statements.

Commissioner Lonsbury – I think it's important also that we remember scale - I think what makes Centennial Lakes so inviting is that it's got an appropriate human scale –

Commissioner Brown - respectfully - I don't have a problem with reduced setbacks - but it is all tied into the context of what's parking, what's traffic , what's' the overall project design, etc – it's not as simple as saying I'm OK with 35 feet. Unfortunately, I feel like my input will be relatively ineffective here because I think they are all tied together - not part and parcel they are all put together and the thing that concerns me is talking about an amendment to the PCD-3 district change and this is a change affects a very large area and we are talking about increasing density with no discussion on traffic or parking which is dramatically effect that – so I am at a loss at how to move forward -OK with reducing the setbacks.

Commissioner Grabiell - I like what everyone has said, (laughter) particularly Mr. Lonsbury when he is in talking about this 35 feet - and buildings that are smaller then 50 feet can come up right close to the promenade and have this public interaction, however it was said, architecturally, but I like that.

Chair Byron - next item – let's go to building setback exceeding 50 feet.

Commissioner Schroeder –I don't know how this actually fits in here but a building setback at 35 feet shouldn't be over three stories wherever it is along the public east west streets or along the promenade - it could be taller beyond that - but the height at the façade line and that build-too line shouldn't be taller then 3 stories and I think it gets at John's point of maintaining human scale.

Chair Byron - are you saying three stories max -and where -

Commissioner Schroeder - at the build-too line, at the east west streets between France and York Avenues and along the promenade.

Chair Byron – Mr. Fischer -

Commissioner Fischer - I agree

Commissioner Lonsbury – I agree - and now for over 50 feet or higher then 3 stories - it should be 1/3 foot setback for each foot of height above 50 feet.

Commissioner Brown - no comment

Commissioner Grabiell - I agree with Mr. Lonsbury

Chair Byron – what about the FAR

Commissioner Schroeder – I think we need to set a minimum FAR of .5 and only allows buildings or developments that are less then .5 under conditional use - trying to ascertain how they might more fully develop this site – (unintelligible)

Commissioner Fischer - I like having him to my left, I agree

Commissioner Lonsbury - I have something that I don't know if it goes here, or you want to do it as another item later- but I think we should somehow talk about lot coverage - and FAR doesn't address what is on the ground level it addresses all the floors on the site, do you want to talk about that now or later. I agree with the two to the left.

Commissioner Brown -no comment

Commissioner Grabiell I want to ask a question – explain to me this FAR thing so I get it straight

Mr. Larsen – it's the gross floor area divided by the lot area or the relationship of the total square footage of the building on all floors relative to the square footage of the entire site.

Commissioner Grabiell – is it square footage of the site, parcel, or is it on or just the building site.

Mr. Larsen - square footage of the entire tract

Commissioner Grabiell - you take the square footage of each floor over the total area of the site including the parking lot and everything.

Commissioner Grabiell - I agree with what they said -

Commissioner Byron – I have a question on FAR help me if you would understand the importance of a minimum FAR -. and I believe you mentioned one of the developments you were concerned about that may be coming from Target is that correct - in the context of Target would you help me understand the importance of a minimum floor area ratio as it relates to our zoning scheme -

Commissioner Schroeder - I am not exactly familiar with the Target site but I believe it won't be more than .5 - one of the things we talked about is more pedestrian orientation and I don't think you get that with buildings that are developed with lesser intensity.

Chair Byron - what do you say to Target if they come in at .4 what are you looking for.

Commissioner Schroeder - look at what Target has done very creatively in their developments in other parts of the country - look at stack use, have them reduce their parking field – Target seems to be very willing to do it in other locations - they don't have to have as much parking –they could have more in-line shops at the ends of the building - another way to configure the uses on the site that doesn't have to do with the massive parking lot out front.

Chair Byron - sounds like and correct me if I am wrong, you kind of stand for less parking, more mass, view of the world.

Commissioner Schroeder - or as you have been saying more intensity on a site.

Chair Byron – lets go to maximum building height -

Commissioner Schroeder – I think it is fine the way it is

Commissioner Fischer - I'm not sure these are the right numbers, but my problem is the 8 stories west of France and east of York - I think in some areas that may be too much - and I think the way it is written – it's saying it is very unlikely to happen – well, to me I want to make sure it doesn't happen in the wrong places, my understanding is there is actually nothing west of France that we are talking about here so I'm a little confused with that language - I guess that is it. I'm OK with the 20 stories, I could be convinced of a slightly different number - but I think it is fine.

Commissioner Lonsbury – I think its advisable to provide that over arching height and I am comfortable with the 20 - my understanding is that west of France Avenue and east of York Avenue the code is one foot setback for each foot over 50 feet so I am comfortable with the 8 stories because it is virtually impossible to go that high because of the 1 foot setback - its not 1/3 foot setback.

Commissioner Fischer - right

Commissioner Brown – I am uncomfortable with 20 stories – It’s not an issue of stories it’s an issue of density and I am uncomfortable with 8 stories west of France Avenue.

Commissioner Grabiell – I prefer something else maybe between 15-20 – 8 stories west of France seems odd (unintelligible)

Chair Byron - Just by itself on maximum height I feel 17 stories between France Avenue and York Avenue and 6 stories west of France and east of York Avenue - I am more comfortable with a stated number of stories then I am on the proposition that it can hardly happen – and secondly when we get on the west side of France we got to start looking at what’s going to come around the corner and move into the Pentagon park area – that’s the way the evolution and that’s the way the study was set up, you know - and 8 stories is too tall west of France east of York. I say 17 and 6 – that’s what I think is right.

Commissioner Grabiell – Mr. Chair I would like to agree with what you just said, it makes sense.

Chair Byron – Conditional Use Permit –

Commissioner Schroeder – I would like to see the provision for CUP for a single principal use in a structure greater than 100,000 square feet for the purpose of getting better site and building design - Chair Byron please repeat that – Commissioner Schroeder - A CUP for any single principal use in a structure that occupies more then 100,000 square feet of floor space for the purposes of getting better site and building design.

Chair Byron – is it a second condition - any problem with office as a principal use -

Commissioner Schroeder - I would say just to kind of tie into that - that I think we should limit the principal use on any street level to the principal permitted use - so we don’t get a building that is residential all the way to the ground floor.

Commissioner Fischer - I agree with Michael -

Chair Byron - What happened to the architect that just gets going at 11 PM
(laughter)

Commissioner Lonsbury – I have nothing to add on this part

Commissioner Brown – no comment

Commissioner Grabel – I am fine with that-

Chair Byron – no comment either

Chair Byron - TDM requirement - what does it stand for -

Mr. Larsen and others - Travel Demand Management -

Commissioner Schroeder – I think this may fit best under this category but I would like to see sidewalks encouraged at every entrance/exit - when you exit the building there should be a public sidewalk and a public sidewalk for every adjacent street - We have to have ways to walk out of public places to enter the street and get to the bus stops, etc.

Chair Byron - it may fit into other areas -

Commissioner Fischer - no comment on travel demand

Commissioner Lonsbury - no comment

Chair Byron – Craig - is the TDM limited to office buildings.

Mr. Larsen - Usually yes, but it is also in our current ordinance that anything that is rezoned to Mixed Use also requires a TDM.

Commissioner Byron – didn't we see one for the Westin proposal – I believe -

Mr. Larsen - yes we did, but staff has the ability to request a TDM and we have exercised that requirement on the Westin-so whether that is our policy - but we area just codifying it here in this case

Chair Byron - that TDM would it have to be approved by the Council.

Mr. Larsen - yes that is correct, and these are most effective when you are dealing with a work force.

Chair Byron – got any add on items

Commissioner Schroeder – I would like to see parking ratios dealt with at the maximum not the minimum if we are really pushing for intensity we should not allow developers to over build parking – keep more green

Commissioner Lonsbury – I would like to address topics on parking – I just want to restate that I think the ordinance should encourage parking to the interior of the site and special wording should be made to address ramps, that they have a façade that matches a retail building or whatever but it must look like the building, (unintelligible) 50 feet or less if they will be up close etc. - and again parking should be encouraged in the interior - especially that we need to keep parking to a minimum on the promenade side of any site - when we get to promenade street there shouldn't be any ingress or egress so there is no reason to have parking –

Chair Byron – I respectfully disagree that we should have a minimum or maximum- I think that parking is a critical issue and there should be adequate parking and we should address what the parking ratio should be so we don't find ourselves in a situation of great density and no place to park - parking is a critical issue and there should be adequate parking - we should address what the parking ratio should be - so we don't get into a situation where no place to park -

Commissioner Grabiell – something needs to be said about the design of ramps so that the ramp isn't just a big concrete piece an ugly thing and that there is some type of architectural control on a parking ramps -

Chair Byron - on parking - that for the moment - I think I disagree with the suggestion that we have a maximum parking ratio - I think that until we find out what the transportation piece of the Southdale area study is going to be and how we are going to move people around - and by what means of transportation we are going to have - and how we are going to make the area pedestrian friendly -it is premature to establish maximum parking ratio - we are going to need a lot of parking for the density some folks may want in there -

Commissioner Schroeder - to be clear I am saying we should not be shorting parking - but we should be concerned with over parking – if we are trying to get people to use the transit systems we shouldn't be providing more parking spaces – it would be too easy to continue using vehicles -

Commissioner Schroeder - one more item - we should have a carefully developed landscape standard plan for developing/redeveloping any site in this area or any where - Centennial Lakes did an incredible job with landscaping and the relationship to parking lots and site development - the Galleria also does a pretty fair job, but if you look at some of the other developments landscaping is pretty dismal, the development should be framed by how the landscape addresses people as they move through by car or walking.

Commissioner Fischer – I just have two elements that may not relate directly- it's just that I would encourage very much that there is a provision in there that is at least a beginning point – and that point is a density bonus to provide affordable housing - and I would say whatever we can do to encourage life cycle housing, and not just the very high end units that we seem to be getting - that a density bonus should be highly encouraged - and also a bonus given for green roofs or other sustainable elements that could help our situation environmentally if there are bonuses for that too.

Commissioner Lonsbury - I have two perfunctory items and traffic - two easy ones first - In the memo we received it was pointed out that the sanitary sewer capacity and I believe that the amendment we have in front of us talks about that any new development that exceeds the currently allowed density that includes sanitary sewer and I think that is a good thing to have in there -another Item I have is a concept that I'm not sure we addressed and it is what I would call maximum lot coverage - and this goes back to the discussion of height, density - and if you are going to allow the buildings to be higher, they should be skinnier - if I am describing that right - rather than building a 6 story building that takes up the whole lot - if we let them go up 18 stories I don't want them to take up the whole lot - and if we let them go up 18 stories there should be a maximum lot coverage which would encourage if you go higher you encourage more open space and common areas so there is a balance when we say OK to higher buildings - but we need to have narrower buildings so there are sight lines and more open space - and I think you do that with a maximum lot coverage requirement.

Chair Byron – and -

Mr. Larsen – yes - I think that fits the intent of the ordinance - I think we do have one now - and even at this zoning it is 30% - and its there and its something in the future we can revisit as part of this overall review.

Commissioner Grabiell – One thing I would like to see in this ordinance concerns 70th Street between France Avenue and Highway 100 - that that corridor be designated a planning district such that the current zoning on that corridor is fixed as it is - and it cannot be changed except under some extraordinary circumstances and with extraneous meeting and regulatory requirements.

Chair Bryon – let's talk traffic as it relates to the proposed zoning amendment and not just talk traffic -

Commissioner Fischer - I would like to see the City create the model for traffic and see all developments fit into and run through that model - my preference would be that we have our consultants build the model and our model does all the studies for all developments/redevelopments - the developer gives

us the information and our people do it and our time is charged back to the developer.

Commissioner Lonsbury – precisely what I would say -

Chair Bryon - should we label that traffic study procedures, a little more refined than traffic?

Commissioner Lonsbury – we need a traffic model for the greater Southdale area and that model should be developed and managed by the City and anyone developing property within this zoning district would pay for that model and present their data to us to be run through that City model – a City traffic model – charged back to them -

Commissioner Brown - are we going to be developing a traffic model on the density we would put on the site – or is there

Commissioner Lonsbury - I think that what we are all aware of and what the study identified is that there were two key intersections 70th Street (France York) in general - but I also believe that France and 76th Street should be included – because I believe these areas are particularly jammed up with traffic right now - so I think there should be again, and I am not the attorney - but I think traffic should be addressed that directly impacts those streets and the density and other considerations be that we somehow minimize the density in those areas that would directly impact 70th and 76th Streets at France Avenue.

Commissioner Brown- add France and Cross-town as well.

Chair Byron – add a third intersection – John do you want to continue –

Commissioner Lonsbury – not at this time

Commissioner Grabiell – I’m not sure what you mean by traffic.

Chair Byron – I’m not sure either – (laughter)

Commissioner Grabiell - I would like to see this in the ordinance that traffic calming devices and restrictions be implemented on 70th Street between France Avenue and Highway 100 and that signage be implemented on 494 /100 and again on 100 encouraging and directing traffic into the Southdale area via 62 and 76th Street to discourage the use of West 70th Street.

Chair Byron – anything further.

Chair Byron – skyways – I’ve been listening for a long time waiting for someone to tell me how transit is going to function in this area whether it is a

pedestrian jitney or whatever it may be - and I am continuing to get more concerned about how to get across 69th and 70th Streets particularly if we get a Westin hotel with its main access 69th Street and a Super Targets main access on West 70th Street – I wouldn't rule out asking some developers to start paying for skyway connections, - the other thing I would add – on traffic - I'm absolutely convinced we can't put a Westin Hotel at the proposed location and a Target at it's location on 69 & 70 Streets without going to the same traffic signalization that we went to on 66th Street like I believe we did within the last 7 years, that's counter to those who want to make it a pedestrian street - but I don't know how you are going to move that traffic in and out through those uncontrolled mid-block crossovers that for example exist on 69th Street now - there are eight potential traffic movements going (unintelligible) on the side of 69th Street just before you get to York, and that will be the main entry and exit for the Westin - and that is also the area Southdale uses very heavily for access to its restaurants and I don't know how long that can function in a uncontrolled environment.

Commissioner Lonsbury - would you also think therefore that the City perhaps needs to have its own traffic management system for the greater Southdale area and that any new developments might be charged or would pay for such a system if we ran them through our system -

Chair Byron - I have no quarrel with that - I don't know enough about it to say yes or no - but it sounds good – it sounds like you're on our side (laughter)

Chair Byron - anything further - I want thank everyone tonight for doing their best -everyone has been very patient and we have worked very hard -

Commissioner Grabiell – what is going to the Council –

Chair Byron – our minutes - motion to adjourn -

Chair Byron – I believe it can be said that many of our comments are contradictions -

Commissioner Brown – I want everyone to know I feel that these are just preliminary recommendations and comments -

Commissioner Fischer - I agree based on what happened here tonight that we did our best to convey six peoples personal views and in essence this is an agenda for the next six months – we would have to work for the next six months to get a consensus - and what we got at this point is six peoples views, the point I would like to make is sure we would like to be given an ideal scenario - we still need a traffic model, etc., but we don't have the time and we can only just pass along our comments -

Chair Byron - maybe not a chance - particularly if there is an effort to get part of these minutes to the council a week from today -

Mr. Larsen – I believe this will be heard for the public hearing on the 21st, we could try to get a draft transcript completed.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:25 PM

Jackie Hoogenakker