



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

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chair Lonsbury, Nancy Scherer, Kevin Staunton, Mike Fischer, Scott Thiss, Floyd Grabel, Stephen Brown

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Geof Workinger and Michael Schroeder

STAFF PRESENT:

Craig Larsen, Wayne Houle, and Jackie Hoogenakker

I. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

The minutes of the February 1, 2006, meeting were filed as submitted.

II. MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF DAVID BYRON:

Acting Chair Lonsbury informed the Commission Mayor Hovland asked him to convene the meeting in light of the recent passing of David Byron, Planning Commission Chair. Acting Chair Lonsbury stated David was a good friend and a great chairman, adding the Commission will miss his wisdom, his expertise, his guidance and his leadership. Acting Chair Lonsbury asked those present to join the Commission in a moment of silence honoring David.

III. ELECTION OF CHAIR:

Acting Chair Lonsbury addressed the Commission explaining at this time a new Chair must be elected to serve the Commission. Acting Chair Lonsbury opened the floor for nominations.

Commissioner Brown moved to nominate Commissioner John Lonsbury as Chair. Commissioner Fischer seconded the motion. All voted aye. Motion carried.

Acting Chair Lonsbury said he is honored by their vote and would do his best to serve the Commission and the residents of Edina.

IV. NEW BUSINESS:

**S-06-4 ERS Development, LLC
7108 Valley View Road
Create One New Buildable Lot**

Mr. Larsen told the Commission the existing home is located in the southwesterly portion of the lot. A detached garage is located to the immediate north of the home. The site slopes significantly from west to east, and the lot is heavily wooded.

Mr. Larsen pointed out the property owner to the immediate north has constructed improvements that encroach on the subject property. The parties have now agreed to and have submitted a new preliminary plat. The new plat involves a land trade in exchange for an easement over the encroaching improvements. Mr. Larsen said both lots in the proposed plat exceed the size standards set out in the Subdivision Ordinance and no variances are required.

Mr. Larsen concluded the shared driveway will limit site disturbance. The additional land added to the new lot increases the flexibility in sighting the new home, and the easement cures the encroachment. Staff recommends approval subject to: Final Plat approval and Subdivision Dedication.

Mr. Peter Beck was present representing ERS Development.

Commissioner Grabiell asked Mr. Larsen if he wants as a condition of approval a shared driveway. Mr. Larsen agreed that should be a condition of approval. Staff wants one driveway to serve both the existing and proposed house. One driveway limits disturbance to the site.

Commissioner Staunton asked how drainage is addressed. Mr. Larsen responded the Engineering Department reviews drainage at the building permit stage.

Chair Lonsbury questioned how the proposed third condition is enforced. Mr. Larsen responded it is a condition that needs to be met before a building permit is issued for construction of the new house.

Mr. Beck addressed the Commission and informed them a formal easement will be prepared and recorded, adding there is no problem in meeting condition three with regard to one driveway serving both lots.

Commissioner Brown moved to recommend preliminary plat approval subject to:

**Final Plat approval
Subdivision Dedication, and
Shared Driveway**

Commissioner Fischer seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried.

**C-06-3 Conditional Use Permit/Lot Division
Normandale Lutheran Church/Frank Carderelle
6100 Normandale Road
6125 Wilryan Avenue**

Mr. Larsen informed the Commission the lot division is for the sale of a portion of the lot at 6125 Wilryan Avenue to the church. The Conditional Use Permits allows the transferred land to be expanded into parking lot area.

Mr. Larsen explained the sale of this land allows the church to add 48 more parking spaces to their existing lot. The plan includes a fence, berm and coniferous plantings to screen the new lot from nearby homes.

Mr. Larsen concluded staff recommends approval of the Lot Division and Conditional Use permit, adding the increased parking will reduce the impact of church activities on the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Don Bauer, and Mr. Lyle Anderson were present representing the church and Mr. Frank Carderelle was present, property owner of 6125 Wilryan Avenue.

Commissioner Grabiell observed if the parking lot is expanded as proposed it will be rather close to the rear yards of some of the homes along Wilrayn, adding it is important that the proposed screening be implemented as submitted.

Commissioner Brown moved to recommend Lot Division and Conditional Use Permit approval to include screening materials; fence, berm and the plantings of coniferous vegetation. Commissioner Fischer seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried.

**Z-06-1 and S-06-5 Preliminary Rezoning & Preliminary Plat
Noonan Construction/Kingdom Properties
5200/5300 France Avenue**

Construct Townhomes

Mr. Larsen informed the Commission the proponent is requesting a rezoning of the northerly 2.2 acres of the existing parking lot to PRD-3, to allow the redevelopment of the site with 20 townhouse units. The parking requirement for this church is 292 seats. The proposal would leave the church with 330 spaces.

Mr. Larsen explained the proposed development includes a common underground garage with each unit having 2 parking stalls plus storage. Additional parking is provided in the common area. The project is served by a single curb cut located on West 52nd Street. Mr. Larsen asked the Commission to note the proposal does request setback variances from France Avenue and from the south and westerly property lines. These variances are similar to variances granted to other projects located within the more urbanized sections of the City.

Mr. Larsen concluded the proposed development is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, and represents an excellent reuse of this property. Staff recommends Preliminary Rezoning and Preliminary Plat approval subject to: final rezoning, final plat and Watershed District permits.

The proponent, Mr. Ed Noonan was present to respond to questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Grabiell questioned if this proposal is approved what would happen to the church if membership grows. Mr. Larsen responded at present the size of the parking area is too large for the church. If the proposal before you this evening is approved the remaining parking spaces on church property still exceed ordinance requirements, which would allow for some growth. Concluding Mr. Larsen said in reality this would become self policing.

Commissioner Brown asked if the church has one sanctuary. Mr. Larsen responded there is only one sanctuary; however, there are other areas in the church, including education rooms where people can meet.

Commissioner Fischer observed it appears the Zoning Ordinance and the Comprehensive Plan do not match. Mr. Larsen responded the subject site is zoned R-1 Single Dwelling Unit District and is indicated as such on the Zoning Map. The zoning map indicates what a site is presently zoned. On the Land Use Map (Comprehensive Plan) the designation of the site is Quasi Public, which includes churches, schools, etc.; however, in the Land Use section of the Comprehensive Plan guidelines are included and over the last couple of decades the City has taken the stance that any development or redevelopment of property along transit corridors makes sense if the use is multi-residential. Commissioner Fischer commented it appears to him in certain circumstances the Commission needs to look to the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Larsen responded that is correct.

Commissioner Staunton asked if the requested variances are handled at the Zoning Board level, or are they handled through the Conditional Use Permit process. Mr. Larsen responded under our current Zoning Ordinance the requested variances are handled with the Conditional Use Permit and are part of your action tonight.

Mr. Edward Noonan, 84 Woodland Circle, addressed the Commission and explained in his opinion this proposal will be first class. Exterior materials will consist of brick, stone, copper, bracketing, and dormers to name a few. Mr. Noonan said their goal is to introduce a project that fits and blends with the existing neighborhood. Continuing, Mr. Noonan explained the townhouse units

will be accessed through one common garage door entrance. Once in the common area of the garage each townhouse unit will have their own garage door and elevator. The “private” garage entrances including elevator will appeal to a broad range of buyers. Concluding, Mr. Noonan said each townhouse unit is approximately 28 feet wide by 65 feet long. The development is also designed with a common courtyard area.

Commissioner Brown said his first reaction to the project is that he really likes it, it’s a great concept; however, he struggles with visitor parking spaces; noting there are only 19 visitor spaces adjacent to the 52nd Street side. Mr. Noonan pointed out in this area parking is also permitted along France Avenue.

Commissioner Thiss asked Mr. Noonan if visitor parking is also provided in the “common” underground garage area. Mr. Noonan responded extra spaces are provided in the underground parking garage; however, if those spaces are used for guests a homeowner would need to allow access.

Commissioner Fischer said he is comfortable with the number of guest parking spaces, but wonders how guests would access the townhouses (along France Avenue) if the parking spaces were taken up along France Avenue, and they ended up parking in the 52nd Street guest parking area. Mr. Noonan responded there is a stairway between the church parking lot and sidewalk that engages the public sidewalk and inner sidewalk of the townhouse development.

Commissioner Staunton questioned what is located west of the subject site. Mr. Noonan responded single family homes are located to the immediate west on Halifax Avenue. Continuing, Mr. Noonan pointed out the residential lots that adjoin this property are very deep. In fact the adjacent houses will be no closer to this proposal than they are to the homes directly across the street. Mr. Noonan noted there is a grade change in this area and landscaping will also be added along the common property line. Commissioner Staunton commented there appears to be a natural buffer between properties. Mr. Noonan agreed, and with graphics pointed out the distance between the subject site and neighboring properties to the west in response to a question about the efforts that have been made to communicate with neighboring property owners about the project, Mr. Noonan informed Commission Members an open house was held to inform immediate neighbors of the proposal, adding 30 neighbors attended, and he received three phone calls from Minneapolis residents.

Chair Lonsbury commented he generally likes the project and the design of the townhouse units, but has a concern with the end units. Chair Lonsbury suggested that Mr. Noonan pay closer attention to those units and their impact. Mr. Noonan said the present drawings do not show the additional landscaping that will be planted along those end units. Mr. Noonan acknowledged much of the focus in the plans was on the courtyard and how it interacts with the units.

Commissioner Grabiell pointed out over the past year the City has approved a number of condo projects along and near France Avenue and questioned who will buy all these units and what will happen to the real estate market if cities, including ours, continue to approve so many multi-housing projects. Mr. Noonan responded this project is a townhouse project, and is

unique to the area. He acknowledged at first he did consider a condo development, and agrees with Commissioner Grabiell that at this time there may be enough new condo projects happening in Edina (including the projects at Centennial Lakes, 50th and France, Indianola & 50th with the possibility of more condo units near Southdale Center Galleria). Continuing, Mr. Noonan reiterated this project is completely different. Again, the proposal is for townhouses. Each "unit" has individual entrances, individual elevators, and individual garages. Mr. Noonan said there are no common hallways, adding in his opinion this project is a good bridge between the single family home and the condo.

Commissioner Grabiell asked for clarification on how much of the parking lot area this project will consume. Mr. Larsen responded the project will be located on the north 2.2 acres of the church parking lot site.

Julie Haugland, 5232 France Avenue, said her concern is with traffic especially along France Avenue and curb cut placement.

Mr. Larsen told the Commission Mr. Houle, City Engineer, is present this evening.

Mr. Houle told the Commission he briefly reviewed the proposal, adding this proposal is scheduled to be heard on March 16th by the Transportation Committee. Continuing, Mr. Houle stated at first glance he doesn't believe this proposal drastically affects the traffic pattern on 54th Street and along France Avenue. He added he believes the levels will remain almost unchanged, especially at the 54th and France Avenue intersection during the Sunday peak service hours. Mr. Houle added it also appears this proposal would actually reduce traffic impact on Sundays at 52nd & France Avenue. Concluding, Mr. Houle reiterated this project will be reviewed by the Transportation Committee in a few weeks.

Chair Lonsbury pointed out the traffic engineer for the project is present this evening.

Mr. Bob Solfelt, 10400 Viking Drive, told the Commission a traffic report was completed and the conclusion of the study is that this project poses no adverse affect on any of the current or proposed levels. Mr. Solfelt added there would be no significant change in traffic patterns. Continuing Mr. Solfelt said the report also suggests changing the timing of the stop light on West 54th Street.

Mr. Stefan Helgeson, 3605 West 55th Street, said in his opinion he believes taking this empty parking lot and doing something with it is positive. Mr. Helgeson said he believes landscaping is a key component to the success of this project.

Commissioner Thiss questioned if the front drop-off area (along France Avenue) is used very much. Mr. Solfelt responded this entrance does generate some traffic; however, the primary entrance for the church is on the south.

Commissioner Brown questioned the growth of the current congregation. Mr. Hall responded that currently the congregation is 300 parishioners, adding

there is one Sunday service and one Saturday evening service. Mr. Hall said he believes the growth of the church will be slow, and should not impact the project.

A discussion ensued with regard to the exterior layout of the site and interior layout of the church and how it interfaces with the proposed townhouse development.

Chair Lonsbury referred to a number of e-mails received this evening from residents of the area expressing their concern with the project and asked Mr. Noonan if he received those letters. Mr. Noonan responded he also received those letters this evening. Mr. Noonan reiterated a neighborhood meeting was held to explain the proposal.

Chair Lonsbury commented at this time without receipt of the Transportation Committee's recommendation the Commission is missing a component and told the Commission as he sees it the Commission can vote this up or down and forward it to the Council for ask for a continuance to wait until the Transportation Committee makes their recommendation.

Commissioner Fischer asked Mr. Larsen if the Commission were to forward this directly to the Council would the Commission hear this again in final form (to include traffic information). Mr. Larsen responded the request this evening is preliminary so both the Commission and Council will hear this at minimum twice. Commissioner Fischer stated he feels comfortable acting on this proposal because it is heard twice and any changes that should be made can be made between preliminary and final, and review of the traffic components will be addressed.

Commissioner Brown stated in general he likes the project; however, he struggles with the setback variances especially from France Avenue, adding he appreciates the fact that only two sections of the building encroach on France Avenue. Commissioner Brown added he is also concerned with hardship. Mr. Larsen said he agrees the setback variances do seem extreme, but for the last 15 years the trend, especially in the more urban areas of Edina is to construct the buildings closer to the street.

Commissioner Thiss said so far he likes what he sees, adding he would like to see additional landscaping planted to soften the project from neighboring properties. Commissioner Thiss asked Mr. Noonan if he is still willing to reduce the amount of visitor parking to increase green space. Mr. Noonan said he is open to whatever the Commission or Council want.

Commissioner Brown commented whatever the motion is it should be subject to receiving input from the Transportation/Traffic Committee. Commissioners agreed.

Commissioner Fischer moved to recommend Preliminary Rezoning and Preliminary Plat approval subject to: final rezoning, final plat, Watershed District permit, landscaping plan, Engineering review and approval, Transportation Committee review and approval of traffic study. Commissioner Brown seconded the motion.

Chair Lonsbury asked Mr. Larsen to explain what the Commission is acting on at the preliminary level. Mr. Larsen responded essentially the action by the Commission this evening at the preliminary level would express the Commission's agreement or disagreement with the proposed land use and proposed density of the project. Continuing, Mr. Larsen said for the last 15-20 years the City has encouraged a closer relationship to the street in our more urban areas. Mr. Larsen said this project demonstrates the more urban environment, noting variances were granted to other projects in the immediate area to achieve this urban relationship. Mr. Larsen concluded at the time of final approval the plans presented to both the Commission and Council will include final exterior building materials, final landscaping plans, and final traffic circulation and patterns.

Commissioner Thiss noted Mr. Noonan did indicate his willingness to remove surface parking spaces to provide more greenspace, adding whatever the final outcome is, he wants to see more landscaping introduced especially along the common lot lines and at the ends of the townhouse units.

Commissioner Fischer stated he isn't very concerned with the variance aspect of the project. He said in his opinion this is a transitional area where the proposed units aren't built right at the sidewalk, or too far back, but somewhere in between. Continuing, Commissioner Fischer added if he hasn't said this before he believes the design is terrific, noting the developer seems to do good work.

Commissioner Staunton stated he believes this is a fine project, but in reading the e-mails presented to us this evening he wants to make sure the buffer between the subject site and the neighboring properties is landscaped to the fullest potential and maintained. With regard to the request for setback variances Commissioner Staunton agreed that it might be desirable to shorten the setbacks along major thorough-fares like France Avenue but suggested that such a change should be made by ordinance rather than variance.

Commissioner Grabiell suggested that someone other than the developer tell us what the housing market will bear, adding he doesn't want to see empty condo or townhouses units in Edina.

Chair Lonsbury called the vote. All voted aye; motion carried.

**P-06-3 Final Development Plan
 Target Corporation
 7000 York Avenue**

Mr. Larsen informed the Commission Target Corporation is proposing to redevelop their site to a new SuperTarget. Presently, the plan is to raze the existing Target Store and construct a new "Super" Target. Mr. Larsen said Super

Targets contain a full grocery element and other amenities that are missing from their regular Target retail stores or the Target Greatland stores.

Mr. Larsen said the proposed plans conform to all PCD-3 requirements, except for parking setback and parking quantity. Mr. Larsen said the key to redevelopment of this site is the relationship to the public space, referred to now as the promenade, directly behind the site. Mr. Larsen said in light of this, more time is needed to further study this issue. Mr. Larsen suggested that the proposal be continued for one month to allow staff and Target additional time to investigate the possibility of developing housing in this area.

Mr. Forest Russell, Alice Davis, Eames Gilmore, John Dietrich and Vern Swing were present representing Target Corporation.

Mr. Russell addressed the Commission and reported the Edina Target store is T-47 and was constructed in 1973, serving Edina for over three decades. Mr. Russell noted Target Corporation is the most philanthropic corporation in the United States, continually giving back to the community. Mr. Russell said the time frame for construction of a SuperTarget is approximately nine months - from the razing of the present store to completion of the new store. Mr. Russell said at present Target is evolving and it is the goal of Target Corporation to develop more SuperTargets, not only in Minnesota, but across the entire country. Continuing, Mr. Russell said a SuperTarget can only be a one level store. He explained the nature of the inner workings of a SuperTarget is conducive to a one level operation. Concluding Mr. Russell said a SuperTarget also includes a full-service grocery element to include bakery, deli and other grocery related elements. Mr. Russell introduced Mr. John Dietrich to further explain the proposed store site redevelopment.

Mr. Dietrich, 6110 Blue Circle Drive, Minnetonka, told the Commission Target is a 14.86 parcel located in Planned Commercial District-3. The present store is roughly 155,00 square feet with 14,400 square feet of in-line retail shops presently in place; however, at present they are vacant. Target Corporation is now proposing removal of the existing Target and in-line retail shops and replacing them with a 196,500 square foot SuperTarget. The entire site will be reconstructed including the parking lot and relocation of the driveway access. The entrance will be relocated to align with the Galleria entrance. Continuing, Mr. Dietrich said the parking lot will be re-stripped with a total parking capacity of 794 parking stalls. Mr. Dietrich told the Commission Target is seeking a variance from the parking requirement. The variance enables Target to reinvest in the site with a new building and extensive landscaping. Mr. Dietrich said all landscaped islands would be irrigated. With graphics Mr. Dietrich pointed out the proposed site layout, circulation and access. He reiterated the site will be generously landscaped focusing on the corners at 70th and York, and Hazelton and York. Mr. Dietrich said in his opinion this is a gem of a store and it is designed to capture the character of Southdale area. Concluding Mr. Dietrich pointed out parking areas that are identified at 15 feet from Hazelton Road will be shifted 5 additional feet to eliminate the need for setback variances. 4/1000 be approved difference or 190 stalls equates to 1.3 acres of hard surface don't need that

Mr. Eames Gilmore, 7304 Tara Road, addressed the Commission and informed them he is proud to be part of the community and a representative of Target Corporation. With graphics and photos Mr. Gilmore pointed out the differing architectural styles throughout the City, including the Galleria, Southdale Library, Yorktown retail development, Walgreens, 50th and France area and the new City Hall building. Continuing, Mr. Gilmore pointed out the interior retail layout and proceeded to point out the differing building elevations. Mr. Gilmore said all elevations will use rich materials with the dark brick front façade, overlapping layers of brick, and signage to incorporate the Target logo. Mr. Gilmore said Target is very excited about this new store, adding it follows the Southdale master plan option almost directly, and subject to the housing element for the future. Mr. Gilmore stated Target feels this project will provide the community with a great piece of architecture and it will energize the Southdale corridor area and the City. Concluding, Mr. Gilmore noted many Edina residents have expressed their excitement at this new store.

Chair Lonsbury thanked Target representatives for their fine presentation, adding it is our Target too. Chair Lonsbury said he appreciates all the work that was put into this, and asked the Commissioners if they have any questions or comments for the developer.

Commissioner Thiss asked Mr. Gilmore if the proposed SuperTarget is similar to the one in Roseville, adding he is trying to get a feel for this building. Mr. Gilmore responded this store is more embellished with architectural features on all sides. He pointed out the tower features, higher quality materials, more varying elements, more landscaping features, cornices which add more layers of depth, etc.

Chair Lonsbury commented he likes all the things said, but is a little disappointed in the design; adding he believes this Target should be something much more special.

Commissioner Brown agreed with Chair Lonsbury's comment that the proposed design falls short of expectations and questioned if the 4/1000 ratio in parking stalls is typical for a SuperTarget. Mr. Russell responded the typical "big box" retail parking ratio is usually between 4-5 spaces per 1000. Mr. Russell said the Edina store is one of the best stores in the country and believes the proposed ratio is adequate and our numbers indicate, we are in fine shape at 4 per 1000.

Commissioner Brown said he appreciates that theory, and asked if there is a SuperTarget(s) in the area with a 4 to 1000 ratio. Mr. Russell responded the SuperTarget is Roseville is 4 spaces per 1000, adding that store went through the holiday season in fine style, with no problems. Mr. Russell said he believes the SuperTarget in West St. Paul is also at a 4/1000 parking ratio. Commissioner Brown asked Mr. Larsen if he contacted any other cities with SuperTargets and asked if the parking ratio met the demand. Mr. Larsen responded he has had no direct contact with any other cities; however, he did visit different SuperTargets and didn't observe any shortages. Mr. Larsen pointed out it is in the best interest of Target to have this ratio work, adding preserving greenspace in this area is important to the City.

Chair Lonsbury said Edina is very proud of their Target especially as the key stone to this area, reiterating he would like to see a better building design. Chair Lonsbury referred to photos of other Target stores in the nation. Mr. Gilmore responded many of the stores depicted are not SuperTargets, and are located in more urban areas and are imbedded on the second floor in many instances.

Commissioner Brown said he also has a concern with access to the back of the site. He said he worries about vehicle access if redeveloped as housing.

Mr. Gilmore said that will be the subject of future sessions, acknowledging the master plan indicates this as housing. Mr. Gilmore pointed out there is 50 plus feet between the Target building wall and the property line, room enough for housing. He added there is also a grade change out there which could setup vehicle parking underneath the housing units if they were constructed as a townhouse development. Concluding, Mr. Gilmore said he envisions a series of courtyards or front porch entries that would face the promenade, adding there are a variety of ways to develop housing, but that is in the future.

Mr. Russell said he envisions entrances to the “proposed future” housing from Hazelton and West 70th Street

Commissioner Grabiell questioned how many parking stalls are proposed, he noted presently there are 732 stalls. Mr. Dietrich said this plan provides 794 parking stalls, so that is an increase. Commissioner Grabiell said with respect to the promenade, adding in his opinion this area is key- key- key to the whole Southdale area redevelopment plan, and questioned if Target is committed to allowing the construction of housing to their rear. Commissioner Grabiell noted this scenario has been talked about, but can or will it be done. Mr. Russell said what Target needs to do in the future is to come up with a basis for a real estate deal, adding right now the property belongs to Target Corporation, Target owns it. Mr. Russell said at present Target doesn't have the mechanism to get there, adding he is sure it's possible. Mr. Russell said architecturally there are details that need to be addressed, one is backing residential onto a commercial structure and complying with certain codes. Concluding, Mr. Russell said he believes it can be solved, but it would take time, adding whether Target would actually outright sell the 50 foot strip to the City who in turn will spin it off to a developer, that piece isn't known. Mr. Russell said the attorneys need to figure this out, adding he believes it is doable. Commissioner Grabiell said he only asked to ensure there is some type of commitment out there.

Commissioner Thiss referred to the courtyard depicted along the promenade (prior to any housing development) and asked if Target would maintain that area. Mr. Russell responded Target will maintain the area along the promenade.

Commissioner Staunton questioned Mr. Larsen where the 5 space per 1000 parking ratio comes from - is it driven by use- is it driven by area, or is it driven by zoning? Mr. Larsen responded the ratio is a parking requirement that has been in part of the City Zoning Ordinance for 30 plus years. How the City came up with the 5 per thousand ratio on shopping centers was a formula for

retail uses greater than 40,000 square feet. Continuing, Mr. Larsen said it seems what the City has been seeing over time is that those numbers don't represent in reality what is out there. Commissioner Staunton commented in his experience one can visit the site on any number of days and can find reasonable parking spaces where one doesn't have to park in the farthest corner of the lot. Mr. Larsen agreed, he added he also uses this Target and has never had to park in the far areas of the Lot. Mr. Larsen asked the Commission to also note that Target has operated under a parking ratio variance for 15 to 20 years without difficulty, adding he believes the current ratio is 4.3/1000. Mr. Larsen said a case can be made that the 4/1000 ratio works in reality, with the honest answer that we haven't gotten real with City code. Commissioner Staunton stated he appreciates that response, adding this may go back to the previous discussion, but it appears the Code hasn't adapted to reality, adding it seems the justification for granting the variance by saying "we don't need it", may not be the correct approach. Concluding, Commissioner Staunton stated maybe the City really needs to re-look at our Codes, and if our Codes don't reflect what is out there change them, instead of granting variances. Mr. Larsen agreed.

Commissioner Fischer commented, and before he makes a few points, a lot of people have said this is their Target, adding for his family that is an understatement. Continuing, Commissioner Fischer stated with excellence comes great expectations, adding in his opinion that applies to Target and it applies to Edina. Commissioner Fischer said if one goes back to the 1950's and the Dayton vision that vision essentially revolutionized retail throughout this entire country. The development of Southdale set a high benchmark, followed by Edinborough, and of course Centennial Lakes. These partnerships between public and private were cutting edge and today they are still being copied around the country. Commissioner Fischer said he finds it interesting that here we are in 2006 and this site is probably the most critical site in the whole Southdale area and the vision started with Dayton's. Continuing, Commissioner Fischer said Target Corporation as a company currently uses design as their differentiator from their competition. Target throughout the country is forcing design to be discussed in "big box" retail adding his concern is that this site right now in the context of Edina and in context of the Southdale area plan needs to be done right, and if the City doesn't get this right the City will be missing the best opportunity it has. Commissioner Fischer stated in his opinion the design can be better, adding he believes there is a willingness on both parts to work together toward that goal. Commissioner Fischer said he really doesn't understand why this can't be two stories. Concluding, Commissioner Fischer said he also thinks eliminating the setback variance may not be the right option.

Mr. Gilmore responded with regard to retail that a two story retail SuperTarget store does not work. Continuing, Mr. Gilmore said the merchandise flow would be compromised, adding it just won't work.

Commissioner Scherer noted it appears the service entrance is rather close to the promenade and questioned how many trucks deliver to Target on a daily basis. Mr. Russell responded he believes between 12-15 trucks deliver to the site weekly, which would be roughly two deliveries per day. Mr. Russell said semi or large truck deliveries usually occur between 4-10 PM. Local deliveries usually occur between 8-12 AM.

A discussion ensued between Commissioners on the advantages of continuing the Target request until the Planning Commission meeting on March 29th. Members felt additional design options should be considered, and a continuation would allow time for redesign.

Chair Lonsbury asked if there are any other comments or thoughts on the matter.

Commissioner Brown said the Commission wants this to be a win win situation. Mr. Russell said he agrees with that and the onus is on both of our groups to get it done and get it done right.

Commissioner Fischer said he believes one of the hesitations this evening is that this request does not return to the Commission for a second look. Commissioner Fischer asked Mr. Larsen if this is a one time deal or does it require two sessions before the Commission and Council. Mr. Larsen responded a Final Development Plan is a one time deal. Mr. Larsen told the Commission there still is adequate time within the 60-day time frame for the Commission to request a continuance to their meeting of March 29th. The Council will hear this mid-April, and they can act on it or also ask the proponents for a continuance. Mr. Larsen reiterated holding this over for thirty days is not a problem.

Commissioner Fischer agreed a continuance is best because if the Commission doesn't like what it sees, the vote would be no, adding it is in the best interest of everyone to work together. Mr. Larsen agreed.

Chair Lonsbury said if he understands correctly it is up to the Commission to make a motion to hold this over until our next meeting, and at that time the Commission will either vote it up or down.

Commissioner Staunton questioned, just to be clear, if the Council were to act on this at its April meeting would that still fall within the 60-day time frame. Mr. Larsen responded that is correct. The April 18 meeting falls within the 60-day time frame. Continuing, Mr. Larsen said that gives the Commission flexibility, noting the Council also has the option of further continuance. Mr. Larsen said he is very comfortable with the Commission holding this over to the meeting on March 29th. Chair Lonsbury told the proponents the City follows State Statues and the Commission wants to make sure the we aren't forced to make a decision we don't want to make just to abide by the Statue.

Mr. Gilmore asked if it would be appropriate to work with City Staff and Commission Members on this issue before their meeting of March 29th. Mr. Larsen responded that should not be a problem - if Commissioners are willing. Mr. Larsen acknowledged it isn't typically done, however, if someone wants to offer their time, it shouldn't be a problem. Chair Lonsbury stated if he understands the Statute correctly not all Commissioners could sit down with Target representatives, but some of us could. Mr. Larsen said that is correct. Mr. Russell said he agrees, and would like to meet with a small number of Commissioners at their desire.

Commissioner Thiss questioned if a motion is needed to suggest that a small group of Commissioners meet. Commissioner Thiss said if the Commission wants to hit this target (no pun intended) by the end of the month I think an "extra meeting" would be a great.

Commissioner Thiss moved that the Chair Lonsbury appoint at least two Commission Members to work with representatives of Target in an advisory manner. Commissioner Brown seconded the motion.

Commissioner Grabel questioned if it is legal for Commissioners to meet in a group with an applicant. Mr. Larsen responded the Commission is advisory to the Council, adding he doesn't believe those rules apply; however, Mr. Larsen suggested that less than a quorum meet, possibly two to three members. Chair Lonsbury stated as he understands the motion and second it is for at least two members. Chair Lonsbury added he also encourages the applicant to reach out to Commission Members via telephone or e-mail, adding any one of us can comment individually. Chair Lonsbury called the motion. All were in favor. Motion carried.

Chair Lonsbury stated at this time he will appoint Commissioner Fischer and himself to participate in meetings with Target officials and City staff. Chair Lonsbury said the meeting will be coordinated through City Staff.

Commissioner Fischer moved to continue the request for Final Development Plan for Target Corporation to the Planning Commission Meeting of March 29, 2006. Commissioner Brown seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried.

IV. INTERGOVERNMENTAL BUSINESS:

Chair Lonsbury acknowledged receipt of the City's Council Connection, Transportation Commission minutes and information from the Watershed District.

V. ADJOURNMENT:

Commissioner Scherer moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:55 PM

Jackie Hoogenakker