Land Use Committee Minutes Draft

February 4, 2016

In Attendance: Daniel Sarasti, Ray Bryan, Ian Luby, Stephen Mastey, Sherm Eagles, Ed Elliott, Fred Foster, Bob Straughn, David Fan, Carol Herman, Keith Hovland, Alex Susko, Roger Purdy, Les Everett

Staff: Suyapa Miranda, Cailin Rogers

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Introductions, Approve Minutes and Agenda | Bob moved to approve the agenda as amended to put committee chair elections first. Alex seconded. The motion passed unanimously.  |
| Chair Election | David put his name forward. Ian also put his name forward. Les nominated Roger. Keith nominated David. Roger nominated Ian. Keith wondered if there could be three co-chairs. Each candidate gave a brief background on themselves. **Keith moved to have all three candidates as co-chairs. Roger seconded. The vote passed unanimously.**  |
| Housekeeping | The office has moved locations. David and Carol need to be added to the newsletter.  |
| Prospect North District Planning | Julie and Dick joined the committee to discuss their work on the Prospect North District Planning project. Prospect Park had a lot of industrial areas falling into disrepair. They ultimately came together as a neighborhood to plan for a vibrant future. They focused on high density housing, specialty offices, etc. They wanted to look at what a 21st century neighborhood would look like and how to communicate that to developers. They built a number of strategic partnerships to work on a design framework to communicate a vision to developers. They created neighborhood development guidelines. Once they had those, they focused on how to implement those guidelines and fulfill their values. They wanted to both express innovation through district systems and attract innovative businesses to their area. Their innovative systems include district heating which connects businesses for a smart way to heat the area. They have engaged a parking conversation to envision how to use the green line, build in flexibility as parking preferences change, and allow builders to use parking most efficiently. They are creating more bike and pedestrian friendly streets to be the “green spine” of the neighborhood. They are working to establish a district stormwater management system. The MWMO is a partner on that project. The entire district goes from TCF stadium over to 280 so it encompasses parts of both Minneapolis and St. Paul. The partnership is excited about working with St. Paul to live out values of art and culture here. They have focused on truly designing the streetscape so that it attracts people and cars are guests. The partnership has created the structure and they continue to seek out partnerships to help fund what the city won't provide. The district stormwater management system is already in place. The purpose of the guidelines was to be able to show a developer who was looking at developing in the neighborhood what it means to develop in that neighborhood and what their goals and vision were. They have consultants who walk develop through the guidelines and who work with developers and the city to help encourage developers to put into place higher standards than the minimum. They are currently working with consulting group Capsule to rebrand and launch a formal website. Bob expressed that he was glad that this partnership includes part of our neighborhood. He hopes we can help this process. Sherman asked about flow of traffic through the area. Julie explained that careful assessments are underway. There will be a traffic study this summer. Alex asked about initial funding sources. Dick explained that they had a good number of volunteer hours involved. The Central Corridor Funders Collaborative gave them their initial $60,000. Julie expressed that they would like a formal liaison to the group appointed who can report back to the Land Use Committee. The St. Paul portion needs to be fully represented there. The Met Council has been fairly involved and this partnership may look at adopting their equity scorecard. **Keith nominated Fred to be the liaison to the partnership. Fred agreed to the nomination. Carol seconded**. Suyapa and Cailin also plan to attend these meetings. Julie clarified that they would like one representative for a workshop and then have at least one person but not more than a couple for the upcoming Surly event and for the every other month meetings. **Les offered an amendment to have Bob also serve as a representative. Keith accepted it as a friendly amendment. The group unanimously approved these representatives.** Stephen wondered how we could motivate the two cities to make these a requirement instead of extra. Julie says she thinks policy is coming. Stephen further queried how SAPCC can help. Julie suggested that we adopt these development guidelines. Ray wondered about connecting with the Grand Rounds and also daylighting creeks. Julie answered that they are working to create those connections and are looking into ways to daylight northern areas of the creek. Both cities are looking at a way to connect to each other. Roger asked about s bridge over 280. Dick responded that there has been a study conducted but that he does not have it with him.Julie added that they have been working with CEZ for years now to find ways to collaborate. Roger mentioned efforts to connect both neighborhoods stemming from the Council. Daniel spoke in favor of the transit way. |
| Tear Down Discussion | There's a tear down activist group we could connect with on this. Ward 3 has some specific zoning requirements to help combat tear downs. We would like someone from Minneapolis who has dealt with this come talk to us. Ed mentioned that the St. Paul Historical Commission tried five years ago to get the authority to review tear downs. Bob mentioned that the mega mansion style has been a huge issue in other cities. Stephen mentioned getting this formally as a goal for 2016. We need to research what has been done in Edina and Minneapolis.  |
| Annual Goals Revision | Carol would like us to have formalized guidelines for processes. The Committee added goals:1. Document formalized processes for the Land Use Committee. Re-visit 2006 Land Use Guidelines. B. Formalize role of chairs. C. Establish best practices (look at other district councils)
2. Work with Prospect North District Partnership.
3. Proactively engage on tear down issues including: reaching out to groups active on this issue and doing appropriate research.
4. Re-envision South St. Anthony Park, especially businesses and town center.
5. Develop Land Use portion of the Comprehensive Plan.
6. Strength connections between North and South St. Anthony Park Andre area west of Highway 280.

**Roger moved to have staff re-word and package goals for review at next meeting. The motion passed unanimously.**Staff will include the goals listed at last month’s meeting as well. |
| ADU Discussion | Keith expressed sadness that the board acted without the clearing of the Land Use Committee on the city’s ADU proposal. He noted disappointment in the way that events happened and that the board acted without input from the Committee and did not acknowledge all of the work and nuance in the ADU Task Force process. Sherm suggested that the board needed to act before the Land Use Committee met again. Keith indicated that D12 could have waited in order to have a letter more representative of the feelings of the neighborhood. He noted that the letter does not accurately represent events in the community process. Stephen added that the letter accurately included information out of other committees like the work of the Environment Committee.David spoke on the role of the Task Force. He also noted that he finds the document self-contradictory because it endorses two different ADU plans. Ian clarified that the two plans are different because they pertain to different geographic areas: north and south SAP. Les explained that he was at the board meeting where the voting occurred and that the board voted for two separate and geographically distinct plans. Keith suggested that the Land Use Committee’s role is a question that needs to be answered.**Keith moved to formally request that D12 revise and resubmit this letter to more accurately represent the issue and more clearly represent the community. Fred seconded and added that he believes that it will be difficult to find people to serve on task forces and committees.** Ian clarified that the city plan and the Task Force’s plan are not contradictory. Roger mentioned that he didn't see disrespect for the Task Force and noted that the Council can do what it wants. He stated that he believes that the letter does reflect community process.Carol added that there was a lot of dissection and discussion on this issue in the neighborhood that the letter does not reflect. Stephen commented on community participation on north and south SAP.Board member Matt weighed in on the issue. He explained that the board formally thanked the Task Force before anyone else. He noted that the board has a great deal of respect for how contentious this issue is and how the Task Force dealt with that contention. The board acted because the city has a vision for this transit-oriented corridor in south SAP and the Council did not see it as effective to oppose the city on this, but also submitted the Task Force’s recommendations for review by the city as a city policy overall. Matt also clarified that procedurally, any resolution passed by the committee comes to the board for review automatically. He also commented that we need to realize that we are all working together as an organization. Les commented that he thinks that the ADU issue was well-discussed at multiple stages. Board member Michael noted that if a resolution is unanimously passed that it goes on the consent agenda. With this resolution, a split vote automatically brought it up for discussion at the board level. Bob reminded the group of his motion at the last meeting that was not voted on to give people in the community to comment at the end of a process even without having engaged during the process.David added that policy states that a D12 Task Force must have a public hearing. **The vote was 5 (Carol, David, Keith, Fred, Bob) to 5 (Alex, Roger, Ian, Les, Stephen) to 1 (Daniel). Ray broke the tie as opposed to the motion. The motion did not pass.**  |
| Adjourn | Les moved to adjourn. Keith seconded. 9:25 pm |