

Minutes of the Prospect Park Association Land Use Committee

Thursday, August 8th, 2019

In Attendance on Sign-In sheet: Eric Amel, Jeff Barnhart Prospect Park Properties, Devan Blanchard, Dan Bryant, David Frank, Dick Gilyard, Gayla Lindt, Florence Littman, Laura Preus, Joe Ring, Lynn Von Korff, Joyce Walker, John Wike, Jeff Wrede, Carl Kaeding, Ann Munt, Brady Nordland, Judy Britton, Helen Sahlin, Noreen Emery, Darin Waring, Magrid Hart, Deidre Kellogg, David Gundale, Rick Bergman, Denny & Jane Carlson, Julie Kimble, Spencer Ung U Garden, Chris Huntley, Jeff Ellerd Wall Companies, Ari Paritz Vermilion Development Co., John Wicks Chair LU Committee.

Please see Agenda for listing of topics discussed.

John Wicks welcomed all persons attending the meeting and called the meeting to order at 7:05 PM.

1. A review of this month's agenda was held and no modifications were recommended. A motion was made to approve the agenda.
2. The second item on the Agenda was a brief discussion of the Land Use meeting minutes for July 2019. Joyce Walker indicated she did not agree with a statement that referred to her. It was agreed to strike this paragraph from the minutes.
3. Next on the Agenda was a presentation by the Momentum Design Group for an extended stay hotel that is in planning for the southeast intersection of Bedford Avenue and University Avenue. Mr. Jeff Wrede the architect for the project described it:
 - The design team had met with the Minneapolis City Planning Commission and were directed to place the building along the street frontage and parking in the rear.
 - The building is being planned for five stories in height.
 - This will be a Residence Inn specifically an extended stay hotel with 102 units.
 - It is planned to be constructed on two adjacent lots one of which is zoned C1 (along University Avenue) and the other R4 (along Bedford). It is their intent with neighborhood approval to combine the two parcels under a common zoning designation for hotels – C3A.
 - 73 parking spaces will be provided - about 70% of units.

Some comments from the Committee members;

- People who live on Bedford across from the project are not in attendance at the meeting.
- Bedford & University Avenue is a complex and difficult intersection.
- Does Marriott Corp Dictate the hotel design?
- What will be the contribution this building brings to the neighborhood?
- It was noted that the individual houses across the street from the site are all very different in style yet considerably less in height than the proposed hotel.

A motion was made and seconded to proceed with a Task Force for the hotel, the following persons volunteered for the Task Force:

- David Gundale
- Lynn Von Korff
- Donna Schneider
- Florence Littman

- Eric Amel
 - John Wicks
 - Efforts will be made to encourage residents who live near the site to join the TF.
4. Next on the agenda was an update by Joe Ring of the status of the Conservation District being organized by neighbors residing near Tower Hill Park on portions of Clarence Ave and Seymour Street. Joe described:
- a. This weekend notes will be sent to the 28 property owners who reside in the proposed district informing them of a meeting to be held on 8/28 from 7 to 9 pm. The purpose of which is to present the draft ordinance to the property owners of the Administrative Guidelines and statement of purpose and moving forward from that point. All of which will depend on the property owners and their acceptance of the information presented to them.
5. The next topic to discuss was a new hotel project to be located at 2800 University Avenue by Prospect Park Properties. Preston Mosser of PPP and Dan Bryant presented the “Home 2 Suites” project MOU for approval by the committee. Dan Described:
- a. The Task Force met 4 times over the past 2 months. They spent considerable time reviewing the ground floor and exterior of the building.
- b. The facility will share parking with the adjacent hotel, approximately 229 spaces – a higher percent than required by the City.

Committee Comments:

1. Was Glendale notified of this project?
 2. What is the Task Force trying to accomplish at tonight’s meeting? Response: approval of the MOU so it can be taken to the next PPA Board meeting for approval.
 3. Some residents were concerned with the number of automobiles that will come to PP.
 4. Another resident expressed concern with the quantity of vehicles that will likely result from having two extended stay facilities in the neighborhood, Home 2 Suites and the other one proposed for Bedford and University Avenue. In response it was noted that the two facilities are quite different.
 5. Several members voiced their support for the project emphasizing Jeff Barnhart’s willingness to work with the neighborhood on the project.
 6. A motion to approve the MOU was made by Lynn Von Korff and seconded by Devan Blanchard Motion passed.
 7. The MOU will be brought to the PPA Board at its August 26th meeting.
6. John Wicks described how the Land Use Committee had been contacted by the architect for the 2424 Essex St. SE residential project. The architect was seeking a letter of support for the project from the Land Use Committee. John Described how the owner and architect had brought the design to the Committee but did not enter into the MOU process and how they were asked to provide a draft letter containing the language that they sought they never complied. John asked, “What should we do?”
- In response it was noted that a letter from the Land Use Committee could be prepared but contain only a description of what actually took place at the meetings. For instance the design did respond to some critiques that were made by the committee of the project
7. Jeff Ellerd of Wall Companies provided an update on the O’Shaughnessy Distillery Project. He said the project was proceeding and that Wall Companies would soon sell the land (August 19th) to the developer for the project and that the project design is in the process of scheduling its

submittal to the City Planning Commission. Jeff apologized for the disconnection that has taken place between the developer and the neighborhood. It is still the intent of the developer to make the project a destination distillery.

Committee Comments:

- a. It was noted that the project may be under construction by October 1st.
- b. A recommendation was made that in the future, if a developer refuses to engage over an extended period of time with the neighborhood, such as an MOU process, that we not recommend writing a letter of support or encouragement to the City for the project.
- c. It was noted that we have a role to play in the review process and if developers chose to circumvent that process we cannot support their projects.
- d. Some committee members were concerned about the relationship of the proposed bike path as it passes by the Distillery Site. It was noted that a meeting must be convened with Cam Gordon to discuss bike path issues through the neighborhood.

9. A discussion of the Vermilion project was added to the Agenda. Eric Amel noted that the developer has scheduled a public hearing meeting with the CPC to review the project which will take place later in September.

Committee Comments:

- a. The primary changes are a removal of the condo units and substitution of additional apartment units with a change in the number of parking spaces.
- b. In response to the “strong” resistance to additional apartment units, it was noted that it reflects a negativism toward renter – which is not beneficial to the neighborhood.
- c. Attempts should be made to obtain the CPC Staff report ahead of the typical issue date.
- d. The developer Ari Paritz was in the audience and he had this to share: “...we shared changes to the project ASAP because we were encumbered with the Law Suit. As a result they were forced into a period of discretion (as to what they could say) due to the Law Suit. They had no opportunity to come back to the Task Force – due to the financial market they couldn’t proceed – the Law Suit halted them.” Furthermore, “...changes reduced the size and height of the former condo tower. The rear of the Art and Architecture building was reduced in depth, and there was no reduction in the public plaza or open space.”
- e. One resident noted that they did not think the changes were minor.
- f. Another resident noted that the broader community is not aware of the changes that have taken place and recommends that a review of the status of the project be brought to the whole community.
- g. A motion was made by Eric Amel to hold a community meeting to review the Vermilion project at the next Land Use Committee meeting to be held on Tuesday, September 10th, at a location to be determined. Motion carried.

10. Meeting was adjourned at 9:30 PM

Minutes prepared by John Wicks – send your comments to him at jonewix@aol.com

