

Draft Meeting Minutes for

Loring Park Master Plan Steering Committee Meeting held October 24, 2012

Those present: Paul Hinderager, Dick Sandberg, Brian Goldberg (HUMC), Neil Reirdon, John Van Heel, Jana Metge (CLPC Coordinator), Beth Elliott (City Planning Dept.)

The meeting focused on addressing comments by city staff on the August draft master plan in order to make final revisions before the plan goes out for a 45 day public review early in 2013. Below are the responses to significant items from the city comments.

● **City comment on Land Use Chapter:** In the Land Use Plan map, we don't think there should be Urban Neighborhood designations spread out in places that are surrounding by Mixed Use. What is the rationale for this? The specific examples are along Spruce from Grant to 15th and on the north side of Yale Place at 13th Street.

S.C. Response - The committee agreed that the sites noted seemed spread out within the mixed use areas. Direction was given to switch the referred-to properties from Urban Neighborhood to the Mixed Use designation.

It was however later pointed out by the lead consultant that Spruce Place and Yale Place had initially been given the Urban Neighborhood land use designations along most of their lengths. This was intentional since they are quieter and more residential than nearby, more commercial, streets. Both Spruce and Yale are adjacent to streets where the Mixed Use land use designation predominates. Because there is a requirement to not have more than one land use designation within any one parcel of land we have the situation where there are properties that cross from one side of a block to another. This goes to the extent on these two streets that the Mixed Use land use designation appears to be the most prevalent. Because of this text will be added to the Land Use Chapter that will recommend that Spruce Place and Yale Place remain as primarily residential streets.

● **City comment on Land Use Chapter:** (referring to Built Form Plan) Recommendations in a small area plan will be a component of a rezoning analysis but cannot reach the level of detail contained here. (and) A three-story designation will be challenging to get approved through both the City Planning Commission and City Council. Any new development would need to be either a single/two-family structure or a townhouse which isn't likely to be financially feasible in a Downtown environment. If the goal is to preserve the historic mansions, it is best to leave that to the recommendations in the chapter on Protecting Historic Resources rather than layering policy in such a way that isn't implementable.

S.C. Response - For the purpose of making the plan more compatible with city planning the S.C. Gave direction to take some steps to simplify the plan and make built form designations a clearer part of the plan. Current and future tower designations will be removed from the plan.

However, the area with the most detail on the plan is Loring Hill. The source for planning in this area is the Loring Hill Design Guidelines, which were developed by the community in order to protect a highly valued historic area. It was the consensus of the committee to respect and retain these aspects of the plan as they had received overwhelming support from the community.

● **City comment on Land Use Chapter :** Is the neighborhood truly supportive of the diagram on page 25? This feels very prescriptive and could result in a lack of creativity on the part of architects and developers (e.g. every new building has the same form). There is definite value in stepping back a structure after the first few stories in order to create a human scale at the sidewalk level and create less mass near adjacent structures but you might want to consider being more flexible beyond that. If this is still a priority, there should at least be an explanation of WHY it is important and valuable.

S.C. Response - The committee did not think the diagram was intended as a design requirement for all conditions across the neighborhood, but rather as a valuable tool that can be utilized to shape new construction that is context sensitive. Direction was given to simplify the diagram and to add an explanation of its intended use. The revised diagram will be coupled with the Context Sensitive Design Questions and the piece that had been known as the Developer's Checklist. These will be part of the Land Use Chapter and a "Developers Guide" that will be developed as a separate document from the small area plan.

● **City comment on Land Use Chapter:** The specific recommendations in the Developer's Checklist on page 26 are difficult to understand. Is a development required to adhere to ALL the direction in this table otherwise it won't be supported by CLPC? What may be more practical is to say that a developer needs to follow the conditions under one of the topical/issue headings rather than all of them.

S.C. Response - It was pointed out by a committee member that there had been a different version of the checklist introduction which broadened the application of the checklist and made it more flexible. The purpose of the checklist was to provide 1) particular things that the neighborhood can encourage everyone doing construction in the neighborhood to do in order to contribute to the neighborhood's sustainability goals and its desire to develop a high quality urban environment that is sensitive to the existing historic fabric.

And 2) For large projects and for projects requiring significant variances, conditional use permits, etc. the checklist was intended as a basis for receiving support from the neighborhood. For particular development, the list is intended to provide developers with a set of desired characteristics that can be used as a starting point for design decisions and discussions with the neighborhood. Direction was given to change the introduction to reflect the above intent and to modify the name of the list. The suggested name was "Developers Guide". Some further thought should be given to the name since this name was also to be used for the broader document on development that is to be developed.

● **City comment on Land Use Chapter:** On page 35, under 2.24, it is not possible to extract any zoning district from the provisions of Increasing Maximum Height nor was this ever discussed in the planning process, at least with City staff. The first full paragraph on this page should be deleted.

S.C. Response - The committee agreed that this paragraph was in conflict with current city provisions and would be incompatible for the master plan as an approved part of the city's comprehensive plan. Direction was given to remove the paragraph. The committee gave direction to add language outlining the community's position regarding building height and the historic fabric.

● **City comment on Land Use Chapter:** On page 36, in the last paragraph under Hillside Impression, does this mean that views from a first floor unit cannot be blocked? The City cannot regulate private views but this could be something that CLPC considers in its own development review process.

S.C. Response – The committee thought that the language regarding views should be consistent with what is in the the Loring Hill Design Guidelines. The guidelines refer only to views from public places. The text will be clarified to specifically reference views from public spaces. CLPC historically has limited it's consideration of views to those from public spaces.

- **City comment on Land Use Chapter:** On page 37, under Mixed Use Development, the language could preclude office or other conversions in mansions. Why is it not appropriate for a mansion to have a single use? It isn't practical to require rehabbed structures to always have a housing component.

S.C. Response – The committee thought a mistake and that in the mansion area that a mix of uses could happen from one building to another rather than, necessarily, within in one building. Direction was given to make the language less restrictive.

- **City comment on Historic Resources Chapter:** On page 19, this list of Context Sensitive Design questions is a great tool. Our advice, however, would be to put this in Built Form section of Chapter 2. It would add some context and rational that is somewhat lost in this section, plus it would be extremely effective when working with developers in ALL situations.

S.C. Response – The committee agreed that it would make sense to locate this list in the Land Use Chapter, however there was also consensus that it was an important element of the Historic Chapter, and should continue to be located there too.

- **City comment on Historic Resources Chapter:** On page 26, under 3.1.6, the last sentence is technically inaccurate because local designation does not necessarily need owner permission. Does this change the intent of the recommendation?

S.C. Response – This section of the chapter is a review of properties that the 2008 Historic survey said may be eligible for historic designation. The descriptions do not include any recommendations that a property be designated. The committee thought the reference to “permission” for designation was outside the scope of the section's topic area and inconsistent with the other property descriptions. Direction was given to remove the last sentence.

- **City comment on Public Realm Chapter:** On page 11, our comments from the August 2011 draft are still the same: Public Works isn't generally supportive of changing classification for either Access Minneapolis street types or functional classification. 15th serves more than just Loring Park. The cross-section for Activity Area Street and Neighborhood Connector are the same. What would be the implementation value in changing these?

S.C. Response – The committee believed that the change of classification would in fact have little affect on the future character of the street. As the proposed classification would have the same street profile as the the current classification, and since it was felt that improvements to 15th were otherwise covered well under recommendations in several parts the plan, direction was given to remove this recommendation.

Loring Park Neighborhood Master Plan Steering Committee Meeting
Thursday, May 9th, 2012 6:30-8:00pm
Loring Park Community Center (in park at 14th and Willow)

- I. Update on master plan approval process
- II. Review of comments on plan by general public and by public officials
- III. Discussion on possible plan modifications
- IV. Review Developers Guide Brochure (see attached)

Note: The brochure is a master plan outline and directory on topics related to new construction in the neighborhood. These include several “opportunity site” renderings. The one of the Nicollet Avenue area is intended to provide a diagrammatic representation of master plan policy, not a detailed architectural vision or a detailed recommendation on the development or preservation of any individual site.

Master Plan Steering Committee Meeting
January 11th, 2012

Those attending: John Van Heel, Roy Williams, Pete Musty, Christopher Hoffer, & Jana Metge (CLPC Coordinator)

Thanks to Loring Park for hosting.

Reports:

There are no comments from Loring Greenway Association. We should ensure that they are invited to the Jan. 21st worksession. Peter noted that there is a “placeholder” in the Master Plan for their comments. They need to write up and submit to us, what detail they want in the plan per their Damon Farber Capital Improvement Plan. This is incomplete in our plan, until we get their feedback.

Roy reported that he is moving off of the Hennepin Ave. Board of Trustees. He has been the Vice President of the Kenwood Neighborhood Group. Pat Scott is also retiring from the neighborhood board. He asked to be kept on the email list through Master Plan completion. He was invited to remain on the Master Plan Steering Committee as an adjacent neighborhood group representative.

Peter reported that John Lauber had completed the Chapters on “Protecting Historic Resources” and “Land Use & Built Form” and that they will be uploaded. John will send link out to all Steering Committee members, as well as those stakeholders who have participated in the process to date. Jana will send Saturday, Jan. 21st notice out and John will follow up “reply all” and post everyone on the link so that chapter review can be done the week prior to Jan. 21st.

Opportunity Sites:

Pete proposed working only on a plan for Nicollet Ave. and the Activity Center area. He will meet with the Convention Center and talk about decking concepts, development, connecting to Stevens Square, and additional parking concepts. We asked Pete to include Central Lutheran and their plans into conceptual policy illustration for this area.

John is scheduled to talk about the Master Plan with Stevens Square on Tuesday, Feb. 7th. Anyone from the Steering Committee is welcome to attend and assist with this presentation.

John suggested that we work on a concept for a "missing tooth" - parking lot development and gave the example of the Joe's Garage site or the 15th Street site Neil Reardon talked about. He thought we should feature a site around the Park. Pete talked about visioning a new development where the 1970's building is currently located (on the NE corner of 15th & Willow). It was suggested that Neil could submit to Peter ideas he had for this.

1730 Site - Christopher brought up concern about any concepts talking about above ground parking structures. He would like to see a policy where underground parking is developed. It had been suggested at prior district parking meetings that if a fund was created for additional public parking, we could ask that developers add a level of underground public parking (paid from this private fund). It was also suggested that underground parking could be constructed at the 1730 Clifton site with entry at the Oak Grove side and at the Groveland side. He expressed concern that if a proposal for a ramp were to surface with townhomes built around it, that the townhomes would never be built. He expressed concern that the 1730 site was assessed and that there was not enough room for a parking ramp, surrounded by townhomes on this site. There has been discussion with the District parking group for development on the 1730 site, with underground public parking (owned by investors from the hill area).

Saturday Worksession:**Format -**

Brief overview by Jana on Community Engagement - 5 minutes

Brief overview by John / Update on LEED/ND status and focus - 10 minutes

Proposed Policy Review by Tables:

Land Use

Protecting Historic Resources

Public Realm - Transportation, Circulation, Parking

Creative Economy & Sustainability at one table unless we line up 5 facilitators

Pete to provide a set up maps for all tables - Activity Center, Future Land Use, Current Land Use, and Building Intensity levels.

We will develop something for individual feedback, available to participants

Chapter Review:

Creative Economy-Cultural Assets - Awaiting input from City Cultural Arts Director (Tom will follow up)

Sustainability - Awaiting input from Gayle Prest, Sustainability Coordinator (Jana and Beth to follow Up)

Public Realm - We need to connect with Loring Greenway Association on this, we need to Meet with Park Administrator/Anita/John Erwin, John will review Nicollet Avenue features and ensure background from Robert Cook work is given to Peter.

Jana asked Peter to clarify and review with Convention Center the reduction of 4 lanes to 2 lanes on Grant. She also asked for language to be included regarding the ongoing illegal taxi cab parking that we have along Grant Street - added enforcement, search of and placement of additional cab stands, ensure no illegal parking and horn honking of taxis.

Also, to discuss with Convention Center - inclusion of vertical greening and lighting along 1st Avenue.

LEED/ND Project:

Kick off aimed for Spring. Lunds has agreed to host and coordinate with their opening.

John reported that 430 Oak Grove is working on LEED points, Magellan development has proposed to be LEED-certified, and that Lunds has proposed to be LEED-certified.

Question was raised where the 7 indicators came from and how selected and why others were not selected. Pete will put a sheet together on this for our next SC Mtg and discussion end of January.

Board Motion Report:

To direct developers to provide no less than 1:1 parking on all future developments and to include this in our Master Plan Development Guidelines. (from Brd. Special Meeting)

Support building intensity for the area surrounding Emerson School to be up to 6 stories (from January Board Meeting - Unanimous)

Discussion on no above ground parking ramps. Policy should be to work with property owners and future developments to provide public parking underground and for existing property owners to develop a fund to pay for such a parking arrangement/development.

To Do:

Meet with Commissioner Gail Dorfman on Plan

Meet with Stevens Square on Nicollet Ave., Freeway, Activity Center- set for Feb. 7th

Meet with MPRB Commissioners and Administrator - Meeting request in

Meet with Property Owners on Nicollet - Proposed for early February

Hold FINAL Worksession on Master Plan - Jan. 21st

Confirm Table facilitators for Jan. 21st - Pete will line up

Respectfully submitted, JLM

Loring Park Neighborhood Master Plan Meeting Notes

Wednesday, Nov. 30th, 2011

Hosted by the Loring Park Community Center

Those present: Brad Conley (resident/MCTC), Roy Williams (HN Methodist Church), John Van Heel (resident/Committee Chair), Lauren Huygen (technical assistance/LEED Project), Dick Sandberg (resident), John Lauber (Consultant Team), Peter Musty (Consultant), and Jana Metge (CLPC Coordinator).

Meeting was called to order at 6:40 p.m. by Chair, John Van Heel. He asked that the Review of the LEED Project and Sustainability Chapter come 1st on the agenda. Agreed. He also asked for staff to update on future timeline to begin the meeting.

The following Announcements were made:

- Annual Holiday Party and Curry Dinner this Thursday, Dec. 1 from 5:30-8:30 at 228 Clifton. Come whenever and stay as long as you'd like. Spread the word.
- "WinterFest" - aka "Light up Loring" - Thurs., Dec. 8th at Loring Park from 6-8 features Carriage rides, bonfire, refreshments, dance performance, and FUN!
- Monday, Dec. 12th - Minneapolis Planning Commission - REVIEW of the Magellan Development Project - 4:30 at City Hall/350 So. 5th St.; Room 317.

I. **Timeline** - Jana reported on the following:

Upcoming staff/partner review of Draft Chapters:

- Meeting with Gayle Prest/City of Minneapolis Sustainability Coordinator to be held on Friday, Dec. 2nd from Noon-1:00 p.m.
- Historic Churches Meeting - Tuesday., Dec. 6th hosted by The Woman's Club of Minneapolis from 11-1:00 p.m.
- Meeting with Tom Borrup (Consultant on NEA/Hennepin Ave. Project) and the new City Cultural Coordinator - Tues., Dec. 2nd at 4:00 p.m.
- Meeting with Convention Center, Central Church, Wesley Church, and SSCO at the Convention Center on Thursday, Dec. 8th, 2011.

Moving Forward -

Jana reported that the following would need to yet occur:

- Steering Committee and City/County/MPRB/Partner review of all chapters of our Master Plan document to ensure that all input and changes have been made;
- Meetings need to be held with all of our Elected Officials on the Plan - City Council member, County Commissioner, Park Board Commissioner, and Sen. Dibble. Relevant plan sections to be discussed with all prior to Sat. wrkshop.
- Meeting with MCTC on Sustainability Section needs to occur.
- Meeting with HN County on Sustainability Section and Recycling Goals need to occur. Check to see if Commissioner Dorfman's office can set up.
- Saturday morning workshop late-January or early February for all involved to date to have an opportunity to review the plan and ensure that their input is reflected in the

document;

- Master Plan Future Land Use Maps and key elements should be on Boards and on display at CLPC's "Love Loring" event;
- Jana asked that the **Final Review and Vote** occur at the **March CLPC ANNUAL Meeting**. Jana will ask Paul if the 3rd Tuesday would work for The Womans' Club again this year and she will also request through the Community Outreach chair of the Club. The Plan should be set up at the Information Fair for review prior to the Meeting and vote;
- Once the Plan is approved by the Community and CLPC Board Beth will put out for the official and required 45-day review processes of the City of Minneapolis.
- Public Hearing at the Planning Commission on our Plan will be scheduled following the 45-day review. Beth will gather feedback and work with the Steering Committee to integrate public comments during these 45 days.
- City Council will review our Plan and hopefully approve it.
- Beth then takes the Plan to the Met Council.

Jana introduced an idea for future discussion. With Duluth and St. Paul moving to form-based zoning - would the Committee want to consider as an Implementation step to our plan, exploring this concept further, maybe as a pilot project for the City. The group supported this idea.

II. Presentation and Review of the **Sustainability Chapter**

Lauren began with overviews of our **LEED/ND project** update. There has been a team of 18 professional volunteers including John Van Heel, Neil Reardon, MPRB staff, City of Minneapolis staff, Lauren, and others who have been working diligently all summer/fall to verify Loring Park Neighborhood's compliance to US Green Building Council standards for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design for Neighborhood Development (LEED/ND). This volunteer group analyzed the neighborhood using the existing LEED/ND rating scale but also then documented shortcomings with using this system in an existing neighborhood vs. a suburban development or brown site development.

Additionally, Lauren has had continued conversations over a 2-year period for the USGBC to reduce the standard \$120,000 for certification. Last month, they came back to us and reported that they would certify for \$20,000. CLPC Board then acted to dedicate \$10,000 of their NRP Phase II Sustainability funding towards this goal as a "match". Lauren reported that LUNDS has offered to sponsor our National Certification Project in coordination with their soon to be LEED-certified building and their Grand Opening Spring of 2012. Jana reported that she had run into Gayle Prest and told her the news and she is excited to be involved and help with the "Kick Off" event.

Lauren reported that with this, the USGBC will be reviewing our Small Area Plan and Peter will need to insert language from their report into the relevant chapters of our plan. If the USGBC recommends approval of our Small Area Plan it will be **the 1st Small Area Plan adopted in the United States!**

Lauren distributed copies of the LEED scoring from the Project Team. In our present condition, we ranked 34 points. 40-49 points are needed to certify; 50-59 points are needed for Silver certification, 60-79 points for Gold certification, and 80+ points for Platinum certification. CLPC can identify gaps identified thru this scoring to develop strategies for improvement. Additionally, any future projects such as MCTC Helland Center, Convention Center, LUNDS store, proposed Housing Projects can get us additional points. Lauren was thanked for her great work and given a **round of applause**.

Policy & Action Overview:

Pete led us through the Policy & Action / Sustainability Chapter for our Plan. Pete reported that this chapter was done within the Context of the Municipal Sustainability Goals. Peter walked us through the Sustainability Chapter and the "Loring Indicators."

Comments/Suggestions were:

- John to review the Summer 2010 narrative language on CURA project
- John asked on Page 8, opening 2 lines, to paint the neighborhood in a better light. John Lauber stated that existing buildings are a benefit to sustainability due to their construction already. Pete will work on this section and its narrative. John stated that urban living is far more sustainable than suburban living and that this needed to be reflected in this Chapter. John stated that building energy improvements and cost savings could then save enough money to help pay for future building improvements.
- All Committee members to review this and discussion will occur at the January Steering Committee meeting. We will not have any meetings in December, but may have 2 meetings - 2nd and 4th Wednesdays in January. Grammar/typo comments go to John. Content comments go to Jana to log.
- Page 11 under "Loring Indicators" - John asked that the word "Conversely" be deleted.
- Jana asked that a meeting be set with Hennepin County regarding this section. They have an state of the art Environmental Dept. We should meet with staff and coordinate/learn about their initiatives and how they could fit with our LEED work.
- Jana requested that on page 14 - 4.2.5 - Delete "establish" and insert "Build upon and expand community garden programs in Loring Park".
- Dick asked that 4.2.5.a be deleted. It is already under the above bullet for Recycling.
- Dick also asked that these items be ordered in coordination with the 2-page "Loring Indicator" document.
- Jana requested that on page 14 under Recycling that we add "Promote and coordinate with HN County". Specifically, they conduct hazardous waste pickups regularly within HN County. We do not need to create our own.
- Jana asked that language be changed under 4.2.6 from "Establish district parking structures" to "Develop feasible District Parking Concepts and Partnerships". Parking Ramp Structures have been voted out by the community.
- Suggestion to use "Locally Grown Food Initiatives" in the narrative of this Chapter since articulated through the community process, as well as a potentially excellent opportunity to organize and recruit new involvement in the neighborhood.
- Suggestion to review inserted photos and review why those particular photos were

chosen. Do this at a Team meeting with Beth during total plan review.

Peter talked about measuring the size diversity of future housing developments. We could increase our LEED points by diversifying the housing types. We have heard through our process that residents would like to see 2-3 unit apartments so that they can continue to live in Loring Park and raise families here. Identifying and suggesting a different variety and range could be part of our development project evaluation process.

With Public Realm improvements, Lauren suggested that we should not be afraid to ask for Public Improvements when reviewing development proposals. Ask about adding greening, additional street trees, vertical greening, etc.

Pete talked about Loring Indicator #1 - Energy Performance of Buildings - which reads "Increase to ten (10) building (new or existing) that meet or exceed LEED or equivalent energy performance standard. Committee should consider if this is a realistic goal for the January meeting.

John asked that we focus on unit vs. building and work to get residents in individual units to live a more energy efficient life style and find a way to document and promote this. Jana stated that as an implementation step, we would take this to the monthly property owner meeting and see if we could get interest to participate and then work from there.

Loring Indicator #2 - Mixed Income Diverse Community - which reads "Achieve and retain maximum points in LEED/ND Neighborhood Pattern & Design." More on this within these notes.

Loring Indicator #3 - Walkability & Connectivity - which reads "Achieve 8 points in LEED ND Neighborhood Pattern & Design.

Pete talked about Loring Indicator #4 - Green Surfaces - which reads "Increase by an equivalent of one Loring Park (35 acres) the total area of 'green' surfaces in Loring Park." He reviewed that green surfaces include grass, native landscaping, permanent community gardens, market gardens, green roofs, and vertical greening. The Committee should think about whether or not this is a realistic goal for discussion in January.

Pete talked on Loring Indicator #5 - Development near Primary Transit Network (Nicollet Avenue) which reads "As a neighborhood-wide goal we will double the total built square footage of properties reachable within $\frac{1}{4}$ mile pedestrian she (walkable distance) from the Primary Transit Network".

Pete discussed Loring Indicator #6 - Off Street Parking - which reads "Reduce by half the total area of off-street surface parking in the neighborhood".

Indicator #7 - Recycling, Composting & Waste - reads "Work to achieve 3:1 recycling to waste (total volume collected). We will meet with HN County on this since it comes from their 70:30

ratio. Loring Park challenge is the number of private vendors/garbage collectors and their restrictions on recycling.

III. Continued Review of the "Protecting Historic Assets" Chapter

John Lauber was present to discuss this Chapter with us. He talked about the 19 Bar. Cultural Designation would follow either the local designation or national designation and would indeed pertain to the structure. But, the narrative for the application would be on the history and use of the building, its significance in the GLBT history of the City of Minneapolis and State - not in the architectural significance. There is more latitude in building improvements with a narrative focused on historical significance than there is one based in architectural elements. He stated that the community should determine whether or not what happened at this location is of such magnitude and played such a part in Mpls. history that they want to capture that, research it, document it, and build upon that significance with historic designation of the site.

There was a question about 420 Groveland, what building it is and if this was a typo. Pete will research and bring back.

John L. walked us through the completed "Historic Asset Inventory" document and its basic recommendations. He reported that HN Ave. Methodist church was inventoried and not recommended for designation. Roy stated that it was owner request, they are not interested in pursuing designation. John L. reported that this is the owner's right.

It was reported that 430 Oak Grove, in its renovation into housing units is pursuing tax credits and will then need to achieve historic designation. Lauren reported that they are not going to pursue LEED certification, but there will be some elements for our scoring.

Conservation Districts - John reported that the Asset Inventory talked about 2 possible historic districts - the mansion area (lower and upper terrace) and the apartment row area. The group discussed pursuing historic designation for the Upper and Lower Terrace/Mansion area and a Conservation District for the Apartments.

A Conservation District looks at human scale, context, feel of an area. It is a way to protect such an environment. It is a much more holistic approach and says that this is an environment we want to protect, enhance, maintain and nurture. There is no regulatory focus as in a Historic Designation and is very flexible. Gives guidelines for new developments, for streetscapes. John suggested that as a part of our plan, we should get the City to officially adopt the Loring Hill Guidelines. They articulate the mold of a Conservation District already. A Conservation district articulates the properties to value and that we want to protect.

Peter showed an example of "Queen Village" out of Philadelphia. He also passed around an article featuring Robert Stipe and Carole Zellie.

Next Meeting will be the 2nd and 4th Wednesdays of January.

No meetings in December. We will use this month to meet with City/County staff and our neighborhood partners to review Plan language.

Meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, JLM

IV. **Review and Discussion of Opportunity Sites** - Tabled to a future meeting.

Master Plan Steering Committee Meeting Notes

Wed., Oct. 26th, 2011

Hosted by Loring Park Community Center

Those present: John Van Heel (resident), Neil Reardon (former resident), Paul Hinderager (resident), Peter Musty (consultant), Jana Metge (CLPC staff), Beth Elliot (City Planning), Tom D'Angelo (Architectural Alliance), Bill Weber (consultant), Roy Williams (HN Methodist), and Dick Sandberg (resident).

Historic Preservation Chapter Overview

Suggestions:

Change the Title of the Chapter to “Protecting Historic Resources” from “Historic Preservation. Discussed was that Historic Preservation was one of the tools to Protect the Resources, stated that this just was not a Chapter title.

Tools – subtitles for this Chapter under a title of **“Protecting Historic Resources”** were discussed as: Historic Preservation, Adaptive Reuse of Buildings, Development Guidelines, Viewshed Corridors, Conservation District, Public Policy suggestions like Philadelphia guidelines noted below.

Also discussed were various suggestions for chapter layout and subtitles. Beth, Peter, Bill, John, and Jana will work on this at the Nov. Team meeting and bring back to the Nov. Steering Committee Mtg.

It was also felt that “Adaptive Reuse of Buildings” was a tool, not a title and that so were Conservation Districts and Re-Zoning. Strong sentiment to recommend clearly in the plan that the next step on the Hill will be a re-zoning study and to clearly articulate this in the recommended actions.

Separate Action Steps from Policies.

Suggested to add Guidelines for new building construction around historically designated properties ex. Philadelphia. Building around a historic property can destroy the historic character of adjacent buildings, as well as the area if not done right, respectfully, and sensitively. Need to articulate in this section, scale and relationships of any new development or addition, next to a historic building.

Need to clearly articulate that our next step is a zoning study for the hill. Put it in recommendations and in the implementation grid.

Several properties not included on Historic map. Request for John Lauber to identify his source for the map, where the properties exhibited came from. Why were they prioritized? It was also suggested that we may want to note properties we want to see protected, that have potential merit.

Take out sections in paragraphs which say “permission and support of” and insert “this building has potential merit”.

Insert names of properties with addresses, so clear for public to identify with.

Under “Legal Infrastructure for Historic Preservation in Minneapolis” Paragraph is fluff. Put in the process. Make the document something that can be used, a tool for folks, not something that folks have no idea what is being said or where to look for it.

Additionally, put the process for Local designation. The introductory paragraphs make no sense.

Describe what the “Grand Rounds System” is – if putting it in the document. What is its purpose, its mission.

Is 1200 2nd Ave. So. In Loring Park? The Architects and Engineers Building?

Suggestion to add a **photo of the Bellevue** on the page with “Harmon Place Historic District”.

Discussion on **enclosed map** – suggested to **bring back to staff workgroup** and review. Group discussed identifying on this map all significant properties – properties that may not be designated, that we may or may not want to designate, but do not want to see removed.

Color in 430 Oak Grove as historic – property to remain – yet to be determined if the new owner is applying for any type of designation. Designation not necessary when applying for Federal Tax Credits, but neighborhood would not want to see this property demolished.

Ensure that **Oak Grove Hotel** is listed as a “significant property” to protect, as well as all of the other old hotels.

Remove “explore local designation” from St. Mark’s and say “building has historic merit and neighborhood would not want to see it demolished”.

Suggestion was to organize this chapter into properties – districts – landmarks.

Request was to find out the history of the 19 Bar – Chapter suggests that we may want to designate it as a **cultural resource**, but members want to know what that means, what are the advantages, the disadvantages. Group asked John Lauber to research and report back at the next SC meeting in November.

Conservation Districts – if these exist in St. Paul, we need to cite them and gather St. Paul ordinance language for our document.

We need to state that the 1999 zoning on the Hill is wrong and should not have occurred. It is totally incompatible with the Loring Hill guidelines and with the historic properties remaining, as well as character on the Hill. If Harmon can get HPC designation, Loring Hill should be more than able to.
FIX 3.8 paragraph.

Re-Work page 14 – paragraph and properties under Loring Hill Design Guidelines.

These were developed to “proactively direct development”. The language presently leads one to believe that this effort was about historic preservation – it was not. The opening paragraph from the Guidelines should be the language used here.

Emerson School – Historic Designation – this needs to be discussed with School and School Board if in the plan. We should state that “should the school leave, we want the building re-used, not torn down”. Include the shared parking feature. Add the input from School Board rep for underground parking concept.

Stressed was that the **entire “U” around Loring Park has an entire different texture** – green space – pedestrian feel. The scale and texture all around Loring Park is unique and needs to be identified and articulated in this plan.

Add Lawns & Trees/streetscape guidelines – emphasize the “front yard” of Loring Hill.

**Direction on Opportunity Sites –
Nicollet Avenue in Loring Village –**

Displayed were maps showing 4 stories at street front on Nicollet stepping up/back to 6 stories. Up to 10 stories were illustrated for the area surrounding the Mpls. Convention Center/Wesley Church on 1st Ave. and along the Freeway edge.

Paul emphasized that we need to enhance that every 1st floor along Nicollet Ave. is commercial/retail/storefront retail. Keep the storefronts up to the streets, no set backs.

Pete stated that general heights are next up for discussion. He proposed stepping up toward the east and downtown. Questions were raised regarding the east side of the Convention Center. This is a staging area for Tour Buses and needed by the Convention Center for parking.

Discussion about whether or not the VOA building and Hyatt area should be a part of the Activity Center – discussion and review of the Activity Center Boundaries. John stated that he wanted to ensure that The Flame, the Music Box were protected. Others stated that supportive/affordable housing would not come down, be removed for any new development and the plan states that we “retain affordable housing” so this section should illustrate this as well.

Next step will be to meet with the Convention Center/Wesley folks and assess. Beth to Set up Convention Center staff and Jana will bring in the Wesley Church.

Another next step is to bring in Stevens Square, Alan Arthur, Kam Talebi, Diane Woelm, Steve Barberio, and Michael McLaughlin/LBA to review Opportunity sites along Nicollet, the Activity Center concept and boundaries, and potential design illustrations.

1730 Clifton in Loring Hill –

Displayed to the Steering Committee was an above ground parking ramp with housing surrounding the parking ramp. Action step is to check in with the Loring Hill folks. Jana and Beth spoke to meeting with Public Work staff and the sentiment on the hill that 2 levels of underground parking with the Episcopal Diocysis (sp?) holding the development/air rights for future development at the 1730 Clifton site. We will revisit ramp vs. 2 levels of underground parking (200 spots) with the District Parking team.

Empty Parking Lots throughout the Neighborhood –

This topic is to be carried over to the November Steering Committee Meeting (**which will be the 5th vs. 4th Wed due to the Thanksgiving Holiday!**).

Progress Report on Master Plan Policy Chapters/Land Use & Public Realm –

Beth requested whether or not the updated and revised chapters were available. Peter will forward

when they are and have available for discussion at the November Team meeting in Beth's office.

Next Meeting is Wed., November 30th from 6:30-8:30 at Loring Park (Note – 4th Thursday is a holiday, so folks may be gone the Wednesday prior.)

Master Plan Steering Committee Meeting

Wed., Sept. 28th, 2011

Hosted by Loring Park Community Center

Steering Committee present: John Van Heel (110 Grant), Mark Nelson (Summit House), Neil Rearson (Visitor/Outstate), Paul Hinderager (Summit House), Colleen Foster (510 Groveland), Christopher Hoffer (510 Groveland), Dick Sandberg (Loring Green), Tom DeAngelo (Architectural Alliance), Roy Williams (HN Methodist Church).

Staff present: Peter Musty (consultant), Beth Elliott (city planner), Jana Metge (CLPC Consultant)

John called meeting at 6:40 p.m.

Congrats to Peter on the birth of his 1st baby!!

John asked for Jana to report on the District Parking meeting held. Beth had organized 3 City Transportation staff for a preliminary discussion this past month. They also discussed the Harmon proposals. Beth will be setting up a 2nd meeting to discuss other Public Works aspects of the plan. Jana will work with Michael McLaughlin to pull stakeholders together for a District Parking discussion.

Land Use Chapter

Loring Greenway – Pete reported that Jana had arranged to have this section reviewed by the Loring Greenway Association at their October Board meeting.

Convention Center – Pete, Jana, John Novak, John Van Heel, and Beth met with Jeff Johnson and Convention Center staff. Pete took us through their powerpoint (to be available on our website at www.loringpark.org).

Their plan looked at Opportunities for enhancing the Convention Center to better compete nationally. They talked about creating a neighborhood “Activity Center” in and around the Convention Center.

Future proposed highlights include: Public Realm enhancements from the Convention Center to Loring Park on Grant Street, Public programming of the plaza area/their front yard, Sustainable infrastructure improvements, and interactive wall which will display Sustainable improvements throughout the City of Minneapolis-an attraction for all convention goers, increased retail in and around the Convention Center (such as the Wells Fargo building and the apartment/office building they presently

own north of the center), and increased activity and connection to the neighborhood in and around Nicollet and 1st Avenue.

Beth suggested that a policy statement should be “Keep existing street grid and enhance the connectivity to the neighborhood”. She suggested that we should have elements in our plan to guide expansion, should any be needed in the future. They did say at the meeting that no expansion is being proposed, but good to have elements in our plan.

Beth also suggested a policy statement to “Maintain existing affordable housing stock”.

Tom and John VH raised the question of 1st Ave and 15th/16th Street. Needs to be increased lighting, vertical greening, enhance the pedestrian experience. John/Jana/Beth reported on the width of new 15th and how during the Meter Farm RFP process, public works reviewed the possibility of taking some of this street, since overbuilt, for public realm/development.

Members requested enhancement to 1st Avenue – Tom stated that the Convention Center has turned their back to both 1st Ave. and Central Lutheran church. We should encourage them to think about activating these areas as well. Tom also suggested researching the “Avenue of the Arts” concept and building those components into our plan. Tom also stated that a policy statement should be that we “value our community resources/assets/the historic churches”.

Jana will ask Beth about existing zoning by Emerson School and Convention Center and have her talk with Convention Center staff on proposed future land use.

Members want to include a Land Bridge Concept and to encourage innovative thinking, but set perimeters to guide future development/expansion.

Beth reported that LaSalle and 1st Avenue are in the City’s plan to convert to 2-way. Dick stated that with the new striping for bike lanes, the 1-ways are working well with bikes.

Loring Village – Highlights from the Discussion:

- Keep Apartment row on 15th Street in the Loring Hill area, do not move to Loring Village
- Claim the southern edge of the Park as Loring Hill’s “front yard”.
- Increase the height intensity of the Emerson School site from 4 stories to 6. Questions raised as to whether or not this was appropriate. Discussion, no resolve at this time. We need to continue the dialogue.
- Discussion on keeping a proposed strip surrounding the Convention Center site along 1st Avenue and new 15th/16th street with a 10 story height intensity. Per discussion, agreed to just code the entire Convention Center area for potential 10 story development.
- Agreed that more height on LaSalle and Nicollet and 1st is OK, looking at up to 10 stories.
- Discussion on 4 or 6 stories along Spruce and 15th St. More discussion needed. Question as to whether or not this would “maintain the existing housing stock”, John questioned the existing zoning and thought it could be problematic to request lower zoning.
- Request to allow flexibility on church owned property for future development needs. Pete will be sending a letter to all 6 churches to discuss future land use issues, public realm, and traffic/circulation needs. Tom DeAngelo has been hired as the Consultant for Central Lutheran Church. Tom was encouraged to bring the Church’s vision into the Loring Master Plan.

- Jana requested to be certain that the Basilica Request letter had been addressed.
- Much discussion on Meter Farm site. Peter had set aside 1/3 of the site for public realm and possible infrastructure should a streetcar come down Nicollet. Jana reported that focus groups had suggested the Markers' Liquor site, by the Freeway as a public realm enhancement for a streetcar stop (also includes the walkway to bus stop along the freeway from the bridge). Peter reported that the idea came from the Nicollet Ave. guidelines. Beth expressed concern, that the site was already a small footprint and to limit it further may prohibit development. John suggested creating "nodes" via public realm improvement in and around 15th & Nicollet since it is an important node. He stated that a goal should be to enhance public realm of node and create publicly accessible space. Jana suggested the policy verbage of "Build in enhanced public realm amenities" – but to not have it be site specific to the Meter Farm. Beth stated that if they posted a RFP, this request could be part of the RFP. We could put that a "Public Plaza is desirable on this site". John suggested that we have a general policy statement and then have Peter illustrate how this could be envisioned in an Opportunity site illustration. John suggested that old 15th Street model a "woonerf" – a pedestrian street which allows emergency vehicles. Paul stated to have Nicollet buildings come up to the street and be in context with Historic Nicollet, he would support enhanced public realm improvements, but felt that any new development had to reflect and be in characteristic of the existing commercial.
- Peter talked about allowing for height in some areas, but by the language of the plan, ensuring that height fits neighborhood and context. Paul asked for a goal which would guard against setting up an opportunity for the existing apartments to be torn down and replace with a large block building. Maybe plan language should reflect "continue with multiple parcels on a block". Pete suggested that we should be intentional about setting a transition area in Loring Village from downtown, as well as in and around a potential streetcar.

Respectfully submitted, JLMetge
9.29.2011

Master Plan workgroup held Wed., Sept. 7th, 2011
 Meeting Notes - Mtg. held 6:30-7:30

SC Members present: John Van Heel (chair), Dick Sandberg, Paul Hinderager, Brad Conley, Mohammed (337 Oak Grove owner), Tom D'Angelo (Arch Alliance), Roy Williams (HN Methodist Church).

Staff Present: Peter Musty (Consultant), Jana Metge (CLPC Coordinator)

Introductions were conducted.

Announcements:

-Blood Drive - Oct. 8th at The Woman's Club of Minneapolis

-Tour of Historic Loring Hill on Sat., Sept. 10th; meet at HN Methodist Parking Lot at 10:00 a.m. Cost is \$5.00

Led by Bob Glancy; Sponsored by Preservation Alliance

-Tour of Historic Churches - Sat., Sept. 17th - see Basilica website - flyers distributed. Fundraiser for their Partnership to Reduce Homelessness. Churches will be HN Methodist, Basilica of St. Mary, and Temple Israel.

- Next Steering Committee meeting is Wed., Sept. 28th from 6:30-8:00 hosted by Loring Park Community Center.

The meeting began with a discussion about the Creative and Economic public policy chapter. Tom was unable to attend. A speaker phone was set up, but hard to hear. Tom/Pete were asked to revamp language about home-based businesses. It was also suggested that more of the data researched (paid through NRP funds at an additional fee to Consultant fee) should be incorporated in the language here (and footnoted).

Built Form Plan:

- Magellan site is labeled with dark yellow - which says "up to 6 stories" - yet there is a T for Tower there.
- Nicollet Ave has sites labeled in gold which says "up to 10 stories" - yet there is a T for Tower there. Most folks think of a Tower larger than 10 stories. There was discussion on what "with conditions" may mean (further down in these minutes)
- There was a T on the Greenway site. Peter stated that it could be where the Hyatt is or where Greenway Gables are. Discussion was that the Hyatt will remain within these next 20 years and that hopefully Greenway Gables would also remain and not be demolished with a Tower going in. Questions were raised as to the future development capacity of Loring Greenway. Folks felt it was developed already to its maximum, no room for additional development along the Greenway. It was also stated that if a building, like VOA, is on a site and already a Tower, that there should be no need for a "T" or for suggesting development as this document does. It is already there. It was suggested to remove all "T's" from this document. Also questioned was Storefront Frontage allowed - since any OR zoning allows it. Suggested to remove this mapping category.

Land Use Policy Chapter:

Loring Greenway - It will be important to get this chapter to the Loring Greenway Association for Board discussion and review. Contact information sent to Peter.

Loring Hill -

- There was not agreement about "conditions for more height", especially on Loring Hill.
- There seemed to be majority opinion that Loring Hill was unique and that development should be analyzed site by site due to the topography of the hill and that it should reflect and respect the historic characteristics of the hill, ensure green spaces (which Tom pointed out was unique to the Hill, the amount of "green" frontage, ensure to not affect view corridors and the light and air of adjacent and preserved mansions.
- There seemed to be agreement for 2.5 or OR1 in the Mansion areas of Loring Hill; though this draft chapter of the plan for the last 2 meetings has said 3-6 stories. There is also disagreement on the freeway edge - though the Loring Hill guidelines say "tower", concern was expressed that the size of the Groveland/317 Grovelans is high enough.
- There was concern about the Build Form Intensity Level page. It was suggested that it was irrelevant for Loring Hill, that development should be analyzed site by site and be sensitive to the topography.

It was suggested to remove this page "Built Form Intensities" from the Master Plan document.

Tom DeAngelo presented a 3-dimensional concept for future development on the Hill which a Loring Hill workgroup consisting of The Woman's Club, surrounding mansion owners (7 of them), folks from 510 Groveland, folks from Summit House, and Architectural Alliance has been a part of over the past 3 months. Tom, has donated his time to create these graphics for submission and inclusion into the Master Plan. He provided both hard copies and on screen.

Tom spoke about Historic Designation as a way to protect the Hill. He reported that the churches and some of the apt. property owners were concerned with designation. The 430 Oak Grove building, now being converted from office to rental housing is pursuing both State and Historic tax credits. If the plan reflected resources available which may prove beneficial to the designation of the area, this may help the conversation along.

Tom also spoke to new development guidelines for buildings surrounded by historic properties, which he found in Philadelphia, PA. It was suggested that these could be reviewed and included as potential policy suggestions in our Implementation plan. Additionally, information about creating a Conservancy for historic properties should be brought forward and included in possible recommendations for this plan.

Jana reported that Beth has stated that a zoning study will follow the completion and approval of our Plan. It is in Beth's 2012 workplan at city planning.

Jana also reported that during the breakout groups at the final Community Design Workshop (in which detailed notes were compiled and are on record) - that participants validated a height equal to OR1 for the mansion areas, 3 stories for the Apartment area. People were concerned that Shoreland Overlay seemed to have no impact or use on Loring Hill. It was reported that during the 1999 zoning change from OR1 to OR3 on the hill, folks were told that the Shoreland Overlay would protect the Hill. Now it does not. This is a great concern to residents there. There was mixed opinion on the height for the freeway edge. Height from 6-10 stories were suggested. Jana suggested that everyone re-read those minutes from this breakout group which Beth and Jana facilitated.

Peter talked about the Loring Village concept and reviewed the draft land future land use map. This came out of a

conversation with the Nicollet Focus group and a follow up meeting with Steve Barberio. Additionally, Jana/Beth/Pete met with the Convention Center and their 2025 plans replicate what has come out of this community process. The meeting with the Convention Center proposed: Activating their plaza area, improvement of Grant Street, support for and promotion of housing in and around LaSalle and Nicollet, support for an "Activity area" to promote the businesses, commercial improvements to the property they own north of the Convention Center, and potential for mixed use development at the current Wells Fargo site on Nicollet Mall. All were excited about the potential for a Nicollet Ave. Street Car. Discussed were future partnerships in event promotion and Nicollet Ave. promotion. We will have Steve Barberio review the Loring Village component of this plan, as well as impacted property owners.

Tom proposed that the 1730 site be looked at for District Parking, as an Opportunity site in the plan and asked if there was consensus in the Loring Park Hill area and community to pursue this. Jana reported that there have been 2 meetings on District parking with interested parties on the Hill. We are waiting for a follow up meeting with City staff to determine financing models for this idea.

Roy asked that HN Methodist parking lot be removed from the potential Opportunity site map. He met with the church Trustees and they have no plans to build in the next 20 years. It was reported that during the Loring Hill process, Larry Dunbar brought forward some development ideas. The church parking lot will be removed from the potential listings per Roy's/Trustee's request.

Peter talked through the section on "additional height" and what items we could barter with developers on for this additional height. Concern was expressed to separate out from this section, what the "expectations" are for a developer, separate from negotiation pieces.

John Erwin suggested to have a streetscape plan identified in the expectations for developers. How many trees, what type, how far apart should be included in Developer expectations for an area. John VH stated that the burying of underground wires should also be included. John Erwin stated that street lighting requirements should be included. Jana reported that CLPC has a policy for expected streetscape/trees and lighting, by Developers which was created during Scott Dibble's time at CLPC.

Peter was asked to coordinate with Tom for inclusion of these prepared concepts.

There was no vote or definite conclusion on the Loring Hill height debate at this meeting.

TIMELINE:

Jana reported that she had cancelled the Sept. 17th worksession. We, the SC, are not far enough along yet to have a stakeholder worksession. Additionally, when we do a community review of the draft plan, we need to have a minimum 30 day, maximum 45 day community posting. Beth had talked about once we have a draft to run the mandated 45-day review at the same time as our community review.

PRIOR to the draft being posted for Community Review we need to:

- Meet with any affected departments, i.e. public works within the City
- Meet with County or State if MNDOT or Metro Transit related
- Meet with Park staff/maybe even take to the Mpls. Park Board
- Meet with City Coordinator and CPED director
- Meet with Councilmember Goodman
- Meet with HN Co. Commissioner Gail Dorfman

Last, but not least, we have talked about having a Saturday morning workshop 9-noon to review the draft plan prior

Thanks to MPRB President John Erwin for attending tonight's work session! He agreed to review and comment on the Public Realm and Land Use chapters. We will also forward to him the Sustainability chapter. John's email is: jerwin@minneapolisparcs.org

Respectfully submitted, JLMetge/CLPC Coordinator
9.13.2011

Master Plan Steering Committee
Meeting Summary
Wed., Aug. 31st, 2011

Present: John Van Heel (Chair/110 W. Grant), Dick Sandberg (1201 Yale), Paul Hinderager (410 Groveland), John Erwin (MPRB President), Tom D'Angelo (Arch Alliance/Business), Roy Williams (HN Methodist), Brad Conley (MCTC/CLPC Board), Beth Elliott (Mpls. City Planning), Pete Musty (Consultant), and Jana Metge (CLPC Coordinator).

Meeting called at 6:40 p.m.
Introductions held and Announcement made.

CULTURAL ASSETS & ECONOMIC VITALITY - Policy Document

Pete with the support of Tom Borrup (on speaker phone) walked through the document. Hard copies were available, as well as on screen. One copy of the Master Plan Content Outline was circulated.

Comments:

Question raised concerning the language around Home-Based businesses in 2.2.b - Peter and Tom asked to revamp and have it read as Tom reported and stated the recommendation in the presentation.

Request to build in the Convention Center ideas into the recommendation page

Request to build in bike parking on Harmon and in other areas with an artistic feature.

Suggested to communicate and coordinate with Tom Hoch pertaining to the NEA grant to connect Hennepin to the Walker Art Center and ensure those components in this plan as they pertain to us. This is a 1.8 mile corridor adjacent to our neighborhood.

Question to the group was on the language Diversity as the chapter title. Does that make sense for what we are trying to say or is there a better word to head up and identify the chapter.

Note: Change Lakota terminology to Native American in this section under possible historical tours.

LAND USE & BUILT FORM - Policy Document

Comments:

MPRB President John Erwin suggested that the neighborhood express their Streetscape desire; type, amount, and location of street trees. He stated that some neighborhoods are choosing evergreen trees/plantings so that there is green year round. He also noted that the neighborhood may like to weigh in on lighting as well and state this clearly within this policy chapter. (NOTE- CLPC does have an existing Streetlight and Tree Streetscape policy; we should ensure that Peter has this to integrate in this plan.) Focus of their plan is 1) Sense of Identity, 2) Institutional Cooperation & Events, and 3) Physical Streetscape & Design. Also they will discuss complimentary in-fill design on Hennepin.

Way-finding terminology - eliminate language of Way-Finding Master Plan to simply Way-Finding.

430 Oak Grove color designation needs to change to housing and live/work units vs. commercial/business.

Oak Grove Grocery needs to be acknowledged on the map.

Request for Historic Preservation to be its own chapter.

Suggested to create Development Standards - Expectations that should come forward with any development proposal and separate this from a Review Checklist when evaluating an incoming development proposal - for example; additional items a development could do for consideration by neighborhood for additional height, Dick Sandberg suggested that the checklist should be over and above what expected standards should be - ie. Stairway to 15th St., additional public parking, pedestrian easements.

John Erwin suggested that we think about innovative storm water management strategies for new developments and include ideas into this document.

Paul Hinderager/John Van Heel - include in policy recommendation to bury all powerlines. John Erwin stated that the Xcel contract is being re-negotiated in Dec and suggested that we talk to Lisa and be one of the 1st neighborhoods to have their power lines buried. This could be a first implementation piece of the Master Plan.

John Erwin talked about MPRB legislative initiative in 2011 for a Park Dedication Fee. The plan was approved by MPRB, the City Council and the Downtown Council as a strategy to get a % of funding for neighborhood greening from any new development. It was stopped at the legislature. Had it gone thru, he approximated that Loring Park Neighborhood would have received \$535,000 from the Magellan development and another \$100,000 from 401 Oak Grove. It was proposed that this funding could be used for greening, playgrounds and parkways within 6 blocks of any development. Jana asked Commissioner Erwin to write up a paragraph for policy support to include in our document and implementation strategy should it return to the legislature next year.

Beth suggested that with LEED language; Peter needed to put in specifically what that means vs. LEED Criteria #2 - it needs to be defined and clear; easy for all to follow, understand, and implement.

Peter reviewed the concept of the "Activity Center" designation around Nicollet Ave. and the Convention Center. Overlooked as well was the concept of "Loring Village" or "Village in Loring". This idea came out of the Nicollet Ave. focus group and Stakeholder interviews, as well as a meeting with Steve Barberio.

Beth reported on the meeting held with the Convention Center today between John Van Heel, John Novak, Peter Musty, Jana, Beth, and Convention Center Staff. Some highlights are: 1) Improving connection to Loring Park from Convention Center via Grant Street, 2) Activate the Open Space in front of the Convention Center with public programming, performance, art, visual art, 3) Activity center to include the neighborhood surrounding Nicollet Ave., 4) More greening, less trash, public art, and 5) LEED improvements being completed which will lead to LEED certification (which is a great thing for our LEED/ND pilot project).

There was concern expressed about the height intensity projected in the Loring Hill section of this Chapter.

Direction is for Peter to review the Community Design Workshop - Loring Hill break out group notes and ensure that what is recommended has come out of the community process. Tom reported that the heights proposed are contrary to the Loring Hill guidelines, especially in the Mansion area (Lower and Upper terrace as defined by the Loring Hill guidelines). Additionally the Loring Hill group has put together a proposal for inclusion into the Master Plan.

Issues raised:

10 stories on south edge by freeway is too high - 317 Groveland is 7 on the freeway side and 5 on the hood side. Mansion area should be OR1 or 2.5 stories to be compliant with comments at Community Design Session and Loring Hill guidelines.

Apartment area should be 3-4 not 6 stories to be within the context and historic character of Loring Hill.

Questions were raised about the definition of "storefront" - whether it is meant to be like a coffee shop within a mansions in the context of Loring Hill with set backs appropriate to the historic area or a suburban strip mall, up to the street design. It was suggested to eliminate the "storefront design" language due to what it implies. Questions raised as to why we would want to identify an area which would allow a "storefront" - business. Why not as a policy state what type of businesses would be allowed in mansions and leave it like that. OR uses are compatible with what we would want. No need to call it out.

Paul requested that Dell Place be removed as a potential commercial site. Not appropriate location for that.

Tom stressed that any language about Loring Hill should reflect the guidelines as well as a potential Historic District. Jana asked that the Historic Asset Inventory which proposes 2 historic district on the Hill should be used for language components in this section of the plan. Tom stated that the biggest issue here is how folks feel about the historic character of the hill and if it is a jewel - we protect it in this plan.

The following intensity was articulated in the Plan Chapter draft:

Intensity A - 4 stories for the Mansion area (Tom reported that folks have been saying OR1 or 2.5 stories)

Intensity B - 6 stories in the Apt. District (Tom reported that folks have been saying 3-4 to be compatible with the Apt. Districts there presently).

Intensity C - 10 Stories - South edge by the Freeway (Tom reported that this is too high, thought folks were talking 6-8).

Tom stated that Lowry Hill is all OR1. Loring Hill was a part of Lowry Hill pre-freeway.

STAFF NOTE: Peter should meet with Tom D-Angelo on this prior to our October Master Plan meeting and then they should come together with a follow-up report.

Next Steps:

It was agreed to have another worksession on the Land Use Policy Chapter on Wed., Sept. 7th from 6:30-8.

Beth requested that Peter make the language syncinct and to the point. She felt that the current language was too academic and did not say enough. Recommendations need to be to the point and focused, not general and/or philosophical.

It was reported that we would need to set another work session on Opportunity Sites only.

Jana reported that she is cancelling the proposed Sat., Sept. 17th Work session to review completed document. We will not have adequate community review of document to be able to have a work session on final review in Sept.

This will put any Community Approval Meeting into early November - IF we work at 2-3 meetings per month on the remainder of the review needed.

Peter needs to review all documents for punctuation and spelling.

Next work session: Wed., Sept 7th from 6:30-8:00. Jana will ask the Park if we can be there again.

Hey Folks - Per Pete's, John's and my meeting with Beth Elliott this past week, here is the schedule being proposed for "next steps" as we write the Loring Park Master Plan:

Wed., Aug. 31st - 6:30-8:30 at Loring Park Community Center - Master Plan Steering Committee

We hope to have all written chapters from Pete, as well as recommendations, so that we can all take pieces to review and bring feedback to the next meeting. At this meeting, we would like Loring Hill/Tom D'Angelo to present for acceptance, their recommendations pertaining to Loring Hill for the Master Plan.

Should we need additional work sessions - we can decide on Aug. 31st - we could hold those on Wed., Sept. 7th and Wed., Sept 14th.

We plan to invite the Steering Committee AND all those who participated in the Community Design Workshops to a 3 hour sessions on Saturday, Sept. 17th from 9-noon. We are looking for someone to host, so let me know if you are willing.

Then, we will change the CLPC Board meeting to the 3rd Monday, Sept. 19, so that the focus of the Board meeting, will be the Master Plan document and input gathered throughout Sept. to date.

Then, both Livability and Land Use Committees will review components of the Plan relevent to their committee work at their Sept. meetings.

Then, we will have a meeting on Wed., Sept. 28th - Master Plan Steering Committee from 6:30-8 at Loring Park to determine and review where we are at.

We would like to propose a Community Review meeting for Thursday, Sept. 29th 6:30-8 and Saturday, Oct. 1st 9-noon (looking for hosts for these meetings as well) for Community to review and approve our completed Master Plan.

At some point in our process when we believe we have a "close to completed plan and OK'd by the Steering Committee" - Beth will post it out for the city's required 45 day public review and public hearing.

My goal is to have City Council approval no later than Dec. 10th.

So, now is the time for us to dig in and get this done!

- Jana, CLPC Coordinator

Community Engagement and Outreach – Loring Park Master Plan *Draft for discussion, circulation and development – Nov. 2009 updated from June 2009*

<u>Timeframe</u>	<u>Task</u>
April 2009-July 2009	Form a Steering Committee reflective of Loring Park neighborhood and stakeholders; determine membership; ensure neighborhood-wide base, as well as representation from renters, owners, business, institution on the SC and/or within the process.
April 2009-April 2010	Traffic Calming Task Force formed; membership recruited; neighborhood Issues identified and prioritize; long-range efforts developed for MPlan
April 2009-Oct. 2010	Report on and promote Master Plan effort in all CLPC meetings & events Secure 1-3 stories in the Downtown Journal on this effort
April 2009-Oct. 2010	Set monthly meeting date for Steering Committee and convene monthly
October 2009-Nov. 2009	Discuss and determine Project Scope – Master Plan Steering Committee
November 2009-Jan. 2010	Steering Committee could do a Walking Tour and inventory properties (?)
February-March 2010	Develop a Request for Proposal with City Planner - approve by CLPC Board - post
March 2010	Report to the Community on Master Plan progress at CLPC Annual Meeting - Promote Neighborhood-wide kick-off
March – May 2010	Plan and Implement a neighborhood-wide Kick-Off Event – May 2010 (?) Set date – Post ad in Downtown Journal – 45 day community notice Visioning session based on Minnesota Design Team methodology
April 2010	Consultant Interviews & Selection x MP Str. Committee, CLPC Board, City Planning staff
May 2010	Contract negotiations between CLPC & NRP & Consultant

May –June 2010	Plan and execute a “Harmon Avenue Design Charette” with MCTC Urban Planning Students (?)
June 2010	Hold focus groups as determined from Project Scope & Kick Off (after consultant is selected and working with us at this time)
May 2010-Aug. 2010	Doorknocking and Intentional Outreach to selected focus areas – TBD
June end-July 2010	Community Meeting to present, create, discuss plan framework (?)
July 2010	Steering Committee & Consultant synthesize input
August 2010	Community Information booth at National Night Out Event to present, discuss Draft Plan, gather input
Aug.-Sept. 2010	August Community Input synthesized and integrated; Oct. Community Meeting publicized – This draft reviewed at Land Use Committee
Oct. 2010	Community Meeting Held – Master Plan approved – Sent to CLPC Board
Nov. 2010	Loring Park Master Plan begins through City processes; Steering Committee Members and neighborhood residents organized for the hearings.

****NOTE – Once a Consultant is hired, there may be more additions to the Com. Engagement components based on discussions with Steering Committee and input from Community.***

Once there is a final plan approval, the City posts a 45-day Public Review and efforts move to City processes Beth Elliot, City Planner will facilitate. During the City Council Committee review, discussion, and approval of Master Plan Steering Committee members should be at Public Hearing, as well as volunteers. The plan will be presented at the Met Council by the City. At that meeting, the CLPC Board Chair and Steering Committee co-chairs and CLPC staff should be present.