

Citizens for a Loring Park Community

## Land Use Committee

Monday, March 28<sup>th</sup>, 2005

6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.

@ CLPC Offices/Loring Park Office Bldg.  
430 Oak Grove St.; Room #207 612-874-9002

### **I. 6:30-6:45 p.m. Call to Order--Agenda Approval, Introductions, Approve Minutes & Announcements** Bob Copeland, CLPC Land Use Committee Chair

Bob asked approval of the agenda. It was approved.

*The draft minutes from February 28, 2005 were amended to note that Colleen Foster seconded the motion to approve the minutes. Also, Jana asked if there was any detail about the impact of the left-turn lanes on Nicollet that should be added-- consensus that the impact would be small but should improve traffic flow. Motion by Paul Hinderager, seconded by Sunny Floum, to approve the minutes from February 28, 2005.*

*Motion passed.*

Bob led introductions of about 35 persons in attendance.

### **II. 6:45-7:15 p.m. City of Lakes Community Land Trust (CLCLT)–Jeff Washburne**

Jeff Washburne, CLCLT director, presented a quick overview of the CLCLT land use model. CLCLT is a nonprofit organization that makes an investment in housing that helps both the initial and subsequent homeowners. The affordability investment that comes through public and foundation dollars is tied to the property. A homeowner who subsequently sells would keep the principal that the homeowner has paid plus a percentage of the increased value of the home. The remaining part of the increased value is used to help the new homeowner purchase the property. There are asset restrictions on participation. This typically works best with single-family homes. The Land Trust usually takes ownership of the land and this limits lenders that will work with borrowers, including Wells Fargo and Fannie Mae. An alternative model is based on long-term deed restrictions, suited for use with condo units. There are other complications for condo units, requiring CLCLT to step in to purchase the unit and resell to a new owner, in order to keep the “clock ticking” on retaining affordability. Examples of CLCLT ownership are Franklin Station homes on Franklin and 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 26<sup>th</sup> and Nicollet Ave.

There was a question about the location of some of the developments described in the CLCLT brochure—there is anticipation that some neighborhoods that are currently less desirable may become more desirable in the next few years. There were other questions about CLCLT involvement in some of the development anticipated for Nicollet Avenue, including the Eitel Hospital site. Another question asked about education for new homeowners—participants are required to participate in training. Association fees that come with condo ownership are a major issue for CLCLT since fees can price someone out of home ownership.

### **III. 7:15-7:30 p.m. Bike Bridge Update—Jana Metge**

Jana distributed a document and displayed a map of the proposed area. The document does not break down the use of each of the several funding sources. Colleen reported on a meeting with 510 Groveland residents and Hennepin Methodist--there was discussion about fences and irrigation among other things.

*Motion by Jim Bullock, seconded by John van Heel, to request more detail in writing on an itemization of proposed expenditures for the \$63,950 from CLPC. In addition, there should be more detail for the uses of the balance of the \$1,007,930 (sources that include Livable Community Supplement, Transportation Enhancement Program, Lowry Hill East Neighborhood, Municipal State Aid, and Art Grant). Finally,*

*request identifying who decided to pool the funds for this project and what is the advantage to the project.*

*Motion passed, one no.*

**IV. 7:30-8:00 p.m. 1730 Clifton Place/Episcopal Site - Work Group Report & Update** John van Heel, Dan Hunt, Todd Elkins

John van Heel reviewed the history of the 1730 Clifton Place Workgroup, established last fall with the purpose of finding a way for residents to more extensively discuss the issues and proposals and further solicit input from residents. There will be a neighborhood meeting on April 18<sup>th</sup> for residents.

Dan Hunt reported that they have met with 510 Groveland residents and the task force to discuss the project. They have not yet finalized drawings on the third proposal pending discussions with St. Marks. Todd Elkins with Cunningham Group Architecture displayed three options for the site including (1) a 6/7 story option, (2) a 12/3 story stepped option, and (3) 16/3 story (the 16-story segment would be about 176-190')/3 stepped option that keeps more of the site bordering the street at the lower, three-story level. The last option would keep a green roof on part of the three-story section and green space toward 510 Groveland with the possibility of an integrated courtyard with 510 Groveland. Todd has yet to create more detail for the third option—it should be about 110+ units although they would be allowed to put in 180 units. The three-story part would be three stacked condo units, not three-story townhouses.

- Question about the three-story level—these buildings will have an eight-foot setback. There was a comment that the buildings would be very close to the property line and a concern that the new condos in the area have been shoe-horned into the site. There was some interest in 510 Groveland residents to push the tower closer to the street.
- Question about the height of Summit House (20 stories) compared to this option—Todd was not sure of the precise measurements of Summit House.
- Question about how this process compares to the earlier tower proposed for a different site that was defeated by the city council. Todd reported that they have come to this solution because of the opposition of 510 Groveland residents to the 6/7 story option that would fit within zoning.
- Comment that the entire neighborhood prefers to have an option not presented--three-stories with no tower. Another resident (from 510 Groveland) commented that the three-story only option was not his preference, questioning whether the person making the comment spoke for the entire neighborhood.
- The president of the 510 Groveland board said that he would prefer three-story town homes but that this may not be realistic for the developer and the board opposes the 6/7 story 84' box that is the first option. The 510 Groveland board's position is in favor of the third option and the board has so communicated with the work group.
- Comment that there should be another stepped option that would combine three stories and six stories.
- Comment appreciative of the task force work but a question about how this option will look from the rest of the neighborhood (not just 510 Groveland) including the view from the park or in juxtaposition to the church towers. Dan Hunt said that they have first worked with 510 Groveland as the nearest neighbor, but the plan is to move on to the rest of the neighborhood and create other views.
- Question whether there would be additional renderings at the April 18 meeting—yes, from various view corridors.

- Comment that the presentation for another tower (Parc Centrale at 430 Oak Grove) may be waiting to see the resolution of this site.
- Compliment for the open-mindedness of the group to develop a proposal. He is less concerned with the previous tower and hopes that there is a new proposal for that site.
- Comment that he came intending to dislike the proposal, but he likes it. His concern is that they have gone from two towers to possibly four towers in the neighborhood and that may be too many.
- There may be an impasse between the 84-foot restriction vs. dislike of boxes. The architect responded that what is on the site now is not a plus for the neighborhood. Economics are an issue—can the “town houses” sell for enough to meet the developer’s needs.
- The economics of development may be an issue—how can this project build in affordable housing? The rate of gentrification in the neighborhood is astounding.

**V. 8:00 – 8:30 p.m. Small Area Plan Task Force - Mike Marn**

Mike distributed additional copies of the plan. Scott will meet with the fund raising committee soon; currently they have secured \$20,000 from NRP. They anticipate needing \$100,000-120,000 total; the consultant part will be about \$60,000. They hope to defray those costs with in-kind contributions and an intern.

- Question about involving property owners in the area of the plan. Mike Marn and Jana responded that CLPC would bring them into the process. Mike McLaughlin stressed the need to involve businesses as early as possible—the area is bigger than he anticipated. John van Heel noted that they have involved some of the area institutions including several churches and the Woman’s Club. The consultant will have to work to bring these interests together.
- The scope of the plan is in agreement with the requirements of the city for a small area plan.
- Comment that CLPC was pushed to develop the plan because of concerns about several specific developments and development is moving quickly. If this were a 40-acre study (a zoning study) then there could be a moratorium on development in the neighborhood. Should the moratorium issue be revisited? This is sometimes done when things are happening so fast that the city feels it is losing control—is this the case here? There was another comment that moratoria often backfire and may not be legally possible here.
- Suggestion that there should be some way to bring developers into preparation of the plan.
- Suggestion that the area must clearly indicate that buildings on the east side of LaSalle are included as shown in the map. The text of the document seems unclear.
- Comment that the plan is expensive and the benefits may not justify the cost.
- Several comments that while there are not many empty sites left for development, teardowns and redevelopment are not far off.

*Motion by Colleen Foster, seconded Robert Cook, to approve the request of the small area planning group to move ahead with the RFP.*

*Motion passed.*

Adjourned 8:30 p.m.