

Minutes - Prospect Park Land Use Committee Meeting

Date: Tuesday, November 13, 2018, 7 PM

Location: Textile Center (3000 University Avenue SE)

People In attendance:

Michele Wallace – *Community Mediation Volunteer*

Jason Fink – *Community Mediation Volunteer*

*Helen Saklin

Lisa Houlton

John Orrison

Lydia McAnarney

Lynn Von Korff

Meredith McNab

Donna Schneider

Margy Stein

David Frank (48 Clarence)

Eric Amel

Martha Joy

Helen Sorinson (sp)

Dan Bryant

University of Minnesota Observer

Devan Blanchard (new PPA Board Member)

George Hanover

Joyce Walker

Joe Ring

Karen Murdock

Florence Littman

*Sue Warner

*George Hansen

Jeff Barnhart (Prospect Park Properties)

Preston Mosser (Prospect Park Properties)

Laura Preus

*Koustauten Iillor (sp)

*Lisa _____ (sp)

John Wicks, chairperson-Land Use Committee

Note, the correct or proper spelling of persons' name containing an * is uncertain.

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson John Wicks at 7:05 PM.

It was noted that the purpose of this meeting was to undertake a committee evaluation of the MOU process as mandated by the PPA Board of Directors at the October 2018 Board Meeting.

1. The two mediation volunteers introduced themselves and stated that they were from the Community Mediation & Restorative Services organization of New Hope, MN.

2. At the initiation of the meeting the Volunteers recommend some ground rules: Keep a respectful tone when you speak; be mindful of time; give everyone a chance to talk; scope/focus on a decision making process; and focus on tonight's discussion.
3. The Volunteers asked everyone to state why they were here and what they hoped to get out of the meeting. Attendees voice a response by going around the room enabling everyone a chance to speak who wanted to. Some comments made included:
 - a. As a new Board Member they wanted to observe how the committee functioned.
 - b. With a new Board, the Land Use committee needs to work beyond previous issues.
 - c. There is a need for adequate communication from committees.
 - d. A need for democracy in our Board and Committees.
 - e. A need to connect with present and former Board Members.
 - f. A need for a revised process in how the Land Use committee reviews projects.
 - g. The Land Use Committee provides an opportunity for residents to engage with developers.
4. Next the Volunteers asked what did or did not work regarding the (MOU) process? Some comments followed:
 - a. Some expressed frustration with the process.
 - b. In other's opinion it was not a democratic process.
 - c. Many people weren't involved because they felt left out of the process.
 - d. To be a neighborhood process you have to involve your neighbors...
 - e. There needs to be a commitment to "transparency".
 - f. Was there a misrepresentation of the project by those most closely involved?
 - g. People trusted the committee but by the time people heard of the project it was too late to alter its consequences.
 - h. A review process took place but its pace outstripped neighborhood involvement.
 - i. Some compared the project to a V vs. a W process. In this instance a V process took-over, meaning there were limited opportunities to apply feedback.
5. The volunteers asked those in attendance how the process could move toward solutions. Some examples given included:
 - a. Provide notices to the neighborhood sooner particularly when a project is seeking zoning variances.
 - b. Developers seek support from Council members and we should demand that our City Council rep. (Cam Gordon) keep us informed. A need to cultivate Council member.
 - c. An extensive email list of PP residents needs to be established.
 - d. There are problems with the PPA website and info there must be up to date.
 - e. For those without email a phone call is necessary.
 - f. Due to the City's design to increase density citywide, the Planning Commission may approve a project over the objections of a neighborhood.
6. At this point in the meeting, a person in attendance distributed two documents suggesting they could help toward solutions. One document was from the International Association

of Public Participation and included “Core Values” for public participation: these guidelines are used by some Minnesota state agencies and the City of Minneapolis. The second document was titled “Best Practices” and gave suggested steps to improve the MOU process.

- a. The documents emphasized the need to notify people to get the word out.
7. A comment was made that the people in attendance do not represent the neighborhood because most people in the neighborhood are young and property renters and the people at this meeting are older and property owners. Another comment was made that there may be more in common among renters and property owners and opportunities to build connections.
8. Another commentator expressed the great need for the MOU process because without it developers will go directly to the City and avoid any contact with the neighborhood.
 - a. It was further noted that if we do maintain an MOU process that it needs to have integrity and persons involved must be informed.
9. One attendee expressed a concern that within the PP Historic district there exists a tension between the property owners and renters.
10. Support was expressed for incorporating the “Best Practices” features into the MOU process. Persons interested in participating in an effort to rewrite the MOU process document were invited to meet prior to the December 11th Land use Committee meeting from 5 to 7 PM, at the offices of PPA, 2828 University Ave. SE.
11. It was suggested that the PPA Board take up at its next meeting the possibility that all committees and the Board itself incorporate the Citizen Participation “Best Practices”.
12. In response to a question “...*if this group should meet again with the “Volunteers” to further discuss reconciliation among neighborhood residents...*”, there was not a strong response from the group that another meeting was necessary and if the MOU is modified with the “Best Practices” and people adhere to the process the issue may resolve itself.
13. The Volunteers were thanked for attending the meeting and providing guidance on the topic discussed.

The meeting concluded approximately 9:10 PM.

Minutes prepared by John Wicks. Send comments and revisions to jonewix@aol.com

Of note: A sign-in sheet was used for this meeting but the transcriber was not able to decipher all the names or email addresses of persons who signed the sheet. For that reason these minutes are being sent to persons on the list whose email addresses were legible. I have attached a copy of the Sign-In sheet and ask persons who receive the minutes to forward them to those persons with an * (asterisk) next to their name.

PPA Land Use Committee Meeting

November 13, 2018

Minneapolis 2040 feedback and current language related to views and historic resources

PPA feedback to Minneapolis 2040 included a suggestion for Policy 94, Action Step c:

- “Create and use design guidelines for historic landscapes and for view corridors to and from significant historic landmarks.” [PPA suggested language is underlined]

The latest draft of Minneapolis 2040 for Policy 94, Action Step c states:

- “Identify the character defining features and paramount views of resources as part of the design guideline process.”

Thus, it currently mentions views, but it is somewhat vague and could be further strengthened.

A motion:

The Prospect Park Association Land Use Committee approves and supports the following:

1) Council member Cam Gordon’s resolution to have the Minneapolis HPC explore the need and possible remedies to protect the view sheds of city designated historic properties, such as the Witch’s Hat Water Tower, and

2) That we recommend that Minneapolis 2040 more explicitly references a proactive approach to identifying and conserving important views associated with historic landmarks. We suggest an action step be added under Policy 94, which could complement action c and state:

“Explore and develop proactive strategies (such as a Scenic Resources Protection Plan) to conserve view sheds associated with major historic landmarks.”