

**205 Park Avenue S.**  
**Project Status & Neighborhood Priorities Checklist**  
(Approved by DMNA Board - 9.19.16)

**Executive Summary**

While it is certainly not the neighborhood's role to act as architect, the DMNA seeks to work with Sherman's development team to support an outcome in which the proposed building's contribution to the public realm is maximized. This document serves as a tool to help the DMNA Land Use Committee, the developer, and city leadership track and communicate the status of key building and site design questions/priorities that have been identified by DMNA Land Use Committee members, as informed by the public engagement activities that preceded Sherman's selection as the developer-of-choice for 205 Park Ave. S by City Council. The DMNA looks forward to working collaboratively with the developer and City leadership to contribute to the best possible outcomes for this project and the surrounding neighborhood.

The questions are organized by the directional face of the building and address similar themes. While the list of the questions may seem long, as a group they build toward a few very specific goals. One should use the key at the beginning of the checklist to identify which items have been resolved and which require further discussion or clarification. Notice that many of the initial questions were resolved by the developer during their presentation at the DMNA Land Use Committee meeting on 9.6.2016.

The questions strive to address the following general themes/goals:

- The building should be architecturally distinct and contemporary, but complementary of and of comparable quality to, the buildings in the adjacent historic district as well as Park Avenue Lofts.
- The view corridor along Park Avenue from Washington Avenue through to the historic mills should be enhanced through set-backs and appropriate exterior materials.
- Each face of the building, particularly the ground floor, should enhance the public realm and the pedestrian experience through exceptional landscaping and lighting as well as appropriate set-backs and window placement. Design specific to each street-face should consider the character of adjacent blocks.
- Opportunity for ground level residences with private entrances from the street should be maximized. To encourage residents to use and customize their "front yards" and thus contribute to street life, the building should be set back to allow for sufficiently sized private outdoor space.

Next steps as well as list of specific requests for Council Member Frey's office have been identified at the end of this document.

**DMNA Position Statement**

The development of 205 Park Avenue is of the utmost importance to the Downtown Minneapolis Neighborhood Association, because of its location at the heart of the historic Mill District. The district is an established residential neighborhood, a historically and architecturally important site, and one of the most frequently visited destinations in Minneapolis. The 205 building will front three distinct streets in the district's public realm. Washington Avenue is the principle commercial corridor between downtown and the University of Minnesota. The 200 block of Park Avenue is a residential

block that also serves as the final segment in one of two pedestrian pathways that connect The Commons with the Mill District and Riverfront. South 2<sup>nd</sup> Street is the “main street” of the district’s urban village, a street defined primarily by historic mill buildings, medium-density residential buildings, cultural institutions, and restaurants. Sherman Associates and CM Frey have pledged to work with the DMNA to address neighborhood concerns about the 205 development; the DMNA Land Use Committee looks forward to this work, particularly regarding the creation of streetscapes that enhance the public realm of the Mill District.

## **205 Park Avenue S. Project Status & Neighborhood Priorities Checklist**

Prepared by: The DMNA - Land Use Committee (LUC)

### Checklist Version Log:

1. DMNA Land Use Committee (LUC) Meeting - Tuesday, Sept. 6, 2016. 6:00 p.m. at ADM Room – Mill City Museum
2. DMNA Board Meeting – LUC Status report to the full DMNA Board, Monday, Sept. 19, 2016
3. 10.13.19 - Additions to Service Alley Section re: Dog Relief
4. DMNA LUC meeting, Tuesday, Dec. 6, 2016
5. **DMNA LUC special meeting (requested by DEV), Thursday, Dec. 22, 2016 (resulting in Dec. 28 DMNA letter to Shane LaFave/Sherman Associates on conceptual Site Greening Plan)**

=====

### **Project Participants**

#### Developer’s Team (DEV):

1. Developer: Sherman Associates ([Brent Webb] Shane LaFave).
2. Architect: ESG (Gretchen Camp, Scott Elofson, Bob Loken).
3. Landscape Architect: Damon Farber Associates (Jesse Symnkywicz).
4. Restaurant and Coffee/Bakery: Kim Bartmann.

#### Other participants:

#### City of Minneapolis Staff:

1. City Council Contact: Jacob Frey – Third Ward. Aides: Heidi Ritchie and Zack Farley.
2. City Planner Contact: (Verify – To be determined.)
3. CPED Business/Term Sheet Negotiator Contacts: Emily Stern, Project Coordinator. (Verify other City CPED staff members.)

=====

**Key:** • = answer given to LUC questions

•• = LUC questions not yet answered, issue unresolved, or continuing conversation

=====

### **Status of the Project (Big Picture):**

1. What is different about the project today when it is compared to the project that was submitted as the application (Dated June 10, 2016) in response to the Request for Proposal (Dated April 15, 2016)?
  - Developer stated (9-6-16) that the developer team has not worked on the project since the June 10, 2016 RFP application was submitted. Architect characterized the RFP package as a

“design competition” work effort and as a result the developer’s team needs to now resolve many site and building design issues.

**• DEV presented LUC with an updated conceptual site plan. Based on conversations with LUC on 12-22-16, DEV provided a revised version of this plan (Site Plan-Greening Study) on 12-23-16.**

2. Status of the building - architectural design, footprint, height?
  - DEV – No Changes.
3. Status of the uses in the building?
  - DEV – No Changes.
4. Status of the site development on the adjacent project property to the east that is not a part of this project? This includes the service alley, dog relief facility and park, the aesthetic modifications to the elevations of the City owned parking ramp.
  - DEV – No Changes.
  - DEV stated that agreement for use of this property will be included in the term sheet. See 12/23-16 Site Plan-Greening Study.**

### **The Building:**

1. Height of the building. Understood to be six floors. Any intent to add additional floors at this time or in the future?
  - DEV - The building remains at six floors and there is no intention to change it.
2. Building placement on the site and shape of the building footprint. Can the building be moved a few feet to the east to allow room for more planting along the Park Avenue edge?
  - DEV stated that the building is as far east as it can go. This is in conflict with the developer’s underground parking drawing that shows the building is about five feet west of the property line shown on the drawing. This needs to be studied further to determine the exact location of the building. LUC wants west face of building moved away from the sidewalk to allow for more planting between the sidewalk and the building. Similar to what exists across the street.
  - **DEV, in an email from 11-19-16 from Shane LaFave, stated that “one of the final things we are working through with the City is to see if we can narrow the fire lane easement on the eastern edge of the property, which would allow us to shift our building a few feet to the east, thereby giving more setback off of Park and providing a better view corridor toward the museum.” At the 12-6-16 LUC meeting, Shane stated that this negotiation was proceeding but that the major difficulty was that permission was needed from the owners of the adjoining apartment building. The LUC offered its support to DEV on this matter.**
  - **At 12-22-16 LUC meeting, DEV stated that Fire Department requirements did not allow for the building to be moved to the east, but that design changes did address the planting issue. See 12/23-16 Site Plan-Greening Study.**
3. What is the brick color? Why was a light color selected? Can it be a darker color so it pairs better with the building across the street to help frame the view of the historic Washburn building rather than compete with it?
  - DEV stated that the color of the brick is not resolved. To be studied further.
4. In the urban design for this site the building footprint shape and design can play a role in directing the public’s attention to the historic buildings on 2nd Street and set up the gateway into the Mill District on Park Avenue. Can the building’s edge as it approaches 2nd Street step back slightly to support the framing of the historic buildings in the public view corridor now Park Avenue?
  - DEV stated that the building’s exact footprint is not resolved. This will be studied further.

### **Washington Avenue Side of the project:**

1. The RFP states (page 6) that the building setback should at least match the setback of the neighboring St. Anthony Mills Apartment in order to have consistent sidewalk width that accommodates landscaping and lighting. Based on the RFP application Site/Landscape Plan the building needs to be moved to the north.
  - DEV stated that the building will be moved back from the sidewalk edge so that it lines up with the neighboring building. This allows space for installing planting at the base of the building.
  - **DEV stated that this alignment has now been included. See 12/23-16 Site Plan-Greening Study.**
2. Have you considered installing the streetscape (sidewalk and planting) in the public right of way based on the design for the new portion of Washington Ave. (Hennepin Ave to 5th) rather than per what now exists in front of the property? The new design has long planting areas (as opposed to a small tree grate) to better support tree growth and allow for more landscaping. This will allow for strips of landscaping in the sidewalk along the front of the building. (See RFP page 7.)
  - DEV stated that they will contact Hennepin County Traffic engineering to determine if they will allow installing the new street edge design. Jacob Frey was asked to assist.
  - **At 12-22-16 LUC meeting, DEV (Gretchen Camp) stated that streetscape will be based new Washington Avenue guidelines. LUC noted that it is unclear that Hennepin County will allow use of new guidelines, and emphasized the need to work with Jacob Frey on this issue.**
3. Confirm that the alley driveway on Washington will remain an exit only. It is currently signed as "Exit Only – Do Not Enter". This is taken to mean that the entire alley will remain one-way circulation for vehicle.
  - DEV stated that the service ally will be a one way going south to Washington Avenue. Also stated that it is 19 feet wide. LUC asked to verify allowed minimum width so the building can be moved further to the east to allow for more planting space along Park Ave.
4. What is the canopy over the restaurant's outdoor dining area? A covered rainproof roof or open trellis?
  - DEV stated that it is a solid canopy of a design to be determined.
5. Will decorative fencing/planters be installed at the edge of the outdoor dining area to provide separation and visual interest?
  - DEV stated that the design is not resolved and still needs to be studied.
  - **Issue discussed at 12-22-16 LUC meeting, with general agreement that long planters are the preferred form of separation.**
6. Will the entire building frontage along this street be clear vision glass with active uses happening on the interior? See activity inside?
  - DEV stated that the intent is to have all clear glass store fronts.
7. What use is anticipated for the small retail space at the building corner?
  - DEV stated that this space will be for a bank tenant. A cash machine.
8. Where will bike parking occur? Quantity and Type?
  - DEV stated that is not resolved and still needs to be studied.
9. Does the "Pathways to Places: Downtown Service Area Master Plan" which is the city's public realm planning framework provide any guidance going forward while doing the design refinement and site furnishings selections?
  - DEV stated that they will research this. LUC will request additional advice from Jacob Frey.

#### **Park Avenue Side of the Project:**

1. Can the building be moved to the east away from the sidewalk to allow for more plantings and curbed grade changes (or short walls to create separations) to create more visual interest and separation from the building wall? Add more "layers". Look to the other side of Park Ave. as an

example to follow.

- DEV stated that the design is not resolved and this will be studied.
  - **DEV update from Shane LaFave (see notes in “The Building” section). Townhome entrances are now recessed to provide more greet space along Park Avenue. See 12/23-16 Site Plan-Greening Study.**
2. Can small decorative fences and gates be added along the edge of the sidewalk to create more visual interest and separation of public and private space? Look to the other side of Park Ave. as an example.
    - DEV stated that the design is not resolved and this will be studied.
    - **Issue discussed at 12-22-16 LUC meeting, with general agreement that decorative fences are preferred.**
  3. Is it possible to include a planting strip at the base of the short wall next to the coffee/bakery outdoor dining area/pedestrian ramp to soften the sidewalk area?
    - DEV stated that the design is not resolved and this will be studied.
  4. Describe the low level pedestrian lighting along this street front. How are you enhancing the visual interest of the private spaces along the public sidewalks?
    - DEV stated that the design is not resolved and this will be studied.
  5. Will the condo owners along the street frontage be allowed to privatize an outdoor space? Space provided to have personal plantings and furnishings?
    - DEV stated that the design is not resolved and this will be studied.
    - **At 12-22-16 LUC meeting, DEV stated that condo owners would be able to privatize outdoor spaces and agreed that it would be desirable for owners to have direct access to the planting strips in front of their units.**

#### **South 2nd Street Side of the Project:**

1. Is it possible to include a planting strip at the base of the short wall next to the coffee/bakery outdoor dining area to soften the sidewalk area?
  - DEV stated that the design is not resolved and this will be studied.
  - **See 12/23-16 Site Plan-Greening Study; planting strips are included in this design,**
2. How high up is the outdoor seating area above the public sidewalk?
  - DEV stated that the design is not resolved and this will be studied.
3. Describe the railing at the edge of the outdoor dining area. Can it be more decorative than one single top rail?
  - DEV stated that the design is not resolved and this will be studied.
  - **Issue discussed at 12-22-16 LUC meeting, with general agreement that an ornamental rail is preferred.**
4. Will the entire building frontage along this street frontage be clear vision glass with active uses happening on the interior? See activity inside?
  - DEV stated that the intent is to have all clear glass store fronts.
5. Where will bike parking occur? Quantity and Type?
  - DEV stated that the design is not resolved and this will be studied.
6. Describe the design of the canopy and outdoor dining area details.
  - DEV stated that the design is not resolved and this will be studied. LUC asked DEV to design the building and outdoor dining area (canopy, railings) to be consistent with a modern building design and not use historic reproduced design details.

#### **Service Alley/ City Parking Ramp Side of the project:**

1. Explain how work associated with the development will be allowed outside the project's defined property on land that is not controlled by the developer. What is the legal means to ensure the dog park and other improvements will remain in place for as long as needed.

- DEV stated that the design and legal agreements are not resolved and this will be studied. LUC asked Jacob Frey to assist.
  - **At 12-22-16 LUC meeting, DEV stated that these agreements would be included in the term sheet.**
2. Dog Park: Look at dividing the dog park into two spaces. One specifically for dog relief and the other for a dog park for dogs to run unleashed. The dog relief area could not have a fence to allow easy access and no interference with dogs running free in the dog park. Explain how these will be built and maintained over time. Verify easy and direct connection to a building entry door for dog owners to use.
    - DEV stated that the design is not resolved and this will be studied. DEV is talking to Dog Grounds to design, build, and maintain the dog park. (DogGrounds.com.)
  3. Due to the fact that the dog park/dog relief facility is currently being shown in a location that is not on the property that will be purchased by Sherman there needs to be a backup plan for installing this on the project property. Will an interior dog washing and grooming area be provided? Look at the nearby new Edition apartments as a good example. Will an interior dog relief facility be provided for this project? Look at the new Portland Tower Condo project as a good example. The trend is for this to be installed in new apartment and condo buildings. The proposed Ironclad apartment will have an interior dog relief facility.
    - • To be addressed by DEV
  4. Confirm that the service alley will have one-way circulation going from the north to the south. Confirm that vehicle traffic coming from the St. Anthony Mills Apartments will not be allowed to go north on the alley paving. How will the alley be signed for “One Way Only”?
    - DEV stated that the design is not resolved and this will be studied. DEV confirmed that the service alley is one way going south to Washington Ave.
  5. How narrow can the alley be? What are the edges along the paving so it looks and feels more pedestrian rather than for vehicles? Are there required minimum width standards (Fire lane?)
    - DEV stated that the design is not resolved and this will be studied.
    - **At 12-22-16 LUC meeting, DEV stated that the fire lane will be reduced from 20’ to the minimum 14’ so there will be a 6’ wide planting bed. See 12/23-16 Site Plan-Greening Study.**
  6. What is the paving material for the alley?
    - DEV stated that the design is not resolved and this will be studied. Looking at installing pavers.
  7. Will the parking ramp be screened beyond just constructing the building in front of it? (RFP page 6)
    - DEV stated that the design is not resolved and this will be studied. City has stated that the ramp face cannot be altered. LUC asked Jacob Frey to assist.
    - **at 12-22-16 LUC meeting, DEV stated that a green screen will be constructed.**
  8. Describe lighting both for night security lighting and for aesthetic lighting. How will this space feel safe and inviting at night?
    - DEV stated that the design is not resolved and this will be studied.

### **Police Sub Station:**

1. Is the police department interested in having and staffing a police sub station in this building?
  - DEV stated that this is not resolved and this will be studied. Coordinate with the DMNA Board – Contact Joe Tamburino.
2. Verify the size and location for the proposed police sub station.
  - DEV stated that the design is not resolved and this will be studied.
3. Will developer pay for interior build out? (walls, elect., plumbing, hvac, etc.)
  - DEV stated that they would build out the space.

4. What will rental agreement be with the City of Minneapolis if constructed? Will tenant be required to pay HOA fees? Will developer donate the space?
  - DEV stated that rental fees or HOA fees would not be involved, although details of agreement have not been resolved.
5. How will signage be handled?
  - DEV stated that this is not resolved and this will be studied.

#### **Schedule/ Dates:**

1. What is the start date for the six month period to negotiate an approved term sheet and get the City's approval so the developer can purchase the land? Is it the start date the date that the City Council voted to approve the Exclusive Negotiating Rights on August 19, 2016? (City file number 16-01130). Finalize the Term Sheet and get City approval to be able to proceed with the project?
  - Brent Webb stated that he will verify the dates with the developer's attorney. Jacob Frey thought that the start date for the six month negotiating period is the date the City Council voted to award Sherman Associates the exclusive negotiating rights for the purchase and development of the property at 205 Park Avenue. This date was August 19, 2016. ~~This means the end of the six month negotiating period will be about February 19, 2017.~~ Verify the exact date with Jacob Frey and CPED staff.
  - Emily Stern has stated (in phone conversation with Joe Tamborino) that the six month period started when the City's acceptance of the Sherman proposal was published in Finance and Commerce on September 3, 2016, so the period ends on 3-3-17.

#### **Next Steps:**

1. Meet with DMNA LUC to present the further developed project and refined site and building design. \*\*Dates to be determined.
2. Planning Commission - Committee of the Whole Meeting? \*\*Date to be determined.
3. Planning Commission Meeting? \*\*Date to be determined.
4. Work with CM Jacob Frey on these issues:
  - 1) Determination of whether Hennepin County Traffic engineering will allow installation of the new Washington Avenue street edge design;
  - 2) Advice regarding the applicability of the City's "Pathway to Places" master plan to the streetscapes of this project;
  - 3) Assistance on work between the developer and the City on design and legal agreements regarding the dog park on City-owned land;
  - 4) Assistance on work with the City regarding the parking ramp screening;
  - 5) Verification of the exact dates of the six-month negotiation period for an approved term sheet.
5. Start construction?
  - DEV stated that the proposed date is December 2017.
6. Complete construction?
  - DEV stated that the proposed date is January 2019.
7. Open the restaurant and coffee/bakery businesses?
  - DEV stated that the proposed date is January 2019.