



MEMORANDUM NORTHFIELD 3RD BUSINESS AND INDUSTRIAL PARK

Date: **May 11, 2010**
To: **Jody Gunderson, EDA**
From: **Hoisington Koegler Group, Inc.**
Re: **April 29th Open House Public Comment Summary**

The following is a summary of public comments received concerning the concept master plan alternatives presented at the April 29th Public Open House conducted in Northfield:

SOUTH SITE

Concept A

Please list the things you like about this scenario

1. Excellent corridors/open space adjacent to streams
2. Land use concepts work well with site
3. Good link of industrial along/near Decker Ave.
4. Pedestrian trail connectivity between areas
5. Clustered development
6. Well done plan for this ag/rural area
7. Although ROW acres are only 7 ac. less than (alt.) "B", it appears, and I think it will feel like much less paved.
8. Greenway and wildlife corridors are preserved w/o roads
9. Low amount of ROW
10. Road plan is better than (alt.) B.
11. I like the education/research center on the east. Why not keep this theme throughout and do industrial in Greenvale?
12. Overall superior use of green space
13. The nature center is good.
14. Wildlife corridors are wide enough to actually work.
15. This development is would be very attractive for a corporate client.
16. The use of higher density housing in this scheme is appropriate, because it builds on existing residential neighborhoods.

Are there other things that should be considered in this scenario?

1. NW corner takes overland stream water flow from rural residences across Old Dutch Road

2. This site needs to set an idea, a standard, a dream of a well planned community for the future.
3. Further cut the business uses, emphasizing research, education, and low impact housing
4. Less density overall – business uses not important here.
5. Pond overflows into stream.
6. Holding pond will run over to Rice Creek in heavy rain.
7. Office park below trout stream looks cramped in.
8. Keep purple development blocks further back from trout stream.
9. Need to move stormwater basin away from Rice Creek trout stream. Move up into office park.
10. Pervious pavers for all of Rice Creek watershed.
11. Consider moving office park on 100th Street up to nature center area.
12. This scheme does not adequately describe how industrial uses would be accommodated in this development. That might not be a problem if both sites are developed, and this one is dedicated to corporate tenants while the north site is primarily for industrial uses.
13. Protection of (and access to?) the creek habitat is paramount for this site, and this scheme creates opportunities for preservation.

Concept B

Please list the things you like about this scenario

1. Good access via roadways that do not involve stream crossings

Are there other things that should be considered in this scenario?

1. Road bisects center N-S wildlife corridor – doesn't really meet corridor connectivity criteria.
2. What is rationale for retail location between the streams? It is rather distracting from features of the site.
3. Don't like road going through whole area.
4. Townhomes should not be necessary in an industrial park
5. Too much building in the Rice Creek watershed.
6. The major street between Decker and Armstrong in concept B may compromise the hydrology of Rice Creek, especially in the eastern portion where the distance between the creeks narrows. It would require careful design, study, construction and monitoring which may be costly. I prefer the minimal roadways in concept A.

NORTH SITE

Concept A

Please list the things you like about this scenario

1. Love this plan.
2. Like the housing and retail mix.
3. Very well done.
4. North Ave. continues straight through

5. Low amount of ROW
6. Good that you included workforce housing and small markets/diners.
7. This scheme nicely compliments proposed Mayo clinic development to the east. Site zoning is nice, in that office uses are positioned closest to the medical uses, and as a buffer to the more industrial uses to the west.

Are there other things that should be considered in this scenario?

1. Alumni housing was already tried east of the hospital and never came to be.
2. A hotel is also questionable in this location, because it is isolated from restaurants and retail that guests would likely utilize. Hotel development could be better sited to support the project goals of supporting downtown. It would be better to position a hotel on a site where hotel guests could walk to the downtown commercial area without crossing Highway 3, or walking more than a few blocks.

Concept B

Please list the things you like about this scenario

1. Don't like the ag-land idea. Plenty of other spaces in the area for this.
2. Not much.

Are there other things that should be considered in this scenario?

1. This scheme presents a second downtown for Northfield that would be in direct competition with the historic downtown we are trying to maintain. Creating a retail/live/work hub with smaller blocks might make sense in a larger community. In Northfield, this is an unnecessary duplication and poor imitation of a real downtown.
2. I don't believe live/work development will succeed in a suburban or rural industrial park. Live/work space is exactly what is needed in the downtown arts corridor developments, not so much in a business park.
3. I'm also concerned about developing housing so far away from existing housing developments. This increases sprawl and costs for infrastructure. Based on the Comp Plan principles, new housing should first be focused on infill sites, then grow incremental outward. This scheme creates too much new housing that is not adequately connected to existing development by contiguous housing, streets, and sidewalks.
- 4.

Concept C

Please list the things you like about this scenario

1. Don't like the ag-land idea unless we have a definite ag company willing to commit.
2. Although intuitively one would say most intense manufacturing uses should be closest to I-35, I like the open feel on the west as a transition.
3. Energy park may also serve development to the west should it occur 50 years from now.
4. Also like southern edge being natural & agri – ie. no crappy retail popping up an highway entrance to Northfield.
5. This is very unique and could be an excellent fit for Northfield
6. Low amount of ROW
7. I like this one best – with ag fields/research area.

Are there other things that should be considered in this scenario?

1. No residential

General Comments

1. Would have liked to see more pictorial/graphic updates on the project website (esp Feb and March drawings). I hope this is remedied in the future, especially when minutes refer to figures and charts.
2. Well done.
3. Good process, although it should have been done 20 years ago.
4. Let's get on with the implementation.
5. Bringing the creeks/rivers into city management will insure better attention to the environment than the current townships do.
6. Like the wellness/medical/senior housing clustered near the hospital.
7. Northfield is becoming a retirement destination/mecca. Maybe we should be playing up the retirement angle.
8. How about complete streets and low impact development practices for roads and parking lots (rain gardens/swales)
9. I live on Edgebrook Drive, the existing residential area off 90th Street East. The concerns of the citizens there are:
 - The money it will take to do infrastructure when the City is publicly talking about the difficulty they have.
 - Concern about big bonding bill, increase of taxes to City of Northfield residents.
 - Short term concern about sale of our properties – 2 homeowners have homes for sale – one has lost 3 potential buyers because of the unsettled nature of this project. In other words – don't drag this out.
10. Keep the southern site for education and research – no conventional industrial/business park. Leave that to the northern site please. Northfield is grabbing so much land there is plenty to make this difference between north and south (sites).
11. Northfield evidently did not realize how much needed to be cut (\$750,000) from the budget when they hired HK to do these plans. We cannot afford them. I pay taxes on a house in town. Need the infrastructure costs by now. Why are these figures not available?
12. With the economy the way it is why not slow down and use the land that you already have annexed in? You want industrial, put it in the north side that you already have. You seem to spend money without having it. You seem to plan on property taxes to help bail you out. Let's wait until the annexation with Bridgewater runs out then try again. Maybe you want to buy our houses from us then we won't give a _____ what you do with it. Put this industrial park behind your own houses. Think about it, you wouldn't want it either.
13. The confluence of three very different streams (Rice, Heath and Cannon) represents a unique and valuable natural resource for our communities. Highest priority should be placed on preserving and improving this resource.
14. Rice Creek, as a cold-water trout stream, is a rare and environmentally-sensitive resource. All phases of development, from concept plans to ground breaking through long-term maintenance should protect the stream and its watershed.
15. Local sources of groundwater may be important to Rice Creek, so we may need to protect its ground watershed as well as its surface watershed. The two may have different

- boundaries. Hydrologic studies to delineate the ground watershed and understand its connection with stream health are required before development. Ground water can impact the flow, temperature, and water quality of a trout stream.
16. The two concepts for the South Site are 60% and 65% permeable. To prevent degradation of streams, the goal should be 10-15% impervious (85-90% permeable).
 17. I am concerned that hydrologic, thermal, and water-quality studies and modeling would reveal that you are overestimating the level of development that can occur on the south site while still conserving and protecting the stream corridors. Or, you are underestimating the cost of low-impact development required to protect the streams and how the potential cost erodes the attractiveness of this site as a business park.
 18. Direct access by the public to Rice Creek should be minimized. In an effort to stabilize the stream banks, we don't want to substitute people traffic for cattle. Residential areas, bridges, and bike trails are better suited for Heath Creek. Light footpaths are better suited for Rice Creek.
 19. A natural park and not a business park is my vision for the south site.
 20. Northfield should concentrate its development efforts on the north site.
 21. Preserving natural areas for future generations is as important as generating jobs, and beautiful natural areas will attract people and businesses to our towns.
 22. I appreciated the open house but was not satisfied with the format. My husband and I had to work late that day so we arrived for the second presentation. The presenter did not introduce himself or others on the committee. He rushed through the material so I didn't learn much about the plans or process. No time was allowed for group discussion or questions. I enjoyed the one on one time with EDA committee members but would have liked more public discourse.