

CARVER COUNTY CDA SPECIAL BOARD MEETING

February 26, 2018
Carver County CDA
705 Walnut Street
Chaska, MN
5 p.m.

MINUTES

PRESENT:

CDA Board: Sarah Carlson, Molly Koivumaki, Darrel Sudheimer, John Fahey, Greg Anderson

Staff: Julie Frick, Allison Streich, Dave Beddoe, Karen Reed

Others: Randy Maluchnik, Carver County Commissioner
Nick Koltavy, Deputy Director of Public Services Carver County
Matt Podhradsky, City Administrator, Chaska
Nate Kabat, Assistant City Administrator, Chaska

I. CONVENE CARVER COUNTY CDA BOARD

II. CALL TO ORDER BY CHAIR

The meeting was called to order at 5:08 p.m. by Chair Sarah Carlson.

III. AGENDA REVIEW AND ADOPTION

Motion to approve agenda as presented. Motion by Anderson, Second by Koivumaki. Motion carried.

IV. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION - None.

V. City of Chaska Redevelopment discussion

Podhradsky indicated that city staff sat down with the architect on the development and discussed how they could best address some of the CDA concerns, as he heard those at the February 15 meeting. There were two main changes from the last meeting. Other than the parking lot, there is as little change to the existing building as possible. The two areas of change are to leave some parking spaces in the back parking lot. The current lot would be cut in half and flipped to maintain the two ADA parking spaces plus five general spaces. They would also potentially assign spaces in the parcel the city will be picking up in Cooper's lot. Also, looking at a courtyard exploration area on the concept.

Kabat provided staff and the Commissioners with some updated hand-outs. He reiterated the new concept of keeping some parking in the back. The dumpsters and condensers would stay where they are currently located. Also, the City heard our concerns on "no value" of the CDA land. The new LOI outlines a process to determine the value.

Koivumaki questioned if there would be access to the retail from our parking lot. Podhradsky explained there would not. Carlson brought up a concern that if 30 years down the road the CDA decided to sell our building, what would potential limitations be regarding adequate parking. Frick said there is a concern that in the long term if we sell the building, will we have adequate parking. Podhradsky explained that the CDA would have easement control on any parking across the street. Carlson asked about any requirements in the Subway lease. Frick stated that they back up to the back of the building (where Dunkin Donuts would go) for deliveries. Podhradsky stated they could probably come up with something for delivery for both Subway and Dunkin Donuts. Koivumaki expressed her thanks for the changes to have the least impact on our residents. She asked how a public property could be deeded to a private developer? What are the legal issues? Podhradsky stated he does not think it would have an impact on us at all. Koivumaki responded that our building is a public property and she does not see the public purpose in selling it to a private developer with no competitive process.

Podhradsky stated that we will have legal control over as many parking spaces after as we did before sale of the land. Koivumaki stated she is uncomfortable with what appears to be an unfair process. Podhradsky stated that the City looked at redeveloping the entire area before and it did not work. Now a provide developer owns some of the land and is able to make the redevelopment work. He would argue that it is not a loss of space but a reorientation of property lines. We will end up whole in the end.

Podhradsky stated by signing the LOI, we are not saying absolutely. This is saying we will go through the process to make sure it meets our criteria. If they do that, then we will be supportive of it. Anderson asked what if a net gain for us? Podhradsky's suggestion is that they would pay us for the loss of spots. An argument can be made that the spots across the street are not the same value as the current parking spots. We would have to come up with a value of what's lost in the current lot. City staff would sit down with Frick to discuss the value, and what we would want to do in the courtyard. The developer would put in a plan with the intention that the CDA takes over maintenance.

Anderson clarified the purpose of tonight's motion would be to develop more specifics related to the LOI. Podhradsky said the City would not develop a purchase agreement until the CDA approved of the specifics. Anderson made a motion to accept the February 8 LOI, as amended for the 2/26 meeting. Second by Sudheimer. Motion passed.

VI. Tourism Study proposal

Frick explained that the Board had requested to see a copy of the Tourism study proposal, so they could discuss it before the April work session with County Commissioners. Carlson explained the intent of the work session would be to seek clarification and discuss with the County Board. What would the end result be? What would the commitment be and staffing requirements? Koivumaki asked Commissioner Maluchnik if all the County Commissioners were up-to-date and what were their thoughts. Commissioner Maluchnik stated they are aware and they want to discuss it further. Kuktavy explained the April 3 meeting was packed and requested to move the work session to April 24. All Board members were not able to attend. Kuktavy will look into holding the work session on April 17.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Anderson. Second by Fahey to adjourn the meeting at 6:17 p.m. Motion carried.

Sarah Carlson, Chair

Date