

DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND
RECREATION



CITY OF SAINT
PAUL

Mayor Christopher B. Coleman

400 City Hall Annex
25 West 4th Street
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55102
www.stpaul.gov/parks

Telephone: 651-266-6400
Facsimile: 651-292-7311

Pedro Park Meeting #4 Notes (09/11/2012)

Meeting Location: 81st on 7th, 81 E. 7th St, Saint Paul, MN

5:30 pm – 7:30 pm

Attendees:

Design Advisory Committee: Kate Swenson (Rossmor), Julia Schrenkler (MPR & Rossmor), Vince Gillespie (The Pointe), Pat Wolf (CRES, Inc.), Marcus Young (Public Arts St. Paul)

Staff: Jody Martinez (Saint Paul Parks), Don Ganje (Saint Paul Parks), Anne Gardner (Saint Paul Parks), Karin Misciewicz (Saint Paul Parks)

Other: Will Weisert (The Pointe), Pat & Gary Mahre (The Pointe), Linda Lette (The Pointe), Carla Smith (The Pointe), Andrea Mathern (The Pointe), David Washburn (resident), Kristina Nelson (CRES, Inc), Pamela Neal (The Pointe)

Meeting #4 Goal:

- Review design goals and objectives, review concept plans for phased park implementation, and gather input from committee members in order to move plans to the next stage of design

- 1) Welcome – Don Ganje welcomed the group
- 2) Anne Gardner presented the agenda
- 3) Anne gave a brief recap of the first three meetings (Oct 25, 2011 and Nov 29, 2011, and May 1, 2012) including a brief summary of the survey results.
- 4) Anne presented the overall Project Design Goals and also the Design Goals and Objectives developed from previous meetings and the online survey. Goals and Objectives are:
 - A. **Provide a Park Design which combines elements of “Natural Landscape Design” (informal, organic, asymmetrical) with elements of “Traditional Landscape Design” (formal, structured, symmetrical).**
 - Investigate site layout ideas which contrast informal/organic shapes with formal/symmetrical shapes

- Utilize a combination of informal/asymmetrical tree and shrub planting schemes with more structured/symmetrical planting ideas.

B. Develop a Park Design which includes a hierarchy of individual, small group and large group gathering space within an overall family friendly setting.

- Provide small seating areas for quiet contemplation
- Provide small group gathering areas for neighborhood interaction
- Provide open unstructured space for informal recreation

C. Provide a Park Design which emphasizes activities conducive to more passive recreational experiences.

- Provide an open and/or enclosed structure for shade such as a gazebo, pergola or conservatory
- Provide a space for outdoor performances
- Provide a water feature
- Provide open lawn area for gatherings

D. Provide a Park Design which is viewed as a “green oasis” from the surrounding urban neighborhood

- Surround site with street tree plantings and places to sit and view adjacent park
- Provide opportunity for bike parking and a dog run
- Relocate bus stop at NW corner of Minnesota and Ninth Street into SW corner of new park
- Remove asphalt surrounding childcare center and substitute green space

5) Anne presented the existing land ownership of the block and the proposed buildout of the park to occur in 3 phases:

- Step 1 – Temporary park or Pedro Parcel – Donation requirement that this is a park by 2014. All current uses remain.
- Step 2 – Half block park – Public Safety Annex is removed and the parking lot land at 10th and Minnesota corner is acquired. Childcare center remains. Remaining block is redeveloped or reconfigured for surface parking lot
- Step 3 – U-shaped – All parcels except the Childcare center are converted to park use. Childcare Center building remains

6) Don Ganje presented concept plans

- Scheme A – Historic Wall is removed
Full Block - Half block - Pedro Parcel
- Scheme B- Historic wall remains
Full Block - Half block - Pedro Parcel

7) Discussion & Responses to plans

- Lighting – Question was regarding what the plan is for lighting. Response is that we will go with standard downtown lighting for perimeter. Interior lighting will be a part of the next stage in design development
- Residents do not want additional assessment to develop the park

- c) Seating- There is some concern for safety and presence of homeless people
 - d) Noise- there is currently a lot of noise from the fire station, bus traffic, and kids in street. Comment was to not increase noise- no big concerts with lots of people. Response was that trees and water will help to mitigate the noise levels
 - e) Other comments included that having noise is a part of downtown living- park should add to more 'positive' noise
 - f) Question regarding what is the barrier for removal of the public safety annex? Response was that removal and relocation of the building is a priority for the city, but there is no current plan or funding to do so
 - g) Comment- do not want to compete with Mears Park or create such a large concert space. There is too much noise at Mears Park
 - h) Comment – it doesn't make sense to create a pocket park
 - i) Comment- Like the wall feature (preserving the existing foundation wall and adding water feature)
 - j) Question regarding dog use: Dog area would be fenced in and separate. Artificial turf will be considered
 - k) Question: would Plan A or Plan B be easier to build out? Response- The two plans have differences and are probably about the same
 - l) Question: Does it make sense to keep both the Public safety Annex and the Childcare Center and create a H shaped park? Response: Preference to keep a continuous park area. Keeping both buildings would create areas that are not visible
 - m) Question: what are the risks of keeping the existing foundation wall and using as a 'feature' on site? Response: Unknown- it's condition requires further evaluation once the Public Safety Annex is torn down. It will require engineering to maintain or preserve it.
 - n) Suggestion: Create a plan for the next steps for the childcare center building should they decide to go.
 - o) Question to consider: Is it preferred to have a tax generating parcel on this block?
 - p) Ramps and walls will deal with grade change where site is not filled.
- 8) Park Staff listed the following as required feedback for moving forward:
- a) Stone wall- Should the existing stone foundation wall stay as a historic element on the site or should it be removed?
 - b) Parking removal- Should parking be incorporated into the long-term planning of the block?
 - c) Half-block vs. Full -block- does a half block concept accomplish the goals and objectives? Should we pursue the full block plan?
 - d) Grade change/Orientation – A main difference between the two plans is that Option A has the potential to be at grade with the sidewalk. Option B (Stone wall remains) requires the park to be at a lower grade due to the existing stone wall. Which option is preferred?
 - e) Design Style- Which option is preferred: A or B?
- 9) Meeting Attendees attached post-it notes with comments to the different concept plans. Comments will be available on the Pedro Park website.

10) Next Steps:

- a) Park staff will gather input and will select one concept to move forward with.
- b) Prepare cost estimate for build out.
- c) There will be one more committee meeting
- d) There will be a final open house to review the final plan.

Notes by Anne Gardner
0918/2012