

October 29, 2018

Rick Varco

345 Randolph Ave. #100 St. Paul MN 55102

rick.varco@seiuhcmn.org

Comment –

On behalf of the thousands of SEIU members who live in Minneapolis, many of them low-wage service workers who struggle to afford housing, I want to share a resolution adopted by the SEIU Minnesota State Council: SEIU MN State Council Resolution in Support of Increased Housing Density Adopted April 26, 2018 Whereas, SEIU members face increasing costs for housing, especially in Minneapolis and St. Paul; and Whereas, local governments, especially Minneapolis and St. Paul, use their zoning authority to limit housing density and the number of new housing units that can be built, thus increasing the cost of housing; and Whereas, dense urban areas generate fewer greenhouse gasses per person and promote union construction jobs; Be it resolved, that the SEIU Minnesota State Council generally opposes zoning limits on density and supports changes to the 2040 comprehensive plans in Minneapolis, St. Paul, and other cities to allow greater density; and Be it further resolved, that the SEIU Minnesota State Council specifically supports the proposal in Minneapolis to legalize 4-plex dwellings citywide.

October 29, 2018

Eileen OConnell

5024 Zenith Ave So

etoconnell@gmail.com

Comment –

Please slow down the 2040 process. It needs a review for water mitigation and other environmental issues. I live next to a monster house and my back yard now has pooling water when it is a heavy rain. The home builders did not follow the zoning and I do not expect that many of those building in the future will either. Just like I doubt they will create affordable housing options in my neighborhood. Consider inclusion into 2040 an Affordable Housing Inclusion Policy like the City of Bloomington is considering. This would help to preserve and maintain already affordable housing and put pressure on builders to create AFFORDABLE new housing. But take some time to consider I am sure that the Met Council would grant an exception for a bit more time to review.

October 29, 2018

Micah Sunde

6120 Russell Ave S

Micah.sunde@gmail.com

Comment –

With the understanding that our beautiful city will not only be growing out but also up, I truly oppose the broad brushed 2040 plan. There needs to be more thought put in to how rezoning will effect specific neighborhoods/schools etc. With the current plan, contractors will benefit while neighborhoods and classrooms will suffer from a influx that they are not prepared for. 2040 needs to be scrapped and a new plan needs to be fully fleshed out before moving forward.

October 29, 2018

Ashley Streetman

3531 Garfield Ave

ashley.streetman@gmail.com

Comment –

Please support and vote for the Minneapolis 2040 initiative.

October 29, 2018

Ryan Brown

1435 W 31st St #102

ryan.brown42@gmail.com

Comment –

I support the comprehensive plan. In order to tackle the challenges of both a housing shortage and climate change, the policies in the plan will encourage the more walkable neighborhoods and diversity of housing types connected to transit corridors. While the policies in the plan will not undo decades of racial inequities, it does move the city in the right direction.

October 29, 2018

Dan Yurek

1313 22nd Ave NE

dan_yurek@hotmail.com

Comment –

I appreciate the changes that were made to the affordable and accessible housing goal, they are a good step forward. I believe mixed income housing is a great program that needs to be embraced for the future of Minneapolis.

October 29, 2018

Rebeca Sharpe

Comment –

This revised plan still does not take into account indiscriminate plowing down of homes in areas that look good on a map. Rather, immediate infill on available plots of land, with existing public transportation infrastructure, should come first. Reducing the number of units per lot continues to ignore the undue pressure on parking needs. Try again.

October 29, 2018

David Norton

4049 Bryant Ave S. , 55409

jacknorton@zoho.com

Comment –

I live in a single family home in Ward 10 and I support four plexes across the city and up to six stories on Bryant Ave. My in-laws, who are retiring, would like to live near their grand kids but there aren't any single-level living condos that work nearby. I'd love to build a 3 unit building in my neighborhood that included a single level living unit for them and two other units, but current code prevents this. Upzoning the entire city will give my in-laws, and many seniors, better options for accessible condos or apartments. I support the 2040 plan to increase density city wide, especially given the white-supremacist exclusionary zoning that has defined single family housing. I support increased density along transit routes- I love on a transit route and think this makes good use of existing resources. As a professional historian (a professor of history who teaches MN history) I find arguments against density to mirror arguments against Jewish people, African Americans, and Asian peoples that white residents used to exclude others, well into the 1970s. My hope is to build a 3 unit with an accessible two bedroom ground level that we could move into in 30 years when our single family home become too much house. Thank you for considering my comments.

October 29, 2018

Dennis Stone

5656 Girard Ave So., Minneapolis 55419

audionut999@msn.com

Comment –

I am a strong supporter of the entire 2040 Plan, though I want to submit a comment specifically about the housing sections. I supported the original version, but I think the revised version is a very reasonable compromise. The city is facing situations that are undeniable: sharply increasing population, smaller family unit sizes, severe housing shortages, sharply rising prices (far higher than incomes), etc. The ONLY answer to these issues is increased density. That idea is also consistent with the current state of housing and urban planning throughout the country. Several cities that have increased housing production have actually seen rents drop in the past year. Another HUGE reason to support the plan is the increasing threat of global warming. I did a comprehensive study of that a few years ago, and I am convinced our situation will be dire in the second half of this century, if not before. Increased density on transit lines is not just a good idea, but necessary. Building a lot of market rate housing also produces affordable housing in the long run. The "trickle down" theory is a real thing, observed by economists. Most lower income people don't live in housing created for them. Rather, they live in aging housing that has decreased in value over time. So we have to do that while at the same time doing more creation of affordable units. Both things are needed. In regard to affordable housing, I also would like to see intelligently reduced regulations for that. Obviously not in a way that allows slum lord activity, but in a common sense way that makes housing more affordable. More allowance of mobile homes could be an option as well. At the same time the city has to commit to a beefed up inspection methodology to make sure lower income housing is maintained properly by landlords. We've seen some egregious examples of landlord abuse in the past few years that can't be tolerated.

October 29, 2018

Will Stancil

901 Summit Ave S
whstancil@gmail.com

Comment –

I support any and all efforts to increase density and development in neighborhood interiors, including loosening built-form or unit restrictions and permitting lot combination, for two reasons. These efforts address housing problems in Minneapolis in at least two ways. First, they make it easier for the private market to meet the city's tremendous demand for mid-market rental units, especially in high-demand neighborhoods where current land-use law makes any net increase of units either impossible or prohibitively expensive. This, in turn, relieves pressure on housing markets in Minneapolis and across the region, and allows housing prices to decline. Second, and more importantly, allowing the creation of new units in areas where housing development has been historically highly restricted is an essential component of any effort to address Minneapolis's long legacy of housing segregation and discrimination. Many areas of the city are virtually off-limits to lower-income residents and residents of color, because they contain no units that are affordable even to middle incomes, no rental units, and have no prospect, under current law, of ever developing such units. No matter how forward-thinking or progressive Minneapolis is today, it counts for nothing if the city's land use laws indefinitely perpetuate decades-old patterns of racial and economic isolation. Restrictive housing rules smuggle the racism of the past into the city's future, and perpetuate the social, educational, financial, physical, and moral harms that accompany segregation. I oppose changes to the original draft comprehensive plan that lower the overall density ceiling in many neighborhoods, including the shift from by-right fourplexes to by-right triplexes. These are a step in the wrong direction. Many properties will not be financially viable as rental units without four units. (I know this firsthand: I have been thrown out of a relatively affordable rental unit in a fourplex because the landlord was forced to eliminate an upstairs rental unit to conform with zoning requirement, rendering the building unsustainable as a rental property.) Many of the most sought-after rental units in our city are in buildings that are illegal to construct today, and that is even more true after the changes to the comp plan. Frankly, I am also concerned about the provenance of these changes, which appear to have been made to placate a vocal minority of relatively affluent propertyowners, most of whom live in highly-segregated quarters of the city, and most of whom are seeking a comprehensive plan that will preserve that status quo. Even in a community-led process, a city is not insulated from civil rights liability because the public participants, rather than the city itself, is guided by racial animus or some other unlawful motive. I would remind the city that it faces important legal fair housing obligations in federal and state law, and these constrain its choices with regards to land use. As with any private or public entity, it faces a duty under Section 3604 of the federal Fair Housing Act to not "perpetuate segregation," including by undertaking actions that have a racially disparate impact. Moreover, as a HUD entitlement community, it is also governed by the Fair Housing Act's duty to "affirmatively further fair housing," which has been defined as the duty to take "meaningful actions to . . . taken to overcome the legacy of segregation, unequal treatment, and historic

Minneapolis 2040 Comprehensive Plan Public Comments

lack of access to opportunity in housing." These duties are written into federal law and have been affirmed by the Supreme Court. They cannot be eliminated or reduced by the administrative choices of the current presidential administration. They will persist in legally enforceable fashion long after that administration concludes. Here, too, the city should be aware that its comprehensive plan is a document for the future as much as for the present.

October 29, 2018

Siobhan Craig

100 East 49th St.

Comment –

I am deeply concerned about the current version of three 2040 PM. It will damage one of the things that makes Minneapolis unique—our beautiful neighborhoods. While I agree with some goals of the plan, especially improving public transportation and diversity, I do not think this is the right way to go about achieving them. Please do not support this plan!

October 29, 2018

Larisa Speetzen

4616 York Ave S

speetzen@gmail.com

Comment –

Instead of commenting specifically on the 2040 plan, I'd like decision makers to know that I think: 1. The 2040 plan in its current form doesn't go far enough in light of the recent IPCC report. 2. We must take drastic, and swift action to reduce our reliance on fossil fuels. 3. We must increase density and amenities throughout Minneapolis in order to reduce urban sprawl and the need for people to drive. 4. We have given up too much public land to cars and their infrastructure. We should take some of it back.

October 29, 2018

Mark McGuire

4740 Emerson Ave S

markjmcguire@gmail.com

Comment –

I'm against the blanket zoning of all residential neighborhoods in Mpls to permit up to triplex density. We live in our Lynnhurst neighborhood because of the large yards, big trees and neighborhood feel where we know each and every neighbor on our street. Zoning triplex development in our neighborhood will radically change the neighborhood character and beauty of the street and will do little to nothing to make the cost of housing lower in Minneapolis. The best way to add housing supply that will lower the cost of living is to do so strategically and thoughtfully on a street by street basis-not a blanket policy that applies to every street in the city regardless of impact on the existing street. That one size fits all policy approach is lazy, sloppy and will do much more harm than good. I hope our city leaders realize they need to approach this on a much more granular and strategically planned level. It's the best approach to lower the cost of housing and do as little disruptive damage to existing neighborhoods as possible at the same time. Thanks for your consideration.

October 29, 2018

John Edwards

2446 Aldrich Ave S, #308

jedwards09@gmail.com

Comment –

I support the Minneapolis 2040 plan. I supported the previous draft too. I think the plan has been compromised too far in the direction of limiting the number of homes, and diversity of housing types -- both near transit and in neighborhood interiors. A UN panel of scientists recently predicted that the effects of climate change will reach crisis levels as early as 2040. Our region is growing and will continue to grow. We want those new people living in Minneapolis, in a walkable city -- near transit, safe bike infrastructure, and daily destinations. The alternative is forcing them to live further and further away in environments built exclusively for car travel. We don't have the luxury of putting off action for another ten years. If we're serious about climate change, we'll take action right now. We haven't built enough housing in Minneapolis over the last ten years. And the kind of housing we have built has been the most expensive kind of housing (large apartment buildings are expensive; fourplexes are more economical). Our ongoing housing shortage is driving an affordability crisis right now. We don't have the luxury of putting off action for another ten years. If we're serious about having enough homes for everyone, we'll take action right now. I know big change is hard. But we don't have the option of saying no. Minneapolis can be an example to the region and the country. We can say, not only are these changes politically possible, but the results of these changes are communities that are more affordable, more connected, and more livable.

October 29, 2018

Sarah McGuire

4740 Emerson Ave S Minneapolis

sarahemcguire@gmail.com

Comment –

I'm against the blanket zoning of all residential neighborhoods in Mpls to permit up to triplex density. We live in our Lynnhurst neighborhood because of the large yards, big trees and neighborhood feel where we know each and every neighbor on our street. Zoning triplex development in our neighborhood will radically change the neighborhood character and beauty of the street and will do little to nothing to make the cost of housing lower in Minneapolis. The best way to add housing supply that will lower the cost of living is to do so strategically and thoughtfully on a street by street basis-not a blanket policy that applies to every street in the city regardless of impact on the existing street. That one size fits all policy approach is lazy, sloppy and will do much more harm than good. I hope our city leaders realize they need to approach this on a much more granular and strategically planned level. It's the best approach to lower the cost of housing and do as little disruptive damage to existing neighborhoods as possible at the same time. Thanks for your consideration.

October 29, 2018

Lance and Linda LaVine

3350 Humboldt ave S

lavin001@umn.edu

Comment –

Seattle has not up zoned everything as does the 2040 plan. Instead developers pay for increased density by 1) building LEED Platnum energy efficient buildings; 2) dedicating at least 3000 s.f. to green space; and 3) contributing \$20/s.f. for s.f. over that normally allowed to an affordable housing fund. Wouldn't this be a much smarter path for Minneapolis if they want something back from developers to support the public good. You plan allows many more housing units to be built than the 60,000 added inhabitants you predict by 2040. By passing this radical up zoning you have eliminated our ability to shape our City or our social housing goals. Please reconsider!

October 29, 2018

Jennifer Taplin

716 West 40th St.
jjjtaplin@yahoo.com

Comment –

Dear Mayor Jacob Frey and Council Members of Minneapolis, I oppose the 2040 Plan. My first concern is my home and surrounding neighbors at 716 West 40th St. between Lyndale and Aldrich. We would be slotted for Corridor Mixed Use. My home has been in my family since the mid 60's and I intend to keep it in the family and pass it on. I have strong ties to my community and care deeply about my neighbors. My neighbors know me as Jenny from the Block. We are happy and very proud of neighborhood. If I wanted to live in a Corridor Mixed Use area I would sell my home and move 10 blocks north to Uptown. I do not want that and that's why I chose to live happily where I am. My other concerns include the state of our roads and other basic infrastructure, concerns over policing and public safety, overcrowding in our schools, concerns for environmental watersheds and green spaces, and the strains placed on our parks. All of these essential functions will see significant cost increases that your plan does not adequately address. What about the increased congestion on our streets and lack of parking needs? These are enormous problems in cities that have invested tens of billions more in public transport systems than Minneapolis. Yet you expect we'll somehow escape these problems and do not properly address them in your plan. I would like for my comments to be made public. Sincerely,
Jenny Taplin 716 West 40th St.

October 29, 2018

Colleen Ryan

2212 Oliver Avenue South, Minneapolis, MN 55405

cmr16@yahoo.com

Comment –

I do not support the 2040 plan in it's current form. It does not address the many thousands of thoughtful and well-meaning comments that were provided by citizens in June/July of 2018. The blanket upzoning is a drastic and unprecedented step that will further harm the environment and the lakes. Please reconsider this plan.

October 29, 2018

MT Mason

Minneapolis, MN

Comment –

Two comments: 1) We are against the proposed CM Schroeder Ordinance: Lot combinations in lower-density zoning districts ordinance (2018-01198). This up-zoning proposal exceeds the authority of our City government: This ordinance would provide the means for the City to invoke Eminent Domain, or the taking of private property for "public good". It is obvious to most citizens that the 2040 Plan favors DEVELOPERS, without the checks and balances of market forces (economists agree that density does not equal equity). This is historically a recipe for bureaucratic disaster. 2) Complex social problems will always exist, despite new 2040 zoning. There are smarter ways to achieve equity goals that provide support systems (jobs, education, family services, finance regulation changes), rather than completely overhauling our superficial physical zoning plan. Ironically, this too-broad social experiment is being forced upon the very FAMILIES who built our extremely desirable neighborhoods with pride and investment. We demand to know: What alternative economic model to home-ownership does the City Council propose as a way for citizens to develop wealth, pay taxes, and improve our city? Thank you!

October 29, 2018

Wendy Haan

3824 47th Ave South, Mpls, MN 55406

wenderful73@yahoo.com

Comment –

Hello My Name is Wendy Haan. I am co-founder of the Minnesota Citizens for the Protection of Migratory Birds. I would like to speak to Policies 6 and 68 of the 2040 plan that address new buildings. Thank you for taking public input from environmental groups who can help mitigate the negative impact of future growth on our natural habitat. Policy 6. Pedestrian-Oriented Building and Site Design A recent study estimated that between 365 million and 988 million birds are killed annually by building collisions in the United States and that migratory birds are at particular risk. Requiring the use of windows in buildings, particularly at the pedestrian level, increases the risk of bird-glass collisions, which occur most often at the first 40–60 feet of a building. Requiring bird-safe glass will reduce this risk as well as add to the energy efficiency of buildings. Please add an action step that amends the zoning code to require that all new construction use bird-safe glass. Policy 68. Energy Efficient and Sustainable Buildings Minneapolis should require, not just encourage, sustainable design in buildings relying on city financing. Bird-safe glass is an important component of sustainable design and should be required in every city-supported building. Bird-safe glass has the added advantage of being energy efficient. Please amend step d. as follows: “Require sustainable design practices and principles for projects supported with City financing, with a focus on robust energy efficiency and building envelope and environmentally friendly building treatments including bird-safe glass.” Minneapolis is known around the world for its parks and lakes, and serves a special role in support of migratory species. Population growth is inevitable and Mpls will be a climate change destination city because of our parks, lakes and rivers. Our city is known the world over for being a major migratory bird flyway. We must play our special role in the protection of these birds. We do not want to be known the world over for creating bird death traps. Thank you.

October 29, 2018

Melissa Cathcart

3018 38 Ave S. Mpls 55406

m@mcart.com

Comment –

I first learned of the 2040 Plan through an article written in the neighborhood paper this past spring by Tony Boza, urging neighbors to voice their opinions and through grumblings on NextDoor. I was amazed that something this important could have been going on for so long without my knowing about it as I am very well informed and I am usually the one who tells my neighbors about important issues. Indeed, I still played this role as none of my neighbors knew about it yet. Clearly little was done to engage residents. My first objections to this plan were rooted in the fact that developers will be allowed to take up much of the foot print of a lot, effectively undoing decades of environmental work in the neighborhoods--rain barrel programs, native plant and rain garden programs, the City's tax credit for homeowners who implement increased water-permeable area on their lot, water shed protections, etc. Without our yards, neighbors won't be outside; without neighbors outside, crime will surge. The City also has an extremely poor record on preservation. This plan pushes so hard for multiple-story buildings and new housing that I fear that our historical buildings are going to be laid to waste like so many before them. The language in the Plan does little to assuage my fears. I have been confounded by the manic push for housing and the City's irrational insistence that we will have hoards of people coming to the Cities. In 1987, when I moved here, there were about 325,000. In 2017 we had 422,331 according to Google. That is a slow drip. With the Baby Boomers dying off and moving into nursing homes, birth rates dropping, and our nation taking in fewer immigrants, from where are these hoards coming?? City reps have been asked repeatedly at meetings and fail to answer. The facts don't add up; why is the investment not in nursing homes and assisted living? I read through some of the plan online and discovered very vague language that seemed to give developers free reign and seemed to give the City more power to eminent domain. This concern was raised by another resident at a town meeting where I was horrified to hear Lisa Bender and Elizabeth (?) claim that Minneapolis has never used eminent domain. When the crowd finally calmed, the representatives averred that they wouldn't have to eminent domain, they would just rezone. Needless to say, that leaves a lot of residents very antsy and mistrustful. We were told at this meeting that the 2040 Plan is based on transit but that the City wasn't going to work on the Transit Plan for another two years!! That's so backwards! I am outraged that our water front is being handed over to private developers after our residents voted to keep it public and accessible to all residents. This is unacceptable. An environmental review must be performed on this plan as it necessitates so much loss of green space, public space, and environmental protections while introducing so much increased construction of very tall buildings. Essentially this plan is a handout to developers, who will make a ton of money and go to whatever suburb or rural area they live in while we have to suffer the crowding (of buildings), the pollution, the crime, the loss of green space (yards and boulevards), the loss of historical buildings and the loss of our neighborhood cultures.

October 29, 2018

Kristina Carlson

5135 Belmont Ave S

carlson.krissi@gmail.com

Comment –

My husband and I have lived in Tangletown for approximately 13 years, and we have kids 7 and 9 at our local MPS elementary. Needing a bit more space, in January of this year we moved within our neighborhood to a bigger home. In connection with the move, we strongly considered moving to the suburbs but decided to stay put. We love the community and beauty of our historic neighborhood and value the diversity at Minneapolis Public Schools. Just a few months after our move, we learned of the new 2040 plan. Because we are close to the Nicollet "corridor", the current (new) plan slates the lot behind our house for high-density, 4-story (or more apparently), multi-unit housing instead of the single-family dwellings that currently exist. I would never have purchased my house had I known I could end up literally in the shadow of a multi-level apartment every morning. I think we need to build smart in Minneapolis--let's not alienate civic-minded, tax-paying folks who love living in the city. The plan needs to be more strategic and thoughtful than simply making every corridor one zone and the adjacent blocks another, ignoring the current existing properties and their owners. Such a plan does not foster affordable housing--these lots would be too expensive to generate that anyway.

October 29, 2018

James McConnell

4428 Fremont Ave South, Minneapolis
jajemcc@gmail.com

Comment –

I STRONGLY oppose the rezoning elements in the 2040 plan that would allow multiplexes where single family homes are throughout the city. This seems like an unthought through approach with an uncertain and potentially irreparably negative result. It is too vast a step that could potentially destroy the wonderful neighborhood feel throughout the city. It also threatens the city's green spaces. Our family moved here for the neighborhoods. Please don't upend them in such a cavalier fashion. As I'm sure many have said, this rezoning proposal is a boon for developers at the expense of city residents.

October 29, 2018

Matt Brillhart

4348 34th Avenue S

Comment –

I lend my full support the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. I bought my house on a bus line and near a train station with full awareness that the area would eventually see development of denser housing around the station area. Allowing for 4-story development along bus lines throughout the city makes sense. Allowing homeowners to add value to their property by expanding or converting to a 2- or 3-unit structure makes sense and will not alter the character of our neighborhoods, which already contain duplexes and small apartment buildings. I fully support the changes that were made to the draft plan around the Blue Line 46th Street Station area, increasing the area designated as Corridor 4 & 6 between 34th Avenue S and the LRT tracks. What the critics of this plan get fundamentally wrong is that physical change takes place very slowly over time. There are no bulldozers coming to already wealthy Southwest neighborhoods, aside from the ones that are already there, replacing small single-family homes with gratuitously oversized single-family homes. If smaller, older homes are going to be demolished, it makes sense to allow multiple units in the replacement structure. A change I'd like to see is that corner lots should remain eligible for up to 4-unit structures. Alternatively (or additionally), I'd also like to see changes in the zoning code to allow corner lots to be subdivided. There are already smaller lots like this all over the city (e.g. 3033 44th St E), where a corner lot has been split (allowing a second house where there would otherwise be a garage). Neighborhoods should have more of that, not less. Smaller lots are an opportunity to add some of the most affordable homeownership opportunities. Such lots under 5,000 square feet are currently prohibited by the zoning code. Lastly, I oppose the changes made in Loring Park from the initial draft plan to the "final draft". Reducing or downzoning the Built Form in Loring Park to "Corridor 4" is not acceptable, and the area should be returned to "Transit 20" and "Corridor 6". The original draft plan designations for Loring Park were far more appropriate than "Corridor 4".

October 29, 2018

Rachel Bruzek

4529 York Avenue South

rbruzek@damico.com

Comment –

The plan will not be good for Linden Hills. The public transportation system we have is inadequate to serve our city as it is. The schools are already full with locals on a waitlist. Our area can not accommodate this plan. It will take away from the way the community already works. We do walk. We do bike. We bought our homes in this area for living in a quiet community. This will take this away. Don't do this to Linden Hills! It is not about community. We do not need this plan!

October 29, 2018

Lynne M Ferguson

6014 Oliver Av S

lferglahn78@yahoo.com

Comment –

I do not support this plan for the following reasons: 1. I don't see any plans for dealing with increased traffic, increased enrollment in already crowded schools, increased police and fire protection. 2. I have not seen any environmental impact study on what putting all these apartment buildings will do to our environment. 3. I don't see any regulations on setbacks or parking that is required of any developer. 4. I don't see how you plan to preserve our trees and the family fabric of our neighborhoods. 5. I don't see any regulations on upkeep of these buildings once they are allowed to be built. 6. Although you think everyone will take the bus or bike, there aren't many that I know that will not drive to the store etc. I have stores not far from here but I don't want to carry big bags of groceries or good home from there. I have a whole block of duplexes on Penn Avenue behind me. I know one person who lives on that whole block although we share an alleyway. People move in and out but they do not join in the community of our neighborhood. What happens to those who want to have a single family home either as they start their families or as they move into different phases of their lives. I enjoy being able to have my dogs in the yard and gardening and doing the maintenance on my home. I have upgraded it inside and made it a very lovely home. What happens if someone next door moves and I have a big apartment building blocking my sun and the view I enjoy. I feel as though you are really pushing to pass this without much thought being given to the consequences of what this will do to our city. I see in the paper today that the developers are joining forces to fight against providing affordable housing units so that will put a kink in your plans to have affordable housing. I really feel that this should be put up for a vote to the residents of this city and see if they want this passed. So far I think over 60% have said they don't want it but I'm not sure you are listening. Although you say it's 2040 planning, I think the effects will be felt in the next couple of years. Please stop, do an environmental impact study and also let the people who live in this city vote on it.

October 29, 2018

Jake Reber

5846 Park Ave S

Peanut_mpls@hotmail.com

Comment –

This plan still is unacceptable for the following reasons: 1 -- Still does not contain any setback restrictions, thus the building can take up majority of lot. 2 -- Does not include anything that guarantees affordable housing (to people of any color) owners will charge market rate. 3 -- Does not address the added cost for infrastructure related to the additional stress on the sewers etc. that are already old and stressed (refer to comment by our mayor). That means more tax dollars will be assessed to our properties. 4 -- This plan does not address anything about parking -- will residents be made to park on already small and congested side streets.

October 29, 2018

Robert Lewis

5340 Colfax Ave So
rlewis22@cocast.net

Comment –

I live in the 13th Ward. I am very concerned that the city employees are not being responsive to my Alderperson when she has asked for clarification on certain points on the 2040 plan in response to her constituents. I am also concerned that there seems to be a rush to get this plan approved without the necessary input from all parts of the city. It seems that there is some hidden agenda to make this happen quickly, no matter if it is the right thing for our city.

October 29, 2018

Pat Doyle

4928 Newton Avenue South

patdoylemail@gmail.com

Comment –

The Planning Commission and City Council should shelve the 2040 plan until further study of its long-range impacts. Moving forward now with this unprecedented and radical experiment in social engineering risks drastic changes in the city from which it may never recover. Housing activists with little stake in the city's future have pushed this plan -- predicated on untested theories -- over the objections of the vast majority of city residents. Its stated goal of increasing affordable housing throughout the city is unlikely to be realized due to basic market economics. But the plan will likely damage residential housing stock and increase traffic congestion. Back away from the precipice before it is too late.

October 29, 2018

Jo George

4016 Beard Ave S

Jebwrg@msn.com

Comment –

Many issues of concern. Primary fact that there has not been an environmental or social impact study available or completed. It should not be rushed thru! The city has to survive with the final decision.

October 29, 2018

Linda Schaetzel

3905 10th Ave S 55407

lindaschaetzel@yahoo.com

Comment –

The updated draft is basically no different than the original plan. I wrote opposing the plan. * Allowing apartments next to single family homes with the entire lot being taken up by an apartment will destroy the backyard green spaces, which absorb CO2, with loss of sunlight. Aka the yard north of the apt. will become a mud hole. 2.5 stories is too high. There will be an increased heat sink event. No codes have been put in place to keep the apartments in character with the neighborhoods. * Every slumlord will sell off his property to make a quick buck. Like the one next door to me. She was allowed to install a boiler by an unlicensed contractor. I have called numerous times regarding the exterior, including peeling lead paint. Inspectors do nothing. * Property owners pay for street repair. Increased car traffic will degrade the street faster for which an individual must pay. Street repair costs should become a city wide tax, not a home owners responsibility. * The transit system is horrid & not viable to get to jobs in the suburbs. I have been a bus rider all my life. 50+ years. Try getting groceries in the winter, taking your kid to daycare & then getting to work. There had better be a full service grocery store & day care center on every block that you intend to make high density. * Low cost single family homes will be bought, plowed under and turned into apts., thus eliminating the opportunity to buy a small home. The financial health of an ethnic group/race is charted by home ownership. You are eliminating that. * Increased building heights around the parks! Parks should be free and open spaces which they will not be in your plan. Shame. * Older homes are built to last. New ones are made of press board which contains a myriad of toxic chemicals, hardly green as you suggest. A contractor once told me that my 118 yr old house will easily last another 100 yrs if maintained. The new ones will be junk piles in 25-50 yrs. * Of the 35 people I talked to about the plan, no one knew about it. The roll out of this plan was done in a truly non-democratic fashion in order to promote the vision of a few. * Long term consequences for livability, environment, transportation have not been rationally examined by you. Total disregard for current homeowners is apparent. For example, I bought this house in 1976, a slumlord piece of trash, after renting for 2 yrs. I have spent since then fixing this wonderful old working man's house, all my \$. I have put trees and gardens for the birds, bees, butterflies in my backyard, converting it from a motor oil weedy mud pit. You have totally disregarded those of us who spent our lives and money preserving & improving the character of our neighborhoods. * Put your money where your mouth is. Many of you, if not most, on the planning commission and city council own single family homes, drive cars, live in above average high density housing. You need to move to high density housing that would be affordable to average citizen, give up your cars. If not, then you are just another elitist group who do not think the rules apply to them. You certainly can not be any busier or more important than other citizens. * The issue may be affordable housing, but the real issue is wages that have not risen since the 1980s, lousy expensive work place insurance programs (yes that includes the city.. I used to work for the city), lack of decent paying jobs in Mpls, poor or non-existent transport to suburban jobs, a piss poor & segregated

Minneapolis 2040 Comprehensive Plan Public Comments

educational system. None of this addressed by you. *A small pilot project in an area that wants more density should be first tried so as to discover unseen issues, the residents of that area, both those living in the apts and their neighbors, providing feedback. * Beware the buyer who moves to Minneapolis. * A McMansion is a mansion whether a single home or a multifamily apt. it destroys the character and livability of the area. * I had no idea that the city planners and council owned every piece of property in Mpls to dispose of as they saw fit. *Your high density movement has spawned progressive fascists on pro density websites, which are also used by council members. I have seen: south Mpls, we are coming for your lawns, take Nicollet island from the park board, build high density. Sounds a lot like the Russian revolution and the French reign of terror. *You did not listen to the original comments sent. You did not publish them as promised. Not a democracy. You want to continue with deregulation, a rather Trumpian, Scott Pruitt move if you ask me.

October 29, 2018

John Reynolds

2918 Dorman Avenue

Comment –

Please reconsider the revised 2040 plan, and work on a proposal that considers the needs and realistic outcomes for each neighborhood rather than imposing a one-size-fits-all plan on us. 1. The new zoning proposal treats wildly different neighborhoods exactly the same. For instance, East Lake Street would essentially be zoned the same as West Lake in Uptown. This makes no sense. East Lake, from ~30th Ave to the river is predominantly single-story retail with one and two story single family residential. If its future is as a second Uptown, it is well more than twenty years out. The existing zoning designation, C4, for most of East Lake Street already allows for an increase in density without disrupting one of the few affordable neighborhoods left in the city. Treating existing commercial and multi-family residential corridors the same as others based solely on the status as a transit route makes no sense. All over the city, particularly in places where property values are lower, it will make home ownership less affordable and less realistic by decreasing the stock of single-family homes. The city should concentrate on building out existing commercial/high density corridors with vacant or underutilized parcels, like Hiawatha, where there are multiple forms of transit to serve dense populations. 2. Allowing three story building to run halfway up the blocks of streets with the proposed 'Interior 3' designation creates an absurd and unfair situation for homeowners up and down these blocks. A drastic zoning shift should not occur in the middle of a block that is currently zoned R1A. The proposed zoning permits development that will pit neighbor versus neighbor, and will benefit some homeowners by increasing the value of their land at the expense of homeowners who fall on the proposed 'Interior 2' side of the block.

October 29, 2018

Damond Kylo

3604 38th Ave S

dakylo@hotmail.com

Comment –

Say NO to the current 2040 plan. Development can coexist with green spaces and clever planning, but the current plan makes NO effort to balance the two. How dare the planners of a healthy city like Minneapolis try to bully through a plan to turn it into a concrete jungle. Minneapolis is unique. There is no reason to turn it into another Chicago.

October 29, 2018

Alice Lehman

3033 East Calhoun Parkway #101, Minneapolis, MN 55408

lehma154@umn.edu

Comment –

1.) My entire block has been up-zoned to interior 3, which is unacceptable. Return the E. Calhoun Pkwy block between 31st St and Lake street to the neighborhood zoning (maintaining current zoning). 2.) Maintain the Shoreland overlay - Explicitly support the SHORELAND District guideline language which calls out a max height of 35 feet along our precious Lake Bde Maka Ska. Don't wall off our lakes!!!! Buildings above 35ft will negatively impact the ability to sail on Bde Maka Ska (Lake Calhoun) as buildings create a wind-shadow 3x their height, which would cover the entire buoy field on Bde Maka Ska and ruin the ability of the Minneapolis Sailing Center to host sailing events and classes. 3.) Do not up-zone the entire city to allow triplexes. This does not address the issue of single family homes being torn down to be replaced with poorly constructed apartments in our family-focused neighborhoods. I will not vote for any city council member that supports the 2040 plan in its current form without these changes being made.

October 29, 2018

Jeanne Kosek

5309 York Ave S, 55410

tomalex3@msn.com

Comment –

It is confounding how a mayor, city council and a planning commission all composed of a few dozen individuals are using their entrusted power to make the lives of hundreds of thousands of city residents miserable. This 2040 plan is a blatant robbery of our liberties, our nest eggs, our sun, our flora, our fauna, our air, our water, our personal transportation, the peacefulness of our neighborhoods, the charm of our neighborhoods, just about every positive reason we have chosen to live in this city. Are U.S. municipalities not democracies? Cease with this easy-to-manipulate comment-gathering nonsense, and poll your constituents via referendum.

October 29, 2018

Matt Brillhart

4348 34th Avenue S

Comment –

I fully support the Minneapolis 2040 plan as presented in the final draft, with one exception where I'd like to see the "Built Form" map reverted to the initial draft. Along the Southwest LRT corridor at/near 21st Street Station (Cedar Lake), built form designations should be returned to how they were depicted in the first draft of the plan. The changes appear geared to appease those who oppose greater housing density near transit, and for no other practical reason. This future LRT Station was always going to have extremely limited development opportunities around the station due to geography and parkland, but bringing the entire area down to "Interior 2" (previously "Corridor 4") will essentially mean that there will be no housing development at this train station. I find that to be completely unacceptable and antithetical to everything the city espouses about Transit Oriented Development and reducing carbon emissions from driving. Please consider revising the Built Form Map back to the first draft, allowing for *some* amount of 3-4 story development at ALL train stations in the city. This one station should not be exempt. Please return West 21st Street to Corridor 4 as in the initial draft plan.

October 29, 2018

Kathryn Wyand

4724 Colfax Ave South

knwyand@gmail.com

Comment –

This message is for our mayor Jacob Frey who called me the night before his election and we discussed the high property taxes and what he was going to do about it. I voted for him and since then my property taxes have gone up another 12% in one year & my property value was just assessed an additional \$55,000 in one year!!! Now you want to re-zone the neighborhood I've lived in for over 30 years for apartment buildings!!! This is wrong on so many levels. I am completely against the 2040 plan and believe it is too focused on making more money without any consideration to what it is going to do to long term residents in the area. I'm being taxed out of my home & losing the neighborhood I've loved for years. You have no regard for older people & the financial pressures we're facing on limited incomes. I don't want the neighborhood to be any more dense than it already is. More density leads to more crime and more crime leads to devalued property values. It's a bad idea with no regard for current residents. Please scrap this plan.

October 29, 2018

Sara Schumacher

4208 Upton Ave S

sara_schumacher@hotmail.com

Comment –

No blanket upzoning of Mpls! Carefully crafted density in appropriate areas around public transportation. Respect the shore land overlay and conduct environmental impact of high density on lakes, parks and neighborhoods. Keep our amazing city green. Involve neighborhood organizations and encourage blending into character of neighborhoods. No tear downs of affordable current housing stock. Encourage homeownership and not rentals!! Actually address affordable housing - not just words. Density does not equal affordable!

October 29, 2018

Glynda Gustafson

5228 Washburn Ave So

Glynda.Gustafson@gmail.com

Comment –

Please listen to the feedback you are receiving in regards to the 2040 plan. There is a lot of dissatisfaction with the current plan and you need to hear that the property owners that are affected are not pleased. Being a home owner in Minneapolis is important to me and I do not want to have to relocate outside the city limits to get the single family home atmosphere I currently live within. Don't push good property tax payers out of the city - we all lose.

October 29, 2018

Noel Schenker

1908 West 49th Street
noel.schenker@gmail.com

Comment –

I remain very concerned about the broad-scale upzoning of residential lots throughout Minneapolis. Particularly poorly conceived is the "backsplash" zoning near modest transit corridors (such as 50th Street), allowing Transit 4 and Interior 2 zoning designations on lots 3/4 of the way up narrow, quiet residential blocks that happen to connect to 50th Street. For 30 consecutive east-west blocks of 50th Street between Lyndale and France Avenues, the small residential streets running south and north of 50th Street (Aldrich, Colfax, Fremont, Queen, York, etc.) are designated Transit 4 and Interior 2 in the proposed zoning, the majority of the way up/down those streets. That type of miles-long, broad-brush approach to upzoning is unsupported by the people-moving capability of 50th Street, and further will destroy the aesthetics, fabric and property values of these quiet residential streets. Why is every single street being covered by the same net?(True in many other residential parts of the city in this plan as well.) Why is there so little professional planning discretion and guidance incorporated into this plan? For example, couldn't multi-unit buildings represented by Transit 4 and Interior 2 designations be developed first in nodes where transit/retail are already in existence (think 50th and Bryant, 50th and Penn, 50th and Xerxes)? The haphazard, wholesale, unproven approach to zoning in this plan seems unreasonable and unnecessarily risky. Without doubt, this plan favors developers at the expense of individual homeowners/taxpayers and could diminish the availability of affordable homes in Minneapolis. Last, why are our elected City Council officials allowed only to participate at the fringes of this process? The citizens of Minneapolis did not vote for the Planning department. Shouldn't a major plan shifting the zoning approach in Minneapolis be considered by voters in some sort of proposal or charter? We vote on matters such as public school funding and liquor licensing for neighborhood restaurants, but with a dramatic change affecting all Minneapolis residents and property owners, all concerned citizens can do is send e-mails and submit comments online?? This proposal seems to march on, with limited modification, despite widespread calls from voters and residents to rethink it and to slow it down. Will it take something dramatic, like a property-tax payment moratorium, for the legitimate citizen concerns about residential zoning changes to really be taken seriously? This proposal and process are both flawed.

October 29, 2018

Eric Barstad

5140 Zenith Ave S

Comment –

I am a Ward 13 resident and single-family property-owner who strongly supports the original Plan's efforts to increase density and development in neighborhood interiors. I oppose the shift from by-right fourplexes to by-right threeplexes in the revised plan. It is facile and short-sighted and was obviously done to appease a small minority of affluent density-haters. Don't let these folks hold Minneapolis' future hostage -- affordable housing and increased density are essential to the long-term social and economic health of our city.

October 29, 2018

David Sadler

4620 West Lake Harriet Parkway

david@sadlerfamily.org

Comment –

What good is this plan? Who benefits from it? No one. The current version of the Minneapolis 2040 plan is a disappointment and unacceptable! There is unanimous agreement the major issue that Minneapolis needs to address is low income housing and the 2040 Plan provides no useful thoughts on how to address this problem now nor in the future. Without addressing affordable housing adequately the plan needs to be withdrawn and replaced with one that does.

October 29, 2018

Angela Corwin

420 Sheridan Ave S
ahalbach@gmail.com

Comment –

Hello - I had previously sent an email on July 22nd with my comments on the original 2040 plan and feel the bulk of my concerns were not addressed. Please consider revisiting the 2040 plan and taking building heights down by approximately 50% from the original plan and minimizing the scale of the buildings as well as retaining more single family housing stock. More density does not necessarily equal more affordable housing - or more equitable housing. Note, I do appreciate some of the changes in scale/size of buildings made around the Loring Park area. Thank you, Angela Corwin

October 29, 2018

P Johnson

3738 Garfield Avenue South

Comment –

Please protect the historic single-family homes located throughout Minneapolis. They are beautiful properties that have been lovingly maintained and adapted for a hundred years. They cannot be replicated once they are destroyed. Allowing these houses to be torn down so developers can erect shoddy, ugly, multi-family dwellings on small lots with no parking for residents will damage the quality of life in our beautiful city. This plan will destroy beautiful homes and replace them with architecturally horrific structures that do not blend with the neighborhood. Look at what was built along the Midtown Greenway and on any vacant lot in the city over the last few years -- ugly buildings stuffed onto small lots with apartments that charge high rent. Not one of them is "affordable." Not. One. Please do not destroy our beautiful homes and city so greedy developers can make a quick buck. You represent the residents of Minneapolis, not developers.

October 29, 2018

Scott Maney

4208 Upton Ave S
smaney@hotmail.com

Comment –

Very disappointed in the process for 2040. Complete failure to authentically engage and use residential input. Blanket upzoning is not planning. Blend higher density usage along ACTUAL wider transit corridors (not a street that just has a bus) into SFH. Protect our parks and lakes and address the environmental problems that will occur with more density. Encourage more green space and protection of canopy. Allow neighborhoods to have a say in their neighborhoods by respecting the work of SAPs. This top down attitude is not democracy!! We expect better than this from our council. Please protect our amazing city and don't ruin it's uniqueness!

October 29, 2018

Christine Lewis

5340 Colfax Av So, Mpls MN 55419

cgillenlewis@comcast.net

Comment –

1. A city change of this magnitude, with serious consequences no matter what, should take YEARS to research and plan, NOT months (or in this most recent reiteration) weeks!! Many people take longer to plan a WEDDING, or a BAR MITZVAH, then the Planning Commission has taken to plan to change the whole appearance and spirit of our city! This is totally irresponsible to not take the needed time and invite residents to actually serve on an ad hoc planning committee. You are all too insulated from reality.

2. I have started to wonder if I, as a homeowner, should be spending any money or energy to make the usual home improvements and repairs to my home of 50 years, partly to make it desirable to a future buyer, when it could all be torn down to make something else if I sell it.

3. I greatly resent implications, allowed by certain city employees and elected officials, that those residents opposed to this poorly-made 2040 Plan, are racist or NIMBY's. How dare you! We will staunchly resist such unfair and untrue labeling. I am so glad when I see minority race people moving into the neighborhood of SW Mpls, for them and for me. Why is the Planning Commission not focusing on how to support affordable home OWNERSHIP? That is the way to truly increase stability for families.

October 29, 2018

Dr. Harlow

2775 Thomas Ave. So. Minneapolis, MN 55416

maryharlow9@aol.com

Comment –

I oppose the 2040 Comp Plan because it is bad for Minneapolis. I do support affordable housing, but this plan does nothing to provide affordable housing. As we have been told repeatedly new construction will be "market rate housing". Also, Kelly Doran and other developers now refuse to build even 10% affordable units in 2040 planned housing. The proposal to build 30+ story buildings and a dense cement city with NO ONSITE PARKING near the north end of Lake Maka Ska is stunningly poor planning for a number of reasons: First, it is an egregious land grab/giveaway to the above developers who were Jacob Frey's major campaign contributors, giving them prime real estate that is not theirs to give away because it belongs to the 6,000,000 people who visit the Chain of Lakes every year. The 2040 Plan threatens the livability of this area by proposing density that will destroy our playground of lakes and greenspace where people come for recreation and a respite from the traffic and density of downtown and Uptown. This proposed cement city is urban sprawl, not urban planning. I don't even think the 2040 "planners" have degrees in city planning. The tiny greenspace around the lakes, sufficient only for small biking and walking paths, will be overwhelmed and trampled. As the MPRB wrote: more people require more greenspace. In addition, Lake Street does not provide the traffic grid to handle the thousands of cars that tenants of the proposed cement city of skyscrapers will create. And we know they will have cars. This is Minnesota. We just had an entire week of rain and will have plenty of ice and snow and sub-zero weather when people will drive their cars. The elderly, handicapped, parents of small children, and anyone who has to haul groceries or deal with an emergency in the middle of the night will drive. If the "planners" are concerned about pollution, why not push for zero emissions cars! We know the 2040 Plan wants to give this prime real estate to developers to do the building for them but the citizens do not want this. Incredibly, the City told reporters that planners deliberately avoided consulting neighborhoods since "they are not representative" of residents. Over 85% of the more than 10,000 residents who responded to the 2040 Comp Plan DISAPPROVED. At least one man who approved announced that he used a bot to generate hundreds of "fake approvals". This is MINORITY RULE! Of course, the mayor and many city council members who support the 2040 Plan will be VOTED OUT OF OFFICE and would lose by a landslide if that vote took place today. The citizens who waded through the ridiculously lengthy, repetitive nearly 300 page 2040 document, likely designed to put them off, have been ignored. This is no way to run a democracy! The City and 2040 Comp Plan want to do away with the small area plan that gives voice to the neighborhoods and has served Minneapolis so well. Possibly the worst failing of the 2040 Comp Plan is to destroy the Shoreland Overlay District ordinance that has preserved the beauty and bucolic character of our lakes, river, creeks, and streams for 30 years. At a time when we are most concerned with protecting nature, they would sell it for a few bucks -- and we will never be able to get it back. I could go on and on to list the offenses of the 2040 Comp Plan: It is hypocritical -- promising protection of the environment while

Minneapolis 2040 Comprehensive Plan Public Comments

destroying our environmental laws, making no provision for development-related pollution and creating urban sprawl; destroying the character and stability of neighborhoods; promising equity and affordable housing that is not going to happen; doing absolutely nothing for struggling parts of Minneapolis, while purporting to address past inequities of redlining that ended in the 1920's and hasn't affected my African-American, Hispanic, Asian, Jewish, Muslim neighbors who own houses on my block near the lakes where they have lived happily for decades. I was told that the 2040 Comp Plan is the brainchild of "young white bikers who want to live by the lakes cheaply". Is this true? Is that why the City is making it so difficult for people to park and drive? I teach refugees ESL at a church on 28th and Chicago and it is single lane gridlock. And I have only seen 2 bikers there all year! Businesses complain it now takes them twice as long to drive to appointments and they have to charge for that time. Parishoners and customers cannot park and have to walk blocks, a problem for elderly/handicapped folks. The "planners" and "our City" have spent \$100,000 of our tax dollars to hire a PR firm to deceive the public and I believe to apply pressure to the "third-party validators", such as the MPRB and the news. The proposed up-zoning of the entire city, while a win for the developers who supported Frey's campaign, threatens the history, character beauty, and self-determination of our neighborhoods and will subject them to random, dense development. Who will invest in a home if they cannot count on a zoning contract with the city? But the "planners" militate against home-ownership at public meetings and strive to divide us by stating that our natural desire for greenspace is "white pastoralism" (Heather Worthington) -- because they have a chip on their shoulders or don't like white people? It is so arrogant to impose their philosophy of density and bike-riding on the vast majority of the citizens of Minneapolis who have stated politely and repeatedly that they don't want the 2040 Comp Plan. Are the "planners" and Mayor from Minneapolis? I doubt it. Because I hear no understanding of the personal identification the citizenry of Minneapolis has with their beloved lakes, neighborhoods, way of life and DEMOCRACY. This is not China or Russia. Listen to the people who live here and would like to preserve the livability of Minneapolis. Could we please get some real planners who will listen to the voice of the people?

October 29, 2018

Mary J Lee

5925 Oakland Ave., Minneapolis, MN 55417

mary.leema14@gmail.com

Comment –

Careful thought must be given to proposed plans to rezone single family neighborhoods - with existing homes - for multiple family dwellings with higher capacity than homes currently in neighborhoods (duplexes). Traffic, parking, city services (water, sewer, gas, electric, trash pick up) and school capacity will be negatively impacted, not to mention the decrease in the value of the existing single family homes. I chose my neighborhood for a reason, including the value and potential re-sale value of my home. I am NOT in favor of making my neighborhood more densely populated - it was not designed for that. I am NOT in favor of the City taking my house and paying me far less than it is worth so that it can be torn down and replaced by a residence where multiple families can live. The lots are too small, I don't welcome the congestion and I don't want to be forced out of my home without being paid fair market value. The current plan is offensive and I do not believe well thought through. The only ones who will win are the developers. I AM NOT IN FAVOR of the proposed plan. Thank you.

October 29, 2018

Matthew Carlson

3122 E 52ND ST

Comment –

I support the original 2040 plan. More housing is needed to lower the overall average cost of rent and ownership in Minneapolis. If we want our local businesses to continue to grow we need more residents spending a lower percentage of their income on housing. I do not see how that can be accomplished without rezoning to allow for density which will lower housing costs.

October 29, 2018

Nora Whiteman

3500 W 29th St

Nora5775@icloud.com

Comment –

This “new” plan doesn’t seem that much different! The goal of creating affordable housing is not going to come through the marketplace alone. You are still let outside major developers come in and make huge profits! We need rapid bus transportation not light rail. Rapid bus can be more flexible and economical. Serious changes need to be made to this plan with input from established neighborhood associations

October 29, 2018

Erich Wunderlich

413 5th St SE Mpls MN 55414

erich.wunder@gmail.com

Comment –

The City of Minneapolis 2040 Comprehensive Plan, contrary to its name, which includes the words “plan” and comprehensive,” is neither comprehensive nor a plan. Rather, it outlines a roadmap for the City’s complete disregard for the planning process. This seems to be in keeping with its practice of late of abdicating its responsibility for enforcement of zoning and planning ordinances, and its disregard for protections of its current comprehensive plan, which incorporates Neighborhood Small Area Plans, Historic District and Lakeshore Overlay District guidelines etc., but rather bending to the demands of developers as they build ever more luxury housing in areas most in need of the plans’ protections. Neighborhoods have been assured that their small area plans will be incorporated in the plan, that Historic District protections will be incorporated, yet there’s no evidence of how any of this will be enforced. Housing Justice advocates have been assured that up zoning, and inclusive zoning, will solve the affordable housing concerns. Yet these steps have worked nowhere else: why would it be any different in Minneapolis? Furthermore, there’s complete disregard of the environmental impacts that the radical up zoning would entail. In the process, the exercise has pitted constituencies against each other. But to be clear: the opposition is not home owners versus renters; rich versus poor; white versus people of color; individual stake-holders versus developers (well, maybe that is it); it’s the people against a City that has failed to effectively engage its residents in the planning process, and appears willing to exclude the residents of the city from planning for the future. Commissioners, for these and a raft of other reasons, this plan should be sent back for a complete rewrite, one that includes the meaningful involvement of impacted communities. Please reject the plan in its current form, and request an extension for completion.

October 29, 2018

Marie Hullander

5909 Thomas Ave s

Mariehullander@gmail.com

Comment –

I just want to state that I do not support the interior streets zoning to triplexes. I do not feel that the quality of our Minneapolis neighborhoods can be maintained just by throwing a blanket upzoning law over the whole city. I think at the very most, starting with changing zoning on high traffic transit corridors makes more sense than the innermost streets of neighborhoods. Parking in winter is already a major concern, adding more housing without an offsite parking requirements is a recipe for disaster.

October 29, 2018

Greg Bastien

2709 E. Minnehaha Pkwy 55417

Comment –

The question is not how do we speed up development, but how do we get good development as our city housing stock ages and we need to prepare for a solar and wind future. Metropolitan Council smart growth and capacity building through updating our infrastructure is our best way to assure quality and affordable development. It is plain that developers are angling for a quid pro quo of money for affordable and any other privately funded upgrades. A city that is neither walkable or drivable will not be desirable. A non metro wide scheme will leave cities paying developers to come to them as the private businesses search out the cheapest and most accessible areas to invest in. No city is large enough and desirable enough to go it alone. Except in a few areas of town no developer will venture both market rate and affordable housing without money inputs from the city that over time would have to be a continuing and growing drain on city finances. Minneapolis can best prepare for the future by envisioning how streets, sewers, water, neighborhood maintenance, parks, and business parks will be differentiated so that people will feel they have to come here to live and work. Zoning should remain a case by case request for variance to see that projects are actually enhancing and detracting from a sustainable city model.

October 29, 2018

Anne Breckenridge

5149 Washburn avenue south
Breckenridge.anne@gmail.com

Comment –

I own property near Thomas and 50th. I would be one of those people who could improve their property to include a third living space. I am not sure that the 2040 has considered how to help me improve my property and add a living space without it being too cost prohibitive which could allow me to rent at an affordable price...I also have to continually increase rents to cover the cost of my increasing tax bill. I feel there should be some thought to consider these issues.

October 29, 2018

Steven Verdoorn

905 West 36th Street

stevenverdoorn@mac.com

Comment –

The 2040 plan is flawed and needs to be reconsidered. The process for engagement and communication for the plan disenfranchised many constituents who are directly effected by the plan. Commenting process was purposefully confusing to older citizens and those with disabilities. It speaks volumes that more marketing effort is placed on telling people about city wide organics recycling than the 2040 plan. Why was a postcard explaining the 2040 plan and how it effects its residents not delivered to everyone in the city limits? The plan removes away any meaningful voice from the individual neighborhoods by eliminating small area plans and decision making from the neighborhood associations. This is not a course a city takes if it is concerned with citizen involvement in shaping the city. Although 2/3 of the comments are negative regarding the plan, these comments are systematically ignored. Public money was spent to engage an out of state public relations firm to promote a plan that residents do not support. If the plan was solid, the city should not have to spend taxpayer money to defend it. The infrastructure is not prepared to support the kind of density the city is proposing. Fire, police, schools, traffic flow, and snow removal and parking is not prepared to deal with the issues that are created by the added density. Little consideration is given to people who cannot ride a bike. The solution provided is to give up your car and ride public transportation. This is unrealistic since Minneapolis does not have the transit infrastructure to support such a solution. People will have cars now and in the future, not planning for that fact is shortsighted and irresponsible. . Nothing in this plan supports affordable housing or a path to greater personal wealth by owning a home or property. The plan only supports market rate housing by developers who are only concerned with profit. In the end, we will be a city who is controlled and owned not by its citizens, but by corporate foreign real estate investment firms and political forces who support them. In fact, the city is actively trying to privatize some of the only true public housing it has such as Glendale, doing the opposite of the stated goals of the plan. If the city is desirable to live in now, this plan does nothing to preserve the many reasons why people want to live here. Instead, it seeks to destroy our natural resources by removing shore overland district protections for Lake Bde Maka Ska and by doing so destroying years of work of the DNR and others to protect our lakes. Protection of our environmental resources should not be superseded by the needs developers and desires of planners to increase density around the lakes. This is only a small sampling of the issues with the current plan. I implore you to LISTEN to your constituents and reject this plan as is.

October 29, 2018

Frank Jenne

1202 W 53rd St, Minneapolis, MN 55419

chipjenne@gmail.com

Comment –

I hope you will consider taking more time to finalize the plan and redraft portions of it. I favor aspects of 2040, oppose others, and have suggested draft amendments for your consideration. I will add more comments to clarify as needed but briefly:

1. Make schools a priority in planning where and if to upzone. Portland, OR chose to downzone one part of the city around an overcrowded school even while upzoning the entirety of the rest of the city. We need that kind of coordination in the planning process.
2. Make the 20mph citywide speed limit actionable language in the Vision Zero policy section.
3. Add a policy for "Free Homes For First Responders" with an expansive view toward first responders to include city police, fire, EMTs, teachers and social workers. City employees who are willing to take on the challenge should receive free quality homes in crisis neighborhoods of Minneapolis in an effort to bring the working class back to the city and to bring to bear the qualities of first responders as neighbors in generating a potential immune response that saves rather than gentrifies communities.

Thank you

October 29, 2018

Sharon Collins

5308 Washburn Ave S
Sleacctoo@gmail.com

Comment –

I support the idea of affordable housing. I am not against multiple living sites. I am an environmentalist. I am concerned with too much cement, too much crowding, too many cars & not enough parking. What about the schools? what about the roads? what about the environment? I am also concerned about the focus on rental property. Not because of the renters but because of the absent rental property ownership. Not enough thought has gone into this. Not enough Community involvement. Not enough planning. The major issue behind affordable housing is that people are working for an income from pre 1980..... of course rents are too high for them.... of course they can't buy houses. Our society is screwed up. We need a total redo. No zoning is not going to solve anything. I just see danger to the environment, danger to the creek and money in the pockets of those who do the building and those who own the multi properties.

October 29, 2018

Neal Gendler

2205 Humboldt Av. S.
ngendler@gmail.com

Comment –

Planning Commission: From everything I've read and heard about the 2040 plan, one important consideration appears to have insufficient consideration: livability. Nowhere is this more apparent than in an illustration posted on the Neighbors website of what might occur on the northwest corner of (the formerly named) Lake Calhoun. High-density development there would make the area all but inaccessible by private automobile; there's only one road! This mistake seems to be occurring already with approval of two towers west of the Calhoun Village shopping area. What's proposed is more than 700 housing units, and again, there's only one road to the rest of the metro area: the already crowded Excelsior Boulevard. There seems to be a notion that increased density will cause residents to walk, ride bicycles and use transit. Walking is a good idea, for those who can, although few of us will walk from, say, East Isles to St. Louis Park for a dental appointment. Biking also is a lovely idea; I ride an exercise bike four hours a week but I have no intention of venturing onto city streets. Walking and biking may be suitable for compact, moderate-climate European cities, but Minneapolis has several months a year of rain, heat, cold, snow and -- worst of all -- ice. And another consideration: You can't carry much. I buy four or five bags of groceries a week, And what if I wanted to buy a 65" television (which I don't but others do); Can I carry that home? On a bike? On a bus? Transit would be wonderful but we don't have a system adequate in coverage or frequency to be convenient unless one works downtown (and leaves work well before 6 p.m. and the reduced nighttime bus schedule. And we won't get a better system because outstate legislators won't pay for it. If you recall, last session there was a mercifully aborted effort to reduce Metro Transit funding. The problem of insufficient housing for people of low income isn't likely to be solved simply by density. If it were, New York would be one of the nation's cheapest places to live. Instead, it's one of the costliest. And I am saddened and alarmed -- and resentful -- at the frequent suggestion that those concerned about or opposed to the 2040 plan are racists. I live in what has become a high-priced neighborhood; it was not so when I bought 34 years ago. Anyone who can afford to buy or rent around here is welcome, and yes, I have some African-American neighbors. We get along fine. The 2040 plan shows a positive desire to increase the city's population, but it needs to align some of its density proposals with the realities of transit, weather and the desire for continued livability. Thank you. People love Minneapolis

October 29, 2018

Nicholas Marcouiller

209 Cedar Lake Road North #3
nicholasmarcouiller@gmail.com

Comment –

I support increasing housing density, public transportation accessibility, and city walkability. I believe these changes will help keep our city vibrant and our people healthy. Crucially, more dense housing would also address the growing economic disparities felt within our city by renters and first-time homeowners. Minneapolis must remain attractive to young talent and livable for all of its citizens, not just the wealthy.

October 29, 2018

Brenda Schwob

Brenda.schwob@gmail.com

Comment –

My family of four, plus one living parent have lived in the area for over 55 years and oppose the 2040 plan that will rezone the South Uptown and ECCO neighborhood, allowing current homes to be torn down to build apartments. It destroys communities and homeownership/investment into the neighborhood. Some development for multi-unit owner occupied housing seems appropriate for our neighborhoods.

October 29, 2018

Craig Buchanan

4417 bryant ave s
craibuc@riseup.net

Comment –

I hate this rezoning place. You're taking my calm, residential neighborhood and turning it into something entirely different. I've had almost NO say in what is happening. It's so galling that group of un-elected people are making such drastic changes! I DEMAND THAT YOU REZONE BRYANT AVENUE SOUTH "INTERIOR 1"!!! LEAVE US ALONE!

October 29, 2018

Bill mc glade

5900 Oakland ave
mbly5900@gmail.com

Comment –

Are u out of your fucking minds! Your bogus plans will drive real estate values down and that's bad for me, living on the parkway I fully support immigration laws Keep the poor poor and keep the rich rich and make them more money. The end goal here is making money and lowering crime rates I get it but this is an awful idea Life is a game ppl don't want the truth but sometimes you have to tell them it. Grow a pair of balls tell people the truth

October 29, 2018

Peggy McGinty

5632 Knox Ave. South

Comment –

I want to know, what's the hurry to push this through? Who's benefiting by rushing such an important city wide plan? Why was there was no environmental impact study done? The idea that no one is going to need cars in 10 years is stupid. You are assuming the Met Council will expand our transit system budget, where's your proof? The plan narrows streets, removes parking and builds buildings without parking. Where is the City of Lakes going to go for a walk? There are no big changes to the plan in the 2nd draft. The Tribune reported that 60% of the comments were OPPOSED and the fact that not all Mpls residents are aware of the proposed zoning changes seems like a plan to keep people out of a very important decision. This is a one size fits all solution, it isn't, it's top down authoritarianism. Thank you for your time. Peggy McGinty

October 29, 2018

Jennifer Walter

3020 Knox ave south

jenny.e.hague@gmail.com

Comment –

My block from 31st street to Lake street in the East Calhoun neighborhood has been upzoned to interior 3. This is outrageous! This is a RESIDENTIAL neighborhood. Please maintain our current zoning of R2B and R3. There is NO mention of respecting the Shoreland Overlay district ordinance height limitations of 35 feet. This ordinance past in the 80's was put in place to protect our sacred lakes and landscape.

October 29, 2018

Bev Whitehouse

4129 Ewing Avenue South
bwhitehouse2@comcast.net

Comment –

I am a 10 plus resident of this community and I am very concerned about the current thinking and draft of the 2040 Plan. I am all about affordable housing but it does not seem this plan will resolve this issue and needs much more close examination before implementation including but not limited the effects on the environment, transportation, home valuation and the overall well-being of higher density housing on current citizens and home owners of this community. Thank you.

October 29, 2018

Susan Hellstrom

4704 Colfax Ave S Mpls 55419

sjhellstrom@comcast.net

Comment –

On the point of process -- I am so deeply disappointed by the void in leadership by City Councilperson President Lisa Bender and Mayor Jacob Frey. I am also stunned by how much the City Council members appear to not be listening to their constituents. You are elected - thereby defining representative government. You have let this debate fester without clarification, communication, or addressing residents' concerns. You have pushed it off on the Long Range Planning office who were hired BY YOU to do a job. You by comparison are ELECTED to do a job - and all responsibility for this terrible mess falls to you. You have been either intentionally nontransparent and non communicative in a meaningful way about the 2040 plan, or you were just really bad at leading through this unprecedented moment. Either way you did and continue to do terrible job and Minneapolis deserves so much better. As for the plan- Why would we gamble with something completely untested like upzoning an entire city? Why would you not want to phase, or test, or do trial areas? The best of social justice and climate justice may be the explanation for the motive - but the plan is completely taking on the unknown which could in end devastating Minneapolis. I have lived here for 25 years, and moved here very intentionally at that time. What gives you the right to take such a gamble on our City with this untested upzoning, and why would you want to? It is a bad way to approach any plan. And back to leadership - why haven't you responded to these concerns at the very least telling the people with my viewpoint why it won't be harmful to Minneapolis.

October 29, 2018

Ryan Johnson

25 Sidney Pl.

ryan.txanson@gmail.com

Comment –

I want to say first, for the reporters reading this: I support this plan. I feel like I have to, if my goals are making sure that there are enough homes to go around, that there are safe streets for everyone, and that we make progress on the climate. I want to thank planners for all the hard work they've put in, dealing with all sorts of bizarre testimony, getting shouted at by entitled residents. I've seen that all firsthand at various local meetings, myself. It's wild, because a lot of the concern that generates all this outrage is essentially, blocked views, concern about shadows and building heights. None of this concern actually comes from racial equity, or climate fears. That said, I don't feel like it goes far enough to address the goals I listed first. It doesn't go far enough to address the concerns of my generation, future generations, or people living here right now who may be low-income, or people of color. When it comes to the climate, the recent IPCC report essentially spells disaster, and I feel like the plan we're getting today is something we should have done in the 90s. When it comes to displacement, and gentrification concerns; or tenants rights, I haven't seen a ton of detail gained in those relevant sections, despite that I know clear policy suggestions have been offered in previous comment sessions. It's extremely obvious to me that there are still redlining-based carveouts of responsibility on these issues for affluent people in Southwest, and it's pretty obvious who is working for these constituents (as they probably are expected to) over the rest of the city. Any time we say no to something or fight to diminish it somewhere, in Southwest, Loring Park, or my neighborhood in Prospect Park; we push that burden for change elsewhere. Anyway: in light of all of that, thanks for putting forth what has been put forth. I expect to be there during the future zoning and housing policy battles, and I'm hoping that we can push for more to address all these concerns. The 2040 plan is a guide, not a minimum or a maximum limit, so I know there's room to get more done.

October 29, 2018

Dan L.

4932 Xerxes Ave S
djleahy22@gmail.com

Comment –

The fact that this is the most aggressive upzoning in North America, based on a hope and a hunch that this may solve an affordable housing concern is staggering hubris. I am flabbergasted that there is not a more incremental approach to zoning on SFHs, specifically as you get further from downtown in all directions. Most infuriating is the indiscriminate striping of transit routes to Corridor 4 far out from the center of the city which clearly demonstrates that the planning commission's desired grasp of current neighborhoods is akin to a 1st grader working a calculus problem; too hard and uninterested. Finally, I know that it will be a grand day when we can all ride Worthington Bikes to and fro work in the winter, but until then, cars/parking and a more modern approach to busing will be needed to service Minneapolis. Upzoning with out requisite parking belches of either fantastic ignorance or comical levels of pixie dust. These are shameful documents, that have been ramrodded down citizens throats via an opaque process hell bent on misinforming and disengaging its opponents. Bravo. 🍷 ☐

October 29, 2018

Jake

2818 31st Ave S

Jakemohan@Gmail.com

Comment –

In the face of catastrophic climate change collapse and the need to welcome immigrants, refugees, people of color, and other marginalized populations into our neighborhoods in the form of a fordable housing, it is irresponsible, immoral, and reactionary to resist the changes in this plan. I purchased my home several years ago with the assistance of a first-time homebuyers' grant. It would be selfish, cruel, and hypocritical for me to deny others the opportunity to live in my neighborhood. I welcome the multi family housing that is already here, as it brings diversity and vibrancy to our neighborhood. I would gladly trade my single-family home for a residence in multi family housing if that is what was required to create a more equitable, sustainable, and inclusive city. I fully support the Minneapolis 2040 plan, and I will continue to press our city leaders to make it even more inclusive and visionary and years to come.

October 29, 2018

Janne Flisrand

2112 Dupont Ave S #3

janne@flisrand.com

Comment –

My neighborhood of Lowry Hill has offered me and countless others opportunities because of the incredible diversity of homes here. I know that many more people would love to live nearby, thanks to the wealth of services, transit, amenities, and the proximity of downtown. I first moved to my home on Halloween 22 years ago. Soon after, I discovered how many people had lived nearby, as it seemed half the pizza delivery drivers told me they'd lived in one of the apartments in my house or on the block. Looking at the proposed built form map, I see that what exists on my block will be allowed under the proposed plan, there are many other examples of wonderful older buildings that will not. I request you amend the plan to include those buildings, with classifications that render them legal under the future code. 900 Summit Ave, existing building is 4 1/2 stories, currently labeled Interior 2 1770 Bryant, existing building is 4 stories, currently labeled Interior 2 2309 & 2315 Irving, existing buildings are 3 1/2 stories, currently labeled Interior 2 901 Summit Ave, existing building is 3 1/2 stories, currently labeled Interior 3 I fear there are dozens more examples. These buildings have been gracious, wonderful neighbors for more than a century. They have provided affordable and flexible homes for individuals and families. We need to honor their existence and contributions by recognizing them in our codes, and make sure that we have space where we can add more buildings like them throughout our city.

October 29, 2018

Kate Sandweiss

2515 Lake Place, 55405

k.sandweiss@comcast.net

Comment –

Reference Policy 1 - allowance of 3-family structures in all neighborhoods. This policy encourages tearing down existing homes. Please consider the health consequences. Many of the existing homes have asbestos and lead paint that will be disturbed by this process. I know from the teardown next to me that stated policies of containing these toxins are not always followed. Furthermore, the toxins in laminates and other building materials that will be used in new homes are not healthy either. I have recently lived through 3.5 years of construction on one side of my home, and 1.5 years on another side. My home office and much of our home was functionally not useable during the day for these three-plus years due to the constant noise of trucks and construction. While this was a serious annoyance, and one made significantly worse by the fact that I work from home, the more serious problem was the health problems that this construction led to. I was one of at least a half dozen near-neighbors who developed upper respiratory illnesses during this time - illnesses that were far worse than we normally experience. My own, totally uncharacteristic, 10 months of poor health led to over 2 dozen doctor visits and resulted in my having had to have surgery, just 3 months ago, for complications from the upper respiratory problems I developed. Fortunately, I had the health insurance, time and resources to deal with these health issues. It makes me furious and sad to think of all of my fellow residents of Minneapolis who will be affected by construction and potential ill health effects of this proposed building boom - residents who will suffer ill health and do NOT have the resources to deal with them. This plan, which ENCOURAGES tearing down existing homes, will have MANY unintended consequences, and I write to bring your attention to the serious public health issue that, from my and my neighbors' direct experience, could well occur. Blanket revision of the zoning code is NOT the answer to creating a healthy, safe, affordable, livable city, a goal that we all share.

October 29, 2018

Donald Hammen

4140-46th Ave. S.

hammen@bitstream.net

Comment –

This plan is not friendly for seniors retired aging in place in their own homes. It does appear to be friendly for people who are economically well off or corporations. Under this plan I could get forced out of my house if not the city of Minneapolis due the fact of being unable to afford to live in Minneapolis. There are several ways to stay welcoming to seniors aging in place. This plan is not one of them. Additionally this plan is anti-neighborhood and anti-neighborhood organization at a time when we need to keep them strong. We need a Minneapolis plan. This isn't it.

October 29, 2018

Barb Ryman

4504 York Ave S

barbryman@gmail.com

Comment –

I am opposed to the 2040 plan. Please, if you want my support, this plan must be revised.

October 29, 2018

Liz Banfield

4936 Xerxes Ave S
lizb@lizbanfield.com

Comment –

I'm a 14-year resident of Fulton. Allowing more multi-unit buildings will adversely the character of our neighborhood by giving developers freedom tear down single-family homes. Furthermore, I believe our neighborhood can't withstand more density. Our community school, Lake Harriet Elementary (K-8) school is already turning away children who move to this district after kindergarten. This plan needs more study and more community input. Thank you, Liz Banfield

October 29, 2018

Eric Paredes

901 W 45th St, Mpls, MN 55419

Comment –

I do NOT support the 2040 plan as it is currently written. More specifically, I do not support the proposed transportation corridor zoning of Bryant avenue nor the zoning proposal to allow the development of multi-plexes to the detriment of the historical charm of our neighborhoods. This is not the way forward.

October 29, 2018

Sheila Nezhad

2649 Longfellow Ave S., Minneapolis

Comment –

I support the 2040 plan! We need more affordable, family housing. Please build four-plexes!

October 29, 2018

Jeff McLaughlin

3033 East Calhoun Parkway #303, Minneapolis, MN 55408

jeffrey.m.mclaughlin@gmail.com

Comment –

1) East Calhoun Parkway between Lake Street and 31st Street is proposed to be up-zoned to Interior 3, I find this ill-advised. Interior 2 is a far more appropriate rating for this block and would still allow for multi-family units, lots to be combined, etc.; but, would still hold to the 2.5 stories that are required by the Shoreland Overlay District Guidelines - which is my point 2. This is regrettable - this is a very neighborhood block - even given it's proximity to Lake Street; it's vastly different than the same block between Lake Street and 31st on Hennepin Avenue, for example, and obviously. Interior 2 is far more appropriate for this block. 2.) Maintain the Shoreland Overlay District Guidelines - Explicitly support the Shoreland Overlay District guideline language which calls out a max height of 2.5 stories or 35 feet along Lake Bde Maka Ska, and all other Minneapolis Lakes. (I know that's how Overlay Guidelines are designed/prescribed to work - but, developers continually try to shrug this off - particularly surrounding Bde Maka Ska - and, the implications are very high for this here and across the city's lakes). Don't wall off our lakes! Let's not be the first to break this long standing agreement, signaling open season for excessive development along all Minneapolis lakes - be it large scale apartment buildings or McMansions, the public's use of lakes will be negatively impacted by not explicitly supporting this language. Specific to Bde Maka Ska, buildings above 35ft will negatively impact the ability to sail on Bde Maka Ska as buildings create a wind-shadow 3x their height, which would cover the entire buoy field on Bde Maka Ska and ruin the ability of the Minneapolis Sailing Center to host sailing events and classes.

October 29, 2018

Richard Hackler

3022 Columbus Avenue
hacklerr@augsborg.edu

Comment –

Hello, Given the threats posed by a rapidly changing climate (I'm writing with the latest IPCC report in mind), I support many of the goals outlined in the revised draft of the Comprehensive Plan. I'm dismayed by some of the changes made since the draft plan-- especially the change that would reduce the height of structures allowed near transit routes-- and I wish the plan went further in demanding that neighborhoods in wealthy, amenity-rich parts of the city (Southwest!) make room for more residents (this would also help achieve the racial equity goals that the plan outlines). However, I still support much of the plan, including the elimination of minimum parking requirements, and the citywide changes to our restrictive zoning ordinances. In short, the IPCC report suggests that we need to fundamentally change the way we live in order to mitigate the worst impacts of a destabilizing climate, and to adapt to the changes that are coming regardless of what we do. At the very least, as residents of Minneapolis we need to welcome more people, to eliminate our dependency on cars, and to expand access to transit, walking, bicycling, and other low or no carbon transportation methods. I hope the plan's most ambitious ideas are enacted, and I hope the Planning Commission and City Council won't heed the voices of homeowners who seem to care more about preserving their property values than figuring out what it means to build a city that's truly prepared to face the challenges posed by climate change.

October 29, 2018

Terrell Daniels

4929 Russell Ave S

Terrell@adlibmpls.com

Comment –

I am opposed to the 2040 plan because it puts density on supposed “corridors” that are too close to the gems of our city, the lakes; “corridors” like west 50th street which is 2 blocks from Harriet and William berry parkway which borders parkland on both sides of bdemakaska and Harriet; this is density with a bludgeon approach vs. a selective, focused planned approach for needed density. Sent from my iPhone

October 29, 2018

Jeff Klein

1507 Washington St. NE

jklein.mn@gmail.com

Comment –

I really appreciate the effort that the team at the city has put into this plan and its associated outreach. It's clearly a thoughtful and well-researched effort, and I'm excited about the future of our city. I want to focus on one issue: I don't see any logical reason to keep Interior 1 as a land-use type, other than an effort to protect a small number of loud and wealthy homeowners from inconveniences and offenses to their sensibilities that are either slight or entirely perceived. The minimum should be Interior 2. Let me list the reasons why: (1) In light of the recent IPCC report on climate change, incremental density upgrades in all of our neighborhoods allow more people to live the lower-carbon life associated with urban living. Housing units not built in these neighborhoods are built instead on wetlands in Hugo. (2) The incremental, missing-middle units that can be built in these neighborhoods are specifically **not** built by the large developers that some see as an enemy, but instead by local people looking to add an income stream and build modest wealth. And they relieve the pressure to build the very large-scale projects that draw so much criticism. (3) The neighborhoods currently listed as Interior 1 have lost significant density over the years due to smaller family sizes - and consequently have lost local corner stores and street life. Adding more units in relatively modestly sized buildings allows these neighborhoods to recapture their former character. (4) Small increases in density drive up land value, adding money to the tax base - an issue of fiscal sustainability. Currently denser areas subsidize infrastructure in less dense areas - a backwards wealth redistribution in a progressive city, from the poor, **to** people wealthy who largely consider themselves progressives. (5) Small and incremental density increases are the way cities have evolved for thousands of years; the idea of locking down a neighborhood and declaring it finished is an entirely post-WWII invention that is a risky experiment that invites only two outcomes: rich enclaves or perpetual decline. I have yet to hear a coherent defense of the exclusionary zoning slated for a large fraction of the city. It seems apparent to me that the **right** course of action is pretty clear in this matter. Whether or not CMs can stand up to political pressure from the city's most well-connected citizens is the question at hand. I think those who support a growing city will be rewarded, politically, in the long run.

October 29, 2018

Dale Abrahamson

1114 Jefferson St NE

Comment –

Mpls has wonderful neighborhoods, the best park system in the country, and livability rating that few large cities can match. Why do you want to destroy all that? Taking a shotgun approach to increase density makes no sense whatsoever. Please, please, please take a step back and rethink this entire proposal. As a 30+ year homeowner in Mpls I do not see any good coming out of the proposal as it stands. We do not want to become another Chicago!

October 29, 2018

Robert McPherson

4936 Xerxes Avenue South

grier22@yahoo.com

Comment –

I'm opposed to the 2040 Plan. No other city has successfully created more affordable housing by an open zoning plan like 2040. I think it's time to end the current plan, and begin afresh based on lessons learned in other cities. Perhaps we could begin by replacing our current planning head with someone with more formidable credentials in the area of affordable housing. Perhaps the new tax incentive plan for Opportunity Zones can become part of a better plan for affordable housing. But I don't think the first step should be to tear up the zoning ordinances on which current neighborhoods have been built and improved for decades.

October 29, 2018

Blue Delli quanti

3404 Emerson Ave S #301, Minneapolis, MN 55408

blue.delli quanti@gmail.com

Comment –

Minneapolis drastically limited new apartments in the 1970's, so we have very few homes that are aging and becoming affordable. Allowing new multi-family buildings ensures the next generation will not have to deal with the same shortage we are in today.

October 29, 2018

Adam Smith

4610 Blaisdell Avenue

Comment –

I am writing in support of the Minneapolis 2040 Comprehensive Plan. While I do not believe it goes far enough in enabling a transformation of the City's built environment necessary to adequately address the challenges of climate change and housing affordability, it is a substantial step in the right direction. I would like to urge my City Council representative Jeremy Schroeder to support adoption of the plan and to continue working to make Minneapolis a national leader in achieving equity in housing and employment opportunities while dramatically reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Bold changes to the City's zoning code and complementary policies will be necessary to address these urgent challenges, and we cannot afford to wait for incremental improvements.

October 29, 2018

Alexa Kelly

4604 York Ave S

kellalexa@gmail.com

Comment –

Re: Minneapolis 2040 Plan I believe that this plan was not thought through. For those living in Linden Hills and adjacent neighborhood, infrastructure is an issue. The neighborhood is already dense as is. Parking and commuting will worsen. Streets are already tight and narrow for navigating. Most residents already park on the street, most only have a one car garage; parking and snow plowing will be an issue. If we allow 1-3 units to be built, there will be more cars on the street. Especially to those of us who live by Southwest high school when kids drive to school. I am adamantly against the 2040 proposal.

October 29, 2018

Michael Rhodes

2514 30th Ave S.

Comment –

Minneapolis is in dire need of higher density housing that is SUPPORTIVE and AFFORDABLE. People and families with lower incomes need to be able to afford to live here. There is so much construction occurring and it would be a shame if regular people were priced out of all of it. High density housing can be environmentally friendly and affordable. Developments should not skirt regulations and price people out of the city.

October 29, 2018

Pat Doyle

patdoylemail@gmail.com

Comment –

The Planning Commission meeting could be a metaphor for how unresponsive city officials are to the majority who oppose the 2040 plan. Held in the cramped city council chambers to reduce crowd size.

October 29, 2018

Lon Ortner

4326 Harriet Avenue

landsortner@comcast.net

Comment –

An environmental impact evaluation and following EIS (Environmental Impact Statement) is appropriate in order to properly advance this plan. Additional three-plexuses in areas which now have single family homes and duplexes cause additional parking needs and additional pollution. Everyone isn't going to be able to take public transportation and this plan seems to ignore that. Not only that, changing the nature of neighborhoods as severely as this plan does is further going to drive out the middle class if the exorbitant taxes don't. Deos the 2040 plan even consider that Minneapolis residents pay twice the taxes on similarly priced homes in Minneapolis? What are they doing to address that issue? Thank you for addressing these issues. Lon Ortner

October 29, 2018

Ceann verdoorn

905 W 36th street

Ceann.klug@gmail.com

Comment –

I am not in favor of the Minneapolis 2040 plan as it stands today. Please listen to the constituents of your city before moving forward to pass this plan. Thank you, CeAnn Verdoorn

October 29, 2018

Karen Holicky-Michaels

1000 W. 46th St. Minneapolis, MN 55419

karen55409@yahoo.com

Comment –

We're extremely concerned that you are going ahead with little changed after 10,000 comments were submitted earlier this summer - it's clear, and admitted publicly, that there is no research to support and no successful implementation of these ideas in other cities. Minneapolis has always been a city of highly involved and engaged communities. We are the neighborhoods who have really supported the city, especially with our taxes. No one has a right to live by the lakes but we all have the right to safe and affordable housing. We have a millennial child who very much wants her own house as do her friends - what will be left and affordable for them? Have you considered how density affects the cities' natural resources, like the lakes? Density does not equal affordable housing - what kind of community and community commitment and engagement will we have with renters coming and going? With people in the neighborhoods in huge apartment/condos that no one knows - will people feel safe as they won't know neighbors? Most folks who need affordable housing won't be able to afford this kind of housing...we feel that the Mayor and city council have been shoving this down our throats and absolutely don't care about the long-term consequences or about the livability of Minneapolis - we have lived here for 28 years and now find ourselves wondering where we're going to live next - your vision is not what we've been building on for all of this time - the opposition has called us names and disrupted our websites and you all have lied to us.

October 29, 2018

Philip Ayotte

3517 E42nd St Mpls MN 55406

topsailre@gmail.com

Comment –

Planners and Officials, Thank you for working so hard yesterday and now to make our city a better place today and tomorrow. Like the planners of the past who saw the potential and correctly laid the foundation for the great city we exist in today, you now recognize that Minneapolis (and St. Paul) are in a good position for needed growth and now is the time to plan this out. Part of the opportunity is because of the region of the USA that Minneapolis is in. We are close to other major metropolitan cities and easily connected to many other great cities via the ports in Lake Superior and the Mississippi river. We are more insulated from the predicted perils of global warming's effects on the coast lines and desert southwest. The leaders of businesses and industry will build new and relocate here. Doctors, scientists, engineers, professors for our expanding schools and all of the good people that go with them will move here. Developers will recognize the demand and invest in us because we are the best available option. Over time it's safe to say that people will more and more move to this region. That is.... if we can house them. New construction and more housing options is good for everyone. Personally, I want to be neighbors with all the good people who fill the likes of the jobs I mentioned before. They and their families will have an interest in making their surroundings and our city better and that's plain good for all. I am so glad you recognize the need for action NOW and I am so glad that you are carefully putting together a plan that if executed correctly, will have the most potential to positively affect the most people. Don't give up!

October 29, 2018

Carol Weiler

2312 Saint Anthony Parkway
Dcweiler4@gmail.com

Comment –

I am opposed to the 2040 proposed plan to change the residential zoning to allow for triplexes. The most that should be allowed are duplexes with no more height than 2 stories. There should be off-street parking required in primarily single-family residential neighborhoods. The proposed density along transit corridors is too high. There should be preservation of green space and lot coverage restrictions.

October 29, 2018

Deborah Manning

4821 Drew Ave. S.

Comment –

I oppose the revised 2040 Plan. It does not address the many, many comments I've read and heard, which is a failed process. It will exacerbate already challenging environmental problems such as storm water management. Handling the wastewater from the hugely increased density will pose a public works nightmare and impact neighborhoods and residents. It will lead to a decline in housing stock as people decide not to improve and maintain their houses if they will be torn down anyway. It discriminates against the elderly and disabled. I can't say anything good about it or the public process involved.

October 29, 2018

Monica Paquette

4219 Wentworth Avenue

paqfam4219@gmail.com

Comment –

We are not opposed to affordable housing but we are completely opposed to the 2040 Plan. We object to the potential very negative impact on Southwest Minneapolis and the Plan's blatant focus on SW Minneapolis. There are empty lots and dilapidated structures all over Minneapolis so no need to focus on such a beautiful area. Other aspects of the plan are very unrealistic, such as the percentage of people who can/would bike to work or other places (not good for the elderly, handicapped, or families), or the focus of employment being in one's neighborhood. This is a campaign against SFHs. My SW neighborhood, Kingfield, is already dense and we see apartments and -plexes every time we go for a walk! Traffic is already horrific and more plexes will bring in people with cars. Sorry, please go back to the drawing board and with input from those of us who actually live here.

October 29, 2018

Eric J. Hansen, AIA

4501 Zenith Ave So

ehansen056@gmail.com

Comment –

I am writing to let you know I oppose the 2040 Plan as presented poorly in various neighborhood groups I have attended (the colored maps are small and hard to read etc) I believe we have enough current Small Area Plans (SAP) around that were just created a few years ago that were put into place that are in direct conflict with what you are presenting in your 2040 Plan. I was the past Co-Chair of LHiNC a few years ago and past Chair of the LHiNC Zoning Committee and also a member of the SAP and all of the new 2040 Plan seems to ignore what has already been done? I believe there is enough capacity in the current zoning areas to handle an enormous amount of additional housing capacity that is needed. I have also read Council person Palmisano's response to Director Frank dated September 23, 2018 and agree with her assessments in that letter that clearly states why the 2040 Plan needs to be revised. I am the current Co-Chair of the AIA Residential Committee and personally find the up-zoning arbitrary. I have lived in Linden Hills since 1986 when I bought an old house (1904) and fixed it up when everyone was leaving for the suburbs. I bought my house specifically because I did not want to live next to a Tri or Four Plex, which if I did I would have bought in an area that would have been at a discounted rate back then. There are many duplexes near my house and that is fine and with ADU's finally available gives those owners more density. However one cannot build a detached ADU in their backyard if it is slightly taller than their primary residence (and no variance process is currently allowed to remedy it). I had asked repeatedly of Zoning staff back many years ago when they were vetting out ADU's..."what about all the one story ramblers and bungalows" you are discriminating against them by not allowing them to build an ADU unless they have a big tall house? I have talked with President Bender in person and offered many "seasoned" AIA architects to come on it to the Zoning office to give our thoughts on things to help out. Please feel free to call me at 612-328-0881 Thank you in advance to scrap this 2040 Plan and to work on a better revised Plan listening to your property owners!

October 29, 2018

Mustafa Ozer

5106 Lyndale Ave S
mp.ozer@gmail.com

Comment –

I oppose the Minneapolis 2040 housing plan. I think efforts in terms of increasing diversity and offering lower cost rental options would be better achieved legislatively where we can put a stop in rental hikes thus increasing the likelihood of urban segregation in our city. Most of the new development proposed in the plan is controlled by contractors and developers. Again this is counter intuitive to the public when the end mission is provide lower cost housing solutions. Why would it be in the interest of the developer / contractor to limit rental costs? In addition, beauty of south Minneapolis is in its suburb feel, and beauty of architecture. If this plan goes through, you will be severely damaging the architecture and beauty of the lakes suburban feel that many have invested and lived in. It does nothing to lower rental costs but everything to historic beauty of the city and the lakes region. Furthermore, when we cannot provide adequate traffic solutions in our mid size city, and especially lack of public transport options from lakes suburb to downtown Minneapolis or St Paul commutes, how are we to sustain the added traffic / parking congestion with the housing developments. Again I oppose the current proposal, and would rather see a public supported legislative solutions to curb rental cost increases in the city.

October 29, 2018

John Grevious

2239 Wilson St

Comment –

Eliminating designated single-family dwelling neighborhoods reduces the diversity of neighborhood styles that is a highlight of the Minneapolis. I grew up in the first ring suburbs; however, during the 80's while commuting to/from the U of M as a student, I took notice of the smaller lot single family neighborhoods I biked through and planted a serious thought to consider living there. Indeed I became a Mpls homeowner in one of those very neighborhoods. Other than during the "Murderapolis era" crisis I have not had serious thoughts of leaving. Thank goodness that degradation was proven to be reversible. The loss of single-family neighborhood zoning, if implemented, may not be easy to reverse. The revised plan shows essentially no regard for the majority of citizens who have staked their homesteads in Minneapolis. Reducing the multiplex limit from 4 to 3 in current R1 single-family neighborhoods is a cartoonish adjustment to the original plan; essentially an insult to the sincere and serious input provided by citizens who have invested their homes upon what should be a stable city. Still biking, I appreciate much of what Minneapolis has to offer but the unbalanced weighting of transportation methods is beginning to have a damaging impact on what should be a "run-of-the-mill" prudent planning process. Ten years ago we decided to stay in Minneapolis and remodel rather than move to a larger home outside the city. A neighborhood rezoning such as this would have most certainly caused us to invest elsewhere. I can only imagine the impact on others considering similar investments in their homes at this time. The fact that the City Planning officials are letting things progress in this manner infers a community instability that is indeed damaging to Minneapolis. This damage may linger even if the current 2040 plan is voted down by the city council. The best damage control the planning commission can do at this point is to present a plan to the city council that preserves single family dwelling neighborhoods. Show the outside world that Minneapolis is a city that can "think big" and brainstorm solutions that meet needs without destroying its heritage. Minneapolis serves up a variety of neighborhood styles and an appreciation of this stylistic diversity should be preserved. Preserve R1 zoning principles and maintain that status in neighborhoods where it works best.

October 29, 2018

Marc Thompson

4821 Drew Ave S, Minneapolis, 55410

marc.allen.thompson@gmail.com

Comment –

The revised plan will NOT address issues of affordable housing. This is because 1) the cost of building housing is going up. Land in the city is relatively scarce (and therefore expensive), the price of building materials is increasing, and trade wages are going up. How much can the city afford to spend in housing subsidies? 2) Changing from four plexus to triplexes in the plan is discriminatory. This move allows builders to ignore ADA accommodations, and the people who need those accommodations often need affordable housing. If they are forced to build accommodations themselves, their housing is no longer affordable. You can expect lawsuits from this one. 3) The emphasis on walking and biking sounds nice, but is discriminatory. People with kids to transport, people who need to commute to the suburbs, and the disabled need access to cars to get to schools, work, and medical appointments. Failing to make this possible is a deliberate discriminatory act. If you really want to make housing affordable you need to address the achievement gap in the schools, improve community policing, attract employers, and get guns off the street. The 2040 plan is about what I would expect to see from a sophomore civics class. I expect something MUCH better from planning professionals.

October 29, 2018

Robert Stevens

2600 Emerson Ave S
rjstevens14@gmail.com

Comment –

I support the 2040 plan and would like it to go even further to allow more housing in single family neighborhoods. If we want to be inclusive, we have to be uniform across the city and not put the burden of new housing in the already dense parts of the city.

October 29, 2018

Tracey McIntire

5008 Upton Avenue South
tamcintire@usewireless.com

Comment –

Has anyone done any studies of the impact on the environment, traffic congestion, wear and tear on the streets and the impact on schools, just to name a few. I work at Lake Harriet School and I know for a fact that the SW Mpls schools are busting at the seams. There are always wait lists for the schools. Not sure how cramming more children into the schools is going to be beneficial. Bigger class sizes? As you know the Mpls. School District has a \$33 million dollar budget deficit. They are cutting staff, cutting back on programs, etc. I think more research has to be done before winging it. Also if you build more rentals, our property values will go down which equals less money made on property taxes. Where are the case studies of other cities that have done this? What were their results? I heard cities such as Seattle have done similar plans and did not have success. It created more problems. I believe they have an even bigger homeless problem now. I think more consideration needs to be taken before moving forward. Thank you!

October 29, 2018

Sharon Sampon

shr4bobmn@gmail.com

Comment –

I am an avid user of the uptown area with its stunning lakes, vibrant commercial areas and beautiful homes. This lovely area will be disrupted with the 2040 plan which is slanted toward one group to the exclusions of others. It is slanted towards cycling while still drawing more traffic to and already congested streets and will be overly disturbing to the tranquility of the single family homes who have great pride valuable stakes in their ownership. There are more moderate homes and smaller apartment buildings and other single rentals that cannot survive this push to overload the area. This is not what is needed in a progressive city such as ours. There has to be a reasonable approach to this development that doesn't include bludgeoning the shore-line overlay that protects a Minneapolis treasure. What is worse about this move to overdevelop the area is: it not done with democratic fairness, it is being pushed through without consideration of the many groups who will be impacted, such as the older population, the less able throughout the city to enjoy the amenities that this area offers. Sharon Sampon

October 29, 2018

Mrs. Debbie Paulaha

912 12th street

patronbooks@sbcglobal.net

Comment –

Russians have defeated the electoral processes, now to destroy Minneapolis, America's finest city.

October 29, 2018

Carla Bland

5214 n 4th Street, Mpls MN 55430

cbland@mwddc.net

Comment –

I live and go to church on the North Side. The Up-Zoning plan does nothing to bring jobs, economic development or affordable housing to the North side. We've not seen a proposal that benefits the current residents of the North Side, however the plan is being advanced. It needs to be rewritten to consider the current residents. Transportation- Biking is not the transportation of choice in our community. There are many families with children, the handicapped and the elderly living on the North Side. Biking is not conducive to these groups and, they should not be forced out of cars and buses for the sake of a powerful few. Homes for families- City-wide up-zoning would harm families with children and endanger our environment. There hasn't been sufficient research to determine the adverse environmental effects on those of us living on the North Side. We need to see the research on what happens when the city's most affordable single-family homes are demolished and replaced by apartments with no green spaces and limited parking spaces. The new proposed housing is more suited to single people and families without children and will displace the current dwellers. This type of housing is appropriate for those that live in surrounding suburbs that want to be closer to downtown and can afford to pay more for housing. I suspect gentrification is in the works.

October 29, 2018

Kyle Olson

5234 40th Ave S, Minneapolis, MN 55417

kolson5581@gmail.com

Comment –

I am in strong support of the draft 2040 plan, and indeed would prefer if the earlier draft was actually what came to pass. The most important element of the plan is the inclusion of the fourplex/threeplex proposal. This simple change will allow our neighborhoods to welcome more neighbors, meaning neighborhood businesses will be able to thrive with a larger customer base, and allowing additional transit investments to become viable. This proposal, combined with the proposed upzonings included in the draft plan, will ultimately allow for more trips to be made by biking, walking, and transit, rather than in personal automobiles. Additionally, we face a housing shortage brought on by low supply, and by allowing more housing units to be built, we will help alleviate the pressure to raise rents in older units spread throughout the city. It's important for affordability, and it is important for equity to open up new neighborhoods for multi-unit buildings throughout the city.

October 29, 2018

Ramos

3712 park ave. S. Mpls. Mn. 55407

Comment –

I don't like the idea of fourplexes being forced into neighborhoods. My block has apartment buildings and I believe what we have is enough. I'm also concerned as to who will be moving into these apartments . I'd hate to see crime go up in the neighborhood. I've lived here 28 years and I've seen good & bad, right now it's good & I wish the city will leave our neighborhood OUT of the plan. Thank you 😊

October 29, 2018

Ramos

3712 park ave. S. Mpls. Mn. 55407

Comment –

I don't like the idea of fourplexes being forced into neighborhoods. My block has apartment buildings and I believe what we have is enough. I'm also concerned as to who will be moving into these apartments . I'd hate to see crime go up in the neighborhood. I've lived here 28 years and I've seen good & bad, right now it's good & I wish the city will leave our neighborhood OUT of the plan. Thank you 😊

October 29, 2018

Nathan Bakken

643 N 5th ST #406

bakke338@umn.edu

Comment –

Climate Change The climate is changing and humans must change if we want to leave our children a sustainable planet. Minneapolis must create access to opportunities for those who cannot afford a car, and make possible a lifestyle where someone can live car-free. **Aging in Place** Many Minneapolis residents want to remain in neighborhoods they've lived in for many years, but have limited housing options in those neighborhoods that are not single-family homes. Allowing more homes also allows more senior housing, where residents do not have to worry about maintenance like lawn mowing, sidewalk shoveling, and the other (expensive!) upkeep that comes along with owning a single-family home. We can also put new multi-family homes in areas where seniors can walk to the grocery store or to a nearby park. **Redlining and Segregation** Minneapolis has a long history of redlining and racial segregation, and this history persists through our zoning code. Allowing more housing in areas that have been historically racially segregated reduces the ongoing impact of these historic wrongs. **Subsidized Affordable Housing** New affordable housing can only be built in neighborhoods that are zoned to allow it. We have had no new affordable housing built in some of the best areas to live in the city, such as Lake of the Isles or Southwest Minneapolis. In order to give people access to great schools and amenities, we need to build housing in those areas. **Gentrification** Minneapolis 2040 is a progressive step toward reducing the existing pressure of gentrification. Lack of new housing in desirable areas has pushed development to gentrifying areas. By allowing more housing to be built everywhere, the pressure is reduced. Every home we don't build in an exclusive neighborhood like Linden Hills will be built in somewhere like Whittier. **Naturally Occurring Affordable Housing** Minneapolis drastically limited new apartments in the 1970's, so we have very few homes that are aging and becoming affordable. Allowing new multi-family buildings ensures the next generation will not have to deal with the same shortage we are in today.

October 29, 2018

Suzanne O'brien

4633 aldrich ave. s.

suzanneob@gmail.com

Comment –

Combining lots on blocks adjacent to transit lines should not be allowed south of 38th Street or north of Lowry Ave. These are quiet side streets far from downtown, not transit routes. Multi-lot buildings are out of scale and would drastically change the character of these blocks. Lots without alley access shouldn't be zoned for anything larger than a duplex. Aside from parking/garage access, there would be no access for garbage trucks to empty dumpsters (needed for multi-unit buildings), emergency vehicles and contractors. Having a driveway big enough to accommodate these needs would take a 40 ft. lot down to a 30 ft. lot, which makes even a duplex a tight squeeze.

October 29, 2018

Jacob Steinberg

915 21st Ave SE Minneapolis, MN 55414

j.steinberg@live.com

Comment –

I support the highest possible density in our city. I support the most thorough and expansive embrace of transit and bicycle infrastructure. I support affordable housing options.

October 29, 2018

Gregory Gibbs

3857 37th Ave South

elydog@gmail.com

Comment –

Gentrification is proceeding apace in many U.S. cities, Minneapolis included. The 'Phase zero' of serious gentrification is both real estate business interest and money ... and government rezoning. That is what is happening here. Instead of rent and building controls being instituted, public housing being created or empty houses seized, the 'market' is the driver. Democrats on this city council are deeply involved in the real estate industries drive to remake the city and remove unprofitable single family homes. Low end single family homes will be replaced with PROFITABLE 3 story housing. Yet 'densification' in no city in the U.S. has proved to be 'affordable' according to any real look at the stats. The whole 'affordable' claim is a lie, here and everywhere else. Look at Seattle, NY, San Fran, Portland - almost anywhere. It is just a way to house more white collar and white young people close to the city core, so they can work at corporate businesses in the city core. "That" is the goal and moving the working class and poor OUT of the city is the result. See the book "How to Kill a City." This is the same process. End Mpls 204.

October 29, 2018

Brandon Kongsjord

2600 University Avenue
bkongsjord@gmail.com

Comment –

Ban all cars! Seriously, I like the plan.

October 29, 2018

Wendy Fine

4006 Zenith Ave So

wsfine@gmail.com

Comment –

I know this is late but I just got back from school. PLEASE LISTEN-The 2040 PLAN IS A SET UP FOR FAILURE. It's compounding all the parking problems with no possible solution but tearing down more homes for parking lots. If you want to make a difference, which i hope you do, this plan would be placed in areas that are starving for improvement: portions of North Minneapolis, portions of South Minneapolis, etc. I have people who live in St. Louis park who use to be Minneapolis residents telling me to move out of Minneapolis as soon as possible because of what the City Council has in mind for their future plans.

October 29, 2018

Tammy Seitel

5112 Newton Avenue South

Comment –

I appreciate the hard work and objectives that have gone into the 2040 Plan. However, I remain in strong disagreement with the plan as revised and urge the city council and mayor to press pause and simply take more time and public input. It is clear that a significant number of fellow citizens object to this plan, and while there have been hearings and other opportunities for comment, very little has shifted in the revised plan. The plan is very risky and once unleashed, difficult to unwind. The fact that similar plans have been disasters in other cities heightens my discomfort. I attended meetings, have read much of the plan, have read news articles about the plan, and visited neighborhood websites to become familiar with other citizen comments. My concerns remain many, including the speed and broad-stroke elimination of zoning rules, the lack of acknowledgement that we live in a severely cold and wintery climate, that taking public transit may be difficult/impractical for many people, and the overall cavalier attitude of some of the city council and the planners (which I witnessed at an open meeting). There are many things the council could alter in the plan that may help achieve the core objectives, but they seem stubbornly unwilling to do so. In summary, I do not support the 2040 Plan in its current revised form.

October 29, 2018

Andrew From

3305 36th Ave S

andrew0from@gmail.com

Comment –

I support the more liberal zoning policies laid out in the new plan. Would've like to see the quadplex everywhere still be an option, but the current solution is still an improvement over the status quo. Minneapolis desperately needs more housing so it's more affordable for everyone to live in.

October 29, 2018

Dave Swan

2400 E 43rd st

Comment –

I am in support of the plan, it is great. Thanks for all the hard work and vision that went into it! I want a vibrant city with lots of places to bike and walk and bus to, not to live in a boring sprawling suburb. I want more affordable housing options and a more diverse community.

October 29, 2018

James Gunderson

5926 Grass Lake Terrace Mpls Mn 55419

gundersonjames52@gmail.com

Comment –

I am against the Minneapolis 2040 project in its current iteration. I do not believe that building multi-unit housing will diversify our neighborhoods. If anything, it will weaken the value of existing strong neighborhoods. There is not enough in-depth information on how this will affect our taxes, school systems, public transportation, or infrastructure (road, water & sewer systems, etc). I suggest a test; let's allow Minneapolis 2040 zoning in small blocs that include City council members' homes who support the initiative. At the end of 10 years, let's assess the results. What has been gained and what has been lost. And if the City council member who supports this idea still lives in the same house.

October 29, 2018

Myles Ambrose

409 7th St SE

myles.ambrose@gmail.com

Comment –

I want to bring more neighbors into our city and make it a more affordable and equitable place to live, so I support the Minneapolis 2040 plan.

October 29, 2018

Janie Myhre

2011 3rd Ave S

Comment –

I am of the opinion that the 2040 plan does not go far enough to rezone/restructure our city planning to both ameliorate racist policies past and present, nor that it does enough to mitigate climate change. However, it is a step in the right direction. It would be more than disappointing to see city officials cow to the vocal, well connected, wealthy members of this city who wish to further enshrine the status quo.

October 29, 2018

Patrick Webster

2011 3rd Ave s #230

Patrickbwebster@gmail.com

Comment –

I don't think the current plan goes far enough to increase density/reduce our dependency on car etc etc, but incremental change is better than no change! Support the 2040 plan

October 29, 2018

Michael Nelson

3418 Harriet Avenue

Mrnelson825@msn.com

Comment –

I support the 2040 plan, however I do not support the required 10% inclusionary requirement. Thank you.

October 29, 2018

Jerelyn Piller

5836 Russell Ave S
jpiller22@aol.com

Comment –

We have Always had a safe Neighborhood. And now in the last few months, we are getting car break ins stolen cars and garage break ins your 2040 Plan will encourage More riff raff that this Neighborhood does't need!!

October 29, 2018

Mike Hermanson

2555 Bryant Ave S Apartment 302

Comment –

The resistance to the 2040 comp plan makes me sick. The fact that a vast majority of the detractors are from ward 13 where most of the bulldozing in the city happens (due to McMansion building) is an irony not lost on me. I grew up in 13, and the historically racist zoning laws there have caused a massive amount of wealth and whiteness to coalesce there. The city of Mpls is in a housing crisis and these people clutching their pearls and decrying "what about my neighborhood" are really saying "what if I have to live near people who aren't like me?" I had one person tell me that he didn't want to live near "poor people." It's disgusting. Frankly, I don't think the 2040 comp plan goes far enough. I would like to see 13 further zoned so that more of it can be used for fourplexes/other multi-family housing units. The red sign brigade is a bunch of fear mongering know-nothings and I'd hate to have my city's future shaped by their loud voices.

October 29, 2018

Peter Erkkila

26 Oak Grove Steet, #21, Minneapolis, MN

Comment –

There are many good reasons to support the Minneapolis 2040 plan, all of them critical to the future of our city. I support the plan because I care deeply about the issues at the heart of these reasons, and want our city to set the standard for addressing the growing reurbanization of American cities, and the response to a coming climate refugee crisis. 1. Our city is already growing. As a renter, I have seen firsthand how rental vacancies have vanished, and prices have increased. I moved to Minneapolis over a decade ago for college, but as my housing situation has changed (not atypical of a queer, underemployed millennial like myself), my options dwindled as naturally affordable 4plexes and duplexes in Kingfield and Whittier gave way to smaller apartments in Loring Park. I am lucky enough to afford my current apartment, which has shrunk in square feet by half and increased in rent by 200 dollars, I know that every apartment search is going to get harder and more expensive unless we do something. 2. Zoning has always been a way wealthy elites restrict access of undesirable people to their enclaves. It is the post white-flight urban order, and we must upend it if we are ever going to repair the terrible damage to this country of which Trump and "Don't Bulldoze" are only symptoms. 3. Climate change will be the greatest threat to humanity in my own lifetime, and I feel a moral obligation, as well as a practical one, to help combat it. Not only do denser cities with less reliance on automobiles help improve our footprint, they will be necessary to face the growing number of people we could see if (or increasingly, when) we see significant numbers of climate refugees or other migration responses to the changing climate and escalating natural catastrophes.

October 29, 2018

Charles Karter

1500 LaSalle Ave, Apt #323

Charles.karter@yahoo.com

Comment –

This draft of the plan has been up for one month, while undergoing changes. It's big, vague, and convoluted. It doesn't incorporate neighborhood associations into its policies, and is inherently unaccountable to the people for all these reasons. I ask that you delay the plan, and find a way to give people, and neighborhood associations, a greater stake in the plan. As well as put this plan up for referendum, so the public can vote on the city's future, which will give the public confidence in the plan itself. "The right of voting for representatives is the primary right by which other rights are protected. To take away this right is to reduce a man to slavery, for slavery consists in being subject to the will of another..." — Thomas Paine, 1795 Don't force the public to abide by your will alone, allow them to vote on this, it's too big, and too influential to centralize the authorization of this plan.

October 29, 2018

Alex Buddington

5108 penn ave s

Comment –

I support the 2040 plan. We need to add more housing to keep living affordable in our city.

October 29, 2018

Laura Moench

4352 Aldrich Ave S

lemoench@gmail.com

Comment –

I support the direction of the 2040 plan. I think that the aim of racial equity and mitigating climate change are the right priorities; I want to see active work to improve the problems with segregation that we have had in Minneapolis. In addition, climate change is our biggest looming threat and prioritizing sustainable growth is a requirement for any plan that I would support. I am also in favor of pedestrian-oriented building and site design, as well as improving non-car-centric transportation design. I am a person that walks around my neighborhood and bikes to work. I would take the bus more if it was more convenient. Focusing on non-car-centric transportation will make our city more pleasant. It will help with sustainability as well. Great work on the 2040 plan. Thank you for your efforts moving our city in the right direction!

October 29, 2018

Timothy Wright

3240 Dupont Ave S

timothynoel@gmail.com

Comment –

I consider myself an older, long-time resident of Minneapolis, I've owned property in the city for over 25 years. The more development and people that have moved here, the better and richer the experience has been. I don't think 1970's-2000's Minneapolis should a model for the future. I remember it as having less people, less interesting places to eat and drink, less parkland, less safety, more cars, more crime. I bike everywhere year-round, and I want to be safe, healthy, and have more destinations to bike to. I don't see why I should have to drive anywhere within Minneapolis. I want more immigration and more types of people to live here. We live in the biggest and most diverse (and best!) city in Minnesota and the surrounding area, this is where density should be, There are a lot of smart people that live here and we could be a world class city if we planned well for our future.

October 29, 2018

Mike Simurdiak

5916 Columbus Ave

Comment –

Dear Minneapolis 2040 committee- I have read through the revised Minneapolis 2040 plan, and I am not sure how the revisions will make any difference from what the original plan was going to incorporate. The StarTrib reported that the opposing comments to the original 2040 plan outweighed the supporting comments 2 to 1, yet the revised plan does not appear to address any of the original plans. Does the city really think that only allowing triplexes instead of four-plexes addresses concerns over neighborhood stability and affordable housing? It appears that the city is interested in telling us that this is what we need to do, even though its residents are overwhelmingly against the 2040 plan. It was as if those who were revising the plan did not listen to the citizens at all. My suggestion is to incorporate more density closer to downtown. This way it will preserve the character of the city and increase the density that the city seems to want to impose on us all. I am frustrated that this does nothing to address the affordable housing issue. Building more units will not lower housing prices to affordable rates. I wish I could offer a better suggestion as to what to do with the affordable housing issue, but just by building more does not mean this issue will be solved. What building more units will do is destroy our neighborhoods while the city becomes a cash cow for developers. Two issues that I am really concerned about: 1. The street that I am on is one block west of Chicago Ave. Therefore, the odd side of my street is completely zoned as Interior 4 near 60th st and as Interior 2 for the remainder of the block between 59th St and 60th St. On the even side of the street (where I live), it is proposed to be zoned as interior 4 near 60th st and interior 2 up to my house. My house would be the lone single family house surrounded by interior 2 dwellings. This is going to affect my property value and make our street look goofy with 4 houses surrounded by interior 2 dwellings. Why would we not zone the whole side of my block as interior 2 if this plan was to pass? 2. In order to build any new dwellings, old ones must be demolished. I want to make sure that the city has a plan and a way to enforce it to ensure that its residents (including small children) are not affected by any lead dust - similar to what has happened in many parts of Detroit. I sincerely hope that you take my suggestions and comments to heart. Please do not allow this plan to go through as revised. It still needs a lot more work to ensure a better Minneapolis.

October 29, 2018

Carol Batteen

4712 Chowen Av S

cbatteen1@yahoo.com

Comment –

Anyone who thinks more people/residents can be added to SW Minneapolis hasn't been in my neighborhood where parking is at a premium, traffic is constant, it's like living in Manhattan. I'm therefore against the 2040 plan which was put forward by someone who doesn't even live here (and backed by a recent transplant mayor). Why not develop the multiple empty lots and substandard housing available in Minneapolis? Why is onus on Mpls instead of sharing it with ST Paul and the close-in suburbs? What kind of Draconian plan is this? No other city in US has been "planned" in this fashion. I intend to vote out anyone who favors this plan, unfortunately I can't vote out the appointees.

October 29, 2018

Susan Saly

600 West 53rd Street, Mpls., MN 55419

Comment –

I am opposed to the current 2040 plan. Too much too soon. It is the cart before the horse. If the current 2040 plan gets pushed through, it is the developers who win and we will have more expensive \$\$ elite housing, not enough street parking, fewer starter homes for young families, and our current stable neighborhoods will be negatively impacted. For example, look at the Uptown area. Low income/middle income housing and rent has been changed to expensive rentals and condos. Uptown has even more congestion, less street parking, and fewer stable community-minded families. Families have moved yet still further out to the suburbs from once stable residential neighborhoods. Keep current residential housing. Perhaps allow for a FEW duplexes that are owner occupied. I live next to 2 apartment buildings at 53rd and Lyndale and kitty corner from another apartment building on Lyndale. There is not adequate parking for the apartment residents. Instead, perhaps tear down blight and abandoned buildings and build up with adequate underground parking. Respectfully, Susan Saly

October 29, 2018

Lynnell Mickelsen

4233 Linden Hills Blvd, Minneapolis 55410

Lynnellmick@gmail.com

Comment –

My husband and I have lived in Ward 13 for almost 30 years. Our children are grown, so at some point, we will want to sell our home and downsize. Which is why we are both big supporters of Minneapolis 2040. We WANT more density, more transit and more options in our neighborhood. We would LOVE to share a duplex or triplex with family and friends when we move out of our home. In the 30 years we have lived on Linden Hills Blvd, we have watched as many old duplexes and tri-plexes were converted into huge single-family homes. Our street has less diversity in income and age than when we moved in. I know the plan is often opposed by people our age (in our early 60s). I don't get it. We won't be able to drive forever. Density and more public transit make aging easier, not harder. I urge the City Council to please support the 2040 plan. Thanks for the consideration.

October 29, 2018

Jenna

7142 france ave north

jennaarons@icloud.com

Comment –

This is essential to protect affordable housing costs in minneapolis

October 29, 2018

Judith Bagan

4712 Chowen Av S

milesaway750@yahoo.com

Comment –

I live in Fulton half a block from SW Highschool, which was increased by 500 students last year. The traffic is like living on a freeway here and at 50th and France. Developers have put up umpteen mcmansions, two directly behind me altering sunshine, noise and loss of privacy. Two quite large apt bluildings are going up quite close by. Density has already overwhelmed us and parking is at a premium, since a lot of older homes have no garages. It seems like growth is already speeding along at a rapid pace, without this artificial plan. Neighborhoods will loose the charm and reason people wished to live here in the first place.

October 29, 2018

Danielle Franklin

2441 W 22nd St

Daniellepatti@gmail.com

Comment –

Allowing developers tear down old houses to build triplexes In neighborhoods will NOT increase affordable housing. It will only allow developers to make more money. Instead, encourage families to invest in neighborhoods and rebuild historic homes. Already in our neighborhood we had a developer tear down two 1950s single family homes and replace them with a three condos priced at million a piece.

October 29, 2018

Catherine Sullivan

5051 Nokomis Ave. S

sullicat.8@gmail.com

Comment –

Please, do not go ahead with proposition 2040. There has got to be a better way to grow our city! I have seen developer after developer tear down homes only to build giant, monster homes to the very ends of the property lines. Growing up in the city in the 1970s, my neighborhood had single family and multifamily homes on the same block. The single family homes were in multiple sizes. We had elderly couples, large families, small families, and renters. As children we ran easily between the houses through the "secret passageways." This was simply SPACE between homes. These developers have no love for our city only their pocketbooks. I am convinced if the prop 2040 goes through it will not diversify or make housing more affordable. In my current MPLS neighborhood, I would not be able to buy my home. In 1997, I bought my first home for \$87,000.00. I was in my second year of teaching in the MPS. I was lucky to have parents to help me. Even without their help, I could have afforded my home. Now...NO WAY! A house of similar size on my block just sold for \$360,000.00! A two bedroom bungalow with no upgrades! That is crazy! There are a ton of environmental concerns, too.

October 29, 2018

Michele Burns

4049 France Ave S

michelesburns@hotmail.com

Comment –

I oppose the 2040 plan. The Met Council's estimates call for less than 40k new residents (not households) in Minneapolis by 2040. The massive upzoning in the 2040 plan is complete overkill for only 40k new people. Since development can occur anywhere city planners are actually hobbled in doing their real job (PLANNING) for changes--i.e. creating and implementing plans for controlled growth within our community including the necessary infrastructure upgrades. Massive and uncontrolled upzoning won't lead to growth everywhere and it won't lead to more affordable housing. It will lead to more intensive density in certain areas (Uptown) where infrastructure changes (transit and roads) are more expensive to improve and will also lead to environmental degradation in some of the cities most beautiful and desirable areas. More paved surface and fewer trees and open land will actually decrease property values, and increase the effects of global warming and flash flooding (see <https://metro council.org/Communities/Planning/Local-Planning-Assistance/CVA.aspx?source=child>). It will also lead to more expensive housing costs. It won't lead to lower housing costs. As the Fed raises interest rates and labor and materials costs rise developers will double down on luxury housing because it is the only area of the unfavorable housing market that holds any chance of being profitable. (Real estate investors are guided by profit and as interest rates rise, projects need to throw off more income in order to crest the "risk free" rate of investment.) Furthermore as the city creates more ad hoc regulation on rental housing, developers and landlords will look to other markets with a less regulated environment for establishing rents, as well as managing and evicting undesirable tenants. A better approach to the issue of affordable housing as well as getting more development more evenly distributed around the city, would be to spend the time to develop a real long range plan that prioritizes development in certain underdeveloped areas of the city and then work with developers to get these areas developed in ways that benefit developers and the city. This more measured, planned, and collaborative approach between the city and developers would offer developers a better likelihood of profitable and successful projects and it would offer the city a better way to plan for, manage, and control the necessary infrastructure upgrades and their costs. I will add that the city council and planning offices pipe dream of a car-less city is never going to happen, nor should it. Many different people live and work in the city and not all of them will want or be able to take our (very substandard) transit system) or bike. So we have to plan the city around a future that includes large numbers of cars. Hopefully our society will make a massive transition to e-vehicles within next decade which will alleviate much of the CO2 from gas powered cars. And the city should also know that other innovations such as 5G (and beyond) may end up making it much easier for people to live rich lives far from cities. In any case the pace of technological advancement will quicken and may be surprising to our limited 2018 vision--perhaps the 2040 plan will end up looking like the hubris driven pipe dream of fools. Finally, I will say I have never been so embarrassed and disappointed with the mayor, city council, and city

Minneapolis 2040 Comprehensive Plan Public Comments

planning office. 2040 is not a plan; it is a sell out to developers who, in an abnormally low interest rate financial environment, begged the city to change the zoning code. But times have changed; the fed has set upon a path of rate hikes and monetary tightening--the low interest rate environment is over which means all the promises those developers made back in 2016 and 2017 are g-o-n-e....like the wind. The mayor, city council and planning office are one very critical step behind the curve and when all the deficiencies of this non-plan 2040 plan become clear to everyone, know that elected and appointed heads will roll, and since we are in the social media era where reputations live on, I hope no one ever forgets who was behind this fiasco.

October 29, 2018

Sarah Gorajski

59

gorajski@gmail.com

Comment –

I am strongly opposed to the current draft 2040 plan. I am not alone. I door knocked in my immediate neighborhood, and you will see that many of my neighbors are also opposed to the plan. I encourage you to drive up and down Columbus, Park, and Oakland streets between 58th street and 60th street and see all the red signs in opposition to the plan. Those signs popped up quickly, and none of them disappeared after the draft revisions were published. My concerns with the plan are as follows: 1) I fully support more affordable housing in the city, but the plan includes no incentive for developers to build lower-priced housing. Developers build housing that makes them the most profit, not what makes it easiest for people to afford housing. Luxury housing makes a larger profit than lower-cost housing, so this is what is being developed. We see this in Uptown, Northeast, and Edina. Even in my neighborhood, small houses are being torn down and replaced with \$700,000-800,000 homes. The current draft would significantly rezone my block and Chicago Ave to allow for up to four story buildings. If developers choose to build in my neighborhood, I think it is more likely that the modest homes will be replaced with expensive apartments or condos because that is what will make the developers the most money. More housing does not automatically equate to more affordable housing. 2) I also fully support remedying the racial and socioeconomic inequalities in Minneapolis, but the current plan does not include a detailed action plan for doing so. Nor does it offer any evidence to show how increasing housing density as proposed, particularly in a neighborhood like mine, will fix this issue. I doubt very much that when expensive condos or apartments pop up in my neighborhood that my neighborhood will become more racially and socioeconomically diverse. 3) I am concerned that the Mayor proposed this plan because his campaign was funded largely by developers. In other words, it appears the Mayor is being influenced by special interests. 4) The current plan's mid-block rezoning boundaries will more significantly negatively impact certain residents over others. For example, I live at 5916 Columbus Ave. Under the current plan, all houses on the odd side of my block and all houses south of my property on my side of the block will be rezoned for larger structures. If a developer chooses my neighborhood for development, most of my neighbors will receive offers for their home, but I will not because the rezoning cutoff is in between my house and my neighbor's. I strongly oppose any rezoning on my block, but at the very least, I request that the zoning on my block be consistent. I will be at a significant disadvantage if I am one of only four houses on my block with different zoning. 5) The current draft does nothing to preserve the character of the neighborhoods. Adding four story buildings to my neighborhood would drastically alter the character of the neighborhood. I encourage you to count the stories of buildings as you drive by them. Four stories is much higher than any structure in my neighborhood. If the plan is implemented, my current view of beautiful tree lined streets and natural light will be replaced with large structures that tower over the trees. 6) The plan falsely presumes that Minneapolis residents want a denser city. I do not want the density of my neighborhood to increase. My

Minneapolis 2040 Comprehensive Plan Public Comments

husband and I chose the Diamond Lake neighborhood because we love all that Minneapolis offers but did not want to live in one of the more dense neighborhoods, such as Uptown and Kingfield. While we enjoyed living in those two neighborhoods in our 20s, we are now ages 39 and 40 with four children and want a quiet neighborhood where our kids can run up and down our block and play with their friends across the street without fear that they will be hit by a car. When we taught our two oldest to ride a bike, we were able to do so in front of our house because our street was quiet enough for us to run behind them on their bikes in the street. If the current draft is implemented, my family will seriously consider moving to a suburb. I appreciate your consideration and encourage you to make further revisions to the 2040 plan. Sincerely, Sarah Gorajski

October 29, 2018

Julia Curran

Ward 7, Precinct 9
happify@gmail.com

Comment –

Overall, I SUPPORT the Mpls 2040 Comp Plan with strong reservations due to how conservative it is in the low cap on housing and the stringent regulations of and how it fails to address the two intertwined, pressing issues that Minneapolis faces: climate breakdown and racial segregation/inequity. In regards to climate change, I'm extremely alarmed at how tepid the plan is (and that it got weaker, rather than stronger) when compared with the rapid shift we need per the UN's IPCC. We know that shared walls are particularly important in a winter climate with the heating energy we require. We know we need higher density to allow the kind of neighborhoods that are walkable and bikeable and accessible for residents of all ages, regardless of disability. We know that we'll see people moving here displaced by climate breakdown, and we know that the first people to arrive will likely be at the income extremes. Fundamentally, the comp plan should be planned in a way that is compatible with our physical collective survival, with resiliency and reduction of GHG emissions at its core. The second draft undermines this goal, while the first draft was far from sufficient, particularly given how slow the rate of change will be. Secondly, both Comp Plan drafts fail to address, let alone rectify the racist redlining and racial covenants that divide our city. We need to be working to undo the legacy of segregation in our city, rather than perpetuating and reinforcing it through low-density and sprawl land use plans. As a long-time resident of Ward 7, I've seen how decreasing neighborhood interior densities have negatively impacted quality of life and amenities in Lowry Hill, as well as how neighborhood desirability increases in this area. Here's what we need to add in: >> More density around the lakes and parks, so more people can benefit from the amenities we have and so people can feel safe walking, running, and biking in our parks at all times of day/year. >> Smaller, more human scale complete neighborhoods that are more walkable, including for people like my father, who is 98 and walks about 2MPH now. >> More intense land uses like corridor 6 throughout ALL of Wards 7 and 13 in particular, even higher than the rest of the Mpls, in order to start addressing the shameful racial segregation that still plagues our city. >> More about how to support walkability, including smaller block size, more entrances per facade, removing highways. >> Allow commercial/mixed use by right in all parts of the city. >> Reduce building-to-building widths to more humane, walkable sizes. I'm not sure what the options are for bringing the plan into compliance with the increased land use intensity and rapid drops in car-dependency that the IPCC tells us we need by 2030, let alone the shifts we need to address our racial segregation and inequity while also welcoming an influx of new residents displaced by climate breakdown. I urge all involved to push not only for a stronger Mpls 2040 based on actual (and conservative--all of you know how difficult consensus is in gov documents within one city, let alone multinationally as the UN IPCC report represents!) scientific data and consensus. Our global timeline is shorter than the Comprehensive Plan looks to--we will see changes out of alignment with this plan BECAUSE of climate breakdown, regardless of what gets passed. It'd be helpful to have a document that can guide us without becoming completely

Minneapolis 2040 Comprehensive Plan Public Comments

useless almost immediately. We don't have time to allow xenophobia and privilege to dominate the ways our city makes decisions right now. We need to plan for our actual reality, not work to placate those for whom the status quo has worked, those who are the safest from danger as our world becomes less stable, those who have, by and large, shaped and chosen our city's current failings and failed to address our racial inequity. Our climate breakdown impacts first communities of color and people of color, both here and globally, both in terms of physical and financial vulnerability, but also in an increase in racist violence, xenophobia, and white supremacy as we're seeing locally and globally. I appreciate greatly and deeply respect the huge amount of work that this plan represents. I hope to see continued work to fully integrate the UN's IPCC report into all city efforts, at a pace faster than this plan.

October 29, 2018

Nathan Koster
5200 Park Ave
najako@gmail.com

Comment –

I support the goals and vision set forth in Mpls 2040.

October 29, 2018

Julie Williams

4425 34th Ave. S. Minneapolis MN 55406

juliew1952@comcast.net

Comment –

Street parking in our neighborhood has been very difficult in the winter since the light rail was built. With our designation as a Corridor 4 Land Use Form there is potential for it to become even worse. If you adopt this plan I hope that you will require apartment builders/owners to include enough off-street parking. I'm sure you want to encourage the use of mass transit, but right now people drive to our neighborhood and park on the streets around here, and then catch the train. Nobody walks any distance to catch the train, and train riders don't take busses if they can help it. I also hope you limit the number of 4-story apartment buildings that can be built on a single block. I have a garden as do many of my neighbors. I moved from a house with almost no sun and bought this house specifically because I wanted a garden. Your plan is so depressing to me. And the impact is going to be so far-reaching. It will drastically change my neighborhood, which I love. Please at least try to minimize the impact by requiring off street parking and limiting the number of 4-story buildings that can be built.

October 29, 2018

Dave Keepper

4940 Oliver Ave S, Minneapolis
davekeepper@gmail.com

Comment –

I have 4 major concerns/problems with the current version of the 2040 plan: - Lack of real-world evidence density = affordability - Transportation left to chance vs smart plan - Top down rules vs neighborhood control - Too much power in non-resident developers' hands Change is expected. Neighborhoods evolve. Let's do it right.

October 29, 2018

Anne Saari

4015 Colfax Avenue S.

asaari@visi.com

Comment –

I object to the current 4020 plan (even with amendments) because it doesn't CLEARLY maintain or even improve our city. I have lived in this city most of my life and love its quirky mix of single-family homes, rental units, and local businesses. It offers a lot to many. I have neighbors of almost all walks of life, age, & income brackets. The last few years, we've seen rampant building without regard to how it affects the community. I've read over & over how variances are doled out freely and dismayed by the undesirable supersized homes & awkward structures that don't fit in with the existing stock. The community needs assurances that developers, who frankly aren't concerned with people, will have to build responsibly. This isn't rejecting any group of people from living here - there should be protections put in place for both current and future tenants. The plan does not legitimately address affordable housing, parking, traffic, & the environmental impact. How difficult is it to be clear on what can happen here with this plan? Hiring an outside consultant to sell the plan does not clarify anything and the expense is offensive to tax payers. Heather Worthington & Lisa Bender do not seem to have valid reasoning for the plan or an understanding attitude, so the objective of this plan is suspect. Please slow down and do not pass the plan in its current state.

October 29, 2018

Bryan Hawkes

4736 Ewing Ave S

bryanhwks@gmail.com

Comment –

We submitted this during the public comment period, but also wanted to share directly with your office. Here are our thoughts on the Minneapolis 2040 plan from two very concerned, Fulton residents: We recently moved to the Fulton neighborhood this year (after deciding against building a new home in Excelsior or Wayzata) because of neighborhood feel, unique single family homes, proximity to the lakes, our jobs, downtown, shopping and many other amenities. While we agree that housing costs are high, encouraging density in housing will not guarantee affordable housing. Without government influence, developers and investors will charge market rates. Zoning that permits building multi-family housing where existing zoning allows single-family will remove the already limited supply of affordable houses. The least expensive houses will likely be targeted by investors as sites for potential apartment building re-builds. Traffic congestion in 50th and France Ave intersection and parking on the side streets is challenging already. The existing plan does not require builders to add off-street parking for prospective residents. Adding more residents will likely make parking very difficult for them and for current residents. More people will be biking in the future? That is not realistic for several segments of existing and future residents (e.g., the elderly, parents with multiple children, the list goes on) The streets may be bike friendly, however our climate is not bike friendly for at least six months of the year (think about global climate change impact on future severe weather). Proposed solutions to grow our city into the future: Focus improving the existing infrastructure. Help people in and around our city access better, more efficient transport to Minneapolis amenities without changing the makeup of individual neighborhoods. Improve our schools - the focus on helping people access "good schools" in "better" sections of Minneapolis sadly ignores the schools and neighborhoods with serious challenges. Strong education will bring better paying jobs and improve the opportunity for many of us to live and work in Minneapolis. Concentrate increased density in housing where existing and future infrastructure build out can support added population without unusual strain on surroundings. Add density where it makes sense: If someone wanted to live in a multiplex or condo, chances are they wouldn't want to live in a predominately single-family home neighborhood. If they wanted single family, they wouldn't want to live near or in downtown. Allow bigger houses, change setbacks moderately, etc. A large segment of the population is seeking and buying larger houses with modern amenities - and gladly paying the larger property taxes. It's a compromise. Overall, economic success for Minneapolis will come from a balance between: Encouraging growth of our population with strategic density and requiring more affordable units in existing multi-family units (e.g., north loop and uptown units are sadly overpriced - therefore "exclusive") Focus on improving our schools - all of them - not just those in Southwest Mpls. Keeping our infrastructure in top shape to meet the needs of a growing city. The continuing healthy mix of entertainment, amenities and lifestyle that drives visitors to Minneapolis year after year. Sincerely, Bryan & Michaela

October 29, 2018

Megan Dowdal-Osborn

5020 41st Avenue south

Megandowdal@usfamily.net

Comment –

I'd like to express my concern and disagreement with 2040.

October 29, 2018

April Grande

5124 Abbott Ave So - Mpls

aprilgrande@aol.com

Comment –

I am still against the 2040 proposal. I don't want our neighborhoods destroyed by putting up multiple storied rental units. It's been difficult enough seeing the McMansions sprouting up all around us. But at least they are single family homes and the people become involved in our community. Multiple rental buildings house transients who are here temporarily and are usually not interested in maintaining or improving our neighborhood. Also, these multiplexes are supposedly helping providing low-income housing but it has been shown that contractors do not include cheaper units in their buildings. It would be better if low-income people could receive help finding single-family homes and maybe receive subsidies to buy them. Also, I was totally appalled to learn that the 2040 committee had hired a PR team to try and appease the opponents of this plan. Their tactics were obvious and disgusting. The committee was hoping to ram it through in spite of all the opposition. This is not democratic. Wake up and consider the concerns of the residents of this wonderful city.

October 29, 2018

Nick Hill

3725 29th Ave S

Comment –

I'm in support of the 2040 plan. I preferred the higher density goals in the first draft, but I'm happy to see improved, clearer direction with affordable housing goals in the 2nd. I appreciate what the city is aiming to do with this plan. It's clear that there's not enough housing in the city to anyone who actually pays attention to what's going on around them, and increasing density is a worthwhile means to try and resolve that. Moreover, our population has changed. Our zoning laws need to reflect those changes and increase the diversity of housing. I also want to speak specifically about a fear I have with the public discussion surrounding this plan. It seems that a very vocal minority of citizens are very opposed to this plan, seemingly due to misinformation and spurious conclusions about negative impacts that increased density will have on their lives, property values, or safety. I don't frequently hear them citing any research or, frankly, any sound reason to justify their fears. It honestly borders on irrational, and I fear coming to a community meeting because of anxiety I have that these people will shout me down to oblivion. I cannot say clearly enough that I am not exaggerating that fear. Additionally, this opposition seems to largely be made up of a segment of the citizenry that has benefited from the current land-use laws, living in homes that have managed to gather value well above inflation due to the artificial home scarcity created by our current laws. That's great for them. But walking around the city, any casual observer would notice that there are a lot more people who don't have the luxury of housing stability. As a city, we need to make sure we look out for the interests of those people too. My support of this plan is bolstered by my belief that people living in this city should be able to find a place to live within their means. We're failing to do that with the current land-use laws, and we need to make changes to resolve that failure. Please don't let a privileged minority prevent us from trying to solve problems that are negatively affecting our community as a whole.

October 29, 2018

Matt Steele

4412 18th Ave S

matt@mattsteele.net

Comment –

I support the Minneapolis 2040 plan as drafted. I only wish it went further. This is critical for the future of Minneapolis, for our environment, and for our neighborhoods. I am a Minneapolis homeowner excited for what this means for my neighborhood. More importantly, I am hopeful for what this plan means for my son who will be 25 in 2040. Please pass this plan and fully implement its policies.

October 29, 2018

Ben Walen

2211 21st Ave S

benwalen@yahoo.com

Comment –

I am pleased that the 2040 Comprehensive Plan provides ways for the city to increase its density, in commercial nodes, along transit routes, and throughout the residential parts of the city. One of my favorite things about the built form in the neighborhood in which I live (Seward) is the diverse mix of residential structures, from single family homes to triplexes to walk-up apartment buildings to high-rises. There seem to be few blocks in the neighborhood that don't have some number of multi-family housing on them. In a time when we absolutely need to reduce our collective carbon emissions, we can create a more sustainable and less polluting city when we live with more density. This leads to better transit options and more commercial options in walking and biking distance from all the city's homes. There should absolutely be ways for the city to incentivize and/or require the creation of low-income housing (throughout all areas of the city), but we also simply need more housing in the aggregate. The 2040 plan has provided for greater density, while being respectful of the current built form throughout the city. So I ask my council member, Council Member Warsame, to support this Comprehensive Plan. Thanks.

October 29, 2018

Susan Rolandelli and Douglas Grina

4431 34th Ave S

rolandelli.grina@gmail.com

Comment –

Dear City Council, It has come to my attention that my block of 34th Ave between 44th St and 45th St has been suggested as a Zone 4 for the Minneapolis 2040 Plan. Here are my concerns: 1. This is a wonderful residential neighborhood; quiet and close-knit. I know my neighbors. While I know affordable housing is in short supply, I do not want to see the tenor my neighborhood so drastically changed to become a street lined with apartments and few houses. I would request that the expansion be reconsidered or very limited so as not to disrupt the general "feel" of the neighborhood as it exists today. This is my priority. 2. If there is going to be new housing, then make sure builders are required to make it affordable so a major problem for our citizenry is actually being addressed. 3. Require Off-Street Parking for any building being considered. This is essential. Thank you for your consideration. It is neighborhoods like mine that make the city so livable! Please keep that in mind and don't destroy it. Kind regards, Susan Rolandelli and Douglas Grina

October 29, 2018

Kevin Whelan

3605 Pleasant Ave S, Minneapolis, MN 55409

KevinWhelan.mn@gmail.com

Comment –

I support the Minneapolis 2040 plan and want to complement the city staff and leaders who had the courage to put racial equity and the views of communities of color at the center of the planning process. The vociferous reaction against the plan only underlies the need for this kind of courageous action. The most controversial part of the plan, removing the ban on small scale rental housing in all neighborhoods seems, to many affordable housing advocates, like a pretty modest step towards making historically segregated-white communities open to people of different incomes while gradually increasing the city's density. I have been fortunate to live as a tenant, (very) small time landlord and homeowner in Minneapolis neighborhoods (Powderhorn, Kingfield and Lyndale) with a diverse housing mix, and think that the rest of the city should welcome this diversity. I support Minneapolis's 2040 Plan because it supports a transition to a more just and sustainable future by:

- Pursuing a deep-carbon retrofit program and other building measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 80 percent by 2050;
- Encouraging the use of transit, biking, and walking over automobile trips;
- Creating more housing everywhere in the city, reducing urban sprawl;
- Advocating for the use of inclusionary zoning and preserving naturally occurring affordable housing;
- Reducing economic, housing, safety, and health disparities among people of color and indigenous peoples compared with white people;
- Calls for tenant's rights protections; and
- Generally increasing density, which is an economic, climate, and social plus.

Arts, culture, ideas, diversity, a concern for equity, and often movements for social change are characteristic of cities precisely because a lot of people live together and interact there. In regard to housing the plan would be even better if it:

- Included stronger and more specific policies to make sure that a substantial portion of new housing is reserved for lower income residents in perpetuity. These might include: a) strong inclusionary zoning language that specifies targets for the lowest income families, and the creation of units that help large families; b) investment in new, large scale public housing, particularly but not exclusively in neighborhoods that are segregated-white c) more detailed plans for creative forms of permanently affordable housing such as Community Land Trusts and a repeal of laws restricting the number of unrelated people living in a domicile; and
- Retained the original language to allow for higher density housing along transit corridors. The city cannot meet its climate goals by continuing to accommodate car-dependent lifestyles. The plan should be revised to better reflect the city's ambitions around climate and clean energy:
- The plans should call for explicitly for 100 percent electric buses within the city by 2030.
- Incentives for including additional specific renewable energy features in new developments should be included.
- The reference to "Explore the environmental attributes of renewable natural gas and biomethane programs potentially offered by CenterPoint Energy" should be deleted....there is no need to explore what the entire global scientific community has empathetically stated--fossil fuels must be phased out very rapidly, in favor of 100% clean energy. Our city's plan should reflect that.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

October 29, 2018

Sonja Sharp

4125 Colfax Ave S, Minneapolis, MN 55409

sonja.m.sharp@gmail.com

Comment –

I am a ten-year resident of East Harriet in Minneapolis. We spent most of that time living in a duplex on a friendly Aldrich block. Last spring we bought a single-family home a few blocks away. Our family is very connected to the neighborhood, with my sister's family, my parents, and many friends living nearby. Our kids go to Barton Open School. In the last few months, I've watched red signs sprout up, raising alarm about the 2040 plan. Bulldozing houses? Graceful arts and crafts homes zoned for extinction? Community versus developers? What is going on here? I researched the plan, and while I love our neighborhood and city, I believe it can—and must—become better than it is today. And I believe the 2040 Plan is an essential step in getting us there. First: climate. The U.N. just released a study warning of the dire consequences of temperature rise by the year—you guessed it—2040. We cannot delay in planning for a comprehensive plan that lowers our city's carbon impact. We need to make it easier, more convenient, and safer to use transit, walk and bike. We need to find creative ways to increase density all over the city. The 2040 Plan is built to tackle this challenge; it's a critical place to start. The 2040 Plan also addresses the need for more equity and diversity in our neighborhoods. By allowing multi-family dwellings on most residential blocks, it lays out a blueprint by which our city could become less racially and economically segregated. More housing, if accompanied by smart policy, will help increase affordable housing. We have seen cities like New York and San Francisco become largely inhabited by the wealthy, leaving poor and middle-class people displaced to the extent that restaurants struggle to find servers. We know that kids also do better in integrated neighborhoods. We need a plan that makes our city a welcoming place for all. Finally, I believe the 2040 Plan will lead to more connected, healthy communities. When neighbors see each other on the street, they get to know one another. Walking to the bus stop or biking to work builds in physical activity throughout day. There a pleasant bustle, a certain liveliness, in seeing neighbors out and about, a joy in interacting in those small ways, that over time, bit by bit, build a community. I urge the City Council to support the 2040 Plan. I see it as a vital step forward as we look to meet critical challenges with courage, generosity, and hope.

October 29, 2018

Kjell Olsen

2317 25th Ave South

kjell+mpls2040feedback@leanside.com

Comment –

Minneapolis needs to go much, much further with its 2040 plan if it hopes to come anywhere close to meeting the plan's stated goals on equity and climate change. It is embarrassing to everyone involved that polemical in-bad-faith arguments made by residents of wealthy white neighborhoods have significantly reduced the allowable density in the second version of the plan. I am ashamed of my fellow citizens for their support of the racist — oops, apparently to appease the insurgent racists we are now calling it "racially restrictive" — status quo. If Minneapolis wants to move forward into the mid-21st century as a livable city, its sights need to settle on vastly increasing housing while even more aggressively reducing personal automobile traffic. The 2040 plan alludes to this, which I applaud. However, it does frustratingly little to address it. I have a few suggestions. First, do everything possible to favor sustainable methods of transportation. Cars are not one of these. Lower the speed limit to 15mph, the speed which has proven to be about where drivers stop killing each other and the vulnerable, not-car-driving users of the street. Convert swathes of existing streets to pedestrian-only arcades, bikeways, and green spaces to ensure the safety of people using their own two legs safe and begin to cool our urban heat island. Reduce all streets to at most 2 car lanes. Once multi-lane through streets have been greatly narrowed to calm vehicle traffic, add substantial bus capacity in the vacated space. Convert requisitioned car lanes into bike lanes that will be safe for everyone from eight months to 108 years old. Maybe then the radical fringe who are today comfortable traversing our deadly streets by bike (3-5%?) will increase to an unremarkable majority! Close freeways to reclaim the hundreds of acres they dedicate to spewing toxic waste while also ensuring the wealth gap by gifting the well-off unfettered access to jobs and opportunity and leaving the vulnerable with few adequate transportation options and virtually no chance of any such affluence. Replace them with dense affordable housing and useful equitable transit. Address the damage done long ago to minority communities when I-94 and 35W slammed through the beating heart of vital minority neighborhoods, destroying them. [Sidebar: Where was the piteous concerned citizenry who now shout with their red lawn signs "Don't bulldoze our homes"? Do they realize the despicable irony in their attempt to maintain the white supremacy they have so long enjoyed?] Re-wild and restore once sacred places and traditions of the indigenous ancestors who for thousands of years and hundreds of generations stewarded the land we have stolen from them and brutally colonized. If you are reading this you are a person with some amount of power to begin to reform the vicious landscape of American capitalism into something better. It's our job, whether through politics, urban planning, or otherwise, to begin to redress racial disparities and address climate necessity. As bold and forward thinking as the current iteration of the 2040 plan is in naming some of these violent historical forces, it doesn't go anywhere near far enough. We, and this plan, need to do more than point out today's ills. We must take measurable action to heal ourselves, our fragmented relationships, and our broken culture. If we can't do this, we risk heating up our earth until

Minneapolis 2040 Comprehensive Plan Public Comments

it boils over, resulting in the massive chaos that is predicted upon our likely failure to stem catastrophic climate change. This plan is a tiptoe in the right direction, when we need to be making leaps and bounds.

October 30, 2018

Tyler Peterson

526 11th Ave SE

Tpeterson1997@gmail.com

Comment –

Overall the 2040 plan looks good. However I am disappointed that the plan for 4-plexes was reduced to triplexes, cutting density by 25%. We need upzoning to releived the pent up demand to live in the city center. I unfortunately will be leaving Minneapolis for grad school in the fall. When I have graduated, if Minneapolis has successfully increased the housing supply and promoted walkable neighborhoods, Minneapolis will be somewhere I look for work. I have loved living here for the past few years as a student. If Minneapolis maintains expensive housing, forcing anyone of moderate means and a family to the suburbs, I will be forced to look elsewhere.

October 30, 2018

Judi Thomas

5837 Park Av

Comment –

Please do not proceed with the 2040 plan, Minneapolis neighborhoods are one of the most beautiful features of the city. The affordable housing proposed is unlikely to be affordable. Reducing parking on street , increasing multiple housing dwellings will overload traffic problems and city sewer systems. We live in the city, use city streets, support city businesses, sent our kids to city schools, support our neighborhood organizations and hope our children and grandchildren will have the same prilivege. Home ownership in lovely , mostly single-family dwellings, paying taxes, maintaining their homes , participating in urban life without the headache of your current 2040 proposal. This plan is not for us!!!

October 30, 2018

James McCluskey

3329 47th Ave South

jmclus1@yahoo.com

Comment –

The reclassifying of all residential areas to allow high density housing is terrible. People bought and investment in areas based on policies that prevents the decay of the single family homes, a lot of people want single family homes, look at the demand...also I just heard that 2040 is also reclassify some open Park area to now be open for development.... Cooper Park as a example.....wow another assault on some beautiful communities.... terrible terrible ideas..... limit high density to very restricted transit corridors ...

October 30, 2018

James McCluskey

3329 47th Ave South

jmclus1@yahoo.com

Comment –

The reclassifying of all residential areas to allow high density housing is terrible. People bought and investment in areas based on policies that prevents the decay of the single family homes, a lot of people want single family homes, look at the demand...also I just heard that 2040 is also reclassify some open Park area to now be open for development.... Cooper Park as a example.....wow another assault on some beautiful communities.... terrible terrible ideas..... limit high density to very restricted transit corridors ...

October 30, 2018

Asiya Browne

2711 15th Ave S

asiyabrowne11@gmail.com

Comment –

I really support Minneapolis 2040. I think it's a great idea.

October 30, 2018

Tracy Jones

4146 30th Ave South
tlhiggs608@msn.com

Comment –

First I would like to say that I love living and working in Minneapolis. It is a beautiful city. I have noticed the change in affordable housing and am discussed with the fact that developers are allowed legally to put up these apartment complexes that are way out of reach for families. Also I believe that my neighborhood is being redlined because I have noticed that houses are selling but not to minorities. All I've been seeing are young white professionals moving in. Also when incomes are used to determine whether people qualify for certain programs, why is the gross incomes used? That is unrealistic because families have taxes, health insurance and retirement funds taken out, some even pay union dues. This is not fair because by the time all these things are taken out people probably take home 60 - 70 percent of that gross income. There should be controlled rents set in place, especially for families and a person's net pay should be considered, not gross. I think building a mix of homes is a great idea! I also think that a program should be in place that would allow a family to rent a house with the option to purchase. They would have to go through an educational program to get them ready for purchasing a home. People would be proud to participate in this type of program. My sister was in a program like that and she has been a homeowner for over twenty years. The habitat for humanity program is a good program but has flaws such as the requirement to have such a large sum of money in the bank. Tell me what family with low income can save thousands of dollars to put down on a home. As for employment unless there are some types of benefits for companies they will not hire fairly because they only hire people that look and act like them. Even if a person has a blemish they will still get the position of a black american. This even happens with employment in the City, at least that is what I've experienced in my department. How about developing employees that you currently have working for you? There are some of us that have been here for many years and still have a lot to go but are put in the corner and forgotten about. We still have experience and skills that are not being utilized. To me that is age discrimination. I have a suggestion regarding property taxes. If a person(s) live in a home for over twenty years their property taxes should be frozen, this way our Senior Citizens will be able to keep their homes if they want to. They are on fixed incomes and thier incomes are not rising with the cost of living so it's just not fair to tax them out of their homes that they paid for and lived in for many years.

October 30, 2018

Troy Davison

3348 47th Ave. S.
tdavison99@gmail.com

Comment –

Please approve the 2040 plan with the most increased density as possible. The world is changing and Minneapolis needs this to keep up with the demand and make room for everyone that would like to live here.

October 30, 2018

Jason Rudie

5105 portland avenue south

jason.rudie@va.gov

Comment –

I strongly disagree with the plans laid out in the Minneapolis 2040 plan.

October 30, 2018

John Speltz

4813 Ewing Avenue S.

johnspeltz@comcast.net

Comment –

Plan 2040 is a dangerous experiment. It is based on ideology - not proven fact. The result will ravage beautiful housing stock and blight the core of Minneapolis. It will NOT reduce energy usage but cost more. With self-inflicted, high-density housing and no off-street parking, buses will be useless. With this radical unbalanced approach, many existing conscientious home owners will leave south Minneapolis. Current residents with many options will not live next to an apartment building – they will move. Your plan will hollow out the city and kill the best part of Minneapolis. Most cities our size would LOVE to have areas like ours and you are killing the area. If you must, take a Greyhound bus to Milwaukee, check out the housing in the inner city. DON'T DO THIS ...

October 30, 2018

Ellie Jordan

1093 23rd Ave se Minneapolis MN 55414

Jorda689@umn.edu

Comment –

I support the 2040 plan. The housing crisis in this city is rampant. The development of a sensible plan to increase affordable housing (not just section 8!!!) for all people that aren't the upper class is long, long overdue.

October 30, 2018

Allison Plummer

4519 Chowen Ave S Minneapolis 55410

allison.booth@gmail.com

Comment –

I am extremely disappointed to be reviewing the "updated" plan and seeing very minimal updates to the plan from the first draft particularly in reference to the new zoning and the downstream impacts it will have. What is most concerning and frankly unethical representation of this city's constituents is the lack of community engagement or involvement in the development of this plan or ability to influence and drive changes to it. With such sweeping changes recommended, this plan should be VOTED ON. The builders of this plan are elected officials of the residents of this city. But the builders of this plan have not allowed their constituents to vote on these sweeping changes. Only 2% of the population of Minneapolis has awareness of this plan. TWO PERCENT! That is beyond shocking. On my block alone, most of my neighbors are not aware of this plan. That is a foundational problem. Initial community building meetings happened during the day – I was never aware of these. I work a 9-5 job as do many of the city's residents. How could we weigh in? Feedback meetings have been hostile, not collaborative, not solution oriented, but more importantly are not widely known about and now seeing the impact of these on the revised plans, disappointing in their ability to impact the plan. I love this city, I love my community, I pay a very high price both in my home price and my property taxes to live in my community. I am ok with that because I see the benefits in our park system, I see the benefits in my schools, and I see the benefits in my community. I believe that this should be the feeling and the opportunity afforded to residents throughout the city not just in my community. HOWEVER, this plan WILL NOT lead to those opportunities for all. This plan will create a further divide in the city's wealth disparities and break apart communities. This plan does not provide a sound, data-driven foundation for its perceived benefits. This plan does not address how there will be infrastructure built and established to support densification. This plan does not illustrate how communities will continue to be built and supported and the re-zoning tears them apart. This plan will not work. This plan has been proven to have extremely detrimental results in cities that have pushed similar plans forward (i.e. Seattle). This plan will HURT Minneapolis, it will break apart the very fabric that it is supposed to be strengthening. LET YOUR CITIZENS VOTE. HEAR YOUR CITIZENS' VOICES. CHANGE THE 2040 PLAN – DO NOT DESTROY MY CITY. DO NOT DESTROY MY COMMUNITY. SUPPORT COMMUNITY. SUPPORT MINNEAPOLIS. SUPPORT THE CITIZENS THAT YOU ARE SUPPOSED TO REPRESENT, BE OUR VOICE NOT OUR ADVERSARY.

October 30, 2018

Eric Van Oss

4145 22nd Ave S

ejvanoss@gmail.com

Comment –

I support the 2040 plan. We need more high density corridors with reliable transit access. Housing is increasingly unaffordable and we need to aggressively develop more housing for all socioeconomic groups in Minneapolis. All residents deserve access to public space, parks, and quality multi-modal transit. Please implement polices that reduce traffic/surface parking and boost density/walkability.

October 30, 2018

Heather Kregel

4924 Oliver

Comment –

if this plan goes through we will be looking to vote out the current representatives.

October 30, 2018

Stephanie Nichols

5420 Colfax Ave S

stephjnichols@gmail.com

Comment –

I disagree with the 2040 plan and understand that the comments that were made are being ignored. I agree with affordable housing but this plan does not promote that and per the recent Start Tribune article on developers it seems that they are also against it. I have talked at length with my council person Linea Palmisano and have sent emails to all the council people and the mayor. The only person to respond is my council person and she is in agreement with me to not move the plan forward. I recently moved from 55th and Aldrich Ave S to Colfax Ave S due to the uncertainty of what might happen behind my house. As the former block leader of 55XX Aldrich Ave S I know I speak for the whole block that they are very concerned with any development that is over 2 stories on 55XX Lyndale Ave S. The 2040 plan slates this section for 6-8 stories with no additional parking. Supposedly the plan takes into account the area plans, well that is questionable. I am fully supporting the group "Minneapolis for Everyone" and hope that the plan will not move forward with out more considerations and changes. The city planners said they talked to neighbors and groups but they did not in my area. My vote is to not move forward with this plan but to take this back to the table and truly meet with people in the areas (block leaders and neighborhood groups) to make a better plan.

October 30, 2018

Harry Poulos

3033 E Calhoun Pkwy #302

Comment –

Please return my block to its current zoning. Please specifically call out the shoreland district guideline height of 35 feet. Thank you.

October 30, 2018

John Rosengren

4654 West Lake Harriet Parkway

john@johnrosengren.net

Comment –

Even with the revisions, I think the 2040 plan still places too much control in the hands of the developers and not enough regulation to deter wanton and greedy development on the city's side. I also disagree that rentals are the best means to increase housing options. I believe if we can encourage home ownership we give individuals and families the chance to build equity and improve their overall standard of living. Consider my story: In 1996, when I was single, I bought a small house (800 square feet) in Linden Hills for \$115,000. The affordable price allowed me to get into the neighborhood, establish credit by making mortgage payments, and build equity. Two years later, when I got married, I sold the house for \$133,000 to a young couple with a child. Same story for them: the chance to get into the neighborhood, etc. A year ago, a developer bought the house for \$295,000, knocked it down and built a 3,600 square foot house that sold for \$1,050,000. This with the city's blessing. Gone was the opportunity for an individual or family of modest means to get into the neighborhood. Instead, yet another upper middle class individual or family becomes a resident. This is not an isolated incident; it's part of a larger pattern decreasing economic diversity in our neighborhood. The solution, as I see it, is not to allow more rentals but to limit the number of teardowns. I'm not opposed to them altogether—our next door neighbors greatly enhanced their property by replacing a rundown house with new construction—but I think this development needs to be allowed with careful consideration about the impact on the neighborhood. It would make sense to require that a certain number of smaller houses be left intact (or replaced at similar price points). Please give the 2040 plan some more thought to include ideas such as this one.

October 30, 2018

Melissa kinnard

6437 Creek View Lane, Eden Prairie, MN 55346

melissa.kinnard@gmail.com

Comment –

I don't see anything about Companion animal care and control, nor do I see anything about city wildlife. We could certainly be more progressive in these areas. An Animal Care and Control with emphasis on sharing and providing knowledge and resource through education and community outreach would be a good direction. The Current AC still feels very institutionally like "The dog catcher". It could be that friendly community resource that people come to and welcome when in need, or seeking help with their animals. There are progressive AC's in our country that could provide a template, or starting point for change.

October 30, 2018

Derek Holmer

Seattle, WA

Comment –

I no longer live in Minneapolis, but did for 6 wonderful years. This plan gives me hope for the future of Minneapolis and that when I return one day, it will be a more welcoming, affordable city where housing, not a McMansion, are a human right. The built form approach is exactly how cities should be approaching this issue. There should be no single family zoning, but to maintain a character of place through the built form allows for lower density neighborhoods but a vast increase in housing capacity. Don't listen to the loud voices of SW Minneapolis. They are the reason Minneapolis has a housing shortage in the first place. Bravo!

October 30, 2018

Kennedy Cole

4127 York Ave S. Minneapolis

kennedycole75@gmail.com

Comment –

I'm very concerned about the density push. Specifically, in SW Minneapolis, there are beautiful, historic homes along the 50th street corridor. I raised my kids in a bungalow right off of 50th on Thomas Ave. It was a wonderful neighborhood for families and kids. I can't imagine that you would tear down those homes to push for modern and sterile multifamily buildings. I like the goals of the plan, but you have gone to far. Don't wreck the best parts of the city. Appreciate the neighborhood gems and leave them alone.

October 30, 2018

Ellen Schmitz

ellenno23@gmail.com

Comment –

First, I have severe concerns with this plan in that there has not been enough evidence provided on the long-term sustainability of a plan like this to understand what are the long term impacts to neighborhoods where high density housing is prevalent. (And what were the impacts to displaced residents) Secondly, this plan does not seem to take into consideration the impacts to the community where homeowners, as part of a retirement plan, are counting on having their home paid off and no mortgage payments in retirement. Has your assessment taken this population into account in the assessment, and if so, how many families will be impacted? If not, why not? For those community members who are/will be living on a fixed income (either in retirement or otherwise) but yet are forced out of their single residence through eminent domain, what is the plan to make them “whole”? Will the city provide equitable housing for these families, will the city pay the going market value for the purchase of a single family home elsewhere? Lastly, and most importantly, why are the tax paying citizens of Minneapolis not being allowed to vote on this plan? Please provide a detailed, specific response to my email, and not a canned response. Sincerely, Ellen & Tim Schmitz, homeowners in Longfellow (East 40th Street) for 37 years.

October 30, 2018

Tony Taylor

3852 24th Ave S 55406

Comment –

South Minneapolis neighborhoods are unique. I have lived in 4-plexes, high risers and different cities. The community atmosphere in south Minneapolis is the best. I am from a small town, my neighborhood as a small town feel. People are friendly, look after each other and communicate often. In high risers, people keep to themselves. Here, people look after each other, people look after houses, cars and pets. That's what one wants in neighborhood. We Have That.

October 30, 2018

Matt Price

3837 Lyndale Ave S

matthewlprice123@gmail.com

Comment –

I don't love it. I live right on Lyndale and my home would be removed. The crime and traffic in the neighborhood is weekly issue. Cramming more people into an already over populated neighborhood will only make matters worst. Where are people going to park that live in these complexes? Aren't developers going to be the ones that have more to gain than the renters? What about using that very large plot of land that K Mart sits on?

October 30, 2018

Nina Ebbighausen

175 Malcolm Avenue SE, Minneapolis, MN 55414
nebbighausen@alliance.us

Comment –

1. The City of Minneapolis 2040 Plan's proposed heights remain significantly too high in the Prospect Park area. The 30-story heights along and near University Avenue adjacent to Prospect Park threaten the quality of the pedestrian realm by reducing open space and access to sunlight and by overwhelming / breaking continuity with existing building stock. Notably, this is one of very few areas outside of the downtown zone (ringed by highways) with this height allowance. Given the relatively narrow width of University Avenue, the proximity of the historic water tower (marking the highest point in Minneapolis), and the immediate adjacency of the residential neighborhood, I consider this a poorly conceived and short-sighted proposal from a planning perspective. Developments beyond 10 stories will create a canyon along University, overwhelming the scale of the Minneapolis water tower landmark as well as surrounding neighborhood. Proposed heights should be reduced accordingly. Among many great resources available for reference, please read *Great Streets* by Allan Jacobs regarding recommended proportions of building heights to street widths and what constitutes pedestrian-friendly street and city planning.

2. Please adopt the Prospect Park Plan submitted to City of Minneapolis Planning in December 2017 into the City of Minneapolis 2040 proposal. I do not see a small area plan for Prospect Park included in the amended 2040 Plan. Prospect Park spent several years building consensus and working closely with prospective partners (including developers) to create a plan for development that reflects the unique quality of the area and accommodates density in concert with affordability and pedestrian-friendly conditions. I believe the Prospect Park Plan meets the criteria for future growth set by the City, it (notably) reflects residents' "feet on the ground" understanding of place, and it already has the support of local residents and businesses. In contrast, the Minneapolis 2040 Plan appears to apply a generic approach to density across the city, thus failing to respond to the unique qualities that make Prospect Park vibrant and diverse.

3. I am concerned that the City of Minneapolis 2040 Plan limits the amount of parking required to be provided by new developments. The revised Plan indicates "Eliminate off-street parking minimums throughout the city and re-evaluate established parking maximums to better align with City goals." The imprecision of this language suggests it is a euphemism for reduction of parking to what I consider untenable levels. With our narrow Prospect Park streets, parking is already too limited, especially in the winter, when accumulation of snow forces one-sided parking, and especially during Gopher games at the University of Minnesota. Already, fire trucks are not able to pass unobstructed through certain neighborhood streets during the winter. Additional street parking loads caused by increased density within the neighborhood will be untenable within an increased population - even assuming a substantial decrease of automobile usage within this population. Though I am indeed an advocate of biking and mass transit, I work two jobs and take night classes. I would not be able to maintain these without the use of my car. One job requires me to make site visits far out of reach of mass transit (and does not offer the use of a company car or car

Minneapolis 2040 Comprehensive Plan Public Comments

subscription). Further, the time between job one and job two as well as job two and my night classes is too brief to accommodate the prolonged transit times associated with using bus, light rail, and bike. (As a result, I use mass transit occasionally rather than regularly.) My house does not have a viable off-street parking space. Because of the hilly nature of Prospect Park, many of my neighbors face similar circumstances. It is also noteworthy that the students living in my neighborhood predominantly own and drive cars. As a result, I/we depend on on-street parking, the availability of which would be overwhelmed by increased demand resulting from the proposed increase in urban density. 4. Closing: The Minneapolis 2040 Plan proposes sweeping changes to the City at a scale that rivals the intrusion of highways 60 years ago. Even as amended, it still reaches much too far in its recommendations for height (notwithstanding the allowance for the City to increase these heights even further on a project-by-project basis) – particularly in the proposal for 30-story development in the Prospect Park neighborhood.

October 30, 2018

SHARON DWYER

4826 COLFAX AVE S

shadwy@msn.com

Comment –

RE: Complete neighborhoods First, developing not only affordable housing, but also high density housing near metro stations absolutely makes sense. Also near transit stops and bus lines. I don't know what it means to break up large blocks into small walkable blocks and wish you would explain that. A distance to walk makes not difference if a block is large or small if you need to get from a to b. What will you do? create alleys to cut blocks in half? No sense here. Also, what specifically is an auto oriented use that you would prohibit? I can't see that there is any such thing other than parking ramps, which of course may be necessary near a transit station and perhaps car washes, auto repair,? And what better place to get these things done than where you have to park your car all day anyway? The entire concept of walkable living districts is not entirely feasible. We can create little communes of employees who work at the businesses in the immediate area? As for shopping, unless we have grocers, targets, hardware stores every couple of miles it is not feasible to secure all our needs from tiny store fronts nor is it usually affordable. We still have to get on the bus or in the car to get the 8 bags of groceries, get to target or walmart across town, go to the doctor, the dentist the eye doctor. And who is to say the employees want to live in little company kingdoms? Transit is key here, not building cost prohibitive little mini communities around a transit station. Supporting affordable housing near transit is absolutely ideal. Encouraging such development on vacant property, especially any vacant property that the city owns is a good idea. Supporting employment growth along good public transportation corridors works perfectly. Much better than building publicly paid for transit to sports facilities who should be supporting their host city better. Minimizing regulatory red tape to encourage small business development and culturally diverse establishments makes good sense. As for making good food readily accessible, first of all I cannot believe you have to expand areas where grocers are allowed! You don't seriously prohibit a grocer anywhere, do you??!! And again, grocers every mile or two is not economically feasible so better public transportation is key. Regarding complete streets/pedestrians/biking: I moved here from the suburbs so I could avoid my car. But biking alongside heavy traffic is so dangerous I just won't do it. My son as a matter of fact has been hit and seriously injured while biking to work twice, neither driver stopped. There must be a better solution than bike lanes on Bryant, Lyndale, Hennepin, etc. I will only ride on side streets or the Park/Portland bike lanes, and the designated trails. Speaking of which, why is it so hard to figure out how to get places on the trails? We have had to ride, for example, the Kenilworth Trails several times to learn for ourselves how to get anywhere, and still don't have it figure out. Exits are not marked, so we experiment and hope that we will remember not only where the exits lead but how to get back to the trail from our destination! Surely something better can be done about signage, exits, entrances and mapping. We love to ride our bikes to large areas of interesting pedestrian activity, if we can identify such areas and then figure out how to safely get there without a car. With that said, I STILL NEED MY CAR! Naturally

Minneapolis 2040 Comprehensive Plan Public Comments

we do not all work in the city, I for one need to get to Mendota Heights. And even for 2 of us I certainly cannot walk to Kowalskis. I can't afford the prices and I can't carry 4 bags of groceries all the way home. Target and Walmart are miles away, Walgreens is limited and not necessarily well priced. So no, I don't want you to give the streets away to bicycles either! You need to properly evaluate each area and make smart decisions, not wishful or forced environments. This particular section of goals is important to get right as it supports so many other goals and plans. Please lets take this slow and implement the reasonable and productive changes a little at a time to properly evaluate the cost effectiveness and feasibility. Turning the whole city upside down will only drive many of us out. With our high taxes, yes, we have high expectations. We expect sound decisions that are fiscally prudent and customized to achieve community relevant results.

October 30, 2018

Janis Negratti

4846 Oakland Ave, Mpls

jknegratti@gmail.com

Comment –

I realize the need to house more people but cramming more people into the same space is not the answer. Look at any of the larger cities..Chicago, NY, LA. It is so congested, parking and navigating are impossible and it really comes down to only those with money can afford to live in many of area...increase in car insurance and house insurance to name a couple increased items. they still have housing issues. How about developing the outer parts/suburbs. the over crowding leads to increase in crime, litter, and overall expensive for less services. Lets not ruin what is so great about our large city of Minneapolis

October 30, 2018

Douglas Peterson

5008 Queen Ave South

douglasprinceton@icloud.com

Comment –

As disabled veteran already hard to find parking on weekends at my house.

October 30, 2018

Adam Plummer

4519 Chowen Avenue South

ajplummer@gmail.com

Comment –

First, basically nobody knew about these 200+ community engagements you all lean on when defending this plan. From there, the “engagements” were not meaningful in any way, and were constructed in a manner so that those participating would deliver the results the city council wants. Secondly, it has been reported that around 2% of Minneapolis residents are even aware of the plan. It’s almost as if this was done strategically and by design. You have everyone’s mailing address, and likely most people’s emails, yet you chose not to broadcast this. Third, the “revised” plan doesn’t change anything meaningful (and no you cannot say “we changed to tri-plexes from Frey, I mean four-plexes – that resulted from considerations related to the American with Disabilities Act). These “revisions” based on the overwhelmingly negative feedback from the first draft are insulting. This entire ordeal has been an embarrassing failure of the democratic process. Awareness of the city engagements, and then the plan, were minimal at best. I watch the news almost daily, listen to NPR while I am working (and paying taxes on my income and creating jobs) and I had no clue about 2040 until I started seeing yard signs. I’m sure that was by design. The community engagements since the original draft was released have not been solutions oriented, have not been collaborative, and displayed an irrational blind commitment from the mayor and city council to stick to the major points of the plan that are most controversial. The only conclusion to be drawn from this is that the plan is agenda based and not a product of community feedback. A review of everyone’s campaign finances can easily support this claim. Lastly, this is a reminder that up zoning has NEVER WORKED. NEVER EVER. NOT ONCE. You all will not succeed where Seattle and others have failed, the reason being that the economics this is based upon are entirely flawed. This entire ordeal is a catastrophe and as a resident I am embarrassed by my elected officials responsible for this plan. I welcome the lawsuit against this that is forthcoming and look forward to the consequences of this plan’s effect on everyone’s careers and aspirations. This is a matter that should be voted on.

October 30, 2018

Jay Sorensen

5746 Bloomington Ave

ezgoing_1958@yahoo.com

Comment –

Please do not go forward with the 2040 plan. It will change Minneapolis in a bad way. Also, it appears to be "shady" as select contractors will be making a lot of money. For the record, me and my wife, Donna, will not be voting for the mayor and/or Jacob Frey, in next election, if they are on board with plan. Thank you for reading this.

October 30, 2018

Sarah Calhoun

3535 Bryant Ave S #313, Minneapolis MN
sarahdcalhoun@gmail.com

Comment –

As a renter, librarian, and historian, I am in full support of the 2040 plan. It is well beyond time to try to erase the centuries of harm done to this city from racist zoning practices and red lining. I cannot believe this is even up for debate. (See also: <https://www.mappingprejudice.org>) I want to note that I currently live in a 7 story apartment building that houses many senior citizens who would benefit from increased density. There are a large number of disabled renters in both my building and the building across the street who also benefit from density. Renters are not terrorists. Please do not let a disgruntled few ruin things for the rest of the city.

October 30, 2018

Brian Cole

6124 3rd Ave S, Minneapolis
misterbcole@gmail.com

Comment –

Please stop! There's no room for more cars! Our houses are already very close together, it's already dense.

October 30, 2018

Barbara Speltz

4813 Ewing Ave. So.
barbspeltz@gmail.com

Comment –

Plan 2040 has not been thought through and the city is ignoring the residents of Minneapolis! We have thousands of signatures in opposition to the plan and yet the city pushed it through to phase 2. Ridiculous! Minneapolis neighborhoods are a treasure to be preserved. Adding multi-housing will NOT reduce energy usage but rather cost more and take away green space with these large footprints. Did the city suddenly become disinterested in raingardens, butterflies, bees and green space to enhance our planet and create communities? Your 2040 plan with no off-street parking will make busing useless. With this ridiculous plan home owners will leave south Minneapolis. Your plan will kill the best part of Minneapolis. Most cities our size would LOVE to have areas like ours and you are killing the area. Listen to the citizens who live in these neighborhoods for this city shouldn't be a dictatorship, but rather a democracy.

October 30, 2018

Molly Hauver

1715 E. 57th st, Minneapolis 55417

molly.n.rich@gmail.com

Comment –

I could not disagree more with the 2040 plan. To put in transit corridors in residential neighborhoods is a bad idea. Increasing the amount of mass transit where so many families live is bad! Also, what the 2040 plan is trying to do hasn't been tried in other big cities. You don't know if it'll work. It's a big experiment. From what I've read...an investor might come in and build low income housing. Then after a few years, the property is sold. A new investor comes in, makes some updates and will increase rent. You are putting everyone at risk by doing this! It'll change the safety of the neighborhood! How do you ensure low income stays low income? How would you feel if a triplex moved in next to you? Do neighbors in a single family home want a triplex next to them? If an investor buys a single family home, they can essentially outbid a family trying to buy a home. It leaves fewer affordable single family homes on the market.

October 30, 2018

Valerie Hurst-Baker

4737 Grand Ave S #1

vhurst007@gmail.com

Comment –

I support the 2040 plan (and wish the 4plex provision was not removed) - increased density alone will not solve the affordable housing crisis, but it's a crucial step toward mitigation of this as well as fighting sprawl. I'm a renter in SW Mpls and have noticed that a lot of anger at the plan stems from a failure to understand that the abundance of single family homes is not a coincidence but rather the result of zoning changes. There is also a perceived fear that density = renters with absentee landlords. My husband and I have full-time jobs but cannot afford to buy where we currently live- a greater variety of housing options such as a condo in a triplex/fourplex building is extremely appealing. For those who aren't as privileged, expanding options for affordable housing (beyond busy transit corridors and areas already saturated with rentals) can benefit the whole community- the Opportunity Atlas shows that your zip code can make an enormous impact on future success

October 30, 2018

Cindy Davis

4849 Ewing ave s
cin.d@me.com

Comment –

i live in minneapolis because i don't want to live in New York, or Chicago or D.C. , where people are crammed together, layered in boxes. whose vision is this? the same people who decided it was a good idea to put McMansions on a small city lot? there's this grand plan with not enough details, without full community support that will be carried out by developers who live somewhere else, like nyc or chicago or d.c. so much energy directed to an imperfect, unimaginative end. we can't even figure out how to get the southwest high school students to pick up their trash in Pershing Park...

October 30, 2018

Kevin Walker

4332 Fremont Ave S, Mpls, MN 55409
walke009@umn.edu

Comment –

I strongly oppose the current zoning changes as proposed in the current second draft of the 2040 plan for several reasons. First, we have already seen an incredible increase in the number of apartment buildings and other rental units built in the South and Southwest Minneapolis region in the past 5-10 years. For example, drive down Lyndale Ave S, Hennepin Ave S, Lake Street, the Greenway, etc. and see the incredible changes and current building taking place. This is already significantly changing the nature of these communities and there does not appear to be any end in sight. Second, I believe that this proposal is being promoted by the developers and those who would profit from this change in zoning. These are the same developers who have bought and torn down many of the modest and moderately priced small homes in the area and build large, expensive homes in their place, further contributing to the shortage of affordable housing in the area. Do we honestly believe that they will exercise any kind of restraint if the zoning laws are changed/relaxed? I, for one, do not. As another example, drive through the neighborhoods of South Minneapolis, Southwest Minneapolis and Edina or St. Louis Park and you will see countless examples where developers have torn down a small affordable house and built a large, expensive house that does not fit with the neighborhood. They have fueled the market of overpriced and oversized houses and now we are seeing the aftermath. The housing market is slowing and housing values have already started to decline. Finally, if the developers are allowed to tear down and build multiplexes in these neighborhoods in the widespread areas that are described in the 2040 Plan, this will decrease the value of the surrounding homes in the area even further. Many people rely on the equity they have in their homes to help build their American Dream. We do not work hard and save in order to buy a home for our family only to see the value of the home decrease thanks to short-sighted City Council members and greedy developers. Our neighborhoods have tremendous character and charm. Please, please, do not destroy this jewel that we have. For those of us who live here, we have chosen to live here instead of moving to the suburbs. Please help us preserve what is great about living in Minneapolis. I believe that these changes are being proposed by people who do not live in South Minneapolis or Southwest Minneapolis, nor do they have the best interests of the community in mind. I encourage you to listen to the constituents in this area and reject the current plan as written. Thank you. Kevin Walker 4332 Fremont Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55409

October 31, 2018

Will Kaye

4545 Zenith Avenue South

willkaye1@msn.com

Comment –

I OPPOSE the 2040 plan as it is for too many reasons to list here. The biggest concern is the change to the character of the neighborhood I have invested in for the past 25 years. Allowing multi unit dwellings in the neighborhood without any plans to address parking is a problem when parking is already a problem in this neighborhood. You need to listen to the feedback from the residents in Minneapolis and change or abort the current plan.

October 31, 2018

Virginia Peterson

5008 Queen Avenue South

vpeterson8@me.com

Comment –

Altering the character of neighborhoods is not a feasible way to provide housing. If carried out it will only lead to people moving out of Minneapolis and destabilizing neighborhoods. This type of plan has failed miserably everywhere it has been tried. Why is that not being looked at? In addition parking on Minneapolis streets is already difficult. This plan would exacerbate this. People are not going to give up their cars and use mass transit.

October 31, 2018

Christopher Paola

2821 43rd Ave S

cpaola@visi.com

Comment –

Increased density makes basic urban environmental and social goods possible, like walkable shopping and effective mass transit. Arguments about parking are beside the point: we shouldn't be so dependent on cars in the first place. Like it or not, the population is going to keep growing for the foreseeable future. The density of housing will determine how much more land we will have to destroy to accommodate that growth. In my view there is nothing most of us can do for the natural environment that is more effective than to discourage building more houses on it. It's pretty simple: Being pro-environment means being anti-sprawl.

October 31, 2018

Camille Benoit

4905 Upton Ave S
camilleb@mac.com

Comment –

This plan is based on flawed assumptions. 1. Density can be created without paying a price. With density, what you get is more strain on existing resources and infrastructure. With more people will come more cars (and yes, *households with kids will always need cars*), more sewers, more transportation, more strain on the natural environment that makes this city one I want to live in. 2. More people crammed into less space does not increase the quality of life for anyone; 3. There are MANY places in this city which are in need of re-development/development -- old, useless buildings that should be torn down to make way for the affordable housing. This plan overlooks the obvious places that need re-development, instead it's looking to further developing areas that are now full of charming, well-maintained properties. 4. The only winners will be the developers. Even with a "mandate" for affordable housing, the simple rules of supply and demand will apply -- and the lakes will always be in high demand, making it impossible to maintain low rents. Demand will always push prices up. 5. Transportation. Buses, trains -- back to part one: Infrastructure doesn't exist to support this plan. MTC is already cutting service because they don't pay drivers enough to put up with what it takes to drive a bus. Trains do not move fast enough (that would require they be placed underground, which costs even more.) In today's world, time is the most precious commodity and PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION IS FAR TOO SLOW. - CAMILLE BENOIT 4905 UPTON AVE S 55410

October 31, 2018

Betsy England

101 Arthur Ave SE

england.elizabeth@gmail.com

Comment –

I moved to Minneapolis five years ago from Chicago, and before then I lived in New York and San Francisco. In all those other cities I loved the walkable access to amenities and the excellent public transportation. While I do enjoy biking much more in Minneapolis than I did in New York or San Francisco, I find the public transit system here to be frustrating, except for the train; the train is great! I am now the mother of a son who has some lung issues, and I'm very concerned about the abundance of cars in Minneapolis. For that reason alone I am very excited about the 2040 Comprehensive Plan, as it aims to reduce car use and increase public transit. I also support the increase in density, as I like walking places. Overall I strongly support the Comp Plan, and I look forward to the City Council voting its support of the plan soon. Thank you very much.

October 31, 2018

John Hartmann

5157 Queen Ave So

hartmann.john@aol.com

Comment –

I attended the Planning Commission Meeting on 10/29/18 (staying until the long and bitter end)----there to support those who were there to oppose the Revised 2040 Plan, particularly how it so significantly impacts allowable density in single family home neighborhoods through "zoning". A few things were apparent from the meeting and the many comments that were made: 1) Those that support the Plan were largely made up of lower income renters who did not indicate much interest in actually owning a home; 2) Those that oppose the Plan were largely made up of middle class income homeowners who had a goal ten to forty-plus years ago of owning their own home and raising a family in the City of Minneapolis; 3) While most (but not always all) of the Commissioners at least had the appearance of listening intently to those who came to make their comments (for over 4 hours), they had already made up their minds, and that being so despite the overwhelming number of negative comments and opposition to the Plan that preceded that evening and that were made during the evening. Quite clearly, that meant that the whole exercise was mostly a sham, perhaps simply to "allow" homeowners, those who have helped build the City of Minneapolis into the desired home of many and who have, while doing so, endured outrageously high real estate taxes for decades, to "vent" without any hope whatsoever of changing the course of this arrogant, ill-conceived and harmful Plan that has such great potential for hurting the those who put the Mayor, the Commission, the City Council and others in the position to do the harm itself--all of that without giving those it impacts any vote on the decisions made (except, perhaps, to vote the culprits out of office at the earliest opportunity). Many of those who were allowed to comment complained of not even knowing the "Plan" was being developed, much less the actual content of the "Plan", until it was welll underway. I was astonished--literally amazed, as were virtually each of my neighbors up and down both sides of my block, to find out about the existence of the process and the "Plan" and that it had already underwent a first draft----moreover, that the City Council members were already 11-2 in favoring that "draft" ! Shame upon and a hopeful quickly-coming end to the political aspirations and careers of all those who have developed, supported and whom have brought this much hated "Plan" into existence.

October 31, 2018

Joey Reid

1215 W 24th St Apt 3
reid0084@yahoo.com

Comment –

Many areas of the city have limited access to commercial zones. This causes people to drive to other areas to buy groceries, shop and meet people. Small scale commercial uses should be included in the Urban Neighborhood designation to allow walkable communities EVERYWHERE. Corridor Mixed use and higher should require multistory buildings and ban drive-throughs. I regularly walk down Hennepin Ave S between Franklin and Lake and have to cross more driveways than signalized intersections. Each driveway is like an uncontrolled intersection: drivers rarely yield to pedestrians and often make unsafe entrances or exist due to the lack of traffic control. For that reason Corridor 6 must ban drive-throughs and limit curb cuts as a first step towards walkable streets. Why are Hennepin Ave S (Routes 6, 12, 17, 114, future E-Line), Nicollet Ave S (Route 18), Chicago Ave S (Route 5, future D-Line), Lake St (Routes 21, 53 and future B-Line), Penn Ave N (Route 19, future C-Line) and Emerson/Fremont N (Route 5), 46th St east of Hiawatha (A-Line) excluded from Transit 10 or Transit 15? They all have all-day high-frequency service and are some of the most productive transit routes in the system. Policy 16, environmental impacts of transportation should include an explicit goal of reducing vehicle miles traveled by reducing the number and length of trips. This can be done by better integrating land-uses across the entire city, not just in areas of existing high density and mixed uses. Policy 18, Pedestrians, should include a goal of publicizing and enforcing state-law requiring motorists to yield to pedestrians at any non-signalized intersection. Portland did this many years ago and life for pedestrians is much easier, less stressful and safer. Policy 20, Transit, should include the stated goal of higher-density and mixed-use zoning around high-frequency transit. Transit is most successful when it connects a mix of uses, at high densities, in a straight line at high frequency. Policy6, Pedestrian oriented building..., items g and h are at odds with the goals of increasing pedestrian activity. Around the world people prefer to walk through dense neighborhoods with narrow streets. People love the old parts of Paris, London, Madrid, Florence, and Tokyo (among many others), all places where shading of public spaces is common because multistory buildings are built to the property line. Rather than vague language about minimizing shadowing, we should encourage development with pedestrian alleys that open up to public squares faced by active uses including restaurants and retail. Policy 25, innovations in transportation..., should explicitly require prioritizing pedestrians and bicycles over vehicles, especially autonomous vehicles. I don't see anything in the plan about limiting the number of short-term rentals like AirBnB, a maximum on the number of days of rental, or limiting permits for rental. It's pretty clear now that short-term rentals can displace people from previously affordable housing. Please add language to the housing policy to prioritize residents over short-term visitors in our housing stock.

October 31, 2018

Gaelle Berg-Mefleh

405 Main Street NE

gaelle.berg@gmail.com

Comment –

I would like to suggest that when planning for increased housing in Minneapolis, we keep in mind the health of our environment and the aesthetics of designing building with PEOPLE in mind. We need to think of the effect that construction of buildings has on communities and how they can build communities of people and not just increase the mass and density of population. This should be done mindfully, with PEOPLE in mind. What is the effect of hundreds of stacked apartments in huge square buildings on the community of people who live in an area. How do people interact and build community under the effect of concrete monoliths that separate people from each other and their environment. Huge towers and square monoliths are not the answer for creating a human community. To build communities in which people interact together and care for their environment and nature, an approach that puts the community of people first, before big realtors and profiteers, and the health and beauty of the environment is essential to the planning effort. What legacy are we leaving for the future? We need an approach that combines mindful, human-scale aesthetics and community-based decisions with smart growth and healthy environments. Many other communities around the world have done this by involving people from the communities in the design, decisions, and determination of the outcomes. This is how you build a city that people live in, they don't just occupy a cubicle for the benefit of big corporations. Human scale, human aesthetics, human communities. Please!

October 31, 2018

Rebecca

Phillips West

Comment –

As a government employee and a homeowner in the Phillips West neighborhood, I am very disappointed for the lack of attention and foresight within the 2040 plan for my neighborhood. I give the team whom put this together a big FAIL for the lack of effort for a leaving to the neighborhood plan that dates to 2009. In my opinion this is the behavior that continues this regions disparity gaps! Shame on you. Please come to the Phillips West Neighborhood Board and meeting to engage our community. Please take my 2017 property taxes and apply it to spending the time necessary to have a well thought out plan for my neighbor that assists with a good quality of life for the people and businesses within it. To be efficient, here is the verbiage to the Phillips West neighborhood from the online 2040 master plan: "Plan Background The purpose of the Phillips West Master Land Use Plan is to serve as a guide for investment and future land use changes within the boundaries of the Phillips West neighborhood. This work was initiated by the Phillips West Neighborhood Organization, which contracted with Hay Dobbs to conduct the planning process and produce the plan document. The Minneapolis City Council adopted the plan as city policy on July 17, 2009. Phillips West Master Land Use Plan (2009) Future Land Use and Built Form Future land use recommendations from the Phillips West Master Land Use Plan are largely consistent with the future land use map in Minneapolis 2040. Properties guided for 'Public, Office, and Institutional' uses in Minneapolis 2040 attempt to match what is in the master plan, with some minor changes where existing residential uses are not expected to accommodate future mixed use development. Commercial uses continue to front Lake Street. Most of the remaining properties in the study area are guided for 'Urban Neighborhood'. Built form recommendations from the master plan are not parcel specific, or lack specificity in the way Minneapolis 2040 is attempting to achieve. The Midtown Minneapolis and Midtown Greenway plans were heavily relied upon to guide built form in the southern end of the study area, where a combination of 'Corridor 6', 'Corridor 4', and 'Transit 10' is applied. Elsewhere in the neighborhood, application of 'Interior 3' is the standard, due to the area's close proximity to downtown." Again, I give this effort a FAIL and expect our city leaders, city employees and their perspective consultant(s) whom worked on this to do much better.