LAND USE APPLICATION SUMMARY

Property Location: 635 Van Buren St NE
Project Name: 635 Van Buren Apartments
Prepared By: Shanna Sether, Principal City Planner, (612) 673-2307
Applicant: 635 Van Buren LLC
Project Contact: Cody Fischer
Request: To allow for a new four-story residential building with 23 dwelling units.

Dwelling Units: 23 dwelling units

Required Applications:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rezoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Petition to rezone the property located at 635 Van Buren St NE from the R1A Multiple-Family District to the R3 Multiple-Family District, retaining the BFC6 Corridor 6 Built Form Overlay District.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Plan Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For a new four-story residential building with 23 dwelling units.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SITE DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1A Multiple-Family District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFC6 Corridor 6 Built Form Overlay District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7,780 square feet / 0.18 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ward 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saint Anthony East Neighborhood Association; adjacent to Marcy Holmes Neighborhood Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Land Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Neighborhood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goods and Services Corridor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Ave NE, one-half block east</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway St NE, two blocks north</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Built Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corridor 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date Application Deemed Complete: March 25, 2022
Date Extension Letter Sent: March 2, 2022
End of 60-Day Decision Period: April 26, 2022
End of 120-Day Decision Period: June 25, 2022
BACKGROUND

SITE DESCRIPTION AND PRESENT USE. The first structure on the property was built as a single-family dwelling in 1893. The original structure was later converted to a two-family dwelling and then was demolished in 1974. The existing single-family dwelling on the property was constructed in 1976.

SURROUNDING PROPERTIES AND NEIGHBORHOOD. The properties in the immediate area, south of Broadway St NE, north of Spring St NE, and west of Central Ave NE are predominantly single- and two-family dwellings. Properties north of Broadway St NE and east of Central Ave NE are a mix of commercial, industrial, and low-density residential. The properties immediately adjacent to the subject property along Van Buren St NE are single-family dwellings and Community Commons Park is across the public alley to the north and east.
PROJECT DESCRIPTION. The applicant is proposing to demolish the existing single-family dwelling to construct a new four-story, multiple-family dwelling with 23 units. The project will have a combination of one-bedroom and one-bedroom + den unit types. The applicant is providing a bicycle room on the first floor with 36 bicycle spaces. The proposed building will not be serviced by natural gas, and will be powered, heated, and cooled by electricity. The applicant is also proposing a 30-40 kWh rooftop solar array.

The existing property is zoned R1A Multiple-Family District and BFC6 Corridor 6 Built Form Overlay District. The R1A District allows up to three dwelling units in a single-residential structure. Therefore, the applicant is proposing to rezone the property from R1A to R3 Multiple-Family District to allow for the proposed 23-unit building. In addition to the rezoning application, the applicant has applied for site plan review.

PUBLIC COMMENTS. Staff have received several comments from the public. Public comments received up until the publication of the staff report are attached. Any additional correspondence received prior to the public meeting will be forwarded on to the Planning Commission for consideration.

ANALYSIS

REZONING

The Department of Community Planning and Economic Development has analyzed the application for a petition to rezone the property at 635 Van Buren St NE from R1A Multiple-Family District to R3 Multiple-Family District, retaining the BFC6 Corridor 6 Built Form Overlay District based on the following findings:

1. Whether the amendment is consistent with the applicable policies of the comprehensive plan.
The proposed zoning would be consistent with the applicable guidance and policies of *Minneapolis 2040* (2020):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Land Use</th>
<th>Guidance</th>
<th>Staff Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td>Urban Neighborhood is a predominantly residential area with a range of allowed building types. May include small-scale institutional and semi-public uses (for example, schools, community centers, religious institutions, public safety facilities, etc.) scattered throughout. Like the Neighborhood Mixed Use category, commercial uses can continue serving their existing commercial function. Commercial zoning is appropriate for these properties, while expansion of commercial uses and zoning into surrounding areas is not encouraged.</td>
<td>The subject property is designated as Urban Neighborhood. The Urban Neighborhood designation would support a variety of uses, including residential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goods and Services Corridor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Ave NE (one-half block east)</td>
<td>Goods and Services Corridors serve two purposes: 1) To indicate where commercial uses should front in relation to properties guided for commercial future land uses, and 2) In addition to the guidance for the mixed use land use categories found in this section, Goods and Services Corridors identify where the establishment or expansion of commercial uses can be considered. Properties immediately adjacent to a Goods and Services Corridor may be considered for commercial activity, allowing for uses similar in scale and scope to the Neighborhood and Corridor Mixed Use categories.</td>
<td>Good and Services Corridors encourage greater residential density to support nearby commercial uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Built Form Guidance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor 6</td>
<td>New and remodeled buildings in the Corridor 6 district should reflect a variety of building types on both moderate and large sized lots. Building heights should be 2 to 6 stories. Building heights should be at least 2 stories in order to best take advantage of the access to transit, jobs, and goods and services provided by the Corridor 6 district. Requests to exceed 6 stories will be evaluated on the basis of whether or not a taller building is a reasonable means for</td>
<td>The proposed building would be four stories, which exceeds the minimum height of two stories and is less than the maximum height of six stories.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following goal from *Minneapolis 2040 (2020)* apply to this proposal:

**Goal 1. Eliminate disparities:** In 2040, Minneapolis will see all communities fully thrive regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, country of origin, religion, or zip code having eliminated deep-rooted disparities in wealth, opportunity, housing, safety, and health.

To achieve the goal of eliminating disparities, the City of Minneapolis will work to undo the legacy that remains from racially discriminatory housing policies by increasing access to opportunity through a greater diversity of housing types, especially in areas that lack housing options as a result of discriminatory housing policy.

**Goal 2. More residents and jobs:** In 2040, Minneapolis will have more residents and jobs, and all people will equitably benefit from that growth.

To achieve the goal equitably benefiting from that growth, the City of Minneapolis will create new opportunities for people to live throughout the city by allowing and encouraging the development of new multifamily housing of various sizes and affordability levels, including in areas that today contain primarily single-family homes.

**Goal 9. Complete neighborhoods:** In 2040, all Minneapolis residents will have access to employment, retail services, healthy food, parks, and other daily needs via walking, biking, and public transit.

To achieve the goal of access to daily needs via walking, biking and public transit, the City of Minneapolis will allow more housing to be built in places close to transit, retail services and employment areas.

**Goal 10. Climate change resilience:** In 2040, Minneapolis will be resilient to the effects of climate change and diminishing natural resources and will be on track to achieve an 80% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2050.

To achieve the goal of climate change resilience, the City of Minneapolis will strive to substantially increase the energy efficiency of buildings by retrofitting existing buildings and improving the design of new buildings. It will also work to accelerate the transition to renewable energy in buildings and transportation. Minneapolis will establish a pattern of development and a transportation network that prioritizes pedestrians, bicyclers and transit users.

The following policies and action steps from *Minneapolis 2040 (2020)* apply to this proposal:

**Policy 1. Access to Housing:** Increase the supply of housing and its diversity of location and types.

a. Allow housing to be built in all areas of the city, except in Production and Distribution areas.

b. Allow the highest-density housing in and near Downtown.

c. Allow multifamily housing on public transit routes, with higher densities along high-frequency routes and near METRO stations.

d. In neighborhood interiors that contain a mix of housing types from single family homes to apartments, allow new housing within that existing range.

**Policy 6. Pedestrian-Oriented Building and Site Design:** Regulate land uses, building design, and site design of new development consistent with a transportation system that prioritizes walking first, followed by bicycling and transit use, and lastly motor vehicle use.
a. Orient buildings and building entrances to the street. Encourage multiple entrances to multi-family residential buildings. The number of entrances in non-residential uses should increase in proportion to the length of the building and be located along main corridors or at the street corner.

c. Require windows and window treatments on buildings that allow clear views into and out of the building.

d. Ensure that buildings incorporate design elements that eliminate long stretches of blank, inactive exterior walls through provision of windows, multiple entrance doors, green walls, and architectural details.

e. Integrate components in building designs that offer seasonal protection to pedestrians, such as awnings and canopies, to encourage pedestrian activity along the street.

g. Encourage building placement that where possible enables solar access and allows light and air into the site and surrounding properties and supports energy efficient lighting.

f. Implement and expand regulations and incentives that promote bicycling, such as the provision of secured storage for bikes near building entrances, storage lockers, and changing and shower facilities.

l. Eliminate the requirement for off-street parking minimums throughout the city, acknowledging that demand for parking will still result in new supply being built, and re-evaluate established parking maximums to better align with City goals.


c. Investigate heating in buildings and industrial energy needs and decarbonization options.

e. Identify and implement ways to encourage, incentivize, or require sustainable design practices and principles for privately funded projects.

g. Encourage use of environmentally responsible building materials and construction practices.

Policy 80. Development Near METRO Stations: Support development and public realm improvements near existing and planned METRO stations that result in walkable districts for living, working, shopping, and recreating.

a. Allow and encourage a dense mix of housing, employment, and commercial goods and services near METRO stations.

c. Require a minimum level of development near METRO stations to ensure that land is used efficiently near major transit investments.

d. Ensure that METRO stations are accessible via sidewalks and bicycle facilities including to those with mobility challenges.

e. Identify and implement strategic investments to increase connectivity and support development.

Staff finds that the proposed rezoning is consistent with the goals and associated policies above. The future land use designation in Minneapolis 2040, for the property is Urban Neighborhood. This designation supports residential uses with a range of allowed building types. The Built Form Designation is Corridor 6 which supports a variety of building types on both moderate and large sized lots. Building heights are required to be at least
two stories to best take advantage of the access to transit, jobs, and goods and services. The applicant is proposing to construct a new four-story, residential building with 23 units. The property has access to high-frequency transit including the #10 Metro Transit bus on Central Ave NE and the #17 Metro Transit Bus on Monroe St NE, three blocks west. The #10 Metro Transit bus is scheduled for upgraded service to the METRO F Line, an Arterial Bus Rapid Transit line, and the line is planned to begin construction in 2025. The planned METRO Stations will be located along Central Ave NE at Spring St NE, which is one-half block south of the subject property. Staff finds that the proposed rezoning from R1A to R3 is consistent with the future land use and built form guidance and associated policies stated above.

2. **Whether the amendment is in the public interest and is not solely for the interest of a single property owner.**

The proposed rezoning is not solely for the interest of the property owner. Rezoning of the site to R3 will allow for redevelopment of a property in a manner consistent with policies from Minneapolis 2040 that call for increased access to housing and transit-oriented development near a future METRO Station. The existing R1A Multiple-Family District does not allow for a multiple-family building with more than three units.

3. **Whether the existing uses of property and the zoning classification of property within the general area of the property in question are compatible with the proposed zoning classification, where the amendment is to change the zoning classification of particular property.**

The property is west of Central Ave NE and south of Broadway St NE; both streets are Goods and Services Corridors which include a combination of industrial, commercial, and low- to medium-density residential uses. Properties along on the east side of Central Ave NE are generally zoned for the I1 Light Industrial District and I2 Medium Industrial District. There are two properties northwest of the site at 718 Van Buren St NE and 705 Jackson St NE that are zoned R5 and are apartment buildings with 12 units each. The properties south of Spring St NE are also zoned R5; there is a 32-unit apartment building at 809 Spring St NE and a 189-unit apartment building at 828 Spring St NE. The properties in the immediate area to the subject property are predominately single- and two-family dwellings zoned R1A and R2B. The existing R1A District would only allow for up to three dwelling units, where more density is supported by the proximity to two Goods and Services Corridors and the built form designation of Corridor 6. The residential uses and very limited commercial and institutional uses which are permitted in the R3 District are highly compatible with the existing uses and zoning districts in the immediate area.

4. **Whether there are reasonable uses of the property in question permitted under the existing zoning classification, where the amendment is to change the zoning classification of particular property.**

The R1A Multiple-family District allow for predominately low density single-, two-, and three-family dwellings and cluster developments. In addition to residential uses, institutional and public uses and public services and utilities may be allowed. However, the R1A District prohibits multiple-family dwelling with four or more units, even though the property is designed for Corridor 6 and near an existing Goods and Services Corridor. While there are reasonable uses of the property permitted under the existing zoning classification, the proposed rezoning to R3 is more consistent with the applicable land use guidance in Minneapolis 2040, the comprehensive plan.

5. **Whether there has been a change in the character or trend of development in the general area of the property in question, which has taken place since such property was placed in its present zoning classification, where the amendment is to change the zoning classification of particular property.**

On December 18, 2020, the Minneapolis City Council adopted the built form overlay zoning districts and associated zoning code amendments to reflect the policies in Minneapolis 2040. As required by state law, the City has begun to review land uses and zoning districts to match the development guidelines that the City Council already approved with Minneapolis 2040. This process will take several years and will include updating the zoning classification of every property in the city to match the land use policies in Minneapolis 2040. The
future land use designation for this property is Urban Neighborhood with Corridor 6 built form guidance, which would support multiple-family zoning. Therefore, staff finds that the proposed rezoning to R3 is more consistent with *Minneapolis 2040*, the comprehensive plan.

**SITE PLAN REVIEW**

The Department of Community Planning and Economic Development has analyzed the application based on the required findings and applicable standards in the site plan review chapter:

**Applicable Standards of Chapter 530, Site Plan Review**

**BUILDING PLACEMENT AND DESIGN**

**Building placement — Meets requirements**

- The proposed project would comply with the building placement standards.

**Principal entrances — Meets requirements**

- The proposed project would comply with the principal entrances standards.

**Visual interest — Requires alternative compliance**

- The proposed project would comply with the visual interest standards, except for the first floor/north elevation where a blank wall exceeds 25 feet in length. The applicant has requested alternative compliance.

**Exterior materials — Meets requirements with Conditions of Approval**

- The applicant is proposing LP Smartside and Pac-Clad aluminum wall panel as the building’s primary exterior materials. The applicant is proposing a thin stone veneer at the base wrapping from the front elevation to the first bay of windows on the side. Staff is recommending that the applicant provide a masonry base material for at least 24” above grade to ensure that the materials maintain durability. Further, the use of plain-faced concrete block shall not be permitted. Exterior material or balcony changes at a later date may require review by the Planning Commission and an amendment to the site plan review.

**Windows — Requires alternative compliance**

- The proposed project would comply with the minimum window requirements, except for the first floor facing Van Buren St NE.
- For residential uses, the zoning code requires that no less than 20 percent of the walls on the first floor shall be windows. The applicant is requesting alternative compliance.

**Window Requirements for Residential Uses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st floor</td>
<td>20% minimum</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80 sq. ft.</td>
<td>47 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd floor and above</td>
<td>10% minimum</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49 sq. ft.</td>
<td>68 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ground floor active functions — Requires alternative compliance**

- The ground floor facing Van Buren St NE contains 62.7 percent (31 feet 1 inch) active functions. At least 70 percent of the first-floor building frontage facing the public street, public sidewalk, or public walkway is required to contain active functions. The applicant has requested alternative compliance.
Roof line – Meets requirements
- The principal roof line of the building is flat and similar to other nearby multiple-family buildings.

Parking garages – Not applicable
- There are no parking garages proposed as part of this project.

ACCESS AND CIRCULATION

Pedestrian access – Meets requirements
- There would be clear and well-lit walkways at least four feet in width connecting building entrances to the adjacent public sidewalk and on-site parking facilities.

Transit access – Not applicable
- No transit shelters are proposed as part of this development.

Vehicular access – Not applicable
- The proposed project is located on a public street and a public alley. There is no off-street parking required or provided for the project.

Residential developments without off-street parking or loading – Requires alternative compliance
- The proposed project does not include at least one (1) temporary drop-off and pick-up space. The applicant has requested alternative compliance.

LANDSCAPING AND SCREENING

General landscaping and screening – Requires alternative compliance
- The proposed project would comply with the general landscaping and screening requirements, except as noted below.
- The applicant is not proposing at least one canopy tree per 500 square feet of the required landscaped area, including all required landscaped yards. The tree requirement for the site is 2 canopy trees and the applicant is proposing 2 ornamental trees. The applicant has requested alternative compliance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7,780 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Footprint</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4,760 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Not Covered by Buildings</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3,020 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaped Area</td>
<td>604 sq. ft.</td>
<td>2,659 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canopy Trees (1:500 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>2 canopy trees</td>
<td>2 ornamental trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrubs (1:100 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>6 shrubs</td>
<td>6 shrubs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parking and loading landscaping and screening – Not applicable
- There is no surface parking proposed for the site, so the site is not subject to the screening and landscaping requirements for parking areas per section 530.170.
Additional landscaping requirements – *Meets requirements with Conditions of Approval*

- The project appears to comply with the additional landscaping requirements in sections 530.180, 530.190, 530.200, and 530.210 of the zoning code.

**ADDITIONAL STANDARDS**

Concrete curbs and wheel stops – *Not applicable*

- There are no surface parking spaces proposed on the site.

Site context – *Meets requirements*

- The proposed project would comply with the site context requirements.

Crime prevention through environmental design – *Requires alternative compliance*

- The proposed project would comply with crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) standards, except as noted below.
- The site plan shows opportunities to increase natural surveillance and visibility between the public and non-public spaces. The proposed project is not meeting the active functions provision or the minimum window requirement on the first floor facing Van Buren St NE and the applicant is seeking alternative compliance.
- The proposed site and buildings should promote natural observation and maximize the opportunities for people to observe adjacent spaces and public sidewalks. The proposed project is not meeting the active functions provision or the minimum window requirement on the first floor facing Van Buren St NE and the applicant is seeking alternative compliance.

Historic preservation – *Not applicable*

- This site is neither historically designated or located in a designated historic district, nor has it been determined to be eligible for designation.

**Applicable Regulations of the Zoning Ordinance**

Off-street Parking and Loading – *Meets requirements*

- The proposed project complies with the applicable vehicle parking, bicycle parking, and loading requirements.

**Vehicle Parking Requirements Per Use (Chapter 541)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Dwellings (23 units)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bicycle Parking Requirements (Chapter 541)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Overall Minimum</th>
<th>Short-term Requirement</th>
<th>Short-term Spaces</th>
<th>Long-term Requirement</th>
<th>Long-term Spaces</th>
<th>Long-term Spaces Without Stairs or Elevator (≥ 50%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Dwellings</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>≥ 90%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Required</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Provided</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall-Mounted Maximum (≥ 75%)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall-Mounted Provided</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Loading Requirements (Chapter 541)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Loading Requirement</th>
<th>Loading Spaces</th>
<th>Proposed Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Dwellings</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Building Bulk – Meets requirements**
- The proposed project would meet the applicable floor area ratio requirements in the BFC6 district.

### Building Bulk Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7,780 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Floor Area</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>19,040 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Building Height – Meets requirements**
- The proposed project would meet the applicable height requirements in the BFC6 district.

### Building Height Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Applied Premium(s)</th>
<th>Premium Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min. Height</td>
<td>2 stories, 20 feet</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Height</td>
<td>6 stories or 84 feet, whichever is less</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6 stories / 84 feet</td>
<td>4 stories / 39 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lot and Residential Unit Requirements – Meets requirements**
- The proposed project would meet the applicable lot and residential unit requirements.
- The application is subject to the delayed phase-in for smaller projects with 20-49 units and the project is not subject to the requirements of Inclusionary Zoning per section 535.90(c)(1) of the zoning code.

### Lot and Residential Unit Requirements Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area</td>
<td>5,000 sq. ft. min.</td>
<td>7,780 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Width</td>
<td>40 ft. min.</td>
<td>60 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impervious Surface Area</td>
<td>85% max.</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lot Coverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>70% max.</th>
<th>61.1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units (DU)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>23 DUs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Residential Area</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14,223 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yard Requirements – *Meets requirements*

- The project would meet the applicable yard requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setback</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front (West)</td>
<td>18 ft. 2 in.</td>
<td>18 ft. 7 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Side (North)</td>
<td>5 ft.</td>
<td>5 ft. 1 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Side (South)</td>
<td>5 ft.</td>
<td>5 ft. 2 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear (West)</td>
<td>5 ft.</td>
<td>14 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signs – *Meets requirements with Conditions of Approval*

- All signs are subject to Chapter 543, On-Premise Signs. The applicant will be required to submit a separate sign permit application for any signage that is proposed.
- The applicant has not proposed signage for the new building; however, all signage must comply with the ordinance, as no variances are allowed for signage in the Residence Districts.

Screening of Mechanical Equipment – *Meets requirements*

- Mechanical equipment is subject to the screening requirements of Chapter 535 and district requirements.
- All mechanical equipment is enclosed within the building or is screened from the public street by the building itself.

Refuse Screening – *Meets requirements with Conditions of Approval*

- Refuse and recycling storage containers are subject to the screening requirements in Chapter 535.
- The refuse and recycling storage containers are located within an enclosure at the rear of the property. As conditioned, the enclosure shall be at least two feet higher than the storage containers.

Lighting – *Meets requirements with Conditions of Approval*

- Existing and proposed lighting must comply with Chapter 535 and Chapter 541 of the zoning code.
- The applicant shall provide a lighting plan showing compliance with Chapter 535 of the zoning code as a condition of approval.

Fences – *Not applicable*

- Fences must comply with the requirements in Chapter 535. The applicant is not proposing additional fencing.

Specific Development Standards – *Meets requirements*

- The applicant’s proposal meets the specific development standards for a multiple-family dwelling in Chapter 536.

Solar Energy System – *Meets requirements*

- The applicant’s proposal meets the requirements for a building-mounted solar energy system in Chapter 535.
### Applicable Policies of the Comprehensive Plan

See Finding #1 under Rezoning.

**Alternative Compliance**

The Planning Commission or zoning administrator may approve alternatives to any site plan review requirement upon finding that the project meets one of three criteria required for alternative compliance. Alternative compliance is requested for the following requirements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Staff Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blank Walls</strong></td>
<td>There is a 31-foot blank wall on the first level of the north elevation.</td>
<td>The blank wall on the north elevation would be 5 feet from the shared property line with low-density residential use. The blank wall is near the front of the structure and would be visible from other properties and the public sidewalk. <strong>Staff recommends that the applicant comply with this standard.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Windows</strong></td>
<td>The first-floor elevation shows 12 percent of the walls facing Van Buren St NE are windows where 20 percent is required.</td>
<td>The applicant is proposing a passive house construction type that maximizes energy efficiency. The front elevation shows two doors with glass inserts, which are not calculated towards the minimum window requirement. The minimum window requirement is to ensure that natural surveillance and visibility is maximized. The first floor includes a bike storage room, small entrance lobby, and one dwelling unit. <strong>Staff finds that the minimum window requirement shall be met and recommends that the applicant comply with the minimum window standards.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active Functions</strong></td>
<td>At least 70 percent of the first-floor building frontage facing the public street. The ground floor facing Van Buren St NE contains 62.7 percent active functions.</td>
<td>The first-floor elevation facing Van Buren St NE includes a bike storage room, small entrance lobby, and one dwelling unit; only 62.7 of the front elevation meets the active function provision. <strong>Staff recommends that the minimum percentage of active functions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop-off Space</td>
<td>Where a newly constructed development with four (4) or more residential units provides zero (0) off-street parking or loading spaces, at least one (1) temporary drop-off and pick-space shall be provided and shall be clearly labeled as such. An accessible route shall be provided between the drop-off and pick-up space and the building. The applicant is not proposing a drop-off space.</td>
<td>The applicant is not providing any off-street vehicle parking. The subject property is adjacent to a public alley. The rear of the lot is proposed to have a trash enclosure, an ornamental tree, and transformer, but there is not sufficient area for a drop-off space. Staff is recommending that the planning commission grant alternative compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canopy Trees</td>
<td>The applicant is not proposing at least one canopy tree per 500 square feet of the required landscaped area, including all required landscaped yards. The tree requirement for the site is 2 canopy trees and the applicant is proposing 2 ornamental trees.</td>
<td>The applicant is proposing two Eastern Redub trees on the site; one at the front of the lot and one at the rear. This tree species does not meet the minimum mature height of 35 feet. Staff is recommending that the applicant provide the minimum required canopy trees for the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPTED</td>
<td>The floor plan does not employ best practices to increase natural surveillance and visibility. The proposed windows in the building do not promote natural observation and minimize opportunities for people to observe adjacent spaces and public sidewalks. The elevation along Van Buren St NE does not meet the active functions provision.</td>
<td>The applicant is proposing a passive house construction type that maximizes energy efficiency. The front elevation shows two doors with glass inserts, which are not calculated towards the minimum window requirement. The minimum window requirement is to ensure that natural surveillance and visibility is maximized. The first floor includes a bike storage room, small entrance lobby, and one dwelling unit; only 62.7 of the front elevation meets the active function provision. Staff finds that the minimum window and active function requirements shall be met in order to comply with the CPTED standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Department of Community Planning and Economic Development (CPED) recommends that the City Planning Commission and/or City Council adopt staff findings for the applications by 635 Van Buren LLC for the property located at 635 Van Buren St NE:

A. Rezoning.

Recommended motion: The City Planning Commission recommends that the City Council approve the petition to rezone 635 Van Buren St NE from the R1A Multiple-Family District to the R3 Multiple-Family District, retaining the BFC6 Corridor 6 Built Form Overlay District.

B. Site Plan Review.

Recommended motion: The City Planning Commission approves the site plan review for a new four-story, multiple-family dwelling with 23 units, subject to the following conditions:

1. All site improvements shall be completed by March 21, 2024, unless extended by the Zoning Administrator, or the permit may be revoked for non-compliance.
2. CPED staff shall review and approve the final site, elevation, landscaping, and lighting plans before building permits may be issued.
3. Blank, uninterrupted walls that do not include windows, entries, recesses or projections, or other architectural elements, shall not exceed twenty-five (25) feet in length, in compliance with section 530.120 of the zoning code.
4. At least 70 percent of the first-floor building frontage facing the public street, public sidewalk, or public walkway shall contain active functions in compliance with Section 530.120 of the zoning code.
5. To ensure the durability of the exterior materials the applicant shall provide a masonry base material for at least 24” above grade.
6. Concrete masonry units shall not be allowed.
7. Not less than 20 percent of the walls on the first floor facing Van Buren St NE shall be windows, in compliance with Section 530.120 of the zoning code.
8. The applicant shall provide at least one canopy tree per 500 square feet of the required landscaped area, including all required landscaped yards, in compliance with Section 530.160 of the zoning code.
9. All signs shall comply with Chapter 543 of the zoning code. All signage requires a separate permit from CPED.
10. The refuse and recycling screening shall be at least two feet higher than the storage containers.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Rezoning ordinance
2. Oblique aerial photo
3. Written description and findings submitted by applicant
4. Survey
5. Site plan
6. Plans
7. Building elevations
8. Renderings
9. Photos
10. Public comments
ORDINANCE

By Goodman

Amending Title 20, Chapter 521 of the Minneapolis Code of Ordinances relating to Zoning Code: Zoning Districts and Maps Generally.

The City Council of the City of Minneapolis do ordain as follows:

Section 1. That Section 521.30 of the above-entitled ordinance be amended by changing the zoning district for the following parcels of land, pursuant to MS 462.357:

Lot 22 and the North 20 feet of Lot 23, Block 2, SIBLEY ADDITION TO ST. ANTHONY, Hennepin County, Minnesota (635 Van Buren Street NE – Plate #15) to the R1A Multiple-Family District to the R3 Multiple-Family District, retaining the BFC6 Corridor 6 Built Form Overlay District.
Context
The property currently consists of a single-family home and 2-car detached garage on an ~7,800 square foot lot. Currently zoned R1A, the property is designated by the Minneapolis 2040 comprehensive plan for “Urban Neighborhood” land use and “Corridor 6” built form. The parcel has alley access and no curb-cut off Van Buren Street.

The #10 bus stop is located ~0.5 blocks away at the corner of Central Avenue & Spring Street, and the #30 crosstown bus stop is located ~1.5 blocks away at the corner of Central Avenue & Broadway Street.

Project Description
635 Van Buren LLC is seeking a zoning change for 635 Van Buren Street NE to deconstruct (for salvage) the existing single-family home and construct a new low carbon footprint, 4-story, ~19,500 gross square foot multifamily building to be used for rental purposes. The new building will feature 23 market-rate rental units. The units will be a mix of moderately sized 1-bed and 1-bed plus den units.

The new rental units will be attainably priced, market rate, pet-friendly housing for individuals and families that desire a transit & bike oriented, low carbon footprint urban lifestyle. The project includes upgraded indoor bike parking (~1.5 bike parking space per unit), cargo-bike parking, a bike cleaning / maintenance area, and pet cleaning station. There is no proposed commercial space or off-street car parking.

The project incorporates ambitious sustainability goals in addition to providing much needed attainably-priced housing in a high demand area with access to excellent transit & bike infrastructure, desirable retail & service amenities and key job centers.

Sustainability Goals
1. Minimum 30% reduction in embodied carbon of building materials
2. Net-zero energy ready (See US Department of Energy)
3. Passive House certification

Key Sustainability Features
- 100% electrified, no natural gas
- 30-40 kWh rooftop solar array
- Low carbon footprint construction materials
- Insulation & air tightness far exceeding code requirements
- Energy Star appliances
- High efficiency heating, cooling and fresh air systems
- Enhanced bike amenities
- Construction durability – Science-based design to ensure a 100+ year building

The project will use Passive House design principles, construction techniques and durable low carbon footprint materials to create a draft-free, comfortable, quiet, and healthy environment for residents, while reducing energy consumption 50-70% and insulating residents from volatile/rising energy costs, energy supply disruptions and extreme weather events.

All heating, cooling, ventilation and appliances will run exclusively on electricity, eliminating the need for natural gas and a dangerous source of indoor air pollution. With insulation and airtightness far exceeding code requirements, ultra-efficient heating, cooling and appliances, and a ~30 kWh roof mounted solar array, the proposed project pushes the envelope on building design for durability, climate resiliency and achieving net-zero carbon emissions.

Embodied and operating emissions reductions will be quantified and shared with any interested stakeholders.
Construction materials will be of higher quality including LPSmartSide siding, LVT flooring, stainless steel EnergyStar appliances, granite countertops and lower embodied carbon insulation. The intended construction schedule will be to start in June 2022.

The proposed project requires a Rezoning Application to change the zoning from R1A to RM3. The building will be used exclusively as residential rental units in conformity with the applicable regulations of the district in which the property is located.

Sincerely,

Cody Fischer

Owner / Applicant
Cody Fischer
635 Van Buren LLC
Mobile: 612-567-3990
Email: service.ckmj@gmail.com
Address: 1995 Grand Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55105
February 1, 2022

Saint Anthony East Neighborhood Association
PO Box #18130
Minneapolis, MN 55418

RE: Proposed Project, Zoning & Land Use Application at 635 Van Buren Street NE
ATTN: Christina Perfetti, Phil Jones, and SAENA Board Members

Members of the Saint Anthony East Neighborhood Organization:

I am writing officially inform you of my submission of Land Use and Re-zoning applications for a proposed multifamily project at 635 Van Buren Street NE, Minneapolis, MN 55413.

Thank you again for the opportunity to present the project and get feedback from the Saint Anthony East community at your meeting on January 25th, 2022.

Context:
The property currently consists of a single-family home and 2-car detached garage on a 7,800 square foot lot. Currently zoned R1A, the property is designated by the Minneapolis 2040 comprehensive plan for “Urban Neighborhood” land use and “Corridor 6” built form. The parcel has alley access and no curb-cut off Van Buren Street.

Land Use Application: The proposed project will require a Rezoning Application to change the zoning from R1A to RM3. No variances or conditional use permits are being requested.

Project Description:
The existing buildings on the site will be deconstructed by the nonprofit by Better Futures Minnesota for salvage and reuse. The new proposed structure for the site is a low carbon footprint, 4-story, ~20,000 gross square foot multifamily apartment building containing 23 rental units. It is anticipated that the units will be a mix of 1-bed and 1-bed plus den units.

The pet-friendly rental units are designed to be attainably priced at market rate, for individuals and families that desire a transit & bike oriented, low carbon footprint urban lifestyle. The project includes upgraded indoor bike parking (~1.5 bike parking spaces per unit), cargo-bike parking, a bike cleaning / maintenance area, and pet cleaning station. There is no proposed commercial space or off-street car parking.

The building will be slab-on-grade, wood framed construction with a flat roof. Façade and exterior finishes were chosen to blend with the neighborhood aesthetic and to achieve the project’s rigorous sustainability goals.

The project incorporates ambitious sustainability goals in addition to providing much needed attainably-priced housing in a high demand area with access to excellent transit & bike infrastructure, desirable retail & service amenities and key job centers.

Sustainability Goals

1. Minimum 30% reduction in embodied carbon of building materials
2. Net-zero energy ready (See US Department of Energy)
3. Passive House certification
Key Sustainability Features

- 100% electrified, no natural gas
- ~40 kWh rooftop solar array
- Low carbon footprint construction materials
- Insulation & air tightness far exceeding code requirements
- Energy Star appliances
- High efficiency heating, cooling and fresh air systems
- Enhanced bike amenities
- Construction durability – Science-based design to ensure a 100+ year building

The project will use Passive House design principles, construction techniques and durable low carbon footprint materials to create a draft-free, comfortable, quiet, and healthy environment for residents, while significantly reducing energy consumption and insulating residents from volatile/rising energy costs, energy supply disruptions and extreme weather events.

All heating, cooling, ventilation and appliances will run exclusively on electricity, eliminating the need for natural gas and a dangerous source of indoor air pollution.

With insulation and airtightness far exceeding code requirements, ultra-efficient heating, cooling and appliances, and a ~40 kWh roof mounted solar array, the proposed project pushes the envelope on building design for durability, climate resiliency and achieving net-zero carbon emissions.

Embodied and operating emissions reductions will be quantified and shared.

Engagement

I appreciate the engagement and correspondence we have had on the project since kicking things off in our first conversation on November 8th, 2021. Attached is a copy of the “SAENA Developer Checklist” I submitted for SAENA staff and board review on November 22nd, 2021. I appreciate you publishing this on your website and sharing with the community. Thank you again for the opportunity to present the project and get feedback from the Saint Anthony East community at your meeting on January 25th, 2022.

Included below is my contact information.

Sincerely,

Cody Fischer

Owner / Applicant

Cody Fischer
Mobile: 612-567-3990
Email: service.ckmj@gmail.com
Address: 1995 Grand Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55105
February 1, 2022

Mr. Michael Rainville  
350 S. Fifth St., Room 307  
Minneapolis, MN 55415

RE: Proposed Project, Zoning & Land Use Application at 635 Van Buren Street NE  
CC: Ryan Sancartier, Henry Järvinen

Dear Council Member Rainville,

I am writing to officially inform you of our proposed multifamily apartment project at 635 Van Buren Street NE, Minneapolis, MN 55413.

**Context:**

The property currently consists of a single-family home and 2-car detached garage on a 7,800 square foot lot. Currently zoned R1A, the property is designated by the Minneapolis 2040 comprehensive plan for “Urban Neighborhood” land use and “Corridor 6” built form. The parcel has alley access and no curb-cut off Van Buren Street.

**Land Use Application:** The proposed project will require a Rezoning Application to change the zoning from R1A to RM3. No variances or conditional use permits are being requested.

**Project Description:**

The existing buildings on the site will be deconstructed by the nonprofit by Better Futures Minnesota for salvage and reuse. The new proposed structure for the site is a low carbon footprint, 4-story, ~20,000 gross square foot multifamily apartment building containing 23 rental units. It is anticipated that the units will be a mix of 1-bed and 1-bed plus den units.

The pet-friendly rental units are designed to be attainably priced at market rate, for individuals and families that desire a transit & bike oriented, low carbon footprint urban lifestyle. The project includes upgraded indoor bike parking (~1.5 bike parking spaces per unit), cargo-bike parking, a bike cleaning / maintenance area, and pet cleaning station. There is no proposed commercial space or off-street car parking.

The building will be slab-on-grade, wood framed construction with a flat roof. Façade and exterior finishes were chosen to blend with the neighborhood aesthetic and to achieve the project’s rigorous sustainability goals.

The project incorporates ambitious sustainability goals in addition to providing much needed attainably-priced housing in a high demand area with access to excellent transit & bike infrastructure, desirable retail & service amenities and key job centers.

**Sustainability Goals**

1. Minimum 30% reduction in embodied carbon of building materials
2. Net-zero energy ready (See US Department of Energy)
3. Passive House certification

**Key Sustainability Features**
• 100% electrified, no natural gas
• ~40 kWh rooftop solar array
• Low carbon footprint construction materials
• Insulation & air tightness far exceeding code requirements
• Energy Star appliances
• High efficiency heating, cooling and fresh air systems
• Enhanced bike amenities
• Construction durability – Science-based design to ensure a 100+ year building

The project will use Passive House design principles, construction techniques and durable low carbon footprint materials to create a draft-free, comfortable, quiet, and healthy environment for residents, while significantly reducing energy consumption and insulating residents from volatile/rising energy costs, energy supply disruptions and extreme weather events.

All heating, cooling, ventilation and appliances will run exclusively on electricity, eliminating the need for natural gas and a dangerous source of indoor air pollution.

With insulation and airtightness far exceeding code requirements, ultra-efficient heating, cooling and appliances, and a ~40 kWh roof mounted solar array, the proposed project pushes the envelope on building design for durability, climate resiliency and achieving net-zero carbon emissions.

Embody and operating emissions reductions will be quantified and shared.

**Stakeholder Engagement:**

In addition to seeking your input, we have been proactive about engaging the broader community prior to the submission of this land use and rezoning application.

In early November 2021 (prior to starting design on the project) I contacted Christina Perfetti at the Saint Anthony East Neighborhood Association to discuss how to best engage the community on the project. Attached is a copy of the “Developer Checklist” I submitted on November 22nd, 2021 for the SAENA staff and board review on. After reviewing the submission, the Board published the Developer Checklist on their website for the community and invited us to present and get comments on the project at the SAENA community meeting on January 25th, 2022. I understand you joined that community meeting, and I appreciate you taking the time to hear our presentation and hear community feedback directly.

I welcome the opportunity to discuss the project with you and would be grateful for any feedback you have on our project goals, design, and city applications. Included below is my contact information.

Sincerely,

Cody Fischer

**Owner/Applicant**
Cody Fischer
Mobile: 612-567-3990
Email: service.ckmj@gmail.com
Address: 1995 Grand Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55105
LEGAL DESCRIPTION:
Lot 22 and the North 20 feet of Lot 23, Block 2, SIBLEY ADDITION TO ST. ANTHONY,
Hennepin County, Minnesota.

SCOPE OF WORK & LIMITATIONS:
1. Showing the length and direction of boundary lines of the legal description listed above. The
scope of our services does not include determining what you own, which is a legal matter.
Please check the legal description with your records or consult with competent legal counsel,
if necessary, to make sure that it is correct and that any matters of record, such as easements,
that you wish to be included on the survey have been shown.
2. Showing the location of observed existing improvements we deem necessary for the survey.
3. Setting survey markers or verifying existing survey markers to establish the corners of the
property.
4. This survey has been completed without the benefit of a current title commitment. There may
be existing easements or other encumbrances that would be revealed by a current title
commitment. Therefore, this survey does not purport to show any easements or encumbrances
other than the ones shown herein.
5. Note that all building dimensions and building tie dimensions to the property lines, are taken
from the siding and or stucco of the building.
6. Showing elevations on the site at selected locations to give some indication of the topography
of the site. We have also provided a benchmark for your use in determining elevations for
construction on this site. The elevations shown relate only to the benchmark provided on this
survey. Use that benchmark and check at least one other feature shown on the survey when
determining other elevations for use on this site or before beginning construction.

STANDARD SYMBOLS & CONVENTIONS:
● Denotes iron survey marker, set, unless otherwise noted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LP SMARTSIDE PREFINISHED ENGINEERED WOOD TRIM - &quot;SNOWSCAPE WHITE&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LP SMARTSIDE PREFINISHED ENGINEERED WOOD LAP SIDING - DIAMOND KOTE &quot;MIDNIGHT&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>LP SMARTSIDE PREFINISHED ENGINEERED WOOD VERTICAL BOARD &amp; BATTEN PANEL - &quot;SNOWSCAPE WHITE&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>EDWARDS STONE THIN VENETIAN - &quot;SKYLINE GREY PLATINUM&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PAC-CLAD ALUMINUM FLUSH WALL PANEL - &quot;CHARCOAL&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENERLUX FIBERGLASS WINDOWS
"DIVE WHITE" AND "BLACK" FRAME

OPAQUE METAL AWNING AT ENTRANCES
FIRST FLOOR: METAL AND WOOD SOLAR SHADES AT WINDOWS
SECOND - FOURTH FLOORS: REINFORCED WOOD SOLAR SHADES
EAGLE 72HM G2
390–410 WATT • HALF CELL MONO PERC MODULE
Positive power tolerance of 0~+3%

- NYSE-listed since 2010, Bloomberg Tier 1 manufacturer
- Best-selling module globally for last 4 years
- Top performance in the strictest 3rd party labs
- 99.9% on-time delivery to the installer
- Automated manufacturing utilizing artificial intelligence
- Vertically integrated, tight controls on quality
- Premium solar panel factories in USA and Malaysia

LINEAR PERFORMANCE WARRANTY
25-Year Performance Warranty

KEY FEATURES

- **Diamond Half Cell Technology**
  World-record breaking efficient mono PERC half cut solar cells deliver high power in a small footprint.

- **Designed for Long Life**
  Uses the same DuPont protective film as the Space Station, Mars Lander, and jetliners. 25-year warranty.

- **Shade Tolerant**
  Twin array design allows continued performance even with shading by trees or debris.

- **Power Boost in Cloudy Conditions**
  A special film diffuses light, boosting performance even with shading by trees or debris.

- **Protected Against All Environments**
  Certified to withstand humidity, heat, rain, marine environments, wind, hailstorms, and packed snow.
**ENGINEERING DRAWINGS**

**Front**

**Side**

**Back**

**MECHANICAL CHARACTERISTICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cells</th>
<th>Mono PERC Diamond Cell (158.75x158.75mm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Half Cells</td>
<td>144 (6x24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions</td>
<td>2008x1002x40mm (79.06x39.45x1.57in)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>22.5kg (49.6lbs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Glass</td>
<td>3.2mm, Anti-Reflection Coating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Transmission, Low Iron, Tempered Glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Anodized Aluminum Alloy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction Box</td>
<td>IP67 Rated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Cables</td>
<td>12 AWG, 1400mm (55.12in) or Customized Length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Type</td>
<td>Type 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure Rating</td>
<td>5400Pa (Snow) &amp; 2400Pa (Wind)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TEMPERATURE CHARACTERISTICS**

Temperature Coefficients of Pmax  
-0.35%/°C

Temperature Coefficients of Voc  
-0.29%/°C

Temperature Coefficients of Isc  
0.048%/°C

Nominal Operating Cell Temperature (NOCT)  
45±2°C

**MAXIMUM RATINGS**

Operating Temperature (°C)  
-40°C~+85°C

Maximum System Voltage  
1500VDC (UL and IEC)

Maximum Series Fuse Rating  
20A

**PACKAGING CONFIGURATION**

(Two pallets = One stack)

27pcs/pallet, 54pcs/stack, 594pcs/40’HQ Container

**ELECTRICAL CHARACTERISTICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module Type</th>
<th>JKM390M-72HL-V</th>
<th>JKM395M-72HL-V</th>
<th>JKM400M-72HL-V</th>
<th>JKM405M-72HL-V</th>
<th>JKM410M-72HL-V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOCT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Power (Pmax)</td>
<td>390Wp</td>
<td>287Wp</td>
<td>395Wp</td>
<td>291Wp</td>
<td>400Wp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Power Voltage (Vmp)</td>
<td>39.64V</td>
<td>37.0V</td>
<td>39.90V</td>
<td>37.4V</td>
<td>40.16V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Power Current (Imp)</td>
<td>9.84A</td>
<td>7.75A</td>
<td>9.90A</td>
<td>7.77A</td>
<td>9.96A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-circuit Voltage (Voc)</td>
<td>48.6V</td>
<td>45.8V</td>
<td>48.8V</td>
<td>46.0V</td>
<td>49.1V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-circuit Current (Isc)</td>
<td>10.46A</td>
<td>8.45A</td>
<td>10.54A</td>
<td>8.51A</td>
<td>10.61A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module Efficiency STC (%)</td>
<td>19.38%</td>
<td>19.63%</td>
<td>19.88%</td>
<td>20.13%</td>
<td>20.38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*STC: Irradiance 1000W/m²  
NOCT: Irradiance 800W/m²

Cell Temperature 25°C  
Ambient Temperature 20°C  
Wind Speed 1m/s

*Power measurement tolerance: ±3%

The company reserves the final right for explanation on any of the information presented hereby, JKM390-410M-72HL-V-A4-US

BUILDING YOUR TRUST IN SOLAR. JINKOSOLAR.US
Installation Guide
EcoFoot2+® 10-Degree Ballasted Racking System
Document No. ECO-002_850

Rev 1.7, January 2020
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Field Support Contact Information
Ecolibrium Solar proudly offers dedicated engineering expertise and superior customer support. For questions about the installation procedures or a specific application, please contact our Field Support Specialists at 866-488-6794 or FieldSupport@EcolibriumSolar.com.

Installer Responsibility
The installer is solely responsible for:

- Utilizing all necessary safety equipment, as required by applicable rules and regulations.
- Complying with all applicable local and national building codes, including any that may supersede this manual.
- Ensuring that Ecolibrium Solar® EcoFoot2+® and other products are appropriate for the specific installation and are designed for the installation environment.
- Ensuring that the roof, its rafters, connections, and other structural support members can support the array under all conditions.
- Maintaining the waterproof integrity of the roof including selection of appropriate flashing if the system is being installed using attachments.
- Ensuring safe installation of all electrical aspects of the entire system

Legal Notices
©2017 Ecolibrium Solar®, Inc. Ecolibrium Solar® and EcoFoot2+® are registered trademarks of Ecolibrium Solar, Inc.
Disclaimer of Liability
ECOLIBRIUM SOLAR® does not assume responsibility and expressly disclaims liability for loss, damage, or expense arising out of, or in any way connected with installation, operation, use, or maintenance by using this manual.

ECOLIBRIUM SOLAR assumes no responsibility for any infringement of patents or other rights of third parties, which may result from use of modules. No license is granted by implication or under any patent or patent rights. The information in this manual is believed to be reliable, but does not constitute an expressed and/or implied warranty.

ECOLIBRIUM SOLAR reserves the right to make changes to the product, specifications, data sheets and this manual without prior notice. This document is not prescriptive regarding safety and does not purport to address all the safety concerns that may arise with its use. Contractors should become familiar with all applicable safety, health, and regulatory requirements before beginning work.

Unauthorized field modification of ECOLIBRIUM SOLAR components or assemblies may affect ECOLIBRIUM SOLAR warranty coverage. Provide written drawings for ECOLIBRIUM SOLAR’s review, comment and approval prior to attempting any field modifications.

Warnings & Safety
Both electrical and roofing knowledge are required to correctly and safely install a solar photovoltaic system. Only qualified and certified installation professionals should install EcoFoot2+. Failure to follow the methods and procedures outlined in this guide may result in injury and/or damage to property.

Carefully read this guide before starting any work. Store a copy of this guide on the job site at all times and contact Ecolibrium Solar with any installation questions related to EcoFoot2+.

Please note the following warnings when installing EcoFoot2+:

- EcoFoot2+ components fit together tightly and could cause pinch injuries.
- EcoFoot2+ components may be hot to the touch if left in the sun.

Please follow the safety requirements below when installing EcoFoot2+:

- Always keep children and unauthorized people away from work areas.
- Always wear required OSHA approved Personal Protective Equipment (PPE).
- Always use insulated tools when working with or near electrical systems.
- Always provide OSHA approved fall protection for all installation personnel.
- Never wear jewelry during mechanical and electrical installation work.
- Never work in rain, snow or extremely windy conditions.
- Never leave a module unsupported or unsecured on the roof.
- Never install broken photovoltaic modules.
- Never use photovoltaic modules as a work surface.

EcoFoot2+ General Application Notes

Site-Specific System Design: Ecolibrium Solar provides drafting services on all EcoFoot2+ projects. This service produces a site-specific design package with an Engineered Stamped Layout including detailed ballast plan and bill of materials.

Roof Type: EcoFoot2+ is designed to mount photovoltaic modules to a range of roof surfaces, including: EPDM, TPO, PVC, Mineral Cap Sheet (a.k.a. Rolled Asphalt), Tar and Gravel.
**Roof Slope Range:** 0-7 degrees maximum, 3-degree limit for unattached seismic.

**Wind Zone:** EcoFoot2+ is designed to mount photovoltaic modules on flat roof surfaces with a maximum pitch of 7 degrees in areas with extreme wind conditions. Please contact Ecolibrium Solar for clarification or assistance.

**Installation Requirements:** EcoFoot2+ is ballasted photovoltaic racking designed as a system which requires all EcoFoot2+ components, the specific module, and ballast placement prescribed in the PE stamped design. The absence of any of these elements in any given sub-array could present a compromised condition on the roof. Arrays shall not be left unattended in such a state during an installation.

This install guide officially documents the components used and proper methods for an EcoFoot2+ installation. Bonding elements are incorporated into EcoFoot2+ components. As the system is built on the roof, components and modules are bonded together. Specific steps to ensure a bonded system are described through the installation guide. It is the installer’s responsibility to ensure that the system is safely and properly installed, and that the system is bonded back to a final ground point.

When wiring the array, keep bare copper from contacting bare aluminum.

**Thermal and Seismic Design Requirements:** EcoFoot2+ is a flexible and expandable design that accommodates various array geometries. Maximum widths for arrays are as follows:
- 60-cell modules, 26 modules in a row
- 72-cell modules, 22 modules in a row
Minimum spacing between sub-arrays is 6”. Site specifics may further limit array sizes and spacing.

**Re-Inspection:** Ecolibrium recommends periodic re-inspection of the installation for loose components, loose fasteners, and any corrosion, such that if found, the affected components are to be immediately replaced.

**Compatible Modules:** Ecolibrium Solar has evaluated many photovoltaic modules for installation compatibility with the EcoFoot 2+ 10-degree racking system. A list of compatible modules may be found in “EcoFoot2+ Install Guide Appendix - Compatible Modules.pdf” on our website: www.ecolibriumsolar.com

**UL2703 Qualification:** In cases where UL 2703 certification is required, the EcoFoot2+ system conforms to the UL2703 Standard for grounding and bonding and fire ratings. The EcoFoot2+ system may be used to ground and/or mount a PV module complying with UL1703 only when the specific module has been evaluated for grounding and /or mounting in compliance with the included instructions.

EcoFoot2+ Racking maintains a Class A fire rating when installed in landscape orientation according to the installation instructions, on a low slope roof Class A roof with Type 1 and Type 2 modules.

Further information about Ecolibrium Solar’s UL2703 Listing, including module load ratings may be found in “EcoFoot2+ Install Guide Appendix - UL2703 Qualification.pdf” at www.ecolibriumsolar.com.

**UL2703 System Label:** The label shown below is stamped into the Wind Deflector (identified as component 5 in the installation guide).

```
The Date Code ABCYZZ shown above will appear on production parts, letters defined as follows:
- ABC shall be an acronym for identifying the source factory
- Y shall be the Quarter of the year (i.e. 1, 2, 3, 4) of manufacture
- ZZ shall be the last 2 digits of the year of manufacture
```
**EcoFoot2+® Core Components**

A. EcoFoot2+ Base

B. Clamp-Lower

C. Clamp-Upper

D. Clevis Pin

E. Deflector

F. Nut
Chalk lines on roof denoting two outside edges of the EcoFoot2+® according to project drawing. Place EcoFoot2+® Bases (A) in position.

Tip: Ensure lines are square using 3-4-5 principle.

Tip: As you build the array, panels will space Bases. Roughly place a few rows of Bases at a time so that they are within reach of final location.

Tip: If installation requires 2 blocks or fewer on the north row, north row Bases can be turned around 180 degrees and tucked under the panel.

Tip: If installation requires butyl, then butyl will be preinstalled on the bottom of the Base with protective tape. Ensure these butyl components are placed where specified in project drawing. Remove protective tape after step 6.

Place Lower Clamp (B) and Upper Clamp (C) into EcoFoot2+ Base (A) as shown. Push Clevis Pin (D) completely into EcoFoot2+® Base(A) to secure Rocker.

Tip: Only install Clamps where modules will rest. Refer to diagram below for correct placement and orientation of Clamps.

Place module onto EcoFoot2+® Base (A). Using a 1/2" deep socket, torque Nuts (F) to 1 4 ft-lbs. Space modules 1/2” apart using the alignment marks on the Clamps.
4 Place Ballast (not included) as required per PE Certified Ballast Plan provided. 
*Tip:* See note below for ballast block placement. In freeze/thaw environments, use concrete block with minimum compressive strength of 3,000psi (ref ASTM C1491-03 Standard Specifications for Concrete Roof Pavers).

5 Route, connect and secure conductors. 
*Tip:* Wire clips attached to the module flange (not included) can be used to dress conductors in a row of modules. Integrated snap features in the Base can be used to dress conductors bridging rows.

6 Place Deflectors (E) into slot on EcoFoot2+® Base and attach to Rocker using Nut (F) provided. Using a 1/2” deep socket, torque Nut (F) to 14 ft-lbs. Application of anti-seize on threaded post is recommended.

7 EcoFoot2+ is listed to carry module-to-module ground bond through the wind deflector. Each row of modules/wind deflectors must be grounded per the NEC and ANSI/NFPA 70 as described in Addendum C of this Install Guide. See Addendum C for requirements and Ground and Bond Path.

---

**EcoFoot2+® Ballast Block Placement**

**One Block**
When using a single ballast block, lay the block flat in the center of EcoFoot2+ Base tray.

**Two Blocks**
When using two ballast blocks, lay the blocks flat in the EcoFoot2+ Base tray.

**Three Blocks**
When placing three ballast blocks in the EcoFoot2+ Base tray, lay one block flat and two on the long edge. This configuration helps to prevent blocks from becoming dislodged accidentally.
**Note:** If a module is to be removed from an array, the following steps must be taken.

a) **Determine module to be removed**
   Identify and mark the module to be removed.

b) **Install ground lug on adjacent modules**
   Install a WEEB Lug 6.7 on both modules adjacent to the module to be removed. Utilize the grounding hole on the frame of the module.

c) **Connect Bonding Jumper**
   Lay a bare #6 CU conductor into the two lay in lugs connected to the adjacent modules. Tighten lay-in lug terminal screw onto the conductor and torque to 7 ft-lbs.

   When wiring the array, keep bare copper from contacting bare aluminum.
Universal Support Brackets Installation

Universal Mid Support Brackets are a non-standard item and only used in heavy load conditions with light-duty panels. The design team at Ecolibrium Solar will indicate use when required.

Installing Lower Universal Mid-Support

To install, pull bracket onto the midpoint of module return flange until upright locking tab pops up on the frame’s edge. This indicates the bracket is fully engaged.
Installing Upper Universal Mid-Support

Install 2 brackets on high side of module frame, positioned 1/3rd in from each corner.

To install, pull brackets onto module return flange until fully seated as shown below.

Installing the Wind Deflector

4. Drop bottom of Wind Deflector into slot located on EcoFoot2+ Base.
5. Clip top of Wind Deflector into 2 Upper Universal Mid-Support Brackets.
6. Attach Wind Deflector to EcoFoot2+ Rocker using Nut provided.
Grounding & Bonding

The EcoFoot2+ system has been tested by TüV Rheinland and conforms to UL 2703 for Grounding and Bonding when installed per the published installation instructions.

EcoFoot2+ carries module-to-module ground bond through the Wind Deflector, Item E listed in the “EcoFoot2+ Core Components” table in this document.

Each row of modules/wind deflectors in an array of up to 400 modules must be grounded per the NEC and ANSI/NFPA 70 either through the designated ground hole in the Wind Deflector, or by drilling a ¼” ground hole into the Wind Deflector a minimum of ½” from any edge. One Ground Lug is required for every 400 modules connected within an array.

Ecolibrium Solar recommends using #6 copper ground wire in conjunction with WEEB grounding devices such as the WEEB-LUG-6.7 or WEEB DSK516. Lugs are a single use component.

Other grounding methods must be reviewed and approved by a licensed master electrician or electrical engineer and Authority Having Jurisdiction (AHJ).

Green lines represent ground bond path. Wind Deflectors carry module-to-module east/west ground bond. Bonding jumpers carry row-to-row north/south ground bond.
Hello Shanna,
My name is Anne Yang and I am emailing you behalf of my mother Bao Vang, she does not speak English but I will be translating for her as to why we are opposed of having the home on 635 Van Buren st NE turned into an apartment complex. My family have lived in this home on 629 Van Buren since 97'. Having an apartment complex in this once quiet neighborhood will no longer be if that is built, residents here already have a hard time finding parking due to the surrounding businesses, these are just a few reasons why we are opposed to 635 Van Buren getting turned. So, my mother and I will be joining the next city hearing. Any questions please feel free to email me back.

Anne Yang
629 Van Buren st Ne.
Get Outlook for iOS

[EXTERNAL] This email originated from outside of the City of Minneapolis. Please exercise caution when opening links or attachments.
I reside at 630 Van Buren; as of May 1st it will be 42 years. I have enjoyed the view of 635 Van Buren; the house is in excellent condition. The larger of the trees adds much to the beauty of the house as does the other tree. The promoter was commenting on how his project would be in so good for the environment. How about what the trees do for the environment? Also, the additional cars on Van Buren would add to parking problems. The one man who quoted a study from the neighborhood said there 1.3 cars per apartment. 1.3 x 24 = 31.2 cars added to the street. Where are they going to park? The promoter was praising bicycle use. How many persons were using bicycles the night of meeting? The unsightly 4 story building across the street and the additional cars should be enough to prevent the project from going forward. Thank you. berniebrockhaus@gmail.com

--
Christina Perfetti (she/her)
Executive Director
St. Anthony East Neighborhood Association
612-314-3651

[EXTERNAL] This email originated from outside of the City of Minneapolis. Please exercise caution when opening links or attachments.
Hello Christina,

I hope you are staying warm and that your new year is off to a great start!

I’m reaching out today to share my concerns with, and opposition of, the proposed development at 635 Van Buren Street. I respectfully request that you pass my concerns along to the Board Members and I humbly request that they vote against the development.

I support thoughtful, well-planned development that meets housing needs in Minneapolis. I have professional experience in housing development; to me, this project seems opportunistic and poorly planned. To place a multi-family housing complex mid-block of a quiet residential street, in a neighborhood that has had a recent influx of new multi-family complexes, and to make those apartments market-rate, without parking or outside green space, does not seem like a sound decision for the existing neighborhood or for future residents.

Based on the lack of professional details in the information provided, this developer seems to have never worked in housing development, construction, or real estate until his latest (still incomplete) venture in Minneapolis. He appears to be a hobbyist developer, which often leads to delays in construction, financing problems, and lack of completion. Further, the developer has not shown that he has completed a market study or evaluation of the project’s feasibility. Is there a demand for market rate apartments that exceeds the supply of open apartments in St. Anthony East or Northeast in general? How does his project differ from the many that have arisen in the last two years, many of which are below desired capacity?

Further, the developer claims to be making an environmentally sound decision by incorporating green concepts into his project. However, demolishing a perfectly habitable (and recently renovated) home is wasteful and harmful. No amount of solar panels can make up for the negative environmental impact of putting useable materials in a landfill and replacing them with new, manufactured materials that have been shipped all across the country (or world). Neighbors, including myself, have worked hard to maintain the original materials in our home—going so far as to delay projects by months so that we could remove and re-install our original, 1906-built floors rather than purchase new, simply because of the environmental impact. To see a home that was built in the 1970s go to waste is heartbreaking and shameful. There are certainly homes that are less structurally sound and are better candidates for demolishing as they are close to being uninhabitable; the developer could likely find one of those homes in a more appropriate location (on a transit corridor, or just not mid-block on a residential street).
I’m proud to be a resident of Saint Anthony East. I love that our neighborhood is a mix of renters and homeowners of all backgrounds. It’s an eclectic mix that works really well. I’m certainly not opposed to more developments or more renters in our neighborhood, so long as the projects are beneficial to the neighborhood. This project is not; this project brings more residents in without providing enough capacity, green space, or parking, while eliminating privacy and comfort of other neighbors’ and their guests. By creating conditions that do not meet the demands of today’s renters in Minneapolis, this project is bound for high turnover of renters even if it is completed. It will be a detriment, rather than a benefit, to Saint Anthony East.

It’s my understanding that Sarah Walbridge-Jones sought to be added to today’s meeting agenda and was denied. This is deeply disappointing and disheartening. SAENA owes a duty to its residents to listen to concerns and allow them to voice opinions. Will there be a future opportunity for Sarah to be heard by the Board and our neighbors? What is the process to be added to the Board agenda?

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Catrina Mairose

--

Christina Perfetti (she/her)
Executive Director
St. Anthony East Neighborhood Association
612-314-3651

[EXTERNAL] This email originated from outside of the City of Minneapolis. Please exercise caution when opening links or attachments.
Hi Shanna,

Thank you for the information.

My husband Dimitri and I share a driveway with 635 Van Buren. The driveway is parallel with the alley and our garage faces 635's garage. The driveway that we share is our only access to enter our garage. We have always shared maintenance costs of the driveway with previous owners of 635 Van Buren. The proposed development would block our access to our garage which would greatly reduce the function of our garage.

To give you a little background, the original garage at our home, 641 Van Buren St NE, was built in 1920 and a new garage was built in 2001. We purchased our home in 2007 and have been using and maintaining the driveway since then.
We are also very concerned how close the proposed building is to the property lot line. We have a basement and have taken measures with landscaping, gutters, etc. to keep moisture away from our home. Our concern is that runoff from a large building would cause moisture issues in our home and the other neighboring property.

I attached a few pictures (with tire tracks thanks to the snow) of the shared driveway and garages. If you look closely at the tire tracks, you will see how we need to access our garage.

Please let me know if you have any questions. Will you please let me know if the application has been deemed complete?

Thank you,
Emily Carr

On Tue, Feb 22, 2022 at 8:51 AM Sether, Shanna M <Shanna.Sether@minneapolismn.gov> wrote:

Good morning Emily,

I have received application materials for 635 Van Buren St NE; however, the plans and materials they have provided are incomplete. I’m expecting some details on the site plan to change, but I’m not sure when they will resubmit. The deadline for the next Planning Commission public hearing is Friday, February 25. If they make that deadline, their application will be on the agenda for the March 21, Planning Commission public hearing.

I can start taking public comments on the proposed project at any time.

Thank you,
Shanna

Shanna Sether
Principal City Planner
She/Her/Hers
Hi Shanna,

Will you please tell me if an application been submitted for 635 Van Buren? If one has been submitted, what is the status?

I copied a neighbor that lives on Van Buren, Sarah Walbridge-Jones, on this email. We are wondering when your office would like to view opposition information that has been gathered.

Thank you for your help,

Emily Carr
On Feb 3, 2022, at 12:13 PM, Emily Carr <carremilyr@gmail.com> wrote:

Thank you for the explanation. I’m sure I’ll have more questions- thanks for your time.

Emily Carr

On Feb 3, 2022, at 12:09 PM, Sether, Shanna M <Shanna.Sether@minneapolismn.gov> wrote:

Hello,

The zoning code requires that all land use applications (rezoning, site plan review, etc.) be heard concurrently at a public hearing. That public hearing takes place at the City Planning Commission. The rezoning is a legislative decision, which will go on to the City Council for a final decision. If any appeals of the decision of the City Planning Commission are filed, the public hearing will be held at the same City Council meetings as the rezoning, but they are separate agenda items and have separate actions.

If the application is deemed complete before February 25, 2022, this will be the schedule:

- City Planning Commission (public hearing) – March 21, 2022
- Business, Inspections, Housing, and Zoning Committee (rezoning and any appeals filed) – April 19, 2022
- City Council Meeting – April 28, 2022

If this round of deadlines are missed, these are the next series of dates:

- City Planning Commission (public hearing) – April 11, 2022
- Business, Inspections, Housing, and Zoning Committee (rezoning and any appeals filed) – May 2, 2022
- City Council Meeting – May 12, 2022

Thank you,
Ok, thanks.
Will the project application and rezoning take place at the same meeting and date or will there be multiple meetings?

If multiple dates, will you please provide those dates?

Thanks for your help,

Emily Carr

On Feb 3, 2022, at 11:13 AM, Sether, Shanna M <Shanna.Sether@minneapolismn.gov> wrote:

No, not yet. I’m expecting the submission any day now.

Thank you,

Shanna

---

Shanna Sether

Principal City Planner

She/Her/Hers

City of Minneapolis – Community Planning and Economic Development

505 4th Avenue S, #320

Minneapolis, MN 55415
Hi Shanna,

Has a formal submission of land use application been received by your office for 635 Van Buren St NE?

Thank you in advance,

Emily Carr
Thank you very much for the information.

Have a nice day,

Emily Carr

On Dec 8, 2021, at 9:34 AM, Sether, Shanna M <Shanna.Sether@minneapolismn.gov> wrote:

Hello Emily,

I do not have a formal submission of a land use application for this property. I understand that the applicant intends to meet with the neighborhood association before they submit. I heard from Christina Perfetti from SAENA that they were going to schedule a community meeting with the developer and residents on January 25.

Thank you,

Shanna

Shanna Sether
Principal City Planner
Good Afternoon,

I am one of the owners/residents of 641 Van Buren St NE and I have been made aware of a proposed development at 635 Van Buren St NE. I was hoping you could give me some information on what has been submitted to your office regarding the proposed project. My neighbors and I
were quite shocked to hear of the proposal for a number of reasons. The primary reason is we were told by Steve Fletcher’s office in 2019 that the 2040 plan had an error and that Van Buren St NE should be treated like the rest of the neighborhood (Interior 3) and should not be included in Corridor 6. Below is a snip of a 2019 email from Fletcher.

Any information you can provide would be greatly appreciated.

Thank you,
Emily Carr
641 Van Buren St NE
612-865-9406
Good Afternoon,

I am one of the owners/residents of 641 Van Buren St NE and I have been made aware of a proposed development at 635 Van Buren St NE. I was hoping you could give me some information on what has been submitted to your office regarding the proposed project. My neighbors and I were quite shocked to hear of the proposal for a number of reasons. The primary reason is we were told by Steve Fletcher’s office in 2019 that the 2040 plan had an error and that Van Buren St NE should be treated like the rest of the neighborhood (Interior 3) and should not be included in Corridor 6. Below is a snip of a 2019 email from Fletcher.

Any information you can provide would be greatly appreciated.

Hi, Chris –

Your timing is remarkable… we were meeting with Heather Worthington when you e-mailed. All are agreed that Van Buren should be treated like all of the other streets in SASTA – Transit 4 along Broadway, and Interior 3 for the rest. Once the Met Council approves the 2040 Plan (probably in late September or so), stuff will compile a list of small technical changes like this one from around the city and submit them all together as an amendment – a pretty straightforward process that the city does quarterly or so; as various land use changes shift. Expect that to happen in January or so. In the meantime, if you hear of people wringing around about land sales on your block, you can tell them the 2040 Plan corrects an error, and Van Buren will be treated like the rest of the neighborhood.

In other news, the Jackson Flats developer seems to have found a buyer – one who wants to hostify the proposal to make 9-10 stories instead of 4 stories. I don’t know a lot more than that, so don’t have an opinion about whether it’s a good thing or not, yet… I told them to reach out to the neighborhood before they get much farther so that they can hear your feedback. Keep me in the loop if you all talk to them.

Best,

Steve

Thank you,
Emily Carr
641 Van Buren St NE
612-865-9406
Cody,
Your proposed development of 635 Van Buren St is met with steep opposition from neighbors. I have attached our letter of opposition and evidence of those households opposed.

Sarah Walbridge-Jones

2 attachments

- 635VanBuren_LetterofOpposition.docx (21K)
- 1.18.22_opposed.pdf (311K)
Hi, Christina. I hope you are well.

We have recently learned about the latest proposed development on VanBuren and it was shared that you were the point person.
Thank you for taking this on.
We are opposed to this development.
Thank you for coordinating.

Karlene Wieland,
M)612-702-3910
O) 612-362-9875 (CST)
Misspellings and brevity by IPhone

--
Christina Perfetti (she/her)
Executive Director
St. Anthony East Neighborhood Association
612-314-3651
Hello Ms. Sether,

Let me introduce myself - I am a resident of the St. Anthony East neighborhood and recently heard about the plan to build a structure for 23 dwellings at this address – 635 Van Buren NE. Since I regularly walk in the neighborhood, I am familiar with the site and the neighboring area. There are a few 4plexes nearby and a smaller apartment building a few blocks away (probably 8-10 units). With the exception of the Spring Street highrise, it is mostly a single family/duplex neighborhood of affordable housing. My concerns are twofold:

1. Affordable housing is being removed for a development that will likely not be affordable nor have parking. This street rarely has open spaces for parking now.
2. The site is very small and it is difficult to see how 23 units can fit here without it being quite tall – more than that recommended by the Minneapolis 2030 planning document.

If you have more information on the plans for this site, I would be interested in hearing about those plans. Thanks so much for your consideration,

Kate Stolpman
603 Adams St. NE
Minneapolis, MN 55413
Hi Christina -

I live at 741 Van Buren St NE. I want more people to live in this neighborhood, because this neighborhood is lovely for families with kids. However, I’m opposed to the current 635 Van Buren St NE project proposal because I don’t believe it’s a family-friendly plan.

To me, family friendly = enough rooms in a home for a family. The apartment complex built on Jackson and Autumn/Broadway last year is entirely one bedrooms! And yet it was originally proposed to be a family-friendly building. It’s not designed for families, it’s designed for single young adults.

If the 635 project needs to be multi-unit (which I’m fine with) then I want it to be a quad townhome situation, or a multi story condo building where each condo unit has 2-3 bedrooms.

The park and community gardens are fantastic for kids. I want new construction to encourage kids to live here. Kids need room, so add room for them in the living unit that will be built at 635.

Thanks,
Marie Kent
612-202-9734
Hi Shanna,

SAENA had our community meeting where Cody Fischer presented his initial designs for 635 Van Buren. I've been contacted by residents about the development. I'll be forwarding their comments as they come in to you, as SAENA's board is not taking a position on this project.

Thank you,
Christina

--
Christina Perfetti (she/her)
Executive Director
St. Anthony East Neighborhood Association
612-314-3651
Hi Shanna,

I live two houses from the proposed project and have been one of the lead organizers in community engagement, specifically with households on Van Buren St and a few on Jackson and Quincy. We are a very tight community, we know each other, respect each other and enjoy living here. Several of us did community engagement and not a single person we spoke to said they are for this development and nobody knew that the 2040 plan allowed this sort of built form for an interior 3 urban neighborhood.

In Mr. Fisher’s application, he mentions in a few letters to SAENA and Mike Rainville his willingness to receive feedback on his proposed project from the neighborhood. What he neglected to include was the fact that he did not receive support for his proposed project and during the SAENA community meeting neighbors asked him to consider not moving forward with this high-density project, some suggested a smaller-scale build to match the neighborhood and others pointed to the fact that our neighborhood is saturated with rentals (61.2%) vs owner-occupied 33.5%. Prior to the SAENA community meeting, we notified Mr. Fisher of our concerns and opposition through email and certified letter. You can review the "Curated Opposed" spreadsheet to review everyone who was engaged, their response, their contact, and whether they are owner or renter. The 2nd tab on this spreadsheet lays out the sequence of events for community engagement and notification to Mr. Fisher of our opposition prior to the SAENA community meeting. The other attachments are evidence of this engagement and the letter 635VanBuren_LetterofOpposition gives all of our reasons for opposing this project and is the letter we sent Mr. Fisher.

Please take this evidence of opposition as the collective voice of my neighbors. I will be sharing your email with this list so they can express their concerns further as well.

I will send a separate email to you on my concerns as the homeowner at 625 Van Buren St.

Sarah Walbridge-Jones

[EXTERNAL] This email originated from outside of the City of Minneapolis. Please exercise caution when opening links or attachments.
Dear Mr. Fischer,

The Saint Anthony East neighborhood is rooted in being a close-knit residential community. We are renters, homeowners, multi-generational, multi-lingual families, parents, pet owners, and good humans who choose to live in this neighborhood because we love the small-town vibe in the city. We hope that by purchasing a home in this neighborhood, you have come to understand this diversity and the balanced ecosystem it creates. Your proposed development of 635 Van Buren Street threatens this balance and is met with steep opposition from your neighbors.

As of the date of this letter, 91% of households on Van Buren St oppose your proposal. Several households on Jackson and Quincy street are also in opposition. While many neighbors have varying reasons for their opposition, the following list provides insight into some of the critical issues with your proposal.

The proposed development at 635 Van Buren Street:

1. Removes the opportunity for home ownership in an affordable, residential neighborhood
   - Minnesota is now fourth in the nation for racial disparity in home ownership. Destroying the single-family home at 635 Van Buren means it will never return to the market and never provide an opportunity for a family to build equity. While there are plenty of open apartments throughout Northeast Minneapolis and Saint Anthony East, there are few attainably priced homes.
   - Continuing to allow developers to take ownership of a home or construction of a new building in our neighborhood is further limiting the market for starter homes and perpetuating racial disparities in home ownership which we oppose.
   - Minneapolis 2040 Plan’s goals surround this include:
     - The goal of expanding home ownership (Policy42, https://minneapolis2040.com/policies/expand-homeownership/)
     - The goal of eliminating disparities (https://minneapolis2040.com/goals/eliminate-disparities/)
     - The goal of creating affordable and accessible housing (https://minneapolis2040.com/goals/affordable-and-accessible-housing/)

2. Creates a negative environmental impact due to unnecessary construction
   - The environmental costs of unnecessarily demolishing a perfectly habitable home and constructing a 20,000 square foot building is hardly "low carbon" project. 635 Van Buren St was built in 1976 and is clearly marketable as a single-family home, as its market value and recent sales demonstrate. Part of being a steward of the land in Minneapolis is recognizing the need to reuse and rebuild, rather than tearing down usable infrastructure in the name of being “environmentally friendly”.

3. Threatens neighborhood aesthetic
   - To place a 4-story, 24-unit building in the middle of a block of one to two story homes will disrupt the aesthetic, flow, and ambiance of the street. Van Buren has an eclectic mix of single-family homes, duplexes, and small multi-family buildings, yet this hodgepodge of styles is cohesive in that no one building on the street stands out. Throughout SAENA, any large multifamily buildings are placed at corners or along busier roadways - not in the middle of a quiet residential street
   - Rezoning of the single parcel at 635 Van Buren runs a significant legal risk of "spot zoning." Spot zoning occurs when a city rezones a single parcel of land to be inconsistent with the surrounding land for the benefit of the owner of the rezoned parcel and to the detriment of surrounding property owners. This is widely known to be an inappropriate practice and is often overturned through litigation.
4. Eliminates green space and environmental impacts of multitudes of people, pets, bikes, and cars

- By the elimination of the sizable yard and trees, the neighborhood will lose significant green space.
- An influx of 20-24 units on a 7840 square foot lot does not appear sustainable. There is no evidence that the increase of density, mid-block in a residential neighborhood, leads to “sustainable leasing and stable housing.”

5. Complete loss of indoor and outdoor privacy for Van Buren neighbors

6. Decrease’s neighborhood parking capacity and burdens the flow of traffic

- The project does not contain off-street parking for residents. While an admirable goal, it is not realistic that all residents of the 24-unit building will forego having a vehicle. Even if half of residents had cars, that creates an unmanageable influx in parking needs. Even for homes with off-street parking, it is difficult to have visitors and guests when all street parking is occupied.
- The intersection at Van Buren, Spring, and Central is already inefficient and dangerous. The high speed of travel on Central, the odd angle to enter Van Buren, and the ambiguous crosswalks over Spring already culminate into an accident-prone intersection. Adding even more bikes, pedestrians, and cars to this jumbled intersection burdens the flow of traffic and safety of neighborhood residents.

7. Reduces in enrollment in 3 local schools

- By utilizing only studio, one- and two-bedroom units, it seems clear this development will be vying for rentals for individuals without families, thereby decreasing the opportunity for school enrollment.

On behalf of all opposing neighbors in Saint Anthony East, we respectfully ask that you refrain from pursuing your proposal to redevelop 635 Van Buren Street.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 612-567-2462.

Sincerely,

Sarah Walbridge-Jones

Attachment: households opposed to this development as of 1/18/2022
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Owner/Renter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>606 Van Buren</td>
<td>John McFadden</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jemcfadden@gmail.com">jemcfadden@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>613 Van Buren</td>
<td>Lewis and roomates</td>
<td>door knocking</td>
<td>Renter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>618 Van Buren St</td>
<td>Ande and Alex</td>
<td><a href="mailto:schneider.anne@gmail.com">schneider.anne@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Renter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620/622 Van Buren</td>
<td>Jim Holmquist</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jholmquist@minneapolisparks.org">jholmquist@minneapolisparks.org</a></td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625 Van Buren</td>
<td>Sarah and Chris</td>
<td><a href="mailto:swalbridgejones@gmail.com">swalbridgejones@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>629 Van Buren</td>
<td>Bao Vang</td>
<td></td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>624 Van Buren</td>
<td>Dave</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dvdblk642@gmail.com">dvdblk642@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Renter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630 Van Buren</td>
<td>Bernie Brockhaus</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Bernie.brockhaus@gmail.com">Bernie.brockhaus@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>634 Van Buren</td>
<td>Evan and Catrina</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mairose.catrina@gmail.com">mairose.catrina@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636 Van Buren</td>
<td>Antoine Bryant</td>
<td><a href="mailto:antoinebryant8@gmail.com">antoinebryant8@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Renter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640 Van Buren</td>
<td>Sherry</td>
<td>phone call</td>
<td>Renter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>641 Van Buren</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td><a href="mailto:carremilvr@gmail.com">carremilvr@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>643 Van Buren</td>
<td>Grace and Tyler</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fleming.gracem@gmail.com">fleming.gracem@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Renter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644 Van Buren</td>
<td>Deidra &amp; Sarah</td>
<td>612-402-4600/sarahthebatty@gmail.com</td>
<td>Renters of different units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>648 Van Buren</td>
<td>Sylvia</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sylv.rad@gmail.com">sylv.rad@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>658 Van Buren</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jordan.n.bennett@gmail.com">jordan.n.bennett@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Renter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>649 Van Buren</td>
<td>Robert &amp; Anna</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rob.k.hanlon@gmail.com">rob.k.hanlon@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>653 Van Buren</td>
<td>Beth</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bettycruiser@comcast.net">bettycruiser@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>659 Van Buren</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>612-655-1659</td>
<td>Renter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708 Van Buren</td>
<td>Alyssa Costopoulos</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alyssa.costopoulos@gmail.com">alyssa.costopoulos@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>714 Van Buren</td>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>phone call</td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>711 Van Buren</td>
<td>Francis &amp; Leeann</td>
<td>door knocking</td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>715 Van Buren</td>
<td>Daniel Stover</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stodan82@hotmail.com">stodan82@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>719 Van Buren</td>
<td>Karen Spitzfaden</td>
<td><a href="mailto:karen.spitzfaden@gmail.com">karen.spitzfaden@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>724 Van Buren</td>
<td>Josh Erdman</td>
<td><a href="mailto:josh.erdman@gmail.com">josh.erdman@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>728 Van Buren</td>
<td>Anise</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anise.m.mazone@gmail.com">anise.m.mazone@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>727 Van Buren</td>
<td>Scottie Raw</td>
<td><a href="mailto:scottallenraw@gmail.com">scottallenraw@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>733 Van Buren</td>
<td>Loni &amp; Tony Sternberg</td>
<td><a href="mailto:loni.leland@gmail.com">loni.leland@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>736/738 Van Buren</td>
<td>Brad Johnson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:brad.johnson@ecolab.com">brad.johnson@ecolab.com</a></td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>737 Van Buren St</td>
<td>Karlene and Jeremy</td>
<td><a href="mailto:karlenewieland@icloud.com">karlenewieland@icloud.com</a></td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>741 Van Buren</td>
<td>Marie/Kent</td>
<td><a href="mailto:themariiekent@gmail.com">themariiekent@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>744 Van Buren</td>
<td>Megan Cappaert</td>
<td><a href="mailto:meg.cappaert@gmail.com">meg.cappaert@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>747 Van Buren</td>
<td>Dave Hauser</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Dave@lpb.net">Dave@lpb.net</a></td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>751 Van Buren</td>
<td>Jeremiah/Erika</td>
<td><a href="mailto:supamiah@gmail.com">supamiah@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>901 Summer</td>
<td>Ryan Parise</td>
<td>door knocking</td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>840 Autumn</td>
<td>Matt</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vckim1000mn@gmail.com">vckim1000mn@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Son of owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>847 Summer</td>
<td>Patrick Sutton</td>
<td><a href="mailto:patricksutton22@gmail.com">patricksutton22@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Renter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623 Jackson</td>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hannah.roze98@gmail.com">hannah.roze98@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Renter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>739 Jackson</td>
<td>Christian Johnson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:chichy70@hotmail.com">chichy70@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>627 Jackson</td>
<td>Janet Bucholdt</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jbucholdt@gmail.com">jbucholdt@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>659 Jackson</td>
<td>Merrit Nelson DeSilva</td>
<td><a href="mailto:merrit.desilva@gmail.com">merrit.desilva@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Owner name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is John McFadden John McFadden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeah I don’t think we !Deep Housing LLC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a current renter, I hAndrew Everett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposed and agree wi Jim Holmquist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Walbridge-Jones &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this project would chaChris Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposed, spoke with s Bao Vang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My brother &amp; I live at Patricia Balko</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposed, agree with n Bernie B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great points you have Evan Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not have any id</td>
<td>Community Housing Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposed</td>
<td>Alex Eernisse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposed</td>
<td>Dimitri &amp; Emily Carr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposed</td>
<td>Shiva Properties LLC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644 Van Buren St is o Mana Holdings Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nope, I've heard not Sylvia Radford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposed would like Miller G Holdings LLC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm generally not oppx Robert Hanlon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>653 Van Buren is mos Elizabeth Ryan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is Clinton at 659 'Matthew Jordahl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark &amp; Andrea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner and I rec Costopoulos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposed</td>
<td>A H Krueger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposed</td>
<td>Francis and LeeAnn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposed</td>
<td>Walosin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>include me in as being Daniel Stover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposed</td>
<td>Karen Spitzfaden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parking The 6XX bloc! Joshua Erdman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposed, include me i:Anise Mazone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposed</td>
<td>Scott Raw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In neighborhood inter Loni &amp; Toni Sternberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is Brad, the owne Brad Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karlene &amp; Jeremy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposed and wonderi Wieland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I live at 741 Van Buren Marie Kent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposed</td>
<td>Megan Cappaert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposed</td>
<td>Dave Hauser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposed</td>
<td>Jeremiah &amp; Erika Stitch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposed</td>
<td>Ryan Parise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I live at 840 Autumn S Sun Kim & Ui Kim
opposed Voyager Enterprises

I just saw the letter ab James & Cynthia Wight
Yeah this guy and his Christian Johnson
opposed Janet M Bucholdt
Merrit Eden Nelson

opposed concerned at Desilva
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequence of Events</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Informed of Development</td>
<td>December 2021</td>
<td>SAENA flyer advertising January community meeting with link to development on SAENA website <a href="https://saenaminneapolis.org/event/january-community-meeting/">https://saenaminneapolis.org/event/january-community-meeting/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement with Neighbors</td>
<td>December 2021-January 2022</td>
<td>note to neighbors (note2neighbors.pdf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving comments from neighbors</td>
<td>January 2022</td>
<td>opposed tab in this excel sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued Engagement with neighbors</td>
<td>January 2022</td>
<td>Hello.docx, 635VanBurenStOpposition.docx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacted Owner/Developer of 635</td>
<td>January 18, 2022</td>
<td>gmail pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAENA community meeting</td>
<td>January 25, 2022</td>
<td>Van Buren.pptx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mail and email</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>door knocking, dropping note in mailbox, community conversations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>received comments from our neighbors via text, phone, and email. All responses were opposed. No response not included in spreadsheet. Did not receive any responses for development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emailed and dropped in mailbox informing neighbors of actions we had taken, next steps and reminder of community meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emailed Mr. Fischer and sent him certified letter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presented at community meeting, followed by comments from neighbors echoing their opposition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hello,

You are receiving this note because you have expressed concern regarding the proposed development at 635 Van Buren St and/or a resident that could be impacted by this proposed development. The enclosed letter outlines most of the reasons for opposition to this development and was recently mailed and emailed to the developer. At this time, we know that the developer has not submitted any plans to the city and based on the cities schedule, the earliest that this application would go to a public hearing would be on March 7, 2022, before the City Planning Commission IF the application is made soon and deemed complete by city planner assigned. Anytime a developer says they are interested in developing the city automatically assigns them a city planner (if that doesn’t tell you something about the city!). The good news is we still have time for this fight!

My plan is to try and present all the arguments outlined in the enclosed letter at the SAENA virtual board meeting scheduled for Tuesday January 25th at 6 pm. You can visit SAENA website to find the details on how to join the meeting via Zoom or call in.

Additionally, I wanted to make you aware that I have contacted our Ward 3 representative and the Mayor’s office asking for a meeting to stop the zoning changes to higher density selected for the east side only of Van Buren St. These changes are in the 2040 plan AND conflict with the SAENA small area plan. Our household noticed this discrepancy in 2019 and have documented email communication with Steve Fletcher’s office that this was a mistake that would be fixed in the 2040 plan. It has not been fixed and the proposed development at 635 Van Buren St is requesting a zoning change to higher density. Higher density typically means 4 stories but with city approval could be 6 stories.

If you want to know what you can do now. You could email Ward3@minneapolismn.gov to voice your support in denying the re-zoning of any parcel on the east side of Van Buren St. AND attend the SAENA board meeting to show your opposition to this proposed development.

Thank you!
Sarah Walbridge-Jones
625 Van Buren St NE
swalbridgejones@gmail.com
Hello Neighbor,

There is a proposed development at 635 Van Buren St NE (current home is a 1980s split level). The owner of 635 Van Buren is proposing a 4 story, 24 unit apartment building to be built where the current home sits. I live next door to the proposed development at 641 Van Buren Street and we are opposed to the project for many reasons. Our neighbors at 625 Van Buren St NE and I are putting together an opposition list of addresses (not names) opposed to the project that we can present to the owner at the January 25th SAENA board meeting.

May we add your address to the opposition list?

If so, please text, call or email me, Emily Carr, or text/call Sarah Walbridge-Jones at 612-567-2462 with your address & tell us you are opposed to the proposed development. We have talked to 20 neighbors on Van Buren St so far and all are opposed to the project.

Thanks for your help!

Emily Carr
641 Van Buren St NE
612-865-9406
carremilyr@gmail.com
Features include an updated kitchen (2017) with granite counter tops and matching black stainless appliances (2019); updated bathroom (2019); carpets and duct work cleaned (2019); front load steam washer and gas dryer; new high efficiency forced air furnace (2019); 2.5 car garage; and a large fenced-in yard!
Lot size: 7840
Also opposed
734, 739 Jackson Street
753 Quincy Street
Reasons for Opposition

• Removes the opportunity for home ownership in an affordable, residential neighborhood
• Creates a negative environmental impact due to unnecessary construction
• Threatens neighborhood aesthetic
• Eliminates green space and environmental impacts of multitudes of people, pets, bikes, and cars
• Complete loss of indoor and outdoor privacy for Van Buren neighbors
• Decrease’s neighborhood parking capacity and burdens the flow of traffic
• Reduces enrollment opportunities in 3 local schools
Hi Shanna,
I am reaching out again to get questions answered and share those answers with the Van Buren St, Jackson St, and Quincy St households who are opposed to this development (I will send you opposition evidence in a separate email).

I asked this in my Friday email to you and am asking again- What exactly were the applicant’s requirements for submittal? Where are the rest of the drawings? Detailed elevations from all 4 sides, parking, landscaping, at the very least should have been along with a narrative.

1. What is the current legal zone (not future plan designation, but zone) on the property- does it allow the use?

2. We understand the 2040 plan has been approved but have specific development standards been drafted or approved? If so, was I required to receive notice?

3. Exactly what set of legally adopted site development standards will be used by staff to evaluate this proposed use on this property? Please send them to me.

4. If development standards have not been adopted on this property, how can there be an objective evaluation of the property and its proposed use that the adjacent property owners can rely on?

6. Planning a city has to include all its residents. We currently feel we have not been part of the process to redesignate the east side of Van Buren St, and this application is premature. As you have been made aware, we emailed Ward 3 representative in 2019 and were told in writing
"we were meeting with Heather Worthington when you e-mailed. All are agreed that Van Buren should be treated like all of the other streets in SAENA – Transit 4 along Broadway, and Interior 3 for the rest. Once the Met Council approves the 2040 Plan (probably in late September or so), staff will compile a list of small technical changes like this one from around the city and submit them all together as an amendment – a pretty straightforward process that the city does quarterly or so, as various land use changes shift. Expect that to happen in January or so. In the meantime, if you hear of people sniffing around about land sales on your block, you can tell them the 2040 Plan contains an error, and Van Buren will be treated like the rest of the neighborhood."

Please confirm you have received this email and in the essence of how short the timeframe is to public hearing, I am hoping to receive responses soon.

Sarah Walbridge-Jones
625 Van Buren St NE

[EXTERNAL] This email originated from outside of the City of Minneapolis. Please exercise caution when opening links or attachments.
Hi Shanna,

Have you received a complete application for 635 van Buren St. NE? How would you like to receive public comments for this project? All but 3 houses on both sides of Van Buren have expressed opposition to this project. May I give them your email address?

Can you share the project plan with me? No plan was made available to the community. At the SAENA January community meeting, Mr. Fisher and his architect presented a lecture on climate change and did not share a complete plan.

Thank you.
Sarah Walbridge-Jones
Hi Shanna,

Will you please tell me if an application been submitted for 635 Van Buren? If one has been submitted, what is the status?
I copied a neighbor that lives on Van Buren, Sarah Walbridge-Jones, on this email. We are wondering when your office would like to view opposition information that has been gathered.

Thank you for your help,

Emily Carr

On Feb 3, 2022, at 12:13 PM, Emily Carr <carremilyr@gmail.com> wrote:

Thank you for the explanation. I’m sure I’ll have more questions- thanks for your time.

Emily Carr

On Feb 3, 2022, at 12:09 PM, Sether, Shanna M <Shanna.Sether@minneapolismn.gov> wrote:

Hello,

The zoning code requires that all land use applications (rezoning, site plan review, etc.) be heard concurrently at a public hearing. That public hearing takes place at the City Planning Commission. The rezoning is a legislative decision, which will go on to the City Council for a final decision. If any appeals of the decision of the City Planning Commission are filed, the public hearing will be held at the same City Council meetings as the rezoning, but they are separate agenda items and have separate actions.

If the application is deemed complete before February 25, 2022, this will be the schedule:

- City Planning Commission (public hearing) – March 21, 2022
- Business, Inspections, Housing, and Zoning Committee (rezoning and any appeals filed) – April 19, 2022
- City Council Meeting – April 28, 2022
If this round of deadlines are missed, these are the next series of dates:

- City Planning Commission (public hearing) – April 11, 2022
- Business, Inspections, Housing, and Zoning Committee (rezoning and any appeals filed) – May 2, 2022
- City Council Meeting – May 12, 2022

Thank you,

Shanna

Shanna Sether
Principal City Planner
She/Her/Hers

City of Minneapolis – Community Planning and Economic Development
505 4th Avenue S, #320
Minneapolis, MN 55415

Office: 612-673-2307

shanna.sether@minneapolismn.gov

www.minneapolismn.gov/cped
Ok, thanks.

Will the project application and rezoning take place at the same meeting and date or will there be multiple meetings?

If multiple dates, will you please provide those dates?

Thanks for your help,

Emily Carr

On Feb 3, 2022, at 11:13 AM, Sether, Shanna M <Shanna.Sether@minneapolismn.gov> wrote:

No, not yet. I’m expecting the submission any day now.

Thank you,

Shanna

Shanna Sether
Hi Shanna,

Has a formal submission of land use application been received by your office for 635 Van Buren St NE?

Thank you in advance,

Emily Carr
On Dec 8, 2021, at 9:43 AM, Emily Carr <carremilyr@gmail.com> wrote:

Good Morning,

Thank you very much for the information.

Have a nice day,

Emily Carr

---

On Dec 8, 2021, at 9:34 AM, Sether, Shanna M <Shanna.Sether@minneapolismn.gov> wrote:

Hello Emily,

I do not have a formal submission of a land use application for this property. I understand that the applicant intends to meet with the neighborhood association before they submit. I heard from Christina Perfetti from SAENA that they were going to schedule a community meeting with the developer and residents on January 25.

Thank you,

Shanna
From: Emily Carr  
<carremilyr@gmail.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 9:42 AM  
To: Sether, Shanna M  
<Shanna.Sether@minneapolismn.gov>  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed Development -635 Van Buren St NE
Good Afternoon,

I am one of the owners/residents of 641 Van Buren St NE and I have been made aware of a proposed development at 635 Van Buren St NE. I was hoping you could give me some information on what has been submitted to your office regarding the proposed project. My neighbors and I were quite shocked to hear of the proposal for a number of reasons. The primary reason is we were told by Steve Fletcher’s office in 2019 that the 2040 plan had an error and that Van Buren St NE should be treated like the rest of the neighborhood (Interior 3) and should not be included in Corridor 6. Below is a snip of a 2019 email from Fletcher.

Any information you can provide would be greatly appreciated.
Thank you,

Emily Carr

641 Van Buren St NE

612-865-9406

[EXTERNAL] This email originated from outside of the City of Minneapolis. Please exercise caution when opening links or attachments.
Hi Shanna,

Thank you for providing the requested information. Please add my comments below:

I am writing today as a neighbor to the proposed 635 Van Buren St NE development. As a longtime NE resident, I can not voice my displeasure of this plan enough. Don’t be fooled by Cody Fishers buzz word laden application. Attainably priced...for whom? Market rate… Please tell us what number is market rate Mr. Fisher? Sustainability??? Under what definition…. 1 bedroom units do not fill the need for families or parents with children in our community. Stainless steel and Granite are nice amenities but do not allow for affordability. Mr. Fishers seems to have discovered a Green dictionary and implemented every word of it into this planning application to sway a decision. More work needs to be put into affordability. This is the main issue in our community. We do not have a shortage of expensive 1 BR rentals.

Instead of listening to developers whose only concern is their own pocket book I ask for our leaders to listen to the neighbors.... the ones who live next to and near this property. We are the ones who have invested our lives in our homes and the neighborhood. These homes that are now being reduced to shacks in the shadow of this monstrosity.

The design provided does not fit in with the neighborhood aesthetic. This is one of the oldest areas in the city and once called St. Anthony. This modern design stands out like a sore thumb. The addition of 23 1 bedroom units to our neighborhood will do nothing but turn it into a parking lot with an oversized building. Natural drainage from the current property will be severely reduced due to paved and roof surface area. The current area of natural drainage was conveniently left out of the application. The slab-built wood frame 4 story construction poses a significant fire risk to neighboring structures, many well over 100 years old. Well Mr. Fisher claims to have engaged stakeholders in the community, he forgot the most important stakeholders... his actual neighbors! We don’t all have time to go to community meetings and stay on top of community developments. How about reaching out to us directly next time.

I appeal to our leaders to deny this application and support affordability and the people who live here.

-635 Van Buren St NE Neighbor

On Mon, Mar 7, 2022 at 7:37 PM Sether, Shanna M <Shanna.Sether@minneapolismn.gov> wrote:

> Hello,
> > Please see the attached plans and documents submitted by the applicant. The proposed rezoning is from R1A Multiple-Family District to R3 Multiple-Family District. The property is already zoned BFC6 Corridor 6 Built Form Overlay (please see attached guide). Site plan review is an application to evaluate the building, landscaping, etc. The staff report is being prepared and will be available next week Wednesday, March 16, by the end of the day.
>
> Please let me know if you have any questions or if you’d like to submit any written comments to be included in the public record.
>
> Thank you,
>
> Shanna
>
> Shanna Sether
>
> Principal City Planner
>
> She/Her/Hers
>
> City of Minneapolis – Community Planning and Economic Development
>
> 505 4th Avenue S, #320
>
> Minneapolis, MN 55415
>
> Office: 612-673-2307
>
> shanna.sether@minneapolismn.gov
>
> www.minneapolismn.gov/cped
>
> From: service <aauctionseller@gmail.com>
> Sent: Monday, March 7, 2022 7:30 PM
> To: Sether, Shanna M <Shanna.Sether@minneapolismn.gov>
> Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed rezone 635 Van Buren
Hello Shanna,

Can you please provide more information on the rezoning and site plan for 635 Van Buren St NE. This location is extremely concerning for a project of this magnitude.

Thank you!

[EXTERNAL] This email originated from outside of the City of Minneapolis. Please exercise caution when opening links or attachments.
Good morning Shanna,

I would like to submit my comments on the application for a zone change from R-1 to R-3 and the site plan for a 23 unit building at 635 Van Buren St NE. I am against the rezoning for the following reasons:

- I do not feel this site is compatible with a 23 unit building. In general, I feel that most sites on Van Buren St NE are not compatible with a 23 unit building.
- It is my opinion that there are reasonable uses of this property without the rezoning. I am currently a renter in the beginning stages of planning to buy my first home. I have found a community in this neighborhood and would love to eventually purchase a home here. There is a pattern of developing family homes into multi-unit buildings which greatly reduces my chances of finding a home in this neighborhood.
- A 23 unit building that does not provide parking will stress Van Buren St. Increased traffic from residents and all of the street parking needed to accommodate them will greatly affect the quiet neighborhood feel of this street.
- A three-story, 23 unit building situated amongst smaller family homes will ruin the aesthetics of this neighborhood street. In addition, the construction of this 23 unit building will require the removal of large shade trees that add to the overall aesthetic of the street.
- I do not feel that this development serves the public interest of other households on Van Buren St NE

In summary, I feel that the rezoning of 635 Van Buren St NE or any home on Van Buren St will heavily tax this street and tarnish this well-established neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Andrea (Ande) Schneider
Resident, Van Buren St NE
Hi Shanna

My name is Andy Krishnan. I was the previous owner of 635 Van buren St NE, Minneapolis, MN 55413. It seems the buyers if my previous residence are trying to develop the property into an egregious 4 story property. I am vehemently opposed to this. I had lived in northeast for 7 years and own 13 smaller multi family and single family homes in the northeast area. Specifically 2 properties on the block of Van Buren. 643 Van Buren and 723 Van Buren. I am a big advocate for homeownership, diversity, and fair market rent/housing. This project seems like a terrible idea. A new property of this size will increase rents across the whole neighborhood. This block has been a very tight knit association for many years. A development like this would ruin the the neighborhood. The St Anthony East Association have maintained and created a great park space along central and this project which was just redone a few years ago and this would destroy that. I understand development has to happen but this is not the location for it at this time. Please keep me informed on the progress of this development.

Thanks,

Andy Krishnan

Shiva Properties, LLC
11800 Singletree Lane Suite 301
Eden Prairie, MN 55344

(612) 388-7525 (Mobile)

(612) 872-2302 (Office)

Realtor at Bridge Realty, LLC
License # 40715232
andykrishnan1@gmail.com
akrishnan@thebridgerealty.com

www.UptownApartmentsmpls.com

[EXTERNAL] This email originated from outside of the City of Minneapolis. Please exercise caution when opening links or attachments.
Shanna,

My name is Brad Johnson and I currently live and own a duplex on Van Buren St. NE. I would challenge a city planner to actually come out and look at the location. This is a very residential area mainly single family and multi family homes. Van Buren also has a very accident-prone intersection at the end of the street, this building will only increase the risk. The apartment will also make parking near impossible on this street and near by streets. An apartment went up on Broadway with no parking. This has affected parking on the north side of Van Buren already. I have additional concerns if you would like to chat. I strongly oppose this development of 635 Van Buren. Feel free to call me if you have any questions (715)519-0296.

Thanks,

Brad J. Johnson
PROCUREMENT MANAGER - PACKAGING

ECOLAB 1 ECOLAB PLACE, ST. PAUL, MN 55102
C 715 519 0296 E Brad.Johnson@ecolab.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail communication and any attachments may contain proprietary and privileged information for the use of the designated recipients named above. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.

[EXTERNAL] This email originated from outside of the City of Minneapolis. Please exercise caution when opening links or attachments.
Hi Shanna,

Thanks again for sharing the concerns the owners of 641 Van Buren Street submitted to the City about the potential impact my proposed project at 635 Van Buren might have on their garage access.

After receiving their comments from you on Friday, February 25th, we studied the issue and I sent them the email below with the attached site drawings to see if we can find a solution that will preserve their garage access.

I haven't heard back from them and have followed up again today accordingly.

I understand this is a private matter regarding private property. I'm forwarding this to you for inclusion in the public record along with their original comments.

Best,
Cody

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Cody Fischer <service.ckmj@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, Mar 2, 2022 at 1:16 PM
Subject: Ensuring Garage Access
To: <carrdimitri@gmail.com>, <carremilyr@gmail.com>, Cody Fischer <service.ckmj@gmail.com>

Emily & Dimitri,

I'm reaching out to see if we can set up a time to discuss possible solutions to your garage access concerns with the development of 635 Van Buren.

City staff shared your comments / concerns with me last Friday, and we've been working on a possible solution since then. I'm grateful you raised the issue so we can improve the design to ensure access for you.

Attached are two schematic, scaled drawings of the relevant alley/driveway area for discussion.

- Drawing 1: shows the existing site plan and how a truck could theoretically pull into the second garage door. In reality, I think this is problematic, as a vehicle wouldn't start perpendicular with the alley and would be difficult in practice.
- Drawing 2: shows the trash enclosure moved further south on my lot, and a potential paved path we could create to give you more of a 45 degree angled path to your garage.

Neither drawing has the ground surface material updated, so ignore that for the time being.
I think Drawing 2 preserves reasonably good access to your garage for even a large vehicle. We cannot move the trash enclosure any further south because we need to maintain ramping accessibility to it for ADA requirements.

If you're open to discussing, I suggest the following next steps:

- Set up a call to discuss your concern
- Verify that our dimensional assumptions are correct. In particular your:
  - Distance from garage door edge to existing fence (we estimate 1'6" in drawing)
  - Garage door width & spacing
  - Distance from garage front to lot line (just use your fence post as the marker)
  - Length of your largest vehicle
- Have my architect and civil engineer flesh out the details once we are aligned on a possible solution

I am available next Tuesday afternoon, Wednesday after 10:00 and Thursday after 11:00 if you'd like to suggest a time that works for you.

I hope to hear from you soon.

--
Kind Regards,

Cody Fischer
M: 612-567-3990
E: service.ckmj@gmail.com

--
Kind Regards,

Cody Fischer
Submit Maintenance Requests at Avail.co
M: 612-567-3990
E: service.ckmj@gmail.com

[EXTERNAL] This email originated from outside of the City of Minneapolis. Please exercise caution when opening links or attachments.
EXISTING GARAGE APPROX. DIM.

VERIFY LOCATION OF EXISTING GARAGE DOORS FROM FENCE

EXISTING WOOD FENCE

PROPERTY LINE

SITE DRAINAGE

PROPOSED BOLLARDS TO PROTECT BUILDING FROM IMPACT DAMAGE

PROPOSED GARAGE ACCESS

1/8" = 1'-0"

CARBON SMART APARTMENTS

635 Van Buren Street NE
Minneapolis, MN

SITE PLAN_X

3/2/2022 12:25:39 PM
Good morning Shanna,

Please see the list below of my reasoning why 635 Van Buren should not be approved for the requested zoning change-

- Council member Steve Fletcher provided written confirmation that he and CPED recognized there was a mistake in the 2040 plan. He said the East side of Van Buren should not be changed to R6.
- The property does not actually back up to Central Ave. The house is on Van Buren St and would not have direct access to Central Ave. The alley and park separate the property from Central Ave.
- On each side of the home, there are single family homes. This 20+ unit, four-story apartment complex, built in between those two-story homes, would not fit the neighborhood aesthetic. Currently, any multi-family complex on Van Buren that is more than four units sits on an intersection or at the end of a block; it does not sit in the middle of the block because, logistically, it does not make sense to have high density in the middle of a residential street.
- The owner is trying to make the most profit by cramming small units into this building with no parking. Despite the green aspect of not having parking, and hoping that people will bike, tenants will have vehicles. Street parking will become unbearable and dangerously overcrowded. Even with an influx of bikers and pedestrians, the increase in foot, bike, and vehicle traffic is not well suited for the intersection of Central Ave and Spring Street, as the turn to get onto Van Buren from Central is already abnormally short. Further, we regularly see vehicles run red lights along Central.
- The 4 story building will encroach on sunlight and privacy for the neighboring properties.
- The existing home is in great condition and has a large yard.
- This redevelopment doesn't make sense south of Summer St, and certainly wouldn't make sense north of Summer St. The raised intersection of Central and Broadway completely blocks the access from Central to the properties north of Summer St. Allowing a zoning change to 635 Van Buren will set precedent that will forever destroy the neighborhood feel of Van Buren St. It will drive homeowners out and developers in.

Thank you,

Evan Johnson
634 Van Buren St. NE
507-254-2642

[EXTERNAL] This email originated from outside of the City of Minneapolis. Please exercise caution when opening links or attachments.
March 11, 2022

City of Minneapolis
Shanna Sether
Principal City planner

Re: Rezoning of 635 Van Buren St NE Minneapolis

My name is Soraya Scott and I own a property at 655 Van Buren St.

I object to rezoning of a single family home to a 23 unit dwelling. According to city zoning requirements which is attached in the following link, parking is a consideration.


Parking on this street is already an issue for residents. Adding another 23 households to the current problem is going to create additional burden on current residents.

There are already a few multi unit buildings on this street with fair amount of density. Additional multi unit buildings is not beneficial for this specific location and would hinder the current residents' quality of life.

Soraya Scott
651-225-0919
RE: 635 Van Buren Proposed Development

To Members of the Minneapolis Planning Commission and Department Staff:

I implore you to think critically about the proposed development at 635 Van Buren and ask you to oppose the project’s site plan and rezoning request.

At the St. Anthony East Neighborhood Association Meeting, Mr. Fischer informed neighbors that the reason he selected this particular area was because of the Minneapolis 2040 Plan’s change in desired density for the east side of Van Buren Street Northeast. As it turns out, that change was a mistake. Former Councilman Steve Fletcher informed neighbors, in writing, that CPED erred in assigning the east side of Van Buren as a BFC6 Built Form Corridor 6 Overlay District. While the error was unfortunately not corrected in the 2040 Plan, this committee has the opportunity to prevent further detriment to the St. Anthony East Neighborhood.

Van Buren Street is not a central corridor. It is a quiet residential street, lined with single-family homes and small-scale multifamily housing. When entering Van Buren from the South and turning onto Van Buren from Central, via Spring Street, vehicles and bicycles are forced to make a quick left turn. That turn is already highly hazardous with cars lining Spring Street, and becomes more dangerous with an influx of pedestrians, cars, and bicycles, especially during evenings and weekends. In just the last few months, we have seen several near-accidents at or near the Central-Spring intersection, plus several cars blatantly running the red light on Central Avenue. Further, the street does not have the capacity to significantly increase the number of parked cars. Though admirable, it is unrealistic that 635 Van Buren would not have any residents with cars, or that they would all rely on public transportation. While 635 Van Buren is near a bus stop, only the 10 stops there and, as mentioned, it is not a particularly safe intersection for pedestrians or bikers.

The east side of Van Buren does not border Central Avenue, which seems to be the most important factor for it being dedicated as Built Form Corridor 6. An alley, the Community Commons Park, and an elevated sidewalk separate Van Buren from Central Avenue. Except for the lot at the triangular corner of Van Buren, Spring Street, and Central Avenue, there are no lots along Van Buren that adjoin Central Avenue. Changing the zoning of this block does not align to its current user the use desired by the existing and surrounding residents and landowners. To only change the zoning of the specific parcel of 635 Van Buren runs the risk of spot zoning, which the City should be weary of engaging in.

The Saint Anthony East Neighborhood is renter friendly and supports multi-family housing. My partner and I own and live in the duplex across the street from 635 Van Buren; our neighbors include a family renting from the Minneapolis Housing Authority, a man who has lived in his 19th century home for over 50 years, families in single-family homes and multifamily
housing, and single or coupled renters in duplexes, triplexes, quadraplexes, and larger. This neighborhood has a great variety of housing types and, importantly, all developments that are larger than three or four units are built along higher traffic areas, such as Spring Street. Maintaining the precedent of keeping developments at street corners keeps them accessible, lightens the burden on traffic, and prevents disruption of existing aesthetic of neighborhoods. Placing a four-story, 20+ apartment complex in the middle of a residential block defies this strategy and disrupts the ecosystem of the neighborhood.

I am a strong proponent of smart, strategic development. 635 Van Buren does not meet that threshold. This development purports to be environmentally friendly, but even if the development is “net zero” when built, the deconstruction of the existing home, plus the process of manufacturing, shipping, and constructing the housing complex, releases significantly more carbon than would occur if the home were left standing. There are plenty of homes that cannot be rebuilt and would make far better candidates for tearing down; this home is not one of them. Being a good steward of our land and existing infrastructure is our duty as Minneapolis residents.

Even if approved, this is a difficult project. Building a 20+ unit complex on the parcel of a single-family home in an established residential neighborhood could be a challenge for even a seasoned developer. At the time Mr. Fischer and his architect team presented at the St. Anthony East Neighborhood Association Meeting, he had not yet completed a housing development. Mr. Fischer has not provided any information as to how this project will be funded or financed, or whether he has the proper infrastructure or support to manage a property of this size in terms of construction, tenant resources, or property management and facility needs.

Finally, Minneapolis needs affordable housing. Mr. Fischer claims his units will be “attainably priced” but has not provided insight as to what, exactly, that means. Based on his construction plans and proposed sustainability standards, these units will be far from qualifying as naturally occurring affordable housing.

I appreciate your time and consideration. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me directly.

Sincerely,

Catrina Mairose
634 Van Buren Street Northeast
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55413
Hi Shanna,

I live at 625 Van Buren St NE, Minneapolis, MN 55413. I am within 350 feet of the property asking for rezoning. As understood by planning staff, the rezone application before the Planning Commission must meet the following criteria to be approved. The attached memo is an analysis of the five (5) criteria and justification on why the rezone does not meet all the criteria, and the Planning Commission should send a recommendation to the planning and zoning committee of the Council to deny this rezoning application. Please see the attached memo for full findings.

Sarah Walbridge-Jones

[EXTERNAL] This email originated from outside of the City of Minneapolis. Please exercise caution when opening links or attachments.
March 15th, 2022
Subject: Rezone testimony on 635 Van Buren St NE

As understood from planning staff, the rezone application before the Planning Commission must meet the following criteria to be approved. This memo is an analysis of the five (5) criteria and justification on why the rezone does not meet all the criteria, and the Planning Commission should send a recommendation to the planning and zoning committee of the Council to deny this rezone application.

From the code:
525.280. Findings and recommendations of city planning commission on zoning amendments. After the close of the hearing on a proposed amendment, the city planning commission shall make findings with respect to the following and shall submit the same together with its recommendations to the zoning and planning committee of the city council:

(1) Whether the amendment is consistent with the applicable policies of the comprehensive plan.

Finding: The subject property along with the properties along Van Buren were designated Corridor 6 in the adopted 2040 Plan. The designation is for “high frequency transit routes as well as in areas near METRO stations

However, the underlying zone which sets the standards and uses for development is still R-1 and only those uses allowed in the zone are currently allowed.

The properties along the east side of Van Buren should never have been included in the Corridor 6 category, and the residents of Van Buren are opposed to this and will be submitting an application to amend the 2040 Plan to remove the Van Buren parcels from the transit designation as well as seeking legal advice on the promise we were made by Steve Fletcher and Heather Worthington that this Built Form was a mistake and would be changed (see attachment)
(2) **Whether the amendment is in the public interest and is not solely for the interest of a single property owner.**

Finding: This is an amendment to the R-1 Zone designation to allow for 23 multifamily units on a 7770 square foot parcel. There are currently no other multifamily units of this density on Van Buren St, but single-family dwellings, duplexes and triplexes that have existed here for at least 30 years. This is not a high-density multifamily neighborhood. This is a neighborhood where there is a mix of units, not all single-family dwellings. This is an application for one lot and one property owner and is solely in the interest of the applicant to construct 23 units on an interior neighborhood street which contains no other multifamily units of this size on a lot of this size.

The below map includes current parcel use:

- Single Family Home
- Duplex, Triplex, or R4 apartment (718 Van Buren only)
(3) Whether the existing uses of property and the zoning classification of property within the general area of the property in question are compatible with the proposed zoning classification, where the amendment is to change the zoning classification of particular property.

Finding: As stated in the 2nd criteria, Van Buren has historically been a neighborhood of more than just single-family units, but not multi-family, high density. The introduction of an apartment building of at least 23 units on a 7770 square foot parcel with no on-site parking, play area, landscaping is completely incompatible with the existing neighborhood. Most homes have off-street parking, play areas for kids, and use on street parking for guests. This is the character, and has been for 50 plus years, the intrusion of multi-family zoning on one small parcel into this neighborhood is not at all compatible.

Many of the neighbors believe the designation in the 2040 Plan of Corridor 6 for one side of Van Buren is a mistake. However, since this application for the rezone was accepted by the City, we have to make our argument here. This is not a transit-related neighborhood, we are not on Central Avenue nor is there a bus stop on Van Buren. There is a buffer of open space, a park, and an easement along with an elevation change between the homes on Van Buren and Central. Our neighborhood owns and maintains the open green space, not the city of Minneapolis. It was a mistake to designate one side of the street as compatible for high density uses as this is not compatible with the existing neighborhood. The neighborhood already serves the ideals of the 2040 Plan in that there is a mix of uses. It is not solely a single-family residential neighborhood. There is a mix.

However, inserting 23 units on a small parcel with no parking is not compatible with the current R-1 Zoning and the existing uses. It just makes no sense to zone one parcel in the center of this neighborhood for multifamily uses with no parking requirement. It will forever alter the character of the existing neighborhood, which we believe was not the intent in the 2040 Plan.
(4) **Whether there are reasonable uses of the property in question permitted under the existing zoning classification, where the amendment is to change the zoning classification of particular property.**

Finding: The existing use of this single property is a single-family dwelling, however, the zoning would allow duplexes and triplexes. There are reasonable uses for the property which do not necessitate a zone change and would leave an existing neighborhood intact and provide home ownership opportunities which supports 2040 plan goal of eliminating disparities in housing.

(5) **Whether there has been a change in the character or trend of development in the general area of the property in question, which has taken place since such property was placed in its present zoning classification, where the amendment is to change the zoning classification of particular property.**

Finding: This neighborhood is not solely a single-family residential area. We understand that the 2040 Plan reduces single family only neighborhoods to allow for duplexes, triplexes and ADU’s, etc. This neighborhood already does that. The trend was established at least 50 years ago. This trend in land development has existed for years. The abrupt change from R-1 to R-3 does not meet this criteria. It will change the character of the neighborhood and is incompatible with the existing legal development.

**This Zone Change should receive a recommendation of denial to Council.**
Hello my name is Jeremiah Stich and I live at 751 van Burene st ne I have lived here for 2 years.

I am writing in opposition of the proposal to zone change the property at 635 Van Burene St NE. Van Burene has historically been a neighborhood of more than just single-family units, but not multi-family, high density. The introduction of an apartment building of at least 23 units on a 7770 square foot parcel with no on-site parking, play area, landscaping is completely incompatible with the existing neighborhood. Most homes have off-street parking, play areas for kids, and use on-street parking for guests. This is the character and has been for 50 plus years, the intrusion of multi-family zoning on one small parcel into this neighborhood is not at all compatible.

This is an application for one lot and one property owner and is solely in the interest of the applicant to construct 23 units on an interior neighborhood street. This would destroy the character of our neighborhood and should receive a recommendation for denial to Council.

Please consider the wishes of the people who live in this neighborhood.

Jeremiah Stich

[EXTERNAL] This email originated from outside of the City of Minneapolis. Please exercise caution when opening links or attachments.
i'm mostly concerned about the build to the lot line on a shared driveway. this neighborhood has endured a lot of change over the decades and can endure more, but directly impacting post-construction use of a neighboring property is a no-go.

looking at the interior layout, it looks more like a series of shoeboxes. i think minneapolis can do better than developer cash grabs at the extent of future livability.

--
dave hauser
612-802-6068
747 van buren
Hello again,
I own a large duplex at 620 VanBuren st ne. since May of 2004. At that time the neighborhood was far from pristine. Over the years the neighborhood has undergone a tremendous change in culture. Its character is vibrant, welcoming and quiet, very quiet. The introduction of an apartment building of at least 23 units on a 7770 square foot parcel with no on-site parking, will destroy the present vibe and feeling of the neighborhood. It would be a crime against the current residents in the area. The idea of not providing any off street parking will create a inhumane affect to seniors and create a very un-safe environment.

Cc: Micheal Rainville

James R Holmquist
MPRB Electrical Foreman
612499-9090
612-313-7768

[EXTERNAL] This email originated from outside of the City of Minneapolis. Please exercise caution when opening links or attachments.
Hi Shanna,

I wanted to reach out as I've been made aware that there is an opportunity for a zone change on our street. I am located at 649 Van Buren St NE, just a few houses down from 635 (the site of the proposed development). I honestly cannot express my opposition strongly enough for this change. We are a quiet street that already deals with an overflow of traffic due to several bars and businesses in the area. Additionally, our street suffers from a very dangerous intersection when trying to drive onto Central, or coming off of Central ave onto Van Buren. I fear that the additional congestion and influx of people will make a dangerous intersection worse, and completely change the feel of the neighborhood.

If this zoning change is allowed to go through, our small alleyway will have to serve more than double the current residents and traffic, which it is completely unequipped to handle. In short, I believe that this is a very self serving development application that will benefit only the property owner of 635 Van Buren, despite the detrimental impact to the rest of the residents. I sincerely hope that you do not recommend a zoning change to our quiet and quaint neighborhood street.

Please feel free to reach out to me if you wish to discuss, though I am sure that you have been inundated with these kinds of pleas.

Best, Robert Hanlon

--

Robert Hanlon
952.913.7002
Classic Auto Reproductions/Kelm Motor Parts

[EXTERNAL] This email originated from outside of the City of Minneapolis. Please exercise caution when opening links or attachments.
Hello, this is Christian Johnson and Stephanie Shadick and we live at 739 Jackson St NE. We've lived here since 2010 and at 626 Jackson St NE from 2008 until we bought our home.

We're writing in opposition of the proposal to zone change the property at 635 Van Buren St NE. Van Buren has historically been a neighborhood of more than just single-family units, but not multi-family, high density. The introduction of an apartment building of at least 23 units on a 7770 square foot parcel with no on-site parking, play area, landscaping is completely incompatible with the existing neighborhood. Most homes have off-street parking, play areas for kids, and use on-street parking for guests. This is the character and has been for 50 plus years, the intrusion of multi-family zoning on one small parcel into this neighborhood is not at all compatible.

This is an application for one lot and one property owner and is solely in the interest of the applicant to construct 23 units on an interior neighborhood street. This would destroy the character of our neighborhood and should receive a recommendation for denial to Council.

Moreover, basically everyone in the neighborhood is against this development. It's just too much for this street and the block.

Where will the cars live? Evening parking saturation on the 600 block of Van Buren is already a nearly daily occurrence, and despite proximity to bus transit and ample bike storage, the people who live there will own cars, like we've seen on our street at 756 Jackson.

The ingress/egress point of our neighborhood at Spring and Central is already congested and awkward for cars and pedestrians and with the MPHA properties and taverns nearby the intersection and neighborhood already endure more traffic than usual.

Additionally, two beautiful mature trees will be removed in order to accommodate the oversized structure. This is unacceptable due to the canopy loss we've already experienced in the neighborhood and citywide.

People need homes but this doesn't mean the developers are allowed to do whatever they want.

We implore Planning and Zoning and the city council to reject this proposal.

Thank you,