

**Excerpt from the
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
Minneapolis Community Planning & Economic Development (CPED)**

250 South Fourth Street, Room 300
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1385
(612) 673-3710 Phone
(612) 673-2526 Fax
(612) 673-2157 TDD

MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 7, 2014

TO: Zoning and Planning Committee

FROM: Jason Wittenberg, Manager, Community Planning & Economic Development – Land Use, Design and Preservation

SUBJECT: Planning Commission decisions of July 14, 2014

The following actions were taken by the Planning Commission on July 14, 2014. As you know, the Planning Commission's decisions on items other than rezonings, text amendments, vacations, 40 Acre studies and comprehensive plan amendments are final subject to a ten calendar day appeal period before permits can be issued.

Commissioners present: President Tucker, Bender, Brown, Forney, Gagnon, Gisselman, Kronzer, Luepke-Pier and Slack – 9

Committee Clerk: Lisa Kusz (612) 673-3710

13. Marcy Holmes Master Plan and Dinkytown Business District Plan (Ward: 3), ([Haila Maze](#)).

A. Master Plan: Consider the adoption of the Marcy-Holmes Neighborhood Master Plan and Dinkytown Business District Plan documents.

Action: The City Planning Commission recommended that the City Council **approve** the Marcy-Holmes Neighborhood Master Plan and Dinkytown Business District Plan document and **amend** the policy guidance for the area into the City's comprehensive plan. The comprehensive plan amendment is subject to final review and approval by the Metropolitan Council.

Aye: Bender, Brown, Forney, Gagnon, Gisselman, Kronzer, Luepke-Pier and Slack

Staff Maze presented the staff report.

President Tucker opened the public hearing.

Robert Stableski (222 2nd St SE): I've chaired the steering committee for the last 15 months that developed the master plan. I think that some of the major features of the plan, in addition to all the open meetings we've had and all the focus groups and all the discussions that Marcy Holmes does not lack people for people who

have opinions of what should be done. It was a vibrant process that I found out and learned a lot from. A lot of discussion was around supporting the City's plan for growth. The neighborhood has grown from 9000 people in the 2000 census to 10,000 people in the 2010 census and we've approved 2500 units since then. Growth is something that is not foreign to us. At the same time, that growth needs to be accompanied by some flexibility and some development of some of the other areas to support it. We want to preserve the character of Marcy Holmes while all this growth is happening. There are parts of the plan which call for some changes and some adaptation in terms of how we can get into some medium density housing and not just have single family and then a periphery of big tall buildings around the outside. I think there are some interesting things in there that are proposed for discussion, they aren't demanded, but they're proposed for discussion. There is a lot of infrastructure that needs to adapt to this neighborhood. If you look at the riverfront alone how much more residential there is there yet the whole infrastructure was designed for commercial and industrial. These are the types of things we hope that the plan can address and can bring to the floor and improve the neighborhood and address the issues in the city. Haila didn't mention the Ninth Street industrial area which we think is an asset that could be redeveloped for incubator businesses and cottage industries and become a vibrant economic part of the neighborhood which I thought was exciting. Then, of course, we want to maintain the riverfront and the access to it. I understand there's a lot of overlap in jurisdictions along the riverfront, but the neighborhood's perspective it's a gem to be protected and something we want to improve both the walking access for the neighborhood, but also the through access for bike trails.

Steve Minn (1701 Madison St NE): My partners and myself were the developers of many of the pioneering residential properties on the riverfront district of this area. We have some comments related to the riverfront section of the plan. We have a piece of property at 600 Main St SE, which is right at the trail head of the Stone Arch Bridge at the intersection of 6th and Main St SE. If you were to drive that intersection at 6th and Main SE it would look like the front surface parking lot of the Stone Arch Apartments, which we built in 2004. My partners and I have over 400 units in the two square block area centered around 6th and Main SE. We've invested over \$100m in three separate properties – the Flour Sack Flats Condominiums, the Stone Arch Apartments, and we recently developed and delivered the 520 2nd St Apartments. We're good property owners, we're good investors and we maintain our properties. Our problem, and why we ask for your assistance today, is that despite our recent public comments both at the neighborhood level hearings and prior hearings on this topic at the input level, we don't think that staff has adequately responded to our concern which is that the land we own at 600 Main St is privately owned, privately held and we have no intent of selling the land for the purposes of a park. The staff has not responded to our comment. John Wall made the comment on 5/18/14 via email, staff's response to the email was that staff added language that the area within the regional park boundary is guided long term for a park for the Metropolitan Council's Regional Park Policy Plan. Well, that's true. I could also say today is Tuesday or today is Monday. Today being Monday would be the correct statement, Tuesday would be incorrect. What we are looking for is an answer to our issue. Our issue is that we own land privately and we have no intention of turning our land into a park. The last time a master plan identified our parcel we got into litigation with the city over whether we were entitled to bring it forward for an apartment development. We don't want to go through that fit again. We ask for your help to identify this parcel as privately held and unless we're a willing seller you'll only develop park land on public lands that are acquired from a willing seller. This report identifies three other private properties; Metal Matic, WD Forbes and the steam plant. We are not on the riverfront; the steam plant is and we're behind the steam plant. We would like the same protections afforded by these specifically named private property owners to identify that our parcel is privately owned, properly zoned for development, it is in the I2 zone with an ILOD overlay and that if we wish to develop it, this adoption of this plan is not an impediment for doing that. Otherwise there is a cloud on our property and we're asking you not to put a cloud on our property by whether we can develop it or not.

President Tucker: We discussed this issue at COW and the precedence of Above the Falls where policy guidance called for park in properties that are not likely to become park soon, but might be with a willing seller.

President Tucker closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Brown: I'd like to move staff recommendation to approve these items and amend the policy guidance in the Comprehensive Plan (Forney seconded).

Aye: Bender, Brown, Forney, Gagnon, Gisselman, Kronzer, Luepke-Pier and Slack