

Marcy-Holmes Neighborhood Master Plan and Dinkytown Business District Plan
Written Comments Received During 45-Day Public Review – as of 6/5/14
Comments summarized below – full text attached as separate document

Comment	Source	Location in Plan	Response
Marcy-Holmes Plan Comments			
<p>I write to provide the following information on behalf of the owners/developers of the 600 Main Street SE property, the Stone Arch Apartments, the Stone Arch Apartments 2, and the Flour Sack Flats Condominiums. Our partnership purchased the property that includes 600 Main Street SE in 1999 when the property was nothing more than an abandoned riverfront wasteland. It was riddled with railroad tracks, and industrial uses. With the City’s support and encouragement (and financing) we cleaned up the area, including significant environmental contamination. We constructed two blocks of Main Street, and singlehandedly revitalized this portion of the neighborhood by constructing hundreds of non-student market-rate, affordable, and for-sale housing units at the end of the Stone Arch Bridge.</p> <p>The 600 Main Street property is located in the City’s I-2 Medium Industrial District with rights under the IL Industrial Living Overlay District (“ILOD”). This means that residential uses are permitted and anticipated for this parcel of land. We have submitted several proposals for residential development on this site that have been encouraged and approved by the local neighborhood organizations and city planners. We have already have invested tens of millions of dollars in our various riverfront projects, and many hours of planning, architectural fees, and engineering expenditures into our property so as to realize our investment backed expectations for this parcel.</p> <p>We Love the Riverfront, and we have made a huge financial</p>	<p>John Wall 5/18/14 email</p>	<p>Marcy-Holmes – Character Areas p. 49</p>	<p>Added language to clarify that the area within the regional park boundary is guided long term for park, per the Metropolitan Council’s regional park policy plan.</p>

<p>commitment to its redevelopment. We are concerned, however, that our privately-owned property is being targeted for parkland. Our investment-backed expectations are that we will build another residential building on this site, with the same support from the City that we received before we cleaned up this part of the Riverfront. We do not support the extension of park designation to our privately owned land, which we intend to develop, consistent with what we and our neighbors have done in the immediate area.</p> <p>We propose that that the master plan language be modified to reflect that any riverfront property planned for acquisition for expanded parkland, be acquired exclusively from “willing sellers” only. Any planning document to the contrary would be considered as an unintended prohibition on private development, and therefore a taking of private property.</p>			
<p>“Eleventh Avenue SE...bike-friendly street...” Bike-friendly street is vague. 11th Avenue is not identified on the Bicycle Master Plan.</p>	Public Works	Marcy-Holmes Executive Summary p. 9	This is part of a larger plan to create an access to the river and bike street on the East Side parallel to 6 th on the West Side.
<p>Make the streets ours. The whole paragraph is oddly written and should be reconsidered. What does “Prioritize the character and feel of local streets” mean?</p>	Public Works	Marcy-Holmes Neighborhood and Plan Context p. 17	Paragraph reworded to clarify that the focus is on ensuring that major roads function well for both locals as well as regional through traffic
<p>Is there still a “Granary Corridor?”</p>	Public Works	Marcy-Holmes Neighborhood and Plan Context p. 18	Vision for Granary Corridor consistent with outcomes from Public Works-led 2012 Granary Corridor study http://www.minneapolis

			mn.gov/cip/all/cip_semi_index . Currently being championed by University District Alliance for implementation.
Graphic at top of page. (1) “The system is outdated; update it to fit,” would prefer to see that statement removed. (2) What is a “green street”? (3) 11th Avenue is not on the Bicycle Master Plan.	Public Works	Marcy-Holmes Plan Frameworks p. 28	(1) reworded to clarify the need for improvement (2) clarified/added language to demonstrate this is a high amenity landscaped corridor (3) added “proposed” to bicycle facilities label on map
“Mitigate the impacts of through traffic on public open spaces...” What does this mean? “...frequency of mass transit...” Mass transit is archaic terminology, should simply be called transit.”	Public Works	Marcy-Holmes Plan Frameworks p. 28	Added language on buffering and traffic calming to clarify mitigation statement Corrected “mass transit” language
Amend sentence “and imposes an annual fee of \$25 for a permit” as rates change.”	Public Works	Marcy-Holmes Plan Frameworks p. 28	Made change as requested
“Create diagonal on street parking to replace surface lots where large truck loading access is not needed.” (1) On street parking and surface lots are a part of two different systems. One cannot replace the other. (2) If on-street diagonal parking is desired an engineering study must be performed to show that it is workable within the curb line of the roadway.	Public Works	Marcy-Holmes Character Areas p. 34	Changed language to clarify that on-street parking supplements (not replaces) off street parking, and to condition based on engineering study

<p>“Reconnect 7th and 8th Avenues between 8th Street and 9th Street to increase the visibility and accessibility of the area.” This is a completely unrealistic expectation. It would require several million dollars to acquire and relocate businesses and build new infrastructure. Who has a budget for that? Also, to condemn the properties the City would have to prove that there is an overwhelming public need to do so.</p>	<p>Public Works</p>	<p>Marcy-Holmes Character Areas p. 35</p>	<p>The plan’s vision recognizes the issues, but also wants to reconnect 9th Street to the neighborhood more visibly. This is part of the larger plan to revitalize that part of the neighborhood. Added language regarding the need to “investigate the feasibility of reconnecting 7th and 8th”</p>
<p>“Improve the bicycle and pedestrian environment on the Stone Arch Bike Boulevard.” Where is the Stone Arch Bike Boulevard and what does it have to do with 9th Street?</p>	<p>Public Works</p>	<p>Marcy-Holmes Character Areas p. 35</p>	<p>The Stone Arch Bike Boulevard is a City-designated bike route. http://www.minneapolis.mn.gov/bicycles/projects/Stone-Arch-Bridge-Presidents It is shown on the map on the same page.</p>
<p>“Improve infrastructure to prevent flooding.” Public Works has a city-wide flood mitigation program underway that is prioritizing needed improvements. Perhaps change to, “Explore infrastructure improvements to prevent flooding.”</p>	<p>Public Works</p>	<p>Marcy-Holmes Character Areas p. 35, 38, 39</p>	<p>Made change to language as requested</p>
<p>“Support locating the streetcar maintenance facility north of Marcy-Holmes.” It is not appropriate for this report to support a particular location for the facility. That decision will be made through the Environmental Assessment process.</p>	<p>Public Works</p>	<p>Marcy-Holmes Character Areas p. 36</p>	<p>Changed language from “support” to “consider” maintenance facility location</p>
<p>“Formalize 5th Street SE as a special neighborhood amenity....” Not really sure what this means?</p>	<p>Public Works</p>	<p>Marcy-Holmes Character Areas p. 38</p>	<p>Clarified language to focus on role of 5th St as neighborhood amenity</p>

			that connects the East Side and West Side
“Add 5th Street SE and recommendations for becoming a park-like street...to the City’s Capital Improvement Plan (CIP).” (1) What is meant by “park-like street?” (2) It is not appropriate for this type of planning document the dictate what is in the CIP.	Public Works	Marcy-Holmes Character Areas p. 38	Clarified that 5th St SE is a street with park-like amenities which is open to cars but prioritizes pedestrian and bicycle traffic
“Improve pedestrian and cyclist crossing experience on 4th and 8th Streets SE by decreasing the crossing distance....” And “Install bump-outs...at all intersections on the south sides of 4th Street. Installing bump-outs to reduce the crossing distance on 4th would require removal of a through-traffic lane. This may not be possible. At most we should say something like, “Conduct a traffic study to determine if bump-outs could be installed on 4th Street SE...”	Public Works	Marcy-Holmes Character Areas p. 39	Made change to language as requested
“Create a neighborhood-oriented experience...along 4th and 8th Streets.” Again, not sure what that really means? Also, 4th and 8th Streets are very different types of roads. 4th Street is an A-Minor Arterial and a State Trunk Highway. 8th Street is a Major Collector and a City street.	Public Works	Marcy-Holmes Character Areas p. 39	Changed language to "Enhance neighborhood experience and environment along 4th and 8th St by increasing priorities for pedestrian and bicycle traffic"
“...pursue City or County ownership.” That would require a substantial commitment of City resources. It is very unlikely the City would want to assume that ownership.	Public Works	Marcy-Holmes Character Areas p. 39	Replace “pursue” with “investigate” to acknowledge that feasibility may need to be determined
“Add 5th Street SE and recommendations for becoming a park-like street...to the City’s Capital Improvement Plan (CIP).” (1) What is meant by “park-like street?” (2) It is not appropriate for this type of planning document the dictate what is in the CIP.	Public Works	Marcy-Holmes Character Areas p. 40	Clarified that 5th St SE is a street with park-like amenities which is open to cars but prioritizes pedestrian and bicycle

			traffic
“Use City capital....to make 5th Street SE a park-like street....” Same comment as above for Page 40.	Public Works	Marcy-Holmes Character Areas p. 43	Removed park-like and City capital references, replaced with language generally supporting the project
“Develop a vertical connection between Dinkytown and Dinkytown Greenway.” That is a funded project in the City’s 5- Year CIP.	Public Works	Marcy-Holmes Character Areas p. 47	Plan implementation is already underway on several of the recommendations; it was determined it was important to restate support in case there was need for additional project funding in future years
“Prioritize 11th Avenue SE...” Change to “Investigate the development of 11th Ave SE...”	Public Works	Marcy-Holmes Character Areas p. 47	Made change to language as requested
“Add 5th Street SE and recommendations for becoming a park- like street...to the City’s Capital Improvement Plan (CIP).” (1) What is meant by “park-like street?” (2) It is not appropriate for this type of planning document the dictate what is in the CIP.	Public Works	Marcy-Holmes Character Areas p. 47	Removed park-like and CIP references, replaced with language generally supporting the project
Change to “Explore improvements to I-35W crossings.....possibly with lighting and wider sidewalks...”	Public Works	Marcy-Holmes Character Areas p. 47	Made change to language as requested
Same comments as above regarding: (1) decreasing crossing distance and installation of bump-outs; (2) “mass” transit; (3) Reestablishing the street grid; and (4) City or county ownership of University Avenue.	Public Works	Marcy-Holmes Character Areas p. 49	Made changes as described above
“Improve 2nd Street SE as a...alternative to University Avenue SE.” (1) 2nd St SE is not on the Bicycle Master Plan. (2) Perhaps change to “Explore improvements to...”	Public Works	Marcy-Holmes Character Areas p. 51	Made change to language as requested

Change to, “Explore increasing the availability of street parking....”	Public Works	Marcy-Holmes Character Areas p. 51	Made change to language as requested
“Explore the development of a public Dinkytown circulator bus...” Historically, neither the City nor Metro Transit has any interest in funding or operating circulator buses.	Public Works	Marcy-Holmes Character Areas p. 56	As discussed in more detail in the Dinkytown plan, the primary partner is the U of M, which currently operates a circulator bus
I don’t know if the M-H Master Plan is posted yet for official comments, but I do have one “quibble” after I read it. On page 38 there is mention of addressing flooding issues. Could that be narrowed down a bit to just the area affected (6 th Ave and 7th St—as far as I know)? By just saying “look into and address flooding”, it makes it sound like the whole west side needs to be building arks! My area doesn’t flood—5th St between 4th & 5th Aves.	Marnie Loven-Bell 4/16/14 email	Marcy-Holmes Character Areas p. 38	Added language to make recommendation more area-specific
Dinkytown Plan Comments			
The current Dinkytown Small Area Plan draft dated 4/17/14 has a Map 5.1 found on page 63, entitled “Dinkytown Area of Potential Historic Significance.” This map does not depict the current status of those properties. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The property at 1315 4th St SE has been formally approved for demolition by the City Council of Minneapolis. This action clearly makes this property a non-contributing property. 2. The property at 410 13th Ave SE has been formally approved for demolition by the City Council of Minneapolis. This action clearly makes this property a non-contributing property. 3. The entire area along 5th St where Opus is building the student housing known as The Venue should be depicted 	Curt Martinson 4/30/14 letter	Dinkytown - Preservation p. 63	Map updated with recommendations

<p>as non-contributory.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. The McDonald's building has a contributory status but the parking lot they own has no status. There have been numerous efforts in the recent past to redevelop this site that leads to believe it should be designated at non-contributory 5. The property at 1301 University is not depicted on the map but should be non-contributory property. It is a new building with commercial and student housing. 6. There are other properties such as 1309-1311 4th St SE where the Hideaway and the US Post Office are located that are the same vintage at 1315 4th St SE. Given the age and non-descript nature of this property, we do not believe it can be determined to be a contributory property. 			
<p>Doran Companies would like to comment on the parking issue as highlighted in the Dinkytown Small Area Plan Draft for review dated 4/17/14. We believe that this is a highly important issue that has been identified by many of the stakeholders in this plan. We would like to share some potential recommendations that could help solve some of the need for additional parking.</p> <p>There are several areas where metered parking could be beneficial to the area. Since the plan considers expanding Dinkytown and its core area, the need for additional short term parking will be necessary. We believe that there are areas where additional short term meters could be added:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Along 12th Ave in front of our 412 Loft building 2. Along 11th Ave in front of our Knoll building 3. Along 5th St SE between 12th and 14th wherever possible 	<p>Curt Martinson 4/30/14 letter</p>	<p>Dinkytown Transportation p. 96</p>	<p>Added reference to potential streets. Plan notes that a decision on locations will require additional coordination with the neighborhood.</p> <p>These suggestions will be forwarded as well to a transportation/parking group that is already meeting to explore implementation options.</p>
<p>Here is another parking idea that may have merit. There is a triangular parcel of land owned by the U of M located in the SE corner of 5th St SE and 15th Ave SE across from the McDonald's. We believe about 30 stalls could be located at that site. It could be</p>	<p>Curt Martinson 4/30/14 letter</p>	<p>Dinkytown Transportation p. 98</p>	<p>Added language to suggest partnership with U of M in developing additional parking. To</p>

explored in conjunction with the University to convert that open space for parking.			date, the U of M has not committed to this idea.
We also believe that in conjunction with the U of M the parking ramp on 4 th St SE could be better defined as parking for Dinkytown. This may include better signage, ramp improvements on the west end of the ramp, making a portal type entry from Dinkytown, etc.	Curt Martinson 4/30/14 letter	Dinkytown Transportation p. 97	Plan includes language on improving ramp and connections to Dinkytown as suggested
In Bus Transit section it mentions that the routes 16 & 50 are currently detoured due to Central Corridor construction. That is no longer the case.	Public Works comments	Dinkytown: Transportation p. 40	Language updated to reflect current conditions
There is mention of a planned connection between East River Parkway and Main Street. That has been expressed as desirable, not sure if it is part of any plan?	Public Works comments	Dinkytown Transportation p. 42	Added reference to Park Board's long term plans for making this connection to complete this segment of the Grand Rounds trail network, but not a road connection
"Explore the development of a public Dinkytown circulator bus." Historically, neither the City nor Metro Transit has any interest in funding or operating circulator buses.	Public Works comments	Dinkytown Transportation p. 95	The plan specifically calls out the U of M, the current operator of a circulator bus in this area, as the primary partner. Plan intentionally does not include City or County as primary partners.
Change language in #14 to "Consider installation of high visibility...."	Public Works comments	Dinkytown Transportation p. 101	Language changed as suggested
Change language in #16 to to "...potentially to include more and improved benches...."	Public Works comments	Dinkytown Transportation p. 101	Language changed as suggested
Change language in #17 to "Regularly repaint faded pavement	Public Works	Dinkytown	Language changed as

markings...”	comments	Transportation p. 102	suggested
Change language to “Consider use of thermoplastic markings...”	Public Works comments	Dinkytown Transportation p. 102	Language changed as suggested
Change language to “Conduct traffic study to consider narrowing...”	Public Works comments	Dinkytown Transportation p. 102	Language changed as suggested
<p>The Dinkytown district is unique civic resource in Minneapolis. It combines historical, cultural and commercial public use values, in a rare combination that makes it a unique element of the Minneapolis city fabric. Along with only a few other comparable districts in Minneapolis, it presents a strong community identity, historical background and continuity, and public usability. Therefore Dinkytown represents an irreplaceable value for Minneapolis, and public planning for Dinkytown must recognize and base itself on the values and elements that make Dinkytown a special element in the city.</p> <p>Dinkytown is a distinctive, four block early 1900s business district. Constructed at the time of streetcar line interchanges, it is made up a distinctive 1 and 2-story brick façade buildings, with wide pedestrian sidewalks and easy access by bike, bus, or car. These buildings on four blocks form a distinctive historical unit, and create the identity of the Dinkytown district. Although some component buildings have been replaced, the district still forms a recognizable stylistic business whole.</p>	Larry Crawford 6/2/14 email	Dinkytown Preservation p. 47	<p>Plan includes language highlighting these aspects of Dinkytown’s history.</p> <p>This letter also used as resource for ongoing designation study.</p>
The identity and ethos of the Dinkytown district has been substantially damaged in the last year by the disastrous failure of the Marcy-Holmes neighborhood association and of the City of Minneapolis to prevent the destructive redevelopment of the adjacent Marshall High School building, and by the demolition of core Dinkytown buildings for the inappropriate Opus building	Larry Crawford 6/2/14 email	Dinkytown Economic Development p. 75	<p>Plan includes references to rapid growth in the area and impact on Dinkytown’s identity</p> <p>Plan also describes</p>

<p>construction. Both of these destructive redevelopments, which should have been blocked during reviews by the Marcy-Holmes community group and the City of Minneapolis in favor of clear and compelling civic values, create an ominous prospect about the future livability, viability and balance of the University District residential neighborhoods.</p> <p>Despite this grave damage to the street scene, human scale, and appeal of Dinkytown, it is still critical for the community to try to preserve the remainder of the Dinkytown district. The district still has value for the community as an appealing small commercial district. (By comparison, unplanned, thoughtless and poor quality design and redevelopment over the last 10 years has made the Stadium Village area a bland, uninviting, and lifeless public space and commercial area.)</p>			<p>ongoing designation study for Dinkytown, representing effort to investigate preservation options for the area</p>
<p>It is key to plan for Dinkytown by respecting the values and needs of a multigenerational community, which is located in three Minneapolis neighborhoods. Dinkytown provides essential shopping, dining, entertainment, library/postal, and other services and amenities to the Marcy-Holmes, Como, and Prospect Park neighborhoods. Therefore any planning for Dinkytown that narrowly focuses on short-term needs and preferences of an 18-25 year old student audience is misguided and destructive. This kind of thinking, along with a misguided drive for the cover term of “density,” has resulted in the current wrongful development projects and public outcry over the failure of Minneapolis city planning for Dinkytown.</p>	<p>Larry Crawford 6/2/14 email</p>	<p>Dinkytown Economic Development p. 69</p>	<p>Market study conducted as part of the plan identifies and acknowledges the broader market for the Dinkytown business district, and makes recommendations accordingly</p>
<p>The objective of planning must be to preserve, strengthen, and reinvigorate Dinkytown as a commercial district that serves a multi-generational (student and non-student) local community, with a strong mix of services (shopping, dining, and other business services), while preserving the architecture, street environment, and ethos that makes Dinkytown one of defining</p>	<p>Larry Crawford 6/2/14 email</p>	<p>Dinkytown Preservation p. 62</p>	<p>The plan references the intent to conduct a historic designation study for Dinkytown, which is currently underway. The study will consider a</p>

<p>areas making up the urban fabric of Minneapolis.</p> <p>The four block Dinkytown core should be preserved against further demolitions and constructions of inappropriate multi-story high density buildings. Appropriate historical designation should be done in order to further these objectives. The University District organization should be given the mission of preserving Dinkytown as a historical resource of value to the multiple neighborhoods surrounding it. This should be done by programs for constructive redevelopment, to preserve facades and adapt Dinkytown buildings for continuing and new retail, dining, and shopping services, in a mix that services the entire surrounding community. To preserve the identity and ethos of Dinkytown, locally owned small businesses should be the norm, instead of the intrusion of national commercial chains which have no historical or compatible connection to the Dinkytown identity as a Minneapolis / University of Minnesota small business district.</p>			<p>range of options for preservation, including what is referenced here.</p>
<p>Dinky Town is already wrecked, why send out something like this now? Most of its ambiance and character are gone. Yeah for progress and tax base! I grew up in Prospect Park, when are you going to start hacking away at that and all its beautiful features (oh now it's got the Light Rail) a thing of beauty. Can't leave a car sitting in your own yard without some creep deciding to do something or take a walk. I suppose it will be a few years down the road and someone will decide oops we made a mistake!</p>	<p>Marguerite Schwartz 4/21/14 email</p>	<p>Dinkytown various locations</p>	<p>The plan acknowledges the rapid growth and change as a reality and attempts to plan in this context. Prospect Park is outside of the scope of this current planning effort.</p>
<p>Property owners oppose any designation of Dinkytown as a local or national historic district, part of the Minnesota Main Street Program or as a Conservation District. While our group agrees that there may be certain properties that warrant historic recognition, the Property Owners also believe that any such designation should be made with precision so that it applies only to the properties truly worth saving, and that any attempt to place a designation on the entire area would be a mistake. Several</p>	<p>Dinkytown property owners 5/8/14 letter</p>	<p>Dinkytown Preservation p. 61</p>	<p>The plan acknowledges both the drawbacks and advantages of historic designation, and recommends further study on these points – currently underway</p>

<p>members of the Owners Group have owned property in Dinkytown for decades and are keenly aware of the evolution of the district, both with regular changes in the identity and mix of tenants and in frequent building renovations and the redevelopment of parcels. Dinkytown’s commercial district has evolved in significant ways over the years, but has always retained a unique character. Landmarking the whole district at this point in time with some sort of historical designation will hinder this natural evolution.</p>			<p>The plan is also designed to be implementable whether or not there are any formal designations.</p>
<p>The Dinkytown parking problem can be solved. The Owners Group believes the effort to create a Business District Plan evolved when Dinkytown lost most of its surface lot parking. We totally agree that parking is an issue for Dinkytown and clearly the ultimate fix would be a public parking facility in or very close to Dinkytown. With the likelihood of that happening being very slim, we have identified some suggestions on how to potentially solve the current parking dilemma:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create a portal or link to the existing parking ramp on 4th St. The plan demonstrated that, except on days when there are large sporting events, there is currently available parking within the 4th St parking ramp. This link should be prominent enough for people in Dinkytown to realize that parking is located just to the east of Dinkytown. Make the walking experience from the ramp to Dinkytown more pedestrian friendly. Work with the University to expand the ramp or a pedestrian entrance to the ramp to the west, closer to Dinkytown. Add signage oriented to Dinkytown. 2. Explore a parking ramp/facility adjacent to Dinkytown. This is recommendation within the report that we believe merits extensive exploration. Either a ramp over the trench or utilizing the current Hennepin County site could be options that need exploring. We would also suggest working with the U of M in this process. There is a small 	<p>Dinkytown property owners 5/8/14 letter</p>	<p>Dinkytown Transportation p.94</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plan includes language regarding connections to and enhancements of the 4th St ramp 2. Plan recommends investigating a ramp as an “immediate term” priority. Added language regarding potential role of University. 3. Plan supports all recommendations listed here.

<p>vacant lot at the SE corner of 5th St SE and 15th Ave SE that is owned by the U of M could be utilized for parking.</p> <p>3. Enhance street parking by changing the design of the current parking configuration. Add additional meters, or could the current bridges allow parking along their curb lines? These are all possibilities that need to be explored. We would also support the implementation of traffic calming ideas and increasing bike/pedestrian safety.</p>			
<p>Expanding Dinkytown’s footprint would be an excellent idea. This expansion could not only be to the west but also to the east towards the University parking ramp. The Owners Group agrees with the City of Minneapolis that Dinkytown is appropriately designated as an Activity Center. More importantly, the concept of rezoning the area to a C3A zoning district – the highest density mixed use district – is essential for this area.</p>	<p>Dinkytown property owners 5/8/14 letter</p>	<p>Dinkytown Land Use p. 108</p>	<p>The plan supports the expansion of the Activity Center, although it is somewhat limited on the east side by the fact the land is predominantly part of the U of M campus, which is exempt from City land use controls.</p>
<p>Creating design criteria is not supported by the Property Owners Group. Dinkytown has evolved by being eclectic and creating criteria of one-size-fits-all does not fit with Dinkytown’s eclectic history.</p>	<p>Dinkytown property owners 5/8/14 letter</p>	<p>Dinkytown Land Use p. 110</p>	<p>The plan states that guidelines are advisory, not regulatory.</p> <p>As written, they are intended to be flexible, focusing on the common elements across a range of building types.</p>
<p>It remains vital to accommodate markets for a vibrant Dinkytown. Dinkytown has always demonstrated a changing mix of tenants and adapted to the ever changing market conditions. This historically has been demonstrated by the many businesses to occupy the area and subsequently leave, close or move to another venue. Dinkytown has had the flexibility to adapt to these</p>	<p>Dinkytown property owners 5/8/14 letter</p>	<p>Dinkytown Economic Development p. 77</p>	<p>The plan supports a wide variety of business types.</p> <p>The one potential restriction, on liquor licenses, is recommended</p>

<p>changes. To envision supporting or restricting certain business activity is not necessary.</p>			<p>via the plan’s market study as a means to limit the potential expansion of a specific business type that might dominate the area and decrease the overall diversity of the business mix.</p>
<p>The Owners Group supports the need for enhanced safety efforts. Some of the improvements should include better lighting, well designed streetscapes, etc. that promote a welcoming and walkable community; changes in traffic calming and pedestrian safety; and more police patrols –especially at peak times during the day/night and during special events.</p>	<p>Dinkytown property owners 5/8/14 letter</p>	<p>Dinkytown Economic Development p. 78</p>	<p>The plan supports all the recommendations listed here.</p>
<p>In regards to 400 14th Ave SE (Schmid Building), we strongly disagree with your assessment that the property should be designated historic. As you brought to light in the History and Preservation chapter of the Dinkytown Business District Plan, other than being built in the early 1900’s there is no historic significance attached to the property. There is no mention of architectural significance, historical significance, ghost signage, nothing, other than the mention of three contemporary tenants. Other than the foundation and shell nothing of any significance remains of the original building. This is not a Historic building, it is an old building!!</p> <p>Dinkytown’s Business District is no different than any other Business District near any other campus in the U.S., constantly evolving and changing to meet the needs. While you try to decide the fate of Dinkytown and preserve its history. We feel you must be able to delineate between true historical significance and nostalgia, we do not feel you have done that. We do not feel that sit ins and riots are typically how Historical Designations are</p>	<p>Roland Reidhead 5/4/14 letter</p>	<p>Dinkytown Preservation p. 61</p>	<p>The plan included just a preliminary assessment of the history of this building. A designation study is now underway will look at this in more detail.</p> <p>The historic designation criteria being used include historic events.</p> <p>The information you provided will be used as part of the designation study as well.</p>

<p>earned. We feel that your attempt at preservation, is a way to deflect the pressure of Marcy Homes and their interests away from the city and their plan stated on page 16 of the Dinkytown Business District Plan. We are of the opinion that if the same amount of energy were put into the parking problem by the city and Marcy Homes, as is being put into this ruse quite a lot could be accomplished.</p>			
<p>I'd like to place a couple comments into the record as a part of the public comment period for the Dinkytown Small Area Plan. The first issue is regarding the potential for creating a historical designation for Dinkytown. In my view, the sheer number of rundown cinderblock buildings built in the 70's disqualify the Dinkytown District from any historical designation. That the Historical Preservation Committee believes a 1920s era generic single story brick building deserves protection is a disservice to the historically significant buildings deserving protection. I wholeheartedly disagree with any attempt to create a historical designation or conservation district for the Dinkytown Business District.</p> <p>I am also opposed to the work by Creative CityMaking being included in the Small Area Plan. If it was their intent to taint the planning process with their obvious anti-development bias, then they were successful. I initially thought they were hired by the partisan Save Dinkytown group instead of the City. I'd be happy to review the video with you to illustrate my point.</p>	<p>Steve Young 4/21/14 email</p>	<p>Dinkytown Preservation p. 64</p>	<p>The historic designation study now underway will assess the eligibility (or lack thereof) of these structures.</p> <p>The Creative City Making video referenced did reflect some misunderstandings of those involved about the intent and focus of the plan. There is no reference to this work in the plan or on the plan's website – nor will there be. The study does include neutral survey data collected through this plan, with results that were comparable to information collected through other means.</p>
<p>We have witnessed the actions of a small group of residents attempt to control the growth of the area. I believe the current situation has been a direct result of MHNA's unwillingness to</p>	<p>Tim Harmsen 5/15/14 letter</p>	<p>Dinkytown Preservation p. 64</p>	<p>The historic designation study now underway will assess the eligibility (or</p>

<p>work or cooperate with other stakeholders in the area.</p> <p>Now we are looking at a similar situation, the designation of Dinkytown proper as historic. All the meetings I have attended the designation was downplayed. Anytime a student resident was asked, they always wanted new buildings and services. The owners of the affected properties unanimously rejected the historic designation. Yet the desires of a few non-property owners, non-business owners, that do not allow open dialogue. They are making sophisticated planning designations. Pushing their agenda over the objections of well-educated and directly affected groups.</p> <p>My wife and I own 320-322 13th Ave. This property was built in 1910. The building was built as a duplex and then converted to a 12 room lodging house. Over the past 114 years it has been modified and changed. The exterior has been covered with vinyl siding, the front and back porches have been removed and rebuilt.</p> <p>The area it is in is a commercial retail district, a 114 year old duplex, that has been used and abused does not make a good representation for the U of M college campus. Here we are in a situation where a few non-owners want that building to be locked in time. Yes, I agree there are buildings that need preservation, buildings that have character, history and give Dinkytown the ambiance and vibe that we all want to keep. 320-322 13th Ave SE is not one of them. Please listen to the voices of the actual owners and residents of that area.</p>			<p>lack thereof) of these structures.</p> <p>The information you provided will be used as part of the designation study as well.</p>
--	--	--	--