

**From:** [Sean Siberio](#)  
**To:** [Council Comment](#)  
**Subject:** 2008 Bryant Ave Apts  
**Date:** Saturday, April 16, 2016 1:36:35 PM

---

To the Z&P Committee,

The continued approval of high density luxury apartments in the Wedge area continues to worsen traffic, increase parking issues, and as many of these approved buildings are "luxury" they also do nothing to address the large gap of affordable housing in the area. To be clear, these projects, such as Motiv which has been disastrous for parking and traffic for those of us on Colfax, have no real restriction clue on how car ownership will impact the area with high density nor do these places to my knowledge have tax abatement units that allow for lower income individuals to afford to live in Uptown. Despite comments that Motiv would only be for people who wanted to walk and use transit everywhere, the fact is that there is no real way to enforce the idea that people who live there don't own cars. You know that, I know that, and the renters definitely know that when the amount of parking spaces allotted is far too small for the number of tenants. So guess whose streets get clogged? Those of us living in the wedge.

**From:** [Hagen, Kelli](#)  
**To:** [Council Comment](#)  
**Subject:** 2008 Bryant Avenue Apt Development  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 20, 2016 11:11:37 AM

---

Dear Sirs,

I am writing in regards to permit #Bzz-7594, 2008 Bryant Ave Apts.

Over the past eight years of living in the Wedge area, the large influx of high-end condos has began to change the structure of the neighborhood and the quality of life we tend to enjoy here. Noise, housing costs and the general integrity of the neighborhood has suffered as a result.

Please reconsider this as the eighth building to be bulldozed in the past 14 months and ensure strict adherence to zoning and other regulations in this matter.

Regards,

Kelli Hagen

**Kelli Hagen**  
Minneapolis Local, Pernod Ricard  
**T: 612.207.2779**



April 19, 2016

To City of Minneapolis Council Members and CPED

RE: Appeal of Demolition of 2008 Bryant Avenue South, BZZ-7594, File Nbr 16-00535

First and foremost, I support the appeal to prevent the demolition of 2008 Bryant Avenue South. This quick approval of the proposed redevelopment leaves me wondering about the validity of our city government officials.

I have been a 28 year resident of the Lowry Hill East Neighborhood. When my husband and I bought our home at 2437 Colfax Avenue South in the 1980s, the beautiful old historic homes were the main attraction and the location so close to the city and lakes was most desirable. For many old and new residents, these reasons have not changed. But alas, the old historic homes are quickly disappearing in what the City and developers have deemed the hottest neighborhood for upscale market rate multi-unit housing.

In the quest to keep up with the demand for what is perceived as marketable housing, the City has bought into the concepts of a limited group of small minded developers who present 'modern' designs but are not held to the highest of building standards. Uptown is the City's current ace in the hole. Now is the opportunity to hold these developers to the maximum standards of what should be leading edge architecture - great design, environmentally green built infill housing that meets or exceeds the present and future needs of the City and the diversity of its residents, not just the young urban single.

But the City in its haste to build, is not considering the future, only the present. Once a plan has been approved by the neighborhood, the developer changes it and is not held to the design that was submitted. There is no accountability for the developer and the neighborhood is stuck with the final building. In this case, the neighborhood was never even notified or the LHENA association able to review the proposal. When 2424 Lyndale was demolished recently, the same thing happened. No one knows that that project will look like. The City has a major opportunity to be a leader in infill urban design but gives in too quickly without holding these developers accountable. This developer and design would never pass muster in Edina, Bloomington or Linden Hills.

In the case of 2008 Bryant, the site plan and plan for potential residents and effects on the neighborhood were highly incomplete. Our neighborhood, neighbors and City have been ill served by those who should know better in the haste to maximize developer goals, not the City goals.

All new housing should be built with preference to livability - green space, solar capture, accessibility, great design and workable spaces with less impact on the environment and the streetscape. All new housing - whether new built or rehabbed - should incorporate a percentage of below market rate affordable housing which attract a mix of workers and family units. This has not been the case in Uptown nor Lowry Hill East. We are now overrun with limited cheap design and materials and very small one bedroom apartments at the expense of the already existing well built historic housing stock.

Additionally, both Uptown and Lowry Hill East are considered a travel destination to the many shops and restaurants. However, those who staff those businesses who have been able to live in the area in the past, are often working for minimum wages, have low annual incomes and walk to their jobs. Every destruction of affordable housing forces these workers to move out of the neighborhood and to travel further to work. Families are being forced out to the suburbs. A neighborhood is only healthy when it offers diversity and a balance mix of its residents.

The best use of a building is to work with what is there, especially when the majority of the structure has so much of its original character and good bones and was already multi-unit. 2008 Bryant Avenue South has all of those and if given the chance will continue to contribute to the historic presence of the street.

The present DDMZ design for a replacement building at 2008 Bryant is:

- lacking in good design - rooms are too small, bedrooms too small, no green space, no real thought as to who the target tenant will be. The exterior shares nothing with its surrounding structures.
- minimally sized and bedrooms are only big enough for a twin size or full size bed.
- lacking in parking - 2 parking spots for 10 units is unthinkable on a busy narrow street that also incorporates a shared bikeway. One of those spots is marked 'handicap only' and the other will not be used in winter except for snow storage.
- unreasonably accessible for the only 'handicapped' tenant. That tenant will have access only at the front of the building after parking in the rear. A person in a wheel chair would find it stressful in the best of weather, let alone when the sidewalk is covered in snow or ice.
- forcing the handicapped tenant to live on the ground floor only, as no elevator is proposed, and is merely a nod to offering a 'handicap accessible' unit.
- inadequate for garbage storage and removal for 10 units.
- not considering the impact on the single family home to the south.
- not considering the historic impact that removal of this building from a potential historic district will have on future scale of the block.
- not providing larger units for families. We have enough one and two bedroom units.

I highly encourage that the Minneapolis City Planning Commission should undertake a fully compliant site review and complete the process it should have undertaken in the first place. This project is not a fit, as currently proposed, and provides evidence that the process 'by which the Minneapolis City Planning Commission reached that decision' has serious internal issues.

Sincerely,

**Kathleen Kullberg**

Historian, former Interior Designer and Resident of Lowry Hill East  
2437 Colfax Avenue South  
Minneapolis, Minnesota

April 19, 2016

To City of Minneapolis Council Members and CPED

RE: Appeal of Demolition of 2008 Bryant Avenue South, BZZ-7594, File Nbr 16-00535

First and foremost, I support the appeal to prevent the demolition of 2008 Bryant Avenue South. This quick approval of the proposed redevelopment leaves me wondering about the validity of our city government officials.

I have been a 28 year resident of the Lowry Hill East Neighborhood. When my husband and I bought our home at 2437 Colfax Avenue South in the 1980s, the beautiful old historic homes were the main attraction and the location so close to the city and lakes was most desirable. For many old and new residents, these reasons have not changed. But alas, the old historic homes are quickly disappearing in what the City and developers have deemed the hottest neighborhood for upscale market rate multi-unit housing.

In the quest to keep up with the demand for what is perceived as marketable housing, the City has bought into the concepts of a limited group of small minded developers who present 'modern' designs but are not held to the highest of building standards. Uptown is the City's current ace in the hole. Now is the opportunity to hold these developers to the maximum standards of what should be leading edge architecture - great design, environmentally green built infill housing that meets or exceeds the present and future needs of the City and the diversity of its residents, not just the young urban single.

But the City in its haste to build, is not considering the future, only the present. Once a plan has been approved by the neighborhood, the developer changes it and is not held to the design that was submitted. There is no accountability for the developer and the neighborhood is stuck with the final building. In this case, the neighborhood was never even notified or the LHENA association able to review the proposal. When 2424 Lyndale was demolished recently, the same thing happened. No one knows that that project will look like. The City has a major opportunity to be a leader in infill urban design but gives in too quickly without holding these developers accountable. This developer and design would never pass muster in Edina, Bloomington or Linden Hills.

In the case of 2008 Bryant, the site plan and plan for potential residents and effects on the neighborhood were highly incomplete. Our neighborhood, neighbors and City have been ill served by those who should know better in the haste to maximize developer goals, not the City goals.

All new housing should be built with preference to livability - green space, solar capture, accessibility, great design and workable spaces with less impact on the environment and the streetscape. All new housing - whether new built or rehabbed - should incorporate a percentage of below market rate affordable housing which attract a mix of workers and family units. This has not been the case in Uptown nor Lowry Hill East. We are now overrun with limited cheap design and materials and very small one bedroom apartments at the expense of the already existing well built historic housing stock.

Additionally, both Uptown and Lowry Hill East are considered a travel destination to the many shops and restaurants. However, those who staff those businesses who have been able to live in the area in the past, are often working for minimum wages, have low annual incomes and walk to their jobs. Every destruction of affordable housing forces these workers to move out of the neighborhood and to travel further to work. Families are being forced out to the suburbs. A neighborhood is only healthy when it offers diversity and a balance mix of its residents.

The best use of a building is to work with what is there, especially when the majority of the structure has so much of its original character and good bones and was already multi-unit. 2008 Bryant Avenue South has all of those and if given the chance will continue to contribute to the historic presence of the street.

The present DDMZ design for a replacement building at 2008 Bryant is:

- lacking in good design - rooms are too small, bedrooms too small, no green space, no real thought as to who the target tenant will be. The exterior shares nothing with its surrounding structures.
- minimally sized and bedrooms are only big enough for a twin size or full size bed.
- lacking in parking - 2 parking spots for 10 units is unthinkable on a busy narrow street that also incorporates a shared bikeway. One of those spots is marked 'handicap only' and the other will not be used in winter except for snow storage.
- unreasonably accessible for the only 'handicapped' tenant. That tenant will have access only at the front of the building after parking in the rear. A person in a wheel chair would find it stressful in the best of weather, let alone when the sidewalk is covered in snow or ice.
- forcing the handicapped tenant to live on the ground floor only, as no elevator is proposed, and is merely a nod to offering a 'handicap accessible' unit.
- inadequate for garbage storage and removal for 10 units.
- not considering the impact on the single family home to the south.
- not considering the historic impact that removal of this building from a potential historic district will have on future scale of the block.
- not providing larger units for families. We have enough one and two bedroom units.

I highly encourage that the Minneapolis City Planning Commission should undertake a fully compliant site review and complete the process it should have undertaken in the first place. This project is not a fit, as currently proposed, and provides evidence that the process 'by which the Minneapolis City Planning Commission reached that decision' has serious internal issues.

Sincerely,

**Kathleen Kullberg**

Historian, former Interior Designer and Resident of Lowry Hill East  
2437 Colfax Avenue South  
Minneapolis, Minnesota

**From:** [Smith, Mei-Ling C.](mailto:Smith_Mei-Ling_C)  
**To:** [Council Comment](#)  
**Subject:** FW: 2008 Bryant Avenue South Appeal  
**Date:** Thursday, April 21, 2016 10:26:41 PM  
**Attachments:** [2008 Bryant Avenue S appeal letter.pdf](#)

---

**From:** kullbkathy@comcast.net [mailto:kullbkathy@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 21, 2016 7:19 PM  
**To:** Smith, Mei-Ling C.  
**Subject:** RE: 2008 Bryant Avenue South Appeal

**Kathleen Kullberg**

*"If your walls could talk..."*

House Historian / Detective

Minneapolis, Minnesota

612-374-4456

----- Original Message -----

From: Mei-Ling C. Smith <[Mei-Ling.Smith@minneapolismn.gov](mailto:Mei-Ling.Smith@minneapolismn.gov)>

To: [kullbkathy@comcast.net](mailto:kullbkathy@comcast.net)

Sent: Wed, 20 Apr 2016 17:48:31 -0000 (UTC)

Subject: RE: 2008 Bryant Avenue South Appeal

Hi Kathleen,

I did not see any attachments. Could you try resending?

Thank you,

Mei-Ling

**From:** [kullbkathy@comcast.net](mailto:kullbkathy@comcast.net) [mailto:kullbkathy@comcast.net]

**Sent:** Wednesday, April 20, 2016 11:40 AM

**To:** Khamsot, Tou Tou; Cano, Alondra; Johnson, Andrew; Johnson, Barbara A. - City Council; Glidden, Elizabeth A.; Frey, Jacob; Quincy, John; Yang, Blong; Gordon, Cam A.; Palmisano, Linea; Bender, Lisa; Goodman, Lisa R.; Reich, Kevin A.; Warsame, Abdi;

Smith, Mei-Ling C.

**Subject:** 2008 Bryant Avenue South Appeal

Re: The Appeal of 2008 Bryant Avenue South, BZZ-7594

Please find attached my comments regarding the proposed demolition and redevelopment of an historic resource in the Lowry Hill East neighborhood. The hearing is scheduled for

Thursday, April 21st.

Sincerely,

**Kathleen Kullberg**

Resident, historian at

2437 Colfax Avenue South

Minneapolis, Minnesota



**From:** [Rachael Kopel](#)  
**To:** [Council Comment](#)  
**Subject:** condos and development  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 20, 2016 5:34:25 PM

---

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing in regards to permit #Bzz-7594, 2008 Bryant Ave Apts.

Over the past six years of living in the Wedge area, the large influx of high-end condos has began to change the structure of the neighborhood and the quality of life we tend to enjoy here. Noise, housing costs and the general integrity of the neighborhood has suffered as a result.

Please reconsider this as the eighth building to be bulldozed in the past 14 months and ensure strict adherence to zoning and other regulations in this matter.

Regards,

Rachael Kopel-Anderson

**From:** [Smith, Mei-Ling C.](mailto:Smith, Mei-Ling C.)  
**To:** [Council Comment](#)  
**Subject:** FW: 2008 Bryant Avenue South Appeal  
**Date:** Friday, April 22, 2016 1:46:09 PM  
**Attachments:** [2008 Bryant Avenue S appeal letter.pdf](#)

---

**From:** kullbkathy@comcast.net [mailto:kullbkathy@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 21, 2016 7:19 PM  
**To:** Smith, Mei-Ling C.  
**Subject:** RE: 2008 Bryant Avenue South Appeal

**Kathleen Kullberg**

*"If your walls could talk..."*

House Historian / Detective

Minneapolis, Minnesota

612-374-4456

----- Original Message -----

**From:** Mei-Ling C. Smith <[Mei-Ling.Smith@minneapolismn.gov](mailto:Mei-Ling.Smith@minneapolismn.gov)>

**To:** [kullbkathy@comcast.net](mailto:kullbkathy@comcast.net)

**Sent:** Wed, 20 Apr 2016 17:48:31 -0000 (UTC)

**Subject:** RE: 2008 Bryant Avenue South Appeal

Hi Kathleen,

I did not see any attachments. Could you try resending?

Thank you,

Mei-Ling

**From:** [kullbkathy@comcast.net](mailto:kullbkathy@comcast.net) [mailto:kullbkathy@comcast.net]

**Sent:** Wednesday, April 20, 2016 11:40 AM

**To:** Khamsot, Tou Tou; Cano, Alondra; Johnson, Andrew; Johnson, Barbara A. - City Council; Glidden, Elizabeth A.; Frey, Jacob; Quincy, John; Yang, Blong; Gordon, Cam A.; Palmisano, Linea; Bender, Lisa; Goodman, Lisa R.; Reich, Kevin A.; Warsame, Abdi; Smith, Mei-Ling C.

**Subject:** 2008 Bryant Avenue South Appeal

Re: The Appeal of 2008 Bryant Avenue South, BZZ-7594

Please find attached my comments regarding the proposed demolition and redevelopment of an historic resource in the Lowry Hill East neighborhood. The hearing is scheduled for Thursday, April 21st.

Sincerely,

**Kathleen Kullberg**

Resident, historian at

2437 Colfax Avenue South

Minneapolis, Minnesota

**From:** [Smith, Mei-Ling C.](#)  
**To:** [Council Comment](#)  
**Subject:** FW: 2008 Bryant Avenue South Appeal  
**Date:** Friday, April 29, 2016 9:15:32 AM

---

On the Council agenda today.

**From:** kullbkathy@comcast.net [mailto:kullbkathy@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 28, 2016 11:32 PM  
**To:** Bender, Lisa  
**Cc:** Smith, Mei-Ling C.  
**Subject:** RE: 2008 Bryant Avenue South Appeal

Thanks for responding, Lisa. Hope you are feeling better.

I would hope the developers would reconsider and rehab the building (based on their original TV show Rehab to Rent concept) rather than tear down. Or perhaps the city would consider moving it under the city's recycling buildings program. It is a very sound house and could contain three very nice units.

Additionally, I am most concerned, if the project goes through, that the actual livability of the apartments is not realistic. The bedrooms are very small, especially in the 2 bedroom units. No Millennial, (sp?) including my daughters, that I know wants to split rent and have a bedroom that only fits a twin bed.

The only handicap unit barely meets the minimum requirements in spacial planning but if a person actually had to live in the unit, it would not be very user friendly /rentable space: the hallway is the minimum but the turning radius should be bigger. The bedroom as shown would not really be wheelchair friendly either. And I am not sure a person in a wheelchair could actually use the bathtub or the kitchen as outlined. I know that by law they have to provide an accessible unit but let's be considerate of that person who might actually be a senior citizen like me one of these days and provide a nice space.

Kathy

**Kathleen Kullberg**

*"If your walls could talk..."*

House Historian / Detective

Minneapolis, Minnesota

612-374-4456

----- Original Message -----

From: Lisa Bender <[Lisa.Bender@minneapolismn.gov](mailto:Lisa.Bender@minneapolismn.gov)>

To: [kullbkathy@comcast.net](mailto:kullbkathy@comcast.net), Mei-Ling C. Smith <[Mei-Ling.Smith@minneapolismn.gov](mailto:Mei-Ling.Smith@minneapolismn.gov)>

Sent: Thu, 28 Apr 2016 18:34:22 -0000 (UTC)

Subject: RE: 2008 Bryant Avenue South Appeal

Kathy,

Thank you for reaching out about this. I have been mulling the best way to respond because the appeal is not to prevent demolition of the building, it is to respond to several specific site plan issues. This building is allowed as of right in our zoning laws, and only needed site plan approval. I understand your perspective of wanting to prevent demolitions but the reality is that we don't have the legal grounds to do so.

I think these site plan details are incredibly important and am always very happy to work with neighbors and the community to improve on details. No one approached my office about this until after it had gone to the CPC hearing.

We have been working with Mei-Ling since to revisit these details about the trash and other issues but after reviewing the pros and cons staff maintained their original recommendation and that is what was approved by Zoning and Planning.

All my best  
Lisa

**From:** [kullbkathy@comcast.net](mailto:kullbkathy@comcast.net) [<mailto:kullbkathy@comcast.net>]

**Sent:** Sunday, April 24, 2016 10:32 PM

**To:** Khamsot, Tou Tou; Cano, Alondra; Johnson, Andrew; Johnson, Barbara A. - City Council; Glidden, Elizabeth A.; Frey, Jacob; Quincy, John; Yang, Blong; Gordon, Cam A.; Palmisano, Linea; Bender, Lisa; Goodman, Lisa R.; Reich, Kevin A.; Warsame, Abdi; Smith, Mei-Ling C.

**Subject:** Fwd: 2008 Bryant Avenue South Appeal

Sorry, apparently most of you did not get the attachment. So I am sending again although the only one who noticed that it was not attached was Mei-ling.

Though the appeal was denied I would hope you would consider my remarks for future development issues in our neighborhoods. Please attach this letter to the other 100 you have received regarding this issue. This is NOT going away and we residents are seriously upset about the lack of concern for the future of this city.

Kathy Kullberg

**Kathleen Kullberg**

*"If your walls could talk..."*

House Historian / Detective

Minneapolis, Minnesota

612-374-4456

----- Forwarded Message -----

**From:** [kullbkathy@comcast.net](mailto:kullbkathy@comcast.net)

**To:** toutou khamsot <[toutou.khamsot@minneapolismn.gov](mailto:toutou.khamsot@minneapolismn.gov)>, alondra cano

<[alondra.cano@minneapolismn.gov](mailto:alondra.cano@minneapolismn.gov)>, andrew johnson

<[andrew.johnson@minneapolismn.gov](mailto:andrew.johnson@minneapolismn.gov)>,

barbara johnson <[barbara.johnson@minneapolismn.gov](mailto:barbara.johnson@minneapolismn.gov)>, elizabeth glidden

<[elizabeth.glidden@minneapolismn.gov](mailto:elizabeth.glidden@minneapolismn.gov)>, jacob frey <[jacob.frey@minneapolismn.gov](mailto:jacob.frey@minneapolismn.gov)>,

john quincy <[john.quincy@minneapolismn.gov](mailto:john.quincy@minneapolismn.gov)>, blong yang

<[blong.yang@minneapolismn.gov](mailto:blong.yang@minneapolismn.gov)>, cam gordon <[cam.gordon@minneapolismn.gov](mailto:cam.gordon@minneapolismn.gov)>,

linea palmisano <[linea.palmisano@minneapolismn.gov](mailto:linea.palmisano@minneapolismn.gov)>, Lisa Bender

<[Lisa.Bender@minneapolismn.gov](mailto:Lisa.Bender@minneapolismn.gov)>, lisa goodman <[lisa.goodman@minneapolismn.gov](mailto:lisa.goodman@minneapolismn.gov)>,

kevin reich <[kevin.reich@minneapolismn.gov](mailto:kevin.reich@minneapolismn.gov)>, abdi warsame

<[abdi.warsame@minneapolismn.gov](mailto:abdi.warsame@minneapolismn.gov)>, mei-ling anderson <[mei-](mailto:mei-ling.anderson@minneapolismn.gov)

[ling.anderson@minneapolismn.gov](mailto:ling.anderson@minneapolismn.gov)>

**Sent:** Wed, 20 Apr 2016 16:39:55 -0000 (UTC)

**Subject:** 2008 Bryant Avenue South Appeal

**Re:** The Appeal of 2008 Bryant Avenue South, BZZ-7594

Please find attached my comments regarding the proposed demolition and redevelopment of an historic resource in the Lowry Hill East neighborhood. The hearing is scheduled for Thursday, April 21st.  
Sincerely,

**Kathleen Kullberg**  
Resident, historian at  
2437 Colfax Avenue South  
Minneapolis, Minnesota

**From:** [Smith, Mei-Ling C.](#)  
**To:** [Council Comment](#)  
**Subject:** FW: 2008 Bryant Avenue South Appeal  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 20, 2016 3:47:07 PM

---

For Z&P tomorrow. I did not receive any attachments, but asked her if she wanted to resend the e-mail immediately after receiving it. No word yet.

**From:** kullbkathy@comcast.net [mailto:kullbkathy@comcast.net]

**Sent:** Wednesday, April 20, 2016 11:40 AM

**To:** Khamsot, Tou Tou; Cano, Alondra; Johnson, Andrew; Johnson, Barbara A. - City Council; Glidden, Elizabeth A.; Frey, Jacob; Quincy, John; Yang, Blong; Gordon, Cam A.; Palmisano, Linea; Bender, Lisa; Goodman, Lisa R.; Reich, Kevin A.; Warsame, Abdi; Smith, Mei-Ling C.

**Subject:** 2008 Bryant Avenue South Appeal

Re: The Appeal of 2008 Bryant Avenue South, BZZ-7594

Please find attached my comments regarding the proposed demolition and redevelopment of an historic resource in the Lowry Hill East neighborhood. The hearing is scheduled for Thursday, April 21st.

Sincerely,

**Kathleen Kullberg**

Resident, historian at  
2437 Colfax Avenue South  
Minneapolis, Minnesota

**From:** [Smith, Mei-Ling C.](#)  
**To:** [Council Comment](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Appeal - 2008 Bryant Avenue South  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 19, 2016 2:58:37 PM

---

[For Thursday's Z&P – 2008 Bryant Ave S.](#)

---

**From:** Sue Bode [mailto:sjbode@msn.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 19, 2016 2:40 PM  
**To:** Khamsot, Tou Tou; Johnson, Andrew; Johnson, Barbara A. - City Council; Glidden, Elizabeth A.; Frey, Jacob; Quincy, John; Yang, Blong; Gordon, Cam A.; Palmisano, Linea; Cano, Alondra; Goodman, Lisa R.; Reich, Kevin A.; Warsame, Abdi; Smith, Mei-Ling C.; Bender, Lisa  
**Subject:** Appeal - 2008 Bryant Avenue South  
Mayor Hodges, Council Members, Z&P Members, CPED, Planning Commission,

I WISH TO SPEAK IN SUPPORT OF THE APPEAL. I am unable to attend the Appeal Hearing due to a family member's surgery Thursday morning, so I'm sending a letter. Please include it in the record.

My husband and I have lived in our home in the Wedge, at [2750 Dupont Avenue South](#) since 1968. After a nearly 40 year reprieve from tear-downs, our neighborhood is again in the developers' crosshairs, with the blessing of the city. Perkins and Levine have now acquired 84 properties in the city, including 28 in the Wedge, 3 more on our block. They have razed 5 homes in the Wedge in just the last year, plus another one a year or so earlier. If this one is allowed, it will be their 7th. Add to that, two more by the Lander group, and you have a neighborhood under assault!

The pro-development crowd says infill development is needed because of "missing teeth". The Wedge has no missing teeth (empty lots). Here, the developers are the dentists, pulling perfectly healthy teeth! There are areas of the city, like North Minneapolis, that do have lots of empty lots, where development would be welcomed. But no, their sights are set on this neighborhood, even though the vacancy rate in these luxury units is high. Good, solid homes are being replaced with inferior quality construction to maximize profits. Average people are being forced out to make room for expensive, luxury units. (Residents next door were informed by a new owner that their rent would be raised \$250 per month! They all moved out, unable to afford such a large increase).

Something very "fishy" seems to be going on. High pressure tactics are being used to coerce people to sell. Houses are being sold without a "For Sale" sign ever going up. Often, the first neighbors even know a house is for sale, is when the utility companies come out to cut the water and gas lines to the house to prep for demolition. By then it is usually too late to stop it. Houses that are being torn down are solid houses, not in disrepair. Often interiors are quickly gutted so historical claims can not be made. These buyers operate under at least a half dozen different LLC's, so people don't always know who is actually purchasing their property. It seems like a shady shell game. Other potential buyers are not given a chance to bid on the properties.

One of these tear downs (2743 Dupont) is across the street from our house...4 tall stories, 4 units, 4 parking spots, on a 40 foot lot, with 4-5 bedrooms per unit. This is not affordable family housing, so will likely have up to 15-20 adult residents. If most have cars, they will clog the street even more, if possible. In addition, this new building shades our solar panels for about a half hour every sunny morning from roughly April to August. This is against the law! The city never bothered to notify us before approving this. I sent a letter and photos to all Council Members. last fall, which was ignored by every single person. Also, my husband spoke to the planner in charge, who told us essentially, "It's been approved, and is a done deal."

Now the city plans to rubber stamp this 4-story, 10-unit building, with a rooftop deck, shared driveway, inadequate plans for parking, snow removal, and trash receptacles, etc., again, without even bothering to notify or involve nearby neighbors, who are affected. Variances are routinely being granted here that are not allowed in other areas of the city. This needs to stop now! And the city needs to put their rubber stamp away, stop enabling these questionable practices, and represent the residents. This Revolutionary quote comes to mind, ..."Taxation without representation is tyranny!"

.  
Susan Bode  
[2750 Dupont Avenue South](https://www.google.com/maps/place/2750+Dupont+Avenue+South,+Washington,+DC+20037)  
[sjbode@msn.com](mailto:sjbode@msn.com)

Sent from my iPad

**From:** [Smith, Mei-Ling C.](mailto:Smith, Mei-Ling C.)  
**To:** [Council Comment](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Appeal re: 2008 Bryant Av S  
**Date:** Monday, April 18, 2016 8:36:43 AM

---

**From:** Christina Langsdorf [mailto:clangsdorf23@gmail.com]

**Sent:** Sunday, April 17, 2016 6:53 PM

**To:** Smith, Mei-Ling C.

**Cc:** Cano, Alondra; Johnson, Andrew; Johnson, Barbara A. - City Council; Glidden, Elizabeth A.; Frey, Jacob; Quincy, John; Yang, Blong; Gordon, Cam A.; Palmisano, Linea; Bender, Lisa; Goodman, Lisa R.; Reich, Kevin A.; Warsame, Abdi

**Subject:** Appeal re: 2008 Bryant Av S

Hello,

I am writing in support of the Minneapolis Neighbors United appeal of the approval of the site plan review application to tear down the existing home and build a 10 unit apartment building at 2008 Bryant Av S.

1) Garbage and recycling storage

I live on this block and current practice is **1 garbage bin and 1 recycling bin per unit** for the single family homes, duplexes and triplexes. The large apartment buildings have commercial size dumpsters.

The Site Plan indicates the use of 4 plastic bins for the garbage and 4 bins for recycling for a 10 Unit Commercial building. Every triplex on the same street has 3 bins for garbage and 3 bins for recycling; the standard 1 per unit. 10 units should require a total of 20 bins. There is no space for 20 bins, or even 10. The 8' x 4'6" single waste collection point right up next to the sidewalk does not address the waste management needs of a 10 unit building. The necessity for someone to drag trash bins to the pad and then drag them back is not a practice allowed for any other modern multi-unit in the neighborhood.

In addition, the city of Minneapolis does not usually offer garbage and recycling collection contracts for commercial buildings (more than 4 residential units). This is a 10 unit commercial building. Therefore, the owners would need to have a contract with an outside company that will normally require dumpsters, *not* individual bins. Although necessary, there is not enough space for 2 dumpsters. And if the owners must have dumpsters, that would necessitate a wider driveway to allow trash and recycling collection. This is a shared driveway. The wear and tear of a garbage truck on residential driveways is well known in Minneapolis and is one of the reasons the practice was discontinued several years ago. The owners of the single family home at 2012 Bryant Ave. S. should not be held responsible for the wear of the increased traffic on their driveway by garbage, recycling, delivery, service, and moving trucks servicing 2008 Bryant Ave. S. The Site Plan states; *Service vehicles are not expected to access the site...* referencing a building in a neighborhood with crowded streets, high rental turnover, an abundance of moving and delivery trucks, with nowhere to put them, blocking the streets, alleyways, and emergency responders.

The location of garbage and recycling bins or dumpsters is also problematic as it is placed on the south property line shared with 2012 Bryant Ave. S..

The proposed garbage solution is completely inadequate. Just from a livability issue, as someone who walks this neighborhood daily, it is very dismaying to think that I will

be walking past overflowing trash cans a few inches from the public sidewalk every single week. **2.6 cubic feet per apartment is not enough.** I don't care how many organics or recyclables are not included in the trash.

2) Snow storage

**The snow storage plan of piling the snow into one parking space is not feasible.**

Any Minnesotan knows that one parking spot does not hold a winter's worth of snow.

3) Landscape buffer

There is no landscape buffer at the south lot line. The residents of 2012 Bryant will have no screening from the commercial property to the north. **It is my understanding that a landscape buffer is required.**

4) Rooftop deck

A rooftop deck is unnecessary to the plans and would deter the enjoyment of the property for the residents of 2012 Bryant Ave S. as well as those living in the apartment building at 905 Franklin. It is likely that this rooftop deck will also impede the enjoyment of other residents on the block. **This is not the greenway.**

Thank you for your consideration of this matter. Please include my comments in the public record.

Christina Langsdorf  
2109 Bryant Av S

**From:** [Smith, Mei-Ling C.](#)  
**To:** [Council Comment](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Appeal - 2008 Bryant Avenue South  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 19, 2016 2:58:37 PM

---

[For Thursday's Z&P – 2008 Bryant Ave S.](#)

---

**From:** Sue Bode [mailto:sjbode@msn.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 19, 2016 2:40 PM  
**To:** Khamsot, Tou Tou; Johnson, Andrew; Johnson, Barbara A. - City Council; Glidden, Elizabeth A.; Frey, Jacob; Quincy, John; Yang, Blong; Gordon, Cam A.; Palmisano, Linea; Cano, Alondra; Goodman, Lisa R.; Reich, Kevin A.; Warsame, Abdi; Smith, Mei-Ling C.; Bender, Lisa  
**Subject:** Appeal - 2008 Bryant Avenue South  
Mayor Hodges, Council Members, Z&P Members, CPED, Planning Commission,

I WISH TO SPEAK IN SUPPORT OF THE APPEAL. I am unable to attend the Appeal Hearing due to a family member's surgery Thursday morning, so I'm sending a letter. Please include it in the record.

My husband and I have lived in our home in the Wedge, at [2750 Dupont Avenue South](#) since 1968. After a nearly 40 year reprieve from tear-downs, our neighborhood is again in the developers' crosshairs, with the blessing of the city. Perkins and Levine have now acquired 84 properties in the city, including 28 in the Wedge, 3 more on our block. They have razed 5 homes in the Wedge in just the last year, plus another one a year or so earlier. If this one is allowed, it will be their 7th. Add to that, two more by the Lander group, and you have a neighborhood under assault!

The pro-development crowd says infill development is needed because of "missing teeth". The Wedge has no missing teeth (empty lots). Here, the developers are the dentists, pulling perfectly healthy teeth! There are areas of the city, like North Minneapolis, that do have lots of empty lots, where development would be welcomed. But no, their sights are set on this neighborhood, even though the vacancy rate in these luxury units is high. Good, solid homes are being replaced with inferior quality construction to maximize profits. Average people are being forced out to make room for expensive, luxury units. (Residents next door were informed by a new owner that their rent would be raised \$250 per month! They all moved out, unable to afford such a large increase).

Something very "fishy" seems to be going on. High pressure tactics are being used to coerce people to sell. Houses are being sold without a "For Sale" sign ever going up. Often, the first neighbors even know a house is for sale, is when the utility companies come out to cut the water and gas lines to the house to prep for demolition. By then it is usually too late to stop it. Houses that are being torn down are solid houses, not in disrepair. Often interiors are quickly gutted so historical claims can not be made. These buyers operate under at least a half dozen different LLC's, so people don't always know who is actually purchasing their property. It seems like a shady shell game. Other potential buyers are not given a chance to bid on the properties.

One of these tear downs (2743 Dupont) is across the street from our house...4 tall stories, 4 units, 4 parking spots, on a 40 foot lot, with 4-5 bedrooms per unit. This is not affordable family housing, so will likely have up to 15-20 adult residents. If most have cars, they will clog the street even more, if possible. In addition, this new building shades our solar panels for about a half hour every sunny morning from roughly April to August. This is against the law! The city never bothered to notify us before approving this. I sent a letter and photos to all Council Members. last fall, which was ignored by every single person. Also, my husband spoke to the planner in charge, who told us essentially, "It's been approved, and is a done deal."

Now the city plans to rubber stamp this 4-story, 10-unit building, with a rooftop deck, shared driveway, inadequate plans for parking, snow removal, and trash receptacles, etc., again, without even bothering to notify or involve nearby neighbors, who are affected. Variances are routinely being granted here that are not allowed in other areas of the city. This needs to stop now! And the city needs to put their rubber stamp away, stop enabling these questionable practices, and represent the residents. This Revolutionary quote comes to mind, ..."Taxation without representation is tyranny!"

.  
Susan Bode  
[2750 Dupont Avenue South](https://www.google.com/maps/place/2750+Dupont+Avenue+South,+Washington,+DC)  
[sjbode@msn.com](mailto:sjbode@msn.com)

Sent from my iPad

**From:** [Smith, Mei-Ling C.](#)  
**To:** [Council Comment](#)  
**Subject:** FW: BZZ-7594 Letter of Support of Appeal for 2008 Bryant Avenue South Apartments,  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 20, 2016 3:45:53 PM

---

**From:** Linda Huhn [mailto:lindahuhnphoto@msn.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 20, 2016 2:31 PM  
**To:** Khamsot, Tou Tou; Cano, Alondra; Johnson, Andrew; Johnson, Barbara A. - City Council; Glidden, Elizabeth A.; Frey, Jacob; Quincy, John; Yang, Blong; Gordon, Cam A.; Palmisano, Linea; Bender, Lisa; Goodman, Lisa R.; Reich, Kevin A.; Warsame, Abdi; Smith, Mei-Ling C.  
**Subject:** BZZ-7594 Letter of Support of Appeal for 2008 Bryant Avenue South Apartments,  
April 20, 2016

Mayor Hodges and Minneapolis City Council Members:

As 39 -year duplex owner/occupant in the Wedge neighborhood, residing at 2553 Dupont Av South, I support the appeal BZZ-7594, File #16-00535. The inadequate review of the proposed demotion of 2008 Bryant Avenue is astounding and sets an undesirable and destructive precedent.

The specific issues with a demolition and then new construction on 2008 Bryant Avenue South site that really get to me involve how the immediate neighbors would be affected by the city's disregard for its own space and snow removal requirements:

No room for two dumpsters, no room to remove or store snow, a shared driveway with the family at the adjacent property that could be crushed by heavy garbage trucks, inadequate parking for 10 new units regardless of the proximity of public transportation. And a rooftop deck that could be a nuisance only 6 feet from this family's property. What are our decisions makers thinking?

The process by which the City of Minneapolis has been condemning properties in our lovely historic neighborhood of heretofore affordable housing resembles a Ponzi scheme. Just like Bernie Madoff, the City of Minneapolis takes care of new owners—in this case development companies who wish to demolish and rebuild for profit—rather than considering legitimate legal, zoning and livability issues for long-time resident property owners who have paid taxes, maintained their properties, cared about our neighborhood, and contributed to what makes Minneapolis a good place to live.

The Wedge is becoming a farm field where historic and beautiful properties are uprooted and new, more profitable ones planted in those spaces whether or not they physically fit or are beneficial to the existing neighborhood environment and the long-term values of affordable and beautiful housing.

This practice **discriminates** against long-term owners, many of retirement age, who will be paying higher taxes due to increased valuations; against people who need affordable rental housing; and **mostly against families who wish to own, because the elevated property values put home ownership in the Wedge financially out of reach for the average family.**

It is families that make a neighborhood, and with its current direction concerning the Wedge neighborhood **the City of Minneapolis has become an anti-family entity**, disregarding zoning laws and in this case allowing inadequate review of the site plan.

I respectfully demand the Mayor and City Council reject the staff findings for this application and the Site Plan Review for 2008 Bryant Avenue South.

Sincerely,

Linda Huhn

(612)374-1435  
2553 Dupont Avenue South  
Minneapolis, MN 55405

**From:** [Smith, Mei-Ling C.](#)  
**To:** [Council Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Fw: Development at 2008 Bryant Ave S  
**Date:** Thursday, April 21, 2016 9:30:35 AM

---

---

**From:** Libby Holden <libby.holden@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 20, 2016 8:58:19 PM  
**To:** Smith, Mei-Ling C.  
**Cc:** Paul Ryan  
**Subject:** Development at 2008 Bryant Ave S

Hello Ms. Smith,

I won't be able to make tomorrow morning's public hearing on 2008 Bryant Ave South, so I'm writing to voice my concerns about the development. My neighbor and fellow board member for Aldrich Point, Paul Ryan, is copied on this in the hope that he can attend and echo my concerns.

I've lived in the LHE neighborhood for 7 years, first as a renter at 1916 Dupont Ave S., then as a renter at 1926 Aldrich Ave S. and subsequently an owner of the same condo. Over that time I've seen parking become severely more constricted. The addition of Burch and several other restaurants that do not have sufficient (if any) free parking available means that folks from downtown and the suburbs are using street parking on Bryant and Aldrich instead. Have you seen the line for ice cream at Sebastian Joe's on a hot July day? Additional parking restrictions imposed on much of Franklin Avenue two years ago further pushed those patrons onto our neighborhood streets.

I live in this neighborhood because of its proximity to the city and use buses and bike commute, but I still need a car to access one of my jobs in the suburbs and care for a family member there. My partner relies on his car to commute to his job in Minnetonka. When I return from a 12-hour day on weeknights, it's common that the nearest parking spot will be over 3 blocks away; during the last emergency parking restriction, I had to park as much as 9 blocks away, well into the Kenwood neighborhood. That's okay as long as I'm able-bodied and walking only a dog, but it makes the parking situation completely untenable for the disabled, the elderly or young families with strollers. I truly want that variety of people to live in LHE, and I don't want to have to move if I injure myself running or get pregnant.

In my experience with developers in downtown and Uptown, they continuously underestimate their future residents' parking needs. For better or worse, we are still a car-based society, and I expect that - should the 2008 Bryant Ave S development proceed - most of those new residents will want to bring their car (or more likely cars, if there's more than one person living there) with them.

**Please press the developers to include a free on-site, off-street parking spot for at least 80% of their units.** I strongly believe that new developments in this neighborhood are inevitable, but they should certainly make the neighborhood better and not worse.

My contact information is below; please let me know if I can offer more information

about my experience living in Lowry Hill East.

Best regards,

Libby Holden

Board member, secretary for Aldrich Point Condominium Association

--

Libby Holden

[libby.holden@gmail.com](mailto:libby.holden@gmail.com)

612-840-0233

**From:** [Connie Lindor](#)  
**To:** [Council Comment](#)  
**Subject:** permit #Bzz-7584 comment  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 20, 2016 4:01:51 PM

---

Dear City Council-

I live in the Wedge neighborhood and also own several duplexes in the area.

I am strongly opposed to the 2008 Bryant development, assuming it calls for more old buildings to be torn down. I will be at the 930am Zoning + Planning meeting tomorrow morning to learn more.

I still am speechless at the disaster that was created at 24th + Colfax with the Motiv Apartments. Do you release that only 4 of 41 apartments have rented to date? The city needs to do a study of vacant luxury apartments in Minneapolis. I work downtown in the tech industry and walk by numerous empty apartments on a daily basis. You aren't paying attention- stop looking at spreadsheets and start walking around and asking questions. It's a bubble that about to burst.

Please. Do not tear down any more old buildings. Especially in the Wedge- we have already lost too many.

Sincerely,  
Connie Lindor

**From:** [Andrea Larson](#)  
**To:** [Council Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Permit #Bzz-7594, 2008 Bryant Ave Apts  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 20, 2016 2:50:02 PM

---

Dear Sirs,

I am writing in regards to permit #Bzz-7594, 2008 Bryant Ave Apts.

Over the past eight years of living in the Wedge area, the large influx of high-end condos has began to change the structure of the neighborhood and the quality of life we tend to enjoy here. Noise, housing costs and the general integrity of the neighborhood has suffered as a result.

Please reconsider this as the eighth building to be bulldozed in the past 14 months and ensure strict adherence to zoning and other regulations in this matter.

Regards,  
Andrea Larson  
223 W Franklin Ave Apt 4  
Minneapolis, MN 55404

To: Susan Trammell  
Ethics Officer & Assistant City Attorney  
ethicsofficer@minneapolismn.gov  
City of Minneapolis  
350 South Fifth Street, Room 210  
Minneapolis, MN 55415

28 April, 2016

## **COMPLAINT**

This document is a complaint based on procedural and ethical points surrounding the use and misuse of Consent Agendas by the Minneapolis City Planning Commission (CPC). This complaint is being filed against Matthew Brown, President of the CPC and the Commissioners of the CPC present at the meetings for;

### **1/11/2016**

Consent Agenda Approved at 6:06 minutes  
Items 6,7,8 placed and passed on the consent agenda  
Commissioners present  
Matthew Brown, President | John Slack, Vice President  
Lisa Bender | Rebecca Gagnon | Ben Gisselman | Ryan Kronzer | Nick Magrino | Sam Rockwell

### **1/25/2016**

Consent Agenda Approved at 5:39 minutes  
Items 1,2,3,5 placed and passed on the consent agenda  
Commissioners present  
Matthew Brown, President | John Slack, Vice President  
Lisa Bender | Rebecca Gagnon | Ben Gisselman | Ryan Kronzer | Nick Magrino | Sam Rockwell | Scott Vreeland

### **2/8/2016**

Consent Agenda Approved at 4:33 minutes  
Items 4,5 placed and passed on the consent agenda  
Commissioners present  
Matthew Brown, President | John Slack, Vice President | Alissa Luepke Pier, Secretary  
Lisa Bender | Rebecca Gagnon | Ryan Kronzer | Nick Magrino | Sam Rockwell | Scott Vreeland

### **2/22/2016**

Consent Agenda Approved at 6:04 minutes  
Items 1,2,3 placed and passed on the consent agenda  
Commissioners present  
Matthew Brown, President | John Slack, Vice President | Alissa Luepke Pier, Secretary  
Lisa Bender | Rebecca Gagnon | Nick Magrino | Sam Rockwell | Amy Sweasy | Scott Vreeland

**3/14/2016**

Consent Agenda Approved at 6:27 minutes

Items 1,3,5,7,8,9 placed and passed on the consent agenda

Commissioners present

Matthew Brown, President | Alissa Luepke Pier, Secretary

Lisa Bender | Rebecca Gagnon | Ryan Kronzer | Nick Magrino | Sam Rockwell | Amy Sweasy | Scott Vreeland

**3/28/2016**

Consent Approved Passed at 3:32 minutes

Items 1,3 placed and passed on the consent agenda

Commissioners present

Matthew Brown, President | John Slack, Vice President | Alissa Luepke Pier, Secretary

Lisa Bender | Ryan Kronzer | Nick Magrino | Sam Rockwell | Amy Sweasy

**4/11/2016**

Consent Agenda Approved at 3:29 minutes

Items 1,3,5 placed and passed on the consent agenda

Commissioners present

Matthew Brown, President | John Slack, Vice President | Alissa Luepke Pier, Secretary

Lisa Bender | Rebecca Gagnon | Ryan Kronzer | Nick Magrino | Amy Sweasy | Scott Vreeland

**4/25/2016**

Consent Agenda Approved at 4:27 minutes

Items 1,2,3,5,6,8,9 placed and passed on the consent agenda

Commissioners present

Matthew Brown, President | John Slack, Vice President | Alissa Luepke Pier, Secretary

Nick Magrino | Amy Sweasy | Scott Vreeland | Sam Rockwell

\*The source of the above information is via video recordings on YouTube as minutes are not posted on the City of Minneapolis website, are not easily accessible, and must be requested from the secretary that keeps the records for the Board with a fee for a copy. This is one other example of a complete lack of transparency in our local government.

**DEFINITION: CONSENT AGENDA**

(Amber Eisenschenk Staff Attorney League of Minnesota Cities)

By resolution or through bylaws, a Board may establish a consent agenda containing routine, noncontroversial items that need little or no deliberation.

- The clerk or person responsible for placing items on the agenda prepares the consent agenda.
- By a majority or higher vote, the Board may approve all actions on the consent agenda with one vote.
- If a member objects to an item placed on the consent agenda, it should be removed and acted on as a separate agenda item.

**Consent Agenda – Typical Items**

- Approval of License Applications
- Approval of Minutes
- Approval of Disbursements/financial
- Approval of Change Orders
- Approval of Payment of Contracts
- Approval of Appointments/Resignations
- Set Hearing Dates
- Authorization to Advertise for Bids
- Approval of Leases and Agreements

<http://mnnahro.org/sites/default/files/Open%20Meeting%20Laws%20Roberts%20Rules%20of%20Order%20-%20Amber%20Eisenschenk.pdf>

**See also Document (A)**

Using a Consent Agenda by Colette Collier Trohan

## PROCEDURAL POINTS

### Rules of City Council (City Ordinance - Appendix A)

- Consent Agendas are not listed as part of approved meeting procedure
  - III. – MEETINGS OF THE COUNCIL Section 8. – Order of Business
  - IV. – COMMITTEES Section 3. – RULES AND PROCEDURES IN COMMITTEES
- As there is *no absence of a rule*, Robert’s Rules of Order, Newly Revised where “Consent Calendars” are listed as an option, does not apply, therefore, the use of a Consent Agenda during CPC meetings (and all other Commission, Committee, and City Council meetings) is an invalid procedure per the above ordinance.
  - – RULES Section 1. - Purpose; Procedural Authority
- The *Duties* of the President are outlined as to *Direct the preparation of an agenda for each meeting outlining all matters to be properly presented for consideration and action*. The word *preparation* infers that the agenda would be prepared prior to the CPC meeting not written during the meeting. Expectations would then be that the posted agenda *is* the agenda less than minor variations such as postponements and withdrawn items.
- Consent Agendas do not fall within the purview of the *Duties of the Chair*
  - IV. – COMMITTEES Section 5. - Committee Management.
- Consent agendas take away the ability of *the public to speak upon a specific subject matter*
  - VII. - PUBLIC HEARINGS Section 1. - Public Hearing, Defined.
- Cancelling public hearings via Consent Agenda is not listed in the *Role of the Chair*
  - VII. - PUBLIC HEARINGS Section 2. - Role of the Chair.
- Even if the *ordinance* is changed to allow for Consent Agendas, Consent Agendas are not for public hearing items
  - See the Definition listed above and Document (A)

## ETHICAL POINTS

### Chapter 15. – Ethics in Government

- The Minneapolis Code of Ethics states clearly that residents *must have confidence and trust in the integrity of their city government*. The disturbing use and misuse of Consent Agendas during the CPC meetings and the resulting approvals negate all trust tax paying citizens have in their city government and their right to be heard.
- The President and Commissioners of the CPC have not avoided *actions that...give the appearance of impropriety or a conflict of interest*.
- The actions of the President and Commissioners of the CPC *give the appearance of impropriety, whether apparent or real*. Due to these actions, there is an impression among many constituents that the President and Commissioners of the CPC show a *bias and favoritism* for developers without accountability to the people they are meant to serve.
- We do not feel that we *can rely in good faith on their words and actions* when only a few minutes into each meeting (see meetings listed above) items posted for a public hearing are placed onto and then approved without discussion on the Consent Agenda for that meeting. A Consent Agenda that was not in existence with even one item prior to the meeting.
- The President and Commissioners of the CPC do not *comply with... the letter...of applicable federal and state law and regulations, the city charter, the Minneapolis Code of Ordinances and city policies and procedures*. Their use of a Consent Agenda which is not listed as an option in the Ordinance governing City Council Procedures and the lack of discussion regarding the use of the Consent Agenda and placement of items on it *appear* to be a lax disregard for their ethical responsibilities as appointed city representatives whose salaries are paid by *us*, the residents of this city.
- The use of Consent Agendas may or may not be considered established practice but it is definitely not listed in the publicly posted procedures or legal city ordinances, therefore, they must not be used.
- All of the Commissioners of the CPC are culpable in the use of the Consent Agendas. Not only have Commissioners present at the above listed meetings all voted to approve the agendas but there is also no known record of them reporting this conduct that we believe violates the Code of Ethics and the listed Procedures. In addition, these CPC Commissioners have not put motions forward to take the listed items off of the Consent Agendas of these meetings (See the Definition listed above and Document (A) ) thereby adding to the *appearance* of collusion among the members against the public that does not belong at City Hall or among the representatives of our city government.
- Citizens of this city are being denied their right to public hearings by the misuse of the Consent Agenda at CPC meetings.
  - 15.10. - Code of ethics; preamble.  
 Minneapolis government exists to serve the people of Minneapolis. In order to do so effectively, the people must have confidence and trust in the integrity of their city government. They deserve elected and appointed officials, city employees and volunteers who maintain the highest ethical principles and avoid misconduct and conflicts of interest, apparent or real. Effective democracy depends on a government that is fair, ethical and accountable to the people it serves...  
 ... a basis for disciplinary action.  
 ...The code of ethics is designed to promote high ethical standards and conduct, and to foster a healthy ethical culture throughout city government. It is a

touchstone for all who work with and for the city to assist them in fulfilling their responsibilities to the people of Minneapolis.

- ARTICLE I. – TRUST

- 15.20. - Ethical aspiration.

We put the public interest ahead of our own personal advancement and financial interests. We disclose conflicts of interest and refrain from participating in decisions where we have a financial interest. We avoid actions that might impair independence of judgment or give the appearance of impropriety or a conflict of interest. We do not use our positions to gain privileges or special treatment and do not use public property or personnel for private or personal purposes.

- ARTICLE II. - FAIRNESS

- 15.130. - Ethical aspiration.

We act honestly, fairly, and openly so that others can rely in good faith on our words and actions. We do not engage in or tolerate any act of discrimination, retaliation, harassment or abuse. We maintain and respect confidentiality and decide all matters based on their merits, free from improper influences

- ARTICLE III. - ACCOUNTABILITY

- 15.180. - Ethical aspiration.

We comply with both the letter and the spirit of applicable federal and state law and regulations, the city charter, the Minneapolis Code of Ordinances and city policies and procedures.

- 15.190. - Avoiding bias or favoritism.

When making decisions, a local official or employee shall act for the benefit of the city, avoid bias or favoritism, and shall respect cultural differences.

- 15.230. - Code of ethics violations.

(a) A local official or employee must report any conduct by other local officials or employees that he or she believes violates this Code of ethics.

(2)

The suspected misconduct of an appointed employee who is not a department head must be reported to either the alleged violator's supervisor or department head or to the ethics officer or to the confidential reporting line. Conduct reported shall be referred to the appropriate official for investigation.

- CHAPTER 525. - ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT

- 525.100. - City planning commission.

(c)

*Public hearings.* The city planning commission shall schedule public hearings not less than twice per month, except in those months where the chair determines that because of holiday schedules or the number of agenda items, one (1) meeting is sufficient to carry out the commission's duties. Such public hearings shall be noticed and conducted pursuant to the provisions of **Error! Hyperlink reference not valid..**

## CONCLUSION

We feel, the actions taken by Matthew Brown, President of the CPC, and the Commissioners of the CPC via the use of Consent Agendas have disintegrated public trust in our local system of government and its representatives and strongly depleted the public's willingness to participate in civic engagement. They have systematically taken away the public's voice by deleting the reasonable opportunity to speak at many public hearings. It is a reasonable expectation that agenda items that are not *routine, noncontroversial items that need little or no deliberation* (see the Definition listed above and Document (A)) and that are posted prior to CPC meetings would not be pushed into Consent Agendas for approval within the first few minutes of each meeting. Unless an item is listed as Item One on a posted agenda, it is a reasonable expectation that if a member of the public arrives at a meeting two or even six minutes after the posted beginning of the meeting of said meeting that Items Two, Three, or even Nine will not have been already approved (see approval times in the meeting list above). Why is the CPC bothering to post, let alone, waste trees and print, an agenda they are not going to come even close to following?

The decision to exclude the public from having a public hearing is illegal. We are expected to pay the CPC's salaries but to not have a say in their decisions. This is taxation without representation.

We also find the President, Matthew Brown, through his initiation of and actions regarding the Consent Agendas and the attending Commissioners of the CPC through their complicit silence beyond voting approval; to be ethically and morally negligent in their duties as appointed commissioners and representatives of the city government and CPED towards the Public they are purported to serve. When signage has more discussion and public input than large, out of place, developments plopped into neighbors back and front yards, there is something very wrong with a system.

The words *to hear* appear throughout Sec.525.100. But how is a Commissioner to make a *fair* and viable decision that, in turn, becomes a recommendation to the Minneapolis Zoning & Planning Committee and the City Council if that Commissioner does not get *to hear* the opinions and arguments of the Public through a Public Hearing?

Our trust has been betrayed.

## REQUESTED ACTIONS

It is a reasonable assumption that by five months into a session, the CPC President and Commissioners would be familiar with, understand, and follow the Ethics Codes and Procedures spelled out in the City of Minneapolis Ordinances. Therefore, we request the following actions to be taken regarding this complaint:

- Action taken to address this complaint within a reasonable amount of time
- Action taken to address the issue raised within a short amount of time
- Clear communication with the Complainants regarding the outcome of the complaint
- A new President elected from the current CPC Commissioners
- A careful examination of the current CPC Commissioners regarding Conflict of Interest.
- Immediate re-training of all members of the Minneapolis City Planning Commission (CPC) regarding Ethics and meeting procedure
- If it is found that they have never received training (although several appear familiar with Robert's Rules of Order during the meetings) it should be noted that those whose job it is to do the training should also be held responsible for the actions stated in this complaint
- Continuous re-examination, monitoring, and enforcement of the city Code of Ethics policy and all city meeting procedures followed by all members of the CPC
- Immediate removal of all CPC Commissioners that are found not following the policies after re-training
- A much more thorough examination of CPC applicants including their qualifications and conflict of interests than is currently followed
  - CHAPTER 15. - ETHICS IN GOVERNMENT
  - ARTICLE III. - ACCOUNTABILITY
  - 15.240. - Sanctions.  
An appointed or classified employee who violates the code of ethics may be subject to disciplinary action, up to and including termination of city employment.

Complaint Submitted By:

Saralyn Romanishan

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Saralyn Romanishan', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

2111 Aldrich Ave S  
Minneapolis, MN 55405  
[sararomanishan@yahoo.com](mailto:sararomanishan@yahoo.com)

Constance Pepin  
4031 Zenith Ave S  
Minneapolis, MN 55410  
[cpepin@bitstream.net](mailto:cpepin@bitstream.net)

Trilby Busch  
2648 Emerson Ave S  
Minneapolis, MN 55408  
[postmodernpost@hotmail.com](mailto:postmodernpost@hotmail.com)

And on behalf of the Minneapolis organization, **Neighborhoods Now**

## Document (A)

### **Using a Consent Agenda**

by Colette Collier Trohan  
Certified Professional Parliamentarian-Teacher  
Professional Registered Parliamentarian

One of the best-kept secrets of efficient boards and assemblies is the consent agenda, also known as the consent calendar. Contrary to popular myth, Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised does not require that every single item be handled with the full pomp and circumstance of a motion, second, debate, and vote. Some decisions are either routine, or are so widely supported that to make approval a separate action would bog the group down.

Enter the consent agenda. By the adoption of a special rule of order allowing for the consent agenda process, a board or assembly can group as many items together as they desire, and adopt them all at once without debate. The consent agenda can be a powerful tool for a board or assembly that is required to give approvals to items that are routine, non-controversial or both.

The secret of the consent agenda's success is twofold: choosing the right items to put on the consent agenda, and educating members so they know how to handle the process. If either piece is missing, the consent agenda loses its effectiveness.

What should be put on the consent agenda? The first time the process is used, it will feel new and members may tend to be overcautious. For most associations, I recommend that only "no-brainers" go on the consent agenda the first few times, so that members can get used to the procedure. It's better to deal with only one or two items and use the process correctly than to start with five or six items and get confused. Approval of the minutes is usually a good item to begin with. If the board or other assembly has been dealing with an issue for some time and all members are familiar with the implications, final approval of that proposal would also be a good item for the consent agenda. Routine matters such as membership acceptance and non-controversial appointments are also ideal candidates.

Where in the meeting should you place the consent agenda? I recommend scheduling it at the beginning, so that the meeting can start out actively supporting its purpose: to make decisions and take actions leading to fulfillment of the association's mission. Be sure to explain the process clearly ahead of time so the members know what to expect.

Here's how a typical consent agenda is handled: The chair places the consent agenda before the assembly and asks, "Does anyone wish to remove any item from the consent agenda?" Since any member who doesn't trust the process can easily remove any or all of the items, it is important (at least at first) that the items not be confrontational or controversial. Similarly, if any member wants a separate vote on any item, or simply wants to discuss an item, that item must be removed from the consent agenda. It's all or nothing. (For that reason, when minutes are to be placed on a consent agenda, it's a good idea to provide the draft minutes well in advance of the meeting; that way, you can include the corrected version on the consent agenda.)

It helps to have each item numbered, so that a member can simply call out “Number 3,” or whatever number they want to remove. In such a case, the chair responds: “Number 3 is removed.” (At that time, the decision should be made whether to take up the issue immediately after the consent agenda is adopted, or to place it under its “regular” category heading for that meeting.)

The chair then asks, “Are there any other items to be removed?” If there are none, the chair states: “Items numbered (listing remaining item numbers) are before you. If there is no objection, these items will be adopted.” (Pause, to see if there is an objection.) “There being no objection, these items are adopted.”

Although an issue may be named by its number during the consent agenda process, the minutes should include the items that were adopted along with the full text of the resolutions or other actions, to provide a complete record of the proceedings.

Parliamentary authorities differ on how to handle consent agendas. Rather than leave it up to varying definitions, I recommend that the body adopt the following special rule of order:

“A consent agenda may be presented by the president at the beginning of a meeting. Items may be removed from the consent agenda on the request of any one member. Items not removed may be adopted by general consent without debate. Removed items may be taken up either immediately after the consent agenda or placed later on the agenda at the discretion of the assembly.”



**From:** [Saralyn Romanishan](#)  
**To:** [Johnson, Barbara A. - City Council](#); [Bender, Lisa](#); [Reich, Kevin A.](#); [Goodman, Lisa R.](#); [Johnson, Andrew](#); [Warsame, Abdi](#); [Frey, Jacob](#); [Yang, Blong](#); [Quincy, John](#); [Glidden, Elizabeth A.](#); [Cano, Alondra](#); [linea.palmasino@minneapolismn.gov](mailto:linea.palmasino@minneapolismn.gov); [Gordon, Cam A.](#); [Council Committee Coordinators](#)  
**Subject:** Postponement of City Council Vote  
**Date:** Thursday, April 28, 2016 3:50:12 PM  
**Attachments:** [Planning Commission complaint 2016.04.27.docx](#)

---

I am addressing this to the President and all Council Members.

This letter is to request that the votes regarding the developments listed on the agenda for the City Council meeting on 29 April, 2016 be postponed. A complaint was filed today with Susan Trammell regarding the conduct of the CPC Commissioners and the effect of their actions on the decision making process (see attached).

In light of this complaint, I request that the City Council postpone the following items to a future meeting until these issues have been addressed and the findings of the Ethics Officer and all other necessary entities have been verified.

I feel that this issue is extremely serious and therefore forwarded the complaint to our local representatives in the Minnesota Statehouse. I appreciate your careful consideration of this request.

Thank you,

Saralyn Romanishan  
2111 Aldrich Ave S  
Minneapolis, MN 55405

### **Agenda Items to be Postponed**

#### Zoning & Planning

##### *ZP Committee Report of [4/21/2016](#)*

1. Site plan review appeal: James Boyle, 2008 Bryant Ave S ([16-00535](#))  
Denying an appeal filed by James Boyle, on behalf of Minneapolis Neighbors United, regarding the City Planning Commission decision to approve the site plan review application (BZZ-7594) to allow a new, four-story apartment building with 10 dwelling units at 2008 Bryant Ave S.
2. Partial alley vacation: Curt Gunsbury and Robb Miller; 2903, 2905, 2907, 2911 Harriet Ave S and 2900, 2904, 2910, and 2912 Grand Ave S ([16-00536](#))
  1. Approving an application by Curt Gunsbury and Robb Miller for a partial alley vacation at 2903, 2905, 2907, and 2911 Harriet Ave S and 2900, 2904, 2910, and 2912 Grand Ave S, to construct a multiple family dwelling, subject to the retention of easements by CenturyLink.
  2. Passage of Resolution approving Vacation 1652.
3. Rezoning: Curt Gunsbury and Robb Miller; 2903, 2905, 2907, 2911 Harriet Ave S and 2900, 2904, 2910, and 2912 Grand Ave S ([16-00537](#))
  1. Approving an application submitted by Curt Gunsbury and Robb Miller to rezone (BZZ-7587) 2903, 2905, 2907, and 2911 Harriet Ave S from the I1 District to the R5

District; and 2900, 2904, 2910, and 2912 Grand Ave S from the R2B District to the R5 District, to allow a new 6-story, 111-unit residential building.

2. Passage of Ordinance amending Title 20, Chapter 521 of the Minneapolis Code of Ordinances relating to Zoning Code: Zoning Districts and Maps Generally.
  4. Landmark designation: Sumner T McKnight Mansion, 2200 Park Ave ([16-00538](#))  
Passage of Resolution approving the local historic landmark designation (BZH-27695) of the Sumner T McKnight Mansion at 2200 Park Ave, subject to conditions.
  5. Environmental Assessment Worksheet determination: Proposed Alatus Tower project, 200 Central Ave SE and 113 2nd St SE ([16-00539](#))
    1. Denying a petition for an Environmental Assessment Worksheet for the proposed Alatus Tower project on the property located at 200 Central Ave SE and 113 2nd St SE.
    2. Adopting the Findings of Fact and Record of Decision as prepared by Community Planning & Economic Development staff.
- Early signature by Mayor requested.

**From:** [Karl Schuettler](#)  
**To:** [Council Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Proposed Development in Lowry Hill East  
**Date:** Monday, April 18, 2016 2:56:49 PM

---

Dear Councilmembers,

I received the attached flyer on my apartment door this morning (2107 Hennepin) regarding a proposed development at 2008 Bryant Ave. In the Lowry Hill East neighborhood. As a "neighbor" of this proposed development, I'd like to register my support for it. The "historic" home in question appears indistinct and derelict, and is wedged in between a bunch of existing apartments and one very large, old, expensive home. The area can and should have more housing, and I'm skeptical of the opponents' sudden discovery of the need for "affordability" in the neighborhood. This is a ruse to shut down development and preserve the neighborhood in its current state for the benefit of homeowners, not the renters who constitute a majority of its population. While I am sympathetic to some concerns surrounding historic preservation and preventing extreme, rapid change in the neighborhood, in this particular case, the scare tactics use by the opponents go too far.

Thanks for your work.  
Karl Schuettler

--

**Karl S. Schuettler**

Hubert H. Humphrey School of Public Affairs | University of Minnesota  
Master of Urban and Regional Planning Candidate, 2016  
President, Planning Student Organization  
Managing Editor, Humphrey Public Affairs Review  
202-421-7917  
[schue155@umn.edu](mailto:schue155@umn.edu)

**From:** [Sheryl Evelo](#)  
**To:** [Council Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Re: 2008 Bryant Ave. So.  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 19, 2016 1:31:20 PM

---

We wonder why this property at 2008 Bryant Ave. So. has been given "fast forward" approval for being bulldozed?

Why don't our city council members adopt a more preservationist approach such as St. Paul's attempts to sell, for a reduced price, the prized older homes that could use some tender loving care? There are actually lots of folks who are interested in our location, have a means to invest and rehabilitate and preserve what can be saved in the lovely old homes.

We have lived in the WEDGE for 44 years and have seen a number of homes in pretty rough shape, bought by young, energetic people who are still living here, refinishing, planting, painting their property and enjoying our neighborhood.

Please reconsider your zeal for "high density, tear down, build new" mentality in this neighborhood. We moved here when that was happening all around us. We worked hard with neighbors to "down zone" so that developers would not be able to do this sort of thing. Why is the cycle happening again?

Thank you for sharing this with the entire council,  
Sheryl and DAvid Evelo  
2301 Bryant Ave. So.  
Mpls, 55405

**From:** [Smith, Mei-Ling C.](mailto:Smith, Mei-Ling C.)  
**To:** [Council Comment](#)  
**Subject:** ZP appeal tomorrow  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 20, 2016 4:41:32 PM

---

**From:** Trilby Busch [mailto:gichi00gami@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 20, 2016 4:40 PM  
**To:** Smith, Mei-Ling C.  
**Subject:** mei-ling.anderson@minneapolismn.gov

This e-mail was sent to the Z&P members this morning. Please make sure it is included in the public record. Thanks.

Members of the City Z&P Committee:

I support the Appeal of the Planning Commission's approval of the Bryant Avenue Apartments project. I cannot attend the April 21st hearing. Please distribute these comments to the City Council for the record.

The City of Minneapolis needs to stop fixating on market-driven issues (building thousands of upscale apartment units) and turn its attention to the proper role of City government: addressing the issues of social justice, racial inequality and housing for people of limited means. A recent article, "[How Much Money Do You Need to Live Comfortably in the 50 Biggest Cities?](#)" shows that Minneapolis residents need \$13k more than the City's median income to live comfortably. Building upscale units in the Wedge compounds, not eases, these problems, which grow worse by the month.

DDMZ (a.k.a. Drew Levin and Danny Perkins)'s infill apartment project at 2008 Bryant with its nine two-bedroom units with only two parking spaces and inadequate provision for waste management is another poorly planned, out-of-scale infill project in Lowry Hill East. The City seems to think that if it writes a regulation excusing developers from providing sufficient parking for new multi-unit buildings that parking problems will magically vanish. They won't; they will worsen. In addition, the roof-top party area on the building would adversely affect the quality of life on the adjoining blocks. We've been through this controversy before in Uptown, where rooftop revelers can be heard for blocks on weekends.

The City promotes its recycling programs (which are very good), yet doesn't consider for a moment the environmental impact of sending tons of embodied energy in the irreplaceable, quality materials in houses wrecked for these new buildings--- buildings of inferior material in slap-dash construction. The greenest and most affordable building is the one already built.

Finally, the Wedge cannot support more "market-rate" apartment units. Nearby, the Motiv Apartment project, which involved the wrecking of two large houses (wrecking, I might add, that was done with no hazardous material containment) is desperately seeking renters. Out of the 42 units in that building, completed a half year ago, only four are rented. So much for market considerations.

Why is the City doing nothing about housing on the North Side? Why is the City fixating on the housing market and not on serving its citizens?

Sincerely,  
Trilby Busch  
2648 Emerson Ave. S.