Request for City Council Committee Action from the Department of Community Planning and Economic Development

Date: **April 8, 2010**

To: **Council Member Gary Schiff, Chair,**
Zoning and Planning Committee
Members of the Committee

Subject: **University District Zoning and Planning Regulatory Review (ZPRR) Summary Report**

Recommendation: **Receive and file report from University District Zoning and Planning Regulatory Review Task Force.**

Department Information

Prepared by: Haila Maze, Principal City Planner, 612-673-2098
Approved by: Karin Berkholtz, Community Planning Supervisor, 612-673-3240
Presenters in Committee: Haila Maze, Principal City Planner

Community Impact

- Neighborhood Notification – Notification of the presentation and report was emailed to neighborhood associations and other community stakeholders in the University District area, including neighborhoods of Cedar Riverside, Marcy Holmes, Prospect Park, Southeast Como, and University.
- Zoning Code – Report developed partially in response to (1) development moratorium on 1-4 unit residential construction or demolition in the University District enacted 10-10-08 (Chapter 585), and (2) zoning text amendment requests, namely site plan review standards and overlay districts (various chapters)

Supporting Information

For your review attached is the summary report from the ZPRR Task Force. Please note this is a receive and file item only – no official action is being requested.

This report represents cooperative effort between a wide range of University-area stakeholders. In Fall 2008, the process was initiated, under the umbrella of the University District Alliance. The purpose was to address land use and development concerns facing neighborhoods in the University District area, including the neighborhoods of Cedar Riverside, Marcy Holmes, Prospect Park, Southeast Como, and University.

This was developed as a follow-up to the University of Minnesota Minneapolis Area Neighborhood Impact Report, and to various neighborhood-initiated discussions – both of

which identified a range of concerns regarding how zoning and planning issues are handled by the City in the University District area, and how they could be improved.

The report identifies a range of implementation actions that can be undertaken to make these improvements. At this time, a few are completed, some are underway, and more are yet to be undertaken. I will touch on implementation priorities in my presentation.

The City has an important role in this process, and an ongoing commitment to assist with implementation.

University District Zoning and Planning Regulatory Review
Summary Report

Overview

Living near a major university is a unique experience. There are both positives and negatives for nearby neighborhoods – ranging from excellent cultural amenities and diverse, well-educated residents to poorly maintained properties and traffic-clogged streets. The neighborhoods around the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis deal with both ends of the spectrum. While unique within the City, these issues are echoed at hundreds of campuses nationwide. Those living in the neighborhood have long investigated ways to mitigate the negative impacts of their location, while celebrating and building on the area's strengths. While much has been done, there remains more to do.

This report represents the latest effort, undertaken as part of cooperative effort between a wide range of University-area stakeholders. In Fall 2008, the University District Zoning and Planning Regulatory Review (ZPRR) process was initiated, under the umbrella of the University Alliance (more information on this provided below). The purpose of ZPRR was to address land use and development concerns facing neighborhoods in the University District area, including the neighborhoods of Cedar Riverside, Marcy Holmes, Prospect Park, Southeast Como, and University. This was developed as a follow-up to the University of Minnesota Minneapolis Area Neighborhood Impact Report, and to various neighborhood-initiated discussions – both of which identified a range of concerns regarding how zoning and planning issues are handled by the City in the University District area, and how they could be improved.

The intended scope of ZPRR was to address issues included parking, occupancy, design standards, zoning, inspections, and public involvement in the development review process. The intent was not to start from scratch, but to build upon existing initiatives and plans to create a coordinated response to this group of related issues. The focus was on what the City could do to improve its regulatory processes, but recommendations which supported these (but were implemented by others) were included too.

This planning process had four main components:

- Reviewing and compiling information on neighborhood issues related to land use and development impacts in the University District, including review of recent studies and meetings and conversations with key neighborhood stakeholders.

- Identifying priority planning and zoning issues facing the District area, particularly those which would benefit from City intervention. Not all may be feasible within project scope.

- Developing an implementation plan for addressing each priority issue, which may include coordination with other ongoing enforcement or regulatory efforts within and outside City government.

- Initiating implementation of plan, and regularly tracking progress towards goals

The report below provides information on the background and context for ZPRR, as well as recommended actions to address identified planning and zoning issues. This report has been made available for public comment via the project website, a series of neighborhood-level meetings and presentations, and a large community meeting. Additional input was gathered through the approval process of two zoning text amendments which were implemented as early recommendations from the plan prior to the completion of this report.

Policy Framework

Impact Report

The initiation of this planning process is largely based on the findings of the University of Minnesota Minneapolis Area Neighborhood Impact Report. The impact report itself was a required condition of legislative approval of funding for the new University of Minnesota Gopher football stadium. In the words of the financing bill, there was a directive "to assess and prepare a report of the impact of the university on the surrounding community and the relationship of the community to the university."

The impact report developed the following vision for the University community: "The communities adjacent to campus will be vital, safe, and attractive places where current and future residents will want to invest their time, talents, and resources for the long term. Together, the campus and neighboring communities will be an environment rich in culture, creativity, community, and human capital and will be a premier asset to the cities and the region of which they are a part. The University, the City of Minneapolis, and the community organizations will have a partnership to achieve and maintain this vision.

In addition to identifying a range of assets of the area, the impact report spelled out a range of concerns facing the area, including pressures on the housing market, a growing imbalance in neighborhood demographics, and transportation/traffic/parking issues. It also noted the interdependent relationship of the neighborhoods and the University, and the need for coordinated and cooperative action.

Recommendations from the plan included:

- Continue the City and University initiatives already underway.
- Initiate organizational steps to create a new alliance that brings together the University, the City, and the neighborhoods and empowers them to act collaboratively.
- Take immediate action on first priority initiatives needed to reverse the neighborhood decline.

- Identify sustained funding for alliance activities, including development and implementation of a long-term plan

The ZPRR process falls primarily under the "first priority initiatives" – that is, work needing to be done that does not require the context of a larger planning process, as issues have already been clearly identified through work that is already complete. The chart below lists some relevant specific recommendations from the impact report which relate to the purpose of ZPRR, and some actions completed to date.

Table 1: Selected Recommendations for ZPRR from Impact Report

Recommendation	Implications for this process
Launch initiative to inspect rental and boarding and lodging facilities in District	Inspection sweep completed in 2007-2008. Review results from sweep, use information to direct future actions
Accelerate initiative to address serious noncompliance with health and safety codes	Ongoing inspections and enforcement work, addressed in more detail in ZPRR.
Develop long term approach to improving condition of rental housing, increasing compliance and maintaining homeownership opportunities	Researching best practices, both local and at other campuses, to develop solutions that can be implemented; recommendations identified through ZPRR.
Raise quality of infill housing and raise standards when necessary; review zoning, housing and site review standards in the district, related to pattern of high density, low quality infill housing	Review of city standards and processes to identify ways to improve quality of new development through ZPRR.
Investigate and develop best practices to address safety and crime issues	Ongoing public safety issues and initiatives will be reviewed and implications and direction for planning/zoning will be identified

Citywide Comprehensive Plan

While the development of the impact report was underway, the City was completing an update to its comprehensive plan, adopted by the City Council in October 2009. While most policies in the plan apply to the entire city rather than any specific place, the designated land use features do identify key areas within the District.

The purpose of these land use features is primarily to direct growth and development in desired and appropriate locations. The comprehensive plan in general provides a vision for growing the city in a sustainable way, so that the city's social, economic, and environmental resources and networks are strengthened. The identified land use features in the University District include:

- Growth centers – These are identified in the plan as major concentrations of jobs and economic activity, along with supporting services and housing. The

University of Minnesota and adjacent areas are identified as a growth center, second in size and importance only to Downtown.

- Activity centers – These are identified as lively places, appropriate for higher densities of most uses, including residential and commercial, including those with day-to-night levels of activity. The Stadium Village, Dinkytown, and Cedar Avenue commercial/mixed use areas are identified as activity centers. The District borders on a fourth, the East Hennepin area which extends into Marcy Holmes.

- Transit station areas – These are defined as fixed route (i.e. light rail) stations located within the city. In addition to other layers of policy, this designation indicates strong support for higher densities and transit-supportive development. The Hiawatha Cedar-Riverside station area is an existing designated one, and the four future Central Corridor stations in the District will be included as well.

- Commercial corridors – These are identified as appropriate for higher densities of primarily commercial mixed use development, including destination commercial areas. Cedar Ave, Riverside Ave, and portions of University Ave are all designated commercial corridors.

- Community corridors – These are identified as connecting links in the road network, and places where, depend on context, moderate to high density residential uses may be appropriate. Como Ave, 4th Ave, and portions of University Ave are identified as community corridors.

- Industrial employment districts – These areas are preserved for future industrial use, as opposed to allowing them to transition to other uses. Policy guidance supports in particular industrial development with higher wage, higher density jobs. SEMI is a designated industrial employment district.

As the above summary suggests, the comprehensive plan provides direction for a significant amount of density and growth, and presents the expectation that development and change will continue to impact the University District neighborhoods. However, it also suggests that such development should be focused and directed so that it is a positive contribution to the health and vitality of the community.

Neighborhood Plans

There are a number of sometimes overlapping plans developed at the neighborhood level within the University District, which also provide significant policy direction. These include the following:

- *Marcy Holmes Master Plan*: This plan for the Marcy Holmes neighborhood outlines a plan for preserving the neighborhood core and historic resources, while encouraging good quality higher density development in designated areas. This

plan also encourages reinvestment in key areas, commercial vitality, support for public parks and open space, and improvements to transportation. The original master plan has had two subsequent supplements: the first detailing development objectives for targeted sites throughout the neighborhood, the second further detailing a development strategy for 15th Avenue.

- *Cedar Riverside Small Area Plan*: This plan for the Cedar Riverside neighborhood emphasizes building and strengthening connections in the neighborhood – though the transportation network, commercial districts, and between the major institutions and the adjacent community. The plan focused on support commercial revitalization, building on arts and culture strengths, and facing the assets and challenges of a vital, diverse population.

- *University Avenue SE & 29th Avenue SE Development Objectives and Design Guidelines* – These two companion documents provide guidance for inspiring and shaping new development that is also compatible with its surrounding context. The guidance is for the portion of the Prospect Park neighborhood near the planned LRT station at University and 29th, and intends to promote high quality transit supportive redevelopment in this area.

- *SEMI Master Plan* – This plan provides guidance for the redevelopment of the South East Minneapolis Industrial (SEMI) Area. The plan's guidance ranges from intensive industrial redevelopment of the northern and central portions of the study area, to transitional mixed use development on the southern side closer to the University. Implementation focuses on needed road and wastewater infrastructure investments.

- *University Master Plan* – The most recent University Master Plan update was completed and adopted by the Board of Regents in 2009. The plan provides direction for the future growth and development of the campus. Relevant to community issues, it identifies the need for joint planning along the boundaries between the campus and the surrounding neighborhoods.

- *NRP plans for neighborhoods* – Action plans funded through the Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP) gave neighborhoods a chance to prioritize and fund key neighborhood initiatives reflecting their identified goals and values. Topics addressed in these plans include: environment, housing, business development, transportation, human and community services, parks and public realm, community building, social and cultural resources, safety and livability, and education and schools.

Reviewing these neighborhood plans shows consistent concerns which are being addressed through the ZPRR process.

University Alliance

The ZPRR planning process was initiated as part of the larger ongoing University Alliance work. The Alliance was established through the impact report as a district-wide collaborative effort to implement the report's recommendations. The direct charge via the legislature was to facilitate, initiate, or manage projects with the University, City, or other public or private entities that are intended to maintain the district as a viable place to study, research and live." Ongoing Alliance activities include:

- Formalizing the alliance to plan and implement actions in the University District
- Follow-up on early initiatives
- Housing inspections and enforcement
- U student education on housing
- Preparing to present a progress report to the legislature in January 2009
- Plan and implement a demonstration project
- Developing a comprehensive vision statement
- Identifying partners and resources

The ZPRR planning process moves for on early initiatives – that is, work on identifying and addressing planning and zoning issues that are already known to be concerns. To maximize effectiveness and coordination, ZPRR shares some background work and visioning with other Alliance activities, as well as drawing on the Alliance's representatives for assistance in the planning process.

Context and Trends

One of the major motivators for the ZPRR planning process is some of the unique challenges and opportunities facing the University District, in comparison with other areas of the city and region. Some of the key trends are identified below, along with some of their implications.

Growth

According to city projections, the University District is projected to grow at a rate higher than the rest of the city from 2000-2030, in both population and jobs. The population is projected to increase by over 8,000 residents, or over 25%, during this period. This does not account for any growth in the "group quarters" population, which would include students living in dormitories and other shared living arrangements.

While this number may not sound overwhelming, it is very significant considering the District's location in a central city, where many neighborhoods have seen decades of population decline – due largely to ever-shrinking household sizes and out-migration from the city. Due to changing demographics – as well as the aforementioned shrinking households – this growth will require new housing, particularly housing that is denser than some existing areas. According to projections, over 3,700 new housing units will be needed to house this increased population.

Employment is also projected to grow by over 6,300 jobs, or 14%, between 2000 and 2030. This is likely to occur in several areas, including the redeveloped SEMI industrial park, the University itself, and some neighborhood commercial areas.

The Market

The projections above were not developed in a vacuum. They reflect, in large part, the distinctive market conditions of this area. While it was not surprising to see substantial interest in new development within the District during past housing boom years, sustained interest in more recent down market times shows that there are unique forces at work here. This is manifested in several ways, listed below:

- *Sustained value of residential properties.* While many areas have seen large drops in housing value recently, the District is not one of them. Data from the Minneapolis Area Association of Realtors shows that the average sales price of single family homes in the District increased through 2007, while most of the city's and region's sub-markets fell. On the positive side, this strengthens the equity position of existing residents and helps prevent both foreclosures and the presence of vacant or boarded houses (which occur at a much lower rate than they do citywide). On the negative side, it makes properties more attractive to be used as revenue-generating rentals rather than sold as owner-occupied single family units – and for properties needing substantial renovation, it incentivizes replacing them with new construction.

- *Ongoing trend for students to live near campus.* Supported by University policy and investment, there is a continued strong interest in students living closer to campus. While the student body is not growing significantly, an increasing percentage is looking for housing closer to campus. Reasons may range from an interest in reducing commuting to school to a desire to participate more directly in the collegiate environment around campus. This raises concerns from other residents of the neighborhood, who are worried about problems often associated with student housing, and the resulting impacts on neighborhood character.

- *Strong rental housing market.* The residential rental vacancy rates in the University District currently hover around 1% – a fraction of the 4% regional rate – as well as continually increasing rents. This continues to attract developers of new projects, particularly in a market where there are many fewer profitable sub-markets in which to build. This continual market pressure means that dealing with the issues in ZPRR has a level of urgency – particularly relating to the preservation of existing homes that might be torn down for new development. Profit motives have encouraged developers to construct buildings that maximize profit while at times minimizing the amount of approvals and community process needed – sometimes against neighborhood wishes.

- *Rapid changes to community character*. The trends working together have caused relatively rapid changes to the surrounding neighborhoods, including shifts in the balance of homeownership to rental, and increased pressures to build newer and higher density development. These pressures were largely the motivator for the development moratorium on 1-4 unit building which was passed in August 2008, in coordination with the ZPRR study. One major objective of ZPRR is to provide the analysis and recommendations needed to address the concerns that precipitated this moratorium prior to its expiration one year from adoption.

Major Projects and Investments

In addition to private sector market forces, the University District is also seeing major public sector projects which are impacting the area – in turn providing unique challenges and opportunities. These include:

- *Central Corridor light rail transit (LRT)*. The construction of the Central Corridor LRT through the University District, projected to begin in 2010, will have a substantial impact on the area. This will provide a direct connection to both Minneapolis and St Paul downtown at four centrally located stations. This will further increase the attractiveness of this as a central location for development and density – not only related to the University but also the larger regional market. The stations themselves and related reconstruction work also provides an opportunity to create new places and streetscapes that will enhance the image and function of the District along the LRT corridor. Potential mitigation projects related to Central Corridor, such as the proposed extension of East River Road, will further impact the area.

- *SEMI redevelopment*. The construction of the first phase of Granary Road – the new road key to opening up the development potential of underutilized portions of SEMI – is funded and will be underway by 2010. This will include linkages to nearby streets and improved stormwater facilities. Private sector development interest to date suggests this will certainly spur new industrial projects. It will also provide the District with a parallel east-west route to the heavily used 4th/University pair.

- *Grand Rounds missing link project*. The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board (MPRB) has long desired to complete its citywide Grand Rounds system by adding a link through northeast and southeast Minneapolis. A plan for this "missing link" was completed in 2008, and the MPRB is looking for ways to fund the proposed route – which would run north-south through the District and create both a new transportation corridor and a community amenity.

- *University's biomedical research and east gateway plans.* The University is looking to build an extension of their campus around the site of the new Gopher football stadium (itself a major investment). This would create new jobs and investment in research – and could create synergy with the adjacent planned

private sector development in SEMI. The University is also looking to invest in a large new ambulatory care clinic to the east of the main campus.

- *Planned bikeways and trails*. In addition to a relatively strong existing system, there are a number of bikeways and trails planned and funded for construction in the University District area. These include major facilities such as the extension of the University of Minnesota trail and a new trail along Granary Road, as well as linkages along Riverside Ave, Como Ave, 10th Ave, 27th Ave, and others.

These investments only emphasize the importance of this area and the potential for further growth and development. The combination of unique conditions and rapid change make for an environment that is challenging to regulate. But the active involvement at the neighborhood and Alliance levels of residents and other key stakeholders shows a strong interest in addressing these issues.

Issue Areas

Throughout the multiple planning processes and discussions that have occurred in the District, some common themes have emerged in the concerns expressed. The purpose of ZPRR, as stated above, is to distill this information and to present potential solutions to address these concerns when feasible. The section below covers the major topic headings identified along with recommended solutions. At the time of this writing, there are still a number of unresolved issues regarding both (1) consensus on top priorities for implementation, and (2) specifics at to how many recommendations will actually be implemented. The aim of the remaining planning process is to help reach agreement and clarity on these points.

Parking and Transportation

Parking concerns are nothing new to the University area, and are common throughout campus areas nationwide. High demand for parking in the University District area reflects combined parking demands from residents, students, visitors, business patrons, commuters, and employees. Many uses – including residential, commercial, and institutional – are not able to accommodate all parking demand on site, leading to spillover effects in surrounding areas. Even when nearby parking is available, many drivers will opt to park further away in order to secure reduced rate or free parking. Furthermore, pricing and regulation of parking varies widely throughout the District, leading to uneven enforcement and impacts.

On the regulatory side, concerns have been raised as to whether the City requires enough parking for new developments, particularly those with a high concentration of students who are likely to own cars. Businesses are concerned about having enough parking for their patrons, while residents are concerned about whether they will be able to park near their homes. Additionally, there is interest in finding ways to further create incentives for people to use alternative forms of travel rather than driving alone.

Addressing parking demands in the District requires the City to balance competing policy directions. The City has been working over the past year on amendments to its parking requirements, but they have generally supported reducing, rather than increasing, requirements. This process does acknowledge, however, that there are some unique factors at work in the District, and that there may be justification for creating different standards for this area of the city than for the rest.

Enforcement

Along with parking, enforcement of various standards generates some of the most extensive discussion in the District on the topic of land use and zoning related issues. This is logical, as it doesn't make sense to implement new regulatory measures if those in place are not consistently enforced. Some of the major areas of concern related to enforcement include addressing property upkeep, over-occupancy, noise and community disturbance, parking, and some public safety issues.

The major challenge of enforcement relates to identifying resources to step up existing efforts in the District – particularly as the city has many areas competing for its attention. Housing-related enforcement is particularly a concern, as citywide increases in foreclosures and vacant/boarded properties (not major District concerns, relative to other areas) divert significant resources. Additionally, some regulations are very challenging to enforce: such as over-occupancy, which can easily be concealed, particularly since residents may be very reluctant to reveal or report violations.

The City has been at work in this area already. In 2007-2008, in the wake of the impact report, housing inspectors conducted a sweep in the District, which netted many citations for violations of city housing regulations. Inspections staff continues to work directly with the University Alliance on enforcement-related issues.

Design and Development Standards

As a result of the strong development interest in the District, there have been many new projects proposed and built in recent times. While some fit in well with the neighborhood character, some do not. One particular area of concern is those approved through the City's administrative review process, which does not require a public hearing before any City board or commission for approval. These projects are typically smaller residential developments with 1-4 units. However, regulatory allowances for number of bedrooms per unit mean that even a small development can house quite a number of people – particularly in projects aimed at students.

Specific areas of concern include the demolition of the existing housing stock to make way for new development, the use of materials or construction techniques that are not attractive or lasting, structures that are out of scale with surrounding uses, and impacts from certain types of student housing which create a nuisance for the adjacent neighborhood (due to parking demand, noise, property maintenance, etc.).

The demolition issue sometimes impacts some of the many properties in the District with designated or potential historic value, which leads to at least additional review and documentation prior to the granting of a demolition permit. Others, however, while lacking significant historic interest by themselves, contribute to the overall character of the neighborhood in a way that cannot be replicated by newer development. The issue is further complicated by a lack of property maintenance, which can cause a property to deteriorate over the years, thus making renovation more expensive and furthering the case for demolition of what once may have been a notable asset to the community.

The City has been working on improving its administrative review process to address some of these concerns, also voiced in other areas of the city. Recent revisions to the development review standards create incentives for better design, more windows, higher quality materials, and other desirable factors. Projects approved under these new standards, while not necessarily perfect, show a number of improvements over those approved in past years before such standards were in place.

One challenge with design standards is that the City often cannot closely enforce highly specific or subjective design requirements – outside of the structure of something like a historic district. Furthermore, the City is not legally able to distinguish between regulations for student housing (the major type of concern) distinct from other housing types. While it is possible to distinguish between family and non-family households, these is concern with unintended consequences from targeting non-family households with more restrictions – particularly in relation to extended immigrant households that may not meet a strict definition of family.

Planning and Zoning Framework

As described above, the planning framework for the area consists of a collection of diverse plans, which have common themes but no unified vision for the District. Additionally, the zoning for this area represents the result of half a dozen rezoning studies over the past 30 years, many of which address issues still of concern for the area – but again, not coordinated closely with one another. Furthermore, there are gaps in the coverage of both of these, resulting in a lack of detailed policy guidance for some areas, including those facing significant change in the future.

It is not in the scope of the ZPRR planning process to create an overarching policy framework for the District. Fortunately, ZPRR will help to inform a larger Alliance effort that will do just that, at least for some common elements in the District. This larger visioning process is underway as of late 2008 and will be completed by mid-2009.

The ZPRR process will look into the issue of the potential need for rezoning in certain areas of the District. Due to the extensive rezoning work done in past years – including as a follow-up to adopted plans – it is anticipated that major, large-scale zoning changes are unneeded or unnecessary. Furthermore, discussion of concerns throughout this process suggests that many of the concerns expressed about development would be better addressed through different tools than changing the zoning of specific parcels.

Public Process

The extent that the public has a role in the development process, particularly in projects approved through administrative review, has been a significant concern throughout the process. While the Alliance does empower neighborhoods and other stakeholders to work together, there are still limits to which they can influence new projects. From the City's perspective, there is the need to balance this desire with legal guarantees of private property rights to allow some development as of right.

While placing all development approvals on a public hearing cycle would almost certainly prove burdensome and unwieldy, there are a number of options for making the process more transparent and encouraging developers to meet with residents and other key stakeholders.

There is another angle to public involvement – connecting groups within the community to improve enforcement, build accountability, and even strength ties to the community good which would encourage participants to be better and more involved citizens. Targeted groups would include landlords, developers, property managers, and students.

Through the Alliance, the University is already supporting a pilot effort to reach out to students through representative students that live in the neighborhoods. Furthermore, the Alliance planning process is seeking input from all of these groups to strengthen into its plans and recommendations. While many of these efforts cannot be regulated by the City, they have the potential to have significant positive impacts.

Recommendations and Implementation

Following are the recommendations reflecting the topics discussed in this report. They are listed in no particular order – prioritization will follow through a joint effort by the community through the Alliance and by the City of Minneapolis.

This section indicates not only what is recommended in the future, but also what actions have already been accomplished or are underway. This acknowledges that a significant amount of work has been done to date to address identified concerns – and future actions should take this into account. Responsible parties are also identified for all action steps, as a successful implementation will require a coordinated effort between a variety of groups to address multifaceted issues.

This section also notes which recommendations may require City Council level action – versus those that can be done within the existing policy framework or administratively with no action needed by elected officials. It also indicates ideas which may need a substantial budget allocation.

Task force members have indicated the desire for this to be a fluid document, which can be updated and implemented in response to changing conditions and priorities. This will not be regarded, therefore, as an official policy document but rather as a guide to implementation that can be adapted as needed.

At the time of this writing, the Alliance Early Starts Committee will likely have ownership of the plan and the implementation process, at least from the perspective of the Alliance. The City of Minneapolis will continue to implement changes internally as opportunity and resources allow.

Table 2: Parking and Transportation Recommendations

Topics	What is Already Being Done?	Recommendations for Future Action	Responsible Groups
Development Parking Requirements			
Residential parking requirements	• Recently adopted parking amendment reduced parking requirements for commercial uses; exempted University area from consideration • PO district covers part of area, reducing parking requirements • Informally enforcing 0.5 spaces/bedroom in U area • Decreased allowed impervious surface, with text amendment	• Establish overlay district with 0.5 spaces/bedroom required for all residential development in District* • Allow compact spaces to meet parking requirements in smaller developments* • Revisit parking area design requirements and enforcement to avoid unattractive yards* • Potentially provide reductions in parking requirements in exchange for high quality bicycle and scooter parking and shared cars*	• CPED Planning • Public Works Transportation
Shared commercial parking	• Already allowed by city ordinance in some situations • Parking amendment eliminated required off-street parking for Dinkytown and Stadium Village development • U of M allows free parking in ramps evenings and Sundays	• Encourage creative shared parking arrangements for commercial uses as part of district parking strategy and through the development review process • Pursue parking study or studies for District area to assess parking utilization and needs, as well as opportunities for sharing facilities	• Business associations • U of M Parking & Transportation • Public Works Transportation
On-Street Parking			
Illegal parking	• Ongoing enforcement efforts citywide	• Work with neighborhood groups to identify offenders and ticket them, including parking illegally in critical parking areas and in no-parking areas (on lawns, intersections, etc.) • Modify the permitting and renewal process to make it harder for people to illegally transfer permits and easier to identify offenders	• Public Works Transportation • Neighborhoods

		• Consider using parking fines to staff increased enforcement in District** • Increase enforcement at strategic times, such as the beginning of semesters** • Combine and coordinate City and U of M enforcement efforts to maximize impact	
Critical parking areas	• Process in place allows property owners to petition city (with 70% agreement) to establish critical parking areas	• Revisit existing critical parking areas to ensure they are appropriate • Encourage landowners to pursue critical parking districts as needed, particularly in areas with substantial commuter parking • Clarify rules regarding who must sign petition (property owner or tenants) to enact critical parking* • Pursue a parking study to determine parking costs and utilization rates in the District**	• Neighborhoods • Public Works Transportation
Parking permits	• Permits issued for residents based on number of licenses, with allowance for visitors	• Encourage larger developments to provide parking on site and opt not to participate in parking permit programs, so as to not overwhelm available spots • Monitor and limit total number of critical parking permits issued for residential developments to better reflect parking supply in surrounding area*	• Public Works Transportation
Metered parking	• Spaces being lost by CCLRT project and related road projects • Parking inventories and assessments being done as part of CCLRT planning effort • City testing new meter	• Minimize removal of on street parking in commercial districts and investigate alternatives • Identify additional areas where new parking meters could be added to help replace those that have been lost	• Met Council • Public Works Transportation • Business associations

	technologies to make parking easier and more efficient		
Commuter Parking			
Park and ride lots for commuters	• Some park and ride based bus routes serve U of M campus (e.g. routes 111, 114, 272, and 652)	• Work with Metro Transit to increase options for commuting from park and rides, and market options to potential users • Work with U of M to encourage use of shuttle service from underutilized lots	• U of M Parking & Transportation • Metro Transit
Carpooling and vanpooling	• U of M and Metro Transit have existing programs to promote this as an option.	• Create incentives for people to use these options	• U of M Parking & Transportation • Metro Transit
Remote long term parking	• Some remote lots available with U of M shuttle service	• Identify and encourage use of remote long-term parking lots for occasional users living near campus, with connections to Metro Transit or U of M buses	• U of M Parking & Transportation • Metro Transit
Pay-per-use parking	• Variety of ramps and lots available through U of M system	• Investigate ways to make paying per use easier and more convenient for drivers, as opposed to unlimited contract options	• Public Works Transportation • U of M Parking & Transportation
On-campus resident parking	• Pay parking available for students living on campus	• Discourage first-year students living on campus from having cars • Construct additional parking (or make other parking arrangements) to accompany any new or expanded on-campus housing	• U of M Parking & Transportation
Alternative Modes			
Incorporating facilities in development	• PUD text amendment provides guidance for bike facilities • New standards for bicycle parking in parking text amendment • Electric vehicle text amendment	• Implement requirements and incentives for accommodating bicycle facilities into new development – racks, lockers, showers, etc. • Ensure that parking for alternative vehicles (e.g. bicycles, motorcycles, scooters,	• CPED Planning • U of M Parking & Transportation

	• On campus bike and pedestrian facilities and programs	possibly electric vehicles) is incorporated into new and improved parking facilities	
Promoting walking, biking and transit	• Ongoing, funded City plans for improvements to bicycle and pedestrian network • CCLRT planning effort, including planned stations, U of M multimodal center	• Promote bicycling, walking, and transit as viable options in the District for transportation • Continue to improve and expand high quality, connected alternative transportation networks that offer travelers convenient and viable options**	• Metro Transit • Public Works Transportation • U of M Parking & Transportation
Neighborhood-serving development	• Ongoing commercial and mixed use redevelopment projects	• Promote neighborhood-serving commercial development in the area to make it more convenient to walk, bike, and ride transit to these destinations • Work with developers to identify local underserved markets for goods and services	• CPED Business Development • Neighborhood associations
Car sharing programs	• Existing car-sharing programs (e.g. Zipcar on U of M campus) • Language in proposed PUD amendment regarding accommodation of shared cars	• Continue to promote car-sharing as a viable option • Work on developing solutions for conveniently accommodating shared cars on the site of new and existing developments	• U of M Parking & Transportation • Public Works Transportation
Affordable bus passes	• Transit pass programs, including U Pass and Metro Pass, serving students and employees • Continual growth in pass usage at U of M since program inception	• Support the continuation of access to affordable passes for students, residents, and employees	• U of M Parking & Transportation • Metro Transit • Business associations
Telecommuting	• New eWorkPlace pilot program offers employers opportunity to learn about telecommuting options; U of M is a partner • Existing U of M telecommuting	• Identify ways to enable and encourage telecommuting by employees working at University District area employers	• U of M administration • Business associations

	options		
Special Events Parking			
Off-campus parking	• Ongoing work group addressing range of stadium issues including parking	• Work with enforcement staff regarding plan for accommodating parking during events - including tailgating • Enforce parking violations during special events, both on and off campus	• Public Works Transportation • U of M Parking & Transportation • Regulatory Services

Table 3: Enforcement Recommendations

Topics	What is Already Being Done	Recommendations for Future Action	Responsible Groups
Increased regulatory enforcement	• Recently completed enforcement sweeps of District in 2003 and 2007-08 • Follow-up on sweeps, especially for violating properties • Flagging properties with illegal licenses in system • Now inspecting properties within 60 days of conversion to rental to identify problems • Catching properties without truth in housing reports and revoking licenses • Improved information on property violations available through 311 • New staffer focused on identifying unlicensed properties • New need for a rental license if advertising a property for rent • Planning annual nuisance sweeps during the summer	• Increase regulatory enforcement actions in District related to livability violations, including repeating recently completed compliance sweeps and following up; include both businesses and residences** • Use information from sweeps to determine best path for future enforcement • Work with neighborhoods to improve reporting of (and response to) violations • Fund enforcement through fines issued and potentially fees for permits** • Pursue tiered system where properties with violations are inspected more frequently than those with none • Implement program to inspect rental properties when ownership changes* • Additional staff to increase enforcement actions** • Implement new online system to track violations and at risk properties** • Implement 2 strikes you're out for illegal renting • Implement new administrative processes to allow for quicker and more efficient hearing process than current citizen board	• Regulatory Services • Neighborhood associations
Clarified expectations of landlords	• Some information already required/ provided through rental and development permitting processes	• Require disclosure of additional information for landlords regarding occupancy, maintenance, conduct, etc.	• Regulatory Services

	• Information on occupancy and zoning included on rental license	• Educate landlords on the issue of over-occupancy, include making restrictions and penalties more explicit in permitting and rental licensing process
		• Encourage use of standard lease format, with improved disclosure of standards
		• Ensure lease language in properties with safety problems helps to address problems
		• Consider a disclosure statement, stating the zoning for the property and the number of unrelated residents allowed by that zoning, to be implemented at three critical points:
		  • when a home is sold, signed by the seller and buyer
		  • in any building permit application, signed by the applicant and the property owner
		  • at the time of rental, signed by the property owner and all the tenants	

Increasing penalties	• Penalties and consequences already in place	• Review existing and potential penalties for violations (e.g. rental license revocation, loss of nonconforming rights, fines, etc.) to ensure they are substantial enough to be a deterrent without being overly punitive • Increase the base fee charged for a violation • Identify ways to ensure that tenants are held responsible for illegal actions, as well as landlords and property owners.	• Regulatory Services
Tracking landlords	• City already is familiar with the records of major landlords in the District	• Register and/or track landlords – possibly through licensing program – to be able to enforce standards more effectively;	• Regulatory Services

	• Landlords cannot renew a rental license without first paying accrued fines on property • Landlords with license revocation cannot rent for 5 years • Improved information on property violations available through 311	• Encourage voluntary certification process with neighborhoods (possibly with fees to pay for District services and upkeep • Make exception for small-scale landlords (own just one small rental property) • Identify approach to ensure that landlords do not use aliases, etc. to avoid tracking • Encourage the U of M to register/certify landlords of student housing	
Improved criminal enforcement	• Ongoing public safety services provided • New noise standards for commercial properties	• Identify ways to be more responsive to criminal activity, including noise, unlawful assembly, etc.**	• Regulatory Services • Police • U of M public safety
Relative homesteads	• New regulatory approach requires rental licenses of relative homesteads	• Monitor new approach to determine if it is effective in addressing problems • If needed, pursue action at state legislature	• Regulatory Services
Homeowners as landlords	• Currently no rental license required with limit of 2 roommates, unless renters in separate unit	• Investigate need for homeowners living in a property to have a rental license to rent out rooms, and determine if/when this is needed	• Regulatory Services
Prohibit outdoor upholstered furniture – unattractive feature on some properties in District	• Council recently declined to pass ordinance banning this furniture, saying existing laws are sufficient	• Use existing laws and regulations to aid in removing dangerous and/or unsightly furniture • Increased focus in enforcement in identifying furniture to be removed, especially fire hazards and those in poor condition	• Regulatory Services
Liquor licenses	• Liquor licenses required • Recent (related) noise ordinance was passed, impacting bars and	• Address issues associated with growing concentration of alcohol-serving establishments in commercial districts	• Regulatory Services

	restaurants	• Consider further limiting number and/or type of liquor licenses	
Mold and moisture problems	• City inspectors will investigate complaints regarding moisture problems on property which are causing mold	• Educate residents, tenants, and landlords regarding their rights and responsibilities regarding property maintenance – particularly regarding moisture seepage and other problems impacting indoor air quality • Encourage reporting and follow-up regarding identified problems	• Neighborhood associations • Regulatory Services

Table 4: Design and Development Standards Recommendations

Topics	What is Already Being Done	Recommendations for Future Action	Responsible Groups
Design standards	• Administrative review process was improved in last few years, using points system	• Modify administrative review standards to limiting use of unfinished wood on outside of home and being more specific regarding what meets front porch requirement* • Work with staff to clearly communicate expectations to potential developers	• CPED Planning • Regulatory Services
Administrative review process	• Recent improvements to process, including adding points system	• Make administrative review process more stringent by requiring more points for approval, possibly more points available - possibly for neighborhood consultation or support*	• CPED Planning
Property management	• City is limited to the degree this can be impacted	• Encourage the development of well-managed and supervised student housing through regulation and enforcement	• Neighborhood associations
Housing choice and variety	• Support available for senior and affordable housing through various programs	• Encourage construction of life-cycle housing options and more balanced housing choices, including housing for families, and seniors	• CPED Housing • CPED Planning
Preservation by district	• Existing historic districts in Marcy Holmes, proposed one in Prospect Park	• Consider use of conservation districts, historic districts, or other tools to define community character and encourage development to comply with identified character, such as Prospect Park *	• CPED Planning – Preservation and Design
Prevent demolitions	• Established process for reviewing proposed demolition of properties with potential historic value • Regulatory process provides encourages efforts to rehab property, including providing	• Discourage demolition of existing homes through regulations that incentivize remodeling and reusing these properties* • Support local and state programs to fund historic building renovation and preservation • Strengthen requirements for notification of	• CPED Planning – Preservation and Design

	flexibility when needed, in order to prevent demolition	neighbors to proposed demolition • Encourage appropriate adaptive reuse of large historic homes that maintains character and integrity • Highlight successful projects in District to serve as guide for others	
Over-occupancy	• Enforce legal occupancy limits on properties	• Improve communications to landlords and renters regarding legal limits to occupancy and consequences of violations • Ensure consequences for property owners who do not comply	• CPED Planning, Regulatory Services

Table 5: Planning and Zoning Framework Recommendations

Topics	What is Already Being Done	Recommendations for Future Action	Responsible Groups
Zoning	• Several rezoning studies have been done for district in past 20 years, covering most of the area and largely down-zoning residential	• Evaluate base zoning to determine if rezoning is needed to align with existing policy for the area* • Strengthen policy support for desired zoning through additional planning	• CPED Planning
Planning and policy guidance	• Recent review of planning and zoning framework	• Evaluate neighborhood, district, and citywide land use plans to determine context for decision making, and support planning efforts to fill in any policy gaps**	• CPED Planning • University Alliance/U of M

Table 6: Public Process Recommendations

Topics	What is Already Being Done	Recommendations for Future Actions	Responsible Groups
Public notification of projects	• Already required as part of administrative review • Recent expanded notifications through weekly planning applications reports (via email)	• Ensure public notification requirements fulfilled through administrative and public hearing processes • Provide information regarding city review and approval processes to the public • Expand online information available to the public on development applications being reviewed by the City and subsequent permits granted**	• CPED Planning • Regulatory Services • Business Information Services
Student outreach	• U-funded student neighborhood liaisons	• Improve outreach – through student, neighborhood, and U of M groups – to improve student-community relations; building on initiatives such as party pamphlet	• University Alliance/U of M • Neighborhood associations
Landlord and developer outreach	• Starting discussions via planning process	• Improved communication with landlords and developers regarding community expectations and standards for development and management, including limits on occupancy and expectations for communicating standards to tenants	• CPED Planning • Regulatory Services • Neighborhood associations
Role of District as reviewer	• Initial discussions through Alliance	• Support role of District Alliance as reviewer of large projects, particularly those with regional impact	• CPED Planning • University Alliance

* May require Minneapolis City Council action to implement
** Potentially large budgetary impact for City budget