

**Excerpt from the  
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES**

**Minneapolis Community Planning & Economic Development (CPED)  
Planning Division**

350 South Fifth Street, Room 210  
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1385  
(612) 673-2597 Phone  
(612) 673-2728 Fax  
(612) 673-2157 TDD

---

**MEMORANDUM**

---

DATE: August 24, 2004

TO: Blake Graham, Manager, Community Planning & Economic Development -  
Planning Division; Phil Schliesman, Licenses

FROM: Neil Anderson, Supervisor, Community Planning & Economic Development -  
Planning Division, Development Services

CC: Barbara Sporlein, Director, Community Planning & Economic Development  
Planning Division

SUBJECT: Planning Commission decisions of August 23, 2004

---

The following actions were taken by the Planning Commission on August 23, 2004. As you know, the Planning Commission's decisions on items other than rezonings, text amendments, vacations, 40 Acre studies and comprehensive plan amendments are final subject to a ten calendar day appeal period before permits can be issued:

**ATTENDANCE**

President Martin, Vice President Hohmann, G. Johnson, Krause, Krueger, Kummer, LaShomb, MacKenzie, and Schiff - 9

**INTRODUCTION TO PUBLIC HEARING**

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**REPORT  
of the**

---

**CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
of the City of Minneapolis**

---

The Minneapolis City Planning Commission, at its meeting on August 23, 2004, took action to **submit the attached comment** on the following items:

**1. Temple Israel Memorial Park Cemetery (Vac-1442a, Ward 8), the south 83 feet of the alley located in Block 6, Portland Addition to Minneapolis (Jim Voll)**

**A. Vacation:** Application by Temple Israel Memorial Park Cemetery to vacate the following right-of-way (Vacation file 1442a): the south 83 feet of the alley located in Block 6, Portland Addition to Minneapolis. The right-of-way to be vacated is entirely on cemetery property.

Action taken: The City Planning Commission recommended that the City Council accept the findings and **approve** the vacation subject to the provision of an easement to Xcel Energy over the north 10 feet of the south 83 feet of the alley to be vacated.

Commission President Martin opened the public hearing.

No one requested to speak to the item.

Commission President Martin closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Krause moved approval (LaShomb seconded).

The motion carried 6 – 0.

**6. Greenway Terrace (BZZ-1867, Ward 6), 2850 Cedar Avenue (Hilary Watson)**

**A. Rezoning:** Application by Dustin Heggem with Heggem & Associates, LLC, for rezoning from R2B to R6 for the property located at 2850 Cedar Avenue.

Action taken: The City Planning Commission recommended that the City Council adopt the findings and **approve** the rezoning application from R2B to R6 for the property located at 2850 Cedar Avenue South.

Staff Hilary Watson presented the staff report.

Commissioner Schiff: On the lack of sidewalk on the 29<sup>th</sup> Street side. The drawings we have right now don't show any walkway...?

Staff Watson: Right, there's no walkway. Their plan shows all landscaping between the building and the curb.

Commissioner Schiff: And what's the width of 29<sup>th</sup> Street?

Staff Watson: I don't know.

Commissioner Schiff: We could require that the street just be narrowed a bit.

Staff Watson: The street already is narrow. It's... I'd say it's maybe 30 feet.

President Martin: There's no parking at all?

Staff Watson: There's parking on the south side, just not the north side of the street. When I was out at the site, there was a vehicle out here chopping up tree stumps and there were cars parked...

President Martin: Illegal business?

Staff Watson: Well, it was on this side. I think it was trees coming out of the Greenway that were being chopped up by Hennepin County. But I couldn't pass around that tree cutting machine until the cars coming east-bound went around. So this is a very narrow street.

Commissioner Schiff: Are there any other areas of the city that you can remind me of where there's a building up to the curb line, no sidewalk, no on-street parking to buffer pedestrian movement...[tape unclear].

Staff Watson: I can't think of anything off the top of my head.

Commissioner Schiff: This is the most unusual thing I've ever seen. Thanks.

Staff Watson: Where the egress doors are, and again these aren't for public access, they're egress doors at the building for emergency purposes – there's a square of concrete, a concrete pad for building code purposes. So if someone did come out that door and they were being picked up, they would be standing on concrete-they would not be standing on the street.

Commission President Martin opened the public hearing.

Dean Davolis (DJR Architecture, 333 Washington Avenue North): I've worked with Hilary and appreciate everything and it's been a good process working on this together, but we respectfully disagree with the setback from Cedar Avenue and believe that's more essential to the project – both in terms of layout and urban design. The other suggestions about putting a foot path in along the south side of the building and the fence, we're ok with that – we can massage those issues. But the setback along Cedar is critical for a variety of reasons. [tape end] That is a photograph of the existing condition right now looking at the property and that metal post that you see right in this corner here – that would be the proposed front of the building to give you scale, that's where the building would sit. Then if you look further down the picture, you see the bridge abutment coming way across over here. So there is a natural setback that has been established in there because of the nature of the road and the bridge and the layout. The other thing about Cedar – there is a mix of front yards, but there's also zero lot setbacks. Cedar is sort of a street that has a variety of front yards and zero setbacks that are mixed in along

those lines. This picture is the building as proposed, and again, that's the same view along Cedar Avenue and you can see the condition that we have set back and added the landscape. And the reason for this was, and this was the opposite trend that you'll probably be seeing later today, we took the building down from four stories to three stories so that we'd lower the amount of pattern on the Greenway, because we could stack four stories and go higher, but for economics and the Greenway shadowing issues and the neighborhood, we took it down to three stories. And for urban design purposes, that a 15 foot green space in that area wouldn't really serve any purpose in terms of a front yard, an aesthetic. A Greenway tends to create a void that may be more problematic than opportunistic because of the nature of the area. So, given the design and working with the Phillips neighborhood – this is what they wanted because they wanted to create more sensitive space, put more eyes on the street, control the corner and keep the height lower so the Greenway would have more sunlight and visibility so we're comfortable with the idea of working with Planning if a sidewalk is necessary. Also, we can't narrow the building, so if we need to modify the street or something, that's ok.

President Martin: A pathway of some sort.

Dean Davolis: A pathway of some sort, which would be preferable to a sidewalk. And adding additional fence, we're fine with, but again, respectfully, denial of that variance would hurt the project in both an economic sense in the urban design sense and would go against trying to keep the shadow off the Greenway and would go against the neighborhood wishes. Thank you.

Ryan Brueske (2712 Cedar Ave S, Housing Chair East Phillips Coalition): We did review this project and most recently, as I believe Hilary mentioned, we approved it through the neighborhood. One concern, speaking on what Dean was mentioning, that if there was a setback on the front yard, people were concerned [tape unclear]. Speaking to the pathway issue, it would be a pathway to nowhere. The lot west of there is currently vacant and we had requested that the developer work with the County to perhaps develop green space with the County. The County owns that land and we'd like to see perhaps volleyball courts or picnic tables or something to that effect. That little area is not a good area right now, and we'd like to make it a nice area because we have a brand new apartment building on Bloomington there on 29<sup>th</sup>, so it would be a great spot to have a nice, well-lit recreational area. As far as controlling traffic, I can see why you wouldn't want to have a pathway that goes to that spot particularly. But in general, the things we appreciated with this development were that they did take into consideration the height with the Greenway. I think the Greenway would like to see it even lower and stepped back to completely eliminate shading on the Greenway, but when the Greenway initially evaluated it, I think Dean alluded to this, it was 45 feet tall. I think on the Greenway side now, it's more on the low 30's, about 32 feet. In our neighborhood, we don't have any 4-story buildings that are residential in nature and we would like to keep it this way. This would be consistent with the Cedar Avenue corridor up and down the corridor – there are no other 4-story buildings and we would like to have some consistency in that regard. Urban design is very well – [it] compliments the other buildings in the area like the [tape unclear] building at 29<sup>th</sup> and Bloomington and the YMCA, which is a few blocks away.

So in general, we're very excited about this development and we would like to continue to work with the developer on some of the design aspects.

Carol Pass (2536 18th Ave S, on Housing Committee): I wanted to mention, I'm glad he talked about the green space because there is quite a bit of it. Interestingly enough, there is no sidewalk at all there now so it's sort of directing people to the other side of the street would be wise at present, though probably there needs to be some kind of pathway. But there's the pathway at present wouldn't go anywhere because there's nothing there now. But I wanted to mention that the traffic congestion issue that plagues us further north does not plague us here. There is space for visitor parking probably right now on both sides of the street because that green space up to the west – people just park there. There's parking on the south side of the street so people will have a place to put their cars that will be safe when they come to visit people there. There also isn't any endangerment because it's only one and two bedroom units. I don't imagine that there will be a lot of children. This looks like a building for young professionals that want to be right on the Greenway because the ramp is within a half a block. There's a brand new ramp and it's very ideal for that. Plus the LRT. So the transit-oriented deal is wonderful there. But I want to emphasize that traffic congestion isn't a problem there and I also wanted to mention that the Greenway board has been very active in trying to help us get this building as low as it is. We've tried really hard. I know they changed the structure of the girders and everything to strengthen them so they could squinch them down and take away some extra feet because we think a 4-story building there will really add a sense of tunneling when you're on the Greenway, which we don't want. If this were on the north side of the Greenway, it might be different because you don't lose the sun, but on the south side we definitely don't want to go any higher than this. So we begged and pleaded and worked with the architect and did all these things to the building so they could bring it down so we really would prefer that we stay at 3 stories and that we can add some green space up the street and move ahead with this project. We're very excited. We like density. We don't want density where there are traffic dangers, et cetera but there aren't any here, so we like this.

Mary Rye (2908 Cedar Avenue): Before I begin, Carol, what is your address again? [response off microphone] 2536 18<sup>th</sup>. And I beg to differ completely with her. I live at 2908 Cedar. Traffic is a problem here. Parking is a problem here already. The setback variance will reduce the sight line. As the planner said, there is an incline on Cedar going down. With the building set there, the sight line, when you enter the intersection, will be reduced at both 29<sup>th</sup> and Cedar and 29<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup>. This will be a danger to vehicular bicycle pedestrian and Minneapolis school bus traffic. With 28<sup>th</sup> Street being an east-bound one-way and the proposed changes at Cedar and Lake Street intersection, and the proposed changes to Lake Street, the current neighborhood residents and the school children need 29<sup>th</sup> Street to remain open at both 18<sup>th</sup> and Cedar. The reduction of the setback will cause problems with snow removal and garbage disposal. These already are problems for myself and my neighbors. None of this is addressed in any of these plans where you build right up to the road. Where is the snow going to go? Reduction of the setback will limit the off-street parking available to residents and visitors. Meaning that currently people park on the setback. If we have a setback, they park on the front yard or

their back yard. We don't even have a side yard for the people to park on when the setback is zero. Reduction of the setback where there is no place to park, how will this place be constructed on and 29<sup>th</sup> Street remain open? How is construction going to happen when there's no place [tape unclear]. Those were the cons against this. The pros are: this property was listed to Gerta Limited Partnership which also owns 1839 East 28<sup>th</sup> Street, 1843 East 28<sup>th</sup> Street, 2821 Cedar Avenue South, 2825 Cedar Avenue South, 2829 Cedar Avenue South and 2828 Longfellow Avenue South. And now they're asking for a zoning variance for 2850 Cedar Avenue. What is ironic about this request is that the Brat lease for this property, 2850 Cedar Avenue South was attempted to be broken early by asserting that Brat was causing traffic problems to the neighborhood. My husband and I truthfully testified that Brat was a good neighbor, were maintaining their property and were parking on their property and scheduling their departures and arrivals to their property at times that did not interfere with school bus schedules and were very polite and accommodating to neighborhood traffic. Now the same people are turning around and are saying that there is not a traffic problem here. Mary Rye, 2908 Cedar. Thank you.

Michael Olson (2445 Aldrich, Midtown Greenway Coalition): We have reviewed the proposal and we have issued a resolution which I think will be sent to your offices soon. If I could read it quickly, it's fairly short. The Midtown Greenway Coalition opposes the proposed Heggem building design for 2850 Cedar Avenue because it violates the key provision of the proposed Midtown Greenway zoning overlay district related to building height limits to protect sunshine on Greenway trails. The proposed development also violates City required setbacks from the north lot line which would be enforced to respect the Greenway as a public use space. This was approved unanimously by the [Midtown Greenway Coalition] Land Use Planning Committee and the Midtown Greenway Coalition. The people who testified earlier said they had dropped the height already by roughly 12 feet. The current height of about mid-30 would still guaranty the Greenway would be shadow for probably six months out of the year. When we initially did the overlay study for this area, we did consider this parcel buildable so we limited our study to south of 29<sup>th</sup> where we found the minimum height for a building south of 29<sup>th</sup> to be 27 feet high, that would ensure sunshine on the Greenway year-around.

President Martin: Minimum or maximum?

Michael Olson: Maximum, thank you. That would be the maximum height of 27 feet. And we would also like to oppose it based on what was stated regarding the previous project that it violates the City's ordinance regarding shading of public green space. Thank you very much.

Ralph Rye (2908 Cedar Avenue): We live two houses from this lot. Interesting that the architect has already picked out the tree that goes along Cedar. Well, we've had trees along Cedar, but they all seem to be trashed by cars crashing into them, so I think your tree will need to be more than a Dogwood, try Ironwood. The setback there – it is a dangerous corner. And if that building goes to that corner, people coming over that hill at a high rate of speed cannot make that corner at 29<sup>th</sup>. If you're going to approve this, you

must abandon 29<sup>th</sup> Street and completely close it down and give them the road. They deserve a road, they're going to build a building for us. Also everybody who lives in there that's going to have more than one bicycle and a car probably and the parking that's available in the building will never keep track of that. I know people like to ride the bikeway, but if you're there, you're going to have two or three bikes – one for pieces, one for the winter, one for whatever. The density of that space is way over what the little lot that's there. Brat Tree has been a good neighbor. It's probably a misuse of the land and housing should go there, and the Greenway should be developed, but this proposal, this density with this lack of concern for the other people that live in that neighborhood and forcing all that sidewalk traffic to the street across, and all the parking to the street across is not consistent with being a good neighbor. Density is good, but this is a little beyond dense.

President Martin: OK, now we're really wanting to hear things that we haven't heard before.

Bob Rainville (2737 18th Ave S, East Phillips Housing Committee): I've lived in the neighborhood since 1942. Born and raised, South High School. I know this neighborhood. We used to jump trains from that bridge that's going over there when I was young and foolish. The reason there is no sidewalk on this property, is that this was railroad property at one time. All the way down. And where Sears is, blocked off that end where the cemetery is on Cedar Avenue, blocked off the other end, so they put no sidewalk on the north side. It's always been that way. There's no alley way coming into this property to have any problem with traffic coming in. 29<sup>th</sup> Street, you can count the cars coming down 29<sup>th</sup> Street on your hand during the daytime. There's very few. The property itself, this 3-story, really fits into the area. Down on 28<sup>th</sup> and Cedar we have a 3-story building that's almost like this except it's about 20 years old, it's kind of aged. I'm on the Housing Committee in the Phillips Neighborhood. Everything I see about this is right for this neighborhood. The Greenway is right behind it. It will not cast much of a shadow down that Greenway. On the other side of the Greenway is commercial property. In front of the property are two houses-one on Cedar, one on 18<sup>th</sup>. There's plenty of parking along 29<sup>th</sup> Street for anybody who comes to visit the property. 18<sup>th</sup> Street is a bear-there is no parking on 18<sup>th</sup>. 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue is awful. The housing – this is what we want. Setbacks are right, everything is right. Thank you very much.

President Martin closed the public hearing.

Commissioner LaShomb: I'm going to move the rezoning (G. Johnson seconded).

President Martin: Alright, discussion of the rezoning.

Commissioner Schiff: Hilary, the R5 or R4 zoning won't get them what they need-R6 is necessary? Just want to verify that.

Staff Watson: The R6 zoning allows 40 dwelling units, they're proposing 26. The reason we chose R6 is because half the property currently is R6 and that's the zoning classification up and down Cedar.

President Martin: So rather than rezoning the whole thing...

Staff Watson: Instead of rezoning the whole property, we just selected the higher of the two densities on the property now.

Commissioner Schiff: Thanks. Move approval.

President Martin: It's already been moved. Commissioner Krause?

Commissioner Krause: Madame Chair, it's clear to me listening to all of this testimony that everyone is not going to get everything they want out of this deal and I'm having a hard time sorting this all out, but this notion of the street, this rarely traveled street – has that ever been considered that it be vacated to give these properties a little more room? I mean if you vacated that street, you would be able to move the building a little further back and solve the shading issues, perhaps solve some of these other problems too. Otherwise, we're going to have a clash of interests here between the staff recommendation, the neighborhood recommendation, the Greenway Coalition's recommendation and probably a couple of other and the neighbors. I'm having a hard time sorting all that out. Was that ever considered?

Staff Watson: No. I mean, I don't think you'd just want to... I don't live in the area and I don't travel down 29<sup>th</sup> Street very often, so I don't know how it functions but I know that from when we did Midtown Exchange, we didn't propose to vacate 29<sup>th</sup> Street there because of all of the one-ways around the hospitals, it was important to keep open the streets. I mean, we convinced them to not vacate 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue because of all of the one-ways and the issues with emergency routes and whatnot. So, I don't know why you would want to vacate this unless you vacated all of it, but Public Works didn't mention that either.

Commissioner Krause: Well, I mean, this is somewhat different in the sense that the curve is here, the curve of the track. So the same conditions that have created some of the hardships that justify some of the variances wouldn't necessarily exist all the way along between 29<sup>th</sup> and the Greenway because it's a straight section of the track there. So you have those rectangular parcels that are easier for development purposes.

Carol Pass: I was the Chair of the East Phillips Commons Committee which built the development on 29<sup>th</sup> and Bloomington. And we had to do a lot of research on all of this stuff and we talked about the possibility of closing the street, et cetera. Basically, the most critical thing that the street's used for is utility things: garbage, fire trucks... And it is the...the kids come there to catch the bus because it is the through street which has limited traffic and if you look, the next street up is 28<sup>th</sup>. You don't want kids catching a bus on 28<sup>th</sup>. So it pools the kids there and that's one of our concerns – one of the reasons

we want this built is that we need some people there. I mean we need more people to just be there because of these kids. But I think that though this is narrow, there isn't a lot of traffic. It's mainly these issues, fire, garbage and school buses. We've found that we would have a great deal of trouble closing it because then you have Lake Street. And there is no place to do these things, and there is no through street, so basically it's a utility street. It isn't a heavy, fast traffic deal. Which is why I'm not concerned about the traffic.

Commissioner LaShomb: Well, I think, Commissioner Krause, the problem is whenever you do something like this, there are conflicts.

President Martin: Conflicts are us, right?

Commissioner LaShomb: Conflicts are us. It will be toys around Christmas time, I guess. We just saw that at the University frat house. But you know, to me, what it really fundamentally comes down to is what are the goals and objectives of the City? And one of the goals and objectives of the City is to have appropriate housing around light rail stations and unless we're going to start building towers at 38<sup>th</sup> and Hiawatha, which I don't think we want to do, that means we're going to have to support projects like this. Two, we want housing in Minneapolis. We want affordable housing, but we want housing. And three, we want to support higher density, and then four, we have a property like this that needs to be improved in terms of its tax status. So there's going to be conflicts. We've wrestled with this shading issue on the Greenway numerous times and I've ridden on the Greenway numerous times and sometimes I'm glad they have shading in some places, but there are bridges. So I guess what I'm saying is we're going to have conflict, so the question is: What's more important in the end? And I think what's more important in the end is to have appropriate density, to have good quality housing, to increase the stability of this neighborhood and to support light rail where we made a six hundred and some million dollar investment. So yeah, there's conflicts, but I just think the rezoning is appropriate and this project seems to me to be fairly consistent with what's going on in the neighborhood.

President Martin: So the motion is to approve the rezoning. All those in favor of that motion, please signify by saying aye.

The motion carried 7 – 0.

Commissioner Schiff: [Move] Approve the CUP (G. Johnson seconded).

President Martin: Any discussion?

Commissioner Hohmann: As far as that setback, if you did have the setback in there...

President Martin: We're not doing the setback yet, this is just the CUP.

Commissioner Hohmann: No, but this kind of flows. This is a 26-unit discussion here and a set back comes up. If you didn't have a setback, with that bump in the bridge there, I guess I don't see that lack of a setback as any big thing. As far as the shading, again, you've got that bump with the bridge there, you've got commercial property on the north. I'd like to see as little shading as possible, but when I look at the north side of the building here and I see all those windows looking out on the Greenway, especially next to a bridge, personally I'm willing to trade a little shade for all those potential eyes looking out on the Greenway next to a bridge.

President Martin: The motion is to approve the CUP, all those in favor of that motion, signify by saying aye.

The motion carried 7 – 0.

President Martin: Variances. Commissioner Schiff.

Commissioner Schiff: Now we're debating the setbacks. I think the role of any good real estate investor or architect is to maximize their investment, and I think they've done that here, but I think they've gone a little too far with the setbacks. I do agree with one of the comments and I'm dealing with another property in my ward right now that has transitioned in site from industrial to another use and there are no sidewalks. Well, now we have to go back and assess the property because the City doesn't just build sidewalks at City expense. We charge the property owner and we assess them in order to build it. We have to consider that this Greenway is in development and it will be in development for the next thirty years because there's nowhere to go right now. One parcel to the west doesn't mean there will never be need for a sidewalk. Sidewalk is for people to be able to get to their building. I think without a sidewalk on this side of the street we are forcing everybody to use the other sidewalk on the other side of the street which is single-family residential in character and then they're all going to be crossing at this intersection in order to get to their building if they're walking from Lake Street. And you can spread out that pedestrian traffic a little more and lessen the impact on other neighbors if you have sidewalk. I think for this one, we're debating Cedar Avenue, where there is a sidewalk, the tree is crunched, if it doesn't have enough air space... I'm going to move [approval] 15 feet to 2 feet for the setback just providing a little bit more vision for the traffic coming around the corner (Krause seconded).

President Martin: OK. Commissioner Krause will like that since it's a little bit of green. [Response off microphone]. OK, any discussion about that one?

The motion carried 7 – 0.

Commissioner Schiff: On the two feet philosophy, in the site plan, staff recommended a pathway or walkway, encouraged into the landscaping plan. Rather than see pavers in the middle of landscaping, I'd rather see a sidewalk, so I think another two feet will do it, and maybe Public Works will move the curb out a little bit in order to help with this, but that's a different conversation. I'm going to move to approve the variance for the corner

sideyard setback along 29<sup>th</sup> from 14 feet to 7 feet for the building, 4 feet for the three bay windows, and 3 feet for the ten balconies. And if I've done my math right, that should move the whole building back 2 feet on 29<sup>th</sup>.

President Martin: Discussion?

Commissioner Schiff: Comment from the architect.

Dean Davolis: Squish is fine. The 2 feet goes the whole length of the building. If Public Works is willing to rebuild a curb, but here's the issue – where does that cost fall? Because obviously, the curb and gutter, so... We necessarily want to keep that in mind. I mean a little narrower street makes sense, but I don't want to have the developer incur the whole cost of rebuilding a street, storm, everything else that comes with it because that can be a very expensive proposition, so we're willing to look at that, but I need some, let's say encouragement from the Public Works side to assist if that's the outcome.

The motion carried 5 – 2 (Krueger and Hohmann opposed).

President Martin: That carries. Commissioner Schiff, it will fall on you to encourage Public Works.

Commissioner Schiff: Absolutely. And I will move to approve the variance for the interior sideyard setback from 9 feet to zero feet, as requested (Krueger seconded).

The motion carried 7 – 0.

Commissioner Schiff: I will move to approve the site plan with a change in number one replacing the word 'required' with 'encourage', from encouraged in the staff report to 'required' for the pathway (Krause seconded).

President Martin: Required pathway, but not yet a sidewalk.

The motion carried 7 – 0.

#### **14 .Plaza at Lake (BZZ-1887, VAC-1433, PL-156, Ward 8), 320, 330, 330½, and 334 East Lake Street ([Lonnie Nichols](#))**

**A. Rezoning:** Application by Young & Wilz Architects Ltd., dba 4th and Lake Development LLC, for a rezoning of 330½ East Lake Street from I-1 (light industrial) to C-2 (Neighborhood Corridor Commercial) for property at 320, 330, 330½, and 334 East Lake Street.

Action taken: The City Planning Commission recommended that the City Council adopt the findings and **approve** the application to rezone 330 ½ East Lake Street (P.I.D.- 34-029-24-44-0034) from I1 to C2.

**F. Vacation:** Application by Young & Wilz Architects Ltd., dba 4th and Lake Development LLC, for an alley vacation for property at 320, 330, 330½, and 334 East Lake Street.

Action taken: The City Planning Commission recommended that the City Council accept the findings and **approve** alley vacation 1433; subject to retention of easements by Qwest and Xcel Energy, and compliance with fire code and public works rededication for the alley opening to Clinton Avenue.

Staff Lonnie Nichols presented the staff report.

Commission President Martin opened the public hearing.

No one requested to speak to the item.

Commission President Martin closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Krause moved approval for all items (G. Johnson seconded).

The motion carried 6 – 0 (Schiff not present for the vote).