MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

State Historic Preservation Office

July 26, 2006

Ms. Rebecca Farrar
Senior Planner
City of Minneapolis
210 City Hall
350 South 5th Street
Minneapolis, MN 55415

Re: EAW – Pacific Block Development
Minneapolis, Hennepin County
SHPO Number: 2006-2403

Dear Ms. Farrar:

Thank you for providing this office with a copy of the Environmental Assessment Worksheet for the above-referenced project. It has been reviewed pursuant to responsibilities given to the Minnesota Historical Society by the Minnesota Historic Sites Act and the Minnesota Field Archaeology Act and through the process outlined in Minnesota Rules 4410.1600.

We have the following comments on this proposed project:

1. As the EAW indicates, both alternatives significantly exceed the heights appropriate for both the national and local historic district. Buildings of this height should not be built in this area.

2. Rehabilitation of historic buildings in the block should be done in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. In this respect, the demolition of the rear portion of the Northwestern Building would not meet the Standards.

3. We recommend that a land use history of the block be prepared as a basis for an assessment of the need for a historic archaeological survey of the site.

Contact us at 651-296-5462 with questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Britta L. Bloomberg

Britta L. Bloomberg
Deputy State Historic Presevation Officer

cc: Greg Mathis, Minneapolis HPC

Minnesota Pollution Control Agency

July 26, 2006

Ms. Rebecca Farrar
City of Minneapolis
Community Planning & Economic Development Department
210 City Hall
350 South 5th Street
Minneapolis, MN 55415

RE: Pacific Block Development
Environmental Assessment Worksheet

Dear Ms. Farrar:

The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) has received copies of the Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) prepared for the above project, prepared by the city of Minneapolis, Responsible Governmental Unit (RGU). The MPCA has not reviewed the EAW for this project. Therefore, the MPCA has no specific comments to provide the RGU. This decision not to review the EAW does not constitute waiver by the MPCA of any pending permits required by the MPCA. Ultimately, it is the responsibility of the project proposer to secure any required permits and to comply with any requisite permit conditions. The enclosed checklist identifies permits that the project may require, together with the most recent contacts at the MPCA.

We remind the RGU that, pursuant to Minn. R. 4410.1700, subp. 5 (Environmental Quality Board Rules), a copy of the RGU's decision on this EAW needs to be sent to the MPCA.

Sincerely,

James E. Sullivan
Project Manager
Environmental Review and Operations Section
Regional Division

JES:mbo

Enclosure

cc: Walter H. Rockenstein II, Pacific Flats, LLC

CHECKLIST

After a cursory review of the proposed project, the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) staff noted areas that may need additional follow-up and/or a permit from the MPCA. Those specific areas are checked below:

☐ SDS Permit – Sanitary Sewer Extension Permit
A State Disposal System (SDS) Permit is required for any extension of a sanitary sewer. If a sanitary sewer is proposed as a part of this project, an application for the SDS Permit should be made to the MPCA by contacting David Sahli, Municipal Division (MUN), Metro Region, at 651/296-8722.

☐ NPDES/SDS Permit for dredged material disposal.
If disposal of dredged material is anticipated, then Brett Ballavance (Duluth office) at 218/723-4837 or Jaramie Logelin (Duluth office) at 218/529-6257 (northern), or Elise Doucette (MUN/Metro Region) at 651/296-7290 or Jeff Smith (Rochester office) at 507/285-7302 (southern) should be contacted.

☒ NPDES Permit – Construction Stormwater:
A General National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit from the MPCA for construction activities will be required for all projects that disturb one (1) or more acres of land. The NPDES Permit specifically requires Best Management Practices which are detailed in the permit (additional information can be found in the MPCA document *Protecting Water Quality in Urban Area*) to prevent erosion and control sedimentation during construction and a stormwater pollution prevention plan to manage pollutants in storm-water runoff from the site that will occur after construction is complete. As a requirement of the NPDES Permit, storm-water wet-detention ponds must be installed to treat the storm-water runoff whenever a project replaces surface vegetation with one or more cumulative acres of impervious surface. If you have need of technical assistance regarding this, please contact Michael Findorff (MUN/Metro Region) at 651/296-6798 or Todd Smith (MUN) at 651/215-6008. For more general information, please contact the appropriate MPCA Regional Office staff below:

- ☐ Brainerd, Lisa Woog at 218/855-5017
- ☐ Duluth, Jim Dexter at 218/529-6253
- ☐ Detroit Lakes, Joyce Cieluch at 218/846-7387
- ☐ Willmar/Marshall, Judy Mader (St. Paul office) at 651/296-7315 or Mark Hanson (Marshall Office) at 507/537-6000
- ☐ Rochester, Roberta Getman at 507/280-2996
- ☒ Metro, Brian Gove (REM/Metro Region) at 651/296-7597

☐ Industrial Stormwater

- ☐ Brainerd, Robin Novotny at 218/828-6114
- ☐ Duluth, John Thomas at 218/723-4928
- ☐ Detroit Lakes, Jack Frederick at 218/846-0734
- ☐ Marshall, Brad Gillingham at 507/537-6381
- ☐ Mankato, Teri Roth at 507/389-5235
- ☐ Rochester, Dennis Hayes at 507/280-2991
- ☐ Rochester, Jeff Smith at 507/285-7302
- ☐ Major Facilities, Elice Doucette (MUN/Metro Region) at 651/296-7290
- ☐ Willmar, Ben Koplin at 320/231-5321

☐ Septic Tank System
Individual septic tank systems design and construction must comply with Minn. R. 7080.
For additional information, contact Mark Wespetal (MUN, Water Policy and Coordination) at 651/296-9322.

☐ Water Quality Certification

Waiver of the Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification is required. When wetlands are altered or impacted by filling, drainage, excavation, or inundation as part of the federal Clean Water Act Section 404 permit process, a statement waiving the 401 Certification from our agency must be obtained.

If you have any questions regarding this, please contact Jennifer Olson, of the Regional Division, Business Systems Unit 1, at 651/297-8611. The MPCA requires the project be evaluated for mitigation in accordance with the following hierarchy of preference:

a. Avoid the impact.
b. Minimize the impact.
c. Mitigate the impact through wetland replacement.

☒ Demolition Debris

Demolition debris must be disposed of at a properly permitted disposal facility. For information on the location of one nearest you, please contact the appropriate MPCA Regional Office staff below:

- ☐ Brainerd, Curt Hoffman at 218/828-6198
- ☐ Detroit Lakes, Roger Rolf at 218/846-0774
- ☐ Duluth, Heidi Kroening at 218/723-4795 or Tim Musick at 218/723-4708
- ☐ Marshall, Brad Gillingham at 507/537-6381
- ☐ Rochester, Mark Hugeback at 507/280-5585
- ☒ Metro, Jackie Deneen (MUN) at 651/297-5847

☒ Asbestos

Asbestos may be present in the building(s) that will be demolished, which requires special handling. Please contact Jackie Deneen (MUN) at 651/297-5847 for additional information.

☐ Wells

Abandonment and/or installation of wells must be done by a licensed well driller. Please contact the Minnesota Department of Health 651/215-0823 for additional information.

☒ Above and Below Ground Tanks

The installation and/or removal of ALL above and below ground tanks must be reported to the MPCA before any work begins. Please contact the MPCA Customer Assistance Center at 651/297-2274 or 800/646-6247 for additional information.

☐ Potential Cumulative Effects

The section of the EAW designated for the analysis and discussion of potential cumulative effects is incomplete. Please refer to *Citizens Advocating Responsible Development v. Kandiyohi Board of Commissioners*, 713 N.W.2d 817 (Minn. 2006). The Court held that a "cumulative potential effects" inquiry under Minn. R. 4410.1700, subp. 7, requires a Responsible Governmental Unit to inquire whether a proposed project, which may not individually have the potential to cause significant environmental effects, could have a significant effect when considered along with other projects that (1) are already in existence, are actually planned for, or for which a basis of expectation has been laid; (2) are located in the surrounding area; and (3) might reasonably be expected to affect the same natural resources

☐ Other Issues Identified by Staff

_____

_____

_____

Farrar, Rebecca D.

From: Wayne Barstad [Wayne.Barstad@dnr.state.mn.us]
Sent: Monday, July 31, 2006 7:39 AM
To: Farrar, Rebecca D.
Subject: Pacific Block Development EAW

The DNR has no comment on this EAW. ..wb

Wayne Barstad
Regional Environmental Assessment Ecologist
Central Region
651 772-7940
wayne.barstad@dnr.state.mn.us

Minnesota Department of Transportation

Metropolitan District
Waters Edge
1500 West County Road B-2
Roseville MN 55113-3174

July 31, 2006

Rebecca Farrar
Senior Planner
Planning Division
Community Planning & Economic Development Department
210 City Hall
350 South 5th Street
Minneapolis, MN 55415

SUBJECT: **Pacific Block Development**
Mn/DOT Review #EAW06-018
Jct CSAH-152, Washington Avenue North
Minneapolis, Hennepin County
Mn/DOT Control Section 2789

Dear Ms. Farrar:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) completed by the City of Minneapolis regarding the above named project. Mn/DOT staff has reviewed the EAW and has the following comment:

Permits:

Any work within or impacting Mn/DOT Right of Way requires a permit. Permit forms are available from Mn/DOT's utility website at the following URL:

www.dot.state.mn.us/tecsup/utility

Please direct any questions regarding permit requirements to Buck Craig (651-582-1447) of Mn/DOT's Metro Permits Section.

If you have any questions concerning this review please contact me at (651) 634-2083.

Sincerely,

Juanita Voigt

Juanita Voigt
Transportation Planner

August 2, 2006

Ms. Rebecca Farrar, Senior Planner
Community Planning & Economic Development Department
City of Minneapolis
210 City Hall
350 South 5th Street
Minneapolis, MN 55415

SUBJECT: ***Environmental Assessment Worksheet***
City of Minneapolis, Pacific Block Development
Metropolitan Council District 7, Review File No. 19787-1

Dear Ms. Farrar:

Metropolitan Council staff reviewed the environmental assessment worksheet (EAW) for the Pacific Block Development. Staff reviewed the EAW to determine: *a) its potential for significant environmental impact and need for an EIS; b) the accuracy and completeness of information presented; c) its impact on regional systems and regional policy, and; d) its impact on Council property, activities and/or facilities.* The project, a mixed-use development comprised of commercial, hotel, office and residential development, totals approximately 750,000 gross square feet. The 2.47 acre site is located between 3rd Ave. N. and 4th Ave N. and between 2nd and Washington Streets. The area is within the in the "Minneapolis Warehouse Historic District" and the "North Loop Warehouse Area."

Staff finds this EAW to be incomplete as submitted. Consequently, we are unable to determine at this time whether the project is in conformity with regional system plans and whether an EIS may be needed. We encourage you to withdraw the EAW until the information requested below is provided, or to issue a supplemental EAW to address the missing information. In the following sections, the Council offers comments on the EAW and requests information to assist in making a determination of whether an EIS is necessary for this project.

Information requested:

Item 18 – Water Quality: Wastewaters (Kyle Colvin, Environmental Services, 651- 602-1151)

Information is needed regarding discharge levels and sewer connections. Additional information is needed before the Council can make a final determination regarding the effect of the project on the regional wastewater disposal system. The project does not appear to have a negative effect on the regional wastewater disposal system, based on the EAW wastewater generation projection of 200,000 gallons per day (gpd). An estimate of the current level of discharge should be provided to Metropolitan Council Environmental Services (MCES) so MCES can determine whether this 200,000 gpd represents an increase or decrease in the level of flow discharged to the regional disposal system.

The document is also unclear on how direct sanitary sewer service is to be provided to the site. Will the site be served by City facilities or will there be a direct connection to MCES interceptor 1-MN-310? A permit is required from MCES if sewer service is to be provided through either a new direct connection to the existing MCES interceptor, or through reconnections at existing connection points with the interceptor. To provide current level of discharge information and/or to initiate the permit process, contact Kyle Colvin, at (651) 602-1151.

Item 27a – Compatibility with Plans and Land Use Regulation (Denise Engen, Community Development, 651-602-1513)

The EAW document should more explicitly address where this project conflicts with and conforms to the City's comprehensive plan for land use and historic resources. It does not appear that the project conflicts with regional policy regarding metropolitan systems. However, it is unclear in the EAW how the Pacific Block project conforms or conflicts with the City's comprehensive plan, particularly for planned land use and historic preservation – and if a plan amendment will be sought.

The City's comprehensive plan includes many policies and implementing instruments. In addition, certain elements of the plan, such as land use and historic preservation, also have specific provisions in state statute. (Refer to the Council's *Local Planning Handbook* found online at http://www.metrocouncil.org/planning/LPH/handbookSep05.pdf .) State statute also directs that implementing instruments of a city's comprehensive plan may not be in conflict with the plan and may not allow activities in conflict with metropolitan system plans. In Minneapolis, the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) implements Chapter 599, Heritage Preservation Regulations, of the city code. It is noted in Section 9c of the EAW that the project does not meet guidelines adopted by the HPC for the project area.

If the proposed project is in conflict with the comprehensive plan, either the project or the plan must be amended before site approvals may be issued. This is true for all re-developments in the City and is of particular concern as denser, mixed-use projects continue to be proposed in Minneapolis – especially in historic districts and/or other special areas.

Advisory Comments:

Item 21 – Traffic (Steve Mahowald, MetroTransit, 612-349-7775)

Transit. Transit will be an essential element in this area of Minneapolis, especially as the area grows in population and jobs due to denser redevelopment, such as is proposed in this project. In particular, this section of Washington Ave. is cited in various documents as part of the future primary transit network. The block proposed for redevelopment currently has a bus stop on westbound Washington Avenue, nearside of 3rd Avenue North. This bus stop must be retained in the completed project. As transit use is expected to increase as a result of this project, space should be provided for a future transit shelter. This can be accomplished by providing a sufficient footprint on the public sidewalk, or by providing space for a shelter within the building envelope/design. There is also an on-street transit layover area across the street from the block to be re-developed – on northbound 2nd Avenue North, between Washington and 2nd Street North. This layover area must be retained until a permanent off-street facility can be built to replace it. When the Pacific Block project reaches the approval stage, the developer should work with MetroTransit to incorporate these regional facilities into project design and implementation.

Item 25d – Nearby Resources: Designated Parks, Recreation Areas and Trails (Jan Youngquist, Community Development, 651-602-1029)

The text in this section of the EAW should note that the project is within 2 blocks of the Cedar Lake Regional Trail, which runs along Hennepin Avenue in this area.

In summary, this EAW is incomplete as submitted. If the information for wastewater and the comprehensive plan consistency is provided, staff will be able to complete its review in a timely manner. If you have any questions or need further information with respect to these matters, please contact the technical reviewer indicated in a particular section, or Denise Pedersen Engen, Principal Reviewer, at (651) 602-1513.

Sincerely,

for Phyllis Hanson, Manager
Local Planning Assistance

cc: Jack Jackson, MultiFamily Market Analyst, MHFA
Tod Sherman, Development Reviews Coordinator, MnDOT - Metro Division
Annette Meeks, Metropolitan Council District 7
Keith Buttleman, Environmental Services
Denise Pedersen Engen, Sector Representative/Principal Reviewer
Cheryl Olsen, Reviews Coordinator

V:\REVIEWS\Communities\Minneapolis\Letters\Minneapolis 2006 EAW Pacific Block Development 19787-1.doc

LEONARD
STREET
AND
DEINARD

150 SOUTH FIFTH STREET SUITE 2300
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 55402
612-335-1500 MAIN
612-335-1657 FAX

ERIC H. GALATZ
612-335-1509 DIRECT
ERIC.GALATZ@LEONARD.COM

August 2, 2006

Ms. Rebecca Farrar, Senior Planner
Minneapolis Planning Division
Community Planning & Economic Development Department
210 City Hall
350 South 5th Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55415

Re: Environmental Assessment Worksheet ("EAW") for Pacific Block Development

Dear Ms. Farrar:

Please accept these comments regarding the July 3, 2006 EAW for the Pacific Block Development on behalf of our clients the Rock Island Lofts Association. The EAW correctly concludes this development is "out of character with the surrounding local and national historic districts and will have a negative visual impact." EAW, at 31.

Despite this conclusion, the EAW fails to discuss how the developer intends to minimize that negative impact and does not discuss alternative development plans that would eliminate or mitigate the negative impact. In alternative number one, the developer proposes to construct an 18-story and 28-story condominium tower. Both towers are considerably higher than any building in this area. The Association agrees that that the "most important environmental issue identified in the EAW is the impact of the project's design on the character of the national and local districts that are the site of the project." Id., at 34.

In addition, the EAW contains incomplete information about other aspects of this development that warrant further information and consideration.

Environmental Inspections

Section 9: Land Use

In this case, the EAW identifies a laundry list of environmental contamination associated with this site and the environmental programs the developer will need to complete. However, in many instances, the EAW does not contain sufficient information to evaluate the extent of the contamination.

For example, the EAW states that the "full extent of groundwater contamination has yet to be identified." EAW, at 14. The EAW states that "VOC contamination, primarily from chlorinated solvents, was detected as this location." The EAW fails, however, to state whether the VOC contamination exceeded either MPCA's Tier 1 SLV or Tier 2 SLV. See id. The EAW should contain this information.

In addition, the EAW states that polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons ("PAH's") were identified in 9 of the 16 soil borings and that none of "these PAHs, detected individually, exceed MPCA Tier 1 SLVs or MPCA Tier 2 SRVs." Id. The EAW, however, does not address the cumulative effects of the PAHs found. Again, the EAW states that the "full extent of soil contamination has yet to be identified." Id.

The environmental review process is designed to "provide usable information to the project proposer, governmental decision makers and the public concerning the primary environmental effects of a proposed project . . . and [to] reduce delay and uncertainty in the environmental review process." Minnesota Rules 4410.0300, subp. 4(a) and (c). However, in at least two instances, the EAW states that the full extent of contamination has not been identified.

In addition to these shortcomings, the EAW does not contain sufficient information to evaluate whether the development on this site will increase the risk of groundwater contamination, not only on this site, but to the surrounding properties.

The EAW Contains Insufficient Information on Cumulative Impacts

Section 18: Water Quality: Wastewater

In this section, the EAW states that the "estimated maximum daily flow [of wastewater] can be computed by the Metropolitan Council Environmental Services' Service Availability Charge method." EAW, at 19. The EAW concludes that "the maximum average daily flow is estimated to be 200,000." It is difficult to comment on this conclusion because the EAW does not contain the underlying data used for this calculation or the calculation itself. The EAW should include this information.

The EAW concludes that the "additional waste water from the Project is within the plant's volume capacity and will not alter the plant's ability to meet its permit requirements." Id. However, this is just one of many examples where the EAW fails to take into account the cumulative impact of this development and future development in this area.

Cumulative impact "means the impact on the environment that results from incremental effects of the project in addition to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects regardless of what person undertakes the other projects." Minn. Rules 4410.0200, subp. 11.

The EAW does mention the Eclipse project, but it does not mention the Twinsville or Whole Foods projects. To truly evaluate the cumulative impact of the development projects in this area, the EAW take into account the Twinsville and Whole Foods projects.

Section 21: Traffic (Travel Demand Management Plan "TDMP")

The EAW states that the consultant analyzed traffic operations at eight intersections and identified two peak times—p.m. peak hour (4:30 to 5:30) and the a.m. peak hour. See EAW, at 21. However, the consultant only analyzed two intersections at the a.m. peak hour. It is unclear why this was done. Given that the traffic analysis identified two peak hours, we do not believe it was appropriate for the consultant to cut short its analysis of the a.m. peak hour. Therefore, we believe the EAW contains insufficient information on the impact this development will have on traffic.

In addition, although the TDMP added trips for the Eclipse development, the TDMP, to our knowledge, did not consider the cumulative impact of this development, the Eclipse development, and the Whole Foods and the Twinsville projects. It is difficult to understand why the TDMP included the Eclipse development, but did not include the Whole Foods project and the significantly larger Twinsville project. These four projects, cumulatively, will no doubt have a significant, and likely negative impact, on the traffic in this area. We all would likely agree that traffic congestion is one of the major problems facing downtown Minneapolis. Yet, the TDMP and EAW does not contain sufficient information to evaluate that problem.

We are also concerned that this development anticipates that vehicle access to the hotel would be on 3rd Avenue and that construction on this block could extend up to five years. 3rd Avenue is one of the main routes out of this historic district and onto the freeway. The EAW fails to recognize this fact and evaluate how the hotel traffic will impact the neighborhood's use of 3rd Avenue.

Finally, the EAW states that while the development is under construction "the adjacent parking lanes will be disrupted along each block face." Id., at 23. The EAW does not contain sufficient information to understand when and how long each parking lane will be disrupted. We believe it is obvious that construction in the parking lanes will necessarily slow down traffic.

Section 24: Odor, Noise and Dust

Demolition and Construction Dust

In Section 24, the EAW should describe the duration, quantities or intensity of any odors, noise, or dust generated during construction. Id., at 24. The EAW states that construction on this site will generate dust. The EAW contains no information on the duration, quantities or intensity of the dust generated by this project. This is basic information required by the EAW.

Traffic Noise

The EAW states that a "detailed noise analysis was completed to assess existing traffic noise levels in the Project area and to determine what effect the proposed project will have on future noise levels." Id., at 25. The noise analysis was not included in the EAW, and it impossible for us to comment on the analysis without having an opportunity to review. In addition, the EAW failed to take into account the Twinsville and Whole Foods projects. Without evaluating the cumulative impact, we believe the EAW contains insufficient information to evaluate the noise impact on this historic neighborhood.

In addition, the EAW concludes that "[n]oise in the proposed residential areas in the Project will exceed daytime and nighttime noise standards. However, the breaks necessary to accommodate the side-street and driveway entrances and the proximity of the development to the roadway would not allow the construction of effective noise barriers." Id., at 27. The EAW contains no information on alternative design plans that would allow for noise mitigation. We believe it is appropriate for the EAW to discuss alternative design plans that would mitigate the noise impacts.

Forever Changing the Character of the Warehouse Historic District

Section 25: Nearby Resources and Section 26: Visual Impacts

We agree that the most important issue addressed by the EAW is that this development would forever change the character of this historic district. The EAW concludes that this development is "out of character with the surrounding local and national historic districts and will have a negative visual impact." Id., at 31. Importantly, the City's Comprehensive Plan encourages that new residential development contribute to the sense of the neighborhood. See id., at 32. However, the proposed design for both condo buildings "is not within conformance of the adopted Warehouse Historic District Guidelines." Id., at 31. We do not believe the condominium towers would contribute in any way to the sense of this historic neighborhood.

The EAW notes that the "Minneapolis Warehouse Historic district cover[s] 150 buildings." Id., at 28. We believe the EAW should have compared the height of the 18 story and 28 story condominium towers to the average height of the buildings in this historic district. We believe that comparison would demonstrate how out of character this development truly is.

Instead, the EAW focuses on a nearby, but distinctly different neighborhood. For example, it discusses the Churchill Apartments (33 stories), the Carlyle (39 stories), and the Eclipse (24 and 32 stories). However, anyone familiar with those projects knows that they are part of a separate and distinct neighborhood. Simply put, we do not believe the Churchill Apartments, the Carlyle and the Eclipse are located in the same neighborhood and should not be relied upon to justify the towering condominiums proposed.

Finally, the EAW fails to address the negative impacts the condominium towers would have on the pedestrian experience, and views into and out the historic district. One important characteristic of the district is sunlit streets attributable to the relatively uniform building height of approximately eight stories. The uniformity of height also provides an identity to the district when viewed from a distance. Comparatively, anyone who has walked down first and Hennepin from the post office to the Carlyle knows that sunlight does not exist on that block. This development would destroy the sunlight and downtown views that are characteristic of this historic district.

Conclusion

The EAW correctly concludes that the "most important environmental issue identified in the EAW is the impact of the project's design on the character of the national and local historic districts that are the site of the project." Id., at 34. The EAW also recognizes that "[a]pprovals of either of the proposed alternatives will set a precedent that may have the cumulative effect of allowing taller infill buildings in the future throughout this district." Id., at 33.

We also believe it is important to consider all of the redevelopment that has recently occurred in this historic district. Because those projects were completed without changing the character of this historic district, we are unclear as to why the EAW contains no information on alternative design plans that would protect the character of this historic district or minimize the noise and traffic impacts.

As the EAW notes, if the City allows the towering condominiums, it will likely lead to similar developments in the future. The City will never have an opportunity to go back in time and restore the character of this historic district. Rather, this neighborhood, instead of keeping its historic character, will simply turn into another area in the City where towering condominiums dominate the skyline. The bottom line is that the EAW contains insufficient information on alternative design proposals and how the developer could mitigate "the most important environmental issue identified in the EAW." Id., at 34. As a result, we believe the City does not have sufficient information to determine whether an Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS") is necessary for this project.

An EIS "shall be ordered for projects that have the potential for significant environmental effects." Minnesota Rules 4410.1700, subp. 1. "In deciding whether a project has the potential for significant environmental effects, the following factors shall be considered:

A. type, extent, and reversibility of environmental effects;
B. cumulative potential effects of related or anticipated future projects;
C. the extent to which the environmental effects are subject to mitigation by ongoing public regulatory authority; and
D. the extent to which environmental effects can be anticipated and controlled as a result of other available environmental studies undertaken by public agencies or the project proper, including other EISs.

Id., subp. 7. Because this project has the potential for significant environmental effects, the City must order an EIS for this project. The EIS, at a minimum, must further evaluate the following issues:

1. The type, extent, and reversibility of the soil and groundwater contamination;
2. The impact of the proposed condominium towers on the character of the national and local historic districts that are the site of the project;
3. The cumulative potential effects of this project, Twinsville and the Whole Foods project on (a) water quality, (b) traffic, and (c) noise; and
4. The extent to which the environmental effects identified in (1)-(3) are subject to mitigation by ongoing public regulatory authority.

All of the issues identified above warrant further analysis and consideration. Based on the foregoing, we request that the City make a positive declaration on the need for an EIS and include within the scope of the EIS appropriate studies to obtain information on the four issues identified above.

Very truly yours,

LEONARD, STREET AND DEINARD
PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION

Eric H. Galatz

FAEGRE & BENSON LLP

UNITED STATES | ENGLAND | GERMANY | CHINA

WALTER H. ROCKENSTEIN II
wrockenstein@faegre.com
(612) 766-7208

August 2, 2006

Ms. Rebecca Farrar
Senior Planner, Planning Division
Community Planning & Economic Development Department
City of Minneapolis
210 City Hall
350 South Fifth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55415

BY E-MAIL AND MESSENGER

Re: Comments On Pacific Block Development Environmental Assessment Worksheet By Pacific Flats, LLC

Dear Ms. Farrar:

The purpose of this letter is to provide comments to the City of Minneapolis ("City") as the Responsible Government Unit ("RGU") that prepared the *Pacific Block Development Environmental Assessment Worksheet* ("EAW") for the Pacific Block Development project ("The Pacific Development" or "Project"). These comments are being submitted on behalf of the Project proposer, Pacific Flats, LLC.

Two assertions in the EAW are either erroneous or seriously misleading. These should be corrected or clarified.

The first inaccuracy is in Item 25(b) on page 31 of the EAW in the discussion of historic resources. The EAW states with respect to both the 28-Story Condo Building Alternative and the 40-Story Condo Building Alternative that "[a]ll rehabilitation and infill construction will require approvals by the HPC." This statement is incorrect with respect to the 40-Story Condo Building Alternative because, in that alternative, the forty-story tower portion of the Building would be constructed entirely on a lot (the "Gehl-Dolphin Lot") that is not within the North Loop Warehouse Area (Local District). Therefore, the tower portion would not be subject to review by the Heritage Preservation Commission ("HPC") and would not require approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness by the City.

A Certificate of Appropriateness is only required for "alteration of a landmark, property in an historic district or nominated property under interim protection." See

Minneapolis Code of Ordinances ("MCO") § 599.320. By definition, the Heritage Preservation Code only applies to "landmarks" and "historic districts" that have been designated by the City Council. See MCO § 599.110, Definitions. Thus, absolutely no legal basis exits for the assertion that rehabilitation or construction that occurs on the Gehl-Dolphin Lot, which is not located within a historic district designated by the City Council, is subject to HPC review or approval.

The above-quoted statement from the EAW may be unintentionally overbroad. The sentence that follows the discussion of HPC review of the 40-Story Condo Building Alternative states that "[a]fter a report by CPED-Planning staff and hearing from the public, the HPC will determine the appropriateness of the design of all the elements of either alternative in the North Loop Warehouse Area (Local District). (Emphasis added.) This sentence could be read to recognize the limit on HPC authority to review only those project components that occur within the locally-designated district. However, given the inconsistency of these two statements in the EAW and the importance of defining the scope of the City's review authority for the Project, we request that the EAW be clarified to explicitly state that alteration and construction on the Gehl-Dolphin Lot is not subject to HPC review or approval.

Second, it is also inaccurate as a matter of law to assert that "[a]pprovals of either of the proposed alternatives will set a precedent that may have the cumulative effect of allowing taller infill buildings in the future throughout this District." See Item 29, "Cumulative Impacts," on page 33 of the EAW (emphasis added). The City's decisions regarding approval, denial, or conditional approval of any historic preservation or zoning applications required for the Pacific Development will have little to no "precedential" effect with respect to applications associated with other projects.

Decisions on applications submitted to the HPC are "quasi-judicial." See *Handicraft Block Ltd. Partnership v. City of Minneapolis*, 611 N.W.2d 16 (Minn. 2000). Quasi-judicial decisions require the City to apply "specific use standards" set by the ordinance "to a particular individual use." *Honn v. City of Coon Rapids*, 313 N.W.2d 409, 417 (Minn. 1981). Thus, decisions on applications for Certificates of Appropriateness must be based on the particular ordinance standards that apply at the time of the decision and the particular characteristics and circumstances of the individual use and property in question. HPC decisions are inherently case-by-case decisions that apply uniquely to the individual property and project at issue and have little to no "precedential" effect on decisions about other properties and projects. It is odd that the City, as the RGU, would take the legal position in an EAW that its discretion on this or any project is limited by its past quasi-judicial decisions on other projects.

We request that the City's response to comments on the EAW include correction or clarification of the two issues raised in this letter.

Finally, Pacific Flats, LLC submits that the EAW is extremely thorough and will provide more than adequate information to City staff and officials who will review and decide the various permits required for the Project. No further investigation through an Environmental Impact Statement is warranted.

Sincerely,

Walter H. Rockenstein II

Walter H. Rockenstein II

ROCWH:LANC:jorsa:M1:1344513.02

August 2, 2006

Ms. Rebecca Farrar, Senior Planner
Minneapolis Planning Division
Community Planning & Economic Development Department
210 City Hall
350 South 5th Street
Mineapolis, MN 55415

Re: Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) for Pacific Block Development

Dear Ms. Farrar:

We are residents of the North Loop neighborhood. Since the EAW for the proposed Pacific Flats development raises many unanswered concerns about this project, we believe that a full environmental impact statement (EIS) is called for.

Because we personally have no scientific or enginnering expertise, we will not comment directly on the portions of the EAW that deal with potential contamination or water quality. However, we note that the EAW raises many questions in that regard which have not been answered adequately by the developer.

We do want to comment on a few other concerns raised by the EAW.

This development will fundamentally alter the character and scale of the neighborhood.

We believe that there is a clear difference in the character and scale of the North Loop neighborhood north of Hennepin Avenue and between Washington Avenue and the river. Not only are there a number of historic structures, but the more recent structures to date have been built to reflect and honor the scale and design of the historic buildings. This has created an area that is unlike any other in the City of Minneapolis.

The "Minneapolis Downtown 2010" study specifically states that an objective of the City is to "promote building heights and designs that protect the image and form of the downtown skyline, that provide transition to the edges of downtown and <u>that protect the scale and qualities in areas of distinctive physical or historic character</u>." (Emphasis added.)

If this project is permitted to go forward, we will irretrievably lose the unique character of this neighborhood. Thus, the City should take every step to insure that all relevant information is analyzed.

The Warehouse Historic District will be severely damaged by this proposal.

Related to our concerns about the effect of this design on the character and scale of our neighborhood is our concern about the damage it will do to the Warehouse Historic District (WHD).

The "Minneapolis Downtown 2010" study makes it clear that an objective of the City is to "encourage new buildings adjacent to historic buildings, sites and districts to be compatible in design." (Emphasis added.) In that context, the Warehouse District is specifically referenced as "one of the few resources that downtown has that cannot be replaced." There is insufficient evidence in the EAW to conclude that the project design is compatible in design with this district.

Preserving and respecting historic sites and buildings means something more than just not tearing down the buildings' facades. In this instance, placing two to four-story historic structures on this block up against 28 (or 40), 18, and ten-story structures and a four-story parking ramp is "historic preservation" in name only. The full effect of this proposed design on the historic structures from all angles needs to be explored further.

This development will cut off sunlight and views of surrounding residents.

We believe that the disproportional heights of this development will cut off sunlight from a number of surrounding buildings for a significant portion of the day, especially during the winter months when sunlight already is in short supply in our northern clime.

Moreover, if a development of this scale is permitted for the Pacific Flats block, it is inevitable that adjoining blocks will see proposals for projects of a comparable scale. The result would be to create canyon-like streets devoid of sunlight for much of the day.

In addition, the disproportional height of Pacific Flats will cut off the central downtown views of hundreds of area residents (including views of such landmark structures as the IDS Center and the Wells Fargo tower). This affects the current and future residents of such developments as Rock Island Lofts, 212 Lofts, 5th Avenue Lofts, Renaissance on the River, The Reserve, The Landings, Riverwalk Lofts, and others.

The Minneapolis Zoning Code (Section 551-850), when setting forth the standards for permitting increased heights of buildings in the downtown area, recognizes as important factors: (1) "access to light and air of surrounding properties"; (2) "shadowing of residential properties…"; (3) "scale and character of surrounding uses"; and (4) "preservation of views of landmark buildings…"

We believe that the mock-ups of the views of Pacific Flats in the EAW do not sufficiently depict the effects of the project.

Traffic flow will be severely and negatively impacted.

At a meeting on May 4, we asked the developer's representatives whether a traffic study had been completed. They indicated that a study had been done. (Presumably, this is the study referenced in the EAW.) However, on further questioning, they admitted that their study fails to take into account any traffic from the nearby proposed 222 Hennepin (Whole Foods) project, from any additional development on blocks adjoining Pacific Flats, and from the Twins ballpark and the associated Twinsville development. So the traffic study done for Pacific Flats and referenced in the EAW clearly is deficient in predicting the cumulative impact of this development on traffic in our area.

This quadrant of our neighborhood is hemmed in by the river along one side and by the StarTribune at one end. One of the prime routes out of the neighborhood and onto the freeway is 3rd Avenue North. That street and others already suffer traffic congestion problems during rush hour. The Pacific Flats plan anticipates that the vehicle access to the hotel will be on 3rd Avenue. We also have heard that 3rd Avenue will be closed off at the Twins ballpark. Additional analysis of this situation is necessary.

This neighborhood is not zoned like downtown and should not permit the same density or height as downtown.

The Pacific Flats developer has made much of the fact that there is no specific height limitation on the corner lot of the block where it wants to erect a 40 or 28-story tower. While it might be true technically that there is no specific height limitation in the B4C-1 zoning area, there is a floor area ratio limitation of four, which effectively limits the height to a large extent. Of course, there also are restrictions arising out of the historical district.

If we look at this zoning (B4C-1), in contrast to other downtown zoning areas, we see that this area is anticipated to be far less dense. For example, the B4C-2, B4-1, and B4S-1 areas all permit a floor area ratio of eight; the B4-2 area permits a ratio of 16. Thus, B4C-1 is contemplated to be one-half or one-fourth as dense as other downtown areas.

Under the Zoning Code, a variance only should be granted where there is "undue hardship" unique to a site. There is no such hardship here, as shown by the various lower density developments successfully completed in this vicinity.

Moreover, the Zoning Code (Section 520-30) states that it is adopted (among other purposes): to promote "aesthetics;" to "protect the character and stability of residential, commercial and industrial areas…;" to "provide adequate light, air, privacy and convenience of access to property…"; and to "protect and conserve the values of land,

buildings and other improvements…" The EAW does not contain sufficient information to demonstrate that these purposes would be met by the Pacific Flats project.

Conclusion.

We ask that the City recognize the need for more information and study prior to acting on the proposed project, and order a full EIS. Thank you for considering our comments.

Lisa Rahne Nekich
Michael Nekich
111 – 4th Ave. N., #707
(612)372.5056

The following summarizes Public Works comments with respect to the EAW (section 21, 29 and 30) and the attached Travel Demand Management Plan (TDMP). The following are specific to the TDMP; however, revisions made to address the comments below will require modification to the respective and applicable EAW section.

TDM Plan Review

1. The proposed site plan identifies the construction of corner bump outs. Please discuss and quantify the on-street parking situation (before vs. after). Currently all four curb faces are metered. The removal of metered parking stalls may incur an annual fee due to revenue lost. The cost to remove 1 meter on 2nd Ave and 2nd St is $1,500 per year, on 3rd Ave is $1,350 and on Washington St is $2,000.
2. Page 8, last sentence. Add a period.
3. Page 9, last paragraph. Reference is made that signal timing improvements are needed to be made in order for the key intersections to operate at acceptable levels. The downtown is centrally controlled pre-timed grid. To properly re-time the intersections evaluated, it may be necessary to add a few additional intersections within the re-timing to include all intersections within a particular zone. See TIS Memo Comment 7, below.
4. Page 12, Alternative Transportation Infrastructure. Please provide a table or discussion of the primary bus routes, schedules and service for the roadways immediately adjacent to the project site (Washington, 2nd Ave, 3rd Ave and 2nd St).
5. Page 16. Provide an Item 7. Item 7 should provide requirements relative to the Developers responsibility to work with Commuter Connection on surveying and monitoring the mode split goals, once occupied and two years thereafter.
6. Page 16. The Developer will be responsible for providing funds to re-time all necessary intersections within the study area and any other intersections within the particular interconnect zone. This would include development of the timing plans, and Minneapolis labor to implement and field fine tune. Any signal modifications or infrastructure improvements required to provide acceptable traffic operations will also be 100 percent funded by the Developer.

Appendix A – TIS Memo

1. Page 7, and throughout doc. Because all intersections within Mpls operate on a pre-timed grid as a system, there may be a need to include a few additional intersections within the study area to include all intersections within a particular zone suggested for re-timing.
2. Page 11, Table A-5. Are the existing land uses (which reductions in trips are being taken) fully occupied? If not, full trip reductions shouldn't be taken. Also, the existing estimated trips being generated should be factored (i.e., reduced) to account for the fact that existing multi-use and modal trips are occurring. The net result is it seems there should be a greater number of new trips in the "Total" row.
3. Page 11, Table A-5 and first paragraph. The discussion with respect to trip reduction and mode split goals needs to be re worded. The application of trip reductions due to

multi-use destinations or due to multi-modal uses is do to its location (e.g. downtown) and area land uses. These reductions occur regardless of typical TDM strategies. The purpose of the TDM plan is to implement measures that further decrease trip generation from what the industry or ITE is telling us. Please note this distinction. Also, the application of a 35 percent (15 percent multi-use and 20 percent multi-modal) seems a bit high. The neighboring Eclipse TDM was allowed a 15 percent multi-modal reduction factor.

4. Page 11, Table A-5. Provide the ITE land use code and trip rate used.
5. Page 16, Washington Ave/3rd Ave and Washington Ave/2nd Ave. Along with this phasing modification, what would the geometry be? Should the left turn arrow be actuated? Should an exclusive left turn lane be provided?

   In review of the intersection traffic volumes, there is a much higher volume of left turning traffic in the northbound direction than southbound at both the 2nd Ave and 3rd Ave intersections. Was this considered in recommending the southbound direction (lower traffic volume) have the protected/permissive phasing? What would the impact be if both the northbound/southbound movements had protected/permissive phasing?

6. Page 17, 1st Paragraph. Are there any feasible measures that could be implemented to increase the left turn storage distance on Washington Ave at 3rd Ave? Could the eastbound left turn storage to 2nd Ave be shortened?
7. We have also reviewed a TDM submitted for the 222 Hennepin Avenue Development located on the block bounded by Washington Avenue and 2nd Street N and 1st Avenue N and Hennepin Avenue N. Due to the proximity of the 222 Hennepin development to Pacific Flats, there is potential for cumulative impacts that are not currently shown in either TDM plan. The 222 Hennepin Avenue TDM plan identified deficient operations at both Washington Avenue/Hennepin Avenue and Washington Avenue/1st Avenue, which ultimately impact the Pacific Flats study.

   Although we are not requiring the Pacific Flats TDM be revised to specifically include 222 Hennepin, we are requiring that Public Works' comments on the operational issues be addressed as discussed above by August 8, 2006. Operational deficiencies identified at the 1st Avenue and Hennepin Avenue intersections will be addressed as part of the 222 Hennepin Avenue TDM. However, some coordination must occur.

   As part of the work to address the operational issues, Synchro models must be submitted to Scott Tacheny for review and direction on any proposed signal phasing modifications and signal re-timing. This review will also ensure the modeling and optimized signal parameters are consistent between the Pacific Flats TDMP and the 222 Hennepin Ave TDMP such that any potential cumulative impacts can be identified, and/or mitigated.

   After review of the traffic models by Minneapolis Staff, further quantification of the required timing and/or infrastructure improvements may be determined.

8. Page 20. Please provide a statement suggesting Minneapolis Public Works evaluate the need for an all-way stop control at the 1st Street N/3rd Avenue N intersection upon completion of the Pacific Flats development.

Appendix B – Parking Memo

1. Figure B-1. Label lots and provide in the legend a description of the lot as it corresponds with tables provided in the memo.
2. Table B-1. Provide a column noted the lot number.
3. Page 6. Please itemize out the intended number of stalls per use being provided with the project (e.g., how many stalls are being designated to the residential use? Are they secure or separated from commercial? How many stalls are for the hotel?, retail, other commercial, etc? How many will be shared amongst uses?) Provide a cross-reference of the stalls intended use against the requirement and demand comparisons.
4. Page 7. What is the residential dwelling unit to parking stall ratio?
5. Page 8, Item 1. Since the on-street parking in the area isn't sufficient to serve the patrons of the commercial space, will patrons be given access to the off-street parking within the project site?
6. Provide discussion of the site plan illustrated bump outs, access points, etc. and the impact to quantity of on-street metered parking stalls. Will any meters need to be removed?

9 North 4th Ave., #102
Minneapolis, MN 55401
612-359-6934
pjbelfiore@yahoo.com

Ms. Rebecca Farrar, Senior Planner
City of Minneapolis
Rebecca.Farrar@ci.minneapolis.mn.us

Re: Pacific Flats Project--Our Comments Sent Via E-Mail to Rebecca Farrar

Dear Ms. Farrar:

We strongly oppose the Pacific Flats project and request that you accept our following comments and pass them on to any city personnel who are part of the decision making process in connection with the Pacific Flats proposals.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,
Elizabeth and Peter Belfiore

Statement of Elizabeth and Peter Belfiore in Opposition to the Pacific Flats Project

(Note: all references to the Environmental Assessment Worksheet--EAW--are to the EAW of June 27, 2006.)

We strongly oppose the Pacific Flats project because it violates both local and national historic district guidelines, it would architecturally and scenically corrupt historic sections of the City of Minneapolis, it would be unjust to other developers who have been forced to conform to the guidelines, it would increase traffic and other pollution, and it would discourage creative architectural development. Below are some further details of our reasons, divided into two parts: I, our immediate reactions as residents of the warehouse district (Renaissance on the River), and II, a few comments on parts of the EAW.

I--Our Immediate Reactions as Residents

--The projected buildings are not in keeping with the historical character of the North Loop neighborhood, a unique and charming area that we enjoy, and very much want to preserve. The historical character of this neighborhood was one of the reasons why we decided to move here in the first place, and not to the center of downtown. We enjoy, for example, walking to Moose and Sadie's and eating brunch, partly because of the surrounding, small-scale historical buildings. We would not enjoy doing so in the shadow of a skyscraper.

--The project will create a great deal of additional traffic in an already crowded area, and one that will become still more crowded after the new stadium is built.

--It would create a precedent for allowing other skyscraper buildings in the neighborhood, including, possibly, the Reserve right next door to us. It would be difficult and unjust for the City to deny others the right to build skyscrapers in this neighborhood.

--Allowing this development would be unfair to previous developers, who have respected the historical character of the neighborhood.

--The real estate market is already saturated. As a result, prices are going down and it is taking longer to sell units. Development on this scale will only make this situation worse, helping to depress the values of all of our homes.

--We do not think that the neighborhood would gain anything that would begin to compensate for the disadvantages of the project. We do not need another hotel or another furniture store in the neighborhood, or any of the other "amenities" that have been mentioned in connection with this project.

--Allowing this project to continue will discourage more creative architectural projects that respect our Historic Preservation guidelines and also add something new and lovely to the Warehouse District.

II--Comments on Parts of the EAW

--The project would occupy the Pacific Block, which, as the EAW states, "is within the National Register 'Minneapolis Historic District' and, except for one parcel, is within the 'North Loop Warehouse Area', a historic district designated by the City of Minneapolis." (City's cover sheet for the "Environmental Assessment Worksheet June 27, 2006.")

--The project would involve the demolition of all or part of protected buildings on the block. (See, for example, p. 6 of the EAW).

--The project's "Alternative One" and "Alternative Two" would each grossly violate the Historic Preservation Guidelines of the City of Minneapolis. Alternative One would plant a 28-story condo building on one part of the block, and an 18-story condo building on another part of the block. Alternative Two would plant a 40-story condo building on the small, allegedly exempt parcel on the block, and a 10-story condo building on another portion of the block. Both alternatives would thus place buildings grossly out of scale with the surrounding architecture of the neighborhood, and grossly violate Historic Preservation guidelines. Not only is the entire block within the protected area of the National Register, and at least most of the block within the local historic district, but even in the case of Alternative Two, in which a huge 40-story condo building which would be placed on an allegedly exempt parcel within the protected block, the huge tower is of course not only spatially but also physically connected to the rest of the project, which is, as noted, all within the protected block. On the physical connection of the 40-story condo building to the rest of the project, the EAW notes: "As with the 28-story Condo Building, a common 4-story base...would connect the condominium structure to the rest of the development...." (EAW, page 5.) Alternative One at least does not claim the protection of an allegedly unprotected parcel within the protected, historic block.

The physical connection of the 40-story building to the rest of the project is relevant as highlighting the absurdity of denying that the huge 40-story condo building violates local historic district guidelines whether or not the parcel on which it stands is exempt. (According to the developer's cockamamie argument, Alternative Two--the 40-story, 10-story condo building alternative--complies with the local guidelines in that the 40-story condo building would reside on the "10% of the block excluded from the local historic district.") (EAW, page 3.)

Note that the developer concedes that Alternative One (28-story and 18-story condo buildings), its "preferred" alternative, violates historic preservation guidelines of Minneapolis, and that Alternative Two (40-story and 10-story condo buildings) will use a lot that is within the national district. (See, for example, EAW, pages 2-3.)

--An indication of how out of proportion the proposed buildings of the project would be, see, for example, page 9 of the EAW, which notes how the height of the proposed buildings compares with surrounding buildings, which would be dwarfed.

--As the EAW itself states, "The height of the proposed towers in both alternatives [28-story and 18-story condo buildings, and 40-story and 10-story condo building] is out of character with the surrounding local and national historic districts and will have a negative visual impact." (EAW, page 31.)

--On increased traffic and other pollution, the EAW seems quite sketchy; an Environmental Impact Statement would be called for if this project were not already blatantly and fatally flawed in numerous ways.

--The EAW states, concerning the project's purpose, that "The project will increase the opportunity for and diversity of living in downtown Minneapolis." (EAW, Page 7.) A more accurate statement would be: "The project's purpose is to make money by creating more spaces for the well-heeled to settle, whether permanently or for a few days in a boutique hotel." Any doubts concerning our translation of the developer's cynical reference to "diversity" may be resolved by reviewing the EAW, reviewing the project's promotional literature, and attending the developer's presentations. Surely "diversity of living" is not enhanced by, for example, stores selling "upscale furnishings" or "upscale clothing"--as described in a Pacific Flats promotional sheet.

We respectfully ask that the City of Minneapolis reject the Pacific Flats project, a project that would severely compromise one of our great historical districts, and diminish the quality of life of the City of Minneapolis.

Sincerely,
Elizabeth and Peter Belfiore

cc: Lisa Goodman, Lynn Berghs, Bob Schmitz

Farrar, Rebecca D.

From: Ted Shogren [shogren@visi.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 01, 2006 12:55 AM
To: Farrar, Rebecca D.
Cc: rjarosh007@aol.com; 'Reddy, Shantanu (STP)'
Subject: FW: Belfiore Opposition to Pacific Flats Development

Dear Ms. Farrar. Please note that I wholly agree with my neighbors' statement with regard the shameful idea of the Pacific Flats Development project. It will be a huge black spot on the neighborhood, Minneapolis, and the city government. I can not emphasize this enough.

Signed,
Ted Shogren
Renaissance on the River Resident.

From: schmitzmay@aol.com [mailto:schmitzmay@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, July 31, 2006 8:29 PM
To: Andovergrp@aol.com
Subject: Fwd: Belfiore Opposition to Pacific Flats Development

Peter's suggested action.

Bob

-----Original Message-----
From: schmitzmay@aol.com
To: Andovergrp@aol.com
Sent: Sun, 30 Jul 2006 1:27 PM
Subject: Fwd: Belfiore Opposition to Pacific Flats Development

FYI - Peter has a number of suggestions that may be helpful.

Bob Schmitz

-----Original Message-----
From: pjbelfiore@yahoo.com
To: schmitzmay@aol.com
Cc: esb@umn.edu
Sent: Sun, 30 Jul 2006 1:08 PM
Subject: Re: Belfiore Opposition to Pacific Flats Development

Hi, Bob:

Yes, let's be sure that people see whatever objections we have.

I should note that my first sending of our statement came back because of a typo in Farrar's e-mail address--there should be no dot after "Farrar"; however, I then forwarded the whole thing to her again, at <Rebecca.Farrar@ci.minneapolis.mn.us>.

I think that even if a person does not write up their own statement, they could always forward ours to Farrar, saying that they agree. Or they could just e-mail Farrar saying they agree with our statement. The

point is, redundancy and repetition are good--it seems to me--and of course the additional name of someone opposed to the development is new information.

Wish Betty and I had had the time to be even more thorough, but we tried.

Thanks,

Peter Belfiore

schmitzmay@aol.com wrote:

Peter, don't recall whether I commented on this response to the EAW -- It's very well stated! I've distributed your piece to our e-mail recipient list in the hope that others will respond in-kind.

Thanks!

Bob

-----Original Message-----
From: pjbelfiore@yahoo.com
To: Rebecca.Farrar.@ci.minneapolis.mn.us
Cc: lisa.goodman@ci.minneapolis.mn.us; lberghs@mn.rr.com; schmitzmay@aol.com
Sent: Fri, 28 Jul 2006 8:27 PM
Subject: Belfiore Opposition to Pacific Flats Development

Dear Ms. Farrar:

Please see attached file.

Thank you for your help

Sincerely,

Peter Belfiore

Check out AOL.com today. Breaking news, video search, pictures, email and IM. All on demand. Always Free.

Farrar, Rebecca D.

From: Reddy, Shantanu (STP) [Shantanu.Reddy@guidant.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 02, 2006 9:52 AM
To: Farrar, Rebecca D.
Subject: Opposition to Pacific Flats Development

Pacific_Flats_2--Peter's_Revis...

> Rebecca:
>
> I am a resident of the Renaissance on the River Development (4th and
> West River Parkway) and my neighbors contacted me about the Pacific
> Flats Development proposal and sent me the attached file.
>
> I agree wholeheartedly with their arguments. Many things they have
> cited are reasons I moved to this area. I don't want to live in the
> shadow of a skyscraper, I love the historical aspect of this area and
> another cookie cutter building violates the spirit of this area. How
> much more traffic do we need and with the slowing housing market, how
> many more condos do we need for people to try to speculate on and
> realize there's little market for them? It seems as many of these
> condos are being bought by flippers and not people interested in
> living in this area? A hotel in this area seems like a ludicrous
> idea. There are beautiful hotels nearby with a lot of history such as
> the Marquette and the Grand and the 601 Graves. These hotels are
> close to the "scene". No one I know would want to stay in a hotel
> where they are proposing with such hotels as I described above
> available.
>
> Bottomline, as a resident and a taxpayer, I am concerned about this
> area being sterilized being squandered by builders who have no
> appreciation for history and the residents of this area and I
> appreciate the fact that you appear to be accepting our comments.
>
> > <<Pacific_Flats_2--Peter's_Revision_of_Pacific_Flats_1.doc>>
> Regards,
>
> Shantanu Reddy
> 315 West River Parkway
> Minneapolis, MN

Farrar, Rebecca D.

From: Joseph Rucci [jrucci7@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 02, 2006 11:52 AM
To: Rebecca.Farrar.@ci.minneapolis.mn.us
Subject: Pacific Flats EAW Comments

I am a Owner of a Townhouse, at Renaissance On The River, in the Warehouse District. I am writing to you to express my opposition to the Pacific Flats Project.

The North Loop is a Warehouse District, which makes for a unique neighborhood. I do not want to live near Skyscrapers, that is why I chose to live in the Warehouse District in the North Loop of Mpls.

The number of people that will be moving into the proposed Flats Residence, along with the 222 and the Eclips Developments, will cause more gridlock during rush hour commutes. Also, the height of the proposed Eclipse and 222 developments are not within the height restrictions allowed in the North Loop Warehouse District. Please have the Developers stay within the height restrictions that are set in place for this wonderful Warehouse Neighborhood.

Thank You,

Joseph C. Rucci, Renaissance On The River Owner

Do you Yahoo!?
Get on board. You're invited to try the new Yahoo! Mail Beta.

Farrar, Rebecca D.

From: RedborisC@aol.com
Sent: Wednesday, August 02, 2006 5:49 AM
To: Farrar, Rebecca D.
Subject: Pacific Flats Project - NOT IN SUPPORT

Dear Ms. Farrar:

We are residents of Renaissance on River and write with grave concerns regarding the Pacific Flats Project proposal to the City. We heard their proposal at a Board meeting of the Renaissance on the River and got to ask questions. This project has no added value to the City of neighborhood.

After reading the letter/email written to you by Elizabeth and Peter Belfiore, we could not describe our thoughts or feelings any better. We support the content of their letter 100%.

Please take into account our views in the decision making process.

Thank you.

Mark and Stephanie Corbey

45 North 4th Avenue 45-103
Minneapolis, MN 55401
612.664.8966

Farrar, Rebecca D.

From: Mark Dillon [Mark.Dillon@meyers.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 02, 2006 8:43 AM
To: Farrar, Rebecca D.
Subject: Pacific Flats:

Importance: High

Hi Rebecca,
My wife and I are residents of Rock Island and we are both in agreement with Peter Belfiore's comments regarding the development called Pacific Flats. It strikes us as way out of proportion to the neighborhood and really not in keeping with the character of the neighborhood at all either. Thank you, Mark Dillon & Susan Austrian 111 4th Ave. N., #406 Minneapolis, MN 55401 621-332-2722

Farrar, Rebecca D.

From: schmitzmay@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, August 01, 2006 5:40 PM
To: Farrar, Rebecca D.
Cc: abaumgarten@meagher.com
Subject: Fwd: Belfiore Opposition to Pacific Flats Development

-----Original Message-----
From: schmitzmay@aol.com
To: pjbelfiore@yahoo.com
Cc: mnekich@mn.rr.com; bhaislet@yahoo.com; mkusy@phd.antioch.edu; fritzkroll@edinarealty.com
Sent: Tue, 1 Aug 2006 5:35 PM
Subject: Re: Belfiore Opposition to Pacific Flats Development

Rebecca, please register that I strongly agree with Peter Belfiore's response to the Pacific Flats EAW and am opposed to the Pacific Flats Project in its current design configurations. We agree with the City's precedent of limiting building height (currently capping out at 6 stories within the confines of this block) in this neighborhood to integrate into the existing architectural environment.

Thank you for registering this position.

Bob Schmitz
President
Rock Island Lofts Associaiton
111 4th Av N #603
Minneapolis, MN

-----Original Message-----
From: pjbelfiore@yahoo.com
To: lberghs@mn.rr.com; schmitzmay@aol.com
Sent: Mon, 31 Jul 2006 12:07 PM
Subject: Fwd: RE: Belfiore Opposition to Pacific Flats Development

Note: forwarded message attached.

Attached Message
From: Rebecca.Farrar@ci.minneapolis.mn.us
To: pjbelfiore@yahoo.com
Subject: RE: Belfiore Opposition to Pacific Flats Development
Date: Mon, 31 Jul 2006 09:11:01 -0500

Hi Peter- I received your comments, and yes they are in time for the 30-day comment period for the EAW. Thank you.

Becca Farrar
Senior Planner - Development Services
Community Planning & Economic Development (CPED)
City of Minneapolis
Room 300 Public Service Center
250 S. Fourth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55415
ph: 612.673.3594
fax: 612.673.2526
rebecca.farrar@ci.minneapolis.mn.us

-----Original Message-----
From: Peter Belfiore [mailto:pjbelfiore@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, July 28, 2006 8:27 PM
To: Rebecca.Farrar.@ci.minneapolis.mn.us
Cc: Goodman, Lisa R; Lynn Berghs; schmitzmay@aol.com
Subject: Belfiore Opposition to Pacific Flats Development

Dear Ms. Farrar:
Please see attached file.
Thank you for your help
Sincerely,
Peter Belfiore

Check out AOL.com today. Breaking news, video search, pictures, email and IM. All on demand. Always Free.

Farrar, Rebecca D.

From: Antosz, Nicole (Minneapolis) [Nicole.Antosz@WatsonWyatt.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 01, 2006 6:02 PM
To: Farrar, Rebecca D.
Subject: FW: Opposition to Pacific Flats Development

Rebecca:

I am a North Loop resident who is in full support of the statements made by Mr. Belfiore in the attached letter. I strongly oppose the pacific plats development (both alternative one and two). In 2004 I spent countless hours researching Minneapolis city condo and loft alternatives and specifically choose the North Loop neighborhood for its distinctive character and distance from the skyscrapers of downtown. I anticipated that this neighborhood would be preserved, as discussed in the Historic Preservation Guidelines of the City of Minneapolis and would give my full support to upholding these guidlelines. If you have any questions in regards to this statement, please don't hesitate to contact me. My contact information is provided below. Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Nicole Antosz
111 4th Avenue North, Suite 405
Minneapolis, MN 55401
952-221-1198
nicole.antosz@watsonwyatt.com

-----Original Message-----
From: pjbelfiore@yahoo.com
To: Rebecca.Farrar.@ci.minneapolis.mn.us
Cc: lisa.goodman@ci.minneapolis.mn.us; lberghs@mn.rr.com; schmitzmay@aol.com
Sent: Fri, 28 Jul 2006 8:27 PM
Subject: Belfiore Opposition to Pacific Flats Development

Dear Ms. Farrar:
Please see attached file.
Thank you for your help
Sincerely,
Peter Belfiore

Check out AOL.com today. Breaking news, video search, pictures, email and IM. All on demand. Always Free.

Farrar, Rebecca D.

From: glbmisc [glbmisc@earthlink.net]
Sent: Wednesday, August 02, 2006 9:44 AM
To: Farrar, Rebecca D.
Subject: Opposition to Pacific Flats Development

Pacific_Flats_2--Peter's_Revis...

Dear Ms. Farrar:

I was going to write my own message to you to state my opposition to the Pacific Flats development, but, upon reading Peter`s letter, I decided that I could not state my feelings more clearly than he did. Please accept this email as a demonstration of support of Peter`s sentiments and my own opposition to the Pacific Flats development. I feel very strongly about preserving the historic nature of our neighborhood....not just for those that live there, but for the entire city.

Sincerely,

Gary Baardsgaard

111 4th Ave N, Unit 505
Minneapolis, MN 55401

>
>
>-
>
>-----Original Message-----
>From: pjbelfiore@yahoo.com
>To: Rebecca.Farrar.@ci.minneapolis.mn.us
>Cc: lisa.goodman@ci.minneapolis.mn.us; lberghs@mn.rr.com;
>schmitzmay@aol.com
>Sent: Fri, 28 Jul 2006 8:27 PM
>Subject: Belfiore Opposition to Pacific Flats Development
>
>
>Dear Ms. Farrar:
> Please see attached file.
> Thank you for your help
> Sincerely,
> Peter Belfiore
>
>
>
>Check out AOL.com today. Breaking news, video search, pictures, email
>and IM. All on demand. Always Free.
>_____
>Check out AOL.com today. Breaking news, video search, pictures, email and IM. All on demand. Always Free.

Farrar, Rebecca D.

From: Rohit Cariappa [rohit.cariappa@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 02, 2006 12:16 AM
To: Farrar, Rebecca D.
Subject: Pacific Flats Development

Dear Ms Farrar:

We would like to add our voices in agreement to Minneapolis North Loop residents Elizabeth and Peter Belfiores well stated opposition to the Pacific Flats Development. We are especially concerned about the height of the 28 storey condo tower. It is totally out of character for our neighborhood. This tower will stick out like a sore thumb and no amount of lipstick or lipservice can hide this architectural pig. We are not averse to the hotel and the the smaller (in height) 18 storey building but the height of the 28 storey tower is an affront to the aesthetics of our neighborhood.

Rohit and Sanjita Cariappa
Rock Island Lofts #605
111 4th Ave N
Minneapolis, MN 55401

August 3, 2006

Ms. Rebecca Farrar, Senior Planner
Minneapolis Planning Division
Community Planning & Economic Development Department
210 City Hall
350 S. 5th Street
Minneapolis, MN 55415

Dear Ms. Farrar,

Please add our names to the list of North Loop residents opposed to the Pacific Flats Development. We wholeheartedly agree with the sentiments expressed by Elizabeth and Peter Belfiore in their earlier statement and we have a few additional issues to point out.

We are very concerned about the housing mix should the Pacific Flats Development go through. At a neighborhood meeting we attended, a developer stated that no rental units would be available unless the 40-story tower was approved. Are we to assume no low or mid-cost condominium units will be available either? The answer was not forthcoming at that meeting. If high cost units predominate, rent for commercial space in the development will no doubt be very high. If this happens, it's quite possible independent small business owners would not be able to rent space, nor keep what they have now in the existing buildings on site. This, of course, would open the door to large chain operations who could afford the rent.

A neighborhood's character is built by the commercial enterprises within it, as much as the housing mix and the unique architecture. To inundate the North Loop neighborhood with chain stores would be to take away the old world charm and create nothing more than a downtown "suburban" mall. If a development on the Pacific Flats site adheres to the existing historic guidelines, if architecture is built on a small scale, perhaps the small business owner won't be driven out and will, as in other historic cities, do much to increase the charm of the area.

Please reject the Pacific Flats Development as it is currently proposed, and help us keep our historic neighborhood intact.

Thank you very much.

Charles A. Haislet
Barbara Haislet
Rock Island Lofts

Farrar, Rebecca D.

From: Janel Russell [janel@janelrusselldesigns.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 02, 2006 12:46 PM
To: Farrar, Rebecca D.
Subject: Pacific Flats EAW

Hello,
I am a resident/owner of a home in Rock Island Lofts. I am writing to make known my opposition to the Pacific Flats project. The following bullets are short and to the point of expressing how I feel.

1. The North Loop is a warehouse district, which is why I purchased here. This is what makes our neighborhood unique. If I had wanted to live amongst the sky scrapers I would have moved in to the central or southern area of the city.
2. Why does this group think they are above the standards set by the national and local historical society's? If others who have built before them have had to adhere to the standards why shouldn't the flats be held to the same? Again, after all it's a warehouse district.
3. There are only a few ways in and out of our neighborhood, the number of people moving into the proposed Flats residences together with 222 and the Eclipse is staggering... I fear gridlock during rush hours and very heavy traffic all other hours.
4. I actually believe that the height of both the Eclipse and 222 are inappropriate for our neighborhood even though they are on the perimeter of our neighborhood. To plant even a 10 story building in our neighborhood is too much. Too much darkness.

I actually love the idea of a boutique hotel and the additional businesses the Flats propose. There must be a way that this can be achieved without a looming tower that changes the look of our unique neighborhood and brings far to many people into our special district.

Thanks for the opportunity to let you know how I feel.

Janel Russell

Farrar, Rebecca D.

From: Scott_Young@irco.com
Sent: Tuesday, August 01, 2006 11:54 PM
To: Farrar, Rebecca D.
Cc: schmitzmay@aol.com
Subject: Pacific Block Mixed Use Development Concerned Neighbor

Ms. Farrar,

I am a concerned resident in the historic North Loop district. I have reviewed the EAW and attachments for the Pacific Block mixed use development and feel that the pictures say a thousand words. If you look at the pictures for the proposed project it shows how this development is out of scale for the neighborhood and surrounding buildings.

I am not against progress and development of the downtown area, but I feel that new development should remain within the architectural character of the north loop district, which this project does not. Allowing this project to pass through would be unfair to every other developer and home owner that has tried to maintain the integrity of this beautiful area of downtown.

Best Regards,
Scott Young

210 N. 2nd Street #504
Minneapolis, MN 55401

Scott Young
Ingersoll-Rand Company
PO Box 582205
Minneapolis, MN 55458-2205
Cell: 612-799-8095
Fax: 612-284-2555
E-Mail: Scott_Young@irco.com

The information contained in this message is privileged and intended only for the recipients named. If the reader is not a representative of the intended recipient, any review, dissemination or copying of this message or the information it contains is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify the sender, and delete the original message and attachments.

210 N 2nd Street, #404
Minneapolis, MN 55401
952-261-9716
cpoock@winthrop.com

Ms. Rebecca Farrar
City of Minneapolis
Rebecca.Farrar@ci.minneapolis.mn.us

Re: Pacific Flats Project--Comments Sent Via E-Mail to Rebecca Farrar

Dear Ms. Farrar:

We strongly oppose the Pacific Flats project. My boyfriend and I purchased a loft in the Whitney Square warehouse building in January. We totally agree with Elizabeth and Peter Belfiore's well-stated response. Either one of the proposed developments (28 story or 40 story) would destroy the character of the Warehouse District. All views of the beautiful downtown scenery and lights would be taken away for everyone from 2nd Street to the river. This is the entire reason we bought where we did (old time feel / history of the warehouse generation and the beautiful view out our window of downtown, which would be totally taken away by either the 28 or 40 story new construction sky scraper). This construction would also hinder the value of many apartments/lofts in the area.

It would be wonderful to keep the Warehouse District feel and develop living which gives that same character. Please preserve the history of this area and the wonderful privilege everyone who lives here has to be a part of it.

Sincerely yours,

Cheri Poock

Farrar, Rebecca D.

From: Gina [bebycik@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 02, 2006 4:27 PM
To: Farrar, Rebecca D.
Cc: schmitzmay@aol.com
Subject: Pacific Flats Development feedback

Ms. Farrar,
I am writing to you in regards to the community feedback on the proposed Pacific Flats Development. I am a North Loop resident and a home owner (I reside in Whitney Square, 210 N 2nd St Apt 208). I would like to express my full agreement with the points raised in the letter of Peter Belfiore he had sent you on this topic.

If you have any questions or would like further feedback from me, feel free to email me back or call me at 651.253.5478.

Sincerely,
Gina Melekh
North Loop Resident

Farrar, Rebecca D.

From: Joshua Brueggeman [Joshua.Brueggeman@RyanCompanies.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 02, 2006 9:12 AM
To: Farrar, Rebecca D.
Cc: Poock, Cheri
Subject: Pacific Flats Developement

Dear Rebecca,

I live in the Whitney Square building in the Warehouse district on the corner of 2nd ave North and 2nd street North. I recently read a letter put together by Peter Belfiore, and I am in total agreement with this statement. The proposition of any buildings within this neighborhood which are higher than any of the surrounding buildings, and out of style with any of the surrounding architecture would be a complete shame. Americans historically cannot pride ourselves on having a long historical architectural history like much of Europe so we need to try as much as we can and preserve what we do have. There are plenty of new developments within the warehouse district that have had to comply with all of the guidelines of fitting within a historic district like this; so allowing a developer to come in and skew perception of the public by making comments that are completely false is ridiculous. There are plenty of areas where a tall tower might fit in within our city, but it is definitely not within the warehouse district.

I happen to work for a construction/architecture/development firm that has to deal with city council and planning commission meetings all of the time, and we are forced to defend the reasoning why certain projects should be allowed to be constructed. It's one thing to design and build a skyscraper within and near other skyscrapers, but to propose something like this next to a lot of low rise historic buildings is preposterous.

My girlfriend and I recently purchased a unit in our building with a downtown view fully understanding that the 1 story building across the street, and the nearby parking lots have the definite possibility of being developed into other buildings. We did not on the other hand think that something out-of-scale with the neighborhood would be proposed, and possibly passed. These concepts for development would not only ruin our views of downtown, and everyone else's in the area, it will destroy the feel of the neighborhood. Thank you so much for hearing my voice, and the voices of anyone else in this matter. Thank you.

JOSHUA R. BRUEGGEMAN
GRADUATE ARCHITECT

Farrar, Rebecca D.

From: kathleen Murphy [kathleenmurphy@earthlink.net]
Sent: Wednesday, August 02, 2006 7:27 PM
To: Farrar, Rebecca D.
Cc: Goodman, Lisa R; lberghs@mn.rr.com; schmitzmay@aol.com; pjbelfiore@yahoo.com
Subject: I Oppose the Pacific Flats Development

Dear Ms. Farrar:

In addition to the objections to the Pacific Flats Development articulated by Elizabeth and Peter Belfiore, dated August 2, 2006, we are writing to add the following comments in opposition to this development:

We own a loft in the Historic Itasca Building, at 708 N. 1st St., and have lived there since 1995. When we moved in, what is now River Station used to be the dumping grounds for Minneapolis' snow. Although we have enjoyed watching the development around us, we have become alarmed at the number of residential developments that now glut the housing market in the Northloop neighborhood. It is now time for the city leadership to carefully scrutinize and rein in future developments, so that existing property values remain competitive, and downtown neighborhoods do not turn into concrete and glass compounds.

We love living in the Warehouse District. It's historical architecture charmed us, as I'm sure it has charmed others. The Pacific Flats Development is neither necessary nor appropriate for the Northloop Neighborhood. The tall buildings would diminish the exceptional masonry and architecture of existing structures. There would be nothing to distinguish the Warehouse District from any other urban area. Does the City of Minneapolis really want to turn its back on its commitment to history? Does Minneapolis really want to cave in to developers who are not interested in honoring the architectural integrity of the Warehouse District?

We hope not.

We urge the City of Minneapolis to REJECT the Pacific Flats Project.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Kathleen M. Murphy
Deborah A. Thorp
708 N. 1st St., #321
Minneapolis, MN 55401
612-204-0764
kathleenmurphy@earthlink.net

Farrar, Rebecca D.

From: schmitzmay@aol.com
Sent: Wednesday, August 02, 2006 12:52 PM
To: Farrar, Rebecca D.
Subject: Fwd: Pacific Flats

Scott is attempting to respond to the EAW.

Tx

-----Original Message-----
From: scoran@coranvisual.com
To: lisa.goodman@ci.minneapolis.mn.us; lberghs@mn.rr.com; schmitzmay@aol.com; pjbelfiore@yahoo.com
Sent: Wed, 2 Aug 2006 11:12 AM
Subject: Pacific Flats

My name is Scott Coran. I live in the 212 Lofts, on First street in Minneapolis.

I am absolutely against the Pacific Flats project.

I agree with every point raised by Elizabeth and Peter Belfiore.

I moved to this part of Minneapolis for many reasons. At the top of my list, was that this specific region was 95% residential. I always refer to this part of the North Loop as our quiet, part of Downtown. The neighborhood, is a warm, sociable and amiable feeling. The historic Warehouse District, had and will have a large part in the great history of Minneapolis. Everyone here not only loves to walk around the area, but when we do, we look at the beauty and charm of these remarkable buildings. A place to talk to other residents of our neighborhood. A real sense of a community. Like no other place in the whole downtown district. The Pacific Flats Project would ruin the quaintness of what this neighborhood is.

The large building, not only will physically overshadow our neighborhood, but with all the retail stores, hotel guests, and hundreds and hundreds of new occupants, this area's ambiance would be ruined. A change that will forever destroy the history of the Warehouse District.

After allowing this (these) projects to be built, and intruding in our charming, friendly AND SAFE neighborhood, it WILL open the door for others with political clout, and resources, to over ride the Preservation Acts that are now in place. These acts are specifically made to save neighborhoods like this. Should the Stone Arch Bridge be removed and a more efficient bridge be built in it's place? Should all the historic mills that show the birth of this great city's history be demolished to have tall condos and retail stores be substituted? NO! The city council have made sure that those areas on both sides of the river are preserved to reflect how Minneapolis became the great city that it is today. We are consistently rated as one of the top places to live in the nation. Part of that analysis is the overall high standard of living.
Attractions, leisure activities, cultural options, parks, and of course our lakes and rivers. People both locally and visitors from all over the world, naturally come down to the Mississippi River to see the natural beauty. The Pacific Flats Project will take away from the aura of Minneapolis' life story.

There is no river with more history in the United States. If the river front neighborhoods becomes a mecca of high rise structures, all the natural beauty of the Mississippi will be destroyed, for ever.

There are so many reasons why the Pacific Flats Project should NOT be built. The additional traffic, pollution and city waste (trash in the streets and alleys, etc.), will change the character of the historic Warehouse District. We are part of Minneapolis' fiber. We MUST maintain the historic atmosphere. The Pacific Flats will cast a hugh shadow on the historic atmosphere, both scenically and literally.

This project must be rejected by the city planning board, and other bodies who has the power to issue permits to erect buildings of over 6 stories in this entire historic district.

Don't ruin a part of Minneapolis' grand character. Saving the buildings of this historic area, and not building large skyscrapers, will ensure generations to come, a place where people can come and view the wonderful history of one our nation's greatest cities. This is where the city of Minneapolis was born. You must do everything in your power to maintain it's integrity.
Once it's gone...it's gone.

Sincerely,

Scott Coran
Coran Visual
212 First Street North
Loft #501
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401
scoran@coranvisual.com
Phone: 612.340.0004
Fax: 612.340.0003
Mobile: 612.801.3675

--

This transmission from Coran Visual may
contain information that is confidential, be protected by
the artist-client nondisclosure agreement
or other applicable privileges, or constitute non-public
information. It is intended to be conveyed only to the
designated recipient(s). If you are not the addressee,
note that any disclosure, distribution or use of the
contents of this message (including any attachments
or electronic links) may be prohibited. Use, dissemination,
distribution, or reproduction of this message by
unintended recipients is not authorized and may be unlawful.
If you received this transmission in error, please destroy it
and notify us immediately at scoran@coranvisual.com .
Because e-mail can be altered electronically, the integrity
of this communication cannot be guaranteed

=

Check out AOL.com today. Breaking news, video search, pictures, email and IM. All on demand. Always Free.

Farrar, Rebecca D.

From: Jason Rohrbaugh [JRohrbaugh@victorysales.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 02, 2006 3:55 PM
To: Farrar, Rebecca D.
Cc: schmitzmay@aol.com; Goodman, Lisa R; lberghs@mn.rr.com
Subject: FW: Belfiore Opposition to Pacific Flats Development

Rebecca,
I have read through the attachment and agree with all of the statements made by Peter. I work in the suburbs and live downtown at the 212 lofts. I've had conversations with neighbors and I can say that my feelings as well as the folks I've talked to are pretty strong on this subject. This is the sort of issue that affects voting choices.

Sincerely,

Jason

****
Jason Rohrbaugh
Account Manager
Victory Sales
1210 Northland Dr. Suite 175
Mendota Heights, MN 55120
(651) 209-8933- phone
(651) 994-6978- fax
(651) 994-6890-main
jrohrbaugh@victorysales.com
****

From: schmitzmay@aol.com [mailto:schmitzmay@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 02, 2006 3:30 PM
To: Andovergrp@aol.com
Subject: Fwd: Belfiore Opposition to Pacific Flats Development

See Peter's attachment. It's a great example of the type of comments one might make re: this project. If you can't get to writing your own comments, I encourage you to tag on to Peter's by simply sending a response back to Rebecca Farrar indicating your "in agreement" with P.Belfiore's response.

Please note that Rebecca's correct e-mail address does not have a "." after Farrar.

Tx,

Bob

-----Original Message-----
From: pjbelfiore@yahoo.com
To: Rebecca.Farrar.@ci.minneapolis.mn.us
Cc: lisa.goodman@ci.minneapolis.mn.us; lberghs@mn.rr.com; schmitzmay@aol.com
Sent: Fri, 28 Jul 2006 8:27 PM
Subject: Belfiore Opposition to Pacific Flats Development

Dear Ms. Farrar:
Please see attached file.
Thank you for your help

Sincerely,
Peter Belfiore

Check out AOL.com today. Breaking news, video search, pictures, email and IM. All on demand. Always Free.

Farrar, Rebecca D.

From: Loren Bolstridge [lorenthree@earthlink.net]
Sent: Wednesday, August 02, 2006 8:48 AM
To: Farrar, Rebecca D.
Cc: schmitzmay@aol.com
Subject: Pacific Flats Development Comment

You have received many impassioned and well phrased comments about the potential monstrosity of the proposed Pacific Flats development (ironic name, isn't it). However, if in fact that corner of the block is zoned high rise with a given density, there's not much that impassioned pleas can do to stop it. The real issue is the zoning in the first place. Much of downtown was razed in the middle of the last century to get rid of the "skid row" environment and make way for "urban renewal". I believe that all or part of the Pacific Flats block was rezoned in the 80s to include high rise high density development consistent with that mid-century idea of what constituted good urban planning. It should be obvious to anyone with a sense of market forces that there is a new paradigm of urban renewal and a new aesthetic for what constitutes desireable urban living. Even le Corbusier regrets some of the ultra-high-density high rises he built on the outskirts of Paris. The existing and ongoing developments in the warehouse district mirror that new aesthetic beautifully, with the Bookman, and other loft developments being good examples.

The real question then is: are the three blocks in question from Hennepin to Third Ave between Washington and Second Street properly zoned? The first block on Hennepin - that makes sense to have that higher rise and higher density. It's across the street from the Towers, in line with the Churchill, and would tie in with the Crossings - all high rise developments. The next two blocks are not as obvious, especially because they already contain historic period warehouse and mercantile structures that define the Warehouse District.

It makes no sense to have one-eighth of a block zoned for the type of high rise that Pacific not-so-Flats envisions, when the remainder of that block, and all the surrounding blocks, are zoned for lower heights, lower densities, and historic significance. It seems that it would be in the best interests of the City of Minneapolis, the North Loop neighborhood, the Warehouse District, historic preservationists, and those of us who live across the street, to rezone that parcel to be consistent with the remainder of that block.

Thanks.

- Loren

Farrar, Rebecca D.

From: Katherine Gee [katherinea.gee@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 02, 2006 1:51 PM
To: Farrar, Rebecca D.
Subject: Fwd: Belfiore Opposition to Pacific Flats Development

Hello, I am aware of the comments put together by Peter, and I agree with him. Pacific Flats would be a detriment to our neighborhood, especially as it doesn't fit w/ the character of the neighborhood. Thank you.
---------- Forwarded message ----------

-----Original Message-----
From: pjbelfiore@yahoo.com
To: lberghs@mn.rr.com; schmitzmay@aol.com
Sent: Mon, 31 Jul 2006 12:07 PM
Subject: Fwd: RE: Belfiore Opposition to Pacific Flats Development

Note: forwarded message attached.
Attached Message
From: Rebecca.Farrar@ci.minneapolis.mn.us
To: pjbelfiore@yahoo.com
Subject: RE: Belfiore Opposition to Pacific Flats Development
Date: Mon, 31 Jul 2006 09:11:01 -0500
Hi Peter- I received your comments, and yes they are in time for the 30-day comment period for the EAW. Thank you.

Becca Farrar
Senior Planner - Development Services
Community Planning & Economic Development (CPED)
City of Minneapolis
Room 300 Public Service Center
250 S. Fourth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55415
ph: 612.673.3594
fax: 612.673.2526
rebecca.farrar@ci.minneapolis.mn.us

-----Original Message-----
From: Peter Belfiore [mailto: pjbelfiore@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, July 28, 2006 8:27 PM
To: Rebecca.Farrar.@ci.minneapolis.mn.us
Cc: Goodman, Lisa R; Lynn Berghs; schmitzmay@aol.com
Subject: Belfiore Opposition to Pacific Flats Development

Dear Ms. Farrar:

Please see attached file.
Thank you for your help
Sincerely,
Peter Belfiore

Check out AOL.com today. Breaking news, video search, pictures, email and IM. All on demand. Always Free.

Farrar, Rebecca D.

From: Kris Lang [kllang@mn.rr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 01, 2006 9:35 PM
To: Farrar, Rebecca D.
Subject: Pacific Flats Development project

Ms. Farrar - I agree with Mr. Woelfel's comments. I am opposed to the Pacific Flats development project and the negative impact it will have on the neighborhood.

Kristina Lang

-----Original Message-----
From: Bryan Woelfel [mailto:bwoelfel@mn.rr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 01, 2006 9:31 PM
To: Kris Lang
Subject: FW: Pacific Flats

Kris - FYI

-----Original Message-----
From: Bryan Woelfel [mailto:bwoelfel@mn.rr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 01, 2006 9:26 PM
To: Rebecca.Farrar@ci.minneapolis.mn.us
Cc: pjbelfiore@yahoo.com; lisa.goodman@ci.minneapolis.mn.us
Subject: Pacific Flats

Ms. Farrar - I would like to express my opposition to the proposed development project called Pacific Flats. The project simply does not fit in the historic warehouse district. I chose to live in this area because of the charm of the old buildings and natural feeling of the current architecture. I do not want that to be inured be the introduction of any building that does not fit the character. The only group that benefits from the project is the developer by gaining profit. The types of services which they claim to bring should come to the district in the form of integration with the surroundings, not destruction of it.

The current zoning codes and historic preservation ideals should be kept in place. When a developer asks for a variance to the building code, that should only be granted when it is deemed overwhelmingly for the betterment of the community. When a few people complain, the city needs to take notice; when tens of people oppose it, the city must think hard about it; when scores of people organize and express their opposition, the city must deny it; when over one 100 people sign a petition against it, the city must perform it's duty and protect the interests of it's citizens.

I also agree with the statements previously delivered to you by Mr. Peter Belfiore.

Thank you for your attention in this matter,

Bryan Woelfel

Farrar, Rebecca D.

From: Bryan Woelfel [bwoelfel@mn.rr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 01, 2006 9:26 PM
To: Farrar, Rebecca D.
Cc: pjbelfiore@yahoo.com; Goodman, Lisa R
Subject: Pacific Flats

Ms. Farrar - I would like to express my opposition to the proposed development project called Pacific Flats. The project simply does not fit in the historic warehouse district. I chose to live in this area because of the charm of the old buildings and natural feeling of the current architecture. I do not want that to be inured be the introduction of any building that does not fit the character. The only group that benefits from the project is the developer by gaining profit. The types of services which they claim to bring should come to the district in the form of integration with the surroundings, not destruction of it.

The current zoning codes and historic preservation ideals should be kept in place. When a developer asks for a variance to the building code, that should only be granted when it is deemed overwhelmingly for the betterment of the community. When a few people complain, the city needs to take notice; when tens of people oppose it, the city must think hard about it; when scores of people organize and express their opposition, the city must deny it; when over one 100 people sign a petition against it, the city must perform it's duty and protect the interests of it's citizens.

I also agree with the statements previously delivered to you by Mr. Peter Belfiore.

Thank you for your attention in this matter,

Bryan Woelfel

Farrar, Rebecca D.

From: Dave [dave@reliablemortgage.net]
Sent: Tuesday, August 01, 2006 12:21 PM
To: Farrar, Rebecca D.
Subject: FW: Belfiore Opposition to Pacific Flats Development

Rebecca,
Please see my comments to the proposed Pacific Flats Development.

Thank You,
Dave Radant
Reliable Mortgage Inc.
-----Original Message-----
From: schmitzmay@aol.com [mailto:schmitzmay@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 01, 2006 11:11 AM
To: dave@reliablemortgage.net
Cc: mnekich@mn.rr.com; bhaislet@yahoo.com; mkusy@phd.antioch.edu; fritzkroll@edinarealty.com
Subject: Re: Belfiore Opposition to Pacific Flats Development

Dave, thanks for your comments and support. It would make a difference if you would follow-up on P Belfiore's statement to Rebecca Farrer. Just forward your support Peter's state,ment to rebecca. It makes a difference!! Plus, you've just reminded me to do the same...

Tx,

Bob

-----Original Message-----
From: dave@reliablemortgage.net
To: schmitzmay@aol.com
Sent: Tue, 1 Aug 2006 11:27 AM
Subject: RE: Belfiore Opposition to Pacific Flats Development

I agree with everything that you oppose in your response to Rebecca Farrar. Frankly, I can't believe that the city would even consider such a development in the warehouse district. I would have never bought at RI lofts if I would have known that something like this could be built on a historic site. I'm of the opinion that if built, our property values will drop in an already saturated condo market and I'm afraid of the precedent that it would set for other developers in the neighborhood. Their proposal is simply grossly out of character with the neighborhood. As a mortgage company owner, I'm experienced with real estate valuations and trends.

Also, I overheard representatives for the developer talking about us over at Dunn Brothers the other day. They think we are an annoyance and pushovers. They plan on doing a mass area mailing soon to residents and businesses to tout the benefits of the project and to support it. They are now gathering a list. We need to be ready to make a stand. We need all the residents in the properties around us to band together. I hope that this is being done. Let me know if you need anything from me.
Thanks,
Dave
-----Original Message-----
From: schmitzmay@aol.com [mailto:schmitzmay@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, July 31, 2006 7:29 PM
To: Andovergrp@aol.com
Subject: Fwd: Belfiore Opposition to Pacific Flats Development

Peter's suggested action.

Bob

-----Original Message-----
From: schmitzmay@aol.com
To: Andovergrp@aol.com
Sent: Sun, 30 Jul 2006 1:27 PM
Subject: Fwd: Belfiore Opposition to Pacific Flats Development

FYI - Peter has a number of suggestions that may be helpful.

Bob Schmitz

-----Original Message-----
From: pjbelfiore@yahoo.com
To: schmitzmay@aol.com
Cc: esb@umn.edu
Sent: Sun, 30 Jul 2006 1:08 PM
Subject: Re: Belfiore Opposition to Pacific Flats Development

Hi, Bob:
Yes, let's be sure that people see whatever objections we have.
I should note that my first sending of our statement came back because of a typo in Farrar's e-mail address--there should be no dot after "Farrar"; however, I then forwarded the whole thing to her again, at <Rebecca.Farrar@ci.minneapolis.mn.us>.
I think that even if a person does not write up their own statement, they could always forward ours to Farrar, saying that they agree. Or they could just e-mail Farrar saying they agree with our statement. The point is, redundancy and repetition are good--it seems to me--and of course the additional name of someone opposed to the development is new information.
Wish Betty and I had had the time to be even more thorough, but we tried.
Thanks,
Peter Belfiore

schmitzmay@aol.com wrote:

> Peter, don't recall whether I commented on this response to the EAW -- It's very well stated! I've distributed your piece to our e-mail recipient list in the hope that others will respond in-kind.
>
> Thanks!
>
> Bob
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: pjbelfiore@yahoo.com
> To: Rebecca.Farrar.@ci.minneapolis.mn.us
> Cc: lisa.goodman@ci.minneapolis.mn.us; lberghs@mn.rr.com; schmitzmay@aol.com
> Sent: Fri, 28 Jul 2006 8:27 PM
> Subject: Belfiore Opposition to Pacific Flats Development
>
> Dear Ms. Farrar:

Please see attached file.
Thank you for your help
Sincerely,
Peter Belfiore

Check out AOL.com today. Breaking news, video search, pictures, email and IM. All on demand. Always Free.

Farrar, Rebecca D.

From: Jennifer Lutgen [jlutgen@plusrelocation.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 02, 2006 4:07 PM
To: Farrar, Rebecca D.
Subject: Re: Pacific Flats Project--Our Comments Sent Via E-Mail to Rebecca Farrar

Ms. Rebecca Farrar, Senior Planner
City of Minneapolis
Rebecca.Farrar@ci.minneapolis.mn.us

Re: Pacific Flats Project--Our Comments Sent Via E-Mail to Rebecca Farrar

Dear Ms. Farrar:

I am writing with requests to the Pacific Flats Project. As a resident of the Warehouse District I would like to share with you my strong opposition to this development. It would have multiple negative effects that I do not believe out –weight the positive. I am sure you can understand our desire as residents in the community to preserve the architectural and scenic integrity of the downtown area, particularly the ware house district. In addition, I strong believe it will have an adverse affect on day to day as well as financial aspects of the current resident's lives. We will have a significant increase in the local population which will affect things such as parking availability (which is already at a premium most nights), increased traffic, etc. In addition, with the addition 450 additional units on the condo market place, the desirability of my own home will be dramatically affected with the additional saturation of an already saturated condo market. We already have vacant condos, what will happen if we added 450 more to the market??

As a long time resident and fan of the city of Minneapolis, I must strenuously plead with you to take these comments as well as the comments of my fellow neighbors into consideration when reviewing the Pacific Flats Project proposal.

Regards,

Jennifer Lutgen
Team Leader, Client Services

Plus Relocation Services, Inc.
600 Hwy 169 South, Suite 550
Minneapolis, MN 55426
T 888.251.2825
D 952.512.5508
F 952.593.2748
After Hours Emergency 612.716.2302

Find your personalized website: www.smoothconnection.com
For more information about our company: www.plusrelocation.com

DISCLAIMER: The information in this message is intended solely for the addressee(s) and may contain confidential or legally privileged information. Access to this message by anyone other than the addressee(s) is unauthorized. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, or disruption of the message, or any action or omission taken by you in reliance on it, is prohibited and may be unlawful. Please immediately contact the sender if you have received this message in error. Thank you.

Farrar, Rebecca D.

From: Aaron Whitney [aaron_whitney@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 02, 2006 1:28 PM
To: Farrar, Rebecca D.
Subject: RE: FW: Pacific Flats

Ms. Farrar-
As a Minneapolis resident and homeowner...and frequent visitor to the warehouse district/North Loop Neighbohood and patron of it's commercial establishments, I would like to emphatically support the statements made by Mr. Woelfel, below. While so many areas of downtown are presently experiencing wonderful redevelopment (which I support), far too few are experiencing historically-significant or -accurate redevelopment...the exception to this rule, in my humble opinion, is the warehouse district/North Loop.

Few people, in my estimation, oppose the Pacific Flats or its developer outright. Most, I imagine, support redevelopment as much as I. Your citizens are merely asking that the building fit the neighborhood, and that it be generally-accepted as a positive addition rather than a detriment. I do not believe this project fits either of those stipulations.

Regards,
Aaron Whitney
Minneapolis, MN

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Bryan Woelfel [mailto:bwoelfel@mn.rr.com]
> Sent: Tuesday, August 01, 2006 9:26 PM
> To: Rebecca.Farrar@ci.minneapolis.mn.us
> Cc: pjbelfiore@yahoo.com; lisa.goodman@ci.minneapolis.mn.us
> Subject: Pacific Flats
>
> Ms. Farrar - I would like to express my opposition to the proposed
> development project called Pacific Flats. The project simply does not
fit
> in the historic warehouse district. I chose to live in this area
because
> of the charm of the old buildings and natural feeling of the current
> architecture. I do not want that to be inured be the introduction of
any
> building that does not fit the character. The only group that
benefits
> from the project is the developer by gaining profit. The types of
> services which they claim to bring should come to the district in the
form
> of integration with the surroundings, not destruction of it.
>
> The current zoning codes and historic preservation ideals should be
kept
> in place. When a developer asks for a variance to the building code,
that
> should only be granted when it is deemed overwhelmingly for the
betterment
> of the community. When a few people complain, the city needs to take
> notice; when tens of people oppose it, the city must think hard about
it;
> when scores of people organize and express their opposition, the city
must
> deny it; when over one 100 people sign a petition against it, the city
> must perform it's duty and protect the interests of it's citizens.
>
> I also agree with the statements previously delivered to you by Mr.
Peter
> Belfiore.
>

> Thank you for your attention in this matter,
>
> Bryan Woelfel

Farrar, Rebecca D.

From: Bruce Rubin [b.rubin@rubincordaro.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 03, 2006 12:29 PM
To: Farrar, Rebecca D.
Cc: Goodman, Lisa R; Bob Schmitz; Peter Belfiore
Subject: Pacific Flats

Hello Rebecca,

In 1984, Jim Cordaro and I bought the Himmelsbach building at 115 N. 1st Street, in part, because we were mesmerized by the untouched historic nature of the neighborhood. Today, we still love living and working in the North Loop.

In 2001 — after an exhaustive 16 month rehab — we moved back into this award-winning space (Minneapolis Historic Preservation Commission — Adaptive Reuse, 2002 Preservation Award). We took great pains to renovate the building in an honest fashion so the historic Minneapolis would not be lost forever. We have also been pleased with how other developers have created new structures that work in harmony with the older buildings that are on every block.

For all of the reasons why we love the North Loop, we oppose the Pacific Flats project. Please note, we are not against development. We are against inappropriate development and Pacific Flats does not respect the character and scale of this neighborhood.

Furthermore, we also agree with all of the comments presented in the *Statement of Elizabeth and Peter Belfiore in Opposition to the Pacific Flats Project* (below) and ask that you please reject the Pacific Flats project.

Sincerely,

Bruce Rubin
Jim Cordaro

Rubin Cordaro Design
115 N. 1st Street
Minneapolis, MN 55401
612-343-0011
612-343-0012 Fax
www.rubincordaro.com

A visual communications firm helping businesses deliver effective messages through compelling design

9 North 4th Ave., #102
Minneapolis, MN 55401
612-359-6934
pjbelfiore@yahoo.com

Ms. Rebecca Farrar, Senior Planner
City of Minneapolis
Rebecca.Farrar@ci.minneapolis.mn.us

Re: Pacific Flats Project--Our Comments Sent Via E-Mail to Rebecca Farrar

Dear Ms. Farrar:

We strongly oppose the Pacific Flats project and request that you accept our following comments and pass them on to any city personnel who are part of the decision making process in connection with the Pacific Flats proposals.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth and Peter Belfiore

Statement of Elizabeth and Peter Belfiore in Opposition to the Pacific Flats Project

(Note: all references to the Environmental Assessment Worksheet--EAW--are to the EAW of June 27, 2006.)

We strongly oppose the Pacific Flats project because it violates both local and national historic district guidelines, it would architecturally and scenically corrupt historic sections of the City of Minneapolis, it would be unjust to other developers who have been forced to conform to the guidelines, it would increase traffic and other pollution, and it would discourage creative architectural development. Below are some further details of our reasons, divided into two parts: I, our immediate reactions as residents of the warehouse district (Renaissance on the River), and II, a few comments on parts of the EAW.

I--Our Immediate Reactions as Residents

--The projected buildings are not in keeping with the historical character of the North Loop neighborhood, a unique and charming area that we enjoy, and very much want to preserve. The historical character of this neighborhood was one of the reasons why we decided to move here in the first place, and not to the center of downtown. We enjoy, for example, walking to Moose and Sadie's and eating brunch, partly because of the surrounding, small-scale historical buildings. We would not enjoy doing so in the shadow of a skyscraper.

--The project will create a great deal of additional traffic in an already crowded area, and one that will become still more crowded after the new stadium is built.
--It would create a precedent for allowing other skyscraper buildings in the neighborhood, including, possibly, the Reserve right next door to us. It would be difficult and unjust for the City to deny others the right to build skyscrapers in this neighborhood.

--Allowing this development would be unfair to previous developers, who have respected the historical character of the neighborhood.

--The real estate market is already saturated. As a result, prices are going down and it is taking longer to sell units. Development on this scale will only make this situation worse, helping to depress the values of all of our homes.

--We do not think that the neighborhood would gain anything that would begin to compensate for the disadvantages of the project. We do not need another hotel or another furniture store in the neighborhood, or any of the other "amenities" that have been mentioned in connection with this project.

--Allowing this project to continue will discourage more creative architectural projects that respect our Historic Preservation guidelines and also add something new and lovely to the Warehouse District.

II--Comments on Parts of the EAW

--The project would occupy the Pacific Block, which, as the EAW states, "is within the National Register 'Minneapolis Historic District' and, except for one parcel, is within the 'North Loop Warehouse Area', a historic district designated by the City of Minneapolis." (City's cover sheet for the "Environmental Assessment Worksheet June 27, 2006.")

--The project would involve the demolition of all or part of protected buildings on the block. (See, for example, p. 6 of the EAW).

--The project's "Alternative One" and "Alternative Two" would each grossly violate the Historic Preservation Guidelines of the City of Minneapolis. Alternative One would plant a 28-story condo building on one part of the block, and an 18-story condo building on another part of the block. Alternative Two would plant a 40-story condo building on the small, allegedly exempt parcel on the block, and a 10-story condo building on another portion of the block. Both alternatives would thus place buildings grossly out of scale with the surrounding architecture of the neighborhood, and grossly violate Historic Preservation guidelines. Not only is the entire block within the protected area of the National Register, and at least most of the block within the local historic district, but even in the case of Alternative Two, in which a huge 40-story condo building which would be placed on an allegedly exempt parcel within the protected block, the huge tower is of course not only spatially but also physically connected to the rest of the project, which is, as noted, all

within the protected block. On the physical connection of the 40-story condo building to the rest of the project, the EAW notes: "As with the 28-story Condo Building, a common 4-story base...would connect the condominium structure to the rest of the development...." (EAW, page 5.) Alternative One at least does not claim the protection of an allegedly unprotected parcel within the protected, historic block.

The physical connection of the 40-story building to the rest of the project is relevant as highlighting the absurdity of denying that the huge 40-story condo building violates local historic district guidelines whether or not the parcel on which it stands is exempt. (According to the developer's cockamamie argument, Alternative Two--the 40-story, 10-story condo building alternative--complies with the local guidelines in that the 40-story condo building would reside on the "10% of the block excluded from the local historic district.") (EAW, page 3.)

Note that the developer concedes that Alternative One (28-story and 18-story condo buildings), its "preferred" alternative, violates historic preservation guidelines of Minneapolis, and that Alternative Two (40-story and 10-story condo buildings) will use a lot that is within the national district. (See, for example, EAW, pages 2-3.)

--An indication of how out of proportion the proposed buildings of the project would be, see, for example, page 9 of the EAW, which notes how the height of the proposed buildings compares with surrounding buildings, which would be dwarfed.

--As the EAW itself states, "The height of the proposed towers in both alternatives [28-story and 18-story condo buildings, and 40-story and 10-story condo building] is out of character with the surrounding local and national historic districts and will have a negative visual impact." (EAW, page 31.)

--On increased traffic and other pollution, the EAW seems quite sketchy; an Environmental Impact Statement would be called for if this project were not already blatantly and fatally flawed in numerous ways.

--The EAW states, concerning the project's purpose, that "The project will increase the opportunity for and diversity of living in downtown Minneapolis." (EAW, Page 7.) A more accurate statement would be: "The project's purpose is to make money by creating more spaces for the well-heeled to settle, whether permanently or for a few days in a boutique hotel." Any doubts concerning our translation of the developer's cynical reference to "diversity" may be resolved by reviewing the EAW, reviewing the project's promotional literature, and attending the developer's presentations. Surely "diversity of living" is not enhanced by, for example, stores selling "upscale furnishings" or "upscale clothing"--as described in a Pacific Flats promotional sheet.

We respectfully ask that the City of Minneapolis reject the Pacific Flats project, a project that would severely compromise one of our great historical districts, and diminish the quality of life of the City of Minneapolis.

Sincerely,
Elizabeth and Peter Belfiore

cc: Lisa Goodman, Lynn Berghs, Bob Schmitz

Farrar, Rebecca D.

From: Jim Cordaro [j.cordaro@rubincordaro.com]

Sent: Thursday, August 03, 2006 11:32 AM

To: Farrar, Rebecca D.

Subject: Pacific Flats project

Dear Ms. Farrar,
I am writing to voice my opposition to the proposed design of the Pacific Flats project. As a longtime resident of the North Loop neighborhood (22 years), I have been witness to much of the growth and development of the area. People come to this corner of the city for its historic character and neighborhood charm. The Pacific Flats project respects neither of these qualities. The size and height of the project is totally out of scale with the neighborhood and violates historic guidelines that have been respected by numerous other developments and renovations (including my own). These historic district guidelines were developed for a reason – to maintain the historic character of areas such as this neighborhood and to prevent projects such as this one from destroying that character. I am very much in favor of growth and development – as long as it is within the guidelines that have been developed and it adds to the character of a neighborhood. The Pacific Flats project does neither of these things.

Thank you for your time.

--
Jim Cordaro
Rubin Cordaro Design
115 N 1st Street
Minneapolis, MN 55401
612-343-0011
612-343-0012 fax
www.rubincordaro.com

A visual communications firm helping businesses deliver effective messages through compelling design

Farrar, Rebecca D.

From: sara nachreiner [sara@mitreboxframing.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 02, 2006 4:25 PM
To: Farrar, Rebecca D.
Subject: Flats issue

Hello Rebecca -
I just wanted to let you know that I am a business owner on Washington Avenue. I am opposed to the height of the Pacific Flats project within a historic district. Please add me to your list of those opposed to the height.

Thank you.

Sara Nachreiner
Mitrebox Framing Studio, LLC
213 Washington Ave N
Minneapolis, MN 55401

P:612.676.0696
F:612.676.0707

www.mitreboxframing.com

::Love it? Frame it::