

**Excerpt from the
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES**

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

250 South Fourth Street, Room 300
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1385
(612) 673-2597 Phone
(612) 673-2526 Fax
(612) 673-2157 TDD

MEMORANDUM

DATE: December 21, 2006

TO: Steve Poor, Manager, Community Planning & Economic Development -
Planning Division

FROM: Jason Wittenberg, Supervisor, Community Planning & Economic Development -
Planning Division, Development Services

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

SUBJECT: Planning Commission decisions of December 18, 2006

The following actions were taken by the Planning Commission on December 18, 2006. As you know, the Planning Commission's decisions on items other than rezonings, text amendments, vacations, 40 Acre studies and comprehensive plan amendments are final subject to a ten calendar day appeal period before permits can be issued:

Commissioners Present: President Motzenbecker, El-Hindi, Huynh, LaShomb, Nordyke, Norkus-Crampton, Schiff and Tucker – 8

Not Present: Henry-Blythe and Krueger

8. Van Cleve Court (BZZ-3345, PL-190, Vac-1477 and Vac-1478, Ward: 2), 901-941 13th Ave SE & 932 12th Ave SE (Janelle Widmeier).

A. Rezoning: Application by Shalaunda Holmes, on behalf of Van Cleve Court Development, LLC, for a rezoning petition to add the Industrial Living overlay district the properties located at 901-941 13th Ave SE & 932 12th Ave SE to allow a residential planned unit development with a mix of new construction and conversion of an existing building.

Action: The City Planning Commission recommended that the City Council adopt the findings and **approve** the petition to add the Industrial Living Overlay District to the properties of 901-941 13th Ave SE and 932 12th Ave SE.

B. Conditional Use Permit: Application by Shalaunda Holmes, on behalf of Van Cleve Court Development, LLC, for a conditional use permit to allow a planned residential development with a total of 236 dwelling units for properties located at 901-941 13th Ave SE & 932 12th Ave SE.

Action: The City Planning Commission adopted the findings and **approved** the application for a conditional use permit to allow a planned unit development with 236 dwelling units for the properties located at 901-941 13th Ave SE and 932 12th Ave SE, subject to the following condition:

1. All signs for individual buildings within the planned unit development shall comply with residential standards for multifamily dwellings on lots less than 40,000 square feet in area from Table 543-1 of the zoning code.

C. Conditional Use Permit: Application by Shalaunda Holmes, on behalf of Van Cleve Court Development, LLC, for a conditional use permit to allow supportive housing with 20 units for properties located at 901-941 13th Ave SE & 932 12th Ave SE.

Action: The City Planning Commission adopted the findings and **approved** the application for a conditional use permit to allow supportive housing serving 20 people for the properties located at 901-941 13th Ave SE and 932 12th Ave SE.

D. Variance: Application by Shalaunda Holmes, on behalf of Van Cleve Court Development, LLC, for a variance to reduce the interior side yard along the southwest property line adjacent to the railroad from 11 feet to 8.5 feet to allow a four story building for properties located at 901-941 13th Ave SE & 932 12th Ave SE.

Action: The City Planning Commission adopted the findings and **approved** the application for a variance to reduce the interior side yard along the South property line from 11 feet to 8.5 feet to allow Building A for the properties located at 901-941 13th Ave SE and 932 12th Ave SE.

E. Variance: Application by Shalaunda Holmes, on behalf of Van Cleve Court Development, LLC, for a variance to reduce the interior side yard along the north property line adjacent to the alley from 9 feet to 6 feet to allow a three story building for properties located at 901-941 13th Ave SE & 932 12th Ave SE.

Action: The City Planning Commission adopted the findings and **approved** the application for a variance to reduce the interior side yard along the North property line from 9 feet to 6 feet to allow Building B for the properties located at 901-941 13th Ave SE and 932 12th Ave SE.

F. Variance: Application by Shalaunda Holmes, on behalf of Van Cleve Court Development, LLC, for a variance to reduce the interior side yard along the southwest property line from 15 feet to 0 feet to allow an addition to the existing building for properties located at 901-941 13th Ave SE & 932 12th Ave SE.

Action: The City Planning Commission adopted the findings and **approved** the application for a variance to reduce the interior side yard along the Southwest property line from 15 feet

to 0 feet to allow an addition to Building F for the properties located at 901-941 13th Ave SE and 932 12th Ave SE.

G. Variance: Application by Shalaunda Holmes, on behalf of Van Cleve Court Development, LLC, for a variance to reduce the interior side yard along the southwest property line from 15 feet to 0 feet to allow balconies for properties located at 901-941 13th Ave SE & 932 12th Ave SE.

Action: The City Planning Commission adopted the findings and **approved** the application for a variance to reduce the interior side yard along the Southwest property line, from 15 feet to 0 feet to allow the balconies to Building F for the properties located at 901-941 13th Ave SE and 932 12th Ave SE.

H. Variance: Application by Shalaunda Holmes, on behalf of Van Cleve Court Development, LLC, for a variance to reduce the minimum lot area requirement from 605 square feet to 471.1 square feet (22.1 percent) to allow 236 dwelling unit for properties located at 901-941 13th Ave SE & 932 12th Ave SE.

Action: The City Planning Commission adopted the findings and **approved** the application for a variance to reduce the minimum lot area requirement from 605 to 471.1 square feet (22.1 percent) to allow 236 dwelling units for the properties located at 901-941 13th Ave SE and 932 12th Ave SE.

I. Site Plan Review: Application by Shalaunda Holmes, on behalf of Van Cleve Court Development, LLC, for a site plan review for properties located at 901-941 13th Ave SE & 932 12th Ave SE.

Action: The City Planning Commission adopted the findings and **approved** the application for site plan review to allow a planned unit development with 236 dwelling units located at the properties of 901-941 13th Ave SE and 932 12th Ave SE, subject to the following conditions:

1. Community Planning and Economic Development Department – Planning Division staff review and approval of the final elevations, site and landscape plans.
2. Site improvements required by Chapter 530 or by the City Planning Commission shall be completed by January 26, 2009, or the permit may be revoked for non-compliance.
3. As required by section 530.170(b) and (c), screening and at least two canopy trees shall be provided between the surface parking area and Brook Avenue.
4. At least 21 of the proposed surface parking spaces shall be within 50 feet of an on-site deciduous tree as required by section 530.170(e) of the zoning code.
5. The retaining wall adjacent to the parking ramp entrance south of Building D shall be parallel to the driveway to comply with Section 530.260 Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design of the zoning code.
6. Mechanical equipment and trash containers shall be screened in compliance with section 535.70 and section 535.80 of the zoning code.

J. Preliminary Plat: Application by Shalaunda Holmes, on behalf of Van Cleve Court Development, LLC, for a preliminary plat for properties located at 901-941 13th Ave SE & 932 12th Ave SE.

Action: The City Planning Commission adopted the findings and **approved** the preliminary plat for the properties located at 901-941 13th Ave SE and 932 12th Ave SE.

K. Vacation: Application by Shalaunda Holmes, on behalf of Van Cleve Court Development, LLC, for alley vacations for the properties located at 901-941 13th Ave SE & 932 12th Ave SE.

Action: The City Planning Commission recommended that the City Council adopt the findings and **approve** the alley vacations for the properties located at 901-941 13th Ave SE and 932 12th Ave SE.

President Motzenbecker opened the public hearing.

No one was present to speak to the item

President Motzenbecker closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Tucker moved approval of the staff recommendation (LaShomb seconded).

The motion carried 7-0.

11. Amend the *Master Plan for the Marcy-Holmes Neighborhood* to include Redevelopment Supplement (Ward: 2) (Jen Jordan)

A. Master Plan: Consideration of City Council adoption of the ***Redevelopment Supplement into the existing adopted Master Plan for the Marcy-Holmes Neighborhood.***

Action: The City Planning Commission recommended that the City Council **approve** the Redevelopment Supplement as an amendment to the existing adopted Master Plan for the Marcy-Holmes Neighborhood as part of the Implementation chapter.

Staff Jordan presented an overview of the report.

President Motzenbecker opened the public hearing.

Council Member Hofstede: I'm the Council Member for the third ward which Marcy-Holmes is a part of. The purpose for my comment was to highlight the hard work of Marcy-Holmes. We've had a very busy year this last year and they've been very engaged and involved and I wanted to commend them for their hard work as well as Jen Jordan's work and especially your work for participating in what I think is an extremely important role in our community. Thank you.

President Motzenbecker closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Tucker moved approval of the staff recommendation (LaShomb seconded).

President Motzenbecker: Any discussion?

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: I thought this was a very nice example of a community articulating what “yes” looks like for their community. It was a proactive approach. I think it was a really nice example of what all communities can learn – how to move forward. So often it seems like communities are in sort of a reactive mode and it’s really nice to see an example of trying to get in front of the ball a little and having a chance to really talk and articulate what the goal is for the community and it’s just great. I really commend the community.

President Motzenbecker: I would second that. I think the redevelopment guideline sheets that were developed are an outstanding example of how many neighborhoods can put together a piece that will help them proactively address development and where they want it and how they want it to occur. Kudos for that. I really appreciated that. Any others? All those in favor? Opposed?

The motion carried 7-0.

12. Midtown Greenway Land Use and Development Plan (Ward: Citywide) (Beth Elliott)

A. Land Use Plan: Consideration of City Council adoption of the *Midtown Greenway Land Use and Development Plan*.

Action: The City Planning Commission recommended City Council **adopt** the Midtown Greenway Land Use and Development Plan as a small area plan and as an articulation of and amendment to the comprehensive plan’s policies, subject to review and approval by the Metropolitan Council with the following changes to the draft plan:

1. Correct the outline boundary of the proposed Calhoun Square redevelopment in the Development Opportunities map to be consistent with the development plan recently approved by the Planning Commission.
2. Add the following language in Chapter VIII, Development Guidelines, under the section titled “Relationship to Surrounding Development”: “Strategies should be implemented to limit shadowing of neighboring properties by new development.”
3. Accept the Consensus Changes to the 12/12/06 version of the Midtown Greenway Land Use and Development Plan as submitted by the Midtown Greenway Coalition.

Staff Elliott presented the report.

Staff Leighton presented overview.

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: I appreciate your comments on height and density and some of the concerns that this raises. It’s pretty consistent. Every time we’re talking about new development or whatever the same concerns come up again and again. One the effects of height specifically that neighborhoods don’t like is the shadowing issue. At a Committee of the Whole meeting I talked to Beth about this and I think we talked again; I looked through the plan and I understand that there are shadow restrictions as it relates to development on the south side of the greenway affecting the greenway. I didn’t see anything in the plan referring to how development on the north side of the greenway would affect the surrounding communities and my understanding was that it was going to be addressed but I couldn’t find it anywhere.

Staff Leighton: I'll put this up again. The three major headings that we organized our development guidelines around were mitigating development intensity relationship to the greenway and relationship to the surrounding development. We have a number of points there that talk about breaking down the scale of a development as it meets adjacent development, borrowing from that architectural language and things of that nature.

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: Is that somewhere in our packet?

Staff Leighton: I can't tell you what page, but it's in the development guidelines chapter.

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: Ok. Thank you.

Staff Leighton: I want to add an underscore that as we went back out to the communities with completion of this plan and presented this whole density and height framework, each of the neighborhoods that we went to were, to more or less degree, felt like it was a good balanced approach. It has been since that process and in getting some of the feedback from some of these more locally centered interest groups that we've heard more about the concerns. I think it's important to note that there are a number of different responses to this.

Staff Leighton continued with the overview.

Staff Leighton finished overview.

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: Regarding the part of this plan that you refer to is called "Relationship to the Greenway" is that the heading... I do see the third point where the solar access to the greenway is highly important and I agree with that sentiment. I don't see anything dealing with shadowing on the north side of the greenway or the housing on the north side of the greenway that would be affected by the potential height and density. What we had talked about was that there was some consideration to the surrounding communities. Is there something referring to that in this plan that I'm missing?

Staff Leighton: No. I don't think it would be inappropriate to add a bullet that says "shadowing of adjacent property should be..."

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: My understanding was that it was going to be added and I just wanted to make sure I wasn't missing it. Thank you.

President Motzenbecker opened the public hearing.

Aaron Rubenstein (3249 Emerson Ave S): I'd like to wear two hats. First, as the chair of the CARAG neighborhood zoning committee and a member of the CARAG neighborhood board, the CARAG neighborhood's position statement is in the supplemental packet. It suggests that there ought to be a height limit or guideline for the type five tall apartment building in the six transit-oriented development districts. Mr. Leighton just discussed why that's not there. I think he said that it would be a very difficult task to undertake. I agree that it would be difficult. I think it's also important. The purpose of this plan is to lay out what the city's and community's vision is for this important part that goes through many communities. I think the plan should tackle that tough issue. We understand that it's not a regulatory height limit. With conditional use permits

many things are possible. Nonetheless, it's a very important issue in the community. The plan simply ducks that difficult issue. I think it would be much preferable if the plan did try to address that. The plan does make a lot of references to height and scale and form and tools and guidelines, but I think the substance really isn't there to deal with that issue. The CARAG neighborhood doesn't support the plan's suggestion that the city rely on the conditional use permitting process to address that issue. Switching to my own personal hat, I want to say that I'm surprised by the timing of this public hearing and the deadline for the public input, which was one business day before this hearing which means that the staff has had no time to review comments that came in at the end. The Planning Commission had no time to review them. I would hope that staff would look at the comments and suggest revisions to the plan. Surely there must be some good ideas that all the people have submitted. I don't know what the usual process is, but it's just surprising to me that this public hearing is one day after and the staff can't thoroughly respond. The Planning Commission, you got these comments that came in last week when you came into this meeting today. I think it does a disservice to community input in the planning process. It seems to me that it would be a better process to lay it over and have a good discussion among the commission with staff and take a look at all the comments and then figure out where to go with this. I think there are some concerns among some of us who participated in this whole planning process that it was strongly directed by City Hall and those of us in the communities didn't [tape error]...in what was going to be in this plan. I understand that this needs to be a collaboration between the city, the city's objectives, the comprehensive plan and the communities. What we don't want to see is the whole process and the plan being railroaded. There's a map at the end of the document of recent development and opportunity sites, in that map for the central area it shows Calhoun Square expanding or extending to the east over to Fremont Avenue and I wonder if that's an intentional demarcation of Calhoun Square or if that's an oversight or an error because the Calhoun Square expansion plans extend to Fremont only north of the t-alley for perhaps the north quarter of the block, but not for the southern three quarters of the block.

Art Erickson (3045 Portland Ave S): I work with Urban Ventures. I got a call today at noon about a meeting tonight. I am just here to speak about a piece of property that we own on the greenway. We bought two and a half acres of junk land down by the railroad tracks back in 1996 to build out two soccer fields that have cost \$1.7 million. We own three bridges; we took two down because you have air rights. We gave one to the city and they put \$2.5 million into the Fourth Avenue Bridge. We are developing the Colin Powell Youth Leadership Center and the Cristo Rey High School which is 9 and 10. The fields, the school and the Colin Powell along with our program places, we call this a Transformation of Leadership Campus. Down there on the greenway, and I believe what would probably be at issue is number six which we call Tar Park right now because we don't know what to call it. It's a very crucial place for us in terms of parking. It makes the fields run. We have four high school gyms in number nine there. We will be serving about 5000 kids in that building. This becomes a very crucial place for us on number six there. Number eight is a community garden that we developed. Bachman's designed it. It's going to be irrigated starting this spring. It will be developed into a nice area with about six park benches on it. I'm just sharing that for information. Any questions?

Christina Melloh (2642 Irving Ave S): I live two blocks north of the midtown greenway. I'm here tonight in my capacity as the president of the Midtown Greenway Coalition Board of Director. I would like to extend our sincere thanks to Commissioner Schiff and the City Council for creating this extensive public process to develop a meaningful plan. In particular, we would like to thank the Planning staff, Tom Leighton, Beth Elliott and the rest of their team for working so closely with the public and the Midtown Greenway Coalition to develop a meaningful plan. Tonight

we're going to share with you some consent amendments that have been achieved with the staff. We want to thank you for incorporating green space, open space, transit planning and public art in the greenway. All of those things are in this plan and we really appreciate it. I'm going to introduce now, Tim Springer, the executive director of the Midtown Greenway Coalition and a planner person and development person for the greenway since its inception. He's going to first introduce the consent amendments that have been agreed and then Tim is going to share with you a few recommendations from the Midtown Greenway Coalition. These items have not yet been incorporated in this document but they will serve to make this document if you choose to incorporate them, into a model that will represent a bold approach to protecting the public investment in the greenway and ensuring it provides benefits to the Minneapolis community for generations to come. Thank you very much for considering these too.

Tim Springer (118 E. 26th St): I'm going to pass out the documents I'm speaking from so you will each have one.

President Motzenbecker: We do have a December 7th comment sheet from you, is that a different item? Is this the consent that is being mentioned; that was unclear to us what that is.

Tim Springer: I'm the executive director for the Midtown Greenway Coalition. We're a grassroots non-profit. The Midtown Greenway Coalition has been working on land planning along the greenway for about six years now. Tonight is an exciting and important combination of all that work. Thank you to the city and the Planning Commission for being team members with the community in this. While some things, perhaps, could have been done better hopefully the result will be outstanding. You can forget the 14 page comment letter in your packet because the Midtown Greenway Coalition and staff have been working closely together to identify which elements of that 14 page document they think makes the document stronger and they agree should be incorporated. Then there are still a brief handful of five or six issues that the Coalition still recommends including that are not consensus items with staff. First I'm going to take you through the document that says at the top "Consensus Changes".

President Motzenbecker: If I could just ask that you keep it real tight on these because we do have them and we would just like the focus to be really intense on this. That'd be great.

Tim Springer: Ok. On page 50, the reason we have this change here is because the map shows a rail transit station for the greenway streetcar line on the west side of Chicago Avenue. We thought there should be some wiggle room because if you want the transit station on the same side of Chicago as Midtown Exchange, it would be on the east side of Chicago. We just recommended adding the language "...although a desire for a rail station to be on the same side of Chicago Avenue as Midtown Exchange (the east side) may impact station siting discussions." Page 55, the text reads "A primary face and main entrances of buildings should address the public street" and we're suggesting adding the words "while not excluding the possibility that additional front doors may at times also front the greenway." That was something echoed by the Midtown Community Works Partnership and their comments document as well. Page 61, we just thought it would be important to make a reference here to the extensive work that was done in \$100,000 Public Art Master Plan for the greenway by having a sentence here that refers to what they recommending for funding public art in the greenway. That sentence is "A special development district for a percent for art ordinance on private development (excluding housing) adjacent to the greenway was a recommendation in a previous document, *Resident Journey: Public Art Master Plan for the Midtown Greenway Corridor*". The next recommended change on page 63 is to

leave the door open for a greater involvement for the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board. Let's say, for example, there should be an open space developed on land adjacent to the Midtown Greenway that serves the purpose not only of an additional entrance ramp into the greenway, but also as passive or active public open space or green space. They may be an appropriate party to participate in either owning or perhaps maintaining that. We're adding in some wiggle room here by adding the language that you see "If open spaces along the greenway at other locations should be proposed where park functions are provided, perhaps even at multi-functional sites where new trail access may be provided the MPRB is a possible candidate to participate in ownership and/or maintenance. A possible implementation mechanism that should be explored is the use of a park dedication fee already considered in both Minneapolis and St. Paul." The next two changes are both very simple. They just say "If you're going to be recommending these things, make a statement that you plan to implement them." The one sentence here on page 66 "Rezoning is anticipated as follow-up up to this plan." On page 40 we replaced a sentence with one stronger "It is anticipated and recommended that the land use guidance proposed in this document be implemented with a rezoning study and subsequent rezoning." Once again, all of this language was worked up in cooperation with city staff. On page three, the land dedication paragraph, while a 15 foot setback for new buildings along the edges of the greenway will make sure that buildings aren't put down in the wrong place so as to ensure the possibility for a public edge along the greenway just like we have along our famous chain of lakes, that will not go all the way to get a walkway on that strip of land implemented. Because it's such a high priority for the city and the county and the Midtown Community Works Partnership and the community it felt like there should be something in there to say "let's take this a step farther" so the suggested language "While a setback requirement recommended elsewhere in this plan would keep buildings from being placed inappropriately relative to the greenway, additional implementation tools such as creative funding ideas for a publicly accessible walkway along the greenway's edge on land dedicated by private parties have yet to be devised and would help to implement such walkways." The last paragraph on page three we're recommending for user friendliness of city staff as a chart to identify what needs to be done to implement this plan; that there be an executive summary to this plan that include a chart of regulatory and zoning changes to be implemented and similarly to guide developers who may not be interested in wading through a longer document to offer a brief table that identifies a guide to them in terms of what they should pay attention to so they don't get part-way down the road planning their development and realize that they're at odds with the city's plan or zoning code. I'm going to ask Tom, do you agree that these make the documents stronger and recommend that they be adopted? Then I'm going to turn your attention to another document and these are recommended changes.

President Motzenbecker: If I could ask your help on this one, we do have it so we don't need you to read the whole sentence to us because we can read it. If you could encapsulate your comment with it, that'd be great.

Tim Springer: Ok. On page 27, the inclusion of ecological landscaping in the principles part of the document is something that was brought up at the public meetings and also at the Steering Committee meetings. In fact, at one of the Steering Committee meetings we talked about it and intended to get back to it and here are the notes from that Steering Committee meeting. It says "it was suggested that principles may need to address other topics such as affordable housing and sustainable/green design. Feedback regarding these specific topics may need to be obtained from the public. Further discussion among the project team and committee will result." We didn't do that. That stuff never got in there, but if there was a quarter where it's appropriate for ecological design, this is it. That would be great to add to the principles. Page 49, previous rail transit

studies for the Midtown Greenway done by the county, the Met Council and the Midtown Greenway Coalition all anticipate a rail transit stop somewhere in the vicinity of 4th Avenue, perhaps 35W to serve a future transit line on 35W, perhaps right at 4th Avenue to serve the Wells Fargo home mortgage campus and the growing business node at 4th and Lake. Page 51, Greenway building types, the Midtown Greenway Coalition and Hennepin County and the Midtown Community Works partnership are in consensus that the more access the better. In fact, Hennepin County Commissioners recently redirected staff to redo a document so as to be more aggressive in opening up the greenway. The way that references to future access point is referred to; it doesn't allow any wiggle room for there to be a building, a new private sector building, that opens up onto the greenway. That means that you wouldn't be able to have a building adjacent to the greenway with a restaurant that opened up towards the trails or new housing with patios towards the public right-of-way, assuming that those patios would not be on public land. That's terrible unfortunate so this offers some wiggle room. That's also consistent with the comments document from the Midtown Community Works Partnership. On page 54, another comment about ecological design. On page 55, there's two different concepts imbedded here in this recommended additional text. It's all about 29th Street. The first sentence there is about the possibility of 29th Street being relocated away from the greenway edge and putting it mid-block somewhere so you still have that traffic connectivity but that allows you the possibility of scooping out the trench wall and creating a plaza down in the greenway at a future rail transit station. This is actually consistent with the diagrams and concepts presented in case study number two. The second concept being presented here, the last sentence that is underlined that begins "further more a vacation of 29th Street...", I would like for you to consider that separately than the sentence above it. The Midtown Greenway Coalition long has suggested that the Midtown Greenway should be a place where bicycles and pedestrians are celebrated ahead of cars and we should keep open the door where we've got cities like Copenhagen that have this expanding set of a car-free zone in their downtown that's so popular it gets bigger every that we should at least leave the door open if the neighborhoods and the policy makers agree that there might be some segments of 29th Street vacated to vehicular traffic to serve as a grand pedestrian and biking greenspace amenity adjacent to the greenway. Page 62, under park dedication fees, this is about the city not painting itself into a corner. If there is a park dedication fee that differs from some that have been proposed so far in terms of how it's configured, maybe you don't have to have a whole new subdivision in order to implement a park dedication fee. It's my understanding in the city of St. Paul, the park dedication fee that they're considering applies if you have infill development and the density of the area is increasing. That suggests a greater need for public open space and they can implement the park dedication fee in that incidence. That added phrase just offers some wiggle room. Page 62, under recommended ownership, this is about the challenge of how 29th Street currently does not have enough public right-of-way along the edge of the greenway to implement two directions of vehicular traffic plus parking plus sidewalks on both sides. Right now there's only a sidewalk away from the greenway so pedestrians can't look into the greenway and that public edge to the greenway is critically important for its integration with the surrounding community and for the safety in the greenway. If there ever is the case that 29th Street is reconstructed and the city has been unsuccessful in securing the additional 16 feet of right-of-way to do the whole shebang, that you prioritize the sidewalk overlooking the greenway over vehicular space. Page 65, under building heights, this is the last comment and it's pretty simple. We continue to recommend that you use a zoning overlay to implement the building height limits on the south side of the greenway to protect the viability of the greenway in the winter time. Staff identified that it is an appropriate tool, but it would be an increased level of city action as compared to what's currently in the plan. This is also a comment supported by the CARAG neighborhood's comments. While not in our

comments, there was a comment letter from a group of residents in the Seward neighborhood that said “please consider incorporating LEED or environmental building design principals”. The Midtown Greenway Coalition board members did discuss that but decided to leave it out so we could just focus on the public’s open space realm and how buildings are configured as they relate to the greenway, but it’s a great idea and you may want to think about that. Affordable housing is another thing that came up in various discussions and the Coalition doesn’t have it in our comments, but it’s an important issue. Public art, there are some brief references to public art in the document which is great. We like to think of public art in the greenway and on Lake Street and in between the greenway and Lake Street as a way to integrate the greenway and Lake Street.

Carl Holmquist (3109 Girard Ave S): I’m an art supporter and user of the greenway. In reading this lengthy document and all the changes that have been done, I still feel very uninformed as a citizen. I don’t think we’re ready to make a decision at this point. There’s a lot of changes that have happened and as Aaron had said earlier, this has been a fairly rushed and not a lot of community input on this plan as it’s been put together. I recommend that we delay any decision that this Commission would make so that we can have more input. The community members, public officials and community organizations that I spoke to, they didn’t know this was happening or have not had enough time to take in 150 pages worth of documentation. The community perception of the community input plan was definitely, as Aaron had said earlier, very predefined as far as outcome. I have 20 years of business consulting experience and I was at one of the Charette meetings. It felt very predefined as far as what the outcome was going to be. Examples of that were we had nonresident architectural students at the Charette meetings. For me, why are they here? Height was discussed in my small group, yet the facilitator that brought it up did not bring it up in our presentation to the group and the shadowing issues that we have. I think, like Aaron was saying earlier, I think this is the time to talk about maximum heights and shadowing. Do we really want to go through another Mosaic process or Lander process? This is our time to look at these and determine what the minimum and maximum heights are. We ought to remember that height does not equal density as we can see with developments like Edgewater where the building is actually less dense and yet taller than the building it replaced. My understanding from the plan is that we are going to have Light Rail transit through the greenway, which I think we all agree probably is not the direction right now and street cars so there is a very big assumption on the density appropriateness for transit that I don’t think has been changed. The first page of the summary says that we’ll have rail transit which I assume is not streetcar. I hope that you will delay decision on this so everyone can get informed on this.

Linda Schutz (1523 W 22nd St): For once I thought I got my comments in on time only to realize that you didn’t get to see them. I sent them in last Monday. I’m sad that that happened. I am looking at all these maps. We have Lake Calhoun and Lake of the Isles very close by. Then I’m looking at this map here which shows a lot of greenbelt by Lake Calhoun and then we’ve got another map showing the greenspace and properties near Lake of the Isles. I am just thinking this draft Midtown Greenway plan is totally undermining and negating and ignoring the history of the Shoreland Overlay District and city shoreline and shoreline protections and the Hennepin Lake Pedestrian Overlay, height restrictions and our Hennepin Avenue Strategic Plan. I understand that a literature review was done and you looked at a lot of other past plans, but I don’t really see any reference on these maps to our Shoreland Overlay line and district. I don’t see any reference to the Hennepin and Lake pedestrian Overlay. This, despite requests that I know I made because I’ve got my notes from when I went to the visioning session at Salem Lutheran Church, I know that our citizens talked in those visioning sessions about respecting our shoreland protections and our overlays and our city lakes and our Hennepin pedestrian guidelines. I think this plan is kind

of destroying that. This, despite repeated requests to the Planning Commission, the Zoning and Planning Committee, the City Council and candidates who ran recently for City Council and Park Board and Library Board and Mayor, all to protect our shoreland and especially the issue of protecting light and air and shadowing and the scale and character and the views. The views not only when you're enjoying the lake on the lake whether you're water surfing, whether you're out there in a canoe or sailboat, but also the views from the buildings that already exist or as you're walking around the lakes. I don't know if it is the intent tonight for the Planning Commission to take the historic step of possibly further undermining our shoreland overlay protections, but if not, then I would ask that if the Commission's going to entertain amendments, of which apparently it is tonight, scads of them that I have never seen until just now, that maybe you would consider an amendment that nothing in this draft plan would undermine the intent or history of our state and city shoreline protects or conflict with terms of our conditional use permit in our city code; much as that is inadequate, but at least it does provide some protection for shadowing and sunlight and views and whatnot. I think we should postpone and have some city meetings within the neighborhoods nearest the transit stations and let's have an executive summary before we adopt the plan not after we adopt the plan so our neighborhoods know what's in it. I know I talked to the Whittier executive director Thursday and she hadn't read the 80 page draft plan and I can be sure she hasn't seen tonight's amendments, three pages of them, must less heard their explanations. I have another request that maybe the Steering Committee for this draft plan could get together and review its own draft plan. It never saw its own draft plan as an advisory committee. That'd be like the Iraq study group or the 911 commission issuing a report it never saw beforehand. What would the public think of that? I'd like to have some input from the handicap community because there are a lot of accessibility issues here. I'm going to submit for the public record, 10 documents that I think have great relevance to this plan and I certainly don't expect anybody to be able to review these quickly, but I don't know if they total 80 pages or 100 pages, but that is what I have been asked to do as a citizen; review all this quickly. My neighborhood group hasn't had a chance to and I think there are a lot of good things in this plan, but again, there are some things that are missing like how we treat the shoreland and some other very monumental historic efforts that we citizens and the city have been involved in.

President Motzenbecker closed the public hearing.

Commissioner LaShomb: I've been kind of a proponent on the Planning Commission of laying things over for a cycle or two and the last time I did that I forgot the plan and I got shot down so I thought maybe that wasn't going to happen anymore. I'm not always sure that it's necessary to lay them over. I think that all these plans are complex and anyone who has done planning knows that there's a certain dynamic to plans. You approve them and then about a year up the road you start to see the flaws in the plan and so it's not a criticism of staff by any means or of the Planning Commission or the city, but along the way reality starts setting in on some of these items and so plans get amended. Just recently we had the Marcy-Holmes Plan which was amended rather significantly I think, and to the better. The Bassett Creek Plan was here a little while ago. That one has been an ongoing work in progress. I think this plan is a work in progress. The question is where do you start the work in progress? I think the important thing to remember about this process is that you are going to have some consensus on some of these issues and I think we should amend them if the staff is willing to accept the consensus items. The recommended changes I think if I were on the Zoning and Planning Committee my directive to the staff would be to respond to those to Zoning and Planning so that they could see how those work. There are issues about other plans and other issues that come up in the public testimony and the record and the staff is going to respond to that one way or the other and I hope in front of Zoning and

Planning. The process has got to start somewhere. I think this is a very good plan. I think the staff has really done a lot of work on this plan and I am glad it's coming. On my time on the Commission we've done a lot of issues, what I call "the trench". We've had a lot of building decisions to make along that way. I wish we had a plan in place on issues like height and shadowing. Those are controversial issues; what does shadowing really mean? What does height really mean? I think the way to do this is to adopt the consensus changes that were proposed tonight as part of the plan and send it forward as part of the plan. The other items I think should go forward with at least an understanding on my part that the staff is going to look at those issues and have some responses to them for Zoning and Planning. There will not be a hearing at Zoning and Planning as I understand it, but that doesn't mean that people that have concerns about it can't get to members of Zoning and Planning; that's how this city government works. I'm going to move with the addition of the consensus changes; I'm going to move that the Planning Commission adopt this for the purpose of sending it to Zoning and Planning with the understanding that issues that have come up in the public hearing process do get referred to Zoning and Planning and maybe the staff can be prepared to address them as Zoning and Planning members look at some of those issues as well. (Tucker seconded)

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: What I like about this plan is that it does speak directly to issues of density. One of the puzzling aspects of some of the rail station plans is that we've always talked about the height of buildings around train stations and that didn't make a lot of sense to me because what we're talking about is how to place development near the infrastructure that can support it. I appreciate the direction conversation about that. The thing I find a little confusing and a little disheartening about this particular plan is that when you're doing a land use plan, what you're hopefully getting is some sort of, if not consensus at least a starting point that everybody can agree on and some parameters that sort of guide things moving forward. What makes me feel that we didn't accomplish that goal, because again we want to send some sort of understandable message to the development community, the neighboring communities, we want all these people to understand the direction we want with this plan and give everybody some direction. In the areas around the future rail stations, section three where the transit oriented development is and the number five tall apartments where it says five plus, I don't see how that really gets us anywhere. To me it just seems like we're going to be right back to conversations about what we want here, it's more than five and then we're off to the races. That has not worked very well and that's where the small area plans around the light rail stations, for instance on the Hiawatha corridor have been so useful because they've given communities to actually... to talk about density, to articulate how that density ought to work in the communities and how to integrate it into the communities. The stated goal of this plan says in parts of it about how the areas should...how that should be translated into the neighborhoods and how to make sure that it's compatible with the present uses. It says "curb the inefficient use of land by regulating maximum and minimum height, setbacks, build-to lines and parking through master planning methods and zoning code regulations." That's on page nine of the summary of research. In talking about just sort of what these plans should do. There's a lot of talk about character and scale and these are issues that people are concerned about. My goal as a community person is to try to figure out a way to "yes" so we can all move forward together. I feel that if you're saying five plus, that's not telling you enough and certainly, as we saw in every light rail station that we reviewed, they were all very different. On the Hiawatha corridor what seemed appropriate for one area felt much different than others. A station in East Phillips has a much different feeling than a feeling on Hennepin. Just to say that the CUP process is going to take care of it, I think that doesn't really sound like a plan. With the CUP process I think that even if we do set some sort of parameters at the highest end, I think at this point most people understand that that's a starting

point, it's not a height limit. It sets a starting point; a point of discussion that we can start exploring the best way to implement the goals of the city and of this corridor and how to integrate it into the existing neighborhoods and make it a win-win. To me it feels like there is a step missing here. I feel like the executive committee, the Steering Committee, should have had a chance to look this over. I'm impressed with all the amendments that the Midtown Greenway Coalition has brought forward here. I'm sure communities would have had some other ideas too if they had an opportunity to explore this stuff in as much depth. I think an extra Steering Committee meeting may have expedited that process. I guess what I am suggesting here and what I am proposing as a substitute amendment is that we send this back just to articulate at least, if not the individual stations, there are three distinct regions that the plan talks about how here and how they are different. The central region, the eastern region, the western region; they all have different flavors, different density, different demographics. I think it's fair to say that one size will not fit all in this. If we can actually come out of this with some, at least a better idea of the flavor and how this plan can be implemented on local scale, that makes a lot more sense to me. I think it's going to be more satisfying to the people involved in this process. They're going to feel like these months of work...they've actually got something out of it. I think it's going to be a lot more useful to the city and it's going to give a clearer direction to the development community about what's appropriate. I'm going to move as a substitute motion that we give this plan back to the communities and at least on the three separate regions of the light rail corridor, present the plan and try to articulate this apartment five designation to see what kind of height limits or height parameters could be set for these individual areas with the understanding that these are starting points and not outright limits.

President Motzenbecker: Commissioners, your substitute motion is to postpone the acceptance of this report and return it to the community basically for more discussion and more opportunity for input in a general sense.

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: In a general sense, but I think specifically it would be nice to get this apartment five articulated based on the character of the community where the stations...these are all based around individual light rail stations or street car stations. If we didn't have this infrastructure coming wouldn't be having this conversation about increasing this density so I think this is fair.

President Motzenbecker: I just wanted that clarification. We do have to vote on whether to accept that substitute motion and we need a second for it. Do we have a second for that postponement? (El-Hindi seconded). Discussion on that? All those in favor? Opposed?

The motion failed 5-2.

President Motzenbecker: Ok. That does not pass so we are back to the original motion of Commissioner LaShomb to look at this before us and have some more comments.

Commissioner Tucker: I wonder if staff has some responses to the unresolved issues of MGLUDP, particularly dealing with the effect on the trench, the historic nature of the trench and the upper promenade possibilities.

Staff Elliott: [mic not on]...we got back just a few comments.

Commissioner Tucker: One other point, is there any reason to think that if this plan is adopted that would supersede the shoreland overlay zoning or the pedestrian overlay zoning where it's already applied?

Staff Elliott: I don't see how, from the standpoint particularly of the pedestrian overlay, how it would probably even compliment by the development guidelines. The pedestrian overlay doesn't have any relation necessarily to height. The shoreland overlay, we didn't do a thorough analysis of the shoreland overlay as it relates to the density in this area, and I'll admit that. I think there will be cases where there will be some rub just like there is now with existing development.

Staff Leighton: This plan doesn't assume light rail. It started with the premise that the public transportation connections are good in certain locations and only going to get better one way or another, but didn't specify what kind. To clarify that with regard to the shadowing strategies, it's not just a matter of adding complexity to the zoning code, staff would advocate for a more performance based standard anyway, even if it wasn't an issue of adding regulation to the code.

President Motzenbecker: In regard to some of these items, the mayor has submitted a statement that he would like to be read into the record so I just want to highlight some of the items there were concerns or questions on for possible inclusion into this plan. The main focus that he was wanting to be looked at was to...was the concern, as has been mentioned by various members of the public and Commissioners, to look at this height issue and really, as he has said in the past comments regarding the downtown/uptown idea and the height issue right around the uptown node... because of that wanting to put more focus for development and however that would play out with some of these recommendations to move it further down towards the Nicollet and Lake Avenue interchange possibly with some of these recommendations putting more pressure on development and developers there to help get this Kmart out and spur development along those ideas and even reference a little more of the Midtown Land Use Plan and the ideas it had for the Kmart section there. Highlighting the Nicollet, I think there was a portion in the entertainment center section where it listed uptown Lyn-Lake but then Nicollet was kind of...it wasn't clear if that was listed or not. They wanted that specified as an entertainment center Nicollet/Eat Street and then Midtown. There was a question about chunks of the piece being broken up. The question was Hennepin to Chicago seemed like a large chunk and I'm wondering if it can be broken to Hennepin to 35 and then 35 to Chicago. Those were some of the comments that were wanting to be submitted. I wanted to say, personally, I think that the height issue should be addressed. It has been mentioned by various constituents and Commissioners about the small area plans and how those are a great way to address some of these and allow community members and everyone else to have a lot of detailed and insightful impact into these height decisions and with the Uptown Small Area Plan just now starting and having a very specific focused area in Uptown with this plan as a compliment I think that might be a much more appropriate and effective place to look at some of these height questions that have been brought up tonight rather than a Greenway Plan which has uptown as a component but also focuses on a much broader and longer space of the city than just uptown. I think the height issue seems to be more appropriate for the Uptown Small Area Plan. There should be some exploration of that so I just wanted to make that clear. I have some changes that I was going to submit. One of the main things I wanted the Commissioners to consider and one of the things I found a little difficult I guess was the idea of mitigating...just the language in the plan. It's my position that density and height aren't things to be just horrified of and we shouldn't have to mitigate them. If you do good urban design in the first place, which is what you're proposing with this plan, I think it's an outstanding plan, there shouldn't be a need to mitigate. It's just a language and a semantic issue

for me. I would prefer us to put in a plan language that kind of doesn't focus on the negative. I want the Commissioners to be aware of that and aware of the possibility of changing some of that language so that it gets the same point across but is not in a negative way. I don't think the city should be focusing on a negative mitigation idea. Wherever possible, have language in this plan because this is our guideline, this is our way that we're going to work with developers and neighborhoods and people to make sure that things we want to have happen, happen. Get a little bit stronger language in here as far as...there's a lot of words for "encouraging" in here, I would almost rather have a little bit stronger language in there if this is coming from the city. Why don't we request or ask that these things happen and then see what happens through the CUP process as they come before us? That could be the place where things could be brought up if there is a discrepancy with it. I would like to add some of those thoughts all the way throughout this document, but I think this is an excellent document. I read it in much detail and I found it to be very thoughtful and it did... I actually thought the public process seemed to be outlined pretty well, but again I wasn't on the other side and I don't have that insight. Those are my comments.

Commissioner El-Hindi: I also want to commend everybody that has worked on this plan. It is pretty comprehensive. I want to make sure to mention in regards to the height, I agree with President Motzenbecker's comments about the height issue, that putting forth a guideline for height does not necessarily restrict the conversation about height. The CUP still does exist, but for any neighborhood, any developer that is going to work within those guidelines it would be a very helpful thing. I recall a couple of projects that came in front of us that have been sent back and started the whole process over. I feel like if those guidelines were in place, maybe this would have been a much easier process for all parties involved. I would say that would be my reason for asking for those guidelines. It was a very good and comprehensive plan and I commend you guys for working as hard as you did.

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: I would like to state appreciation for all the work that has gone into this plan. It's pretty comprehensive. One of the things we talk about is always height. It's the affect of that on the surrounding communities. I think the art of a lot of these things and certainly sites like the Urban Design Center for the University of Minnesota, they have really intensive discussions in terms of dwelling units per acre and how that can be expressed. Those are always my questions in talking to the communities surrounding these small area plans, the light rail station plans. I ask if they are opposed to the density component of this or opposed to this particular expression of it. A lot of times, in some of these plans and certainly in some of the light rail station area plans, I never saw the density. I even asked specifically "what it is this supposed to represent in terms of density?" because all I saw were tall buildings in an arrangement. What I was told is that there weren't technically goals at this point. There are desired things in some cities like Portland, along light rail corridors for instance, there are specific goals for density which is rational planning because you are trying to arrange density near the infrastructure that can support it and that makes total sense to me. When you're looking at the type of planning that's going on here in the number three district around these future stations, I hope that in the future that the people living near these future stations are going to have the same opportunity that the people have gotten on the Hiawatha light rail corridor to better articulate what that density can look like in their areas. I think that that has gone a long way towards buy-in. Not only to their area station, but to the City's goals as a whole. I hope that this is just a starting point because there are a lot of questions that are left unanswered here. I hope that there is a plan, and I guess I'd like to know, if the goal ultimately is to start doing some of these future light rail area plans. We're lucky right now because obviously the street car or whatever rail we end up on this corridor that's coming we have some time, but this is, as part of the Planning

process we've gotten sort of a general overlay here, but now we need to get down to the specifics and is that in the works around these sites?

Staff Elliott: You're absolutely right. This is not a transit station area plan. It's not meant to be site specific for each of the transit station areas. When we started this process two years ago we were having that same conversation of whether it was going to be street car or LRT. Two years later we're still discussing that. It really will depend on what type of transit is coming in the corridor. It's my feeling that there absolutely needs to be a transit station area plan for each of these locations once the stations are explicitly located and we know what type of transit is there.

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: At this point we do have potential transit stations listed as part of this plan and obviously if we were just talking about a bike trail and a bus route we wouldn't be focusing density at these intersections so there must be some sort of anticipation that this is coming forward. I'm curious, moving forward, how can we further anticipate that and stay ahead of the curve like the Marcy-Holmes people did and not constantly playing catch-up.

Staff Elliott: Right. These also are the north-south transit spines that we put the transit oriented districts on. Those are already the existing bus routes; it's where we have our existing commercial corridors. They're identified land use features in our citywide comprehensive plan. Those would be the places that we would go to for this most intense development because there is already transportation uses there. You're right, there does need to be a more specific look at each of these locations when the known transit is going to happen. We just weren't capable of doing that in a corridor-wide plan with this much expanse of area. This right now is meant to give land use guidance for the entire corridor looking at the corridor-wide and then transit plans can be done for the specific areas as is happening in Uptown.

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: The other thing I would mention is that with the existing transit intersections we have now, we're actually going to end up with more density on the greenway nodes than we are on the Lake Street nodes in some of these areas. We've certainly seen the height and the density emphasized there. We are anticipating infrastructure, I just wish I knew if it was going to be in 10 years or 15 years or 20 years or whatever it's going to be because I have heard a lot of different dates.

Staff Elliott: So do I. I think it is very important, but [tape ended] ...under the assumption when we started this plan that there will be transit in this corridor. Hennepin County had already done some studies, they had already done their feasibility study of this corridor and identified it as a potential for LRT and had identified those potential stations. We didn't want to ignore that fact as we discussed density and land uses in this corridor.

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: But we are giving a green light to that kind of development now prior to that infrastructure being in place so that's just something that we're going to have to keep in mind in future land use decisions. Thank you very much. I do have one amendment I would like to add to this dealing with the shadowing issue. On page 55, under the "Relationship to the Greenway", bullet point three "Solar access to the greenway is highly important. Any given part of the Greenway trail should have exposure to the sun for much of the day. A number of strategies may be employed to achieve this objective. These include stepping back the mass of future buildings along the south side of the Greenway, giving taller buildings a relatively narrow east-west dimension, and pivoting the orientation of buildings to a diagonal that allows morning and afternoon sunlight to pass by the northeast and northwest building faces to shine on the

Greenway.” One of the issues that came up several times is that some of the surrounding communities felt that there was being more consideration of development on how it was affecting the greenway versus how it was affecting the surrounding communities. What I’d like to add to this and this is per our conversation, “Similar strategies should be implemented to limit shadowing on neighborhoods from new development on the north side of the greenway corridor.” I think that would go a long way. If somebody wants to add some other language or fool around with the language on there, that’s fine with me, but I really want to send a signal that we want whatever happens on the greenway corridor to show sensitivity to the greenway but also to the surrounding neighborhoods. We certainly have been talking about shadowing and the effects of shadowing and density and height on all these things. If we can use some of the mitigating factors like the stepbacks and things that we talk about on a regular basis and make that part of this plan, that again will show sensitivity to the neighborhoods.

Staff Leighton: If I could suggest that amendment, that new language, be placed in the section that’s about the relationship to surrounding development instead of relationships to the greenway.

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: Ok. Then we can just say “Strategies should be implemented to limit shadowing on neighborhoods from new development on the north side of the greenway corridor.” Is that acceptable? A friendly amendment. To piggy-back on that, with the amendment that the Midtown Greenway Coalition added on page three, “However, this function can be provided better by buildings on the north side of the Greenway where trail shading is not an issue because of winter sun angles and where the buildings are adjacent to the trails and not the future rail transit.” There is a counter veiling public safety value associated with windows that provide visual connections to and informal surveillance in the Midtown Greenway. They’re talking about that you can have taller buildings on the north side with windows facing the greenway that would ameliorate the stepbacks that limit the amount of windows and eyes of the greenway on the south side, which is what they’re suggesting. One of the shadowing mitigation factors is to stepback buildings on the south side of the greenway, which the downside of that from Planning perspective is that it limits the amount of eyes on the greenway because you don’t have so much massing directly on the greenway. What they’re saying here is that if you do more massing on the north side of the greenway, you do have more eyes on the greenway which mitigates the lack of eyes on the greenway on the south side. I would like to add in here “Appropriate stepbacks should be implemented on these buildings to limit shadowing on neighborhoods to the north.” Ok?

Staff Leighton: Yes, that’s fine.

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: Are we voting on adopting these documents?

Staff Leighton: I don’t know if the Commission is planning on adopting the recommended changes. The current motion I don’t think does.

Commissioner Tucker: I just wonder if we can give Jason a chance to read back what he understands these amendments do be.

Staff Wittenberg: My understanding is that the second one that was reference is actually written already. I have not jotted that one down. The first one was “Similar strategies should be implemented to limit shadowing on neighborhoods on the north side of the greenway corridor.” That’s to be inserted on page 55 in the “Relationships to Surrounding Development” section.

Commissioner LaShomb: Commissioner Norkus-Crampton's amendment is to the recommended changes. What I would suggest is that we not pass the recommended changes, however, I think your amendment should go as part of that package because we do want those recommended changes to go forward.

President Motzenbecker: Commissioner LaShomb, just a point of clarification, you're just saying that the statement, the small sentence that Commissioner Norkus-Crampton wanted to add even though she was looking at the recommended changes, you just think we should add that as a standard sentence in the existing document...

Commissioner LaShomb: No. What I'm saying is the Midtown Greenway Coalition offered some recommended changes and I feel uncomfortable amending their changes since they're not ours and we're not going to pass them. What I would suggest is that these go forward to Zoning and Planning and I think the Commissioner's language should go forward as well. If we passed her language without passing the recommended changes then, effectively, we're not passing it. I think that's procedurally a strange conundrum.

Commissioner Tucker: I think all we need to do is add a second to Commissioner Norkus-Crampton's amendments, they are hers, she just happens to lift some language from the unresolved suggestions so we would just add those two amendments. I will second them.

Commissioner El-Hindi: Just to add to the confusion, my understanding is that this amended language is acceptable by the Planning staff.

Staff Leighton: These documents by the Midtown Greenway Coalition were titled that way because there was an extensive conversation around the changes they wanted to make and we finalized the plan based on that, but then there was some additional dialogue, some of which we felt like would be acceptable to staff. These are the additional dialogue that didn't make it in time for the Planning Commission, but they are acceptable to staff.

Commissioner Huynh: I have a comment to pass on to the planners that worked on the area plan. I just want to second what President Motzenbecker said, but also reinstate what Commissioner Norkus-Crampton has mentioned which is that just look at emphasizing the plan as more of a vision plan and let the small area plan and the neighborhoods develop the details for what is applicable for height, what is appropriate for density and what are the uses that come out of this. What the Planner's came up with in the development plan and what the Midtown Greenway Coalition...it's a great plan that we should just all take a look at, but not take it the force where it's interpreted in a negative way that when a developer or anybody that looks at this document interprets as a way that doesn't emphasize the natural amenities that the greenway has and instead just focuses on the negative issues of height and density and what we don't like to focus on, but why not enhance the amenities that we have. I just want to commend the Planner's that worked on the area. When we proceed with this plan and if we were to do future amendments, we should also look at incorporating sustainable technologies and language into a chapter perhaps as a summary for when small area plans do incorporate this vision plan into their neighborhood plan is to look at how they can integrate sustainable technology such as LEED. Perhaps not going for LEED certification, but look at adopting some sustainable strategies that doesn't necessarily pertain to the site, but also to the building. Incorporating some of this language is crucial in development of Minneapolis long-term and I feel that it's perhaps missing in this but perhaps for the next iteration that we should take a look at it definitely.

Staff Elliott: You had mentioned some changes, some revisions to some language that you wanted as well, is that incorporated into this decision?

President Motzenbecker: It is and I will submit those to the record. They are written and they are minor semantic or punctuation changes. Mr. Rubenstein, you had a question; the public hearing is closed, but we will take a clarification.

Aaron Rubenstein: [not on mic].

Staff Elliott: Nothing was done intentionally to change the boundary of the development scenario for Calhoun Square. I assume it was in the place where we did case studies and there might have been a scenario at that time that was a proposal but I'm not sure exactly what it was.

President Motzenbecker: Perhaps you can contact Mr. Rubenstein after the hearing and make sure that the outline boundary is corrected to what was approved by the Planning Commission previously.

Staff Elliott: Right. I want to make sure it's clear, though, that it was not intentional that we drew the boundary differently than what was approved at Planning Commission and City Council.

Staff Wittenberg: President Motzenbecker, I'd actually suggest that if that is a change that the Commission desires that it actually makes that part of the motion rather than relying on staff to tinker with the map after the Commission has acted.

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: I move that we add that correction to the report (Tucker seconded).

President Motzenbecker: Any further comments? All those in favor of the amendments before us? All those opposed?

The motion carried 6-0.

President Motzenbecker: The amendments are accepted and now we will vote on the whole acceptance of the proposal. All those in favor? Opposed?

The motion carried 6-0.