

**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: November 28, 2007

TO: Steve Poor, Planning Supervisor – Zoning Administrator, 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 November 13, 2007

The following actions were taken by the Planning Commission on November 13, 2007. 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, Mains, Nordyke, Norkus-Crampton, Schiff and Tucker – 9

Not present: Williams (excused)

Committee Clerk: Lisa Baldwin (612) 673-3710

14. Creekside Commons (BZZ-3755 and Vac-1538, Ward: 11), 5400, 5404 and 5412 Stevens Ave S (Hilary Dvorak).

A. Rezoning: Application by Matt Crellin on behalf of the Plymouth Church Neighborhood Foundation for a rezoning from R1 to R5 for the properties located at 5400, 5404 and 5412 Stevens Ave S.

Action: The City Planning Commission recommended that the City Council adopt the findings and **approve** the rezoning petition to change the zoning of the properties located at 5400, 5404 and 5412 Stevens Ave S from R1 to R5 district.

B. Conditional Use Permit: Application by Matt Crellin on behalf of the Plymouth Church Neighborhood Foundation for a conditional use permit for 30 dwelling units for the properties located at 5400, 5404 and 5412 Stevens Ave S.

Action: The City Planning Commission adopted the findings and **approved** the conditional use permit for 30 dwelling units located at 5400, 5404 and 5412 Stevens Ave S subject to the following condition:

1. The conditional use permit shall be recorded with Hennepin County as required by Minn. Stat. 462.3595, subd. 4 before building permits may be issued or before the use or activity requiring a conditional use permit may commence. Unless extended by the zoning administrator, the conditional use permit shall expire if it is not recorded within one year of approval.

C. Variance: Application by Matt Crellin on behalf of the Plymouth Church Neighborhood Foundation for a variance to reduce the required number of off-street parking spaces for the dwellings from 29 to 27 for the properties located at 5400, 5404 and 5412 Stevens Ave S.

Action: The City Planning Commission adopted the findings and **approved** the variance application to reduce the required number of off-street parking spaces for the dwellings from 29 to 27 located at 5400, 5404 and 5412 Stevens Ave S subject to the following conditions:

1. The Mayflower Community Congregational Church shall revise their lease agreement with The Museum of Russian Art to allow not more than 31 parking spaces be leased on Saturdays and Sundays between 7 am and 6 pm.
2. The Mayflower Community Congregational Church parking lot shall be re-stripped to accommodate 96 parking spaces.

D. Variance: Application by Matt Crellin on behalf of the Plymouth Church Neighborhood Foundation for a variance to reduce the required front yard setback along E 54th St from the established setback of 21 feet to 17 feet for the properties located at 5400, 5404 and 5412 Stevens Ave S.

Action: This variance application to reduce the required front yard setback along E 54th St has been **returned** to the applicant.

E. Variance: Application by Matt Crellin on behalf of the Plymouth Church Neighborhood Foundation for a variance to reduce the front yard setback along Stevens Ave S from the required 15 feet to 0 feet for the properties located at 5400, 5404 and 5412 Stevens Ave S.

Action: The City Planning Commission adopted the findings and **approved** the variance application to reduce the front yard setback along Stevens Ave S from the required 15 feet to 0 feet located at 5400, 5404 and 5412 Stevens Ave S.

F. Site Plan Review: Application by Matt Crellin on behalf of the Plymouth Church Neighborhood Foundation for a site plan review for the properties located at 5400, 5404 and 5412 Stevens Ave S.

Action: The City Planning Commission adopted the findings and **approved** the site plan review application for the property located at 5400, 5404 and 5412 Stevens Ave S subject to the following conditions:

1. A total of seven canopy trees shall be planted on the property as required by Section 530.160.
2. Approval of the final site, elevation, landscaping and lighting plans by the Department of Community Planning and Economic Development – Planning Division.
3. All site improvements shall be completed by November 13, 2008, unless extended by the Zoning Administrator, or the permit may be revoked for non-compliance.
4. There shall be a minimum of 14 bicycle parking spaces provided in the enclosed parking garage for the residents.
5. Applicant shall work with staff to minimize light pollution and foot candles on the site.
6. Louvers shall be installed in back of the windows of the enclosed parking garage to help reduce glare.
7. Replace Dwarf Bush Honeysuckle with Cotoneaster or other hedge plants around the surface parking areas.

G. Vacation: Application by Matt Crellin on behalf of the Plymouth Church Neighborhood Foundation for a vacation of a water main located in a vacated portion of Stevens Ave.

Action: The City Planning Commission recommended that the City Council accept the findings and **approve** the application to vacate a City of Minneapolis Water Main Easement as reserved in vacated Stevens Ave S; covering the westerly 19 feet of vacated Stevens Ave and lying adjacent to Lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and the North 22 feet of Lot 5, Clarke's Stevens Ave Rearrangement to Minneapolis; according to the plat of record and Vacation dated August 14, 1981, on file at the Hennepin County Recorders office, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Staff Dvorak presented the staff report.

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: I notice that it's 30 units at three stories at this point; is R5 the lowest zoning that can accomplish that or are we going beyond looking more into the future of this corridor? So R4 would not meet the requirement for 30 units and three stories?

Staff Dvorak: I looked through the R4 and I would have to get my file out. There was one issue that would have required an additional variance to go to R4. I can't think of what it is off the top of my head, but I can find it during the public hearing portion and let you know.

Staff Dvorak continued with the staff report.

Commissioner Schiff: I know how we all love the details and intricacies of our parking and I'm sure I'm the only one, but I'm getting a little bombarded with numbers here and am trying to keep them all straight. Can you clarify, why does the Mayflower Church need parking on Saturday? Is that a requirement of the code? Is a requirement of...

Staff Dvorak: It's a requirement of the code. In writing the staff report and talking with my supervisor about a lot of this in great detail, churches provide spaces for weddings and other events. The zoning code requires 100% on Saturday's. Synagogues have services on Saturday's as well. All religious institutions have that parking requirement.

Commissioner Schiff: Does the museum have more need for parking on Saturday than the church?

Staff Dvorak: The parking requirement for the museum was 45. I didn't run a breakdown of what that would require on Saturday's at this time because their lease was for 38 spaces. I know it's complicated, but Jason and I did arrive that this was the best way to show the numbers accurately given everyone's agreements with everyone.

Commissioner Schiff: Ok. So in the shared parking we've got 67 spaces that cannot be used by residents? Why not use that 67 spaces for the residents? Does it have to be used by the church on Sunday?

Staff Dvorak: I'm not following you.

Commissioner Schiff: Alright. I'm probably getting a little bit lost in the shared parking ratios to try to understand it. One other question on the Diamond Lake Road issue, can you clarify why alley access is not allowed through the parking lot from Diamond Lake Rd rather than just through 54th St from the alley?

Staff Dvorak: You can get to the alley from Diamond Lake Rd if you drive through the church's parking.

Commissioner Schiff: So you can get access from Diamond Lake Rd through the parking lot.

Staff Dvorak: This is where the alley is located.

Commissioner Schiff: You don't have to go down 54th St?

Staff Dvorak: If you drive through the parking lot of the church you can access that alley.

Commissioner Schiff: Great. Thanks for clarifying that. I apologize, mister chair. Officer Bedard's visitation is tonight. His parents live in my district so I do need to get to that before it's over so I will need to step out at some time.

Staff Dvorak concluded the staff report.

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: I just want to say thank you. I think you did a great job here, especially on the shared parking. I think it's really important not to fudge on that stuff and I know the numbers can get a little crazy. If we're really trying to make this work, these are exactly the kind of things we have to think about. I appreciate the creativity in trying to figure out ways of making this work, but I really appreciate hard numbers and trying to be fair to everybody and make sure that we know exactly what we're voting on so thank you.

President Motzenbecker: Before we open the public hearing, give me a show of hands of those who are here in favor. Those not in favor? It's about half and half. I will open the public hearing for this. Just for the sake of clarity for us and the Commission, try to keep the comments focused. I have a feeling I'm going to hear a lot of the same comments about parking and other things like that. I'm going to ask you please, it will help us substantially if you could...those for, those against, we're going to give you about 20 minutes for each side. Please just kind of talk amongst yourselves, line up and then come present. Commissioner Tucker will keep a time for that and we'll progress that way. Please listen to your fellow constituents and we request that as you come up, please give us new information. We prefer not to hear things repeated over and over. That would be most appreciated.

Lee Blons [not on sign-in sheet]: I'm the executive director of Plymouth Church Neighborhood Foundation, the applicant. We're a non-profit housing organization. We're here seeking your approval so that we can create Creekside Commons, a wonderful new housing opportunity for families in the Tangletown neighborhood in southwest Minneapolis. This development is made possible by Mayflower Community Church to the donation of their land and a willingness to share parking, including the specific parking conditions listed in the staff report. Although they are not a wealthy congregation, they have made the decision to donate an asset worth about \$600,000 to build the community they believe in. Housing choice in a neighborhood creates a strong and vibrant community. Rental housing is an important part of housing choice. Over half the residents of the city of Minneapolis are renters. Creekside Commons provides housing for a mix of incomes and a mix of family sizes. A neighborhood should have quality housing for bank executives and bank tellers, for school principals and first-year teachers, for fourth generation Americans and newly arriving refugee families. This housing focused on working families with rents ranging from \$550 to about \$1000 a month will be created with financing from the low income housing tax credit program and other public and private funds. A few of the units will be rent subsidized through a collaboration with the Minneapolis Public Housing Authority to help those like single moms and new refugee families have a place to live while building their own economic self-sufficiency. Although mostly family housing, the development has a smattering of one-bedroom units to create housing opportunities for seniors and young adults, which will create a mix of ages within the housing. There are 1400 home owners in the Tangletown neighborhood. Adding 30 rental units creates housing opportunities for people without changing the character of the neighborhood. As you've seen, Creekside Commons is designed to mirror the architecture of the neighborhood. A pitched roof, front stoops, landscaping in both fronts and back, make it an attractive addition to the neighborhood. It's designed for families with a play area and greenspace outside and a multi-purpose room inside and a computer resource center. We believe that to grow as a vital city we need to think creatively about how to share space with each other and our neighbors. Design to meet green community standards. We're proud to be replacing surface parking with underground parking, to be sharing parking so we're utilizing our scarce resource of land most efficiently and to be investing in the city and not contributing to urban sprawl on the fringe of our metropolitan area. The Foundation has participated in a series of meetings with neighborhood residents beginning in April; some with over 100 participants. We've worked to reassure neighbors that rental housing won't bring crime up and property values down. We're pleased that the need and desire for workforce housing in the area has been embraced by Tangletown and other neighborhood associations. Creekside Commons will be developed on a block that is already zoned for multi-family and commercial with the exception of the church which is, of course, supportive of our request. There are no remaining single-family homes on this block. The board of the Tangletown Neighborhood Association voted unanimously to not oppose our request for zoning. We originally proposed a four-story

development with 40 units which would be allowed under the R5 zoning as Ms. Dvorak shared with you, since our site is four full lots. However, there were concerns raised that that was too large, both physically as well as socially. In response, we've eliminated a full floor of housing going down to three stories and only 30 units, the proposal that you see in front you today, which is a deduction of 25% of the units that we had originally hoped to build. To be honest, it was a hard decision because we know of so many families that want and need this housing opportunity. However, we wanted our development to fit into the neighborhood fabric and we wanted to be responsive to the concerns of our future neighbors. At this lower height we have the same number of stories as the adjacent apartment building. We cast no shadow on the single-family home across the street. With fewer units we have more greenspace per person. We've also work with city staff for several months to address their concerns as well. Based on their recommendations we made a number of modifications to the design so that the staff is now able to recommend approval of our full proposal. We think that the end result of this community process is a great project. Creekside Commons will be a wonderful place for the residents to raise their families, an asset to the neighborhood and a significant investment by the community for the community. We ask for your support to further the goal of our growing progressive city to create housing opportunities for people of all incomes in all our neighborhoods. Thank you.

Bart Nelson [not on sign-in sheet]: I'm an architect with UrbanWorks Architecture. I've been working with Plymouth Mayflower, meeting with members of the community and I have some graphics that I think will help explain things a little further so I'd like to show some of those.

President Motzenbecker: Again, you're taking up your side's time. Are there things you felt were unclear to us? I just want to be cognizant of everyone's...

Bart Nelson: I guess I could ask you, is there anything...Hilary did a great job, a thorough job, she had the numbers right, but I think there are graphic things I could actually explain that might make things clearer.

Commissioner El-Hindi: Actually, I think it would help if you could just take two minutes and walk through the graphics that you have.

Commissioner Mains: In your process, I'd like to look at the play area; where that is, I couldn't tell on the small plans that we have. Also, just a count of the total number of bedrooms.

Bart Nelson: Total number of bedrooms is 71. I will go quickly through this then. This is 35W, north is up. This is Diamond Lake Rd. We wanted to emphasize how this block that this site is on is different than the residential to the north. The residential to the north... this is really a site that is a point of transition from the residential to the larger buildings on this block. One of the important things to show is that a view down Stevens shows that it goes from a residential feel to a much more on-ramp or off-ramp and frontage road feel when you get to our site. Our site would be on the right hand side of this view. It narrows down and becomes a much more urban setting. As far as the site itself, you can see here that we have held the street wall in our design and we made the entrances along 54th more residential in feel and scale and I think that's an important consideration. I think Commissioner Mains has asked about the play area. The play area is here off the back entrance as well as a courtyard that is off a community space so there are places to have parties that overflow into the outdoor space. The playground is set within a landscaped area. If I could just show a couple more things about the parking; this diagram might help you to visualize that. The garage door, which demarcates the residential from the church

parking. Church parking is in green which is in sheltered here and also has some surface parking. The red 27 stalls are shown in this case. Lastly, I wanted to say that we looked at the topography and the character of the buildings around and we feel that the massing that we've come up with, with the pitched roof, actually reads smaller than a flat roof three story building, which is what we have to the west. You can see that the roof is receding so what you read as the height as you're walking along is actually eaves (?) [tape unclear]. Lastly, I want to put up what the image would be as you're looking down 54th towards Stevens Avenue. The neighboring building would be on the right and this would be the north side of the complex.

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: So does the street go downhill or is this just a perspective?

Bart Nelson: It does go down and that's one of the important things about this site. It goes down 11 feet from where the front entrance is to Stevens. I also want to say that the building next door is actually four feet higher than ours.

Commissioner Tucker: You have about 11 minutes.

Carol Lansing (90 S 7th St): Plymouth Church asked me to respond to just some of the points raised by the opposition and I will just highlight the ones that haven't been addressed. With respect to the rezoning, that is your key issue and if you find the rezoning is appropriate to R5 then the building is compliant with all of the district regulations. Hilary mentioned multiple policy support for this rezoning. I wanted to point out that the opponents have said that this site isn't on the community corridors of Nicollet and Diamond Lake, but it's on block bounded by those streets so all policies related to community corridors and neighborhood nodes are applicable to this site. They also argued that if you rezoned this R5, you will be creating an island of C1 zoning where the church property is. If the church property was ever redeveloped, C1 would not...I mean, R1, would not be appropriate. It wouldn't be developed at that density. It would be either higher density housing or mixed-use and so the R5 on this site would be consistent with what should occur in the future. The building is bigger than other apartment buildings on the block, but as Hilary has explained, its relative size given the much larger lot does not make it need any variances for FAR units per dwelling. The L-shape of the building, I believe, actually mitigates the impact of that mass on the neighbors. The parking variance, I think, is one of those red herrings. We're only talking about two spaces and that reduction for two spaces is only practically needed on Sunday mornings because the additional parking will be available to residents and visitors outside of that time. A little extra evidentiary support, according to 2000 census data, the actual parking demand for rental housing in Minneapolis is only .95. A unique circumstance to support the parking variance, including the shared parking opportunity, the fact that it's in proximity to two community corridors and transit. The setback along Stevens, again, I think The Boulevard, the fact that two front yards are required for this property, the wide boulevard and the fact that it's adjacent to a parking lot are unique circumstances that also support that variance. I will yield to all these people behind me who want to speak.

Mary Jane Adams (3217 Colorado Ave S, St. Louis Park): I'm here as a representative, as the moderator of Mayflower Church. As that moderator, I serve as a leader of most of the decision-making bodies of the church and I am privileged to be able to talk to you about this today. Mayflower has been committed to our neighborhood, community and city since 1925. Part of our mission as a church community is to have an active role in creating justice in our world. It therefore gives us great pleasure and great joy to be able to offer this gift of land to Plymouth Church Neighborhood Foundation for the development of Creekside Commons. We hope that

this gift will be a blessing upon the entire city of Minneapolis by offering greatly needed affordable housing. Throughout Mayflower's discernment process, the project's development process, great attention has been paid to the impact of Creekside Commons may have on parking. Mayflower is committed to its efforts around sharing space. In that, we have enjoyed our relationship with the Russian Museum of Art. We are eager to not only continue our commitment of shared space, but to expand it by sharing parking with Creekside Commons. Mayflower is aware of the issues this sharing can raise, therefore, the trustees of Mayflower Church have reviewed the conditions specific to Mayflower that will enable us to find resolution to the parking concerns. The Mayflower trustees accept these conditions. Mayflower Church will revise their lease with the Museum of Russian Art to allow not more than 31 parking spaces to be leased on Saturday's and Sunday's between 7 a.m. and 6 p.m. Mayflower will also re-stripe their parking lot to accommodate 96 parking spaces. We've already been in conversation with the Museum of Russian Art regarding these changes and the Museum of Russian Art has indicated that this is a workable solution. As a church we recognize and appreciate concerns regarding parking. We are glad to be able to find a solution so that we might turn our attention from the concerns about where we park our cars to the concerns about where people have a place to live. As current owner of the site and future neighbor, we strongly support the rezoning of the site and request that all variances be approved.

Commissioner Tucker: You have about six and a half minutes.

Paul Lohman (4612 Aldrich Ave S): I'm a resident of the Lynnhurst neighborhood which is directly adjacent to Tangletown. I'm speaking because of my interest in this project and because I was president of the Lynnhurst neighborhood board during the time that Boulevard project at 54th and Lyndale was proposed and debated. This is a mixed-use property of 24 units of rental housing located at 53rd and Lyndale. During our process we heard many of the same concerns that are being expressed about Creekside Commons; concerns about traffic and congestion, about the building being too large, that condos and not rentals should be built and many more. It is, perhaps, not unusual that people are concerned about these issues but none of the concerns expressed has come to pass. The building, The Boulevard at 53rd and Lyndale is an attractive building with no problems and no problems have brought to the attention of the neighborhood association. I'm also active with a group called LASR-CC, which is Lyndale Avenue South Renewal – Creek to Crosstown. This group was formed by the four neighborhoods, including the Tangletown neighborhood, that intersect at the corner of 54th and Lyndale, partially in response to The Boulevard project, but to study and plan for development along the Lyndale corridor. Part of our process was to participate in the corridor housing initiative where we studied in great detail the issues of commercial corridors, housing and development. Had some of those opposed to Creekside Commons attended the four public meetings they would've come to understand that Creekside Commons is an ideal project that sites higher density development along a commercial corridor. The project comprises workforce housing, an important type of housing that is difficult to site in southwest Minneapolis because of the high cost of land. Creekside Commons will help to accomplish the goal of dispersing mixed income housing throughout the city and allow people to live closer to where they work and providing ready access to transit options. I urge you to support Creekside Commons. Thank you.

Carol Lewis (2910 E Franklin Ave): I want to tell you that this project is very near and dear to my heart for a number of reasons. My son is a 10th grader in the high school in Tangletown. He is an honor student and he shows great promise and I must say that they are doing some wonderful things in the school in the Tangletown community in the high school. Secondly, I want to say

that I am privileged and pleased to speak as a tenant. I have lived in the Seward community for 11 years. I've devoted every year to that; to fighting for, speaking out and advocating for quality affordable housing for working adults. I am a landlord's dream. I work, I keep a clean apartment, I have a good rental history, I'm a good mother and I'm a woman of faith and vision. I ask you to please approve housing at Creekside Commons because I would love to live there. Thank you.

Commissioner Tucker: You have about four minutes.

Yvonne Pearson (4928 Harriet Ave S): I just wanted to say that when the flyers came from the Minneapolis Residents for Smarty Density, I thought "great, I'm so glad there are people who are supporting this building" and I was very startled to discover that they weren't supporting the building because I think this building is a wonderful example of smart density. I'm also puzzled by their objections because they're objecting to the disproportionality of the building and the building is actually aesthetically much more pleasing than the other multi-family units that are already on that block. The problems with traffic and parking seem to be red herrings. I feel proud of our neighborhood that we're looking at this kind of affordable housing and I want to speak in support of it. I also wanted to just ask, on behalf of some of the other neighborhood residents in line behind me, if we can have a little more time to talk since people have not been repeating themselves.

President Motzenbecker: We'll see as we go. We may make it.

Commissioner Tucker: Two minutes.

Jim Nicholie (5334 Stevens Ave S): I've been a resident of south Minneapolis for 34 years. I've lived at this site for 17 years. I'm here to support this project. I think it's a wonderful one. With due respect to my neighbors, I think some of the problems have been exaggerated. Even the graphics show an 11 story building a block long. Really, this is a nice project and we need a place like this where people can raise their children and these are the folks who wait on our tables, clean our homes, who provide home health care for our elderly and sick and who babysit our youngest children. We have to increase the density in the city. We have to make good use of underused properties and we have to locate affordable housing all over the city. This is really smart and this is a really good project and it will help do a part to reduce pollution and urban sprawl. I'm looking forward to getting to know my neighbors.

Commissioner Tucker: One minute.

Lisa Kugler (4737 Garfield Ave): I've been a Tangletown resident for 18 year. I welcome the opportunity for my children to go to school with the children who will leave at Creekside Commons. I'm happy to share my parks, public streets and stores. I have children in the public schools; the oldest is a junior in high school. I coordinate the volunteer reading program at Barton. In my experience there are many positive and no negative consequences to increasing the economic and racial diversity of Tangletown. I'm also one of the partners in The Boulevard which is essentially the sample case only a couple blocks away. I'm familiar with all of these arguments because they were all raised for The Boulevard. In almost three years there have been no police calls, no evictions and only one official complaint to the city. The complaint was that the stucco color on the side of the building was boring. I really mostly want to address the idea that affordable housing or big apartment buildings decrease property values. There's been a big

study. That study was reviewed for buildings within a block...single family houses within a block of subsidized housing and there are 12 houses behind The Boulevard with no alley or street in-between. From 2004 to 2005, the year The Boulevard was completed, market values for the 12 houses increased 14% compared to the city average of 4%. Houses that sold, sold basically at the estimated market value even one that sold right in the middle of construction and if there had been no houses sold since 2004 so if people felt that the building was blighting their existence they would probably have taken advantage of the building boom and have sold some time between 2004 and now. I will leave you a copy of this data that comes from Hennepin County and just encourage you to support the project. I think The Boulevard demonstrates that it won't cause problems.

Marcus Lynn-Klimenko (229 W Rustic Lodge): My spouse owns a business in Tangletown. My kids work in Tangletown. We've lived there for 18 years. I work in the field of affordable housing and I'm here walking the talk. Here I am asking for our neighborhood to do something about it. I thank the T and A board for supporting the project. I feel like we have an unspoken compact in this country that if you work hard, play by the rules, you'll be able to raise a family, send your kids to good schools and live in decent neighborhoods. This compact is challenged when more and more people need to work 2+ jobs just to be able to afford their housing. Study after study just shows how much more people, us in this room, are paying towards their housing. I continue to read weekly of the severe lack of affordable housing in the Twin Cities area and I'm proud of our neighborhood for participating in this regional and national issue. I'm glad that we're at the table, similar to communities like Edina, Chaska and Maple Grove. I support the project; it's straightforward. We have a neighborhood institution, Mayflower Church, that's the sponsor of the project and not some absent owner that lives in Florida. Mayflower is part of the community. There's a strong developer in Plymouth Community Neighborhood Foundation who is committed to make Minneapolis neighborhoods strong, vibrant and livable. They are a trustworthy organization and don't deserve the tacks they've received. As I walk the neighborhood and shop the many wonderful Tangletown business such as Kowalski's, Holiday, Starbucks, Caffeina, Caribou as well as thanking the new teachers either at Ramsey or at Washburn or new firefighters at the fire station. I do hope that the wonderful folks who serve us on a daily basis and who dream to live in this neighborhood are able to. Lastly, I keep thinking of that Woody Guthrie song, This Land Is Your Land, and I'm proud of a song that could represent this country so well. Can you imagine a country where the lyrics are "this land is my land, this land is my land?" I think Tangletown in Minneapolis is a neighborhood city that believes in this land is your land, this land is my land. Thank you.

Paul Gates (4917 Garfield Ave): Much of what I want to say has been said so I'll edit my comments severely. Tangletown as a neighborhood is fully established; it's really fully built out. There are, arguably, one or two sites in the neighborhood that can take on additional multi-family housing. This is the one chance that Tangletown has to contribute to the citywide effort to add density and add affordable housing. If we miss this chance, Tangletown as a neighborhood misses that boat completely. This is a very modest proposal. It's a project which could, as of right, have 40 or 50 units; instead they're proposing 30. It's a project that is only asking for two small variances. I doubt you've seen many projects of this magnitude that come forth only asking for two variances. It's a project which has apparently taken great pains to comply with both the Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning Code. In my opinion, it's exactly what smart density looks like and I hope that you'll support it. Thanks.

Miriam Weinstein (111 Pratt St): I'm a resident of Tangletown. I live a short walk from the proposed housing project, Creekside Commons. My first response when I heard about the possibility of this unit in my neighborhood was one of excitement. I think the property under consideration is ideal. It's close to public transportation, the freeway, schools and a short walk to a variety of stores and the public library. The apartment complex has been well thought out with underground parking and an attractive exterior and includes a range of apartment sizes which will offer units for people from single families to multi-generational families. Beyond these facts, I believe that whenever possible, it is necessary to provide viable affordable housing options in Minneapolis. In the case of the proposed Creekside Commons, it would allow the residents of Tangletown to share not only our freeway access and ease of public transportation, but we can also share our beautiful tree-lined streets and winding Minnehaha Creek with our new neighbors. Affordable housing is one important way to increase the diversity of our community and our neighborhood. I believe that a more diverse community will make a stronger and healthier community for all citizens. Thank you.

Robert Pomroy (5424 Chicago Ave): I'm going to speak specifically to letter C regarding parking. A lot of the small number of neighbors who oppose this project do so on the basis of parking. I wanted to address a study that a church did long before we had any kind of final designs just to determine for ourselves whether this was feasible. It was a very scientific study, it was not taken with regard to what the neighborhood would think, this was for ourselves first and for the congregation second. We took a statistical sample at regular intervals. We did derivation from the mean. The division of Public Works included it as an addendum in their study so you probably have it in your possession. What we determined was, the day that we chose that was a day that we expected to reach capacity, we did reach capacity, but only twice in the entire period of time and only 15 minutes and that was without using any...or dramatically limited use of off-street parking. I think we had five people parking on the street and some of those may not have been from the church. I just wanted to point out that when it comes to the parking issue, as was brought up earlier, it's really a red herring. It's a specious argument that really has no value.

President Motzenbecker: Ok. It looks like we're up to the opposite camp. They had 28 minutes so we're going to allow the same to be fair. I appreciate new information, always, so if you could respect the same we would love it.

Harry Kaiser (5344 Stevens Ave): I live directly across the street from the proposed development. I want to thank you all for reading, carefully, all of the documents that we sent you that you got in your packet. I know it's a lot of information, but this is a big decision and we appreciate the fact that you thoroughly read all of our arguments. Tonight, with my colleagues permission...I represent Minneapolis Residents for Smart Density and we are a group of 40 or 50 households near the project that would like to see it scaled down. We are not against affordable housing on this site, we're against the size of the proposal. With all due respect to all these comments, we can achieve what all these people want to get done, but we would like to see it done in a way that respects the scale of the neighborhood. That would be the focus of my comments. With my colleague's permission, we are going to respond to the staff report. Our comments will be limited to the site plan review and less emotional and less...you know what I'm saying. They're going to let me speak for a while and I appreciate that. The first thing I'd like to say is to point out some nitpicky flaws in the staff report. The staff report sites policy 4.2 as applicable to the proposal, but 4.2, the entire section of the Minneapolis Plan, specifically refers to development policies on community corridors and we'd like to strenuously point out that the proposal is not on a community corridor. It's not even close enough to a community corridor to qualify for the lower

.9 parking ratio. The Minneapolis Plan identifies community corridors, major housing sites and transit station areas as areas that they would like to see this kind of density and we'd like to point out that the proposal is not within any of those areas. The staff report also sites the promotion of medium density, residential development around neighborhood commercial nodes. The requested zoning for this building is R5, however, which is considered high density. One of the policies cited by Hilary was about medium density residential development around commercial nodes and R5 is considered among the highest density possible. Finally, the staff report also sites the city's support for new medium and high density housing in appropriate locations throughout the city and the crux of our arguments are going to be that this location is not appropriate for this kind of size, but the city also has a policy of developing a close dialogue with community participants about appropriate locations and design standards for new housing when growing the city's housing supply. The community participants in this case have largely decided that the proposal in question is an inappropriate location for that level of density. If you look at the map in front of you, 90% of the neighbors within two blocks of the development have joined our neighborhood group opposing the size of the proposal so those are some of your community participants. Both the Tangletown Neighborhood Association and the Windom Community Council have written letters opposing the size of the proposal and they are also community participants. Most of the businesses in the Nicollet Ave and Diamond Lake Rd commercial node are also opposed to the proposal and they are community participants. Diamond Lake Ace Hardware, Green Dog Sports, NBA Accounting, The Professionals Hair Salon, Academy of Ra Wang Do, Phil's Barber Shop, George Ricky – the owner of the apartment building next door, Tangletown Gardens, Frame Factory, Aqua City Plumbing, Wellington Security, Scott Ja-Mama's Barbecue, Slick Rock Construction. Considering the opposition from the neighborhood leadership and the overwhelming opposition of the immediate residents and business owners, the amendment, if approved, would be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan's policy of developing a close dialogue with community participants. Also, the staff report sites the city's policy of providing and maintaining areas that are predominately developed with single and two family structures. This proposal, however, is a multi-family development that would not maintain the area of single and two family structures in which the parcel sits so we wonder why that was cited as an argument for this proposal lining up with the Comprehensive Plan. Single and two family structures was one of the implementation steps that Hilary cited and this is not a single or two family structure. Furthermore, 9.21 of the Comprehensive Plan states that the city will preserve and enhance the quality of living in residential neighborhoods, regulate structures and uses which may affect the character and desirability of residential areas and ensure amenities including light, air, privacy and open space. The rezoning will adversely affect the desirability of the Brittany Apartments right next store at 101 E 54th St by blocking sunlight from a majority of its east facing windows. They talked about not shadowing my house, but a majority of the apartment building directly to the west would be definitely shadowed by the building. The proposal will create second and third floor apartment windows which will compromise privacy in the back yards of neighboring houses on Stevens and 1st Ave and it will decrease open space. They talked about moving the property up to the lot line to increase open space, but the building is taking 17,245 square feet of open space and decreasing it to 6730. With regard to light, air, privacy and open space, the rezoning is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Also, regarding whether the amendment is in the public interest and is not solely for the interest of a single property owner, affordable housing and the focus of new development near commercial nodes are in the public interest. A massive structure which turns its back to the existing neighborhood and suggests a development rezoning with numerous variances is solely in the interest of the property owner. Also, with regards to whether the existing uses of property and the zoning classification of property within the general area of the property in question are compatible with the proposed

zoning classification...oh, I'll skip that part...the developers are focusing on the block that the building is on, meaning the rest of the church, the Diamond Lake Hardware and the other apartment buildings; we consider the general area that the proposed building is going up into to be the apartment buildings and our houses and so the extension of R5 on the three lots is arbitrary and not compatible with the adjacent R1 district north of 54th Street. A reasonable approach would be to maintain the R1 setbacks adjacent to our R1 district and if rezoning is considered to keep the proposed structure in character with the existing setbacks, placement of a continuous building façade on 54th Street is not an acceptable transition from a single family district. The existing R5 structures have front and side setbacks. They're two to five to three stories and they have a relationship to 54th Street and the R1 district where my house is. The proposed rezoning would allow a continuous wall around 54th Street which is over 150 feet in length which forces two-way access on to a 14 foot alley and is not respectful of the adjacent properties. This building in pink is the proposal and you can see how, when you consider the true radius around from the building, the new proposal dwarfs both the existing apartment buildings and the houses immediately north of the building and you can really see it in this picture. In response to if there are reasonable uses of the property in question permitted under the existing zoning classification, a reasonable use, we feel, would be an R1 district and single-family structures. That's certainly reasonable. Other alternatives may be R2, R3 or R4 zoning which would duplex, triplex and/or townhomes with variances and conditional use permits that don't sever the relationship between the parcel and the R1 neighborhood immediately north of it. In response to whether there has been a change in character or trend of development in the general area, I'm sure you are all used to these findings. The changes to the area have been driven by Mayflower Church and not the freeway or adjacent property owners. Everything that has changed about the area has been at the behest of Mayflower Church. On to the conditional use permit. The conditional use requires that the establishment, maintenance or operation of the conditional use won't be detrimental or endanger public health, safety, comfort or general welfare. The staff report cites a belief on the part of the Planning Commission that the conditional use will not be detrimental but doesn't support its belief. Our response to that is that the existing 14 alley being suggested as the access on 54th Street is not wide enough for two-way travel. Congestion and/or conflicts are bound to occur as this alley will see an increase of...or the proposal will see an increase of 300 daily trips. A typical driveway should be 22 feet minimum and allow a car going one way to cross a car going the other way and it shouldn't be on the same property line as the alley. This alley access will be detrimental to the public safety. Also, the main exit from the proposal will be on to Stevens Avenue, a southbound one-way. This alley cut here is...Stevens Avenue is a southbound one-way and there is traffic coming off of Highway 35 and for that reason, traffic will have to merge with high-speed traffic exiting 35W at Diamond Lake Road and that will also be detrimental to the public safety. We're concerned about how someone would get out of this alley cut and over to the left-hand turn lane on Diamond Lake Road, crossing the people exiting off 35W, which we know from living there is at a very fast speed. Conditional use permits require that the use will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the vicinity. The staff report's calculations about density are deceiving because they treat all apartment units as equal. For instance, The Brittany right next door to the development has 21 units, but 15 of them are one bedrooms and six are two bedrooms. That entire building has 27 bedrooms. The proposed apartment building, on the other hand, has nine three bedroom units and 3 four bedrooms which comes to 71 bedrooms. It doesn't have high density in terms of units, but it has...but because so many of the units are large it has massive density in terms of square footage. The Brittany is 20,337 square feet. The proposal is 63,078 which is over three times the size. Because the proposal's lot is only 1.75 times larger than The Brittany, the new structure's square footage should also be only at 1.75 times larger rather than 3.1 times larger. This would keep the new

building more in scale with the rest of the buildings nearby. Also, another way the proposed project would be injurious to the use and enjoyment, is blocking sunlight from the majority of the east façade of the Brittany apartments, increasing the amount of exterior lighting shining into neighboring homes and decreasing privacy in the backyards of neighboring homes, despite fences, because of the proposed building's height. The requirement for a conditional use is that there are adequate utilities, access roads [tape ended]...like that. The proposal's application cites two public alleys off both 54th Street and Stevens Avenue as the main vehicle access to the parking lot. Because these alleys are not wide enough for two-way traffic, or certainly the 54th Street one is not wide enough for two-way traffic, they are inadequate access roads. Also, the staff report erroneously states that 50 of the 68 parking spaces are accessed from the east-west alley, that's the one that is on Stevens, because the east-west alley, in reality, can't be accessed from southbound 35W because it is north of the exit. It also cannot be accessed from northbound 35W because it's on Stevens Avenue which is a one-way going in the opposite direction. We're saying that there won't be as many cars using the Stevens Avenue as an entrance because it only really makes sense to use this entrance when you're coming off Minnehaha Pkwy. The lion's share of the trips into this building...Stevens Avenue will be a good exit, but the lion's share of entrances coming off of 35W will have to be up Diamond Lake Rd, down Nicollet and down 54th St, as well as any Nicollet traffic is going to be using 54th Street and any Diamond Lake Road traffic is going to be using 54th Street unless the church allows people to cut across their parking lot, which would also create a public safety hazard because of the daycare there and the Boy Scout meetings and so forth. I don't think they want cars cruising across their parking lot to get to this building. The city planning staff has their numbers wrong in terms of how many cars are going to be using the Stevens Avenue exit to access the building. Most of the cars are going to be using that 14 foot alley there.

President Motzenbecker: Mr. Kaiser, just a time check for you, you have about 14 minutes or so left.

Harry Kaiser: Thank you. The city's traffic engineer said that traffic from both directions of Nicollet Ave and Diamond Lake Road would use the north-south alley on 54th Street, therefore, the Stevens Avenue alley will primarily be an exit forcing all of the ingress on to the north-south alley which is 14 feet wide and can only carry one car at a time. Regarding the condition that traffic congestion has been taken into consideration, the east-west alley exits on to a very high speed portion of Stevens. Also, the staff report calculation that Mayflower will still have 137 spaces after construction of the proposal assumes that the re-striping of the south lot will still produce 96 regulation, eight and a half foot, parking spaces. Until the church's capacity for 96 regulation spaces, where currently there are only 87, is proven, the conditional use should not be permitted. In terms of reducing the number of parking spaces, the problem with the city staff's parking summary and recommendations is that it assumes that Sunday mornings between 7:00 a.m. and 2:00 p.m. is the only time that Mayflower has peak use. The church's calendar shows numerous events during the week which have not been taken into account. Residents can attest to a full parking lot at Mayflower with cars spilling out on to the streets at times other than 7:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on Sundays. The justification for the acceptability of the shared parking proposal is not inline with the conservative approach taken by the city with respect to parking. The code requires an examination of the maximum number of persons that can attend worship services on any given day throughout the year, likely Christmas, not just seven hours a week for Sunday morning services. Christmas and a lot of the holidays where the church is going to be busy will not be falling on Sundays where the residents aren't allowed to use the balance of the parking garage. Another factor, which significantly contributes to the parking issues, is that Mayflower

granted those 38 spaces for the exclusive use of the museum. They've also leased three spots to Wellington Security and I don't think that was taken into account in the staff report. The museum's parking is fully dependent on Mayflower Church. The parking lease agreement was what got the museum their variance in the first place. We feel like reducing their lease violates the museum's original agreement with the city about how they were going to handle their parking. This is going to affect people that live in Tangletown and Windom because Windom already has parking problems from the museum on their streets; 55th and Stevens, 55th and 1st Avenue and so on. As a result of the plans of the proposed development and parking variance request up for discussion today and without violating the terms of the city's approval of the Russian Museum parking variance from 2004, Mayflower Church's parking availability on all but Sundays will be 108 spaces total, less the 38 leased to the museum which equals 70 spaces available during the week. This is a net parking loss to Mayflower at all times except for Sunday mornings. Hilary has already admitted that they will not be in compliance on Saturdays without the reduced lease with the museum. We certainly don't support reducing the museum's parking requirements to 31 spaces. Can I have a time check?

President Motzenbecker: Ten minutes. Eight minutes, sorry.

Harry Kaiser: In terms of the front yard setback, the applicant's requested variance to reduce the front yard setback along Stevens Avenue from the required 15 feet to zero will cause a hardship to the residents of the new development themselves, the existing neighbors and even Mayflower Church congregants by creating an opportunity for decreased safety. The Stevens side of the proposed building has several projections which cannot easily be monitored. The closed access of 35W in the sound wall directly to the east will create a tunnel-like area of low visibility. The setback variance will cause an interruption in the sightline from the existing homes on Stevens Avenue; a disruption in the sightline which is incompatible with the community atmosphere of the neighborhood. It will also cut off sunlight which will cause this already tunnel-like area to be dark and unwelcoming. In addition, the extreme setback variance will contribute to the fortress-like effect of the proposed development further setting it apart from the character and scale of the existing residents and businesses of Tangletown. They talked about moving it close to the lot line to maximize greenspace, but in effect, if they were not allowed the variance, there would be much more greenspace in front of the building than there will be once it's built behind the building where the play area is going to be. Rather than having a 15 foot lawn all along the east side of the building, they're proposing to have a tiny little playground inside the "L", which we don't think even benefits the residents of the building but it certainly doesn't benefit the people that live north of the property. On to some of the site plan review stuff, the placement of the building is supposed to reinforce the street wall, maximize natural surveillance and visibility and facilitate pedestrian access and circulation. This building does not reinforce the street wall. It reinforces the street wall on 54th Street because it lines up with The Brittany, but it doesn't reinforce the street wall of my house and Kendall's house and Annie Lex's house, which have deep setbacks from Stevens, whereas this building...these three houses are the first three houses on the block, they are significantly setback from Stevens. The street wall that's created by all the houses on Stevens is broken by the building. This might be a good time to point out that Stevens Avenue from 35th Street all the way down to the city border is all R1. The existing R5 that includes the Karmel and The Brittany is already an aberration that shoves density further east than anywhere else from 35th to the city border. Extending it even further east is not a logical extension, it actually would be tacking on to something that is already an aberration.

President Motzenbecker: Just want to make you aware, you have four behind you and you have seven minutes.

Harry Kaiser: I'll take a time out and let Jerry Doyle speak from the Tangletown Neighborhood Association.

Jerry Doyle (4808 Pleasant Ave S): I'm on the Tangletown board. I just want to reiterate one thing that was in our letter, which I helped compose. Basically it's in contradiction to what Lee Blohns said about the Tangletown board being unanimously in favor of this. The vote was actually four to three, three being against. The four that were for it, were on condition that they had concerns with it being 30 units also being too large. We were looking for cutback at that point also. That's where all the conditions and everything else...

Commissioner LaShomb: I think I heard about 15 times that people think this should be smaller so I'm going to pose the question that our television audience has to be asking right now and that is, how big do you think this project could be and be viable?

Jerry Doyle: Is that question to me?

Commissioner LaShomb: Anybody that has an answer because so far all I've heard is that it should be smaller.

Harry Kaiser: Our group would be in favor of a building that is in similar scale to the building next door which is around 20,000 square feet. We don't think it's instructive to speak in terms of units because so many of the units proposed are so large. We would prefer, in terms of keeping it in the scale of the neighborhood, to talk in terms of square footage. They are proposing 63,000 square feet. The building next door is 20. My house is 19. Our group would be in favor of a building that was in similar scale to The Brittany which is around 20,000 square feet.

Curt Kellett (5329 1st Ave): I'm one of the residents who is going to be affected by this. My argument is toward McMansionism. There is a big debate going on about McMansions. My other question is, there were letters from RLK Engineering, James Yarish and a neighborhood letter written by Harry Kaiser, did you guys receive those?

President Motzenbecker: Yes.

Duane Evans (5336 1st Ave S): I'm five houses away from this. In regards to what you're asking about the size, we had tried to put forth some alternatives including Habitat for Humanity. We have some neighbors involved with that. The church has been unwilling to deal with that. Although they are portraying this as a nonprofit organization, in reality they are taking nine million dollars in tax credits for a donation of a small parcel of land. The actual spots where they are building this does not line up with where the jobs are. In their own application, they have this document that shows...the stars are where they're building these "workforce housing". If you'll notice, in Hennepin County where they are building a majority of these, they're getting either zero job growth or -14 next job loss. If they're actually trying to help these people, it doesn't seem logical to put the housing away from where the jobs are and then forcing these people to ride buses or what have you to get to their work. It would make more sense if they could find a more appropriate location that is closer to actually where the jobs are going to be versus forcing them to separate from their families and spend all their time on buses.

Commissioner Tucker: Two and a half minutes left.

Bruce Hanks [not on sign-in sheet]: Just the one thing I haven't heard overly addressed is just the size of the building and the amount of bedrooms. From what I'm told, there is going to be anywhere between 40-50 children, maybe 75 children in the building. I guess the question we have as some of the commercial owners there is where are they going to go and play? On 54th and Nicollet, there is a parking lot we have that is right behind Libby Frozen Custard and any time I come over there on a Saturday morning or Sunday morning or when the sun is going down the businesses are closed. It's the skateboard park; kids are bouncing balls off the back of Libby Frozen Custard. When they're really bored, the building turns into a climbing wall. We're constantly chasing kids away. I guess my question is, if you're going to have that many children, where are they going to play? They're going to have a half-court basketball court. Two people playing one-on-one that are 16 years old, they're going to dominate that court the rest of the day. I don't know where these other 13, 14, 15, 16 year old kids are going to go. They're not going to go to the south because that's all residential neighborhood. They're not going to go across the street because that's the freeway. They might venture down to Minnehaha Creek and wonder around, but that's going to get boring, there's no open space there. They're eventually going to wind up wandering down to Nicollet where the lights are the lots are to play. That's just my concern. I don't know how they're going to monitor or what have you. Up to this point they're not being monitored. The kids that are in the building right behind us, you can shoo them away. As soon as they see my car now they run anyway because they know I'm going to get out and chase them away. A lot of kids are going to be wandering around. They have no place to hang out.

Commissioner Tucker: Less than a minute.

Leah Kaiser (5344 Stevens Ave): I live directly across...this is my house. I want to leave you with the message that the Residents for Smart Density are really not opposed to affordable housing. We're not even opposed to this particular project at all. What we're really hoping for the commission to do is look at the concerns that we have, and we believe that they're really viable concerns. We really dedicated a lot of time and energy going into looking at the details, trying to approach this with an open mind. We, the people that live here, the 90% that are opposed to this, are really just falling back on if we could scale it down, could we partner with Mayflower and Plymouth in a way that has not been done before. Aside from the comments that have been made, we really want to embrace this in our neighborhood and we really want to make it a win-win for the individuals that are going to live there, for the businesses that have customers there and the of course for us that live in the neighborhood. If we could just appeal to you to take a look really closely at the information that we're presenting, we're just asking for that time and consideration. Thank you.

President Motzenbecker closed the public hearing.

President Motzenbecker: I want to say thank you very much. I appreciate the respectful manner in which you guys have presented and we appreciate it. It was excellent information that will help us.

Commissioner LaShomb: Maybe it's premature to make a motion but I'm going to try one. First of all, I do want to say that I do appreciate the dialogue and the discussion. I've been on the Planning Commission six years and if you think this is the first time this kind of issue has

appeared in front of the Planning Commission, watch television. On Channel 79 at 4:30 on Mondays and what you'll discover is that it isn't. This was a very good discussion. I think in some ways the issue is a moral issue and I am a good Methodist and believe in social service and all the things that go with that concept. I think the discussion tonight really wasn't a discussion about whether this is the morally right thing to do or not to do. I think the real issue is if it works here. I guess my reaction to this is that I'm a little frustrated when I hear these kinds of discussions because in my six years on the Planning Commission we have approved a lot of projects with a high degree of density for a lot of different reasons. I was trying to make a list and no project is the same as another project so anyone can debate me and say it's not the same. Just down in the part of south Minneapolis that I live in we approved a significantly sized project at 43rd and Hiawatha that was in a residential area. We approved one at 46th and Hiawatha that was a significant density. On 54th Avenue by the Veteran's Hospital...Olin's Crossings. None of those are affordable housing units per se but they are highly dense units and they're very close in to residential neighborhoods. Not everybody in neighborhoods like them. For Olin Crossings, people came out of the woodwork and said it would never work in their community. If you lived over by Bloomington Avenue in south Minneapolis you'd discover that density over there is just going bonkers. They're adding density and housing over there in ways that they see as ways to build their community and provide housing. I think the basic point about this is, I'm having a little trouble understand that this is a large project when I've seen some of the other projects that we have approved at the Planning Commission in terms of density. I don't see this as a large project. The second thing I don't see about this is that I think that we all have to understand that providing housing for individuals who have income restrictions or for a variety of other reasons is a citywide problem, it is not simply of problem of putting it in the Phillips neighborhood. We had a big debate about three months ago about the Fair Housing Standards Act because under the Fair Housing Standards Act they are putting housing for individuals with disabilities into the Phillips neighborhood to the point where Phillips neighborhood, pretty soon, is going to be called the disabled Phillips neighborhood. My feeling is that we need to disperse housing for individuals who are challenged because of disability or income or other social reasons. When I look at this project, I see it as a way to disperse those opportunities across the city. That means that everyone has got to take a little bit of the piece of the action. I don't think it's a liability to take affordable housing in your neighborhood. I think in the end it's going to be an asset. The question is not to allow the kind of concentrations that we have tended to allow in the city of Minneapolis when it comes to issues like affordable housing or housing for disabled people. The third thing is, if you go in the packet and take a look at the agencies and government who have been working on this project, I'm not totally sure what it means that says that the application has been working in cooperation. I'm assuming that there is some financing involved in this cooperation. Minnesota Housing Finance Agency, City of Minneapolis, Hennepin County, Minneapolis Public Housing Authority and private resources; it sounds like this project has been thought out by a lot of people. Given all of those facts, I think that this is an appropriate site for this kind of project and so I move the rezoning from R1 to R5 (Tucker seconded).

Commissioner Nordyke: I would agree that it is a good project. I think it's really nicely designed and I don't think that, in general, the density is certainly any worse than a lot of other projects that we have seen. The question though, I think I'm having trouble with, is the fact that I have been personally involved in low income housing for 20 years, I think it's a well designed project, I agree that the city needs to work hard to distribute the projects around the city, but I don't think that when I look at the reasons for me to rezone something that my personal enjoyment of the project lays too heavily on the process of rezoning. Who is the Plymouth Church Neighborhood Foundation associated with? Is that with the Plymouth Congregational Church? Ok, thank you.

The number two finding with the zoning piece, this relates to the low income housing piece, it strikes me that when you're talking here about this Minneapolis Plan and the policy makers and all, under that kind of logic, wouldn't any affordable housing project that we do in this city fit the finding in number two? Is that truly the case? That really doesn't strike me as really the intent of that, right? Simply because this is affordable housing it is therefore not in the sole interest of the property owner, it is in the public good.

Staff Dvorak: It is in the public interest to disperse affordable housing throughout the city. The policies in finding number one state that.

Commissioner Nordyke: Question then is, in any discussion that we have about rezoning, if it is an affordable project, affordable housing project, it will fill the requirements of number two? Is that the way that we look at that?

Staff Dvorak: I think that's a difficult question.

President Motzenbecker: It would definitely be a factor.

Staff Dvorak: I think it would have to be a factor in that. There are a number of reasons. Increasing density alone is a policy of the city of Minneapolis. Increasing the number of affordable units in the city is another policy. I guess it could have been written or it could be written to say increasing density and dispersing affordable housing throughout the city are policies of the city of Minneapolis and therefore rezoning this property is in compliance with the policies as approved by the City Council.

Commissioner Nordyke: Isn't a policy to promote single family housing as well?

Staff Dvorak: It would be increasing density to build in-fill housing on vacant lots.

Commissioner Nordyke: I haven't sat here and done a lot of low income housing projects. Is it basically our policy as a board that if something is a low income housing project that number two is satisfied?

Staff Sporlein: I think you're being overly simplistic for this. Context matters and also it's not affordable housing anywhere. Increasing affordable housing is an adopted City policy, but also where and context matters. In concentrated areas is not a policy. Does it happen sometimes? Sure, because there are competing policies and then a policy decision is made. It's not simply "every time it's this", it's a contributing factor, something to consider when you're considering all the findings of a rezoning.

Commissioner Nordyke: Ok, I might talk about that a little bit later. Finding number three on this; we have done a lot of density in places, but the problem that I'm having with this is that even though we really like the project and even though we understand that the church is on Diamond Lake and all that, the property is surrounded by R1.

President Motzenbecker: R5 is directly adjacent and C1 is...

Commissioner Nordyke: Ok, three sides. It has R5 on one side and on three sides it has R1, right?

Staff Dvorak: It has R1 to the north and the south. The freeway is to the east. I guess by how our zoning maps are drawn we go to the centerline so I guess you could say the freeway is zoned R1, but I don't think it's one car traveling up and down the road on a daily basis so I would say that's maybe taken out of context to say that the freeway is zoned R1.

Commissioner Nordyke: Ok, let's say the freeway is a given. We'll just pretend like that doesn't exist.

Staff Dvorak: Then you have R1 to the north, R1 to the south and then R5 to the west.

Commissioner Nordyke: There is currently a single family home on this site.

Staff Dvorak: There is one single family home on the site that the church uses.

Commissioner Nordyke: For discussion purposes, when I usually see things like this, it's a little bit more than just one side being bounded by a different...

Staff Dvorak: Churches can go in any zoning district. I shouldn't say any zoning district, I'm not sure about industrial zoning, but I think it's allowed in I1. The church could be zoned C2 and it would be a permitted use.

Commissioner Nordyke: That I understand, but my point is that it's not. It's zoned R1.

Staff Dvorak: That's correct.

Commissioner Nordyke: When I look at these things, I try to get some context, as Commissioner Schiff said earlier when he was talking about the other property that we were talking about, apologized to the people that bought those condos without realizing that there was a commercial zone next to them. I try to look at it so that the context of the people who own it and move in there and it's not unreasonable to me that these single family home owners would look at something like this and assume that there wouldn't be a high density project put in across the street from them. My last point on this is with regard to finding number four. I think the point is, we have to find reasons why that there is no unreasonable use for this property but one of them is single family dwellings and there is a single family dwelling there and there are five reasonable uses that we can list at this property that could be done right here.

Staff Dvorak: They could put three community residential facilities on the lot with up to 18 residents. They could do two more single family homes. They could convert the parking lot and the vacant lot to a community garden, a public park, which I don't think the Park Board would buy this land because it's not enough acreage and the next one would be a place of assembly. Those are the only five permitted uses. In the R1, there aren't many conditional uses that could go in because of its zoning classification.

Commissioner Nordyke: Right, but the issue I'm having with this, under the context right here, is it's clearly happening right across the street. There is a single family home that's on it. There are single family homes right across the street on the same frontage. To me, in that particular sense, the idea that there's not a reasonable use for the property is one of the biggest reasons I'm having...saying that I could make that finding in number four. By big issue here is not with the project, it's a great project. My issue is that we don't get to go rezoning things next door to

people with single family homes because we like the project. We have to have a reason to do that and I'm going to say...I'm going to hear what my commissioners have to say but I'm not right now convinced that we have the findings to...

Staff Dvorak: I would point out that unlike a variance; you don't need to make all findings for a rezoning to approve it.

Commissioner Nordyke: I'm not buying three out of the five.

Staff Dvorak: I'm just pointing it out for the commissioners and everyone in the audience that unlike variances you don't have to.

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: I continue to have the question about why R5 rather than R4 if R5 allows so much more than what we're actually looking for here.

Staff Dvorak: This project could go R4 with no other additional variances. The only thing that would need to occur is...the density allowed in the R4 it's 1500 square feet per dwelling unit. That would allow 22 dwelling units on the site with the density bonus for affordable housing, that's an additional four. With the density bonus for enclosed parking, that's an additional four. That gets you to exactly 30 units. It could be zoned R4 with no additional variances. Nothing else changes; the setbacks are the same, the maximum FAR is 1.5 versus 2 but the site's FAR is 1.3 so it's a moot point. Other than the density and accepting us to do the analysis which I've done shorthanded they would meet the density in the R4.

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: There was mention about bike parking and interior bike parking; can you speak more to that? Is that part of the project?

Staff Dvorak: They are providing interior bicycle parking on the residential portion of the parking garage which reduces their parking requirement by one. They are providing more than four bicycle spaces given the number of units, but that's the minimum required to offset the parking requirement by one.

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: Ok. So we might think about more for there. I guess, in dealing with the R4 versus R5, I understand that...I think generally this is a good project. I hate to over-zone in the rezoning, to go higher than we need to out of respect for the community. I think it signals some assurances that this project couldn't change or somebody couldn't buy the project and do something different further down the road or whatever because the zoning is forever. That's one thing I was curious about when I saw what R5 allowed and it seemed so off from what we were doing there. I guess I would urge my fellow commissioners to think about going R4 versus R5 if we don't need that additional zoning. The other thing that occurs to me to, it seems like this exit that goes on to Stevens Avenue right now from the church parking lot, I'm assuming that people are leaving that and merging with the traffic that's coming off of 35W now, correct?

Staff Dvorak: I don't go here on Sundays so I'm not sure, but I would assume that if people are leaving this parking lot you can use the alley on to Stevens.

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: Generally, when I look at this project and the pictures, it's interesting the perspective on the picture, which is why I asked pointblank, from a perspective if

this building is taller or shorter than the building to the west of it. One side presented a picture that it looked like it was much taller than the building to the west of it and then the other one presented that it was shorter. I think I heard correctly that it was four to six feet shorter than the building directly to the west. When I look at this site specifically, it's not the most desirable site. You're facing a freeway wall, a wooden wall directly across the street. To me it seems that they got the height down, they went from four stories to three stories. Frankly, I would find four stories more problematic in this location. With the three stories, and since it's going downhill anyway and with that highway wall right there kind of making it not the nicest site in the world anyway, I think that there has been a lot of attention to the aesthetics as far as trying to be sensitive to some kind of affordable housing but nice housing, aesthetic housing. I think the scale seems like it fits in with its contour nicely into the hill. I think the shared parking issue...of course there are going to be some things done with that...

President Motzenbecker: Focus on the zoning, please.

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: With the zoning specifically, I guess I don't see a good reason to go to R5 if we don't need R5. If this doesn't pass, I would make a counter proposal that we just go with R4 if that's what's really necessary to make the project viable and I think as a courtesy to the neighbors that would go a long way towards not overzoning and maybe making people a little more nervous.

Commissioner El-Hindi: I agree with Commissioner Norkus-Crampton about the rezoning to R4. My question is to staff, did you go to R5 so you could have a contiguous R5 zoning coming from the back of the property to the west? Was that the main reason?

Staff Dvorak: No. When I originally met with the applicants, they were proposing 40 units. After a series of neighborhood meetings the developer reduced their count to 30 but submitted everything at R5 because that had been what we were planning on all along, but after the neighborhood meetings and reducing it by 10 units...actually, in our incomplete letter back to them we said that they may want to consider R4. It was "you could possibly go R4; we may need to check everything else again." For sake of timing, we kept moving forward with R5 because that is how they submitted everything to us initially.

Commissioner El-Hindi: So if this body would approve an R4 today, do you feel confident about the type of application that they have that it would be sufficient for this project at this point?

Staff Dvorak: I would defer to Jason on approving a zoning classification. It's less than what they asked for.

Commissioner El-Hindi: Or do we have to deny the application?

Staff Wittenberg: I would suggest that if you were to entertain a motion that gets you to that point, it would be to deny the R5 district and in lieu thereof approve the R4 district. Between now and the time the City Council Zoning and Planning committee roles around we can have additional discussions about whether any other issues are raised by the R4 district as well as discussing the issue with the city attorneys.

Commissioner Tucker: I will speak for the motion, item A, to rezone R1 to R5. I think staff laid it out very nicely. It's adjacent to R5 zoning, much of the rest of the block an R5 or R6. The

proximity to the community corridors and the commercial node and most important of all, the city Comp Plan policies calling for higher density in the city and particularly for affordable housing dispersed throughout the city. I think this is a good case. If we want to think about a lower zoning, I think we should pass this motion and suggest that Z&P, when they take it up automatically, think about R4 perhaps after staff has researched that a bit more to see if there are any problems with the R4. So, I will vote for LaShomb's motion.

Commissioner Huynh: I will probably support Commissioner Tucker's and Commissioner LaShomb's motion on rezoning from R1 to R5. I want to speak as a Kenny neighborhood resident who, for the last three and a half years, have used the on ramp, which now the bridge is down for Diamond Lake and now by default take Minnehaha up through Stevens and go through Diamond Lake on the way home. I go past this site every day on my way home. I think that it is applicable and consistent with the Minneapolis Plan. It does accommodate density. I think it is an appropriate site. If you compare the site where it is in terms of where the Mayflower is to where the adjacent neighborhood single family block, the context and character is very different. You have mass transit right on the corner right on the corner of where Diamond Lake is intersecting with Stevens. That's a transfer point for where the major buses go through. Currently, with the bridge being down, the buses have been rerouted. It accommodates a lot of people who need or who depend on mass transit to be able to use it without using single occupancy vehicles which is the reason why we have sprawl throughout the city. Therefore, with providing amenities along community corridors, it's an ideal location for everyone. I love our neighborhood and I'm sure everyone in Tangletown, Windom and Lynnhurst would speak in favor their neighborhoods and that's the reasons why we live in the neighborhoods. I did want to speak to neighborhood nodes in terms of the commercial and retail that we have on Nicollet, but also on Lyndale. There isn't a reason other than work why I leave that area. We have the Parkway, Kowalski's, Cub Foods, the museum, gas stations, Walgreens, everything that you need to sustain your lifestyle. It's a livable community in that neighborhood. By not accommodating density where you can with mass transit, I think is not consistent with accommodating medium density housing for people that I think that we should accommodate for, especially when they don't make a lot of money. I just want to speak in favor of density with finding number one.

Commissioner Mains: I will also support the motion. Contrary to my commissioner on the other end, I do buy all the reasons for the zoning change and I do think R5 is probably appropriate here. I don't think you would sell a single family home looking out directly across the street at a very high sound barrier right on a freeway exit. Some questions have been raised about parking and traffic. I do appreciate the comments and everyone who has talked. I was thinking through this. The concern about people merging onto Stevens...

President Motzenbecker: Can we keep it focused to the zoning?

Commissioner Mains: I think if you oppose this density, in effect you are opposing workforce housing. I live in a neighborhood that has the same population profile of the Stevens neighborhood, the Seward neighborhood, and we're actually looking for opportunities for workforce housing. I will be sorry to lose one of my neighbors who wants to move here. Workforce housing is important. It's not for people necessarily outside your neighborhood. My 24 year old daughter has a degree in teaching and is a teacher for an after school program for a major nonprofit plus works for another nonprofit and is living at home because she can't afford any place to rent. This is the type of housing we need. This is where we need this housing. We need this housing across the city. We don't just need it in Phillips, we don't just need it in

Powderhorn, we don't just need it Seward. We need it across the city because these jobs are across the city. What we found in the Seward neighborhood is you need a quality developer, you have a quality developer. You have a developer with a track record, that they are providing a playground, that they are providing a community room and that they are providing a computer lab is an indication that you have a quality developer here. I think you should be this organization is proposing this.

Staff Wittenberg: One additional point about the R4 versus the R5 district; it's partly dependent on what you do with the parking variance. Ms. Dvorak can correct me if I'm wrong, but if you were to deny the parking variance and the applicant were to provide a couple of extra spaces and those spaces were outdoors the applicant may not qualify then for the density bonus that would get them up to the 30 units that would be allowed in the R4 district.

President Motzenbecker: That just confused me.

Staff Wittenberg: The applicant would not qualify for the additional density bonus to get them to 30 units if you were to zone to the R4 district.

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: So if we do approve the parking variance then there's no issue?

Staff Wittenberg: Then that issue should be a non-issue then.

Commissioner LaShomb: I think procedurally the way this is going to all work is that individuals who don't want this project, if they see down-zoning it to 4 is a reasonable thing to do, they can propose it at Zoning and Planning. I think I want to leave it at 5 because that's what they were originally told to do predominately and I think now to go back and say they could do it cheaper...there's kind of a rule that you should do as minimal zoning as you have to do, but I think in this case I think it's kind of gray about what the impact of an R4 is in this situation so staff's going to have to do some work between now and Z&P. If people in the community are worried about a 4 versus a 5 I guess they can bring it up in an appeal which is probably going to be coming anyway. I'm going to ask that we call the question.

Staff Sporlein: On rezonings, the Planning Commission is advisory to the City Council. The City Council makes those decisions. On the other land use application, the Planning Commission is final action unless appealed.

President Motzenbecker: The action before us is to rezone the site per staff recommendation from R1 to R5. All those in favor? Opposed?

The motion carried 4-3 (Schiff not present for the vote).

Commissioner LaShomb: I'm going to move the conditional use permit for 30 dwelling units (Tucker seconded). I wasn't sure I got a consistent answer out of the community about exactly what they thought out to happen on this site other than it shouldn't be 30 units. I heard 19, which is probably as close as we're going to get to anything. I guess anybody who has tracked any of the housing projects across the city whether they are affordable housing or others and goes back and looks at housing projects within neighborhoods you would come to the conclusion pretty fast that 30 units on a site this size is not unusual. In fact, I think it's, in some ways, an

underutilization of this site. They went from 40 to 30; I think that's a reasonably good compromise given concerns of people in the neighborhood. I think the conditional use permit is appropriate at 30.

President Motzenbecker: I would add to that, they can have 51 units by right with an R5 and they are only choosing to have 30. They went down from 40 to 30. I understand some of the other commissioner's concerns with the previous thing, but I really think this is smart and appropriate units of density for this site. It's a half a block from a major bus line, the number 18, which is one of the most heavily traveled in the city. I do think that this level of density is very smart and very appropriate here for similar reasons that were already brought up.

Commissioner Nordyke: If you all insist that this must be an R5, then I agree with Commissioner LaShomb that this is perfectly appropriate density and the developer should probably be commended for keeping it at what is at least reasonable density. So, I'm going to vote in favor of it.

Commissioner Tucker: I think that's perfectly appropriate. As you mentioned, 51 would be allowed. We have the community corridors, the commercial node and the Comp Plan policies. I want to especially thank staff for that little chart about density of adjacent properties; that was very helpful to lay out the case there. I liked all your charts because I understood them actually.

President Motzenbecker: All those in favor? Opposed?

The motion carried 7-0 (Schiff not present for the vote).

Commissioner LaShomb: This is the issue I am having the most trouble with because it sounded so convoluted that I don't know anyone's going to carry the thing out. In our experience in housing projects in the city of Minneapolis we have always had issues about how parking works. A variance from 29 to 27 is not excessive. In fact, it's pretty darn conservative. We've seen some projects where they have wanted to cut the parking to close to zip. My feeling about this is that it's going to require a lot of enforcement on the church's part and a lot of enforcement on this project's part to keep this parking thing working. It's inevitable whenever you build a project that you're going to have some increased parking on the streets and you're going to have some increased congestion. What the issue really comes down to is how vigilant all the players are to accomplish this. I was thinking of this idea of the church is going to have to figure out a way to clean out this parking lot on Saturdays and Sundays so they can use it for church parking. My reason was that maybe I'm getting old and so I don't have to worry about people staying overnight anymore, but to tell my friends 35 years ago that they'd have get their car out of there by 7:00 a.m., that's a little goofy. In any event, I think the real issue is going from 29 to 27 and how the other pieces of this go together is going to be something that individuals are going to have to work with the museum, the church and with this project. Ultimately, people in the community are going to have to work with their alderman and other people to police this so that the parking works. I think, inevitably, it will work.

Commissioner Tucker: I understood this parking thing as long as I kept looking at table 541-2 on page 11. The narrative got me confused, but looking at the chart I understood it. I think we'll be looking at a lot more of these as we go along because, as we know, there is plenty of parking, it's just not managed very well. This is a good effort to manage the available parking. I do appreciate your analysis of it and I think it will work. I appreciate the church working with the Russian Art

Museum and their own housing project to make this all work. I think this is a good idea and I'm in favor of it.

Commissioner Mains: I want to thank staff. I did understand the parking and that chart was very good. I think shared parking is something we should be working more at and I hope we see a lot more charts like this. I think that made a lot of sense. A couple of issues addressed by the neighborhood...I live in an area where I have to get off interstate 94 on 25th Avenue and if you think your intersection is busy, try merging there. I have no problem merging either direction there anytime of day. That's not going to be an issue. I did sort of a back of an envelope calculation too with 71 bedrooms. We have a back of the envelope calculation we do for student housing. We'd like to see one parking space for every two bedrooms in student housing. Student housing is where you get the most parking requirement. This comes out at 35, which is really close to what we're having. It fits. If it would have come out at 40 I would question it, but it fits. The back of the envelope calculation seems to work for me so I think this makes sense.

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: I have a question about the parking lot. I think some of the neighbors are correct that in trying to get into the site, there probably are going to be a lot of people cutting through that parking lot to get to the development rather than going all the way around the block. I was curious if there were any traffic calming things presently in the parking lot to sort of slow people as they're flying through there. Can anybody answer that for me?

Lee Blohns: No, there are not traffic calming measures. We have talked to Mayflower Church about that. People have asked if they will cut off access. At this point it really is much more to get the housing development going and really seeing if there are issues, but certainly that's up for consideration or making it one way within the church parking lot to slow things.

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: You can really imagine how people, especially coming off of 35, they're not going to want to go all the way around the block all the way to Nicollet, they're going to want to cut through that parking lot.

Lee Blohns: As you can imagine, right now people cut through that parking lot. By the landscaping we're putting in on the north parking lot, we'll already create traffic calming measures for people who might be trying to go into the north part of the neighborhood. We're hopeful, but certainly things will be added if necessary.

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: I did want to make one amendment to the parking for the CUP for the...or the variance for the parking. For the bike parking, since there are going to be a lot of children there...

President Motzenbecker: Do you want it in the CUP?

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: It seems like if we're talking about parking spaces and the parking spaces is dependant on bike parking as well, correct? Is that appropriate?

President Motzenbecker: I just wanted to check.

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: It seems reasonable to me if we have 30 units with children, at least 10 bike parking spaces seems to be a conservative bare minimum to start with. I'd like to make that an additional condition to allow for the variance for the reduced parking.

President Motzenbecker: So how many more spaces?

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: Ten, please.

President Motzenbecker: Ten total, or 10 additional to the four.

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: Why don't we say 10 additional to the four? If we have 30 units and it's for families.

President Motzenbecker: So 14 bike parking spots altogether.

Commissioner LaShomb: I wonder if that should go under the site plan.

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: I guess the only reason I was wondering if it was logical here is because since part of the reason that they're reducing the parking is because they are doing bike parking. I wasn't quite sure...

President Motzenbecker: The code only allows for the four at this point. Any more would just be a site plan.

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: Ok. Thank you.

President Motzenbecker: All those in favor? Opposed?

The motion carried 7-0 (Schiff not present for the vote).

Commissioner LaShomb: Variance D has been returned.

Staff Dvorak: I don't think it was done; it should be part of this.

Commissioner LaShomb: I move that variance D be returned and that we approve variance E, site plan review with parking for bicycles and G, which is the vacation of the water easement (Huynh seconded).

President Motzenbecker: We already have the 14 bike spaces total added to the site plan review. Any more discussion? Going into my professional minutia, one of the site plan reviews was recommending a Dwarf Bush Honeysuckle for a hedge plant that needed to be 95% opaque and those really are not a good hedge plant. They're very short. They only get about three feet, if that.

Staff Dvorak: That's the minimum of what's required is three to...

President Motzenbecker: There are other hedge plant materials mentioned on the site plan that are much better so I think just to be consistent we'll keep it at like the Cotoneaster which is also on the site plan.

Staff Dvorak: So all shrubs to be, I'm sorry, I didn't hear the name.

President Motzenbecker: The hedge plants, we can just replace the dwarf bush. Hilary, if you could clarify, the open windows on the parking level, I had somewhat of a question or concern if when cars are parking in there if the headlights will be coming out that window and glaring into any neighboring...

Staff Dvorak: The headlights that will be shining through those windows will be...well at least on this side, this is the freeway side of the...or the sound wall side of the building. These are the only windows that are in the parking garage level facing 54th. Maybe Bart can answer the question, but if the cars are here I don't think headlights are going to be shining through window.

President Motzenbecker: Or even over head lights because there are some where I've seen where you drive or walk by on the street and the over head lights are coming down and they are quiet bright so I'm wondering if there is a way to perhaps louver that or screen those windows, keeping them open but just a louvering.

Bart Nelson: We had actually talked about louvers on that side. On the Stevens side, all the sills of those opens are above headlight height so you won't see any headlights out of the other windows.

Commissioner Huynh: For light that would potentially trespass the site, maybe just have staff work with the applicant to reduce light pollution past the property line and minimize the foot candles.

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: I just want to make one more comment about the aesthetics of this project. When I look at this building, I don't see an institutional sort of looking housing, I don't see something that looks like affordable housing. I see a nice quality building that there have been a lot of attempts to sort of match the surrounding character despite the increase in density. I hope that moving forward that the community can all get behind this. I live in the East Calhoun neighborhood and it's considered pretty much an affluent area, but we have 65% rental. That is something that always surprises people, but it's nice rental. It's obvious if landlords care about what they're building. It's obvious if landlords care about what they're managing. I think in this case, the thing that's working in the favor of the community and the people looking for affordable housing is that you have responsible community partners that are going to try to make this a success. They want to make a success for themselves as well as for the community. I really hope that moving forward it's seen as an asset to the area.

President Motzenbecker: I would second that. I would just like to commend the group. I think this is actually one of the best, or better, examples of this type of housing design that I have seen up here. We have a variance, a site plan review with the following conditions – that there be 14 bike parking spots total, that the applicant work with staff to minimize light pollution and foot candles on the site, that some louvers be added to the open parking windows to help reduce glare and we exchange the Dwarf Bush Honeysuckle for the Cotoneaster and then the vacation of the easement. All those in favor? Opposed?

The motion carried 7-0 (Schiff not present for the vote).

Staff Dvorak: Clarification for the applicant, did we move E?

President Motzenbecker: Yes, E, F and G.