

**University District Zoning and Planning Regulatory Review  
Task Force Meeting #9**

Tuesday, February 24, 2009  
12 Morrill Hall  
100 Church St SE  
8:00 AM – 9:30 AM

**MEETING NOTES**

Task force participants present: Florence Littman, Mary Miller, Tim Harmsen, Ron Lischeid, Jason Klohs, Jo Radzwill, Kate Fournier, William Wells, Doug Carlson, Bill Dane

Others present: Peg Wolff, Robert Downs, Joe Bernard, Jessica Thesing, Robb Clarksen

**Welcome and Introductions**

Task force members and other attendees introduced themselves

**Discuss Draft Report Comments**

Reviewed summary of all comments received by City staff to date. The comments were discussed under the headings below, focusing on areas of agreement.

*Parking and Transportation*

- At this time there is limited support for a district wide parking strategy using the City's on street permit parking strategy. However, this is an item that deserves greater study in the future as University staff and student commuters continue to impact the livability of the district.
- Better enforcement of the current parking regulations should occur.
  - Consider increased enforcement early on in fall and spring semesters.
  - Increase inspections after regular business hours.
  - Concentrate enforcement to certain times of the year.

*Enforcement*

- The University should consider certifying landlords – something that they have done in the past.
  - Criteria to be determined.
- Landlords should partner with the neighborhoods to create an accreditation process – possibly through a sub-group of the Neighborhood Associations themselves. This could serve to create a direct connection between landlords, students, and the neighborhoods – possibly resulting in less reliance on City inspections.
- Consider a fee based landlord association that helps to pay for general maintenance and upkeep of housing – i.e. shoveling of snow.
- Strict enforcement of existing City regulations.
- City should encourage altering state laws related to relative homestead.

- In some instances students should be held directly responsible for violations of City ordinances.
- The University should encourage a common lease for all landlords – perhaps through a University or Neighborhood accreditation program.

#### *Design and Development Standards*

- Neighborhood notification for 1-4 unit structures and demolitions needs to change.
  - Neighborhoods could be one of the required recipients for Preliminary Development Review (PDR) plans on 1-4 unit structures – along with a narrative description of the project.
- A different parking requirement could encourage smaller units/bedroom counts.
- Encourage retention of existing housing stock in certain areas – when conversions to rental do occur, they should happen in a manner that retains the character of the home and allows for future conversion back to home-ownership housing.

#### *Planning and Zoning Framework*

- Due to time constraints, the task force did not discuss this item – attendees were encouraged to submit any additional comments in writing.

#### *Public Process*

- Due to time constraints, the task force did not discuss this item – attendees were encouraged to submit any additional comments in writing.

#### **Action plan for addressing moratoria**

City of Minneapolis CPED staff presented several options for moving forward to address the concerns laid out in the 1-4 Unit and Demolition moratoria. Staff will be spending the coming weeks to do additional analysis on the options presented. Several pros and cons of the proposals are listed on the last page of the [meeting handouts](#). Some additional comments on the options are listed below:

#### *Floor Area Ratio (FAR) for 1-4 Unit Structures*

- Pros and cons were discussed – there is some concern that this would stifle development and does not create an incentive for landlords to improve their property.
- People also pointed out that this may encourage developers to acquire groups of parcels for larger development rather than developing small projects one by one – there was mixed opinion as to whether or not this was a good thing.

#### *Increased parking requirement for residential development*

- There was agreement that several different numbers should be considered for the requirement – not just 0.5 spaces per bedroom.
- There was a concern raised that an increase in parking requirement could lock many properties into their current condition by making it difficult to redevelop – leaving no incentive for property owners to further invest in the district.
- Staff should consider alternative modes of transportation as ways to address the parking problem.

**Timeline of next steps**

- City staff will continue work on addressing the moratoria, with the goal of implementing ordinance changes before the moratoria expire. Mr. Wells offered assistance in analyzing the options.
- The next ZPRR Task Force meetings are tentatively scheduled for March 24<sup>th</sup>, and April 28<sup>th</sup>, from 8:00am – 9:30am in Morrill Hall Room 12. Depending on progress of staff work, and whether or not other issues arise, the March meeting may not be necessary – an update will be sent out by email in the coming weeks.