

Comments from Stadium Village University Avenue Station Area Plan – Final List
Public Comment Period: May 1 – June 14, 2012

This includes all substantive comments made during the public comment period, as well as the way they were responded to by staff editing the plan. This does not include minor typos and edits that were corrected. This included U of M comments not in the table presented at CPC Committee of the Whole.

Source	Referring to	Comment	Response
6/7/12 Public Meeting	Transportation chapter	Need improvements to intersection at 27 th , Franklin, and E River – congested and unsafe for cars and pedestrians	Added to recommendations in Transportation chapter
6/7/12 Public Meeting	Transportation chapter	Need to make signage and wayfinding intuitive for customers of businesses	Addressed in both transportation and economic development chapters
6/7/12 Public Meeting	Transportation chapter	Emphasize that parking prices are key – some consider them too expensive to pay	Parking section of transportation chapter includes analysis of cost
6/7/12 Public Meeting	Economic development chapter	How do existing businesses fit into the future plan for the area? How do we keep them from being pushed out or priced out by new development?	Strategies to retain a diversity of businesses included in economic development chapter
6/7/12 Public Meeting	Transportation chapter	Need designation of 24 hour critical parking zone in Motley area along Erie & Ontario – no room for residents to park on football game days	Added language to short-term parking recommendations regarding critical parking in neighborhood areas
6/7/12 Public Meeting	Urban design & public realm chapter	Public safety needs to be address – outsiders see college students as “easy pickings” and target them; how do we encourage law enforcement presence (e.g. landlord subsidizing police officer’s rent)	Added language about public safety to the urban design and public realm chapter
6/7/12 Public Meeting	Urban design & public realm chapter	What is the quality of structures that are built? Some large new buildings seem very cheaply done; how do we encourage buildings that are soundproof, concrete construction, high quality? U professors and staff don’t want to live in cheaply made buildings	Plan advocates for high quality development through suggested design standards; state legislation places some limits on level of quality we can mandate
6/7/12 Public Meeting	Urban design & public realm chapter	Need to focus on environmental sustainability, energy efficiency – good design ideas like active solar, parking out of sight, other “green” concepts	Urban design and public realm chapter includes language on encouraging sustainable design
6/7/12 Public Meeting	Economic development	Would like to see a grocery store in the area – questions on how to make that happen	Market study demonstrates demand for commercial uses, including groceries; report available in appendix
6/7/12 Public Meeting	Housing chapter	We need more affordable housing, including family housing; need more specific plan for how to make this happen – not just talk, but action	Text added to implementation chapter to better describe potential implementation paths
6/7/12 Public Meeting	Urban design & public realm chapter	Consider land bridge over I-94 to create green space and open up land for development	An interesting idea, though outside of the focus area for the plan; may be considered in open space plan currently underway

			though College of Design
6/7/12 Public Meeting	Urban design & public realm chapter	Consider shadowing by tall buildings of adjacent properties; need to avoid excessive shadowing	Added recommendation regarding consideration of shadowing
6/7/12 Public Meeting	Economic development	There are lots of commercial vacancies between 29 th and Emerald along University; how do we enrich this area and strengthen business climate? Need to trigger new growth to strengthen area.	This issue is addressed in economic development chapter
6/7/12 Public Meeting	Transportation chapter	Near Huron entrance off of I-94, there is a bus stop; there is no good way to get to it – need pedestrian walkway, safe way to get there	Added recommendation to transportation chapter
6/7/12 Public Meeting	Housing chapter	Note that it is “cool” to live near Minneapolis U of M campus – the St Paul campus housing does not have the same level of demand	Duly noted
6/7/12 Public Meeting	Urban design & public realm chapter and appendix	Map shows existing bike routes on Oak and University east of split with 4 th ; neither of these connections currently exist	Map revised
6/7/12 Public Meeting	Urban design & public realm chapter and appendix	Need better east-west bike connections through campus, around Scholars’ Walk area	Added recommendation to urban design and public realm chapter
6/7/12 Public Meeting	Urban design & public realm chapter and appendix	Link to St Paul bike system at border is an important one – need to call this out in recommendations; Oak is also probably an important link	Added recommendation to urban design and public realm chapter
6/4/12 PPERRIA neighborhood group	Urban design & public realm chapter and appendix	Need to be more explicit on map with connection to 27 th Ave Grand Rounds route	Line added to show Grand Rounds proposed route
6/4/12 PPERRIA neighborhood group	Economic development chapter	Need more commercial uses, retail and services, not just a bedroom community	This issue is addressed in economic development chapter
6/4/12 PPERRIA neighborhood group	Transportation chapter	Currently, parking not convenient enough in some places for commercial to be viable; need on-street, convenient solutions; organize and provide consistent signage to make parking locations clearer	This issue is addressed in transportation chapter
6/4/12 PPERRIA neighborhood group	Transportation chapter	Traffic volumes on University Ave vary a lot during the day; perhaps allow limited on-street parking during off-peak hours	Added recommendation to transportation chapter
6/4/12 PPERRIA neighborhood group	Transportation chapter	More clearly outline caveats and preconditions in main text regarding district parking proposal	More clarification added to recommendations for district parking
6/4/12 PPERRIA neighborhood group	Transportation chapter	Show support for SEMI redevelopment and Granary Road (phase I) completion	Added recommendations to transportation chapter
6/4/12 PPERRIA neighborhood group	Land use chapter p. 75	Add caption to clarify this is not the plan’s “official” land use map	Added caption as indicated
6/4/12 PPERRIA	Land use chapter p.	Review “arts related” recommendations to ensure the language is	Added reference to institutional uses;

neighborhood group	78	flexible enough to include other desirable uses as well; need other retail there – add “institutional” to possible uses, strengthen language in support of businesses	language includes a range of land use types in addition to arts
6/4/12 PPERRIA neighborhood group	Urban design & public realm chapter p. 87 and appendix	Clarify that green space on map 7.3 doesn’t necessarily mandate exact layout or imply public ownership; address liability/safety issues regarding green space (how monitored and policed?); Granary Park needs better labeling to show likely just passive green space	Added language to clarify that the private green spaces are not mandated, and would in most cases be continued to be maintained as private property
6/4/12 PPERRIA neighborhood group	Urban design & public realm	U of M needs to manage stormwater too; make sure this is clear in text	Added language clarifying that U of M should also use stormwater best management practices
6/4/12 PPERRIA neighborhood group	Introduction chapter	Clarify difference between small area plan and regulations, including the purpose, and how they are used and implemented; specific note regarding graphics and renderings (evocative, not a site plan)	Added clarifying language to introduction chapter regarding difference between plan and regulations, and note regarding graphics
6/4/12 PPERRIA neighborhood group	Implementation chapter p. 121	Clarify “pocket parks” recommendation to be more clear that this is not mandated or necessarily public space on any given site	Added language clarifying this
6/4/12 PPERRIA neighborhood group	Transportation chapter	Ensure parking recommendations reference interim solutions during construction/short term	Plan includes short term/interim solutions
5/31/12 Prospect Park station group	Land use chapter	Should allow some flexibility of uses (e.g. commercial) around PP station area and on 4 th Ave SE, but make it clear this should not be required – also, do not siphon energy off of University Ave (main commercial corridor); on 29 th should focus commercial on corners	Added detail to recommendations for 4 th St in land use chapter
5/31/12 Prospect Park station group	Land use chapter	Clarify that taller buildings would be acceptable and appropriate around PP station area	Included in recommendations for station area in land use chapter
5/31/12 Prospect Park station group	Transportation chapter	Consider innovative treatments for 4 th Ave – not a through street so there’s an opportunity to do something interesting; including potential for innovative stormwater treatments	Added language suggesting this possibility in transportation chapter
5/31/12 Prospect Park station group	Transportation, Economic development chapters	Show support for SEMI buildout, incorporating ideas from PPERRIA planning and SEMI Master Plan	Added recommendations to transportation chapter in support of this
5/31/12 Prospect Park station group	Land use chapter	Future land use map should show 27 th Ave going through property north of 4 th	Space for 27 th Ave right-of-way extension added to future land use map between 4 th and transitway
5/31/12 Prospect Park station group	Transportation chapter	Consider limited auto access from 29 th , with curb cuts off of 4 th	Review of station area design suggests this will be the case
5/25/12 Glendale Resident Council	Urban design & public realm chapter	Buildings need to be renovated or replaced – newer and more attractive so people can be proud to show they live here	Support for renovation of Glendale is included in housing chapter
5/25/12 Glendale	Economic	Need more restaurants and shops, businesses in the area to meet	Market study supports the development of

Resident Council	development chapter	needs of residents	additional retail and services in area
5/25/12 Glendale Resident Council	Housing chapter	Need more affordable housing options for people	Additional guidance provided for affordable housing development in implementation chapter
5/25/12 Glendale Resident Council	Urban design & public realm chapter	More safety and security needed in area, including with new development	New text and recommendations added to urban design and public realm chapter
5/25/12 Glendale Resident Council	Land use chapter	Would like to have a library located nearby – no one close to here now	Library referenced as possible use in area
5/22/12 SEBA meeting	Land use chapter	Make sure it's clear how this relates to U of M boundary, both existing and future	U boundary shown on future land use map, with clarification as to how it was drawn in the text
5/22/12 SEBA meeting	Housing chapter	How much does this focus on affordable housing? Should encourage other types as well. Need to more clearly define “workforce housing”	Additional language added to implementation chapter clarifying this; workforce housing added to glossary
5/22/12 SEBA meeting	Urban design & public realm chapter	How does this connect to the plans for the Grand Rounds? That needs to be clear in the plan	Urban design and public realm chapter outlines link to Grand Rounds
5/22/12 SEBA meeting	Economic development chapter	Describe marketing work to be done along University Ave to support businesses, and other assistance	Economic development chapter describes marketing work being done
5/22/12 SEBA meeting	Transportation chapter	Include updated graphics of Stadium Village station in the plan (from CCLRT project office)	New graphics added to plan
5/22/12 SEBA meeting	Urban design & public realm chapter	Highlight resources available for energy efficiency improvements	Language regarding energy efficiency added to implementation chapter
5/15/12 SVCA meeting	Land use chapter	Need to work on making area around U of M more inviting and welcoming to the community; build better and enhance the public realm	Land use chapter uses U of M master plan language to address this issue
5/15/12 SVCA meeting	Urban design & public realm chapter	Commercial properties are too built out – no place for people to enjoy open space	Urban design and public realm chapter has some recommended solutions to this
5/15/12 SVCA meeting	Urban design & public realm chapter	Consider Harvard for an improved pedestrian connection into campus	Added reference to Harvard St to pedestrian improvements section
5/15/12 SVCA meeting	Urban design & public realm chapter	Use the green spaces we have better; work with U of M to make spaces work better (e.g. moveable chairs)	Added recommendation to green space section
5/15/12 SVCA meeting	Urban design & public realm	Would like broader definition of an “entertainment district” for this area, to allow more dynamic signs (note: the U is opposed to some lighted signs)	Noted; may be addressed during implementation phase
5/15/12 SVCA meeting	Transportation chapter	On street parking is not configured well on Delaware, needs to be adjusted	Meter recommendation includes need for coordination between U of M and City
5/15/12 SVCA meeting	Transportation chapter	Will need to consider the grades with people crossing at 27 th and 4 th	Noted; will be addressed during implementation
5/15/12 SVCA	Urban design &	Huron “gateway” is currently just trash and weeds; gives you a	Added language regarding need to invest in

meeting	public realm chapter	bad feeling – plus low quality apartments on west side of road	corridor streetscape
5/15/12 SVCA meeting	Economic development chapter	Would like more local ownership of businesses in this area; corporate ones not invested in community	Language in plan encourages mix of business types and ownership
5/2/12 Alliance meeting	Transportation chapter	U of M may oppose new on street parking around campus unless vetted with their PTS staff; may conflict with circulation and loading, plus U has excess capacity in their parking system	Meter recommendation includes need for coordination between U of M and City
5/2/12 Alliance meeting	Land use chapter	Coordinate with St Paul around planning for Westgate station area, since it straddles the city limits	Additional content added from St Paul Westgate plan, with discussion on compatibility of two plans
5/2/12 Student group	Economic development chapter	Pedestrian traffic is key to businesses surviving in Stadium Village area	Urban design and public realm chapter addresses this directly
5/2/12 Student group	Housing chapter	New student housing may be overbuilt; it is too expensive and pricing out students, causing others to max out their student loans	Housing section talks about student housing market and need for affordable housing
5/2/12 Student group	Transportation chapter	The bus transfer location on Huron is unsafe for walking – like walking on a freeway ramp	Recommendation added to transportation chapter
5/2/12 Student group	Land use chapter	Vacate rail spur east of Huron, use for trail connection	Added language to the land use chapter
5/2/12 Student group	Transportation chapter	Reduce or calm traffic on Huron – not pedestrian friendly right now	Addressed in urban design and public realm chapter with streetscape recommendations
5/2/12 Student group	Urban design & public realm chapter	Bridge 9 to Granary Road bicycle connection is an important one	Identified as part of the existing and planned bicycle network
5/2/12 Student group	Urban design & public realm chapter	Public safety is an important concern; consider CPTED and architectural/design solutions	Added language and recommendations to urban design and public realm chapter
5/2/12 Student group	Transportation chapter	Off-street parking supplies should be reduced (this area should be leading in this way); encourage shared parking and established critical parking area throughout Prospect Park	Added recommendations regarding shared parking and critical parking
5/2/12 Student group	Urban design & public realm chapter	Expand public realm through green spaces and plazas; support plan for Missing Link connection	Addressed in recommendations in urban design and public realm chapter
5/2/12 Student group	Economic development chapter	Are there many jobs in the area east of Huron near Delaware?	Relatively modest number; most industrial uses expected to transition eventually
5/2/12 Student group	Transportation chapter	15 th Ave SE is a priority for bicycle connectivity	Added recommendation to transportation chapter
Internal staff comment	Land use chapter	Need updated parcel boundaries around stadium	County staff is investigating
Internal staff comment	Land use chapter	Can clarify industrial also includes office-related uses	Added clarification to text in land use chapter
Internal staff comment	Transportation chapter	Mill and overlay or reconstruction of University Ave between 25 th and 29 th should be a priority; can include bike lanes and parking	Added recommendation regarding University Ave to transportation chapter

Dick Gilyard – submitted notes	Implementation chapter p.117	Clarify what the compatibility refers to regarding campus edges	Added clarifying language
Dick Gilyard – submitted notes	Implementation chapter p. 119	Huron Blvd section should also refer to the fact this is a gateway into the neighborhood and U of M area	Added language to land use chapter
Dick Gilyard – submitted notes	Implementation chapter	Consider way to show “ongoing” activities in implementation framework	Added clarifying language to implementation chapter
Dick Gilyard – submitted notes	Implementation chapter p. 120	Appropriate use will depend on size and location (not placement) of the property; also add “inviting” to description of pedestrian movements	Made changes to language in implementation chapter
Dick Gilyard – submitted notes	Implementation chapter p. 122	More proactive adjective than “support” in indicating housing types for this area; also reinforce the need to maintain low density core	Made changes to language in implementation chapter
Dick Gilyard – submitted notes	Implementation chapter p. 126	Add “and other” to possible locations for temporary surface parking lots	Changed language to allow for other sites
Julia Wallace – submitted notes	Implementation chapter p. 118	Support office/industrial uses in coordination with Prospect Park station area; note that Hubbard site is in Westgate station area	Added language to land use chapter
Julia Wallace – submitted notes	Implementation chapter p. 121	Proposed bike connection on 4 th is very close to transitway trail (1/2 block)	Changed recommendation to reflect presence of parallel route
Julia Wallace – submitted notes	Implementation chapter p. 123	Need to strengthen commercial should also refer to Bedford/University commercial node	Added reference to commercial node to recommendation
Julia Wallace – submitted notes	Implementation chapter p.127	University & 27 th intersection needs left turn lanes	Added reference to turn lanes in recommendation
Internal staff comment	Urban design & public realm chapter	Need more clarity about the review of Greek houses, including historic district and interaction with U of M	Added clarification to recommendation in urban design and public realm chapter
Internal staff comment	Land use chapter	Review City comments submitted on U of M master plan	The comments have been reviewed, plan is consistent with previous City position
Internal staff comment	Urban design & public realm chapter	Bicycle Advisory Committee members should review and comment	Plan circulated for review; no comments received to date
Internal staff comment	Implementation chapter	Compare with University & 29 th Plan to ensure no conflicts; describe how to use both	Addressed generally in plan; will have staff guidance regarding plan usage
Internal staff comment	Land use chapter	Compare transitional industrial zoning to North Loop area – possibly similar circumstances?	North Loop has retained some industrial zoning in transitional areas, rather than rezoning outright, due to uncertainties about transition timeframe, etc.
Julia Wallace 6/7/12 letter	Introduction and Land use chapters	Add reference to the Westgate station, since it is so close to the city limits, and station area extends into Minneapolis; this area needs additional study and coordination with St Paul; consider commercial node, development potential, and gateway role	Added language to existing conditions and land use chapter and recommendations
Julia Wallace 6/7/12	Transportation	Questions regarding utilization of parking lots in Segment 4 – only	Added recommendation regarding

letter	chapter and appendix	used during weekdays, potential extra (event) parking weekends? 4 th St utilization very high due to local users e.g. Fraser	encouraging shared parking
Julia Wallace 6/7/12 letter	Transportation chapter and appendix (pp. 38, 114, 126)	Temporary lot at Hubbard has already been completed – plan should be updated to reflect this	Changed to more general recommendation regarding temporary lots
Julia Wallace 6/7/12 letter	Transportation chapter and appendix (p. 52)	On the map, the city boundary is in the wrong place – this needs to be moved one block east	Checked with consultant regarding editing map
Julia Wallace 6/7/12 letter	Urban design & public realm chapter and appendix (p. 44)	Does not address actual city gateway (Emerald/Bedford) among identified “primary gateways” – need way to mark this location	Added reference to role of Westgate area as a city gateway
Julia Wallace 6/7/12 letter	Urban design & public realm chapter and appendix (p. 71)	Map is mislabeled – transitway is labeled 4 th St by mistake	Correction made to map
Steering committee comments	Land use chapter	Reference “joint planning area” status of Motley from U of M master plan	Added recommendation to land use chapter regarding joint planning area
Steering committee comments	Transportation chapter	30 th Ave and surrounding streets need reconstruction	Added recommendation to transportation chapter
Steering committee comments	Housing and Economic development chapters	How do we identify and support front-end projects? How do we clarify top priorities for implementation? Need to call this out in the plan	Added priorities and details for implementation
Steering committee comments	Introduction and land use chapters	Some of the most valuable real estate in the region is here – worth noting	Added reference in introduction chapter
Steering committee comments	Implementation chapter	Add business associations to parking recommendations in support of implementation	Added to various recommendations as appropriate
David Barnhart 6/13/12 letter	Transportation chapter (pp. 107, 113-115, 124-125)	Cannot realistically support businesses and meet parking needs with existing restrictions on new and expanded surface parking; recommendations are inadequate; suggestions that parking demand will decrease or district parking will work are unrealistic	Parking plan provides a wide variety of options; new surface lots currently are in opposition to existing policy guidance and regulations
David Barnhart 6/13/12 letter	Land use chapter (pp. 78, 118, 123)	Focus on arts related uses is unduly restrictive, unnecessary, and should be eliminated from the plan	Arts focus reflects community process and priorities; language also allows a wide range of other uses and does not mandate arts presence in new development; added further detail on institutional uses
David Barnhart 6/13/12 letter	Urban design & public realm (pp.75, 86, 87, 91, and 121)	Do not like showing green space on private property or suggest it should be privately supplied or maintained; map on pg 75 should be eliminated, as should all references that suggest guiding for more than what’s required by code	Added language clarifying that this is not mandated, and that it will likely remain private property

David Barnhart 6/13/12 letter	Land use chapter (pp. 66-67)	Clarify that mixed use land use guidance does not eliminate the opportunity for dense housing development, with very high densities supportable at transit locations	Land use chapter states that high density residential is appropriate at station areas
David Barnhart 6/13/12 letter	Land use chapter (pp. 75, 78, 81, 87, 91, 118, 123)	Wants to allow for high density on his site at the station, not just open space/green space; counterintuitive to not allow highest densities at the station itself; would like to be able to use C3A zoning on his property (2929 University)	Plan does not set a height limit for this area, and say high densities would be appropriate
Aaron Keniski 6/12/12 letter	Land use chapter	New 3-4 story mixed-use development on site of Hong Kong Noodles/Value Liquors; New medium density residential development replacing three homes on Ontario Street; New 5-6 story mixed-use development on site of Arby's and CSL Plasma; Replacement of industrial warehouse across street from Solhaus Apartments with new residential development;	Suggested developments are largely consistent with plan guidance, although plan is less specific as to height
Aaron Keniski 6/12/12 letter	Land use chapter	Especially east of the Stadium Village Station along University Avenue increase residential density (less student-oriented/mixed-income, mixed unit style/size options) and along 4th Street east of 27 th Avenue promote higher density residential on surface parking lots and building north of 4th Street (in this area, affordable housing can be incorporated into the developments, possibly mixed use TOD close to either light rail station)	Suggested developments are largely consistent with plan guidance, although plan is less specific as to some details
Aaron Keniski 6/12/12 letter	Land use chapter	West side of Huron and Motley area is a good location for higher density housing for students, professors, and University employees (affordable housing could be incorporated for workforce housing)	Suggested developments are largely consistent with plan guidance, although plan is less specific as to height
Aaron Keniski 6/12/12 letter	Transportation chapter	Preserve as much parking as possible and provide underground parking as part of redevelopments along 4th Street; with other developments, include underground parking that can be utilized at certain hours of the day by the public	Parking policies adjusted to reflect opportunities along 4 th St
Aaron Keniski 6/12/12 letter	Urban design & public realm chapter	Place public artwork or art piece on the triangle lot bordered by Huron Blvd., Washington Ave, and University Ave; improve pedestrian environment immediately surrounding triangle lot by utilizing bump-outs or increasing crosswalk time; utilize streetscape enhancements to transform Huron Blvd into a more pedestrian-oriented street that combines well with auto traffic; create attractive, pedestrian-oriented plaza on lot to the west of triangle lot; increasing sidewalk width along Stadium Village corridor for streetscape improvements and outdoor seating	Suggested developments are largely consistent with plan guidance, although plan is less specific as to some details
Aaron Keniski 6/12/12 letter	Urban design & public realm chapter	Over time, implement road and streetscape improvements to 4th Street to promote a more aesthetically pleasing pedestrian street; like emphasis put on encouraging mixed-use blocks to activate the streets and create more pedestrian activity along 27th Ave, 29th	Suggested developments are largely consistent with plan guidance, although plan is less specific as to some details

		Ave, Huron Blvd (also need to improve pedestrian facilities along these streets); like the plans for corridor and gateway improvements especially along Huron Blvd., Washington Ave, University Ave, 27th Ave and 4th Street	
Aaron Keniski 6/12/12 letter	Land use chapter	A development that would activate the green space to the west of the Washington Ave/Huron Blvd. intersection (mixed-use project with retail that utilizes space) would really pull this gateway area together.	Suggested developments are largely consistent with plan guidance, although plan is less specific as to some details
Aaron Keniski 6/12/12 letter	Land use chapter	The building on the northwest corner of the University and 27th Ave intersection is not a very attractive building and it's in a location where a much more attractive, multiple-story development (mainly residential) could be used to activate it, creating a more inviting pedestrian environment within walking distance of either LRT station.	Suggested developments are largely consistent with plan guidance, although plan is less specific as to some details
William Seeley 6/8/12 letter	Transportation chapter and appendix	The Oak Street Ramp (listed in Table 6) states that there are 1837 contract spaces and only 356 transient spaces. Most of the parking contracts should be modified to limit exclusive contract parking rights from 6:00 am - 6:00 pm. After 6:00 pm the space should be made available to transient users. Given the most of the on-street parking spaces along Washington and University Ave will be eliminated, this would partially off-set this loss to transient users.	Transportation chapter suggests negotiation with U of M to allow for lower rates for short term and/or off peak users
William Seeley 6/8/12 letter	Transportation chapter and appendix	The recently installed on-street meters within 3 blocks of the Rec Center are set up such that University Parking can instantly change the hourly meter rates remotely. Last winter I noted that meters just west of the Rec Center near the Civil Engineering Building charges about \$3.00/hour! In my opinion this hourly rate is grossly excessive. Moreover, if I parked in the Radisson Ramp, on most evenings the Event Parking rate is a flat \$8 - \$10/event. In my opinion this is also excessive for a user who only needs to park for 1.5 – 2 hours. Thus while extremely high off-street and Event Ramp parking prices are set to benefit the revenue flow to University Parking, they also decrease the revenue flow to the University Rec Center and other venues, such as the University Athletic Department.	Transportation chapter suggests negotiation with U of M to allow for lower rates for short term and/or off peak users
William Seeley 6/8/12 letter	Transportation chapter and appendix	Off street metered parking should be kept as uniform as possible. This will eliminate people going to a parking place where the price is much too high for their budget, only to have to drive around to find a cheaper off-street parking place. This "driving around" creates more traffic congestion, vehicle pollution, gas use and frustration by the user!	A more consistent and uniform parking system is a recommendation; some event parking is likely to occur around the U of M, in response to peak demand at certain times

Candice McDermott 6/14/12 letter	Implementation chapter	In this time of continuing financial crises and uncertain employment, the plan does not mention conserving funds. The “resource partners” appear to be federal, state, county and city entities whose sources are actually my tax dollars. Please be respectful of the impact on us! Can we please postpone the start of new projects for two or more years and instead utilize what we have until we can recover a bit? Shelve the idea of public artwork for now -- taxpayers cannot afford such luxuries. When finances become stable, it would be nice to have graceful sculptures in Greek, Roman, or Art Nouveau styles.	Language added to implementation chapter to clarify that the plan is to be implemented over time, when funds and opportunities become available
Candice McDermott 6/14/12 letter	Land use chapter	Has it been determined why the surveyed individuals felt the U of MN area was more approachable than St. Paul? Could it be that they could see their destination as they approach the campus, as opposed to St. Paul’s tall buildings that block all views? Creating canyons along University, Washington, Huron and 27 th will block lines of sight and therefore create an unfriendly, confusing approach to campus. We were promised that new construction would not be built up to the edge of the street resulting in canyons, yet it’s already occurred and apparently will continue	The plan has guidance recommending setbacks when the right-of-way is too narrow to create a comfortable pedestrian realm. Added language regarding shadowing by tall buildings
Candice McDermott 6/14/12 letter	Urban design & public realm chapter	Excessive signage adds visual clutter to street and directional signs, blinking lights, moving traffic, pedestrians, bikes, etc. Visitors are overwhelmed and intimidated when they are unable to see the medical buildings and campus landmarks. We should make it easy for them to get here. High density/multi-story buildings will conceal the landmarks.	The plan recommends simple, consistent wayfinding signs for parking and main destinations
Candice McDermott 6/14/12 letter	Housing chapter	Is high density housing really good for the overall community, especially if it is transient, or will it cause the currently stable population to leave? Is the purpose simply to create a demand for the light rail in order to offset its extreme cost?	The market study work done suggests a demand for this type of housing; the plan also balances with intent to maintain much of the existing neighborhood fabric in Prospect Park
Candice McDermott 6/14/12 letter	Urban design & public realm chapter	What is the plan for increasing police and emergency responders to match the increase in population? Where will added personnel, fire trucks, etc., be placed and how will they be funded?	Added section on public safety to urban design and public realm chapter
Candice McDermott 6/14/12 letter	Land use and urban design & public realm chapters	Unfortunately, the new high-density housing in Stadium Village and Dinkytown does NOT preserve the quaint character of the areas. Contrary to the promise that new construction would be set back from the sidewalk to avoid canyons, the zoning board approved to-the-curb buildings that loom over the street. Prospect Park’s character is that of 1- to 2-story single family residences, but the goal of high-density housing (multi-story, multi-use)	City guidance is for taller buildings, located along major corridors and in node and centers; added language to land use chapter about purpose of high density residential

		contradicts this. Please don't add tall buildings. Street-side parks and/or gardens would be a refreshing view for residents and rail riders.	
Candice McDermott 6/14/12 letter	Economic development chapter	Will new mixed-use construction offer more than coffee shops and gyms at street level?	The market study provides a range of underserved retail and service markets, demonstrating demand to developers for a diversity of new commercial
Candice McDermott 6/14/12 letter	Housing chapter	Quiet, solidly constructed housing is essential to attract a stable population of long-term residents such as University faculty, staff, and professionals who work in downtown Minneapolis. The only way to achieve this is for the zoning board to agree to approve structures having nothing less than concrete walls/floors and extra sound insulation. This would have the added benefit of protection from fire and the structural vibrations from the light rail. One example of such construction is the Thornton Place building near Franklin and 27th Ave. S.E.	Added recommendation to housing chapter encouraging high quality construction
Candice McDermott 6/14/12 letter	Transportation and urban design & public realm chapters	<i>Huron/Fulton intersection, pedestrian crossing.</i> How will pedestrians navigate to this intersection from 27th Ave.? The current option is through the parking lot of the University Commons Apartments. Will the owner be expected to maintain a plowed path for the general public to navigate to the intersection? Will additional lighting be installed? <i>South of Fulton St. intersection.</i> How will fire and emergency vehicles reach dwellings? Construction of new dwellings is currently restricted due to lack of access via the existing street or alley.	Added recommendation for providing public connection and access when feasible
Candice McDermott 6/14/12 letter	Urban design & public realm chapter	Power lines are not addressed in the plan. Assuming they will be present, please do not plant trees under them. Following the philosophy of sustainability, it makes no sense to plant trees that will be maimed in two to three years when branches become entangled, and cut down the following year only to repeat the process, which is costly in terms of labor, equipment, and trees. Please plant them away from power lines.	Added this detail to recommendation on development of urban forest
Candice McDermott 6/14/12 letter	Urban design & public realm chapter	According to the plan's examples, curbside pit-planters holding weather-tolerant plants may be employed. To me, these knee-deep holes would be hazardous to pedestrians and provide opportunities for lawsuits against the city. It is easy to imagine stepping or falling into them. Assuming humans will continue to be human, these holes would quickly collect garbage. Please plan flat, continuous sidewalks that are safe for pedestrians, easily plowed,	Added accessibility concerns to stormwater management recommendation

		and apt to stay clean.	
Candice McDermott 6/14/12 letter	Urban design & public realm chapter	Pocket parks: Will upkeep (mowing, trimming, garbage and snow removal) be sustainable? They seem very nice but will they become opportunities for crime?	Added clarification that these will likely be privately owned and maintained
Candice McDermott 6/14/12 letter	Urban design & public realm chapter	This plan and all others should engage and support our local establishments. Have these bicycle rental docks diverted revenues away from local bike shops? If possible, I would like to know the cost of one of these bikes, the cost of the dock, the cost to maintain the solar panels on them, the cost of the trailers needed to deliver them in spring and remove them in fall, the pickups needed to pull the trailers, and the cost of the (parks?) employees.	The Nice Ride system is handled through a separate planning and implementation process; this information should be available from the project coordinators
Kathleen Macosko 6/7/12 letter	Urban design & public realm chapter	I would like to put in a plug for a good, but not expensive food store, and better livability with extra green space, biking etc. and views of the River, which presently are hidden by trees. With all the extra city coming into Stadium Village, it's important to max the green areas such as the River.	The plan recommendations support both a diversification of businesses, and new green space and connectivity
David Barnhart 6/15/12 letter	History & background chapter (p. 29)	Red dots representing contributing properties are all wrong. i.e. 2827 Williams is not a contributing property.	Updated map, removing incorrect dots
David Barnhart 6/15/12 letter	Existing conditions chapter (p. 37)	3000 4th St is not institutional as indicated by blue on map	This is an approved map from the comprehensive plan, for information purposes only; it does not provide policy guidance
David Barnhart 6/15/12 letter	Land use chapter (p. 65)	2900 ½ University is not medium density residential as indicated on map. It is C2.	Change made to map
David Barnhart 6/15/12 letter	Urban design & public realm (p. 81)	Define “compact mixed use development”	Will be defined in glossary
David Barnhart 6/15/12 letter	Urban design & public realm (p. 90)	Why are we talking about 8’ or 10’ wide sidewalks	The sidewalk standards stated here reflect City standards established through the Access Minneapolis plan, referenced here
David Barnhart 6/15/12 letter	General	Is there a glossary of terms? For instance human scale, district parking system, residential character, transit oriented, pedestrian oriented, public realm	Glossary will be added to appendix, with these terms and others
Internal staff comments	Existing conditions chapter (p. 35)	Stadium is an allowed use in I1, this should be clarified in text	Text changed to make this clear
Internal staff comments	General	Spell out acronyms; add captions to photos to clarify what they are	Acronyms removed where possible
Internal staff comments	Existing conditions chapter (p. 44)	Explain land grant status of University and impact on zoning	Added clarifying paragraph to existing conditions chapter
Internal staff	Land use chapter (p.	Clarify role of historic review of properties in development review	Added clarifying language

comments	76)	process	
Internal staff comments	Land use chapter (p. 79), Transportation chapter (pp. 113-114)	Clarify that district parking is for immediate uses, not a remote park and ride facility	Clarified this in text
Internal staff comments	Urban design & public realm chapter (p. 90)	Reword to make it more clear how sidewalk widths and setbacks are considered in the development review process	Section reworded and clarified
Internal staff comments	Economic development chapter (p. 103)	Clarify land use and economic development guidance for SEMI to ensure it is consistent with other policy	Changed wording to reflect existing policy
Internal staff comments	Transportation chapter (p. 113)	Provide more detail on what is meant by a 311-based system for traffic information	Modified policy to be more clear, consolidated with other policy language
Internal staff comments	Transportation chapter (p. 114)	Building new free-standing parking facilities is not consistent with policy for this area.	Clarified to explain what was permitted for parking in the area
Internal staff comments	Overall	Add hyperlinks between chapters and to outside documents	<i>Will be added once plan is complete</i>
Internal staff comments	Executive summary (p. 6)	Do people know what designated land use features are?	Will be defined in glossary
Internal staff comments	History and Background (p. 29)	Could the University neighborhood have its own neighborhood association?	In theory yes, but none has been organized to date and it is challenging given the highly transient population
Internal staff comments	History and Background (p. 34)	Need a key to explain the commuter graphic	Added information about how to interpret
Internal staff comments	Existing conditions (p. 40)	Cannot read wording on graphic	Added explanatory caption
Internal staff comments	Urban design & public realm (p. 85)	Add reference to safety in discussion of public realm	Text added to section
PPERRIA 6/20/12 letter	Land use chapter (p. 65)	Recommend showing the U of M Foundation properties on Washington Avenue as residential.	U of M Foundation properties should continue to be shown as mixed use since this is a prime location for commercial, and if the property was to redevelop in the future that should be an option
PPERRIA 6/20/12 letter	Land use chapter (p. 65)	Recommend maintaining the north side of Williams Avenue in the area of Glendale as residential.	The parcels on the north side of Williams are through parcels that also front on University where mixed use is appropriate; not standard City practice to have split guidance for a parcel; added language in chapter to emphasize the need to keep commercial uses from fronting on

			Williams and other side streets
PPERRIA 6/20/12 letter	Land use chapter (pp. 74-75)	Revise open space land use characteristics to call for open space at key locations connected by a cohesive, comprehensively planned public realm.	Language regarding a cohesive system added
PPERRIA 6/20/12 letter	Land use chapter (p. 76)	Motley Area: This section of the report is inadequate in that it does not reflect the fact that the regents-approved 2009 Campus Master Plan identified this as a Joint Planning Area and called for a collaborative planning process between the University of Minnesota, the city and the neighborhood. The report correctly identifies the area as one in transition. If, however, the interests of the existing homeowners are to be respected, and if the objective of achieving thoughtfully designed, appropriately scaled transitions on those seams where the institution meets the neighborhood, this area must not continue to be developed on a piecemeal, parcel by parcel basis but requires a comprehensive development framework that defines circulation, public realm and long term institutional as well as private / nonprofit sector land use.	Added this language to the Motley section, and included implementation step supporting further action on this
PPERRIA 6/20/12 letter	Land use chapter (pp. 78-79)	We support this section, which is in alignment with the Prospect Park 2020 Station Area plan, but would stress the time is now for a SEMI area development framework to be updated and brought into alignment with contemporary opportunities and fully integrated with the development proposed for the Prospect Park Station Area. We strongly support high-density mixed use development at the Station Area site and high-density residential development along Fourth Street SE.	Additional language added to plan with revised guidance for SEMI area, with new implementation step
PPERRIA 6/20/12 letter	Urban design & public realm chapter (pp. 85-87)	We strongly support the recommendations of this section, but would additionally recommend that the report reinforce the importance to plan public spaces on private land to align with one another and to establish a connecting public realm. The graphic on page 87 should diagrammatically indicate that the network of open spaces and connecting public realm would extend into and serve the SEMI area.	Added language regarding connectivity of the public realm, with new implementation step
PPERRIA 6/20/12 letter	Economic development chapter (p. 100)	The McComb Group report identifies a substantial market for specialty / professional offices in the area of the Prospect Park station for those firms and businesses desiring proximity to the University of Minnesota, the medical center and research park but would not choose to be in the student directed environment of Stadium Village.	Added this language to the chapter, and modified implementation step
PPERRIA 6/20/12	Transportation	PPERRIA strongly supports the concept of transit-oriented-	Added section of text on district parking

letter	chapter (p. 114)	development centralized district parking called for Segment 4. The planned recommendation should consider identifying a process for implementation that will assure potential investors that this resource will be developed within the time frame necessary to serve planned development. Any doubt that centralized parking will, in fact, be developed will greatly diminish the potential for successful high-density, high-return investment.	and necessary steps to ensure its viability. More detail added to implementation steps.
PPERRIA 6/20/12 letter	Implementation chapter (p. 118)	In addition to office, this section should call for the development of research oriented, technology transfer, system design, etc. uses.	Added detail to implementation step for SEMI area
PPERRIA 6/20/12 letter	Implementation chapter (p. 119)	Emphasize the need for a comprehensive framework developed through a joint planning process as a necessary tool to achieving the long term goals of the several stakeholders.	Added content in implementation step
PPERRIA 6/20/12 letter	Implementation chapter (p. 125)	We recommend including language calling for consideration of designing Fourth Street SE. as a pilot project incorporating those features, materials and water management techniques that will allow it to serve as a laboratory model for other residential streets throughout the metropolitan area.	Added detail to text of chapter and implementation step regarding improvements to 4 th Street SE
U of M 6/28/12 letter	Implementation chapter (p. 117)	“Support the development of the University of Minnesota campus within designated boundaries and planned expansion areas, with particular attention to compatibility along the edges of the campus.” - Language should quote Campus Master Plan verbatim and only be assigned to UMN or removed from plan document entirely; prefer: “Apply the published Regent’s Boundary to guide future planning and expansion of campus activities and to convey to the broader community the University’s long term plans.”	Change made as suggested; added text to Land Use chapter to clarify what the Regent’s Boundary is, for those who are unfamiliar with the term
U of M 6/28/12 letter	Implementation chapter (p. 117)	“Encourage the University to strategically site new development in locations where it will contribute to defining, consolidating, and adding to the vibrancy of campus and the surrounding community.” - Language should quote Campus Master Plan verbatim and only be assigned to UMN or removed from plan document entirely – Prefer: “Strategically site new University and University-affiliated development in locations where they will contribute to defining, consolidating and adding to the vibrancy of campus and the surrounding community”	Change made as suggested
U of M 6/28/12 letter	Implementation chapter (p. 117)	“Support the design of flexible learning, living, working and gathering spaces to support community.” - Language should quote Campus Master Plan verbatim and only be assigned to UMN or removed from plan document entirely; Prefer: “Design flexible learning, living, working, and gathering spaces to support community.” This language is in the Campus Master Plan but	Change made as suggested

		could be acceptable in the Stadium Village Plan if it applies to all land use direction, not just land under University jurisdiction.	
U of M 6/28/12 letter	Implementation chapter (p. 117)	“Ensure that development on the edge of campus is designed in a way that is compatible with surrounding neighborhood character, and buildings do not focus exclusively inward towards campus and turn their back on the adjacent area” - Language should quote Campus Master Plan verbatim and only be assigned to UMN or removed from plan document entirely. – prefer: “Ensure that new development located at the campus’ edge conveys the institution’s image and physical identity, while acknowledging and respecting the adjacent urban environment.”	Change made as requested; collaboration between groups captured in other policies
U of M 6/28/12 letter	Implementation chapter (p. 117)	“Work in partnership with the University and neighborhood through the development review process, to ensure that new development is generally consistent with City policy and regulations regarding land use, zoning, and related topics.” - This language is acceptable	Noted
U of M 6/28/12 letter	Implementation chapter (p. 117)	“Encourage the University to consider the importance of the sites immediately at the station platform in their future plans for development, taking advantage of the transit accessibility and high visibility in choosing the use.” - This language is acceptable.	Noted
U of M 6/28/12 letter	Implementation chapter (p. 117)	“Work with the neighborhood and University regarding the edges between the campus and community, and support collaborative planning and development review around proposed projects.” - This language is acceptable.	Noted
U of M 6/28/12 letter	Implementation chapter (p. 119)	“Preserve the unique character of the University of Minnesota campus and Prospect Park neighborhood, while encouraging growth and development in appropriate areas.” - This language is not clear because unique character is not defined in the document. Recommend delete University of Minnesota campus from sentence.	Change made as requested; primary concern of this plan is with Prospect Park’s character
U of M 6/28/12 letter	Implementation chapter (p. 119)	“As the opportunities for infill development emerge, the new development should reinforce the urban pattern by extending the street grid and placing buildings to define the streets and enhance pedestrian walkability.” - This language is acceptable.	Noted
U of M 6/28/12 letter	Implementation chapter (p. 121)	“Create a new festival plaza adjacent to the TCF Stadium at the northwest corner of University Avenue and 23rd Avenue SE.” This language is acceptable.	Noted
U of M 6/28/12 letter	Implementation	“Create a wayfinding system for the station areas, public transit,	Noted

	chapter (p. 121)	businesses, parks, and University of Minnesota campus that is not only informative but also contributes to the area’s design character.” This language is acceptable.	
U of M 6/28/12 letter	Implementation chapter (p. 121)	“Continue to work with the University regarding strategies and approaches for accommodating students, faculty, and staff near campus in a way that is sustainable and strengthens neighborhoods.” - This language is acceptable	Noted
U of M 6/28/12 letter	Implementation chapter (p.123)	“Support the development of wayfinding and parking strategies that make accessing commercial areas easier and more convenient.” - This language is acceptable.	Noted
U of M 6/28/12 letter	Implementation chapter (p.124)	“Install wayfinding signage to direct parkers to available “transient” stalls in the University’s four ramps and pedestrians to businesses.” - Needs more discussion/ review at University of MN. Re-write to “Work together to define needs for ” instead of “install”	Change made as suggested
U of M 6/28/12 letter	Implementation chapter (p.124)	“Install changeable message boards to notify parkers of available parking stalls in the ramps, especially during events.” - Needs more discussion/ review at University of MN. Re-write to “Work together to determine need for” instead of “install”	Change made as suggested
U of M 6/28/12 letter	Implementation chapter (p.124)	“Enter into discussions with owners of existing parking facilities to identify ways existing parking services might be modified to facilitate higher turnover and cooperative arrangements with adjacent businesses.” - Remove U of M from language, next policy addresses same items.	Change made as suggested
U of M 6/28/12 letter	Implementation chapter (p.124)	“Initiate a parking validation program where the University sets aside a block of stalls in the Washington Avenue Ramp for the exclusive use of business patrons who will be able to validate their tickets with local businesses and receive reduced rate parking. For example: the first 30 minutes at no cost and/or a reduced rate for short term parking.” - Program has existed in the past but was not popular b/c merchants had to pay for validation voucher. Is this a viable proposal to make if there is no merchant support for the program/ financial participation required? Suggest removal or more generic discussions	Changed language to suggest investigating the feasibility of this option; also not connected to specific ramp location
U of M 6/28/12 letter	Implementation chapter (p.124)	“Discuss with the University the possibility of establishing reduced rates for business patrons that would go into effect during of-peak time periods.” - This language could be acceptable but programs of this type have historically been operated with the financial participation of businesses ‘discounting’ the rates. If	Changed language to suggest need to look into feasibility of this

		there is no appetite for changing the basic factors involved, strategy may not be valid.	
U of M 6/28/12 letter	Implementation chapter (p.124)	“Install meters and allow on-street parking on the east side of Ontario Street between Fulton and Essex Streets and on the north side of Essex Street between Ontario and Huron.” - This should be included in the language below and does not merit being called out separately from the broader directive of installing meters and on-street parking discussed and agreed upon by the University and the City.	Language removed – this has been discussed further since original policy proposed, and agree with U’s comment
U of M 6/28/12 letter	Implementation chapter (p.124)	“Implement additional meters on nearby streets as agreed upon by the City and the University.” - This language is acceptable given prior work on the topic.	Noted
U of M 6/28/12 letter	Implementation chapter (p.126)	“Implement a remote parking program in privately owned parking facilities, north, east, south, and west of the study area. Remote parking facilities should have excess capacity and should be located along transit routes that serve the study area.” Suggest removal of reference to U of M. Sustained demand for parking from U of M community has not been demonstrated over last 3-5 years.	This policy has been removed, based on this and further internal discussion with City staff regarding lack of policy support for park and ride programs
U of M 6/28/12 letter	Implementation chapter (p.126)	“Develop a consistent, universal signage directing motorists to public parking locations, and pedestrians to businesses and other attractions.” - This language is acceptable within the context of U of M District signage proposals to date. Extent of coordination with City units not anticipated.	Noted
U of M 6/28/12 letter	Implementation chapter (p.126)	“Locate at each cross street along University to guide to parking destinations.” - Unclear recommendation, likely to create visual clutter/proliferation of signage. This language is not acceptable.	Noted; consolidated with other more general policy, removed reference to frequency of sign placement
U of M 6/28/12 letter	Implementation chapter (p.126)	“Develop a University of Minnesota web page that identifies available parking supplies in real time.” - Website expansion/development may include such options but still to be developed at discretion of Parking and Transportation Services. Only a UMN responsibility, no other parties involved.	Consolidated with another policy to provide more general guidance on public parking information
U of M 6/28/12 letter	Implementation chapter (p.126)	“Provide parking assistance to the public via a “311” system.” Website would serve this purpose. Not likely the University would participate in creating a secondary telecom based system for University facilities.	Consolidated with another policy to provide more general guidance on public parking information
U of M 6/28/12 letter	Implementation chapter (p.126)	“University of Minnesota contract surface lots in Segments 2 and 3 should convert from contract parking during weekdays to public parking during weeknights.” - This language is not acceptable at this time. Issue will be further studied for cost benefit and risk	Changed to suggest a more general approach be investigated for feasibility

		analysis by UMN alone.	
U of M 6/28/12 letter	Implementation chapter (p.126)	“Install additional metered spaces in the study area per City of Minneapolis Public Works recommendations.” Recommend addition “with the concurrence of University of MN when metered spaces are abutting University property” to reinforce mutual decision making about campus parking patterns.	Change made as suggested
U of M 6/28/12 letter	Implementation chapter (p.126)	“Install permanent signage directing motorists traveling eastbound on University Avenue to University of Minnesota parking facilities.” - Some variable message signs designed and installed by U of M already perform this function. Not a viable proposal at this time. Delete U of M participation in recommendation.	Change made as suggested
U of M 6/28/12 letter	Implementation chapter (p.126)	“Install universal “P” signs at strategic locations along University and side streets directing motorists to public parking.” - University has developed a uniform signage program consistent with AASHTO requirements, including access to parking. This recommendation is redundant as it relates to University property.	Change made – redundant with more general policy earlier in document
U of M 6/28/12 letter	Implementation chapter (p.126)	“Identify all lots providing public parking with clearly visible universal “P” sign designations.” - This issue will be further studied for cost-benefit and risk analysis by UMN. Not timely to include in recommendations at this time.	Change made – redundant with more general policy earlier in document