

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development

105 5th Ave S, Suite 200
Minneapolis, MN 55401
(612) 673-2597 Phone
(612) 673-2526 Fax
(612) 673-2157 TDD

MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 28, 2014

TO: Planning Commission Members

FROM: Haila Maze, Principal Planner

SUBJECT: Nicollet Island East Bank Neighborhood Small Area Plan

In the Dropbox and on the [project website](#) is a copy of the Nicollet Island East Bank Neighborhood Small Area Plan, to be discussed at the August 28 Committee of the Whole. This plan was brought to CPC COW on June 12 for discussion. Since then, the plan completed its 45 day public review from June 30 to August 13 and is ready to move through the City's approval process.

This plan represents the culmination of a yearlong planning process, led by the Nicollet Island East Bank Neighborhood Association (NIEBNA), to plan for the future of the neighborhood. This is the neighborhood's first small area plan, and also the first for this portion of the East Hennepin Activity Center, which is located mostly within the neighborhood boundaries. A smaller portion of the Activity Center east of Central Avenue is located in adjacent Marcy-Holmes neighborhood. Marcy-Holmes just had its own small area plan, the [Marcy-Holmes Neighborhood Master Plan](#), adopted by City Council on August 15. The two neighborhoods' visions are consistent and compatible for these adjoining areas.

Developing a small area plan for each Activity Center in the city is a stated goal in the adopted *Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth*, the City's comprehensive plan.

The Nicollet Island East Bank neighborhood is actually a combination of two distinct areas. Nicollet Island is largely low density residential and parkland. Meanwhile, the East Bank area is medium to high density mixed use. The plan focuses primarily on the East Bank portion, as this is where the plan anticipates the growth and change will happen.

Some key plan highlights:

- Expands the East Hennepin Activity Center boundary to cover the entire neighborhood area on the mainland, supporting high density mixed use development; support. Encourages zoning changes to incentivize higher density, quality projects.

- Maintains Nicollet Island largely as is. The island is mostly under Park Board ownership and is being addressed in more detail through Central Riverfront Master Plan currently underway.
- Supports investigation of the feasibility of converting one-way to two-way streets (particularly 1st and Hennepin), to improve pedestrian environment and enhance redevelopment opportunities.
- Supports modern streetcars on Hennepin and 1st through entire neighborhood and up into Northeast, to provide quality transit service.
- Provides a framework for design review of new development, including requiring active street level frontage and encouraging higher densities.
- Grows population and jobs in the neighborhood, consistent with Activity Center guidance.

More information on the plan content and process is available on the [project website](#).

The 45 day comments are attached, also with proposed responses. The plan itself is currently under review and revision by the neighborhood organization. Most comments were supportive, with some requesting clarification and additional information. Some substantive comments on infrastructure priorities stated that it should be clear that additional studies would be needed to explore some of the details of the proposed projects. This will be made clearer in the document.

It is proposed that the 45 day draft be amended as suggested in the attached comment responses, as well as any feedback provided through CPC COW, to move forward at this point through the formal approval process.

It is the intent to bring this plan to the September 15, 2014 Planning Commission for approval.

Attachments:

- Comments received during 45 day comment period
- Proposed responses to 45 day comments

Maze, Haila R.

From: Clegg, Barry F. <Barry.Clegg@gpmlaw.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 07, 2014 9:00 AM
To: Maze, Haila R.
Subject: Comment on NIEBNA Small Area Plan

I support adoption of the Small Area Plan as proposed. My sense is that most neighborhoods support the City's goal of population growth and density in principle, but that support melts away when projects are actually proposed that increase density and height. I am glad to see my neighborhood welcome that density and height and propose some thoughtful guidelines as to how that can be achieved in ways that are pedestrian friendly and promote economic development. The Nicollet Island East Bank Neighborhood is the logical extension of downtown population growth on the East Bank and this plan encourages and facilitates that growth in a positive way.

Thanks.

Barry Clegg
Nicollet Island

Barry Clegg
Attorney

Gray Plant Mooty
500 IDS Center
80 South Eighth Street
Minneapolis, MN USA 55402

Phone: 612.632.3220
Fax: 612.632.4220

Barry.Clegg@gpmlaw.com

[Click Here For My Bio](#)



NOTICE: This message is from a law firm, and it may contain or attach confidential information or an attorney-client communication that is confidential and privileged by law. It is not intended for transmission to or receipt by any unauthorized person. If you believe that you have received this message or any attachment in error, simply delete both from your system without reading or copying, and notify the sender by e-mail or by calling 612-632-3000. Thank you.

Maze, Haila R.

From: Dore Mead <dore.mead@usa.net>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 8:36 AM
To: Maze, Haila R.
Subject: Comments on the draft Small Area Plan for Nicollet Island-East Bank Neighborhood

Dear Haila:

This e-mail provides my comments on the draft Small Area Plan (SAP) for the Nicollet Island-East Bank Neighborhood. All of these comments refer to the East Bank portion of the neighborhood only.

The current Minneapolis Zoning Code does not include a primary zoning district that is a good match for the future development I believe the Nicollet Island-East Bank Neighborhood Association (NIEBNA) envisions for the East Bank. The lack of an appropriate zoning district led the SAP's steering committee and the NIEBNA Board to search for an alternative approach to effect the same result an appropriate primary zoning district could accomplish in a more conventional way. In the draft SAP, that alternative approach takes the form of expanded standards for the Pedestrian Oriented Overlay District.

A more-direct approach -- namely, an appropriate primary zoning district -- would be better. But that approach would take time, time that's not likely available as quickly as needed in today's development climate. So in the meantime, I applaud the alternative approach for trying to accomplish the neighborhood's wishes in a fashion I hope the City will support and developers will understand.

In particular, in a neighborhood that seeks a significant increase in density and a City that seeks the same, the current code's reliance on maximum height restrictions seems contradictory and self-defeating. Consider the Corner Apartments, proposed at the corner of First Avenue Northeast and Second Street Northeast, part of a Planned Use Development the City approved years ago. The PUD anticipates the Corner Apartments as a ten-story building with, I believe, nearly 100 dwelling units. By contrast, the developer now plans to proceed with a six-story structure that accommodates only 56 apartments; and yet the developer is not required to return to the City for approval to build fewer units -- because that's the nature of the current zoning code.

Another example (albeit just outside the East Bank) is Kelly Doran's Mill & Main project. I understand the City approved that development as an 11-story structure, with appropriate density. By contrast, it is now nearing completion with several fewer floors and, of course, less density.

Instead, wouldn't an appropriate primary zoning district for a near-downtown, urban core neighborhood establish a *minimum* height for a structure, rather than a *maximum*? Or at least a *required* height? Wouldn't it be in the City's best interest to require developers who decide to provide *less* density to return to the City for approval? Why make it easy for developers to do *less* than they themselves had once proposed? At times, "doing less" may be justified; but shouldn't the developer have to prove that case to the City, given the City's vested interest in growing the population and the employment base?

I agree wholeheartedly with NIEBNA's commitment to the development of tall, architecturally-distinguished, mixed-use towers that will significantly increase both the population and the employment base of the East Bank. At the same time, where appropriate, smaller mixed-use structures should protect and complement nearby low-rise historic buildings.

Throughout the East Bank, ground floor spaces should be filled with thriving, pedestrian-oriented commercial

businesses that attract people to shopping, dining, personal service, and entertainment venues. With more residents and more people working in the neighborhood, the East Bank will be able to support more commercial businesses. At the same time, those new residents, workers and businesses will put more "eyes on the streets" during the work week as well as nights and weekends, making the East Bank even safer than it is today.

The ideal primary zoning district for the East Bank would require developers to maximize the residential population and employment base in the neighborhood by building tall, slender structures. That district would also value historic structures by allowing developers to construct smaller structures were appropriate near low-rise historic buildings. And finally, the district would require developers to provide ground-floor designs with "active façade features" that would further enhance the pedestrian experience in the East Bank.

Haila, it has been wonderful working with you during the Small Area Plan's development process. You do the City proud!

Doré Mead
Apartment 1603
110 First Avenue Northeast
Minneapolis, MN 55413
612.581.2639

Maze, Haila R.

From: John Larkey <john_larkey@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:31 PM
To: Maze, Haila R.
Subject: NIEB SAP - public comment

Haila, overall I think the NIEB SAP is very well-done & balances amenities and needs of commercial, residential & visitor stakeholder groups that will make NIEB one of the most desirable neighborhoods to live, work & play - and is a plan that has a vision for the future.

I share a few specific comments with CPED below. If any questions, please let me know. jkl

Restore one-way streets to two-way operations - this is a must.

Support streetcar implementation - this is a must. The initial route terminus should be Lowry Ave - the NE corridor is the largest re-development contributor to the streetcar project justification & route must extend this far.

The street car maintenance barn should not be in NIEB (this was mentioned in one public street car meeting - this barn should be at Broadway (existing rail yard area), or further north & east.

Expand Pedestrian Oriented Overlay District to include entire neighborhood. This is a must. Also, should extend across Central Ave (into Marcy Holmes) & the adjoining areas of SAE & SAW at the triangle point of NI-EB.

Attract high quality development to underutilized areas - Superior Plating site (& the East end of this block) are immediate priorities. The Wells Fargo bank block, and US bank block / Surdyks / West Photo should also be high priority for re-development & will be the "heart" of the neighborhood.

Increase emphasis on pedestrian and bicycling. Specifically, improve connections to the riverfront parkland and to bicycle and pedestrian trails. with amenities such as bike racks, artwork, wider sidewalks, trees, parklets, enhanced lighting, street "furniture" (benches, tables, etc.), and transparent building facades.

Infrastructure - eliminate overhead utilities & upgrade wireless access when opportunities present themselves

Embrace density and diversity - three specific examples: encourage taller buildings; include residential options across price point spectrum; incorporate child & pet-friendly amenities in the community.

Green space to be included in all developments & across the neighborhood. The surface lot on SE corner of 1st Ave NE & 2nd St NE is TOO SMALL for a significant development - this should be established as a park / green space for the entire community to utilize.

Appropriate amount of parking should be included in planning of any new developments.

A "new zoning" classification for Activity Centers like NIEB may be necessary for CPED/City to establish - one does not currently exist. Key components would include higher density & design factors mentioned in the plan.

A Special Tax increment zone (similar to DID) in the area should be considered for businesses in the area - to support safety, cleanliness & desirability for businesses, residents and visitors.

Improved access and linkage to River is a must and should be integrated into the MPRB / Waterfront planning. A specific consideration of access to the water and recreation (hiking, biking, canoeing, picnicking, etc) is a must.

Sent from my iPad

Maze, Haila R.

From: Kyle Watkins <jkwatkins@FocusFinancial.com>
Sent: Friday, July 18, 2014 4:45 PM
To: Maze, Haila R.
Subject: NIEBNA small area plan

Hello,

I am a resident at The Cobalt. We moved into the area from the suburbs a few years ago. I just read the small area plan and I think it is fantastic work. It provides an excellent, proactive vision for the area. It is a tremendous framework for assessing future development proposals. I believe the next few years, with the right new developments, will provide a great opportunity to get the synergy going that will last for years and feed on itself. Thank you for all of those who worked on this plan!

Kyle Watkins, CFP®

Financial Advisor
Executive Officer

FOCUS FINANCIAL

14985 Glazier Avenue | Suite 404
Apple Valley | MN 55124

952 997-8955 *direct*
952 953-4300 *main*
877 697-0296 *toll free*
952 953-4443 *fax*

jkwatkins@focusfinancial.com
www.watkins-focusfinancial.com

Securities offered through Royal Alliance Associates Inc., member FINRA/SIPC. Investment advisory services offered through Focus Financial Network, Inc., a registered investment advisor not affiliated with Royal Alliance Associates, Inc.

Please Note: We are not able to accept buy or sell instructions by email or voicemail.

This message and any attachments contain information by Focus Financial Network, Inc., which may be confidential and/or privileged and is intended exclusively for use only by the addressee(s) named on this transmission. If you are not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are notified that any review, retention, copying, distribution or use of this transmission is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify the sender immediately by e-mail or by telephone and destroy all copies of this message.



REAL ESTATE DIVISION
Strategic Planning and Resources Department

701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400, Minneapolis, MN 55415-4937
General 612-348-9260 Fax 612-348-9710

TO: Haila Maze, AICP
Principal City Planner
City of Minneapolis
Community Planning and Economic Development

FROM: J. Michael Noonan, AICP
Senior Department Administrator

DATE: August 11, 2014

RE: Nicollet Island – East Bank Neighborhood – Small Area Plan

The Nicollet Island – East Bank Neighborhood – Small Area Plan has been reviewed by a number of departments within Hennepin County. The County supports the vision of the plan and its major strategic goals. The top priorities of the plan establish a direction for the future. We endorse the stated goal of taking advantage of all the neighborhood has to offer and the promise of what can become.

"The neighborhood of the future will have safe and bustling streets and sidewalks where people can be found walking at all hours of the day and night. In a compact neighborhood teeming with people, tall buildings will comfortably face shorter neighbors, and no two buildings will look exactly alike. The community will be transit oriented and people friendly. It will include the full spectrum of housing, business and other options that will attract and support residents and visitors from across the region and beyond."

We are encouraged by the accommodating and supportive nature of the plan and the desire to be a place of action and accommodation.

Hennepin County does have specific comments related to certain of these priorities and these will follow. These comments related to chapter 3 of the Plan.

- Hennepin Avenue and 1st Avenue (CSAH 52) are a one-way pair of minor arterial roadways that extend from 7th Street SE across the Mississippi River bridge. After crossing into downtown Minneapolis, these roadways merge into a two-way roadway, which intersects with Washington Avenue (CSAH 152). These roadways then continue as city streets through downtown Minneapolis.

The small area plan strongly favors the conversion of Hennepin Avenue and 1st Avenue from the current one-way roadway pair to two-way operations on each roadway. Numerous examples were provided in the plan (Table 3-1) demonstrating one-way roadways that were converted or evaluated for conversion into two-way roadways. However, no information was provided with these examples to show a comparison of traffic volumes, patterns, speeds, crashes, etc. In addition, the Hennepin Avenue and 1st Avenue 2-way Conversion Evaluation Report completed by Minneapolis Public Works Traffic and Parking Services (July 2010) was referenced in the plan. This report states that nine design alternatives were analyzed using the VISSIM traffic analysis software. However, it is not clear over what portions of the Hennepin Avenue and 1st Avenue segments was analyzed.

Impacts of one-way to two-way roadway conversions affect traffic operations and safety by increasing conflicts and the potential for crashes. These sections of Hennepin Avenue and 1st Avenue currently carry 15,300 and 10,300 vehicles per day, respectively. This one-way pair of roadways provides sufficient capacity for motorists traveling to/from downtown Minneapolis. This desired change to the roadway network will impact traffic patterns and may shift traffic volumes onto adjacent roadways and/or river crossings. Unless it can be demonstrated that this proposed change will function acceptably from a traffic operations and safety perspective, Hennepin County does not currently support this proposed change.

- The plan identifies the locally preferred alignment for the streetcar transit service (Nicollet – Central Streetcar Line), which would utilize the Hennepin Avenue bridge as the river crossing with Hennepin Avenue as a northbound route and 1st Avenue as a southbound route. Hennepin County supports multi-modal travel and supporting connections, including the streetcar and other transit modes. However, with the potential configurations shown in the plan (including mixing streetcar and vehicular traffic), the capacity of Hennepin Avenue and 1st Avenue could likely be reduced. Microscopic traffic analysis is needed to demonstrate that, with the streetcar service as proposed along Hennepin Avenue and 1st Avenue, traffic would continue to operate at an acceptable level of service.
- Safety concerns are identified in the plan at the following two intersections due to the current design (skewed intersection):
 - Central Avenue/East Hennepin Avenue/5th Street
 - Central Avenue/1st Avenue/7th Street

In the plan, a possible closure of 5th Street between Central Avenue and East Hennepin Avenue is proposed. While this is a complex area that may merit

improvement, further analysis of the traffic volumes and travel patterns is needed to determine the impacts of this potential closure.

- The plan states that pedestrians should have priority along the corridors in the study area, with elimination of all pedestrian push buttons at traffic signals proposed. In general, the county supports an integrated transportation system that serves buses, bicyclists, and pedestrians as well as cars and commercial traffic. As opportunities for improvements to pedestrian and bicycle modes occur in this area, the county may consider potential traffic signal improvements such as countdown timers.
- The county supports the maintenance of pedestrian facilities throughout the year, as proposed in the plan. However, more discussion of current responsibilities and proposed changes to determine the goals of the maintenance plan and the identified funding to support those changes.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide our comments. We are available to discuss these in greater detail. This can be arranged by contacting me at 612 348-8537.

JMN/jmn



**Minneapolis
Park & Recreation Board**

Administrative Offices
2117 West River Road
Minneapolis, MN 55411-2227

Operations Center
3800 Bryant Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55409-1000

Phone
612-230-6400

Fax:
612-230-6500

www.minneapolisparcs.org

President
Liz Wielinski

Vice President
Scott Vreeland

Commissioners
Brad Bourn
John Erwin
Meg Forney
Steffanie Musich
Jon C. Olson
Anita Tabb
M. Annie Young

Superintendent
Jayne Miller

Secretary to the Board
Pamela French

August 13, 2014

Haila Maze, AICP, Principal City Planner
Community Planning & Economic Development
105 5th Avenue South, Room 200
Minneapolis, MN 55401

**Re: Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board Comments on the Draft Nicollet
Island-East Bank Neighborhood Small Area Plan**

Dear Ms. Maze:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Nicollet Island-East Bank Neighborhood Small Area Plan. The Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board (MPRB) is proud to own and maintain public parkland within the neighborhood and looks forward to an ongoing partnership. We offer the following comments on the draft plan:

- The plan recommends using trade-off criteria to evaluate increasing height and density of new development. This is similar to a performance-based approach and has the potential of providing positive public benefits. MPRB staff would like to be involved in further discussions on how this approach could enhance the provision of park amenities in the area.
- The parks and open space chapter of the plan articulates goals and strategic actions for parklets and streetscape enhancements. The plan also mentions exploring using funds generated from the Minneapolis Park Dedication Ordinance to fund these improvements. These types of improvements are within existing public right-of-way and, in some cases, would be temporary. The Minneapolis Park Dedication Ordinance articulates how and where park dedication fees can be spent. They must be spent on parkland acquisition or park development at MPRB discretion. The MPRB will focus on long-term investments and give priority to needs in existing parks. The MPRB will employ the “private land maintained for public use” park dedication option in only unique circumstances when the option provides strategic facilities or connectivity or when there is no nearby park.
- The parks and open space chapter also mentions a desire to pursue adding a micro, urban park/open space in the northeast section of

the neighborhood. MPRB staff would be interested in exploring this idea further with the neighborhood to determine if there is a suitable location, whether it should be a public or private space, and whether it would be a good match for the Minneapolis Park Dedication Ordinance.

- The introduction articulates that the land adjacent to the Mississippi River and Nicollet Island are in the National Park and the Mississippi National River and Recreation Area. It further indicates that the land is subject to U. S. National Park Service regulations. The area is designated as the Mississippi National River and Recreation Area. The National Park Service works with 25 local governments, several state agencies and numerous organizations to protect the globally significant resources along the 72-mile stretch of river running through the Minneapolis/Saint Paul metro area. The regulations of the National Park Services pertain to those lands within the corridor that are owned by the National Park Service/Department of Interior.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the draft Nicollet Island-East Bank Neighborhood Small Area Plan.

Sincerely,



Bruce L. Chamberlain
Assistant Superintendent for Planning

cc: President Liz Wielinski

Nicollet Island-East Bank Neighborhood Small Area Plan
Public Works Comments

- Page 1-5. Other Planning Efforts Affecting the Nicollet Island-East Bank Neighborhood” – There is no mention of the Pedestrian Master Plan.
- Page 2-12. “Curb cuts are not to be implemented without specific justification of the necessity.” That is always true. “In all cases...signage and other means...” It may not always be practical to sign every curb cut and doing so would result in “sign clutter” and more obstructions in the pedestrian realm.
- Page 3-2. Strategic Actions #1 & #2 – Public Works will not commit to the statements regarding restoring East Hennepin, 1st Avenue NE, and 4th Street to two-way traffic. At most, we could say “study” or “examine” conversion of these roadways to two-way traffic.
- Page 3-2. Strategic Actions #5 – “...year-round maintenance of the pedestrian realm” sounds like snow removal. Sidewalk snow removal is the responsibility of the adjacent property owner.
- Page 3-2. Strategic Actions #9 – This statement doesn’t make sense. Traffic signals operate on a coordinated, timed basis. The push-button provides priority for the next phase of the signal for pedestrians. Eliminating the push-button would *reduce* the priority for pedestrians.
- Page 3-2. Strategic Actions #10 – A Ped/Bike bridge at this location is not identified in the Bicycle Mater Plan.
- Page 3-3. 2nd Paragraph – Change to “*This Plan calls for....and for **exploring the restoration of two-way traffic...***”
- Page 3-3. Last Paragraph – Change to “***If East Hennepin Avenue and 1st Avenue....***”
- Page 3-4. Plan for Transportation – Same comment as above: Public Works will not commit to the statements regarding restoring East Hennepin, 1st Avenue NE, and 4th Street to two-way traffic. At most, we could say “study” or “examine” conversion of these roadways to two-way traffic.
- Page 3-8. Change to “*The **design of the streetcar line should consider the possibility of the restoration of....***”
- Page 3-9. Address Problematic Intersections in the Neighborhood – Change to “*With the **potential conversion of...***”
- Page 3-10. Enhance Transit Information – “The Metropolitan Council should install real time arrival signs at all transit stops in the neighborhood.” Has this been vetted by Met Council? This is not their standard practice.

CPED Manager NIEB Plan Comments

- Recommendations for bicycle connections in the plan are not necessarily clear. Need to add map showing proposed facilities, including linkages to Downtown network.
- The plan needs to more fully address heritage preservation concerns. This is a potential historic district. Plan needs to acknowledge this and point towards an approach for reviewing this. It may be suggesting the need for a separate study, since the potential district actually extends beyond the NIEB neighborhood boundaries.
- All blocks in the main part of the neighborhood need to show up as mixed use, as stated in the text. This is inconsistent on the maps.
- The language around affordable housing needs to be expanded and enhanced.

Nicollet Island East Bank Small Area Plan

Comments and **SUGGESTED Responses from 45 Day Review Period – as of 8/14/14**

Comment	Source	Location in Plan	SUGGESTED Response
<p>I support adoption of the Small Area Plan as proposed. My sense is that most neighborhoods support the City’s goal of population growth and density in principle, but that support melts away when projects are actually proposed that increase density and height. I am glad to see my neighborhood welcome that density and height and propose some thoughtful guidelines as to how that can be achieved in ways that are pedestrian friendly and promote economic development. The Nicollet Island East Bank Neighborhood is the logical extension of downtown population growth on the East Bank and this plan encourages and facilitates that growth in a positive way.</p>	Barry Clegg		
<p>The current Minneapolis Zoning Code does not include a primary zoning district that is a good match for the future development I believe the Nicollet Island-East Bank Neighborhood Association (NIEBNA) envisions for the East Bank. The lack of an appropriate zoning district led the SAP's steering committee and the NIEBNA Board to search for an alternative approach to effect the same result an appropriate primary zoning district could accomplish in a more conventional way. In the draft SAP, that alternative approach takes the form of expanded standards for the Pedestrian Oriented Overlay District.</p>	Dore Mead		
<p>A more-direct approach -- namely, an appropriate primary zoning district -- would be better. But that approach would take time, time that's not likely available as quickly as needed in today's development climate. So in the meantime, I applaud the alternative approach for trying to accomplish the neighborhood's wishes in a fashion I hope the City will support and developers will understand.</p>	Dore Mead		
<p>In particular, in a neighborhood that seeks a significant increase</p>	Dore Mead		

<p>in density and a City that seeks the same, the current code's reliance on maximum height restrictions seems contradictory and self-defeating. Consider the Corner Apartments, proposed at the corner of First Avenue Northeast and Second Street Northeast, part of a Planned Use Development the City approved years ago. The PUD anticipates the Corner Apartments as a ten-story building with, I believe, nearly 100 dwelling units. By contrast, the developer now plans to proceed with a six-story structure that accommodates only 56 apartments; and yet the developer is not required to return to the City for approval to build fewer units -- because that's the nature of the current zoning code.</p>			
<p>Another example (albeit just outside the East Bank) is Kelly Doran's Mill & Main project. I understand the City approved that development as an 11-story structure, with appropriate density. By contrast, it is now nearing completion with several fewer floors and, of course, less density.</p>	Dore Mead		
<p>Instead, wouldn't an appropriate primary zoning district for a near-downtown, urban core neighborhood establish a <i>minimum</i> height for a structure, rather than a <i>maximum</i>? Or at least a <i>required</i> height? Wouldn't it be in the City's best interest to require developers who decide to provide <i>less</i> density to return to the City for approval? Why make it easy for developers to do <i>less</i> than they themselves had once proposed? At times, "doing less" may be justified; but shouldn't the developer have to prove that case to the City, given the City's vested interested in growing the population and the employment base?</p>	Dore Mead		
<p>I agree wholeheartedly with NIEBNA's commitment to the development of tall, architecturally-distinguished, mixed-use towers that will significantly increase both the population and the employment base of the East Bank. At the same time, where appropriate, smaller mixed-use structures should protect and complement nearby low-rise historic buildings.</p>	Dore Mead		
<p>Throughout the East Bank, ground floor spaces should be filled</p>	Dore Mead		

with thriving, pedestrian-oriented commercial businesses that attract people to shopping, dining, personal service, and entertainment venues. With more residents and more people working in the neighborhood, the East Bank will be able to support more commercial businesses. At the same time, those new residents, workers and businesses will put more "eyes on the streets" during the work week as well as nights and weekends, making the East Bank even safer than it is today.			
The ideal primary zoning district for the East Bank would require developers to maximize the residential population and employment base in the neighborhood by building tall, slender structures. That district would also value historic structures by allowing developers to construct smaller structures were appropriate near low-rise historic buildings. And finally, the district would require developers to provide ground-floor designs with "active façade features" that would further enhance the pedestrian experience in the East Bank.	Dore Mead		
Overall I think the NIEB SAP is very well-done & balances amenities and needs of commercial, residential & visitor stakeholder groups that will make NIEB one of the most desirable neighborhoods to live, work & play - and is a plan that has a vision for the future.	John Larkey		
Restore one-way streets to two-way operations - this is a must.	John Larkey		
Support streetcar implementation - this is a must. The initial route terminus should be Lowry Ave - the NE corridor is the largest re-development contributor to the streetcar project justification & route must extend this far.	John Larkey		
The street car maintenance barn should not be in NIEB (this was mentioned in one public street car meeting - this barn should be at Broadway (existing rail yard area), or further north & east.	John Larkey		
Expand Pedestrian Oriented Overlay District to include entire neighborhood. This is a must. Also, should extend across Central Ave (into Marcy Holmes) & the adjoining areas of SAE & SAW	John Larkey		

at the triangle point of NI-EB.			
Attract high quality development to underutilized areas - Superior Plating site and the East end of this block are immediate priorities. The Wells Fargo bank block, and US Bank block / Surdyks / West Photo should also be high priority for re-development & will be the "heart" of the neighborhood.	John Larkey		
Increase emphasis on pedestrian and bicycling. Specifically, improve connections to the riverfront parkland and to bicycle and pedestrian trails with amenities such as bike racks, artwork, wider sidewalks, trees, parklets, enhanced lighting, street "furniture" (benches, tables, etc.), and transparent building facades.	John Larkey		
Infrastructure - eliminate overhead utilities & upgrade wireless access when opportunities present themselves	John Larkey		
Embrace density and diversity - three specific examples: encourage taller buildings; include residential options across price point spectrum; incorporate child & pet-friendly amenities in the community.	John Larkey		
Green space to be included in all developments & across the neighborhood. The surface lot on SE corner of 1 st Ave NE & 2nd St NE is TOO SMALL for a significant development - this should be established as a park /green space for the entire community to utilize.	John Larkey		
Appropriate amount of parking should be included in planning of any new developments.	John Larkey		
A "new zoning" classification for Activity Centers like NIEB may be necessary for CPED/City to establish - one does not currently exist. Key components would include higher density & design factors mentioned in the plan.	John Larkey		
A Special Tax increment zone (similar to DID) in the area should be considered for businesses in the area – to support safety, cleanliness & desirability for businesses, residents and visitors.	John Larkey		
Improved access and linkage to River is a must and should be integrated into the MPRB / Waterfront planning. A specific	John Larkey		

<p>consideration of access to the water and recreation (hiking, biking, canoeing, picnicking, etc.) is a must.</p>			
<p>I am a resident at The Cobalt. We moved into the area from the suburbs a few years ago. I just read the small area plan and I think it is fantastic work. It provides an excellent, proactive vision for the area. It is a tremendous framework for assessing future development proposals. I believe the next few years, with the right new developments, will provide a great opportunity to get the synergy going that will last for years and feed on itself. Thank you for all of those who worked on this plan!</p>	<p>Kyle Watkins</p>		
<p>The Nicollet Island East Bank Neighborhood Small Area plan has been reviewed by a number of departments within Hennepin County. The County supports the vision of the plan and its major strategic goals. The top priorities of the plan establish a direction for the future. We endorse the stated goal of taking advantage of all the neighborhood has to offer and the promise of what it can become.</p>	<p>Hennepin County</p>		
<p>We are encouraged by the accommodating and supportive nature of the plan and the desire to be a place of action and accommodation.</p>	<p>Hennepin County</p>		
<p>Hennepin Avenue and 1st Ave (CSAH 52) are a one-way pair of minor arterial roadways that extend from 7th Street SE across the Mississippi River bridge. After crossing into downtown Minneapolis, these roadways merge into a two-way roadway, which intersects with Washington Avenue (CSAH 152). These roadways then continue as city streets through downtown Minneapolis.</p> <p>The small area plan strongly favors the conversion of Hennepin Avenue and 1st Avenue from the current one-way roadway pair to two-way operations on each roadway. Numerous examples were provided in the plan (Table 3-1) demonstrating one-way roadways that were converted or evaluated for conversion into two-way</p>	<p>Hennepin County</p>		

<p>roadways. However, no information was provided with these examples to show a comparison of traffic volumes, patterns, speeds, crashes, etc. In addition, the Hennepin Avenue and 1st Avenue 2-way Conversion Evaluation Report completed by Minneapolis Public Works Traffic and Parking Services (July 2010) was referenced in the plan. This report states that nine design alternatives were analyzed using the VISSIM traffic analysis software. However, it is not over what portions of the Hennepin Avenue and 1st Avenue segments were analyzed.</p> <p>Impacts of one-way to two-way roadway conversions affect traffic operations and safety by increasing conflicts and the potential for crashes. These sections of Hennepin Avenue and 1st Avenue currently carry 15,300 and 10,300 vehicles per day, respectively. This one-way pair of roadways provides sufficient capacity for motorists traveling to/from downtown Minneapolis. This desired change to the roadway network will impact traffic patterns and may shift traffic volumes onto adjacent roadways and/or river crossings. Unless it can be demonstrated that this proposed change will function acceptably from a traffic operations and safety perspective, Hennepin County does not currently support this proposed change.</p>			
<p>The plan identifies the locally preferred alignment for the streetcar transit service (Nicollet-Central streetcar line), which would utilize the Hennepin Avenue bridge as the river crossing with Hennepin Avenue as a northbound route and 1st Avenue as a southbound route. Hennepin County supports multimodal travel and supporting connections, including the streetcar and other transit modes. However, with the potential configurations shown in the plan (including mixing streetcar and vehicular traffic), the capacity of Hennepin Avenue and 1st Avenue could likely be reduced. Microscopic traffic analysis is needed to demonstrate that, with the streetcar service as proposed along Hennepin</p>	<p>Hennepin County</p>		

<p>Avenue and 1st Avenue, traffic would continue to operate at an acceptable level of service.</p>			
<p>Safety concerns are identified in the plan at the following two intersections due to the current design (skewed intersection):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Avenue/East Hennepin Avenue/5th Street • Central Avenue/1st Avenue/7th Street <p>In the plan, a possible closure of 5th Street between Central Avenue and East Hennepin Avenue is proposed. While this is a complex area that may merit improvement, further analysis of the traffic volumes and travel patterns is needed to determine the impacts of this potential closure.</p>	<p>Hennepin County</p>		
<p>The plan states that pedestrians should have priority along the corridors in the study area, with elimination of all pedestrian push buttons at traffic signals proposed. In general, the county supports an integrated transportation system that serves buses, bicyclists, and pedestrians as well as cars and commercial traffic. As opportunities for improvements to pedestrian and bicycle modes occur in this area, the county may consider potential traffic signal improvements such as countdown timers.</p>	<p>Hennepin County</p>		
<p>The county supports the maintenance of pedestrian facilities throughout the year, as proposed in the plan. However, more discussion of current responsibilities and proposed changes to determine the goals of maintenance plan and the identified funding to support those changes.</p>	<p>Hennepin County</p>		
<p>The plan recommends using trade-off criteria to evaluate increasing height and density of new development. This is similar to a performance-based approach and has the potential of providing positive public benefits. MPRB staff would like to be involved in further discussions on how this approach could enhance the provision of park amenities in the area.</p>	<p>Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board</p>		
<p>The parks and open space chapter of the plan articulates goals and strategic actions for parklets and streetscape enhancements. The plan also mentions exploring using funds generated from the</p>	<p>Minneapolis Park and Recreation</p>		

<p>Minneapolis Park Dedication Ordinance to fund these improvements. These types of improvements are within existing public right-of-way and, in some cases, would be temporary. The Minneapolis Park Dedication Ordinance articulates how and where park dedication fees can be spent. They must be spent on parkland acquisition or park development at MPRB discretion. The MPRB will focus on long-term investments and give priority to needs in existing parks. The MPRB will employ the “private land maintained for public use” park dedication option in only unique circumstances when the option provides strategic facilities or connectivity or when there is no nearby park.</p>	<p>Board</p>		
<p>The parks and open space chapter also mentions a desire to pursue adding a micro, urban park/open space in the northeast section of the neighborhood. MPRB staff would be interested in exploring this idea further with the neighborhood to determine if there is a suitable location, whether it should be a public or private space, and whether it would be a good match for the Minneapolis Park Dedication Ordinance.</p>	<p>Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board</p>		
<p>The introduction articulates that the land adjacent to the Mississippi River and Nicollet Island are in the National Park and the Mississippi National River and Recreation Area. It further indicates that the land is subject to U. S. National Park Service regulations. The area is designated as the Mississippi National River and Recreation Area. The National Park Service works with 25 local governments, several state agencies and numerous organizations to protect the globally significant resources along the 72-mile stretch of river running through the Minneapolis/Saint Paul metro area. The regulations of the National Park Services pertain to those lands within the corridor that are owned by the National Park Service/Department of Interior.</p>	<p>Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board</p>		
<p>Other Planning Efforts Affecting the Nicollet Island-East Bank Neighborhood” – There is no mention of the Pedestrian Master Plan.</p>	<p>Public Works staff</p>	<p>p. 1-5</p>	

“Curb cuts are not to be implemented without specific justification of the necessity.” That is always true. “In all cases...signage and other means...” It may not always be practical to sign every curb cut and doing so would result in “sign clutter” and more obstructions in the pedestrian realm.	Public Works staff	p. 2-12	
Strategic Actions #1 & #2 – Public Works will not commit to the statements regarding restoring East Hennepin, 1st Avenue NE, and 4th Street to two-way traffic. At most, we could say “study” or “examine” conversion of these roadways to two-way traffic.	Public Works staff	p. 3-2	
Strategic Actions #5 – “...year-round maintenance of the pedestrian realm” sounds like snow removal. Sidewalk snow removal is the responsibility of the adjacent property owner.	Public Works staff	p. 3-2	
Strategic Actions #9 – This statement doesn’t make sense. Traffic signals operate on a coordinated, timed basis. The push-button provides priority for the next phase of the signal for pedestrians. Eliminating the push-button would reduce the priority for pedestrians.	Public Works staff	p. 3-2	
Strategic Actions #10 – A Ped/Bike bridge at this location is not identified in the Bicycle Master Plan.	Public Works staff	p. 3-2	
2nd Paragraph – Change to “This Plan calls for....and for exploring the restoration of two-way traffic...”	Public Works staff	p. 3-3	
Last Paragraph – Change to “ If East Hennepin Avenue and 1st Avenue....”	Public Works staff	p. 3-3	
Page 3-4. Plan for Transportation – Same comment as above: Public Works will not commit to the statements regarding restoring East Hennepin, 1st Avenue NE, and 4th Street to two-way traffic. At most, we could say “study” or “examine” conversion of these roadways to two-way traffic.	Public Works staff	p. 3-4	
Change to “The design of the streetcar line should consider the possibility of the restoration of....”	Public Works staff	p. 3-8	
Address Problematic Intersections in the Neighborhood – Change to “With the potential conversion of...”	Public Works staff	p. 3-9	
Enhance Transit Information – “The Metropolitan Council should	Public Works	p. 3-10	

install real time arrival signs at all transit stops in the neighborhood.” Has this been vetted by Met Council? This is not their standard practice.	staff		
Recommendations for bicycle connections in the plan are not necessarily clear. Need to add map showing proposed facilities, including linkages to Downtown network.	CPED staff		
The plan needs to more fully address heritage preservation concerns. This is a potential historic district. Plan needs to acknowledge this and point towards an approach for reviewing this. It may be suggesting the need for a separate study, since the potential district actually extends beyond the NIEB neighborhood boundaries.	CPED staff		
All blocks in the main part of the neighborhood need to show up as mixed use, as stated in the text. This is inconsistent on the maps.	CPED staff		
The language around affordable housing needs to be expanded and enhanced.	CPED staff		