

**Department of Community Planning and Economic Development**

105 5<sup>th</sup> 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: St. Anthony East Neighborhood Small Area Plan

---

In the Dropbox and on the [project website](#) is a copy of the St. Anthony East 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 St. Anthony East Neighborhood Organization (SAENA), to plan for the future of the neighborhood. This is the neighborhood's first small area plan. While the neighborhood does not contain an Activity Center, it is immediately adjacent to the East Hennepin Activity Center, which is located in the adjoining Nicollet Island East Bank neighborhood, which also has a small area plan in development. 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.

Additionally, the neighborhood is located along the route of the proposed Nicollet Central streetcar, which is currently being studied. It is possible that a station would be located within the neighborhood, though the route and stations are not yet finalized or funded.

Some key highlights of the St. Anthony East plan:

- Supports additional mixed use development along Broadway St, Central Ave, and the intersection of Spring St and Monroe St.
- Supports the reuse of the Webster School building, including current Minneapolis Public Schools plan to reopen as school serving Northeast and Downtown neighborhoods.
- Guides for denser mixed use development near the proposed streetcar station at Central Ave and Spring St.
- Encourages improved bicycle facilities within neighborhood, as well as traffic calming to reduce cut-through traffic avoiding Broadway St and Central Ave.

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.

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:** Adam Klein <klei0115@umn.edu>  
**Sent:** Friday, August 15, 2014 12:58 PM  
**To:** Maze, Haila R.  
**Subject:** SAENA Master Plan

Haila,

I just saw that the deadline passes for comments on the St Anthony East Master Plan. Understanding I am too late, I was hoping I still might comment.

\*Mostly I wanted to say I agreed with the plan, and would like to reiterate at least my families desire to not expand high density construction in our neighborhood (Over 3 stories) outside of the currently designated zones.

\*Also, I was wondering if there could be any plans in the future to open a stop in NE on the Northstar Line? With the growing construction, plan for a potential 40 story highrise on riverside, and other growth concerns, it would be greatly helpful to open a direct route from NE to Target field, so we can connect with other transit lines. With the difficulty in place at the Superior Plating site, it might make development more attractive. Otherwise, there could be space for a staircase, and access at 5th Street, or even over on Spring after it crosses Central.

\*Since I am a homeowner, while I do understand concerns about costs raising in the neighborhood, I'm not that interested in keeping them under control. Perhaps a fund could be established to offer grants for long term renters (10-years)?

\*The polling was close, but I do approve of a dog park if they put on in at the park. (I'm not a dog owner though, so no strong feelings towards, just not any against)

Sorry for the long list, I was trying to keep it brief since I appreciate you have a rather busy schedule. Mostly I wanted to comment on my highest concerns. Otherwise, I feel the plan looks good.

Thanks,

--

Adam Klein, Senior Administrative Director  
University of Minnesota  
Institute for Engineering in Medicine  
420 Delaware Ave SE, 725 Mayo MMC 609  
Minneapolis, MN 55455  
Tel 612.624.8483  
[www.iem.umn.edu](http://www.iem.umn.edu)

## Maze, Haila R.

---

**From:** Janrose444@aol.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 08, 2014 12:43 PM  
**To:** Maze, Haila R.  
**Subject:** St. Anthony East

Hi,  
My house was built in 1868, as verified by a House History service I hired. I am at 651 Jefferson St. NE. There is no abstract for the house but when I bought I was told it was built in 1868 and the House History confirmed that, although the first record was found in the 1880 census. Thanks.  
Jeanette LeVesque  
612 379 7035

## Maze, Haila R.

---

**From:** Janrose444@aol.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 08, 2014 12:50 PM  
**To:** Maze, Haila R.  
**Subject:** Plan for St. Anthony East

Hello,

I read parts of the information from your office about our neighborhood. For my part, I would like to see less multiple housing than we have as the houses are not kept up well and some of the people are not as caring about the neighborhood than single family or duplex owners.

I would like to see more lighting in the neighborhood too. That may help discourage criminals.

I like dogs but the reason I do not support a dog park is that it only helps a certain segment of the population, not all segments.

I like the idea of Webster School being inhabited by artists or preschoolers. I would love also to see a small mom & pop grocery store or bakery in the neighborhood.

Thanks.

Jeanette LeVesque  
651 Jefferson St. NE  
612 379 7035

## LUDP Comments on St Anthony East Plan

p. 35 – Community Commons: Just want to sure we are wording this carefully. I know the neighborhood currently owns the land, but once we go on the record stating that this will be a future community garden, there will be no going back. I think it's a fine use now, but do we anticipate development pressure creeping up this way with a streetcar line?

p. 35 – On rear entrances: Just flagging this for potential conflicts with our site plan review chapter. We obviously want the emphasis on the front entry and minimal use of any rear entrances.

p. 35 – Typo: change “intense” to “dense” development at Monroe St

p. 35 - Are we thinking future comp plan designation of Monroe/Spring as a neighborhood commercial node?

p. 43 - The range of R4 is really limited to medium density.

p. 43 - It would be more appropriate to note here that R6 allows up to six stories.

p. 44 - For all of these descriptions of zoning districts it may be best to just copy and paste from the zoning code for consistency.

p. 45 – For overlay districts: Again, it may be best to just copy and paste from the zoning code here

p. 45 – Overlay districts, not overlay zoning

p. 47 - This whole section on converting duplexes to condominiums is concerning and not necessarily correct. It may be more appropriate to just end this after the first sentence.

p. 47 – Change “single family and duplex zoning” to “single- and two-family zoning”

p. 47 – Remove extra period after “where the streetcar station is recommended”

p. 47 – Regarding neighborhood typologies, I am assuming we would get a chance to review this?

## St Anthony East Plan – Comments from CPED Managers

- Should define PO district and other land use features consistently across plans, particularly for the public who does not know what these terms mean
- Make sure language is not too technical and jargon-filled
- Bike lanes are identified strongly here, which is good
- Low density residential should also be defined here
- Fully update Webster School narrative to reflect current MPS decision, to make it clearer that exercise is just for future consideration – and that building will be used as a school

St. Anthony East Neighborhood Association Master Plan  
Public Works Comments

- Page 36. (Also cross section on page 41) Monroe Street. The proposed cross section for Monroe St NE needs some refinements. The bike lanes need to be a minimum of 5' wide (preferred minimum of 6' for a curb side bike lane). Advisory bike lanes or 10' travel lanes could be explored, although this is an MSA route and would require a variance process.
- Page 40. The proposed cross section for Spring Street should show two 5-foot bike lanes, as described in the text on page 36.

**St. Anthony East Small Area Plan**

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

Comment	Source	Location in Plan	<b>SUGGESTED</b> Response
I agreed with the plan, and would like to reiterate at least my families desire to not expand high density construction in our neighborhood (Over 3 stories) outside of the currently designated zones.	Adam Klein	Future Land Use and Transportation p. 34	High density future land use is shown only within an existing high density area in the neighborhood.
I was wondering if there could be any plans in the future to open a stop in NE on the Northstar Line? With the growing construction, plan for a potential 40 story high rise on riverside, and other growth concerns, it would be greatly helpful to open a direct route from NE to Target field, so we can connect with other transit lines. With the difficulty in place at the Superior Plating site, it might make development more attractive. Otherwise, there could be space for a staircase, and access at 5th Street, or even over on Spring after it crosses Central.	Adam Klein	Physical Characteristics p. 21	At present, there are no immediate plans to add a station for the Northstar line in NE Minneapolis.
Since I am a homeowner, while I do understand concerns about costs rising in the neighborhood, I'm not that interested in keeping them under control. Perhaps a fund could be established to offer grants for long term renters (10-years)?	Adam Klein	Background Research p. 8	While it was not true for everyone, many participants in the neighborhood survey noted that affordability was something they found attractive about the neighborhood. The plan emphasizes choice – i.e. a wide range of affordability for different households.
The polling was close, but I do approve of a dog park if they put on in at the park. (I'm not a dog owner though, so no strong feelings towards, just not any against)	Adam Klein	Background Research p. 10	The plan notes that the polling on the dog park concept was split 50/50, and stops short of a firm

			recommendation at this time, pending additional conversation and engagement.
My house was built in 1868, as verified by a House History service I hired. I am at 651 Jefferson St. NE. There is no abstract for the house but when I bought I was told it was built in 1868 and the House History confirmed that, although the first record was found in the 1880 census.	Jeanette LeVesque	Physical Characteristics p. 19	Thanks for providing this information. The plan includes a map showing the estimated age of buildings to provide context for the age and character of the neighborhood.
For my part, I would like to see less multiple housing than we have as the houses are not kept up well and some of the people are not as caring about the neighborhood as single family or duplex owners.	Jeanette LeVesque	Goal Statements p. 47	The plan supports maintaining single- and two-family zoning in the interior of the neighborhood.
I would like to see more lighting in the neighborhood too. That may help discourage criminals.	Jeanette LeVesque	Goal Statements p. 48	The plan supports the installation of additional street lighting
I like dogs but the reason I do not support a dog park is that it only helps a certain segment of the population, not all segments.	Jeanette LeVesque	Background Research p. 10	The plan notes that the polling on the dog park concept was split 50/50, and stops short of a firm recommendation at this time, pending additional conversation and engagement.
I like the idea of Webster School being inhabited by artists or preschoolers. I would love also to see a small mom & pop grocery store or bakery in the neighborhood.	Jeanette LeVesque	Goal Statements p. 48	Since MPS decided to reopen Webster as a public school, the plan supports this action. However, the plan retains

			findings from the planning process regarding other desired uses, in case something changes in the future.
Should define PO district, low density residential, and other land use features consistently across plans, particularly for the public who does not know what these terms mean. Make sure language is not too technical and jargon-filled.	CPED staff	Existing Zoning p. 45	Zoning definitions updated to ensure they are consistent with City zoning code
Bike lanes are identified strongly here, which is good	CPED staff	Future Land Use and Transportation p. 36	The plan describes additional bike facilities that are desired for the neighborhood
Fully update Webster School narrative to reflect current MPS decision, to make it clearer that exercise is just for future consideration – and that building will be used as a school	CPED staff	Background Research p. 7-8, 10-12	Narrative updated to include that this is just an exercise for future consideration, since the near-term MPS decision (supported by the neighborhood) is to use the building as a public school
The proposed cross section for Monroe St NE needs some refinements. The bike lanes need to be a minimum of 5’ wide (preferred minimum of 6’ for a curb side bike lane). Advisory bike lanes or 10’ travel lanes could be explored, although this is an MSA route and would require a variance process.	Public Works staff	Future Land Use and Transportation p. 36 and cross section on p. 41	Updated narrative and graphic to remove reference to 4’ lanes, and replace with suggested language
The proposed cross section for Spring Street should show two 5-foot bike lanes, as described in the text on page 36.	Public Works staff	Future Land Use and Transportation p. 40	Updated graphic to match narrative
Community Commons: Just want to sure we are wording this carefully. I know the neighborhood currently owns the land, but once we go on the record stating that this will be a future	CPED staff	Future Land Use and Transportation p. 35	Added language that use of land may need to be reevaluated as streetcar

community garden, there will be no going back. I think it's a fine use now, but do we anticipate development pressure creeping up this way with a streetcar line?			planning progresses, due to proximity to the line and potential station.
On rear entrances: Just flagging this for potential conflicts with our site plan review chapter. We obviously want the emphasis on the front entry and minimal use of any rear entrances.	CPED staff	Future Land Use and Transportation p. 35	Added language noting that primary access is still prioritized for the front of the buildings
Typo: change “intense” to “dense” development at Monroe St	CPED staff	Future Land Use and Transportation p. 35	Made change as requested
Are we thinking future comp plan designation of Monroe/Spring as a neighborhood commercial node?	CPED staff	Future Land Use and Transportation p. 35	Added language regarding new neighborhood commercial node at Monroe and Spring, and added boundary to map
The range of R4 is really limited to medium density.	CPED staff	Existing Zoning p. 43	Made change as requested
It would be more appropriate to note here that R6 allows up to six stories.	CPED staff	Existing Zoning p. 43	Made change as requested
For all of these descriptions of zoning districts it may be best to just copy and paste from the zoning code for consistency.	CPED staff	Existing Zoning p. 44	Updated language to reflect definitions in zoning code
For overlay districts: Again, it may be best to just copy and paste from the zoning code here	CPED staff	Existing Zoning p. 45	Updated language to reflect definitions in zoning code
Overlay districts, not overlay zoning	CPED staff	Existing Zoning p. 45	Made change as requested
This whole section on converting duplexes to condominiums is concerning and not necessarily correct. It may be more appropriate to just end this after the first sentence.	CPED staff	p. 47	Made change as requested
Change “single family and duplex zoning” to “single- and two-family zoning”	CPED staff	p. 47	Made change as requested

Remove extra period after “where the streetcar station is recommended”	CPED staff	p. 47	Made change as requested
Regarding neighborhood typologies, I am assuming we would get a chance to review this?	CPED staff	p. 47	Added reference to coordinating review and development of this with City staff