

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: January 29, 2015

TO: Planning Commission Members

FROM: Haila Maze, Principal Planner

SUBJECT: Holland Neighborhood Small Area Plan

In the Dropbox and on the [project website](#) is a copy of the Holland Neighborhood Small Area Plan, to be discussed at the January 29, 2015 Committee of the Whole. This plan was brought to CPC COW on October 30, 2014 for discussion. Since then, the plan completed its 45 day public review from November 10 to December 24, 2014 and is ready to move through the City's approval process.

This plan represents the culmination of a yearlong planning process, led by the Holland Neighborhood Improvement Association (HNIA) to plan for the future of the neighborhood. This is the neighborhood's first small area plan. It also updates the plan for the Central and Lowry Activity Center, which is partially located within the neighborhood boundaries. 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.

A portion of Holland was covered in the Central Avenue Small Area Plan, which was adopted by City Council in 2008. This plan updates that vision, though it is largely consistent with the earlier framework.

Holland overlaps also with the ongoing Lowry Avenue NE Community Works study, which is being led by Hennepin County. The plan addresses the overlap and is generally consistent with the draft County plan. However, since the Lowry plan has not yet been released for public review, it is not possible to fully compare the two at this point.

Some key highlights of the Holland plan:

- The Lowry Ave corridor is guided for pedestrian-oriented mixed use, with additional infill development and commercial at key intersections.
- Mixed use guidance was expanded to locations along Lowry Ave NE and 22nd Ave NE, - with the designation of new neighborhood commercial nodes.

- Support for commercial corridor development along Central Ave NE, and supporting density along parallel Jackson St NE.
- Development of a “signature street” concept along 22nd Ave NE, building upon the Holland Commons around Edison, Jackson Square Park, the Firefighters’ Museum, and Northeast Library – as well as public art and placemaking elements.
- Increase bicycle and pedestrian connectivity, including addressing the barriers created by the railroad and its overpasses.

The 45 day comments are attached, along 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 February 9, 2015 Planning Commission for approval.

Attachment:

- Comments and proposed responses received during 45 day comment period

**Holland Small Area Plan
Comments and Responses from 45 Day Review Period – as of 1/5/15**

Comment	Source	Location in Plan	Response
<p>First, as a long-time resident, current Holland board member, and SAP steering committee member, I am pleased with the SAP as drafted by Cuningham and Associates. We all intentionally sought input from property owners, business owners, renters, old, young, jurisdictional partners (county, parks, city, schools) and people from many different backgrounds. In the end I think the Holland SAP reflects an appropriate balance between new intentional and directed investment and the maintaining of a neighborhood vibe where organic, spontaneous, eclectic expression is also highly valued. In the end, it is not about preserving the past simply because it is old - it is about allowing the soul and character of the neighborhood to continue to thrive while also revitalizing challenged infrastructure and building stock.</p> <p>I am also particularly excited about the vision laid out regarding the environment and the arts. It is my hope that, by laying out the intention to invite innovative solutions to environmental challenges and innovation in public art, Holland will find even more partners to help us achieve these visions.</p> <p>Ultimately it is my hope that Holland will continue its upward trajectory as a neighborhood that welcomes all kinds of people, and that offers experience to rival any city anywhere.</p>	<p>Adelheid Koski</p>	<p>Multiple</p>	<p>Comments acknowledged</p>
<p>How does Marshall St fit into Holland plan, if it's not in Holland? What is driving the emphasis on stormwater management there?</p>	<p>Public Works</p>	<p>p. 25</p>	<p>Added language clarifying relationship between Holland and Marshall St, and focus on stormwater</p>

Implementing bike “sharrows” on Lowry Ave is not consistent with the Bicycle Master Plan.	Public Works	p. 34	Added language more generally supporting safe accommodation of bicycles on Lowry
This is not entirely consistent with the County’s plan for Lowry. The plan should reference the County ongoing Lowry Ave NE Community Works planning process and draft concepts for the roadway and streetscape.	Public Works	p. 31-36	Added references to County’s Lowry Ave Plan, which is not yet available for public review, but was coordinated closely with the Holland planning process
The cross section shown is not consistent with draft in County plan in several ways	Public Works	p. 36	Added references to County’s Lowry Ave Plan, which is not yet available for public review, but was coordinated closely with the Holland planning process
Construction of Holland Basin was intended to address the flooding in in this area. Are there really still problem areas that need additional stormwater management? Would it be more effective to modify the existing basin rather than adding additional BMPs.	Public Works	p. 43	Added modifications to basin as potential option to address stormwater issues. There are still some flooding issues, and growth and development may impact further.
Again what level of flooding is currently being experienced? Small boulevard BMPs are not likely to be very effective for flooding from large rain events.	Public Works	p. 44	Added detail on flooding issues in the community and scale of improvements needed
A “meandering” roadway could present some maintenance issues for snow plowing and street sweeping. The use of colored	Public Works	p. 46	Qualified that options for innovative roads could be

pavements and crosswalks slightly increases capital costs and also results in increased costs for operations and maintenance.			explored, including discussion of increased maintenance needs
Same comments as with pages 43 and 44.	Public Works	p. 47	See above
Make sure proposed alterations/amenities added to Basin are compatible with its primary use of stormwater management.	Public Works	p. 51-52	Added language regarding this
Improving the space under the railroad overpasses with “lighting and art” is a good idea, but the issue of paying for the implementation as well as ongoing maintenance costs should be addressed.	Public Works	p. 60	Added reference to need for additional resources
Definition for “transitional industrial” should match the comprehensive plan – i.e. transition, not transfer	CPED	p. 21	Made suggested change
On all pages, “neighborhood nodes” should say “neighborhood commercial nodes” instead, so it is consistent with the comprehensive plan	CPED	p. 21-22, 35	Made suggested change
The plan should indicate which neighborhood commercial nodes are existing, and which ones are being added with this plan (as well as any other proposed changes to land use features)	CPED	p. 22	Indicated existing and new commercial nodes
Guidance for new building setbacks should be changed to 5’-8’ so it does not conflict with Chapter 530 of the zoning code. Alternatively, change so it is more specific to sidewalk width than to building setbacks.	CPED	p. 23	Made suggested change
Add “street” to the reference to Washington and Monroe. In general, use full street names for clarity.	CPED	p. 25	Made suggested change
In item A, “workshop” should be plural	CPED	p. 26	Made suggested change
Regarding the graphic showing building heights: The zoning code doesn't allow for half stories above 2.5. From three stories on, half stories are just counted as stories. These heights also seem a little conservative for medium and high density development.	CPED	p. 26	Graphic updated with heights more consistent with zoning code and land use guidance
Please clarify the meaning of this sentence: “Places where the grid is skewed are celebrated with terminated views.” It is defined later on, but people may not realize that.	CPED	p. 26	Added clarifying language
Clarify that “joint planning area” is in Logan Park neighborhood	CPED	p. 26	Added clarifying

			language
The railroad era housing in the neighborhood <i>may</i> be potentially historically significant. It likely needs additional evaluation and study before we can make that determination.	CPED	p. 27	Added clarifying language
“Initiatives Areas” – initiative should be singular	CPED	p. 29	Made suggested change
Again, limit the maximum setback of 8' to be consistent with Chapter 530 or make the recommendation more about sidewalk width than building setbacks.	CPED	p. 35 and 36	Made suggested change
“However” should have a comma after it	CPED	p. 37	Made suggested change
“Large surface parking” should have “lots” added to it	CPED	p. 37	Made suggested change
Central Ave in general is not an Activity Center. The area around Central and Lowry has been. Central overall in this location is a Commercial Corridor.	CPED	p. 40	Added clarifying language
Need to clarify that 18 th and Central is in Logan Park neighborhood, not Holland	CPED	p. 40	Added clarifying language
The height recommendations on this page don't match completely with those on page 26	CPED	p. 41	Made changes for consistency
Have the suggestions here for the use of Edison High School and Jackson Square Park been vetted with MPS and MPRB?	CPED	p. 51	Clarified that there as ongoing involvement of MPS and MPRB in planning process
Need to ensure height guidance is consistent with other parts of plan (e.g. p. 26)	CPED	p. 53	Made changes for consistency
“dependant” is misspelled	CPED	p. 56	Made suggested change
“along side” should be one word	CPED	p. 58	Made suggested change