



CPED STAFF REPORT

Prepared for the City Planning Commission

CPC Agenda Item #1
September 15, 2014

SMALL AREA PLAN SUMMARY

<i>Project Name:</i>	St. Anthony East Neighborhood Small Area Plan
<i>Prepared By:</i>	Haila Maze , Principal Planner, (612) 673-2098
<i>Ward:</i>	3
<i>Neighborhood:</i>	St. Anthony East Neighborhood Association
<i>Existing Land Use Features:</i>	<i>Activity Center:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• East Hennepin commercial district (adjacent) <i>Community Corridors:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Central Ave NE• Broadway St NE
<i>Zoning Plate Numbers:</i>	14 and 15

BACKGROUND AND PROCESS

The St. Anthony East neighborhood is located within Minneapolis' Northeast Community and is one of the oldest neighborhoods within the city. The neighborhood's boundaries are Broadway Street NE to the north, Central Avenue NE to the east and southeast, railroad tracks to the south, 5th Street NE to the southwest, and Washington Street NE to the west. It contains a mix of uses, including low, medium, and high density residential; institutional; and commercial. It is immediately adjacent to industrial areas.

While the neighborhood does not have any major centers or nodes within its boundaries, it is immediately adjacent to the East Hennepin Activity Center on its southern boundary. This proximity means that the guidance for that portion of the neighborhood is for higher density housing – something which the plan indeed supports. It also borders the proposed alignment for the Central-Nicollet Streetcar corridor. Preliminary layout concepts for the streetcar show at least one station area located in the neighborhood. The plan also reflects this. It should be noted that Central Ave NE is already part of the Metro Transit's Hi Frequency Network, due to bus Route 10.

This is the St. Anthony East neighborhood's first small area plan. It was initiated and led by the St. Anthony East Neighborhood Association (SAENA). The motivating factors for planning included: (1) the aforementioned proximity to an Activity Center and streetcar route; (2) a desire for flexibility in the reuse of the existing building stock, and (3) an effort to enhance the neighborhood as a community of "choice" with all the advantages of urban living, including housing options, green space and public realm amenities, and additional commercial.

It should be noted that plans for two adjacent neighborhoods – Sheridan and Nicollet Island-East Bank – are moving forward on the same approval timeframe. While each plan must be reviewed and approved separately, they are being tracked together since they share similar geography and issues, and are together a policy framework for a significant part of Northeast Minneapolis.

Planning Process and Community Engagement

Prior to beginning its plan update, the SAENA board developed a request for proposals to hire a consultant to assist them with the planning process. They retained the services of a consultant team led by Biko Associates, which worked with them throughout.

Working with the consultant, SAENA assembled a representative steering committee to guide the planning process. The process included robust public outreach, including:

- A neighborhood-wide survey, designed, tested, and administered by SAENA
- One-on-one interviews with representative stakeholders
- Engagement with artists, an important local stakeholder group
- Engagement with the Webster School Subcommittee (at the time the process was initiated, this large site was vacant and its future unknown; it is now being reopened as a school)

This planning process lasted for much of 2013. Overall, the process involved over 300 residents, business people, and other stakeholders. SAENA reviewed and accepted the draft plan in early 2014.

Review and Approval Process

The plan was first brought to the City Planning Commission Committee of the Whole (CPC COW) on June 12, 2014, to provide an overview of the plan. The 45-day public review period was held from June 30 to August 13, 2014. Public comments received during that period were compiled, and a response was provided for each one. Comments and responses for both periods are included here.

The plan was subsequently brought back to CPC COW on August 28, 2014. Since then, the plan has been amended to reflect comments from the 45 day review and from the CPC COW meeting.

After review and action by the Minneapolis City Planning Commission, CPED intends to take the plan to the Zoning and Planning Committee of the City Council on October 9, 2014.

Pending full adoption of the plan by the CPC and Council, it will be submitted subsequently to the Metropolitan Council for amendment to the *Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth* (the City's comprehensive plan).

PLAN OVERVIEW

The St Anthony East Plan policy direction is divided into two main sections: (1) plan frameworks for land use, transportation, and design and (2) overall goal statements and recommendations.

Plan Frameworks

Land Use

The future land use direction for St. Anthony East builds on its existing land use patterns. Balancing existing conditions and projected future growth, the plan “preserves and protects lower density, single

family and duplex residential by identifying locations where comparatively higher density residential development can occur.” Growth areas for higher density residential and mixed use include the area adjacent to the East Hennepin Activity Center along Central and 3rd, which is also proximate to the proposed streetcar station area.

The plan also embraces mixed use development, and looks for ways to incorporate it within the neighborhood. This includes strengthening an existing area at Central and Spring (adjacent to the proposed streetcar station area), expanding and formalizing a node at Monroe and Spring, and looking at reuse of properties along Broadway. The Broadway proposal is particularly worth noting, in that it recommends reuse of existing largely residential properties for small scale commercial and mixed use. The scale of Broadway mixed use is moderate in bulk and intensity – reflecting the Community Corridor designation of the street.

The planning process addressed the reuse of the Webster School building in depth. At the time the process was initiated, this major presence in the neighborhood was shuttered, and its future unknown. The planning process explored some alternative uses for the property. The school district has since announced plans to reopen it as a public elementary school. The neighborhood fully supports this, but has opted to retain some of the work it did regarding alternative uses, as there may be changes in the future to the status of the school – or other opportunities that open up nearby.

It should be noted that this planning process took place in the very preliminary stages of development of the Nicollet-Central streetcar. Many things, including the precise location of stations, are still far from being finalized. Additionally, full station area planning will no doubt need to include other neighborhood as well – such as Beltrami and Marcy-Holmes, which border St. Anthony East along Central Ave. That said, this plan provides a starting point for how density and development will be built up along the streetcar – and how streetcar can add value to the community.

Transportation

The transportation direction in this plan focuses on expansion of multimodal options. The plan fully supports the development of the Central-Nicollet streetcar proposal, though concepts are still very preliminary and will require ongoing work and coordination.

The plan also recommends improved bicycle connectivity through the neighborhood. This includes proposals to add bicycle lanes to several routes, including Spring and Monroe.

Finally, the plan acknowledges that its neighborhood streets sometimes act as a cut-through for traffic seeking to avoid congestion on Central and Broadway. As a result, it proposes several pedestrian-friendly streetscape improvements designed to calm traffic and enhance the pedestrian realm.

Design

The plan incorporates several recommendations for improving the public realm, focused on concepts of good urban design. These include greening, public art, and bicycle and pedestrian amenities.

Goal Statements

The plan outlines nine major goals statements with accompanying implementation steps:

1. Identify opportunities to implement the recommended future, market-driven mixed use housing development plan while maintaining the overall, low density, single family nature of the neighborhood.
2. Enhance opportunities for home ownership.
3. Generally provide opportunities for the development of commercial/retail uses and specifically strengthen the commercial node at the neighborhood's core (intersection of Monroe Street/Spring Street).
4. Improve the character of neighborhood streets to reinforce hospitable pedestrian and cycling environments.
5. Reinforce the hierarchy of the neighborhood's streets where some provide local access and others provide for transit, snow emergencies, and continuous travel across the neighborhood.
6. Improve accessibility by expanding transit and bike facilities serving the neighborhood.
7. Improve the parks by updating and maintaining equipment and developing new park space in the southwest quadrant of the Central Avenue/Broadway Street intersection.
8. Enhance the visual appeal and design character of the neighborhood to enhance livability.
9. Identify a re-use program for the Webster School that will benefit the neighborhood and its residents and feature the school building as a neighborhood asset.

Implementation

The plan has a fairly simple implementation framework, based on following up on implementation steps to the goal statements listed above. Involvement in the Nicollet-Central streetcar planning process, and the planned reopening of Webster School are likely to be two of the near-term priorities for plan implementation.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CONSISTENCY

This plan will be consistent with the following applicable policies of [The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth](#):

Land Use Policy 1.1: Establish land use regulations to achieve the highest possible development standards, enhance the environment, protect public health, support a vital mix of land uses, and promote flexible approaches to carry out the comprehensive plan.

1.1.6 Develop small area plans for designated land use features, particularly Activity Centers, Growth Centers, and Major Retail Centers, in consultation with neighborhood associations, residents, and other stakeholders.

Land Use Policy 1.5: Promote growth and encourage overall city vitality by directing new commercial and mixed use development to designated corridors and districts.

1.5.1 Support an appropriate mix of uses within a district or corridor with attention to surrounding uses, community needs and preferences, and availability of public facilities.

Land Use Policy 1.8: Preserve the stability and diversity of the city's neighborhoods while allowing for increased density in order to attract and retain long-term residents and businesses.

1.8.1 Promote a range of housing types and residential densities, with highest density development concentrated in and along appropriate land use features.

Land Use Policy 1.9: Through attention to the mix and intensity of land uses and transit service, the City will support development along Community Corridors that enhances residential livability and pedestrian access.

1.9.1 Support the continued presence of existing small-scale retail sales and commercial services along Community Corridors.

Land Use Policy 1.12: Support Activity Centers by preserving the mix and intensity of land uses and by enhancing the design features that give each center its unique urban character.

1.12.7 Encourage the development of medium- to high-density housing immediately adjacent to Activity Centers to serve as a transition to surrounding residential areas.

Transportation Policy 2.1: Encourage growth and reinvestment by sustaining the development of a multi-modal transportation system.

2.1.1 Continue addressing the needs of all modes of transportation, emphasizing the development of a more effective transit network.

Transportation Policy 2.2: Support successful streets and communities by balancing the needs of all modes of transportation with land use policy.

2.2.3 Promote street and sidewalk design that balances handling traffic flow with pedestrian orientation and principles of traditional urban form.

Transportation Policy 2.3: Encourage walking throughout the city by ensuring that routes are safe, comfortable, pleasant, and accessible.

2.3.1 Ensure that there are safe and accessible pedestrian routes to major destinations, including transit corridors, from nearby residential areas.

Transportation Policy 2.5: Ensure that bicycling throughout the city is safe, comfortable and pleasant.

2.5.1 Complete a network of on- and off-street primary bicycle corridors.

Housing Policy 3.1: Grow by increasing the supply of housing.

3.1.1 Support the development of new medium- and high-density housing in appropriate locations throughout the city.

3.1.2 Use planning processes and other opportunities for community engagement to build community understanding of the important role that urban density plays in stabilizing and strengthening the city.

Housing Policy 3.2: Support housing density in locations that are well connected by transit, and are close to commercial, cultural and natural amenities.

3.2.1 Encourage and support housing development along commercial and community corridors, and in and near growth centers, activity centers, retail centers, transit station areas, and neighborhood commercial nodes.

3.2.2 Engage in dialogue with communities about appropriate locations for housing density, and ways to make new development compatible with existing structures and uses.

The St. Anthony East neighborhood is bordered by two Community Corridors, but does not otherwise currently have designated land use features. The plan does recommend adding a Neighborhood Commercial Node at Spring and Monroe, building on existing commercial cluster at that location. In addition, the plan recommends the expansion of some commercial and mixed use designations along the Central and Broadway Community Corridors.

The justification for these new and expanded land use features is to more fully accommodate growth and development in the City. This overall goal is highly consistent with the comprehensive plan.

Otherwise, this plan's land use and design guidance is otherwise largely consistent with existing comprehensive plan guidance for the applicable land use features. The plan is also largely consistent in terms of its guidance on other topics, including housing, transportation, and urban design.

The plan is also largely consistent with an overlapping adopted plan that was incorporated into the comprehensive plan – namely the 2008 *Central Avenue Small Area Plan* that included the neighborhood's frontage along Central Ave NE. The one exception is the expansion of commercial and mixed use guidance in the St. Anthony Plan around Spring and Central. Since these plans cover mostly different geographies, it is anticipated that they both will remain in place. However, the St. Anthony East plan will be the more updated policy guidance for the neighborhood.

FUTURE RELATED ACTIONS

Implementation of the plan recommendations is part of Planning staff's 2014 work plan and will likely continue into the future. Elements of this include:

- **Comprehensive plan changes.** This plan will be incorporated into the City's comprehensive plan, including incorporating this plan's future land use map into the comprehensive plan's citywide Future Land Use map and making the changes noted above to the land use features. This requires Metropolitan Council review for consistency with regional systems plans, in accordance with state law. As this review follows City approvals, City adoption of the plan as part of the comprehensive plan will be contingent on the pending Metropolitan Council review. This will move forward after plan adoption, possibly bundled with other pending comprehensive plan updates.
- **Potential text amendment or rezoning.** While the plan does not propose major land use changes that would necessarily impact base zoning (at least not immediately), it does suggest some potential zoning code changes. These may be accommodated through a future rezoning study – again, perhaps handled jointly with other pending zoning changes needed in adjacent and nearby neighborhoods that also have small area plans underway.
- **Development review.** Future development proposals for property in the St. Anthony East neighborhood will require Planning Commission review of development applications such as rezonings, conditional use permits, and site plan review. In this way, the Planning Commission has a role in the incremental implementation of the plan. Environmental impact assessments and/or transportation demand management studies will be undertaken as necessary.
- **Capital project prioritization.** The capital improvements process (through the City, County, and other public entities) provides an important way to implement recommended projects in the comprehensive plan. This plan's identification of these projects provides additional priority and weight to them in project review and ranking. It also allows for proposals to be made when funding opportunities (such as grants) emerge.

- **Support for stakeholder-led implementation efforts.** As this is the neighborhood's plan, some implementation may be led by the neighborhood association, based on their interest and capacity. This is anticipated to be ongoing and will need periodic City review or assistance.
- **Streetcar planning.** Additional transportation and design work will be necessary for development and implementation of the plan for the Nicollet-Central Streetcar.

PUBLIC COMMENT

A number of comments were received during the 45-day comment period from individuals, community organizations, and government staff. There were a number changes as a result of these comments, including adding detail and clarification around topics and concepts in the plan. These edits did not represent large changes in the direction or intent of the plan, but rather added to the existing framework. A table listing the comments and the responses to them is attached.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation of the Department of Community Planning and Economic Development:

The Department of Community Planning and Economic Development recommends that the City Planning Commission and City Council **approve** the St. Anthony East Neighborhood Small Area Plan and **amend** the policy guidance for the area into the City's existing comprehensive plan with the following conditions:

- The comprehensive plan amendment is subject to final review and approval by the Metropolitan Council.
- Additional transportation planning and design work will be necessary for development and implementation of the Nicollet-Central Streetcar. The features and recommendations of this plan will be referenced in that planning process and reevaluated in conjunction with the larger project. They may be adjusted, refined, or updated if necessary.
- The features and recommendations of this plan will be used to guide preparation of an updated comprehensive plan in upcoming years. As with all small area plans, features and recommendations of this plan will be reevaluated and may be adjusted or updated in the next update to the Comprehensive Plan.

ATTACHMENTS

- St. Anthony East Neighborhood Small Area Plan
- Written comments received to date
- Table of comments and responses

The plan is also available online at: <http://www.ci.minneapolis.mn.us/cped/projects/StAnthonyEastPlan>.

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

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 Responses from 45 Day Review Period – as of 9/8/14**

Comment	Source	Location in Plan	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

Comment	Source	Location in Plan	Response
			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.

Comment	Source	Location in Plan	Response
			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	CPED staff	Future Land Use	Added language that use

Comment	Source	Location in Plan	Response
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?		and Transportation p. 35	of land may need to be reevaluated as streetcar 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	CPED staff	p. 47	Made change as requested

Comment	Source	Location in Plan	Response
appropriate to just end this after the first sentence.			
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