

## "Hill and Lake Residents Speak"

Over 160 residents attended the June 6 Minneapolis 2040 Comp Plan Information Session, sponsored by the four Hill and Lake neighborhoods. Several of them offered their comments on the meeting and on the draft Comp Plan itself. (Compiled by Michael Wilson.)

**Canan Karatekin** / Cedar-Isles-Dean

It was good to have a chance to hear about the 2040 plan. However, I was disappointed to hear the city planners say several times that they had no control over "market forces" and had no way to predict what the market would do. The impression I got from the meeting was that the developers of high-end homes would have free rein over the city by 2040. I hope there will be a mechanism by which we find out how feedback from the community has been incorporated into the plan. Thanks for the chance to give feedback.

**Sam and Barbara Murphy** / Kenwood

Alert neighbors. The draft Minneapolis 2040 plan is a far-reaching change that will have a major, irrevocable impact on the lakes neighborhoods. Driving four-story apartment buildings up along Franklin Avenue and 21st Street through Lowry Hill and Kenwood will impact entire neighborhoods that are the envy of most cities. Look how the increased density along Lake Street into uptown has generated serious traffic and pedestrian safety issues, with no improvement in transportation, affordable housing or segregation. That is your future.

**Robert Hinck** / Lowry Hill

The Minneapolis 2040 proposal extols the virtues and vibrancy of our city, and then states the intention to change it. Density merely for growth's sake is coerced, not an organic response. The desire to increase density, as suggested, will likely result in the same effect as the freeways dividing neighborhoods in the 1960s. This time it'll be the canyons of condos that dwarf and isolate businesses, homes and residents. Sometimes what is not built is as important as what is.

**Harriet Horwitz** / East Isles

What is worth saving? In 1988, as developers proposed a 25-story apartment tower adjoining the Calhoun Beach Club, concerned citizens throughout the city let their council members know how vital our Chain of Lakes Regional Park is to the unique identity of Minneapolis. In response, the City Council unanimously voted to adopt the Shoreland Overlay District ordinance, conforming to DNR protections limiting building height within 1000 feet of lakes. Under Minneapolis 2040, however, those protections will be removed and buildings reaching 30 stories are possible. Currently, buildings with over 1200 units near Bde Mka Ska are min 1988 for limitations so that, genera-



The June 6 four-neighborhood Comp Plan information meeting was led by Heather Worthington (left), the city's director of long-range planning, and Brian Schaffer (right), principal project coordinator. Shawn Smith (center), KIAA board chair, was the moderator.

(Photo: Dorothy Childers. Caption: Michael Wilson.)

tions from now, grandkids could still see the sky. Is that achievement now to be lost?

**Karen and Jerry Bergseth** / Cedar-Isles-Dean

The strong anti-automobile bias in the plan is troubling. Commuting aside, most people will still need a car for independence and flexibility. Penalizing car owners by mandating minimal parking while increasing density in proposed new housing seems counter-productive. Auto industry sources predict 40-50% of new vehicles will be electric by 2040, and those will be facing a parking nightmare under this plan. We may be trying to solve a problem that will not exist beyond 2040.

**Linda Mack** / Kenwood

Is allowing four-plexes in all neighborhoods the best way to make housing accessible to all? It seems likely that the least valuable properties would be the ones that would be re-developed—smaller houses in affordable neighborhoods—and therefore a housing stock that meets the need for affordable housing would actually be destroyed. Let's test out the economics of this proposal before a wholesale change that could have negative consequences.

**Cam Winton** / Lowry Hill

I have three key concerns about the Minneapolis 2040 plan:

- It would threaten the safety of our neighborhood's children to allow four-story construction across the street from Kenwood Elementary – as the draft plan does. That many more people and their cars—in

an area that's already congested every morning and afternoon—would increase the risk of a child being hit by a car.

- It would trample a community resource to allow any construction along Kenilworth Trail south of West 21st Street – as the draft plan does.

- It would demolish the fabric of already-dense neighborhoods to allow construction of four-story buildings the full length of Franklin Ave. and West 21st Street – as the draft plan does.

**Evan Boyd** / East Isles

Moving people in the Minneapolis 2040 Plan: I have been a resident in the Uptown area for eight years and I worked in downtown Minneapolis for 27 years. In both areas several apartment, condominium, and corporate buildings have been built but I have seen no improvement in moving people in and out of downtown or Uptown. All future residences and businesses should have off-street parking. While I agree with bike lanes it seems regressive to make 26th and 28th one lane for cars when there is great Greenway biking close at hand. Should there be more one-way streets with no parking, streets dedicated to bikes, buses, taxis, Uber, Lyft etc.? We do not have good mass transportation and often the streets are closed for events.

**Nancy and Jim Nikora** / Cedar-Isles-Dean

Ms. Worthington stated the Plan 2040 recognizes the shortage of affordable housing and encourages density of existing and new development. Significant projects are slated for the Lake Street transit corridor, but their higher rents contradict the Plan's goals. We're told the city cannot control development projects, however the Hiawatha corridor has fully developed transit where more affordable housing could be encouraged with TIF funds. Our lakes, protected by Theodore Wirth and 1987's Shoreline Overlay, are the city's most valuable asset, and must not be walled off to profit a few.

**Brian Repko and Kristin Gaarder** / Kenwood

Unfortunately, transit plans don't keep up with the density plans. People still need cars that require parking and traffic planning. Also, lack of affordable housing and altering the single-family neighborhoods are issues. We prefer density at intersections, not along full corridors. We are concerned that density near Bde Maka Ska has an environmental impact. For Kenwood, any corridor to SWLRT would be better as a bike corridor and not a Corridor 4 level.

**Michael Rothman** / Cedar-Isles-Dean

At 245 pages the Minneapolis 2040 Plan is indeed utopian in scope. Racial equity is a wonderful priority. So is more density. I fear, however, that the plan is

## "Hill and Lake Residents Speak"

(Page 2)

something of a Trojan horse insofar as the 30-story towers in CIDNA indicate a field day for developers who will, as always, let the market be their guide. Affordable housing will be the loser. Let there be low-rise and walkability. Save my Calhoun Village Punch Pizza, or else!

**John and Loni Healam** / East Isles

We thought that the presenter on June 6, Heather Worthington, did an excellent job in outlining the 2040 Comprehensive Plan (not policy!), and in answering audience questions. We noticed the demographics of those attending this meeting: very few minorities and largely, like us, of the older generation. I would thus suggest (partially in jest!) that very individual residential real estate would be of more consideration than current housing and commercial properties and how they will change by 2040.

**Jeremy Nichols and Evelyn Turner** / Kenwood

In addition to the concerns about, and obvious mistakes in, the land use designations, there is substantial policy overreach and an absence of consideration of how the implementation of the policies is to be funded. The plan is difficult to understand as it is full of technical terms and written in jargon. It promotes a particular ideological agenda. Written in an arrogant and patronizing tone, it denigrates those who haven't "gotten with the program," in particular "white people" (Goal 1) and automobile users.

The plan promotes overreaching regulation, which expands the city's police power. It has very little about basic municipal services: public safety, utilities and street maintenance. It implies city control of the Park Board and Metro Transit. It does not consider that the city is part of a region and that some issues could be better addressed in cooperation with other units of government. It does not consider the appropriate form of government for the city or city finances in general.

**Mike Sward** / Cedar-Isles-Dean

Over ice cream with my 12 year old godchild yesterday, backyards came up. "Are they important", I asked. "I know everyone can't have one," she replied. "I just can't imagine growing up without ours! We play there all the time. My moms like it because we're safe!"

I'm a Realtor, and her words echo the concern I hear most frequently from Buyers: "What assurances

---

*"Let's test out the economics of this proposal before a wholesale change that could have negative consequences."*

-- Linda Mack

---

are there that multi-unit dwellings won't take over and ruin the neighborhood?" Most of us welcome diversity in all forms, from home-styles to life-styles. What rises to a valid, consistent concern is how to integrate a balance of growth that's reasonable and sustainable given our current infrastructure without losing the beauty of these magnificent-single family settings. An old yet wise saying reminds us not to "toss out the baby with the bath water!" Nurturing community must include mindfulness surrounding what has sustained itself and even flourished, as many search for single-family dwellings, protected by sensible zoning rules.

**Mark Addicks** / Lowry Hill

I had three reactions to our neighborhood meeting. There is a lack of agreement about whether this plan is meant to address affordable housing—which we all

care about—or density. The Mayor says the 2040 Plan will lead to more affordable housing; the Plan's author says it absolutely does not. Clarity on this point is critical. If the Plan is just for density, then we should be discussing the best way to address density.

Second, the 2040 Plan assumes that property values remain strong. I am not sure that single-family homes—especially in our neighborhood—will retain their values when next to four story residential buildings. So property taxes could be negatively affected in the future.

Third, the 2040 Plan has ZERO design requirements for all this development. I fear the individual character and design features of our neighborhoods will be replaced by a boring sameness, much like we are seeing in the current development boom. Think of our Hennepin Avenue today: it is an ugly amalgam of poorly conceived strip centers and random retail outlets with ZERO character and ZERO unifying design elements, all because no one from city government was paying attention. You could be in any poorly-planned city in the United States. I fear that this will be the actual legacy of the 2040 Plan from Mayor Frey and Council President Bender.

**Nancy and Jack Sousa** / Cedar-Isles-Dean

As a couple who downsized and moved from a very dense neighborhood in Boston to the CIDNA neighborhood of Minneapolis eight years ago, we are now hoping to age in place. We can't do that without help from the city. The 2040 plan might have good intentions in making the city livable for everyone, but I don't see any substantive plans for pedestrian safety and improvements in public transit near my neighborhood. As we age, we will become one of those people who will want to give up a car and walk or take public transportation to obtain services. The "Nice Ride" across the street will not be good enough!