

Comment Number	Shape on map?	Comment
1	No	Definition of "Urban" neighborhood isn't very Urban-quite suburban.
2	No	Yes! Focus on building up run down areas.
3	No	Density.
4	No	Expand Interior 3 along more transit routes. E.g. Bhe LRT, 9,7, etc.
5	No	I love the direction of this plan! In order to have affordable housing, walkable neighborhoods, and well-maintained amenities, we need more diverse housing options everywhere. And more neighbors means higher tax base, so we can all have nice things!
6	No	Eliminating parking minimums citywide is a really good thing!
7	No	I LOVE this plan. Thank you.
8	No	More support to establish minority businesss, especially with Italian community.
9	No	I thank this is great. Thank you for taking equity and sustainabiliy seriously over existing exclusionary zoning
10	No	I'd love to see more small commercial develement - eg groceries, etc- in neighborhood interiors
11	No	NO CLAUSE FOR OPPORTUNITY Tp build higher than stated zoning
12	No	yes - more shops + grocery + commercial in neighborhood interiora & increase consumer bases to support them
13	No	Better more frequent increased public transit and make more affordable - should be plenty #1 before addressing on land-use plans
14	No	Difficult to stay in city/home on flyed retirement-cost exceed what it's planned for.
15	No	Allow low intensity office + commercial in urban neighborhoods
16	No	Merge "neighborhood offices + services" with a mixed use district; ct- allow retail
17	No	Looks like developers have made the plan.
18	No	You have no answers how can you make a good plan?
19	No	I'd like to see more mixed use zoning in South Minneapolis. There need to be amanities with in walking distance.
20	No	"Neighborhood officies + services" Makes NO sense. Vs corrider mixed use commercial
21	No	What role does Greg Russ have in this 2040 plan process?
22	No	\$275,000/unit to build new. Numbers don't support "affordable housing" narrative
23	No	Why did Lara Norkus quit planning committee? Because lack of public engagement/input.
24	No	No printed copy of the plan exists!
25	No	Language is too vague.
26	No	Mayor & city council members pushing through plan with little input from community & much push back from residents.
27	No	The burdon on the failing school system has not been addressed = disparity
28	No	More commercial spaces! Support creatin small store fronts

29	No	Need more use everywhere, to support walkability going in place.
30	No	MPLS has been trying to privatise public housing for over 5 years yet we are supposed to believe that they will support affordable housing when the 2040 plan doesn't #Glendale
31	No	Why are you encouraging bigger footprints of medical + educational institutions, if in your words :It would reduce housing stock"? I thought we wanted MORE people housed not less. If that means moving, why give us more hardship?
32	No	Built form map looks good. There doesn't appear to be a distinct difference backed with Interior I + Z I'd like to see more multi-family zoning around parks.
33	No	Not to allow realstate developers to build expensive single family homes or expensive apartments. More pricing for low to middle income city for rich only.
34	No	Stop building high rises by the lakes. It will keep people away from enjoying the few open green spacs left! Keep shoveline zoning it was developed there research + community input.
35	No	Keep free parking on Hennepin in neighborhoods. Developments need to build parking spaces for tenants, workers + friends. Traffic is already terrible, seniors + more can't bike or get to bus.
36	No	Bike paths with safety dividers should be just 1/2 year given MN weather + bike usage. Not realistic for city to be just bike + public transit use. Bridges need parking for each unit.
37	No	Assumption of increased popuulation growth is not supported. 1. Baby boomers dying. 2. Generation Z is small. 3. People will choose other cities because too expensive to live here & no affordable housing, no low cost single-family houses.
38	No	All city should be mixed use for walkable goals.
39	No	Seems any street can be designated a "transit corridor" language is to vague.
40	No	High density = 0 yards 1. Park system overburdened 2. Neighbors have no reason to meet each other because no yards/gardens 3. Increased crime
41	No	Plan disavows developers of <u>eoning</u> and variance requirements but residents still subject to them.
42	No	A city staffer here just said hackers have prevented people from having their concerns get to city council, etc. "The hackers" she said, "are against it." Why would they stop real concerns from getting anywhere? (That might negatively impact 2040?) What is this, Trump <u>infiltrating</u> the process? Hackers?! Really?!
43	No	There are tons of houses on the market right now. Why are the prices through the roof? We have a housing crisis in this city that isn't being addressed by any of this! You have to be rich or go into debt for the rest of your lives. It's worse than the last crisis.
44	No	You don't build community by catering to the developers + corporations. Community is local. Arts are local. Food is local- and disverse!
45	No	I listen to NPR all day. Nothing has been in the news about this. I get the Sunday paper. My husband + son are <u>avid</u> news junkies. We knew nothing about this! Transparent? I don't think so!

46	No	Why is it this has been in the works for so long and NO ONE in my neighborhood has heard about it or know what it is? Can't understand the maps at all!
47	No	Will these 4 plexes allow for vegetable gardens on the premises? Not tiny little plots, but sustaining gardens? Will there be classes in each block to encourage this kind of sustainability?
48	No	No! Golf courses, move regular <u>parus</u> and use native vegetation to area to comeut invasive species please.
49	No	Have you calculated how much available land there in for production? If you want well-paying jobs, then make accomodations for those <u>businessy</u> . We keep zoning them out.
50	No	It should be simpler than this. Build a house. Put people in it. Look at how Salt Lake City has eliminated most homelessness. From the community up, not the bureaucracy down.
51	No	Sent a brochure to <u>Lorey</u> have keep in <u>Klithedgoles</u> about 2040 plan. You do it for recycling. This is a <u>monumentil</u> charge. Give it its due.
52	No	What is the right number of people for the city? What is our <u>capacity</u> ? How much more do we then need in basic <u>services</u> ?
53	No	The whole thing smells. It will serve developers + realtors very well, at tax payer dollars. Just like the staduims.
54	No	High - Density = Large Footprint This reverses decades of grassroots efforts to clean water and air, including native plant, water barrel, rain garden, and permeable surface programs.
55	No	Is it true that 4 plexes won't have to worry about parking ordinances because low income people won't want or don't have cars? You try using public transport to 2+3 jobs + get home to feed your kids, get them from school + put them to bed. Are there going to be green space in yards for gardens for these 4 plexes?
56	No	What is MPHS planning to do with the #43 million surplus they've been sitting on?
57	No	What about low income families living in rental property? What are your plans to helping them <u>lead</u> stable housing?
58	No	Concerned about lower priced houses being bought up by developers + <u>encleaiug acer</u> pool of homeless families
59	No	I live on a block with mixed housing- is someone going to come knocking at my door to buy my house + force me to move.
60	No	If we allow more business on public transit lines, will we be building more schools to follow the housing migration? More than a 15 minutes bus to school is not conducive to learning. My son had 45 minutes ride to school only 2 miles away.
61	No	Development should be focused in run-down areas (<u>Hiawatha</u> Mill) not on <u>Koslgnoves</u> SFD areas.
62	No	If new official industrial/commercial property is expanding, why don't they go into the old, industrial parks, etc, instead of taking away prime real estate for housing on public transit lines? Let them pay to increase public transit accessibility, not taxpayers pushes out of their own neighborhoods.
63	No	Housing density along. Transit corridors requires <u>differing</u> approaches. Not everywhere- and <u>increased</u> density should REQUIRE additional off street parking.
64	No	I support the requirement of retail on the first floor of certain <u>Mlted</u> uses! Great idea for creating good public spaces.

65	No	Keep rents affordable. The sons of Norway project with 500 new people, not enough parking, high rents for tiny spaces will displace people. It's diverse housing structures that diverse populations can't afford.
66	No	Our physical reality is shutting- we need to allow for a city not auto-dependent. Aves aren't guaranteed on sustainable but need adaptability with inflow (unpredictable) of people displaced by climate <u>catastrophet</u> .
67	No	Need increased density + mixed use on lakes and river in particular, all parks generally. Would help eyes on the park. Also allow transit on parkways!
68	No	Does the plan mean to force people to walk on bike or perhaps bus? To read the grocery store and bring home a weeks worth of groceries on the bus? I realize that some must - and they would rather not- Age and infirmly <u>proleade</u> it.
69	No	Most <u>interior</u> 2/3 don't need to have <u>builtform</u> differences than corridors whole DISTRICTS, not just restricting commercial to corridors!
70	No	What underused or poorly used land has been identified to build affordable housing? How many potential units? e.g Hiawatha Ave whose the old grain elevators are.
71	No	<u>Interior 2</u> should allow buildings as tall as already exist. It should be 3'2 <u>stowe</u> , not 2'2.
72	No	The "intrusion" in neighborhood interiors is counter - productive connected. It's a plan component on steriods. Four-plex units of 2-5 stories, plopped with others in neighborhood of single family homes is a killer for home values and, <u>unfiendely</u> , the tax base.
73	No	1. the assumption that mpls. Needs to grow is <u>tonse!</u> We don't need to grow, we need to fix the problems we already have! We have
74	No	Builtform 5/14 MTAS 1). The desired increase, indensity needs to be paired with an increase intransit <u>infrastructure</u> . If the goal is to use public transit and biking not cars to deal with the number of people then the policies need to reflect new street desgins. 2). How will the rezoning work with historic and conservation districts? Are those all option for blocks that want to keep the existing housing in place? 3). Combining parcels to <u>sliper</u> blocks is a concern in some areas of the city.
75	No	Too much density taking away <u>single</u> family homes- we are the <u>mirlegse!</u> A middle class city with panks! These has to be parking for <u>meelt</u> - <u>we homes!</u>
76	No	Where <u>du/tu/4plexes</u> are allowed can the neighbors be notified <u>puo</u> to <u>allaoenp</u> density.
77	No	Ensure that <u>how mlted use-designed nodes</u> in <u>neighborhood</u> interiors get supplies from city to survive and thrive. They are important for residents.
78	No	City demographic predictions so far aren't fully <u>accontry</u> for people displaced by climate charge. We need to build on this start by pushing up the housing cap throughout the city, to allow us to start preparing for <u>displaced</u> people we will welcome in coming years. All are welcome here!
79	No	If you involve the neighborhood in the evolution of development for their space... you will open up real possibilities for the transitions to greater density without losing the <u>CHARACTER</u> the make spaced desirable.

80	No	Infrastructure-- for example ability of schools to accommodate new students. <u>Pancing</u> should be provided for new dev. (not just street parking).
81	No	We need to consider short and long term consequences (8 planning options) to putting our higher density (more affordable) housing and our commercial corridors where we funnel our noisy, polluting <u>commuter</u> traffic. Cars are on wheels- get them off our major streets!
82	No	More meeting middle dedicated streets just <u>forecars</u> - to ease traffic
83	No	More time is needed to evaluate this
84	No	Sometimes developers are the only ones to timely benefit from the social engineering
85	No	The broad objectives of the 2040 plan are very landable, but I am very concerned about the draft built from plan-- which does not seem to have been given sufficient care. Far more study of individual streets and existing built from needs to be done before this is converted into revised zoning plans.
86	No	For example: 50th street abd 36th street are very different to 21st street and the portion of Franklin that runs through Lowry Hill-- and yet they are all categorized as Corridor 4 and Interior 3. The current bus route (25) on Densks would be a much more appropriate transit corridors, due to the street grade, building, stoch, and character/ <u>anenity</u> of the portion of henwood <u>poch</u> bisected. The historic building stoch in these neighborhoods is an asset to the city and needs more sensitivity then the proposed blunt zoning.. Access to the henwood <u>porch</u> facilities and swimming at East Cedar Beach could be faciliteted with civic <u>pond</u> buildings, and density could be increased through <u>loocenivs</u> of use <u>nestrictias</u> an existing historic building <u>stoch</u> and consideration of 'Interior 3' type development inly by committee on a case by case basis.
87	No	Our neighbrhoods are <u>unigee</u> and the neighborhood association are critical to on-going <u>communice-flow</u> as the neighborhoods.
88	No	Favor <u>plaoing laecier buoas</u> on south side to access and ability for houses to include solar panel.
89	No	Request an extension on the Court Plan. People currently living here have very little time to connect on this very complicated place!!
90	No	Parking is an issue today. You must plan for parking in higher density. Amy Momsen 4633 S. Ewing
91	No	We need electric car charging station and incentrives to purchase electric vehicles. NOT everyone bikes! In fact, asmspopulations prefer not to bike. Get rid of bike lanes. Fund masstransit.
92	No	Change the <u>charter</u> to allow more public referenduns and more ways to recall elected officials.
93	No	Outreach should have (& should!) include notices of this massive proposed in water bills so every household sets it.
94	No	Plan shouldn't seem to really advert transit needs-- build up transit first then bring on density.
95	No	This is so complex-- we need more time to comment. This will affect all of us for years to come. Extend comment period. Also this open house doesn't feel as informative as a question answer.
96	No	In Interior 3- Limit the number of parcels that can be combined. Set a clear limit for how many units can be in a development.

97	No	Love that this draft ends single-family zoning. Single-family zoning is exclusionary zoning.
98	No	1). <u>Decouple</u> density with affordability. They are not related in the way you think. 2). Diversity is changing on its own. The <u>millenral</u> you are forgetting are not in the same place as their <u>place</u> .
99	No	Density = Congestion
100	No	Why would I go ahead and put solar panels on my house if you allow 5 story building next door East a shadow.
101	No	You may have been working on this for 3 years. But ... until, Frey and <u>Benler</u> come out publicially along with the <u>commotion</u> plan the people had not started.
102	No	Keep the neighborhood assciations autonomous and fully funded.
103	No	Request an extension on the comprehensive plan approval due to 1). Lack of outreach (how did you reach out to elders?) 2). This plan does not meet the needs of mpl residents.
104	No	This plan is useless to everyone except the developers.
105	No	The company plan proposal is vague and incomplete the residents of this city are being railroaded. We need an extension for real outreach. The city cannot provide actual ways of how their wishlist will be achieved.
106	No	The goal should be a liveable city- NOT density of density sake!
107	No	The proposal land use maps do not provide enough green space for residents and the buildings are too tall!
108	No	Create RFP for independent architects. Not for developers or architects who work for developers.
109	No	Neighborhood Associations must remain fully autonomsou and fully funded dedicated fundly.
110	No	Lack of outreach to people who are not connected to technology-- affects poor elderly. NOT <u>EQUITABLE</u>
111	No	5/14 Landuse-- Consider reclaiming freeway corridors for active land uses land (bridge or freeway removal)
112	No	What is the plans -Ultimate goal for the city, Main goal, Vision? -What is the 2 projected population/makeup (what are we planning for? Who?) -Cars <u>u5</u> reality (show <u>area</u> -- actions of growth)
113	No	5/14- Landuse --Allow more home-based business by right! Smaller storefronts, more frequent-doorways (20 max). Eliminate setback minimums and instead maximums. Stop 3'awning restrictions- drops ice on sidewalks. Go <u>widor!</u>
114	No	5/14- Landuse -Corridors 5 Interior 3 --Talk to the residents! Stop playing SIMCITY with real citizens Lives and Homes
115	No	How would we get developers/landords to care about the new tenants in nds developments. Restrictions on cost/development so that people are benefiting. 4-plex owner occupied require (LANDUSE)
116	No	More collaborative funding for transit. More real solution funding for public housing. More realistic approach to housing.
117	No	Housing must be affordable to all people and not displace residents
118	No	Don't want to lose garden green space and historic housing to edge to edge luxury condos that push out current residents and <u>gentrify</u> the neighborhood.

119	No	The change in zoning to allow 4 plex <u>building</u> on any city lot is not workable-- Not all city lots are standard size --not all blocks have alleyway or back lot access. There will be investment incentive to tear down <u>starter</u> home blocks. Can 1 block have 10-20 4 plexes built-- how will this be controlled. What will happen to blocks with 1 and a half story <u>bungalows</u> when 2 of 4 plexes are built between a <u>bungalow</u> --eliminating sunlight in the house's yard on 4 plexes are much <u>duper buildings</u> . --No off street parking is <u>about</u> to developers but bad for the neighborhood and 4 plex renters. Each of you do not own a car or a renter might have a bike, motorcylcle, scooter; want a secure plan to pack it. 4 plexes are different to keep up economically due to having only 4 units-- Many now will be built and turnover to become rundown, in 5-10 years.
120	No	What about keeping affordable houses for 1st time buyers and families-- That stoch will be first to go and/or people unwilling to invest in a block which will no longer have stable neighbors.
121	No	As this is built: Zoning is key. No out- <u>law</u> require green space think about-
122	No	Less silly variances and survey --why needed if not hear property lines?
123	No	I live 2 doors from a 4-plex with no off-street parking. There are 9 vehicles I know of there. Bryant is a bus route, so some winters parking is forbidden on 1 side. Parking is a problem even without more 4-plexes. On Sunday, a nearby church has parking on city streets for blocks. I can't imagine living with more cars that would result from more 4-plexes. It meakes Richfield look good to me after 40 years on Bryant.
124	No	More commercial nodes everywhere.
125	No	Jacob Frey doesn't care about our city's cultural or architectual heritage. He doesn't care about POC or working people. He's a <u>Shalee</u> Oil Salesman.
126	No	More food tickets please.
127	No	Grider 3 and Grider 4 are too <u>diaste</u> a switch from single family
128	No	Crappy rental housing that is too expensive, crappy wages, crappy schools in the <u>poonen</u> neighborhoods crappy policing, crappy public transportation, crappy <u>laoe</u> relations. We should fix these <u>patterns</u> before growth is even on the table. The citizens don't want the city to grow, and in fact, growth will fuel these issues. The mayor and his developer <u>cronies</u> , by way of their greed and <u>hubnis</u> will ruin this city at the expense of the citizens!!!
129	No	New buildings-- ones that depart from the existing housing stock (a 3 story building next to a bungalow) will SHRED the fabric of the neighborhood.
130	No	I've lived in a modest Minneapolis home for 30 years. If the city looks more like uptown I am moving elsewhere. There are modest homes and now in different neighborhoods.
131	No	Determine commercial areas first then route transit.
132	No	The city council and mayor are in the pocket of corporations and developers. Amend the charter to make them accommotable!
133	No	As a millienial I want to live in a city that cares about all people regardless of income --that means building up not just out, and prioritizing bus, bike, and walk-wars.

134	No	Problem with higher density and fewer parlong spaces + zoning allowing, zero lot line, need green space/zonning , not mass produced dense housing.
135	No	Should NOT change building zoning around transit lines. Should route transit lines around population.
136	No	The proposed zoning is bas. No to density with no plan!
137	No	No <u>privatization</u> for public housing
138	No	I love bike lanes! (I am serious)
139	No	We need more density in all parts of the city. We already have four plexes in neighborhoods and they're great. If we're going to have a city that houses all the people who want to live here and makes housing more affordable. That can't happen by keeping our neighborhoods zoned for SFH.
140	No	Tax the developers!
141	No	Ask for an extension for the camp plan from <u>meeting</u> council
142	No	The city must fund mass transit not bike lanes.
143	No	No to transitorented development
144	No	High Density= Genetrification --Developers will choose low priced single family homes to buy and demolish, (they are trying to make a healthy profit) leaving few homes for first time buyers. Gentrification never leads to affordable housing?
145	No	Keep neighborhoods association <u>autonoymous</u> and we'll funded!
146	No	We must save naturally <u>occurring</u> affordable housing
147	No	Restore historical walkability with higher density housing and some commercial allowable by right everywhere.
148	No	Existing residential neighborhoods should not be degraded by building 3-4 story multifamily units. Buildings should be to scale neighborhoods--2 story.
149	No	Please consider determining multifamily commercial zones first, THEN determines transit routes.
150	No	No clauses for higher buildings, regardless of plan.
151	No	Zoning for additional heights (corridors 3 and 4) will negatively affect neighborhoods. DO NOT ZONE HIGHER THAN 3 stories in reidential areas.
152	No	I love the idea of increasing the house stock by sllowing 4 plexes in more places! There aren't anymore starter houses --I looked-- and are important first step to stability housing prices is to allow for more housing.
153	No	Expedite allowing more density, flexible use. With <u>spiralling</u> climate crisis, delay in predatory.
154	No	New buildings should make sure the neighbors are not negatively impacted by crater/homes or duplexes.
155	No	Where do homeowners' interests come into play? Will my block change around me?
156	No	Make growth smart, maybe too much is bad!
157	No	Clauses for "NO STREET PARKING" on streets with single family homes.
158	No	BIKE TRAILS-- Better connections into <u>neiglbt biking</u> cities-- better conections and complete trails (DIAGNOL TRAIL-- ROSEVILLE--U OF M)

159	No	More mixed-use in our city helps create a more walkable, accessible environment.
160	No	I don't think the predominantly single family home neighborhoods should be zoned to allow multi-family homes beyond duplexes. Keep the larger multi-family structures near the transit corridors.
161	No	Nice people
162	No	Final policies that could facilitate shared parking. How can the city help?
163	No	1. Engage public at bus stage 2. Need QR code at stations in Mpls 3. Need to consider <u>demoved</u> for <u>cemetaries</u> .
164	Yes	COmpare demographics north and south of Lowry - choosing to allow more housing to the south continues racial and economic segregation.
165	Yes	This entire area is a several minutes' drive from 62, giving access to some of the most job-rich parts of the region in a less than 30 minute driving commute. They can handle the vehicle traffic.
166	Yes	More mixed use in this already walkable area would be an improvement.
167	Yes	Fill the empty lots in North Minneapolis first!
168	Yes	yes to ^ height + density in s. mpls, esp. around lrt + corridors
169	Yes	Lowry Hill, East Isles, Kenwood, & other Ward 7 areas need much higher density to allow the restoration of historical transit frequency. Also to start addressing income segregation & lack of amenities.
170	Yes	Need higher density west of Hennepin at minimum. Also absence of commercial in Lowry Hill, west of Isles, makes hard to age in place.
171	Yes	Upzone Kenwood / Lowry Hill / etc -- so close to downtown and so good for walk / transit access. INTERIOR 3.
172	Yes	My neighborhood is changing as small single family homes are demolished and turned into very large single family home. Many land trusts could help or provide money to build something more affordable.
173	Yes	Smaller massing to fit into the character of these areas.
174	Yes	Retain set backs in existing Interior 1, 2, & 3 and wherever appropriate.
175	Yes	In interior 2 limit the number of parcels that can be combined. Set a clear limit for how many units can be in a development.
176	Yes	INterior 1,2,&3 "should" be 1-2.5 stories. Tighten up the language from "should" to "shall". Too much wiggle room.
177	Yes	Changing zoning across from single family homes worth \$500,000-\$2million dollars is NOT OK without immediate homeowners approval. Plus need architectural guidelines - Amy M
178	Yes	Why not increase density in existing moderate income areas? In other words, how does this plan meet goal of affordable housing near lake Harriet?
179	Yes	Keep single-family areas intact. Homeowners are invested in keeping neighborhoods safe, clean, and quiet.
180	Yes	We love our nghbrhds! This is why we chose to live here. plse don't make them unlivable with increased density, increased pollution, decreased beauty by changing the zoning of sing.fam homes. Ppl fr other cities can only dream ofsuch classic,beautiful hs
181	Yes	No quads

182	Yes	Density should be shown more concentrated at nodes rather than just continuous along corridors in SW.
183	Yes	This area needs to be much higher density - the location is central & the presence of the 25 (former I) is a relic of much higher freq. buses is a historic strength. Souglas has a lot of multi unity buildings & historically even more serviced that functi
184	Yes	This is aRCAW & we need a lot more density here to start addressing the decades of increasing racial & economic exclusion happening still. We also need this in the rest of SW Mpls, but as a POC resident of Ward for 30 years, that's myprimary personal conc
185	Yes	I really don't think more density is needed along 46th Street. This is really close to 42nd Street, and I think this would be better as lower density.
186	Yes	Why not just extend this all they way to 46th street?
187	Yes	Why not just make this entire block interior 3?
188	Yes	Why not just make this interior 3?
189	Yes	Park and Portland need Corridor 4-6 to leverage bike and car lanes
190	Yes	need higher than 6 because bus
191	Yes	needs higher than 6 because bus
192	Yes	needs higher than 6 because bus
193	Yes	needs higher than 4 ...LRT
194	Yes	This is a quiet residential street lined with single-family homes. Why is it appropriate to zone it for up to 4-story buildings?
195	Yes	Area should include Interior 3 and Corridor 4 categories
196	Yes	Area should include Interior 3 and Corridor 4 categories
197	Yes	Area should include Interior 3
198	Yes	Why not move this up to corridor 4 up to 42nd Ave?
199	Yes	Why not make this corridor 4? It is also right along a bikeway and transit corridor.
200	Yes	This are should just stay interior 2 or interior 1.
201	Yes	Here is a natural feature with walk/bike amenities where housing near it is extremely expensive and limited. We should remove those barriers.
202	Yes	As a homeowner who lives on 38th St, I'm concerned about the proposal to increase the ht and density along this rte. This will only make our st busier & less liveable. Please let the Mpls nghbrhoods retain their character. We don't want to live in Chicag
203	Yes	This is not a corridor on land use map, I don't think it should be a corridor (should be lined with interior)
204	Yes	This section is not accessible from Penn, so it should be interior
205	Yes	Douglas is a transit route; it should have Corridor 4/Interior 3 form just as other residential routes
206	Yes	This residential area (urban neighborhood land use) should be Interior 2

207	Yes	This area near Loring Park is limited to 5-6 stories under the approved Loring Park
208	Yes	No
209	Yes	Why would Corridor 4 designation be given to a current single family neighbor which in no way is a high density traffic corridor. There are about 6 busses a day that use Franklin. this makes no sense and should be changed. The people in this neighborhood
210	Yes	I object to this built form. I understand that the city wants to densify along transit corridors -- a goal I support. But this transit corridor may never come to pass. Please let's actually do the stupid thing of building a train through a park where nob
211	Yes	Tangletown is an area of well-maintained single-family homes, and building 6-story apartment buildings on Nicollet would shade out gardens, make solar panels impossible and lower resale values. Allowing 3 stories on Belmont would ruin its liveability.
212	Yes	Restrict Belmont to Interior 1. Too much good housing stock to lose.
213	Yes	Restrict both sides of Nicollet to Interior 3. This would limit congestion and allow sunlight.
214	Yes	How much are we paying people with urban planning degrees to write guidelines that don't get followed? Who owns this stuff? Do they care?
215	Yes	Thrilled that more people can have access to new transit projects
216	Yes	So close to the light rail and downtown, yet only corridor 4? Think bigger and taller!
217	Yes	Very curious down zoning suggeste he suggested here. Is it for historic landmark reasons? A concern for viewsheds? It makes me wonder about 20 story ht proposed across park where two other historic churches are. What? no similar conct preserving viewshed
218	Yes	Increase density along blue line and hiawatha corridor
219	Yes	Have interior 2 extended further south than 38th st
220	Yes	love extending the franklin ave commercial corridor to 21st st station
221	Yes	The density of interior 3 from 50th st is too much. The streets are filled with cars now. It is unrealistic to expect families to live without cars.
222	Yes	Interior 3 should extend at least 2 1/2 blocks west of hennepin from kenwood parkway to lake street. Also, along douglas!
223	Yes	Built form should be mirrored on either side of Hennepin, especially N of Lake. That Lowry Hill/East Isles has lower zoning than Lowry Hill East due to historic redlining + we must dismantle that race based exclusionary zoning
224	Yes	Plymouth Ave should be higher than corridor 4
225	Yes	It seems like the goal is to make the zoning more consistant, but then there are still patchy areas. e.g. 38th, 46th sts.
226	Yes	It seems like the goal is to make the zoning more consistant, but then there are still patchy areas. e.g. 38th, 46th sts.
227	Yes	It seems like the goal is to make the zoning more consistant, but then there are still patchy areas. e.g. 38th, 46th sts.
228	Yes	It seems like the goal is to make the zoning more consistant, but then there are still patchy areas. e.g. 38th, 46th sts.

229	Yes	Figure out a plan to help address the use of highways to hurt marginalized communities-be visionary in Minneapolis * This looks like a great area to zone for awesome uses as MNDOT/USDOT adjust for communities. We could reconnect the neighborhood & streng
230	Yes	We could reconnect the neighborhood & strengthen communities (or be ready to!)
231	Yes	and here too! We could reconnect the neighborhood & strengthen communities (or be ready to!)
232	Yes	across this little stretch of homes if you had fourplexes in each one you'd have 32 new units that could hold 32 new families. Burroughs School is already overwhelmed.
233	Yes	Step up height on corridor and scale down as we move into neighborhoods
234	Yes	We need transit lines to the WEST (eg the Arboretum)!! We do not have mass transit.
235	Yes	Congestion is already an issue on 50th between Lyndale and Bryant. Adding 4 story rental units will only increase the noise & congestion. Why is no logic being used here?
236	Yes	Concerns about larger buildings w/o parking adding to congestion on bryant -- especially when buses meet
237	Yes	Why is Bryant Corridor 4 and not Lyndale? Has anyone ever driven these two streets? Clearly Lyndale should be Corridor 4 not Bryant
238	Yes	This area should be denser
239	Yes	This area should be denser
240	Yes	Why would there not be more density allowed on the other side of the street? Also, could you allow for more of a step down? So it would go from interior 3 to interior 2?
241	Yes	Just keep density along 42nd Ave. 46th Ave is too nearby.
242	Yes	Why not just make this interior 2? They will have high density all around them. I think interior 1 will be strange here.
243	Yes	Needs towers
244	Yes	Kenwood Elementary School has been here since 1908. It's already crowded and crazy on the street during morning and afternoon drop-off/pick-up. To increase the density of the block facing the school would compound the problem.
245	Yes	upzone area around BRT to transit 20
246	Yes	upzone this side to transit 20 because of BRT
247	Yes	I own a house on 42nd ave in this area and this is totally unacceptable. It is mostly single family homes with only a few multi family homes right now, all are at max 2 stories high. Changing this to a mostly commercial / rental district will ruin it
248	Yes	I'm surprised th
249	Yes	I'm surprised that these BRT stops are not transit built form
250	Yes	adf
251	Yes	just testing

252	Yes	They are building 40 story towers here, so why are you only permitting 10 stories here? It should be Transit 30 at minimum.
253	Yes	This area and the area to the east of Loring Park should be limited to 5-6 stories as in the approved Loring Park Development Plan. Otherwise Loring Park will feel like it is in the bottom of a cavern, not the nice open and sunny space it that it is now
254	Yes	I could live with a three-story building next to me but I don't want a six-story building looking down on my backyard. No privacy; no sun. Our backyard would be like a fishbowl. It would kill our property value.
255	Yes	It is stupid to put such dense commercial development in a park
256	Yes	Please build the LRT and reroute the buses before you upzone this neighborhood. More fourplexes would be a great way to add density here while keeping with current form, and provide bridge to higher proposed heights/densities
257	Yes	This is a great example of how a TOD area can be created. This area should continue to be the primary focus for pushing growth. I'd much prefer to see the growth in these areas surrounded by existing rentals and commercial nodes.
258	Yes	Glad to see high rise density at this location so close to the West Lake LRT
259	Yes	Bring more density to Bryn Mawr! I am excited about the proposed changes to the neighborhood. Despite being only a few minutes from downtown, we are geographically isolated. More development will hopefully bring more people and more businesses.
260	Yes	This should be an extension of Wirth Park. Any mass dwelling units will overload traffic coming in and out of Bryn Mawr
261	Yes	People are already speeding down this road. Traffic is heavy through residential neighborhoods
262	Yes	Since this is the only access/exit point, all traffic from the mass dwelling unit will clog an already residential road
263	Yes	This would be an ideal place for an extension of Wirth Park - possibly extra pay lots to increase revenue
264	Yes	This stop sign is violated regularly from 3pm to 7pm.
265	Yes	The congestion here at rush hour is massive
266	Yes	This would make a great park office
267	Yes	Introduction of 30 story development radically changes neighborhood -- should be mix use 8 story limit
268	Yes	I support the increase in density around transit and for the Calhoun Towers redevelopment. What an exciting opportunity for this area of Minneapolis!
269	Yes	High Density LRT Development needed and supported
270	Yes	No West bound 94 to North bound 35W...What?
271	Yes	Love the new stadium and surrounding development!
272	Yes	concerned that this narrow road with protected parks and an elementary school is now zoned for 4 story structures. Bus route is only a commuter route - not really a major corridor for travel

273	Yes	this is the proposed light rail line - not a place for 4 story structures. current plan has rail line going underground so would retain bike path. No roads/parking/access to 4 story structures here
274	Yes	current transit plan does not address the density proposed by this designation of Transit 30. I saw the tram/and light rail. Neither of which have even started construction to keep up with this level of density
275	Yes	transit plan does not keep up with proposed density plan
276	Yes	transit plan does not keep up with proposed density plan
277	Yes	concerned about environmental impact to the water/park system that MSP continues to boast is #1 in nation.
278	Yes	nothing in this plan addresses cost of housing or property tax. the city is becoming to expensive to live in
279	Yes	reducing / taking away affordable housing does not allow first time home buyers to purchase in Minneapolis. They are now forced into suburbs thereby not allowing for wealth generation in the city
280	Yes	Have Core 50 extended to DT East
281	Yes	More density + commercial along water (esp lakes)
282	Yes	There's a lot of great multifamily housing throughout East Isles, and it would be great to have zoning (Int 3) that would allow for that to continue
283	Yes	LRT future stops are too small zoned?
284	Yes	Develop standard for air/water quality before we allow new production and processing must be enforced. no grand father businesses with lower standards (production/processing)
285	Yes	North Mpls Riverfront should be residential and mixed use like NE. the River should be for people everywhere!!!
286	Yes	Allow for ADU on non-homestead properties. Broadway and Central - concerned about impact of development. Too many houses in the area. More family oriented activity to support Logan Park
287	Yes	Move heavy trucks traffic off of University. Add bus routes to University NE that head to Dinky town.
288	Yes	Allow small scale commercial uses in neighborhood interior
289	Yes	I'm all for increased housing density (esp. with affordable housing) in my currently single-family home neighborhood! Zoning changes to create the possibility for more units in current buildings seems to be a move in the right direction.
290	Yes	Upzone Penn and Glenwood. 10 stories, great access to BRT and LRT
291	Yes	My beautiful home could have a 100+ complex butted up against it. No THANKS!
292	Yes	My home and that of all of my neighbors could turn into small apartment buildings which is out of scale to the lots and houses around us. Please don't approve fourplexing. Maybe duplexes and ADUs but even that should come with stipulations.
293	Yes	If it isn't already, the Nicollet Island Inn should be historically protected.
294	Yes	This small triangle is home to a run-down insurance "office" and a billboard. I support turning this into a small park. It would be an ideal place for a fountain or public art piece since it is at a key intersection.

295	Yes	Perhaps the Loring Post Office can be torn down following the fire and replaced with the new main post office, allowing for the exciting riverfront development on the current post office site? Great freeway access for all of those mail trucks!
296	Yes	Love the greenway!
297	Yes	I would like to see Mia expanded. Currently only about 10% of the art in its collection is even displayed! The original plans called for Mia to be the whole block. I support relocating The Children's Theater and MCAD to other locations.
298	Yes	Assume Franklin is shown as transit line/corridor for where currently there are single family homes because of proposed SWLRT. If it does not happen, this designation is not appropriate. Also the station area map for 21st street does not show Franklin as a t
299	Yes	Kenwood Park has been found to be eligible for listing on National Historic Register per study.
300	Yes	Very happy to see some limited density planned for 50th Street. This is a reasonable approach in this corridor.
301	Yes	I am happy to see this level of density along the Greenway.
302	Yes	I appreciate the foresight to encourage very high density and heights at the W Lake Transit Station.
303	Yes	Like the 4 Story height limitation on interior neighborhood main east west roads. This is an important area.
304	Yes	I would rather this whole stretch along the LRT at Hwy 55 be a minimum of Transit 10. The stretches between stations isn't terribly far and it would encourage further pedestrian improvements. Also the minimum doesn't change much so you still get the height
305	Yes	Why is this area not Core 50?
306	Yes	This should mirror the height of the buildings already on site -- especially as you get further into the island.
307	Yes	I was a little surprised to see such a busy thoroughfare as Lowry listed as Corridor 4. I would think Corridor 6 is more appropriate.
308	Yes	This corridor may be too far gone at this point but this would represent a significant loss in small scale retail (in historic buildings).
309	Yes	type a comment
310	Yes	needs mixed use for walkability
311	Yes	needs mixed use for walkability
312	Yes	needs mixed use for walkability
313	Yes	needs mixed use for walkability
314	Yes	needs mixed use for walkability
315	Yes	Consider changing to Corridor Mixed Use based on Policy 80, Action Steps a and h. Encourage more than exclusive residential uses in close proximity to existing METRO Orange Line station.
316	Yes	This future land use should be "Public, Office, and Institutional". It includes

317	Yes	This future land use should be "Production Mixed Use". The buildings in this area are no longer industrial and include a charter school, Minneapolis Public Housing Authority, former Zuccaro's Produce (vacant), parking ramp, and surface parking lot.
318	Yes	Consider as possible tear down and extension of Cleveland Park
319	Yes	Why not expand production mixed use in this area, to allow for potential residential
320	Yes	This seems appropriate for more mixed use along 18th and near the park, given proximity to major retails and highway.
321	Yes	This should be up zoned to corridor mixed use.
322	Yes	love that commercial is required here with many openings and great architectural features
323	Yes	The Orange Line station at 46th St and 35W needs some TOD. The housing stock near 46th St is rather run down. Chicago Ave gets the D-Line in 2020, and there are plans for improving transit on Nicollet. Upzone 46th from Nic to Chicago.
324	Yes	This could be upzoned
325	Yes	Strict "Production and Processing" doesn't really make sense here considering the direct border with North Loop residential. Should be "Production Mixed Use" at the very least.
326	Yes	This area has great access to high-frequency transit and has many amenities, such as the Lakes, grocery stores, etc. within walking distance. It needs more housing and mixed-use projects.
327	Yes	This is a low-density area that has very little commercial but does have high-frequency buses. More housing could help sustain commercial nodes like on 13th Ave.
328	Yes	This is a very exclusive and wealthy area of Minneapolis that has great schools but is exclusively single-family homes. Building more homes will allow more people to live in this wonderful neighborhood.
329	Yes	I would like these properties to be commercial
330	Yes	In Chapter 1 "Land Use" of the 2009 "Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth," this area of 38th Street is the "Land Use" category of "Urban Neighborhood. On that map, it sits between two "Neighborhood Commercial Nodes" that are "Mixed Use."
331	Yes	PARKING RAMP PLEASE
332	Yes	Parking ramp with storefronts facing lake please
333	Yes	Allow corner stores/small commercial within zones like this if we want to see more density/fewer car trips/etc. If people can't walk to pick up a few items, they're going to drive to a designated commercial corridors or Target
334	Yes	Could
335	Yes	This stretch of 44th Ave N should be zoned to allow for both residential and commercial uses.
336	Yes	Corridors like 38th St should be mixed use, not "urban neighborhood"
337	Yes	Area around 38th St station should be zoned for higher density housing
338	Yes	46th St should be mixed use near 35W... huge TOD opportunity

339	Yes	Could use more commercial not just production jobs. Add housing to this too? Great mixed node!
340	Yes	Move HERC
341	Yes	I'd love more density in Corcoran - there's a great/vibrant community growing around the Lake St LRT stop and Midtown Farmers Market!
342	Yes	already mixed use
343	Yes	already mixed
344	Yes	already mixed
345	Yes	build up without sacrificing historical character in the neighborhoods
346	Yes	I believe this whole area could become neighborhood mixed use. It is the location farthest from lake, lyndale, or hennepin. There is already a few shops on the northeast corner it should also be extended to all four corners.
347	Yes	We live in the Midtown Greenway Land Use and Development Plan Small Area Plan on Lake Street and Excelsior Boulevard. There was recently approved a new development on this intersection by Brickstone Development. It was controversial, but with the assis
348	Yes	This feature is so difficult to use that is totally unusable.
349	Yes	More mixed use please!!
350	Yes	More mixed use along 42nd Ave!
351	Yes	More mixed use should be allowed here.
352	Yes	More mixed use along this corridor would nicely compliment Highland Park and the Ford Site.
353	Yes	I don't think this makes sense for a goods and service corridor - the street is narrow and it isn't on an existing transit route. It would be very difficult to fit buses, bike lanes, and pedestrian friendly sidewalks on this section of 42nd.
354	Yes	Why do you have corridor 4/interior 3 run along this stretch of road when it's not also a designated goods and service corridor? The whole classification scheme for this aspect of the plan seems poorly thought out.
355	Yes	This is a very stretch of narrow road and is already high-traffic. It doesn't make sense to try to squeeze more traffic onto it. The goods and service corridor, if it exists at all, should follow the route the 9 takes.
356	Yes	I find it curious that you're imposing a high-density, high-traffic goods and service corridor along 42nd Ave S but not 25th street in Seward. This road already has commercial and retail on it. Was Seward spared because of politics?
357	Yes	Corridor should not stop at this section
358	Yes	8th St SE is becoming a major transportation and bike corridor, both sides of 8th St SE need to be zoned R5
359	Yes	"Downtown Longfellow" needs: more parking, better access to LRT including wide sidewalks and lighting, enforcement of no parking in bike lanes, snow removal in median pedestrian area, traffic calming, a parking structure, a way to cross the street on foot
360	Yes	the sidewalk is too narrow here, not well maintained and poorly lit. if you want dense urban transit oriented development, this needs to be addressed.

361	Yes	How many decades will it take before something is done about this black hole? It's an underpass below a train line - it should have businesses that people getting off the train want to use - hot dog stand, cigarette store, coffee cart, taco truck, icecre
362	Yes	There needs to be something other than the back of Target here - walking to and from LRT/ Longfellow is like walking through a suburban wasteland of behind Target blowing trash empty parking lot
363	Yes	Oops! We hid the awesome farmers market behind an open-air homeless camp / drunk tank chill zone. Better luck next time!
364	Yes	THIS INTERSECTION IS A NIGHTMARE. There is not enough time to cross (on foot, bike or in car!) when you are allowed to. Bike lanes appear and disappear randomly. Debris from car accidents never gets cleaned up.
365	Yes	I got all this trash, cool if I dump it here? K, thanks!
366	Yes	WTF is up with this intersection?!?
367	Yes	Nowhere to cross the street in these two blocks - there's a median that doesn't get shoveled out in the winter, in the middle of a 5 way intersection with 5 parking lots emptying into the intersection. Wheelchairs? Strollers? Blind people - good luck!
368	Yes	"Destination/Mixed Use" ? So, by 2040 the city is going to remove the 3rd precinct? AWESOME!
369	Yes	46th/35W is a regional METRO station. Upzone 46th St from Nicollet to Chicago!
370	Yes	Why only interior 1 on broadway? should be higher.
371	Yes	Community mixed use full block
372	Yes	Lake was historically a great place of small comm. and manufac. businesses. Many people walked to work! Ecologically great! I think its a mistake to discourage expansion as you do in your descrip of nbrhd mixed use. Thats a death sentence for small business
373	Yes	Keep nicollet eat street continuous, adhere to zoning that 1st floor of new apartment buildings need to be commercial.
374	Yes	I'm excited for the potential to expand housing options beyond SFHs, especially in areas such as SW Mpls that have traditionally excluded people outside of a certain socio-economic status & continue to do so via neighborhood organizations
375	Yes	extend
376	Yes	extend
377	Yes	This is an inappropriate location for mixed use development. This area should remain residential
378	Yes	We need more corridor mixed use in the interior of this neighborhood to make it more walkable.
379	Yes	There is already some corridor mixed use in this area? Could we add more to make this more of a node?
380	Yes	More mixed use at this node please! This would be a great spot!
381	Yes	More density and mixed use around existing commercial nodes would make them more vibrant!

382	Yes	More mixed use and density near schools, such as Samford Middle School would make things much more convenient for families.
383	Yes	Why not allow mixed use here?
384	Yes	We need to help expand this commercial district around the Riverview Theater! More mixed use and density.
385	Yes	Allow small scale commercial uses within urban neighborhoods, particularly if it is clear that the property has historically been used commercially. There are buildings scattered throughout Northeast that clearly used to be commercial until commercial us
386	Yes	I enjoy the fact that the service corridor goes through the K-Mart.
387	Yes	Why is this not mixed use? This is right next to other great existing mixed use districts on 42nd Street.
388	Yes	This should also be mixed use. It is along the River Lake Greenway.
389	Yes	Add more mixed use here!
390	Yes	Add more mixed use here.
391	Yes	Add more mixed use here.
392	Yes	I support the skyways. We should celebrate and improve our transportation systems, not try to be some other city. Street level should be improved but not by killing the skyway.
393	Yes	This area even under the future land use and built form would not allow density equivalent to what already exists, ei 4 story, 30 unit buildings. This area is accessible to the 2, 4, 6, 12, 25, and 114 buses, as well as bike trails, it should be dense
394	Yes	comment on map
395	Yes	northern metals is moving. what will the city's guidance be for the site? It would be nice to see this site get a more palatable use
396	Yes	This area should not be exclusively production and processing. Especially on walkable neighborhood corridors such as 11th Ave or Plymouth Ave or Washington.
397	Yes	Why have awkward parcel-level designations? Encourage a built form that is consistent regardless of use.
398	Yes	Encourage mixed uses immediately adjacent to major employment/institutional land uses such as 27th/5th Ave S. Walkable coffee/lunch/services/post-work-libations welcomed.
399	Yes	Encourage mixed uses immediately adjacent to major employment/institutional land uses such as 27th/5th Ave S. Walkable coffee/lunch/services/post-work-libations welcomed.
400	Yes	Encourage more mixed-use adjacent to institutions and hospitals. End the oppressive monopoly of corporate foodservices at hospitals by providing walkable alternatives closer than Midtown Market.
401	Yes	Upzone the corridor between Lake and Midtown Greenway
402	Yes	Encourage more mixed-use along 28th St east of Nicollet.
403	Yes	Encourage more mixed-use along 28th St.
404	Yes	This is the Birchwood Cafe. Should allow commercial use.

405	Yes	Based on this proposed land use plan, the next door homes could be torn down and an apartment building built next door. This would adversely effect our property values and negatively effect our family-oriented block by introducing transient renters.
406	Yes	These properties are in between two other commercial proeprties, should be commercial
407	Yes	Birchwood Cafe, seems this should be zoned mixed use
408	Yes	While a home now, this was once a commercial building, and it should be allowed to be a mixed use building in the future.
409	Yes	Once upon a time commercial, future use should allow that.
410	Yes	Can part of parcel be zoned to allow for commercial/mixed use right on Franklin? Displacing a parking lot.
411	Yes	Zone to allow commercial
412	Yes	Isn't there a coffee shop in here? Make sure future land use allows this commercial space
413	Yes	My understanding is that this would allow six story mixed use buildings. This affects the livability of our neighborhood. It puts windows and balconies facing over our patios and backyards.
414	Yes	There should not be any drive-thru restaurants on our primary commercial/transit corridors. I don't have any problem with fast food. A drive-thru takes up a considerable amount of space. They aren't pedestrian friendly. We need better/high use of land.
415	Yes	ADUs should be able to be built without the requirement they be owner-occupied. Allow them on any city lot.
416	Yes	I'm against the affordable family living and senior living complexes. It will bring little value to Bryn Mawr, and bring more traffic and disturb the peace of the park, residences. A "business" is a better value because of limited use (weekdays only).
417	Yes	I'm against the affordable family living and senior living complexes. Who makes "money" on this development - a land developer?
418	Yes	Instead of affordable living: could we extend Theo Wirth Park? The Park brings more benefits to all. Land developers take advantage of govt policies and make dollars on low rent housing. Does not give "back" to community.
419	Yes	Not for the affordable housing and senior living complex. Could this land be used for the adjacent school? Or a community building?
420	Yes	50th is already backed up from Lyndale to France (and beyond) daily after 2:45. The pollution is horrible, and getting worse. How will anyone be able to get out of their streets on to 50th once 6 story apartments (with no parking) are built on each sid
421	Yes	All of this indsutrial space along the greenway is good for new development, but 6 storeis is way too tall for an otherwsie residential neighborhood. 3-4 stories would be fine and fit the neighborhood
422	Yes	all four corners should be neighborhood mixed use
423	Yes	Love ground level retail in the "destination mixed use"
424	Yes	Ward 7, esp W of Hennepin, has lost too many housing units. Allow subdividing mansions.

425	Yes	Ward 7 needs much higher density to allow return of frequent transit and address historic inequity.
426	Yes	Need higher density allowed and mixed use around lakes and parks for equity and safety.
427	Yes	Recognize the commercial (house w/ ____?) NW corner Dupont & 22nd
428	Yes	At former Roof Depot site plan bike-friendly, transit friendly, indoor urban organic farm. Call EPIC and ask what does the neighborhood want? Polluting industries must go. Smith Foundry and Bituminous Roadway
429	Yes	Let workers have housing near their jobs! (build above the facility?)
430	Yes	There are 2 active industrial businesses here. Yet 2000 planned units of housing. Why preserve it.
431	Yes	Plan for alternative uses in the future for present-day urban golf courses
432	Yes	All of downtown is a destination
433	Yes	SE corner of Uni/37th NE, change to nhood mixed use to fit surrounding character (senior housing, small retail on other corners)
434	Yes	I support the idea of taking down the current parking ramp and converting this space to parkland to meet up with the existing Gateway Park.
435	Yes	This small triangle should be park land. I support putting in a fountain or public art or obelisk. All great cities have monuments at key intersections and this one at Hennepin & Central should too!
436	Yes	I support development plans for this odd block to be multi-family housing.
437	Yes	Please replace this surface parking lot with housing.
438	Yes	Please connect the bike trails between Father Hennepin Park/Stone Arch Bridge and the U of M/Dinkytown Greenway. The existing path is used even though it is private property.
439	Yes	Create connection to Dinkytown Greenway from Father Hennepin Park.
440	Yes	How about taking out these surface parking lots and replacing them with a new Children's Theater relocated from the current Mia space?
441	Yes	All RR yards should be legislated out of the city (other comment) Only if it is used for alternative community transportation instead.
442	Yes	This is beautiful, valuable riverfront property that people should have access to, instead of being used for industrial polluters. (West river Parkway north of downtown)
443	Yes	4th street SE. is single family, land use urban neighborhood make it interior 2. Built form should be same as rest neighborhood.
444	Yes	Taller buildings (eg Transit 10 or 15) when immediately adjacent to single family homes are problematic how can there be buffers? see University SE.
445	Yes	Extend higher density further from corridors - No reason to have little slivers of single family housings betweenBloomington Ave. and Cedar.
446	Yes	Would like to see higher density further into neighborhood (Not just along corridors)

447	Yes	Please do not change the livability and character of our beautiful neighborhoods by allowing 4plexes in single family homes.
448	Yes	Encourage single family housing near natural amenities to not destroy beautiful, peaceful vistas around lakes, rivers, parks ...
449	Yes	The transit 30 proposal for West Calhoun will destroy the natural beauty of our lakes, scanning forever the sky views from Bde Mcka Ska, Cedar and Lake of the Isles and ruining those jewels of our city for generations to come.
450	Yes	Transit 30 - Density along Lake St. and Excelsior in the West Calhoun Neighborhood is already excessive. we cannot support more congestion in this area.
451	Yes	Why not Transit 15/20 on both sides of 35W at Lake St.