

So, let's talk about what 'density' really is

Readers Comments

SEPTEMBER 18

Density=mass/volume.

Adding more objects in the same space. More people, taller buildings, more stuff.

Is this a good idea,...no. It is a ploy to get more tax money to pay for those who dont work.

LIKEthumb_up

REPLYreply

Reportflag

SkywayHam

9:22AM

Why is it not a good idea? Dense urban areas are consistently shown to be better for the environment as a whole and are more significantly more efficient in managing resources than spreading people out far and wide in suburban sprawl. It doesn't come without its downsides (at least for some folks), but I don't think there's enough evidence to firmly say it's not a good idea.

Perhaps not the ideal for yourself and your preferences, but that's okay. That doesn't mean the idea is bad, though

LIKEthumb_up1

REPLYreply

Reportflag

tailofcloris

SEPTEMBER 18

All along the SW light rail are plans to plop down massive apartment eyesores in the middle of nowhere. It's a profit bonanza for developers, but is nothing but sprawl. Can the residents walk to most everything they need within a mile? No. To their place of employment with 3 miles? No.

It does add much more automobile pollution and congestion.

LIKEthumb_up1

REPLYreply

Reportflag

chiefwiggum

SEPTEMBER 18

I recommend googling "what's wrong with Carol Becker" and read the FAQ surrounding her odd behavior and frivolous lawsuits. I'm not sure this is somebody we want steering these matters.

LIKEthumb_up4

REPLYreply

Reportflag

cnelson22

SEPTEMBER 18

I don't know about "deserving density" but I agree with the comments on the effect of transit on creating density organically. I think the council is concerned with an imagined utopia where they can push and

So, let's talk about what 'density' really is

Readers Comments

pull the levers to achieve it. Getting rid of single-family neighborhoods is the wrong way to go, EXCEPT on transit corridors.

LIKEthumb_up6

REPLYreply

Reportflag

E-Stoye

SEPTEMBER 18

Bravo, thank goodness that a person that knows what they are talking about is given a forum to speak about these issues. In particular that the 2040 plan is a giveaway to builders at the expense of neighborhoods and that the triplex regulation is a guaranteed increase in housing prices.

For anyone that wants to know how the triplex zoning ordinance will increase prices and destroy neighborhoods it is very simple and I will explain. Let's say you live on 40th and Longfellow, right across from Sibley Park, a very nice area of primarily single family homes. Your home is worth about \$250,000 currently. Your next door neighbor sells their home that is run down to a 'We buy ugly houses guy' for \$100,000. Builder buys it, builds a triplex, sells it for \$400,000. This happens on several lots in your neighborhood. Now your lot is worth more money due to recent sales in your area, your property taxes go up. You are priced out of your home, you sell too so you can live someplace where property taxes aren't \$500 a month, and next thing you know the whole area around Longfellow and 40th is no longer the neighborhood you used to live in, it is a bunch of rental properties with their decrease in upkeep and their increase in crime. Landlords are happy, you as a homeowner are not.

LIKEthumb_up12

REPLYreply

Reportflag

Amiller92

SEPTEMBER 18

Leaving aside that I think you've got the causation running in the wrong direction, the scenario you describe doesn't require any triplexes. Some new McMansions will do.

(Also not sure that a triplex being worth more than the house it replaces says anything about the market or assessed value of your house, a different kind of structure.)

LIKEthumb_up2

REPLYreply

Reportflag

chiefwiggum

SEPTEMBER 18

But cities aren't museums. Streetscapes change.

If the market demands that an area is so desirable that more people want to live there than the current housing stock can handle, then incrementally converting the housing stock to accommodate demand should happen.

Sure, nothing happens without a set of positive and negative effects. But here's what happens when

So, let's talk about what 'density' really is

Readers Comments

you force low density when the market demands an increase. The central city does not have enough dwelling units to accommodate the number of people want to live there, and thus they are pushed outward further and further. Forced low density begets sprawl. What happens when a city experiences sprawl? Highways are expanded and widened, automobile dependence increases, etc.

People in the city say they like city life the way it is, but that doesn't occur in a vacuum. If you want more car traffic, ever widening highways, and a sprawling hellscape that resembles Phoenix...then yeah...force low density. Otherwise, recognize that some blocks are going to change from single family to triplex over a number of years, and that *gasp* isn't the worst thing to happen.

LIKEthumb_up4

REPLYreply

Reportflag

mpmpls

SEPTEMBER 18

Becker doesn't oppose density. What she does say is that the city is trying to do it in a very stupid, and ultimately unsuccessful way. Scattering apartments and triplexes promiscuously, helter-skelter, around the city is the exact opposite of density.

LIKEthumb_up

REPLYreply

Reportflag

ohnowtf

SEPTEMBER 18

This isn't how it works. Property tax assessments are based on the sum of the land value and improvements. The land value for one parcel won't change just because someone built improvements on a nearby parcel. The reason the triplex sold for \$400k in your example is because of the value of improvements, not an increase in land value.

Now, if you argue that adding triplexes in a neighborhood makes it more desirable and creates imbalances in supply and demand, then that could indeed lead to valuation increase of existing SFHs.

But people have argued the opposite - that a triplex will devalue their SFH.

LIKEthumb_up2

REPLYreply

Reportflag

SHOW MORE REPLIES

chiefwiggum

SEPTEMBER 18

Man, I've gotta disagree with the author's assessment of pretty much everything.

First of, the fact that she's likening the faux-density of the far southern burbs to that of Minneapolis is complete fallacy. They can't even come close to being compared, and using an outer-ring burb that has some apartment complexes as an argument against the 2040 plan is foolish.

So, let's talk about what 'density' really is

Readers Comments

There's already functional density in most parts of Minneapolis, as the city was gridded and designed before the all-mighty automobile dominated every single planning decision. The bones for functional density are present in the city, the problem is that there's been onerous zoning restrictions that have created pent up demand and artificially kept density lower than the market demands.

The 2040 plan isn't going to result in a whole bunch of block-long 10-story megaplexes popping up where nobody wants to live. They're going to show up first and foremost along those streetcar corridors and light-rail stops. That's what the market will bear.

And lastly, one of the biggest reasons we haven't seen as much development radiating from the Blue Line stops is because virtually no development happened anywhere between the years of 2008 and 2013. But in the past 5 years we've seen quite a bit pop up near those stops, and that's only going to increase. Change doesn't happen over night.

LIKEthumb_up7

REPLYreply

Reportflag

readingbylakeharriet

SEPTEMBER 18

. You missed a foundational premise of the article - the exurb example is just that, to put density in perspective, to point out that even what the burbs think of as density isn't enough to spur major transit investment - and to bring that back to Minneapolis, we need to develop density in discrete locations to maximize our transit investment, and just like the burbs, spreading upzoning everywhere means it's not concentrated enough.

LIKEthumb_up5

REPLYreply

Reportflag

ohnowtf

SEPTEMBER 18

We are spending over \$1billion to extend a light rail line to places that lack density. So it isn't true that you need density to spur transit investment. Transit investment, unfortunately, is political.

The reality is many of our local bus routes are already beyond capacity, and have been for years, but we haven't seen enhancements or improvements. Maybe a lot of the money that was allocated to suburban BRT lines and express buses would've been better served enhancing local bus routes.

If we want to concentrate development, who gets to decide where it goes? I'd argue Linden Hills is the ideal area for high levels of density due to its relative proximity to downtown and job clusters in Edina/Bloomington/western burbs. Oh and all the parks/green space for people to enjoy! Yet, I don't think most of the residents in Linden Hills would agree that their neighborhood is a prime spot for density.

LIKEthumb_up

So, let's talk about what 'density' really is

Readers Comments

REPLYreply

Reportflag

Amiller92

SEPTEMBER 18

Ms. Becker has a penchant for internally inconsistent arguments. It cannot both be the case that dense development won't happen, thus we need to prohibit it, and that the plan will wind up with 10 story towers everywhere if we don't concentrate them. The fact that there are still places that have not redeveloped around the blue line is, in fact, pretty strong evidence that the haphazard development she predicts isn't actually going to happen.

Of course, it's also simply untrue that the plan allows 10 story towers everywhere, but I guess one can just make up whatever facts one would like.

To say nothing of the strange assertion that "developers" make more money by building randomly rather than in amenity-rich (i.e., near transit, stores and restaurants) areas.

LIKEthumb_up7

REPLYreply

Reportflag

readingbylakeharriet

SEPTEMBER 18

. The corridors are a very poor way to guide development. I think the essence of the argument is that the city should have focused the massive upzoning more, and that spreading triplexes everywhere, and high density corridors snaking through the cities residential areas is inefficient.

LIKEthumb_up3

REPLYreply

Reportflag

Amiller92

SEPTEMBER 18

Right, the underlying mistaken assumption is that smaller scale development is somehow a supply side substitute for larger scale development (i.e., that a hypothetical "developer" will build triplexes instead of towers). It doesn't work that way and no one will be making that choice.

LIKEthumb_up

REPLYreply

Reportflag

Amiller92

SEPTEMBER 18

Oh, and we already have "high[er] density corridors snaking through the cit[y]'s residential areas" because the streets that used to have streetcars already have duplexes and small apartment buildings.

LIKEthumb_up

REPLYreply

Reportflag

readingbylakeharriet

SEPTEMBER 18

So, let's talk about what 'density' really is

Readers Comments

. Legalize duplexes and small apt buildings, fine. Great plan. Putting 4-6-8-10 story multi lot buildings on those same blocks is a whole different scale and many of these streets are not appropriate for that scale.

LIKEthumb_up1

REPLYreply

Reportflag

fedup76

SEPTEMBER 18

Densification without a commensurate increase in the police force is a recipe for disaster. We are already seeing this in downtown Minneapolis.

LIKEthumb_up10

REPLYreply

Reportflag

AustinMpls

SEPTEMBER 18

You might have to spell out that argument. There's some decent data that suggests the opposite - i.e., bustling streets prevent crime. What does density inherently spell disaster without more police?

LIKEthumb_up3

REPLYreply

Reportflag

ohnowtf

SEPTEMBER 18

So many inaccurate statements in this opinion piece.

I live in a house zoned for a transit corridor. Not all transit corridors allow 10 stories. The one I live in will be zoned for up to 6 stories. And these are on existing transit lines, so transit already works here. This is not a case of let's add more people and then hope transit follows. This is a case of transit already exists so lets add more people there, and hope transit enhancements follow.

There has been density added along the blue line. You can see it when you travel the corridor. The reason it hasn't been extended further from the line is literally because of zoning restrictions.

Why does the author assume that future development won't occur predominantly where it has been occurring - in and around downtown. Clearly, we've been building functionality density in Uptown, downtown, North Loop, NE, and UofM. That is going to continue, if not accelerate, under the 2040 plan.

The fact that we might see some triplexes and small apartments built here and there throughout Minneapolis is a good thing.

LIKEthumb_up12

REPLYreply

Reportflag

birchtree

SEPTEMBER 18

So, let's talk about what 'density' really is

Readers Comments

"Functionality density" = big, square, shipping container-like blockhouses built one after another like Soviet-era planned cities. This is the new American dream? I don't think so for most people. This density push will destroy what has made the twin cities a nice place to live.

LIKEthumb_up7

REPLYreply

Reportflag

ohnowtf

SEPTEMBER 18

This is about Minneapolis, not the twin cities.

And as if suburban development isn't as monotonous as new apartments/condos in Minneapolis. Almost all buildings are squares or rectangles. Can anyone really tell the difference between a new development in Blaine, Woodbury, Apple Valley, etc?

You could even say the same thing about my Minneapolis neighborhood. Most of the houses look similar. You can see the same templates used over and over, with slight variations. They were kit houses, after all. I don't understand the "sameness" complaint.

LIKEthumb_up1

REPLYreply

Reportflag

birchtree

SEPTEMBER 18

That's fine - enjoy your box. I'll stay in my house with a yard.

LIKEthumb_up2

REPLYreply

Reportflag

robczar1

SEPTEMBER 18

Why and how exactly is removing city review of the impact of new triplexes and apartments a good thing? Often the supporting reason is "it increases density". When pressed, supporters of increased density suggest imagined benefits without evidence or also looking at the downside of increased density. Lack of supporting evidence the crux of the counterpoint. Note that your comment also lacks any support for the idea of a good thing.

LIKEthumb_up2

REPLYreply

Reportflag

SkywayHam

SEPTEMBER 18

If you go to the Google and type in "benefits of housing density," you'll find a wealth of information out there for you. I won't deny there are some downsides, but some of the pros (which, in my opinion outweigh the cons) are:

- Easier to manage school districts due to less sprawl/transportation needs of its students
- lower cost to maintain and build out infrastructure like roads, water mains, etc. because you need fewer feet/yards of pipe and line to connect residents than you would if, say, everyone had dozens of

So, let's talk about what 'density' really is

Readers Comments

feet between their home and their neighbors' (or you don't need utilities running way out to the middle of nowhere for a new housing development)

- Police and Fire are more effective the denser a city is (assuming appropriate funding and staffing, which I recognize can be an issue in this city)

- higher density attracts more employers to the area because employers want to be where their people are

The lists wear on, but there are definitely benefits to be considered for improved density in this city

LIKEthumb_up3

REPLYreply

Reportflag

robczar1

SEPTEMBER 18

Obviously, suburban sprawl is and always was a bad idea from an economic or environmental perspective. But, we are talking about changing existing situations that already are much denser than suburbs. So, the issue is about benefits of allowing unbridled development that is going to affect the nature of existing, in some cases, thriving communities and replacing them with even more dense ones. So, the issue is more complex than a list of unsupported reflections on dense verses sparse populations. How much density to too much, what are we willing to give up for that extra density?

LIKEthumb_up2

REPLYreply

Reportflag

SkywayHam

SEPTEMBER 18

That's a fair counterpoint and one where, I think, we start devolving into matters of opinion, so I'll bow out there as I imagine my "too much" is very, very different from others' (likely yours, I imagine, too) "too much" and I'm willing to give up quite a bit for the development of what we could have in the future.

New communities rise on the backs of old ones all the time, often losing some of the "charm" that used to exist, but is replaced by its own "charm" and sets of pros and cons as years go by and the new neighborhood develops its own new identity.

While I empathize with those who have lived in those areas for a long time and have grown accustomed to their "charm" and pros and cons, I'm more in favor of allowing more people to live in the places they want to live and to allow people to do more with their private property (e.g., transform their single-family home into a duplex or triplex if they want).

LIKEthumb_up1

REPLYreply

Reportflag

ohnowtf

SEPTEMBER 18

It is a good thing because they will offer more housing options in parts of Minneapolis that haven't had many other options besides owner-occupied SFHs.

So, let's talk about what 'density' really is

Readers Comments

We see old, unkempt homes all over south Minneapolis torn down and replaced by large SFHs that sell for \$500k+. Would it really be that horrible to see some duplexes and triplexes instead?

LIKEthumb_up1

REPLYreply

Reportflag

qqq

SEPTEMBER 18

Because the choice to live among owner-occupied homes was taken away after folks have invested their life in what they wanted.

Let residents vote neighborhood by neighborhood how they want the character to change.

LIKEthumb_up6

REPLYreply

Reportflag

SkywayHam

SEPTEMBER 18

@qqq, what in the 2040 plan removes your choice to live among owner-occupied homes? Code before 2040 could have easily allowed for your neighbors in single-family homes to be renters in a property owned by someone who lived really far away already, anyway.

LIKEthumb_up1

REPLYreply

Reportflag

SHOW MORE REPLIES

blitz09

SEPTEMBER 18

This is a very deceptive look at the issues of density, transit and affordability. Her cherry-picked example of the 38th St LRT station ignores new development that has occurred within a few blocks - new housing, new businesses, new retail. Shame on her - she does not deserve to be called an analyst.

LIKEthumb_up11

REPLYreply

Reportflag

SkywayHam

SEPTEMBER 18

I don't know, she's very good at analyzing all the data and identifying the pieces she cherry-picks to ignore because they don't fit her narrative

LIKEthumb_up7

REPLYreply

Reportflag

robczar1

SEPTEMBER 18

Can you point to the analysis used to support increased density? The 2040 plan references many noble goals; but lacks any support linking increasing density by changing zoning across the board with those goals. Density is currently just an ideology, not a solution or guide to a better future.

LIKEthumb_up6

So, let's talk about what 'density' really is

Readers Comments

REPLYreply

Reportflag

propwash

SEPTEMBER 18

Shaming are we? The woke are a special breed of righteousness.

LIKEthumb_up3

REPLYreply

Reportflag

mplsjim

SEPTEMBER 18

100% agreed

LIKEthumb_up

REPLYreply

Reportflag

Lbanks6

SEPTEMBER 18

The city council passed this measure, it is decided. Can we stop talking about it until it takes effect and people can see the actual impact of the measure? Right now, before the 2040 plan takes effect, the small homes in my Minneapolis neighborhood that are being sold now are being torn up to build huge houses that only a rich family can afford. How does having huge expensive homes help anyone, other than a privileged few? Nobody will force anyone to sell or bulldoze their home, and triplexes won't make anyone less safe or our neighborhoods more scary. They will allow some renters an avenue into neighborhoods they can't now easily find a home - and yes, more housing along commercial corridors will help make mass transit much more prevalent in those areas - a benefit not only for the people in the commercial corridor but those who live nearby. Carol, take your ball and go home. This is over and all of your 'editorial counterpoints' just sound like sour grapes from a very bitter perspective. It is as if the Strib is Carol's personal platform to gripe - i think that is what Nextdoor dot com is for.

LIKEthumb_up8

REPLYreply

Reportflag

SkywayHam

SEPTEMBER 18

Wait until you see her rantings on e-democracy....

LIKEthumb_up2

REPLYreply

Reportflag

MNgrrrl_18

SEPTEMBER 18

I usually dismiss an opinion containing the words "rant" or "spew." Calm down.

LIKEthumb_up

REPLYreply

Reportflag

robczar1

SEPTEMBER 18

So, let's talk about what 'density' really is

Readers Comments

If you want to prevent tear downs, then do so. Don't pretend that replacing huge single family tear downs are somehow morally inferior than supporting triplex and apartment tear downs. In both cases developers will be determining the nature of the neighborhood and future course of the city.

LIKEthumb_up1

REPLYreply

Reportflag

MongooseB

SEPTEMBER 18

I still don't understand what real density is, and I am genuinely interested. Off to google, I guess?

LIKEthumb_up2

REPLYreply

Reportflag

SkywayHam

SEPTEMBER 18

"Real density" seems to be defined as "whatever kind of density I want and not the kind I don't want and DEFINITELY not in my backyard". A meaningless, hollow phrase with no real weight or basis outside of being a phrase that sounds good and you hope will rally people to your cause despite nobody else understanding what it means either

LIKEthumb_up3

REPLYreply

Reportflag

justthetruth

SEPTEMBER 18

It would be interesting to see just what kind of tax revenue the City is looking for from the 2040 Plan. I suspect that to fund their Progressive policies, they would prefer multi-unit developments that generate more tax revenue than single family homes. This isn't about livability or being trendy, this is about income streams. Which will be reduced by the inevitable social costs associated with high density environments.

LIKEthumb_up11

REPLYreply

Reportflag

SkywayHam

SEPTEMBER 18

Shouldn't you also want that? Don't more people living in the same area spread the tax burden around to more people, thus reducing each individual's tax-assessment?

Like, just for an example (all numbers made up for ease of illustration), if the city needs to collect \$50 from each of 100 people who live on a block in order to maintain the road/sidewalk/utility lines and mains/etc., wouldn't they only have to collect \$25 from each person if 200 people lived on that block instead?

Sure, there'd likely be a marginal increase due to the increased use, but most of our infrastructure could handle quite a bit more people without an intense increase of costs. So, wouldn't \$30/person still be better than \$50?

So, let's talk about what 'density' really is

Readers Comments

LIKEthumb_up2

REPLYreply

Reportflag

justthetruth

SEPTEMBER 18

Doesn't work that way. Government always increases. It increases even more with more people. It will end up with more than \$50/person to use your example. It's just that more taxes will be borne by the high rentals and/or owned units. While the social costs will be borne by those not able to afford those units.

LIKEthumb_up3

REPLYreply

Reportflag

SkywayHam

SEPTEMBER 18

That goes against a lot of the research I've come across (can't link any due to Strib's policies here), which shows that more people living in the same space tend to spread burdens around and ultimately lower the costs levied to each resident living in the area. The only exception seems to be property tax, which can increase if an area becomes more in-demand as it densifies and is followed by an increase in property values.

In that case, one's individual property tax may go up with the value of their property. But, on the other hand, the value of the property is going up, which seems like a win

LIKEthumb_up2

REPLYreply

Reportflag

justthetruth

SEPTEMBER 18

What happens to affordable housing in such a scenario? Where do those who can't afford rising property values go?

LIKEthumb_up

REPLYreply

Reportflag

YolandoSmith

SEPTEMBER 18

We shouldn't adopt Soviet style units where people are crammed in like sardines. Let's trying to keep a stable population instead.

LIKEthumb_up9

REPLYreply

Reportflag

SkywayHam

SEPTEMBER 18

If you want a planned community with explicit population targets, move to a housing development with an HOA in the suburbs.

Cities thrive when they have more people and a good way to kill a city in the long run is to discourage

So, let's talk about what 'density' really is

Readers Comments

people from moving to it just so that we can keep things at whatever "stable population" you might feel is appropriate.

More people means more money means better and improved services. More people also mean more efficiencies with our infrastructure, reducing the per-person cost of things like sewer lines, gas mains, roads, etc.

LIKEthumb_up4

REPLYreply

Reportflag

KGAL689

SEPTEMBER 18

This is more nonsense from Carol Becker. Every additional unit within a half mile of decent transit saves a person from moving to some car-dependent suburb or exurb.

LIKEthumb_up16

REPLYreply

Reportflag

wichahcala

SEPTEMBER 18

This whole counterproductive push for increased density is nothing more than a justification for building the billion-dollar light rail system ... which was sold on the argument of the city's increasing density. Back in the 60s we used to decry inner city density as the cause of crime and poverty. Guess we were wrong, eh?

LIKEthumb_up16

REPLYreply

Reportflag

SkywayHam

SEPTEMBER 18

Yeah, I think they were, especially because white flight from the urban cores was largely driven by car companies trying to get more people into the suburbs, where car ownership is a requirement just to get around, which gets more and more people to buy cars. The "American Dream" of a white-picket fence out in the 'burbs with 2.5 kids and a car or two is largely a product of marketing forces, just like how Coca-Cola popularized and cemented our modern-day view of Santa Claus in our collective psyche to try and sell more Coke through the winter. He existed before (as did the 'burbs), but was definitely leveraged, popularized, and then exploited by Coke (just like the idea of the "American Dream") as a way to pad the business ledger

LIKEthumb_up5

REPLYreply

Reportflag

justthetruth

SEPTEMBER 18

White flight has more to do with demographic shifts along racial lines, increased crime and declining school systems than it does with cars.

LIKEthumb_up1

REPLYreply

So, let's talk about what 'density' really is

Readers Comments

Reportflag

readingbylakeharriet

SEPTEMBER 18

. The city should have spurred development at small, neighborhood commercial nodes, as past comp plans and most nationally prioritize. this has the effect to reinforce the walkable pedestrian friendly centers that make our city so liveable. Instead, by dragging the highlighter of max density down long residential streets that happen to carry a bus line (some of these streets are only 2 lanes of traffic!) the city has damaged this model and prioritized dropping large multi-family units into low scale residential neighborhoods. We are now seeing discussion about specific neighborhoods and areas where this “one size” approach is not going to work. It’s such a shame the extreme density advocates and their allies on the city council wouldn’t listen to any of the other adult voices in the room and make a plan that will really work for everyone.

LIKEthumb_up12

REPLYreply

Reportflag

SkywayHam

SEPTEMBER 18

I don't understand why we can't do both?

Like, the city is in a huge housing shortage at the moment, even with all the construction in recent years. The city needs to build a lot of housing everywhere and relatively quickly.

So, why not raise the floor citywide by allowing a little extra density everywhere (most single-family neighborhoods will only now just be allowed up to triplexes; not like a lot of these neighborhoods are suddenly re-zoned for 10+ story buildings) while ALSO implementing policies and incentives to encourage any incoming density to be focused around transit nodes and busy transit routes.

As an example, we already see this a little bit with policies that allow developers to build less parking (which is quite expensive and can discourage new development) if they're within a certain distance of certain types of transit lines.

So, in that way, we are encouraging the developers to build with more of a focus to those pre-identified areas.

But, with the shortage we have, just encouraging density in those places isn't enough. So, let's also let these neighborhoods that had previously only allowed single-family homes to also dense up a little bit.

LIKEthumb_up3

REPLYreply

Reportflag

Pat5ch

SEPTEMBER 18

So, let's talk about what 'density' really is

Readers Comments

Let's discuss what is meant here by "work for everyone." Because what we have had up until now has not been "working for everyone" it has been working for people who can afford to buy a house and have two cars in the middle of a 3.5 million person metropolitan area. What it doesn't work for is younger generations, who work in the city, and don't have generational wealth or a career that allows them to afford to live in the city. The city is outgrowing the old plans—that is the whole point! It's not working anymore! And just because the plan disfavors single family homes in the middle of a huge metro area does not make it bad! Your solution is to have no solution to these new problems. I'm glad this mindset is going the way of the dodo.

What is often lost in all these discussions is the fact that Minneapolis was gridded out long before zoning codes even existed. Without restrictive zoning designed to protect the interests of existing homeowners (who conveniently were almost always white) at the expense of everyone else, Minneapolis would look much different than it does today.

LIKEthumb_up4

REPLYreply

Reportflag

stealurface

SEPTEMBER 18

Patch- you seem to assume greater density means more affordable. That assumption has been repeatedly proven inaccurate. Look at our most dense cities and ask yourself if they are more or less affordable than Minneapolis. Not everyone can afford to live in the city. Do what others have done start with a small fixer upper in the suburbs and move towards the city as your income and net worth increase.

LIKEthumb_up

REPLYreply

Reportflag

Millsap73

SEPTEMBER 18

High density cities with lots of better transit options than we have now or planned (like the southwest line) have something in common, massive housing costs. San Francisco, New York, Chicago, D.C., London, Paris etc... Yeah, there's a great example of affordable housing to aspire to via just adding density... (sigh) Our council is shortsighted and governing to populist soundbites.

LIKEthumb_up12

REPLYreply

Reportflag

smcg142000

SEPTEMBER 18

@Millsap73 What those cities have is high demand which leads to high housing costs. They have high demand because these are the kinds of cities that educated, forward-thinking, innovative people under 40 want to live in.

LIKEthumb_up9

REPLYreply

Reportflag

So, let's talk about what 'density' really is

Readers Comments

SkywayHam
SEPTEMBER 18

The housing costs aren't due to the density, though. The higher housing costs are due to TONS of people wanting to live (or born into living) in those places, increasing demand for housing. Density follows that demand (i.e., "gotta build more housing to put all the people who want to live here").

However, for all of those places, demand seems to rise as fast (or faster) than supply (i.e., more and more people continue to want to live there/are born there, but new housing construction isn't keeping up or is only just slightly ahead of population growth), which means there isn't a chance for rents and other housing costs to come down because the supply:demand ratio is still weighted towards demand.

Housing costs have been steadily rising in Minneapolis because there's significantly more demand and, thus, competition for housing. The only way, outside of legislating rent control or something like that, to get housing prices to come down is to allow more housing to be built.

LIKEthumb_up3

REPLYreply

Reportflag

Amiller92
SEPTEMBER 18

Tokyo

LIKEthumb_up

REPLYreply

Reportflag

SkywayHam
SEPTEMBER 18

What about it? As an example of ultra-dense mega-opolis that's INCREDIBLY safe, well-connected, and where people manage to get around for their entire lives without needing a car? I agree, sounds pretty great!

Housing costs are fairly high, but only because they can't build housing fast enough to keep up (though, with their population growing at a slower and slower rate each year, they might just be able to wait for that problem to age itself away)

LIKEthumb_up3

REPLYreply

Reportflag

Amiller92
SEPTEMBER 18

Tokyo housing costs are relatively low, actually. They've built a ton of housing.

LIKEthumb_up2

REPLYreply

Reportflag

SkywayHam
SEPTEMBER 18

So, let's talk about what 'density' really is

Readers Comments

Oh, wow, that's cool! I hadn't heard that. I found a price of living comparison site (numbeo), which makes it look like housing costs are quite a bit cheaper (about 10%) in Tokyo than in Minneapolis. However, that's just looking at number of bedrooms and not per square foot, which would likely show a different outcome (because you tend to get less space per apartment in Tokyo than here).

Regardless, I still think (and I *think* you're agreeing) that Tokyo is a pretty positive example of what density can be and provide

LIKEthumb_up3

REPLYreply

Reportflag

Millsap73

SEPTEMBER 18

Exactly, and it's not done with triplexes...

LIKEthumb_up

REPLYreply

Reportflag

SkywayHam

SEPTEMBER 18

Do you think Tokyo went from single-/two-story homes to skyscrapers overnight?

Absolutely not; it densified over time. Parts of the city that had been primarily single-family homes converted up to the next level over time. Then, what was once SFH but became the equivalent of Duplex/Triplex/small apartments got built up to larger (10+ story) apartment buildings, which, too, got replace by towers as demand increased enough in parts of the city.

Triplexes are not the only answer (and nobody's saying they are), but definitely a tool and step in that direction. We could have had more density codified in 2040, too, if it weren't for a small section of intensely vocal opponents, anyway.

At least they're a stepping stone to a denser city overall than just maintaining the status quo

LIKEthumb_up1

REPLYreply

Reportflag

Amiller92

SEPTEMBER 18

It's done by allowing everywhere to take the next step up in density (if a property owner wants to).

LIKEthumb_up1

REPLYreply

Reportflag

kellyesque

SEPTEMBER 18

Functional density is LA, NY, and SF and to that I say no thanks.

LIKEthumb_up10

REPLYreply

So, let's talk about what 'density' really is

Readers Comments

Reportflag

mcmahon34

SEPTEMBER 18

I agree completely. This new comp plan is developer driven and is about corporate profits not about livable neighborhoods. Our city council failed on this one. Time for some new councilors.

LIKEthumb_up19

REPLYreply

Reportflag

chrisois

SEPTEMBER 18

What the author failed to mention is that 20 years ago Seattle created around 10 urban villages where they ushered density and growth. It worked, but being so contained, it resulted in prices that were unsustainable. There was the missing middle of density. Minneapolis used to allow duplex's and fourplexes all over the city until they were outlawed due to race mixing. It's time to erase the sins of the past and embrace the new. This plan has been praised by most urban planners worldwide. We will be the leading example.

LIKEthumb_up12

REPLYreply

Reportflag

karendavid816

SEPTEMBER 18

"Minneapolis used to allow duplex's and fourplexes all over the city until they were outlawed due to race mixing..??? I grew up in a very white part of Minneapolis. It had lots of duplexes and four plexes but hardly a non-white face to be seen. Is the intent of the new zoning race mixing or affordable homes or what?

LIKEthumb_up10

REPLYreply

Reportflag

mobocracy

SEPTEMBER 18

More developer profit basically means lower developer cost, which might mean the cost per unit of housing construction is less, resulting in some reduction overall in average rents or more units being built. I don't think it's an inherently conspiratorial angle.

The larger problem with density as a whole is that high density cities tend to be just less pleasant to live in. More crowds to navigate, more competition for housing resources, more difficulty getting around. NYC, Chicago, etc, are all a lot harder to live in because of their density on a day to day lifestyle basis, unless of course you are very rich.

The magic of Minneapolis was always this precarious balance between relatively spacious single family homes and leafy neighborhoods combined with some level of urbanization that added variety and interest to living, but without making every day life so much more complicated or intense.

LIKEthumb_up12

REPLYreply

So, let's talk about what 'density' really is

Readers Comments

Reportflag

stealurface

SEPTEMBER 18

Mobo - your initial premise is flawed. More profit does not equal lower cost. each project is evaluated on the ROI based on the land labor materials necessary to construct the project and the rents that can be received.

LIKEthumb_up1

REPLYreply

Reportflag

Lauralund

SEPTEMBER 18

NYC is extremely easy to get around in.

LIKEthumb_up1

REPLYreply

Reportflag

m231231

SEPTEMBER 18

I just hate getting run over with a bicycle, kicked , pants removed and getting pummeled. Little too much density for my taste.

LIKEthumb_up13

REPLYreply

Reportflag

odinman

SEPTEMBER 18

Those brutal robberies and vicious assaults should have been front page news in my opinion.

LIKEthumb_up15

REPLYreply

Reportflag

blitz09

SEPTEMBER 18

Different story, guys, Go post elsewhere.

LIKEthumb_up4

REPLYreply

Reportflag

supervon2

SEPTEMBER 18

Density is defined this way. For the elites in power it's mansions for them and the rest can suffer.

LIKEthumb_up7

REPLYreply

Reportflag

kamaura

SEPTEMBER 18

Envious much? Envy is the worst form of greed. Good luck with you future being envious of others.

LIKEthumb_up6

REPLYreply

Reportflag

tim7759

SEPTEMBER 18

So, let's talk about what 'density' really is

Readers Comments

Your DFL elected city council knows better If you don't like the direction then change the leadership But it never happens so you can only assume the people are happy with everything

LIKEthumb_up9

REPLYreply

Reportflag

karendavid816

SEPTEMBER 18

Minneapolis has elections as a formality. The DFL endorsing convention is where these wackos get elected.

LIKEthumb_up11

REPLYreply

Reportflag

G0ldGopher

SEPTEMBER 18

Thank you, Carol, from the bottom of my heart. My heart is Minneapolis and I'm worried for it with this 2040 plan. You've beautifully articulated why city planners need to have a say in development, just as city planners do in.....every other big city in the nation.

LIKEthumb_up19

REPLYreply

Reportflag

Pat5ch

SEPTEMBER 18

The 2040 plan was literally drafted by the Department of Community Planning and Economic Development—so what are you even talking about?

LIKEthumb_up3

REPLYreply

Reportflag

Comment44

SEPTEMBER 17

I've loved Mpls because it was accessible. From my home near the U of M I could drive to Uptown, the lakes, Edina, White Bear Lk with a reasonable commute. Now I feel stuck close to home because of traffic congestion. My friends in San Francisco always debated whether they should face the traffic when they wanted to go out. I very much feel that way now. My lovely "little big city" has become so much less livable. The city has ruined this precious resource with their false promise of density's benefits.

LIKEthumb_up38

REPLYreply

Reportflag

So_So_So

SEPTEMBER 18

You are in the perfect place to bike everywhere; also traffic in the cities is similar to LA traffic, congested on certain routes at certain times but overall moving.

LIKEthumb_up3

REPLYreply

Reportflag

citizenz

SEPTEMBER 18

So, let's talk about what 'density' really is

Readers Comments

Yep, 'cause it is always 70 degrees and sunny in Minneapolis, even at 10 pm.

LIKEthumb_up17

REPLYreply

Reportflag

mommysue

SEPTEMBER 18

Bike? Please don't push your own lifestyle on others. Our climate does not allow most of us to bike year round. Perhaps this person has young children, is handicapped, elderly or god forbid unable to bike.

LIKEthumb_up13

REPLYreply

Reportflag

Pat5ch

SEPTEMBER 18

What a beautifully transparent expression of selfish entitlement that perfectly encapsulates why opponents of 2040 need go. Basically, in light of all the challenges and immense societal changes occurring, you want the government to make sure nothing about your daily life changes, making other people bear the cost of those changes instead.

LIKEthumb_up3

REPLYreply

Reportflag

ohnowtf

SEPTEMBER 18

And where do you think the congestion is coming from? You can't shield Minneapolis from congestion when we are in the center of a metro that continues to sprawl. Every new SFH we build in the suburbs and exurbs adds more vehicle trips throughout the network. This is not caused by density. Just drive around any western city - tons of congestion without density ... because everyone drives.

LIKEthumb_up1

REPLYreply

Reportflag

TheDarkOne

SEPTEMBER 17

I'd say there's enough "density" in the corridors of City Hall to go around for all the citizens of Minneapolis.

LIKEthumb_up28

REPLYreply

Reportflag

missriver123

SEPTEMBER 17

I don't have a real opinion on the basic thoughts of this editorial, but I find it interesting that it ends with the developers control apparently everything and the 2040 plan is nothing but an effort to line the developers pockets with money. It's always the evil developers fault. But stop and think for a moment, if the developers control the city council and mayor why did they pass their Inclusionary Zoning ordinance which will only end up limiting development and growth and raise rents. If the developers control the city council why did the council pass limits on background checks for criminals and others and limits on security deposits.

So, let's talk about what 'density' really is

Readers Comments

This city council is not controlled by the developers but maybe it would be better if they were given what they are doing.

LIKEthumb_up8

REPLYreply

Reportflag

failey

SEPTEMBER 18

are you trying to say that you feel our representatives represent the citizens? When did regular citizens without money or influence start getting represented?

LIKEthumb_up4

REPLYreply

Reportflag

perr0280

SEPTEMBER 17

I agree with this article. We dont need single family homes cut up into triplexes. That will ruin neighborhoods. The quiet neighborhood within the city with single family owners is what some people still want and that should be preserved. Renting homes should be more limited. Not encouraged with triplexes. People that want density should be able to find it in certain areas near downtown. Focus on those isolated areas for a better plan.

LIKEthumb_up27

REPLYreply

Reportflag

smcg142000

SEPTEMBER 18

@perr0280 In other words density is a good idea, just not in your backyard.

LIKEthumb_up5

REPLYreply

Reportflag

SkywayHam

SEPTEMBER 18

We also need less of the city telling me what I can and can't do with the property I own. If I own a single-family home and decide I want to convert it to a duplex/triplex, why should I not be allowed to?

LIKEthumb_up2

REPLYreply

Reportflag

CarolBecker

SEPTEMBER 18

Because it isn't just about you. If you demolish your home and replace it with an expensive duplex or triplex, you have removed opportunities for home ownership, you have reduced lower cost housing and you have affected the housing market. You can argue that when one person does this, it is no big deal. But when a bunch of people do it, it has negative consequences.

LIKEthumb_up1

REPLYreply

Reportflag

So, let's talk about what 'density' really is

Readers Comments

Amiller92

SEPTEMBER 18

"opportunities?"

Even granting you the assumption that the duplex or triplex will not be owner-occupied and/or condo, where are you getting the plural from?

LIKEthumb_up1

REPLYreply

Reportflag

SkywayHam

SEPTEMBER 18

What if I'm still living in that triplex/duplex or I've condo-ed it out? If anything, I've then improved access to home ownership because it'll likely be cheaper to purchase a condo in a triplex/duplex than an entire single-family home.

There's also tons of demand for rental units. Now my duplex/triplex has helped make it more affordable for more people to rent/live in the area.

Homeownership is one way to build wealth (might even be a really good one), but it is not the only one and renters deserve places to live and thrive, too.

Even then converted/replacing a single-family home does not have to mean that the opportunities for homeownership on the lot have decreased.

LIKEthumb_up1

REPLYreply

Reportflag

uptownguy33

SEPTEMBER 18

Duplexes and triplexes are within reach of average people and are much more affordable than a SFH since you have someone else helping pay the mortgage. Anyone building a SFH can build a 2-3 unit multi family home just as easily and more affordably- We both know that-right?

LIKEthumb_up

REPLYreply

Reportflag

Amiller92

SEPTEMBER 18

People who want suburban style neighborhoods have many, many options available to them.

LIKEthumb_up2

REPLYreply

Reportflag

stealurface

SEPTEMBER 18

Which part of Minneapolis is like a suburban style neighborhood? I want to know so I can avoid that area.

So, let's talk about what 'density' really is

Readers Comments

LIKEthumb_up

REPLYreply

Reportflag

Neighbor2All

SEPTEMBER 17

This could not be more spot on! Yes, Seattle was smarter with both targeted density on 6% of the city land - and a rigorous Environmental Impact assessment. Minneapolis has chosen not to follow cities like Seattle - or St. Paul! Our neighbor to the east took a much more measured approach by targeting density instead of having it literally pop up like popcorn. We need to vote this City Council and Mayor OUT!!

LIKEthumb_up23

REPLYreply

Reportflag

Sally10

SEPTEMBER 18

Seattle is destroyed. I left there in 1999, because I could see it coming. 20 years later there's so much less green space and so many tall buildings that it feels dark when you walk the sidewalks. Growing home/rental prices have driven up homelessness, resulting in tents, RVs, garbage and syringes lining the streets, sidewalks, ditches, and neighborhoods. I don't think this is our vision for Minneapolis.

LIKEthumb_up13

REPLYreply

Reportflag

paulus

SEPTEMBER 18

But it's happening to Minneapolis already. Soon it will be just another city ruined by Democrats like San Francisco, Seattle, Baltimore, Chicago, etc.

LIKEthumb_up7

REPLYreply

Reportflag

citizenz

SEPTEMBER 18

Fat chance of that. Minneapolitans just look for the Democrat label when voting.

LIKEthumb_up4

REPLYreply

Reportflag

robczar1

SEPTEMBER 17

Yes, density has become a cause. But, it this is a thoughtless cause without evidence of benefits. Sound evidence does exist that increased density has some negatives including higher crime rate, increased anxiety, parking issues, etc.. Likely it will change the nature of delicate neighborhoods into cookie cutter communities that seem fresh and new...for now. But, thoughtless development will have destroyed the connection with the past and the very thing that makes neighborhoods attractive and special. Density is simply a ratio, a number. Increasing that number is no guarantee of any benefit. How fast it changes or how the change is obtained probably matters much more than what the number is.

LIKEthumb_up14

So, let's talk about what 'density' really is

Readers Comments

REPLYreply

Reportflag

mshayek

SEPTEMBER 17

Dear Ms. Becker, analyst.

I realize that many young people and some in the city want to be able to walk to lakes, restaurants, coffee shops and the like - and be able to get to other spots without their own vehicle.

Yet not everyone in the metro area feels this way - and not everyone in Minneapolis does, either.

Some of us need our own personal vehicle for work - or we are older and have infirmities that rule out hoping on a train or riding a bike. Some of us (as already mentioned here) like too have a bit of "elbow room" where they are - and feel that everyone is not on top of one another.

I am a long ago transplant to the Twin Cities and I love the area. But I fear that more than a few of current proposals and policies are going to cause the Minneapolis/St. Paul to develop some of the ghastly messes we see in locations like San Francisco, LA, Seattle and others.

We ought to consider the preferences of all. I believe not all want the changes that are being proposed in the city to become reality.

LIKEthumb_up25

REPLYreply

Reportflag

smcg142000

SEPTEMBER 18

@msyayek Even if your dreaded scenario were to develop it won't happen in your lifetime. Allowing triplexes encourages slow, incremental development by individual developers and small investors. No major developer is going to buy 500 single family homes to build triplexes. It's not worth their time and the return on investment when they can be building large apartment complexes on major corridors.

LIKEthumb_up3

REPLYreply

Reportflag

CarolBecker

SEPTEMBER 18

Over half the single family homes in North Minneapolis are now rental. Invitation Homes owns over 700 single family homes there already. It is currently worth corporations time to own and rent homes. The result is that lower value homes are being gobbled up and turned to rental, keeping poor people poor.

LIKEthumb_up

REPLYreply

Reportflag

smcg142000

SEPTEMBER 18

So, let's talk about what 'density' really is

Readers Comments

@CarolBecker Own and rent yes. That's very profitable, especially in the poorest parts of town. Buy, tear down and build triplexes no. Two very different things.

LIKEthumb_up1

REPLYreply

Reportflag

Beeser65

SEPTEMBER 17

I was excited by this commentary. Yes! Let's have a discussion about density. Unfortunately this never actually argues for something. It is a waste of a rebuttal that could have articulated something. It's a sign of our times that we yet again spend time attempting to say someone is wrong, versus a real discussion of ideas. I'm disappointed in the Star Tribune. I've come to expect better.

LIKEthumb_up7

REPLYreply

Reportflag

Scooter126

SEPTEMBER 17

Makes you wonder what those "good" progressives traded off. Less cops! More useless non-profits that employ friends? Less vociferous opposition in next election..

LIKEthumb_up24

REPLYreply

Reportflag

thecableguy

SEPTEMBER 17

Lisa Bender is beholden to developers, not citizens of her ward. In fact, every business owner I've spoken to has the same story: "Lisa Bender won't listen to you unless you are connected to one of her developers"

LIKEthumb_up33

REPLYreply

Reportflag

callmeq

SEPTEMBER 17

What exactly does one need to do to be considered an "analyst"?

LIKEthumb_up12

REPLYreply

Reportflag

MNgrrrl_18

SEPTEMBER 17

Transportation planning credentials and a lifetime of public service.

LIKEthumb_up9

REPLYreply

Reportflag

whittierres

SEPTEMBER 17

Carol Becker is the former head of the Minneapolis Board of Estimate and Taxation. Guessing that qualifies as an uber analyst.

LIKEthumb_up12

So, let's talk about what 'density' really is

Readers Comments

REPLYreply

Reportflag

mattaudio

SEPTEMBER 17

File lots of frivolous lawsuits against the city that cost taxpayers lots of money despite getting dismissed immediately.

LIKEthumb_up8

REPLYreply

Reportflag

CarolBecker

SEPTEMBER 18

Matt - if you are talking about the lawsuit to protect citizens ability to participate in the budget, yes I lost. And I got eight pages from a judge who explained why it was so important to do this. I did it and I would do it again to protect citizen's rights to participate in their government.

LIKEthumb_up4

REPLYreply

Reportflag

SkywayHam

SEPTEMBER 18

Wasting time and taxpayer money on frivolous lawsuits when you don't get your way and then, as an elected official, underhandedly trying to steal the brand and trademark of one of your critics

LIKEthumb_up2

REPLYreply

Reportflag

saywhat567

SEPTEMBER 17

Absolutely right. The developers are calling the shots and they will be the only winners. Frey and many of the council have to go.

LIKEthumb_up34

REPLYreply

Reportflag

WaterBunker

SEPTEMBER 17

We deserve real density? Says who? Density equals crime. So dream about walking to a store or restaurant...and being assaulted.

LIKEthumb_up32

REPLYreply

Reportflag

Nimbus1

SEPTEMBER 18

You are correct WaterB. But leftists have no logical skills, from their belief that we can control weather and climate through taxation to this.

LIKEthumb_up

REPLYreply

Reportflag

ngwhite

SEPTEMBER 17

So, let's talk about what 'density' really is

Readers Comments

No one “deserves” density. I choose elbow room. I think people “deserve” elbow room.

LIKEthumb_up32

REPLYreply

Reportflag

smcg142000

SEPTEMBER 18

@ngwhite I have no problem with you having elbow room as long as you are willing to pay for it. City dwellers are subsidizing suburban elbow room in a major way. Do the math. The cost to service a square in the city is not appreciably higher than the cost to service the same area in the suburbs. If the city spends \$1 million on infrastructure, maintenance and city services it is split 7,109 ways in a square mile or \$142 per person. If the same thing happens in Lakeville it is split 1655 ways or \$604 per person. If we add in the cost of freeway construction the difference becomes exponentially greater. Something tells me the folks in Lakeville would not be happy if their taxes were raised enough to cover their actual costs.

LIKEthumb_up4

REPLYreply

Reportflag

ngwhite

SEPTEMBER 18

Oh I pay for elbow room and it's worth every square foot. I go downtown Mpls 6 times a year to the Guthrie. When the Southwest boondoggle is completed I'll take it instead of driving. I don't have to pay since nobody checks.

LIKEthumb_up1

REPLYreply

Reportflag

kender

SEPTEMBER 17

The social engineering experiments in Minneapolis are appalling. Light rail that will never ever pay for itself is an example. Billions spent by the Leftist daydreamers have made Minneapolis way to expensive and over regulated.

Decades ago I lived in Minneapolis, but I will never do so again. There is no urban blight and overcrowding in areas such as Savage, Shakopee and Prior Lake, just to name a few.

LIKEthumb_up32

REPLYreply

Reportflag

MNgrrrl_18

SEPTEMBER 17

We simply don't have enough space to fit all the people this area is projected to gain over the next 20 years unless we build more densely. There are arguments about how we will build more densely, as Ms. Becker points out. But the need to build more densely is inescapable. They ain't making any more land, last I heard - and even if they were, we can't afford to build more infrastructure outside the metropolitan urban service area. If you build more housing at the edges of the metro, you will need more capacity in roads, wastewater treatment, schools, etc. We can't live as if it were the 1950's and we only had as many people as we had then. Gotta prepare for the future.

So, let's talk about what 'density' really is

Readers Comments

LIKEthumb_up10

REPLYreply

Reportflag

kender

SEPTEMBER 17

Who says we cannot keep building?! Have you never been to the east coast from Boston down to Washington DC? Just about one population area. How about the metros such as a Chicago, New Yoirk City and LA?

“If you build it they will come.”

LIKEthumb_up2

REPLYreply

Reportflag

smcg142000

SEPTEMBER 18

@kender We could keep building if the people who want to live among the cornfields were willing to pay the actual cost of doing so. They are not.

LIKEthumb_up3

REPLYreply

Reportflag

Nimbus1

SEPTEMBER 18

What happened to that story in the paper about a year ago stating how many young ones are leaving Mn?

LIKEthumb_up

REPLYreply

Reportflag

Nimbus1

SEPTEMBER 18

And we gotta make it colder, snowier and get those glaciers building too. Dang we have lots to do, right Leftists?

LIKEthumb_up

REPLYreply

Reportflag

wmjrbryant

SEPTEMBER 17

But there's nothing to do out there. For us, Orchestras, theater fine ding is important.

LIKEthumb_up5

REPLYreply

Reportflag

kmullen1970

SEPTEMBER 17

Enjoy Savage, Shakopee you can have it. All I see from 169 is row aftet row of Beige townhouses. Meh.

No thanks

LIKEthumb_up18

REPLYreply

So, let's talk about what 'density' really is

Readers Comments

Reportflag

Sagacity

SEPTEMBER 17

Here is what the leftist powers that be in Mpls want. Control. Control over what you can build. Control over where you can live. Control over how you can live. Control over how you can use private property. Etc.

They want to eliminate your freedoms so they can implement their agenda. You get what you vote for.

LIKEthumb_up44

REPLYreply

Reportflag

failey

SEPTEMBER 18

what is leftist about a controlling government? Wouldn't that be the opposite of the democracy the leftist ideology preaches?

LIKEthumb_up1

REPLYreply

Reportflag

wichahcala

SEPTEMBER 18

If the left believed in democracy, they wouldn't be spending all their time trying to get rid of a duly elected president.

LIKEthumb_up4

REPLYreply

Reportflag

failey

SEPTEMBER 18

if the left doesn't believe in democracy then they are not leftist and you should stop calling them the left wing. can you name a political science book that doesn't say the left-wing preaches Democratic control

LIKEthumb_up

REPLYreply

Reportflag

failey

SEPTEMBER 18

Wich what part of leftist ideology do you think the Democrats represent? What makes you think the Democratic party is a left-wing leftist ideology party?

LIKEthumb_up

REPLYreply

Reportflag

smcg142000

SEPTEMBER 18

@Sagacity Um it is the anti-density folks who want to maintain control so as to keep out people they don't want living in their neighborhood. It has been that way for more than 100 years.

LIKEthumb_up2

REPLYreply

Reportflag

So, let's talk about what 'density' really is

Readers Comments

Nimbus1

SEPTEMBER 18

I don't want thugs, miscreants in my neighborhood. Sue me.

LIKEthumb_up1

REPLYreply

Reportflag

smcg142000

SEPTEMBER 18

@Nimbus1 I don't want Trump

supporters in my neighborhood either

LIKEthumb_up

REPLYreply

Reportflag

SkywayHam

SEPTEMBER 18

Woah, woah, woah, woah, woah

I'm sorry, in what way does the removal of single-family zoning do anything but INCREASE a property owner's control over what they can build, what they can do with existing property, or where they can do it? Doesn't loosening zoning restrictions improve one's personal agency over all of that?

Keep in mind, too, that 2040 DOES NOT BAN SINGLE-FAMILY HOMES. All it does is put an end to single-family-only zoning options. You are still more than welcome to construct a single-family home. It's just that you are no longer obligated to ONLY be able to build a single-family home in certain parts of the city.

Sounds like more freedom to me. What am I missing?

LIKEthumb_up4

REPLYreply

Reportflag

mplsjim

SEPTEMBER 17

We have seen high density along the Hiawatha line, note Bloomington's Central station. In addition, while Lyndale does have single-family homes along the bus route, it is dominated by commercial businesses along the portion of Lyndale that has those bus routes.

LIKEthumb_up5

REPLYreply

Reportflag

bannedonrun

SEPTEMBER 17

Ahhhhhhhhhhhhhhhh....density. "we don't live in NY, but want to change where we are to NY, but we don't want to move to NY because we don't like NY, we like it here.....but we want to change it here.....to a place we don't like".....

LIKEthumb_up42

REPLYreply

So, let's talk about what 'density' really is

Readers Comments

Reportflag

BikeGirl

SEPTEMBER 17

Not many living here in Minnesota could afford to live in NYC even if they wanted to.

My step sister has lived in NYC for the last 30 years and wouldn't live anywhere else after growing up in rural PA in a town of 2,000. She lives more in one day than most Minnesotans do in a month with all the opportunities that are in the city.

LIKEthumb_up1

REPLYreply

Reportflag

wegman

SEPTEMBER 18

I grew up in NYC. As I type with some degree of frequency, "I'm from New York, with an emphasis on the PAST tense."

Less crime, lower taxes, less traffic. Plenty to do here and, for the most part, safer. Although the powers in Minneapolis and St. Paul seem to want to be taking pages out of the high crime playbook.

LIKEthumb_up8

REPLYreply

Reportflag

sirtophamhat

SEPTEMBER 18

"She lives more in one day than most Minnesotans do in a month with all the opportunities that are in the city."

How do you even see where you are walking with your nose up that high?