

**From:** [Polly Heintz](#)  
**To:** [Greg Weiner](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Opposition to RM-1 to RM-2 Rezoning of 1984 Marshall  
**Date:** Thursday, April 18, 2024 9:28:58 AM

---

**From:** Scott Vanwert <[scottavanwert@gmail.com](mailto:scottavanwert@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 17, 2024 9:58 PM  
**To:** Anika Bowie <[Anika.Bowie@ci.stpaul.mn.us](mailto:Anika.Bowie@ci.stpaul.mn.us)>  
**Cc:** #CI-StPaul\_Ward1 <[Ward1@ci.stpaul.mn.us](mailto:Ward1@ci.stpaul.mn.us)>  
**Subject:** Opposition to RM-1 to RM-2 Rezoning of 1984 Marshall

**Think Before You Click:** This email originated **outside** our organization.

Dear Council Member Bowie,

I would like to express our opposition to the up-zoning from RM-1 to RM-2 the parcel located at 1984 Marshall. From my understanding this request is due to the developer wishing to add a fifth rental townhouse which would exceed the square footage limits of RM-1 where four units could be built under current RM-1 with no variance or rezoning needed. So the request amounts to permanent up-zoning of the parcel for a net gain of 1 student/market rate rental unit.

For the sake of our children's and grandchildren's futures, I would hope that the City Council will / should expect a developer to bring a far greater benefit to our community than this for the special consideration of up-zoning.

For example, I/we would likely be supportive of a variance (not rezoning) for this project if it contained some long term resident / community benefits aligned with needs and priorities such as the following:

- Long term designated affordable housing unit(s)

- Rooftop Solar

- Onsite parking build with electric vehicles charging (or on street EV charging facilitated by developer)

- Net Zero Energy Design

- Heat Pump Demonstration Project

- Bicycle Friendly Features (eg storage pods)

- Other Green / landscaping / water preserving features

**But it does not include any of the above**, and is an ordinary townhouse based on design ideas the developer has shared, seeking maximum profitability and not with community needs / priorities in mind. A question to consider is "Does this up-zoning request on balance merit special treatment over all the other RM-1 parcel along this stretch of Marshall?" And so again we urge a no vote, while a yes vote would be an invitation for any and all rezoning requests that provide little or no broader community benefit, but simply provide more profits to developers. A no vote is also consistent with the community recommendations provided to the City Council by the Union Park District Council and City Planning Commission.

(Also as a matter of principle it seems that a variance request better fits this situation versus rezoning which ought to relate to broader & greater long term benefits to the community since rezoning stays in place even if this project isn't built.)

Respectively Yours,

Scott Van Wert & Lisa Albrecht

1985 Marshall Ave

Saint Paul, MN