

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>
Sent: Wednesday, April 17, 2024 9:58 PM
To: Anika Bowie <Anika.Bowie@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Cc: #CI-StPaul_Ward1 <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