



APPLICATION FOR APPEAL

Department of Safety and Inspections
375 Jackson Street, Suite 220
Saint Paul, MN 55101-1806
651-266-9008

Zoning office use only

File no. 17-004205

Fee \$453.00

Tentative hearing date:

FEB 1, 2017

APPLICANT

Name McKenna Skrypek

Address 7040 132nd Street North

City Hugo St. MN Zip 55038 Daytime phone 651-407-2850

Name of owner (if different) Sunray Laundromat - Remi Iselewa

PROPERTY LOCATION

Address 373 Ruth Street North

Legal description: See attached survey.

(attach additional sheet if necessary)

TYPE OF APPEAL: Application is hereby made for an appeal to the:

- Board of Zoning Appeals City Council

under the provisions of Chapter 61, Section 601, Paragraph _____ of the Zoning Code, to appeal a decision made by the Board of Zoning Appeals

on January 4, 2017, 200____. File number: 16-107288
(date of decision)

GROUND FOR APPEAL: Explain why you feel there has been an error in any requirement, permit, decision or refusal made by an administrative official, or an error in fact, procedure or finding made by the Board of Zoning Appeals or the Planning Commission.

Please see attached

(attach additional sheet if necessary)

Applicant's signature McKenna Skrypek Date 1/16/17 City agent _____

It seems that there is an error in the decision based on a few different items. First, in the BZA's findings, number two states that the current plan is not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, however it seems that the sidewalks, boulevards, and pedestrian lighting that would be added would be making his more pedestrian friendly than it currently is. Next, number three of the BZA's findings states that the finding is not met because there would still be sufficient parking spaces based on the zoning requirements for parking in this area. While it would still meet the minimum parking spaces as specified, this is not practical for development and increasing the building size would decrease parking spaces, while increasing the amount of traffic to this multi-tenant commercial building. While the hope is to increase pedestrian and transit traffic, it would still be a safety issue being on the corner lot and not having sufficient parking for the vehicle traffic. In number four of the BZA's findings, they state that "building a smaller building is a choice not a circumstance" while that is true, it seems that none of the practical concerns have been taken into consideration, such as parking and ponding. In addition to the practical concerns the intent of the Owner, Architect and Contractor of this project is to build a quality building, while it is *possible* to "value engineer" as stated in the hearing, what that really means is building a cheaper building. If this appeal is denied this project will be forced to increase in size and decrease in the quality of materials that are to be used. This leads us to our final issue, which is number six of the BZA's findings that allowing this variance of .07% FAR will alter the character of the surrounding area. First, this project *is* intended to alter the current site, which at this time is a vacant lot and an eye sore at that. As stated previously, the Owner wishes to use quality finishes and have a first class building to fit in with the character that Saint Paul is known for. We hope that the findings stated by the BZA will be reconsidered as we think that this project would do nothing but benefit the current area and community.

