

From: Sarah Stocco [<mailto:yellow.cabin@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, June 11, 2018 9:14 AM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward3
Subject: Snelling and St. Clair Development

Hello!

My name is Sarah Stocco, and I am a home owner who lives on Berkeley Avenue between Snelling Avenue and Macalester Street. I am writing in support of the proposed development on the corner of Snelling and St. Clair. I am a direct neighbor of this proposal, and I approve of the move to increase housing density on a major transit corridor. I know many of my neighbors have reservations about this proposal because it "doesn't fit with the character of the neighborhood," but I feel that is very thinly veiled NIMBY-ism. I chose to live in St. Paul because it is a city, and part of living in a city is diversifying the types of housing within EVERY neighborhood, including mine. I also voted for and campaigned for Mayor Carter in part because of his support of making housing a priority, and that is what this proposal helps to do.

I would be lying if I didn't admit that it will feel weird at first to have such a large building on that corner, but we have lived here for seven years with a crappy parking lot and a rundown bakery. It may look different from what we're used to, but it will serve a purpose of increasing housing in St. Paul, and that is something I cannot oppose just because it is in my backyard.

Thank you for your time!

Best to you,
Sarah Stocco
1611 Berkeley Avenue
St. Paul

From: Mckenzie, James [<mailto:james.mckenzie@email.und.edu>]
Sent: Monday, June 11, 2018 5:57 PM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward3
Subject: ST Clair/Snelling

Mr.Tolbert:

Enough already with the seedy decline of Snelling and St.Clair. I live five houses down from Snelling on Berkeley; I am an old (78) white guy; I strongly support the new development whose shadow, as the sun rises, will likely reach far enough down my street to darken our still mortgaged home. It's a good thing; way better than the empty buildings there now, especially the shady operations of Rosemark Bakery. Clean up the land under the old gas station; clean up the pollution from the noble Sweeney Cleaners; get with our new realities.

We need new life there, a life suitable for 21st century urban living. Love the A Line; love the Green Line. We are not a suburb.

jimck
1598 Berkeley Ave.

From: Brian C Martinson [<mailto:brian.c.martinson@gmail.com>]

Sent: Thursday, June 14, 2018 9:22 AM

To: #CI-StPaul_Ward4 <Ward4@ci.stpaul.mn.us>; #CI-StPaul_Ward2 <Ward2@ci.stpaul.mn.us>; #CI-StPaul_Ward3 <Ward3@ci.stpaul.mn.us>; #CI-StPaul_Ward5 <Ward5@ci.stpaul.mn.us>; #CI-StPaul_Ward6 <Ward6@ci.stpaul.mn.us>; #CI-StPaul_Ward7 <Ward7@ci.stpaul.mn.us>

Subject: Please approve the CUP re: building height for proposed construction at Snelling and Saint Clair

Dear Councilmembers,

I hope to be present to speak at the June 20 Council meeting on this issue, but I have more to say about the appeal from the "Neighbors for Responsible Development" group than there will be time for there. So I respectfully request that the following be entered in the written record of discussion of this matter.

This group has repeatedly claimed that their voice is not being heard by the City, and that they are only doing this because they care so much about their neighborhood. I'm inclined to judge the veracity of such claims on the basis of what sorts of arguments a group brings to the table to express their concerns. In this case, the specific concerns listed in their appeal are all largely specious, making their claims of concern appear disingenuous. Here are their concerns verbatim from the appeal, and my own responses.

- Claim: Heights of 68'4 and 47' will impact the sunlight and privacy of adjacent single story neighborhood homes, immediately to the east. This will radically interfere with residents' quality of life.

Response: There are three single-family houses to the EAST of the proposed construction. The sun-angle being from the East and South of the proposed building, it's shadow will fall to the North and West, meaning it is physically impossible for it to interfere with sunlight falling on these houses. Moreover, shade study information the developer shared at a meeting of the Macalaster-Groveland Community Council's Housing and Land Use Committee showed that at no point during an annual cycle would shadow from the most recently proposed version of their building fall in a way that would "radically interfere" with any residents lives nor the businesses to the North or West of the proposed construction.

The claim of a privacy issue for the three single-family homes is also unsupported. First of all, the developer has already made changes to the SE corner of the proposed development to address the (as yet unsupported) concerns about privacy. Second, I'm also fairly certain that this issue was raised about The Finn (also a TJL project) before it was constructed. I happen to be friends with the folks who live in the single-story, single-family home immediately behind The Finn, and had the pleasure of celebrating a birthday party with them in their backyard recently. Based on this first-hand observation of an existing multi-level property immediately adjacent to a single-level home, I can attest that there were no concerns about the privacy of this backyard party, and multiple people in attendance commented on how pleasantly surprised they were about that fact.

- Claim: Construction of these properties at CUP heights proposed will result in additional floors and tenants adding to unsustainable traffic levels at the St. Clair | Snelling intersection. No traffic study has been done nor has one been proposed.

Response: The CUP pertains only to the highest floor of the proposed building. How many additional units does that represent, relative to a building with one less floor? Due to set-backs, and other “de-massing” compromises the developer has already built in to their plan, it’s clearly fewer than the lower floors, but let’s be generous and say that it represents a full 1/3 of the total 118 residential units in the building. That’s an additional 39 units. Let’s further assume that tenants in each of those units makes 3 trips a day, and that all of those trips are taken by single-occupancy motor-vehicle. That’s 117 additional single-occupancy motor-vehicle trips at the Snelling and Saint Clair intersection daily. The ADT on Saint Clair there has been estimated at around 7600, and the ADT on Snelling there has been estimated in excess of 20,000. So those putative additional 117 car-trips would represent an addition of roughly 1.5% to ADT on Saint Clair, and less than an additional ½ of 1% (0.006) to ADT on Snelling. These are not the radical traffic increases the appeal is claiming will occur.

- Claim: Over 100 additional cars at this intersection will cause traffic congestion and result in parking issues on adjacent streets, limiting parking options for current homeowners and neighboring businesses.

Response: See response above. Moreover, given added parking spaces in the building for residents and some for the commercial spaces, the claim about limiting parking options is not well supported.

- Claim: Pedestrian safety, increased exhaust and noise due to 118 new apartments on this corner are public health concerns no one has yet addressed.

Response: Again, the CUP does not pertain to all 118 residential units, just those on the proposed top floor, so based on the estimates above, we’re really talking **at most** 39 additional cars. That’s roughly **one** A-Line bus worth of traffic if all those drivers of single-occupancy motor-vehicles were to opt to take the bus (which has a stop immediately adjacent to the proposed property) rather than electing to take their cars. If this neighborhood group is truly concerned about pedestrian safety, exhaust and noise due to added traffic at that intersection, it would seem their efforts would be better placed in advocating for safer streets, “Complete Streets,” pedestrian safety initiatives such as the Stop-For-Me campaign, and supporting greater use of the A-Line, rather than exercising themselves with this appeal to stymie construction of much needed housing in our neighborhood. This would also be completely consistent with the Saint Paul Comprehensive Plan for 2040 – “T-19. Shift mode share towards pedestrian, bike, public transit and carpooling.” And “T-23. Improve public transit mode share and support quality public transit in all parts of Saint Paul through strategic **establishment of transit-supportive land use intensity and design.**” (That “land use intensity and design” means increasing density, particularly along transit-corridors.)

- Claim: The added height and massive design will be detrimental to the existing character of the immediate neighborhood and negatively affect property values.

Response: Again, the CUP pertains only to the top floor of the proposed building. The “massiveness” of the building is largely a subjective issue, and the developer has already made

multiple compromises on the design to concretely address the expressed concerns that some still find it too massive. These include additional set-backs, smaller and fewer units on the top floor, cut-ins to break up the visual continuity of the street-facing surfaces, and others. No support or explanation is offered for the claim that the building will be detrimental to the existing character of the immediate neighborhood. The area is currently characterized by a flat-lot used for parking, and several dilapidated buildings to the South, giving this corner a vaguely blighted character, at least relative to the rest of the Macalaster-Groveland neighborhood. Other buildings at that intersection are not single-family homes, but multi-level commercial buildings, some with billboards atop them that reach almost the same height as the proposed building. I see no evidence offered that this new construction would have a negative effect on any property values in the area, and evidence from other locations indicates that such construction often increases surrounding property values. See also T-23 above from the Saint Paul Comprehensive Plan 2040 as well as “LU-1. Encourage transit-supportive density and direct the majority of growth to areas with the highest existing or planned transit capacity.”

- Claim: Young professionals have already sold their homes on the 200 block of Brimhall rather than have their backyards face the height of the development proposed.

Response: There’s no reason to doubt that young professionals may have sold their houses on the 200 block of Brimhall. The houses on this block are relatively small, and are therefore some of the more affordable in the neighborhood, making them reasonable “starter homes,” for young professionals, who often buy such homes and intend to own them for relatively short periods, until they outgrow the spaces and feel need or desire to move to larger spaces. Often, as is the case in at least one instance here, new young professionals purchase the houses sold by other young professionals. So observing young professionals selling their houses on Brimhall is an expected part of the experience and character of this neighborhood, not some aberration. Moreover, as someone whose experience in this neighborhood reflects precisely the pattern just described, I can vouch that the decision to make such a move is influenced by far more salient and manifold factors than concerns about a new development across the alley from their backyards. The housing market is particularly “hot” at this time, and there appears to be some level of “pent up demand” for making residential moves. So when folks say they are moving for this or that reason, I always take it with a grain of salt, as I ponder how large the capital gain is likely to be on the property they are selling.

I do not feel that the claims made in the appeal of this CUP should be taken at face value. I believe they represent an emotional appeal made largely out of fear of change, and that a more reason-based consideration of the CUP suggests that it should be supported. I encourage you to support approval of the CUP for the added height for construction at 246 Snelling Ave. S.

Thank you.

--

Brian C. Martinson, PhD
1943 Princeton Ave, Saint Paul, MN 55105 (Ward 4, Precinct 7)
Senior Research Investigator | HealthPartners Institute
Research Scientist | Minneapolis VA - CCDOR
Associate Professor | Dept of Medicine, University of Minnesota

From: Robert Wales [<mailto:rawales@gmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, June 14, 2018 9:32 AM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward3
Cc: McMahon, Melanie (CI-StPaul)
Subject: LaValle Development

Good morning, CM Tolbert and Melanie.

Just wanted to express my concern regarding the appeal of the vote to issue a CUP to the proposed development at St Clair and Snelling. The appeal is citing that the request doesn't meet the following conditions:

“The use will not be detrimental to the existing character of the development in the immediate neighborhood or endanger the public health, safety and general welfare.”

“The use will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property for uses permitted in the district.”

I see no merit in this argument. It's the same old ploy to define the character of a neighborhood according to a few people's standards.

Saint Paul needs to stop clinging to the notion it is a small town and realize that it is a city and we need to grow and continue to develop in order to provide for its current residents as well as attract new residents and businesses.

Sincerely,
Robert Wales
1727 Race St
Saint Paul, MN 55116

From: Jeff Christenson [mailto:Jeff_Christenson@ajg.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 14, 2018 10:28 AM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward3
Subject: Snelling and St. Clair Development

Good morning, Councilmember Tolbert,

I'm writing to briefly express my support for the proposed development at Snelling and St. Clair. I know that there is an appeal of the Planning Commission's approval of the CUP, which rests (in part) on whether this development is consistent with neighborhood character.

From my perspective as the owner of a single-family home just a few blocks from this site, I feel that it is totally consistent with the character of the neighborhood, which I would describe as primarily single-family homes along non-arterial streets lined by higher-density housing and commercial uses along the main corridors, such as Snelling, Grand, St. Clair, etc. I can see how someone could claim that this proposed development is inconsistent with neighborhood character, but that claim only makes sense to me if they're only considering their immediate neighborhood, and not how the land use changes on busier/wider streets. On my block (on

Lincoln), for example, I am sure that I have neighbors who would describe our neighborhood as single-family homes, but that isn't true. We have several multi-family rental properties along with single-family homes on Lincoln, and just one block North, Grand is mostly three- or four-story apartments along with either single-family homes or homes that have been converted to commercial use. Along Snelling, there is a mix of single-family homes, 3-5 story apartments/condos, and commercial uses.

In terms of the relative definition of neighborhood character, an analogous situation arose last year with the Ford Site discussion, where neighbors to the North claimed the site plan was inconsistent with neighborhood character, where in reality that argument only makes some sense if you're looking at the site from the homes to the North of Ford Parkway; if you were to stand on the roof of one of the apartment buildings that would be Southeast of the Ford Site and look Northwest, it seems to me that the planned use would look consistent with the existing use Southeast of the site.

Also, it seems to me that projects like the one proposed here are exactly what the City Council was envisioning when it approved the South Snelling re-zoning last year, which is to say, traditional neighborhood zoning that increases in density along main "nodes" such as Snelling and St. Clair.

Please deny the appeal and allow St. Paul to grow as a city.

Thanks for your consideration.

Jeff Christenson, J.D.

1482 Lincoln Ave.
St. Paul, MN 55105

From: Wil Totten [mailto:wtotten@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, June 14, 2018 2:27 PM

To: #CI-StPaul_Ward3

Cc: Rachel Nelson

Subject: Support for Snelling and St Clair Project and CUP

I support the Lavallo development at Snelling and St Clair. Transit oriented development is a very good thing. Many residents of this proposed building will be people who choose to not own cars and use our transit system, bicycle or walk to take care of their business and pleasure needs.

The NIMBYs are so tiresome...

Wil Totten, 1808 Highland Parkway

From: Kateri Routh [mailto:katerirouth@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 14, 2018 9:03 AM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward1; #CI-StPaul_Ward2; #CI-StPaul_Ward3; #CI-StPaul_Ward4; #CI-StPaul_Ward5; #CI-StPaul_Ward6; #CI-StPaul_Ward7
Subject: In full support of St. Clair / Snelling development!

I'm writing in full support of granting the CUP for the new development at St. Clair & Snelling.

Our city needs more housing. Our long-term goals for both Mac Groveland and the city as a whole is to create that housing, specifically on transit lines. The A-Line is a great addition to Snelling, let's use it!

The developers are well within the zoning code as you well know, a CUP is not a variance. This building is thoughtfully designed and I encourage the city to think about the entire population, not the critical voices of a few wealthy home owners that don't want to see any change in their neighborhood.

Kateri Routh
2093 Stanford Ave.
Saint Paul, MN

From: Hillary Frazey [mailto:hillary.frazey@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 14, 2018 2:07 PM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward3
Subject: Support for Development at St Clair and Snelling

Dear Councilmember Tolbert,

I am a homeowner in Ward 3, and I am writing in support of the proposed LaValle development at Saint Clair and Snelling.

The project fits existing zoning requirements and will replace a dilapidated parking lot and one-story buildings that are in poor condition. Furthermore, the developer listened to community feedback and made adjustments to plans. This type of investment in Mac/Groveland should be encouraged and supported.

We desperately need more places for people to live in this part of Saint Paul. Since this development is in a perfect location with high frequency transit, it makes sense to put it here. It will enhance the neighborhood and allow us to welcome new neighbors.

Thank you,
Hillary Frazey
2027 Stanford Avenue

From: Rachel Wiken [mailto:rachel.wiken@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 14, 2018 3:45 PM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward3 <Ward3@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Cc: Dave Ankarlo VII <anka0004@umn.edu>
Subject: Support for Snelling / St Clair

Council Member Tolbert,

I am writing again in support for the development at Snelling and St Clair. My husband and I live 3 blocks from the development and are strong supports of rebuilding that corner, which has become an eyesore.

I think it is ridiculous that opposition groups are being allowed to stop this project after the developer has met the conditions set forth by the city and already adjusted the project based on neighborhood feedback. "Neighborhood character" is not decided by those vocally in opposition. I argue that this development would be a great match for our urban neighborhood.

We need housing in St Paul. We need options for people who do not want or are not able to maintain 100 year old homes. We need options for housing and retail that are walkable, bikeable, and accessible by transit.

Please make this project happen.

Rachel Wiken and Dave Ankarlo
1459 Berkeley

From: Jake Rueter <jake.rueter@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 16, 2018 2:19:18 PM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward4
Cc: #CI-StPaul_Ward3; Kantner, Libby (CI-StPaul)
Subject: Support for St Clair/Snelling Project

Hello Councilmember Henningson,

I'm writing today to express my support for the proposed development at St Clair and Snelling. This project will add more housing units to address our ongoing housing crisis, add new businesses to a vital part of Snelling Avenue, and increase the city's tax base. I hope you support this fantastic transit-oriented development on one of the most critical transit corridors in Saint Paul.

Cheers,

Jake Rueter
1347 Blair Ave

From: Benjamin Ashley-Wurtmann <ben.wurtmann@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 15, 2018 8:57:16 PM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward3; #CI-StPaul_Ward4
Subject: Support for Snelling/St clair development

Please reject the unfounded appeal of this project. There are plenty of other multi story apartments in the area (and as a Mac student, I lived in a few of them) so the idea that this is “out of character” for the neighborhood is untenable.

Transit oriented development is needed to house the thousands of new St. Paul residents coming each year.

As a nearby neighbor, please allow this project to move forward without any more delay.

Ben Ashley-Wurtmann
1661 Iglehart

From: Casey Peterson <cmpeterson31@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 15, 2018 12:40:38 PM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward4
Cc: #CI-StPaul_Ward3
Subject: In support of Snelling/Saint Clair Housing Development

Hello Council Member Stark,

I’m Casey Peterson, a resident of Ward 4, and I’m writing in support of the proposed LaValle development at Snelling and Saint Clair. This is a great mixed-use complex that will help provide the housing that our city desperately needs. Housing with great walkability and access to transit is the sort of “neighborhood character” our city should strive for. Single-family homes are nice and charming, but that will not address the housing shortage as adroitly as mixed-use developments such as this.

Please consider voting to keep this project alive.

I’ve copied Council Member Tolbert, as it is his ward and I would like him to also see my support.

Thanks for your time and your service.
Casey Peterson

From: John Hoeschen [mailto:jhoeschen@stpaulcornerdrug.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 14, 2018 7:44 AM
To: Richardson, Mike (CI-StPaul)
Subject: [18-067-973 Snelling Ave](#) Development Appeal

Mike,

My name is John Hoeschen and I resided at [1557 Osceola Ave, St. Paul, MN 55105](#). I am unable to attend the June 20th hearing regarding appeal of the conditional use permit for building height of the proposed [246-258 Snelling Avenue](#) development project and would like to log a few comments via email.

First off, I am in full support of development at this site as proposed and as approved. I own the property immediately north across St. Clair Ave. from the site, 232-[240 Snelling Avenue](#). I own and operate St. Paul Corner Drug, 240 Snelling Ave South. My property has a 40,000 kW solar array on the roof. There has been a lot of discussion regarding the possibility of this new building interfering with the solar production of this array. Even with the conditional use permit for the proposed height, there will be NO influence on my solar array. I wanted to weigh in on that topic because I have encountered neighbors arguing, on my behalf, concerned about my solar array, claiming that this new building will "shade" the array and decrease production. Know that I am not of that belief nor are they arguing that issue with my approval or suggestion.

Second, I gave up 3 prime in/out parking spots along the Snelling side of my property for the new A-Line BRT station. I would like to see it used at an increased capacity. A property such as proposed, I believe, would significantly increase the utilization of the A-Line station and promote the use of public transit.

Third and last, I have been watching the current parking lot and buildings deteriorate over the past 30 years and the site is "RIPE" for development and improvement. The most outspoken neighbors opposing this development don't live anywhere near the site. In fact, one of them claims she will have to look at the backside of this building from her back yard. She lives on Warwick Street and there is no way she could possibly see the building from her back yard. The structure would need to be 30 stories high for her to see it, over the trees. Another very outspoken individual lives within blocks of the Mississippi River on Fairmount Avenue, nearly 1 & 1/2 miles away. I know both of these parties, personally, and believe they are arguing against this project because they believe it will harm businesses like mine and other around the area. That is their opinion and not mine. I have made it clear to them that I am in favor of the development and I wanted to make clear to the committee that any arguments against the project that refer to my business and property, in my absence, do not come with my approval. These individuals are merely trying to whip up stories involving negative impact to nearly 100 year old businesses to support their opposition to advancement and development. I do not agree with them.

Thank you for your time and my wish is that the Planning Commission uphold their previous approval of the conditional use permit for building height on the development.

From: Jacob Huelster [mailto:jacobhuelster@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 14, 2018 3:52 PM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward2 <Ward2@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Cc: #CI-StPaul_Ward3 <Ward3@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Subject: Snelling & St. Clair Development

I am writing today to support the proposed development at Snelling and St. Clair. I wrote in a month ago, before the Zoning Committee meeting May 10th, but am writing again in light of the appeal filed by the group "Neighbors for Responsible Development" and the upcoming hearing on June 20th.

New buildings like this are critical tools to combat the housing shortage that Saint Paul is experiencing. This one in particular has been planned in the most responsible way possible. It creates 118 new dwelling units on a patch of land that currently has none. It's on a major transit corridor. It's within walking distance of two colleges and a variety of retail and restaurants. It's a vision for a more economically and environmentally positive future for our city.

I live in ward 2, though I have deep ties to the Mac-Grove neighborhood. My grandparents met at Macalaster and lived for more than 50 years on Amherst St while my grandfather was an english professor at Mac. Both my parents went to Macalaster as well, as well as multiple uncles. I think that this new development will be an excellent addition to the neighborhood, and it will serve the area well. Snelling and St. Clair are two busy, business-lined streets. Both feature bus lines. Placing a taller building directly on the intersection makes sense, and positively affects the neighborhood character. An added plus will be all the new neighbors we will get to meet!

Thank you for your time.

Jacob Huelster
[246 Stevens St W](http://246StevensStW.com)
[Saint Paul MN 55107](http://SaintPaulMN55107.com)

From: jmhjmd@aol.com [mailto:jmhjmd@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2018 9:47 AM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward3 <Ward3@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Subject: St. Clair / Snelling Development

Please vote in favor of this project.

I have lived in St. Paul for almost 40 of my 67 years, from the Rondo neighborhood of the early 1950s to Mac-Groveland since the 1980s. I've watched it change greatly over that time, sometimes successfully, sometimes foolishly. Until very recently, our population growth and tax base were stagnant while the demand for city-supplied services grew. We have come close to collapse at times. So, I was sorry to see Michelle Berg's Viewpoint [Villager] on the St. Clair/Snelling project recently approved by the St. Paul Planning Commission, not because she opposes the project but because of the mindset it displays. Development need not be a matter of neighbor against developer, particularly in this case.

It seems to me that Jim LaValle listened carefully to neighborhood concerns and made legitimate efforts to address those concerns while still keeping the project viable. Given Ms. Berg's complaints, it's unlikely Mr. LaValle's group could have done anything to placate Ms. Berg short of abandoning the project. I, for one, am happy to see the current buildings fall to be replaced by higher density housing that will boost our property tax base, particularly at a time when our local taxes are increasing at a ridiculous pace.

Ms. Berg objects to the fact a conditional use permit may be granted based on what she believes are the developer's financial goals. The developer could have achieved the same square footage by staying within the current height limits. But that would have resulted in exactly the type of monolithic structure so many objected to earlier. That was addressed by stepping back successive stories, among other things. The increased height (in the area closest to a non-residential building) made a CUP necessary to allow

the builder to accommodate neighborhood concerns and still make the numbers work.

We cannot remain a city of bungalows forever. We must accept vertical growth in order that our homes remain affordable and that we can maintain the services we've demanded over the decades. It's that or start trimming those services now, before those of us on fixed incomes are squeezed out of our homes by rising prices and the resulting tax increases.

James M. Hamilton
1310 Osceola Ave.

Mac-Groveland

From: Michaela Ahern [mailto:michaela.ahern@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2018 10:03 AM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward3 <Ward3@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Subject: Support for development at Snelling and St Clair

Good morning Councilmember Tolbert,

I am writing to express my support for the proposed development at Snelling and St Clair. I think this is exactly the kind of development that should be occurring on high frequency transit lines. Additionally, it's proximity to Macalester is a great asset.

Michaela Ahern

[864 St Paul Ave](#)

[St Paul, MN 55116](#)

From: Jason DeBoer-Moran [mailto:newcoventry@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2018 12:56 PM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward2 <Ward2@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Cc: #CI-StPaul_Ward3 <Ward3@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Subject: LaValle Development at St. Clair and Snelling

Greetings, Councilmember Noecker.

I am writing to you today to voice my support for the LaValle Development at St. Clair and Snelling. It is a relief to see a smart project like this come to this corner after years of wondering what will become of this intersection. I appreciate the attention the developer has given to the streetscape and the work they have done to create a similar pedestrian experience as nearby buildings. I understand there are concerns regarding the Conditional Use Permit requested by the developer. The CUP requested will allow exactly the kind of developments that should be happening along significant transit thoroughfares in our city. The additional height will allow more residential space for families and those looking to age in place in our community.

Those opposing this CUP seem to be indicating that the conditional use is somehow detrimental to the existing character of the immediate neighborhood or safety and health. I do not see how this is the case. The immediate vicinity is currently a parking lot and a strip mall. The buildings across the street are similar in pedestrian style, and when you take into account the billboards above St. Paul Corner Drug, they are of a similar height.

I look forward to living the rest of my life in a city that is accommodating to the needs of our aging neighbors and that encourages the use of the transit resources that have been allocated. This development is exactly the type of development that I hope to see occurring along Snelling, Marshall Avenue, and West Seventh in the future.

Thank you for your consideration,

Jason DeBoer-Moran

961 Eleanor Avenue

St. Paul, MN 55102

From: Melissa Floyd [mailto:mofloyd21@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2018 1:26 PM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward3 <Ward3@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Subject: St. Clair & Snelling Development - Yes

Councilman Tolbert,

This is just a quick note to show support of the proposed development at St. Clair & Snelling. Our family is unable to make tonight's meeting, but fully supports adding affordable housing to this neighborhood.

We are active bikers, walkers, public transit users. We welcome development that encourages economic growth for our small business neighbors. The focus on parking and neighborhood "character" being put above the need for housing is frustrating to watch.

My husband and I were long time renters in St. Paul before buying a home in MacGrove. Our long term plan is to return to renting or buying a condo when our kids are older. I question our ability to stay in St. Paul at the rate of projects being turned down or downsized. My husband has been a SPPS teacher for 20 years. I manage a small business located in St. Paul. We are incredibly vested in seeing growth for the city we love.

I hope you support this project and the long-term growth plans our city deserves.

Thank you for your time!

Melissa Floyd

[1450 Juliet Ave](#)

Dear City Council,

I am homeowner who lives a few blocks from the proposed development at Snelling & Saint Clair. (The fact that I am a homeowner should give my opinion no greater weight than a renter, but it seems important to some people) I oppose the appeal and wholeheartedly support the project. I testified at the Mac-Groveland HLU hearing but can not attend tonight.

The city needs this project. The neighborhood needs this project. Comments submitted by others including Jeff Christensen, Rob Wales, Hilary Frazey, Brian Martinson, and Will Totten summarize the arguments well.

We need more housing. It's no more massive than that ugly dorm I lived in at Summit & Snelling, a half mile to the north. Let's get this done.

--

Elizabeth Wefel
444 Warwick Street

Saint Paul, MN 55105