

From: Fred Foster
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2016 9:43 AM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward4
Subject: Green Line Zoning Proposal

Hi Russ,

Aside from the differences of opinion regarding the true purpose of this ordinance, I believe a basic error has been overlooked that needs to be addressed before further action can be taken.

As it has been presented, the proposed ordinance creates a new zoning category of "accessory dwelling", which is inconsistent with the definition of "accessory use" as currently defined in the city zoning laws. Therefore, for this proposal to be considered, it must either re-define the meaning of "accessory" as used in the zoning language, or it must re-name the new category "additional dwelling", which is the correct term for the proposed new use.

Sec. 65.910 of the Zoning Code makes it clear that an accessory use is a use different from the primary use. Similarly, if you own two cars you can call one of them your "accessory motor vehicle" but in reality you have two cars. They can be a different color, make and model, but you still have two cars. Two dwellings are two dwellings.

If an alternative, appropriate place can be found for incorporating "additional dwellings" into the zoning laws, important questions can then be asked about why the Planning Commission is making this proposal. For example:

- How will the city create urban density with a small number of small houses in back yards scattered around the Green Line?
- How will the city provide affordable housing with private property owners charging whatever rent they want, and choosing whom to rent their dwelling to?

Thank you Russ, for considering these points when reviewing the purpose and appropriateness of the Planning Commission's proposal.

Regards,
Fred Foster