

Dear Council Members:

Each of you should have received this email, and now, I am sending to the group.

My in-laws are Mike and Phyl Tierney. As you may know, their home and adjacent property, both under their ownerships for many decades, is for sale, and a small group of people have tried to block such a sale, deeming that the city should step in to declare it be made part of the historical district, forbidding it be sold to someone who may demo it for the purposes of building new, more energy efficient residents.

It seems clear to many that their properties have been unfairly targeted by this small faction.

Since the mid 60's, Mike and Phyl did the best they could to maintain very old homes, now beyond repair in many buyers' opinion.

It seems to have attracted a developer or two, but this small group is doing their best to run them off, claiming this home should be "saved" or "preserved" for their historical value to the neighborhood. This is a very unreasonable wish, fiscally speaking. Furthermore, and with due respect, what business is it of theirs?

Mike and Phyl now live in a retirement community because 1905 was no longer safe for them to live in. The home is terribly inefficient, from an energy consumption standpoint, and the cost to update all the utilities would make any such restoration project unfeasible.

Should this developer choose to erect new housing for other families to live in, why should anyone feel it is within their rights to intervene? Letting a small group of neighbors dictate city policy, and set precedence for other property owners to be targeted in the future is not fair to any property owner. What about the property values of those remaining in this neighborhood, should their home become part of the "historical district?" I suspect demand would decline, as would the associated values of those homes. How is that fair to those property owners?

If the developer replaced 1905 and/or [1911](#) with new, efficient (green) homes, the city will certainly make sure the new structure(s) are built to local and state codes through the permit process. This is one such role of the city, the support of providing stability to property values, as well as providing safe homes in which people may live and raise families. But for the city to step in and mandate that a home be placed into a historical district, all at the whim of a small group of people who want things to "remain the same" for their own interest, well, that just isn't fair. They should not be able to impose their demands (wishes) against the freedoms allowed to Mike and Phyl Tierney as property owners.

Thank you for consideration. This is a matter of great importance, not just for the Tierney's, but for all those property owners who would be affected as well.

I urge you, please vote NO out of respect for all the property owners.

Respectfully,

Andy Holt

Dear Council,

I also sent this individually to all members...needed to make sure it got read by all and that you realize what you are doing if you take away my parents rights regarding their home.

Please do not do this to my aging parents...

Please...they have owned and lived in this family home since July 1965!

They have raised 9 children working two jobs to make ends meet.

My father is too proud to have ever asked anyone (including the government) for help.

We lived frugally and they were very good parents to us all.

My dad has always had to do all his own work on the home and in his old age had trouble keeping it up both physically and financially.

He is a very proud man...would not accept help or handouts...

We convinced them to move to the Highlands because the home is unsafe to live in.

They need the money from the sale to live what is left of their lives...please let them sell this to the buyer who has plans to tear it down because that is what it is...a tear down.

We would be happy to walk you through it if you would like...see for yourself...please let them sell.

This small contingent of people(who most don't even live in the neighborhood!) already chased away one very good offer. No "rehab" offers have been given! Because they all know it is a tear down.

It was over heard at the community meeting that some want to do this to drive the price down...this is so unfair to my elderly parents...this is their retirement/rent money!

How can you all believe this is ok to do to a war veteran and model citizen who is now in his last years and needs this money to pay his rent.

This is so incredibly sad...Ms Berres has even called my dad and harassed him...he has dementia...please just do what is right here...

PLEASE VOTE NO to the moratorium.

sincerely,

Jean Holt

From: tdmauer@aol.com [<mailto:tdmauer@aol.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, March 20, 2018 3:19 PM

To: #CI-StPaul_Ward4 <Ward4@ci.stpaul.mn.us>

Subject: RES 18-455

Hello Ms. Henningson,

I am writing to voice my strong opposition to your proposal of a moratorium on lot splits & demo permits for the Merriam Park neighborhood. As a life-long resident of St Paul, I feel this is NOT needed as our city already has a procedure in place for situations such as this.

As a daughter of the owners of 2 properties on the list of properties that are affected by your proposal, I must tell you we feel we are being unfairly singled out - targeted if you will - by your moratorium proposal. As I mentioned earlier, St Paul has procedures in place for situations just like this and we have followed them, only to be blind-sided by your proposal. We have heard from many owners and residents in the area that feel the same way - this moratorium is NOT needed. Please reconsider your vote on this issue. Remember, you are there to represent and protect the rights of ALL residents in your district, not just the special interest groups.

Thank you for your time, and I welcome your feedback.
Teresa (Tierney) Mauer

From: COLLEEN BOECKMAN [<mailto:boeckman.coleen@comcast.net>]
Sent: Tuesday, March 20, 2018 3:47 PM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward4 <Ward4@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Subject: RES-455 Merriam Park Heritage Preservation District

Hello Samantha,

Regarding 1905 Iglehart Ave. The house is not habitable. Why not let the property owners get what they can out of it. They are an older couple that need this income. This is their retirement money. They have had reasonable offers that backed out because of a small group of the Union Park. Why is the council trying to take away the property owners rights? I am confused and sad for the owners. By the way the owners are the nicest people you could ever meet. Please reply as to why should the rights of the property owner be taken away. Thank You for your time.

Coleen Boeckman

From: tdmauer@aol.com [<mailto:tdmauer@aol.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, March 20, 2018 4:17 PM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward1
Subject: RES-18-455

Hello Mr Thao,

I realize this city resolution by Ms.Henningson - a moratorium on lot splits and demo permits in Ward 4 - only affects a small number of property owners that are not in your ward, but I am concerned about the precedence this moratorium could set for the City of St. Paul, and hope you will reconsider your "yes" vote on this.

From what I understand, a small but vocal group is trying to prevent a property owner from improving their property. Why is the City Council involved? There are procedures already set up in the City of Saint Paul to handle situations just like this. Why is this group being allowed to circumvent the rules and take away property owners rights?

Thank you for your time,
Teresa Mauer

From: Jake Rueter [<mailto:jake.rueter@gmail.com>]
Sent: Saturday, March 24, 2018 12:27 PM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward4 <Ward4@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Cc: Kantner, Libby (CI-StPaul) <libby.kantner@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Subject: Opposition to Housing Moratorium

Dear Councilmember Henningson,

My name is Jake Rueter and I am a home owner in Ward 4. I'm writing today to express my opposition to the proposed development moratorium in Merriam Park.

Our city and region is in the midst of a housing crisis and Saint Paul needs to be a leader in developing more housing, especially in transit-rich areas like Merriam Park.

Moratoriums increase housing costs, block people from becoming part of the fabric of our community, and increase our city's environmental footprint. If Saint Paul is serious about being a welcoming community and leader in the fight against climate change, then we must not pass moratoriums like this one.

With respect,

Jake Rueter
13XX Blair Ave

From: Dan Kolar [<mailto:dan@crdnofmn.com>]
Sent: Sunday, March 25, 2018 7:46 PM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward4 <Ward4@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Subject: 1954 Iglehart

Samantha,

Thank you for the letter and your work with the City Council. I'd be interested to see more info on the 1983 study but the map was not included in the letter that was sent. I live at 1954 with my wife and 4 young children. We love the neighborhood and hope to be here for a long time. The proposals for development are concerning but stopping them by deeming properties historically significant is more concerning. I cannot attend the meeting as I have conflicts on both dates. The following are my thoughts. I specially oppose my home falling into this category for the following reasons.

1. 1954 has been significantly modified from the original structure. There have been numerous additions out in as well as much reconstruction. It was turned from a single family home to a 5 unit building. Unfortunately much of the woodwork, character, originality was lost in these redevelopments. It is far from the home it was originally built as.
2. Our homes are investments. My property taxes skyrocketed this year, street assessments cost over \$2k a yr, and yet the city service do not improve as we pay more and more every year in city fees. For families who have young children the city is making it unaffordable to live in these neighborhoods. This property will be less valuable with a historical designation. Repairs and improvements will be much more expensive and complicated. Soon the only ones who can afford to live in this neighborhood are landlords who rent it out, developers who want to tear it down, or older retired folks. Long gone are the days of younger families living here together.

In conclusion I want to say I hope we live in this neighborhood until our kids are grown and we can then pass this amazing building on to them to live in and care for. I am invested here but it's an investment and this historical designation threatens the value of our investment and that is concerning. Thank you for your time.

--

Dan Kolar

From: T Mauer [<mailto:tdmauer@aol.com>]
Sent: Monday, April 09, 2018 4:06 PM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward6 <Ward6@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Subject: Please vote NO on RES 18-455

Dear Councilmember Bostrom,

My name is Teresa Tierney Mauer and I am a daughter of Michael and Phyllis Tierney, owners of 1905 & 1911 Iglehart Avenue in St. Paul. I attended the public hearing portion of the April 4th council meeting but did not speak. My brother, Mike Tierney spoke for our family but I felt compelled to write today to explain and counter some of the points brought up in the public hearing.

Mike shared the financial impact of the moratorium and temporary ordinance on our 89 year-old parents, and I'd like to explain further. The properties are adjacent and together total 3-1/2 lots. Unfortunately, the exterior, interior, and infrastructure of both of buildings are in bad shape, as the photos passed around to the Council during the meeting illustrated. Not many parcels like this come up for sale in St. Paul very often, so it's a unique opportunity to enhance the neighborhood and achieve many of the City Planning Commission's goals and needs of all residents. An opportunity in which 3 separate builders have submitted written offers to bring this to fruition in the 6 months we've had the properties on the market.

Our current offer is from a builder that wants to remove the deteriorating structures to build homes for new families, and he's willing to await your decision. However, if the moratorium goes into effect, this buyer will have no choice but to back out. Which means the City's action will directly add unplanned expense and result in 2 buildings in worse shape than when we started 6 months ago.

The first buyer withdrew his offer because of pressure from the community group behind this moratorium, and while we were awaiting his decision, the furnace gave out and the pipes and radiators froze. The second offer was well-below market value and the builder required a contract for deed. We have had 27 other walk-throughs without an offer, many citing an extraordinary rehab cost which would exceed their sale price in the Merriam Park neighborhood.

As my brother explained in the meeting, our parents now live in an assisted living facility. These properties are their retirement fund and their savings will be used to pay for their rent and medical care, rather than to fund the rehabilitation of these 2 structures to appease neighbors, resulting in money lost when the properties are sold.

What concerns us and other property owners is this urgent need for a moratorium. The "pro moratorium" side makes it sound like there are developers waiting to pounce on this neighborhood and tear down its historical structures. Of the 43 residences on the list, all of them are still standing.

A “pro-moratorium” speaker, Ms. Berres mentioned at last week’s meeting that she knew of multiple parties that would buy either property. Some of these parties have walked through them, but no one interested in rehabbing or moving the structures has submitted a viable offer.

Ms. Berres also suggested that 1905 Iglehart could be “donated.” As my brother mentioned, these properties fund my parents’ retirement plan. Their only income now is from Social Security and withdrawals from their rapidly diminishing IRA account to pay their monthly rent and medical expenses in addition to the taxes and utilities on these 2 deteriorating properties. I’m sorry but “donating” 1905 is not a viable option for my parents.

One interesting note from the 1983 Historic Sites Survey: on page 129, it says that Colonel John Merriam, the developer of the area, “sold lots and stipulated that the houses which were to be built has to cost at least \$1500 and that they had to be completed within 1 year of the purchase of the lot.” That’s it – no other stipulation on the type, style or size of the home. It just had to cost at least \$1,500, everything else was left to each individual property owner to decide what was right for their family. Everyone has the right to live in a home of their choosing – Victorian, Art Deco, Colonial, Craftsman, Mid-Century Modern, Tudor, etc. Why should the personal choice of a few loud voices override another’s? Colonel Merriam celebrated the individuality and creativity of our forefathers - shouldn’t we be allowed that same freedom now?

Our family feels singled out by this council’s actions, and that the ordinance was passed in an arbitrary and capricious manner. Further, we feel the historical preservation protection and pushing up the survey date is merely a pretext, and that the real reason for the zoning change request is that vocal, organized neighbors oppose the demolition because they do not want structures that they don’t like to be built on the properties. See: *State by Rochester Ass’n v. City of Rochester* 268 NW 2d 885 (Minn. 1978). The City of Saint Paul has procedures in place for situations just like this, and it has been working for years. I think Council Member Tolbert said it best when he said a moratorium should be used as “a last resort”, and this is not the time for last resorts.

To summarize –this moratorium is simply not needed. I urge you to please vote NO on RES-18-455 at the April 11th meeting.

Thank you for your time and again, please vote NO on resolution 18-455.

Teresa Tierney Mauer

Ronald G. Black
Sholly A. Blustin
Katherine M. Henning

Paralegals:
Darcy M. Wilke
Bridget M. Liljequist



BLACK LAW
Attorneys at Law

First National Financial Center
812 Main Street, Suite 102
Elk River, MN 55330

P: 763.441.7040
F: 763.441.0901
www.blacklawmn.com

10 April 2018

St. Paul City Council
310 City Hall
15 Kellogg Boulevard West
St. Paul, MN 55102

Re: Interim Ordinance Merriam Park
City Council File Number: 18-15

Dear City Council Members:

Please be advised that the undersigned law firm represents Mr. and Mrs. Michael Tierney, the owners of 1905 and 1911 Iglehart Avenue, St. Paul, Minnesota. This letter is being submitted in opposition to Interim Ordinance Merriam Park, City Council File No. 18-15. This interim ordinance is on the City Council's April 9, 2018 agenda for final adoption.

For the record, Mr. and Mrs. Tierney oppose the adoption of this interim ordinance as it serves no purpose other than to impose unnecessary restrictions on their properties that has, and continues to, interfere with their ability to sell those properties on the open market. As has been discussed in both community meetings and public hearings, the stated purpose of the interim ordinance is to maintain "the status quo in the boundaries of the potential Merriam Park Heritage Preservation District pending the completion of a report, recommendation and nomination to place the potential Merriam Park Heritage Preservation District on a register of historic places and possible amendments to the City's official controls for protecting historic properties". See: Legislative Details Report, p. 1 of 4. Initially, the interim ordinance was proposed as a complete moratorium on the City's issuance of zoning permits, demolition permits, site plans, lot splits, building permits, occupancy permits and/or plat approvals in the proposed Merriam Park Heritage Park Preservation District. Its scope was later scaled back to be a 9-month¹ moratorium on the issuance of demolition permits and/or lot splits approvals for the properties identified as possible entrants into the potential Merriam Park Heritage Preservation District. It was also apparently agreed that it would take the city's Heritage Preservation Commission up to 9 months to complete its report as to whether these identified properties qualify for protection as historic sites under the Historic Preservation chapter of the City's Comprehensive Plan.

¹ It is estimated that the Heritage Preservation Commission will take up to 9 months to complete its report as to whether these identified properties qualify for protection as historic sites.

The Interim Ordinance is Based on Pretext

What has been troubling throughout the journey of this interim ordinance is the fact that the debate has not been over the historic significance of the properties identified in the 1983 Historic Sites Survey of Saint Paul and Ramsey County (“1983 Study”). In fact, prior to December 2017, there has not been any significant discussion about a proposed Merriam Park Heritage Preservation District or about the historic value of the homes mentioned in the survey. The discussion focused on ways to prevent potential purchasers of homes in the Merriam Park area from developing those properties into multi-family homes, especially the Tierneys’ properties on Iglehart Avenue. Without having many legal options at their disposal to control the sale of neighboring properties to “acceptable” purchasers, these residents have turned to historic preservation laws as a gateway through which they can interfere with their neighbors’ ability to exercise their property rights. Creatively, they have tried to justify this interference by reaching back in time to the city’s 1983 Study and arguing that because the Tierneys’ properties are identified in that Study as having possible historic value, those properties (and others) now need immediate protection from potential purchasers who have development ideas that they do not approve of.² This point was driven home in a public meeting that was conducted on December 22, 2017 involving a potential purchaser of the Tierneys’ properties, Jon Schwartzman. At that meeting, which resulted in Mr. Schwartzman cancelling his purchase agreement with our clients, a long time Merriam Park resident was quoted as saying that “Our neighborhood is just saturated with sober housing, and student housing and apartments... We want single-family homes.” F. Melo, “Developer has big plans for St. Paul’s Merriam Park, amid controversy”, St. Paul Pioneer Press, December 23, 2017.

This point was recently confirmed by George Gause of the Heritage Preservation Commission³ (“HPC”). According to Mr. Gause, the HPC did not have the protection of these properties as being high on their historical preservation agenda. Instead, he said that they only became an issue because community advocacy groups were making a lot of noise over the demolition permits that have been applied for by potential purchasers of affected properties, most notably the properties owned by Mr. and Mrs. Tierney. As such, the HPC’s action in support of the interim ordinance is actually the result of community opposition to the ***actions of potential property buyers***, not the preservation of properties that were identified as possible historic resources some 35 years ago. Therefore, since the interim ordinance is not based on something more concrete than neighborhood opposition and only represents an expression of concern for the public safety and welfare of the Merriam Park community, it does not satisfy the requirements for an interim ordinance as set in Minn. Stat. §462.355, subd. 4. See: Naegele Outdoor Advertising Co. v. Village of Minnetonka, 162 N.W.2d 206, 209 (1968); Chanhassen Estates Residents Association v. City of Chanhassen, 342 N.W.2d 335, 340 (Minn.1984); Chase v. City of Minneapolis, 401 N.W.2d 408, 412 (Minn.App.1987) (the City’s action in denying a zoning permit must be based on something more “concrete than neighborhood opposition and

² No Seller of an affected property has applied for a demolition permit in recent months.

³ Mr. Gause spoke at the March 28, 2018 community meeting regarding the subject interim ordinance.

expressions of concern for public safety and welfare.”); Wedemeyer v. City of Minneapolis, 540 N.W.2d 539 (Minn. Ct. App. 1995)

The Interim Ordinance Only Perpetuates Confusion

Beyond the pretextual basis of the interim ordinance, it should be noted that the city’s legislative report was not accurate when it concluded that an interim ordinance was needed because “...the City’s heritage preservation ordinance presently lacks a process or procedure for demolition delay or interim protection which could provide protection to historic resources during the lengthy designation process for properties which are nominated or eligible for historic designation.” As noted above, the affected properties in this case have been subject to possible historic designation for 35 years, yet the City has done nothing to follow up on the study and/or protect said properties. Now, the City wants to affirm an interim ordinance that would impose only upon these specific properties a nine-month moratorium on the issuance of demolition and/or lot splitting permits because the “City’s heritage preservation ordinance presently lacks a process or procedure for demolition delay or interim protection which could provide protection to historic resources during the lengthy designation process for properties which are nominated or eligible for historic designation.” See: City of St. Paul Legislation Details Report for Ord 18-15, p. 2.

More specifically, the interim ordinance seeks to extend the HPC’s powers under Minn. Stat. §462.355, subd. 4 and City Code Ch. 73 so that it can have control over properties being permitted for demolition, but which are not located within an actual historic district by granting the HPC with the power to maintain the “status quo in the boundaries of the potential Merriam Park Heritage Preservation District pending the completion of a report, recommendation and nomination to place the potential Merriam Park Heritage Preservation District on a register of historic places and possible amendments to the City’s official controls for protecting historic properties.”

This amendment as presented fails for a number of reasons. First, in order for this interim ordinance to be valid it must conform to the requirements of Minn. Stat. §462.355, subd. 4(a) which states in relevant part:

If a municipality is **conducting studies or has authorized a study to be conducted or has held or has scheduled a hearing** for the purpose of considering adoption or amendment of a comprehensive plan or official controls as defined in section 462.352, subdivision 15, or if new territory for which plans or controls have not been adopted is annexed to a municipality, the governing body of the municipality may adopt an interim ordinance applicable to all or part of its jurisdiction for the purpose of protecting the planning process and the health, safety and welfare of its citizens....

Id.

As the bolded text in the aforementioned statute indicates, a municipality is authorized to issue interim ordinances if it is “conducting studies or has authorized a study to be conducted.” In this

case, the city of St. Paul has not authorized nor is it not conducting a study with respect to the “potential Merriam Park Heritage Preservation District”. Instead, it has reached into the past and pulled out a survey from 1983 and a context study from 2001 and is trying to substitute those documents for the immediate study that is required by the statute. In other words, the statute ties the need for an interim ordinance to the immediacy of a study. It does not grant the city the extraordinary power to pass an interim ordinance when the basis for that exercise of power is the city’s failure to timely act upon a 35-year-old survey of possible historic resources. Since this interim ordinance is not tied to an immediate study or an authorization to conduct such a study, it does not conform to the requirements of Minn. Stat. §462.335, subd.4. See: League of Minnesota Cities Information Memo: Subdivision Guide for Cities, December 14, 2017, p. 11 (An interim ordinance may be adopted only for one of the following circumstances where a city chooses to do the following actions: (1) Conducts studies on the issue, (2) Authorizes conducting a study...).

This distinction has not been lost by the HPC as is evident in their purposed changes to city code Ch. 73, wherein they have recognized in purposed §73.104(t) the following definition for “interim protection”: Protection from demolition or alteration given to a nominated property or district following the commission’s decision to commence a designation study. Again, the immediacy between interim ordinances and the need to protect pending studies is quite clear. If the city passes the interim ordinance currently pending, it will be passing an ordinance that will conflict with the modifications to Ch. 73 as currently proposed by HPC.

Why Change What is Currently Working?

Finally, a very simple question should be asked. Give the stated difficulties with the proposed interim ordinance, why pass it into law when the current system is working as designed? The answer, you should not do so. Members of the Merriam Park community do not want neighboring properties sold to developers who are interested in building multi-family homes even if those properties are zoned for such a use. Currently, the city of St. Paul has in place a process for granting or denying demolition permits on a case by case basis. That process has worked to defeat the last two (2) demolition permit applications that have been submitted by potential purchasers of 1905 and 1911 Iglehart Avenue. To act now and pass an interim ordinance that conflicts with both state law and the HPC’s proposed changes to Ch. 73, let alone interferes with a process that is actually working within city government, does not appear to be a logical pathway to follow in order to resolve the underlying issues in this matter.

On behalf of our clients, we respectfully request that you vote down RES 18-15 at the April 10, 2018 city council meeting.

Very Truly Yours,

BLACK LAW

By: _____

Sholly A. Blustin

From: Heidi Schallberg [<mailto:heidils@gmail.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2018 11:33 PM

To: #CI-StPaul_Ward4 <Ward4@ci.stpaul.mn.us>; #CI-StPaul_Ward3 <Ward3@ci.stpaul.mn.us>; Kantner, Libby (CI-StPaul) <libby.kantner@ci.stpaul.mn.us>; McMahon, Melanie (CI-StPaul) <Melanie.McMahon@ci.stpaul.mn.us>

Subject: Do not do a Merriam Park moratorium

Council Members Henningson and Tolbert,

I understand the logic behind the idea of a short-term moratorium to address potentially historic properties in a systematic way rather than using city resources over and over again as proposals come forward. Intellectually, I get it.

However, I was concerned when I read comments from the family of the owners of the properties at 1905 and 1911 Iglehart Avenue that were posted as part of a recent Council meeting packet. The Star Tribune article today sealed my concern.

While the city may have the ability to enact a moratorium, as the elected officials charged with that decision, I ask you to consider whether people are the top priority in this city, or if property is. If people are, then property owners should be able to sell their property as they need to in order to meet their own needs. If property is paramount, well... I guess that will just be that family's problem to figure out how to pay for their parents' care and living expenses while also having to maintain properties they need to sell. I sure wouldn't want to be in that situation myself, and I wouldn't wish that on anyone else. I ask you to not pick property over people.

Add this situation to the housing crunch we have. Livable cities are for people first. People need safe, affordable housing, whether they rent or own. If we lose sight of that, we have failed as fellow human beings.

Please allow the Tierney family to sell their properties. If a developer wants to buy them and build more housing, well, we desperately need it.

The word "character" gets tossed around a lot in St. Paul. It's a nebulous term in most contexts. It's being used in this context. A friend of mine has made the observation that character is how we treat other people. Please show your character. Please show the character of a livable city that cares about people first. Don't pass a moratorium in Merriam Park.

Sincerely,

Heidi Schallberg

706 MRB S #204 (a renter acutely aware of the housing shortage for my fellow renters, who all too often aren't heard enough by City Hall)

April 11, 2018

Dear Councilmembers:

I am a son-in-law to Mike and Phyllis Tierney and reside in Illinois. I wrote to you on March 20th, expressing some of my views in opposition to the adoption of the interim ordinance. As well, I was present at the council meeting which took place one week ago today.

Others are better suited to express legal precedents in opposition to the interim ordinance, but I implore you to consider the financial burden you will place on two long-term residence of that neighborhood, should you adopt such an ordinance.

I am an outsider to Minnesota, but through my 33 years of being married into this family, one thing has resonated with me more than any other. These folks, Mike and Phyllis, represent all that is good about the people of Minnesota. The term "**Minnesota Nice**" **gets thrown** around often, and I've **found the** people in your community to be just that, and Mike and Phyl are of wonderful example of the good people of your community.

It seems so contrary that you would prevent them due consideration as they sell the only asset(s) they have in order to properly fund their later years. The proceeds from such a sale are not earmarked for extravagant, selfish purchases, rather for their own basic and necessary sustainability.

No doubt, St. Paul is a welcoming place, full of kind people. Its diversity is supported by its core values of being accepting and inclusive. So, it stuck me as "**exclusive and unaccepting**" **when listening** to those in support of the moratorium, many of whom expressed concerns for their own personal benefit. 1905 Iglehart is beyond any reasonable restoration, at least from a fiscally-responsible standpoint. Should it be sold to a developer, and new homes constructed, allowing new families to move into the neighborhood, **wouldn't this be more in line with St. Paul's** core values? **Don't** young families deserve the same opportunity to live in this beautiful neighborhood, raise their families, attend the local schools, enjoying all the neighborhood has to offer? I can't imagine the council shares the view of one of the primary supporters of this moratorium who stated publicly the following: "**For me, it's** more important to save the character of a city than to have another 10,000 people live here." The character of this neighborhood is more about its residence, and future residence, than an old dilapidated structure.

Lastly, to know Mike and Phyllis, please consider that, over the years, they have taken nothing from others, rather proudly earned whatever they have, all on their own. I believe this way of life represents the goodness of your community. The **don't take handouts, don't ask anything of others, and have lived** their lives decently and by the rules. Whenever offered help, they proudly deny any assistance from family, and assure us they are doing just fine. So, they are not going to take money or assistance from a generous family member, that is beyond question, as their pride and dignity has guided them to live by their own means, and not a dime beyond that. In all the years I've **been around them**, when I have been fortunate enough to convince them **we'd like to** take them out for dinner, it would result in watching them order water, share an entrée, and decline dessert or coffee. They are modest, humble and proud, and most of all, very kind people. They are true examples of Minnesota Nice!

Please consider these fine people of your community as you make your decision on this day.

Respectfully,
Andy Holt

Re; RES18-455 Merriam Park Heritage Preservation District

Dear Councilmembers,

Please vote no to the moratorium RES-18-455. It does not make sense to have a moratorium. It is obvious that 1905 and 1911 are being singled out and it is a shame to what the small group of neighbors are doing to the property owners. Please help! Vote No!

Coleen Boeckman