

Hello- I am a concerned resident of highland park. I recently bought s house here in highland after trying to find a home here for 4 years. My husband and I are both working professionals who work in downtown Minneapolis and could have easily stayed in Minneapolis or moved to any number of small suburb communities, but we wanted to move into the charming neighborhood of highland park without all the congestion and noise. Sis t paul offers a true community and neighborhood that us millennials crave. We are very concerned about the city planning committee and its desire to actually listen to the residents. As millennials, it is very important to us that we aren't just told "we hear you" but action is taken to reflect our concerns and complete transparency is provided. So I have included my request below.

If you are planning on voting for the zoning change to T3, please reconsider. I think this city and its citizens deserve better, more thoughtful planning.

I oppose the zoning change to T3 zoning that La Cesse Company is requesting for their building proposal at Snelling and St. Clair. Their proposal is too large for the site and too tall at 55 feet. It does not allow for adequate green space, does not appear to have a set back from the sidewalk and does not really replace the lost retail space. The area already has parking and congestion issues and the plan does not provide enough parking for the amount of units or the retail space. I have also not seen any specific numbers on the expected capacity of the rental units. It is my understanding that each bedroom can legally house 2 people, so the maximum number of people and vehicles depends on the size of each unit and that needs to be taken into consideration when planning. You cannot assume that a 2 or 3 bedroom unit will only have 2 or 3 residents. It could have 4 or 6. In the interest of transparency, you need to take the maximum capacity of a building into account when projecting the impact on traffic, safety and parking needs. This proposed building dwarfs the surrounding homes and buildings and is totally at odds with St. Paul's Comprehensive Plan to preserve and promote existing neighborhoods. Certainly a more modest building of 2 or 3 stories with some retail would be much more compatible with the neighborhood. People want to live in St. Paul because of its neighborhoods, T3 zoning at this site and others that are being proposed is threatening to destroy the uniqueness of St. Paul's greatest asset-its neighborhoods.

I hope you take my vote to oppose this into consideration and vote to oppose the zoning change.

Please let me know that this letter was received.(there are a couple different web addresses)

Sincerely,
Maggie LaNasa
17xx Bohland Ave, Saint Paul, MN 55116.

Dear Council Members,

I am currently a citizen of Highland Park and have been a citizen of Macalester Groveland and Highland Park for the past 50 plus years.

I am writing to you to let you know that I oppose the zoning change to T3 zoning that La Cesse Company is requesting for their building proposal at Snelling and St. Clair. Their proposal is too large for the site and too tall at 55 feet. It does not allow for adequate green space, does not appear to have a set back from the sidewalk and does not really replace the lost retail space. The area already has parking and congestion issues and the plan does not provide enough parking for the amount of units or the retail space. I have also not seen any specific numbers on the expected capacity of the rental units. It is my understanding that each bedroom can legally house 2 people, so the maximum number of people and vehicles depends on the size of each unit and that needs to be taken into consideration when planning. You cannot assume that a 2 or 3 bedroom unit will only have 2 or 3 residents. It could have 4 or 6. In the interest of transparency, you need to take the maximum capacity of a building into account when projecting the impact on traffic, safety and parking needs. This proposed building dwarfs the surrounding homes and buildings and is totally at odds with St. Paul's Comprehensive Plan to preserve and promote existing neighborhoods. Certainly a more modest building of 2 or 3 stories with some retail would be much more compatible with the neighborhood. People want to live in St. Paul because of its neighborhoods, T3 zoning at this site and others that are being proposed is threatening to destroy the uniqueness of St. Paul's greatest asset-its neighborhoods.

If you are planning on voting for the zoning change to T3, please reconsider. I think this city and its citizens deserve better, more thoughtful planning.

Please let me know that this letter was received.(there are a couple different web addresses)

Sincerely,
Anne McQuillan
13xx Pinehurst Avenue
St. Paul, Mn 55116

Dear Councilmembers,

I am a citizen of Highland Park and am writing to let you know that **I oppose the zoning change to T3 zoning** that is being requested by the La Cesse Company for the building proposal at Snelling and St. Clair Avenue. I feel that the proposed building is out of scale and character for the neighbor (at about 5 1/2 stories). It allows for minimal green space and only accommodates a limited amount of retail space.

I would much prefer to see a more modest building (or even the option of two buildings) with fewer stories, that would include added green space to keep more with the character of the neighborhood.

I would ask that you consider this request in your plans.

Sincerely,
Jan Martland
12xx Bayard Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55116

May 13, 2017

Members of the Saint Paul City Council,

Please review this letter and other attachments pertaining to the development proposal for Snelling and St. Clair. We have previously submitted a letter of opposition to the T3 zoning, however, at this time, we have additional information we wish to bring forward. Again, we want to be clear that we support a reasonable development of this property, but we strongly object to the granting of the T3 zoning request for the reasons cited in our previous letter and for the following reasons:

There has been misrepresentation in the documentation and tallying of citizen letters. In reference to the interpretation and tallying of citizen letters, the Chairman of the St. Paul Zoning Board indicated that unless a citizen's opposition letter specifically stated that they did not want the zoning change, their letter may not have been tallied in the category of letters opposing the zoning change. Careful review of all letters submitted reveals that of the 47 people opposing the project in writing, 9 people specifically stated that they were opposed to the T3 zoning, a change of zoning, or a rezoning of the property. Interestingly, the converse reasoning was not applied when tallying the letters that were in favor of the rezoning. Of the 21 letters of support, only 1 person actually stated that they were in favor of the T3 zoning change. ***On the Summary Report submitted to the Planning Commission, it was stated that there were 26 letters in favor of the zoning change and 24 letters opposed. In addition, a careful review of all letters indicates that there was a total of 21 letters in favor of the proposed development and a total of 47 letters that are opposed. We feel that there has been a misrepresentation in the documentation and tallying of these letters.*** Please see the information below and the attachments for additional documentation regarding these letters. The letters can be reviewed in their entirety on the St. Paul Government website.

LETTERS OF OPPOSITION

⁹ people specifically state opposition of the T3 zoning or to a change in zoning. (C. Nippoldt, K. McGuire, D. McGuire, C. Burke, J. Burke, Zoff, Hubble, Bylander, Bostrom).

- 13 people state that 55 feet or 5 1/2 stories is too high and/or they would prefer a building with 2, 3, or 4 floors. (Maloney-Vinz, Earl, Moseley, Shirilla, R. Edlund, B. Edlund, Powell, M. Allers, K. Allers, Bevins, Mr. and Mrs. Childers, Bell)
- 16 people state they are opposed to the height, density, size, scale, or mass of the proposed building/want something more in keeping with the scale of the neighborhood (S. Ryan, B. Ryan, Flanagan, Hildebrand, A. Nippoldt, Heath, Koehler, Wilmes, Ziebarth, Anderson, Fabel, Hall, M. McCallum, D. McCallum, Kerr, Dean)
- 7 people state opposition based on the poor design/aesthetics/lack of green space (Gannon, Peterson, Berg, Libbus, Demming, Pfankuch, Osen)
- 2 people demonstrated uncertainty/unclarity pertaining to how many stories T3 or 55 feet will allow, or they state that 55' should be the maximum but ask for a smaller building. (Nortrom, Arnosti)

47 TOTAL

LETTERS OF SUPPORT

- 1 person specifically stated favor of T3 zoning and supported the 55 foot height and the CUP (61.5'). (Buck)
- 3 person mentioned they are okay with 55 feet or (61.5 feet) but do not mention zoning or T3 zoning. (Gilbert, Downes, Henderson))
- 9 people support the project but mention some concern or reservation regarding some aspect of the proposal such as green space, bike parking, provision for cars, safety, aesthetics, etc. (O'Gara, Hauser, Hood, Christiansen, Wherley, Zaayer, Ledger, Cruz, Sonn). None of these mention zoning or T3 zoning.
- 5 people offer general support of the project but do not mention anything specific pertaining to the size or zoning. (Noble, Wilsey, Wales, Janisch, Willis.)
- 3 people demonstrate uncertainty/unclarity pertaining to how many stories T3 or 55 feet will allow (Todd, Dr. & Mrs. Walinga)

21 TOTAL

ADDITIONAL LETTERS/NOT COMPUTED IN TOTALS

- 1 letter of inquiry (Jorgenson)
- 1 letter did not clearly state support or opposition (Mason)

There has been misinterpretation of the sentiment expressed in the citizen letters. 16 of the 47 letters of opposition use terminology such as “the building is too tall”, “it is too long”, “it is too massive”, and “the scale does not fit the neighborhood”. It should be clear that these letters are objecting to the size allowed by T3 zoning, and their letters should be considered to be in opposition of the zoning change as well. Instead, many of these letters were not counted as being opposed to the rezoning.

There is a general lack of understanding of the term “mixed-use” that should be resolved before zoning amendment adoption. This confusion was expressed by members of the Macalester-Groveland District Council Land Use Committee on April 26th, and it was expressed by members of the St. Paul Zoning Board at the April 13th hearing. When the mixed-use question was raised, a member of the Zoning Board commented that the LeCesse Company should not be penalized when the city has not specifically defined the requirements for “mixed-use” in the zoning code. **This confusion should be resolved and a clear interpretation of the defined term should be made *BEFORE zoning changes are considered or granted.***

There is a lack of transparency in, and adherence to, the zoning amendment process. Minnesota Statute Section 462.357 Subd. 3. states “No zoning ordinance or amendment thereto shall be adopted until a public hearing has been held thereon by the planning agency or governing body.” Although public hearings have been held on the development of specific parcels, the zoning study for South Snelling Avenue has not yet been adopted, nor has it been presented at a public hearing. The first public hearing on that zoning study is scheduled for May 19, 2017. ***The fact that individual parcels of land are being rezoned to the new standard before there has been a public hearing on that zoning study runs against the intent of this statutory requirement.*** Furthermore, it is difficult for citizens to completely understand T3 zoning classifications that have not yet been presented at a public hearing. ***Several letters from citizens reveal that they are unclear about what can be allowed under T3 zoning. We***

are concerned that the City is taking advantage of this lack of understanding in order to advance the development of individual parcels.

Because the specific criteria for T3 zoning are loosely defined, there is a huge margin for interpretation and a huge margin for error that is being exploited at the expense of the neighbors. In the case of the LeCesse proposal, the developer has used the leniency of the zoning code to maximize profitability offered through T3 zoning, while incorporating only the bare minimum required in terms of “mixed-use”, “green space”, and “set-back requirements”. Furthermore, the loosely defined zoning code creates misunderstanding and opens opportunity for developers to take advantage. As in the case of the LeCesse proposal, this has resulted in a proposal that is grossly out of scale with the existing neighborhood.

Citizen input is being ignored. In good faith, residents have attended MGCC meetings for almost an entire year to express their concerns and provide input to the developer (almost 150 people at the late August meeting and a strong representation at subsequent meetings). At the meetings, the great majority of residents have voiced their desire for a development of moderate density mixed-use, as well as a building that is similar in scale to buildings at that intersection. ***Several letters from residents state that their input has been virtually ignored.***

Deceptive tactics are being used to appease and or wear down neighbors. Scaling back the grossly out of scale plan to a somewhat less grossly out of scale plan seems to be an attempt to appease neighbors by making them think that concessions have been made. Furthermore, the process has been dragged out until neighborhood opposition has waned. Neighborhood residents are disgusted and worn out from the stress of this process, not to mention the concern about potential loss of value to, and loss of enjoyment of, their properties. Many letters from citizens express this.

There appears to be a general disregard for preserving the character of existing neighborhoods. Citizens should have a right to choose their housing preference. Furthermore, residents should have input into the zoning and development of their own neighborhood, and their voices should be heard, respected, and accurately noted. Mac-Groveland and Highland are low-density residential areas that developed along the southernmost end of South Snelling Avenue, where rates of traffic are considerably lower. Residents should have the right to preserve the character of this neighborhood. The Twin City area offers different neighborhoods with different housing options. With the unique situation of having two, major, interconnected cities, where high-density housing abounds in the downtown areas and along University Avenue, there should be enough high-density housing from which to choose. High-density housing does not have to permeate every area of the city, thereby denying the rights of those who do not desire high-density and prefer a quieter neighborhood. ***In their letters, some residents of the neighborhood have commented that they feel they are being forced out of the neighborhood where they have resided for 30 or more years.***

The City does not appear to be acting in the best interest of the current residents. It appears that this project is being driven by The City’s agenda for high-density development, and The City gives tax incentives to developers who build high-density along traffic corridors. Tragically, this comes at the expense of neighborhood residents and businesses who pay for these tax incentives that will devalue their properties, compromise their businesses, and destroy their neighborhoods.

The City's actions are inconsistent with stated policy goals of the City of St. Paul Comprehensive Plan 2010-2019. Housing Strategy 2 is to Preserve and Promote Established Neighborhoods. The proposed zoning change to T3 allows a structure that is completely incompatible with the low-density single family homes of the area. This incompatibility will devalue the existing homes and neighborhoods rather than preserve or promote them as stated in the goals of the Comprehensive Plan. Furthermore, the Comprehensive Plan states:

Substantial growth is not expected in all neighborhoods. Established Neighborhoods are residential areas of predominately single-family housing and adjacent neighborhood-serving commercial uses. These are areas of stability where the existing character will be essentially maintained.

The City's actions appear to run completely against this stated policy goal.

For the above-mentioned reasons, as well as those stated in our original letter of opposition, we strongly object to the zoning change to T3 at the Snelling/St. Clair location.

Kathryn and Dennis McGuire
22xx Fairmount Avenue
Saint Paul, MN 55105

LETTERS OF OPPOSITION

SUMMARY: A total of 47 people wrote in opposition of this project (If two people of the same household wrote the letter jointly, both persons were counted in this total).

9 people specifically state opposition of the T3 zoning or change in zoning. (C. Nippoldt, K. McGuire, D. McGuire, C. Burke,

J. Burke, Zoff, Hubble, Bylander, Bostrom).

13 people state that 55 feet or 5 1/2 stories is too high and/or they would prefer a building with 2, 3, or 4 floors. (Maloney-

Vinz, Earl, Moseley, Shirilla, R. Edlund, B. Edlund, Powell, M. Allers, K. Allers, Bevins, Mr. and Mrs. Childers, Bell)

16 people mention they are opposed to the height, density, size, scale, or mass of the proposed building/want something more

in keeping with the scale of the neighborhood (S. Ryan, B. Ryan, Flanagan, Hildebrand, A.

Nippoldt, Heath, Koehler,

Wilmes, Ziebarth, Anderson, Fabel, Hall, M. McCallum, D. McCallum, Kerr, Dean)

7 people commented on the poor design/aesthetics/lack of green space (Gannon, Peterson, Berg, Libbus, Demming,

Pfankuch, Osen)

2 people demonstrated uncertainty/confusion pertaining to how many stories T3 or 55 feet will allow (Nortrom, Arnosti)

Lisa Maloney-Vinz. 15xx Goodrich

"If you drive around St. Paul, up and down Snelling as well as on Grand, **newer housing developments have three floors of units** and many provide parking within the development. Anything larger than that will just be an eyesore and not safe nor a mark of responsible and sustainable development. . . **need a new and revised, especially smaller plan.**"

Sean Ryan

Brandi Ryan 16xx Palace

"It is **too big** compared to the surrounding single family homes and commercial buildings, it reduces the number of retail businesses from 5 to 1, and it detrimentally takes away from the character of the

neighborhood. . . the **surrounding area has 2 and 3 story commercial/retail buildings and 2 story single family homes. . . reduce the height and scale of the building.**”

M.C. Flanagan, 2xx S. Warwick

“Meetings with the neighbors have yielded few changes to the original, nondescript “design”-a plan that **makes no effort to be architecturally interesting or correspond to the scale and look of nearby structures. If approved, LeCesse’s massive wall of concrete will extend nearly a full city block—**completely overshadowing 1.5 story bungalows and backyards immediately to the east. . . contradicts the Mac-Groveland’s own Community Plan Recommendations for Urban Design, particularly those that call for housing and commercial properties that are compatible with the character of the neighborhood. . . this project will adversely affect the Snelling/Saint Clair intersection and adjacent neighborhoods. If zoning changes approved at the MG HLU Committee are passed at the city level, this and future developments can reach 55’ tall or up to 90’ with a conditional use permit.”

Lori Bostrom, 7xx Summit Avenue

“I am writing in **opposition to the proposed rezoning and conditional use permit** for the development which is proposed for Snelling and St. Clair Avenues. . . This would be spot zoning . . .way too massive. . .at odds with the City’s comprehensive plan which encourages mixed-use development along mass transit corridors.”

Christopher Nippoldt, 3xx Saratoga Street South

“I ask that you **deny the request to zone the area as T3** as it would simply be inconsistent with the surrounding neighborhood and the City’s vision for the area.”

Kathy McGuire

Dennis McGuire, 22xx Fairmount Avenue

“ . . we are strongly opposed to the size and scale of the proposed development, and we are **opposed to the change in zoning to T3 as well as the conditional use permit.**”

Sherri Hildebrandt, 16xx Berkeley

I am in favor of enhancements the block, but I am **not in favor of this project. . . It will tower over every other structure**-not only on that block but from I-94 to West Seventh Street. It is **completely out of keeping with the size of other structures on the street, let alone on that block.**”

Amanda Nippoldt, 3xx South Saratoga Street (entered twice AND entered in two different locations)

“One of **our issues with this development is the sheer size and proximity to single family homes** is unprecedented and causes serious concerns with issues we dealt with at the Vintage on Selby. LeCesse’s examples of building height do not take account of where these buildings are located. Even Vintage on Selby is butted up against nearly all multifamily rental homes. When researching their building examples, Vintage on Selby, The Finn, The Waters, Wilder Park, Highland Water Tower, Cleveland High Rise, and 740 Mississippi River Blvd., you’ll see that they are buffered by parks, parking lots, commercial buildings, or multi-family rentals. . . **the sheer size of the building is nearly 1 1/2 blocks long and will simply tower over anything in the vicinity.**”

Jessica Burke

Clayton Burke, 2xx Brimhall (This letter appears in two different locations)

“**The staff report as written also makes no effort to discuss options other than T3 zoning,** simply because that is

what this specific developer is proposing. **What about T2 zoning for this site? T2 zoning has been discussed by many in opposition at the MGCC meetings as a more appropriate alternative as far as scale and density** for this particular site and the omission of that piece of the discussion feels purposeful and frankly a bit unscrupulous.

T2 zoning, by definition, aligns with the Land Use and Housing goals as adopted by the City of St. Paul late last August and it seems that T3 + CUP is now the only consideration simply because the current developer cannot make his economics work otherwise. . . I have included a Google map screenshot of the currently proposed site as well as all the comparative sites the developer presented in an attempt to **exemplify the unprecedented adjacency to residential this proposal reflects**, but also the fact that these sites are in much more predominantly commercial corridors. . . **Our concern with this development is not the effort to find a higher use for this space, but the immense scale and lack of retail space that would actually drive a real benefit for the members of the community.**

Julia Earl

Bill Moseley, 3xx Macalester Street (This letter appears in two different locations)

“Please find attached letter of **opposition to the proposed 55 foot tall, high-density housing and retail development** at the corner of St. Clair and Snelling Avenues. We oppose this proposal and the conditional use permit. Additional comments may be found in the attached document.” **“We would find a 2-3 story building is acceptable.”**

Tim Heath, 15xx Osceola (This letter was recorded in two different places)

“Please do what you can to send this proposal back to the drawing board. . . Certainly the city can achieve its goal of higher density along Snelling Ave. without the creation of **such an extreme, imposing and monolithic structure**. this is obviously a cookie-cutter design that was developed with **no regard to the neighborhood or the scale of the surrounding buildings**. . . The LeCesse proposal is **grotesquely out of place**. There are numerous examples along Snelling Avenue of new, higher-density housing that include setbacks, terraces, and in general have considered the scale and aesthetics of the neighborhood. We should be able to do better for Snelling and St. Clair.”

Amy Shirilla, 15xx Goodrich

“The height of the building is **too tall for the space**. . . **Please consider a three story building that will not dwarf the structures, businesses, and homes in the surrounding area**. . . The design I saw does not fit in with the neighborhood or the nearby buildings.

Carol Zoff, 4xx Saratoga

“I am writing to strongly express my **opposition to the proposed changes to the zoning to T3 that would allow the 55’ height of any building there**. . . I am also writing to strongly express my opposition to the proposed building. . . The third reason I am writing is to strongly oppose the Conditional Use Permit to the developer because it is detrimental to the existing character of the development in the immediate neighborhood.”

Larry Gannon, 15xx Lincoln

“**This building will not be built. My neighbors are organizing to not let you okay this WALL.**”

Cathy Peterson, 14xx Stanford (This letter is recorded in two different places.)

“Consideration is needed for **green space** and ecology and mitigating climate change, which has been a stated goal of the City of St. Paul in the past years. **I oppose the development as**

noted as it does not include alternative energy or green space for significant water run-off.”

Russ Edhlund

Bonnie Edhlund, 15xx Sargent

“We think this development does not reflect the character of the Mac-Groveland neighborhood. You only need to look at the height of the building (5 1/2 stories) to see that is it way too massive. It totally blocks views to the west for residents living east of the proposed structure. There is no set-back from Snelling. . . We do not object to development at this corner, but **such development should be in keeping with the scale and character of our neighborhood.**”

Max Allers

Karin Allers, 15xx Sargent

“As a businessman and CEO of my company, I need to think, plan, and adjust for the future and ‘create’ a future for those that follow. I do this we need to allow the neighborhood to evolve, but carefully weigh form over function. **If a new development is so large it overwhelms the existing businesses (not only the traffic flow), causing them to lose patronage and cause an increased level of congestion, we are accepting a reduced quality of life for the sake of progress.** . . . Compromise seems to be what is always a best practice in most cases. **What if this is a 2 (or 3) story complex with more than anticipated parking available for the new building AND for existing business to share and maintain their level of patronage AND hopefully an increased patronage.** . . .In most cases: less is more.

Michelle Myers Berg, 15xx Goodrich

“**Please, I genuinely urge you to allow those experts suited to the task, to properly evaluate the designs of the structure that is being proposed for the southeast corner of St. Clair and Snelling.** People who are architects and artists who do not have a vested interest in the taxes or economic aspects of the property would be a good choice. If you do this well, more people will be encouraged to build other similar structures along the Snelling corridor. If this is handled poorly, I imagine that people will seek their deserved historic designation and all of the mandated protection which that implies. . . I hope you pay attention to these voices. For every letter you receive, there are another fifty people who stand in agreement but who simply do not have the time and inclination to write. **This matters so much in relation to the overall future of the neighborhood. It doesn’t matter how much density you try to create if people are no longer willing to live in the area.**”

Autumn Hubbell, 16xx Stanford

I do not support this particular building nor the changes in zoning it would require. . . . I would support a 3 story, maybe 4 story apartment building. I would support more retail. I would like to see those things but they need to be thoughtfully developed and respectful of the neighborhood. . . .We do not want to be Uptown.”

Margaret Malde Arnosti, 17xx Princeton

“Strictly limit the height of any development to a maximum of 55 feet. . . **Require more street level greenery and retail.** . . **Were they to eliminate one floor of apartments, they would reduce the height of the building below 55 feet.** With fewer apartments, parking requirements would decline, allowing additional first floor rent-paying retail at street level. Please suggest they consider this.”

Ted Powell, 7xx Grand Avenue

“That intersection doesn’t need a 4 or 5 story building, it would wreck the look and feel of the old neighborhood.”

Winston Koehler, 17xx Palace Avenue

“The development proposed at the Snelling/St.Clair intersection will be **too disruptive and incompatible with the surrounding existing land uses**. In the long run, the factors that make that site so desirable (safety, housing values, ambiance, convenience, etc) will be so compromised by this development that it will be, in effect, a killing of the goose that is about to lay the golden egg. . . **If the city continues to only pay lip service to the legitimate concerns of neighbors, elected officials will be eroding their political base of support, city staff as well as officials will lose the trust of citizens, and in the end we will all lose except those developers who can make a profit and run.**, leaving us local yokels to suffer the consequences of short-term narrow-minded planning. **Please reduce the size of this proposal. . .”**

Imad Libbus, 17xx block of Stanford

“My primary concern is that the proposed development is **contrary to the character of all Mac Groveland**. . . to support the proposal, the developer presents a ridiculous collection of buildings for comparison: Wilder Park, Highland Park Water Tower, Cleveland High Rise, and 740 Mississippi Blvd. None of these buildings are in the neighborhood. . . **A better comparison is the Oxford Hill development (Grand and Oxford), which has only 3 residential floors above the retail level, and has significant set-backs.**

Mary Antonia Wilmes, 13xx Berkeley

“I can’t get over **how tall the proposed building is, which will have an even larger appearance because it is so long**. . . **Also, the design has no relationship to the buildings in the area**. . . I don’t know how the proposed development could qualify as “mixed-use” since the current proposal only has about 1000 square feet set aside for one retailer, if that. I don’t consider that reasonable “mixed-use”. . . **the proposed building is way out of scale.**”

Kathleen Demming, 15xx Goodrich

“We are getting the distinct impression that the city planners don’t give a damn about what those in the neighborhood think. . . If a new smaller building which provides ample parking for already existing business on the corner of Snelling/St. Clair is approved - and provides for lower-rent housing, I think it should provide for the existing businesses on the SE corner to remain there as part of the retail infrastructure, as they’ve served this community for decades. . . As a decades’ long resident of Macalester-Groveland, **I am writing to tell you how alarmed I am at the proposals for buildings in the area which I think sully the unique character of our neighborhood.**”

Allison Pfankuch, 16xx Niles

“I was really excited to hear that the SE corner of Snelling and St. Clair is finally going to be redeveloped until I saw the drawing and article in the Villager. **A six story block long building does not fit in this neighborhood**. It would be a giant wall towering over adjacent properties and the street. Redevelopment on a scale such as this should not be allowed. We need developers that want to work with the city and neighborhoods to enhance and improve our community, not just maximize profits for the developer. Higher density development does not

have to look like this. . . **Adding some brick, stone, and glass does not change or disguise the fact that this is a block long 5-6 story wall in a neighborhood setting.**”

Bart Bevins, 17xx Scheffer

“If the developer can’t afford to build anything less than 6 stories the city should end this now. **4 stories is the max. Their building is too big and exceedingly boring.** They should find a new site and the city start over. **Sorry Josh.**”

Marilyn Ziebarth, 1xx Vernon

“. . .the building design is painfully generic and monolithic—Texan. **And far too tall.. .Please reduce the height and make it an interesting building.**”

Scott Nortrom, 19xx Berkeley

“The current design is completely out of scale with the neighborhood and will cast long shadows on the two story neighboring historic buildings. **Reducing the project to three stories would be better.** I strongly urge at minimum that this project be reduced to T-3 (55 feet in height).”

Kathy Childers, 3xx Warwick

Mr. Childers

“I am adamantly **opposed to this development because of its overall size and height. A maximum height of 4 stories makes much more sense for the surrounding aesthetics of the neighborhood.** And its overall size is excessive as well considering what’s around it. . . I am a Mac-Groveland resident. My husband and I live at 351 Warwick Street and he is in agreement with my concerns.”

Janet Anderson, 17xx Sargent

“**I would like to see the building be less tall,** have less car parking, and more bicycle parking.”

Elizabeth Fabel, 17xx Princeton

“**This design is out of scale,** favors cars way too much, reduces the livability of the street level neighborhood by ignoring the desire ability of street level retail/commerce, and is just plain suburban ugly.. . **this particular project is not a good fit for this neighborhood.** I would say that this incarnation of this project is what is not a good fit but since non of the incarnations have differed greatly(except to lose street level retail in favor of parking) I have to believe that it is this developer that is not a good fit.”

Eleanor Hall, 1xx Cambridge

“. . . the building design is **still too high,** the towers are inappropriate and there will be too much light lost at that corner. I think many residents are very unhappy about the current design but **would be quite happy with a scaled-down version that fits the scale of the Mac Groveland neighborhood.**”

Mary McCallum

Derek McCallum, 15xxx Fairmount

“**For this neighborhood, a building of this scale is an automatic eyesore—taking up a full block and going up at the proposed height are just not the right idea.** We prefer the scale of The Waters residential building at Snelling and Scheffer. . . We urge the rejection of the granting of the conditional use permit to build over 55 feet.. . We do not want our neighborhood turned into a character-less strip mall kind of place. . . We agree with a neighbor who was recently quoted in The Villager who opined “...you’ve lost the size and scale of Mac Groveland.”

Sara Kerr, 3xx Brimhall

“I am deeply concerned about the scale of this proposed apartment building. . .The only way to decrease visual mass is to make the building no bigger than four stories-basically the height of the new senior housing next to Gloria Dei. Personally, I think a single massive apartment that stretches nearly the entire length of a block is way, way out of scale.”

Alexis Bylander, 2xx Brimhall

“. . .I strongly oppose rezoning the property on the corner of Snelling and St. Clair from B2 to T3.

Marsha Bell, 15xx Goodrich

“. . .We had the same out-state developer (disappointed a local company was not involved)-plus many of the concerns noted by the community at previous meetings were ignored and the same concerns remain on the new proposal. At the previous meetings, the majority of the community comments opposed the size, the location, the architecture, how this building will be used, wanting shops/stores on lower level, the potential parking problems, increased traffic concerns. . . We were asked to give our opinions but it feels like no one is listening or seriously looking at the situation. It is very sad to hear from people in the neighborhood who are not supporting this development state that there’s nothing they can do—so they aren’t writing you letters. It should not be this way.. . The proposed 6+ story housing/density project does not fit in our neighborhood-it way too large for that corner. I and others support 3 story buildings with apartments on the top two floors and affordable shops available on the street level with room on a sidewalk so thee can be outdoor seating where appropriate. . . I would suggest instead of making it one long building, separate it with areas for additional parking.”

Karen Osen, 15xx Goodrich

“. . .I cannot in good conscience sit idly by and watch the charming, historical character of our MacGroveland neighborhood be compromised by what LeCesse is hoping to disrupt this community with. . .If the direction the neighborhood appears to be going in continues, we will feel “forced out”, despite the fact that in our late fifties, my husband and I are still enjoying good health and appreciate taking advantage of so much so close. . .And why should we allow a developer to swoop in form out of state and erect the proposed intrusive monstrosity which would block light to every building on three sides, and be unattractive to boot? . . Examples of architecture I applaud are The Vintage on Selby. . .as well as the building on Grand and Oxford. . .They are attractive and consistent with the neighborhood, and not too tall. They have balconies, step back walls as they get taller, and recessed entrances. Building materials used help them look similar to older existing buildings, such as patterned brickwork. They blend in with the neighborhood. . . “

Jessica Burke, 2xx Brimhall (Jessica Burke wrote an earlier letter with her husband Clayton. Her second letter is not counted in the total, but portions are included here because it contains pertinent information that their previous letter did not contain.)

“It seems as though the zoning and economic development team has taken the liberty to alter the suggested zoning from T2 to T3. I realize nothing is solidified at this point, but the change truly does beg the question-why change from T2 to T3 for this meeting (and ultimately, what will likely be presented to the Planning Commission)? . . .It is my understanding that all of these various meetings at the neighborhood and city level are to incorporate the commentary of the community members in making the final decision...has your team truly received so much input supporting the 6+ story, nearly 70 foot building up to this point to confidently and diplomatically make the decision to recommend that zoning change? I find it truly hard to

believe after all of the various meetings I have attended and conversations I have had with impacted neighbors...it seems, to me, that there is a greater consensus around something more reflective of T2 zoning rather than T3. The meeting with the potential developer in late August attracted nearly 150 attendees, none of which (at least those of the dozens that spoke) were in full support of this sort of scale at this intersection, but rather medium density, mixed use development the more broadly benefits the community. **As an involved and concerned community member in this process, I feel like my invited input is being intentionally quieted to benefit a higher-density-driven city agenda; I truly hope that I am wrong about that.**"

Richard Dean,

I have been following the plans for this development. **I am pleased that the most recent proposal, reviewed at the Mac-Groveland Community Council's Housing and Land Use Committee, has scaled back the original proposal. However, I still have strong reservations about the current proposal.** I understand that most of the structure will be 61.5 feet tall, but the north and south ends will be 76 feet tall. I realize the need for development and for housing, but I believe the current plan results in a building that does not fit, in size and scale, with the neighborhood. . . **I would like to see a new proposal that scales back the size and scale of the building.**"

LETTERS OF SUPPORT

SUMMARY: A total of 21 people wrote in support of this project.

1 person specifically stated favor of T3 zoning and support the 55 foot height limit and CUP (61.5'). (Buck)

3 people mentioned they are okay with 55 feet or (61.5 feet) or support the height in general. (Gilbert, Downes, Henderson)

9 people support the project but mention some concern or reservation regarding some aspect of the proposal such as green space, bike parking, provision for cars, safety, aesthetics, etc. (O'Gara, Hauser, Hood, Christiansen, Wherley, Zaayer, Ledger, Cruz, Sonn,).

5 people offer general support of the project but do not mention anything specific pertaining to the size or zoning. (Noble, Wilsey, Wales, Janisch, Willis,)

3 people demonstrate uncertainty/confusion pertaining to how many stories T3 or 55 feet will allow (Todd, Dr. & Mrs. Walinga)

Erin O'Gara, 15xx Sargent (This letter was entered twice)

"I would encourage the new apartment building (if it is approved for re-zoning) to **please consider providing discount vouchers or other incentives for residents to be car free or just take public transportation as much as possible.**" NO MENTION OF ZONING OR T3 ZONING.

Jessica Hauser, 13xx Sargent (This letter is recorded in two different places)

"Several aspects the plan give me pause and prevent me from fully supporting the current development proposal. . .

I would like to see the parking areas scaled back to make more room for retail space. . . The lack of bike parking is a great concern. . .I would like to encourage a pedestrian safety plan be implemented at the time of the construction. . .Finally a greener, more welcoming streetscape would have an additional benefit of helping to reduce our carbon

footprint as well as making the corner more aesthetically pleasing.” NO MENTION OF ZONING OR T3 ZONING.

David Wallinga, MD,

Mrs. Wallinga, 3xx Brimhall (This letter was entered more than once and in two different locations))

“ . . I and my family of four strenuously oppose the conditional use permit or CUP for this project. The finished project should have a height no taller than the 55 foot maximum allowed without a CUP under the T3 zoning change being sought. I am not opposed to the zoning change itself.”
“Most significantly, the height of this building is overwhelming. . . Not only the height, but the uninterrupted length of the building is the problem, because it will replace a busy commercial strip of active, taxpaying business with only a single retail store and parking. . . Even at 62 feet, this building is far too tall for this very residential neighborhood. **Even though the existing buildings are two stories, I would welcome a building 50% taller—that is three stories. With some trepidation, I could even accept a four story building but only if the upper two floors were stepped significantly back from the street and alley to reduce the canyon effect . . .**”

Michael Noble, 18xx Goodrich

“Cities need investment; climate and transit need density; that block is sad and dated and needs to be scraped to the ground and redone. Put me in the column of a pro-development, pro-investment environmental activist and 30+ year neighbor. The more people who live in our neighborhood, the better. The more people who live here, the better the transit, the more tax base and the less property tax pressure on my neighbors.” NO MENTION OF ZONING OR T3 ZONING.

Roger Wilsey, 9xx Summit Avenue

“I am a citizen of St. Paul and wanted to email my support for this redevelopment project. . . This project would definitely upgrade the entire area and be another fine piece of redevelopment going on along Snelling Avenue
It certainly will have a positive impact on public health and welfare and the surrounding business community.”
NO MENTION OF ZONING OR T3 ZONING.

Jeff Janisch, 18xx Laurel

“All in favor of this development at Snelling and St. Clair.” THIS IS THE ENTIRE LETTER—
NO MENTION OF ZONING OR T3 ZONING.

Nathaniel Hood, 18xx Montreal

“The LeCesse development is not perfect, but one I ultimately encourage you to support. . . I wish the building frontage facing Snelling included more retail space as opposed to a blank wall with windows to the parking garage on the southernmost segment. the building could also do a better job scaling back in the rear to allow more afternoon light to access the backyards of Brimhall Street residents.” NO MENTION OF ZONING OR T3 ZONING.

Rob Wales, 19xx Sheridan

“Just wanted to make sure that before next week I dropped you an email to voice my support for responsible development in Saint Paul and specifically the plans for the St. Clair high-density development.” NO MENTION OF ZONING OR T3 ZONING.

Jeff Christiansen, 14xx Lincoln

"I wanted to express my support for the planned development at Snelling and St. Clair. While I am sensitive to resident concerns over parking, traffic congestion, and other issues that come with new development, I think this is a well designed development and is consistent with the city's plan to add more housing." NO MENTION OF ZONING OR T3 ZONING.

Joseph F. Henderson, 18xx Pinehurst

"Our area needs more multi-unit housing options for the future and for the graying of the current residents. This will be a dramatic improvement for the neighborhood and the **proposed height is perfectly appropriate** for the Snelling corridor." NO MENTION OF ZONING OR T3 ZONING

Marjorie Wherley, 16xx Lincoln

"I am in favor of development along major public transportation corridors. I am also in favor of developments that will result in a net increase in property taxes. **But I am also in favor of limiting construction/rehab in the residential neighborhoods if/when it would change the character of the neighborhood.**" NO MENTION OF ZONING OR T3 ZONING

Jeff Zaayer, 17xx Saunders

I'm writing to express my support for the development proposal at St. Clair and Snelling. . . In addition to the **excess in parking**, I am concerned that the current plans do not show **bicycle parking**, also there is a **three car width curb** cut out on Snelling to provide access and egress for cars, this creates an **extended exposure to threats for pedestrians** in a corridor that is already one of the most dangerous in the city for people on foot. . . As someone who rented in Highland before purchasing a home in the neighborhood and who additionally had several friends who have rented in Highland and Mac-Grove prior to purchasing, I am confident that this project will help be a stepping stone for homeowners on both ends of being homeowner. NO MENTION OF ZONING OR T3 ZONING.

Amanda Willis, 19xx Sheridan

"When I first heard of the proposed development on the SE corner of St. Clair **I was very excited**. We recently moved into Highland Park into a rental house, but we are looking to buy in the next few years. **I love the new A line** and it would be so easy for people who live there to get to either downtown. We've wanted to go down to a 1 car family for awhile now, and this would be possible if we lived in that area." NO MENTION OF ZONING OR T3 ZONING

Thomas Todd, 3xx Brimhall

"I do not object to the TN3 Zoning. I object to the extra height sought in the conditional use permit. . . From Marshall to Fort Road, and from Lexington to the River, on-the-street structures top out at four stories, with two exceptions.

There are some larger buildings set off by themselves on large properties. But there are no street-side buildings of six stories, and only two of five: The Vintage /Whole Foods development, and the old apartment building at Snelling and Randolph. Neither of these puts a five -story cliff along the sidewalk." **MR. TODD DOES NOT SEEM TO UNDERSTAND THAT A T3 55' BUILDING IS FIVE STORIES.**

Joe Downes, 16xx Berkeley

"**I am not opposed to the development or even the height of the proposal.** One improvement **I would like to see however is more of a sight line variety to the west facing facade on Snelling.** NO MENTION OF ZONING OR T3 ZONING

Rhys Ledger, 14xx Wellesley

We support the proposed development with a few minor caveats. We ask that **sunlight for Corner Drug's solar panels be preserved**. We also request **serious requirements to maximize pedestrian orientation and for the planning and maintenance of boulevard greenery**. NO MENTION OF ZONING OR T3 ZONING

Bob Buck, 14xx Sargent

"I support the zoning change to T3, as well as the CUP height change to 61.5 feet. I also agree with the guidelines the the Mac-Grove Housing and Land Use listed regarding the CUP are well considered. My concerns are these: lack of affordable housing in Mac-Grove. This project will do nothing to answer that deficit. There needs to be more consideration for street level retail. . . Any housing density without local amenities isn't a sound community plan. . . I'd like to see the city be more innovative about dealing with over abundance of parking slots for these types of developments.

Carlos Cruz, no address

". . .I would like to express my support for this type of development in area. . . However, as others may have already expressed, **I'm extremely concerned about the height variance request. the proposed building height seems extremely too tall, and does not seem to fit with the surrounding buildings/might clash with existing surroundings.** While I encourage this type of development (mixed-use, dense), the variance height request seems to be a bit excessive and would encourage the developer to consider reducing/removing one of the floors (or finding another way of significantly lowering the building height). NO MENTION OF ZONING OR T3 ZONING

Mark Gilbert, 18xx Lincoln

"I am in favor of developing higher living density long Snelling Avenue. . . **I don't think all the density we want has to be build on this one lot. I think the 55 feet that we've already planned for would be sufficient,** rather than granting a variance to allow 61.5 feet. **What's the point of planning, if we just ignore our plans whenever a developer asks us to?** NO MENTION OF ZONING OR T3 ZONING

Mike Sonn, 14xx Wellesley

"I just wanted to share my excitement of the new LDC plan for St. Clair & Snelling. . .I do have some concerns that I'd like to address: . . the **3 lane curb cut** on St. Clair directly next to the alley curb cut. . . **zero bike parking**. . .this development is **massively over-parked**. . .**creating an engaging streetscape** would go a long way to addressing the concerns about the building's appearance. . .**The luxury housing of today is the affordable housing of tomorrow.**" NO MENTION OF T3 ZONING

LETTERS THAT DO NOT CLEARLY SUPPORT OR OPPOSE

Vernon Jorgensen, 16xx Berkeley

"Please consider this, the Drugstore and apartments on the NE corner of St. Clair and Snelling have solar panels on top of the two story building. Won't the 70+foot building block those?

Char Mason, 6xx Mount Curve Blvd. (This letter is entered twice)

I do not believe the complex should exceed current height limits of 55' . . . Please keep the development as low as possible.

THOMAS C. PLUNKETT
ATTORNEY AT LAW

101 EAST FIFTH STREET
SUITE 1500
ST. PAUL, MN 55101
PHONE: 651-222-4357
FAX: 651-297-6134
EMAIL: TCP@TP4JUSTICE.COM

May 15, 2017

VIA Email – Contact-Council@ci.stpaul.mn.us

St. Paul City Counsel
City Government Office
15 W Kellogg Blvd #310
St. Paul, MN 55101

RE: Zoning Change Snelling-St. Clair

Dear City Counsel;

This letter is to oppose the zoning change to T3 at Snelling and St. Claire. It is important that T3 zoning be denied. The proposed height of the building (55 ft-5 1/2 stories) is not consistent with our neighborhood where 2 to 3 stories are standard. The size of the residential complex at roughly a city block is also inconsistent with our neighborhood. In addition to aesthetics, this change will negatively impact parking for existing businesses and cause spill over parking onto residential streets. The lack of commercial space and green space is also a concern. Local businesses have already lost parking for express bus/traffic calming making further loss an added unfairness.

I would not object to a 2 story residential building or 3 story building with ground level retail that had some form of green space incorporated into the structure. I am concerned about this proposal is not in keeping with the buildings and home in our neighborhood.

If you have any questions regarding this, please contact me at 651-222-4357.

Very truly yours,

V/S – Thomas C. Plunkett

Thomas C. Plunkett

TCP/ao