



SUMMIT-UNIVERSITY
PLANNING COUNCIL

Board of Directors
2018

Chair

Steve Wilson
Hallie Q. Brown

Vice Chair

Angela Burns

Secretary

Mike Foley

Treasurer

Eric Ebbesen

**Chair, Neighborhood
Development**

Raymond Krause

**Chair, Communications and
Outreach**

Megan Jaunich

**Chair, Community
Improvement and Safety**

Daria Caldwell

Martha Tilton

Unity Church Unitarian

Donna Evans

ASANDC

Judith Tande

Ramsey Hill Association

Katie Ka-Vang

AEDA

Mary Morris

Ibrahim Kamla

Marvin Scroggins

Elizabeth Wagoner

Garry Nordenstam

Pam Biladeau

Galen Benshoof

April 3, 2018

Tony Johnson
Planning & Economic Development
25 W. 4th St., Suite 1400
Saint Paul, MN 55102

Dear Mr. Johnson,

I am writing on behalf of the Summit-University Planning Council to inform you that we support Mr. Hupp's variance applications. He presented his plans at our March Neighborhood Development Committee meeting, and the committee voted to recommend SUPC supports his plans. The full Board later voted in favor at our March meeting.

I would like to make a special note that it is impressive that Mr. Hupp figured out a way to have contracted parking and provide affordable housing as part of his renewed plans. We hope that this can be encouragement and proof for other developers that it is possible, and the needs of the community can be met with a little creativity.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any further questions.

Thank you,

Jens Werner
Executive Director
Summit-University Planning Council
627 Selby Ave Suite A
Saint Paul, MN 55102

Support
FILE
18-035099

Benner II, Jerome (CI-StPaul)

FILE
18-035099
Support
FILE

From: Gail Graham <ggraham@msmarket.coop>
Sent: Wednesday, March 21, 2018 2:52 PM
To: Benner II, Jerome (CI-StPaul)
Subject: letter of support for file 18-035099

Dear Mr. Benner,

I will not be able to attend the meeting on the 26th, so I am writing to express our support for granting the variances being requested by Hupp Holdings LLC for the proposed 6-unit row house at 617 Laurel, file number 18-035099. The lot in question has been vacant for decades and it would be a positive move for the community to develop additional housing. I believe that careful thought has gone into plan and the benefits warrant the granting of the requested variances.

Thank you for adding our voice supporting the project as you deliberate the merits. Should you need additional information I can be reached at 651-310-9461.

Sincerely,

Gail Graham | General Manager

Mississippi Market Natural Foods Co-op
Three St. Paul locations | www.msmarket.coop

Administrative Office | 622 Selby Ave. St. Paul, MN 55104
651-310-9461 (direct)
651-310-9498 (fax)

Benner II, Jerome (CI-StPaul)

From: Jean Schroeffer <jshrep@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, April 16, 2018 4:09 PM
To: Benner II, Jerome (CI-StPaul)
Subject: 617 Laurel

Opposition
FILE
18-03509P

Jerome,

This RM2, multi-family residential zoning district requires 1,500 square feet of lot area per unit.

This variance should be denied. His 7,179 square foot lot is substantially too small for six units. However, a variance for five units could be granted. He needs only a 320 square feet variance for five units. He has almost 79% of what is required for that fifth, and final, lot. A concession for that 22% lack could be made on grounds that his lot is on a high-traffic street near a transit stop and backs up to a lot with a large commercial building on a high-traffic intersection. Reasonable density is appropriate.

The zoning code states that no multi-family dwellings can be built to create three or more dwelling units on a lot that is less than 9,000 square feet in area.

This variance should be granted. First, the regulation doesn't make sense. The code requires the first three units of a multi-family building to have 3,000 square feet each, regardless of zoning, but once a lot has that 9,000 square feet, if the zoning is RM2, then each unit needs only 1,500 square feet. The result is that an RM2 lot, once it is large enough for three units, is instantly large enough for six units. The city should amend the code to provide consistent lot density requirements. (Example: 4,000 square feet for one-family plus an additional 1,000 square feet for each additional unit.) Second, in all cases, the city should consider existing surrounding activity and the availability of public facilities.

A side yard setback of 9' is required; a setback of 3' is proposed for a variance request of 6'.

A variance on the west line could be granted, but a variance on the east lot line should be denied. Sidelot requirements should be consistent with existing conditions. Existing structures on the same side of this block are offset closer to their western lot lines. This new construction could similarly be placed close to its Dale Street sidewalk, but it should be placed farther away than 3' from the structure near its eastern line - probably the full 9'.

Based on the number of proposed units, seven off-street parking spaces are required; the applicant is providing 6 off-street spaces for a variance of one parking space.

This variance should be denied. Street parking in the area is limited; off-street parking is needed. Nevertheless, the issue is moot if the development is limited to five units.

A setback of 9' is required for the off-street parking area; the applicant is proposing a setback of one foot for both east and west sides of the parking lot for a variance request of 8'.

Both parking setbacks should be granted, with conditions. Existing conditions should be considered: The location of the proposed parking is appropriate; neighbors are also parking their cars near the alley. Off-street parking is needed to compensate for limited street parking in this neighborhood. The conditions would be fences. The proposed opaque fence on the east boundary should be required so that people on the applicant's lot cannot possibly trespass on his neighbor's property. A fence should be installed along the Dale St. sidewalk to protect pedestrians. That fence should be open (picket or aluminum/iron - not chain link), to keep the area visible from the street for security purposes.

Jean Schroeffer
jshrep@aol.com
271 Summit Avenue
Saint Paul, MN 55102

Benner II, Jerome (CI-StPaul)

Opposition

From: Benner II, Jerome (CI-StPaul)
Sent: Monday, April 16, 2018 11:46 AM
To: 'ROBERT T BUTLER'
Cc: Crippen, Debbie (CI-StPaul)
Subject: RE: File # 18-035099 617 Laurel Avenue

FILE
18-035099

Thank you, Robert, for your comments. The Board will get an opportunity to review your comments prior to the meeting on April 23.

Jerome

From: ROBERT T BUTLER [mailto:roberttbutler@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, April 16, 2018 11:39 AM
To: Benner II, Jerome (CI-StPaul) <jerome.benner.ii@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Subject: File # 18-035099 617 Laurel Avenue

Board of Zoning Appeals,

We are writing to express our concern and opposition to the granting of variances to this project. My wife and I are 35 year resident/owners of 580 Laurel Ave., about 1/2 block to the east of this proposed project. We love and appreciate the neighborhood that we live in and have enjoyed its development over the years, however we are opposed to the granting of variances to this 6 unit row house project for the following reasons:

1. The variances requested are quite significant for a project does not add unique value. If granted, these substantial variances would appear to make the city code meaningless. We think that in order to consider variances of this magnitude there should be comparable unique gains for the city and neighborhood - and we don't see any here. The project would add 6 more apartment rentals in an area already full of rentals. The current building/zoning code would allow for the construction of 3 or 4? units within the guidelines. So the losses resulting from abandoning the district zoning/building code should be measured against the gain of two or three more apartment rentals. We believe that the loss will outweigh the gain.
2. No matter how nice the project looks on paper it is still is 6 rentals crowded into a narrow strip of 7,180 ft². This neighborhood is struggling to maintain and develop architecture that is consistent with its historic and traditional character. Hopefully the design features will be more solid than some simple trim elements, but no matter how you dress 6 units up on this small site they will still be obviously jammed together, and especially crowding the sidewalk and street. The historic Selby/Dale corner deserves something better.
3. Parking is an issue in this neighborhood and the variance request of "one space" misses the point that the extra units requested also add to the additional parking beyond what is allowed under the current zoning. The area to the east of the proposed project has been experiencing parking problems related to the business along Selby and, if allowed, this project will make that situation worse.

Thanks for considering these concerns.

Robert and Karrol Butler
(651) 228-1671

*Robert Butler
580 Laurel Avenue
Saint Paul, MN 55102*

Benner II, Jerome (CI-StPaul)

From: Joe Rittmann <joeritt@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 15, 2018 2:03 PM
To: Benner II, Jerome (CI-StPaul)
Subject: Re: 18-035099-617 Laurel Av

Opposition
FILE
18-035099

Dear Mr. Benner

Board of Zoning Appeals, St Paul

Thank you for your Notice of Public Hearing dated April 13 for the scheduled hearing on April 23 on the request for multiple variances.

I hereby re-submit my objections and concerns expressed in my email to you dated 27 Mar below. That is, the variances proposed are so large, they are in effect a violation of the code and not variances at all.

I oppose the requested variance 1 on the grounds that a 20% reduction from the minimum required lot area of 9000 sq feet to 7180 sq feet is too much loss of green space. It is not necessary-the housing plan is being changed to exploit the property against the ruling codes. And for what benefit? Only the business plan, and not the common good.

Despite the claim made in the hearing that there are other properties which reserved little green space, the majority of neighborhood residences by far are all about green space around residential areas. Even multiple family dwellings like ours has substantial green space around. Yes, businesses are permitted to reduce green space (mistakenly I believe), but the proposed building is a residence not a business. The large apartment buildings further south on Dale, west of Dale on Selby, and north of Selby which sacrificed green space is also unfortunate, and out of character for the neighborhood of residences.

I oppose the requested variance 2 on the grounds that it increases the density of the neighborhood more than is zoned. However, if the planned exploitation were intended for affordable housing for low income persons, then increased density would at least be tolerable for its benefit for the vulnerable population of the city. I don't see that a variance should be given because the original approved construction of 4 apartments with 3 bedrooms each turned out to be a bad business decision.

The request to increase the exploitation with 6 apartments with 2 bedrooms with the additional variance for parking and reduction of green space goes way beyond a marginal variance. In other words, while St Paul city is pleased with investment in housing, it needs to consider its responsibility to maintain the coding and not sacrifice it to the benefit of a private developer. However, if St Paul City requires that sacrificing green space is necessary to obtain affordable housing for low income families on Dale Ave, then some green space might be sacrificed.

I oppose the requested variance 3 because it is also a large reduction of green space, that is about 67% reduction. All of the other variances discussed at the hearing were for amounts of less than 10%.

I oppose the requested variance 4 because even one extra on street parking will congest the available parking around the Dale and Selby intersection.

I oppose the request variance 5 because it also disregards the code for green space on the lot.

In general, these requests for variance are solely for the added profit of the owner at the expense of the community and renter quality of housing. Is the loss of green space for added property tax of the city necessary at this Dale and Selby area?

Basically, the design could be for 4 units of 2 bedrooms, if the owner prefers smaller units. There is no justification for the code for quality living around Dale and Selby to be sacrificed for the profit of the owner and additional property tax of the city.

However, one acceptable reconciliation for 6 units that require sacrificing the code for quality housing would be that the proposed construction was for low income affordable housing, which St Paul City is in dire need of, given the large number of homeless families around and the vast shortage of low income housing solutions.

I hope I will be able to attend the hearing as well.

Thank you for your service.

best wishes, joe rittmann

599 Laurel Av, Apt 4, ST Paul, MN 55102

tel: 218 760-9353

email: joeritt@gmail.com

On 27-Mar-18 08:49, Joe Rittmann wrote:

Dear Mr. Benner

Board of Zoning Appeals

I am the owner and live at 599 Laurel Ave, Apt 4. (3rd house east of 617 Laurel Ave.)

Over the years, I have enjoyed the green space that the 617 Laurel Ave property has given to Dale St, especially the very ungreen intersection of Dale and Selby.

I wished that the city or I would have purchased the property and kept it as a park. You notice that there is one park within a half mile. So, it is a huge benefit that the code requires a portion of each residential lot to be maintained as a green space in our neighborhood. You can see that the neighborhoods which don't require sufficient green space around homes and in parks are not as healthy. So, of course, the first loss I noticed was when the new owner of the property chopped down all the trees.

I also understand that the benefit to the city revenue from property taxes is one reason to increase exploitation of a property in the city. I wonder if the cost benefit analysis has taken into account the loss of green space and loss of common good and health of all. I wonder why the City is not ensuring that new construction helps with affordable housing and vulnerable populations for the city.

I oppose the requested variance A or 1 on the grounds that a 20% reduction from the minimum required lot area of 9000 sq feet to 7180 sq feet is too much loss of green space. It is not

FILE
18-035099

necessary-the housing plan is being changed to exploit the property against the ruling codes. And for what benefit? Only the business plan, and not the common good.

FILE
18-035099

Despite the claim made in the hearing that there are other properties which reserved little green space, the majority of neighborhood residences by far are all about green space around residential areas. Even multiple family dwellings like ours has substantial green space around. Yes, businesses are permitted to reduce green space (mistakenly I believe), but the proposed building is a residence not a business. The large apartment buildings further south on Dale, west of Dale on Selby, and north of Selby which sacrificed green space is also unfortunate, and out of character for the neighborhood of residences.

I oppose the requested variance B or 2 on the grounds that it increases the density of the neighborhood more than is zoned. However, if the planned exploitation were intended for affordable housing for low income persons, then increased density would at least be tolerable for its benefit for the vulnerable population of the city. I don't see that a variance should be given because the original approved construction of 4 apartments with 3 bedrooms each turned out to be a bad business decision.

The request to increase the exploitation with 6 apartments with 2 bedrooms with the additional variance for parking and reduction of green space goes way beyond a marginal variance. In other words, while St Paul city is pleased with investment in housing, it needs to consider its responsibility to maintain the coding and not sacrifice it to the benefit of a private developer. However, if St Paul City requires that sacrificing green space is necessary to obtain affordable housing for low income families on Dale Ave, then some green space might be sacrificed.

I oppose the requested variance C or because it is also a large reduction of green space, that is about 67% reduction. All of the other variances discussed at the hearing were for amounts of less than 10%.

And, I join with others who support the opposition to the plan on the basis of failure to meet the approved parking code.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Dr Joseph Rittmann

Owner, 599 Laurel Ave, Apt 4, St Paul, MN 55102

tel: [218 760-9353](tel:2187609353)

email joeritt@gmail.com

FILE
18-035099

Crippen, Debbie (CI-StPaul)

From: Benner II, Jerome (CI-StPaul)
Sent: Tuesday, March 20, 2018 11:04 AM
To: Elizabeth Petit
Cc: Crippen, Debbie (CI-StPaul)
Subject: RE: File #18-035099 -- 617 Laurel Ave

Opposition

Thanks for your comments, I'll add them to the final report.

Jerome

From: Elizabeth Petit [mailto:libbypetit@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 20, 2018 10:34 AM
To: Benner II, Jerome (CI-StPaul) <jerome.benner.ii@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Subject: File #18-035099 -- 617 Laurel Ave

Dear Jerome:

I am writing regarding the letter that was sent out to us at the end of last week regarding a hearing yesterday on 3 variances requested on proposed townhomes at 617 Laurel Ave. I am sorry with such short notice I was not able to attend the meeting.

My husband and I live in the townhomes on Kent/Selby with a very similar layout and have been here since the homes were built in 1997. We have a far larger lot and only 4 townhomes on this lot. This allows for a driveway in the back with tuck-under garage space. Our cars rarely take up space on the street and we can keep them safe in the garage.

We strongly object to these variances for the following reasons:

- Squeezing 6 units into an area zoned for 3 is going to bring down the quality of the neighborhood and make it "slum like".
- Similar units were squeezed into the lot on Dale & Marshall about 15 years ago -- they are built almost into the street and strangers sit on the homeowners steps regularly. The owners keep their curtains closed at all times and are not an active part of the neighborhood. These properties have brought the neighborhood down.
- The corner of Dale & Selby is extremely busy as it is and adding 6 more homes (where 3 should be) is adding to the danger of that corner. I am not able to make a left-hand turn out of the alley onto Dale as it is now and even a right-hand turn is most difficult because of the traffic and parked cars along Dale. They hide the view of traffic on Dale. Adding 6 more homes and at least 12 more cars is going to add to the danger.
- This project will bring the neighborhood down. We have worked for years to make Dale & Selby area a great neighborhood.
- I have no objection to 3 or even 4 homes as we have (although their property is much smaller than ours so 3 would probably be best).

Please don't allow money hungry builders from the suburbs to bring down our property and our neighborhood. I can't imagine this being allowed in Eden Prairie where the builders have their offices.

Regards,

Libby Pett
157 Kent St.

617
LAUREL
AVE

OPPOSITION

Benner II, Jerome (CI-StPaul)

From: ericlein@gmail.com on behalf of Eric L <eric@apts.cc>
Sent: Sunday, March 25, 2018 5:34 AM
To: Benner II, Jerome (CI-StPaul)
Subject: BZA Public Hearing Notification --- 617 LAUREL
Attachments: 20180324131248013.pdf

FILE
18-035099

Thank you Jerome! That's very helpful.

I live near Summit and Western, and own apartment buildings on Holly east of Dale and on Grand near Victoria. Parking congestion in these neighborhoods is a non-stop issue. Today's developer at 617 Laurel is "only" four parking spaces short, and that's about to be fixed by sharing with neighbors via a lease (*see Staff Report, Section E. Findings, #1*).

Success brings dollars - and headaches. Customers of local businesses already fill nearby residential streets with their cars. 10- or 30-years from now today's owners will sell to buyers who will have fresh ideas and grand plans. Plus, Selby, Dale, Grand and Victoria are likely to become even more popular. Frustrated residents will, again, consider Permit Parking zones. Business owners will advocate, again, to eliminate single-sided parking on too-narrow streets close to Selby. Developers will cry "Hardship," and the City is likely, again, to grant short-sighted incremental (one-space-at-a-time) variances that worsen on-street parking. Parking studies will fail, again, to create more space (or funding) out of thin air. And unrecorded shared parking leases (i.e. "invisible" to title companies, etc.) will have been misplaced and long-forgotten.

SUGGESTION regarding shared parking for 617 Laurel:

1. Require that an **EASEMENT** (not a lease) in favor of 617 LAUREL for **all-day every-day** (24/7) off-street parking on NEIGHBORING LAND (at _____) be approved by the City, granted by the owner of that LAND, and recorded in Ramsey County; and
2. Ensure that the 24/7 shared parking on NEIGHBORING LAND does not use any spaces that are (or someday will be) required by occupants/customers/visitors of that LAND; and
3. Ensure that, 10- or 40- or 70-years from now when the owner of that LAND proposes a new use, City planners will not overlook, forget about or ignore today's shared parking arrangement.

Best wishes,
Eric Lein

On Sat, Mar 24, 2018 at 1:16 PM, Benner II, Jerome (CI-StPaul) <jerome.benner.ii@ci.stpaul.mn.us> wrote:

Hi Eric,

Please see the attached document. I've included my staff report along with the applicant's documents as well.

617
LAUREL AVE

OPPOSITION

Vue, Der (CI-StPaul)

From: Benner II, Jerome (CI-StPaul)
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2018 9:20 AM
To: Craig Upright
Cc: Vue, Der (CI-StPaul)
Subject: RE: Comments on File # 18 - 035099

FILE
18-035099

Thank you for your comments, Craig.

Jerome

-----Original Message-----

From: Craig Upright [mailto:craig.upright@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 25, 2018 6:50 PM
To: Benner II, Jerome (CI-StPaul) <jerome.benner.ii@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Subject: Comments on File # 18 - 035099

Dear Mr. Brenner,

I am writing in regard to the variance requests in File # 18 - 035099 for the parcel at 617 Laurel Avenue. I live on Hague Avenue, less one than block from the lot in question.

I object to granting any of these variances. This lot is obviously too small for the building that has been proposed. The footprint would significantly reduce the amount of green space on the property, and that would not be in character with our neighborhood. In addition, while the address for this parcel is on Laurel Avenue, the majority of the public perimeter for this lot is on Dale Avenue. This is a busier artery with limited parking — especially with the bar up the street — and there would be very limited availability for parking via the alley behind Laurel.

The biggest problem is that the developers want to pack 6 sets of renters into a space that is only appropriate for three. The combination of limited parking, butting up against the neighbor's property with a small buffer, and a lack of green space would seem to be a very good recipe for creating 6 miserable families.

I am firmly opposed to granting these variances. Thank you for your attention in adding these comments to this file.

-- Craig

Craig Upright
661 Hague Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55104

(651) 298-8649 -- home
(612) 600-1282 -- mobile

craig.upright@gmail.com

617
LAUREL AVE

OPPOSITION

Benner II, Jerome (CI-StPaul)

From: Ruthann Godollei <godollei@macalester.edu>
Sent: Sunday, March 25, 2018 6:24 PM
To: Benner II, Jerome (CI-StPaul)
Subject: 18-035099

FILE
18-035099

Dear Mr. Benner II, I am writing to object to the variances requested by Hupp Holdings II, LLC on the matter of File 18-035099, the development of the lot at 617 Laurel, at the end of my block. That lot is clearly too small for a 6-plex. City zoning keeps the green-to-paved-and-built ratio in balance and I believe it should be adhered to.

The variances requested include a structure too large for the lot by 20%.

They also ask permission to overpopulate the building at twice the allowable limit of families for a lot that size. And they want to scrimp on the amount of side yard setback by two thirds, effectively eliminating the green strip that allows for snowmelt, runoff and provide a tiny bit of room for children to play safely.

Among the good features of this neighborhood, that makes it livable, is not cramming families into units at too dense rates, so people can park, so there are some plants offsetting the pollution, and room for people to sit in their yards, meet their neighbors and feel some sense of belonging.

This developer could propose a 4 plex, which would be more in scale with the lot and the area. The zoning works, so please follow its guidelines.

--

Ruthann Godollei
661 Hague
St. Paul, MN 55104
godollei@macalester.edu

FILE
18-035099

Crippen, Debbie (CI-StPaul)

From: Benner II, Jerome (CI-StPaul)
Sent: Wednesday, March 21, 2018 3:41 PM
To: Crippen, Debbie (CI-StPaul)
Subject: FW: File # 18-035099 - 617 Laurel Ave

Concerns but supports

From: brian@pergolaonline.com [mailto:brian@pergolaonline.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 18, 2018 3:39 PM
To: Benner II, Jerome (CI-StPaul) <jerome.benner.ii@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Cc: awhupp@gmail.com
Subject: File # 18-035099 - 617 Laurel Ave

Dear Mr. Benner,

Although I was previously in support of the plan originally discussed for this site last year in File #17-006710 - 617 Laurel Ave; I have concerns about the current plan and the variances requested.

The north/south bound traffic on Dale St is heavy and the cross street at Laurel Ave is particularly challenging since it doesn't cross Dale St in a straight line as it travels East/West. Laurel Ave at Dale St is not an easy intersection to maneuver. My property is located at the North East corner of Laurel and Dale so I am particularly sensitive to this issue.

I am concerned that increasing the density of the planned development to six row houses will make that traffic situation more challenging.

I would like to see a site plan to determine how parking/traffic will work for the proposed development. If a site plan is available, please forward to me.

Sincerely,
Brian Pergament
Pergola Management

From: Diana S [mailto:soran.diana@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 18, 2018 3:13 PM
To: Benner II, Jerome (CI-StPaul) <jerome.benner.ii@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Subject: Zoning Hearing- 617 Laurel Avenue

FILE
18-035099

Mr. Benner,

I am a resident in the Selby-Dale area and I am concerned about the zoning variances requests for the row house that will be built on 617 Laurel Ave. I am unable to attend the upcoming hearing but wanted to provide written input regarding my concerns about the requests.

I am excited that that a project has been developed for this lot, but I feel that the variances requested are too great. A 6 unit row house on a 7,180 square foot lot with only 1 foot setback on multiple sides of the proposed construction will disrupt the aesthetics of the neighborhood by overtaking the lot with a large building on a small lot and result in a large percentage of hard ground cover.

I believe modifications need to be made to:

- 1- ensure the construction doesn't overburden the lot. This will make the building more consistent to the other buildings on the street/neighborhood
- 2- Decrease the amount of hard ground cover to reduce soil sealing. Soil sealing has tremendous environmental impacts¹

I am excited that improvements are being made to the neighborhood but also want to ensure they are aesthetically compatible and environmental sustainable. I hope the council will consider these issues and contribute at the upcoming hearing.

Thanks,
Diana Soran

¹ Assessment of Soil Sealing Management Responses, Strategies, and Targets Toward Ecologically Sustainable Urban Land Use Management. *Ambio*. 2014 May; 43(4): 530-541.

FILE
18-035099

Crippen, Debbie (CI-StPaul)

From: Benner II, Jerome (CI-StPaul)
Sent: Friday, April 20, 2018 11:41 AM
To: Crippen, Debbie (CI-StPaul)
Subject: FW: 617 Laurel ave

Please add this as a handout for 617 Laurel.

Thanks,

Jerome

From: Jason Parr [mailto:jparr@jspproperties.com]
Sent: Friday, April 20, 2018 11:40 AM
To: Benner II, Jerome (CI-StPaul) <jerome.benner.ii@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Subject: 617 Laurel ave

Jerome

We own a single family home on laurel ave and 4 condo building on Kent. Both a few blocks maximum from 617 Laurel ave, a planned 6 unit development location.

We oppose this for several reasons, largely lack of parking in comparison to practical property uses, too much density in comparison to zoning variances, and increased risks of accidents and uses on that location. Dale street is busy and this is not the proper setback property use for this parcel.

Thanks
Jason Parr

JSP Companies
Serving Twin Cities in Minnesota & Southern California

Management, Development & Investment, Rental

www.jspproperties.com

Email: jparr@jspproperties.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE - This e-mail transmission, and any documents, files or previous e-mail messages attached to it, may contain information that is confidential or legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, or a person responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you must not read or play this transmission and that any disclosure, copying, printing, distribution or use of any of the information contained in or attached to this transmission is STRICTLY PROHIBITED. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately notify the sender by telephone or return e-mail and delete the original transmission and its attachments without reading or saving in any manner. Thank you.

FILE

18-035099

Crippen, Debbie (CI-StPaul)

From: Benner II, Jerome (CI-StPaul)
Sent: Friday, April 20, 2018 11:42 AM
To: Crippen, Debbie (CI-StPaul)
Subject: FW: Board Zoning Appeals File # 18-035099

Please add as a handout for 617 Laurel.

Thanks,

Jerome

From: Luiz VINHOLI [mailto:vinholi@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 11:28 PM
To: Benner II, Jerome (CI-StPaul) <jerome.benner.ii@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Subject: Board Zoning Appeals File # 18-035099

Regarding property address: 617 Laurel Avenue

Applicant: Hupp Holding III, llc

I would like to express my concern regarding these variances which goes **against** the zoning code that states that no multi- family dwelling units can be built to create three or more dwelling units on a lot that is less than 9,000 square feet. A Variance request of 1,820 square feet to build **6 units** seems inappropriate for such a small lot in a busy street and many local business next to it.

This is a such traffic congested area with an already very busy alley where residents who wants to get on Dale ave from the Laurel ave alley are constantly at risk of car accidents due to partially blocked view from the cars parking on the East side of Dale avenue. During the winter months it becomes even more dangerous due to snow accumulation at end of the alley. Furthermore, I believe that the request variance of 3' for the side will agravante this situation Please be considered of this issue!

Louis

593 Laurel # 1e

From: Carol McElroy [mailto:caroljmcElroy08@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, April 20, 2018 12:09 PM
To: Benner II, Jerome (CI-StPaul) <jerome.benner.ii@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Subject: Comments for: 617 Laurel Ave. File #: 18-035099

FILE
18-035099

Jerome,

I am against granting variance for Hupp Holdings, particularly less than 9000 square feet, side yard setback of only 3 feet, and parking offset of only 1 foot. I am concerned about obstructiong vision at that intersection, particularly with the alley at Dale. That exit point is dangerous as even parked cars now obstruct view.

I recommend that the variance not be granted because of its proximity to a very busy intersection of Dale and Selby with heavy car and bus traffic. I believe that the rule for setbacks were put in place for good reason, and no exception should be made. Any further obstruction of view could result in increased accidents, especially for those who exit from the alley.

Thank you for your consideration.

Carol McElroy

593 Laurel ave #2e

Coverage Card

Construction Stormwater National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System/State Disposal System General Permit MNR100001

The construction site identified below is covered under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System/State Disposal System General Permit MNR100001 and is authorized by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) to discharge stormwater associated with construction activities.

Permit ID Number: C00050128
Owner: Saint Paul city of
General Contractor: Shaw-Lundquist Associates
Project Name: Scheffer Community Center

Permit Coverage Date: 06/13/2018

If you have questions regarding the stormwater program for construction activity, please access the MPCA Stormwater website at <http://www.pca.state.mn.us/stormwater>, or call the Construction Stormwater Program at 651-757-2119 or toll free at 800-657-3804.



Capitol Region Watershed District

1410 Energy Park Drive, Suite 4 • Saint Paul, MN 55108

T: (651) 644-8888 • F: (651) 644-8894 • capitolregionwd.org

June 6, 2018

Christopher Stark
St. Paul Parks and Rec
25 West 4th Street (CHA 400)
St. Paul, MN 55102

RE: CRWD Permit 18-012 Scheffer Community Center

Dear Mr. Stark:

This letter serves to inform you that the required permit documents have been received and reviewed. All conditions for permit 18-012 Scheffer Community Center have been satisfied and the permit was issued on 06/07/2018 (see attached). Please contact me at 651-644-8888 to schedule an erosion and sediment control inspection as soon as the required practices have been installed.

Please also note that the eventual closure of this permit will be contingent upon the submittal of a complete and accurate as-built survey completed after construction to document and verify adequate stormwater treatment. This survey should include, but is not limited to, all basin/swale grades, pipe inlets, outlet pipes and structures, emergency overflows, orifices, weirs, pipe sizes, draitile elevations and sizes, and any associated stormwater infrastructure. Submit at your earliest convenience for efficient permit closure when the project is complete.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Elizabeth Hosch".

Elizabeth Hosch, CESSWI
BMP Inspector

cc: Amy Santerre, Shaw-Lundquist
Duane Snorek, Shaw-Lundquist
Mike Palm, City of St. Paul
Stephen Ubl, City of St. Paul
Tia Anderson, City of St. Paul
Wes Saunders-Pearce, City of St. Paul



Payne-Phalen

COMMUNITY COUNCIL

567 Payne Avenue, St. Paul MN 55130 www.paynephalen.org 651-774-5234 district5@paynephalen.org

June 5, 2018

Philip Cattanach
OPUS Development Company LLC
10350 Bren Road West
Minnetonka, MN 55343

Re: Beacon Bluff site plan

Dear Mr. Cattanach,

At the May 22, 2018 meeting of our Board of Directors, you presented the site plan and building rendering for a Beacon Bluff parcel on Wells Street at Phalen Boulevard. This project is in collaboration with the St. Paul Port Authority. Items mentioned in the presentation included potential occupancy interest, a pocket park, and underground storm water management.

The Payne-Phalen Community Council Board voted overwhelmingly to support this project. We look forward to the continuation of this project.

On behalf of the Board of Directors,

Robin R. Hockey

for
Lissa Jones-Lofgren
Interim Executive Director

LJL/rch

Site Plan Review Approval Status -- The Vomela Companies/845 Minnehaha Ave.

Department	Reviewer	Summary of Outstanding Site Plan Requirements	Status	Approval Date
Zoning	L Zangs T Anderson		Under Review	
Planning	B Dermody	Requesting (not requiring) holding the corner better via landscaping or other elements	Approved	4/24/2018
Heritage Preservation	C Boulware		N/A	
PW Transportation Planning	D Kuebler C Paavola	See comments	Under Review	
PW Mapping & Records	J Brown	845 Minnehaha Ave	Approved	4/27/2018
PW Construction	S Brimer	no issues	Approved	4/18/2018
PW Sidewalks	A Czaia		Under Review	
PW Sewers	A Sima		Under Review	
Water Resource/ Erosion Control	W Saunders- Pearce		Approved	4/16/2018
Water Utility	J Murphy A Leier		Under Review	
Fire Safety	A Wiese A McLaughlin		Under Review	
Parks Forestry	Z Jorgensen		Under Review	
Parks & Recreation	P Sawyer		Approved	3/23/2018
Plumbing Review	R Jacobs	Comments: Provide additional roof drainage plans and indicate the specific design. Once the design is determined, add notes to Civil,	Under Review	4/23/2018

Department	Reviewer	Summary of Outstanding Site Plan Requirements	Status	Approval Date
Building Plan Review	J Williamette		FYI	
Parkland Dedication	L Zangs T Anderson		Under Review	
Smart Trips	B Alper		Approved	
Ramsey County	E Laberee		N/A	
MnDOT	K Scheffing		FYI	
Metro Transit	B Farrington		FYI	
Capitol Region WD	F Kelley E Hosch		Under Review	
Ramsey Washington WD	N Soderholm		N/A	
MPCA Construction SW Permit	L Zangs T Anderson	permit 4/12/18	Approved	5/18/2018
City Council Ward	6		FYI	
District Council	4		FYI	