

Dear Council President Brendmoen and City Councilmembers,

I strongly oppose the proposed amendments to the West Marshall Avenue Rezoning Plan that will be presented to the City Council today.

In particular, they make a mockery of the PARTICIPATORY DEMOCRATIC PROCESS involved in the plan's development -- which exhibited collaboration, compromise and consensus.

This plan reintroduces ideas that were reviewed and explicitly rejected by the Planning Commission -- specifically plans to provide exceptional large-scale status to 3 properties by the same owner.

This is about profit, not people. Developers pockets, not renters' affordable opportunities. We have seen these large-scale projects in our neighborhood -- and they are not affordable, nor styled for small families or senior citizens (the people most challenged by housing problems).

The new proposal fails to consider quantitative arguments and provides no evidence that the proposed changes are urgently needed now, or reflect equitable distribution of growth throughout the city. The unamended plan allows potential for density along the West Marshall Avenue to TRIPLE or QUADRUPLE (based on different assumptions about apartment size). More than that will be a swath of density akin to I-94 running through Rondo.

Earlier, I expressed a fear that special interests -- including real estate developers from outside the neighborhood or even outside Saint Paul -- would seek at the last minute to derail the consensus achieved by those truly committed to negotiating and developing the plan throughout its history. The developers' interest in profits from unregulated development are very clear, even if cloaked in the false rhetoric of benefiting residents. Here we see that prediction coming true. This is not about people. It is about profit.

I trust you will support participatory democracy in action and approve the unamended consensus plan, already approved by the District Council and the Planning Commission.

Yours,

Douglas Allchin

2005 Carrol Avenue, St. Paul, MN 55104

Dear Council Member Mitra Jalali Nelson

I write to you having just received and read my friend and neighbor Douglas Allchin's well written letter regarding the Rezoning process associated with Marshall Avenue and the zoning study you are now going to be present to vote for.

For the past 18 years, I have worked in the trenches of the Economic Development and Public Finance arena. Between my occupational choice and my passion for both real estate and public service, I think I have some good intel on housing, construction, and affordability patterns in the Twin Cities. I spent

almost 15 years as a City Planner/Economic Development Specialist for CPED in Minneapolis, and the past 3 for the State of Minnesota where I administer grants funds - federal and state tax dollars - to support subsidization of public transit in the Twin Cities and Greater Minnesota. With this as my background, I am particularly offended by the notion that you are, with the stroke of your pen, poised to delete all the good work of an extensive neighborhood outreach effort which led to the development of the rezoning plan recommended by UPDC and the City Planning Commission, in the apparent interest of preserving affordable housing opportunities. It is not a tried or tested method.

Should you proceed, however, I want to you to do so with Douglas comments regarding the creation of Affordable Housing and the Marshall and Moore Apartments now under construction clearly in perspective. The RM2 Zoning code does NOTHING to create Affordable Housing. The RM1 zoning district will do NOTHING to create any affordable housing. All these designations do is dictate how many units can be built on some dirt. They say nothing about quality or the appearance, or any other merits, for that matter, of a given development in and of themselves. What we do see time and again is that high density zoning designations, combined with the mercury hot Twin Cities real estate market, and we get out of town developers with dollar signs for eyeballs. Indeed, I live in a 4 bedroom 1908 home across the alley from the "Affordable Luxury" that is Schwartzmanns M and M project. That building, with its \$3200/month units will run at 1.6 times my mortgage payment. Sure, it might be "luxury" (jury is out!), but it is anything but affordable. Here is a link to [Metropolitan Councils affordability index](#). Note that 100% of MMI for a 4 bedroom turns out to be \$2733.75!!! On what planet is \$3200/ month (EG 120% of MMI affordable to a family of four?? Have we reached the point where the eligibility requirement is dual-PHDs and 6 figure salaries to live in St Paul ??

If you are serious about protecting the interest of renters, use your power wisely and work on **requiring developers to build housing** that is priced to be realistically available to all Saint Paul residents. Use your power to **get the University of St Thomas to do its part** and funnel some of its monstrous endowment to build more housing on campus. **And finally, please use your power to *balance* the interests of the renters you claim to represent with those of us who have mortgaged our futures by investing in Saint Paul.**

Robert Clarksen, MPA

Professional Land Use Planning and Development Services

1980 Iglehart Avenue, Saint Paul, Minnesota 55104

Dear Mitra,

I cannot believe that you have just taken your place on the City Council and are already proposing over 100 amendments to a zoning ordinance that we as neighbors as well as the City Planning office, Union Park Council, and other groups and neighbors have worked for months and months to craft. We have developed an ordinance that involved many, many voices and for many of us expresses compromises and regulations that differing peoples agree with or at least can live with. And now you're going to basically throw the whole thing out and make us start over? This has been a long, open, and democratic process. Anyone who cares about this neighborhood and its future have been invited to participate and have participated. What do you say to people like me who went to multiple meetings, canvassed neighbors, collected signatures, got involved in the process, attended City Council meetings, and--believed this was a democratic process where our voices and ideas mattered. Your action to change the ordinance so much that it no longer reflects the values of those who helped shape it is disturbing and disheartening. I have a hard time believing that you care much at all for those of us who currently live near Marshall Avenue and worked so hard the past six months on this ordinance. I would like you to schedule a meeting to explain what the point of our work was.

Catherine Spaeth

1879 Carroll Avenue

Dear Councilmember Jalali Nelson:

My husband and I have lived on Dayton Avenue, near Finn Street for 32 years. We have gone to several meetings over the past year or so to participate in the discussion of the rezoning of Marshall Avenue. A lot of time has been spent with various groups of people to come up with a plan that helps to meet the goal of increasing housing density without drastically changing the look and feel of our neighborhood. Is the compromise perfect? No. But it's pretty good.

Imagine my surprise when a neighbor mentioned that you have come up with a new plan that increases the potential density waaaay beyond the compromise plan.

Surprise is a nice word, blindsided is a better word.

Changing the zoning on Marshall and Finn (2122 Marshall) so that a beautiful old home could be torn down and a 5 story behemoth constructed in its place? You can't be serious. It would be so out of character on a street of classy turn of the century homes. The former owner of that home took wonderful care of her home and property. It sounds like the new owner is fine with that home and several others in the neighborhood being "upzoned" so that bigger and taller buildings can be put up in their places. No, No, No. Converting some of the single family, large homes on Marshall to duplexes might make some sense, but single handedly coming up with a new plan that is much denser and taller without the input of people who have been living in the neighborhood a very long time makes absolutely no sense. It's very disappointing to see a new city councilwoman take these drastic steps just a few weeks after being sworn in. You must make time to listen to your constituents on this matter. We are not happy. I look

forward to hearing your response to this e mail, and how you plan to involve more of the neighbors in the rezoning plan.

Deb Mitchell
2115 Dayton Avenue

Good morning Mitra:

I thought all night about the amendments to the zoning proposal for Marshall Avenue. Please, please, please go with the original proposal. The amendments seem to favor Mr. Kvasnik and the properties he owns; with T3 zoning we would have tall apartment buildings on Finn, Wilder and Cleveland; this is not appropriate in this residential corridor. Through meetings of Union Park District Council, UST Amy Gage and Saturday locals, many, many neighbors participated and worked hard to accomplish a compromise. Please, please end the creative process and be faithful to the original zoning proposal and vote on its approval at the meeting tonight. Mr. Kvasnik came to one UPDC meeting; he did not participate in the process. This is not fair. We want to preserve our community and the residential corridor of Marshall Ave.

Marshall Avenue is full of historic homes that make up one of the beautiful drives of St. Paul. Please don't let them be destroyed by developers who want to put in big apartment buildings. We want to save our beautiful city and the homes that were built so long ago. Please, please, please reconsider and withdraw the amendments. Present the original Zoning Proposal for Marshall Avenue.

Thank you for respecting us and the neighborhood we love.

Charlotte Berres

1919 Iglehart

St. Paul 55104

Dear Councilmember Nelson,

I and a homeowner and business owner in Merriam Park and would like to thank you for your efforts to work with our community on the West Marshall Avenue Zoning Study. This is not something new. Our community is involved, aware, educated, sensitive and invested in this long process and the outcomes.

Some of my neighbors have been extremely involved and represent a consensus here. I want to thank Douglas Allchin for his untiring work to be an inclusive and thoughtful participant and communicator. I am aware of his communications with the council and yourself and encourage you to talk directly with him. As he has noted, the study, "promotes Naturally Occurring Affordable Housing. It promotes expanded housing, while discouraging *unaffordable* development-for-profit. For all these reasons, I think, the plan represents a strong consensus, and was accordingly endorsed by the District Council and approved by the Planning Commission."

I totally agree with Mr. Allchin and urge you to consider the long-term process and actions we have undergone together in the neighborhood. Remember that once something is “sold” we can never afford to buy it back. Merriam Park is a mixed and beautiful gem in our city so let us all proceed slowly and together.

Sincerely,

Deborah McLaren
1873 Iglehart Avenue

To: #CI-StPaul_Ward1 <Ward1@ci.stpaul.mn.us>

Subject: West Marshall Zoning Ammendment

Council Member Thao:

I encourage you to strike down the planned changes proposed by Mitra Nelson regarding the West Marshall Rezoning Study. **Instead, please ratify the consensus plan developed by the City's Planning and Economic Development office and the Union Park District Council.**

After nearly a year of robust community engagement with neighbors and stakeholders, the consensus plan exceeds the density guidelines established by the city’s 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

Mitra’s amendment doesn’t address housing affordability in Union Park. It up-zones 65% of the properties in the consensus plan at the detriment to a well-established neighborhood. Her plan turns a deaf ear to the scores of neighbors who turned-out for hearings, walking tours, and UPDC meetings to voice their concerns and reach outcomes that achieve the city’s goals.

Most egregious, though, is the spot zoning her amendment offers to one property owner David Kvasnik at 2063 Marshall, 2122 Marshall and 2190 Marshall Avenue. All three of his properties have been up-zoned to T2 and T3. I’m not sure why Mitra Nelson would grant such advantage to the one while ignoring the many but I am sure that you and the rest of the council would not want to be complicit to such obvious cronyism.

It’s absurd to undermine the democratic process of a year-long study in favor of half-baked ideas. Please reject the amendment of our ill-informed Ward 4 council member and approve the consensus proposal on October 17th.

Dan Taylor
2127 Dayton Avenue

Dear Councilmember Nelson:

Again, I am disappointed by your actions on the West Marshall Avenue zoning, which have not only discounted but now inflamed community residents. It seems (to me at least) that you have chosen confrontation over collaboration, and support for a style of government that privileges unilateral executive action over democracy and consensus.

Earlier I said that you had "allies in affordability." That is quite true, especially in a neighborhood that is one of the most steadfast DFL areas in the state, and among the highest in voter turnout, too. However, that does not mean that you have allies in "mindless density." Again, you seem to have staked your political position and we will all see what comes of it.

I feel it important at this particular time to point to two misleading comments that you made recently to the City Council.

First, you represented your plan as honoring a principle of limiting height to 3 stories. The plan you presented does not do this. The zoning designation for T3 is a mixed-use "traditional neighborhood" classification that allows 5 stories without a variance, and 6 stories with an approved design. Hence, the two properties (conspicuously both owned by Mr. Kvasnik) that you (re)designated as T3 are NOT limited to 3 stories at all. This is a case of misunderstanding or misrepresentation. Council President Brendmoen was clearly under the impression in her later comment that your amendments "don't add height, but do add density." Her comment indicates clearly that you misconveyed facts about your proposal.

Second, you commented that community residents want commercial properties (T1 zones) at the intersections of Fairview, Prior and Finn Avenues. This is also incorrect or misleading. Community residents want a varied streetscape, and in planning for growth, sought to concentrate that needed growth at particular nodes, where it seemed more appropriate. The proposal for T1 zones at these intersections was thus a COMPROMISE and a BALANCE between density concerns and livability concerns. It was not an absolute desire. I do not think you will find any public testimony to date to support your interpretation of specific community desires on this matter. Your amended proposal provides unarticulated and invariant high-density "swath zoning" from Cretin to Snelling. It does not respect the principles of heterogeneity and balance, hence there is no need to concentrate overall growth at particular nodes.

Further, it was NEVER the community's desire to promote commercial development at Finn. From a city planner's perspective (and we have two city planners who work for the City of Minneapolis living in this area, just off Marshall), placing such a structure one block away from commercial developments at Cretin and Cleveland is not objectively justified. The only thing that made it appropriate at the other intersections was that they were cross streets that allowed access across I-94, and thus had traffic lights. Finn does neither. A "bus-stop" is not a legitimate justification. Your proposal and your public comments misrepresent community sentiment, and further expose your special allowances specifically for the properties of David Kvasnik.

These misrepresentations matter in terms of the apparent justification you provide to the City Council, as well as your image among residents -- as whether you listen carefully to all stakeholders -- and especially in your role as an elected representative, whether you are interested in and committed to representing and accommodating the concerns of ALL Ward 4 residents.

While you live in Ward 4 and could have participated in this project from the beginning, you seemed to have remained aloof and missed the interaction of different perspectives and the spirit of compromise that resulted in the consensus plan. In offering a wholesale replacement proposal involving some 140 properties, you have also failed to respect the City's established democratic process of public input, with no evidence that due process was not followed along the way. Indeed, quite the opposite. One observer noted that this project had more public engagement and input than any other she had witnessed in the

last two decades. As I see it, that disregard alienates the constituents/voters of Ward 4 and, unfortunately, may well limit your effectiveness at instituting other, more fruitful changes in the future. If so, that would be sad.

Yours truly,

Douglas Allchin

Hello,

I am wholeheartedly opposed to the new West Marshall Zoning Plan and beg you to vote instead on the consensus plan that was moved forward by our community, not a single individual supported by an appointee.

This is the letter I sent to Council Member Nelson, and I hope you will reconsider this. It isn't right. We need real estate values to support the wealth of families, not development corporations.

Thank you.

--Laura Smith
2127 Iglehart Avenue

Dear Council Member Nelson,

I was saddened to learn that all the community work that went into the compromise plan for the West Marshall Zoning plan was set aside to favor developers, particularly at the corner of Cleveland and Marshall.

Have you read the book, "How to Kill a City: Gentrification, Inequality, and the Fight for the Neighborhood" by Peter Moskowitz, yet? It makes a compelling argument about preserving the historic and economic diversity of a city by regulating growth with careful zoning and building. We undoubtedly need new housing and AFFORDABLE housing in our city, and we need it quickly. But if we enact zoning laws that make it profitable to tear down existing, perfectly sound housing en masse (5 at a time? Really?) to build what is never really affordable housing that primarily services young college students and professional couples, we add to the terrible trouble people have in finding reasonable housing in the city. Sure, we might attract a few more restaurants and coffee spots along Marshall, but we would lose our unique character. We will end up with buildings that look JUST like everywhere else with new growth. I want Kopplins and the Marshall Stop, not Starbucks and Holiday.

I want more affordable housing in this part of town. I want homes that families can buy and enjoy for years to come. I want a place for dog-walkers, bicyclists, kids on scooters, and people in wheelchairs to feel safe and welcome. I want increases in property values to go towards the wealth-building of families, not corporations.

If our values on Pill Hill go up (please, I've been waiting for 13 years to recover), our city's tax base goes up and we contribute more to the budget but also get something in return when we sell. Our property values won't increase here or ANYwhere around UST if the only people who will buy our houses will be the developers who will tear them down and replace them with 12 apartments. You will sell all of us out to them; we'll be lucky to have anyone want to buy our homes except corporations.

We will see so many changes here with the soccer stadium and the new development in Highland. Let's slow down a little and preserve the street for families and a few modest apartments. Please go back to the compromises that were worked on before you got in office. Decisions about new housing must be community-driven, not profit-driven.

Thank you.

--Laura Smith
2127 Iglehart Avenue

It saddens me that the city has made no bones about having more densely populated housing in such a beautiful neighborhood. We can witness the beginnings of the change in the neighborhood on the north east corner of Marshall and Moore. Much to my dismay, our home that we have lived in for 37 years is on the rezoning block. I lived for 25 years at 2137 Shelby, and taught for 27 years at St. Mark's school. I do care about this community, but think it is a done deal already. I have heard the Mayor talk about density in population. I do blame the University of St. Thomas. Their greed for money has drawn more students than their land locked campus can house, therefore these students dominate the area bound by Selby, Cleveland, Cretin and Marshall and beyond. My plot of land is deeper than normal plots (as are all on Marshall between Cleveland and Cretin) making a nice spot for an apartment building. With the two busses and light rail near, why not pick on this neighborhood.

As I said, it saddens me.

Michele Egan
2078 Marshall Ave.

I am a home owner on Marshall Ave who opposes the Oct 17 plan to rezone marshall for 3 story apartment buildings. This was not the original plan presented.

Thank you
Don Carlson
1775 Marshall Ave
St. Paul MN 55104

My wife and I are long-time residents in St. Paul and 17 years in Merriam Park. The city did a lot of work to align on the original rezoning plan. We are NOT in favor of additional changes.

The goal is to maintain a thriving and balanced neighborhood, as has been the vision for over 100 years. To change more is to potentially do irreparable harm.

The original plan was thoughtful and balanced. Please do not proceed with additional amendments.

Sincerely,

Jaye Peterson

I have lived in Union Park for 22 years. I am NOT in favor of additional changes to the Marshall Avenue zoning. While I understand it's important to provide suitable housing for more people, I believe the neighborhood has gotten steadily more congested which negatively effects both livability and safety of residents, especially pedestrians and bicyclists.

The goal is to maintain a thriving and balanced neighborhood, as has been the vision for over 100 years. To change more is to potentially do irreparable harm.

Please do not proceed with additional amendments.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Miggler

1753 Dayton avenue

I am one of many Merriam Park neighbors who have spent many, many hours over the past year participating in good faith in what we thought was a democratic process intended to hear our voices and produce a compromise zoning ordinance for West Marshall Avenue. Boy, were we wrong. A consensus ordinance has been developed, but now our newly elected Councilmember Mitra Jalali Nelson is proposing over 100 amendments to the ordinance before it can be voted on, effectively throwing out a year's worth of neighborhood efforts. While her goal may be to bring density to Merriam Park, it does so in a way that alienates and angers residents like me who now feel disregarded and shunted aside. It leaves me asking: what was the point of all those meetings and why would I participate in the future? The ordinance that was finished and ready to be voted on will be scrapped in favor of changes that do precious little for affordability while favoring developers and helping people profit by tearing down historic homes. It's disturbing and disheartening.

Catherine Spaeth

1879 Carroll Avenue

Dear Mitra

I am the neighbor that live directly across from on Marshall Avenue that you propose to zone for an apartment building. I do not understand your approach to changing whole zoning of Marshall Avenue without considering the history and the nature of what Marshall Avenue is. It does not appear that you value what the neighborhood is and would rather destroy 100 year old works of art that many of these homes are. Or care about us who live here and love this neighborhood. I for one and many others have moved here to St. Paul for the character and historical value this neighborhood offers us. When you throw around the terms high density and affordability most people think of a lesser quality of housing being offered. This is not why we live in this neighborhood. We already have a quality of resident issues here with the University of St. Thomas 2 blocks away. By rezoning this will only add to the problems that exist here. I do believe the reason you have the backing of the rest of the city council is that they have someone willing to do the bidding of the mayor that does not involve them and their ward. I implore you to reconsider your proposal.

Respectfully
Randy Harrison
2127 Marshall Ave.

Please add my name to the list of neighbors who are absolutely opposed to the current plan for Marshall Av. Having paid high taxes to live in this neighborhood, only to be told that one block away will be hundreds of more units - if the plan is passed, is hardly fair. We are all disappointed in our representative of Ward 4. Please reconsider the current plan.

Judy Thomas
2126 Iglehart Av

Mitra:

I have lived in St. Paul for more than 20 years, including 17 years on Marshall Avenue. I am very confused about recent news reports about further changes to the rezoning plans for Marshall—particularly after so much thought and public input went into the original plan which seemed to be a done deal.

Are there going to be any additional public meetings about these new proposed changes? We received information that you are planning to rezone all houses (mine is at 1756 Marshall on the corner of Marshall and Wheeler) on Marshall to be 3-story apartments. Is this true? Can you explain your rationale and how you came to this recommendation? Also, do you have any input on what this means to our neighborhoods? Are developers going to come knocking on our doors? Can neighbors sell out without any consideration of the families near by? Is this development limited to busy corners and intersections? Why aren't you considering more development along Selby (between Fairview and Snelling) where there seems to ample space for development!

Mitra, if you were to share more information about your thought process via some public meetings, encourage neighbors to share their feedback and concerns, you may actually gain some supporters. However the way this is coming about at the last minute just doesn't feel right. Obviously I have some concerns (and

some ideas!) but I would also like to hear your side and how this type of development would benefit me and my neighbors who have lived here for decades and plan to stay.

I look forward to your response.

Sarah Peterson

2005 Carroll Ave., St. Paul, MN 55104

October 7, 2018

Saint Paul City Council City Hall
15 Kellogg Blvd.
West Saint Paul, MN 55102

Re: West Marshall Avenue Zoning Study

Dear Council President Brendmoen and Honorable Council Members:

I support increasing density by three- to four-fold from current land use along West Marshall Avenue. A bold, dramatic change, yes?

I support increasing density to 42-53½ units per acre (currently 12.5), which is higher even than the upper limit of the 4-30 units/acre density that is prescribed in the city's 2030 Comprehensive Plan for a Residential Corridor, such as Marshall Avenue (similarly, 5 to 30 for an Urban Neighborhood in the draft 2040 Comp Plan).

These numbers support **the general goal of accommodating growth and providing more housing in St. Paul.**

At the same time, **I also support preserving the scale and character of the Merriam Park neighborhood**, as articulated in the "General Provisions and Definitions" of the city's Zoning Code:

Sec. 60.103.(l). To encourage a compatible mix of land uses, at densities that support transit, that reflect the scale, character and urban design of Saint Paul's existing traditional neighborhoods

and echoed in the 2016 Union Park District Plan, approved by the City Council: LU2.3 Ensure that new development fits within the character and scale of adjacent neighborhoods.

This goal may seem to conflict with the goals of increasing housing density. But it need not, with creative problem-solving and a spirit of collaboration.

Amazingly, the August 10th consensus plan for rezoning West Marshall Avenue — **endorsed by the Union Park District Council, and approved by the St. Paul Planning Commission** — managed to meet **both these goals**. That is surely why, in part, it achieved a consensus status. What other policy benchmarks are possibly available for sound, legally justified decision-making? *How are these remarkable numbers for growth not adequate by the City's own reckoning and long-term planning, expressed in the Comprehensive Plan?*

Given that the consensus rezoning plan meets and even exceeds all these policy benchmarks, I am **puzzled indeed** why the new Council Member from Ward 4 has found the plan inadequate. The amendments she submitted on October 3 are needlessly aggressive. They are not explicitly rooted in any adopted City policy. There seems to be complete disregard of quantitative analysis or evidence. The vision seems to be a blind ideology of density, density, density, without attention to the larger scope of enacted policy documents, such as the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, the 2016 District Plan (or even the draft 2040 Comp Plan, yet to be approved). For example, one property was upzoned from the surrounding area because it was at a bus stop. The “traditional neighborhood” designation that she applied was created for *major* transport intersections, not such trivial cases. There is no need for additional commercial services there, which are already available one block in either direction. The justification she presented leaves the ordinary reasoner stunned.

In addition, there is **no consideration for affordability**, which is the core housing problem, as I understand it.

Equally important, the rezoning study — authorized by the City Council — **followed due process**. The tradition of public engagement and input is especially strong in Minnesota, with its laws about open meetings and such. The new Council Member has not provided any evidence that due process was not followed. Instead, she has provided a wholesale replacement plan, as though the year-long study itself was irrelevant. Perhaps even more importantly, she has dismissed outright the recommendation of the Planning Commission, discounting entirely the general review and advisory role of the Commission itself.

Even worse, perhaps, the amendments that have been submitted provide special “upzoned” exceptions to four properties, all owned by the same person. Regardless of the facts, this yields at least an appearance of cronyism behind closed doors. Residents and citizens have good reason to be duly skeptical if the full City Council approves this plan.

I write to you rather than my own City Council member from Ward 4 because **efforts to meet with her and engage in authentic dialogue, explore shared values, and/or negotiate consensus have failed**. The result is a plan that has genuinely inflamed residents. This does not promote respect for city government. From my perspective, at least, I feel as though I am

watching the collapse of democratic government, along with the loss of the role of civility and civil dialogue that underlies civilization.

I respectfully invite members of the City Council to confer with their new colleague from Ward 4. The original consensus plan that she has rejected meets all the goals she promoted in her election campaign. Numbers and evidence show this. The plan approved by the Planning Commission also promotes good will among residents, unlike the substitute amendment now in place. The Council Member for Ward 4 resides there and could have participated in this project at any point in its development. Why should she not now respect the community engagement process that residents have pursued in good faith, and look ahead to shaping prospective changes in the future? As the ancient book of wisdom the *Tao Te Ching* advises, “to earn respect, extend respect.”

As indicated at the outset, **I support** the city’s goals of growth and affordable housing. I support inclusionary zoning. I support an increase in minimum wage, to address the core problem of income disparities. I support measures to increase the availability of condominiums, apartment cooperatives, and small scale houses, all towards helping current renters build equity towards owning a home, rather than feed landlords’ and developers’ pockets month after month. I am not alone among my neighbors in advocating all these measures. However, **I do not support** mindless density. And I do not support unilateral, undemocratic actions. Nor do others. *Please help the new Council Member from Ward 4 see a more prudent and inclusive path* on the rezoning of West Marshall Avenue, by withdrawing the amendment and restoring the August 10 consensus plan as recommended to the City Council by the Planning Commission.



Yours most sincerely,

Douglas Allchin

From: Meg Arnosti [<mailto:arnosti.meg@gmail.com>]

Sent: Monday, October 08, 2018 10:10 AM

To: #CI-StPaul_Ward1; #CI-StPaul_Ward2; #CI-StPaul_Ward3; #CI-StPaul_Ward4; #CI-StPaul_Ward5; #CI-StPaul_Ward6; #CI-StPaul_Ward7; Dadlez, Kady (CI-StPaul); Burger, Kathryn (CI-StPaul); Thor, Christina (CI-StPaul); Maki, Taina (CI-StPaul); McMahon, Melanie (CI-StPaul); Kelley, Pattie (CI-StPaul); kim.obrien@ci.stpaul.mn.us; Sanders, Donna (CI-StPaul); Renstrom, Scott (CI-StPaul); Freking, Heidi (CI-StPaul); Harr, Stephanie (CI-StPaul); Heintz, Polly (CI-StPaul)

Subject: Support the Neighborhood Plan for West Marshall Avenue

I am outraged that Mitra Jalali Nelson has submitted a substitute amendment for the zoning plans on West Marshall Avenue. The neighborhood and the Union Park District Council worked tirelessly on a consensus plan, which was approved by the Planning Commission on August 10. The substitute plan allows for an uninterrupted swath of 3-story buildings from Cretin to Snelling and multi-use structures which would destroy the historic character of Marshall Avenue.

This issue is not just about Ward 4. Marshall is a street that many in the City know and love because we drive it every day. Many of us love St. Paul's historic charm and also want density. The plan that was worked out achieved that balance.

It would set a terrible precedent for the City Council to ignore the neighborhood. You risk being seen as succumbing to machine politics. St. Paul is about neighborhoods, not about strong-arm tactics.

Please, reject this substitute amendment and support the neighborhood plan.

Sincerely,
Meg Arnosti
1722 Princeton Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55105

Dear Council Member Nelson,
Congratulations on your successful campaign to represent the Fourth Ward. We voted for you and are happy that you won. We've lived at 2012 Iglehart for 30 years and raised our children here, and we love Merriam Park.
Please reconsider your substitute amendment changing zoning for West Marshall Avenue. The most recent rezoning recommendations known as the "consensus plan" were carefully worked out by the neighborhood, the City staff, the UPDC, and the Planning Commission. This plan will create significant opportunities for affordable housing/student housing while maintaining the character of this neighborhood.
The cycle of older generations moving on and young families moving in provides a stability that makes this neighborhood a wonderful place to live. But this stability will disappear if unwise increases in density drive out homeowners. Preserving historic homes is vital to sustain this neighborhood.

Sincerely,
Bruce and Jean Bakke
2012 Iglehart Ave.

Dear Honorable Council member Jalali Nelson:

As you may well know, the community was actively engaged in developing a "consensus plan" that provided for growth, while also preserving the scale and character of the neighborhood. This plan was approved by the Planning Commission on August 10.

I understand that you have submitted a new plan that increases density and makes no allowance for historical preservation or affordability. I am surprised that you would disregard the consensus of your constituents, AND the Planning Commission.

Our plan took a long time to gather neighbor concerns and address them, and everyone was contacted to contribute. When you do not support our plan, you are disregarding the constituents that voted for you.

I, Julia and Tarrance respectfully request that you reconsider your position and support the zoning plans for Marshall Ave as approved by the Planning Commission.

Thank you for your consideration.

Meline Juarez
1926 Marshall Ave.
St. Paul, MN 55104

Dear Councilmember Jalali-Nelson:

On Friday, September 29, you and I spoke cordially and candidly by phone about the amendments you proposed for the consensus Marshall Avenue zoning plan at the City Council meeting two days earlier. We agreed that there's an affordable housing shortage in Saint Paul for young people in their 20's and 30's (including my own daughter!), and that increased housing density is at least part of the solution to this problem. We also agreed---or so I thought---that zoning changes should not inadvertently destroy vital neighborhoods, or impoverish some of its residents, or enrich outside developers at the expense of individuals and families who have served as long-term anchors and sustainers of a community.

So please imagine my disappointment on learning that you subsequently acted to jettison the consensus plan, and supplant it with a hasty, extreme, and likely harmful alternative. Besides the disrespect this unilateral action shows towards the city professionals and community leaders who worked for a year on the consensus plan—which was approved by the Planning Commission on August 10 and recommended to the City Council on Sept. 19---your proposal shows little apparent consideration of consequences for the neighborhood. What's more, it does not strike me at all as an effective plan. I genuinely believe it is unlikely to help the up-and-coming young people you wish to champion.

I and many others in Ward 4 support your and the Mayor Carter's social justice goals. We support increasing affordable housing across Saint Paul, and doing more to raise household income. But we also want any plans to work and to not destroy existing healthy communities. As a result, we support meaningful, effective, and reasonable increases in density in our own neighborhood. The consensus plan achieves these goals by permitting 300%-400% density increases while preserving the character and livability of Marshall Avenue and surrounding neighborhoods. Unfortunately, your new proposal--with its call for precipitous five-fold increases in density--is more likely to destroy lynchpins of the neighborhood and to prompt reckless changes that will make the neighborhood either undesirable or unattainable for your target constituents.

The terms of your proposal create a wide continuous swath of 3-story apartment buildings all along Marshall Avenue, displacing or removing nearly all single-family houses, and inserting 5-story apartment buildings in critical and visible locations. (It's hard not to wonder whether these 5-story exceptions are actually meant to be placeholders until future rezoning turns the entire length of Marshall Avenue into five-story buildings---or higher!)

Though the intention of your plan may be to provide affordable housing for middle- and low-income renters, this vision ignores the economics of urban development and of apartment/mixed-use construction. Several studies show that, given current fixed construction and maintenance costs and prevailing housing market prices, only two architectural styles can yield the profitability required by builders and developers to create large multifamily structures in urban settings. Neither style serves the needs of your target constituents.

The first feasible style is to create cut-rate, bare-minimum-amenity structures, with as many low square-footage units as possible to maximize rental income. The second---and today more prevalent---approach is to create buildings with large, highly-accessorized apartments that appeal to well-heeled, established, affluent renters. Such high-end apartments are invariably too expensive for students, low-income, or middle-income individuals and families. (Examples of this type of development may be seen today on University Avenue, at 1977 and 1880 Marshall Avenue, and at the intersection of Snelling and Selby Avenues.)

The outcomes of either of these development scenarios are dismal. In the first scenario, the inevitable drop in local property values will generate homeowner flight, as owners sell their homes as quickly as possible to "cut their losses". Any potential property tax gains from high-rise buildings on Marshall will be more than offset by lower tax revenue from the reduced values of the rest of the area, producing a net revenue loss for the city. Those seniors and retirees who cannot afford to sell at a loss, since their life savings are entirely tied up in their homes, will be left behind. The incomes, well-being, and lifestyles of such seniors could decline significantly, as their limited other savings evaporate and their ability to borrow falls.

In the second scenario, new well-appointed townhouse-like apartments will rent at prices far above what students, singles, and young couples and families can afford. Such new

developments will most likely attract high-income or high asset empty-nesters, as they downsize from single-family houses to equally comfortable, but lower-maintenance, apartments. Developers will target this older, more-affluent end of the market because the demand for such units is growing as the huge demographic of baby-boomers wind down their careers. Developers will be far more attracted to this high-end market than to other market segments because each unit can yield higher profits per square foot.

I am a "recovering" former New Yorker, and I fear your plan has too great a chance of either turning the Marshall Avenue corridor into a local version of the Bronx, or of turning it into a wealthy, gentrified enclave like the Upper East Side of Manhattan. In either scenario, the middle-class loses, the developers win, and the historic Victorian charm of the neighborhood vanishes for good.

I respectfully request that you retract or greatly delay your well-meant but unintentionally damaging---and almost certainly ineffective---proposal. Instead, please revive the August 2018 consensus zoning plan recommended by the City and the Union District Council. I and others in the community are prepared to work with you on more reasonable and effective ideas---such as incenting small-footprint affordable units for purchase rather than for rent---that will more effectively address the housing needs of your constituents while preserving a vital and valued neighborhood in Saint Paul.

Sincerely,

Stephen M. Levin
2073 Marshall Avenue
Saint Paul, MN 55104

Mitra Jalali Nelson,

As a constituent of Ward 4 who voted for you in the election, I was astonished at your proposal to do away with the "consensus plan" that was approved by the Planning Commission on August 10th concerning the Zoning Proposal for West Marshall. As a candidate who ran on a platform of listening to the voices of your constituents, this action seems a betrayal of the people you represent. The approved plan was the result of a highly democratic process which took into consideration the input of all kinds of neighbors who actually live in the area that will be affected by this plan. It is a compromise that provides for growth, while also preserving the scale and character of the neighborhood. We have lived at 1821 Carroll Ave for 30 years. There are a mixture of people living in their own homes, rental properties, a sober home and a halfway house in our block alone. This area already includes a mixture of housing situations. While we do not object to increasing density in our neighborhood along Marshall, the consensus plan already allowed for an increase of density of 3-4X growth along Marshall Avenue, at densities of 42-53.5 units/acre. This is a significant increase in density and represents a major change for those who live in this area. Opening up Marshall Ave to even more commercial development, which won't be mandated to keep rents at lower rates, will not alleviate the reasonably priced rental property

shortage or benefit those living in this are who you are supposed to be representing. What neighborhood groups in Ward 4 did you include in a conversation when you came up with your new proposal? The Planning Commission is a governmental review and advisory body that did its job by engaging the community in its process and approved a proposal on August 10th that was the result of compromises between the interests of people living here and concerns on behalf of the city as a whole. You do this Ward and faith in the democratic process a disservice by unilaterally rejecting this approved plan at the last minute.

Eileen Degnan
Ward 4 resident

Councilmember Jalali Nelson,

I just finished watching video of the Council meeting in which you introduced the amendment relating to the Marshall Avenue Zoning Study. I am writing with the following questions to in order to better understand your proposed amendment and its potential impacts :

1. During the meeting, you frequently referenced increasing density as your motivation for the amendment. Can you expound on that driver? What benefits do you anticipate increased density will bring? What negative impacts do you anticipate and how do you propose the City mitigate those impacts?
2. Has a study been conducted to determine what impacts increased density may have on vehicular traffic, bus ridership, and parking impacts? Assuming increased density will increase traffic on Marshall, what steps will the city take to ensure that traffic does not spill out on secondary roads?
3. Are there provisions in the zoning categories proposed that will ensure the building form, function, and ancillary services (like parking) compliment the existing structures, set backs, and services in the area?
4. If the zoning is implemented as you proposed, what do you expect the neighborhood character to be like? In other words, is there an area of St. Paul or elsewhere in the Twin Cities that you would consider to be a model of the type of redevelopment the proposed zoning would facilitate?
5. The proposed zoning will likely result in redevelopment of properties and demolition of existing structures. Construction waste is a significant environmental pollutant and building materials have considerable embodied energy and pollution. What efforts has the City undertaken to ensure construction wastes from private development are recycled or repurposed, and new construction is more sustainable (both during construction and in operation).
6. Affordable housing is a significant concern in the Twin Cities. Most housing developed is market rate and increasing density will not necessarily result in more affordable housing. What steps do you propose be taken as these properties are redeveloped to ensure they contribute to increasing the stock of affordable housing?

Thanks for your time and attention to these questions.

Sincerely,
Shane Stennes
1882 Iglehart Avenue

Hi Mitra,

I supported you in your run for City Council. I read about your Marshall Ave re-zoning plan and am frankly disappointed. There was a consensus plan approved by the planning commission, that promotes a democratic process for making changes. I supported the moratorium on development on Marshall to allow for time to get input from the community, a single short meeting (not in our neighborhood) with 8 days notice is not the democratic process we had in mind.

Many of my neighbors are pretty upset, many supported and door knocked with you for your campaign. I think you need to re-consider this proposed plan.

Your proposal advocates:

- Interfering with the previously hard-fought community consensus with just one person (yourself), who was not involved in the process.
- density without affordability
- growth without respect for history
- developers' pockets, not renters' pockets
- profit, not people
- excessive sudden change in density, not justified by the 2030 City Comprehensive Plan

The August 10 consensus plan, which you are proposing to override, was approved by the Planning Commission, and supports growth. It achieves a high density, but with variation.

The consensus plan also supports a democratic process of collaboration and compromise. From all appearances, your plan is all about a decision you made without consulting the people affected and disrupting a long process of community engagement and compromise. I could be wrong, and would love to hear from you if that is the case. I thank you in advance for addressing our concerns.

Sincerely,

Bridget Axelson

1783 Iglehart Ave

Why did you decide against the community consensus?

Will my property values go down at 1842 Iglehart Ave?

Thank you
R Thurow

I realize that the vote on 10/17 is just a formality, but I'm writing to ask that it be tabled until more environmental impact evaluation can be done. It is ridiculous to believe that increasing density and car/bus traffic along Marshall and building 3-5 story buildings on Cleveland and Marshall won't have extreme, negative impact on traffic movement and air quality. Without another on ramp to 94, the traffic on Cretin will be even more backed up than it already is, and some of us can attest that asthma is a predictable result of this. And then we'll add traffic from the Ford development?? Like the 72 year old man on Nextdoor who sees the writing on the wall regarding the increases in taxes that exceed his increases in income, and that he and his wife will be unable to afford staying in the home they've cared for and loved for many years, I also will have to move within the next 5-7 years after owning my home here for almost 30 years, but am hopeful that at some point, you who make decisions will see that by destroying the character of neighborhoods and continually increasing the cost of living in St. Paul, you will destroy the neighborhoods. If you think this can't happen, please take a trip to Detroit, the place I fled from. First the homes on the busiest streets become unsightly and uncared for, then the first block, then the second block and eventually the entire neighborhood falls into disrepair and only those with no ability to leave stay there. It takes awhile, but you can avert this if you take care to maintain what is special about St. Paul.

Ruth Butros

358 N. Cretin Ave.

To City Council Members and Staff:

We are distressed and dismayed that the West Marshall Avenue zoning plan developed over the past year at council's request by city staff with citizen/resident input has been cast aside and a very different, much less neighborhood-friendly, proposal put in its place entirely without citizen input. In fact, input allowed those citizens opposing the new plan will be limited to fifteen minutes during the public portion of the council meeting scheduled for October 17th at which the substituted plan will be up for vote. This arbitrary action not only goes against transparency and citizen input so often touted by city officials but also undermines citizen faith and confidence in city government.

From what little information can be gleaned, the substitute plan is intended to promote density and diversity as well as affordable housing. Clearly it encourages density by allowing three story apartment buildings all along Marshall west of Snelling and five or more story retail/residential structures at Cleveland and Cretin Avenues. Whether it will encourage diversity or provide affordable housing is less clear. The plan appears to give developers a free hand which will most likely translate into costly buildings and high rents. It is safe to assume that over time, what is now a tree-lined Marshall Avenue with a mix of single and multiple family residences and apartment buildings will give way to a stark, soulless canyon of bland new apartment and retail/apartment structures. Considering that Marshall Avenue serves as the "core" of the surrounding neighborhood, significant changes in its makeup will impact streets to its north and south. It is likely that potential buyers will pass on houses backing up to large buildings, resulting in these properties lingering on the market, declining in value, and suffering from neglect. And that neglect will spread as surrounding owners feel less confident about the value of

their homes and start to wonder whether the neighborhood will remain a place they want to live. Our home on the south side of Iglehart Avenue just west of Cleveland could well be one of the new plan's early victims.

Thus, under the new plan, developers are the clear winners and surrounding property owners the likely losers. The sad part is that this is a viable, desirable neighborhood that can remain so with a little nurturing. Its houses were built to last by skilled carpenters and craftsmen using lumber from Minnesota's virgin forests. We submit that the plan developed in conjunction with the residents provides this nurture while allowing for significant increases in density and expanding the number of affordable apartments.

Accordingly, we ask that you vote against the new plan and further consider the plan developed with citizen input.

George and Linda Bounds
2072 Iglehart Avenue

Councilmember Nelson,
I'm writing you today to express my deep concern for the amended re-zoning plan put forth for Marshall Avenue.

While I'm supportive of re-zoning and redevelopment in the area, leading to more density of housing and mixed-use amenities... I believe the plan going before the City Council next week is not an appropriate scale for the neighborhood. I am not in support of the amendments to the current re-zoning proposal.

I live on Dayton Avenue between Cretin and Exeter, and I cannot imagine how negative the impact to our block will be with a (T-3) 5-story complex that occupies 78-79% of the combined lots. This complex would be built up-against and alley shared by 1-2 story homes, many of which were built in the early 1900's with very small lot-sized footprints. The new redevelopment would loom over our neighborhood, and have negative quality of life impacts on parking, noise, traffic and ruin the "feel" of our neighborhood forever.

I believe that RM-1 or T-1 zoning would still allow for meaningful redevelopment, additional housing and mixed-use services... 3-stories maximum, with first floor having mixed-use businesses would be a more appropriate scale. A more appropriate scale still meets your campaign promises of being "pro-housing" and growing density within your Ward-4 while balancing that with a neighborhood with such distinctive character.

I also believe that any new development needs to have enough underground parking for residents, I believe that there should be one underground parking space for each bedroom... any less than that will continue to crowd our residential streets with parking challenges already strained by student rentals on our block. While I understand it's a large transit corridor, and people "may" use mass-transit with less cars, the present-day reality is that everyone typically has their own car. Our block's situation is one with several duplexes that have student rentals, and there's 4-6 street spaces taken up by each duplex, and that's with each rental having a 2-car garage off the alley.

I hope that the City Council can support re-zoning and re-development in a way that respects the integrity of the neighborhood, and takes more neighbors voices in account when making the decision.

Thank you for your consideration leading into next week's vote,
Keith Koch

Dear M.J. Nelson,

I bought my home in Merriam Park when I was 28. As a homeowner for 40 years now, I've seen what happens when houses are razed for multiple occupancy structures or are converted to higher density rentals: the noise, the traffic, the litter, the decline of air quality, the loss of civility, etc.

Most of all, bigger buildings result in the loss of pride and participation in the neighborhood, notably less emotional and financial investment in those things that make a neighborhood a neighborhood: gardens, schools, libraries, the local culture. Fewer families and more singles or couples in apartment buildings means less sociability, less accountability,

I've traveled the world and seen the loss of character that comes with higher, newer buildings in formerly charming, welcoming and interesting human-scale neighborhoods.

So I strenuously object to Mitra Nelson's imposition of zoning stately homes on Marshall to apartments. This is not what the majority of us want or designed for our street. Marshall is not Summit Avenue, however it is a runner up for its pleasant and architecturally interesting buildings. It is a corridor into our neighborhood, and we are proud of it as it is.

Please represent the residents' point of view powerfully against the rezoning plan!

Thank you.
Karin Winegar
1832 Carroll Avenue

City Council Member Nelson,

My house is on Marshall Avenue and preserving a neighborhood environment where I will be raising my 3 small children is important to me. We have already considered moving off of Marshall since it is a busy street; adding large businesses and apartment buildings will further contribute to this. Our house is over 120 years old and represents a piece of our city's history that future owners may not appreciate, or may clear to make room newer and less affordable structures.

Please respect the community of Marshall Avenue as well as the work put in by its members on the consensus plan approved this past August. I ask you to represent your constituents, to work with us, and please do not vote against us.

Sincerely,

Alex Coyne,
1785 Marshall Ave

From: **Winston Kaehler** <winkaehler@gmail.com>

Date: Tue, Oct 9, 2018 at 8:35 PM

Subject: West Marshall Avenue rezoning

To: <ward1@ci.stpaul.mn.us>

The original rezoning plan for West Marshall Avenue approved by the Planning Commission last August admirably balances the interests of various constituencies and represents extensive time and effort on the part of local residents and City staff and officials to do so. The proposed amendments to that rezoning plan essentially gut the plan and contradict its intent and benefits. The amendments should be withdrawn or voted down, and the rezoning plan should be adopted as approved by the Planning Commission and neighborhood groups. To adopt the amendments would be to subvert the original plan, essentially killing the goose that is laying the golden eggs, undermining the efforts of so many who have worked long and hard to improve West Marshall Avenue and to reconcile the differing visions of what it should become in the future.

Ms. Nelson,

I have lived in Merriam Park for nearly 25 years. I am extremely concerned about the recent developments and all the additional traffic that has come with it. I understand that you plan to support rezoning efforts that will remove more historic homes and replace them with 3-5 story apartment buildings designed for the transient student population.

Those of us that invested in this neighborhood decades ago did so because of the historic architecture and the quiet neighborhood vibe. These suburban style developments are killing both and will eventually push long time residents and tax payers out of the neighborhood.

Please protect our neighborhood and historic St Paul!

Thank you

Deb Gil

1685 Dayton Avenue

Mitra, I am so disappointed to hear the news of the rezoning plan you submitted. As someone who supported you, voted for you, and talked you up to my neighbors and friends, I feel very betrayed that you'd do this to a street and neighborhood I dearly love. If this plan goes through, please know that I will work hard to get you voted out of your position on city council as soon as possible. If this was your vision for my neighborhood, you should have made that clear during your run. I would have voted differently. I'm also working to let my neighbors know of your new high-impact plan for our street and hoping they will oppose you at every turn in regards to this plan.

Your constituent,

Stephanie Hanson

Councilmember Nelson,

I'm writing you today to express my deep concern for the amended re-zoning plan put forth for Marshall Avenue.

While I'm supportive of re-zoning and redevelopment in the area, leading to more density of housing and mixed-use amenities... I believe the plan going before the City Council next week is not an appropriate scale for the neighborhood. I am not in support of the amendments to the current re-zoning proposal.

I live one house west from the corner of Dayton Avenue and Cretin on the north side of the street, and I cannot imagine how negative the impact to our block will be with a (T-3) 5-story complex that occupies 78-79% of the combined lots. This complex would be built up-against and alley shared by 1-2 story homes, many of which were built in the early 1900's with very small lot-sized footprints. The new redevelopment would loom over our neighborhood, and have negative quality of life impacts on parking, noise, traffic and ruin the "feel" of our neighborhood forever. In addition, our neighborhood is already stretched thin for parking as it is with the St. Thomas students. Even with the rental housing and restaurants along Marshall Avenue now, parking in our alley has become a problem. Many of the tenants try to park tight alongside garages even though they technically are in the alley. There have been weeks where recycling and trash has not been picked up in the alley due to the inability of the trucks to fit with all the "extra" parking that is being created. Thankfully we have yet to have an emergency where a firetruck could not get through the alley. The plan to have 5 story buildings taking up 78%-79% of the lots will only exacerbate this problem.

I believe that RM-1 or T-1 zoning would still allow for meaningful redevelopment, additional housing and mixed-use services... 3-stories maximum, with first floor having mixed-use businesses would be a more appropriate scale. A more appropriate scale still meets your campaign promises of being "pro-housing" and growing density within your Ward-4 while balancing that with a neighborhood with such distinctive character.

I also believe that any new development needs to have enough underground parking for residents, I believe that there should be one underground parking space for each bedroom... any less than that will continue to crowd our residential streets with parking challenges already strained by student rentals on our block. While I understand it's a large transit corridor, and people "may" use mass-transit with less cars, the present-day reality is that everyone typically has their own car. Our block's situation is one with several duplexes that have student rentals, and there's 4-6 street spaces taken up by each duplex, and that's with each rental having a 2-car garage off the alley.

I hope that the City Council can support re-zoning and re-development in a way that respects the integrity of the neighborhood, and takes more neighbors voices in account when making the decision.

Thank you for your consideration leading into next week's vote,

Drew Baese

As a 35 year resident and homeowner in Marion Park we are appalled by M. J. Nelsons rejection of the community zoning consensus regarding properties along Marshall Ave. and her plans for rezoning for more three story apartment buildings between Cleveland and Snelling. Over the years we have witnessed an increasing disregard by our city council of the needs and desires of the actual residents of our community. When did we lose the notion that our representatives should actually represent the community that they serve rather than push for their own personal agendas and special interests? We chose to live here, raise our families here, and invest in our older homes and properties because of the family friendly values and lifestyle that existed. We have seen a steady erosion of these values, especially in recent years, in favor of development, money, and certain individuals vision for the future of our community.

Ms. Nelson, please remember who you are representing, specifically those that currently live, work and pay taxes in the community. Our concerns are valid. Your agenda should not supersede that of the community that you are supposed to serve. Accept and abide by the community zoning consensus currently before you. Please try to temper your liberal agenda in order to better represent your district.

Respectfully,

Michael Furey

Dear Council Member Nelson,

I am writing to you today because I am strongly opposed to your proposed amendments to the West Marshall Avenue Rezoning Plan. The plan as proposed goes directly against the hard work of Merriam Park neighbors and the Planning Commission.

I live on Dayton Avenue, between Cretin and Exeter and have had a front row seat to a busier, more chaotic neighborhood since I moved in eleven years ago. Cretin Avenue traveling north is currently more like a very long on-ramp to the freeway, drivers race through in their attempt to beat the traffic light at Marshall and Cretin. Drivers traveling south on Cretin are students racing to find a free on-street parking space near Saint Thomas. Drivers hoping to beat the traffic going east on Marshall often use Dayton Avenue during rush hour. Our house sits two blocks from the University of Saint Thomas. When we moved in, there were two student rentals on our street, there are now five. This block currently has 28 students (two of the properties are duplexes catering to students). Each of those students has a car and I have personally watched them drive to class at St. Thomas. We already have higher density one block off Marshall Avenue in the form of students filling single-family homes and duplexes.

The idea of creating a large 5 story mixed-use apartment building on the corner of Cretin and Marshall with the argument of encouraging residents there to use mass transit flies in the face of logic. Now imagine another 5-story apartment building a block away at Finn and Marshall and then two more buildings on the opposite corners of Cleveland and Marshall. That would be four-5 story apartment buildings lining a two-lane road within two city blocks. Marshall Avenue

already has bumper-to-bumper traffic throughout the day. A bus is not going to solve the congestion on this road because that bus would be stopped in gridlock.

The fact that there is one owner of each of these mentioned properties is suspicious. There is one thing driving his development plans and that is money. It is not about contributing to the fabric of the neighborhood or providing affordable housing. It is simply about making as much money as he can off the property he and his family have owned for years.

I encourage you to reconsider the amendments and to refer to the original plan supported by the neighborhood as well as the Planning Commission. Zoning these parcels at T2, which would provide a 3-story mixed-use development, stays within the character of the neighborhood and still provides additional housing options for people hoping to move into our neighborhood.

Yours,

Kristina Kliber

To Councilmember Nelson:

You might as well know right up front that I did not vote for you. When you won the election, I was disappointed, but still had hopes that you would work well for Ward 4 citizens, taking into account the desires and work of those of us who have lived here much longer than you, and who have seen the history of growth, not all of it good. I'm very upset with your behind-the-scenes attempts to undo the months-long work of volunteer citizen and the UPDC.

You have already proven that you do not represent the majority of Ward 4 citizens, by your deliberately timed amendments to the pre-existing proposed rezoning ordinance.

Could you possibly have picked on a different neighborhood than this one, which is already clogged with renters and rental housing? Among other renters there are many students from St. Thomas University and the University of Minnesota, as you should know. The negative impacts of cramming more people into this area include traffic problems, parking problems and excess noise.

Why do you think that those of us who live in the Marshall-Cretin area have, for years, voluntarily paid fees for permit parking? It's so we can park in front of our own dwellings in spots that, otherwise, are taken by commuting students to this area for classes at St. Thomas. Where do you think all the potential renters of the building you would see go up on Marshall and Cretin would park their cars? Do not for a minute believe that they will all ride public transit and be without cars.

Do you know why the citizens who live on Otis Avenue, south of Marshall, have successfully gotten speed bumps on their street? This has happened because of the increased traffic density on Marshall and Cretin, resulting in cut-through traffic, from those who want to avoid driving on Marshall. These drivers don't only use Otis; they rush down Dayton, Selby, Riverwoods, Exeter, and Montrose, as well as our alleys, every day, without consideration of speed limits.

As for the noise, we have more than our share of it. Ask Amy Gage, the Neighborhood Liaison from UST how many complaints she receives from residents about excess noise. We don't need more!

In conclusion, I do NOT support more density on Marshall and Cretin Avenues, or in the St. Thomas area. What's more important for me to convey, however, is that I do not support you or trust you to be an advocate for Ward 4 citizens. You have shown yourself to be dishonest with your scheme to change what had already been approved with careful citizen work. I am disgusted.

Sincerely,

Margaret Wirth-Johnson, 2224 Dayton Avenue, St. Paul, MN 55104

Dear Council,

As a resident of ward 4, at 2177 Iglehart ave, we are greatly concerned and opposed to the new rezoning proposed by Mrs. Nelson. Our neighborhood has worked over a year to ensure the plan provided for growth, while also preserving the scale and character of the neighborhood. It was voted on August 10. Now our new representative has added a new provision to allow 3 story and 5 story multi-use structure. This will destroy our neighborhood. There is already a huge traffic problem on Cretin Ave and this is before the Ford site is built. The congestion of cars on Marshall during peak hours is evident. Cars use Iglehart Ave. to avoid the lights and our children are not safe to cross streets easily. Beautiful old homes will eventually be sold to investors for these new building which will add to the traffic congestion. It seems to us that the only people that will benefit are contractors and builders. I am fully aware that there is a need of rental space, but it should not be at the expense of us who have lived and raised our families for decades here, paying extremely high taxes to live here. Please think carefully of what you will be doing by voting on this new proposal. Please keep the one agreed on on August 10.

Thank you,

Joyce Nilsen

Dear St. Paul City Council Members--I am discouraged to see the process that the City has conducted in rezoning West Marshall Avenue. Over a year of citizen participation and neighborhood compromise was thrown out at the request of one council member. That seems unwise and destructive. I am even more concerned that the City Council is engaged in a knee-jerk, ill-informed exercise. I suggest, instead, that the Council pursue a Smart Zoning policy. What is smart zoning? It is zoning informed by accurate and relevant facts, that looks forward, not back.

Smart Zoning of West Marshall Avenue would be based on accurate and relevant information. How many units of new housing will St. Paul need in the next 30-40 years? How many units are already on the drawing board (Ford Site, University Avenue)? What should the mix of rental and homeownership be? Where does new housing make the most sense? What price points for rent and home sales prices

are most needed? If we build expensive housing (which seems to be the large majority of housing being built), does that help or hurt the City to fill the need for affordable housing?

And Smart Zoning looks forward, not back. Fifty years ago, St. Paul had huge tracts of industrial land holding railyards, large factories and warehouses. Many of those businesses are gone or downsized. Some of those properties--the Upper Landing, large tracts north of University Avenue between Cleveland and Highway 280--hold thousands of new housing units. Self-driving cars are here, and will spread rapidly:

<https://www.bbc.com/news/business-45786690>. When they do, many parking lots and garages will be obsolete. Might that create an opportunity to convert many alleys in St. Paul to residential lanes, fronted by accessory dwelling units?

If the City Council and Planning Staff do not know the answers to all of the questions raised above and have not sought to harmonize our current zoning with the City that will come to be in the next 20-40 years, then you are not practicing Smart Zoning. Rather, you are engaged in a process of mindless zoning that is unlikely to serve the City and its residents well. I encourage the City Council to reject Council Member Nelson's amendments to the West Marshall Avenue rezoning plan and adopt the plan recommended by the Planning Commission.

--

Shaun McElhatton

St. Paul City Council Members,

I am strongly opposed to the proposed amendments to the West Marshall Avenue Zoning, put forward by Councilmember Jalai Nelson at the City Council meeting on October 3, 2018.

The original recommendations from the planning commission were developed as a result of a thorough, participatory, consultative process with the neighborhood and other stakeholders. As far as I can ascertain, the zoning recommendations from the planning commission represent a compromise among different stakeholder interests. No one got all of what they wanted, but almost everyone had some of their needs and concerns addressed. The proposed amendments circumvent that process and the compromise that was reached. In a democracy, process matters. If the amendments are allowed to pass they will undermine future engagement efforts by the City and erode citizens' faith in elected officials.

I am supportive of increased density when it facilitates benefits to the City and to the neighborhood. Councilmember Jalai Nelson and proponents of the amendments she has proposed indicate that further increasing density (beyond the increased density encompassed in the planning commission recommendations) will facilitate a whole host of benefits including better utilization of transit, a stronger tax base, reduced greenhouse gas emissions, and more affordable housing. I agree that these outcomes are desirable, but as a sustainability professional I can tell you that the causation between increased density and any of these benefits is debatable and not certain. However, increased density, beyond the capacity of systems and services to support it, can lead to a whole host of negative, unintended consequences including less utilization of transit, a smaller tax base, increased emissions, and more expensive housing. On October 9, I sent the questions copied below to Councilmember Jalai Nelson to determine whether some of these unintended costs were considered and addressed in her proposal to amend the zoning. I have not received a response to these questions, so I continue to be

concerned that the amended zoning will deliver small, concentrated benefits for a few property owners while foisting significant costs on the community.

For these reasons, I urge the Council to reject the amendments proposed by Councilmember Jalai Nelson and adopt the recommendations from the planning commission.

Sincerely,

Shane Stennes
1882 Iglehart Avenue
St. Paul, MN

Dear Councilmember Prince,

This letter is to express our extreme displeasure with Councilmember Nelson's recent actions to submit changes to the pre-existing plan for Marshall Avenue. Nelson's non-transparency in her behind-the-scenes attempts to make these changes at the last minute does not represent the best interests of those of us who live near Marshall and Cretin.

Please do not allow her plan to take effect.

We have lived near Marshall and Cretin for 27 years, as renters and homeowners, and we have seen much growth in density, in traffic, and in noise. Citizens in this pocket of St. Paul (known as "Shadow Falls") undertook many years ago to address some of problems caused by the growth. We petitioned, and pay for, permit parking on our streets; we managed to get speed bumps installed on Otis Avenue to slow down the cut-through drivers who want to avoid lights and jams on Marshall Avenue at rush hours; and, by constantly working with individuals at the University of St. Thomas over many years, we have strived to develop better relations with student renters in our area. All of these efforts had to do with maintaining a safe, healthy neighborhood in which we have invested.

We do understand the need for affordable housing in our city, and that Marshall Avenue is a street on which it makes sense to consider building such affordable properties. The issues are how much, and how big?

But the main problem, as far as we are concerned, and the reason why you should vote against Councilmember Nelson's proposal, is that it does not represent what had been carefully crafted over months by city staff and neighborhood volunteers, and it does not reflect what many of us feel is fair or smart for the Marshall-Cretin intersection.

Sincerely,

James Johnson and Margaret Wirth-Johnson
2224 Dayton Avenue, St. Paul, MN 55014

Dear Mitra and other valued council members,

I would like to offer you my perspective on rezoning Merriam Park, and in particular, the property located on the corner of Finn and Marshall Avenues.

Our family lives just one house east of 2122 Marshall, one of the properties in question. When we purchased our house in 2012 for a mere \$260,000, we were told that the previous owners were selling it to us because they wanted a family to reside here, in order to maintain the unique balance of Merriam Park, (a special blend of student-renters, families and businesses on Marshall Ave.) And so, to our delight, we moved into this charming neighborhood and started enjoying its many amenities: Saint Mark's School & Church, Kopplins Coffee Shop, Kim's Chow Mein, etc.

2122 is a property we see from our windows, and have always admired. We personally knew the owner there, she was a warm and affable nurse with whom everyone chatted and shared neighborhood news. She resided next to a household of Catholic sisters, and was often seen gardening in her yard and pampering the Sisters' black Scottie dog. During the summer of 2017 we were heartbroken to learn that she would no longer be living there, and soon after there was a huge estate sale where all of her belongings were peddled in just three days.

There was speculation among the neighbors as to who would purchase the property--I remember that some of us even wanted to buy her meticulously kept home, complete with a large lawn, trees and wild landscaping. (Each year, Bonnie would hire a lawn care expert to make sure she had plenty of flowers and plants that would enhance the quality of life.) The price was fairly reasonable for Merriam Park, just \$349,000, but that was out of budget for the majority of us neighbors. Nevertheless, we all hoped that whoever decided to buy the house, would carry on Bonnie's legacy.

Weeks later we saw a gentleman walking around with the real estate agent and we knew that the sale was to come shortly, for the price was almost too good to be true. To our surprise, the house sold surprisingly below market value--at \$325,000. (...especially because it is on a corner lot and has a very large yard.)

Around the start of winter in 2017 a group of friendly college students moved in. They are still living there as of now. I must say that they are respectful and attentive neighbors, they have never acted out of character and seem diligent when taking care of the property at 2122.

Now, less than a year after this home was purchased, there is talk that the proprietor wants to raze it to the ground to build a three or five story apartment building, and most of the neighborhood is extremely distressed by this. So many of us have already mentioned important issues like excessive traffic, lack of parking, historical demolition, and the taking down of 80-year old trees. We do not want to be accused of NIMBYISM (Not In My Backyard), and we have listened to the other side and can certainly see their reasons for wanting more housing options in Merriam Park. Yet another three or five-story apartment building along Marshall Avenue really isn't the answer. We already have one development going up now... another one would cause an abrupt change in density to our alleys and roadways. There would be a detrimental impact to traffic flow on a street (with a designated bike path) that is already jam-packed with cars during morning and afternoon rush hours, where car accidents frequently occur. And what about the adverse effects this construction would have on the centenary tree(s) on the property, has this been considered at all?

I strongly believe the proposed development on Marshall Avenue would be a grave mistake. It would not respect the neighborhood harmony, nor the street pattern (especially with the bicycle lane), and would actually be a detriment to the unique environment we share in Merriam Park.

Sincerely yours,

Margaret Creighton
2114 Marshall Avenue

October 15, 2018

Re: In Favor of West Marshall Avenue Rezoning without Any Amendments – My Address is
1984 Carroll Avenue

Dear Council President Brendmoen, City Council members, and Ms. Dadlez,

We write to support the Planning Commission-approved Marshall Avenue zoning recommendations as originally presented to the Council and oppose the amendments that have been recently proposed.

Though we are fortunate enough to own our home, we have family and friends who are painfully affected by spiking prices and limited options. We are well aware that St. Paul has a severe shortage of affordable housing. Recognizing these needs, our community endorsed a zoning proposal for Marshall Avenue that created the opportunity for aggressive growth.[1] The consensus proposal that is before you for approval allows 38-51% growth above existing zoning, and 238%-326% above existing land use. With a 3-4 fold increase in residents along Marshall Avenue, it should come as no surprise that the community was concerned about the impact on traffic flow, and placed the greatest density in locations with the greatest options for public transportation (north-south intersecting routes and upcoming rapid transit bus line stops).

During the development process the community became aware that current Minnesota law creates sufficient barriers to the development of condominiums that RM zoning will likely result in more apartments rather than owner-occupied structures. The consensus proposal includes areas of RM1 zoning to avoid non-conformity, as well RM1 zoning from Pierce to Fry due to its proximity to Snelling and the planned rapid transit bus stop at Marshall and Fry. The consensus proposal eliminates the remaining R (single family) zoning on Marshall, and recommends a total of approximately 4 ½ blocks RT1 (RT = duplexes and triplexes) zoning and 2 blocks RT2 zoning.

Council Member Nelson's proposed amendment replaces all areas of RT zoning (duplexes, triplexes) with RM zoning (apartments)

In part, your decision on the proposed amendments depends on whether there is sufficient justification to support and retain the option for any areas of occupant-owned structures (single family homes, duplexes, and triplexes) over the 2.1 mile stretch of Marshall from Hamline to the river. We think retaining this option is fully justified.

The January 2018 Minnesota Housing report on Key Trends in Housing (copy attached) noted that 80% of people aged 40 and above own or expect to own a home. The report finds that less than 30% of those younger than 30 own a home, but an additional 60% expect to someday own a home (a total of nearly 90%). The report also noted racial disparities in the rates of home ownership (white 76.1%, Asian/Pacific Islander 58.0%, American Indian 48.6%, Hispanic 45.0%, and African-American 22.8%). (The rate of ownership in our neighborhood [49%] is far below

the US Census Bureau's 2014 American Community Survey reported rate of home ownership for St. Paul – Minneapolis [nearly 70%] .) These disparities are of great concern when you consider that the January 2018 Minnesota Housing report also noted that each year of successful homeownership increases household wealth by an average \$9500 and that renters do not generally experience gains in wealth.

The September 2013 Harvard University Joint Center for Housing Studies analysis “Is Homeownership Still an Effective Means of Building Wealth for Low-Income Households? (Was it Ever?)” (copy attached) concluded:

“Even after the tremendous decline in housing prices and the rising wave of foreclosures that began in 2007, homeownership continues to be a significant source of household wealth, and remains particularly important for lower-income and minority households.”

“While African-American and lower-income households were somewhat less likely to sustain homeownership, these groups also experienced sizable gains in net wealth on average that was associated with owning, while renters saw few gains.”

The January 2018 Minnesota Housing report also noted a limited supply of both rental properties and homes. We believe there is more than sufficient justification to support the proposed 6 ½ blocks of RT zoning along Marshall Avenue.

You must also decide whether there is sufficient justification to support the proposed amendment's focuses of T zoning changes between Wilder and Exeter. Changes at this late stage in the process severely limit the ability of the community to process and respond as a community. And the lack of any specific information about the rationale for these changes severely limits our ability to process and respond as individuals. That said, our gut reaction is that the changes are odd, unjustified, and entirely out of place. It is illogical to allow the tallest building at the top rather than the middle of a 0.3 mile slope with a 60 foot rise. It is also illogical to allow an isolated section of T2 properties in the middle of a 2 block stretch of beautiful houses.

We respectfully urge you to support the Planning Commission-approved Marshall Avenue zoning recommendations as originally proposed.

Thank you,

Mark and Cecilia Morrow
1984 Carroll Avenue



2018 Minnesota
Housing Trends.pdf



Home Ownership
2013.pdf

Council-member Nelson,

My name is Joe Opack. My wife and I and four kids live in your ward and I am writing to you with intention of voicing a concern with some of the proposed zoning changes to Marshall Ave. I understand the need for more housing in the twin cities metro and specifically St. Paul. I also understand that Marshall Ave is a major artery that has for a long time been more than just a "residential street".

That being said, as a resident of the neighborhood, I feel that scale is important in city planning. The "scale" of St. Paul is a major draw to the neighborhood. I don't feel the average resident in these neighborhoods lives here because they want an "urban" lifestyle. I feel they want to live here because they want a scaled down lifestyle that is close to an urban center. By that I mean they want walkable amenities, short commutes, close neighbors who they know, etc. Five story apartment/condos don't really fit that narrative.

That being said, I know Marshall Ave is not as residential as most streets in the area. I would urge you to consider a few compromises. If possible shorten the height of the buildings. Three to four stories seems more appropriate. Also, add commercial requirements at street level. Give existing residents something to look forward to along with the future residents. It is always fun to know a new business will be opening and not just another building with residents that you will never see because of the lack of personal interaction that is inherent with apartment complexes. First floor commercial space will help connect the building residents to the community. Lastly, underground parking. With the uncertainty of the affects of the Ford site development and future zoning changes such as this, I feel that traffic and parking will create conflict and stresses in these neighborhoods. The concept of people using their cars less at this period in history in Minnesota is misguided. My rationale behind that opinion is this. Manhattan has arguably the best, most comprehensive mass transit system in the country, and people do use it. However, with that wonderful grid of public transportation at their disposal, the streets of Manhattan are still absolutely clogged with cars. My point is that even in a city that has a very functional and convenient mass transit system, people still use their cars. St. Paul has a very inefficient mass transit system with nowhere near the grid system that is so vital to its efficiency. Traffic will be an issue and it will affect how people live, how they make decisions where to live and who they vote for to make their city planning decisions.

Families are ultimately what will keep these communities flourishing. The neighborhoods have to be conducive to families and I'm not convinced that the current zoning proposals ensure that. I appreciate you taking the time to read this and I hope you will consider opinions like mine and my family's as you are forming yours. Thank you.

Joe Opack

To Council Member M.J. Nelson,

I've just received news about your rejecting the community zoning consensus for my neighborhood.

New to office and already you're acting like other City of St. Paul government officials who go against careful planning and wishes for quality of life issues, by doing your own "thing". I'm very disappointed and angry at this news!

I didn't vote for you and this is one of the reasons why: inexperience and a view that seemed limited in scope and having a special project focus for a select few. It now is showing itself to be true

Do you have any concept of what this neighborhood is like? What we already struggle with in all the college house property issues and increasing sober house living communities? Traffic and parking that is so congested already (for example, college houses with 4-12 tenants each bringing their own cars and party habits). Homes that have been converted to sober house living where individuals (more than allowed to regular renter rules) bring their added cars to the mix?

I never can park in front of my own house the way it is! Soon, we'll all have to get parking permits to even live here the way it is.

The character of my neighborhood doesn't need or want a high density corridor smack in the middle of it.

Potential for increased crime.

Who's really driving this bus? The City or St. Thomas and their \$? Fast talking developers promising pipe dreams? (another long term hot topic, in case you didn't know: St. Thomas not doing nearly enough to rectify the student housing shortage / problems on their own property and \$ talks)

Rental places that no one can afford to rent? Cash cow for the city of St. Paul and increasing our property taxes somewhere in the mix and again using us as their private piggy bank?

All rhetorical questions, but valid points and realities. There's so much more that I haven't expressed.

Please reconsider your poor decision and rectify this. Accept the community zoning consensus created by the hard work of us who really know what's best for our community.

You don't seem to know or want what's best and already aren't working with or in community. I don't see you representing the very ward you were elected for and this is awful news.

Who are you really representing, Ms. Nelson?

Respectfully submitted,
Chillon Leach
1795 Dayton Avenue
(homeowner for over 25 years)

Councilperson Nelson,

I am writing to express my opposition to the amendments to rezoning Marshall Ave from Cretin to to Snelling Avenues. I also am opposed to the mixed-use building plan proposal for the corners of Marshall/Cretin and Marshall Cleveland.

I have lived on Dayton Ave between Cleveland and Finn for over 34 years and have seen the housing density increase (due to single family owner-occupied homes converted to St Thomas student rental

housing). This increased density has had a negative effect on the housing stock as well as quality of life in our neighborhood. The plan you propose would benefit housing developers, landlords, and St Thomas students to the detriment of single-family homeowners such as my wife and me. The proposed zoning changes would affect us directly and negatively since we live in close proximity, and ignores the principle of gradual evolution in the character of a neighborhood.

I am particularly disappointed that as a new council person you have chosen to disregard the previous discussions and work of stakeholders in this community and unilaterally proposed a higher density option. I urge you to withdraw your amendment and support the August 10 consensus plan approved by the Planning Commission.

I am copying the remaining council members and ask them to vote against the zoning amendments and support the Planning Commission's August 10 proposal.

Allen J. Dundek
2091 Dayton Ave
St Paul, MN 55104

Looking at a map of what you have proposed makes me sick to my stomach. The character of our Merriam Park neighborhood is being destroyed with your plan. We are opposed to the current rezoning plan for the following reasons:

- density without affordability
- growth without respect for history
- developers' pockets, not renters' pockets
- intervention of community consensus by one person, not involved in the process
- *excessive* and *sudden* change in density, not fostering gradual evolution in the "scale and character of the neighborhood," a principle specified in the Zoning Code

Do not vote to pass this plan you have come up with. Take into consideration the plan that was previously developed and approved August 10. Public input by the people who actually live in this neighborhood and who are directly affected should be considered.

Sincerely,

Lisa and Rod MacDonald

From: Dale Halladay [<mailto:dale.halladay@outlook.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, October 16, 2018 5:43 PM

To: #CI-StPaul_Ward6 <Ward6@ci.stpaul.mn.us>

Cc: Renstrom, Scott (CI-StPaul) <scott.renstrom@ci.stpaul.mn.us>

Subject: Tomorrow please vote NO to CM Nelson's plan for West Marshall re-zoning

Dear Councilmember Bostrom:

Please heed the request of two residents of Merriam Park and vote NO on the West Marshall Avenue Re-zoning Proposal as amended by Councilmember Nelson.

Councilmember Nelson has unilaterally dis-regarded a plan that was carefully crafted by thousands of hours of neighborhood participation with hundreds of residents involved. This neighborhood-based plan called for a density growth along Marshall Avenue of more than three-fold while keeping the unique character of the street and neighborhood intact, avoiding a monolithic and cookie-cutter development. This neighborhood-based plan was approved by the City of St. Paul's Planning Commission on August 10th.

We attended the Union Park District Council's Committee on Land Use and Economic Development yesterday evening, October 15th, at which Councilmember Nelson was in attendance. When asked on what basis she had dis-regarded the carefully crafted plan of the neighborhood which was approved by the city's Planning Commission, the best she could muster was a vague comment about her receiving feedback from "dozens and dozens" of emails who claimed dissatisfaction with the neighborhood plan and that she felt her plan better positioned the neighborhood for the next hundred years.

Councilmember Nelson's perceived attitude of complete dis-regard for the dozens and dozens of unhappy constituents in the room (who were motivated enough to climb to the third floor as the elevator was out of order!), and to the hundreds of people who had contributed thousands of hours to the re-zoning development process, was shocking. That Councilmember Nelson believes her plan, developed in a community vacuum after being in office for a few weeks, can position the neighborhood for the next hundred years reveals her as another autocratic politician. We have enough of those already.

Please do not support Councilmember Nelson's Amended West Marshall re-Zoning because it makes a travesty of the entire participatory government process – and will make West Marshall Avenue a dreary canyon of cookie-cutter condos. It would be best to start the process all over again with a clean slate.

Sincerely,
Dale Halladay

1936 Dayton Avenue

Dear Councilperson Nelson,

I'm writing to encourage you to discard your 11th-hour changes to the rezoning plan for Marshall Avenue. Please, please do not disregard and disrespect the hard work of your colleagues and input of your constituents that has already gone into the TN2 designation, which is ideal for adding density while maintaining the character of the neighborhood.

Sincerely,
Vanessa Rousseau
Merriam Park

Hello,

I'm writing to share my thoughts on the proposed rezoning of Marshall Avenue.

I strongly disagree with the planning commission's request to rezone my street to bring more congestion in an already densely populated area. We're already dealing with a high population of college students and issues related parking and excessive trash. I fear allowing for more multi family structures would further compound these issues.

I've lived in my home for nearly 9 years and find there are two types of home owners in this neighborhood. The first are those (like me) that love the area, love old homes and have found an affordable neighborhood in which they can improve a historic home of their very own. The second type are slumlords that only wish to maximize their investment by cramming as many residents into a property as they can. These are the homeowners who would use the proposed rezoning to their benefit with no intention of ever improving their property.

In addition I fear that rezoning this area would further increase our already extremely high taxes. When I purchased my home in 2010 and my taxes were a mere \$2300. I'm now paying \$4900. As a single woman, I can hardly afford to stay in the home I so lovingly maintain. When I compare like valued properties even just a few blocks away, I find our taxes on Marshall are significantly higher. Perhaps in an effort to price out single families.

Please, please, please reconsider the Planning Commission's recommendation and instead listen to the City Council.

Thank you,
Julie Peterson
1782 Marshall Avenue

To the St Paul City Council members, Ms. Dadlez and Mayor Carter:

I'm writing this note as a 32 year resident of Merriam Park, regarding the rezoning of Marshall Avenue. I am asking that you please:

1. Oppose council member Nelson's amendments.
2. Support the August 10th Planning Commission plan developed by community members and Ms. Dadlez over the past year.

3. Oppose Mr. Kvasnik's request that his properties be upzoned, especially 2122 Marshall. The consensus plan has adequate increases in density. Spread the "density-love" to other wards.

With your vote against the amendments, you can help show our new city council member that her last minute zoning amendment without input from her constituents (especially those who helped develop the consensus plan) or the Planning Commission isn't the way our city council works.

Thank you,
Deb and Glenn Mitchell
Council Member Nelson:

I am a constituent and have read with great disappointment about your proposed changes to the rezoning plan for Marshall Avenue. I strongly urge you to withdraw your proposal and support the comprise rezoning plan that was originally introduced.

The original plan provided for reasonable development and involved a great deal of community involvement and compromise. The process was inclusive. For you to ignore the importance of that process and the concerns of your constituents is disappointing and frustrating. I understood you were running on a platform of inclusiveness. To now ignore the opinions and concerns of a large number of people who have lived in St. Paul for a long time does not fulfill your obligation as an elected official.

I am especially concerned about the removal of possible historic protections. St. Paul is a gem in large part because it has preserved its historic homes and buildings. The interests of developers to maximize their profits in the short term should not outweigh the interests of long-time residence who care deeply about our neighborhoods and neighbors.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Richtman
1939 Portland Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55104

Dear St. Paul City Council Members:

My name is Marguerite Spencer. I have lived on the Northeast corner of Dayton and Finn since 1990. I am a professional, as well as a parent of six children who have gone to school along the West Marshall corridor. I am in favor of moderate development and reject the up-zoning amendments recently proposed by Councilwoman Mitra Jalali Nelson without precedent or neighborhood input. Here are my three reasons:

(1) Unlike some letter writers' worry, Merriam Park is already a vibrant, healthy and welcoming neighborhood, with thriving long-term businesses, e.g., Izzy's, Tillie's (Trotter's), Marshall Stop, and Marshall Liquors. The neighborhood also supports several church communities and two grade schools, one of which is located on Marshall Avenue itself. The University of St. Thomas provides added

stability. Moderate development would enhance the neighborhood, but excessive development is not needed to retain its viability. In fact, it may have the opposite effect. This may be especially true with the proposed up-zoning at the Northwest corner of Marshall and Finn from RT1 to T2 at an intersection that, unlike the one at Cleveland, is solidly residential in all directions.

(2) Letter writers who are concerned about “down-zoning” may not realize that we have already reached a democratic consensus on” up-zoning” that allows for significant development. This lack of context allows for a slight of hand by those in favor of even greater development.

(3) We may need to exercise caution when considering David Kvasnik’s position. He is a neighbor who will not be affected as directly as others since he resides two blocks off of Marshall Avenue. But most importantly, David is a developer who may be exercising that slight of hand. Indeed, he owns the residential property on the corner of Marshall and Finn.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that you vote against the up-zoning amendments proposed by fellow Councilwoman Mitra Jalali Nelson.

Respectfully,

Marguerite Spencer, M.A., J.D
2117 Dayton Avenue

Dear City Council

I’ve been an owner at 2094 Marshall Avenue for twenty years, loving my historic neighborhood and the vibrant community encompassing home-owning neighbors, students, and local businesses. I’ve enjoyed the growth of independent small businesses like Kopplins, Izzy’s, Tillie’s Farmhouse, that foster further community in revitalized existing structures.

I had an opportunity to sell in 2010 and stayed because I love the neighborhood and its lively atmosphere. I urge you to preserve and continue supporting this by **endorsing the 10 August consensus plan approved by the Planning Commission**. My friends and neighbors **fiercely oppose the 3 October West Marshall zoning amendment** to rezone all our single-family homes into what could eventually become a sterile row of 3 story apartments. The neighborhood is NOT opposed to development; rather, we welcome it, but it must consider and incorporate the voices of those impacted in the actual developing community.

We care about supporting housing through increased density. Yet this must be done in a manner that supports density of development while also preserving the historic scale and character. A dramatic three to four-fold increase in density with 42-53 units per acre doesn’t just violate this balance, but violates St. Paul city’s own policy guidelines for a residential corridor (not to exceed 4-40 units/acre).

We care about our beautiful, historic neighborhoods, including rehabilitating existing housing stock and developing multi-unit options that don’t jeopardize the long-term health and sustainability of our neighborhood. Why should single voices be allowed to overthrow a year-long study commissioned by the Council, and disregard extensive community involvement from those who also own and live in the neighborhood? Why should David Kvasnik, a landlord who has snatched up single-family homes which now stand tattered and rented exclusively to students, have a bigger voice than the host of owner-occupied single-family homes that surround his forlorn properties? Why should a single Council Member such as Mitra Jalili Nelson have an opinion that is worth more than the vast population of owners and renters around her?

The neighbors and owners of Marshall Avenue **oppose the 3 October T3 zoning plan** because while it promotes density, it doesn't promote affordability. It emphasizes growth without respect for historic preservation and appears callous about razing well-maintained historic homes such as the one at SW corner of Marshall and Finn. It profits developers and not renters, and prioritizes profits over people. It disregards community by allowing individuals who have not been involved in the community consensus process to intervene, circumventing collaboration. Most damaging, it forces excessive, sudden, vast change in density vs. the gradual evolution that would maintain scale and character of neighborhoods, a principle specified in the Zoning Code.

We urge you to endorse the 10 August plan which was approved by the Planning Council to support growth while preserving the scale and character of the neighborhood, arrived through a democratic process of collaboration and consensus building. This will achieve an impressive density of 42-53/acre, while also promoting pedestrian, bicycle and public transit.

Thank you for listening to the residents and owners of the community we love here in Merriam Park.

Regards,

Sheila M. Stewart
Owner of 2094 Marshall Ave

Kady Dadlez
Senior Planner
25 West Fourth Street
1400 City Hall Annex
Saint Paul, MN 55102

I am writing to you concerning the recent amendments proposed by the City Council regarding zoning changes along Marshall Avenue. My wife and I own and occupy a single family home (2090 Marshall Avenue) within the area affected by the West Marshall Zoning Plan and the recent proposed amendments. We are IN AGREEMENT with the zoning changes AS PROPOSED IN THE ORIGINAL PLAN, passed by the Planning Commission after months of study and public input, and aligned to the St. Paul Comprehensive 2030 City Plan. We are OPPOSED to the recent, last-minute AMENDMENTS proposed by our council member Mitra Jalali Nelson that would further upzone ours and surrounding properties.

Our views are largely reflected in the Union Park 2016 Community Plan: <https://unionpark2030.files.wordpress.com/2018/05/up2030-proposed-5-1-18.pdf>. More specifically, West Marshall is a two-lane residential corridor, and NOT a four-lane mixed-use corridor as stated in the Comprehensive Plan. To further upzone West Marshall Avenue beyond the original zoning change plan, would drastically alter the feel and scale of the neighborhood, further line the pockets of a few large and influential property owners, and do very little to promote affordable housing in a walkable, human-scaled neighborhood. If the amendments are adopted, we fear that development would cause a tipping point on ours and surrounding blocks, where property owners like us will have no incentive to upkeep our homes, our quality of life would suffer greatly, and we would be left to escape with whatever some developer deems our city parcel worth.

My wife and I take great pride in our 1908 home, we have poured our financial resources, blood, sweat, and tears into our property over the past several years. It is our hope to live here for many years, and hopefully our stewardship will make ours a great home for those that come after us as well. With non-

incremental development on West Marshall Avenue, as proposed by the recent amendments, our pride and stewardship and that of our neighbors may be for naught.

We urge the City Council to adopt the original zoning plan, which still upzones Marshall Avenue significantly, while maintaining the feel and scale of the neighborhood. The original plan was the result of months of study and eventual consensus among all stakeholders. The proposed amendments seem to be a last-minute circumventing of that democratic process, with the purpose of enriching Mr. David Kvasnik and his family of financiers, who conveniently happen to own the properties that stand to gain the most financially.

We hope that our Ward 4 council member and the City Council respect the community input into this process and enact the original West Marshall Avenue Zoning Plan.

Thank you,

Jason J & Deborah E Dalebroux
2090 Marshall Avenue
Saint Paul, MN 55104

Kady,

I am an owner of a property on Marshall Avenue that is currently being rezoned. I am concerned about the recent amendments brought forward that would increase density along Marshall and also doesn't factor in the hard work and input from local residents that went into the original plan—a plan that truly aimed to strike a balance between the needs of a growing vibrant area and demand for housing with the desires and input of the people who actually live here!

As a longtime resident of St. Paul and a homeowner on Marshall for nearly 18 years, I hope you do not proceed with these amendments.

Sarah Peterson
1756 Marshall Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55104
Dear Ms. Dadlez,

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to write to you and be heard about the West Marshall Zoning Study. My husband and I purchased our home at 1764 Marshall Avenue in the spring of 2017. We understood then that we were purchasing a home on a relatively busy street, but also understood that our neighborhood consisted of primarily medium-density, family residential uses.

We received your October 8 letter, and while the history and description of the proposed changes are not terribly clear, we nonetheless are worried about further proposed changes that would allow for higher-density uses along West Marshall (in particular, any re-zoning that would allow for five-story mixed commercial/residential uses) because of the increased traffic flow on Marshall. We also would hope that West Marshall not be further converted to college housing for St. Thomas students.

We understand and support that the city needs to plan for population growth, but would ask that it be done in a thoughtful and balanced way. Please do not proceed with additional amendments.

Sincerely,

Mary Bortscheller & Christopher Moore
1764 Marshall Avenue



Dan Fowlds
email.pdf

Ms. Dadlez,

I am writing to express my opposition of the Planning Commission's rezoning recommendations regarding the West Marshall Ave Zoning Study. My wife and I own 1954 Iglehart and live there with our family in one of the units. My 4 young children (7, 5, 5, 1.5yrs) attend the neighborhood schools and we are active members in the neighborhood and attend a church across the street from us. We are heavily invested in the area. We love our home and neighborhood and hope to one day pass it on to our children. I oppose the the rezoning study in general and specifically the rezoning of our home. The rezoning would significantly impact the value of the home we pour energy, money, hrs, and work into every day and decrease the value we hope to pass on to our children. The reality is most of the neighbors don't understand the impact the rezoning would have on their homes and the movement is lead by a select few who constantly send e-mails striking a sense of panic and urgency into the neighborhood (see forwarded email). I have voiced my opposition to my neighborhood, but I still have to live here. My children play with neighborhood kids and run around the park all day. If I want this to continue I can't organize an opposition group or we'd be ostracized in the neighborhood.....the amount of dog poop in my front yard would quadruple if I did.....

Please leave the zoning as is. It benefits the businesses, the neighborhood, the churches, and the schools. Thank you for serving our city and please let me know if you need anything at all from me.



Raza Hasan
email.pdf

This letter is in addition to our letter of September 18th, 2018. The current zoning for 1921 Marshall Avenue, RM2, is the correct description to concentrate population near major thoroughfares, transit and related facilities. The addition of the new soccer facility and development of the Ford plant land will actually increase the volume of traffic on Marshall Avenue as a major traffic corridor. Marshall Avenue has been a major thoroughfare in the city for decades, linking up with Lake Street in Minneapolis.

Attempting to lower the housing density and traffic on Marshall by using RM1 zoning is certainly a step backward for comprehensive, orderly development of what is already a multiple-family building at 1921 Marshall. Conversion of 1921 to a one family, low density environment would be cost prohibitive, and it has no known appreciative historic value. Also, consider the current neighbors - a Safe House with multiple bedrooms on the west side and a six plex on the east side. There are also very large apartment buildings at the nearest intersection, Marshall and Prior.

We have no concerns about protecting neighboring side streets from development, and RM1 would seem to be the appropriate designation.

Therefore, our request and recommendation is to continue the current zoning description of RM2 for 1921 Marshall Avenue, in St. Paul.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

David H. Jensen , Sieglinde A. Bier
2000 Lower Saint Dennis Road

From: Laurel Collins [<mailto:laurelmcollins@gmail.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, October 17, 2018 10:02 AM

To: Dadlez, Kady (CI-StPaul)

Subject: West Marshall Avenue Zoning Study

Greetings City Council Members,

I'm unable to make it to the public hearing this evening, but wanted to comment on West Marshall Ave Zoning. I live at 1735 Marshall Ave, and I attended the Union Park District Council meeting on Monday. Frankly, I'm a little confused about it all - we have received two letters in the last couple months suggesting different zoning for our home. We bought our home 5 years ago, and we are a family of 5. We purchased this home in part because Marshall Ave offered homes that we could afford, where other areas of the St. Paul were far too expensive.

Essentially, we feel that the original proposal (NOT the amended version recently proposed by Mitra Jalali Nelson) makes the most sense. Much work and research went into it, it encourages growth in this area but not at an extreme rate. The UPDC did not support the amendment, and I agree with this. Growth is inevitable in an urban environment, but we can be deliberate and thoughtful about it.

Thank you,
Laurel Collins
1735 Marshall Ave.

From: Pamela Cherry [<mailto:cherr006@gmail.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, October 17, 2018 11:42 AM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward6 <Ward6@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Cc: Renstrom, Scott (CI-StPaul) <scott.renstrom@ci.stpaul.mn.us>; Freking, Heidi (CI-StPaul) <heidi.freking@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Subject: Marshall Avenue Zoning Plan

Dear Council Member Bostrom,

We are writing to you to ask you to consider working with your fellow council members to withdraw the amended plan for the rezoning of Marshall Avenue surfaced by Council member Nelson, and, instead, authorize the August 10th plan. While we are single family home owners, we are not opposed to all rentals and all students. It was insulting to see one of the landowners/developers characterize those opposed to the amended plan as such.

We have owned our home for 17 years and love the mix of properties. We understand the need for more housing in our beautiful neighborhood and support increasing it by over 300% as accomplished by the plan developed in the inclusive, collaborative, and public process with deep participation from the neighborhood and city planners. No process is perfect but this one was clearly preferable from the closed door, secretive process that produced Council member Nelson's amended plan that to values specific requests from developers over residents.

We are pro-density and we voted for Mitra Nelson. We are her base and are opposed to her plan. Withdrawing your amendment and supporting the collaboratively developed plan is a "win" for current residents, future residents, and for the council. Thank you in advance for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,
Pamela Cherry and Shane Stubblefield
2191 Dayton Avenue

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing with regard to the Proposed Amendments to the West Marshall Avenue Zoning Study. My husband and I have owned and occupied our single family residence at 2095 Dayton Avenue for the past 16 years. We would like to voice our **SUPPORT** for the **ORIGINAL West Marshall Zoning Plan** and our **OPPOSITION** to the **Amendment** made by Mitra Jalali Nelson in which she proposes to upzone our neighborhood.

As alumni of the University of St. Thomas, we purchased our home because of the vibrancy, historical value, and community that the neighborhood has to offer.

Merriam Park is rich with historical value with homes scaled within acceptable limits, rental units and businesses scaled and created with the neighborhood value in mind, and property owners concerned with preserving the integrity of the neighborhood. During the past 15 years, I have collected alley snowplow funds to make sure our alleys are taken care of in the winter. At the same time, I and our neighbors have worked hard with the student landlords in our area and on our block to make a more livable and respectful community between students, landlords, and single family residents. Just on our block, respect and livability has come little by little with much correspondence with area residents, St. Paul Police and the University of St. Thomas.

You may wonder why I mention student housing in correlation with Council Member Nelson's disregard for the **ORIGINAL West Marshall Zoning Plan**. In Council Member Nelson's Amendment, she made her recommendation based in part on a letter written by David Kvasnik, a student housing and commercial real estate landlord in the Merriam Park neighborhood. Mr. Kvasnik wrote his letter in support of upzoning because he has much to win in the upzoning proposal. He is a student housing landlord and he owns the business property at the corner of Marshall and Cretin. The 2063 Dayton Avenue student house at the corner of Marshall and Cleveland has always been a problem student house. Student parties and garbage are a regular occurrence at that property. In fact, the police were just called again to that property on Saturday due to the large party, which was large enough to warrant the Porta-potty in the backyard. The 1991 Marshall Avenue home that Mr. Kvasnik just purchased under the umbrella of an LLC incorporated under Florida law is also student housing. This property was a single family residence since it was built. And prior to its recent purchase by Mr. Kvasnik, it was meticulously maintained. It is a beautiful home and stands next to beautiful homes. Mr. Kvasnik wants to raze a beautiful, well-maintained property to profit from multi-use development.

The arguments in Mr. Kvasnik's letter in support for higher-density retail with rental units for workers and families is misleading and disingenuous at best. First of all, Mr. Kvasnik profits from students and the University of St. Thomas. The University is in need of more rental space. If the city allows additional rental units along the West Marshall corridor, students will fill those units, not families. Also, Mr. Kvasnik makes his living from students as a student housing landlord. To say that he will refuse to rent to students, or does not want to rent to students is misleading. Mr. Kvasnik is in the rental business for a profit. He will follow the money where the money leads. Second, students do not use public transportation. In fact, the majority of residents, both renter and property owner, along the corridor **do not** utilize public transportation. Cars line the streets and side streets to the degree that streets are inundated with cars. This will not change with more rental and retail units. It will only exacerbate an enormous problem. Third, the city likes to talk about affordable housing. The area in

question is not zoned for affordable housing. I do realize that affordable housing must be made available to individuals and families who are desperately in need of housing options they can afford. And I fully support affordable housing. But there is no money in it. And the developers who buy the land to build along the corridor are not going to build units they cannot see profit in.

As I mentioned earlier, my husband and I love our home. We love our neighbors and neighborhood. However, we fear that upzoning the neighborhood would not only detrimentally change the look, feel, character, integrity of the neighborhood, but it would further tip the balance of property owner versus rental and commercial real estate. As a neighborhood, we already work hard to create a livable, walkable, community-oriented area. But with higher-density, the scales would tip in a direction where that would no longer be the case. While the original zoning plan would increase density to a certain degree, it would not have the negative impact that upzoning the entire neighborhood would have as proposed in the Amendment. The West Marshall neighborhood cannot sustain the upzoning proposal in the Amendment. The likelihood of increased crime, traffic, car-lined side streets, 3-5 story buildings and demolition of historically well-maintained and beautiful homes of the West Marshall neighborhood that upzoning the neighborhood would have would not promote a livable or safe community.

Thus, we urge the City Council to adopt the ORIGINAL zoning plan and NOT the Amendment to the zoning plan as proposed by Mitra Jalali Nelson.

Thank you for your consideration,

Sarah Dvorak and Todd Lutkauskas
2095 Dayton Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55104

Dear council members & Ms. Dadlez,

I was born in 1984; I am a millennial. As a millennial, my priorities are: saving our dying planet; giving opportunity to those most disadvantaged in our society, while checking the worst impulses of the powerful; and preserving the beauty and history of our community.

To suggest that it is only older, well-off home owners who want to curb demolition and new building projects in St. Paul is absurd. The developers who come into a community, buy it out, tear it down and build cheap, overpriced apartments all in the name of profit are exactly the type of person that my generation stands against. If you are not hearing an outpouring of millennial voices in favor of preservation, it is probably because those living paycheck to paycheck do not have the luxury of civic engagement that the older, established boomers do.

What my generation is looking for is not the “privilege” of being caught in an endless cycle of debt and inflated rent in sterile, soulless developments. The solution to affordability and low vacancy rates, which are likely to plummet with the massive amount of projects underway, is not to ignore sound city planning principles. We have ample opportunity to build, quality high-density housing where it will blend seamlessly with the existing fabric of the city.

The anger and frustration voiced by others of my generation is understandable; I feel it too, but it is misdirected. The idea that the plan set forward isn't good enough because it has been supported by established homeowners is poor policy. It is the established homeowners who have the time and energy to fight for history and preservation. It is done out of a genuine love of our city and most certainly not to exclude any group. It's simply bad governance to rely on an unfounded perception of non-representation or exclusivity to put forward last minute and non-public gross revisions of the plan so carefully crafted by the community. I can say with certainty that the anger and pain felt by some millennials on this issue was heard and well considered in the process of bringing the ultimate plan forward.

Sincerely,

Adam Schaab

1985 Marshall Ave.

To Mitra Nelson

I am opposed to the unilateral changes you made to the Marshall Rezoning Plan. The original compromise plan (before your amendment) was agreed to by all concerned parties through the Union Park Council. I feel like your amendment proves that you have not listened to the needs of your constituents, but only to your personal high density agenda. While I can agree that there is a need for more housing, simply increasing housing density will not solve the problem of reasonably priced housing for most people.

Please reconsider.

Lorraine Larson, 2127 Temple Court

I do not support the amended Marshall Ave Zoning Study Proposal

Dear Council President Brendmoen, Councilmembers and Ms. Dadlez,

I was born and raised in Saint Paul and have owned my home at **1985 Marshall** for 26+ years and love the vibrancy and diversity of Merriam Park.

I want to thank you, the Union Park District Council, it's CLUED committee, the exceptionally hard work of the City planning staff (PED) and the Zoning Commission for all the hard work, flexibility and community engagement generated through this now 14+ month long process to create the new West Marshall Avenue's zoning plan presented to the City Council in August.

I DO NOT support the recently amended Zoning Proposal sponsored by Councilmember Nelson.

What I do not like about the amended plan:

- 1) It almost completely bypasses the results of a well-publicized democratic process requiring compromise by all participants that included numerous stakeholders including students and renters. A process in which many one of the newly emerged supporters of the amended plan could have chosen to directly participate in but chose not to.
- 2) The amended plan is a poor fit the stated goals and vision of Saint Paul's Union Park comprehensive plan for West Marshall
- 3) It does not strikes a balance allowing growth and expansion of housing and businesses, while allowing Marshal's character to survive with density expansion more generally focused at commercial and transportation nodes along the avenue.
- 4) it does not help to retain and promote a future for West Marshall with a good mix of building types at reasonable scale for each block, but invokes a one size fits an overly simplified mentality.
- 5) it allows for expanded higher density T2 & T3 (both allowing the same density in terms of Units/acre) at appropriate nodes with transportation connections / access to light rail across I94, **but does not** appropriately distinguish where T2 (35 ft max.) versus T3 (55 feet max.) best fit along the corridor.

With Kind Regards,

Scott Van Wert

1985 Marshall Ave..

Hello Council Member Nelson. I am writing to ask you to reconsider your rejection of a community developed zoning plan for Marshall Avenue between Snelling and Cleveland/Cretin.

I ask this for primarily two reasons:

First, this plan potentially creates tremendous density for this neighborhood which is already dealing with student housing density, and all the attendant issues of property decay, parking, and noise and congestion.

Secondly, rejecting a planning commission recommendation is not simply rejecting a plan from another city department - it is rejecting the time and effort of community members who contributed to the plan. It is difficult enough to recruit citizens to work on projects like this - and it will be made more difficult if it appears that their work will all come to naught. Please take the long view of encouraging citizen involvement in city government on this.

I have never been a NIMBY proponent. However, rezoning without regard to neighborhood input is reckless. There has to be some middle ground here. Please work to find that.

Lora Dundek
2091 Dayton Avenue

From: Ruth Butros [<mailto:rbutros@msn.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, October 17, 2018 12:45 PM
To: Dadlez, Kady (CI-StPaul)
Subject: Rezoning

There are many of us who live near Cleveland and Cretin who are very concerned about the possibility of rezoning that would allow 3-5 story buildings that would change not only the feel and appearance of the neighborhood but would certainly result in increased traffic and pollution. This is not just "unpleasant " but is a health concern. The traffic on Cretin Avenue is already unbearable, even on weekends when there used to be a decrease, please at least table a vote on this and ask for an environmental study by an independent assessor.

Thank you,

Ruth Butros

358 North Cretin Avenue

I live on Dayton Avenue, between Cretin and Exeter and have had a front row seat to a busier, more chaotic neighborhood since I moved in eleven years ago. Cretin Avenue traveling north is currently more like a very long on-ramp to the freeway, drivers race through in their attempt to beat the traffic light at Marshall and Cretin. Drivers traveling south on Cretin are students racing to find a free on-street parking space near Saint Thomas. Drivers hoping to beat the traffic going east on Marshall often use Dayton Avenue during rush hour. Our house sits two blocks from the University of Saint Thomas. When we moved in, there were two student rentals on our street,

there are now five. This block currently has 28 students (two of the properties are duplexes catering to students). Each of those students has a car and I have personally watched them drive to class at St. Thomas. We already have higher density one block off Marshall Avenue in the form of students filling single-family homes and duplexes.

The idea of creating a large 5 story mixed-use apartment building on the corner of Cretin and Marshall with the argument of encouraging residents there to use mass transit flies in the face of logic. Now imagine another 5-story apartment building a block away at Finn and Marshall and then two more buildings on the opposite corners of Cleveland and Marshall. That would be four-5 story apartment buildings lining a two-lane road within two city blocks. Marshall Avenue already has bumper-to-bumper traffic throughout the day. A bus is not going to solve the congestion on this road because that bus would be stopped in gridlock.

The fact that there is one owner of each of these mentioned properties is suspicious. There is one thing driving his development plans and that is money. It is not about contributing to the fabric of the neighborhood or providing affordable housing. It is simply about making as much money as he can off the property he and his family have owned for years.

I encourage you to reconsider the amendments and to refer to the original plan supported by the neighborhood as well as the Planning Commission. Zoning these parcels at T2, which would provide a 3-story mixed-use development, stays within the character of the neighborhood and still provides additional housing options for people hoping to move into our neighborhood.

Yours,
Kristina Kliber
2204 Dayton Avenue

10/17/2018

To the St. Paul City Council:

This is an open letter expressing opposition to the amendments to the rezoning plan, advanced by Mitra Nelson, along Marshall Avenue between Hamline Avenue and the Mississippi River. It is clear from the approval, by the Planning Commission, of the August 10 plan and the efforts to obtain historic home protection for many of the houses in the area that the majority of Merriam Park residents would like to maintain the current character of this community. We consider ourselves to be a part of this majority and strongly disagree with the amendments to the approved plan of August 10.

As a resident who has lived in this neighborhood for just over a year, I like many others, moved here because of its people, its charm, and its history. Accordingly, the Planning Commission understands this and approved the August 10 plan that will maintain the character of the neighborhood and provide proper room for the community to grow. However, the amendments to the plan disregard the interests of the residents and would denigrate Marshall Avenue and Merriam Park. Moreover, these amendments were only recently introduced on October, 3rd and caused a delay in the survey to determine the suitability for historic home protection. This was not only a tactical move by Mitra

Nelson to allow the moratorium on the houses to expire, but was also a deliberate attempt on her part to take advantage of unsuspecting residents by submitting her amendments for vote without giving adequate time for her amendments to be reviewed by the community. Such tactics are deceptive and clearly show that Mitra Nelson does not have the best interests of the residents nor the future of this beautiful community at heart.

As a home owner, I feel betrayed by these amendments and poorly represented by Mitra Nelson. As a newly elected official, we have very little knowledge of her future agenda and I am wary that her intentions for this neighborhood are drastically different from the residents and she will continue to employ dishonest methods to try and change what we love about this neighborhood. As such, I implore the Council to recognize and respect the wishes of the residents and vote against Mitra Nelson's amendments to the August 10 plan.

Sincerely,

Joseph and Jacqueline Gravert
1731 Marshall Avenue

From: Rachel Westermeyer <weste065@umn.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, October 16, 2018 10:30 PM
To: Thao, Dai (CI-StPaul) <dai.thao@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Cc: Rachel Westermeyer <weste065@umn.edu>
Subject: Please OPPOSE the proposed amendments to the West Marshall Zoning Study

Dear Dai,

I am writing to request that you OPPOSE Council Member Mitra Nelson's proposed amendments to the West Marshall Avenue Zoning Study for this reason:

These new proposed amendments focus on heavy density and developer centered buildings whose focus is profits, not affordability.

As a 55 year resident of an owner/occupied duplex in this Merriam Park neighborhood I strongly support a balance of density and uses to maintain the neighborhood character and balance needed to support a healthy and vibrant community.

Again, I ask you to OPPOSE the amendments proposed by Council Member, Mitra J. Nelson.

Thank you.

Rachel M. Westermeyer
1935 Summit Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55105