From: Robert McClain
To: *CI-StPaul_Contact-Council
Subject: Public Hearing Notice - City Council Appeal
Date: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 8:28:08 AM
Attachments: City Council Appeal 25-039863.docx

You don't often get email from rmcclain115@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

I am writing regarding:
Appeal File# 25-039863
Variance File# 25-028644

I am submitting the attached document as my public comment regarding this matter.
In addition, it is my intent to speak at the appeal hearing on Wednesday, June 25,2025.
If you have any questions or concerns please feel free to contact me via return email.
Thank you.

437 Sherburne Avenue
Saint Paul, MN 55103

Juned 23, 2025

Saint Paul City Council
Ramsey County Courthouse
15 Kellogg Boulevard West
Saint Paul, MN 55101-1805

RE: PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE – CITY COUNCIL APPEAL - File # 25-039863

To All Parties Concerned:

The applicant in this matter, Dominic Carchedi, is appealing the decision of the Board of Zoning Appeals public hearing of May 12, 2025 – File #25-028644, where it was requested that a variance of city zoning requirement be granted which would allow the applicant to establish and operate a 24-resident supportive recovery/sober housing facility at 418 Sherburne Avenue,

My name is Robert McClain; the owner of the property located at 437 Sherburne Avenue. I am requesting that the city council uphold the decision of the Board of Zoning Appeals for the following reasons:

- The distance requirements for recovery/sober housing were established by Minnesota State Legislature to avoid the clustering of housing so that no specific neighborhood would become disproportionately impacted. The applicant must be referred to the Minnesota State Legislature for redress.
- In addition to the issue of distance between supportive housing units, other factors need to be considered in the decision-making process.
- My neighbors and I were under the impression that the property in question was to house four (4) families once construction was completed, which I am told was also indicated in the initial land use application.
- The new proposal is a distinct variant from the type of housing expected, which is now clearly a residential facility for a specific population
- There was little outreach, if any, from the applicant or others associated with this project with neighbors who feel blindsided learning of the intended use of this new construction.
- The proposed land/building use should have been part of a community engagement process for review, input, evaluation and acceptance by neighbors surrounding the facility.

- The concentration of 24 individuals who share common substance abuse challenges, and possibly mental health issues as well having to live in such a confined space is concerning. I suspect that it will not be long before the "drug vultures" begin circling above seeking the most vulnerable among them once the word gets out of a "captive audience"
- These individuals may or may not be familiar with each other may be forced to share living quarters with someone who may impede their attempt at successful recovery.
- I challenge the individual or collective thought process that concluded that productive outcomes will be achieved in the housing of 24 recovering substance abuse individuals in a facility that is within a "stone's throw" from a liquor store and tobacco shop that promotes the selling of drug paraphernalia. These two businesses consume extensive law enforcement resources due to the number of violent acts, shootings, public gambling and drug dealing that take place on or near their properties.
- Neighbors have brought to my attention their witnessing of behaviors/activity at the 418 Sherburne Avenue property that may lead to problem property issues in the long run and have been reluctant to openly complain to anyone.
- The applicant has stated in a previous hearing that everything is going well and neighbors like him and the facility. The applicant stated that there are currently two tenants occupying the facility with no problems following the rules and regulations submitted in the submitted application. The painting of this rosy picture is disingenuous, and when full capacity is achieved the story will surely change. Human nature is unpredictable and impactful.
- The list of rules and/or conditions submitted by the applicant, "manager", are consistent with other recovery/sober facilities. The degree of compliance will certainly vary since the residents are recovering from a lengthy and abusive relationship with drugs and/or alcohol. These are people, not robots, and many have demonstrated a pattern of deliberate or circumstantial failure.
- Neighbors have expressed the concern of not having on-site staffing, supervision or management at this facility, consisting of 24 "vulnerable" residents who are to rely on "peer to peer" supervision and personal accountability during non-business hours. Although there is value in "peer to peer" support neighbors are not confident in its effectiveness.
- My neighbors and I are not opposed to recovery/sober housing, and we want to be supportive of people facing substance abuse challenges, but it is unreasonable for this applicant to expect our acceptance or approval of a concentration of 24 individuals in a supportive housing arrangement at this specific location without prior consultation through a community process.

I ask that the Saint Paul City Council Appeals process deny the applicant's requested variance and appeal.

Sincerely,

Robert McClain