

Dear Mr. Stark,

As a Desnoyer Park resident, I can assure you that not all of us are opposed to this development.

It is a noisy spot right next to the freeway that is not well suited for housing. There is also an active railroad spur on the street that goes over to Weyerhaeuser's distribution center right next to this property. I saw a train there yesterday. There is also a more active CP rail line that goes under the Pelham Avenue freeway overpass bridge.

Close in jobs are needed too and we also need to increase our tax base.

On another issue, I appreciate all of your bicycle advocacy work, especially the sidewalk at the Town & Country club.

Sincerely,

Richard Sanford
626 Desnoyer Avenue

Dear Councilmember Stark,

Concerning development at 650 Pelham:

The above property that is slated for development is a concern for me. I live south of the neighborhood but work in the area and bike along Pelham Blvd in my commute. I feel that the Port Authority should address the concerns that the local district councils have with the project. The people who live near this area will be most directly affected by the development and must have a voice in the outcome. Rezoning an area to meet a developers wishes but ignoring the concerns of the neighborhood is not acceptable. A community is composed of both businesses and residents and both should have input into any development. Both the Port Authority and the developer should recognize and respect this premise and work with the community.

sincerely,

Alan Knaeble

resident of St. Paul

Dear Councilmember Starks,

As a resident of Desnoyer Park, I am writing to support the proposed development at Pelham/Wabasha, opposing the Union Park District Council's appeal for the site plan that will be discussed at a public hearing tomorrow evening. From what I have read, this development will be a vast improvement over the trucking site that used to be there. This site is really not part of the Desnoyer Park neighborhood - if I am going for a walk or bike ride, I am much more likely to go down to the river and enjoy the trails in that area. In the 4 years I have lived in Desnoyer Park, I have walked across 94 exactly once. I also don't believe traffic will increase to unmanageable levels - we live in a city! St. Paul needs new business development now more than ever. Please allow the development to go ahead as planned.

Sincerely,

Jill Smith

572 Cromwell Ave

I am NOT in support of a light industrial development 3 blocks from my house, and 3ight next to the new light rail. What on earth are you thinking?!!!!

Mike nylund
529 glendale st
St paul,mn

Dear Councilmember Stark,

My name is Matt Miller and I live at 389 Otis Ave in Desnoyer Park in St. Paul. I have been a Desnoyer Park Improvement Association board member for the past four years.

I am writing you to voice my support for the Union Park District Council's appeal of the site plan for the Port Authority's development at Pelham/Wabash to the St. Paul City Council. Furthermore, after investing countless hours in issues affecting our neighborhood over the past several years, I am very disappointed and concerned that such a plan could be moved forward without greater community involvement, especially when such care has gone into plans around development near the central corridor that do not match this proposed use.

I am asking you to put conditions on the development at the very least. I, for one, am not interested in concessions such as trees, shrubs and sidewalks. The area should not be zoned light industrial. I believe there is tremendous community support for a design change to the plan. As an active citizen, with additional family members that are 40 year residents of this neighborhood, I will be interested to see how this situation is handled and how the concerns of the community are represented.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Matt Miller

Dear Gentlemen:

I am in support of the UPDC appeal against the proposed site plan at Wabash and Pelham. I plan on attending tomorrow night's (Oct. 5, 2011 @ 5:30 PM) City Council hearing at the scheduled St. Paul City Council Meeting.

Sincerely,
Mathew Curran
609 Eustis Street
(651) 646-8197

I'm writing to ask you to reconsider the site plan for 650 Pelham. I ride my bicycle to work from Mac-Groveland to Raymond/University every day past that site and it really strikes me that we are putting in a suburban style project that is short sighted and does not account for long term vision for that part of the city. This area may look tired now, but it has great potential with its proximity to light rail and convenience to both downtowns. Please reconsider this.

Barbara LaMotte lamotte.barbara@gmail.com

It is with dismay I have to even write this. That you folks would commit \$1 billion to a major transit corridor project only to proceed to ruin that very project through bone headed zoning is simply beyond my comprehension. This is the failure of imagination of elected leaders that leaves voters scratching their heads.

The corridor, for success, requires a commitment of high density development. The communities have been engaged in this process from the beginning. The zoning overlays for 650 Pelham clearly outlined the transition to high density TND. It is so obvious. The site is within three blocks of one of the stations. But no, you folks in your infinite wisdom exempt the site to hold an industrial zoning and ruin the access to the station for Desnoyer Park.

Not only that, in your infinite wisdom you have preserved and expanded the Rock Ten Paper Plant. So now our access via Pelham will be through a hideously ugly industrial park, and our access via Cretin will be past Rock Ten.

This is nothing but crony capitalism financed by bankers that I have come to loathe. You guys take a piece of ground and sell it to one of your buddies for \$1 that is worth \$4 million. He can run to the bank and finance the whole thing with the true value of the land and pocket the cash. Is it any wonder he lives in Florida. So good luck papering the pockets of your cronies with money and feeding us fake community input structures only to stab us in the back at the end.

Is it any wonder the level of disgust with government there is. You destroy the commons, ruin and endanger pedestrian and bikers, ruin the corridor for us, and paper the pockets of your cronies. Nice job.

It sickens me. And it especially galls me you are the one who introduced this amendment. Secret meeting, secret dealing, fake community contact, concern, blah blah blah. The fix was so obviously in on this one.

Scot Torkelson
612-986-2575

Gentlemen -

I would like to add my opposition to the speculative suburban - styled development on Pelham. It is a perfect example of old school thinking and drastically sells out our future on that lot in a way that undermines the very progressive activities of a wide variety of volunteer groups surrounding the corridor development opportunities.

This plan's underlying assumptions are fundamentally flawed, and will not be covered over by small cosmetic fixes such as flowers, fences, etc, etc. There needs to be a more considered program with an integrated design that fits into the neighboring buildings' aesthetic, allows for higher density, civic involvement, and addresses the linking potential that this site has. Identifying developers that are local and committed to long term community improvement is also important.

Please utilize any available tools you have to rescind the current plan's approvals and look to your community for them to help you identify better options. We care, we have the tools, and we are willing to help. Especially in this time of economic fragility, we need to better utilize our public resources to lay the foundation for a healthy, productive, vibrant future.

Thanks.

Geoffrey Warner, AIA
Principal Architect • weeHouse Founder
Alchemy Architects • 856 Raymond Ave Studio G. St. Paul, MN 55114 • 651-647-6650.
www.alchemyarch.com

Please enter this e-mail message into the official record for today's public hearing on the Union Park District Council's appeal of the site plan for 650 Pelham Avenue in St. Paul. I support the appeal for several reasons.

First, the community has overwhelmingly expressed desires for specific types of development. There is no reason to deny this request. The building is being built in the hope that the developer can then find and sign a tenant. Given that there is no one currently committed to occupying the building, there are no hardships to a business that wants to occupy this building, once built.

Second, and most importantly, the site falls inside a special zoning district created to maximize investment close to the Central Corridor LRT. The plan for the Raymond Area Station was created with a great deal of community input, and was adopted as part of the Comprehensive Plan. The plan for this building does not meet the specifications of this plan. Why did the City spend so much time and taxpayer money to develop a plan, and why did the community participate in the plan, if the City chooses to ignore the plan any time it is convenient? The plan is supposed to guide development, but isn't doing so in this case.

I ask that you grant the appeal of the Union Park District Council and associated groups and don't approve any plan for this site that doesn't meet the specifications spelled out in the Raymond Area Station Plan.

Benita Warns
1440 Lafond Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55104
651-641-1037
warns@pclink.com

Council Member Stark –

I am not able to attend the Appeals Hearing tonight regarding the Pelham site due to a prior commitment. I hope you will accept my comments as follows –

As Chair of the District 12 Land Use Committee, I have been very involved with the Pelham/ Wabash site and its proposed redevelopment. While I support the mission of the Port Authority of creating jobs, I would simply say that this particular development is the wrong building type for this site.

At our first meeting with the PA, we noted that our District Plan favored a TN zoning for this area, with an emphasis on Mixed Use developments that would support residential with possible commercial / light industrial uses. We wanted developments that would anchor corners, minimize parking and relate strongly to pedestrian, bike and light rail transportation. We wanted developments that become vital parts of a residential and Artists community that we see developing at the corner of Raymond and University as per our Creative Enterprise Zone efforts. As we said in meetings with the PA, we want all of this area to be “more natural, more urban and more connected.”

While we were never asked to vote on this site plan, as a variance was never requested, we did express our displeasure at the meetings and in written communications with Tom Beach.

The plan presents a suburban type, car oriented development in an urban setting. It presents a sea of asphalt at the Southern gateway to our community. It encourages car traffic and lower density on the fringe of a Transit Oriented area.

To their credit, I think the PA has made some efforts to mitigate the impact of the development (added sidewalks and landscaping). The building itself would be appropriate in another (suburban) location. But at this site there is simply no way this can be dressed up enough to make it work and fit into the fabric of our neighborhood.

I hope that the appeal is given serious consideration.

Roger Purdy, LEED AP – Construction Administrator

250 Third Avenue North, Suite 450, Minneapolis, MN 55401

Direct 612.752.6957 | Cell 612.239.2856

LHBcorp.com

LHB, Inc. | PERFORMANCE DRIVEN DESIGN.