

From: Patrick Sweeney [<mailto:pat.ann.sweeney@gmail.com>]

Sent: Sunday, February 4, 2018 4:40 PM

To: #CI-StPaul_Ward7 <Ward7@ci.stpaul.mn.us>

Cc: Harr, Stephanie (CI-StPaul) <Stephanie.Harr@ci.stpaul.mn.us>; Heintz, Polly (CI-StPaul) <polly.heintz@ci.stpaul.mn.us>

Subject: Ward 7 Opposed to Marshall and Moore apartments

Council Member Prince:

I am writing to join my neighbors in urging you to reject the proposed student dormitory/apartment complex at the northeast corner of Marshall Avenue and Moore Street.

Our family has lived at 2006 Carroll Ave., about two blocks northwest of the site, since 1981. We believe the proposed five-story complex is completely out of character for the site and would detract from the neighborhood feel and livability of our part of Merriam Park.

I happen to be writing this email while I am visiting my son's family in Chicago. We see neighborhood after neighborhood in which three-story apartments are intermingled successfully with single-family homes. A five-story apartment complex in any of these Chicago neighborhoods would be just as out of character as the proposed dormitory would be in ours.

My wife, Ann, and I attended the Zoning Committee meeting in which the committee approved the site plan. The process was respectful of the neighborhood opponents, and the city planner who presented the proposal to the committee did so in a professional manner.

Nevertheless, we had several objections to the process:

- For my wife and me, the impact of the proposed dormitory was most clearly illustrated by a graphic presented by our across-the-street neighbor, Douglas Allchin. It showed an outline of the proposed building looming over the homes it would replace. The developer's architect was allowed to suggest that the graphic was somehow out of perspective and inaccurate. But the architect was not required to provide even the slightest evidence for his assertion. And the committee chair refused to allow one of our neighbors to respond to the architect. I am attaching a version of that graphic updated by Mr. Allchin.
- There were considerable neighborhood objections to the city's conclusion that the complex's underground parking would all be underground, allowing greater density than otherwise would be permitted on the site. Several of the neighbors said the enclosed parking area, or parts of it, would be 2 feet above the grade. The city planner cited a conclusion other members of the planning staff had reached that the underground parking would, in fact, be underground when measured against some sort of average of the grade on the sloping lot.

I urge you to take a look at that graphic prepared by Mr. Allchin, ask your staff to judge its accuracy and then decide whether the dormitory fits the character of the neighborhood.

I also urge you to get to the bottom of whether the underground parking would, in fact, be underground and eligible for the density exemption the developer seeks.

My family has been very fortunate to live in this neighborhood. I realize the objections raised by my neighbors and me might seem insignificant compared to problems in some other neighborhoods. But we believe the city should not allow any neighborhood to be significantly diminished mainly to suit the profit motives of a suburban developer. Those two lots at Marshall and Moore can be used or re-developed in ways that would preserve the character and integrity of our neighborhood.

Thank you.

Patrick D. Sweeney
2006 Carroll Ave.

St. Paul, MN 55104



From: Michael Kroona [<mailto:mrkroona@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, February 4, 2018 2:47 PM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward7 <Ward7@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Cc: Harr, Stephanie (CI-StPaul) <Stephanie.Harr@ci.stpaul.mn.us>; Heintz, Polly (CI-StPaul) <polly.heintz@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Subject: Opposed to the Marshall & Moore Apartments – Residents at 1890 Iglehart Avenue

Dear Councilmember Prince,

I (Michael Kroona) am emailing a second time on behalf of my family to express our opposition to the proposed development of a five-story apartment building at the existing property addresses of 1973 and 1977 Marshall Avenue.

We ask for you to reverse the Planning Commission's decision to approve the site plan for this five-story apartment building.

Respectfully yours,

Michael and Andria Kroona
1890 Iglehart Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55104

From: Douglas Allchin [<mailto:allch001@umn.edu>]
Sent: Friday, February 02, 2018 9:08 PM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward1; Xiong, Mai Chong (CI-StPaul); Zimny, Joanna (CI-StPaul); #CI-StPaul_Ward2; Maki, Taina (CI-StPaul); Kayla@umn.edu; Thao@umn.edu; --Ward@umn.edu; 2@umn.edu; Executive@umn.edu; Assistant:@umn.edu
Subject: Marshall & Moore Apartments Proposal

Dear President Brendmoen, Mr. Stark (Ward 4) and other Members of the Saint Paul City Council,

I write about the proposed large-scale development project for a 5-story apartment building in the Marshall Avenue Residential Corridor, at the intersection of Moore Avenue -- being considered under appeal by the Council this coming week.

Although I would fully support a 3-story apartment building, with appropriate density, and designed for and affordable to the general public, the proposal does not fit in the character and most especially the SCALE of neighborhood, even under its zoning designation as a Residential Corridor. It is easy to see that this is a LARGE-SCALE, HIGH-DENSITY COMMERCIAL DORMITORY that does not belong in a residential neighborhood. (See attached visual.)

A building of this scale -- 5 stories -- is unprecedented in the whole surrounding area -- nearly one square mile, where 3 and 2.5 stories are common, even for numerous apartments. The building occupancy -- 61 residents in 16 "family" units on 0.35 acre (!) -- violates the density norms that have been established in the 2010 Saint Paul Comprehensive Plan, limited to 4-30 units per acre (a limit of 10.5 on this property). The proposed building would tower over the trees, quite the opposite of what is portrayed in the developer's misleading rendering. As a simple visual indicates, its size is completely out of scale with the neighborhood.

The proposed development makes many efforts to accommodate zoning regulations, but runs afoul of them at the edges again and again, precisely because the scale of the project is too large. There are good reasons why the many apartment buildings in the immediate area are only 3 stories.

There are many technical details about this plan, documented in the letter of appeal, but they all boil down to the SCALE being out of proportion to the neighborhood. So, please allow me to draw some of the connections. The project was originally planned for 3 lots, but the 3rd homeowner was not interested in the sale, so the project had to be squeezed onto 2 lots. The project goes UP instead. To accommodate more units, the developer has appealed to an EXCEPTION based on underground parking spaces -- although it is not clear that this allowance was ever intended to trump the City's 2010 Comprehensive Plan on residential density. But in building down, the garage slopes down and runs afoul of the 100-year flood level. In attempting to raise the garage level, the garage is no longer underground, but breaks ground level, and the developer hopes to hide it by extra fill. But in adding extra soil fill, the parking slab is raised, and the height of the entry to the handicapped parking (which is fixed on the 5-story plan) becomes too low to meet regulations.

The garage roof -- which has been disguised as a "driveway" -- now covers over half the surface area of the property -- another violation of code. While a pump in the garage would seem important, it is not included in the plans, as it would reduce the number of parking spaces, and so decrease the extra unit-allowance the developer is seeking. (There are other problems of crowding in the basement, such as lack of access to a utility room, lack of adequate space for trash and recycling for a building of this SCALE, vehicle maneuverability problems)--but again, any reduction in parking space allocation limits the much-sought allowance for number of units (which is dubious at the outset). In making on-grade parking and driveways--again, to accommodate the extraordinary density of 61 residents in 0.35 acre-- the proposed driveway is excessive --causing runoff and erosion problems, as well as encroachment issues. The developer proposes a visual screen at the property line -- a mere 2 feet from the neighboring house (unusual proximity a result of history, here). One might be more accommodating were this an effort to provide affordable housing in the city. It is not. "Single family"

units are projected to cost a minimum of \$3,200 per month, for a space meeting the absolute lower limit of required square footage.

They are designed with 4 ultra-small bedrooms (again, scraping the allowed limit): this is a student dormitory by design and by price.

As an indication of the local problem of high-density student residence, there is already a zoning layover for the neighborhood, which surrounds St. Thomas University, limiting the density of student residences in single-family homes. This project neatly tries to step around the problem by making a "multi-family" dwelling. It is not a "multi-family residence." It is a private student dormitory. As a further indication of this purpose, all those who spoke in favor of the developer's proposal at the Zoning Commission hearing were current or former St. Thomas students (including the developer's son). All the "minor" zoning infringements--and they are many--stem from this one purpose: trying to cram 61 high-paying residents in

0.35 acre. This is not what the City planned here.

There would be little problem with a 3-story building on this site, limited at 10 family units of 1-, 2- and occasional 3-bedroom units.

That would reflect the character and scale of the neighborhood. But this outsized 5-story, high-density 4-bedroom-per-unit commercial dormitory does not meet the criteria dictated in the City's 2010 Comprehensive Plan, or reflected in the spirit of the RM2-zoned "residential corridor."

Finally, I understand that the city staff member who conducted the review of this property has limited experience in the position. There is no reason to question the reviewer's motives or intent. However, the minutes of the Zoning Commission meeting, which approved the project despite detailed disapproval by the Union Park District Council, will document that the members fully relied (in good faith) on Staff, and did not fully address the contrary testimony presented at the hearing. It is the proper function of an appeal to allow other experts to identify oversights in the review of an inexperienced reviewer, and for that evidence to be fully considered.

This building will set an unwelcome precedent far beyond the few blocks around its location, and it is appropriate for the City Council to duly review, reconsider, and reverse the Zoning Commission's "rubber-stamp" approval, based on larger considerations of interpreting the City's 2010 Comprehensive Plan. I hope the City Council will heed the testimony identifying the apparently minor, but numerous and significant zoning code violations noted in the letter of appeal, and REJECT this proposal as it is now offered, while explicit welcoming a proposal more in the scale of the neighborhood.

Yours truly,

Douglas Allchin
2005 Carroll Ave., St. Paul



From: Libbie Henderson [<mailto:libbieh2005@gmail.com>]

Sent: Sunday, February 04, 2018 3:12 PM

To: #CI-StPaul_Ward1; #CI-StPaul_Ward2; #CI-StPaul_Ward3; #CI-StPaul_Ward4; #CI-StPaul_Ward5; #CI-StPaul_Ward6; #CI-StPaul_Ward7

Cc: Xiong, Mai Chong (CI-StPaul); joanna.zimmy@ci.stpaul.mn.us; Maki, Taina (CI-StPaul); McMahon, Melanie (CI-StPaul); Kelley, Pattie (CI-StPaul); Henningson, Samantha (CI-StPaul); Bauer, Kelly (CI-StPaul); OBrien, Kim (CI-StPaul); Sanders, Donna (CI-StPaul); Renstrom, Scott (CI-StPaul); Lagos, Heidi (CI-StPaul); Harr, Stephanie (CI-StPaul); polly.heinta@ci.stpaul.mn.us

Subject: Opposed to the Marshall & Moore Apts.-Owner @ 2005 Carroll Ave.

Dear Council member and staff:

I am greatly opposed to the proposed apartment building at the NE corner of Marshall and Moore in St. Paul. My opposition is based on:

- the proposed building is **completely** out of scale for the site, and the neighborhood as well as out of character.
- my understanding of the planning review process overall is that planning approval was based on a number of contingent analyses. It sounds like a house of cards and if any one of those analyses didn't come out exactly right many of the other ones would fall through. It feels like the proposal has been shoe-horned onto a site that is too small for it.
- the neighborhood already has concerns and problems with the number of rental properties and students in the neighborhood. It seems that this will only exacerbate those problems (for example: speeding cars, drinking, partying).
- There is a grade school only a block away, as well as a church. This is not an appropriate location for such a densely developed apartment building.

I could go on at length, but will leave my comments brief at this time. I ask you to consider fully what you hear at your meeting on Wednesday, and what this may mean for this neighborhood as well as other neighborhoods in the area. Approval of this proposal is setting a precedent.

Elizabeth Henderson
2005 Carroll Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55104

From: Jim Bruns [<mailto:hayriverfarm@gmail.com>]

Sent: Sunday, February 04, 2018 8:33 PM

To: #CI-StPaul_Ward4; #CI-StPaul_Ward1; #CI-StPaul_Ward3; #CI-StPaul_Ward5; #CI-StPaul_Ward6; #CI-StPaul_Ward7

Subject: Marshall and Moore is a dorm without a campus. Public nuisance for private profit.

Hi,

My name is Jim Bruns and I live at 1889 Iglehart. I'm another person opposed to the large five story building at Marshall and Moore. It's a dormitory, and it belongs on campus, not in our neighborhood.

This is another example of public nuisance for private profit in our neighborhood. Other examples are a Whole Foods and large apartment building at an important intersection, a Starbucks that needs a traffic cop and blocks traffic and bikes all the time anyways, and a stadium that doesn't have parking. We don't want a dorm without a campus, too.

Jim

From: Michelle Kaiser [<mailto:michelle.kaiser1@gmail.com>]

Sent: Sunday, February 04, 2018 11:05 PM

To: #CI-StPaul_Ward4

Subject: Opposed to the Marshall & Moore Apartments – Owner of property at 1976 Iglehart Avenue

Dear Councilmember Stark

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Marshall & Moore Apartments site plan approval and respectfully request that you reverse the Planning Commission's decision. We have owned the property directly behind the proposed building since 1983. Over the years we have seen the area slowly erode from a neighborhood of close knit owners of single family homes to a disgusting conglomeration of student rental properties. These students do not have a vested interest in the neighborhood or in Saint Paul. I feel confident in making this statement by witnessing the behavior of these students (and parents) over the years. Public

drunkenness, lewdness, drug dealing, noise and property violations do not represent behavior that constitutes a neighborhood. Expanding that venue exacerbates those problems. Student housing needs **must** be addressed by the local universities. Only they can constructively set behavior expectations with meaningful repercussions to their renters. Without university oversight these properties drain community resources such as police, fire and emergency services.

I implore you and your fellow council members to stop this development and challenge the local universities to address housing issue.

Respectfully submitted

Michelle Kaiser