

Langer, Samantha (CI-StPaul)

From: Emily Metcalfe <emily.met75@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 01, 2018 1:05 PM
To: Dermody, Bill (CI-StPaul)
Subject: St. Paul on the Hill - 1524 Summit Ave

Hi, Bill,

I am not able to attend the Zoning Commission meeting tomorrow regarding the proposed use of the former St. Paul on the Hill church at 1524 Summit Ave, but I would like to enter the following for public comment:

I live at 1559 Summit Ave, across from the former St. Paul on the Hill church. This is a beautiful building that contributes to the quality of our neighborhood. I support the proposed uses of the building being considered by the Zoning Commission.

In order to preserve structures like the one at 1524 Summit, we need to find viable ways to repurpose them. John Rupp has found several uses for this building, including religious, educational, and commercial uses. I am glad to see people coming to our neighborhood to worship, learn, and enjoy themselves in this building.

Please grant the requested variance.

Best regards,

Emily Metcalfe
1559 Summit Ave.

Langer, Samantha (CI-StPaul)

From: shg_cairns <shg_cairns@cheqnet.net>
Sent: Thursday, August 02, 2018 9:23 AM
To: Dermody, Bill (CI-StPaul)
Cc: McMahan, Melanie (CI-StPaul)
Subject: Saint Paul Zoning Commission 8-2-18 hearing on 1524 Summit variance

RE: 1524 Summit Ave. zoning request

As a 30+ year resident and taxpayer at 1894 Summit Ave. in St Paul, I respectfully request that the Saint Paul Zoning Commission add the following conditions on the variance requested by the developer of the property at 1524 Summit Ave. for health and safety concerns and as precedent for any future development in this residential area. These conditions include the following:

- Please limit the activities, performances, "innovation center" use, educational services to the hours of 7:00am until 10:00pm;
- Please expand the on-site parking requirements to an additional 20 vehicles during building operating hours to bring the new expanded business use identified in the variance request of the building more into compliance with the other businesses and educational centers covered by St. Paul zoning and parking codes. Chapter 63 of the Zoning code covers the new and expanded uses requested in this variance for not only part time students, office, restaurant/bar, commercial assembly hall without fixed seating, and music hall.
- Please require that the conditions of the variance include specific limitations on the activities that can be conducted on site as part of the "innovation center". This nebulous function that is currently undefined could pave the way for additional rented office space, a production facility, charter school or other functions that require more parking and/or hours of operation.

Rationale for these Variance conditions for health and safety concerns:

--hours of operation capped at 7am until 10pm is requested for life-safety concerns of bicyclists attending activities at this facility during evening hours. The unfortunate deaths and injuries of bicyclists in the street at the juncture of the Snelling/Summit streets with the poorly designed access streets during evening hours and periods of high daytime traffic is a concern. City staff contend that more mass transit/non-car travel is expected by patrons of the church/innovation center. Thus increased bike travel and potential for bicyclist injury at this dangerous intersection can be expected if not mitigated and planned for in the zoning variance request. Additionally, this is a residential neighborhood. Our children and grandchildren (and homeowners/renters) are trying to sleep. Having events scheduled from 7am until midnight creates noise that is evident during the current church services and following the service with slamming car doors. Having the prospect of music and "innovation center" events til midnight on multiple nights during the week is not why we own/rent in this neighborhood. This is why we have a St Paul noise ordinance.

--expanded on-site parking is requested for several reasons. The nearby school within the same block, while having primarily daytime operation, creates injury zones during the day with increased traffic during drop-off/pick-up hours. While patrons are looking for on-street parking near the church, the end of school day dismissal of students seeking transport could create spaces for childhood injuries with additional church/innovation center cars seeking on street parking. A dedicated parking space during daytime hours Monday-Friday would decrease these injury zones.

--The expanded uses of the building as an "innovation center", while creative as a legal tool to expand the future scope and function of the building to meet the financial needs of this for-profit entity, does little to define the actual function of work that will be conducted on the location. Innovation Center use, once approved by this variance, could include 3D printer production of devices, music production during non-working hours by artists, office space rented to organizations or co-working space rented to multiple people during the hours of operation, secure Amazon drop

off/pick-up location, food/beverage production, and many more creative and profitable ventures. Again the impact of health safety concerns for the residents of the area depends on what is produced on location (3-D printed guns for example) or the increased frequency of drop-off/pick ups of deliveries during neighboring school hours, or increased use of/disposal of hazardous waste in a residential area.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide comments on this zoning variance for 1524 Summit Ave. I strongly request that conditions be placed on this variance to limit hours of operation to 7am to 10pm, to require at least 20 adjacent or nearby increased off-street parking spots and bike racks prior to variance approval and to limit the scope of this variance to that of music performance and church services and not approve expanded "innovation center" activities without another well defined variance request.

Katherine Cairns
1894 Summit Ave.
St Paul, MN 55105
651-690-1474



August 2, 2018

Tammera R. Diehm
 Direct Dial: (612) 604-6658
 Direct Fax: (612) 604-6958
 tdiehm@winthrop.com

Zoning Committee of the Planning Commission
 City of Saint Paul
 25 West 4th Street
 City Hall Annex, Suite 1400
 Saint Paul, Minnesota 55102
 Attn: Mr. Bill Dermody

VIA E-MAIL

Re: Historic Use Variance - Summit Center for Arts & Innovation

Dear Zoning Committee:

Our firm represents the Summit Avenue Residential Preservation Association (“SARPA”), an organization whose mission is to preserve the historic, residential and urban park character of Summit Avenue. This letter is submitted in opposition to the application for a historic use variance (the “Variance”) that was filed by the Summit Center for Arts & Innovation (the “Applicant”) for property located at 1524 Summit Avenue (the “Property”). Because the use that will result from the Variance is (a) not compatible with the existing uses in the surrounding area and the underlying zoning classification and (b) not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan (the “Comp Plan”) for the City of Saint Paul (the “City”), SARPA respectfully requests that Zoning Committee recommend that the Planning Commission deny the Variance.

Background and Standard of Review

The Applicant proposes to convert the former St. Paul’s Episcopal Church on-the Hill building and ground into the Summit Center for Arts and Innovation. According to the application materials, the use of the Applicant seeks to “create a one of a kind venue with world class acoustics and technical capabilities.”¹ Based on the Applicant’s own description, there is no dispute that the use of the Property will be significantly intensified – unlike a religious center that hosts occasional community events, the proposed reuse plan indicates that the Applicant intends to use the Property from 7 am until midnight, 7-days a week, 365 days a year. The proposed uses will include both public and private programs and events, a recording studio and rehearsal location, music, art and/or other related schools, and a variety of spiritual and church uses. It will be a place for weddings, memorial services and receptions and it will host outdoor events and community activities in a garden area. While the Application materials present a picture of a vibrant event center, and focus on the economic benefit of reuse to the owner, neither the Applicant nor City Staff effectively evaluate the impact of the intensification of use on the surrounding neighborhood or its consistency

¹ Historic Use Variance Application for The Summit Center for Arts and Innovation, revised June 25, 2018 (the “Application”), p.3.

with the City's Comp Plan, nor do they propose any strategies for addressing the impact that this reuse will have on the neighbors.

The Saint Paul City Code (the "Code") establishes the findings and review process for historic use variances, specifically noting that the following five (5) findings must be made in order to approve this type of variance:

- (1) *The proposed use is reasonable and compatible with the historic use(s) of the site or that the new use is consistent with section 73.04(5) of this chapter.*
- (2) *The proposed use complies with the adopted preservation program, and the United States' Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, as applicable.*
- (3) *The historic use variance is necessary to alleviate practical difficulties unique to the heritage preservation site that prevents its use in a manner consistent with its historic use or that the new use is consistent with section 73.04(5) of this chapter, and that these difficulties were not created by the applicant.*
- (4) *The proposed use is compatible with existing uses in the surrounding area and the underlying zoning classifications in the area.*
- (5) *The proposed use is consistent with the comprehensive plan.²*

The Code requires the Planning Commission to hold a public hearing for the purpose of making findings regarding the application's consistency with the Comp Plan and the application's compatibility with the underlying zoning classifications in the surrounding area (findings number 4 and 5 above).³

Importantly, the Variance that you are being asked to consider today is different from many variance applications that you review because it requests a variance from the permitted "use" of the property. Most variances are "area" variances through which applicants request flexibility related to dimensional requirements in the Code such as setbacks or lot coverage. A "use variance" is less common and, because it attempts to effectively change the zoning of a parcel of property without going through the otherwise required rezoning process, Minnesota courts have been careful to put limits on the ability of a local government to grant this type of exception to

² Code Section 73.03.1(c)

³ Code Section 73.03.1(e). While this letter will address the two factors that must be evaluated by the Zoning Committee and Planning Commission, it should be noted that SARPA believes that the Application fails to meet the other required findings and, since the City Council is charged with reviewing "all materials relative to the case" by copy of this letter, SARPA urges the City Council to re-examine the findings made by the Historic Preservation Commission as additional evidence as to why the Variance should be denied.

established code requirements.⁴ Because of the change in use, it is even more important that the Planning Commission, and the Zoning Committee, consider whether the proposed use is consistent with the underlying zoning and with the adopted Comp Plan. As outlined below, the proposed intensification of the use of the Property, under the Variance, is not compatible with the existing uses or the underlying zoning classification, nor is it consistent with the Comp Plan and because of this, the Variance should be denied.

I. The proposed use is not compatible with existing uses or the underlying zoning classifications in the area.

The Staff Report indicates that the proposed use is compatible with existing uses in the surrounding area and the underlying zoning classifications in the area because “the proposed institutional use is compatible with the institutional uses nearby to the west and those permitted in the RM1 zoning district.”⁵ The Staff Report further states that “parking impact is anticipated to be similar to the church use.”⁶ SARPA respectfully disagrees with both of these statements and the accompanying staff analysis because (a) the Variance would allow an intensification of use on the Property that far exceeds what otherwise exists in the RM1 district, and (b) the parking impact of the proposed use far exceeds the impacts associated with the prior church use.

By definition, the RM1 district is a low density, multi-family residential district that allows certain civic and institutional uses. According to Section 65.200 of the Code, these uses include schools, colleges, universities, nonprofit institutions of higher learning and religious, social and cultural institutions. SARPA acknowledges that the proposal for the reuse of the Property includes some of these uses and, because of this, the Applicant contends that the proposed use is consistent with RM1 type uses. However, there are some very important differences between the proposed use and other “similar” uses in the surrounding area.

Specifically, SARPA has reviewed the non-residential uses along Summit Avenue and notes the following:

1. *Similarity to existing religious uses.* Excluding the subject Property, there are nine (9) churches currently operating on Summit Avenue. All of these churches are tax-exempt organizations and none of them have a liquor license. The primary use of each of these buildings is to provide a place of worship for their members. Importantly, all nine (9) religious properties operate close to peak capacity one day each week – typically on Sundays and the intensity of use of these buildings is significantly less during all other times. While these buildings may occasionally host a wedding or a funeral, they do not market themselves as a for-profit event center. Finally, most of these other locations have sufficient, dedicated parking for these events.

⁴ See *In re Stadsvold*, 754 N.W.2d 323, 329 (Minn. 2008).

⁵ Staff Report p.2.

⁶ *Id.*

2. *Similarity to existing educational uses.* Excluding the music school that exists at the subject Property, there are five (5) schools (including colleges or universities) with at least some portion of their facilities located on Summit Avenue. All of these other schools are operated as tax-exempt institutions and all have a primary purpose of meeting the educational needs of their students. These educational facilities only operate at peak capacity for nine (9) months each year and all of them have addressed the parking needs of their students and teachers by building or allocating dedicated parking areas. Although the larger institutions such as St. Thomas and Macalester offer occasional ancillary activities such as concerts, and also occasionally offer food and beverage for their students, these activities are held in sites scattered around their campuses and generally off of Summit Avenue.
3. *Similarity to existing civic or cultural centers.* The Germanic-American Institute and the American Association of University Women's St. Paul Club are probably the best examples of civic organizations or cultural centers operating on Summit Avenue. Both are tax-exempt organizations that hold occasional events to support their specific missions. Neither of these properties holds a liquor license and both have restrictions on hours of operation as well as on the size, scope and frequency of their events. Both have maximum capacity of approximately 200 people and the Germanic-American Institute offers dedicated parking.

In comparison, if granted, the Variance will allow the subject Property to be used in a way that is quite inconsistent with the other religious, educational and civic / cultural institutions that exist in the surrounding area. The Applicant seeks to operate a church, a school and a cultural / social institution on a single site with outdoor entertainment / event space, serving food and liquor, and bringing large numbers of people to the Property from 7 am until midnight, 7-days a week, 365 days a year. Finally, unlike the other owners of similar properties in this district, the Applicant is not a tax-exempt entity. While the Applicant has reassured the City that the business entity he has selected requires a social investment component, the entity is undeniably operating for-profit. Because of this, the City cannot ignore the fact that a for-profit owner and operator is likely going to be motivated by maximizing the use of the Property, thereby increasing the intensity of uses. All of these facts support SARPA's position that the Application, as presented, will increase the intensity of use on this singular site to such an extent that it will go far beyond what would otherwise be allowed under the RM1 zoning classification, making the Variance an inappropriate deviation from the well-established Code standards.

II. The proposed use is not consistent with the comprehensive plan.

The Staff Report notes that the proposed use is consistent with both the Land Use Chapter and the Historic Preservation Chapter of the Comp Plan because:

(1) the Land Use Chapter of the Comp Plan designates the site as part of an "Established Neighborhood" and the Established Neighborhood designation

allows for institutional use clusters at intersections of arterial and collector streets such as Summit and Snelling; and

(2) the use is consistent with the Historic Preservation Chapter of the Comp Plan "as detailed in the HPC recommendation."⁷

As a preliminary matter, we note that the Code designates the Planning Commission as the body that must evaluate whether an application is consistent with the Comp Plan. Because of this, a finding by the Heritage Preservation Commission ("HPC") that the proposed use is consistent with the Comp Plan is not a sufficient finding, nor is it even instructive to the Planning Commission or Zoning Committee. Regardless, the conclusions of the HPC are worth reviewing because they highlight the lack of depth of analysis that has been done in this case.

The HPC appears to have justified its support of the Variance request because one of the policy statements listed under a strategy heading in the Historic Preservation section of the Comp Plan is to "realize the full economic potential of key historic resources."⁸ The HPC, in its resolution, noted that "the plan for reuse of this structure will accomplish that goal while maintaining and protecting this valuable historic community resource."⁹ In providing this analysis, the HPC ignored several other fundamental provisions of the Historic Preservation section of the Comp Plan and tried to simplify what is actually a fairly complex analysis. To be clear, SARPA supports the City's efforts to preserve historic buildings and uses, and also supports efforts to realize the full economic potential of key historic resources. However, economic gain cannot come at the price of preserving and protecting the overall character of the Summit Avenue area. Recognizing full economic potential does not mean that an unreasonable intensification of use is appropriate, particularly when little effort has been made to reduce the impact of the intensification. Just as economic considerations cannot legally be used to satisfy a finding of practical difficulties in a variance analysis, the mere fact that a property owner could increase the economic potential of an historic building does not justify a use variance. In fact, in the same section of the Comp Plan that was cited by the HPC, there is an express acknowledgment that intensification of use is not something that should be taken lightly. In describing Historic Preservation Strategy 5, policy 5.1, the Comp Plan states, [o]ne of the most daunting challenges facing historic resources is knowing how to best change or intensify their use."¹⁰ In electing to change or intensify historic uses, the City must carefully consider the impact of the change in use on the surrounding neighborhood.

In addition, neither the Staff Report, nor the HPC findings address how the Variance, which results in an intensification of use, will impact other strategies contained in the Comp Plan. For example, Strategy 6 (Preserve Areas with Unique Architectural, Urban and Spatial Characteristics that Enhance the Character of the Built Environment) expressly seeks to preserve areas like Summit Avenue. It should be noted that, under Historic Preservation policy statement 6.3, all of Summit Avenue is considered a historically protected conservation district and, as a result, any re-

⁷ Staff Report p.2.

⁸ See Comp Plan HP p. 21, 5.3.

⁹ HPC June 29, 2018 minutes.

¹⁰ Comp Plan HP p. 21, 5.1.

development or reuse plans for sites or structures on the Avenue must ensure the continued protection of this unique urban space for the City.

Finally, the Land Use Chapter of the Comp Plan, as noted in the Staff Report, designates the Property as “Established Neighborhood.” Staff notes that institutional use clusters are allowed at intersections of arterial or collector streets. However, in providing this information, the Staff Report fails to include the rest of the language in the Established Neighborhood section of the Land Use Chapter which is necessary to understand the context of the commercial uses that should be allowed. The full text states:

*“Established Neighborhoods are characterized almost entirely by single-family houses and duplexes, as well as scattered small scale multi-family housing. Commercial areas at intersections of arterial or collector streets provide **goods and services for residents of the immediate neighborhood.**”¹¹*

The proposed reuse of this Property, as currently submitted, does not provide goods and services for residents of the immediate neighborhood. Instead, it seeks to draw visitors from far and wide and create a commercial use that far exceeds what was intended for Established Neighborhoods under the Comp Plan. Accordingly, if granted, the Variance would result in allowing an intensification of use that would not only fail to preserve the fundamental nature and character of Summit Avenue, but that is also inconsistent with the guidelines that have been established in multiple sections of the Comp Plan.

III. Conclusion.

In conclusion, we ask the Zoning Committee to recognize that it has an obligation to carefully review the request for a Variance and to determine if the Applicant has satisfied the requirements of the Code. In doing so, SARPA is confident that the Planning Commission will determine that the Application fails to satisfy the requirements of the Code and therefore, the Variance must be denied. SARPA supports the preservation of historic uses on Summit Avenue, and also supports efforts to invest in, and revitalize, this important part of the City. While the Applicant has outlined a use that successfully reuses an historic building, the City has a responsibility to ensure that the proposed use of the Property will not create an unacceptable burden on the surrounding area.

While the application for the Variance and the Staff Report focus on maximizing the economic use of the Property, neither (1) provide adequate consideration of the impacts of the proposed intensification of use on the health, safety and welfare of the surrounding areas, nor (2) adequately assess the consistency of this intensification of use with the underlying zoning and /or Comp Plan. As demonstrated above, the current Variance application fails to meet the standards that are required in order for the Planning Commission to approve the Variance. As a result, and for all of the reasons outlined above, SARPA respectfully requests that the Zoning Committee recommend

¹¹ Comp Plan, Land Use p.9 (emphasis added).

Zoning Committee
August 2, 2018
Page 7

denial of the Variance and direct staff to further explore ways that any intensification of use of this Property will protect the health, safety and welfare of the surrounding areas.

Very truly yours,

WINTHROP & WEINSTINE, P.A.

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Tammera R Diehm". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'T' and a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Tammera R. Diehm

cc: Mr. Robert Morrison
Mr. Thomas Darling
Ms. Carolyn Will

15866470v2

ZF # 18-084-109

Langer, Samantha (CI-StPaul)

From: Tammy Meister <tmeister51@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 31, 2018 12:49 PM
To: Dermody, Bill (CI-StPaul)
Subject: Church on 1524 summit

Hi I am headed out of town for a meeting this Thursday so can not attend the hearing

I am opposed to the plans for this building

It does not fall in the design of summit to be non commercial

There is in no way enough parking availability for this building in relation to its size. There needs to be restrictions on its use and time I both live and have a business near this

Please let me know you thought
Tammy Meister
1605 Summit ave

(business 1696 Grand Ave)

Sent from my iPhone

18-084-109

Langer, Samantha (CI-StPaul)

From: Claire LaChance <claire.lachance@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 31, 2018 10:47 PM
To: Dermody, Bill (CI-StPaul)
Subject: Meeting Thursday

Hello Mr. Dermody,

I am the current secretary of SARPA (Summit Avenue Residential Preservation Association) and am writing to voice my very real concerns with John Rupp's proposal to run a for-profit business on Summit Avenue. I am out of town and unable to attend the hearing on Thursday evening.

For over 100 years, Summit has maintained zoning as a residential district, not allowing for-profit businesses to operate on the avenue. Not only does allowing this variance start a dangerous trend of for-profit businesses being allowed on Summit, but there are a myriad of other day to day issues as well. One of those issues is that the former church offers almost no parking spaces. This means that Mr. Rupp's reception hall events of 300+ people will clog Summit and surrounding streets with parked cars. Additionally, the proposal suggests that the operating hours will be 7am to midnight with "other times by special arrangement". Both the guaranteed parking issues and wide range of operating hours will be an unwelcome change for neighbors who have bought their homes on a designated residential street. These are just a couple of the major issues this business will bring to Summit Avenue.

Please do not make the mistake of letting this get past the Zoning committee, it needs many more restrictions to fit into the intended use of Summit Ave.

Thank you,

Claire LaChance

Langer, Samantha (CI-StPaul)

From: Carolyn Will <carolyn@cwcommunications.info>
Sent: Wednesday, August 01, 2018 9:18 AM
To: Dermody, Bill (CI-StPaul)
Subject: Historic use variance for St. Paul on the Hill church

Bill,

I am a neighbor of the St. Paul on the Hill church. I live one block away. I am also the current president of the Summit Avenue Residential Preservation Association.

I have serious concerns about the for-profit commercial aspects of the operation Commonwealth Properties plans to run in the church property. Since 1915, Summit Avenue has been zoned for residential, noncommercial organizations such as schools and churches. The intensity of the commercial, for-profit business Mr. Rupp plans to operate in this already congested area would choke the life out of it. If the city grants this variance, it's like opening Pandora's box. All that we treasure about this historic avenue would be undermined. We all love Summit Avenue for the residential, urban park-like characteristics. The city's PR arm – Visit Saint Paul – often points out the uniqueness and beauty of Summit Avenue when describing our city to visiting conferences, national media, etc. That will all be undermined with this nonstop, all hours commercial business proposed for Saint Paul Church on the Hill. This to me looks like short-term thinking for the profit of one, but to the detriment of all who value this historic avenue.

Respectfully submitted,
Carolyn Will
1583 Summit Avenue
Saint Paul, MN
612-414-9661

Carolyn Will
[Carolyn@cwcommunications.info](mailto:carolyn@cwcommunications.info)
612-414-9661
CW Marketing & Communications
www.cwcommunications.info



18-084-109

From: Harry Walsh [mailto:harrywalsh375@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 31, 2018 10:59 AM
To: Dermody, Bill (CI-StPaul) <bill.dermody@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Subject: 1524 Summit Avenue

Dear Mr. Dermody:

The variance that is requested for 1524 Summit would amount to a revolution in the use of that church. The petitioner tries to identify precedents, but what he proposes would intensify the use of the church by seven times! Most obviously, since the church has very few parking spaces, to park on Summit, east of Snelling, would become a constant struggle, every day. The other problems of a seven-times intensified use are also obvious. Activities that are welcome or tolerable on one scale are a completely different matter when multiplied by seven.

The Zoning Commission should recommend that the City deny the petition or, at least, delay its decision until the opinions of all the affected voters can be developed.

Sincerely,

Harry Walsh

456 Summit Avenue, #206

18-084-109

Langer, Samantha (CI-StPaul)

From: Phil Martineau <martineauflip@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 01, 2018 5:25 PM
To: Dermody, Bill (CI-StPaul)
Subject: 1524 Summit Building

Dear Mr. Dermody:

I plan to attend the City Zoning Commission meeting tomorrow. But one point I wish to make to you in advance is this;

Let's call this building what it is. It is now a rental property being proposed as a **night club**.

It is NOT a church, although at one time it was. It is not now. The owner proposes to rent it out for profit to darn near any group for any purpose.

This BUILDING is no longer a church even if the owner plans to have a religious organization as one renter. Any proposed legal entity cleverness does not make it anything less than what is being proposed....a **night club in the heart of our residential neighborhood**.

This is also an attempt to sidestep the St. Paul City noise variance process and ordinance of 10:00 pm noise limitation.

Sincerely

Phil Martineau
1474 Summit Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55105

651-352-2800

ZF# 18-084-109

Dermody, Bill (CI-StPaul)

From: mike@mrdan.com
Sent: Thursday, August 2, 2018 10:15 AM
To: Dermody, Bill (CI-StPaul)
Subject: 1524 Summit Rezoning Request - AGAINST

Dear Bill,

In response to the Zoning request for

1. I am NOT in favor of the rezoning of this property. A church is fine as are all the others on this historic street.
2. Since the church was formulated the parking on Summit and in front of my home is gone from 10-12 now.
3. The addition of any new traffic will make this street unbearable as it already has become with endless traffic.
4. The HUGE NEW daycare (3 Million dollar renovation) on Grand & Pascal (This area is only one block away from the 1524 Summit Church) was pushed through by the city without any of my knowledge or thoughts. This daycare for over 2 decades has caused tremendous parking and traffic issues as they have NEVER had any parking for their employees or daycare. NOW with the new renovation and construction I predict that these streets in the 1400 block (Summit, Pascal, Grand ave.) will be consumed with hundreds of new cars and more unwanted traffic all hours of the day.

** I wish the public and neighbors were notified for this outrageous development! Thanks for giving me the opportunity to respond to this issue.(SARPA Flyer Informed me of this zoning issue. Nothing from the city again??

Michael & Melanie - 1464 Summit Avenue Resident / 651-324-5078

Submitted by Simon Kennedy
1525 Summit



1525 Summit Ave Parking Issues





**Summit Ave Parking Congestion...
for EVERY Event**

