

From: Jean Schroepfer <jshrep@aol.com>

Sent: Friday, July 20, 2018 4:55 PM

To: *CI-StPaul_Contact-Council

Subject: ADUs

I support allowing ADUs city-wide.

I would further expand implementation by eliminating the owner-occupancy requirement and the relative unit-size requirement where the units are on a lot of at least 6,000 square feet. Alternatively, I would support allowing duplexes citywide

on lots that big.

Jean Schroepfer

jshrep@aol.com

To whom it may concern,

Hello and thank you in advance for your time in reading my story.

My name is Jonathan Bender and I am a first time homeowner in the West 7th neighborhood. I have always wanted to live in a small efficient home after seeing some of the designs on the internet and reading about their practicality and economic benefit. My writing here is to express my thoughts and support for the expansion of the ADU eligibility to help support this long term goal.

I purchased my duplex in November of last year and after quickly repairing the main unit I posted to rent the unit. Within a day my inbox was completely filled with interest, much of which ranged from singles to families. This high demand, complimented by the homelessness I would encounter while working at West Side Community Health Services made it clear that St Paul could greatly benefit from affordable housing improvements such as ADUs.

The benefits of allowing more ADUs seems clear - energy efficiency, affordability for college students/singles/elderly, normalizing housing supply, and the jobs for building them. From my experience so far here I have never considered overcrowding and issue, many houses I even wonder who lives in them. People on my street seem to just got to work, come home, and spend time inside in the evenings.

If this expansion is passed I would certainly make use of it promptly. I have heard interest by other homeowner friends as well.

Thank you for your time in reading my letter. It is my hope that the expansion of ADU eligibility is passed and implemented.

Jonathan Bender

From: TOM DIMOND <tdimond@q.com>

Sent: Sunday, August 12, 2018 3:11 PM

To: Henningson, Samantha (CI-StPaul); #CI-StPaul_Ward4

Subject: Please do not eliminate single family neighborhoods

Tom Dimond

2119 Skyway Drive

Saint Paul, MN 55119

August 11, 2018

RE: Please do not eliminate single family neighborhoods in Saint Paul

1. Eliminating all single family housing neighborhoods imposes the choice of some on all.

Saint Paul is renowned for the single family neighborhoods it offers. Whether your raising a

family or just enjoy your own private yard, gardening, solitude and green space offered by a single family neighborhood, you have great choices in St Paul. Saint Paul offers 5 individualized single family district designations that range from the RL District with 21,780 square foot lots, to the R-4 District with 5,000 square foot lots. Some believe you should no longer have the choice of living in a single family neighborhood. The proposed zoning change eliminates all single dwelling unit per lot neighborhoods. It forces everyone into two dwellings per lot neighborhoods. Every lot in your neighborhood and our City can add a second dwelling. Over time we will force out of Saint Paul those that prefer the single dwelling per lot neighborhoods we currently have. The ordinance eliminates a housing choice valued by many. It limits housing options by imposing a vision that does not allow for single dwelling per lot neighborhoods.

2. None of this has to happen.

Under current zoning, residents of any neighborhood can request a zoning change to two dwellings per lot. The City Council can approve RT1 zoning that allows two dwellings per lot. Change from one dwelling per lot to two dwellings per lot should come from homeowners of specific neighborhoods. It should not be imposed on everyone in Saint Paul. Saint Paul homeowners should be able to retain single dwelling per lot zoning if they want it. The City Council should retain the current zoning and consider changes to two dwellings per lot, on a case by case basis, when and if homeowners request a change to their property. Homeowners who live in single dwelling per lot neighborhoods should not be forced against their will to live in two dwelling per lot neighborhoods. Instead of imposing change on all neighborhoods, the City should notify all property owners and support change where the majority of homeowners petition for change.

3. The process has been less than inclusive.

The City Council should not impose this zoning change on all neighborhoods without written legal notice to all property owners. Posting on social media or staff meetings with District Councils is not proper notice to homeowners. Few people I talk to are aware of the zoning change that may be imposed on their property. For most people, their home is their largest and most personal purchase. Changes to neighborhood zoning can have significant financial and family livability impacts. All property owners affected deserve a notice in writing before action is taken that affects their home and property. This proposal allows a second dwelling on every lot in your neighborhood. This proposal could significantly change what most people consider a very personal and important part of their life and their most valuable possession. Using my District Council as an example. A District Council committee made a recommendation on behalf of the Council without ever holding a meeting with the neighborhood homeowners who would be affected by rezoning. This should not substitute for homeowners having a say about their property. Most Highwood residents would be surprised to hear of proposed zoning changes that would allow two dwellings on every lot on their block.

4. Doubling the number of dwelling units on a lot is not incidental

Saint Paul zoning code requires that to approve something as an accessory use it must be: clearly incidental to and customarily found in connection with. Two dwelling units per lot is prohibited in single dwelling zoning districts so it clearly does not meet the legal requirement of incidental. Changing single dwelling per lot zoning to two dwelling units per lot is a fundamental change to the zoning. Two units per lot is prohibited so it is not customarily found in single family zoning. The zoning code does not allow for accessory use as a back door and improper way of changing the zoning of our homes and limiting homeowner input.

5. Proposed changes do not protect the environment in RL zoning

The proposed zoning would allow two dwelling units on a 5,000 square foot lot in RL zoning.

RL zoning serves to protect fragile bluff lands in the Mississippi River Corridor by limiting the density of development. Sec. 66.211. - Intent RL one-family large lot - "The RL one-family large lot residential district is the lowest density residential district. It provides for a semirural environment of predominantly low-density, one family dwellings ... that serve the residents of the district. The district is designed to protect, maintain and enhance wooded areas, wildlife, and plant resources, fragile bluff areas, topography and large expanses of natural vegetation cover; to reduce erosion and excessive stormwater runoff associated with higher-density development; ...". Sec. 60. 103 - Intent and purpose of the zoning code - (b) To implement the policies of the comprehensive plan. The Mississippi River Corridor Plan, Great River Passage and Highwood Small Area plan lay out the policies and importance of protecting and enhancing the State and Federal designated areas of Highwood. Protections approved by the City Council limit development to one dwelling unit per lot of 21,780 square feet. A blanket city-wide provision allowing two dwelling units on a lot of 5,000 square feet is in direct conflict with our adopted Mississippi River Corridor Critical Area protections.

6. Required parking should follow Table 63.207 Minimum Required Off Street Parking

The definition of family in the zoning code includes up to two unrelated or related individuals, family members of both individuals, individuals caring for family members and the property, and two additional unrelated individuals. Current zoning allows all to reside in single family zoning. A zoning change is not required to care for or have extended family and unrelated people live with you. The proposed accessory dwelling unit zoning is to develop a second dwelling unit on the same lot. Generally, these would be individuals not currently living in the existing dwelling unit. This increases the need for off street parking. Two dwelling units on a single lot should follow the same minimum off street parking requirements as other two dwelling units. One and two dwelling units are required to have 1.5 spaces per unit. Three car garages are common place on single family homes today. Cars, trucks, fishing boats and camping trailers are all part of active living in MN. Adequate off street parking is called for.

Sec. 60.103 Intent and purpose . (g) To lessen congestion in public streets by providing for offstreet parking of motor vehicles....

August 13, 2018

Office of the City Council

310 City Hall

[15 Kellogg Blvd. West](#)

Saint Paul, MN 55102

Dear Council Members,

I am a resident of the City of St. Paul and the Director of the University of Minnesota's Design Center, and I am writing in strong support of the Planning Commission's recommendation that the City Council approve the allowance of ADU's citywide, the elimination of the 5,000 sf minimum lot size, and the allowance of ADU's in large-lot RL zoning.

Accessory dwelling units offer an important way to increase the density of the city without having to create bulky new buildings that are not always appropriate in some neighborhoods. I want to address two other issues, though, that do not get enough attention in the ADU debate.

These dwelling units allow cities to diversify neighborhoods, providing low-cost housing in places where the home values have made it almost impossible for people of modest means to live there. If St. Paul wants to continue to be a city that welcomes and accommodates all people, ADU's are one way to do so. Also, your approval of this recommendation will prepare the city for the dramatic increase in the availability of garages, now used for the parking of cars, for other uses. My center is doing research on the advent of autonomous vehicles and the approaching transportation revolution that they will trigger, leading automobile companies to become mobility service providers and causing most people within a

decade or two, to call-up rides on-demand rather than own cars.

That means that a large percentage of the land and structures now devoted to parking cars will no longer be needed for that purpose, and ADU's can be a way for property owners to convert garages and parking spaces into the affordable housing that the city very much needs.

Please support the excellent recommendations of your Planning Commission.

Sincerely,

Thomas Fisher, Assoc. AIA

Professor and Director

From: Jeff Christenson [mailto:Jeff_Christenson@ajg.com]

Sent: Wednesday, August 15, 2018 11:48 AM

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

Subject: Support for ADUs

Good morning, Councilmembers,

I'm writing to briefly express my support for city-wide adoption of ADUs, which I believe to be on tonight's City Council agenda. As many indicators have shown, there is not enough housing in St. Paul. The vacancy rate is below a healthy level, and rent increases are easily outpacing salary increases for most employees. It is becoming more difficult for people to buy homes given that prices are increasing so fast and inventory is so low.

Against that backdrop, making ADUs possible city-wide is just the kind of policy that could soon benefit people looking for homes. It wouldn't require a large amount of capital from (potentially out-of-state) developers, who sometimes become the subject of scorn by some of our neighbors who plead that only luxury housing is being built and none of the new units being added are affordable. It is also sensitive to the likely need of many current St. Paul homeowners to age in place. I could see how it would be very attractive for an empty-nester couple to move into such a unit, sell their (now too large for them) home, and be able to stay in the neighborhood and maintain those friendships that they've built over the span of 30 or more years.

Finally, this sort of permissive zoning policy change will not result in a sudden onslaught of ADUs. Minneapolis has had ADUs city-wide for a number of years and not that many units have been built. This is just the type of low-risk policy St. Paul should adopt to make the city more livable.

Thanks for your consideration.

Jeff Christenson, J.D.

1482 Lincoln Ave.

St. Paul, MN 55105

Council Member Tolbert et al.,

I'm unable to make the public comment period during tonight's City Council meeting, but I wanted to express my support for allowing Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) city wide.

ADUs are a very important piece of the much larger puzzle of housing. A common argument against new housing units is that they come in the form of "large" apartment buildings. ADUs allow for additional

housing units within the context of Single Family Home (SFH) neighborhoods. This allows for additional units while maintaining "neighborhood character" (even if I disagree with the premise that neighborhood character is defined by buildings and SFHs).

ADUs also allow for smaller units to be built which will provide opportunities for our neighbors to age in place, either by owning the property and moving into the ADU or renting an ADU from a neighbor. Right now, many of our neighborhoods don't have these types of units available. We must address this pressing issue as our population ages.

ADUs allow for reinvestment in our current housing stock. This would address the overwhelming concern of teardowns, especially in Ward 3.

Please support the staff proposal to expand ADU allowance city wide.

Thank you,
Mike Sonn
1458 Wellesley Ave

Dear Councilmember -

I am a resident within your ward. I am concerned that the ADU regulations proposed once again only benefit our wealthy neighbors. Why are we limiting them on a lot size to under 5,000? My property is 3,500 and multiple neighbors and I have discussed how we'd love to add ADU's on our properties, but because of an arbitrary lot size limit, you are effectively only allowing them on parts of our city with larger lot sizes, which generally have larger homes, which generally cost more money (such as Highland). We want them in Hamline Midway to increase our potential profit opportunities and to increase the density of neighbors in our community. Please reconsider the lot size requirements to 3,000 sq feet instead.

--

Kevin D. Marquardt

From: Charles Drayton [<mailto:chuckdrayton@gmail.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, August 08, 2018 9:59 PM
To: info@summithillassociation.org; Noecker, Rebecca (CI-StPaul)
Subject: ADUs

Dear Ms. Noecker and the Summit Hill Association:

Thank you for taking the time to read our comments regarding the ADU ordinance coming before the city council regarding Accessory Dwelling Units ("ADUs").

It's clear that more research on the topic needs to be done regarding this short-sighted ordinance. We find it discouraging and irresponsible that the City wants to impose a zoning change on Summit Hill, already one of the densest areas in the city, that disregards its history, all to fulfill the current planning mantra of *density*, while solving none of the City's housing problems.

As we understand it, since 2016, St. Paul has allowed ADUs in a small test area on either side of the Green Line between Lexington and Emerald. Only one ADU has been registered, an 800 square foot

over the garage unit that the owner, a contractor, estimates would have cost \$175,000 had he hired all the work (his cost was \$125,000), and that he plans to rent at just under market rate, so its apparent that ADUs have not been the miracle fix.

With greater density comes more cars, and cars need parking. SHA's recent parking survey demonstrated that there is an increased demand for an inadequate supply of parking in Summit Hill. Density fuels the parking issues that have plagued Summit Hill for decades as evidenced by the large permit parking district and continual efforts to manage parking along Grand and neighboring streets. The City has no parking data - even for Grand, the data is 13 years old and woefully incomplete.

The City tells us that houses in Summit Hill are underutilized, just by looking at them from the outside. This is nonsense, Summit Hill is tied for the third densest area in the city. We are lucky in our neighborhood to have many historic and stately homes, as well as many small houses and apartment buildings that provide affordable housing. The historic nature of the neighborhood is an asset to the city, and it draws many visitors. ADUs, because they can be built anywhere so long as the lot is big enough, will detract from and diminish the character with of the historic neighborhood.

In its drive to increase property taxes, the City will kill the best neighborhoods, ones that feed it so much in tax revenue. If the city wants to destroy the best neighborhoods in the city, please proceed, but our hope and prayer is that the City stops peddling the ADU ordinance in Summit Hill and listens to the property owners.

Very truly yours,

Teagan and Charles Drayton

Dear City Council Representatives,

I'm writing to you in regards to the proposal to allow city-wide ADUs in hopes that my comments will be useful in the context of tomorrow's hearing. I think allowing city-wide ADUs is a good idea if they increase the supply of long-term rentals and/or allow for extended families to live alongside each other. ADUs as long-term rentals at least has the potential to mitigate the decrease in supply of single-family housing with an increase in supply to long-term rental housing, but I'm worried about ADUs being built as short-term rentals and cannibalizing a portion of the already tight housing market by turning single-family households into (more valuable and higher-priced) hybrid housing/rental business. One of my top priorities as a resident is opening up the Saint Paul housing market, and I think increasing the supply of long-term rentals is very important to the long-term health of the city. I think the tight rental market is inflating home values, as investors who purchased homes cheaply after the house crash are reluctant to sell them now when rent is high and renters are plentiful. I'm worried that ADUs as short-term rentals would encourage owner-occupied homeowners to build ADUs as sources of auxiliary income generated by their property, making the property more valuable and homeowners even more reluctant to sell.

Thanks for taking my concerns into consideration, and I hope they're helpful to you in creating good policy. Thanks also for all of your hard work.

Best,
Ben Findlay
934 Grand Ave.

From: Lou Ann Norquist [<mailto:lanorquist1@gmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, September 13, 2018 4:58 PM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward7 <Ward7@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Subject: ADUs

Hi Jane, I think the ADU idea should move forward. I think it will be perfect for Ward 7. Yes, there will be problems and concerns. Our area is fraught with dwelling violations already, but I think the Additional Dwelling Unit proposal has a lot of merit. If I had the money, I would turn my detached garage into a 3-season porch (one season garage) with a guest loft above. That would make my tiny 1 bedroom house so much more accommodating. We need to invest in more housing inspectors!! ...and speaking of housing. I think Housing Hub is in over their heads with the retaining wall at 207 Maple St. They obviously don't know what they are doing and it looks a little scary. That's off topic. Anyway, I give ADUs two thumbs up!! Thank you.

From: Julia and Hud Hobday [<mailto:funkday34@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Friday, September 14, 2018 3:22 PM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward7 <Ward7@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Subject: Accessory Dwelling Units

Hello!

I am a resident of Ward 7 and I'd like to express my support for Accessory Dwelling Units. Thank you for your work in bringing about the study. Please continue to work toward making this option a reality!

Thank you for your time,

Julia Hobday

To - Council Members — September 12, 2018

I am John Arlandson, a member of Christ Lutheran Church on Capitol Hill. I am also a member of the St. Paul Caucus of ISAIAH – Affordable Housing Task Group

Our Mission is to understand and facilitate opportunities for all people in the City of St. Paul to have an affordable, stable home.

We know that without a stable livable home it is very hard to thrive in our City.

One of the issues that we are championing is that of ADU's (Affordable Dwelling Units) – the issue that is before us here today.

As a person of faith, a member of ISAIAH, and a concerned neighbor, I express my strong support for the ADU ordinance and urge you to pass the ordinance.

According a Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) report in 2008, ADUs benefit communities in many ways:

- They allow families to stay together by allowing an elderly or disabled member to live near their family caregivers while also maintaining some privacy
- They are more affordable to build than regular real estate
- Because they are built on land that the family/owner already has, their construction does not incur the extra cost of land
- They increase the supply of a community's housing
- They are many times more affordable to rent for low-income persons, elderly, disabled, or young students on fixed incomes, and empty nesters.
- They are flexible and can be designed to blend in to surrounding architecture, or can be built/designed inside an existing home
- Because they can be connected to the utilities of the primary dwelling, there is no need to develop new infrastructure
- They allow more efficient use of housing stock, and provide an alternative to creating major zoning changes that significantly change neighborhoods

I support ADUs because their creation helps increase the stock of affordable housing in St Paul, which the city is in desperate need of.

We are facing a crisis in the shortages of affordable housing in St Paul. Due to stagnant wages and quickly rising rents,

St. Paul has a history of ADU's. As I drive down Summit Avenue I see the carriage houses that once housed people and horses. They now have become units that are occupied by owners and renters.

There are more than a hundred homeless families in Ramsey County. Many of the children in these families attend St Paul Public Schools. In addition, due to shortages in Emergency shelters, about 75 of these homeless families are waiting to get into shelter, and are living in their cars, the streets, on public transit, or sleeping on the floors of relatives/friends.

My faith calls me to work to create a city where all residents can work, live, and thrive. I therefore strongly support the ADU ordinance because it will take us one step closer to that goal.

Thank you for voting in favor of ADU's.

St. Paul City Council members:

In light of the upcoming vote on accessory dwelling units, I wanted to share this resolution in support of increased housing density passed by the SEIU Minnesota State Council.

Rick Varco
SEIU Healthcare Minnesota
Political Director
651-231-2775

Text below also:

SEIU MN State Council Resolution in Support of Increased Housing Density
Adopted April 26, 2018

Whereas, SEIU members face increasing costs for housing, especially in Minneapolis and St. Paul; and

Whereas, local governments, especially Minneapolis and St. Paul, use their zoning authority to limit housing density and the number of new housing units that can be built, thus increasing the cost of housing; and

Whereas, dense urban areas generate fewer greenhouse gasses per person and promote union construction jobs;

Be it resolved, that the SEIU Minnesota State Council generally opposes zoning limits on density and supports changes to the 2040 comprehensive plans in Minneapolis, St. Paul, and other cities to allow greater density; and

Be it further resolved, that the SEIU Minnesota State Council specifically supports the proposal in Minneapolis to legalize 4-plex dwellings citywide.

From: Max Holdhusen [<mailto:maxwellholdhusen@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, September 24, 2018 6:52 PM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward2 <Ward2@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Subject: Support ADUs

Dear Councilmember Noecker,

As a Summit Hill resident I urge you to support an ADU policy that includes every neighborhood in the city. Our neighborhoods have gotten increasingly unaffordable for working class people to live in and an inclusive ADU policy is one piece that might help alleviate our affordability gap. Even if it resulted in a dozen or so new rental units- that would be a lot in an area that has added very few new housing units, besides large expensive mansions.

I hope the policy is flexible and allows ADUs on any size property. I also hope that the requirement that bans exterior stairs is reconsidered.

Thank you for your time and service!

Max Holdhusen
665 Fairmount

Dear Members of the City Council,

I am writing to oppose the expansion of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU's) throughout all of St. Paul as provided for in the proposed Ordinance 18-28 to be voted on by the City Council on September 26.

The Summit Hill Association correspondence to the City Council indicated that there are a number of unanswered questions that need to be carefully addressed before a resolution such as this one is adopted citywide. Also, my understanding was that when ADU's were adopted for a portion of the Green Line, a promise was made that the issue would be looked at again in 4 years. Now, with a sample size of one ADU (that has been built in St. Paul along the Green Line,) the City is considering expanding the option to build ADUs to the entire city without waiting the aforementioned 4 years and without a realistic explanation of how this one ADU helped address the issue of **Affordable** Housing!

A widely accepted definition of affordable housing is that for housing to be considered affordable, no more than 30% of the family income is to be spent on housing. Research I have seen indicates that ADU construction costs can be expected to be about double per square foot that of new construction on an open lot; therefore, it does not seem realistic to expect that homeowners are going to rent out their ADUs at below market rates to provide affordable housing after experiencing steep construction costs.

Just last week, I spoke to a homeowner living near Bde Maka Ska (formerly known as Lake Calhoun.) He said that the ADUs built near his house are being used as Airbnbs to create rental income (which hurts the hotel industry and does not address the housing crisis). The net result is that nearly every weekend, there are different people using the Airbnb next door to him and he is experiencing the invasion of privacy that comes from a stream of people that he has never met coming and going and peering into his backyard and observing his family's activities.

The summary report issued by the St. Anthony Park Task Force on November 18, 2015 contained this statement **"The key issue for the Task Force is the need to preserve the unique character of the St. Anthony Park neighborhood balanced with the allowing reasonable use of one's property."** Many property owners in St. Paul have invested heavily into their respective properties in order to build the neighborhood and the quality of life that they desire **based on the fact that they were living in a neighborhood zoned as single family residential.** Allowing the construction of ADUs in every lot in the city that meets the minimum criteria has the potential of turning my immediate neighborhood near the St. Paul Campus of the U of M into Dinkytown II.

The "Other Views" section of the Star Tribune on 9-19-2018, quotes an editorial in the Dallas Morning News stating "...increasing the pool of affordable housing, while important, doesn't necessarily translate into **economic mobility, which should be the end game of housing policy.**" (emphasis added).

While the housing crisis is real and needs to be aggressively addressed, it should not be addressed hastily and without a broad strategy that includes economic mobility and the opportunities for

neighborhoods such as Summit Hill and St. Anthony Park (and others) to maintain their unique identity.

The Summit Hill Association has respectfully requested more time to study this issue and I wholeheartedly agree with them that this ordinance should not be passed at this time.

Keith Hovland

1476 Chelmsford St.

St Paul MN 55108

Dear City Council Members –

9-18-18

I do not agree with the proposal to modify the ordinance to permit ADU's a city wide - especially as a remedy for our affordable housing crisis. It seems to me that the proponents of ADU's keep moving the goal posts to fit the progressive theme of the day. First it was to save the environment, then to save energy, then to keep the elderly in their homes, then to increase density – as if that was a land-use-people solver. And now the hot-button issue is **Affordable Housing**. It is a national issue and a real crisis in some areas of the country. But it is a multi-faceted issue calling for remedies through a variety of public and private partnerships. ADU's will not be affordable to folks now living in tents or reluctantly sleeping on a less than hand-me-down splinter-ridden Futon in their ex-brother-in-law's unheated pine-paneled basement - that has no egress. With ADU construction costs that probably are about double per square foot that of new construction on an open lot – it simply ain't gonna happen! Some might say that tinkering around the edges of the lack of affordable housing crisis by introducing ADUs as a solution - is a ruse.

Although St. Anthony Park does not have the "Historic District" designation that Summit Hill has – we are also unique. We too fought "city hall" and won, in 1975, a somewhat similar issue; to deny rental apartments in existing homes. I suggest council members review those materials. The rationale remains relevant to this day.

We all, as much as finances allow, move into a perspective neighborhood based on esthetics, home style, schools, transportation choices, etc. Once there you do not expect a blanket change to create a fertile field of unintended consequences. (The proposed change flaunts the concept that "all politics are local" – for the vast majority of the power-brokers/decision-makers do not live in your area and have no "feel" for its distinctiveness!)

St. Anthony Park is undergoing enough change to last a life-time – as short as mine is. Luther Seminary as a physical and spiritual asset has nearly disappeared – like a last puff of smoke from a North Shore campfire – to be replaced by a gigantic housing complex (that that brother-in-law with a splinters in his butt could never afford). I dare say that with the prevailing green-space = the almighty dollar view of St. Anthony Park, we will be lucky to have enough green at Como Ave. and Luther Place, to set up a public picnic table. And then there's the pending sale of Breck Woods. I fear that its opponents, not unlike opponents of the current ADU proposal, will be dismissed out of hand.

Think about it. Do you want an Airbnb next door to you? Do you want your "neighborhood" turned into Dinky Town (not that there is anything wrong with Dinky Town – especially if you are a fifth year Ph.D. candidate in an Urban Planning program – whose subject is "How to Clutter a Green Space")?

Stay well - sleep well, drink lots of water, use twice the grass seed you think you need, and floss daily!

Jack Neely, 1446 Chelmsford St. 55108

jrneely@comcast.net

Dear Members of the St. Paul City Council:

I am writing you about the proposed expansion of our city's Accessory Dwelling Unit ordinance. I am dismayed that the Council is seriously considering expanding the existing ordinance that allows ADUs within a half-mile of the Green Line since the feasibility of the current policy has not been sufficiently tested.

There is one ADU within the defined half-mile limit and (according to an article in the Tribune) that unit is rented at market rate to a non-family member, addressing neither affordable nor senior housing issues that were cited as problems to be solved by ADUs. At the Council meeting that I attended where the current ordinance was voted upon and passed, at least one Council member noted that the results of the ordinance should be reviewed in four years. Those who were in charge of creating the ADU ordinance were very careful to make only positive comments about it but serious concerns were expressed by a city building representative about inspections and enforcing compliance with the ADU ordinance.

I live in north Saint Anthony Park. The ADU issue was divisive when first discussed in our neighborhood. Two of the very active advocates and leaders of the that push for ADUs in SAP have recently sold their homes and they and their wives have joined other older residents in purchasing condos in the new co-op senior housing on the former Luther Seminary campus, rejecting the idea of building their very own ADU. I think that is clearly sensible. Along with the new senior housing condos, two years ago SAP added an apartment building located in the business center that is fully rented out, again to older residents who wished to stay in SAP and chose to sell their old homes rather than build ADUs. (The apartment building also provides space on its street level for two businesses.)

As I see it, ADUs simply will not solve the problem of providing affordable housing or meet the real needs of older residents. The city can offer incentives or take more vigorous action to encourage developers to include affordable housing. And judging from the ever-growing aged population (of which I'm a member), developers offering senior housing, either condos or apartments, will find a receptive audience.

ADUs are not the optimum approach to ensure affordable housing, senior housing or density promotion. Please reconsider the expansion of the ADU ordinance and consider desirable alternatives.

Carol Herman
2195 Hendon Ave.
St. Paul, MN 55108

Hello. My name is Irene Markley. I live in Ward 4 at 1905 Chelton Ave W. I am wholly in favor of the ordinance to allow accessory dwelling on existing properties. I think that St. Paul needs to allow property owners and citizens to make choices about living spaces especially as we realize that this is very good way to make use of our land. Not ever one wants to or can afford a large house. Thank you irene Markley. I hope this issue can be voted on at Wednesday's council meeting instead of "hold over" "hold over ". Just make a just decision for all people in our city of St Pauk

From: Bryce Rasmussen [<mailto:bprasm@gmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, October 09, 2018 10:13 AM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward3
Subject: In Support of ADUs

Hi Chris,

This is Bryce Rasmussen of 435 Lexington Pkwy S, St Paul, MN 55105, and I'm writing in support of city-wide ADUs. I am in my 30s and both my parents and in-laws are beginning to slow down in their older age. As a millennial swamped with student debt and parents who can't afford assisted living apartments cohabitating is our only option. We love our house in Mac-Groveland and plan to stay forever. An ADU would still allow our parents some independence in their later stage of life. Please vote to support the city-wide ADU ordinance.

Thanks,

- Bryce

--

Bryce Rasmussen