

**From:** [Kristin Koziol](#)  
**To:** [Greg Weiner](#)  
**Subject:** Fw: Protect Rent Control  
**Date:** Monday, April 14, 2025 9:15:01 AM

---

For Ord 25-29

---

**From:** Max Fredell <frede692@umn.edu>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 11, 2025 08:46 AM  
**To:** #CI-StPaul\_Ward4 <Ward4@ci.stpaul.mn.us>  
**Subject:** Protect Rent Control

Some people who received this message don't often get email from frede692@umn.edu. [Learn why this is important](#)

**Think Before You Click:** This email originated **outside** our organization.

Hello,

I'm Max Fredell, a resident of ward 4, I live right next to the State fairgrounds. Please protect Rent Control. I am a renter, a full-time worker, and social work student, so I don't have time for public hearings, unlike real estate developers. Rent control has made grad school a financial possibility for me. Had my rent kept pace with prior raises before the rent control ordinance, I would've been priced out of the neighborhood around the University of Minnesota's St. Paul campus and had to leave the city. I voted for the ordinance a couple years ago and stand by that choice as one of the best things the city has done for renters.

Best,  
Max Fredell  
Ward 4

**From:** [Jess Corner](#)  
**To:** [\\*CI-StPaul Contact-Council](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment Regarding Ord 25-29 Amendment to Chapter 193A.08  
**Date:** Friday, April 11, 2025 12:37:19 PM  
**Attachments:** [Written Comment J Corner Ord25-29.pdf](#)

---

You don't often get email from jessicalaynelambert@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hello,

I'm writing regarding the public record on Ord 25-29 Amendment to Chapter 193.A08 of the legislative code pertaining to rent stabilization.

Please include this attached written comment for the next pertinent meeting, if possible?  
Thank you!

Best,  
Jess

4.11.2025

Saint Paul City Council  
15 Kellogg Blvd W  
Saint Paul, MN 55102

Dear Councilmembers,

My name is Jess Corner, and I am a homeowner, residing in Dayton's Bluff, in Ward 7, District 4, writing in opposition to the proposed amendment (Ord 25-29) of Chapter 193A.08 of the Legislative Code pertaining to rent stabilization.

This is my first time engaging with the City Council in this way, but I feel strongly about what the proposed amendment to exempt post-2004 buildings from rent stabilization would mean for the future of Saint Paul.

This amendment is being framed as a way to encourage development, but in reality, it's a step backward. It chips away at the protections that help my neighbors remain housed and stable in a city they've helped build. This isn't a thoughtful solution—it's an arbitrary carve-out for corporate interests. I've seen no data that justifies using 2004 or 2005 as a meaningful cutoff. And while housing development is down across the state, Saint Paul is actually doing better than Minneapolis in new housing permits. So why the concession?

Rent stabilization isn't just about limiting rent hikes—it's about fairness. It helps keep families, small landlords, and first-time buyers from being pushed out by unchecked rent increases and speculative development.

This exemption would also hurt historic preservation and the creative reuse of existing buildings—the very things that give Saint Paul its identity. My own home was built in 1905. It has its quirks, but it's solid, energy efficient, and affordable—something that's increasingly hard to find in new construction.

Some argue this change affects only a small percentage of buildings, but it sets a dangerous precedent. It would encourage demolition and luxury development while discouraging local investment and neighborhood stability.

We all want more affordable housing. But density doesn't equal occupancy. In our own neighborhood, I've seen new homes built right next to long-vacant, livable ones. A nearby sober house was shuttered and boarded up just last month. The issue isn't space—it's *what we choose to prioritize and incentivize*.

**This amendment helps developers—not renters. It won't increase affordability. It will undermine it.**

I urge you to vote no. Stand with tenants, stand with neighborhoods, and stand by the promises you made to your constituents.

Sincerely,



Jess Corner  
Maria Avenue, St. Paul MN 55106

**From:** [Kyle Steinke](#)  
**To:** [\\*CI-StPaul Contact-Council](#)  
**Cc:** [CouncilHearing \(CI-StPaul\)](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment: Oppose Rent Stabilization Rollbacks  
**Date:** Friday, April 11, 2025 7:32:19 AM

---

You don't often get email from kylesteinke@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

**To the Members of the St. Paul City Council,**

My name is Kyle Steinke. I am a public school teacher, union member, and longtime St. Paul resident. I'm writing to strongly oppose the proposed amendments that would reshape our voter-approved rent stabilization ordinance to appease developers and investors.

Let's be honest about what's happening here: St. Paul's working people voted for rent stabilization in 2021 because the market failed us. Now, instead of honoring that democratic mandate, some city leaders want to gut the policy under pressure from real estate interests who see housing not as a human need but as a profit engine.

We've heard endless claims that rent stabilization has "scared off" construction. But the facts don't support them. Construction has slowed across the entire region—even in cities without rent control. Developers are using rent stabilization as a scapegoat to extract more concessions, just like they always do. The idea that protecting renters is why we have fewer cranes in the sky is convenient for them, but it's not true.

Exempting new construction or post-2004 properties doesn't solve the housing crisis—it creates a two-tier system that rewards demolition and fuels displacement. It encourages developer speculation that destabilizes neighborhoods and prices out low-income residents, all under the false promise of "affordable housing."

Rent stabilization wasn't perfect initially, and it's already been watered down once. To gut it further would be a betrayal of the public trust—and a giveaway to profiteers.

We need bold, public-minded policy that puts people before profit. That means standing firm on rent stabilization, not carving it up to satisfy investors. We've tried developer-driven policy for decades. It hasn't delivered affordability, only higher rents and displacement. Let's stop making decisions that serve private profit and start focusing on long-term stability for the people who actually live here.

**Sincerely,**

Kyle Steinke