

Name	Address	What is your preferred option(s) for updating parking requirements? (View options at stpaul.gov/family-study)	Comment
Mike Reynolds	1388 Lafond Avenue	Option 2: "Full Elimination";	Both options seem to provide effective pathways to improve inclusive development, to continue to move us toward infrastructure more centered around goals for density and mass transit, to align with climate goals, etc. My only concern about reduction, rather than elimination, is that it might increase income stratification across neighborhoods. Those neighborhoods outside transit nodes and networks could continue to resist greater densification, could use parking minimums to constrain differentiation of housing and transit options, etc. But, again, both options seem great improvements on the current situation.
Peter Butler	2100 block of Bayard Avenue	None of the above;	I don't believe reducing parking will reduce vehicle emissions. People will just drive somewhere else and developers will offer as much off-street parking as their business demands. The city was laid out well before vehicle ownership became widespread and largely due to streetcar lines extending from downtown to the edges of the city. The urban sprawl narrative is appropriate for the suburbs but not St. Paul or Minneapolis, which are the most dense cities in the state. If you want to promote density, let buildings be higher than 55 feet outside of downtown, which would really increase the market value per parcel square feet.
John Slade	3 Linder Court	Option 1: "Parking Minimum Reductions";	Residents of affordable housing may not have the freedom to choose to not drive a car. They may - will likely - have to work outside of the 'regular' working hours and may be working and living and going to school in areas without direct connections.
Nathan Mills	1069 Suburban Ave, St Paul MN 55106	None of the above;	Please let the free market present better options for alternative modes of transportation. Having government do this by force will do nothing but increase costs and make life more difficult for working families.

Name	Address	What is your preferred option(s) for updating parking requirements? (View options at stpaul.gov/family-study)	Comment
Matthew O'Toole	1944 Portland Avenue	Option 1: "Parking Minimum Reductions";	<p>I realize this is not exactly one of the choices, but I am in favor of removing all parking restrictions for retail/commercial/business locations, but not residential sites. The simple reason is that businesses will have customers coming and going, but apartment/condo complexes will have all their cars at the location at once, putting a great deal of strain on the area.</p> <p>Regardless, parking minimums are too high in St. Paul. We're a city, not Eden Prairie</p>

Name	Address	What is your preferred option(s) for updating parking requirements? (View options at stpaul.gov/family-study)	Comment
Anne Thom	1355 North Victoria Street, St. Paul, MN 55117	None of the above;	<p>Everyone will be old, someday and as you age, the chances of a disability that impairs mobility increases. These proposals are onerous for both disabled and older people and that never seems to enter the conversation. Something that also doesn't enter your conversations is the safety and efficiency of public transportation. I use the bus, outside of pandemic times, to get to work and occasionally to get to events. If I drive to an event I am driving a car full of people so again, your conversation doesn't make any allowances for using vehicles more efficiently as when I am transporting four people instead of driving alone, but I digress. I have been a transit rider since I was 5 years old. The system has deteriorated. I live three miles from downtown St. Paul and my choice is to walk six blocks and catch a bus that takes 20 minutes to downtown or walk two blocks and catch a bus that takes 45 minutes to downtown. During the "rush hours", buses run two times an hour. During the rest of the day, buses run once an hour so if you have a doctor appointment you have to take half a day from work to complete your errand. I have a part time job in downtown at night. It's at a theater so when the show ends, and we finish work, it's a situation where you are standing usually in a place with no bus shelter, or in the winter, just plain out in the cold, for an hour possibly waiting for a bus. Regardless of if there is a shelter or not, you get threatened, harassed, asked for money, cigarettes or your phone. When I have a show at night and I am taking the bus, I never take my phone or my wallet with me, so if I need money, i.d. or to make a personal phone call, I am out of luck for the day. It also means I can't patronize downtown businesses after the show because access to my funds is at home, safe. Then there's being threatened, harassed and asked for money, cigarettes or my phone while riding the bus. Then there's being followed when you get off the bus and have to walk the six blocks home through your dark neighborhood - I usually walk in the street then and I plan ahead so I am carrying nothing of value. My lengthy point is to ask that leave the</p>

Name	Address	What is your preferred option(s) for updating parking requirements? (View options at stpaul.gov/family-study)	Comment
			<p>parking alone and let market forces usher the change. Your proposals discriminate against the disabled and are ageist. Until the city does something about crimes against person being out of control, I don't want to hear a lecture on the evils of driving a car and being able to park that car near where you have business. It just isn't safe to be out on foot in this city, at night. Until Metro Transit does something about the complete disaster that their service has become, it's also not safe to ride transit. I am sure the authors of these proposals are young, and someday will get to be old, if you are lucky and then you'll want 1. Parking and 2. Safe, reliable, expedient public transit. Since you can't offer me the latter, I wish to keep the former.</p>

Name	Address	What is your preferred option(s) for updating parking requirements? (View options at stpaul.gov/family-study)	Comment
Terr	789 Geranium Ave	Option 2: "Full Elimination";	<p>For those of us who spend our entire lives in a city (or various cities, some much larger than this) parking is somewhat of an acquired skill to be proud of and not legislated.</p> <p>I've noticed in this area (and others) that parking restrictions/regulations seem only to serve the privileged. People that need to have parking legislated for them should live in suburbs. In my opinion and observations in Saint Paul, requiring businesses to have off street parking discourages start ups and established businesses alike. Come on.</p>
Sue Kirk	705 Summit Avenue #5, St. Paul, MN 55105	Option 1: "Parking Minimum Reductions";	<p>Must limit number of vehicles for public safety as well as property upkeep to two vehicles per residential household and one vehicle per tenant of a single multi unit dwelling 2 tenants =2 parking spaces</p> <p>Wouldn't mind paying a permit fee either</p>
Kathy Gromer MD	1257 Edgcumbe Road	None of the above;	<p>How about increase off street parking requirements? If you are going to allow all the new 4-5 story apartments, they need enough parking so shopping avenues like Grand still have spots—I don't want to have to drive to suburbs to shop! I want to shop on Selby and Grand and Snelling near the stores!</p>
Red & Johnny	668 Como Ave, St Paul 55103	None of the above;	<p>Take into account the location and residents. When every adult at a multi-family rental residence has at least 1 or 2 vehicles on the street, neighbors shouldn't always have to grant them parking in front of their single-family houses where the owners have been maintaining the boulevard and street and paying taxes. Elderly residents may need access to the street to get to the doctor; the rentals residents' vehicles block the sidewalks and biking lanes, drive on the boulevard, tear up the lawn & garden, and toss their trash on it every day. The renters don't rake leaves off the street and boulevard; they don't shovel the sidewalks; their cars block access to street sweepers and snowplows.</p>

Name	Address	What is your preferred option(s) for updating parking requirements? (View options at stpaul.gov/family-study)	Comment
Hilary Gustafson	1244 Blair Ave	Option 1: "Parking Minimum Reductions";	<p>Having lived in high density areas - two close to light rail (Summit Grand Ave neighborhood, creative Arts District - Carleton Place Lofts, and Hamline Midway neighborhood) there is a definite need for minimum parking requirements. One parking space per unit is sufficient, though there should be requirements for a few guest parking spots as well in the requirements.</p> <p>Parking is difficult in the high density areas along the light rail - check out parking behind Carleton Place Lofts. There are congestion issues, safety hazards - and this is mid day, at odd hours, on weekends, holidays etc.</p> <p>With the addition 3 other apartment complexes in a very short period of time you are able to see exactly what happens when parking requirements are tossed aside because of proximity to mass transit.</p> <p>Mind you Carleton lofts has sufficient parking for their residents, three new apartments are spilling over onto the streets.</p> <p>Just because there is the convenience of mass transit near a residential area does not by any means determine if residents will own or use a car. Yes, some individuals will solely use mass transit- but clearly many people are still owning/ using personal vehicles which need parking.</p> <p>One important thing to highlight is the failure of the blanket parking policy requiring adjustments to suit area specific road design, commercial and non-profit parking needs in the area.</p> <p>Charles Avenue between Carleton ST and Hampden Ave had parking restrictions prior to the Union Flats and RAY developments - no parking on north side of Charles Ave. After completion, parking is now allowed on</p>

Name	Address	What is your preferred option(s) for updating parking requirements? (View options at stpaul.gov/family-study)	Comment
			<p>both sides of the street. The road is not wide enough to accommodate two cars in opposite directions, there are cars parked illegally making navigation difficult and dangerous. Sight lines are impeded, coupled with high traffic volume - commercial, heavy equipment material hauling, and delivery trucks it makes one question who is actually thinking through and approving these developments and code changes? Is there anyone pulling all of these factors together before approving? Think Car-Bucks on Snelling, think Alliance field during soccer season, think St. Thomas, St.Kates and Macalasters congestion.</p> <p>Yes, the city needs housing, no doubt in that. Unsure how much we really need housing if CC is denying a project proposal that is suitable for the space, accommodating to the communities desires and requires no CUPs - Lexington Station Apartments.</p> <p>Requiring housing that can accommodate its residents parking, adjusting designs to the neighborhood commercial, non profit and traffic volume makes the most sense.</p>

Name	Address	What is your preferred option(s) for updating parking requirements? (View options at stpaul.gov/family-study)	Comment
Robert Kopf, Jr	952 Ashland Ave	None of the above;	<p>I do not use “alternative” modes of transport at all from November through -April. The risk of falling in ice and I shoveled walks and poorly maintained street intersections means I drive my car more in the winter than in the other months.</p> <p>I do not and will not do business with any organization that does not have parking during those months. I do and will increase drives to suburban stores to shop. This includes grocery, hardware and gift purchasing. It also includes (once we can return to normal) dining out. Without adequate close parking I will drive further to minimize exposure to the hazards of walking in winter.</p>
Roddie Turner	452 Laurel Avenue	Option 1: "Parking Minimum Reductions";	I live near condos and apartments that do not provide parking. Often there is no on street parking. If the city wants to encourage bike use, why are there no more Nice Rides in St. Paul? Or bike racks on Selby or Grand?
Aaron Snyder	1082 Ashland Ave. Saint Paul MN 55104	Option 2: "Full Elimination";	Support full elimination. Need to promote car free neighborhoods and promote walkable and livable areas. Expanded use of mass transit is a benefit to us all.
Anastacia Marlett	214 Lexington Parkway North	None of the above;	<p>St Paul businesses serve more than people who live near mass transit or can walk to them. Our businesses should be destinations that draw folks from all over the Twin Cities. Removing parking will make our businesses even less desirable for people who don't use transit or live within walking distance.</p> <p>Additionally, please account for businesses that sell large items that require close parking for placing into vehicles.</p>
Alexandra Cunliffe	1961 Berkeley Ave	Option 2: "Full Elimination";	My family chooses to live in Saint Paul because of the walkability and multiple transit options apart from driving. The parking lots near businesses are often unsafe for us as pedestrians. Also, there is ample street parking in Saint Paul. I would support removing the minimum parking requirements. Thank you!

Name	Address	What is your preferred option(s) for updating parking requirements? (View options at stpaul.gov/family-study)	Comment
Hannah Pallmeyer	1226 Englewood Ave, St Paul	Option 2: "Full Elimination";	I fully support eliminating parking minimums. We devote too much of our city to moving and storing cars. I think that we should free up some space that would be directed to unnecessary parking for any number of other land uses: housing, parks, bike/pedestrian improvements, commercial space, etc. Mandatory parking minimums encourage people to drive places and increase the cost of development. We should be doing anything we can as a city to make it possible for folks to cut back on driving and prioritize sustainable transportation methods (bike, transit, walking, etc) instead. Climate change is one of the biggest crises we face as a society and we should take immediate action to address that. One such action is eliminating parking minimums. I live near the Midway shopping area and it is outrageous how much open parking space I see every time I shop there - I wish we could use that land in other ways. Please support eliminating parking minimums!
karin andeson	2007 W 61st St	None of the above;	As someone who travels to STP frequently from Mpls. to go to work, a gallery, have lunch at a neighborhood restaurant or visit a friend you do need to consider cars. Not all public transit is workable - especially for a quick lunch from work. And, it is already difficult to "scatter" the car parking as many neighborhoods are posted for parking only for residents. If you want to be a welcoming city, please welcome all modes of travel, including cars.
William Jones	292 Warwick St, St Paul, MN 55105	Option 2: "Full Elimination";	The parking requirement drives up the cost of housing, discourages transit-oriented development, and subsidizes car-owners at the expense of others.

Name	Address	What is your preferred option(s) for updating parking requirements? (View options at stpaul.gov/family-study)	Comment
Sharon Lynch	63 douglas		<p>I live on a permit parking Street. I believe the permit is necessary because of the number of presidents without off-street parking and the amount of cars looking for parking to attend businesses. The cost of the permits is \$25 each. They have also raised the cost of the daily parking hang tags to \$3 each. I feel this is excessive. To have to pay \$3 a day for repairman, visitors, Etc is outrageous. I am paying a lot of money Street Maintenance and property taxes.</p> <p>2 points I'm trying to make.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Permits on Douglas are necessary 2) Cost of daily are excessive
Jacob Scott	333 Oneida St.	Option 2: "Full Elimination";	Get rid of parking minimums. St. Paul should be doing everything we can to encourage transit, walking, and bicycling.
Clare	Brown	Option 2: "Full Elimination";	It is important to prioritize accessibility & safety for pedestrians and bikers in these resolutions. Efforts to reduce vehicle traffic is essential for the flourishing of the city.
Leah Johnston	2008 Grand Avenue APT B2	None of the above;	<p>I am an apartment dweller and I need to have street parking in front of my building for safety reasons. If I am arriving home after dark I DO NOT want to be forced to park several blocks away from my home because you have eliminated parking for my building. Good grief! This is an insane idea. Please do not implement this plan. Renters matter too and I cannot afford an off-street parking space (and none are available in my area).</p>
Ashton Horsley	238 Dunlap St. S	Option 1: "Parking Minimum Reductions";	<p>I am in favor of reducing parking minimums in St. Paul. I, along with many other residents, have to drive for my work during the week; I must have a car, and have benefited from having off-street parking. I do not believe parking minimums should be eliminated for those of us who must drive, for any reason. However, when I am in the neighborhood, I can bike and walk everywhere. The environmental and housing-access advantages that will come from reducing the current parking minimum—which often requires more physical space than buildings themselves—will be</p>

Name	Address	What is your preferred option(s) for updating parking requirements? (View options at stpaul.gov/family-study)	Comment
			enormous, and help make our city a more equitable and sustainable place to live.
Brian C. Martinson	1943 Princeton Ave	Option 2: "Full Elimination";	Whomever decided to hold the Webinar via Teams surely didn't think that through. While I have some access to a Teams account through my workplace and on my work-computer, it is NOT something that most anybody I know has on their personal computers, as the software *requires* a connection to some institutional entity to login to. So if you had very low participation in this webinar, now you know why. Why not use a more widely accessible webinar platform?! Not a brilliant way to share information, nor solicit input...
Emily Dombeck	1457 Blair Ave	Option 2: "Full Elimination";	Eliminating the parking minimum will encourage density and walkability, and will lower our city's climate impact. These are good things!
LeAnn Taylor	2122 Lincoln Ave	Option 2: "Full Elimination";	I'm a convert! The report helped me recognize the errors in my thinking. For the betterment of the planet and future generations, we must give up our old ways and embrace human-focused (not car-focused) development. I look forward to the day when our public transportation network is even more expansive. Thank you for your careful and thoughtful attention to this issue.
Noreen Tyler	333 Ramsey St	None of the above;	I do not support reducing parking minimums. Clearly much of the new development lacks adequate parking now. I see double parking on narrow streets creating dangerous conditions for all, especially in winter. I realize there is a lot of political push from a certain, white and privileged portion of the political landscape who want all vehicles other than public transportation to magically disappear. P The need and desire for individual motorized transport is not going to diminish. Campaigning for

Name	Address	What is your preferred option(s) for updating parking requirements? (View options at stpaul.gov/family-study)	Comment
			higher fees for oversized vehicles would be sensible. Find ways to reward folks who drive sub compacts and compacts.
Jack Fei	1359 Sargent Avenue	Option 2: "Full Elimination";	I prefer the full elimination option, however reduce the number of units from 25 to 10 for mandatory TDM participation. Offer greater flexibility in variances for developers who accept TDM to prevent tiresome NIMBY objections to density that don't involve parking: e.g. 'it's too tall', 'it's too big'.
Thomas Fitzgerald	958 Linwood Ave	Option 2: "Full Elimination";	I support removing parking minimums city-wide. Parking should not be a pre-requisite for any new construction. City street parking is not a right and should not be treated as such. Bicycle parking minimums should be incentivized by the city, but should also not hold up a development (though bike parking is much cheaper and takes up much less space).
Sam Burgess	101 10th Street E	Option 2: "Full Elimination";	Full elimination of all mandatory parking minimums is a vital step that St. Paul must take to ensure a more environmentally-sustainable, people-centric, fiscally-responsible, and equitable future. The negative externalities associated with parking minimums are well-documented, including by St. Paul planning staff, and parking minimums serve no relevant purpose in the 21st century. I hope St. Paul follows in the footsteps of other cities like Hartford, Buffalo, and Berkeley in eliminating parking minimums completely.
Char Mason	695 Mount Curve Blvd.	None of the above;	Parking availability will be needed for all businesses and residences. I do not support reducing parking minimums or eliminating them. By doing that, you will place undo burden on neighboring residences.