



**DATE:** July 22, 2021

**TO:** Planning Commission

**FROM:** Menaka Mohan, Principal Planner PED

**RE:** Public Comment as of July 21, 2021 for Proposed Amendments to Open Space Lot Specific Standards for the Ford Site Zoning and Public Realm Master Plan

---

### **Background**

On June 11, 2021 the Planning Commission [released proposed amendments to Open Space Lot Specific Standards for the Ford Site Zoning and Public Realm Master Plan](#).<sup>1</sup> For a public hearing to be held on July 23, 2021.

### **Public Comment**

Below are comments received as of July 21, 2021.

---

<sup>1</sup> To access the report please visit: [https://www.stpaul.gov/sites/default/files/2021-06/Final\\_PC\\_FordOpenSpaceforLots\\_proposedamendments\\_packet%2006.09.21.pdf](https://www.stpaul.gov/sites/default/files/2021-06/Final_PC_FordOpenSpaceforLots_proposedamendments_packet%2006.09.21.pdf)

No	Date	Name	Address	Comment
1	7/13/2021	Kate M. Hunt	2081 Highland Parkway	<p data-bbox="1115 217 1940 427">Ms. Mohan, I am submitting the following response on behalf of the Neighbors for a Livable St. Paul to be incorporated into the City of St. Paul public record regarding the Ford site proposed zoning amendments.</p> <p data-bbox="1115 480 1465 643">Thank you, Kate M. Hunt 2081 Highland Parkway St. Paul, MN 55116</p> <p data-bbox="1115 696 1961 1417">Neighbors for a Livable St. Paul (NLSP) response to the City amendments to the definition of open space lot standards for the Ford Site Zoning and Public Realm Master Plan for the 7/23/21 Planning Commission's public hearing: The proposed amendments to the city's own definition of "open space" and lot coverage reads like Alice in Wonderland, where reality is being distorted. When confronted by NLSP about the definition of open space [through legal action using a Writ of Mandamus petition - filed on October 28, 2020], the city could not explain its own open space definitions or developer requirements. Subsequently, the city proposed a resolution which removes the term "open space" from the Ford Site Zoning and Public Realm Master Plan, thus almost eliminating the need for Ryan Companies, the developer, to ask for future variances on density.</p>

No	Date	Name	Address	Comment
				<p>The city claims that the new Master Plan amendments will clarify the definitions of “open space” and building density. In our view, the 32 pages of amended language are indecipherable and further obscure any clear understanding of "open space." These amendments appear to push even more density than was allowed in the 2017 Master Zoning Plan. Yes, certainly correct the city's inconsistent definitions of open space but do not eliminate the very zoning safeguards that the city itself endorsed in 2017 to prevent unfettered building density.</p>

No	Date	Name	Address	Comment
2	7/13/2021	Bruce Hoppe	- 531 Mt Curve Blvd	<p data-bbox="1115 152 1289 183">Ms. Mohan,</p> <p data-bbox="1115 240 1940 529">The following are my personal comments regarding the proposed amendments to Open Space Lot Specific Standards in the Ford Site Zoning and Public Realm Master Plan (Ford MP) and accompanying zoning text amendments to be discussed Friday, July 23, 2021 at 8:30am. I cannot attend this public hearing, thus need to submit written comments – as follows:</p> <ul data-bbox="1115 586 1955 1440" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1115 586 1955 662">• My family and I live at 531 Mount Curve Blvd / Ward 3 – only several blocks from the Ford site</li> <li data-bbox="1115 672 1955 1052">• Overall, the June 4, 2021, 32-page Study of Proposed Amendments to Open Space Lot Specific Standards for the Ford Site Zoning and Public Realm Master Plan (to the Planning Commission from the Comprehensive and Neighborhood Planning Committee) presented superfluous verbiage that essentially allows Ryan Companies to build-out more density on the Ford site and be permitted to reduce setbacks and “surface-level” publicly accessible open space</li> <li data-bbox="1115 1062 1955 1271">• For example - revision to the definition of Functional Green Roof area on page 31 of the memo - deleting “which is surfaced” from the sentence “which is surfaced with soil” – could now allow a private concrete patio with a potted plant to count towards “open space”</li> <li data-bbox="1115 1281 1955 1440">• The report of proposed amendments is filled with technical jargon and details that the average community member will not easily grasp – such as details around the measure of density (Floor to Area Ratio) and what</li> </ul>

No	Date	Name	Address	Comment
				<p>PED and Ryan are gunning for with this amendment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Between the lines of your report, it appears that the City is trying to rewrite their own rules that get in the way of allowing Ryan to change the original Master Plan mandates</li> <li>• Fundamentally, my comment is to simply not rewrite or redefine the open space mandates that Ryan had to adhere to in the original Master Plan – thus not allowing private balconies and rooftop gardens to count towards open space – this is just playing with the definition of “open space”</li> <li>• Upon reading your background, you surly understand the connection between the built environment and public health / quality of life</li> <li>• The New Urbanists paradigm seems to advocate highest density at any cost to the existing community – this high density paradigm will eventually bring diminishing returns as the quality of life factors diminishes in Highland Park. Further, as with any urban planning trend/cycle, the desire to live in high-density urban settings may shift back to single family housing stock – especially post-pandemic and as working-at-home increases. I know I can’t change St. Paul PED’s indoctrination into New Urbanist principles – but we can influence eventually using the voting booth for new Council members and new Mayor</li> <li>• The community is closely watching the moves that Ryan Companies and the PED are making that are possibly not in the best interest of the residents of Highland. Evidence continues to stack up that the City is</li> </ul>

No	Date	Name	Address	Comment
				<p>bending the rules in favor of the developers, not the tax payer / home owner</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The city continues to ignore its own development planning rules or makes up new ones when it suits a purpose. As more open space disappears within the Ford development, the dream that was promoted by City leaders and Ryan Companies will disappear as well</li> <li>• Subsequently, the city proposed a resolution which removes the term "open space" from the Ford Site Zoning and Public Realm Master Plan, thus almost eliminating the need for Ryan Companies, the developer, to ask for future variances on density – setting a critical precedent</li> </ul> <p>Maybe we are misinterpreting some of what is being proposed in your hard-to-decipher report. It may serve your interest to clarify to the public, in layperson’s terms, the key points/proposals and potential outcomes – how about one PowerPoint slide with cause-&amp;-effect bullets? I know that Ryan Companies has a strong marketing department. You should know that there is a grassroots community group with a database of over 1000 community supporters (called Neighbors for a Livable St. Paul) that is monitoring the cadence of systematic variance requests and redefinition of laws and codes that seemingly support developers.  <a href="https://www.livablesaintpaul.com/">https://www.livablesaintpaul.com/</a></p> <p>To conclude: I’m opposed to all of the proposed Ford site zoning amendments – virtually everything in the</p>

<b>No</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Comment</b>
				<p>proposed language appears to only support Ryan's ability to reduce "real" open green space and build-out to an even higher density than the original Master Plan. The Master Plan should remain intact as the guide to the Ford development.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Bruce Hoppe – 531 Mt Curve Blvd, Highland 55116</p>

No	Date	Name	Address	Comment
3	7/13/2021	Howard J. Miller	2081 Highland Parkway	<p>Ms. Mohan, I am submitting the following response on behalf of the Neighbors for a Livable St. Paul to be incorporated into the City of St. Paul public record regarding the Ford site proposed zoning amendments.</p> <p>Thank you, Howard J. Miller 2081 Highland Parkway St. Paul, MN 55116</p> <p>It is very difficult to imagine completing a large-scale development like Highland Bridge without dependable measurements. St Paul set out with such measurements and zoning requirements, but they have since disappeared. An entire volume produced by PED and HRA &amp; Associates and a task force dedicated to defining open space was published in February 2011. In May, 2017 this very commission reviewed and approved a Ford Site Zoning and Public Realm Master Plan which included an exhaustive list of reliable measurements for the new development that both developer and neighbors could depend on.</p> <p>For reasons that no one seems able to offer, these measurements have been discarded. These measurements are, in fact, part of the 32-page resolution you are being asked to review and approve today. If you open the document and scroll through it you will find them redlined on many of the pages. Why</p>



No	Date	Name	Address	Comment
				<p>were they withdrawn from the Master Plan? Both PED staff and apparently, engineers employed by the Ryan company found them confusing and difficult to work with.</p> <p>In 2011, the PED led planning commission defined open space as follows: "Open space: Natural lands, athletic fields (even if managed by non-city entity), recreational lands, community gathering spaces and recreational buildings which are publicly-owned and/or publicly-accessible. The term is not intended to refer to privately-owned lands, yards, urban plazas, stormwater treatment areas or public street rights-of-way unless, through agreement, the land is designated as public space with a recreational and/or habitat function."</p> <p>A footnote on the second page of the Notice of this Public Hearings states that the exact opposite is the case. How is this possible? These are just the beginnings of the questions this group must answer. The people of St. Paul are waiting for the answers.</p> <p>Howard J. Miller</p>
4	7/19/2021	Jim McQuillan	519 Mount Curve Blvd	Please make sure that all original green space remains in the final Ford bridge development. Anything less than that would be a disingenuous change in plan.

No	Date	Name	Address	Comment
5	7/19/2021	Lainey	1235 Cleveland Ave S	<p data-bbox="1115 152 1325 183">Dear Menaka,</p> <p data-bbox="1115 240 1961 529">We understand the need to make adjustments to the Master Plan, but we oppose the removal of the concept and defined term “open space” from the Highland Bridge Master Plan. The developer and the city should be held accountable to provide the defined percentage of open space for each parcel, as outlined in the Ford Master Plan.</p> <p data-bbox="1115 586 1556 617">Please reconsider. Thank you.</p> <p data-bbox="1115 673 1213 704">Lainey</p>

No	Date	Name	Address	Comment
6	7/19/2021	Mary Lilly	458 Mount Curve Blvd	<p>Hello Menaka Mohan:</p> <p>Regarding the "open space" included in the Highland Bridge Master Plan, the developer and the city must be held accountable to provide the defined percentage of open space for each parcel as outlined in the plan.</p> <p>I urge the planning department not to remove the words "which is surfaced" from the definition of Functional Green Roof Area. "Functional Green Roof Area shall be defined as area atop surface on a building, open to the sky and air, which is surfaced with soil and living plant materials for the purpose of retaining rainwater and absorbing heat from sunlight." Removing these words would undermine the environmental policy objectives that these roofs are intended to serve. Under the city's proposed revision, a concrete patio with a small potted plant could satisfy the definition.</p> <p>This development was promoted as a 21st century model village and is meant to be attractive and useful to all the residents, regardless of socio-economic status. The aesthetic benefits of open space for each building parcel should positively impact the entire community and not just those who use a balcony or a roof-top deck.</p> <p>Thank you for reconsidering this.</p>

<b>No</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Comment</b>
				Resident - Mac Groveland

No	Date	Name	Address	Comment
7	7/19/2021	Ms. C. Bittner	1496 Laurel Ave	<p data-bbox="1115 152 1493 183">To whom it may concern:</p> <p data-bbox="1115 240 1955 574">I am writing in regards to the Highland Bridge Development and proposed changes to the language and intent of the master plan. Please stop trying to end-run agreements and intents that serve the surrounding community. Please champion the idea of a smaller, more appropriate-to-the-surrounding area, development. To a real neighborhood. Please note I said neighborhood, not City Council money-maker.</p> <p data-bbox="1115 631 1948 1138">Specifically I oppose the removal of the concept and defined term "open space" from the Highland Bridge Master Plan. The developer and the city should be held accountable to provide the defined percentage of open space for each parcel, as outlined in the Ford Master Plan. They should be accountable to all of the agreements in place. That's why they are there!!! So far it seems that whatever isn't easy for a developer or the city is either tried to be redefined, removed or given a variance from our city council. I ask that the city and planners continue forward in good faith to the agreements in place.</p> <p data-bbox="1115 1195 1955 1440">I urge the planning department and the city to clarify the definition of "open space" so that it is clear exactly how "open space" is distinct from "building lot coverage." The aesthetic benefits of open space for each building parcel should positively impact the entire community and not just those who use a balcony or a roof-top deck.</p>

No	Date	Name	Address	Comment
				<p>I urge the planning department not to remove the words "which is surfaced" from the definition of functional Green Roof Area. "Functional Green Roof Area shall be defined as area atop surface on a building, open to the sky and air, which is surfaced with soil and living plant materials for the purpose of retaining rainwater and absorbing heat from sunlight." Removing these words would undermine the environmental policy objectives that these Functional Green Roofs are intended to serve. The whole point of a functional green roof is to be surfaced in order to have positive environmental impact. To suggest a patio or deck that is not SURFACED meets this intent is ridiculous. To try and change the wording shows that the city and planners are not working in good faith to the intent of the previously agreed language. Potted plants do not retain rainwater or absorb heat to any degree that would positively affect the area. The city and planning knew what Functional Green Roof Area entailed when it was put in the language. They need to be held to the language.</p> <p>I am ready for the planners and city to stop trying to find loop-holes and/or change things they don't happen to like just so they can make more money or make something easier. To create a community that is close, size-appropriate, and a great place to live, is worth some extra effort. Quality of life, quality of neighborhood should be just as important to the city and planners as the "of the moment" bottom line. The city should be working</p>

<b>No</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Comment</b>
				<p>on our behalf, not a developers or their own. We are the community, and they should represent us.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>

No	Date	Name	Address	Comment
8	7/19/2021	Jennifer Krzmarzick	Montrose Lane	<p>Hi,</p> <p>We are writing to oppose the removal of the term “open space” from the Highland Bridge Master Plan. The developer and the city should be held accountable to provide the defined percentage of open space for each parcel, as outlined in the Ford Master Plan.</p> <p>This is of great concern to us as neighbors of this development which has already affected the quality of our neighborhood and daily lives, and not in a positive way.</p> <p>Open space is key to the quality of the development and should not be the same as "building lot coverage." Open space affects the entire community and not just those who use a balcony or a roof-top deck.</p> <p>Thank you</p>
9	7/19/2021	Kent Petterson	503 St. Clair Ave	<p>Is this really a serious City of St. Paul Gov't policy? Removing a critical definition of Open Space from the Ford plan is foolish and an end run around good public policy. People need open space and guidance for it is critical for implementing public policy. Space that is not easily available to everyone is not open space. Shame on the city for pursuing this elimination change. This type of change is relevant for the entire city as it will give developers a new avenue to build a less livable city.</p>



No	Date	Name	Address	Comment
10	7/19/2021	Lance Teachworth	1734 Hampshire Ave.	<p>I am concerned about the City's proposed change in the development's master plan, i.e., amending or eliminating the definition of "open space." I participated in the various community discussions about the development plan, but it seems that some of the elements of that plan that residents advocated for and were included in the Master Plan are now being "watered down" in favor of the developer's desire for greater density.</p> <p>Please retain the existing provisions in the plan regarding "open space."</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

No	Date	Name	Address	Comment
11	7/19/2021	Thomas Nicosia	1264 Davern st	<p>Open spaces are very important to the neighborhood both inside the Highland Bridge property and surrounding areas within Highlands district.</p> <p>There are so many benefits for parks and open space from urban heat, trees and greenery, pollution both noise and debris not to mention having a view of open space outside an already heavily populated area (as the plan calls for).</p> <p>My concern goes further than just a green roof. That roof is not "public" space and neighbors wouldn't be able to access sitting on a bench and enjoying the few months a year we get to enjoy the outside. It would also make meeting neighbors and the normal social aspect a family friendly neighborhood provides.</p> <p>Open areas also allow for snow build up and helps provide a majestic scene during the winter months that roof tops won't provide.</p> <p>I urge you to please don't redefine the definition of "open space".</p> <p>I've been following the development for years now and hope to move there if things go as planned but if Ryan Companies keeps trying to pack more and more people in and delete greenery / open spaces I seriously doubt I'll want to move.</p>

No	Date	Name	Address	Comment
12	7/19/2021	Maggie Killeen	2076 Niles Ave	I urge the planning department not to remove the words "which is surfaced" from the definition of functional Green Roof Area. "Functional Green Roof Area shall be defined as area atop surface on a building, open to the sky and air, which is surfaced with soil and living plant materials for the purpose of retaining rainwater and absorbing heat from sunlight." Removing these words would undermine the environmental policy objectives that these Functional Green Roofs are intended to serve. Under the city's proposed revision, a concrete patio with a small potted plant would apparently satisfy the definition.
13	7/19/2021	Dale A. Johnson	1263 Scheffer Ave.	To whom it may concern :  I'm opposed to the removal of the words Open Space from any and all documents in regards to project at Highland Bridge. I think we have been more than congenial in all of our dealings with these issues. We now need to stand our ground. Thank You

No	Date	Name	Address	Comment
14	7/19/2021	Elizabeth, Michelle & Dina Lenz	1817 Palace,	<p>We understand the need to make adjustments to the Master Plan, but we oppose the removal of the concept and defined term “open space” from the Highland Bridge Master Plan. The developer and the city should be held accountable to provide the defined percentage of open space for each parcel, as outlined in the Ford Master Plan.</p> <p>- We urge the planning department and the city to clarify the definition of “open space” so that it is clear exactly how “open space” is distinct from “building lot coverage.” The aesthetic benefits of open space for each building parcel should positively impact the entire community and not just those who use a balcony or a roof-top deck.</p> <p>- We urge the planning department not to remove the words "which is surfaced" from the definition of functional Green Roof Area. "Functional Green Roof Area shall be defined as area atop surface on a building, open to the sky and air, which is surfaced with soil and living plant materials for the purpose of retaining rainwater and absorbing heat from sunlight." Removing these words would undermine the environmental policy objectives that these Functional Green Roofs are intended to serve. Under the city's proposed revision, a concrete patio with a small potted plant would apparently satisfy the definition.</p> <p>Thanks,</p>

No	Date	Name	Address	Comment
15	7/19/2021	Anne Brataas	507 Montrose Lane	<p data-bbox="1115 152 1430 183">Dear Public Servants,</p> <p data-bbox="1115 240 1934 402">As a 27-year resident of the Highland Park neighborhood, I strenuously oppose language changes to the Highland Bridge Master Plan that would remove the concept and the defined term of "open space."</p> <p data-bbox="1115 459 1955 1003">This plan was negotiated in utmost good faith by neighbors who built the value you now seek to market in this development. We, NOT YOU, administered daily care, tended and stewarded the lawns, gardens, alleys; we maintained standards of litter-free beauty, created the civic commity, friendly relationships and respect for the environment and law-abiding behaviors that make Highland Park such a desirable place to live. By altering the language of "open space" you undermine this value base and the very identity and of Highland Park. You betray the vision and meaning of this St. Paul neighborhood and our life's work to create and maintain it.</p> <p data-bbox="1115 1060 1955 1440">We understand the stated goal of increasing optimal Highland-quality housing opportunities for more people, and we share it. But please note: the foundation of this neighborhood is its beautiful, restful, renewing connection to nature through open spaces. Your legal and moral duty is to share the actual experience of living in Highland Park, not merely the Highland address to "look like" you've improved housing options to accommodate diversity.</p>

No	Date	Name	Address	Comment
				<p>It is your legal and moral obligation to maintain the true value we Highland neighbors created for you — public servants! — and to share this value, not just the address in a cynical nod to housing equity. The way to ensure more people can enjoy a genuine Highland Park lifestyle experience in their housing — and not just have a Highland address— is to preserve the language, concept and spirit of “open space” in the master planning document.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and attention.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Anne Brataas</p>

No	Date	Name	Address	Comment
16	7/19/2021	Donald Kist	1959 Palace Ave.	<p>As a citizen and neighbor of the Highland Bridge project I must oppose the removal of the concept and defined term, "open space" from the Highland Bridge Master Plan. The developer and city should be held accountable to provide the defined percentage of open space for each parcel, as outlined in the Ford Master Plan.</p> <p>We urge the planning department and city to clarify the definition of "open space" so that it is clear exactly how "open space" is distinct from "building lot coverage" The aesthetic benefits of open space for each building parcel should positively impact the entire community and not just those who use a balcony or roof-top deck.</p> <p>We urge the planning department to remove the words "which is surfaced" from the definition of functional Green Roof Area. Functional Green Roof Area shall be defined as area surface on top of a building, open to the sky and air, which is surface with soil and living plant materials for the purpose of retaining rainwater and absorbing heat from sunlight. Removing these words would undermine the environmental policy objectives that these functional green roofs are intended to serve.</p> <p>Under the city's proposed revision, a concrete patio with a small potted plant would satisfy the definition.</p> <p>Sincerely, Donald Kist</p>

No	Date	Name	Address	Comment
26	7/19/2021	Char Mason	695 Mount Curve Blvd.	<p>Hello-</p> <p>I would like to voice my request that the City of St. Paul Planning Department NOT remove the defined term “open space” from the Highland Bridge Master Plan. The developer and the city should be held accountable to provide the defined percentage of open space for each parcel, as outlined in the Ford Master Plan.</p> <p>We urge the planning department and the city to clarify the definition of “open space” so that it is clear exactly how “open space” is distinct from “building lot coverage.” The aesthetic benefits of open space for each building parcel should positively impact the entire community and not just those who use a balcony or a roof-top deck.</p> <p>I am deeply concerned by this change as it represents a substantial departure from the city's original master plan which was carefully crafted over a decade of community input to ease neighbor concerns about maximum high density planning.</p> <p>Please no bait and switch.</p>



No	Date	Name	Address	Comment
17	7/20/2021	Mathews Hollinshead	2114 Pinehurst Ave	<p>I support the City's position on changing the definition of open space at Highland Bridge.</p> <p>1. To be walkable, development at Highland Bridge must be at pedestrian scale. Contrary to stereotype, too much open space sometimes separates access to structures to beyond pedestrian scale. In early Modernism, when the automobile was considered progress, Le Corbusier proposed a version of Paris that would have made walking impossible.</p> <p>2. Highland Bridge must be marketable, viable and successful. The new parks, both public and private, will provide ample open space. Large setbacks on development parcels cannot be affordably maintained and will not be programmed for recreation as will be the parks. Such empty percentages of development space will merely be dead space, not amenity.</p> <p>3. St. Paul taxpayers desperately need relief in the form of new taxbase. Highland Bridge, if developed properly, offers such relief. Let's not compromise that potential.</p>

No	Date	Name	Address	Comment
18	7/20/2021	Christa Treichel	1860 Mississippi River Blvd S	<p data-bbox="1115 152 1247 185">Menaka,</p> <p data-bbox="1115 240 1959 529">While I understand the need to make adjustments to the Master Plan, I oppose the removal of the concept and defined term “open space” from the Highland Bridge Master Plan. The developer and the city should be held accountable to provide the defined percentage of open space for each parcel, as outlined in the Ford Master Plan.</p> <p data-bbox="1115 584 1955 922">I am urging the planning department and the city to clarify the definition of “open space” so that it is clear exactly how “open space” is distinct from “building lot coverage.” The aesthetic benefits of open space for each building parcel should positively impact the entire community and not just those who use a balcony or a roof-top deck. As a resident in this community, I feel strongly about this issue.</p> <p data-bbox="1115 977 1959 1354">I urge the planning department not to remove the words "which is surfaced" from the definition of functional Green Roof Area. "Functional Green Roof Area shall be defined as area atop surface on a building, open to the sky and air, which is surfaced with soil and living plant materials for the purpose of retaining rainwater and absorbing heat from sunlight." Removing these words would undermine the environmental policy objectives that these Functional Green Roofs are intended to serve.</p> <p data-bbox="1115 1409 1278 1442">Thank you,</p>

No	Date	Name	Address	Comment
19	7/20/2021	Jan Martland	1219 Bayard Avenue	<p>To All concerned,</p> <p>I am writing as a concerned citizen of St. Paul about the Ford Plant site. First off, the developer and city should be held accountable to provide the percentage of “open space” as is outlined in the Ford Master Plan. We need MORE open space NOT less that benefits everyone, not just the people who have access to a roof top deck or balcony. We need more grass, trees, flowers, landscaping in the area not less.</p> <p>The term “open space” should also be clarified so that it is clear exactly how “open space” is distinct from the “building lot coverage.” Again, more greenspace is needed, not less.</p> <p>The planning department should NOT remove the words “which is surfaced” from its definition of a functional Green Roof Area. With climate change, it is prudent to have meaningful rooftops surfaced with soil and living plant material which will help with absorbing heat and rainwater vs brick and mortar which will do neither.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>

No	Date	Name	Address	Comment
20	7/20/2021	Christie Englund	2169 Wellesley Ave	<p data-bbox="1115 152 1339 183">Menka Mohan,</p> <p data-bbox="1115 282 1944 358">The following points are of concern to me regarding the Ford Master Plan open space.</p> <p data-bbox="1115 370 1955 574">This, in addition to the high population density creating greater neighborhood traffic congestion and air pollution, bring into question the planners consideration of future livability in the area vs excessive overreach for profit from the project.</p> <p data-bbox="1115 673 1961 959">- We understand the need to make adjustments to the Master Plan, but we oppose the removal of the concept and defined term "open space" from the Highland Bridge Master Plan. The developer and the city should be held accountable to provide the defined percentage of open space for each parcel, as outlined in the Ford Master Plan.</p> <p data-bbox="1115 1019 1955 1268">- We urge the planning department and the city to clarify the definition of "open space" so that it is clear exactly how "open space" is distinct from "building lot coverage." The aesthetic benefits of open space for each building parcel should positively impact the entire community and not just those who use a balcony or a roof-top deck.</p> <p data-bbox="1115 1328 1913 1440">- We urge the planning department not to remove the words "which is surfaced" from the definition of functional Green Roof Area. "Functional Green Roof</p>

No	Date	Name	Address	Comment
				<p>Area shall be defined as area atop surface on a building, open to the sky and air, which is surfaced with soil and living plant materials for the purpose of retaining rainwater and absorbing heat from sunlight." Removing these words would undermine the environmental policy objectives that these Functional Green Roofs are intended to serve. Under the city's proposed revision, a concrete patio with a small potted plant would apparently satisfy the definition.</p> <p>Regards,</p>

No	Date	Name	Address	Comment
21	7/20/2021	Jan Martland	1219 Bayard Avenue	<p>To All concerned,</p> <p>I am writing as a concerned citizen of St. Paul about the Ford Plant site. First off, the developer and city should be held accountable to provide the percentage of “open space” as is outlined in the Ford Master Plan. We need MORE open space NOT less that benefits everyone, not just the people who have access to a roof top deck or balcony. We need more grass, trees, flowers, landscaping in the area not less.</p> <p>The term “open space” should also be clarified so that it is clear exactly how “open space” is distinct from the “building lot coverage.” Again, more greenspace is needed, not less.</p> <p>The planning department should NOT remove the words “which is surfaced” from its definition of a functional Green Roof Area. With climate change, it is prudent to have meaningful rooftops surfaced with soil and living plant material which will help with absorbing heat and rainwater vs brick and mortar which will do neither.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>

No	Date	Name	Address	Comment
22	7/20/2021	Kathryn and Ron Bennett	700 Mount Curve Boulevard	<p>To Saint Paul Planning Department</p> <p>As decades-long residents of Highland Park, we feel a strong commitment to this community. We have participated in the planning meetings over the past 10 years for the Ford Site or what is now called Highland Bridge.</p> <p>We have been dismayed by the number of variances granted to the original neighbor-approved plan to the site.</p> <p>Now comes another attack on the rights of the voting and tax-payer citizens of this neighborhood.</p> <p>In the April ruling the Judge commented that it is possible to conclude that the City of Saint Paul failed to perform their official duty imposed by law to enforce the Ford Site Zoning and Public Realm Master Plan. We agree.</p> <p>We strongly oppose the removal of the concept and defined term 'open space' requirement in the Highland Bridge Master Plan.</p> <p>The developer and city should be held accountable to provide the defined percentage of open space for each parcel, as outlined in the Ford Master Plan.</p> <p>We support the Neighbors for a Livable Saint Paul in urging the planning department of the city to clarify the</p>

No	Date	Name	Address	Comment
				<p>definition of 'open space' so that it is clear exactly how 'open space' is distinct from 'building lot coverage.' The aesthetic benefits of open space for each building parcel should positively impact the entire community and not just those who use a balcony or a roof-top deck.</p> <p>We urge the planning department not to remove the words 'which is surfaced' from the definition of functional Green Roof Area. 'Functional Green Roof Area shall be defined as area atop surface on a building, open to the sky and air, which is surfaced with soil and living plant materials for the purpose of retaining rainwater and absorbing heat from sunlight.' Removing these words would undermine the environmental policy objectives that these Functional Green Roofs are intended to serve. Under the city's proposed revision, a concrete patio with a small potted plant would apparently satisfy the definition.</p> <p>Kathryn and Ron Bennett</p>



No	Date	Name	Address	Comment
23	7/20/2021	Ms. C. Bittner	1496 Laurel Ave	<p data-bbox="1115 152 1493 183">To whom it may concern:</p> <p data-bbox="1115 240 1955 574">I am writing in regards to the Highland Bridge Development and proposed changes to the language and intent of the master plan. Please stop trying to end-run agreements and intents that serve the surrounding community. Please champion the idea of a smaller, more appropriate-to-the-surrounding area, development. To a real neighborhood. Please note I said neighborhood, not City Council money-maker.</p> <p data-bbox="1115 631 1948 1138">Specifically I oppose the removal of the concept and defined term “open space” from the Highland Bridge Master Plan. The developer and the city should be held accountable to provide the defined percentage of open space for each parcel, as outlined in the Ford Master Plan. They should be accountable to all of the agreements in place. That's why they are there!!! So far it seems that whatever isn't easy for a developer or the city is either tried to be redefined, removed or given a variance from our city council. I ask that the city and planners continue forward in good faith to the agreements in place.</p> <p data-bbox="1115 1195 1955 1440">I urge the planning department and the city to clarify the definition of “open space” so that it is clear exactly how “open space” is distinct from “building lot coverage.” The aesthetic benefits of open space for each building parcel should positively impact the entire community and not just those who use a balcony or a roof-top deck.</p>

No	Date	Name	Address	Comment
				<p>I urge the planning department not to remove the words "which is surfaced" from the definition of functional Green Roof Area. "Functional Green Roof Area shall be defined as area atop surface on a building, open to the sky and air, which is surfaced with soil and living plant materials for the purpose of retaining rainwater and absorbing heat from sunlight." Removing these words would undermine the environmental policy objectives that these Functional Green Roofs are intended to serve. The whole point of a functional green roof is to be surfaced in order to have positive environmental impact. To suggest a patio or deck that is not SURFACED meets this intent is ridiculous. To try and change the wording shows that the city and planners are not working in good faith to the intent of the previously agreed language. Potted plants do not retain rainwater or absorb heat to any degree that would positively affect the area. The city and planning knew what Functional Green Roof Area entailed when it was put in the language. They need to be held to the language.</p> <p>I am ready for the planners and city to stop trying to find loop-holes and/or change things they don't happen to like just so they can make more money or make something easier. To create a community that is close, size-appropriate, and a great place to live, is worth some extra effort. Quality of life, quality of neighborhood should be just as important to the city and planners as the "of the moment" bottom line. The city should be working</p>

No	Date	Name	Address	Comment
				<p>on our behalf, not a developers or their own. We are the community, and they should represent us.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p> <p>Ms. C. Bittner</p>
24	7/20/2021	Asa W. Hoyt	636 Desnoyer Ave.	More trees, more trees, more trees "I speak for the trees"-Dr. Seuss

No	Date	Name	Address	Comment
25	7/20/2021	Luana Ciccarelli	1419 Palace Ave	<p>Good morning, As a current resident of Highland Park (and part of a family who has resided in Highland Park for 50+ years) I would like to echo the comments below about the lack of clarity on the definition of "open space."</p> <p>- We understand the need to make adjustments to the Master Plan, but we oppose the removal of the concept and defined term "open space" from the Highland Bridge Master Plan. The developer and the city should be held accountable to provide the defined percentage of open space for each parcel, as outlined in the Ford Master Plan.</p> <p>- We urge the planning department and the city to clarify the definition of "open space" so that it is clear exactly how "open space" is distinct from "building lot coverage." The aesthetic benefits of open space for each building parcel should positively impact the entire community and not just those who use a balcony or a roof-top deck.</p> <p>- We urge the planning department not to remove the words "which is surfaced" from the definition of functional Green Roof Area. "Functional Green Roof Area shall be defined as area atop surface on a building, open to the sky and air, which is surfaced with soil and living plant materials for the purpose of retaining rainwater and absorbing heat from sunlight." Removing these words would undermine the environmental policy objectives that these Functional Green Roofs are</p>

<b>No</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Comment</b>
				<p>intended to serve. Under the city's proposed revision, a concrete patio with a small potted plant would apparently satisfy the definition.</p> <p>Sincerely, Luana Ciccarelli</p>

No	Date	Name	Address	Comment
27	7/20/2021	John Pilney	1620 Scheffer Ave	<p>Talk about scheming to get around reducing open space at the Ford Master Plan has almost been a last straw for us to live in Highland Park. The current leadership in St. Paul seem that at even opportunity for new multiply housing developments to maximize the number of units and then even to eliminate parking space requirements (forcing cars to spill over into neighborhoods for packing).</p> <p>I will be closely watching how the city leaders respond to this situation and if is unfavorable will work hard in future elections to elect different leaders.</p> <p>John Pilney</p>

No	Date	Name	Address	Comment
28	7/20/2021	Renate Sharp	536 Mt. Curve Blvd.	<p data-bbox="1115 152 1350 183">Dear Ms. Mohan,</p> <p data-bbox="1115 232 1955 342">Highland Park has been my home for the past fifty years and I am very concerned about our environment, increased traffic and the proposed open space developments at the Ford site.</p> <p data-bbox="1115 391 1923 659">Our environment is of utmost importance in these times of climate change experiences and we must not permit increases in concrete, brick, and mortar and decreases in grass, landscaping, and trees beyond the intent of the codified plan. My concerns are well expressed by the Neighbors for a Livable Saint Paul. Thus permit me to share their writing with you.</p> <p data-bbox="1115 708 1955 935">We understand the need to make adjustments to the Master Plan, but we oppose the removal of the concept and defined term "open space" from the Highland Bridge Master Plan. The developer and the city should be held accountable to provide the defined percentage of open space for each parcel, as outlined in the Ford Master Plan.</p> <p data-bbox="1115 984 1955 1211">- We urge the planning department and the city to clarify the definition of "open space" so that it is clear exactly how "open space" is distinct from "building lot coverage." The aesthetic benefits of open space for each building parcel should positively impact the entire community and not just those who use a balcony or a roof-top deck.</p> <p data-bbox="1115 1260 1955 1406">- We urge the planning department not to remove the words "which is surfaced" from the definition of functional Green Roof Area. "Functional Green Roof Area shall be defined as area atop surface on a building, open to the sky and air, which</p>

<b>No</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Comment</b>
				<p>is surfaced with soil and living plant materials for the purpose of retaining rainwater and absorbing heat from sunlight." Removing these words would undermine the environmental policy objectives that these Functional Green Roofs are intended to serve. Under the city's proposed revision, a concrete patio with a small potted plant would apparently satisfy the definition.</p> <p>Thank you so very much for your attention to this grave matter! Warmly,</p>



No	Date	Name	Address	Comment
29	7/20/2021	Eric Amann	2231 Scheffer Avenue	<p>Ms. Mohan, As a resident of St. Paul Highland Park, living very close to the Ford plant development, I am shocked and very concerned at recent proposals to do away with Open Space provisions in the development. When governments that are supposed to represent the people, cave in to the interests of developers and big business, that is the kind of thing that fosters distrust of government officials among the citizens. Please do the right thing here.</p> <p>- I understand the need to make adjustments to the Master Plan, but oppose the removal of the concept and defined term "open space" from the Highland Bridge Master Plan. The developer and the city should be held accountable to provide the defined percentage of open space for each parcel, as outlined in the Ford Master Plan.</p> <p>- I urge the planning department and the city to clarify the definition of "open space" so that it is clear exactly how "open space" is distinct from "building lot coverage." The aesthetic benefits of open space for each building parcel should positively impact the entire community and not just those who use a balcony or a roof-top deck.</p> <p>- I urge the planning department not to remove the words "which is surfaced" from the definition of functional Green Roof Area. "Functional Green Roof Area shall be defined as area atop surface on a building, open to the sky and air, which is surfaced with soil and living plant materials for the purpose of retaining rainwater and absorbing heat from sunlight." Removing these words would undermine the environmental policy objectives that these Functional Green Roofs are</p>

No	Date	Name	Address	Comment
				<p>intended to serve. Under the city's proposed revision, a concrete patio with a small potted plant would apparently satisfy the definition.</p> <p>Eric Amann</p>
30	7/21/2021	Winston Kaehler	1712 Palace Avenue	<p>The attempts to remove "open space" requirements and definitions from the Ford Master Plan seem to be a thinly veiled effort by the City to kowtow to the developer's wish to negate community input years ago into the final master plan. City officials and staff should put a higher priority on serving the public interest, as opposed to maximizing the profits of private developers.</p>

No	Date	Name	Address	Comment
31	7/21/2021	Victoria Stewart	124 Montrose Place	<p>I understand the need to make adjustments to the Master Plan, but I oppose the removal of the concept and defined term "open space" from the Highland Bridge Master Plan. The developer and the city should be held accountable to provide the defined percentage of open space for each parcel, as outlined in the Ford Master Plan.</p> <p>I urge the planning department and the city to clarify the definition of "open space" so that it is clear exactly how "open space" is distinct from "building lot coverage." The aesthetic benefits of open space for each building parcel should positively impact the entire community and not just those who use a balcony or a roof-top deck.</p> <p>Further, I urge the planning department not to remove the words "which is surfaced" from the definition of functional Green Roof Area. "Functional Green Roof Area shall be defined as area atop surface on a building, open to the sky and air, which is surfaced with soil and living plant materials for the purpose of retaining rainwater and absorbing heat from sunlight." Removing these words would undermine the environmental policy objectives that these Functional Green Roofs are intended to serve. Under the city's proposed revision, a concrete patio with a small potted plant would apparently satisfy the definition.</p> <p>Please do not give "carte blanche" to the developer. Stick to the Ford Master Plan.</p>