

city of saint paul
planning commission resolution
file number
date

WHEREAS, Independent School District 625/Wedum Albion LLC, File # 18-059-091, has applied to rezone from R4 one family residential to T3 traditional neighborhood under the provisions of § 61.801(b) of the Saint Paul Legislative Code, property located at 900 Albion Avenue, Parcel Identification Number (PIN) 15.28.23.14.0030, legally described as West End Block 22; and

WHEREAS, the Zoning Committee of the Planning Commission, on May 24, 2018, held a public hearing at which all persons present were given an opportunity to be heard pursuant to said application in accordance with the requirements of § 61.303 of the Saint Paul Legislative Code; and

WHEREAS, the Saint Paul Planning Commission, based on the evidence presented to its Zoning Committee at the public hearing as substantially reflected in the minutes, made the following findings of fact:

1. The applicant has a purchase agreement with Independent School District 625 (ISD 625) to acquire the property and is petitioning to rezone it from R4 to T3, with the consent of ISD 625. A market rate senior living community with approximately 165 units is proposed for the first phase of development. The five-story senior living community will include independent living, assisted living, and memory care units along with a town center that may include a kitchen, dining areas, bistro, exercise room, theater, library, community room, and other common spaces. Construction of the first phase of development is planned for the western portion of the site and is anticipated to begin in fall 2018. The planned realignment of Lexington Parkway to intersect with West 7th Street at existing Elway Street will divide the property into two development parcels. Construction of the second phase of development on the eastern parcel is anticipated to occur in about five years and is planned for additional housing. Existing facilities on-site related to the former school will be removed.
2. The proposed zoning is consistent with the way this area has developed. The intent of the T3 traditional neighborhood zoning district is to provide for higher-density pedestrian- and transit-oriented mixed use development. West 7th Street and Lexington Parkway, which border the site, are major corridors in the city that each day carry about 30,000 and 8,000 vehicles respectively. West 7th Street is a mixed use corridor and the selected route for a modern streetcar transit line, known as Riverview Corridor, which will create a new transit connection between Downtown Saint Paul, the airport, and Mall of America. The senior housing development proposed for the site is an appropriate use along the mixed use

moved by _____

seconded by _____

in favor _____

against _____

corridor, which calls for higher density development along thoroughfares served by public transit. The new transit way will serve the uses developed on the property.

3. The proposed zoning is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The property is located in a mixed use corridor, a primary thoroughfare in the city that is served by public transit. Land Use Policy 1.23 states, "Guide development along mixed use corridors. The City should recognize community circumstances and preferences as stated in City adopted summaries of small area plans and district plans, while still providing additional housing opportunities at densities that support transit." Land Use Policy 1.25 states, "Promote the development of more intensive housing on mixed use corridors where supported by zoning that permits mixed use and multi-family residential development." Land Use Policy 1.26 states, "Permit residential development at densities of 30-150 units per acre." The District 15 Plan states, "Through the implementation of this Plan, the community strives to incorporate a mix of uses and a pedestrian-friendly street environment in commercial areas."
4. The proposed zoning, which permits a mix of residential and commercial uses, is compatible with uses in the surrounding area. West 7th Street is a mixed use corridor with a variety of commercial uses including post office, gas station, bank, medical clinic, and nursery. Low density residential uses and parkland are located along Lexington Parkway and Albion Avenue.
5. The petition for rezoning was found to be sufficient on May 3, 2018: 26 parcels eligible; 18 parcels required; and 19 parcels signed.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Saint Paul Planning Commission recommends to the City Council that the application of Independent School District/Wedum Albion LLC to rezone from R4 one family residential to T3 traditional neighborhood for property at 900 Albion Avenue be approved.

city of saint paul
planning commission resolution
file number
date

WHEREAS, Wedum Albion LLC, File # 18-057-154, has applied for a conditional use permit for a building height up to 65 feet and variance not to have a primary building entrance from 7th Street, under the provisions of § 61.501, § 61.202(b), and § 61.601 of the Saint Paul Legislative Code, on property located at 900 Albion Avenue, Parcel Identification Number (PIN) 15.28.23.14.0030, legally described as West End Block 22;

WHEREAS, the Zoning Committee of the Planning Commission, on May 24, 2018, held a public hearing at which all persons present were given an opportunity to be heard pursuant to said application in accordance with the requirements of §61.303 of the Saint Paul Legislative Code; and

WHEREAS, the Saint Paul Planning Commission, based on the evidence presented to its Zoning Committee at the public hearing as substantially reflected in the minutes, made the following findings of fact:

1. The applicant has a purchase agreement with Independent School District 625 (ISD 625) to acquire the property and is petitioning to rezone it from R4 to T3 and obtain a conditional use permit and variance, with the consent of ISD 625. A market rate senior living community with approximately 165 units is proposed for the first phase of development. The five-story senior living community will include independent living, assisted living, and memory care units along with a town center that may include a kitchen, dining areas, bistro, exercise room, theater, library, community room, and other common spaces. Construction of the first phase of development is planned for the western portion of the site and is anticipated to begin in fall 2018. The planned realignment of Lexington Parkway to intersect with West 7th Street at existing Elway Street will divide the property into two development parcels. Construction of the second phase of development on the eastern parcel is anticipated to occur in about five years and is planned for additional housing. Existing facilities on-site related to the former school will be removed.

The applicant requests a conditional use permit to allow a maximum building height of 65 feet. The proposed building height is 58 feet. The decorative elements near the West 7th-New Lexington Parkway corner project above the roof top but do not count towards building height. The actual building height is not yet known because the exact location of the building cannot be determined until the realignment of Lexington Parkway is finalized. Grade, depth to bedrock, and water table issues could also impact building design and necessitate minor site plan adjustments that could affect the building height.

moved by _____
seconded by _____
in favor _____
against _____

The applicant also requests a variance from the traditional neighborhood district design standard requiring a primary pedestrian building entrance on all arterial and collector streets. No primary entrance is planned along West 7th Street. The floor plan for the senior living campus includes memory care units on the first floor along West 7th Street. These secured units have no entrances to prevent residents who are a wandering risk from leaving the building. In addition, with two lanes of westbound traffic on the north side of West 7th Street, there is no safe location for drop-offs and pick-ups. An entrance with an ADA ramp is planned for New Lexington Parkway near the corner at West 7th Street.

2. T3 dimensional standards limit height of multifamily residential buildings to 45 feet and allow additional height by right with larger setbacks from side and rear property lines. The portion of the building along West 7th Street is setback 10 feet, 4 feet more than the required 6 feet, allowing for a building height of 49 feet by right.

Along Old Lexington Parkway, which abuts land zoned R1 and R4, the building height is limited to 25 feet at the property line and additional height is allowed by right based on setback from the property line. The 6 foot side yard setback along Old Lexington Parkway allows the building height to be 31 feet by right at the 6 foot setback line. § 66.331(g) of the zoning code allows a maximum building height of 90 feet with a conditional use permit. The applicant requests a conditional use permit to allow a building of up to 65 feet.

3. Zoning Code § 61.501 lists five standards that all conditional uses must satisfy:

- (a) *The extent, location and intensity of the use will be in substantial compliance with the Saint Paul Comprehensive Plan and any applicable subarea plans which were approved by the city council.* This condition is met. The property is located in a mixed use corridor, a primary thoroughfare in the city that is served by public transit. Land Use Policy 1.23 states, "Guide development along mixed use corridors. The City should recognize community circumstances and preferences as stated in City adopted summaries of small area plans and district plans, while still providing additional housing opportunities at densities that support transit." Land Use Policy 1.25 states, "Promote the development of more intensive housing on mixed use corridors where supported by zoning that permits mixed use and multi-family residential development." Land Use Policy 1.26 states, "Permit residential development at densities of 30-150 units per acre." The District 15 Plan states, "Through the implementation of this Plan, the community strives to incorporate a mix of uses and a pedestrian-friendly street environment in commercial areas." The additional building height allows for increased density on the site, which is supported by the comprehensive plan. This is a large site bordered by primary thoroughfares.
- (b) *The use will provide adequate ingress and egress to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets.* This condition is met. Saint Paul and Ramsey County Public Works departments are involved in discussions regarding the site plan because of their involvement with the realignment of Lexington Parkway. Four main access points are planned. Three curb cuts on Old Lexington Parkway will provide two-way access to the surface parking lot and to the ramp to underground parking. The access on New Lexington Parkway includes a bump-in for pedestrian loading and unloading.
- (c) *The use will not be detrimental to the existing character of the development in the immediate neighborhood or endanger the public health, safety and general welfare.* This condition is met. West 7th Street and Lexington Parkway, which border the site, are major corridors in the city that each day carry about 30,000 and 8,000 vehicles respectively. West 7th Street is a mixed use corridor and the selected route for a modern streetcar transit line, known as Riverview Corridor, which will create a new transit

connection between Downtown Saint Paul, the airport, and Mall of America. The proposed senior living community is an appropriate use for the mixed use corridor that calls for higher density development along thoroughfares served by public transit. The new transit way will serve residents, visitors, and staff of the proposed development. The site design places the building close to the property line along West 7th Street and further away from the lower density residential uses on Lexington Parkway.

- (d) *The use will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property for uses permitted in the district.* This condition is met. The proposed use will not prevent future development that is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and existing zoning.
 - (e) *The use shall, in all other respects, conform to the applicable regulations of the district in which it is located.* Subject to the proposed zoning from R4 to T3, and to the variance from the T3 design district standards to allow no primary pedestrian entrance from West 7th Street (discussed in finding #4), the use will conform to all other applicable T3 district regulations.
4. Zoning Code § 61.601 states that the Planning Commission shall have the power to grant variances from the strict enforcement of the provisions of this code upon a finding that:
- (a) *The variance is in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the zoning code.* This finding is met. Purposes of the zoning code per § 60.103 include: 1) to encourage a compatible mix of land uses, at densities that support transit, that reflect the scale, character and urban design of Saint Paul's existing traditional neighborhoods; and 2) to provide housing choice and housing affordability.
 - (b) *The variance is consistent with the comprehensive plan.* This finding is met. The property is located in a mixed use corridor where 30 to 150 dwelling units per acre is permitted. Mixed use corridors are primary thoroughfares in the city that are served by public transit. Land Use Policy 1.23 states, "Guide development along mixed use corridors. The City should recognize community circumstances and preferences as stated in City adopted summaries of small area plans and district plans, while still providing additional housing opportunities at densities that support transit." Land Use Policy 1.25 states, "Promote the development of more intensive housing on mixed use corridors where supported by zoning that permits mixed use and multi-family residential development. Land Use Policy 1.26 states, "Permit residential development at densities of 30-150 units per acre." The District 15 Plan states, "Through the implementation of this Plan, the community strives to incorporate a mix of uses and a pedestrian-friendly street environment in commercial areas."
 - (c) *The applicant has established that there are practical difficulties in complying with the provision; that the property owner proposes to use the property in a reasonable manner not permitted by the provision. Economic considerations alone do not constitute practical difficulties.* This finding is met. The site design has the building set close to the property line and anchoring the corner, as called for by the traditional design standards. Consequently, there is no safe location for drop-offs and pick-ups along West 7th Street, which has two lanes of westbound traffic on the north side of West 7th Street making a primary pedestrian entrance less necessary. In addition, secured memory care units are planned for the first floor along West 7th Street. Having entrances in the memory care area are not conducive to preventing residents who are a wandering risk from leaving the building. A primary entrance with an ADA ramp is planned for New Lexington Parkway near the corner at West 7th Street where a bump-in can more safely accommodate pick-ups and drop-offs.

- (d) *The plight of the landowner is due to circumstances unique to the property not created by the landowner.* This finding is met. The triangularly shaped parcel contributes to site planning challenges discussed in Finding 4(b) as does the city and county plans to bisect the site to realign Lexington Parkway.
- (e) *The variance will not permit any use that is not allowed in the zoning district where the affected land is located.* This finding is met.
- (f) *The variance will not alter the essential character of the surrounding area.* This finding is met. The West 7th Street façade includes elements that relate to the human scale including awnings and windows that provide eyes on the street. Projections and balconies on upper floors break up the massing along the street frontage. A primary pedestrian entrance is planned near the corner of New Lexington Parkway and West 7th Street. The elevated patio at the corner of Lexington and West 7th Street will have a private entrance for residents.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Saint Paul Planning Commission, under the authority of the City's Legislative Code, that the application of Wedum Albion LLC for a conditional use permit for a building height up to 65 feet and variance not to have a primary building entrance from 7th Street at 900 Albion Ave is hereby approved, subject to the following conditions:

1. Rezoning of the site from R4 to T3.
2. Final plans approved by the Zoning Administrator for this use shall be in substantial compliance with the plan submitted and approved as part of this application.

city of saint paul
planning commission resolution
file number
date

WHEREAS, Urban Growler, File #18-059-455, has applied for a conditional use permit for a farmers market with up to 20 vendors under the provisions of § 65.515 and § 61.501 of the Saint Paul Legislative Code, on property located at 2325 Endicott St., Parcel Identification Number (PIN) 29.29.23.13.0058, legally described as Lot 5, Block 1, Update Addition; and

WHEREAS, the Zoning Committee of the Planning Commission, on May 24, 2018, held a public hearing at which all persons present were given an opportunity to be heard pursuant to said application in accordance with the requirements of §61.303 of the Saint Paul Legislative Code; and

WHEREAS, the Saint Paul Planning Commission, based on the evidence presented to its Zoning Committee at the public hearing as substantially reflected in the minutes, made the following findings of fact:

1. The applicant in seeking a conditional use permit for a weekly farmers market with five (5) to 20 vendors. The market will be on Sundays from May to September. The market will be hosted by Urban Growler Brewing Company, who is a tenant of the property, and they will be joining the MN Farmers Market Association. The market will be located on a portion of the parking lot.
2. Zoning Code § 65.515 defines *farmers market* as “an outdoor market at a fixed location consisting primarily of farmers and gardeners for the purpose of selling the products of their farm, garden, apiary, or forest directly to the public,” for which it lists the following standards and conditions that apply to the proposed farmers market at 2325 Endicott Street:

(b) Approval of a site plan showing the number and location of vendors at the site, with contact information for a designated market director responsible for coordinating the market vendors and activities, and for providing the zoning administrator with updated contact information if it changes. This condition can be met subject to zoning administrator approval of a site plan showing the number and location of vendors at the site, with contact information for a designated market director responsible for coordinating the market vendors and activities, and providing the zoning administrator with updated contact information if it changes.

Standards and conditions for farmers markets with more than five (5) vendors:

- (c) A conditional use permit is required.* The applicant is requesting a conditional use permit for a farmers market for up to 20 vendors.
- (d) The use shall be limited to no more than three (3) days per week.* This condition is met. The farmers market is proposed to be held one day per week, on Sundays.
- (e) Foods, manufactured goods, wares and merchandise may be sold if approved by the Planning Commission.* This condition is met. The farmers market will include up to 20 local growers and cottage food producers

moved by _____
seconded by _____
in favor _____
against _____

Standards and conditions for farmers markets with five (5) or fewer vendors:

(f) *Sales shall be limited to no more than two (2) days per week between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m.* This condition can be met subject to limiting operation of the farmers market to these hours. The farmers market is proposed to operate one day per week on Sundays with five to 20 vendors.

3. Zoning Code § 61.501 lists five standards that all conditional uses must satisfy:

(a) *The extent, location and intensity of the use will be in substantial compliance with the Saint Paul Comprehensive Plan and any applicable subarea plans which were approved by the city council.* This condition is met. Because the use will increase the employment density of the parcel, it is supported by the following policies from the Land Use Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan:

- *2.4 Focus the growth of employment centers in Downtown, the Central Corridor, industrial corridors, and on larger tracts of land, where there is infrastructure capacity and where redevelopment as employment centers, or as mixed-use development that includes employment centers, could occur.*
- *2.14 Promote the development of employment opportunities in the Central Corridor, consistent with the Central Corridor Development Strategy.*

(b) *The use will provide adequate ingress and egress to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets.* This condition is met. The use will be located on a lot with a multitenant building. There will be adequate parking on the lot and on adjacent streets. Parking demand for other commercial uses will be less because the market will operate only on Sundays when many businesses are closed.

(c) *The use will not be detrimental to the existing character of the development in the immediate neighborhood or endanger the public health, safety and general welfare.* This condition is met. The use will have a minimal (temporary) impact to the character of the development in the immediate neighborhood and will provide improved access to produce and food.

(d) *The use will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property for uses permitted in the district.* This condition is met. The limited scale and duration of the use is not anticipated to impede permitted uses of improvements to surrounding properties.

(e) *The use shall, in all other respects, conform to the applicable regulations of the district in which it is located.* This condition is met. The use conforms to other applicable regulations.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Saint Paul Planning Commission, under the authority of the City's Legislative Code, that the application of Urban Growler for a conditional use permit for a farmers market with up to 20 vendors at 2325 Endicott St. is hereby approved with the following conditions:

1. Final approval by the Zoning Administrator of a site plan showing the number and location of vendors at the site, which shall be in substantial compliance with the plan submitted as part of this application.
2. The applicant shall provide the Zoning Administrator with contact information for a designated market director responsible for coordinating the market vendors and activities, and with updated contact information if it changes.
3. The farmers market shall operate only on Sundays between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m.

St. Anthony Park Community Council/District 12
2395 University Avenue West, Suite 300E
Saint Paul, MN 55114



Department of Planning and Economic Development
Zoning Section
1400 City Hall Annex
25 Fourth Street West
Saint Paul, MN 55102

May 22, 2018

Dear Zoning Committee,

I am writing you on behalf of the St. Anthony Park Community Council with support for the Urban Growler Farmers Market. The Board voted unanimously in favor of the conditional use permit at our May 10, 2018 board meeting to provide a letter of support, with the condition that the Farmers Market strongly consider EBT access and, due to lack of sidewalk, work with the City and Community Council to facilitate safe access for people with disability issues, bikers, pedestrians, etc.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Kathryn Murray".

Kathryn Murray, Executive Director
kathryn@sapcc.org | 651-649-5992
www.sapcc.org

Endicott LLC

**2325 ENDICOTT STREET
ST. PAUL, MN 55114**

Thursday, May 24th, 2018

Dear Saint Paul City Planning Commission,

I am writing to you today to show our support for the Conditional Use Permit being applied for by the Urban Growler Brewing Company [UGBC].

We wholeheartedly support and grant permission to our tenants UGBC to use the property in front of their establishment for the purpose of holding a weekly farmers market.

We understand that UGBC would like to begin this use in late spring and hope to last through early autumn, as weather and yield of harvest allow.

This permission extends through the full period (2 years) of any Farmers Market Permit and/or Conditional Use Permit that may be granted by the City of Saint Paul to UGBC for this purpose.

Signed,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Niles Deneen', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Niles Deneen -
Chief Financial Manager
Endicott LLC

city of saint paul
planning commission resolution
file number
date

WHEREAS Brett Ripley, File # 18-050-373, has applied for a reestablishment of a legal nonconforming use as a 4-family dwelling under the provisions of § 62.102, § 62.106(h), and § 62.109(e) of the Saint Paul Legislative Code, on property located at 1685 Taylor Ave., Parcel Identification Number (PIN) 28.29.23.41.0037, legally described as Lot 9 and W 37 ft. Lot 10, Block 3, College Place Taylor's Division; and

WHEREAS, the Zoning Committee of the Planning Commission, on May 24, 2018, held a public hearing at which all persons present were given an opportunity to be heard pursuant to said application in accordance with the requirements of § 61.303 of the Saint Paul Legislative Code; and

WHEREAS, the Saint Paul Planning Commission, based on the evidence presented to its Zoning Committee at the public hearing as substantially reflected in the minutes, made the following findings of fact:

1. The original building permit for the house at 1685 Taylor Avenue shows that it was constructed in 1897 as a one-family dwelling. The 1930 census shows that it was a one-family dwelling with owner occupants, John and Minnie Gebhard, and their son. The 1940 census shows that it was a one-family dwelling with a 74-year old owner occupant, Minnie Gebhard. City directories as recent as 1948 list only one resident in the house. In 1949 and again in 1965, city directories listed four apparently unrelated individuals residing at 1685 Taylor, with no indication of the number of units. A 1975 city directory listed four apparently unrelated individuals residing at the address, along with a phone number for each, suggesting that there were four units in the structure at that time. A Sanborn Insurance map covering the years 1929-1955 shows that the house was a one-family dwelling in 1929 and that it had been converted to flats by 1955, very likely between 1949 and 1955.
2. The property was zoned "B" Residence, which allowed one- and two-family dwellings, from 1922 to 1975. The property was rezoned R4 one-family residential when the City adopted a new zoning code in 1975. The property has never been zoned to allow more than two dwelling units.
3. Department of Safety and Inspections (DSI) records show that the house received a Certificate of Occupancy (C of O) for four dwelling units in 1982, which appears to have remained in place until 2006, even though the property has never been zoned to allow more than two dwelling units and there is no evidence of building permits to convert the house to three or four units.
4. Both the applicant and City records (a C of O) indicate that the previous property owner

moved by _____
seconded by _____
in favor _____
against _____

began using the first and second floor as one living unit around 2006, and continued to rent the third floor unit and the basement dwelling unit. By 2011, all units were vacant. The structure was registered as a Category II vacant building in 2012. At that time, a DSI inspector confirmed that the first and second floors were still designed as two separate dwelling units (a locking door separating the units, and each having a fully functioning kitchen), and DSI Zoning ordered that the locking door be removed and one kitchen be removed by removing all cabinets and capping gas, water and drain lines inside the walls, and disconnecting them at the source if feasible. Compliance with these orders was to be required prior to issuance of a C of O for the property, a condition of sale for a Category II vacant building. The responsible party at the time (the executor of the previous owner's estate) appealed the order. It does not appear that the appeal was granted, but DSI Zoning agreed to removal of the basement unit in lieu of the required alternations to the first and second floor units.

5. On or about August 20, 2012, a DSI inspector met with the executor and Brett Ripley (the applicant) at the property and informed them that the structure was eligible for a C of O as a three-family dwelling, provided compliance with the previous order and that a fire separation between the first and second floors was established. According to City records, the sale of the home to the applicant was scheduled to close on August 29, 2012, and a new Certificate of Occupancy was issued in January 2013.
6. Zoning Code § 62.102 states: *"A use or structure will be presumed legally nonconforming if it can be demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence that prior to October 25, 1975, the use or structure was established, converted, or expanded and occupied pursuant to building permits issued by the city; if the use or structure was allowed in its location at the time it was established; or if it can be demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence that the particular use or structure has been in existence continuously since December 13, 1956. The burden of proof shall be on the property owner. ...the planning commission may approve permits granting legal nonconforming status to uses or structures that do not meet these standards as set forth in section 62.109(a) and (b)".* Based upon clear and convincing evidence that use of the house at 1685 Taylor Avenue as a two-family dwelling was established under the old "B" Residence zoning that allowed a two-family dwelling at this location, use of the house as a two-family dwelling can be presumed to have had legal nonconforming status under the current R4 one-family residential zoning.
7. Zoning Code § 62.106(h) states: *"When a legal nonconforming use is discontinued or ceases to exist for a continuous period of more than one (1) year, the building, or building and land in combination shall thereafter be used in conformance with the regulations of the district in which it is located, unless the planning commission approves a permit to reestablish the nonconforming use as set forth in section 62.109(e). A residential building vacant for more than one (1) year may be reestablished at the number of units for which it was originally constructed provided that it has not been physically converted to a fewer number of units".* It appears that the house at 1685 Taylor, which was originally constructed as a one-family dwelling and is located in the R4 one-family residential zoning district, lost its legal nonconforming status as a two-family dwelling when it was vacant from 2011-2013. Zoning Code § 62.106(h) provides that the legal nonconforming use may be reestablished as set forth in § 62.109(e).
8. Zoning Code § 62.109(e) states: *When a legal nonconforming use of a structure, or structure and land in combination, is discontinued or ceases to exist for a continuous period of more than one (1) year, the planning commission may permit the reestablishment of a nonconforming use if the commission makes the following findings:*

- (1) *The structure, or structure and land in combination, cannot reasonably or economically be used for a conforming purpose.* This finding is met for reestablishment of legal nonconforming use of the house as a 2-family dwelling or (based on findings of previous zoning administrators and other City building officials) as a 3-family dwelling, but not as a 4-family dwelling. While the house was originally constructed as a one-family dwelling, which it was designed for, it is a relatively large house that was legally converted to a two-family dwelling several decades ago, and it would not be reasonable or economical to require conversion back to a one-family dwelling now. It appears that the house could reasonably and economically be used as a 2-family or 3-family dwelling.
- (2) *The proposed use is equally appropriate or more appropriate to the district than the previous legal nonconforming use.* This finding is met for reestablishment of legal nonconforming use of the house as a two-family dwelling or (based on findings of previous zoning administrators and other City building officials) as a 3-family dwelling, but not as a 4-family dwelling. Based upon clear and convincing evidence that use of the house as a two-family dwelling was established under the old "B" Residence zoning that allowed a two-family dwelling at this location, use of the house as a two-family dwelling can be presumed to have had legal nonconforming status in the current R4 one-family residential zoning district under the requirements for this in Zoning Code § 62.102. Use of the house as a two-family dwelling is equally appropriate to the R4 one-family residential district as the previous legal nonconforming use of the house as a two-family dwelling. Use of the house as a 3-family dwelling is equally appropriate to the R4 one-family residential district as the previous use of the house as a 3-family dwelling that a City inspector told the applicant in 2012 was eligible for a C of O, and for which a C of O was issued in 2013.
- (3) *The proposed use will not be detrimental to the existing character of development in the immediate neighborhood or endanger the public health, safety, or general welfare.* This finding is met. The structure has been used for up to four units with no indication that it was detrimental to the existing character of development in the immediate neighborhood or that it endangered the public health, safety, or general welfare.
- (4) *The proposed use is consistent with the comprehensive plan.* This finding is met. This property is located in an area that the Comprehensive Plan gives a future land use designation of "Established Neighborhood", described as a "*predominantly residential area with a range of housing types. Single family houses and duplexes predominate, although there may be smaller scale multifamily housing scattered within these neighborhoods*". The Hamline Midway Community Plan advocates for "*the development of alternatives to single family housing throughout the neighborhood*".
- (5) *A notarized petition of at least two-thirds of the owners of the described parcels of real estate within one hundred (100) feet of the subject property has been submitted stating their support for the use.* This finding is met. The petition was found sufficient on April 6, 2018: 16 parcels eligible; 11 parcels required; 11 parcels signed.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Saint Paul Planning Commission, under the authority of the City's Legislative Code, based on the findings above, that the application of Brett Ripley for reestablishment of a legal nonconforming use of the house at 1685 Taylor Avenue is hereby denied for a 4-family dwelling, and approved for a 2- or 3-family dwelling subject to the following condition:

1. A fire C of O inspection shall be scheduled within one year from the date of approval.

From: [Rebecca Holman](#)
To: [Williams, Josh \(CI-StPaul\)](#)
Cc: [Brett Ripley](#)
Subject: Housing at 1685 W Taylor
Date: Thursday, April 26, 2018 7:16:45 AM

Hello,

I'm writing for Brett and Laura Ripley to let you know that I am a current tenant at their property (1685 W Taylor Ave, Saint Paul MN 55104). I want to let you know that the house divided up into four units works just fine as is. It wouldn't make sense to combine them. Brett and Laura are wonderful landlords and they take care of maintenance issues right away.

Best regards,

Rebecca

From: Ruthie Mathews
To: Williams, Josh (CI-StPaul)
Cc: Josh Mathews
Subject: 1685 W. Taylor Avenue
Date: Wednesday, April 25, 2018 9:45:27 PM

Dear Josh,

Our names are Josh and Ruthie Mathews and we lived at 1685 W. Taylor Avenue in 2013 and 2014.

We wanted to reach out regarding their application for a fourth unit. Brett and Laura were great tenants: they cared about us, about the house, and about the neighborhood. When we moved in, they gave us a rundown of the neighborhood, introduced us to neighbors, and made us feel like a part of the community. It was obvious that they were connected to the neighborhood and wanted good for it.

The house itself is was in good shape and Brett made efforts to update it as well. After living in it, it very clearly is a distinct four-unit building. There are separate entrances for each unit and a clear sense of privacy in each unit. To use the building as three-units would require drastic restructuring and an odd configuration for the units being combined. We would whole-heartedly recommend maintaining the current structural layout of the house as a four-unit building.

Hope this email finds you well, Josh. If you have any questions, feel free to reach out to us. Our number is 262-620-3569.

Warmly,

Josh and Ruthie Mathews

From: molddoctor@minnesotamolddoctor.com
To: [Williams, Josh \(CI-StPaul\)](#)
Subject: variance: 16985 Taylor Avenue, Saint Paul 55104
Date: Wednesday, April 25, 2018 7:38:13 PM

If the variance can be for specifically the current owners, it has my full support but if the variance goes with the property am I a bit hesitant. At one time there were parking problems. They have been resolved. The current tenants and landlord are considerate.

If the property were to be sold, I would be more comfortable in it reverting to three apartments until more is known about any potential new owner.

Stephanie Digby
1682 Taylor Avenue
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55104
651 642 1288

From: Lauren Chesnut
To: Williams, Josh (CI-StPaul)
Subject: 1685 Taylor Avenue
Date: Wednesday, April 25, 2018 11:07:26 PM

Dear Mr. Williams,

I wanted to get in touch with you regarding our current home, Apartment 2 of 1685 W. Taylor Ave, owned by Brett and Laura Ripley. My husband and I have lived here on the second floor for the past four and a half years. We love this place and hope to continue living here for the foreseeable future. The number of current units in the house works great. Each of the units is very spacious, and it wouldn't really make much sense to combine them in any way. Brett and Laura are great landlords who are very responsive, as well as generous people.

We like 1685 the way it is now, and hope it won't have to change any time soon.

Thanks for your consideration,
Lauren Chesnut

419.494.3350

From: Jon Neal
To: Williams, Josh (CI-StPaul)
Subject: Support of the Ripleys
Date: Wednesday, April 25, 2018 9:34:47 PM

Hello Josh,

My name is Jon Neal, and I'm a previous tenant of 1685 Taylor Ave. I wanted to email to show my support of Brett and Laura Ripley. The house is clearly laid out as a 4-plex, and it would not make any sense to combine any of the units. The Ripleys are great landlords, and clearly care about the neighborhood. Thank you for your consideration.

From: [Carol Imsdahl](#)
To: [Williams, Josh \(CI-StPaul\)](#)
Cc: brettriple@gmail.com
Subject: 1685 Taylor Ave St. Paul MN
Date: Wednesday, April 25, 2018 6:47:46 PM

Dear Josh,

I am writing to say I feel the property at 1685 Taylor Ave in St. Paul should be allowed to be turned back into a four unit apartment building. Since it was built to be a four unit apartment I see no reason why it should not be turned back into one. I live right next door and have never had a problem with the owners or any tenants that have lived there.

The owners, Brett and Laura Ripley are very responsible, conscientious landlords. They maintain the property and live just a few blocks away if any problems should occur.

Thank you for your time.

Regards,
Carol Imsdahl
1689 Taylor Ave. St. Paul, MN

Owners' reply to Staff Report

First, on multiple occasions the City has determined it is a legal triplex.

In 2012 the Zoning Administrator determined it was a legal triplex.

In 2014 the Planning Commission made a Finding of Fact, based on a Staff Report, that the property is a legal nonconforming triplex. That finding was correct then, is valid now and can be relied upon.

In 2017, the Legislative Hearing Officer also made a finding that the property was a legal nonconforming triplex (see minutes below).

Secondly, DSI – the department which issues zoning letters to property purchasers – informed Brett Ripley before he purchased the property that the structure was eligible for a certificate of occupancy as a triplex. He and Laura would not have purchased the property if it were only a duplex or single family.

Thirdly, it properly became a legal nonconforming four unit building in 1975 and continued as such until 2006, based upon the following:

- A duplex was a permitted use in the B zoning in effect from 1922 to 1975.
- In 1955 there is evidence that it had been converted to multi-family (flats).
- In 1959 a building permit application shows it was used as a duplex.
- Permit issued Feb. 20, 1959 is for an exterior staircase (for an entrance to a separate dwelling unit).
- It was conforming.
- After 1975, when the code was changed, it was presumed legally nonconforming.
- Existing legal nonconforming 2 family uses may be expanded (Sec. 62.106(m)).
- It was expanded at that time and used as a 4 plex from 1975-2006.
- § 62.102, subd. 1 simply creates a presumption that certain nonconforming uses are lawful without prohibiting the continuance of other existing uses. Hooper v. St. Paul, 353 N.W.2d 138 (1984).
- Therefore, it has been a legal nonconforming 4 plex from 1975-2006.
- It may have lost legal non-conforming status.

The owner seeks to re-establish that legal non-conforming status as a 4 plex.

*Findings
that it
was a
legal
non-conforming*

Minutes note:

Brett Ripley, owner, appeared. Fire Supervisor A.J. Neis: -noted that Supervisor James Perucca is also here today -complaint inspection: building is illegally occupied; 1685 Taylor Ave used to be a legal nonconforming 4-plex -as zoning rules had changed, the previous owner had decided to use 2 of the units for herself for over a year; it became a triplex; now, it's a legal nonconforming triplex; it's in a district that doesn't allow multi-family housing -the Appellant purchased the property & was aware that it was going to be used as a triplex; the Appellant lived in the home so it was not subject to a fire inspection; since he has moved into a different home, the property is still being used as a triplex -there was some confusion on the inspector's part because he wasn't quite clear on the occupancy rules -the Appellant had been renting out the 4th unit illegally for Airb&b for additional income, thinking that he was compliant because it wasn't "technically" occupied; he was also using it for his parents' holiday visits, etc, which would have been fine had he lived there (it would have been part of his unit) -the kitchen needs to be taken out of the 4th unit; if removed, it's back to a legal nonconforming triplex Ms. Moermond: -and that space could be added to an adjacent unit -so, you abated the Orders for the removal of the kitchen back in 2012 Mr. Neis: -I believe that was under the previous ownership; the owner had agreed to use that all as one space; they were going to use it as an entertainment area -there is no code requirement that says a single family home can not have 2 kitchens; if they agreed to use that & it was owner-occupied.... we would allow that Mr. Ripley: -we have a 4-plex that's zoned as a triplex Ms. Moermond: -I think it's zoned as a duplex and you have a legal nonconforming triplex Mr. Ripley: -the option of combining it doesn't make economic sense & so, we have an extra unit -it seems a bit wild that we own this building & our parents can't stay/live there -we live 2 blocks away Ms. Moermond: -have you considered filing for an appeal with the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA)? Mr. Neis: -the BZA denied it Mr. Ripley: -we got all our neighbors' signatures; we really tried to do this the right way -I figured that I could find some way to use this space; the lower unit has just 1 bedroom Mr. Neis: -you knew this when you bought it; you knew it was a triplex -we do sympathize; the space is safe; habitable; it's just the zoning Ms. Moermond: -I can't change the BZA's decision -City Council Public Hearing is Nov 1, 2017 Deny the appeal.

Action:

Referred

Action text:

Referred to the City Council due back on 11/1/2017

city of saint paul
planning commission resolution
file number
date

WHEREAS, Michael Colestock, File # 18-059-805, has applied for a conditional use permit and variance for a supportive housing facility to serve 7 adult facility residents and their dependents under the provisions of § 65.161, § 61.501, § 61.601, and § 61.202(b) of the Saint Paul Legislative Code, on property located at 903 Beech St., Parcel Identification Number (PIN) 33.29.22.22.0013, legally described as Lot 22, Stinson's Subdivision of Block 111, Lyman Dayton's Addition; and

WHEREAS, the Zoning Committee of the Planning Commission, on May 24, 2018, held a public hearing at which all persons present were given an opportunity to be heard pursuant to said application in accordance with the requirements of §61.303 of the Saint Paul Legislative Code; and

WHEREAS, the Saint Paul Planning Commission, based on the evidence presented to its Zoning Committee at the public hearing as substantially reflected in the minutes, made the following findings of fact:

1. Zoning Code § 65.161 lists three standards and conditions for supportive housing that apply to the subject application:
 - (a) *The facility shall be a minimum distance of 1,320 feet from any other of the following congregate living facilities with more than four (4) adult residents, except in B4-B5 business districts where it shall be at least 600 feet from any other such facility: supportive housing facility, licensed correctional community residential facility, emergency housing facility, shelter for battered persons, or overnight shelter.* This condition is met. The nearest such facility is about 2,100 feet to the west at 680 Greenbrier Street.
 - (b) *In RL-RT1 residential districts, the facility shall serve six (6) or fewer facility residents. In RT2 residential, traditional neighborhood, OS-B3 business and IT-I2 industrial districts, the facility shall serve 16 or fewer facility residents.* This condition is not met. The applicant has requested a variance from the strict enforcement of this requirement in order to permit a supportive housing facility to serve mothers recovering from substance abuse and their children, including seven (7) adults plus an unspecified number of their dependents, in a single-family house that is zoned RT1 two-family residential.
 - (c) *In residential and T1 traditional neighborhood districts, a conditional use permit is required for facilities serving seven (7) or more facility residents.* The applicant has requested a conditional use permit for a supportive housing facility to serve mothers recovering from substance abuse and their children, including seven (7) adults plus an

moved by _____
seconded by _____
in favor _____
against _____

unspecified number of their dependents, in a single-family house that is zoned RT1 two-family residential.

2. In December 2015, the City of Saint Paul approved a congregate living zoning study that combined three types of congregate living into the single category of “supportive housing facility.” One type, “health department licensed community residential facility” was not permitted in the RT1 zoning district. Another type, “human services department licensed community residential facility” was limited to six (6) facility residents (of any age) in the RT1 zoning district, which became the model for the new umbrella category of “supportive housing facility.” The third type, “transitional housing facility” was limited to six (6) adult facility residents and minor children in their care. The subject application’s use would have been categorized as “transitional housing facility” prior to December 2015, as were two other facilities operated by the same applicant that were approved earlier in 2015. If the old transitional housing facility rules still applied, the subject application would require a conditional use permit because it exceeds four (4) adult facility residents and would be limited to six (6) adult facility residents because it is in an RT1 residential district.
3. Zoning Code § 61.601 states that the Planning Commission shall have the power to grant variances from the strict enforcement of the provisions of this code upon a finding that:
 - (a) *The variance is in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the zoning code.* This finding is met if the number of adult facility residents is limited to six (6). The general purposes and intent of the zoning code include promoting and protecting the general welfare of the community, encouraging a compatible mix of land uses that reflect the character of Saint Paul’s existing traditional neighborhoods, and providing housing choice and housing affordability. The variance application states that there is an extensive need for supportive housing for mothers recovering from substance abuse and their children; providing such housing promotes the general welfare of the community. Limiting the use to six adult facility residents is consistent with the intent and purpose of the code to limit the occupancy to six facility residents in the RT1 district to be compatible with the surrounding land use. Providing for their children is consistent with the general welfare of the community and with economical use of this large, 6-bedroom house to provide affordable housing for mothers and their children. *The variance is consistent with the comprehensive plan.* This finding is met. The proposed variance is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan’s Housing Chapter, which supports a broad range of housing types in city neighborhoods (Strategy H1.1), and with the Land Use Chapter (Figure LU-B) designation of the site as part of an Established Neighborhood in which the existing character should be maintained (Strategy LU1.5). Full use of this large 6-bedroom house with the addition of children will not change the character of the neighborhood.
 - (b) *The applicant has established that there are practical difficulties in complying with the provision; that the property owner proposes to use the property in a reasonable manner not permitted by the provision. Economic considerations alone do not constitute practical difficulties.* This finding is met. The variance would allow reasonable use of the house for families rather than separating mothers from their children or serving only people without children.
 - (c) *The plight of the landowner is due to circumstances unique to the property not created by the landowner.* This finding is met. This uniquely large, 6-bedroom, 2-bathroom house is well-suited to the proposed supportive housing for 6 mothers and their dependent children.

- (d) *The variance will not permit any use that is not allowed in the zoning district where the affected land is located.* This finding is met. Supportive housing facilities are allowed in the RT1 zoning district.
 - (e) *The variance will not alter the essential character of the surrounding area.* This finding is met if the number of adult facility residents is limited to six (6). The addition of children will not alter the essential character of the surrounding area.
4. Zoning Code § 61.501 lists five general standards that must be met for the Planning Commission to grant approval of a conditional use permit:
- (a) *The extent, location and intensity of the use will be in substantial compliance with the Saint Paul Comprehensive Plan and any applicable subarea plans which were approved by the city council.* This condition is met. The proposed supportive housing use is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Housing Chapter, which supports a broad range of housing types in city neighborhoods (Strategy H1.1), and with the Land Use Chapter (Figure LU-B) designation of the site as part of an Established Neighborhood in which the existing character should be maintained (Strategy LU1.5). The addition of children will not change the character of the area.
 - (b) *The use will provide adequate ingress and egress to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets.* This condition is met. The site has a two car-garage and room for two surface parking spaces accessed via the alley and can use on-street parking on Beech Street. The traffic impact of the facility is anticipated to be similar to residential uses allowed in the zoning district.
 - (c) *The use will not be detrimental to the existing character of the development in the immediate neighborhood or endanger the public health, safety and general welfare.* This condition is met. The proposed use is similar in anticipated traffic and noise impact to the site's previous use. Additionally, there is substantial nearby on-street parking available. No building expansion is proposed. The use will not be detrimental to the existing character of development in the area or endanger the public health, safety and general welfare.
 - (d) *The use will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property for uses permitted in the district.* This condition is met. The surrounding area is developed and the proposed use will have no effect on improvement of surrounding property.
 - (e) *The use shall, in all other respects, conform to the applicable regulations of the district in which it is located.* Subject to limiting the number of adult facility residents to six (6) and to the variance discussed in Finding 3 to provide for the dependent children in their care, the use will conform to all other applicable RT1 district regulations.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Saint Paul Planning Commission, under the authority of the City's Legislative Code, that the application of Michaelene Colestock for a conditional use permit and variance for a supportive housing facility to serve 7 adult facility residents and their dependents at 903 Beech St. is hereby approved with the following condition:.

1. The facility shall be limited to six (6) adult facility residents, along with the dependent children in their care.

From: Deanna j Layer [mailto:layerdj@icloud.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 17, 2018 1:17 PM
To: Dermody, Bill (CI-StPaul) <bill.dermody@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Subject: 7 adult facility

NO it would bring problems. No way

We live on Beech St We been on this Street since 1962 . Closes to Forest .

city of saint paul
planning commission resolution
file number
date

WHEREAS, Michaelene Colestock, File # 18-059-899, has applied for a conditional use permit and variance for supportive housing facility to serve 6 adult facility residents and their dependents under the provisions of § 65.161, § 61.501, § 61.601, and § 61.202(b) of the Saint Paul Legislative Code, on property located at 884 Hyacinth Ave. E., Parcel Identification Number (PIN) 21.29.22.33.0042, legally described as Ex. E 20 ft. Lot 1 and all of Lot 2, Malmquists Addition; and

WHEREAS, the Zoning Committee of the Planning Commission, on May 24, 2018, held a public hearing at which all persons present were given an opportunity to be heard pursuant to said application in accordance with the requirements of §61.303 of the Saint Paul Legislative Code; and

WHEREAS, the Saint Paul Planning Commission, based on the evidence presented to its Zoning Committee at the public hearing as substantially reflected in the minutes, made the following findings of fact:

1. Zoning Code § 65.161 lists three standards and conditions for supportive housing that apply to the subject application:
 - (a) *The facility shall be a minimum distance of 1,320 feet from any other of the following congregate living facilities with more than four (4) adult residents, except in B4-B5 business districts where it shall be at least 600 feet from any other such facility: supportive housing facility, licensed correctional community residential facility, emergency housing facility, shelter for battered persons, or overnight shelter. This condition is met. The nearest such facility is about 1,520 feet to the south at 917 Jessamine Ave E.*
 - (b) *In RL-RT1 residential districts, the facility shall serve six (6) or fewer facility residents. In RT2 residential, traditional neighborhood, OS-B3 business and IT-I2 industrial districts, the facility shall serve 16 or fewer facility residents. This condition is not met. The applicant has requested a variance from the strict enforcement of this requirement in order to permit a supportive housing facility to serve mothers recovering from substance abuse and their children, including six (6) adults plus an unspecified number of their dependents, in a single-family house that is zoned R4 one-family residential.*
 - (c) *In residential and T1 traditional neighborhood districts, a conditional use permit is required for facilities serving seven (7) or more facility residents. The applicant has requested a conditional use permit for a supportive housing facility to serve mothers recovering from substance abuse and their children, including six (6) adults plus an*

moved by _____
seconded by _____
in favor _____
against _____

unspecified number of their dependents, in a single-family house that is zoned R4 one-family residential.

2. In December 2015, the City of Saint Paul approved a congregate living zoning study that combined three types of congregate living into the single category of "supportive housing facility." One type, "health department licensed community residential facility" was not permitted in the R4 zoning district. Another type, "human services department licensed community residential facility" was limited to six (6) facility residents (of any age) in the R4 zoning district, which became the model for the new umbrella category of "supportive housing facility." The third type, "transitional housing facility" was limited to six (6) adult facility residents and minor children in their care. The subject application's use would have been categorized as "transitional housing facility" prior to December 2015, as were two other facilities operated by the same applicant that were approved earlier in 2015. If the old transitional housing facility rules still applied, the subject application would require a conditional use permit because it exceeds four (4) adult facility residents and would be limited to six (6) adult facility residents because it is in an R4 residential district.
3. Zoning Code § 61.601 states that the Planning Commission shall have the power to grant variances from the strict enforcement of the provisions of this code upon a finding that:
 - (a) *The variance is in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the zoning code.* This finding is met. The general purposes and intent of the zoning code include promoting and protecting the general welfare of the community, encouraging a compatible mix of land uses that reflect the character of Saint Paul's existing traditional neighborhoods, and providing housing choice and housing affordability. The variance application states that there is an extensive need for supportive housing for mothers recovering from substance abuse and their children; providing such housing promotes the general welfare of the community.
 - (b) *The variance is consistent with the comprehensive plan.* This finding is met. The proposed variance is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Housing Chapter, which supports a broad range of housing types in city neighborhoods (Strategy H1.1), and with the Land Use Chapter (Figure LU-B) designation of the site as part of an Established Neighborhood in which the existing character should be maintained (Strategy LU1.5). The addition of children to six (6) adult facility residents will not change the character of the neighborhood.
 - (c) *The applicant has established that there are practical difficulties in complying with the provision; that the property owner proposes to use the property in a reasonable manner not permitted by the provision. Economic considerations alone do not constitute practical difficulties.* This finding is met. The proposed use, supportive housing for mothers and their dependent children, is unique and presents practical difficulties in complying with this provision.
 - (d) *The plight of the landowner is due to circumstances unique to the property not created by the landowner.* This finding is met. Although the 4-bedroom, 1.5-bathroom house on the lot is not a uniquely large facility nor unique in any other way, the area dimensions of the house in all respects complies with the requirements of the zoning code as do the area dimensions of the zoning lot on which the house is located. The requested variance goes to the number of residents permitted to reside in the structure. The applicant's unique "plight" therefore goes to the number of residents permitted under the zoning and does not implicate in any manner anything having to do with the land. Accordingly, for the purposes of this variance, this condition is met.
 - (e) *The variance will not permit any use that is not allowed in the zoning district where the*

affected land is located. This finding is met. Supportive housing facilities are allowed in the R4 zoning district.

- (f) *The variance will not alter the essential character of the surrounding area.* This finding is met. The addition of children to the six (6) adult facility residents will not alter the essential character of the surrounding area.
4. Zoning Code § 61.501 lists five general standards that must be met for the Planning Commission to grant approval of a conditional use permit:
- (a) *The extent, location and intensity of the use will be in substantial compliance with the Saint Paul Comprehensive Plan and any applicable subarea plans which were approved by the city council.* This condition is met. The proposed supportive housing use is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Housing Chapter, which supports a broad range of housing types in city neighborhoods (Strategy H1.1), and with the Land Use Chapter (Figure LU-B) designation of the site as part of an Established Neighborhood in which the existing character should be maintained (Strategy LU1.5). The addition of children will not change the character of the area.
 - (b) *The use will provide adequate ingress and egress to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets.* This condition is met. The site has a one-car garage and room for two surface parking spaces accessed via the alley and can use on-street parking on Hyacinth Avenue and Mendota Street. The traffic impact of the facility is anticipated to be similar to residential uses allowed in the zoning district.
 - (c) *The use will not be detrimental to the existing character of the development in the immediate neighborhood or endanger the public health, safety and general welfare.* This condition is met. The proposed use is similar in anticipated traffic and noise impact to the site's previous use. Additionally, there is substantial nearby on-street parking available. No building expansion is proposed. The use will not be detrimental to the existing character of development in the area or endanger the public health, safety and general welfare.
 - (d) *The use will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property for uses permitted in the district.* This condition is met. The surrounding area is developed and the proposed use will have no effect on improvement of surrounding property.
 - (e) *The use shall, in all other respects, conform to the applicable regulations of the district in which it is located.* This condition is not met, which is the subject of the accompanying variance. The proposed use does not conform to the requirement in Zoning Code § 65.161 that limits supportive housing facilities to six (6) or fewer facility residents in an R4 one-family residential district.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Saint Paul Planning Commission, under the authority of the City's Legislative Code, that the application of Michaelene Colestock for a conditional use permit and variance for supportive housing facility to serve 6 adult facility residents and their dependents at 884 Hyacinth Ave. E. is hereby approved.



Payne-Phalen

COMMUNITY COUNCIL

567 Payne Avenue, St. Paul MN 55130 www.paynephallen.org 651-774-5234 district5@paynephallen.org

May 24, 2018

Zoning Committee
Saint Paul Planning Commission
25 W 4th Street, 1400 CHA
Saint Paul MN 55102

Re: 884 Hyacinth Ave E, File #18-059-899
Conditional Use Permit

Dear Zoning Board:

At its May 22nd meeting, the Payne-Phalen Community Council voted to offer a letter of support for the variance requested at 884 Hyacinth, to support sober women and their children.

Sincerely,

Lissa Jones-Lofgren
Interim Executive Director

May 17, 2018

To: Mayor Melvin Carter

File # 18-059-899

File Name: Michaelene Colestock

From Karen Landkamer

Re: property at 884 Hyacinth Avenue East, St Paul MN 55106

Dear Mayor Carter,

I have received a notice from the Department of Planning and Economic Development that has prompted me to write the attached letter.

I wish to oppose the plans to convert 884 Hyacinth Avenue East into a Residential Facility for recovering women and their dependents. Apparently the plans are to allow for six women and their children.

The house being considered is a one family home with three bedrooms, I do not feel this can be comfortable for parties involved and I have qualms about letting this home become a rental property. I understand there are three parking spaces behind the house and a large percentage of the residents do not own cars. Might there be many visitors at this residence when it is full? This could present problems for the surrounding neighbors.

My husband and I have lived at 887 Hyacinth Avenue East for 54 years and we have a very nice neighborhood with new families coming in plus some long time residents besides ourselves.

I hope my letter will be considered before this is approved. If you have any questions of me you may call me at 651-774-7620.

Sincerely,

Karen Landkamer

887 Hyacinth Avenue East

St Paul MN 55106

651-774-7620

CC: Bill Dermody, City of St Paul, Planning and Development

Mayor Melvin Carter, Mayor of St Paul MN

From: Barb Pecks
To: Dermody, Bill (CI-StPaul)
Subject: variance for 884 Hyacinth Ave E
Date: Thursday, May 24, 2018 8:18:52 AM

I want to voice my concerns regarding the variance request for the a 3 bedroom 1 bath, single family home at 884 Hyacinth Ave. E. in St Paul, file #18-059-899.

I am opposed to the variance on the grounds that I believe putting 6 adults and their children in a 3 bedroom 1 bath home is not the best living environment. I believe modifications have been made to turn the home into a 4 bedroom 1.5 bath house but I believe this still is not the best environment for a families during recovery. During my district planning meeting on Tuesday evening all neighbors to the house opposed the variance. The committee voted to grant a letter of support. A suggestion from a committee member to run the program for a year and build relationships with the community and neighbors before requesting a variance was ignored.

I would ask that the planning committee consider a 1 bedroom 1 adult policy for this facility.

Sincerely

Barb Pecks
876 Orange Ave E

From: Christian Schweitzer
To: Englund, Cherie (CI-StPaul)
Subject: 884 Hyacinth CUP application
Date: Thursday, May 24, 2018 11:24:33 AM

Dear Ms. Englund,

Thank you for taking the time this morning to answer my questions. Please relay the following information to members of the Zoning Committee in time for this afternoon's hearing on the 884 Hyacinth CUP application.

My full contact info is:

Chris Schweitzer
440 Montana Ave. E
Saint Paul, MN 55130
651-271-6253

I am a member of the Payne-Phalen Community Council board but today I am contacting the committee on my own behalf and on behalf of the many neighbors of the 884 Hyacinth house who attended the recent PPCC meeting in vocal opposition to the CUP application.

You will see that the PPCC has elected to send a letter of support to this CUP despite my own opposition and the opposition of every neighbor in attendance at that meeting. Please note that the board vote to support the CUP was not unanimous and was taken after a contentious hearing.

I write to emphasise the following points:

- 1) No one opposes the stated mission of the Sober House at 884 Hyacinth or the house as it operates today, though some neighbors voiced serious concerns. The opposition regards the proposal to expand the permissible occupancy of the house by 50%, from 4 adult women and their minor children, to 6 adult women and their minor children.
- 2) The house at 884 Hyacinth is a very small house even for the number of persons currently in occupancy - there is some dispute as to the number of bedrooms (city staff says 3, Ms.Colestock insists 4) but the proposed CUP would increase the allowed number of persons residing in the Sober House up to 12-20 (six adults plus 1-3 minor children per adult). That's AT LEAST three humans in each bedroom, with the possibility to increase that up to five per bedroom.
- 3) At the PPCC hearing, a community member spoke up as a former Chemical Dependency worker on the importance of having a tranquil, low-stress environment for success in long-term recovery. As mentioned this is a small house, and filling it up with vulnerable women and their children will make the house a constantly noisy stressful environment for the resident/clients and their neighbors. **Increasing the occupancy in this fashion will inevitably damage the ability of the resident clients to successfully meet their recovery goals AND impact the neighborhood negatively in the form of increased noise, drama, and police calls.**

4) Ms. Colestock emphasizes the unique nature of her company's services, being the only Sober House provider which accepts children. I urge the committee to ask WHY, given the obvious demand among potential clients, no other recovery provider in the area does this? Is it appropriate for this category of recovery client to be cohabiting with children at this stage of recovery?

5) Ms Colestock also argues that increasing the number of persons in the 884 Hyacinth house is justified because, unless she is allowed to place more clients there, those clients will be relegated to homelessness. I would counter that this type of argument could be used to justify ignoring any regulation on her business. In my view, your (and her) first responsibility is to the clients already in her care and her neighbors. Permitting this increase would allow Ms. Colestock to operate 884 Hyacinth in a fashion that fails to fulfill those responsibilities.

It's clear to me the only party that would benefit from this proposal would be Ms Colestock and her for-profit corporation, Spence Specialties LLC.

Regards,

Chris Schweitzer

city of saint paul
planning commission resolution
file number
date

WHEREAS, Khue Thi Dang, File # 18-058-139, has applied for a conditional use permit for an auto repair shop with modification of conditions for minimum lot area (15,000 sq. ft. required, 7,160 sq. ft. available) and landscaped buffer next to residential property (10 ft. required, 7 ft. proposed), under the provisions of § 65.705, § 61.501, and § 61.502 of the Saint Paul Legislative Code, on property located at 71 Annapolis St. W., Parcel Identification Number (PIN) 07.28.22.44.0115, legally described as McManigal and Varney's Rearrangement of Block 17 of Jackson & Bidwell's Addition, S 78 ft. of fol. E 14.5 ft. of Lot 12 and all of Lots 13 and 14; and

WHEREAS, the Zoning Committee of the Planning Commission, on May 24, 2018, held a public hearing at which all persons present were given an opportunity to be heard pursuant to said application in accordance with the requirements of § 61.303 of the Saint Paul Legislative Code; and

WHEREAS, the Saint Paul Planning Commission, based on the evidence presented to its Zoning Committee at the public hearing as substantially reflected in the minutes, made the following findings of fact:

1. The application is for a conditional use permit for an auto repair station, with modification of conditions for minimum lot area (15,000 sq. ft. required, 7,160 sq. ft. available) and landscaped buffer next to residential property (10 ft. required, 7 ft. proposed) . The expected hours of operation are 7 a.m. to 6 p.m. six days per week.
2. § 65.705 lists the following standards and conditions that an auto repair station must satisfy at this location:
 - (a) *The minimum lot area shall be fifteen thousand (15,000) square feet.* This condition is not met. The lot is 7,840 square feet. The applicant has requested a modification of this condition.
 - (b) *A ten-foot landscaped buffer with screen planting and an obscuring fence shall be required along any property line adjoining an existing residence or adjoining land zoned residential.* This condition can be met in part subject to installation of appropriate screen planting (to be determined as part of site plan review), and replacement of the deteriorated existing fence along the west property line with a new 4.5-foot high obscuring fence. The applicant has requested a modification of the ten foot buffer requirement (7 feet proposed) due to their inability to meet the ten-foot requirement. The submitted site plan does not include the required screen planting, which will need to be determined as part of the site plan review process. There is currently fencing located along both the northern and western property lines of this property: a six-foot

moved by _____
seconded by _____
in favor _____
against _____

high privacy fence on the north and a four-foot fence on the west. The fence on the western property line is in very poor condition. To meet the requirement, the existing fence along the west property line must be removed and replaced with a 4.5-foot obscuring fence.

- (c) *All repair work shall be done within an enclosed building.* This standard is met. The applicant will conduct all repair activities within the existing building.
 - (d) *There shall be no outside storage.* This standard is met. The submitted site plan does not indicate any outdoor storage areas.
3. § 61.501 lists five standards that all conditional uses must satisfy:
- (a) *The extent, location and intensity of the use will be in substantial compliance with the Saint Paul Comprehensive Plan and any applicable subarea plans which were approved by the city council.* This condition is met. This site is guided Residential Corridors, which is “predominated by medium density residential uses,” but is not limited to such use. Business Development Objective 1 of the West Side Community Plan states: “Reinvigorate the economy of the West Side through commercial/industrial start ups and business expansion;” and Strategy B1.2 states: “Attract businesses that will increase the diversity of products and neighborhood services available to residents and visitors.”
 - (b) *The use will provide adequate ingress and egress to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets.* This condition can be met subject to decreasing the width of the Stryker Avenue curb cut to 14 feet and just using it as exit from the property, with a sign identifying it as such. This existing curb cut is too close to the intersection. To decrease conflicts between vehicles attempting to enter the site from Stryker and those moving through the intersection, the driveway on Stryker should be narrowed to 14 feet and only used as an exit from the property. The “Do Not Enter” sign identified on the submitted site plan should be located closer to the curb cut.
 - (c) *The use will not be detrimental to the existing character of the development in the immediate neighborhood or endanger the public health, safety and general welfare.* This condition is met. This site has been used as an auto service station, an auto body shop, and mostly as a storage facility since the late 1940s. This property is one of three commercial properties in a small commercial node. Use of this property as an auto repair station will not be detrimental to the existing character of the neighborhood and will not endanger the public health, safety, and general welfare of the area.
 - (d) *The use will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property for uses permitted in the district.* This condition is met. This project reuses an existing site built for auto-related uses for an auto-related use. The parcels around this site are already developed.
 - (e) *The use shall, in all other respects, conform to the applicable regulations of the district in which it is located.* This condition is met.
4. The planning commission may approve modifications of special conditions when specific criteria of § 61.502 are met: *strict application of such special conditions would unreasonably limit or prevent otherwise lawful use of a piece of property or an existing structure and would result in exceptional undue hardship to the owner of such property or structure; provided, that such modification will not impair the intent and purpose of such special condition and is consistent with health, morals and general welfare of the community and is consistent with reasonable enjoyment of adjacent property.* This finding is met as strict application of both the minimum lot area requirement and 10-foot buffer would unreasonably limit the use of this property and structure, and result in exceptional hardship to the property owner. According

to City records, this site has been used as auto-related use since the late 1940s, and Ramsey County property records show the building was constructed in 1950. The minimum lot area standard for an auto repair station was adopted in 1975. Without a modification of the lot area condition, this building cannot be used for its intended use. This site currently has a 7-foot landscaped buffer adjacent to the western property line. Changing the existing paved parking lot to meet the 10-foot buffer requirement would result in loss of existing off-street parking. Modification of this condition would not impair the intent of the condition, which is buffering of the use from adjacent residentially used and zoned properties, provided that appropriate screen planting (to be determined as part of site plan review) is installed along the west property line, and the deteriorated existing fence along the west property line is replaced with a new 4.5 foot high obscuring fence.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Saint Paul Planning Commission, under the authority of the City's Legislative Code, that the application of Kue Thi Dang for a conditional use permit for an auto repair shop with modification of conditions for minimum lot area (15,000 sq. ft. required, 7,160 sq. ft. available) and landscaped buffer next to residential property (10 ft. required, 7 feet proposed) at 71 Annapolis St. W. is hereby approved with the following conditions:

1. Final plans approved by the Zoning Administrator for this use shall be in substantial compliance with the plan submitted as part of the conditional use permit application.
2. Installation of appropriate screen planting (to be determined as part of site plan review) along the west property line.
3. Replacement of the deteriorated existing fence along the west property line with a new 4.5 foot high obscuring fence.
4. Narrowing of the Stryker Avenue driveway to 14 feet.
5. Relocation of the "Do Not Enter" sign for the Stryker Avenue driveway from the location shown on the submitted site plan to a location closer to the curb cut.

city of saint paul
planning commission resolution
file number
date

WHEREAS, Geneet Kidane, File # 18-057-614, has applied for reestablishment of a nonconforming duplex with a variance of the consent petition requirement (owners of 13 parcels required, 6 signed) under the provisions of § 62.109(e), § 61.202(b), and § 61.601 of the Saint Paul Legislative Code, on property located at 758 Charles Ave., Parcel Identification Number (PIN) 35.29.23.13.0125, legally described as Chute Brothers Division No. 10, Lot 5; and

WHEREAS, the Zoning Committee of the Planning Commission, on May 24, 2018, held a public hearing at which all persons present were given an opportunity to be heard pursuant to said application in accordance with the requirements of §61.303 of the Saint Paul Legislative Code; and

WHEREAS, the Saint Paul Planning Commission, based on the evidence presented to its Zoning Committee at the public hearing as substantially reflected in the minutes, made the following findings of fact:

1. The application requests a variance of the consent petition requirement for reestablishment of a nonconforming use. Zoning Code § 61.601 states that the Planning Commission shall have the power to grant variances from the strict enforcement of the provisions of the Zoning Code based on the following required findings.
 - a) *The variance is in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the zoning code. This finding is met.* The applicant has made a good faith effort to contact property owners to obtain signatures on the consent petition, in harmony with the intent of this requirement. The applicant is requesting a variance from the strict enforcement of the consent petition requirement due to practical difficulties discussed in paragraph (c) below, in order to reestablish a duplex use that is consistent with the comprehensive plan and the general purposes and intent of the zoning code for this location. Two of the intentions of the Zoning Code are the following: § 60.103(i), *to encourage a compatible mix of land uses, at densities that support transit, that reflect the scale, character and urban design of Saint Paul's existing traditional neighborhoods;* and § 60.103(j), *to provide housing choice and housing affordability.* The subject parcel is within a quarter mile of light rail transit. The house has been a duplex since at least 1965. A duplex at this location is compatible with the surrounding mix of uses and development, and will add transit-supporting density within the central corridor.
 - b) *The variance is consistent with the comprehensive plan. This finding is met.* The subject parcel is within an established neighborhood, which is defined by the comprehensive plan as *areas characterized almost entirely by single family houses and*

moved by _____
seconded by _____
in favor _____
against _____

duplexes. The proposed reestablishment of the duplex is consistent with this general land designation as well as a number of policies in the comprehensive plan. LU-1.41 calls for promoting the development of a range of housing types and housing values in each of the 17 planning districts. LU-1.42 calls for promoting the development of housing in mixed-use neighborhoods that supports walking and the use of public transportation. H-1.1 calls for increasing housing choices across the city to support economically diverse neighborhoods. Strategy H1 of the District 7 Neighborhood Plan calls for preserving the existing housing stock by rehabilitating units to accommodate future use. A variance of the petition requirement will allow the duplex use to be reestablished, consistent with the general land use designation and the policies listed above.

- c) *The applicant has established that there are practical difficulties in complying with the provision; that the property owner proposes to use the property in a reasonable manner not permitted by the provision. Economic considerations alone do not constitute practical difficulties. This finding is met.* The applicant has attempted to obtain the required signatures of two thirds of the property owners within 100 feet to satisfy the consent petition requirement for more than a year. There are practical difficulties in complying with this in a neighborhood where the majority of the residents cannot sign consent petitions to fulfil this requirement for various zoning applications because they are not property owners. According the last five year estimate from the American Community Survey (2012-2016), 62% of the households in Frogtown were renter occupied. Within 100 feet of the subject parcel 30% (6 of 19 eligible parcels) are non-owner occupied parcels. In order for the applicant to satisfy the petition requirement, she would need to obtain 100% consent from the owner occupied properties within 100 feet.
 - d) *The plight of the landowner is due to circumstances unique to the property not created by the landowner. This finding is met.* The owner bought the property at auction from the county as a category II vacant building. In order to reestablish the duplex use, a number of code compliance repairs are required in addition to Planning Commission approval of a nonconforming use permit. The concentration of non-owner occupied properties, and the requirement that consent petitions can only be signed by property owners, is a unique circumstance that was not created by the landowner.
 - e) *The variance will not permit any use that is not allowed in the zoning district where the affected land is located. This finding is met.* The variance will simply allow the Planning Commission to consider approval of the application for reestablishment of nonconforming use of the house as a duplex.
 - f) *The variance will not alter the essential character of the surrounding area. This finding is met.* There is a mix of including housing types in the immediate area, including ten other nonconforming duplexes on the same block as the subject property. Varying the petition requirement in order to facilitate reestablishment of the nonconforming duplex will not alter the essential character of the surrounding area.
2. The duplex conversion guidelines adopted by the Planning Commission state that staff will recommend denial of applications for reestablishment of legal nonconforming status for a duplex in a residential district unless, in addition to the required findings in § 62.109(e) of the Zoning Code, the following guidelines are met:
- A. *Lot size of at least 5000 square feet with a lot width or front footage of 40 feet. This guideline is met.* The lot has 40 feet of frontage on Charles Avenue and the total lot area with half of the alley applied to the lot area requirement is 5280 sq. feet.

- B. *Gross living area, after completion of duplex conversion, of at least 1500 square feet. Neither unit shall be smaller than 500 square feet. This guideline is met. The total square footage of the structure is 1818 sq. feet. It is an up-down duplex with roughly 900 sq. foot units.*
 - C. *Three off-street parking spaces (non-stacked) are preferred; two spaces are the required minimum. This guideline met. There is a two car garage and a parking pad with two parking spaces on the property.*
 - D. *All remodeling work for the duplex is on the inside of the structure unless the plans for exterior changes are approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals as part of the variance. (The Planning Commission will approve these changes for the cases they handle.) This guideline is met. No changes exterior changes are proposed as a part of this application.*
 - E. *For the purpose of protecting the welfare and safety of the occupants of any structure that has been converted into a duplex without the necessary permits, a code compliance inspection shall be conducted and the necessary permits obtained to bring the entire structure into conformance with building and fire code standards; or the property owner must, as a condition of the approval, make the necessary improvements to obtain the necessary permits and bring the entire structure into building and fire code compliance within the time specified in the resolution. This guideline is met. The property was a category II vacant building. The applicant has brought one of the units up to code and is currently residing at the residence.*
3. Section 62.109(e) states: *When a legal nonconforming use of a structure, or structure and land in combination, is discontinued or ceases to exist for a continuous period of more than one (1) year, the planning commission may permit the reestablishment of a nonconforming use if the commission makes the following findings:*
- (1) *The structure, or structure and land in combination, cannot reasonably or economically be used for a conforming purpose. This finding is met. City records indicate that the subject structure has been a duplex since at least 1965. The structure is configured as an up-down duplex with separate kitchens, utilities, and entrances. The applicant has spent nearly \$70,000 rehabbing the structure and has been approved to occupy one of the units. Because of the existing layout as an up-down duplex and the property's long history as a two unit structure, this property cannot reasonably or economically be converted to a conforming single family residential use.*
 - (2) *The proposed use is equally appropriate or more appropriate to the district than the previous legal nonconforming use. This finding is met. The proposed duplex use is the same as the previous duplex use.*
 - (3) *The proposed use will not be detrimental to the existing character of development in the immediate neighborhood or endanger the public health, safety, or general welfare. This finding is met. According to city records this property has been a duplex since at least 1965 and there are ten other nonconforming duplexes on the block. The property was vacant since 2012 until the applicant purchased the property in 2015. Between 2002 and 2015, prior to the applicant obtaining the property, there were 40 complaints on record for the property for numerous property maintenance issues and crime. After the applicant acquired the property in 2015 there have only been two complaints against the property for rubbish, likely associated with the required construction to bring the property up to code. Considering the context of other nonconforming duplexes on the same block and the vast reduction in complaints filed against the property since the applicant acquired it, reestablishment of the nonconforming use will not be detrimental to the*

existing character of development in the immediate neighborhood or endanger the public health, safety, or general welfare.

- (4) *The proposed use is consistent with the comprehensive plan. This finding is met.* The subject parcel is within an established neighborhood, which is defined by the comprehensive plan as *areas characterized almost entirely by single family houses and duplexes*. The proposed reestablishment of the duplex is consistent with this general land designation as well as a number of policies in the comprehensive plan. LU-1.41 calls for promoting the development of a range of housing types and housing values in each of the 17 planning districts. LU-1.42 calls for promoting the development of housing in mixed-use neighborhoods that supports walking and the use of public transportation. Policy H-1.1 calls for increasing housing choices across the city to support economically diverse neighborhoods. Strategy H1 of the District 7 Neighborhood Plan calls for preserving the existing housing stock by rehabilitating units to accommodate future use.
- (5) *A notarized petition of at least two-thirds of the owners of the described parcels of real estate within one hundred (100) feet of the subject property has been submitted stating their support for the use.* The application includes a request for a variance of this petition requirement, which is addressed in Finding 1 above.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Saint Paul Planning Commission, under the authority of the City's Legislative Code, that the application of Geneet Kidane for reestablishment of a nonconforming duplex with a variance of the consent petition requirement (owners of 13 parcels required, 6 signed) at 758 Charles Ave. is hereby approved with the following condition:

1. The applicant shall adhere to all applicable code requirements and obtain a certificate of occupancy for the vacant second unit.

From: Johnson, Tony (CI-StPaul)
To: Englund, Cherie (CI-StPaul)
Subject: FW: 758 Single Family House RE: 18-057-614
Date: Wednesday, May 23, 2018 3:02:17 PM

From: D Cando [mailto:littledebbiek77@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 23, 2018 2:57 PM
To: Johnson, Tony (CI-StPaul)
Subject: Fw: 758 Single Family House RE: 18-057-614

From: D Cando <littledebbiek77@yahoo.com>

To: "tony.johnson@ci.stpaul.mn.us" <tony.johnson@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Sent: Wednesday, May 23, 2018 2:51 PM
Subject: 758 Single Family House
Re File #: 18-057-614

758 Charles Avenue was sold as a Single Family house.

Why? City of St. Paul, Ramsey County, and the State of Minnesota waited out the time (how much time? - no taxes paid for this waiting time?) to turn this previous duplex to a Single Family House because the prior owner did not pay taxes on this house for seven years (7 years + waiting time + 6 months fix up time -- no taxes paid).

When the 758 Charles Avenue house was sold, it was sold under the understanding that it was a Single Family House, plus it had a long list of things to repair within 6 months of the sold date. All of this information was clearly in writing for all people to consider, prior to buying the house.

To date, the 758 Charles Avenue house
is past due of the 6 months sold date, and
this SF house has many repairs to do to make it a Single Family House, and
no taxes has been paid on it for the 6 months to fix it up and to current date, and
13 signatures are needed from the neighbors, and only 6 signatures has been collected.

Im at 760 Charles Avenue.

When i first bought my house, I had two utility bills.

Geneet Kidane was sour she has two furnaces, two floors to heat, and two utility bills.
Some old houses have two furnaces to heat the house efficiently, no big deal.

I conversed with Geneet Kidane about 6 days ago. She told me this, "I don't pay taxes on this house, and whether it is a single family house or a duplex, i do not plan to pay taxes on this house. How can i afford to pay taxes on this house when I have my children to take care of?"

Please consider all the points made above. It seems to weigh towards and that the neighbors nearby prefer to want this 758 Charles Avenue single family house to remain a single family house, as there is not even 1/2 signatures required provided by Geneet Kidane.

If it is possible, we would like that the 6 months deadline to fixing up the house - the taxes are due starting at that point.

And, good luck attempting to collect taxes on this 758 Charles Avenue house, as, once again, based on the conversation i had with Geneet Kidane, she does not plan to pay taxes on the house or duplex, as she has her kids to take care of as her reasoning not to.

Debra Lee
760 Charles Avenue
St Paul MN 55104
612-836-8229