All meetings of the St. Louis Park Planning Commission will be conducted by telephone or other electronic means until further notice. This is in accordance with a local emergency declaration issued by Mayor Jake Spano March 16, 2020 in response to the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic. Additionally, city facilities are closed to the public in keeping with the Executive Orders 20-20 and 20-33 issued by Gov. Tim Walz directing Minnesotans to Stay at Home March 28 through May 4, 2020.

All members of the St. Louis Park Planning Commission will participate in the June 3, 2020 planning commission meeting by electronic device or telephone rather than by being personally present at the planning commission’s regular meeting place at 5005 Minnetonka Blvd.

Members of the public can monitor this meeting by video and audio at https://bit.ly/watchslppc and on local cable (Comcast SD channel 17, or CenturyLink SD channel 8117 and HD channel 8617) or by calling +1-312-535-8110 meeting number (access code): 359 770 50 for audio only. Cisco Webex will be used to conduct videoconference meetings of the planning commission, with planning commissioners and staff participating from multiple locations.

Those who wish to provide comments during the public hearing at this meeting can do so by calling 952-562-2888, and calls will be taken and heard by the commission in the order received.

AGENDA

1. Call to order – Roll Call

2. Approval of minutes – May 20, 2020

3. Hearings

   3a. Union Park Flats (Union Congregational Church project)
       Applicant: Project for Pride in Living
       Case No.: 20-03-CP, 20-04-S, 20-05-PUD

4. Other Business: None.

5. Communications

6. Adjournment

Auxiliary aids for individuals with disabilities are available upon request. To make arrangements, please call the administration department at 952.924.2525 (TDD 952.924.2518) at least 96 hours in advance of meeting.
MEMBERS PRESENT: Jim Beneke, Lynette Dumalag, Matt Eckholm, Courtney Erwin, Claudia Johnston-Madison, Jessica Kraft, Carl Robertson.

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Jacquelyn Kramer, Jennifer Monson, Sean Walther, Mara Strand

GUESTS: David Anderson, Frauenshuh, Inc; Jon Fahning, Bremer Bank; Jackie Miller, RSP Architects; Vicki VanDell, Loucks Associates

1. Call to Order – Roll Call

2. Approval of Minutes of April 15, 2020

Commissioner Beneke made a motion to approve the minutes. Commissioner Dumalag seconded the motion, and the motion passed on a vote of 7-0.

3. Public Hearings

A. Bremer Bank Conditional Use Permit

Applicant: David Anderson, Frauenshuh

Case Nos: 20-07-CUP

Ms. Kramer presented the report.

The applicant, Mr. Anderson of Frauenshuh, is applying for a CUP to build Bremer Bank and drive-thru at 7924 Highway 7. The area is a little over an acre in size. The property is guided commercial use. The existing building would be removed and the bank built on the site.

The CUP is requested to build the bank with two 24-hour drive-up ATMs. The plan meets the city’s vehicular, bicycle, and electric vehicle charging parking requirements.
Traffic circulation was noted, with a possibility of modifying the proposed site plan to provide an entrance-only from 37th Street and two-way access to Texas Avenue, however Ms. Kramer noted there will be more discussion prior to going to city council to present.

The bank will have a drive-thru teller window and drive-thru ATMs.

Ms. Kramer reviewed the CUP requirements for 24-hour operations and in-vehicle sales in the C-1 district and general CUP requirements.

The applicant held an online neighborhood meeting on May 13, 2020.

Commissioner Erwin asked about the fence or high wall on the north side of the property. She asked if that is existing or new being proposed on the site.

Ms. Kramer stated the design Commissioner Erwin referred to shows the reconstructed wall, built into the hill. The existing wall will be rebuilt, and a fence added per the building code. She added the lighting plan shows no spillover onto adjacent properties and was approved by city staff.

Commissioner Johnston-Madison asked what the wall is made of, and also if it was a living wall, as it looked like vines are growing on it.

Ms. Kramer stated the developer has proposed ivy and creeping greenery on the wall as part of the landscape plan. She stated the materials of the wall meets the city’s architectural material standards.

Commissioner Eckholm asked how much traffic is anticipated moving from Knollwood to this new site, across the road. He stated this will be more of a direct cross, but he is concerned about the amount of traffic there, and with bike lanes and the future LRT station. He stated he wants to understand how traffic will impact the area.

Ms. Kramer stated there has been no traffic studies on the changes to the site plan, but added this is something staff will look at before presenting to city council.

Mr. Walther stated staff anticipate a reduction in overall trip traffic to the site.

Chair Kraft opened the public hearing.
There were no comments from the public.

The Chair closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Robertson stated this feels like a straightforward project with no red flags. He appreciated hearing the traffic will be reviewed a bit more, along with the cross traffic. Overall, it’s a handsome building and fits into the neighborhood well, and he is excited about it, and will fully support it.

Commissioner Robertson made a motion, and Commissioner Johnston-Madison seconded, recommending approval of the Bremer Bank CUP. The motion passed on a vote of 7-0.

4. Other Business – none

5. Communications

Mr. Walther stated there will be a study session held following the Planning Commission meeting this evening. He noted the call-in number for the public to listen in on the meeting. He noted the link is also on the Planning Commission page on the city website, and folks can connect this way as well.

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:23 p.m.

STUDY SESSION

The study session commenced at 6:25 p.m.

1. Background on Wooddale Avenue light rail transit station area planning

Mr. Walther stated there will be some general background information provided this evening, and a time for questions and answers.

Ms. Kramer presented on the land use plan. Transit oriented development (TOD) is defined in the city’s comp plan and allows a mix of pedestrian-oriented uses along the TOD line. She noted residential is 85% of the land use in a TOD.

Mr. Walther pointed out the priority areas in the 2040 comp plan, including the three LRT areas, which are the general area of focus and redevelopment. He noted south of
36th Street and east of Wooddale would have more intensive uses, according to the comp plan, and a large area is zoned for future office use. He added the comp plan also notes this area should be revisited in the future, and that the TOD land use allows for flexibility of uses in this area.

Ms. Kramer presented the 2003 Elmwood land use and transit plan, which focuses on the area around the Wooddale LRT, and had much community engagement. She noted the 2003 Elmwood study looked at land use recommendations in the Elmwood neighborhood, establishing 36th Street as a main street. The study looked at commercial, industrial and residential uses in the area. She noted the plan also included development of Wooddale Avenue and the Hwy 7 frontage road, improvements to transit and bicycle connections.

Mr. Walther stated some parts of this study have changed over time, as development of the area has changed. He noted storm water management changes were also reviewed as part of the study.

Commissioner Robertson and Commissioner Dumalag agreed it would be beneficial to see an overlay of the area as it was, as it is now, and as it might be after future development. Mr. Walther stated staff could provide this for future consideration.

Chair Kraft asked if the plan prioritized certain elements, or if dictated more by proposed developments. She asked if there were priorities that came out of the study.

Mr. Walther said the study focused on providing a framework to help make decisions as proposals came forward, while looking at the 2003 plan, the comp plan, and the area as it is currently, while considering current goals and policies as well.

Commissioner Beneke asked about the bridge over Hwy 100. Mr. Walther stated until the bridge is part of the city’s capital improvement plan, it’s not real. At this point there has been no consideration of a bridge, but a connection to Wooddale was something that has been discussed.

Commissioner Johnston-Madison noted a discussion and proposal from the past on Excelsior Blvd. Mr. Walther stated he is familiar with this study and it has been referenced over time.

Ms. Monson discussed information about the 2009 Wooddale Station Area Plan, which was part of the visioning related to the LRT stations. She summarized the recommendations from the plan and noted that even though the 2009 plan recommended 4-story buildings along 36th Street, building codes have changed, and taller buildings have been allowed.
Mr. Walther added that the plan was a technical review, and the scope and environmental review of the LRT stations were still in flux at the time. He noted that a park and ride was also being reviewed for the Wooddale Station in 2009, but it is no longer being considered.

Ms. Monson reviewed parking trends within the city and best practices across the nation. She noted the city prioritizes pedestrians first, then bikes and transit, then motorized vehicles.

Commissioner Dumalag noted previous plans and development approvals were made prior to the investment in LRT, but now as development is coming before the commission, parking will need to be adjusted accordingly. She asked if there is an interim plan related to parking in the city.

Mr. Walther stated the city has required more parking than needed, along with a traffic or parking management plan that puts the onus on owners to come up with parking plans. He added how the city manages on-street parking in the next few years will be important.

Commissioner Robertson asked if the city will look at allowing restaurants flexibility on outdoor seating in light of the Governor’s requirements due to COVID-19.

Mr. Walther stated this is being reviewed and that staff is hoping to bring a policy forward to the council for review and approval to allow for expanded outdoor seating areas for a temporary time period, with social distancing.

Commissioner Robertson asked about updates on the Galaxy Drive-In Restaurant. Ms. Kramer stated there have been no updates recently, although it looks like they are making some changes in the drive-up parking area.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:27 p.m.
3a Union Park Flats (Union Congregational Church project)

Location: 3700 Alabama Avenue South and 6027 37th Street West
Case Numbers: 20-03-CP, 20-04-S, 20-05-PUD
Applicant: Project for Pride in Living
Owner: Union Congregational Church
Review Deadline: 60 days: May 1, 2020 120 days (extended): July 7, 2020

Recommended actions:
Chair to open the public hearing, take testimony and close the public hearing.
Motion to recommend approval of the comprehensive plan amendment, the preliminary and final plat, and the preliminary and final planned unit development (PUD) subject to the conditions recommended by staff.

Summary of request: Abbie Loosen, of Project for Pride in Living (PPL), requests city approvals for a comprehensive plan amendment, preliminary and final plat, and planned unit development (PUD) in order to construct a new apartment development called Union Park Flats on a portion of the site currently occupied by Union Congregational Church. The comprehensive plan amendment would reguide 6027 37th Street West and a portion of 3700 Alabama Avenue South from CIV – civic to RH – high density residential. The proposed plat would create two new lots from the two existing church parcels. The PUD would rezone both properties from R-3 two-family residence to a new PUD zoning district.

Site area (acres): 1.77

Current use: church, daycare

Surrounding land uses:
North: industrial/warehouse
East: multi-family residential, office
South: single family residential
West: single family residential

Current 2040 land use guidance
CIV - civic

Current zoning
R-3 two-family residence

Proposed 2040 land use guidance
Apartment lot: RH - high density residential
Church lot: CIV - civic

Proposed zoning
PUD planned unit development
Site map:

Background: Union Congregational Church currently owns and operates the project site. The site is three blocks from the Wooddale Light Rail Transit Station that is currently under construction and will be completed in 2023. The church will sell a portion of their property to an affiliate of PPL; PPL intends to own and manage this new housing for the long term. The northern portion of the existing church building, as well as the surface parking lot on the west side of the site, will be demolished in order to allow construction of the new apartment building.

The proposed apartment building will be three stories tall and include a mix of studio, one-bedroom, two-bedroom, and three-bedroom units totaling 60 units. Rents will be affordable to households with incomes ranging from 30% of the area median income (AMI) or $30,000 for a household of 4 to 80% of AMI or $80,000 for a household of 4. Most of the units will be set aside for households at or below 50% and 60% of AMI or $50,000 and $60,000, respectively, for households of 4 and the average income level for the building will be at or below 60% of AMI. The building will contain one level of underground parking and the site plan includes a small surface parking lot south of the apartment building.

Previous planning approvals: City council granted a zoning permit to construct the parking lot on 6027 West 37th street on October 19, 1981 (Resolution 6996). On September 21, 1987, city council granted a conditional use permit (CUP) to construct a 24 square foot sign at 3700
Alabama Avenue (Resolution 87-135). As part of the approval process, staff recommend city council rescind these resolutions if the applications are approved.

**Present considerations:** The applicant requests that the city:

A. Amend the Comprehensive Plan 2040 Future Land Use Map for 6027 37th Street West and a portion of 3700 Alabama Avenue South from CIV – civic to RH – high density residential.

B. Approve a preliminary and final plat to create two new parcels for development.

C. Amend the zoning map and zoning ordinance to rezone the subject properties from R-3 two-family residence to PUD planned unit development.

**Comprehensive plan amendment:** The applicant requests a change to the future land use designation of 6027 37th Street West and a portion of 3700 Alabama Avenue South from CIV – civic to RH – high density residential. Below is a map showing the area of interest from the comprehensive clan future land use map and proposed change.

**Existing and proposed future land use**

A request for amending the city’s land use plan and zoning map should be evaluated from the perspective of land use planning principles and community goals. These reflect the community’s long-range vision and broad goals about what kind of community it wants to be and what makes strong neighborhoods.
This amendment request is driven by a specific proposal for development. The request is for residential development at a density of 50 units per acre, which is considered High Density (RH) in the Comprehensive Plan. The amendment may be evaluated independently of the development proposal against the goals of the Comprehensive Plan for the subject properties. The amendment itself does not permit the proposed development but is one step in the approvals process.

**General consistency with the comprehensive plan.** The city’s land use plan should reflect the broad goals, policies and implementation strategies incorporated in the comprehensive plan. Staff identified the following goals in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan that are applicable to the proposed application:

**Livable Communities Goal 2:** Promote building and site design that creates a connected, human scale, multimodal, and safe environment for people who live and work here.
   A. Encourage quality design in new construction such as building orientation, scale, massing, and pedestrian access.
   B. Encourage new buildings to orient to walkable streets with appropriate building height to street width ratios.

**Residential Land Use Goal 1:** Create a mix of residential land uses and housing types to increase housing choices, including affordable housing, and increase the viability of neighborhood services through redevelopment or infill development.
   A. Engage the community to determine how to allow a broader range of housing types and densities within and adjacent to existing low-density residential neighborhoods that are complementary and compatible with the existing neighborhood character.
   B. Promote and support the development of medium and high-density residential land uses near commercial centers and nodes.
   C. Ensure that new and redeveloped medium and high-density residential land uses are located within walking distance of transit and commercial services.

**Housing Goal 1:** The City of St. Louis Park will promote and facilitate a balanced and enduring housing stock that offers a continuum of diverse lifecycle housing choices suitable for households of all income levels including, but not limited to affordable, senior, multi-generational, supportive and mixed income housing, disbursed throughout the city.
   A. Create a broad range of housing types to provide more diverse and creative housing choices to meet the needs of current and future residents.
   E. Use infill and redevelopment opportunities to assist in meeting housing goals.

**Housing Goal 3:** The city is committed to promoting quality multi-family developments, both rental and owner occupied, in appropriate locations, including near transit centers, retail and employment centers and in commercial mixed-use districts.
   B. Promote high-quality architectural design in the construction of new multi-family developments.
   D. Increase densities and housing options on high frequency transit routes and near rail stations.
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**Housing Goal 4:** The city is committed to creating, preserving and improving the city’s rental housing stock.

B. Promote the inclusion of family-sized units (2 and 3 bedroom) in newly constructed multi-family developments.

C. Minimize the involuntary displacement of people of color, indigenous people and vulnerable populations, such as low-income households, the elderly and people with disabilities from their communities as neighborhoods grow and change.

**Housing Goal 6:** The city is committed to promoting affordable housing options for low- and moderate-income households.

B. Ensure affordable housing is disbursed throughout the city and not concentrated in any one area.

C. Promote the inclusion of affordable housing in new developments, including those located near the Southwest Light Rail Transit Corridor and other transit nodes, retail and employment centers and commercial mixed-use districts.

**Wooddale LRT station area land use guidance:** The 2040 Land Use Plan envisions the Wooddale Avenue Station Area as a transit-oriented development (TOD) neighborhood, particularly south of the future transit line. The plan guided much of the land in the core of the station area to the new Transit Oriented Development land use designation. The goal of TOD designation is to create pedestrian-scale developments within a ten-minute walk of a transitway station. Beyond the immediate station area, the remaining land is primarily guided for medium- and high-density residential. The subject property is within the priority redevelopment area around the Wooddale LRT station.

The 2040 Comprehensive Plan include the city’s Livable Community Principles, which provide policy direction that allows mix use land use designations to achieve high residential densities. These principles include structured parking, affordable housing, sustainable site and building design elements, and high quality attractive indoor/outdoor recreation and amenity areas. RH high density residential is one of the land use designations the plan identifies as applicable to these principles.

In addition to the above, the Land Use Plan also references one of the city’s previous planning studies. The subject property was just outside of the boundary of the study area. Staff’s summary of the study as it relates to the subject property is provided below.

**2003 Elmwood land use, transit & transportation study.**

The study developed a thirty-year vision for the neighborhood and acts as a tool for guiding decisions on future redevelopment, infill development and infrastructure changes in the Elmwood area. The study area is generally bounded by Highway 7, Highway 100, Wooddale Avenue and Brunswick Avenue in southeast St. Louis Park.

There was significant public input and was an excellent indicator of neighborhood residents’ opinions about the future of land use, transportation and transit. The study process identified strong community preference for new single-family homes, and the study identified several market barriers to this type of development in the area.
Recommendations in the 2003 study were based in part on 2000-2020 Comprehensive Plan. The Pechiney Plastics (now JonnyPops / Nordic Ware warehouse) was assumed to continue as an industrial use; should there be an opportunity to redevelop, medium-density residential use should be considered. Scale and building materials should complement the single-family neighborhood. The block east of the project site was recommended to be medium density on the north half of the block, and low density (townhomes) on the south half due to adjacent single-family homes. The plan also recommended potential and appropriateness of TOD on the site. It is less clear how the 2003 plan defined TOD, except that it promoted a walkable, urban village area. The parcel northeast of the subject property was recommended for high density residential.

Staff find the proposed comprehensive plan amendment to reguide the apartment site to high density residential would bring the site into alignment with land use guidance around the Wooddale LRT station. The proposal creates a pedestrian-scaled development within a ten-minute walk of the Wooddale LRT Station area. Staff also find the project meets these Livable Communities principles in the 2040 plan: structured parking, affordable housing, high quality outdoor recreation and amenity areas.

While the proposed project does not follow the 2003 study recommendations for adjacent parcels for medium and low-density land use guidance, staff find it does follow other principles in the 2003 plan. The architectural design includes building materials and colors that respect and complement the nearby single-family homes including stone and brick in natural colors, rather than glass and metal. Staff find the proposed site plan provides sufficient buffer between the proposed apartment building and the existing single-family homes. The large setback that is consistent with the house to the south on Brunswick Avenue South gives greater space between the apartment building and the single-family houses to the west. The height of the building meets the current zoning district height maximum of the site, and staff find the proposed height to be compatible with nearby single family, multi-family, and nonresidential buildings.

The desire for move-up housing is in part a desire for more family housing. 88% of the units in the proposed development are two and three bedrooms, which is an excellent opportunity to increase the stock of family housing in the neighborhood.

The next two pages include area plans that provide information on the future land use guidance in the 2003 study:
Study area illustrative plan - 2003 Elmwood study

Subject property
Availability of infrastructure.
*Water and sewer:* City engineering and operations staff have reviewed the proposed development and found the public water and sewer infrastructure in the area to be adequate to serve the proposed development.
Traffic: The city hired SRF Consulting Group to conduct a trip generation review of the proposed project. At the time the study was conducted, the applicant proposed 80 dwelling units on the site. SRF’s analysis concluded the earlier 80-unit project would generate 43 more daily trips to and from the site compared to the current uses. These new site trips would be more spread out throughout the day, rather than concentrated during morning and afternoon peak hours like the current daycare use on the site. The current proposal of 60 dwelling units will generate even fewer trips to and from the site than shown in the analysis.

City staff find the development to have no impact to the transportation network and no changes will be necessary to the surrounding street network. Please see the attached trip generation analysis memo for further details.

Stormwater: The applicant must obtain both city and Minnehaha Creek Watershed District permits prior to construction.

Impacts to surrounding properties and the physical character of the neighborhood. Removal of the existing building and redevelopment of the north parcel will change the character of the property. The area around the project site includes a variety of land uses, including single family houses and duplexes to the west and south; multi-family homes to the east; and industrial/warehouse use to the north. Staff find the proposed three-story building to be compatible with these nearby uses in land use and building height. The proposed use is more residential in character than the group daycare and surface parking lot uses present today. This development is also similar in scale to mixed-use and transit-oriented development around the Wooddale LRT station, yet meets the height requirements of the present R-3 zoning district. Staff find the proposed building materials reflect the existing architectural character of the neighborhood, while not attempting to replicate the same historical style. The yard on the west end of the property matches that of the house to the south and provides a landscaped space respectful of the rest of the block and park use to the northwest.

Staff finds the goals and policies of the comprehensive plan support re-guiding this property to RH high density residential.

Regional policy. The Metropolitan Council’s Thrive MSP Transportation Policy Plan as applied to half-mile radius of the Wooddale Avenue LRT station requires an average minimum development density of sites that redevelop to be 50 units per acre. This allows for some sites to be less than 50 units per acre, but other sites in the station area would have to develop at higher densities in order to maintain compliance with this regional policy.

Metropolitan Council review of this comprehensive plan amendment is required. The Met Council must authorize the city to put the amendment into effect. Staff expect that a change to allow a residential density of 50 units per acre would be viewed favorably by Met Council.

Preliminary and final plat analysis: the applicant seeks preliminary and final plat approval to create two new parcels from two existing parcels.

Lots: The subdivision would create two new lots:

- Lot 1, Block 1: 51,713 square feet. This lot would contain the new apartment building.
• Lot 2, Block 1: 25,330 square feet. This lot would contain the existing church.

Right of way dedication: no right of way dedication is proposed for this project.

Easements: Drainage and utility easements are provided along all property lines as per the requirements of the city’s subdivision ordinance. All easements abutting city right-of-way are ten feet in width, and easements provided along all internal property lines are five feet in width.

Alley and neighboring property access: An existing alley provides access to two single-family residential lots south and west of the project site to Brunswick Avenue South. No change is proposed to the alley and the single-family properties will maintain access to Brunswick. The church property includes a surface parking lot that encroaches upon the north-south portion of the alley; the paved lot has been on the site since at least 1962. Functionally, access to the east-west alley from Brunswick Avenue to Oxford Street occurs through the drive aisle of the parking lot which is not aligned with the alley right-of-way. Staff recommend a condition of approval attached to the plat application that requires formalization and documentation of current conditions to maintain permanent public access to the alley. This would include an encroachment agreement for the parking spaces and a public access agreement across the drive lane of the church’s parking lot. No physical changes would be required since the public interest in maintaining functional access to the alley would be maintained. The agreement could also address the church’s financial responsibilities to return the alley to its original location if it is needed in the future by the city.

Access and site circulation: The structured parking underneath the apartment building will be accessed from Alabama Avenue South. The surface parking lot south of the apartment building will be accessed from the existing alley, which connects to Brunswick Avenue South and Oxford Street West through the church parking lot.

The main pedestrian entrance to the apartment building is located on 37th Street West, with secondary building entrances on either side of the interior courtyard. Ground-floor units have direct access to the exterior through private patios.

Sidewalks: The city’s subdivision ordinance requires sidewalks along all streets. Existing sidewalk along all three street frontages (Brunswick Avenue South, 37th Street West, and Alabama Avenue South) shall be preserved or reconstructed as part of this development.

Park and trail dedication: In response to the pandemic, Governor’s Order 20-20 and city council Resolution 20-066, the parks and recreation advisory commission did not hold a meeting and make a recommendation to the city council regarding park dedication for the current application. Based on Resolution 20-066 and the city’s desire to provide efficient and ongoing services, city staff recommended the city council adopt city staff’s recommendation regarding park dedication. No new parks are designated for this area in the comprehensive plan; therefore, cash-in-lieu of land is recommended by staff. The 2020 fee schedule sets the residential park dedication fee at $1,500 per dwelling unit and the residential trail dedication fee at $225 per dwelling units. Park dedication fees for non-residential properties are set at 5% of the current market value of the unimproved land as determined by the city assessor. Staff
recommend collecting $90,000 in park dedication fees and $13,500 in trail dedication fees for the apartment parcel, and $12,607.32 in park dedication fees for the church parcel.

Staff find the preliminary and final plat meet city requirements.

**PUD analysis:** The developer requests approval of a preliminary and final planned unit development (PUD). A PUD is a rezoning (zoning map amendment) and zoning text amendment that establish the regulations for a specific property.

The proposed land use guidance would allow the density of 50 units per acre on the apartment lot requested by the applicant. Approval of the PUD will be contingent upon approval of the comprehensive plan amendment request.

The site does not currently meet the 2-acre minimum for a PUD request. The city council may waive this requirement. The city council reviewed a concept plan for the development on January 13, 2020. While no action was taken on the concept plan at that time, council input to staff was that they would consider a waiver. Staff support the use of a PUD zoning for this property as it allows for conditions and requirements that fit the context and character of the individual site and advances the city’s affordable housing and green building goals.

Below is a map showing the area of interest from the city zoning map and proposed change.
Building and site design analysis: Staff find the proposed development meets the PUD ordinance goals for building and site design. The ordinance requires the city to find that the quality of building and site design proposed will substantially enhance aesthetics of the site and implement relevant goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan. In addition, the following criteria shall be satisfied:

(1) The design shall consider the project as a whole and shall create a unified environment within project boundaries by ensuring architectural compatibility of all structures, efficient vehicular and pedestrian circulation, aesthetically pleasing landscape and site features, and design and efficient use of utilities. Staff find the plan meets this requirement.

(2) The design of a PUD shall achieve compatibility of the project with surrounding land uses, both existing and proposed, and shall minimize the potential adverse impacts of the PUD on surrounding land uses and the potential adverse effects of the surrounding land uses on the PUD. Based on the analysis described in the comprehensive plan amendment section of this report, staff find the proposed three-story building and multi-family residential use to be compatible with surrounding uses, and the potential for adverse impacts on surrounding land uses has been minimized by the site design and the current proposed size of the project. Staff find this criteria will be met.

(3) A PUD shall comply with the City’s Green Building Policy. This criteria will be met. The project will comply with the city’s green building policy as well as achieve over 100 optional points through the Enterprise Green Communities program.

(4) The use of green roofs or white roofs and on-site renewable energy is encouraged. The development does not propose green roof or white roofs. While this is encouraged; it is not required. The building will meet the city’s green building policy.

(5) A PUD shall comply with the city’s Inclusionary Housing Policy. The applicant proposes a 100% affordable housing project with a range of affordability from 30% to 80% AMI. This proposal meets and exceeds the requirements of the inclusionary housing policy. This criteria will be met.

Zoning analysis. The following table provides the development metrics. The property will be rezoned to a PUD. The proposed performance and development standards, as indicated in the development plans, establish the development requirements for this property if approved.
### Zoning compliance table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Met?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use</strong></td>
<td>Set by PUD</td>
<td>Lot 1: residential</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 2: civic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Density</strong></td>
<td>High density land use: 75 units/acre</td>
<td>50 units/acre</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lot area</strong></td>
<td>2.0 acres minimum</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>Pending council approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sidewalks</strong></td>
<td>Required along all street</td>
<td>Provided along all street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>frontages</td>
<td>frontages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setbacks – apartment lot</strong></td>
<td>Set by PUD</td>
<td>Alabama (front): 15.08’</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brunswick (front): 32.42’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37th (side street): 14.75’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>south (interior side): 12.08’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setbacks – church lot</strong></td>
<td>Set by PUD</td>
<td>Oxford (front): 26.5’</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alabama (side street): 32.58’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>west (interior side): 56.67’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>north (rear): 5’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Height</strong></td>
<td>Set by PUD</td>
<td>3 stories / 33.46’</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building materials</strong></td>
<td>Minimum of 60% Class 1 materials</td>
<td>Minimum of 60% Class 1 materials</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on each building elevation</td>
<td>provided on each building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>elevation: brick, stone, glass,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>stucco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicular parking</strong></td>
<td>Apartment: 120</td>
<td>Apartment: 90</td>
<td>Yes; see below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Church: 49</td>
<td>Church: 36 (no change)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bicycle parking</strong></td>
<td>Apartment: 72</td>
<td>Apartment: 108</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Church: 5</td>
<td>Church: 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electric vehicle supply</strong></td>
<td>Level 1: 9</td>
<td>Level 1: 9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>equipment (EVSE)</strong></td>
<td>Level 2: 2</td>
<td>Level 2: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conduit: 9 spaces</td>
<td>Conduit: 14 spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open area/DORA</strong></td>
<td>Set by PUD</td>
<td>Apartment: 14.23%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Church: no change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscaping</strong></td>
<td>Apartment parcel: 60 trees, 300</td>
<td>Apartment: 79 trees, 652 shrubs,</td>
<td>Yes, see below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shrubs</td>
<td>additional perennial and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>grass plantings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Church: no change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tree replacement</strong></td>
<td>14.25 caliper inches</td>
<td>15 caliper inches</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refuse handling</strong></td>
<td>Full screening required;</td>
<td>Plan will comply with all solid</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>compliance with city’s Solid Waste</td>
<td>waste handling and screening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ordinance required</td>
<td>requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit service</strong></td>
<td>None required</td>
<td>Site is ¼ mile from future</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wooddale LRT station; Bus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>route 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stormwater management</strong></td>
<td>Meet city and state requirements</td>
<td>Site will meet requirements</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Uses: The Union Park Flats PUD zoning district would include two parcels. Parcel 2 contains the existing church, and no changes are proposed to the use on this lot. Parcel 1 is a multi-family apartment building with the following unit breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Type</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
<th>Number of Bedrooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One bedroom</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two bedroom</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three bedroom</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Building height: The proposed apartment building height of 33.46 feet complies with the building height maximum of the present R-3 zoning district, which is 35 feet. The applicant provided a street elevation study comparing the proposed building to the estimated height and elevations of the surrounding existing buildings. Please see Sheet AL104 Block Elevation Study in the development plans attached to the end of this report. Staff find the proposed building height is appropriate in this location and respectful of the height recommendations for surrounding properties in the 2003 land use study in addition to meeting the current zoning height maximum.

Vehicular parking (apartment): One component of providing a well-connected transit village is right sizing the parking requirements. Requiring parking above and beyond what is needed for a transit-oriented development has unintended consequences of reducing the walkability of an area by underutilizing space, places a higher cost on construction which may be then passed on to tenants, and causes the development to be designed around parking rather than designed for people.

St. Louis Park has not amended the parking ordinance to allow for greater reductions of parking for developments near SWLRT, though an amendment to the code is anticipated prior to the opening of the light rail in 2023. In the meantime, the city is looking at the parking required within transit-oriented districts on a project-by-project basis. The code allows for parking quantity requirements to be revised upward or downward by city council as part of a planned unit development based on verifiable information pertaining to parking. In addition, the ordinance allows for parking reductions based on shared parking and available on-street parking adjacent to the property. The city has been conservative in our approach to reducing parking for residential uses. Staff analysis and logic to the parking analysis for this development is described below.

Three-bedroom units, particularly in an affordable housing development such as this, typically rent to families, rather than adult roommates who may potentially each own a vehicle. Thus, staff find it appropriate to reduce the parking requirements for three-bedroom units from three spaces to two. PPL stated previous projects in the Twin cities typically have a 1:1 ratio between apartment units and on-site parking because their moderate- and lower-income households tend not to own many cars. The recent Oxford Village development along Blake Road in Hopkins includes 51 dwelling units and 61 parking spaces, for a ratio of 1:1.2 units to parking spaces. Oxford Village shares several similarities to this proposed development in terms of unit
types and suburban, transit-oriented location, and city staff from Hopkins that worked on the development indicated the parking is working well.

While the current zoning code does not allow transit reductions for multi-family development, this language was prepared at a time when the only transit service available to the city was bus service, rather than light rail service, which creates a greater influence on reducing parking demand than bus stops alone. If approved, this project would open around the same time as the Wooddale LRT station. Thus, staff recommend a modal reduction for proximity to a future LRT station.

Based on current best practices regarding parking in transit-oriented development, parking requirements for existing and approved development projects around LRT stations in St. Louis Park, and analysis of this proposal, staff recommend a parking reduction of 25% for the proposed apartment building.

The proposed apartment site plan includes 69 parking stalls in one underground structured parking level, and 10 spaces in a surface parking lot south of the building. Eleven on-street parking spaces on Brunswick Avenue South and Alabama Avenue South are adjacent to the site, and thus allow for a one to one reduction in off-street parking, or essentially included in the parking for the site for a total of 90 parking stalls, or 1.5 parking spaces per unit. This ratio of parking stalls to dwelling units is similar to most of the recent developments around the Wooddale LRT station.

PPL and Union Congregational Church are exploring a potential shared parking agreement to allow apartment visitors to use select parking stalls on the church surface lot. The final format of this agreement, including the question of permanency, has not been finalize at this time, so staff have not included these parking spaces in the apartment building parking counts.

City code allows up to 20% of required parking to be compact stalls. The site plan includes 10 (12.7%) of the stalls to be compact.

**Vehicular parking (church):** At the completion of the apartment building construction, the church parcel will have 31 parking spaces in a surface parking lot west of the building. Five off-street parking spaces on Alabama Avenue are adjacent to the parcel and thus available for inclusion in parking provided on site, for a total of 36 parking spaces.

Union Congregational Church has an informal (i.e. not a permanent easement) agreement with Luther Company (3701 Alabama Avenue South) to use 15 parking stalls on their property during worship service. Because this agreement is not a permanent legal condition on the property, these 15 spaces cannot be included in the required parking counts. However, staff recommend granting a parking requirement reduction for the church site based on the site’s proximity to the Wooddale LRT station and the current under-utilization of the north surface parking lot to be included in the apartment redevelopment. The agreement with Luther is an appropriate and efficient shared parking arrangement; it is a bonus to the development and will for the term of the agreement reduce the demand for on-street parking generated by the church.
Bicycle parking: 102 bicycle racks are provided in the underground parking level and six bicycle racks are provided near exterior entrances on the outside of the apartment building for a total of 108 bicycle parking spaces on the apartment lot. The proposed apartment site plan meets zoning code bicycle parking requirements. When the church undergoes renovations and site work, five bicycle parking spaces shall be added to bring the church site into compliance with city code.

Electric vehicle parking: The apartment lot will meet electric vehicle service equipment (EVSE) requirements in city code. The proposed church improvements do not change or reconstruct any church parking spaces; therefore, the church property would not be subject to the requirements of the EVSE parking ordinance at this time. If and when the church parking lot is reconstructed in the future, the church site would then have to comply with the ordinance and provide EV infrastructure.

Landscape plan: City code requires a minimum of 60 trees and 300 shrubs on the apartment lot. The proposed apartment site plan proposes 79 trees and 652 shrubs and thus meets the requirements in the zoning code. In addition, the plan includes 363 perennial and grass plantings, a 788 square foot rain garden with adjacent seating area south of the interior courtyard, and 1,321 square feet of pollinator plantings in the southwest portion of the site plan. No changes are proposed to the landscaping on the church lot at this time.

Designed outdoor recreation area (DORA). There is no minimum DORA requirement for planned unit developments. The apartment site plan provides 14.23% of the total site area of DORA in the interior courtyard. This space includes a small playground, picnic and seating areas, grills, an activity lawn, and an outdoor art installation.

Lighting: The proposed apartment lighting plan meets city code requirements for average levels of illumination in the surface parking lot as well as light levels at the property line. Outdoor lighting fixtures will be equipped with daylight and/or motion sensors, and all pole lighting will be downcast to minimize glare onto neighboring properties. Lighting on the church lot will remain unchanged, except for new lighting at the new narthex entrances. This lighting plan will be reviewed and approved by city staff for compliance with site lighting requirements in the city code.

Shadow study: City code requires that all new multi-family and nonresidential buildings and additions shall be located so that the structure does not cast a shadow that covers more than 50% of another building wall for a period greater than two hours between 9 a.m. and 3 p.m. for more than 60 days of the year. This provision does not apply to buildings in an industrial use district nor buildings in the same PUD district.

The applicant submitted a shadow study for staff review and approval. The only building that is impacted by shadows cast by the apartment building is the JonnyPops/Nordic Ware building north of the site. The impacts are within the requirements required by city code. Furthermore, this parcel is currently zoned I-G general industrial and there are no windows on the south side of the building; the shadows on the building do not impact the interior quality of the building. The development meets city code shadowing requirements.
**Signs.** A sign plan was not submitted for review. The site shall comply with the same sign regulations as applied to sites zoned R-4 multiple-family residence.

**Public engagement process:** All property owners within 500 feet of the proposed development were notified by mail of both neighborhood meetings, the final revisions to the project to be submitted to planning commission for review, and the public hearing. Legal notices were published in the official newspaper regarding the public hearing. Information was shared through NextDoor and the city website. A “proposed development” sign with contact information was posted on the property. Notifications regarding the proposal met State Statute and city code requirements and included additional efforts beyond those minimum requirements.

**Large neighborhood meetings:** The developer held two large neighborhood meetings on January 7, 2020 and March 10, 2020. The first meeting had approximately 50 attendees and the second meeting had approximately 125 attendees. Below is a brief summary of issues raised at these meetings:

- Engagement process with the neighborhood
  - Criticism that communication from the church was insufficient
  - Criticism that neighborhood involvement in initial design process and developer selection was insufficient
  - Perception that decisions on the project were being made without sufficient public input
- Proposed height of the apartment building (at the time of the second neighborhood meeting, the apartment was four stories tall). Some residents felt a two-story building was the maximum acceptable height at this site. Other residents pointed out that previous church leaders 17 years ago opposed a proposed tall building near the current site.
- Housing density of project. Some residents felt no more than 20 units per acre would be appropriate on the site.
- Affordability levels (both for and against proposed levels)
- Support for more affordable housing in the neighborhood, including positive racial equity impacts
- Effects of concentration of affordable housing units in one site
- Architectural character of the apartment building not compatible with the character of the existing single-family and duplex neighborhood
- Concern regarding setting a precedent for additional higher density development in the neighborhood
- Concern regarding the proposed project’s conformance with previous planning studies and the 2040 Comprehensive Plan
- Support for the project based on its potential to meet the goals of the 2040 Comprehensive Plan
- Building shadow impacts on adjacent properties
- Proposed development’s impact on surrounding property values
- Traffic impacts to the neighborhood
- Spillover parking from the site into neighboring streets
- Crime and safety concerns around affordable housing developments
• Concerns/questions regarding other potential developments in the area
• Concern around PPL’s management of other sites in the area

Small neighborhood group meetings: City staff, PPL and church leaders met several times with a small group of neighborhood leaders over the course of the project. All of these meetings were held via web conference due to the current health pandemic. This neighborhood leaders group shared their guiding principles for the Elmwood neighborhood:

We partner with all stakeholders to jointly craft a “truly great” development increasing the “livability” of Elmwood and St Louis Park. We look beyond the boundaries of the development to ensure it fits and adds to the unique character of the neighborhood. Insights from strategic planning on land use from the Elmwood Area Land Use Study and 2040 Comp Plan guides our priorities:

1. The density (of the project) is consistent with the strategic land use plans.
2. The height/scope of the structure fits the context of its surroundings within the guidelines of land use plans.
3. The on-site off-street parking allocation meets/exceeds the standard.
4. The architectural design and materials are of the highest level of quality while matching the character of the neighborhood.
5. The affordable housing solution promotes inclusion by mixing all income levels within a development.

The neighborhood group identified guiding principles from both the 2040 comprehensive plan and the 2003 Elmwood land use study they found relevant to the site. The 2040 plan guides the site for medium density residential with housing density range of six to thirty units per acre. The 2040 plan recommends the creation of appropriate and effective buffer or transition areas between different land use types. The Elmwood study recommends residential density should transition progressively from low to medium to high from existing single-family homes. The 2040 plan recommends a variety of housing types that may be compatible in scale to single family homes, including duplexes, townhomes, and small two- and three-story apartment buildings.

The 2003 study recommends structured parking should be integrated into the building complex, preferably below grade. The Livable Community Principle: Structured Parking in the 2040 plan states the city should continue to enforce parking standards.

The 2003 plan notes the historic housing stock of the Elmwood neighborhood and states new development should complement existing single-family homes in form, style and material selection. The 2003 plan highlighted Jorvig Park as having historic significance for both the neighborhood and the city. Proposed development configurations should complement Jorvig Park.

Based on this analysis of previous planning efforts in the neighborhood, the group identified these areas of concern, in order of neighborhood priority:

1. Housing density of project
2. Building height/scale
3. Parking
4. Traffic
5. Architectural character
6. Proposed affordability levels

Based on the above guiding principles and neighborhood concerns, the neighborhood leaders group made several recommendations and requests regarding the project and the approval process. The group recommended revisions to the project that included a reduction in the building height from four stories to two stories on the west side of the property north of single-family parcels, and three stories on the east side of the property north of the church. They also recommended a reduction in the unit count to reduce the housing density to 30 units per acre to follow the current medium density land use guidance. The group called attention to the northwest corner of the project site near Jorvig Park as an opportunity for unique architectural features that complement the historic nature of the park and the group recommended against installing a playground in the interior courtyard. The group asked for a mixed income project that included both affordable and market rate units. The group discussed screening the surface parking lot on the apartment parcel from the single-family parcels to the south. A presentation explaining the neighborhood leaders’ positions and diagrams illustrating the neighborhood recommendations are attached to this report.

Additional public feedback: All letters and emails staff have received attached to this report in chronological order. Please note that some of the emails refer to earlier versions of the project, and some residents submitted multiple comments on the project. In general, staff received similar public feedback via email and letters as what residents expressed during the large and small neighborhood meetings.

Charter complaint: A charter complaint is referenced in some of the comments. Please note that the city council reviewed the charter complaint at their meeting on May 18, 2020. The city council after considering the evidence presented and all reports, determined that a violation of Charter Section 2.09 did not occur and the complaint was dismissed in its entirety, with no further action.

Applicant response to neighborhood feedback: The development team has modified their proposal several times in response to neighborhood and city input to better address the goals of the comprehensive plan, the 2003 study and the feedback received from the neighborhood through this process. The next page contains a table and summary of the revisions the project has undergone throughout the city approval process.
When first presented to council during the January 13 study session, the apartment building was four stories, approximately 80 units and 175 bedrooms.  
At the time the applicant submitted formal planning applications on March 2, 2020, the bedroom count was reduced to 135, the building mass was reduced 10%, the building setback to Brunswick was increased by 20 feet, the building exterior was redesigned for compatibility with adjacent single family homes, and the surface parking lot was planned for construction at the opening of the building, rather than as a proof-of-parking concept.  
PPL resubmitted plans on April 24, 2020. The revised plans proposed a 68-unit apartment building with 136 bedrooms, building façade and pitched roof design to complement the nearby single-family homes, and 1-2 story height decreases along the east and south sides of the building closest to the adjacent single-family homes.  
PPL submitted final revisions to the project plans on May 22, 2020. The project before planning commission tonight is a 60-unit apartment building with 120 bedrooms. The building is 3 stories and has been revised to a flat roof to bring the building height under the maximum allowed in the R-3 two family zoning district.  

PPL has submitted letters to neighborhood leaders, city staff, and all property owners within 500 feet of the project site explaining their rationale for the current project size. Please see the attached PPL correspondence. In addition, a church representative submitted a stakeholder analysis for the project and a summary of development that has occurred along the Blue and Green LRT lines. Both documents are attached to this report.  

**Next steps**: City council will take action on the comprehensive plan amendment and the preliminary and final plat and hold a first reading of the PUD ordinance on June 15, 2020. City council is tentatively scheduled to hold the second reading of the PUD ordinance on July 6, 2020.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number of units</th>
<th>Number of bedrooms</th>
<th>Parking spaces</th>
<th>Building height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 13, 2020</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(city council study session)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2, 2020</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>81 + 10 spaces shown as proof of parking</td>
<td>4 stories, with 3 story massing along New Brunswick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(formal applications)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 24, 2020</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4 stories, with 2-3 stories along New Brunswick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current proposal</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3 stories</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regular meeting meeting of June 3, 2020 (Item No. 3a)
Title: Union Park Flats (Union Congregational Church project)

Recommendations:

Staff recommends approval of the Union Park Flats Comprehensive Plan Amendment. Staff recommend approval of the requested comprehensive plan amendment changing the land use designation of the future land use map from CIV civic to RH – high density residential.

Staff recommends approval of the Union Park Flats preliminary and final plat subject to the following conditions:

1. City council approval of the comprehensive plan amendment to high density residential and Metropolitan Council authorization of the comprehensive plan amendment associated with the development applications.

2. The site shall be developed, used and maintained in accordance with the conditions of this ordinance, approved official exhibits, and city code.

3. All utility service structures shall be buried. If any utility service structure cannot be buried (i.e. electric transformer), it shall be integrated into the building design and 100% screened from off-site with materials consistent with the primary façade materials.

4. Prior to the city signing and releasing the final plat to the developer for filing with Hennepin County:
   a. A financial security in the form of a cash escrow or letter of credit in the amount of $1,000 shall be submitted to the city to ensure that a signed Mylar copy of the final plat is provided to the city.
   b. Assent form and official exhibits shall be signed by the applicant and property owner.
   c. A temporary private use of public land encroachment and agreement for public use/access of the parking lot drive lane and the terms for reestablishing the functionality of the platted alley entered into prior to signing off on the final plat.

5. Prior to starting any land disturbing activities, the following conditions shall be met:
   a. The developer shall pay to the city the park dedication fee of $102,607.32 for the two uses, and trail dedication fee of $12,607.32 for residential uses.
   b. A performance guarantee in the form of cash escrow or irrevocable letter of credit shall be provided to the City of St. Louis Park in the amount of 1.25 times of the costs of all public improvements (sidewalks and boulevards), and the private site stormwater management system and landscaping. Proof of recording the final plat shall be submitted to the City.
   c. Assent Form and Official Exhibits shall be signed by the applicant and property owner.
   d. A preconstruction meeting shall be held with the appropriate development, construction, private utility, and city representatives.
   e. All necessary permits shall be obtained.
f. A performance guarantee in the form of cash escrow or irrevocable letter of credit shall be provided to the City of St. Louis Park for all public improvements and landscaping.

Staff recommend approval of the resolution rescinding previous approvals for a parking lot at 6027 37th Street West and a 24 square foot sign at 3700 Alabama Avenue South.

Staff recommends approval of the Union Village Apartments preliminary and final planned unit development subject to the following conditions:

1. City council approval of the comprehensive plan amendment to high density residential and Metropolitan Council authorization of the comprehensive plan amendment associated with the development applications.

2. The site shall be developed, used and maintained in accordance with the conditions of this ordinance, approved official exhibits, and city code.

3. Prior to issuance of building permits, the following conditions shall be met:
   a. The developer shall sign the city’s assent form and the official exhibits.
   b. A planning development contract shall be executed between the developer and city that addresses, at a minimum:
      i. The conditions of PUD approval as applicable or appropriate.
      ii. The installation of all public improvements including, but not limited to, boulevard trees, sidewalks and boulevards.
      iii. A performance guarantee in the form of cash escrow or irrevocable letter of credit shall be provided to the City of St. Louis Park in the amount of 1.25 times of the costs of all public improvements (sidewalks and boulevards), and the private site landscaping.
      iv. A private use of public land encroachment and permanent agreement for public use/access of the north-south portion of the alley.
      v. The developer shall reimburse city attorney’s fees in drafting/reviewing such documents as required in the final PUD approval.
   c. Final construction plans for all public improvements and private stormwater system shall be signed by a registered engineer and submitted to the city engineer for review and approval.
   d. Building material samples and colors shall be submitted to the city for review and approval.

4. The developer shall comply with the following conditions during construction:
   a. All city noise ordinances shall be complied with, including that there be no construction activity between the hours of 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. Monday through Friday, and between 10 p.m. and 9 a.m. on weekends and holidays.
   b. The site shall be kept free of dust and debris that could blow onto neighboring properties.
   c. Public streets shall be maintained free of dirt and shall be cleaned as necessary.
d. The city shall be contacted a minimum of 72 hours prior to any work in a public street.
e. Work in a public street shall take place only upon the determination by the city engineer (or designee) that appropriate safety measures have been taken to ensure motorist and pedestrian safety.
f. The developer shall install and maintain chain link security fencing that is at least six feet tall along the perimeter of the site. All gates and access points shall be locked during non-working hours.
g. Temporary electric power connections shall not adversely impact surrounding neighborhood service.

5. Prior to the issuance of any permanent certificate of occupancy permit the following shall be completed: public improvements, private utilities, site landscaping and irrigation, and storm water management system shall be installed in accordance with the Official Exhibits.

6. A sign permit shall be submitted for city approval if new signage is proposed on the site. The materials used in, and placement of, all signs shall be integrated with the building design and architecture.

7. All mechanical equipment shall be fully screened. Rooftop equipment may be located as indicated in the Official Exhibits so as not to be visible from off-site.

8. In addition to any other remedies, the developer or owner shall pay an administrative fee of $750 per violation of any condition of this approval.

Supporting documents: draft PUD ordinance, trip generation analysis memo, PPL letters, project stakeholder analysis, LRT multifamily development summary, Elmwood neighborhood leader group recommendations, public correspondence regarding the project, development plans

Prepared by: Jacquelyn Kramer, associate planner
Reviewed by: Sean Walther, planning and zoning supervisor
Ordinance No. ___-20

Ordinance amending the St. Louis Park City Code relating to zoning by creating Section 36-268-PUD 17 as a Planned Unit Development Zoning District for the property located at 3700 Alabama Avenue South and 6027 37th Street West

The City of St. Louis Park does ordain:

Section 1. The city council has considered the advice and recommendation of the planning commission (Case No. 20-05-PUD) for amending the Zoning Ordinance Section 36-268-PUD 17.

Section 2. The city council voted on June 15, 2020, to approve Resolution No. 20-xxx amending the 2040 Comprehensive Plan and the future land use designation for the subject properties located at 3700 Alabama Avenue South and 6027 37th Street West from Civic to High Density Residential. Said comprehensive plan amendment is associated with this ordinance and requires Metropolitan Council review and authorization to put it into effect.

Section 3. The Zoning Map shall be amended by reclassifying the following described lands from R-3 Two-Family Residence to PUD 17:

Parcel 1:
Lots 17 to 21 inclusive and Lots 24 to 30 inclusive, Block 48, "Rearrangement of St. Louis Park". Subject to alleys per document number 2692744. (Abstract)
and
Lots 5 and 6, Block 48, "St. Louis Park Centre". (Torrens)

Parcel 2:
Lot 7, Block 48, "St. Louis Park Centre". (Abstract)
and
Lot 8, Block 48, "St. Louis Park Centre". (Torrens)
and
Lots 9 and 10, Block 48, "St. Louis Park Centre". (Torrens)

Section 4. The St. Louis Park Ordinance Code Section 26-268 is hereby amended to add the following Planned Unit Development Zoning District:

Section 36-268-PUD 17.

(a) Development Plan.

The site located on property legally described above, shall be developed, used and maintained in conformance with the following Final PUD signed Official Exhibits:
1. G001 Title Sheet
2. AL101 Architectural Site Plan
3. AL102 Architectural Context Plan
4. AL103 Shadow Study
5. AL104 Block Elevation Study
6. Existing Conditions Survey
7. Lot Division Survey
8. Preliminary Plat
9. Final Plat
10. C100 Selective Site Demolition and Erosion Control Plan
11. C200 Grading, Drainage, and Erosion Control Plan
12. C300 Utility Plan
13. C400 Paving and Geometric Plan
14. C500 Civil Details
15. C501 Civil Details
16. C600 Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
17. L010 General Notes & Schedules
18. L011 Reference Note & Plant Schedules
19. L012 Tree Preservation Plan
20. L110 Overall Site Plan
21. L111 Enlarged Site Plan – Courtyard
22. L120 Overall Site Plan – DORA Exhibit
23. L140 Overall Tree Plan
24. L141 Overall Shrub & Perennial Plan
25. L142 Enlarged Landscape Plan – Courtyard
26. L500 Landscape Details
27. L501 Landscape Details
28. E0.00 Electrical Site Lighting Plan
29. A001.0 Sublevel 1 – Overall Plan
30. A101.0 Level 1 Plan – Overall
31. A102.0 Level 2 Plan – Overall
32. A103.0 – Level 3 Plan – Overall
33. A201 Roof Plan – Overall
34. A301 Building Elevations
35. A302 Building Elevations
36. A303 Building Elevations
37. A304 Building Elevations
38. PUD A1 Church Concept Models
39. PUD A2 Church Demolition Plan
40. PUD A3 Church Plan
41. PUPD A4 Church Building Elevations

The site plan shall also conform to the following requirements:
1. Parking shall be provided off-street.
   a. A total of 69 parking spaces shall be provided in structured parking.
   b. A total of 10 parking spaces shall be provided in the Parcel 1 surface lot.
   c. A total of 31 parking spaces shall be provided in the Parcel 2 parking lot.
2. Parcel 1 shall be developed with 60 residential units.
3. The maximum height of both parcels shall not exceed 35 feet.
4. Parcel 1 shall contain a minimum of 14% designed outdoor recreation area.

(b) Permitted Uses.
1. The following uses are permitted uses on Parcel 1:
   a. Multiple-family dwellings. Uses associated with the multiple-family dwellings, including but not limited to fitness facility, mail room, assembly room or general amenity space.
2. The following uses are permitted uses on Parcel 2:
   a. Religious institutions.

(c) Accessory Uses. Accessory uses are as follows:
1. Accessory utility structures including:
   a. Small wind energy conversion system as defined in 36-4 Definitions.
   b. Solar energy systems. A solar energy system with a supporting framework that is
      either place on, or anchored in, the ground and that is independent of any
      building or other structure; or that is affixed to or an integral part of a principal
      or accessory building, including but not limited to photovoltaic or hot water solar
      energy systems which are contained within roofing materials, windows,
      skylights, and awnings.
   c. Cisterns and rainwater collection systems.
2. Decorative landscape features including but not limited to pools, arbors and terraces.
3. Family day care serving 14 or fewer persons.
4. Gardening and other horticultural uses.
5. Private garages and parking lots.
6. Property management or rental office provided it does not occupy more than ten
   percent of the gross floor area.
8. Service and retail facilities intended for use of residents not to exceed ten percent of the
   gross floor area of the development.
9. Outdoor seating, public address (PA) systems are prohibited.
10. Outdoor storage is prohibited.
11. Home occupations are permitted with the condition that they comply with all of the
    following conditions:
    a. All material or equipment shall be stored within an enclosed structure.
    b. Operation of the home occupation is not apparent from the public right-of-way.
    c. The activity does not involve warehousing, distribution or retail sales of
       merchandise produced off the site.
    d. No person is employed at the residence who does not legally reside in the home
       except that a licensed group family day care facility may have one outside
       employee.
    e. No light of vibration originating from the business operation is discernible at the
       property line.
    f. Only equipment, machinery and materials which are normally found in the home
       are used in the conduct of the home occupation.
    g. No more than one non-illuminated wall sign limited to two square feet in area is
       used to identify the home occupation.
    h. Space within the dwelling devoted to the home occupation does not exceed one
       room or ten percent of the floor area, whichever is greater.
    i. No portion of the home occupation is permitted within any attached or detached
       accessory building.
j. The structure housing the home occupation conforms to the building code; and in the case where the home occupation is day care or if there are any customers or students, the home occupation has received a certificate of occupancy.

(d) **Special Performance Standards**

a. All general zoning requirements not specifically addressed in this ordinance shall be met, including but not limited to: outdoor lighting, architectural design, landscaping, parking, and screening requirements.

b. All trash, garbage, waste materials, trash containers, and recycling containers shall be kept in the manner required by this Code. All trash handling and loading areas shall be screened from view within a waste enclosure.

c. Signage shall be in conformance with the R-4 Multiple-Family Residence Zoning District and shall comply with the following:
   1. Pylon signs shall be prohibited.

**Section 5.** This ordinance shall take effect upon Metropolitan Council authorization of the associated comprehensive plan amendment approved by City Council Resolution 20-xxx and not sooner than 10 days after publication.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First reading</th>
<th>June 15, 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second reading</td>
<td>July 6, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of publication</td>
<td>July 16, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date ordinance takes effect</td>
<td>Upon Metropolitan Council authorization of the associated comprehensive plan amendment and no sooner than July 26, 2020.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviewed for administration: 

Adopted by the City Council July 6, 2020

______________________________  ______________________________
Thomas K. Harmening, city manager        Jake Spano, mayor

Attest: 

Approved as to form and execution:

______________________________  ______________________________
Melissa Kennedy, city clerk          Soren Mattick, city attorney
To: Jacquelyn Kramer, Associate Planner  
City of St. Louis Park  

From: Matt Pacyna, PE, Principal  
Brent Clark, PE, Senior Engineer  

Date: March 9, 2020  

Subject: Union Congregational Church Trip Generation Review  

Introduction  

SRF has completed a trip generation review for the proposed residential redevelopment of a portion of the Union Congregational Church located in the southwest quadrant of the 37th Street West and Alabama Avenue intersection in St. Louis Park, MN. The main objectives of this review are to compare the current site trip generation to the proposed redevelopment plan using the ITE Trip Generation Handbook, 10th Edition, as well as land use, employment, and student data provided by the church. The following sections provide the assumptions, analysis, and study conclusions offered for consideration.

Land Use Assumptions  

The existing site is generally bounded by 37th Street to the north, Brunswick Avenue to the west, Oxford Street to the south, and Alabama Avenue to the east. The existing land use consists of a church, narthex, and approximately 13,000 square feet (sf) of general space within a two-story building. The two-story building consists of a 5,000 sf daycare, while the rest of the building was assumed to be vacant. The existing daycare has 21 employees who serve approximately 85 children and the church has six (6) employees that work at various times of the day. The proposed redevelopment, which is shown in Figure 1, consists of a four-story 80-unit affordable housing building. As part of the redevelopment, the parking lot in the northwest quadrant and the two-story building will be demolished (the daycare will be relocated off-site). The existing church will remain, while the narthex will be reconstructed.

Trip Generation  

To understand traffic impacts associated with the proposed redevelopment, a trip generation comparison was completed for both the existing and proposed land uses for the a.m. and p.m. peak hours (generally an hour between 6-9 a.m. and 4-6 p.m.) and a daily basis. These estimates, shown in Table 1, were developed using the ITE Trip Generation Manual, Tenth Edition, as well as data provided by the church. Note that trip generation estimates were not developed for the church under existing or future conditions. Based on the church’s office hours and amount of employees (six), the number of peak hour trips generated by the church is expected to be minimal. In addition, it was assumed that most church events that occur on weekdays generally take place after typical p.m. peak hour periods.
Site Plan
Union Congregational Church Trip Generation Review
City of St. Louis Park
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Table 1. Trip Generation Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Type (ITE Code)</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>A.M. Peak Hour Trips</th>
<th>P.M. Peak Hour Trips</th>
<th>Daily Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Land Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Care Center (565)</td>
<td>85 Children</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Land Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Rise Multifamily Housing (221)</td>
<td>80 DU</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modal Reduction (10%)</td>
<td>(-1)</td>
<td>(-2)</td>
<td>(-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Site Trips</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Site Trip Reduction</td>
<td>(-35)</td>
<td>(-31)</td>
<td>(-32)</td>
<td>(-36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net New Site Trips</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that a 10 percent modal reduction was applied to the proposed redevelopment trip generation estimate to account for available and planned transit options in the study area (Metro Transit Route 17/615 and future Green Line LRT). Accounting for the modal reductions, the proposed development is expected to generate a total of approximately 25 a.m. peak hour, 32 p.m. peak hour, and 391 daily trips.

To determine the approximate net change in overall site trips, the existing daycare center trips were subtracted from the proposed redevelopment site trips. Taking into account the existing site trip reduction, the proposed redevelopment is expected to generate approximately 41 less a.m. peak hour, 36 less p.m. peak hour, and 43 more daily site trips.
April 23, 2020

Dear Members of the Elmwood Neighborhood Housing Group:

It is with some regret that we are writing to inform you that we will be proceeding through the City’s process with the project we have most recently presented to you. It is always our desire to work with the surrounding community in order to create an outcome that is acceptable to most if not all. However, in this instance, it has become clear that we are starting from very different points; the neighborhood’s density expectation has been set by the 2003 land use study and our expectation is based on the current general approach to transit-oriented sites, and the Metropolitan Council’s density guidance for sites within LRT station areas (see https://metrocouncil.org/Handbook/Files/Resources/Fact-Sheet/LAND-USE/Density-and-Activity-Near-Transit.aspx, and https://www.stlouispark.org/home/showdocument?id=15304, particularly the map on page 23.)

We had hoped that the changes we made – lowering the bedroom count, shrinking the building’s footprint, pulling the building back from Brunswick to create more distance between it and the adjacent houses, changing the design to reduce the scale of the western end of the building, moving to a pitched roof and more residential scale detailing, and reducing the size and height of the building by reducing the unit count by twelve- would make the building acceptable to you. However, from our last discussion, it is clear that these changes are insufficient.

During our discussion, two general questions at the heart of the issue arose which are complicated and I do not feel that we answered in an adequate fashion. The first is, why does the project need to be of a certain size? Can’t it be smaller? How small can it be and still be economically viable?

As many of you probably already understand, part of the answer to this lies in the nature of multi-family real estate. The most efficient apartment buildings, whether market-rate or affordable, are four or five story double-loaded corridors with surface parking. If a building exceeds five stories, it can no longer be built with standard wood framing, which is considerably cheaper than concrete or steel. There are certain fixed costs which are associated with a building regardless of its height: the cost of the site, the utility hook-ups, the foundation and excavation, and the roof. These items will vary only slightly with the addition of floors, so the cost of individual units on a third or fourth floor is relatively cheap and reduces the share of the fixed costs each unit must bear. Keeping the cost of units down and the rents up allows for the return on their investment which profit-motivated developers are seeking and is why, as you’ve likely observed, they will resist making a particular project smaller or shorter.
At some point, the difference between the market rents and the cost of the units no longer provides an adequate return to the profit-motivated developer and/or investor, and the project no longer “pencils out” and doesn’t go forward. Clearly you understand this dynamic and your question as to how few units will we need to build in order to reach the desired return on investment makes perfect sense in this context. If economics were the only consideration, that calculation would be pretty straightforward and that question would be easy to answer.

However, and this is the second part of the answer, our financing is only driven in part by economic considerations. In fact, most of the 25 factors on which our projects are evaluated run counter to typical economics. For example, in this project we are building family units with three bedrooms. These are unusual in the market because the additional square footage cost doesn’t generally command the higher rent needed to create the typical return on investment. As another example, we agree to keep our rents affordable to lower income households (or, in this case, a range of household incomes, including those on the lower end) for forty years, and we further agree to rent only to households below those income thresholds. Obviously, these types of restrictions don’t make sense in the usual maximizing the return on investment universe.

However, that being said, Minnesota Housing (the primary agency providing financing for the development of affordable housing), being vigilant stewards of our tax dollars, cares deeply about project costs. They want projects which provide for the lowest income residents, have rental subsidy, have major sources of financing other than themselves, meet or exceed Minnesota’s Green Communities standards, are built with labor being paid the prevailing (union) wages, are non-smoking, fully accessible buildings, AND are low cost. To reinforce this desire for lower costs, projects applying for funds are awarded additional points for cost containment and are eliminated altogether if they exceed a certain cost threshold.

To make this a bit more murky, neither of these numbers is established or stated at the time of application. The cost containment points are awarded to the cheapest half of the projects on a per unit basis within project type (i.e. family projects compete with family projects, projects in the metro area compete with projects in the metro area, etc.). This can lead to a race to the bottom in terms of quality which PPL, as an agency, avoids, because we feel that the long term consequences of pursuing a lowest initial first cost are not worth the additional score or the long-term impact on building quality and durability. To date we have only gotten cost containment points on one project. Generally, we are able to meet the financing thresholds through a combination of other “non-economic” factors. However, on two occasions, we have exceeded the absolute threshold and have had projects, which scored very well on other criteria, rejected for reasons of cost. The absolute number is not stated and is dictated by Minnesota Housing or City staff to allow for some flexibility and judgment in this area while attending to the costs of similar projects. So, our general approach is not to be the cheapest project, but to be enough under the threshold to be able to attract financing.
Here’s how the project we’ve proposed adjacent to the Church site fares within this context. In our initial technical assistance session with Minnesota Housing, the reaction to our, at that time, 80-unit project was “wow, very expensive.” After some lengthy explanation, the cost was perceived as more reasonable, but we were certainly put on notice. In particular, the cost of the land, though typical of transit-oriented sites, was much higher than normal. Typically, suburban projects come in at $10,000 to $15,000 a unit, and we were then at $25,000/unit. Our current 68-unit project has a land cost of $29,412/unit. This is nearing $30,000/unit which we feel, based on our past experience, is a number which puts the project in danger of being rejected outright by Minnesota Housing. Related to that, our original total development cost was $345,000/unit and is now (at 68 units) $365,000/unit. Until a few years ago, projects at more than $300,000/unit (two of ours) were rejected. Given the acceleration in construction pricing, we are now assuming, probably hoping is a better word, that the ceiling has moved up to around $350,000/unit. One way or another, we are bumping up against it if we haven’t already gone over.

By now your eyes have probably glazed over, but we want to be transparent about what we’re doing, what our constraints are, and why we feel that we need to maintain the number of units that we have in the project. We realize that $350,000/unit may seem ridiculously high, but we can assure you that, given all of the governmental constraints put on projects of this type, we are in good company.

The second general question which we wanted to answer more fully was “in what ways does this project benefit us?” Below is a list of what we perceive as the project’s benefits.

Regional Benefits:
1. Creates more equity by providing an opportunity for lower income households to advance economically. Lower rent will allow the household to channel funds into savings, education, improving job skills, lowering credit card debt, paying for medicine and health care, buying better food, etc.
2. Stimulates the local economy. Housing provides more customers for local businesses.
3. Provides jobs. Building, maintaining, and managing housing all require an on-site or local workforce.
4. Increases the local tax base. This allows for more and more efficient government services. Our TIF request, if awarded, will have an impact on the project’s contribution to the tax base for 15 years, but after that the project will pay significant taxes that will be undiminished by TIF.
5. Supports workers in the local economy. Most of the households served by affordable housing work in the local service economy in hospitals, schools, banks, retail establishments, restaurants, delivery services, etc.
6. Adds to the vitality of the city. Households living in affordable housing tend to be younger and have children who attend local schools. They will tend to stay in and add to
the community for years to come. Consider the opposite; your community becomes older and loses population.

7. Increases the population and political clout of the community.
8. Contributes to a greener future for everyone. Higher density makes for more efficient land use, shorter trips between home, work, shopping, and leisure (which, if short enough, are made on foot or by bicycle), a more efficient use of the existing infrastructure such as roads, water, electricity, etc. coupled with less pressure to create new infrastructure, and less solid waste in the construction and operations of the housing.

Benefits specific to this site:
1. With its proximity to the light rail, many retail and shopping opportunities, and local jobs, such as at the hospital and clinics, the environmental and economic benefits are increased dramatically.
2. The purchase of the land allows the church to continue as a viable community institution.
3. This development will help the City reach its affordable housing goals.
4. The site is in a transitional area that would logically be moving to higher density. It is not in the middle of an area of lower density single family and duplex development.
5. This development will provide an affordable option for families in a location where there are currently only market rate options which are often prohibitively expensive. If this project is like PPL’s other recent developments, most of the residents will be from close to the site – in this case from St. Louis Park or the surrounding areas.

Finally, we want to thank you for your interest in the project and for your support of the affordable housing we are endeavoring to create. Density is frequently a difficult question, and we can appreciate your position on this issue. If you have any other questions or comments, please feel free to reach out to us and we will do our best to address them. Thanks again.

Sincerely,

Abbie Loosen, Chris Wilson, and the rest of the Union Park Flats team
Dear Elmwood Residents and Property Owners,

We believe you have recently received notice of public hearing from the City of Saint Louis Park regarding the proposed Union Park Flats housing development to be located on two adjacent parcels, 3700 Alabama Avenue and 6027 37th Street West, in the Elmwood Neighborhood of Saint Louis Park. This letter provides an update regarding the proposed project, which has evolved since the City sent the notice. All of the meeting details provided in the City’s notice remain the same – please refer to that original notice for meeting details.

CHANGES MADE

In response to neighborhood input received over the course of two larger in-person meetings in January and March, as well as subsequent (virtual) conversations with other neighbors that have contacted us, the project has been reduced to 60 units, and the fourth floor of the building has been removed. In addition, the pitched roof has been replaced by a flat roof to further reduce the height of the building and any visual impact on the neighborhood. The new, three-story proposal is reflected on the attached perspective and site plan.

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

We want to share, clearly and directly, the facts about the revised project that will be heard by the Planning Commission on June 3. The revised project has the following characteristics:

- **60 units**
- **A mix of incomes**, ranging from 30% of AMI to 80% of AMI (approximately $30,000 - $80,000 for a family of four, as an example).
  - PPL commits to keeping these units affordable at these incomes for a minimum of 40 years, and, as with all of our affordable housing developments, compliance with this commitment will be monitored annually by the Minnesota Housing Finance Agency.
- **Three stories**, or 33’-6” as measured from the 214’ topographic line to the top of the roof.
  - Saint Louis Park, as with many other cities, measures building height to the top of a flat roof, and excludes the parapet, which is why the drawings reflect this measurement. Including the parapet adds 3 to 5 feet to the visible height of the building.
  - For reference, the 214 topographic line crosses the middle of the curb cut into the church’s north parking lot.
  - The proposed building to top of parapet is approximately level with the estimated height of the top of Union Church’s pitched roof.
- **90 parking spaces** (69 below-grade spaces, 10 surface spaces on site, and 11 on-street parking spaces directly adjacent to the property and allowed by City code to be counted in the project total) for a ratio of 1.5 parking spaces per dwelling unit.
- **A commitment to quality construction and sustainability.**
  - The project will meet the requirements of the City of Saint Louis Park’s ambitious Green Building Policy.
  - Exterior materials will be brick, real (cementitious) stucco, and fiber-cement lap siding, in compliance with the City’s exterior materials guidance.
The northern portion of the church building will need to be demolished, and the church’s north surface parking lot will be removed. PPL will own and manage this housing over the long term.

As the original notice stated, the application is for a comprehensive plan amendment, a planned unit development (PUD), preliminary and final plat at 3700 Alabama Avenue and 6027 37th Street West.

More information on the project can be found at the city website: https://www.stlouispark.org/government/departments-divisions/community-development/development-projects, and click on ‘Union Park Flats’ or ‘Union Congregational Church.’

We are excited about the many benefits this project will bring to Saint Louis Park, and to the Elmwood Neighborhood in particular, including:
- Providing new, high-quality housing options for a range of incomes, something that is in very short supply in Saint Louis Park and throughout the metro area.
- Expanding equitable outcomes for people of color.
- Creating jobs. Building, maintaining, and managing housing all require an on-site or local workforce.
- Supporting workers in the local economy. Most of the households residing in PPL housing work in the local service economy in hospitals, schools, banks, retail establishments, and the like.
- Enhancing the station area with more people and more vitality, increasing the customer base for local businesses.
- Supporting investment in transit by adding riders within walking distance of the Wooddale LRT Station.
- Contributing to a greener future for everyone. Compact development makes for more efficient land use, shorter trips between home, work, shopping, and leisure (which, if short enough, are made on foot or by bicycle), a more efficient use of the existing infrastructure such as roads, water, and electric grid.
- Adding to the vitality of the city. Households living in affordable housing tend to be younger and have children who attend local schools. They will tend to stay in and add to the community for years to come. Consider the opposite; a community becomes older and loses population.

This letter will be mailed to owners of all properties within 500 feet of 3700 Alabama Avenue and 6027 37th Street West, emailed to the Elmwood Neighborhood Group, and posted on NextDoor. If you have questions or request clarifications about the project, please contact Abbie Loosen at abbie.loosen@ppl-inc.org. You may also contact the City as indicated in the public hearing notice.

Kind regards,

Abbie Loosen, Chris Wilson, and Malika Billingslea
Project for Pride in Living
Site Plan

Perspective of northwest corner of the building (view from Jorvig Park):
The City of St. Louis Park
Goals:
• Create more affordable housing throughout the City; meet the goal of 439 new units by 2030.
• Reduce climate impacts in a wide variety of ways, including housing, following the City’s Climate Action Plan.
• Gain an understanding of racial equity, develop a shared racial equity analysis including definitions, analyze policies and practices from a racial equity perspective, and strategize with others on how government can advance racial equity.
• Allow as many residents as possible to benefit from the $2.1 billion investment in the Green LRT line; three station platforms are in St. Louis Park.
• Continue to attract new families to the City to support schools, the resale housing market, and community vibrancy.

Union Congregational UCC Church
Goals:
• Rework the existing facilities to embrace the future; transform the sanctuary to a modern space that meets code.
• Unburden from unneeded, expensive legacy facilities.
• Capture the value of long-held real estate assets and redeploy new capital in service to the church’s future.
• Establish new sustainable budget/operations.
• “Walk the talk” of the mission; serve families with housing.
• Energize the congregation and attract new members.
• Leave a lasting legacy for generations to come.
• Stay at the current location another 80 years!

Union Park Flats
Goals:
• 68 units; reduced from 80 in original proposal (-15%).
• ~850 feet walking distance (1/6th mile) to the Wooddale Station LRT platform.
• Mixed-income; units from 30% to 80% AMI ($30k-$80k for a family of 4).
• Family housing; 51 units with 2 or 3 bedrooms; 75% of total.
• Density of 57 units per acre; on the lower end for a TOD site.
• Height of 2-4 stories, steps down to 2-3 stories on sides adjacent to four SF homes; reduction from all-4-story plan. Size reduction of 13,700+ sf.
• Gabled and hipped roof design fits neighborhood character and is desired by Elmwood Neighborhood Association.
• Fits with the City’s most recent vision for area in the 2040 Plan.
• 136 total bedrooms; reduced from 160 in original proposal (-16%).
• Building was moved 20 to the east, away from homes along Brunswick Avenue; 120 feet of space now between building and homes.
• 80 on-site parking stalls; 1.18/unit; 1:1 is a common ratio at TOD sites.
• Traffic demand for new building is expected to be similar to that for the current church+daycare use.
• Will enable many more children to live and go to school in St. Louis Park, supporting the City’s Children First commitment.
• Working families at Union Park Flats are potential homebuyers in the City.

Elmwood Neighborhood
Goals:
• Maintain the history and character of the neighborhood as new developments occur.
• Ensure that new developments provide sufficient on-site parking so existing residents don’t have difficulty parking on their streets.
• Manage traffic effectively to not create new problems.
• Keep new developments to an appropriate height and density in light of planning efforts done for the area.
• Support a mix of housing types, including affordable.
• Welcome new residents to the community.

Project for Pride in Living
Goals:
• Provide as much high-quality affordable housing as possible to those in need.
• Expand to the suburbs, where need is greatest.
• Work in a variety of cities; expand connections and experience.
• Establish relationships with new service partners.
• Create innovative housing developments; partnering with a church is exciting and holds great promise to learn and grow.
• Build PPL’s project portfolio and increase resident-clients for management staff and job training programs.
• Be as productive as possible with each development site to achieve the most efficient use of precious non-profit funds.
• Limit excess or unnecessary costs; achieve economies of scale.
Additional Information:

**Density, unit count and height:**
- 12/10/19 Nicollet Partners professional appraisal for the current housing site (1.20 acres) concluded that:
  - the most productive use of the site is a higher-density multi-family development.
  - rental housing is the most financially feasible use.
  - a building of up to 6 stories in height is feasible.
  - a proposal of 87 units at 72.5 units per acre is appropriate and feasible for the site.
- 9/24/18 Nicollet Partners appraisal for the entire Union site (1.77 acres including the sanctuary) concluded that the site would be suitable for a 5 to 6-story building with up to 100 units.
- Union UCC Church is identified in the 2040 Comp Plan as a redevelopment site in the Wooddale Station TOD district.

**Traffic:**
- A traffic study done in early 2020 by the City concluded that traffic levels for an 80-unit building will be only marginally different than the current site operations, which include a daycare center as well as the church.

**Affordable housing need/demand:**
- The Met Council's goal for St. Louis Park is 439 new affordable units by 2030.
- The Met Council's goal for St. Louis Park last decade was 501 affordable units, but the City only added 54 affordable units, just 3.5% of total new rental units produced (1,555 units in 13 developments).
- The Twin Cities failed to produce roughly 31,000 affordable units needed last decade (60% AMI and below). The goal in the current decade is an additional 38,000 affordable units, for a total of approximately 70,000 new affordable units needed in the Twin Cities by 2030.
KEY FACTS ABOUT THE BLUE LINE CORRIDOR

- 12-mile stretch with 19 station platforms
- Opened in June 2004; 3.5 million riders in 2014
- 2,139 new multifamily units delivered since 2010*
- 995 units to be delivered in 2016*
- 2,245 additional units proposed*

* Excludes age-restricted/senior housing projects.

BLUE LINE CORRIDOR DEMOGRAPHICS

(1/2 Mile Radius)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>Avg. Annual Growth %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>57,643</td>
<td>66,035</td>
<td>76,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>25,433</td>
<td>29,170</td>
<td>32,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment (Jobs)</td>
<td>148,200</td>
<td>158,468</td>
<td>169,921</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Met Council, Minnesota Geospatial Commons

DOWNTOWN MINNEAPOLIS PROJECTS

- Junction Flats | 182 Units
- District 600 | 78 Units
- Dock Street Flats | 185 Units
- Velo | 101 Units
- The Nic on 5th | 286 Units
- Mill City Quarter (U/C) | 150 Units
- Mill District City Apartments | 175 Units
- Emanuel Housing | 101 Units
- The Encore (U/C) | 123 Units

PROJECTS ON THE BLUE LINE OUTSIDE OF DOWNTOWN MINNEAPOLIS

- Five15 on the Park | 259 Units
- Rising Cedar | 40 Units
- Clare Midtown | 45 Units
- Corcoran Triangle (U/C) | 135 Units
- Station 38 Apartments | 64 Units
- Upper Post Veterans Community | 58 Units
- IndiGO (U/C) | 394 Units

Image Credits: Mill City Quarter (Star Tribune), Edition Apartments (Ryan Companies/Excelsior Group), The Encore (Sherman Associates), Corcoran Triangle (BKV Group), IndiGO (ESG Architects)
KEY FACTS ABOUT THE GREEN LINE CORRIDOR (WEST)

- 11-mile stretch with 18 station platforms (8 in western half)
- Opened in June 2014; 10.9 million riders in first year.
- 1,562 new multifamily units delivered since 2010*
- 292 units to be delivered in 2016*
- 684 additional units proposed*
* Excludes age-restricted/senior housing projects.

MULTIFAMILY DEVELOPMENT NODES

- West Bank U of M
- East Bank U of M (Northrup Mall Area, Health Complex, Stadium Village)
- Prospect Park
- University Avenue West (Highway 280 to Snelling Avenue)

GREEN LINE CORRIDOR (WEST) DEMOGRAPHICS (1/2 Mile Radius)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Employment (Jobs)</th>
<th>Avg. Annual Growth %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>36,196</td>
<td>12,992</td>
<td>50,565</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>38,361</td>
<td>14,129</td>
<td>57,635</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>40,785</td>
<td>15,320</td>
<td>61,965</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Met Council, Minnesota Geospatial Commons

MULTIFAMILY DEVELOPMENT NODES

- West Bank U of M
- East Bank U of M (Northrup Mall Area, Health Complex, Stadium Village)
- Prospect Park
- University Avenue West (Highway 280 to Snelling Avenue)

**MARKET VIEWPOINT: TWIN CITIES MULTIFAMILY MARKET 2015-16**

*Image Credits: 2700 University (Flaherty & Collins Properties), Prior Crossing (Cermak Rhoades Architects)*

**MARKET VIEWPOINT: TWIN CITIES MULTIFAMILY MARKET 2015-16**

*Image Credits: 2700 University (Flaherty & Collins Properties), Prior Crossing (Cermak Rhoades Architects)*
KEY FACTS ABOUT THE GREEN LINE CORRIDOR (EAST)

• 11-mile stretch with 18 station platforms (10 in eastern half)
• Opened in June 2014; 10.9 million riders in first year.
• 1,086 new multifamily units delivered since 2010*
• 421 units to be delivered in 2016*
• 538 additional units proposed*

* Excludes age-restricted/senior housing projects.

MULTIFAMILY DEVELOPMENT NODES

• University Avenue East (Snelling Avenue to Capitol Building)
• Downtown St. Paul - West
• Downtown St. Paul - Lowertown

GREEN LINE CORRIDOR (EAST) DEMOGRAPHICS
(1/2 Mile Radius)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>Avg. Annual Growth %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>37,088</td>
<td>44,572</td>
<td>48,600</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>15,131</td>
<td>17,462</td>
<td>19,416</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment (Jobs)</td>
<td>54,655</td>
<td>66,769</td>
<td>71,884</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Met Council, Minnesota Geospatial Commons

MULTIFAMILY DEVELOPMENT NODES

• University Avenue East (Snelling Avenue to Capitol Building)
• Downtown St. Paul - West
• Downtown St. Paul - Lowertown

GREEN LINE CORRIDOR (EAST) DEMOGRAPHICS
(1/2 Mile Radius)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>Avg. Annual Growth %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>37,088</td>
<td>44,572</td>
<td>48,600</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>15,131</td>
<td>17,462</td>
<td>19,416</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment (Jobs)</td>
<td>54,655</td>
<td>66,769</td>
<td>71,884</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Met Council, Minnesota Geospatial Commons
ELMWOOD NEIGHBORHOOD

HOW MIGHT WE DO SOMETHING TRULY GREAT?

OUR PRINCIPLES:

We commit to:

Partnering with all stakeholders to jointly craft a “truly great” development increasing the “livability” of Elmwood and St Louis Park.

Looking beyond the boundaries of the development to ensure it fits and adds to the unique character of the neighborhood.

Leveraging strategic planning on land use from the Elmwood Area Land Use Study and 2040 Comp Plan to guide our priorities.
ELMWOOD NEIGHBORHOOD

A PATH TO TRULY GREAT.

OUR PRIORITIES:

1. The density is consistent with the strategic land use plans.

2. The height/scope of the structure fits the context of its surroundings and within the guidelines of land use plans.

3. The on-site off-street parking allocation meets city code requirements.

4. The architectural design and materials are of high quality while matching the neighborhood character.

5. Promote inclusive, affordable housing goals through the active participation of all neighborhoods in the city with developments including all income levels.
ELMWOOD NEIGHBORHOOD

AN INTENTIONAL PLAN FOR DENSITY.
LAST PARCEL ABUTTING SINGLE-FAMILY HOMES.

2040 COMP PLAN (Adopted August 2019):

Future land use map allows for medium density residential in the range of six (6) to thirty (30) units per acre.

Preserve and enhance the livability and unique character of each neighborhood’s residential areas.

Require the creation of appropriate and effective buffer or transition areas between different land-use types.

ELMWOOD LAND USE STUDY:

Residential density should transition progressively from low to medium to high as you move away from the existing single-family homes.
ELMWOOD NEIGHBORHOOD

GUIDANCE ON APPROPRIATE HEIGHT/SCOPE.

2040 COMP PLAN (Adopted August 2019):
Future land use allows for a variety of housing types that are compatible in scale to the single-family homes, including single-family detached, duplexes, townhomes, and small two- to three-story apartment buildings.

Encourage infill and redevelopment...that is neighborhood scale in building size, architecture, and orientation to the street.

ELMWOOD LAND USE STUDY:

UCC strongly opposed a proposed four-story apartment complex abutting their property to the east. They demanded that redevelopments not exceed the height of adjacent properties; in this case, their church. They were successful and have set the precedent for the neighborhood.

Metropolitan Council TOD
Best Practice
Appropriate to Context
The appropriateness and feasibility of density varies from community to community.

St. Louis Park, Wooddale Flats on Wooddale Avenue near Excelsior Boulevard. This residential development on Wooddale Avenue near Excelsior Boulevard adds moderate density that fits into the adjoining single-family neighborhood. Density: 15 units per acre. Height: 30ft next to single-family, max is 43 ft on three-story section. Parking: 2.5 stalls per unit

Elmwood Land Use Study
ELMWOOD NEIGHBORHOOD

PLANNED PARKING MAINTAINS NEIGHBORHOOD FEEL.

2040 COMP PLAN (Adopted August 2019):


CITY CODE SEC. 36-361:

Code requires off-street parking for “Multi-family (development) at one space per bedroom...shall not be eligible for transit or PUD reduction in required parking.”

ELMWOOD LAND USE STUDY:

Structured parking should be integrated into the building complex, preferably below grade.

On prior developments, UCC expressed concerns that under planning for parking would result in on-street, eliminating parking used by churchgoers.
ELMWOOD NEIGHBORHOOD

GREAT ARCHITECTURE, DESIGN AND MATERIALS ARE TIMELESS.

SLP HISTORICAL SOCIETY:

Thirty (30) of SLP’s seventy (70) homes built 1900 or earlier are in Elmwood (highest neighborhood concentration). Seventeen (17) of these homes are within two blocks of the proposed structure. Some of SLP oldest homes are within 300f ft (1891, 1895, 1895, 1895, 1895, 1910) and historic depot (1887).

CITY CODE SEC. 36-32:

PUD on “Tracts of land less than two acres may be approved only if the applicant can demonstrate that a project of superior design can be achieved or that greater compliance with the comprehensive plan.”

ELMWOOD LAND USE STUDY:

“Form, style, and material selection complement the remainder of the Elmwood single-family housing stock.”

“Jorvig Park, has historical significance for both the neighborhood and community.” “Jorvig Park will continue to serve as the neighborhoods’ cornerstone park. Its historical significance should be preserved.” “Development configuration should complement Jorvig Park.”
ELMWOOD NEIGHBORHOOD

ALL ARE WELCOME IN ELMWOOD.

Elmwood is the original village, comprising 3% of the city land area, with 1500+ diverse housing units, supports a city wide effort to 2030 goal of creating 439 affordable.

Under this goal, affordable units approved to date:
159 (55%) Elmwood.
116 (45%) in the rest of the city.

600+ Naturally Occurring Affordable Housing Units Elmwood (Rental & Owned).

Today, nearly 50% of the housing units in Elmwood are affordable.

SWLRT HOUSING GAPS ANALYSIS (2015) recommended building 600 units in the next 15 years, 135 (23%) affordable units.

Best practices promote mixed-income of all levels in affordable housing developments.

HUD definitions AMI: High (170%+), Middle (169%), Moderate (120%), Low (80%), Very Low (60%), Very Low (50% - Section 8 Eligible), and Extremely Low (30% - Section 8 Eligible)
## Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Zoning</th>
<th>Elmwood Study</th>
<th>2040 Comp Plan</th>
<th>Neighborhood Compromise</th>
<th>Developer Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>R3 - One-Family &amp; Two-Family Dwellings</td>
<td>Low-Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>Medium Density (on the high end)</td>
<td>“R-C High Density Multi-Family Code” limit 50 unit/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>11 units/acre</td>
<td>20 units/acre</td>
<td>6-30 units/acre</td>
<td>45 &amp; 25 units/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>Lesser of 35 ft or 3 stories</td>
<td>2.5 stories</td>
<td>small apartment 2-3 stories or single-family, duplex, townhouse</td>
<td>2 stories on Brunswick (27 ft) 3 stories on Alabama (35ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-street Parking</td>
<td>1 stall/bedroom</td>
<td>2 stall/unit</td>
<td>1 stall/bedroom</td>
<td>1.8 stall/unit, maximize underground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Neighborhood Compromise</td>
<td>Complement historic asset, Jorvig Park</td>
<td>Preserve and enhance Residential Neighborhoods</td>
<td>Architecture and Scaling consistent with surroundings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design is big box, details reminding residents of 70’s apartments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OUR IDEA – NEIGHBORHOOD COMPROMISE #3

40 Units Total

“The Family Parcel”
Density: 25 unit per acre
Height: 27 ft, two-story, flat or sloped roof
Other: Townhouse Style w/ Front Doors on Brunswick. Larger Units that have Single Family Home Feel.

Parking: 1.8 Stalls per Unit

“The Transition Parcel”
Density: 45 unit per acre
Height: 35 ft, three-story, flat roof
Other: Style of an old building (like a renovated school)
OUR IDEA – NEIGHBORHOOD COMPROMISE #3

Each Section 1, 2, 3 should have a unique architecture, this will make the scale feel smaller, look like 3 smaller buildings.

Move Open Parking HERE, South to North of Buildings
*better traffic flow*

Exterior of stone and brick

Two-story Building

Outdoor Gathering Space
***No Playground, Use Park, Consider additional investment in park play structure improvement***
Using city parks creates community

Expanded Footprint increases units & underground parking (TOD)

Three-Story Building

Underground Parking Entrance HERE
Reference
• Elmwood Area Land Use Study (2003) – Valid thru 2033
• 2040 Comprehensive Plan (2019) – Valid thru 2040
• Wooddale Ave Transit Development Planning Study (2009)
• SWLRT Housing Gaps Analysis Study (2015)
• Comprehensive Housing Market Study Update for St. Louis Park (2018)
• Metropolitan Council TOD Guide
• St Louis Park City Council Agenda & Packets
• St Louis Park Inclusive Housing Policy
• Housing and Urban Development (HUD) https://www.huduser.gov/
Dear Council Member Mavity,

Subsequent to our meeting on January 7, 2020 with the potential developer for Union Congregational Church's property at 37th St. and Alabama Ave., the Elmwood Neighborhood Association met and needs your help with this project. Collectively, we have developed a position statement that we would like you to champion as our representative.

“The Elmwood Neighborhood Association supports development on the Union Congregational Church site that fits the scale and scope of this historic neighborhood, transitioning down in height as it approaches the single-family homes, with ample off-street parking, and integrated affordable housing (including both senior and non-senior components) not to exceed 20% of the housing units."

We believe this finds balance for all stakeholders. As our Ward 2 representative, we hope you can support and advocate the spirit and intent of this position with this developer or a different one.

Thank you! We look forward to the next steps in this process and providing any additional neighborhood feedback.

- The Elmwood Neighborhood Association
FYI

From: Tom Harmening <THARMENING@stlouispark.org>
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2020 9:24 AM
To: mark leonard <marklnrd@gmail.com>; Nancy Deno <ndeno@stlouispark.org>
Cc: Karen Barton <kbarton@stlouispark.org>
Subject: RE: Union Congregational United Church of Christ Project

Hello Colleen and Mark – thanks very much for sharing your thoughts and concerns about the project UCC has proposed with PPL. I wanted to make sure you were aware of the communication J.W. Starrett representing the Elmwood Neighborhood Association sent to 2nd Ward Councilmember Anne Mavity recently expressing thoughts as well. Please see below. I would also encourage you to contact Councilmember Mavity. Her email address is amavity@stlouispark.org

Regards - Tom

Dear Council Member Mavity,

Subsequent to our meeting on January 7, 2020 with the potential developer for Union Congregational Church’s property at 37th St. and Alabama Ave., the Elmwood Neighborhood Association met and needs your help with this project. Collectively, we have developed a position statement that we would like you to champion as our representative.

“The Elmwood Neighborhood Association supports development on the Union Congregational Church site that fits the scale and scope of this historic neighborhood, transitioning down in height as it approaches the single-family homes, with ample off-street parking, and integrated affordable housing (including both senior and non-senior components) not to exceed 20% of the housing units.”

We believe this finds balance for all stakeholders. As our Ward 2 representative, we hope you can support and advocate the spirit and intent of this position with this developer or a different one.

Thank you! We look forward to the next steps in this process and providing any additional neighborhood feedback.

- The Elmwood Neighborhood Association
Dear City Manager and Deputy City Manager:

As a resident who is directly across the street from the Union Congregation Church development we are writing to you for your assistance.

Just recently the church notified the neighborhood of their project, the developer that they have chosen, and their time frame. This came as a complete surprise to us yet, the Church has stated they have been working on this for almost a year without any neighborhood input. Working with property owners who will be affected by a significant zoning change, early on, would seem to not only be prudent but respectful.

The Pastor of the Church is rigid, letting residents know this is the project, and its fits their Christian mission, and there are no alternatives. Just recently they finally commenced their very first meeting in which they invited residents. You need to be made aware this meeting was informational only. They do hear the many concerns but are also very clear and forthright they have no plans to make any changes. Furthermore, they have eluded that the delay in involving neighbors was under guidance given from city officials. Living in St. Louis Park since 1999, in two different neighborhoods, I find this hard to believe.

Thus, we are asking you to direct them to start the process over, working and engaging residents from the beginning. We bought our house knowing the zoning around us. They would like to change the zoning greatly for their own benefit not caring about the adverse effects for the surrounding area. Granting them a rezoning when they did not genuinely engage the community does not seem fair or just. They have a strong mission as a Church and we understand their desire to push what they want, but to do it at the expense of others, affecting quality of life of others, seems inconsistent with the values of the church or our city. With a genuine team approach and inclusive process it is very possible a win win can be accomplished. A process of collaboration from the onset can result in a project that would both, assist them with their goals, and find compatibility that is not detrimental to the neighborhood.

Thank you for your help.

Colleen and Mark Leonard

6200 Oxford St, St. Louis Park, MN 55416
Sean Walther, AICP  
Planning and Zoning Supervisor | City of St. Louis Park  
5005 Minnetonka Blvd, St. Louis Park, MN 55416  
Office: 952.924.2574  
www.stlouispark.org  
Experience LIFE in the Park.

From: Tom Harmening <THARMENING@stlouispark.org>  
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 7:03 AM  
To: Sean Walther <swalther@stlouispark.org>; Karen Barton <kbarton@stlouispark.org>  
Subject: Fwd: Proposed Union Congregation Church Project

FYI and file  
Get Outlook for iOS

From: Anne Mavity <amavity@stlouispark.org>  
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 3:52 AM  
To: mark leonard  
Cc: Jake Spano; Tom Harmening; Nancy Deno  
Subject: Re: Proposed Union Congregation Church Project

Mark and Colleen,

I’ve reduced the cc: list so as not to get in trouble with our open meeting laws.

Again I appreciate your email and want to remain in conversation on this. I have encouraged the developer to work with the neighborhood, and now that they have formally submitted an application, the city has a more formal role in evaluating and considering this project. If you haven’t seen it yet, please see the city’s website, where we have developments listed, and you can access the information we have been provided by PPL.

I don’t have any authority over the church/the seller of the property. As a property owner, they can sell to whomever they want. We do have approval authority, as guided by our ordinances, for the development itself through PPL, and that is where I think my energy is best spent.

I’ll look forward to seeing you at the meeting next Tuesday and again, am happy to chat separately in person or by phone. I very much appreciate your thoughts and input on this and that you both are always so thoughtful and reasonable in these matters. thanks for that.
Anne

Anne Mavity
City Councilmember
952-913-1108

On Mar 4, 2020, at 9:03 AM, mark leonard <marklnrd@gmail.com> wrote:

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Council Member Mavity,

Thank you very much for getting back to us.

We agree and I think you will generally find that neighbors understand that higher density with SWLRT is appropriate and that Elmwood has worked with developers in the past to accomplish this. An early example is the neighborhood worked in collaboration with both Quadian Corporation and the city to design a project that increased density and found balance with design, population mix, and provide a flow into the single family homes of the Elmwood Neighborhood. This was accomplished knowing SWLRT would come and be a positive addition for everyone.

The Church so far has made absolutely no genuine effort to work with other property owners in regards to the design and mix of this project, as you mentioned this is everything. I find it more than a little concerning the Church has a final project that involved no input from the immediate community. Conversations with the Church and the single meeting we had, appear to dictate to the neighborhood the project is final and going forward regardless, true and meaningful engagement is much more than this. The church eluded that prior meetings with city officials (these all occurred prior to the first and only meeting with neighbors) have resulted in a blessing of the project as is and they are moving forward based on that given direction. To those of us that have made our home in the neighborhood feel this lack of engagement with the community feels as if the Church is only working to further its own agenda and working in its own interest without concern of the effect on its neighbors and/or other surrounding property owners. This is evident by the Church putting the onus on neighborhood leaders to advocate for and communicate any meetings. Normally, I would think, the party wanting a zoning change would be the one responsible for proactively coordinating and communicating effectively interactive meetings well in advance. Seems unreasonable and uncommon practice to put this burden onto the residents, unless it was known this would be an unpopular project, putting 100 plus new neighbors in an increasingly congested part of the city.

As our representative we need your help to encourage the Church to finally work in conjunction with all stakeholders on an overall design that will find the appropriate balance. If the Church won’t and
are just going to attempt to push this through, as is, we need your support in leading the effort to deny any of these very significant zoning changes and other approvals. If not designed in collaboration with the interest of all parties involved it will have detrimental influence on the surrounding neighborhood. The Churches actions from the perspective of the neighborhood appear to have made a deliberate attempt to work on an unpopular project in the hope it could be fast tracked without community input. These actions are inconsistent with the values of our Elmwood Community as we feel we are good neighbors and attempt to find middle ground where possible. Lastly, we believe that if they would be just willing to work with the surrounding Elmwood Community this project can be a win win.

As you can see we are in great need of your assistance.

Thankfully,

Mark and Colleen Leonard

On Thu, Feb 20, 2020 at 2:15 PM Anne Mavity <amavity@stlouispark.org> wrote:

Thanks mark.

I met with them at their invitation prior to the neighborhood meeting and told them that more neighborhood engagement is better all around. Apparently the neighborhood reps didn’t get the mtg notice out with much lead time and I understand another meeting was scheduled by them to talk with neighbors again soon. I will show up to these meetings to listen to concerns and suggestions so I better understand those perspectives. I do believe that more density near the SWLRT is appropriate but design is everything in terms of how it works with neighboring properties.

They have not submitted an application to the city yet so it’s not officially under any city control in terms of reviews, notices, etc. but again my advice to them was to engage with neighbors more.

I’m happy to talk with you directly as well - call me at (952) 913-1108.

Anne Mavity

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 20, 2020, at 11:33 AM, mark leonard <marklnrd@gmail.com> wrote:

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Council Members,
As a resident who is directly across the street from the Union Congregation Church development we are writing to you for your assistance.

Just recently the church notified the neighborhood of their project, the developer that they have chosen, and their time frame. This came as a complete surprise to us yet, the Church has stated they have been working on this for almost a year without any neighborhood input. Working with property owners who will be affected by a significant zoning change, early on, would seem to not only be prudent but respectful.

The Pastor of the Church is rigid, letting residents know this is the project, and its fits their Christian mission, and there are no alternatives. Just recently they finally commenced their very first meeting in which they invited residents. You need to be made aware this meeting was informational only. They do hear the many concerns but are also very clear and forthright they have no plans to make any changes. Furthermore, they have eluded that the delay in involving neighbors was under guidance given from city officials. Living in St. Louis Park since 1999, in two different neighborhoods, I find this hard to believe.

Thus, we are asking you to direct them to start the process over, working and engaging residents from the beginning. We bought our house knowing the zoning around us. They would like to change the zoning greatly for their own benefit not caring about the adverse effects for the surrounding area. Granting them a rezoning when they did not genuinely engage the community does not seem fair or just. They have a strong mission as a Church and we understand their desire to push what they want, but to do it at the expense of others, affecting quality of life of others, seems inconsistent with the values of the church or our city. With a genuine team approach and inclusive process it is very possible a win win can be accomplished. A process of collaboration from the onset can result in a project that would both, assist them with their goals, and find compatibility that is not detrimental to the neighborhood.

Thank you for your help.

Colleen and Mark Leonard

6200 Oxford St, St. Louis Park, MN 55416
Hi Anne,

I want to thank you for attending the neighborhood meeting earlier this week and listening to the neighborhood’s concerns about this proposed project.

I was planning to talk at the meeting, but as it got longer I decided I would just write this email instead.

Just as we heard from most in attendance at the meeting, I also struggle with the density of this project. This development is not located on a main/busy street such or in an area where development of this density would be expected. It is instead located in an area next to single family residential housing. I understand the church’s need for additional revenue, but simply because 80 units is what is required for them to make enough profit on the sale of the property does not mean that 80 units is the appropriate density.

The question then becomes what is the appropriate density for a location such as this. Luckily, the city of St. Louis Park has recently conducted a study on a building site very similar to this location (Eliot Community Center Site Reuse Study) that should provide everyone with appropriate guidelines to follow. The Eliot study was also about a development where a school/community site was being redeveloped and it even talks about being in an area with single family homes, a church across the street, and nearby commercial and industrial uses. The apartments that opened on the Eliot site opened less than five years ago, so this study should still be relevant today. The study can still be found on the city’s website. I would attach it, but I suspect attachments are not opened. It is remarkable to71(286,815),(958,984)

Findings of the study conclude that medium density residential of six to 30 units per acre should be built on the site and that anything built should complement the existing scale and character of the surrounding homes. The study notes that on the Eliot site this would equate to 26 to 129 units.

Based on other information on the city website I found that the final design of the apartments built on at the Eliot location was 138 units which equates to 32 units per acre, so just slightly over the top range of the study. Further, the apartments on the Eliot site are two stories, and step up to three stories in some locations. The proposed four stories on the UCC site is simply too much.

Based on my below correspondence with Jacquelyn within the planning division of SLP, the UCC site is 1.19 acres. At 30 units per acre as the Eliot study recommends, this would result in a development
of 36 units on the UCC site. It would come up to 38 units on the UCC site at the ending 32 units per acre of what was finally built on the Eliot site. The proposal for the UCC site is 67 units per acre, which is over double these densities. This was shocking to me that the city is even entertaining the thoughts of a development that is this dense. Why are we even having to attend neighborhood meetings to defend our neighborhood from this development? The city should be applying such studies themselves and making sure they do not even get to the point where a neighborhood meeting is required.

The city has recently gone through a heated debate about bike lanes in the city (Southwest Bikeway Improvements) and one of the themes used to approve that work was around treating that neighborhood the same as previous neighborhoods were treated when similar initiatives were proposed. Please treat the Elmwood neighborhood the same as the neighborhood around the Eliot site was treated for proposed residential development.

I ask that you please consider these numbers as this proposal is voted on by the city and ensure that this development stays at 30 units per acre. I also ask that you please read the Eliot site study and that the study is attached to any agenda items reviewed by the city council or planning commission. Please also include my thoughts and concerns with other members of both the city council and the planning commission and that those members are informed about the Eliot site study. The study should clearly help define what the density of development of the UCC site should be.

Thanks,
Brian (an Elmwood neighborhood resident)

---

From: Jacquelyn Kramer (mailto:jkramer@stlouispark.org)
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2020 9:33 AM
To: Fuchs, Brian R. (BLM)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Union Congregational Church

Good morning Brian,

The proposed apartment building lot would be 1.19 acres. So with 80 units it would have a density of 67 units per acre. One of the requests from the developer is a comprehensive plan amendment, which would reguide the proposed parcel from the civic designation to high density residential, which allows up to 75 units per acre. Please let me know if you have any other questions about the proposal. Thanks.

Jacquelyn Kramer (she/her/hers)
Associate Planner | City of St. Louis Park
5005 Minnetonka Blvd, St. Louis Park, MN 55416
Office: 952.928.1375
www.stlouispark.org
Experience LIFE in the Park.

From: Fuchs, Brian R. (BLM) <BRFuchs@express-scripts.com>
Hi Jacquelyn,

I attended the neighborhood meeting last night on the proposed development on the school/community portion of the UCC property. One thing I was wondering once I got home was what is the size of the proposed building site in terms of acres? I am wondering what 80 units would be in terms of density stated as units per acre.

Thanks,
Brian
Hello Karen, Sean, and Jacquelyn:

Hope this email finds you well.

Writing to you today in regards to Project for Pride in Living (PPL) request for city approval to construct a four story, 80-unit affordable apartment building on property owned by Union Congregational Church (UCC). As you are aware their request for approval includes significant changes and multiple concessions including:

- A comprehensive plan amendment to regicide the northern portion of the site from civic to high density residential.
- Rezoning the site to a planned unit development (PUD), to achieve an amendment for both the zoning map and zoning text.
- Preliminary and final plat approval to create a north parcel for the apartment building and a south parcel for the church.

As mentioned in one of the publications, and as we know, when a proposed redevelopment like this is initiated, consideration must be given to both the housing goals and neighborhood land use development goals.

The comprehensive Elmwood Area Land Use, Transit, and Transportation Study, included the following active participants the City of St. Louis Park (Community Development, Public Works, and Parks), Hennepin County, the Met Council, Metro Transit, the MN DOT, Three River Parks District, Hennepin County Regional Rail Authority, the Twin City and Western Railroad, a Community Advisory Committee,
and twelve area businesses, including Aldersgate Methodist. A Project management Team was formed to direct the study and assure effective consultations/coordination between all agencies along with regular communication. The study was in anticipation and considered light rail and other changes we are seeing.

The completed study set forth a collaborative vision for the future. With vast parties involved in this extensive process, it was meant to assure that no single interest would be larger than the overall area. As stated in the study the purpose was to establish a reasonable framework for decision making, provide direction and focus, be used as evaluation criteria in reviewing private sector development initiatives; establish a common expectation amongst decision makers, policy makers, property owners and tenants.

The study and communication set forth the following:

* Areas ‘small town’ feel should be preserved

* Rowhouses or townhomes

* Integrated (not concentrated) affordable housing

* Compatible Land uses with the single family residential area, community character

* Parcels west of Wooddale Avenue should be redeveloped for residential use, progressively increasing in density from Oxford Street north to West 36th street

* Age-restricted housing should be considered as a development component responding to neighborhood and community needs.

* Residential density should transition from low to high, increasing south to north.

* Owner-occupied housing should be encouraged

* Irregular land use patterns between single family homes and other land uses should have clear distinct
*Low density townhomes on the north side of Oxford Street should have an architectural character and scale that compliments the residential neighborhoods scale and character.

Attended, for the first time in a very long time, this past Tuesday, a community meeting, and was taken back by the church’s (UCC) position and demeanor. Pastor Barb was not bashful and stated “We don’t have to be transparent but we will today”. She expressed the view that participation is not needed as they are the seller – it was demeaning as an attendee. She went onto say that they did not want any meetings until their “Ducks were in a row”. With the surrounding context it was explicit that until what they wanted was completed they were not going to share. Pastor Barb went on to communicate that even after this sale there is no guarantee they would be viable for very long. Unsure if it is prudent to jump through hoops for them to cash in short term.

Back in my active days I can vividly remember how active the UCC board and parishioners (many still members today) were regarding the Quadion development. They demanded (an understatement) that one of the early initial proposals be thrown out in its entirety due to height, density, and parking. Subsequently they insisted that the project significantly be reduce in scale and scope, in no case should it be over two stories, and must have more than ample off street parking. This was to assure it would not affect their Sundays and other event on street parking. They were adamant that the Quadion development scale down as it approached the church and the neighborhood. It is very ironic that now they are requesting a PUD with the height jumping back up significantly (even as it more closely borders the neighborhood), against the precedent they helped set and were passionate about. If allowed this will have the same drawbacks on others in which they previously successfully and aggressively argued to prevent happening to themselves.
Also to note it appeared the developer was not being genuine or transparent. One example, he was asked a question from a resident “If there would be the need for any city assistance and if so the amount”. He paused, said yes, and then when asked for general amount from the resident – “will it be .5M or 1M or where a bouts”, he said they do not know. Yet it is already published they will be requesting around $972,000 and it was evident he clearly knew. Very disheartening. Not sure this lack of forthrightness should be rewarded and thus if this is a developer that meets the ethical standards that should be expected.

The resident attendees included some that were very emotional, and one who is notorious and self-focused. There were also some very well-articulated, thought-out, constructive, and legitimate concerns communicated. Thought the overall desires they communicated were collaborative and solution based. Generally, it was a development with the appropriate scope, scaling down as it approaches the neighborhood, with both affordability and market rate housing, designed to accommodate parking and transitional architecture, would makes sense for everyone. Seemed reasonable, practical, balanced, while meeting some of the needs for all. It was good to see that the folks were not saying absolutely nothing should happen at this site.

In regards to the seller and one developer requests it is evident that they have chosen to ignore the very foundation and DNA of St. Louis Park, embracing requirements and guidance from an inclusive process. It is reasonable that the criteria in the 30 year land to use study be considered as intended. I can imagine there are many developers/buyers that would be willing to work in conjunction with the seller and the city on a project, at this site, that would meet the variety of needs.

As you will recognize they have not met many of the requirements and objectives including those set forth
in the land use study listed above. A project that meets these goals is clearly possible, as evident by other successful redevelopments in the area. As mentioned they are requesting very significant changes and concessions. Thus, very hopeful the recommendation is not to proceed with the applications and denial.

Appreciate your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

John Basill
Dear Honorable Mayor and City Council:

We recently attended a neighborhood meeting regarding the Union Congregational Church property.

Although we were not made aware of this project until to just recently, we are for affordable housing. We have been long term residents, who have been active in the community over the years, from coaching girls soccer to currently being employed at the school district helping our children.

We have had the time to research and digest this concept - PLEASE take the time to read the reviews on PPL attached. It is a struggle to find any positive reviews on this specific developer. I am sure PPL is well intentioned but this would be one of their largest projects and you will find they are struggling. This cannot be the only choice. There has to be a developer that would design a project with complimentary architecture, appropriate density, transitional height as it borders single family homes, and a better track record.

Lastly, being active in the schools, children of lower socio-economic means struggle more when they come from concentrated housing we have in our city. The "village" approach is dramatically more effective if in fact we want to help lower income children succeed. It would be better to add eighty more units of affordable housing throughout the community. For example, over the next eight developments add ten affordable units in each. From firsthand experience this will benefit individuals seeking affordable housing the most and in numerous ways.

Thank you for your time.

Sue and Gregg Anderson
i hope you all are staying healthy and safe right now.

On Mar 23, 2020, at 10:01 AM, Anne Mavity <amavity@stlouispark.org> wrote:

I understand your frustration.

When the developers and church first informed me about the development I immediately told them as I tell every developer when they come in with an idea that the city expects in hopes that they will engage the community and neighborhood early and often. The city does not have control over that part of the process. Now that an official application is in the city will be following its processes and protocols and timelines.

Anne Mavity

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 23, 2020, at 9:30 AM, m ritter <schmike1979@gmail.com> wrote:

Thanks for the quick response Anne.

As you are aware the pastor stated at the meeting that they had been working with the developer and the city for some time - many months(years?). This project is scaling up significantly as it comes into the neighborhood and has given no consideration to the existing neighborhood and homes. As you were aware of the meetings and this project, it would have seemed appropriate as our representative, that you assure the church actually formally communication to residents, if actionable feedback was welcome.

At the meeting I am sure you heard the pastor state that she does not need to be transparent but will try to be tonight. She also talked about as the seller there was no obligation to get this input. I find it sad that I had to find out about this meeting second hand along with the lack of involvement, in a major change, with less then 60
days to final approval. There is only one proposal and it was clear at the meeting this is the plan.

I would hope you can be counted on not to support this project.

Thanks.

Mike

On Mar 22, 2020, at 9:47 PM, Anne Mavity <amavity@stlouispark.org> wrote:

Hi Mike,

Thanks for the email. The city has statute based timelines that guide its response times once a project has applied to the city. I’ll let staff fill in those details.

The two meetings to date were meetings organized and hosted by the church and the developer, not by the city, even though I have attended each one.

Now that the city has received a formal application, the city’s official review has begun - and you can get information about the project now on the city’s website.

Staff can follow up with details on the process and timing. Feel feel to email or call me with additional comments or questions.

Best,

Anne Mavity

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 22, 2020, at 9:20 PM, m ritter <schmike1979@gmail.com> wrote:

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mayor and Council:

A project was sprung on our neighborhood at a March 10th meeting. The UCC informed us that they are going to have an 80 unit 4 story complex built directly adjacent to single family properties.
I live very close to the Church (less than 2 blocks). Thanks to word of mouth from my neighbors this was the first meeting I was aware of. I do not understand the lack of notice or communication on a project that will have major impact on all of us who live in the neighborhood.

With final approvals set for May 4th (less than 60 days from May 10th meeting does not seem fair) this is what unfortunately occurs - see picture.

I hope this project will be reevaluated.

Thank You
Mike

Two homes for sale.
<Screenshot 2020-03-17 at 6.35.05 PM.jpeg>
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Thanks Jacquelyn,

Just a couple observations. We all realize this is a very significant change in what the property is being used for today, even with the minor changes. I was made aware of the following at the meeting: (just does not seem reasonable or fair – seems to be slanted):

This project actually increases in height significantly as it approaches the neighborhood. There is already scaling down in height (townhome height) which seems to work well for everyone as a transition to the neighborhood.

I learned at the meeting that the church lobbied very hard to make sure that the development across the street transitioned down to their property. They also assured there was more than enough off street parking so that parking for their services was not jeopardized.

If there is going to be this significant change in land use, ignoring precedent scaling, should there not have been more of a process, involvement, a study for what would make sense, especially since the Church said they were working on this back in mid 2019.

As mentioned not sure why this is the only option. It sure appears like this is being rammed through when a proposal that would work for everyone could occur. It would just seem best to get all parties together and come back with recommendations that could work for everyone. Since this is achievable I am unsure why this project should go forward.

Those are just some thoughts which would seem equitable.

Mike

On Mar 23, 2020, at 10:49 AM, Jacquelyn Kramer <jkrämer@stlouispark.org> wrote:

Good morning Mike,

Here are some further details on the notifications that have gone out and will go out for this project.

As Councilmember Mavity mentioned, the church has held two neighborhood meetings on this project on January 7 and March 10. Meeting information was distributed on neighborhood email lists and social media, and the March 10 meeting was advertised on mailed flyers. These flyers should have reached every property within 500 feet of the project site.

For the city approval process, state statute has strict requirements on the public outreach required for public hearings and council action. A notice will be published in the Sun Sailor at least ten day before the planning commission public hearing, so that notice will appear in the paper next Thursday. Also next week, every property within 500 feet of the project site will receive a letter from the city describing the project and the public hearing.

In addition to these state statute requirements, city social media accounts (Facebook and Nextdoor) have been advertising the neighborhood meetings. These accounts will distribute information on the public hearing as the date approaches as well. We also email public hearing notices directly to neighborhood organizations. The city website will update with meeting information as it becomes available.
Good morning Mike,

Thank you for reaching out to Councilmember Mavity and city staff. I am tracking every email, phone call, and letter we receive on this project to ensure they are presented to planning commission and city council as they make their decisions.

To expand upon Councilmember Mavity's earlier email: the city received the formal planning applications for this project on March 2. Once the application is submitted and deemed complete by staff, we can then publish project details and schedule a public hearing, which will be held on April 15. I will update the project page on the city website when I have more information on the format of the public hearing: https://www.stlouispark.org/government/departments-divisions/community-development/development-projects/union-congregational-church.

State statute requires that cities approve or deny planning applications within 60 days of a complete submittal. We can administratively extend that deadline another 60 days, but we try to get applications to council as close to that deadline as possible. That is the reason this project (and all applications that need council approval) move through the city process in 2-3 months.

The developer has made some modifications to their project based on neighborhood feedback, including adding surface parking south of the apartment building, reducing the number of bedrooms, and altering the west elevation design to create a more townhome-like feel across the street from the single family homes. I understand these modifications may not satisfy your concerns, which is why the city will take comments on this project until city council makes a decision on May 4. Please let me know if you have any other questions on the project, and thank you again for your engagement.

Hi Mike,

Thanks for the email. The city has statute based timelines that guide its response times once a project has applied to the city. I'll let staff fill in those details.

The two meetings to date were meetings organized and hosted by the church and the developer, not by the city, even though I have attended each one.

Now that the city has received a formal application, the city’s official review has begun — and you can get information about the project now on the city’s website.

Staff can follow up with details on the process and timing. Feel feel to email or call me with additional comments or questions.

Best,

Anne Mavity

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 22, 2020, at 9:20 PM, m ritter <schmike1979@gmail.com> wrote:

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.
Dear Mayor and Council:

A project was sprung on our neighborhood at a March 10th meeting. The UCC informed us that they are going to have an 80 unit 4 story complex built directly adjacent to single family properties.

I live very close to the Church (less than 2 blocks). Thanks to word of mouth from my neighbors this was the first meeting I was aware of. I do not understand the lack of notice of communication on a project that will have major impact on all of us who live in the neighborhood.

With final approvals set for May 4th (less than 60 days from May 10th meeting does not seem fair) this is what unfortunately occurs - see picture.

I hope this project will be reevaluated.

Thank You

Mike

Two homes for sale.
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Thor Joeson reviewed Project for Pride in Living... September 4, 2015 at 10:23 AM

You don't want them coming to your neighborhood. The building operated by PPL in the Cleveland Neighborhood of Minneapolis is a horrible addition to the neighborhood. People of all walks of life deserve a place to live, but blighted communities on the North side do not need more absentee landlords under the shield of non-profit status. Be wary of this organization if they come looking at property in your neighborhood.

Marilyn Smith-Hanson doesn't recommend Project for Pride in Living.
1 year ago

When you have unexpected circumstances arise and you need help and understanding from your landlord, they will kick you out on the streets with out any remorse.

Sue Keator doesn't recommend Project for Pride in Living.
4 years ago

PPL has allowed the multi unit building at 3405 Penn Ave N. to be a detriment to the neighborhood. For at least the past two years, PPL has told homeowners nearby that things will improve. Meanwhile, the tenants of 3405 continue to drink and use drugs openly, vandalize neighbors' property and make a general pigsty of their area. What has to be done to get this fixed? The property manager gives lip service only.

Fearnone King Kayar

This whole housing program with them needs to be revamped from the CEO down. they are all snakes that slither together. they are not for the community they for self pockets not just the money from the sponsors but the dealer they protect on their property while they evict families with disable children for making complaints.
Jake Brue doesn't recommend Project for Pride in Living.
9 months ago

They housed Mohamed Noor. Don’t believe me? It's public record.

Like Comment Share

Dan Mason doesn't recommend Project for Pride in Living.
4 years ago

1 star
This is a terrible organization. The last thing you want is a PPL building in your neighborhood. They attract the worst type of people and then concentrate them in apartment buildings. It's like a flop house for people that have failed at life. Ex-cons, child molesters, rapists, and murderers.

2

Like Comment Share

Renee' Eaves doesn't recommend Project for Pride in Living.
1 year ago

I don’t know where there funding is going but it is definitely not going to help people in need. When you actually get them to do anything there is no follow through.

3

Like Comment Share

Shannon Martin recommends Project for Pride in Living.
3 years ago

5 stars
This school helped me get into a great job, and helped me build my resume. I love this school.

4

Like Comment Share
I came there because a friend needed some assistance with housing and a job search. I came with the friend so I could assist her better and for support. I was underwhelmed when we left there because this was recommended my people that I know. They said that it would be great for those who are struggling with things that are related to services that they provide. While they do provide those certain services my friend needed, they weren't given to her like we had expected. My friend and I left there unhappy with the lack of help that we got.

Even though the staff was friendly, they didn't know what they were doing. Some of the staff had to ask multiple other staff members about simple answers my friend needed. I didn't feel that they have the knowledge needed to have a job there. I wonder how they ever got hired there in the first place. They were able to help a little with the job search part. However, nothing came of it. The friend didn't feel she got the help she needed. We'll be choosing a different organization. We won't be back.
7 months ago

If your willing to take a chance and come here to hamline station apartments 1305-1309 University Ave for any reason you may want to make sure you wear a bullet proof vest or carry some mace, have an oxygen machine, park your car a block away and all your shots should be up to date. If your visiting anyone on the bottom floor stay away from the windows cause you may get cut from someone kicking in the window or hit by a bullet coming through the window. Keep a close eye on your kids because none of the managers informed of us that they are renting to people who are pedophiles and predators. Found out on a fluke by getting a police report for another reason and they listed every call at this complex. Rapes, drug overdoses that resulted in death in the hallway, stairwell and lobby. People get drunk and stands at the opposite ends of the hallway and shoots at one another some kind of came they play. Tenants luring young girls into their apartment by offering them alcohol. It's a revolving door something everyday. Be safe.

9 months ago

I wish I didn't have to give any stars. This company is a total scam. They get all this funding which is supposed to help with low income housing for low income families. Project income housing for low income families. Project for pride and living are straight bully's. They have no problem lying on you to be able to file an eviction if you complain about the unsafe conditions or contact legal services. They continuously violate HUD rules and yet thinks it's ok. Just as HUD does. Like allowing people to live on their property with family members that can not be put on their lease due to having violent felonies. Which has over and over again put paying tenants in danger. Yet they have a slogan that states they provide safe and affordable housing. They raise the rent by saying we have to pay for maintenance, security and cleaning. The only time things are cleaned and fixed are when there is an outside yearly inspection by HUD or the banks that help fund them come or if you have section 8 and they put an abatement in place. Everytime you call for security they tell us there is no security for this building@ 1305-1309 University Ave West St Paul Mn. And the list goes on. Rapes, murders, suicide, terroristic threats, people using the kids play area for target practice,. Kids being assaulted by friends and family members of tenants for giving them their info to enter the building. every type of drugs known to man. YES CORPORATE MANAGEMENT SITE MANAGEMENT AND CEO all are very aware of this and refuse to address it. Even the police are frustrated with this property. They're Moto is it's probably best if you move to find a safe place for you and your family instead of them addressing the problems. And again they say that they provide A SAFE AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING. 238 police calls from 1/1/18 to present. You can get this information from the police station. I did. Im sure by sharing this I will get another violation and another eviction letter but I'm moving so you Kate Norman, Ali markel, Hannah Gibson and Mr CEO Paul Williams can't stop me from putting this out there. Pictures coming soon.
Crime Alert and Safety Warning

Attention Residents of Hamline Station:

On Friday, June 4 around 10:00 p.m. there was an incident involving shots fired in the back parking lot of our property. We are very jarred and PPI is actively involved in the police investigation. If you saw anything or anyone suspicious on that evening, or at any time, PLEASE report it to the police or the office immediately. The safety of our residents is important to PPI and we are doing everything we can. Security and police patrols at the property will be increased immediately.

Please continue to report any suspicious activity and contact the office if you have any questions or concerns. The phone number for the Hamline Station office is 612-455-2779, the phone number for the EPC Security Team is 612-223-6307.

Thank you,
PPI Management

A letter to pacify us like they are really trying to do something. It’s not the first time these to opposite gang members did this.
7 months ago
i hope you all are staying healthy and safe right now.

On Mar 23, 2020, at 10:01 AM, Anne Mavity <amavity@stlouispark.org> wrote:

I understand your frustration.

When the developers and church first informed me about the development I immediately told them as I tell every developer when they come in with an idea that the city expects in hopes that they will engage the community and neighborhood early and often. The city does not have control over that part of the process. Now that an official application is in the city will be following its processes and protocols and timelines.

Anne Mavity

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 23, 2020, at 9:30 AM, m ritter <schmike1979@gmail.com> wrote:

Thanks for the quick response Anne.

As you are aware the pastor stated at the meeting that they had been working with the developer and the city for some time - many months(years?). This project is scaling up significantly as it comes into the neighborhood and has given no consideration to the existing neighborhood and homes. As you were aware of the meetings and this project, it would have seemed appropriate as our representative, that you assure the church actually formally communication to residents, if actionable feedback was welcome.

At the meeting I am sure you heard the pastor state that she does not need to be transparent but will try to be tonight. She also talked about as the seller there was no obligation to get this input. I find it sad that I had to find out about this meeting second hand along with the lack of involvement, in a major change, with less than 60
days to final approval. There is only one proposal and it was clear at the meeting this is the plan.

I would hope you can be counted on not to support this project.

Thanks.

Mike

On Mar 22, 2020, at 9:47 PM, Anne Mavity <amavity@stlouispark.org> wrote:

Hi Mike,

Thanks for the email. The city has statute based timelines that guide its response times once a project has applied to the city. I’ll let staff fill in those details.

The two meetings to date were meetings organized and hosted by the church and the developer, not by the city, even though I have attended each one.

Now that the city has received a formal application, the city’s official review has begun - and you can get information about the project now on the city’s website.

Staff can follow up with details on the process and timing. Feel feel to email or call me with additional comments or questions.

Best,

Anne Mavity

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 22, 2020, at 9:20 PM, m ritter <schmike1979@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Mayor and Council:

A project was sprung on our neighborhood at a March 10th meeting. The UCC informed us that they are going to have an 80 unit 4 story complex built directly adjacent to single family properties.
I live very close to the Church (less than 2 blocks). Thanks to word of mouth from my neighbors this was the first meeting I was aware of. I do not understand the lack of notice or communication on a project that will have major impact on all of us who live in the neighborhood.

With final approvals set for May 4th (less than 60 days from May 10th meeting does not seem fair) this is what unfortunately occurs - see picture.

I hope this project will be reevaluated.

Thank You
Mike

Two homes for sale.
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Dear respected Council and Planning Staff Members Jacquelyn and Sean:
My single family home borders the Church immediately to its West and immediately to the South of
the proposed development. I am truly at ground zero for this development.

My concern is the scale of the proposed development so close to my and other single-family homes. While my garage cannot exceed 15 feet in height, it seems completely incongruous to allow a 50 – 60 foot roof just 50 to 100 feet to my North.

But most significantly, the scale of the proposed development does not comply with the City approved Elmwood Community Development Plan to gradually increase in height as we move away from single family homes.

**Bottom Line**: a three or four story development is too high within this block and is out of compliance with the city’s approved development plan.

**Request**: Wholeheartedly approve a development of no more than two stories.

I can be reached anytime for discussion.

Sincerely,
Mitchell Aldrich
6016 Oxford St.
952.212.5564
Jacquelyn,

I am a current Elmwood homeowner, lived here for the past 20 years. My family has owned and operated a St Louis Park based business for over 50 years. I grew up in and around the Park; getting donuts at Palms Bakery, sodas at Pic-a-Pop, lunch at the Lincoln Dell; the bunk bed I shared with my brother came from Treasure Island and many more great SLP memories. A list of experiences that compelled me to raise my family in SLP.

I also have a long connection to PPL. In 1997, I began volunteering with PPL as part of the college group that contributed hundreds of volunteer hours to their cause. Through my employer, I continued volunteering with PPL as a tutor and now assisting undeserved communities with quality employment opportunities. I believe in the PPL mission.

Unfortunately, the well intended PPL group has designed a proposed development should not be built:

1) Structure is too big and too dense for the site. This would be the tallest/highest and most dense building southwest of the Wooddale & 36th intersection, yet directly abutting multiple single-family homes. The structure is 3x the height of the average home in the area, nearly 4x the height of one of the adjacent homes and would tower more than 20 ft above the peek of Union Congregational Church. Further, it will be larger and greater than 30% more dense than Village in the Park and Park Lofts developments to the northeast.

2) Structure has too little parking. The proposed project has less than 60% of the parking required by code (City Code Sec, 36-361), while eliminating 70% of the off-street parking currently used by the church. Transit experts predict the apartment complex would generate 75+ vehicles parking on the street, daily. The elimination of the church parking lot will add 50+ additional vehicles parking on-street during church functions (currently, the church lot fill 3-4 days a week). This will result in ~125 additional vehicles parking on Elmwood streets most days of the week.

3) Structure does not fit the historic character of the neighborhood. The proposed structure is a massive contemporary box that would sit with in 300 ft of some of SLP oldest homes (1891, 1895, 1895, 1895, 1895, 1910) and historic depot (1887). More than 30 of SLP’s 70 home built 1900 or earlier are in Elmwood - of which 17 are with in 2 blocks the contemporary box. Any structure should fit the architectural nature or this area as laid out in the Elmwood Land Use Study and SLP 2040 plan.

Per the current and valid Elmwood Land Use Study, appropriate development for sites abutting existing single family homes should be "Low-density townhouses...of a form, style and material selection that complements the remainder of the Elmwood
single-family housing stock". Low-medium density on this site is no more than 2.5 stories, with ample underground parking stalls, and architecture that fits the historical nature of the surrounding homes and neighborhood. This is the standard that any developer of the site must meet.

Please share my commentary, above, and strong opposition to the current development proposal with the planning committee and city council.

Thanks,

John
Jacquelyn-

The Union Congregational Church (UCC) proposed development is way beyond what is reasonable for the Elmwood Neighborhood. It completely contradicts the city of St Louis Park and the UCC’s stance on a recently proposed development in the neighborhood on a couple important issues. Scale, Parking and Aesthetics.

Since you will be voting on this matter soon, I feel it is important that you understand what is happening in the Elmwood Neighborhood (not an industrial area) so you can make an informed vote. A vote that will reflect the citizens that you represent.

In the Elmwood Land Use Study, the UCC hosted and participated in creating a neighborhood position statement. During that study and during the proposed Quadion re-development the UCC strongly opposed the proposed 4 story apartment complex just east of their property. The reason being it would be inappropriate for the neighborhood and would overwhelm the historic church. At that time the UCC advocated for stepped increase in density and in height as it moved AWAY from the church and the single family homes. They pushed hard for the development to not exceed the height of their church (2.5 stories). Fast forward to today, they have completely ignored their neighbors input as well as the concerns of their historic church building.

The second concern is parking and safety. With narrow roads and especially during the winter months, adding 75-100 more vehicles parked on the streets will make it next to impossible for emergency vehicles to move through the neighborhoods and will end badly if and when there is an emergency. I hope you can take some time to drive, walk or bike through this area before making your decision. Also in the Elmwood Land Use Study the UCC argued aggressively for higher levels of structured off-street parking for neighboring developments citing concern that under planning the parking situation will result in residents parking on the streets which would eliminate the on-street parking for their church service and event goers. There was a compromise made that there would be 2 structured parking stalls per unit in the town homes. Even with the 2 stalls per unit, the town homes have cars parking on the street daily. What has changed with the off street parking concerns today?

A third concern is aesthetics. St. Louis Park’s 2040 Plan clearly states re/development must fit historic single-family home character of the neighborhood and contribute positively to its livability. It recommends that a development should “preserve and enhance the livability and unique character of each neighborhoods residential areas…Require the creation of appropriate and effective buffer or transition areas between different land use.” The south side of the enormous proposed building is majority fiber-cement with a small amount stone. The proposed building is a contemporary box with no characteristics of the historic church or
neighborhood that we live in.

I encourage you to visit this site before making your decision so you fully understand how the proposed project does not fit in scale and will over congest this area. All aspects mentioned above can be addressed by simply scaling this project way back.

Be honest, would you want a massive 65’ - 4 story building directly in the backyard of your families rambler, as well as all of the vehicles from that building parked in the front of your home?

thank you for your time

mike
Our family has lived in our house on 3700 Brunswick Ave So for 40 years and I am writing to express our dismay that our neighborhood church is trying to get a variance to build a huge 4 story apartment building towering over our 2 story house. This is totally out of proportion with the neighborhood. With the proposed larger population and lack of off street parking, I fear the character of the neighborhood would be irreversibly damaged. Please consider this neighborhood and the people living here before allowing such a drastic change to happen regardless of the "well meaning " proposals that have been sprung on us in the last month.

Thank you.

Richard and Claudia Coperine

Sent from my iPhone
Dear Jacqueline, I am writing to you to express my concerns for the proposed PPL project that is slated for development at Union Congregational Church.

I feel that the size of the proposed project is way too massive for this location. A four story/80 unit apartment building would look wildly out of place in this historic part of St. Louis Park. If built at this size, it would cast shadows over the adjacent park and homes. If built at this size it would be three times the height of the homes that are adjacent to the development.

With this massive size, comes the next problem. Lack of parking. The proposed development has only 70 underground parking spaces with an additional 10 spots above ground, sacrificing green space. The city currently has a requirement that multi-family housing needs to provide 1 parking spot per bedroom. The proposed project is supposed to have 135 bedrooms. That is more that 50 spots short of the city requirement that would end up parking on our already narrow crowded city streets. Between businesses, church’s needs, and residents there is much street parking already.

Also, this proposed project design does not look or feel like it is going to fit into this very unique and historic part of St Louis Park. The proposed development in fact looks far from it. It looks like a stack-a-shack...buildings that get put in as quickly and cheaply as possible, with no concern for existing properties or long term character of the area.

That being said, be no means am I opposed to development on the site. As a person that has been active at Meadowbrook Collaborative and Perspectives, Inc. over the years, it just needs to be reasonable. For example, 40 units, which would allow ample parking, complimentary architecture, and building exterior that fit in with this wonderful historic area of St. Louis Park. One could assume that the church would want a building as large as they could get, for their own financial benefit. This should not be the community’s problem. With the right size building they can get some of what they need without sacrificing the character and adversely effecting others.

Respectfully,

Sue Basil
6208 Oxford Street
St. Louis Park
952.905.6798
Mr. Harmening,

As our neighborhood has been closely following and trying to have our input heard by the developers of the Union Congregational Church development, the city appears to moving rapidly forward with this application despite a pandemic that currently has city facilities closed.

The city's development's page was updated this week to say the scheduled April 15 Planning Commission meeting would be held virtually which is not conducive for public discourse of this nature. Presumably, the city council would be doing the same on May 4. Residents of St. Louis Park have a right to publicly comment and the methods offered do not allow for accessibility to those who may not have phone service, internet access, or auxiliary aids available for their disabilities.

We ask that these meetings and any subsequent action on the development and other non-essential agenda items before the city be delayed until all facilities are safe and open to the public once social distancing guidelines are suspended. We feel this is the proper and right thing to do so the city can focus on essential services during this state of emergency.

We hope you have already been thinking the same thing and look forward to you reply.

--
Thank you,
Elmwood Neighborhood Association Board
Thank you for your response Rachel and I apologize for any inconvenience.

I sent the same email to my ward council member but haven’t heard anything back.

My email was simply expressing concern on 3 things: Scale. Parking/Safety. Aesthetics.

The reason being it would be an architectural sin to bury the historic building with the proposed structure. I hope your request doesn’t fall on deaf ears.

I sent an email to you on the 22nd of March but never received a response. I hope these emails find you in good health.

Dear Council Member Harris

I sent an email to you on the 22nd of March but never received a response. I hope these emails find you in good health.

The Union Congregational Church/UCC proposed development is way beyond what is reasonable for the Elmwood Neighborhood. It completely contradicts the city of St Louis Park and the UCC’s stance on a recently proposed development in the neighborhood on a couple important issues. Scale, Parking and Aesthetics.

Since you will be voting on this matter soon, I feel it is important that you understand what is happening in the Elmwood Neighborhood(not an industrial area) so you can make an informed vote. A vote that will reflect the citizens that you represent.

In the Elmwood Land Use Study, the UCC hosted and participated in creating a neighborhood position statement. During that study and during the proposed Quaidian re-development the UCC strongly opposed the proposed 4 story apartment complex just east of their property. The reason being it would be inappropriate for the neighborhood and would overwhelm the historic church. At that time the UCC advocated for stepped increase in density and in height as it moved AWAY from the church and the single family homes. They pushed hard for the development to not exceed the height of their church(2.5 stories). Fast forward to today, they have completely ignored their neighbors input as well as the concerns of their historic church building.

The second concern is parking and safety. With narrow roads and especially during the winter months, adding 75-100 more vehicles parked on the streets will make it next to impossible for emergency vehicles to move through the neighborhood and will result in residents parking on the streets which would eliminate the on-street parking for their church service and event goers. There was a compromise made that there would be 2 structured parking stalls per unit in the town homes. Even with the 2 stalls per unit, the town homes have cars parking on the street daily. What has changed with the off street parking concerns today?

The second concern is parking and safety. With narrow roads and especially during the winter months, adding 75-100 more vehicles parked on the streets will make it next to impossible for emergency vehicles to move through the neighborhood and will end badly if and when there is an emergency. I hope you can take some time to drive, walk or bike through this area before making your decision. Also in the Elmwood Land Use Study the UCC appealed aggressively for higher levels of structured off-street parking for neighboring developments citing concern that under planning the parking situation will result in residents parking on the streets which would eliminate the on-street parking for their church service and event goers. There was a compromise made that there would be 2 structured parking stalls per unit in the town homes. Even with the 2 stalls per unit, the town homes have cars parking on the street daily. What has changed with the off street parking concerns today?

A third concern is aesthetics. St. Louis Park’s 2040 Plan clearly states development must fit the neighborhood and contribute positively to its livability. It recommends that a development should “preserve and enhance the livability and unique character of each neighborhoods residential area.” Require the creation of appropriate and effective buffer or transition areas between different land uses.” The south side of the enormous proposed building is majority fiber-cement with a small amount stone. The proposed building is a contemporary box with no characteristics of the historic church or neighborhood that we live in.

I encourage you to visit this site before making your decision so you fully understand how the proposed project does not fit in scale and will overpower this area. All aspects mentioned above can be addressed by simply scaling this project way back.

Be honest, would you want a massive 65’ - 4 story building directly in the backyard of your families rambler, as well as all of the vehicles from that building parked in the front of your home?

Thank you for your time.

Mike
Hi Jacquelyn,

Thank you again for your time on the phone.

I just want to summarize my concerns with the proposed apartment building development at the Union Congregational Church on 37th St. and Alabama.

1. The size of the proposed building is TOO BIG for the neighborhood. They want to build a 4-story, 80-unit, 130-bedroom apartment. The 2003 Elmwood Land Use Study does not allow for anything that big to be built next to houses. That apartment would tower over Johnny Pops, the adjacent houses, historic Jorvig Park and train depot, and the church itself. The apartment needs to be only 2 stories on the north side and 1 story on the south side, so it tapers into the neighborhood.

2. Insufficient Parking. The proposed 130-bedroom apartment only allows for 70 underground parking stalls. Dozens of extra cars are going to be parking all over the streets within 2 blocks of the apartment. This will be a huge problem when the church has their services and other events, since the apartment will be built over the church's 52-stall parking lot. Many more cars going in and out of a 4-story apartment leads to additional safety concerns for my kids and the neighborhood kids who are going to the park or walking and biking around that block.

The developer, Project for Pride in Living, can keep the 70 underground parking stalls, but the building needs to come down to 2 stories to fit the scope of Elmwood.

Thank you for your kind attention,

Eric Litkey

6025 Goodrich Ave.
Dear Jacquelyn,

Thank you so much for your willingness to listen to me on the phone this past week about my concerns regarding the Elmwood/UCC/PPL proposal. It was so nice to actually speak with someone instead of just email. I have listed below the email that I sent to some members of the Planning Commission for your review.

In light of the current events, I am not sure why this particular project is being so heavily fast tracked without allowing the involved parties to actually be present for debate and discussion. I have been involved with numerous Zoom meetings for work which work well when one person is leading the discussion and everyone else listens, but this is not at all conducive to the type of meeting that would otherwise be held in this situation with so many participants. I would think there are certainly more pressing matters the city could be dealing with right now. Perhaps you could shed some light on that for me?

I thank you for everything you are doing for St. Louis Park through this difficult time with the added challenges of remote work and the ever changing demands.

Hope you are staying safe and healthy,
JoAnn Litkey

My name is JoAnn Litkey; I live in the Elmwood neighborhood, and I would like a few moments of your time to discuss the proposed development at the Union Congregational Church site. The proposed development is a 4 story, 80-unit apartment building with around 130-160 bedrooms and 80 total parking spaces (this includes guest parking), that will sit directly across the alley and street from single family homes as well as the historic Jorvig park.

I hope you can agree that this is clearly far too massive in scope to fit the appropriate size of the neighborhood. This building would be 3 to 4 times the height and the other surrounding homes. There would easily be 80-100 cars parked on the neighborhood streets at all times which substantially increases the likelihood of a pedestrian (my kid on a bike) involved motor vehicle accident. The additional traffic coming and going would make crossing the streets a dangerous proposition as we know that no kid actually looks both ways both bolting out into the street. As a mother of young kids, who bike and run up and down the streets, this is frankly a terrifying situation. Additionally, what are these apartment residents to do in the winter during a snow emergency and streets need to be plowed? Is the plan just to no longer plow Elmwood? The newer, narrow streets with 100+ cars parked up and down both sides of every block will make it impossible for those cars to be moved every time it snows. What about street cleaning in the fall and spring? That will never happen in the Elmwood neighborhood again with so much street parking and no possible alternative off
street parking.

I cannot imagine that any home owner, regardless of neighborhood, would like something of this overwhelming size to be built across the street from their own home. This project as proposed is breathtakingly shortsighted for a multitude of reasons: massively inappropriate size and scope, laughably inadequate parking, unanswered and serious safety concerns for pedestrians/kids, impossible city road maintenance, and building an apartment of the cheapest materials possible in the oldest neighborhood of St. Louis Park. The developer is expecting to have control of this property for 40 years. What exactly will be the imperative for them in 5 to 10 years to replace the failing siding, broken windows, and deterioration that happens quickly with rental property?

I am begging the planning commission to stop this current proposal so that all parties involved can have the time needed to collaborate and make a thoughtful decision that will benefit all parties involved: the current home owners in the Elmwood neighborhood, Union Congregational Church, and St. Louis Park as a whole. I feel that this project is being fast tracked in an effort to push it through before anyone has an opportunity to realize the enormity of the mistake that is about to be made. Please Please Please! Let us stop and consider before this mistake is made that cannot be undone, and then the only people who will be left to deal with the inevitable disastrous consequences will be the Elmwood home owners. Thank you so much for reading my very long email and your kind attention and I look forward to hearing any thoughts you may have about this matter.
Hi Joann, I’m glad I was able to get in touch with you.

The complicating factor with the land use application for the project in question, and any other land use applications for that matter, is that the city is bound to a provision in state law that requires the city meet time deadlines for formally acting on land use applications. Specifically, council has 60 days to make a decision, with the option of administratively extending the deadline another 60 days. If we don’t meet these requirements the applications are automatically considered approved. Proposals or requests have been made to the state legislature to relax these requirements, but those haven’t gone anywhere so far. So despite our current technological limitations, staff have to hold public hearings and council sessions and provide ways for folks to comment to the best of our ability.

That being said, I heard from the developer this morning that they would like to delay the public hearing, so that they can revise the plans based on neighborhood feedback. I’ll update the city website when we have a new public hearing date. Personally I’m a little pessimistic when it comes to the resolution of our current pandemic situation, so I would not be surprised if even with this delay, we will still need to hold the public hearing online rather than at city hall. But fingers crossed I’m wrong and we can get back to business as usual sooner rather than later.

Stay healthy and have a good weekend!

Jacquelyn Kramer (she/her/hers)
Associate Planner | City of St. Louis Park
5005 Minnetonka Blvd, St. Louis Park, MN 55416
Office: 952.928.1375
www.stlouispark.org
Experience LIFE in the Park.

From: Eric Litkey <elitkey@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, April 3, 2020 3:15 PM
To: Jacquelyn Kramer <jkramer@stlouispark.org>
Subject: Elmwood Project

Dear Jacquelyn,

Thank you so much for your willingness to listen to me on the phone this past week about my concerns regarding the Elmwood/UCC/PPL proposal. It was so nice to actually speak with someone instead of just email. I have listed below the email that I sent to some members of the Planning
Commission for your review.
In light of the current events, I am not sure why this particular project is being so heavily fast tracked without allowing the involved parties to actually be present for debate and discussion. I have been involved with numerous Zoom meetings for work which work well when one person is leading the discussion and everyone else listens, but this is not at all conducive to the type of meeting that would otherwise be held in this situation with so many participants. I would think there are certainly more pressing matters the city could be dealing with right now. Perhaps you could shed some light on that for me?
I thank you for everything you are doing for St. Louis Park through this difficult time with the added challenges of remote work and the ever changing demands.

Hope you are staying safe and healthy,
JoAnn Litkey

My name is JoAnn Litkey; I live in the Elmwood neighborhood, and I would like a few moments of your time to discuss the proposed development at the Union Congregational Church site. The proposed development is a 4 story, 80-unit apartment building with around 130-160 bedrooms and 80 total parking spaces (this includes guest parking), that will sit directly across the alley and street from single family homes as well as the historic Jorvig park.

I hope you can agree that this is clearly far too massive in scope to fit the appropriate size of the neighborhood. This building would be 3 to 4 times the height and the other surrounding homes. There would easily be 80-100 cars parked on the neighborhood streets at all times which substantially increases the likelihood of a pedestrian (my kid on a bike) involved motor vehicle accident. The additional traffic coming and going would make crossing the streets a dangerous proposition as we know that no kid actually looks both ways both bolting out into the street. As a mother of young kids, who bike and run up and down the streets, this is frankly a terrifying situation. Additionally, what are these apartment residents to do in the winter during a snow emergency and streets need to be plowed? Is the plan just to no longer plow Elmwood? The newer, narrow streets with 100+ cars parked up and down both sides of every block will make it impossible for those cars to be moved every time it snows. What about street cleaning in the fall and spring? That will never happen in the Elmwood neighborhood again with so much street parking and no possible alternative off street parking.

I cannot imagine that any home owner, regardless of neighborhood, would like something of this overwhelming size to be built across the street from their own home. This project as proposed is breathtakingly shortsighted for a multitude of reasons: massively inappropriate size and scope, laughably inadequate parking, unanswered and serious safety concerns for pedestrians/kids, impossible city road maintenance, and building an apartment of the cheapest materials possible in the oldest neighborhood of St. Louis Park. The developer is expecting to have control of this property for 40 years. What exactly will be the imperative for them in 5 to 10 years to replace the failing siding, broken windows, and deterioration that happens quickly with rental property?

I am begging the planning commission to stop this current proposal so that all parties involved can have the time needed to collaborate and make a thoughtful decision that will benefit all
parties involved: the current home owners in the Elmwood neighborhood, Union Congregational Church, and St. Louis Park as a whole. I feel that this project is being fast tracked in an effort to push it through before anyone has an opportunity to realize the enormity of the mistake that is about to be made. Please Please Please! Let us stop and consider before this mistake is made that cannot be undone, and then the only people who will be left to deal with the inevitable disastrous consequences will be the Elmwood home owners. Thank you so much for reading my very long email and your kind attention and I look forward to hearing any thoughts you may have about this matter.
Hello,
May name is Earl Barnett III, And I reside at and own 3762 Alabama Ave S, St Louis Park, Mn 55416.

I’m sure you have received a lot of feed back on the proposed development. I do not support the development. This will create a traffic congestion. Our street and neighborhood is mostly a quiet one except during rush hour mornings and evenings. We would like to keep the traffic to as minimal as possible.

I’m surprised that for development, that St Louis Park was chosen. There’s other places in the Twin Cities that needs more development attention like the Frog Town area, Phillips neighborhood, or North Minneapolis. These areas are begging for newer updated, modern affordable living/ development.

Our area will already be over-developed by the light rail. We do not want all the traffic and noise of more people in our neighborhood. We do not want the traffic or more people in this neighborhood. During rush hour, the traffic already backs up at the lights and stop signs on Alabama.

Thank you.

Earl Barnett III
Sent from my iPhone
Hello!

I hope this email finds you well I wanted to reach out to voice concerns with the development happening a block away from my home....

My biggest complaint is that we as a neighborhood we were not consulted or allowed to provide any input into the project until it was basically already said and done... This really saddens and angers me- this is my home and my neighborhood... I’ve had no voice or been asked to give any input into something happening a stone’s throw away from my front door. We have 3 neighbors moving already in response to what is going on and the lack of help or concern our city leaders have in helping is shameful.

The scale of this proposed project is beyond anything reasonable for the lot size and is inconsistent with details in the Elmwood Land Use Study. Also, if I remember correctly UCC was a strong opponent of a project that would butt up to their property to the east because the height and density was inappropriate for the neighborhood and their historic church so seems weird they are now all about this new project in our neighborhood which totally contradicts their previous stance. The neighborhood shouldn’t have to suffer because they are having financial issues, thus fast tracking a development that they would've been fighting against had this been a year or two ago, themselves.

Our neighborhood went under road construction last year to narrow our roads....the thought behind that is that it will slow drivers down....great, but this development will put a HUGE strain on street parking. Its insufficient...the proposed plan only has 70 structured parking stalls which is less than 1 per unit and doesn't meet the min requirement. These roads will be flooded with street parking like uptown, crowded, hard enough in winter to plow as it is. Clearly lacks the proper parking requirement alone & thus doesn't fit with the neighborhood. Union alone is a huge contributor to the on street parking already....eliminating the parking lot they already use will then drive even MORE people to park on the streets...sound like they are expecting 75-100 off street parking daily in our area...this is insane & puts strains on parking for owners of homes currently here.

The design in no way compliments the Historic Neighborhood or contributes to it... we hold 30 of the 70 historic homes in SLP....highest neighborhood concentration in SLP.. this area is HISTORIC and everything that is built here should complement this area down to the materials used to build here......the materials on the proposed building are mostly fiber cement and a splash of stone....it will put a shadow on our park and historic depot building...this is going to TOWER over our park and depot building which does not compliment or fit the area or fit what has been recommended for our area in general based on the study’s/recommendations for our neighborhood. We should be mindful on anything we propose in this area otherwise why even deem this a historic neighborhood if we
don’t adhere to these recommendations.

I’m hopeful that more discussions will result in a project with the proper scope, scale, parking and architectural design. PPL has acknowledge that the project is very large for the sight. If it does eventually come to you with no significant changes that balance the project for the area, we ask that you decline a project that is for the primary benefit of the church, the mortgage broker, and the developer, does not have a solution for the area as a whole, and did not embrace the neighborhood until very late in the process.

Thank you!

Shannon Sackrison
Mark and Katia-
Thank you for your email regarding this project. I’m not sure if you are aware but earlier this week, after meeting with a group of residents from the neighborhood, the developers have pulled this project from the process so they can refine their proposal. Not sure what all will change but wanted you to know that. You might want to reach out to the Elmwood neighborhood association/board to learn more.

Have a good day,

Jake Spano
Mayor
St. Louis Park, MN
(he/him/his)
952-928-1448 (direct)

---

On Apr 9, 2020, at 10:07 PM, Mark Bredesen <MBredesen@manulife.com> wrote:

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To : City Council and Planning Commission, City of St Louis Park (c/o Jacquelyn Kramer)

CC : Jake Spano, Mayor and Bob Broshat, President, Village in the Park Homeowner Association

RE : Planned unit development from Project in Pride in Living at 3700 Alabama Ave

My name is Mark Bredesen and my wife Katia and I are long-term residents of St Louis Park. We have been living at our current residence at 5900 Oxford Street #10 for 7 years which is less than one (1) block from the planned development.

My wife and I strenuously disagree with the development as it is currently proposed. Our primary concern revolves around the concentration of large numbers of affordable housing units in a single location as the 4-story, 80 unit plan currently allows for.
Concentrated affordable housing has been extensively tried over the past 50 years in the United States and has been a complete failure by any objective measure. Cities and municipalities that spent significant resources building concentrated affordable housing structures in the 1960s and 70s have since spent the past several decades dismantling them after experiencing overwhelmingly negative outcomes. Both Cabrini-Green in Chicago and Cedar-Riverside in Minneapolis are relevant examples of the failure of a concentrated approach. Regrettably, putting large numbers of people of low socioeconomic status in immediate proximity to each other has been definitively shown to produce several negative effects, most notably significant increases in crime (including, but not limited to, violent crime and narcotics trafficking).

Mixed developments, however, encompassing both affordable and market rate units, have shown disproportionately better outcomes in median income growth, educational attainment and neighborhood property values and has tended to be an uplifting contributor for residents closer to the poverty line. As you are aware, our Village in the Park development contains a mix of market/affordable (~10%) units and has been an overwhelmingly positive and local example of how this type of development can succeed.

Given the widely known and acknowledged trends associated with concentrated affordable housing – of which a multitude of supportive studies are available from academic and governmental organizations, including HUD – it is both intellectually astounding and borderline negligent that our City Council in 2020 would pursue a development project as has been proposed at 3700 Alabama Avenue. While the benefits/payoffs to the Church and developer are obvious and apparent, the project ultimately benefits none of the stakeholders that “Project in Pride in Living” claims to want to help....residents of the building will suffer from the same detrimental trends seen elsewhere with concentrated affordable housing, while area residents such as myself will be exceedingly burdened with a neighborhood victimized by higher crime, unwanted density and lower quality of life.

If “Project in Pride”, the Church and the City Council are genuinely interested in listening to area residents, there are two obvious and concrete steps that can be taken to adjust the project to reflect concerns expressed by us and the 20+ neighbors of ours we've spoken to over the past two weeks:

- First, the project can be reduced from 80 units/4 stories to 40 units/2 stories to fit with the development pattern of the surrounding neighborhood, existing zoning ordinances and area traffic infrastructure.
- Second, the project can be modified to include no more than 20% affordable housing (and no less than 80% market rate housing) which will ensure that the affordable housing residents have a chance to succeed and, hopefully, one day graduate into market rate tenants. These are reasonable, prudent compromises that let everyone come away from this project a “winner” and contribute to the long term
viability of our very successful and diverse existing neighborhood character.

Respectfully,

Mark Bredesen
Katia Bredesen
5900 Oxford Street #10

Mark R. Bredesen
SVP - GO Performance Measurement Attribution Risk
Manulife Investment Management
E mbredesen@manulife.com | O 1 (617) 572-5182

197 Clarendon Street, Boston, MA 02116
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STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY The information contained in this email message and any attachments may be confidential and legally privileged and is intended for the use of the addressee(s) only. If you are not an intended recipient, please: (1) notify me immediately by replying to this message; (2) do not use, disseminate, distribute or reproduce any part of the message or any attachment; and (3) destroy all copies of this message and any attachments.
Hi Jake,

Thanks for getting back to us, and we were pleased to learn that the developer has pulled the project in its current form (after sending my email, I spoke on the phone last night with Bob Broshat who is the President of the Village in the Park association).

Bob and I agreed that a positive next step would be for Anne (and yourself, if available) to come meet with the residents of Village in the Park in a formal meeting in one of our condo buildings. I believe that all of the ~200 people in our community are reasonable and willing to make compromises to see this project succeed, but we also are the largest group in direct proximity to the development and will be disproportionately affected by any negative outcome. While comments on the record via email are helpful, I think an in-person meeting will help Anne and yourself understand really how strongly people feel about this project.

Together with Village in the Park and the Elmwood Association, I believe it was quite apparent that there were serious concerns about the project as it was proposed from the local neighborhood so we’re glad to see this project back at the drawing board. Hopefully, we can all work together to produce a positive, long term result.

Lastly, one last point about me – in my 43 years, this is the first time I’ve ever written a letter to a mayor or city council with a concern about anything which hopefully illustrates the importance of this matter to regular folks like us.

Thanks Jake and best wishes for a wonderful weekend.

Mark

---

From: Jake Spano <jspano@stlouispark.org>
Sent: Friday, April 10, 2020 9:28 AM
To: Mark Bredesen <MBredesen@manulife.com>
Cc: Jacquelyn Kramer <jkramer@stlouispark.org>; rbroshat@gmail.com; Anne Mavity <amavity@stlouispark.org>; Karen Barton <kbarton@stlouispark.org>; Tom Harmening <THARMENING@stlouispark.org>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Comments on PUD at 3700 Alabama Ave / 6027 37th St W

Mark and Katia-

Thank you for your email regarding this project. I’m not sure if you are aware but earlier this week, after meeting with a group of residents from the neighborhood, the developers have pulled this project from the process so they can refine their proposal. Not sure what all will change but wanted
you to know that. You might want to reach out to the Elmwood neighborhood association/board to learn more.

Have a good day,

Jake Spano
Mayor
St. Louis Park, MN
(he/him/his)
952-928-1448 (direct)

On Apr 9, 2020, at 10:07 PM, Mark Bredesen <MBredesen@manulife.com> wrote:

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To : City Council and Planning Commission, City of St Louis Park (c/o Jacquelyn Kramer)

CC : Jake Spano, Mayor and Bob Broshat, President, Village in the Park Homeowner Association

RE : Planned unit development from Project in Pride in Living at 3700 Alabama Ave

My name is Mark Bredesen and my wife Katia and I are long-term residents of St Louis Park. We have been living at our current residence at 5900 Oxford Street #10 for 7 years which is less than one (1) block from the planned development.

My wife and I strenuously disagree with the development as it is currently proposed. Our primary concern revolves around the concentration of large numbers of affordable housing units in a single location as the 4-story, 80 unit plan currently allows for.

Concentrated affordable housing has been extensively tried over the past 50 years in the United States and has been a complete failure by any objective measure. Cities and municipalities that spent significant resources building concentrated affordable housing
structures in the 1960s and 70s have since spent the past several decades dismantling them after experiencing overwhelmingly negative outcomes. Both Cabrini-Green in Chicago and Cedar-Riverside in Minneapolis are relevant examples of the failure of a concentrated approach. Regrettably, putting large numbers of people of low socioeconomic status in immediate proximity to each other has been definitively shown to produce several negative effects, most notably significant increases in crime (including, but not limited to, violent crime and narcotics trafficking).

Mixed developments, however, encompassing both affordable and market rate units, have shown disproportionately better outcomes in median income growth, educational attainment and neighborhood property values and has tended to be an uplifting contributor for residents closer to the poverty line. As you are aware, our Village in the Park development contains a mix of market/affordable (~10%) units and has been an overwhelmingly positive and local example of how this type of development can succeed.

Given the widely known and acknowledged trends associated with concentrated affordable housing – of which a multitude of supportive studies are available from academic and governmental organizations, including HUD – it is both intellectually astounding and borderline negligent that our City Council in 2020 would pursue a development project as has been proposed at 3700 Alabama Avenue. While the benefits/payoffs to the Church and developer are obvious and apparent, the project ultimately benefits none of the stakeholders that “Project in Pride in Living” claims to want to help….residents of the building will suffer from the same detrimental trends seen elsewhere with concentrated affordable housing, while area residents such as myself will be exceedingly burdened with a neighborhood victimized by higher crime, unwanted density and lower quality of life.

If “Project in Pride”, the Church and the City Council are genuinely interested in listening to area residents, there are two obvious and concrete steps that can be taken to adjust the project to reflect concerns expressed by us and the 20+ neighbors of ours we’ve spoken to over the past two weeks:

- First, the project can be reduced from 80 units/4 stories to 40 units/2 stories to fit with the development pattern of the surrounding neighborhood, existing zoning ordinances and area traffic infrastructure.
- Second, the project can be modified to include no more than 20% affordable housing (and no less than 80% market rate housing) which will ensure that the affordable housing residents have a chance to succeed and, hopefully, one day graduate into market rate tenants. These are reasonable, prudent compromises that let everyone come away from this project a “winner” and contribute to the long term viability of our very successful and diverse existing neighborhood character.
To whom it may concern,

I am a home owner in the Brooklawns neighborhood. I am very concerned about the historic Elmwood neighborhood with the proposed project at the UCC site.

First of all, let the current situation in our world be an ever present reminder why multi-unit housing is not a safe avenue for the citizens of the metro to live in. As a nurse, I can tell you diseases such as Covid-19, which is spread via airborne, droplet and contact, has been shown to rapidly spread throughout an entire building if one person is infected. Just look at the current problem in New York City.

Next, the beautiful history of St Louis Park must be preserved. If we do not preserve the oldest neighborhood then what good does history do for any of us?? The proposed project does not fit the current historic character of the Elmwood neighborhood. The proposed project is a massive size and is slated to be built with the cheapest possible materials.

Thirdly, as a neighbor who walks, drives and bikes the Elmwood neighborhood, we will not be safe with all the traffic, and the on-street parking this will generate. We choose to live here and not in Minneapolis or St Paul for less congestion and more space and safety while we walk, bike and drive.

Lastly and most importantly, please do not take away our rights as homeowners to be heard and our opinions respected. Elmwood neighborhood is the oldest and most desired place to raise families; please do not destroy that because one church has financial difficulties.

Sincerely,
A very concerned SLP resident

Sent from my iPhone
FYI

From: Tim Brausen <tbrausen@stlouispark.org>
Sent: Sunday, April 26, 2020 12:31 PM
To: Janice Goldstein <janice.l.goldstein@gmail.com>
Cc: Karen Barton <kbarton@stlouispark.org>; Tom Harmening <THARMENING@stlouispark.org>
Subject: Re: PPL development in Elmwood neighborhood

Ms. Goldstein, thank you for your note on this proposal. By copy of this email, I am sharing your note with our Community Development Director and City Manager so that it is a part of our official record relating to the proposal.

I have been generally supportive of this proposal, though it has not yet been formally presented to the City Council. I understand there will still be community meetings and a public hearing before formal action on the proposal is taken. As always, we’ll try to do what’s best for the community.

Regards, Tim

Tim Brausen
St. Louis Park Ward 4 City Council Member
Telephone: 952-451-8492
Sent from my iPad

On Apr 24, 2020, at 9:09 AM, Janice Goldstein <janice.l.goldstein@gmail.com> wrote:

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Tim,

I’m writing in support of the planned development by Project for Pride in Living and the Union Congregational Church in the Elmwood neighborhood. The lack of affordable housing has reached crisis proportions for several years now. And the current Covid-19 pandemic has exposed even further the challenges of low income households to pay for rents and feed their families. Most of these households are minorities or single parents who work low wage jobs.

Our city’s 2040 Comprehensive Plan states, “Housing disparities exist among different groups of people, both in the city and the region. In order for St. Louis Park to be a leader in racial equity and inclusion, the city must examine all housing decisions and policies through a racial equity lens.” 88% of all African American residents in St. Louis
Park are renters.

The 2040 Plan further states, “Since 1980 the city’s population has grown approximately 10%, adding approximately 4,500 people to the community. With this growth comes increased demand for housing and a corresponding increase in housing prices and rents. As a result, housing units that were once affordable no longer are, and less housing options are available for low-income residents in the city and the metro area.” With the nonprofit PLACE backing away from their long-planned development that was to include fifty affordable apartments, we desperately need the PPL development in our city.

PPL has developments in Minneapolis, St. Paul, Robbinsdale, New Hope and Hopkins. But nothing in St. Louis Park. Scroll down on their web page https://www.ppl-inc.org/ppl-properties to see all their properties.

Please support the Project for Pride and Living development in the Elmwood neighborhood. We desperately need more affordable housing in St. Louis Park. Affordable housing improves health as families don’t have to choose between paying rent or buying healthy food or paying for dental and medical expenses. And safe and stable housing reduces stress on families and children, and children do better in school. We are all in this together.

Sincerely,

Janice Goldstein
4730 Park Commons Drive
St. Louis Park, MN 55416
Tom:

Thanks for your time yesterday to talk about Union Park Flats and the letter from six Elmwood neighborhood residents regarding Councilmember Anne Mavity. I understand that you have quite a challenge striking a balance between the larger forces of development and change, and the desires of residents to see things stay the same or progress much more slowly. I appreciate your calm, measured approach in trying to hear all perspectives, to help foster a path that achieves a workable compromise for all. I wanted to follow-up with you with a bit more information, and my perspective.

First, as I mentioned yesterday, I have known Anne in my industry for somewhere near 20 years, and I have always found her actions to be very thoughtful, of the highest integrity, and never for self-benefit. Anne has been a true leader for the full affordable housing industry in Minnesota, and she seeks achievements at the broad levels of policy, advocacy/awareness, and expansion of funding for production, housing preservation, and service delivery for the entire industry. Her professional focus is not at a specific project level and it makes no sense that she would seek or claim any professional accomplishment from a particular project gaining local government approval. It’s simply outside of her area of focus and intention. Frankly, she would likely lose credibility in the industry if people thought she were focused on specific projects (“why not mine?”) and not focused on advancing broader industry issues, the role for which she was hired.
Second, I wanted to address the issue of the Elmwood neighborhood’s focus on the 2003 design document for the vision of the Union Park Flats parcel. It’s very important to state that this plan, while well-intentioned and well-researched at the time, provides a severely outdated vision for what is happening now in the development industry and housing market. Since that plan was finished 17 years ago, the broad view of what should have happened with transit-oriented development (TOD) sites has radically changed due to the following forces (all of which I strongly understand from my professional work):

- **The emergence of condominium demand in 2002-2006** with roughly 5,000 new units added in the Twin Cities at that time; this was early proof-of-concept that a significant portion of the market seeks higher-density living in changing urban settings.

- **The opening of fixed-rail transit in the Twin Cities, starting with the Blue Line LRT in Minneapolis in June 2004.** Since this time, the development pattern at TOD sites has solidified and been mostly perfected (economically, design-wise) at decidedly higher densities of 50+ units per acre.

- **The collapse of the housing market starting in about 2007,** which drove many households back into rental housing at higher levels/percentages that have been sustained since then.

- **The large rise in multifamily demand and construction.** Over the past decade, close to 50,000 new rental units were built in the Twin Cities, signalling a fundamental shift toward higher-density living. Prior to the coronavirus, the Twin Cities apartment vacancy rate was 3.1% (YE 2019), one of the lowest such rates in the country.

- **Strong interest in living in, or closer to, the urban core.** Minneapolis and St. Paul achieved strong population growth over the past ten years after many decades of decline. Many first-ring suburbs saw a resurgence as well, through redevelopment (no better example than SLP!).

- **Great success of TOD rental housing developments of at least 4 stories in height.** In the past ten years in the 7-county metro area, approximately 16,500 new rental units in 125 buildings opened within ½-mile from a rail station platform for the Green Line LRT, Blue Line LRT or Northstar Commuter rail. The average height for these buildings was 6.36 stories (above ground), with 82% of the buildings (103 of 125) at 4 stories above ground or higher.

- **The emergence of climate change as a leading issue that affects consumer choice for housing locations and styles.** A large proportion of the housing market now wants to live in areas with short commutes to work, less reliance on cars, in closer-in locations in the central cities and first-ring suburbs, with many amenities within walking distance. Think DT Minneapolis, West End, Southdale. (I have maps that clearly show this.)

- **Novel coronavirus-19.** The demand for affordably-priced rental housing is forecast to skyrocket, unfortunately, due to the severe economic effects of the response to the virus. *Developments such as Union Park Flats will be needed more than ever.*
PPL's design for Union Park Flats is more than appropriate for a TOD site that is 1/6th mile (~850 feet) from an LRT station platform. Frankly, it could be easily argued that 2-4 stories in height with only 68 units represents an underutilization of the parcel, especially when compared to other TOD sites that have been developed in the Twin Cities in recent years. In my opinion, PPL has made a big effort to accommodate the neighborhood through a reduction in building height, a 13,000+-square-foot reduction in building size, and a 15% reduction in unit count at Union Park Flats. Additional concessions will render the project unworkable economically and financially for PPL (a wonderful housing provider) and the church (an 80-year great member of the Elmwood neighborhood).

I hope that this note provides a clear perspective and is helpful to you. I have data to back up my above assertions. By all means, feel free to call or email me with any questions that you have. My cell phone number is 952-564-0677. Also, I should mention that I am a 22-year resident of St. Louis Park (Browndale Park) with my wife and two kids, and my wife and I have been heavily involved as volunteers in the public schools, youth sports and other youth activities, a City commision, and overall civic life.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration, Tom.

Regards,

Tom

Thomas G. O'Neil
Vice President of Market Development
Dougherty Mortgage LLC
90 South Seventh Street, Suite 4300
Minneapolis, MN 55402
612-317-2122 Phone
612-317-2125 Fax
toneil@doughertymarkets.com

This E-mail and any attachment contains information which is private and confidential and is intended for the addressee only. If you are not an addressee, you are not authorized to read, copy or use the E-mail or any attachment. If you have received this E-mail in error, please notify the sender by return E-mail and then destroy it.
Dear Ms. Kramer,

I am adding my name in support of the planned development by Project for Pride in Living and the Union Congregational Church in the Elmwood neighborhood. The lack of affordable housing has reached crisis proportions for several years now. And the current Covid 19 pandemic has exposed even further the challenges of low income households to pay for rents and feed their families. Most of these households are minorities or single parents who work low wage jobs.

88% of all African American residents in St. Louis Park are renters. As our city’s 2040 Comprehensive Plan includes addressing housing disparities in dealing with racial equity it is important we continue to develop affordable housing.

The 2040 Plan further states, “Since 1980 the city’s population has grown approximately 10%, adding approximately 4,500 people to the community. With this growth comes increased demand for housing and a corresponding increase in housing prices and rents. As a result, housing units that were once affordable no longer are, and less housing options are available for low-income residents in the city and the metro area.” With the nonprofit PLACE backing away from their long-planned development that was to include fifty affordable apartments, we desperately need the PPL development in our city.

Please support the Project for Pride and Living development in the Elmwood neighborhood. We desperately need more affordable housing in St. Louis Park. Affordable housing improves health as families don’t have to choose between paying rent or buying healthy food or paying for dental and medical expenses. And safe and stable housing reduces stress on families and children, and children do better in school. We are all in this together. I would prefer their plan to be able to add back the three or even more bedrooms to support families.

Sincerely,

Stephen Ziff (he/him/his)
2930 Monterey Avenue
St. Louis Park, 55416

Sent from Mail for Windows 10
Dear Ms. Kramer,

We are writing in support of the planned development by Project for Pride in Living and the Union Congregational Church in the Elmwood neighborhood. There is a crisis in affordable housing and Covid-19 has truly changed the landscape. And challenges of low income households to pay for rents and/or find affordable housing while feeding their families seems like an impossible goal.

As Janice Goldstein, St. Louis Park Community Housing Team, pointed out to our Team the city’s 2040 Plan states, “Since 1980 the city’s population has grown approximately 10%, adding approximately 4,500 people to the community. With this growth comes increased demand for housing and a corresponding increase in housing prices and rents. As a result, housing units that were once affordable no longer are, and less housing options are available for low-income residents in the city and the metro area.”

With the nonprofit PLACE backing away from their long-planned development that was to include fifty affordable apartments, we desperately need the PPL development in our city. PPL has been helping communities to recognize and provide critically needed housing for low-income individuals and families. Where are these people to go? St. Louis Park as a whole, not broken into neighborhood communities should and need to step up and stand for fairness for all. Safe and stable housing reduces stress on families and children, and adults become good citizens, while their children do better in school.

Today more than ever we are all in this together.

Sincerely,

Roxanne & Richard Lange
STLP Community Housing Team Members
Dear Ms. Kramer,

Please see my attached letter of support for the proposed affordable housing project at Alabama and Oxford. Feel free to contact me with any questions.

Thanks so much,

Mary Wagner

Mary D. Wagner, MD
UMN-Methodist Hospital Family Medicine Residency Program
6600 Excelsior Blvd, Suite 100
St Louis Park MN, 55426

Ph 952-993-3635
Fax 952-993-6798
Email mary.wagner@parknicollet.com
Dear Jacqueline,

In 2016, the Minnesota Housing Partnership reported that the rising cost of housing accompanied by stagnant incomes of many renters, contributed to increased numbers of cost burdened households, particularly among those in Minnesota with lower incomes. Within the past four years, St. Louis Park has lost more than 500 affordable units when Meadowbrook was sold and remodeled.

In 2018, the City commissioned a report from Maxfield Consulting on its current and future housing needs that noted a potential demand for 3,700 new housing units through 2030. In its recommendations, the Maxfield report noted that between the present and 2030, 409 affordable rental units are needed in the City. Union Congregational Church in partnership with Project for Pride in Living is proposing to build a 68-unit affordable-rent apartment on land adjacent to the church. In response to input from several neighborhood meetings they've convened, they've made concessions to the footprint, number of units and the height of the building.

As an original member of the St. Louis Park Community Housing Team, I urge you to support this project. Our group is unanimous in our advocacy that this project go forward. Maxfield’s 2018 report recommended the City plan for multiple multifamily affordable rental housing that would target residents at 50-60% AMI. The Union Congregational project is targeting just this population.

From 2016 through 2018, in its last two years of existence, I was the Coordinator for the Meadowbrook Collaborative that was sponsored in part, by the City. I had the heart wrenching experience of supporting families who lost their affordable housing when Meadowbrook cycled through its renovations and precipitously raised its rent in 2017. Unfortunately, for most of these families, they had to leave the City to find affordable rental rates. I have many stories of these families' hardships due to the loss of their affordable housing at Meadowbrook. Please -- let's welcome them back into
the community by approving this project.

I'm available to answer any questions or provide more information.

Thank you.

Debbie Wells

--
Debbie Wells
Coordinator
SLP Family Services Collaborative
St. Louis Park Schools
6715 Minnetonka Blvd.
St. Louis Park, MN  55426
https://slpfamilyservices.org/
O - 952-928-6418
C - 414-243-6673
This letter is to voice strong support for the affordable housing project proposed by Project for Pride in Living with Union Congregational United Church of Christ. My wife and I have lived in St. Louis Park, three blocks from Union UCC, for 27 years. We love this neighborhood and can’t imagine living anywhere else. About ten years ago, we joined Union UCC. We were attracted by the open and welcoming community made up of people with passion for improving the lives of others. We have been similarly impressed with Project for Pride in living, a highly respected charitable organization with a 45-year history of working for affordable housing in the Twin Cities. In that time PPL has improved the lives of thousands of people. PPL currently owns and operates over 1500 units of housing. They have a proven track record in the area of affordable housing. The project’s location in our beautiful, friendly neighborhood is close to transit, parks and trails, shopping and medical services making it a great location for affordable housing.

The need for more affordable housing is undeniable and it is clear that this project can make a significant impact. Unfortunately, the potential impact is at odds with the desire of some people in the immediate neighborhood for a scaled back project. A smaller project will serve fewer people and have less of an impact on the problem. I trust that in balancing those concerns the opportunity to do significant good will not be lost.

Sincerely,

Kurt and Kathy Hunter

5918 W. 39th St.

St. Louis Park, MN
Hi Kurt,

Thank you for your note. I’m so grateful for your advocacy for affordable housing in St. Louis Park.

Because of my day job at the Minnesota Housing Partnership and the advocacy work we do with PPL and other affordable housing providers, I will be recusing myself from voting on this project.

Thankfully, there are six others on the council who can vote on it and would benefit from hearing from you!

Best,

Anne

Anne Mavity

Sent from my iPhone

On May 5, 2020, at 8:30 AM, "kurt@huntermarionettes.com" <kurt@huntermarionettes.com> wrote:

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

This letter is to voice strong support for the affordable housing project proposed by Project for Pride in Living with Union Congregational United Church of Christ. My wife and I have lived in St. Louis Park, three blocks from Union UCC, for 27 years. We love this neighborhood and can’t imagine living anywhere else. About ten years ago, we joined Union UCC. We were attracted by the open and welcoming community made up of people with passion for improving the lives of others. We have been similarly impressed with Project for Pride in living, a highly respected charitable organization with a 45-year history of working for affordable housing in the Twin Cities. In that time PPL has improved the lives of thousands of people. PPL currently owns and operates over 1500 units of housing. They have a proven track record in the area of affordable housing. The project’s location in our beautiful, friendly neighborhood is close to transit, parks and trails, shopping and medical services making it a great location for affordable housing.

The need for more affordable housing is undeniable and it is clear that this project can make a significant impact. Unfortunately, the potential impact is at odds with the desire of some people in the immediate neighborhood for a scaled back project. A smaller project will serve fewer people and have less of an impact on the problem. I trust that in balancing those concerns the opportunity to do significant good will not be lost.
Sincerely,
Kurt and Kathy Hunter
5918 W. 39th St.
St. Louis Park, MN
Dear Ms. Kramer,

I have been a resident of St. Louis Park since 2008. I am also a renter. As a Black woman living in a country that consistently ignores the inequities marginalized communities experience, it is deeply dismaying to live in a community where those with privilege do not use their power to advance equity for those who lack agency and resources to do so. I ask that the needs of those who lack the power to have their needs be heard be centered in a city that has vowed a commitment to equity and inclusion, including our critical housing needs in the city we call our home, St. Louis Park.

There are many marginalized groups in SLP that live in rental housing, the vast majority of Black and POC residents in SLP are renters, as well as many members of the disabled and senior communities. These groups are already economically disenfranchised in the workplace, due to racism, ageism or ableism, leading to many of these groups being underpaid or underemployed. Occupational segregation has forced many Black and Hispanic people into low wage-earning jobs; jobs that have been lost or increased their exposure to the virus during this pandemic. Those same low wage positions have also increased the likelihood of individuals and families being forced to live in residentially segregated communities, exposing them to food deserts and environmental pollution that endangers their health.

While many with economic privilege claim that the answer to the wage gap is higher education, studies show higher learning does not resolve the racial wage gap, especially when both race and gender are considered (American Community Survey, 2016). I myself learned of its impact on my own earnings, when a white male former co-worker, conscious of racial and gender wage disparities, revealed that he was being paid $5,000 more than me, despite my greater experience in our field, having a job title two pay grades above his own and an advanced degree. Racial bias has resulted in a greater need for Black and POC communities to need affordable housing, so they can meet their families’ basic needs, including access to safe communities, affordable fresh food and good schools for their children. We are in desperate need of those with power to recognize and answer those needs, instead of widening the economic barriers created by systematic oppression. United UCC and Project for Pride and Living is trying to help answer those needs in our community by building affordable housing in SLP.

When I first moved to SLP in 2008, my low wages qualified me for childcare assistance that I could not obtain as the long waiting list of other families in need exceeded the limited funds. It took more than a year for my number to finally be called. Had it not been for a neighbor informing me of STEP to help with food insecurity at that time, I am not sure how my child and I would have managed, as most of my monthly income went to housing and childcare costs. After moving to another
apartment complex, my rent began to outpace my annual job increases in 2015. While I assumed some of this was due to residual effects of the housing bubble still driving homeowners to rent, discussions with my property manager revealed that it was instead due to market rate increases caused by the continued development of luxury apartments. Sienna Apartment Homes was being built just down the street from my complex at the time, where a one-bedroom unit currently goes from $1,440-$2,645 a month.

I live in an apartment building built in 1968. There are no amenities or unit upgrades, no heated garage, playground or work out facility, not even a party room. This year, my rent increase for a two-bedroom unit was $100. 40% of my income goes to rent alone, while the recommended rent to income ratio is 30%. I am rent overburdened, as are my senior and disabled neighbors on fixed incomes and my neighbors who work in retail and the restaurant industry. Several residents in the apartment complex across the street from me have complained about their own rental increases, which were much steeper than my building experienced. Unless we are ready to move further away from our jobs and move our children to other school districts, we are forced to cut corners on basic necessities, pick up additional hours, or additional jobs that will mean even less time with our families and this was prior to COVID-19’s devastation.

We are in the midst of a pandemic where, while Black people make up only 14% of the population nationally, they make up one-third of the deaths from Coronavirus. Hispanics and Indigenous communities, groups that are also marginalized, are also bearing the worst of the unemployment, illness and death in the current crisis. Lack of safe and affordable housing is contributing to these dire statistics among marginalized communities. The affordable housing needs of these communities deserve to be a priority. While I fall below middle class and am above the poverty line, I and many of the SLP renters that I know represent the profile of families PPL’s project would serve. While I hope SLP will eventually increase efforts to meet the housing needs of those at and below the poverty line as well, I ask that you approve this project to aid current SLP renters that are being priced out of the community. While large luxury apartment projects with only a small fraction of units being dedicated to affordability continue to be approved, projects of greater need, serving renters who cannot afford luxury rents fall by the wayside. This is not reflective of the purported values of St. Louis Park.

I heard first-hand what some within the Elmwood community think of renters in need of affordable housing at neighborhood meeting. I witnessed many speakers call renters “dangerous criminals” who would destroy the Elmwood community and further alleged they would threaten their children’s safety. Others suggested there would be drug problems and that the building would be an eyesore depleting their property values. It was difficult hearing vitriol directed at SLP renters, knowing that those shared ideas were stereotyping based on bias against renters. The people demonized by the statements are my neighbors and the people that were demonizing them are also my neighbors. Quite honestly, it was a wake-up call for me to learn that I, and those like me, are not accepted as part of SLP. I used to brag to my friends that live outside of SLP about how much I love living in an inclusive community and about the “All Are Welcome Here” signs displayed in homeowner’s yards. Too often, the loudest voices heard are those that already hold power and would rather insulate, than share some of that power with those in need of a fair chance. PPL and Union UCC have already adapted this project multiple times to make concessions to the demands being made. Those in opposition to this project clearly lack perspective or understanding of what we
stand to lose if this project does not move forward.

Saint Louis Park is my and the rest of the rental communities home too! Do we and our families have no value in our community, unless we own a home, or can afford a luxury apartment? Do we, especially those of us belonging to underserved racial minorities, not belong here, despite SLP’s commitment to leading on issues of racial equity and inclusion? Are there communities here that are permitted to exclude those beneath a certain tax bracket? I am hoping that I will not have to prepare my son in the near future to say goodbye to his friends and his community. Not because I decided to move to another area for a job opportunity or to purchase a home, but rather because I cannot afford to call this community home. Economic walls limiting access are being built around this community that will continue to force those who fall below SLP’s middle class out of it. This will not change unless those in positions of leadership take action. I ask that you allow this project to move forward and increase efforts to make SLP an inclusive, affordable community for marginalized residents who have been overlooked for far too long.

Thank you.

Elizabeth Stroder
Dear Ms. Kramer,

I am writing as a concerned citizen of St. Louis Park and founding member of the St. Louis Park Community Housing Team. My husband, Dan and I were drawn to this community for its diversity, stated priorities of equity and inclusion and engagement of citizens. Since moving here in 1994, we have been involved with almost every aspect of life in St. Louis Park, as volunteers, parents, participants, members and benefactors. We are proud of our community and are compelled to make our voices heard when change is needed.

As many have shared, experts in the housing industry have identified affordable housing as our most critical need now and into the future. Safe, affordable housing is vital to the stability, health and wealth of a family.

Contrary to a common belief, renters in St. Louis Park and our surrounding community live in their apartments on average 6-9 years. Unfortunately, when rents continue to rise, many SLP families have been forced to move. Based on known demographics, most of these families represent minority populations, which means, we are creating a less diverse community when we neglect to make affordable housing a priority.

While the vitality of any city is based on a diverse portfolio of plans and development, we must stay true to our commitment of racial equity and inclusion. Based on the 2018 Maxfield report, St. Louis Park must make affordable housing a greater priority, with a projected need of 3,700 affordable apartment units to meet the economic profile of our neighbors needing housing. The UCC and Project for Pride and Living project is an excellent opportunity to advance the initiative of affordable housing.

I understand many, significant concessions have been made to appease the neighbors of Elmwood. While many of their concerns may have merit, I hope the leadership of our community are moved by our city’s stated values and initiatives rather than an outcry of “Not in my backyard” neighbors. In the infinite wisdom and words of the late Paul Wellstone, lets remember, “We all do better when we all do better”.

Kirsten Brekke Albright

Jacquelyn Kramer

Larry Kraft; Nadia Mohamed; Margaret Rog; Anne Mavity; Tim Brauser; Tom Harmening; Darius Gray; Alicia Sojourner; Karen Barton; Michele Schnitker; Marney Olson; Jake Spano
Sincerely,

Kirsten Brekke Albright
Dear Ms. Kramer,

As a long-time resident of St. Louis Park, I am writing in support of the proposed Housing Project by Union Congregational Church in the Elmwood Neighborhood of St. Louis Park.

I am very pleased that the Church would consider the advancement of affordable housing for our City, and that they are working with Project for Pride in Living, a well known and experienced nonprofit developer.

Union Congregational Church has been extraordinarily open to comments from the Elmwood Neighborhood, and has accordingly taken steps to modify the plans for the proposed structure in the following ways: reducing the number of units from 80 to 68, with commensurate parking spaces; increasing the set-back, and reducing the height to 2.5 stories on the Brunswick side. I believe this demonstrates several quantifiable responses to requests from the Elmwood neighborhood.

I believe this Project helps to address a deep need for affordable housing in our community. Residents at this building will be from a variety of income levels (various percentages of Area Mean Income). The rapidly dwindling supply of naturally occurring affordable housing underscores the need for projects like this. It is my firm belief that all the cities in the metro area need to increase their stock of affordable housing, and St. Louis Park needs to do its part in this metro-wide effort.

In summary, in order for St. Louis Park to continue to be an open, welcoming, and diverse Community, we need more housing projects of this type. I hope the City will support, encourage, and facilitate the continued development of affordable housing, including this Project at Union Congregational Church. I would be very proud to have this Project as part of our wonderful St. Louis Park City.

Thank you for all you do for the Planning and Housing in St. Louis Park. You are an important part of helping to make a Community we can all be proud of.

Sincerely,
Barb Patterson
Mr. Fuchs.

The appropriate density of development on the property is one of the policy questions posed in this application. You described the density limitations of the present St. Louis Park 2040 comprehensive plan land use guidance in your March email message.

The applicants, not the city, have requested high density residential development of the parcel. The applicants initially proposed 80 units total on the property which is about 67 units per acre. The city does not dictate what the applicant can request and we must respond to the formal applications within 60-120 days under State Statutes. City staff have not made a recommendation regarding the proposed application, yet. City staff will make our recommendation to the planning commission in our staff report for the scheduled public hearing and meeting to be held on June 3, 2020. Notice for that meeting will sent out at least 10 days before the hearing. The planning commission will be asked to make a recommendation to the city council. The city council will make the final decision.

The applicant is amending their initial proposal to a degree which will reduce the proposed density of the development. The proposal is expected to remain in the range of the high density residential category. The city will post revised information about the development on the development projects page of the city website by no later than Thursday (May 21, 2020) with the latest information. The staff report for the planning commission meeting will be posted to the planning commission webpage on the city website by the afternoon of Friday, May 29, 2020.

The best point of contact for procedural questions is Jacquelyn Kramer, associate planner. She has been copied on these emails and her office number is 952.928.1375.

I hope this information is helpful as you track this application through the city review process.

Sean Walther (he/him/his)
Planning and Zoning Supervisor | City of St. Louis Park
5005 Minnetonka Blvd, St. Louis Park, MN 55416
Office: 952.924.2574
www.stlouispark.org
Experience LIFE in the Park.

Respond now to the census at 2020census.gov. It is easy, safe and important!
Subject: Re: Union Congregational Church

Sean Walthers is best positioned to address your question.

Anne Mavity

Sent from my iPhone

On May 15, 2020, at 3:10 PM, Fuchs, Brian R. (BLM) <BRFuchs@express-scripts.com> wrote:

Is it possible to get a response from the city as far as what level of development is okay on this site?

Has the city developed a density level that they would be willing to bring to the council for their approval?

Thanks,
Brian Fuchs

From: Fuchs, Brian R. (BLM)
Sent: Thursday, March 12, 2020 3:37 PM
To: amavity@stlouispark.org
Cc: jkramer@stlouispark.org; swalther@stlouispark.org
Subject: FW: Union Congregational Church

Hi Anne,

I want to thank you for attending the neighborhood meeting earlier this week and listening to the neighborhood’s concerns about this proposed project.

I was planning to talk at the meeting, but as it got longer I decided I would just write this email instead.

Just as we heard from most in attendance at the meeting, I also struggle with the density of this project. This development is not located on a main/busy street such or in an area where development of this density would be expected. It is instead located in an area next to single family residential housing. I understand the church’s need for additional revenue, but simply because 80 units is what is required for them to make enough profit on the sale of the property does not mean that 80 units is the appropriate density.

The question then becomes what is the appropriate density for a location such as this. Luckily, the city of St. Louis Park has recently conducted a study on a building site very similar to this location...
(Eliot Community Center Site Reuse Study) that should provide everyone with appropriate guidelines to follow. The Eliot study was also about a development where a school/community site was being redeveloped and it even talks about being in an area with single family homes, a church across the street, and nearby commercial and industrial uses. The apartments that opened on the Eliot site opened less than five years ago, so this study should still be relevant today. The study can still be found on the city’s website. I would attach it, but I suspect attachments are not opened. It is remarkable to read this study and find how much it can be applied to the Union Congregation Church (UCC) site.

Findings of the study conclude that medium density residential of six to 30 units per acre should be built on the site and that anything built should complement the existing scale and character of the surrounding homes. The study notes that on the Eliot site this would equate to 26 to 129 units.

Based on other information on the city website I found that the final design of the apartments built on at the Eliot location was 138 units which equates to 32 units per acre, so just slightly over the top range of the study. Further, the apartments on the Eliot site are two stories, and step up to three stories in some locations. The proposed four stories on the UCC site is simply too much.

Based on my below correspondence with Jacquelyn within the planning division of SLP, the UCC site is 1.19 acres. At 30 units per acre as the Eliot study recommends, this would result in a development of 36 units on the UCC site. It would come up to 38 units on the UCC site at the ending 32 units per acre of what was finally built on the Eliot site. The proposal for the UCC site is 67 units per acre, which is over double these densities. This was shocking to me that the city is even entertaining the thoughts of a development that is this dense. Why are we even having to attend neighborhood meetings to defend our neighborhood from this development? The city should be applying such studies themselves and making sure they do not even get to the point where a neighborhood meeting is required.

The city has recently gone through a heated debate about bike lanes in the city (Southwest Bikeway Improvements) and one of the themes used to approve that work was around treating that neighborhood the same as previous neighborhoods were treated when similar initiatives were proposed. Please treat the Elmwood neighborhood the same as the neighborhood around the Eliot site was treated for proposed residential development.

I ask that you please consider these numbers as this proposal is voted on by the city and ensure that this development stays at 30 units per acre. I also ask that you please read the Eliot site study and that the study is attached to any agenda items reviewed by the city council or planning commission. Please also include my thoughts and concerns with other members of both the city council and the planning commission and that those members are informed about the Eliot site study. The study should clearly help define what the density of development of the UCC site should be.

Thanks,
Brian (an Elmwood neighborhood resident)
Good morning Brian,

The proposed apartment building lot would be 1.19 acres. So with 80 units it would have a density of 67 units per acre. One of the requests from the developer is a comprehensive plan amendment, which would reguide the proposed parcel from the civic designation to high density residential, which allows up to 75 units per acre.

Please let me know if you have any other questions about the proposal. Thanks.

Jacquelyn Kramer (she/her/hers)
Associate Planner | City of St. Louis Park
5005 Minnetonka Blvd, St. Louis Park, MN 55416
Office: 952.928.1375
www.stlouispark.org
Experience LIFE in the Park.

Hi Jacquelyn,

I attended the neighborhood meeting last night on the proposed development on the school/community portion of the UCC property. One thing I was wondering once I got home was what is the size of the proposed building site in terms of acres? I am wondering what 80 units would be in terms of density stated as units per acre.

Thanks,
Brian
Dear Ms. Kramer,

I am writing to express my support for the PPL housing project which is being proposed by the Union UCC Church. St. Louis Park is need of housing that is affordable to all income levels. The PPL project will provide much needed housing as well as support for low income families and individuals.

The implementation of this project is consistent with the goals of the community as stated in the Comprehensive 2040 plan:

The overall goal for housing in St. Louis Park is to: “Promote and facilitate a balanced and enduring housing stock that offers a continuum of diverse life-cycle housing choices suitable for households of all income levels including affordable, senior, supportive and mixed income housing disbursed throughout the City.”

Project for Pride in Living is an established organization that has been successful in building and supporting stable housing. Their mission statement reflects this commitment:

PPL builds the hope, assets and self-reliance of individuals and families who have lower incomes by providing transformative affordable housing and employment readiness services.

I urge you to support this important project. As a teacher I see first hand the impact that housing instability has on students. As a member of the St Louis Park community, I want to live in a city with a diverse stock of dignified, affordable housing for people across the income spectrum.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Phelan
3944 Joppa Ave South
St Louis Park, MN
Mr. Spano and City Council Members,

I've been reaching out to our city council member for Elmwood, Anne Mavity, without reply since March. We're very concerned about the density of the proposed development at UCC Congregational Church on Alabama. It's my understanding that they're proposing a development of anywhere between 50 to 80 units, mostly 2-3 bedrooms each, for a property in our neighborhood that is zoned for closer to 30 units. This would be right next to single family homes. This is truly unacceptable, and it's not consistent with other developments in the area.

We understand the need for progress, and we understand the need for housing that supports the movement towards mass transit in the area, but this size of a development within a residential neighborhood and next to single family homes is truly unacceptable if not punitive. Additionally, we're hearing of possible unethical business/governmental dealings that involve conflicts of interest in order to push this development through. I remember reading an article on this in the Sun Sailor a few months ago, and the rumblings on this topic are getting louder.

Please see previous e-mails to Anne Mavity below. We're hopeful that the City of St. Louis Park will help to further educate our neighborhood on why the city is taking these steps to push through a development that breaks density standards, zoning laws, and in a manner that has brought up rumors of severe ethical shortcomings.

I can be reached by phone or e-mail if anybody would be willing to take the time to educate me on the events that have transpired to date. A well-publicized meeting with our neighborhood to discuss the development as well as how under served we are by our city council representative would likely be enlightening for everybody.

I'm a proud citizen of St. Louis Park, and I am supportive of our city government as a whole. You've made real positive progress for our city over the years that we have lived here, and I commend you for it. Unfortunately, what is being planned for the development at the UCC Congregational Church on Alabama Avenue is a mistake and the process continues to be suspect.

Thanks.

Randal Dick
612-730-5621
--------- Forwarded message ---------
From: Randal Dick <randal.s.dick@gmail.com>
Date: Thu, Mar 26, 2020 at 8:42 PM
Subject: Fwd: Proposed development at Union Congregational Church
To: <amavity@stlouispark.org>
Hi Anne,

I didn’t hear back from you on this. As one of your constituents, I sure would appreciate hearing your thoughts on your position related to this upcoming development decision. If I’m misunderstanding the development, I’m hoping you will help to better inform me.

Thanks.

Randy

Begin forwarded message:

From: Randal Dick <randal.s.dick@gmail.com>
Date: March 12, 2020 at 2:23:40 PM CDT
To: amavity@stlouispark.org
Subject: Proposed development at Union Congregational Church

Hi Anne,

We met a couple of years ago at an Elmwood neighborhood gathering at Justad Park, and it was a pleasure. I believe the hot topic at the time was adding sidewalks to the neighborhood and how extreme the opposition seemed be towards a solution that allows kids to walk and ride their bicycles safely in our neighborhood.

Recently, I’ve been catching up to the proposed development at Union Congregational Church. I’m hearing about opposition reasoning that I agree with and some that I do not. There are 3 things stick out to me that are concerning:

1. The size and height of the development seems overwhelming for that part of the neighborhood. 4 stories of building with 80 units right next to single family homes just doesn't seem like a good idea or fair to the folks that live in that area. Is there an option that has less height and less density that still addresses the church's financial issues?

2. Parking will be unusually challenging. Street parking around the nearby townhomes and condos is always full, and the density of that development is far less than what is being proposed at the church property. That's a lot of cars that will naturally be added to already crowded streets as 80 new families need to add a second car or have visitors/guests. Beyond just parking and traffic challenges, the increased car density is going to create safety issues for our residents. In theory, the light rail will help to address this, but I haven't seen that to be the case in any other similar neighborhood along the existing light rail lines. The surrounding areas become one big park-and-ride (even with official park-and-
rides just one neighborhood away). The additional cars that will come with 80 new units built on half a city block is going to make this situation even worse for the residents in that area.

3. The decision seems rushed. I just learned of this new development after the "proposed development" sign went up on the property recently. I'm now hearing that a decision will be made by the council in April. I'm sure I'm exaggerating, but it seems like more time, consideration, communication, and neighborhood involvement went into what kind of playground structure we were going to build at Justad Park as well as the recent sidewalk topic. Is there a way to slow this down a little and ensure that the neighborhood is fully informed and has the opportunity to provide thoughtful input? I believe that there have been 2 meetings to date, and I heard that the opposition was intense. That tells me that any near-term decision is premature or forced.

I'm all for progress and re-development in Elmwood, but this proposal seems pretty intrusive and rushed. I'm hopeful that we can take the time that is necessary to find a solution that has a chance of creating harmony rather than angst in the neighborhood.

I'm curious to hear your position on the topic as well as your ideas for ensuring that your constituents in Elmwood are heard, feel like they have the opportunity to influence the proposed development due to the direct impact to the nearby residents, and therefore drive more buy-in for progress to the neighborhood.

Thanks, Anne.

Randal Dick
612-730-5621
CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mayor Spano,

I hope that you and your family are well in crazy times.

I wanted to express my personal opinions and perhaps get some clarity/insight on project processes. I will fully admit I am not an expert in city politics, zoning, project financing etc. but I am just thinking from a common sense standpoint:

Size and Scale- Take out any and all factors other than how the proposed project will look within the area. There are 2/3 story condos towards 36th and Wooddale that the Church itself apparently fought for before they were built, and then the last proposal I saw (I believe it has come down a little bit since but haven't seen new proposals yet) was 4 stories directly across the street from single family homes. From a planning perspective how does this make sense? this will tower over the entire area (the church is one story, the industrial buildings are one story) and change the entire landscape rather than be somewhat integrated into the area? Folks that are more in tuned then I have brought up that there is an Elmwood study that was to be followed until 2030 I was told that states all new structure should scale back into single family homes, is this a real study or was this redone?  

-Parking & Alabama traffic-the streets of Elmwood were narrowed last year which I learned "slows" traffic down. The last proposal seen didn't have enough parking for even 1 car per unit, but they proposed building a park within the complex? what's wrong with the park across the street?? I have been told many tenants wont own cars, is this part of criteria that PPL vets out for living in the complex because 6/7months out of the year we have freezing temperatures in our climate. The start tribune did a study that states 98% of Minnesotans prefer to drive, so while yes folks can hop on the light rail, we live in a climate that almost forces Minnesotans to own at least one car to be able to go out to run errands for groceries/essentials ... were not in California where folks can walk a few miles 12 months out of the year...

-There are many young families that have moved in and around the Elmwood area with young kids, and the area has 2 parks in Justad and the Depot where folks can walk and kids can run because it is relatively a quiet neighborhood/area, but after both of these projects (Jessen Press and UCC) Alabama is going to be loaded from both ends no longer making it that safe. It will be a congested, high density mess.

Inclusivity of neighborhood from beginning stages on developments- After attending the UCC neighborhood meeting which was highly attended, one of the main topics again and again was lack of neighborhood engagement in initial planning process. Clearly the initial proposal caused controversy within the Elmwood neighborhood once it was seen which means that from the get go there wasn't a sufficient input? Where does the ball land on this to clearly get input? does City Council lay out to developers the best way to engage the community? whoever was in the initial study didn't represent the broader neighborhood opinion and so does this process need to be looked at? Seems to me that developers, the city, citizens could save A LOT of time, money and effort it is more coordinated from the beginning, no? the fact that neighborhood representatives filed a complaint on a council member seems that this process and perhaps some trust is broken. While I imagine there is pushback on most projects, there has to be a better way to be more transparent on what is going on in citizens backyards...

Adhering to your vision statement on the website below regarding neighborhoods:
Plan By Neighborhood
Vision For Neighborhoods
St. Louis Park’s Plan by Neighborhood is guided by the city’s vision of creating and maintaining a very “livable community” built upon strong neighborhoods. The ideal neighborhood has a center, public gathering places, green spaces, identifiable edges, and a walkable environment. Although each neighborhood has a unique history, development pattern, character, challenges, and opportunities, all neighborhoods should ideally provide a healthy living environment with convenient access to essential community services, including transportation options, jobs, parks and open space, shopping, services, entertainment, and other urban amenities.

Strong neighborhoods are the backbone of St. Louis Park being a healthy community. As the community and neighborhoods face inevitable change over time, the city values the preservation and enhancement of each neighborhood’s unique sense of identity based on its location, natural features, history, development character and residents. Ideally, strong neighborhoods also provide connectedness and support for a wide range of individuals and families, a source of friendship and neighbors you can rely upon if the need arises.

Within this statement on the website it states: "the city values the preservation and enhancement of each neighborhoods unique sense of identity based on its location, natural features, history, development character and residents." How does a 4 story building preserve and enhance our neighborhood? the size of the project is being dictated based on what the church needs to survive which by the way, the Pastor at the neighborhood meeting out right admitted that they probably wont survive even after this lump some funding-believe she said maybe 5 years?!!!!!!!

In conclusion, I hope that the city council and planning commission and the powers that be really consider the voices of whom they represent. Why does the development have to be so big? I know a new proposal is coming down a little in size but I can tell you that the neighborhood will be receptive to a project that is in line with size and scale that makes sense moving into a single family home neighborhood and will not vastly change the identity of it. Which means a 2 1/2 story max building in line with what is across the street (even this size will change the area but we as residents can embrace it). There is no reason all parties can't negotiate and come to some sort of an agreement that will support affordable housing initiatives and help the neighborhood embrace change. I appreciate you taking the time to read this and welcome any response (phone or email) to any of the questions within this note.

Respectfully,

Andrew Sackrison
952-250-0308
6215 Oxford Street SLP, MN 55416
Hello
I live at 5920 Oxford St. Between Alabama and Woodale Ave. when the street was reconstructed a few years ago it must have narrowed a bit. Cars are allied to park on both sides of the street which does not leave enough width for two vehicles to pass through. If another multi residence is built a couple of hundred feet from this street the traffic will become very bad. Please consider affect. Also ask that you consider only allowing parking on one side of the street. In the winter it’s much worse with snow mating the street eve narrower. Thank you

Allison Ladd
5920 Oxford St
Ms. Kramer -

I am a property owner one block from the proposed PPL Union Congregational Church housing project.

**I am writing to express my strong support for the project.** It is important to provide affordable housing to the community and this is a great place for it, due to the high density of the area and the proximity to the light rail station. Additionally, the building renderings are appealing.

I welcome this addition to the neighborhood and am hopeful the city council will approve the project.

Thank you for receiving and sharing my input.

John Evans  
5900 Oxford Street #17
Hi Jake,

I understand that the PPL project has been resubmitted to the City Council at 3 stories/60 units and still at 100% affordable housing.

I would like to resubmit my original comments below into the formal record as a strenuous objection to having any development in this location with a 100% affordable component. As my original note detailed, the “100% affordable” model is a demonstrated failure after being tried extensively in recent American urban planning history and is unacceptable to myself as well as our neighbors.

The entire effort with this development, with a lack of transparency and engagement with the community, has been a case study in how not to do things at the local government level. How can St Louis Park preach “inclusion and respect” yet act in such a diametrically opposite manner with critical development projects such as this? The only way I see this project succeeding is starting from scratch with an honest and fair process as the entire thing is basically polluted at this point.

PS In my 44 years in the area, this is the 1st time I’ve ever written any City Council or government official about anything. I’m a fair representation of how otherwise normal/everyday people have been infuriated by this project and the secretive, dictatorial way things have proceeded. I cannot tell you how many of my neighbors I’ve stopped and spoken with over the past 3 months who feel the same way – people who rarely/never get involved in local government, but are absolutely incensed at what’s happening here.

Best regards,

Mark and Katia Bredesen

5900 Oxford Street #10
Thank you for your email regarding this project. I’m not sure if you are aware but earlier this week, after meeting with a group of residents from the neighborhood, the developers have pulled this project from the process so they can refine their proposal. Not sure what all will change but wanted you to know that. You might want to reach out to the Elmwood neighborhood association/board to learn more.

Have a good day,

Jake Spano
Mayor
St. Louis Park, MN
(he/him/his)
952-928-1448 (direct)

On Apr 9, 2020, at 10:07 PM, Mark Bredesen <MBredesen@manulife.com> wrote:

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To : City Council and Planning Commission, City of St Louis Park (c/o Jacquelyn Kramer)

CC : Jake Spano, Mayor and Bob Broshat, President, Village in the Park Homeowner Association

RE : Planned unit development from Project in Pride in Living at 3700 Alabama Ave

My name is Mark Bredesen and my wife Katia and I are long-term residents of St Louis Park. We have been living at our current residence at 5900 Oxford Street #10 for 7 years which is less than one (1) block from the planned development.

My wife and I strenuously disagree with the development as it is currently proposed. Our primary concern revolves around the concentration of large numbers of affordable housing units in a single location as the 4-story, 80 unit plan currently allows for.
Concentrated affordable housing has been extensively tried over the past 50 years in the United States and has been a complete failure by any objective measure. Cities and municipalities that spent significant resources building concentrated affordable housing structures in the 1960s and 70s have since spent the past several decades dismantling them after experiencing overwhelmingly negative outcomes. Both Cabrini-Green in Chicago and Cedar-Riverside in Minneapolis are relevant examples of the failure of a concentrated approach. Regrettably, putting large numbers of people of low socioeconomic status in immediate proximity to each other has been definitively shown to produce several negative effects, most notably significant increases in crime (including, but not limited to, violent crime and narcotics trafficking).

Mixed developments, however, encompassing both affordable and market rate units, have shown disproportionately better outcomes in median income growth, educational attainment and neighborhood property values and has tended to be an uplifting contributor for residents closer to the poverty line. As you are aware, our Village in the Park development contains a mix of market/affordable (~10%) units and has been an overwhelmingly positive and local example of how this type of development can succeed.

Given the widely known and acknowledged trends associated with concentrated affordable housing – of which a multitude of supportive studies are available from academic and governmental organizations, including HUD – it is both intellectually astounding and borderline negligent that our City Council in 2020 would pursue a development project as has been proposed at 3700 Alabama Avenue. While the benefits/payoffs to the Church and developer are obvious and apparent, the project ultimately benefits none of the stakeholders that “Project in Pride in Living” claims to want to help….residents of the building will suffer from the same detrimental trends seen elsewhere with concentrated affordable housing, while area residents such as myself will be exceedingly burdened with a neighborhood victimized by higher crime, unwanted density and lower quality of life.

If “Project in Pride”, the Church and the City Council are genuinely interested in listening to area residents, there are two obvious and concrete steps that can be taken to adjust the project to reflect concerns expressed by us and the 20+ neighbors of ours we’ve spoken to over the past two weeks:

- First, the project can be reduced from 80 units/4 stories to 40 units/2 stories to fit with the development pattern of the surrounding neighborhood, existing zoning ordinances and area traffic infrastructure.
- Second, the project can be modified to include no more than 20% affordable housing (and no less than 80% market rate housing) which will ensure that the affordable housing residents have a chance to succeed and, hopefully, one day graduate into market rate tenants. These are reasonable, prudent compromises that let everyone come away from this project a “winner” and contribute to the long term
viability of our very successful and diverse existing neighborhood character.

Respectfully,

Mark Bredesen
Katia Bredesen
5900 Oxford Street #10

Mark R. Bredesen
SVP - GO Performance Measurement Attribution Risk
Manulife Investment Management
E mbredesen@manulife.com | O 1 (617) 572-5182

197 Clarendon Street, Boston, MA 02116

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY The information contained in this email message and any attachments may be confidential and legally privileged and is intended for the use of the addressee(s) only. If you are not an intended recipient, please: (1) notify me immediately by replying to this message; (2) do not use, disseminate, distribute or reproduce any part of the message or any attachment; and (3) destroy all copies of this message and any attachments.
Dear Mayor Spano,

I appreciated the time and our last conversation. I was able to view the updated plans proposed by PPL for the UCC development last night and I understand that city staff did some work to get those out to the neighborhood in short order which I am thankful for!

As we discussed recently, I have sought to educate myself on the wholistic planning of the city to better understand the direction and goals the city has for future enhancement and development.

In looking over the 2040 comprehensive plan I can’t help but wonder how far off this new proposal still is from what is supposed to be a “guide” for medium density residential that the city council voted approval for? Please read these statements below directly from the plan and vision on the city website:

5-125 Where We Are Headed This section establishes the city’s comprehensive plan land use designations, which are fully defined below. The 2040 Future Land Use Plan Map, Figure 5-5, which is the city’s official land use plan map, uses these land use designations to guide all land within the city’s boundaries. These designations guide current and future land use planning and development through the year 2040. They are intended to use sound planning principles to shape the character, type and density of future development. Any new development, redevelopment, change in land use, or change in zoning is required to be consistent with the land use designation for each parcel.

***the last sentence in this statement, “change in zoning is required to be consistent with the land use designation for each parcel”-this proposal is not consistent with the land use designation.

5-125 RM - Medium Density Residential The Medium Density Residential designation is intended for residential areas adjacent to commercial centers, corridors, and nodes. It allows net residential densities from six (6) to 30 units per acre. This designation allows a variety of housing types that are compatible in scale to single family homes, including single-family detached, duplexes, townhomes, and small two- or three-story apartment buildings.

***6-30 units per acre, it is my understanding the land is 1.2 acres for UCC project meaning that 60 proposed units is still almost double the amount of units the land use study suggests?

***is a three-story building across the street in scale to single family homes which the land sits up about 8-10 ft from the neighborhood to begin with?

In reading these statements above I hope that you can understand how this frustrates residents when what is being proposed directly contradicts the plan laid out by the city itself! I realize the land use study isn’t the end all be all, but this isn’t even close, what is the point of doing an expensive study that lays out the next 20 years if it isn’t somewhat followed?

Moving on, the area of the proposed development is going to change dramatically with light rail and all the opportunities of other buildings in the area (such as Johnny pops to name one). This is the last parcel directly next to single family homes and what is approved here will set the baseline for other developments very close to it. I hope
the city council and planning commission would consider a project of 40 units which is still 10 units above the recommended amount but what I personally think the neighborhood should agree with to embrace the change that is coming. I do not think this is an unreasonable request and I believe that this will alleviate a lot of what has been a frustrating process to this point.

I will recognize and I really am glad that PPL decided to engage the neighborhood on this project, but I am also aware the developers come in very high to get what they want in the end, we are very close to a solution for all parties coming to agreement and I hope we get there.

In the last council meeting I heard a lot about acting honestly, ethically and with integrity. Doing what you say your going to do (ie the land use study and comprehensive plan that was just passed last fall) has everything to do with those words. Please follow through with what has been laid out in these plans because as of now, approving this project is misleading to the residents of St. Louis Park/Elmwood neighborhood.

I welcome any feedback that you or council members Nadia Mohamed and Larry Kraft may have.

Thank You,

Andrew Sackrison
Evening!

Just got our notice about the hearing on 6/3 for the UCC development...I've reached out before but wanted to make sure I submitted my comments for record again. We are happy we are finally being heard & have been able to submit comments on the project (in the nick of time). Sounds like PPL still has some work to do to meet the scope/scale of what would fit this neighborhood...

We still need your help and are seeking your assistance to support us. We need you guys to ask tough questions and make sure the developer understands what we are asking is not unreasonable...(hence the 2040 plan SLP has published-this project is beyond anything suggested for this historic area & beyond anything past surveys have recommended).

Even if we are piggybacking off the Met Councils recommendations for developments in this type of zoning along the transit line...we are still VERY far off for what this neighborhood can handle alone in the size/scale/scope. They shouldn't be allowed a pass just because its affordable housing. We'd be asking any developer to uphold these standards & recommendations.

This piece of land is on 1.2 acres- the study suggests max 30 units per acre is recommended...they are still proposing 4 story/68+ units. This is still double! They must come down in size....

We also need to see mixed income at least up to 80% AMI or throw in some market rate units. Diversity proves to work-our neighborhood is the gold standard in how that is working!

We are a historic neighborhood -we need to preserve the single family homes (depot & park) that are still here & have been deemed important to SLP. There is enough high density projects and housing going on in this area, on much busier streets, that are not as close to single family homes that meet the overall vision for SLP.... This particular lot/area on Alabama cannot. We are asking for your help to ensure what is built here fits this area and enhances the neighborhood, not diminish it.

I could go on but I think the biggest argument here is size. There is still a lot of room for improvement. I really hope we are heard and you can ensure the council is doing its due diligence to make sure this is also the right fit for this neighborhood.

Thank you for taking the time to read this and for your work in our community!
UNITY VILLAGE APARTMENTS

SNOWALL PERSONS BY THESE PRESENTS: The (The) Iowa Congregational Church, a religious organization, owner of the following described property:

Lot 51 in Block 10, City of St. Louis Park, Minnesota, as shown on the Plat of "Unity Village," recorded in the Office of the Recorder of the City of St. Louis Park, Minnesota, in Plat Book No. 10, Page 39

This Instrument is executed upon the following day of June, in the year of our Lord, 2023.

By

STREET OF MINNESOTA
COUNTY OF Hennepin
City of St. Louis Park

City of St. Louis Park
MINNESOTA
COUNTY OF Hennepin

ST. LOUIS PARK, MINNESOTA

This plat of UNITY VILLAGE APARTMENTS has been approved and accepted by the City Council of the City of St. Louis Park, Minnesota, as a regular meeting thereof held on the day of June, 2023. 

By

Mark V. Chapa, Hennepin County Auditor

SURVEY ENGINEER, Ramsey County, Minnesota

Pamela McHofford, McHofford, Inc., who has approved this plat on the day of June, 2023.

By

County Recorder, Ramsey County, Minnesota

COUNTY RECORDER, Ramsey County, Minnesota

By

Mark V. Chapa, Hennepin County Auditor

By

Civil Clerk

By

County Recorder

By

Deputy

By

County Clerk

By

Recorder

By

 Deputy
OUTLINE OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

EXISTING TREE TO REMAIN

EXISTING TREE TO BE REMOVED

EXISTING TREE SCHEDULE

ID COMMON NAME SIZE SIGNIFICANCE STATUS REMOVAL

D1 ELM 3 NONE REMOVE
D2 SPRUCE 2 NONE REMOVE
D3 V.I.F 2 NONE REMOVE
D4 SPRUCE 2 NONE REMOVE
D5 ELM 3 NONE REMOVE
D6 ELM 3 NONE REMOVE
D7 PINE 3 NONE REMOVE
D8 MAPLE 14 SIGNIFICANT REMOVE
D9 BIRCH 7 SIGNIFICANT REMOVE
D10 BIRCH 8 SIGNIFICANT REMOVE
D11 V.I.F 5 NONE REMOVE
D12 V.I.F 4 NONE REMOVE
D13 V.I.F. 8 SIGNIFICANT REMOVE
D14 MAPLE 8 NONE REMOVE
E1 CRABAPPLE 3 NONE RETAIN / PROTECT
E2 BIRCH 3 NONE RETAIN / PROTECT
E3 CRABAPPLE 3 NONE RETAIN / PROTECT

81 TOTAL DIAMETER INCHES EXISTING TREES
37 TOTAL DIAMETER INCHES SIGNIFICANT TREE REMOVAL

TREE REPLACEMENT CALCULATIONS

TOTAL DIAMETER INCHES OF EXISTING TREES: 81" TOTAL INCHES
TOTAL DIAMETER INCHES OF SIGNIFICANT TREES REMOVED: 37" TOTAL INCHES
TOTAL DIAMETER INCHES OF REPLACEMENT TREES: 15" TOTAL INCHES

TREE REMOVAL AND PROTECTION NOTES:

1. ANY TREE, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF SALIX (WILLOW), BOXELDER, SIBERIAN ELM AND BLACK LOCUST IS CONSIDERED TO BE SIGNIFICANT UNDER THE LANDSCAPING SECTION OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE IF IT IS AT LEAST 5 CALIPER INCHES FOR DECIDUOUS TREES AND 6 CALIPER INCHES FOR CONIFERS. ASPEN, COTTONWOOD OR SILVER MAPLE IS CONSIDERED SIGNIFICANT IF IT IS AT LEAST 12 INCHES IN DIAMETER AT BREAST HEIGHT (DBH).

2. TREES TO BE SAVED MUST BE PHYSICALLY PROTECTED FROM HARM OR DESTRUCTION BY THE FOLLOWING SPECIFICATIONS:
   - BEFORE ANY CONSTRUCTION OR GRADING ACTIVITY OCCURS, AN ORANGE SAFETY FENCE THAT IS 4 FEET HIGH MUST BE PLACED AROUND THE DRIP LINE BORDER OF TREES TO BE SAVED.
   - NOTHING MAY BE STORED WITHIN THE DRIP LINE.
   - CHANGES IN SOIL CHEMISTRY MUST BE PREVENTED.
   - DRAINAGE PATTERNS MAY NOT CHANGE THE SOIL MOISTURE CONTENT OF TREES TO BE SAVED.
   - PRUNING OF OAK AND ELM TREES MUST NOT TAKE PLACE FROM MAY 1 THROUGH JULY 31.

3. REFER TO 1/L500 FOR TREE PROTECTION DETAIL.

4. SEE L140 - OVERALL LANDSCAPE PLAN FOR FINAL TREE COUNT, SPECIES SELECTION AND PLACEMENT THROUGHOUT THE SITE.
OVERALL SITE PLAN - DORA EXHIBIT

DORA INFORMATION

- TOTAL PROJECT AREA: 51,810 SF
- MINIMUM DORA AREA: 6,217 SF (12%)
- DORA AREA - MAIN ENTRY: 411 SF
- DORA AREA - COURTYARD: 7,374 SF

TOTAL DORA AREA: 7,785 SF (15%)
EXISTING TREE, TO REMAIN

TREE SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEST 37TH STREET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALABAMA AVENUE SOUTH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BRUNSWICK AVENUE SOUTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TREES CODE</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>BOTANICAL / COMMON NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC-F 6</td>
<td>ACER X FREEMANII <code>JEFFSRED</code> / AUTUMN BLAZE MAPLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-P 5</td>
<td>BETULA POPULIFOLIA <code>WHITESPIRE</code> / WHITESPIRE BIRCH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI-B 6</td>
<td>GINKGO BILOBA <code>PRINCETON SENTRY</code> / PRINCETON SENTRY GINGKO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL-I 6</td>
<td>GLEDITSIA TRIACANTHOS INERMIS <code>SKYCOLE</code> TM / SKYLINE THORNLESS HONEY LOCUST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL-T 6</td>
<td>GLEDITSIA TRIACANTHOS VAR. INERMIS <code>DRAVES</code> / STREET KEEPER HONEY LOCUST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS-V 3</td>
<td>OSTRYA VIRGINIANA / IRONWOOD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QU-W 5</td>
<td>QUERCUS X WAREI <code>LONG</code> TM / REGAL PRINCE OAK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO-D 6</td>
<td>SORBUS DECORA / SHOWY MOUNTAIN ASH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY-R 4</td>
<td>SYRINGA RETICULATA <code>IVORY SILK</code> / IVORY SILK JAPANESE TREE LILAC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI-A 7</td>
<td>TILIA AMERICANA <code>REDMOND</code> / REDMOND AMERICAN LINDEN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UL-A 5</td>
<td>ULMUS AMERICANA <code>PRINCETON</code> / AMERICAN ELM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVERGREEN TREES CODE</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>BOTANICAL / COMMON NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TH-O 22</td>
<td>THUJA OCCIDENTALIS <code>BAILJOHN</code> TM / TECHNITO ARBORVITAE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TREE REPLACEMENT REQUIREMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- ONE TREE PER DWELLING UNIT: 68 TREES
- (68 UNITS):
- SIGNIFICANT TREE REPLACEMENT: 6 TREES
- (15 CALIPER INCHES)

TOTAL REPLACEMENT TREES: 74 REQUIRED TREES

OVERALL TREE COUNT
- OVERSTORY TREES: 46 TREES
- UNDERSTORY TREES: 9 TREES
- ORNAMENTAL TREES: 4 TREES
- CONIFEROUS TREES: 22 TREES

TOTAL TREE COUNT: 81 TREES PROVIDED
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHRUB / PERENNIAL SCHEDULE</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>BOTANICAL / COMMON NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Adapted Ground Cover</td>
<td>SOD</td>
<td>SOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Cover Schedule</td>
<td>NORTH SCALE: 1&quot;=16'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUNDCOVER SCHEDULE</th>
<th>NORTHEAST</th>
<th>SOUTHEAST</th>
<th>CENTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allium Stellatum / Prairie Onion</td>
<td>IRIS VERSICOLOR / BLUE FLAG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liatris Spicata 'Kobold' / Spike Gayfeather</td>
<td>Panicum Virgatum / Switch Grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudbeckia Hirta / Black-Eyed Susan</td>
<td>Schizachyrium Scoparium / Little Bluestem Grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RAINGARDEN MIX</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>BOTANICAL / COMMON NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allium Stellatum / Prairie Onion</td>
<td>Iris Versicolor / Blue Flag</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liatris Spicata 'Floristan Violet' / Tall Violet Gayfeather</td>
<td>Rudbeckia Hirta / Black-Eyed Susan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schizachyrium Scoparium / Little Bluestem Grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| AS-C | ASTILBE CHINENSIS 'MAGGIE DALEY' / MAGGIE DALEY ASTILBE |
| NE-F | NEPETA X FAASSENII 'WALKER'S LOW' / WALKER'S LOW CATMINT |
| PE-A | PEROVSKIA ATRIPLICIFOLIA 'BLUE JEAN BABY' / BLUE JEAN BABY RUSSIAN SAGE |
| SC-S | SCHIZACHYRIUM SCOPARIUM 'BLUE HEAVEN' / BLUE HEAVEN LITTLE BLUESTEM |
| SP-H | SPOROBOLUS HETEROLEPIS / PRAIRIE DROPSEED |
| VI-O | VIBURNUM OPULUS 'NANUM' / DWARF EUROPEAN VIBURNUM |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHRUB AREAS CODE</th>
<th>BOTANICAL / COMMON NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIERVILLA LONICERA / DWARF BUSH HONEYSUCKLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYDRANGEA PANICULATA 'JANE' / LITTLE LIME HYDRANGEA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSOCARPUS OPULIFOLIUS 'DONNA MAY' / DONNA MAY NINEBARK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SORBARIA SORBIFOLIA 'SEM' / SEM ASH LEAF SPIREA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPIRAEA BETULIFOLIA 'COURISPI01' TM / PINK SPARKLER BIRCHLEAF SPIRAEA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPIRAEA MEDIA 'SMSMBK' TM / BLUE KAZOO DOUBLE PLAY SPIRAEA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYRINGA X 'PINK PERFUME' TM / BLOOMERANG PINK PERFUME LILAC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAxUS X MEDIA 'TAUNTONII' / TAUTON YEW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHIZACHYRIUM SCOPARIUM / LITTLE BLUESTEM GRASS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUDBECKIA HIRTA / BLACK-EYED SUSAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>