

HOUSING AND LAND USE COMMITTEE MEETING
Malester-Groveland Community Council
Wednesday, April 22, 2020 -6:30 p.m.
Held remotely via Zoom

Chair: Mike Moore

Staff: Alexa Golemo

Attendees:

Brian Baird ~ Kate Baxter-Kauf ~ Tom Dietsche ~ Jack Fei ~ Colin Fesser
Sara Jost ~ Marc Manderscheid ~ Brian Martinson ~ Wendy Merrell ~ Dave Pasiuk ~
Cathy Plessner ~ Art Punyko ~ Tim Schmidt ~ Mike Sonn ~ James Walker ~ Elizabeth
Wefel ~ Mike Moore ~ Alexa Golemo (staff)

AGENDA

- 6:30 I Introductions
Mike spoke to goals, process and responsibilities of the committee.
Mike and Alexa explained Zoom procedures for speaking and voting.
- 6:35 II. Addition/Deletion of agenda items
None
- 6:37 III. Approval of February 2020 Minutes
The meeting minutes were approved by a unanimous Zoom Chat Vote
- 6:40 IV. 1769 Grand Avenue Variance Application,
Lucas Wiborg and Maxx Smith, Property Owners & Ken Piper, Architect

Mr, Wiborg gave a visual presentation with the following narrative:

Purchased 1769 Grand in October 2019. An up and down Duplex on a 10,000 square.foot lot that was built in 1916. Initial plan to renovate. Redevelopment highest and best use

BLOCK

CVS 1960 VINTAGE APARTMENT

LOTS Unique with 200 yd depth - Typical 100-150 for residential
infers intent to serve as commercial mixed use corridor
very few low-intensity on this section of Grand

Nearby 150 ft blocks single family residential

on this section from fairview to Wheeler there are
7 commercial lots, 7 multifamily, 3 1 and 2 family properties one of which is the subject.

The land use mix led them to believe that medium multifamily is the most appropriate use.

Width of 50 ft provides challenges

Subject is steps from the Grand Fairview Neighborhood Node. As identified in the 2040 Comp Plan, Neighborhood Nodes serve to create 20 minute walkable cities. Get all their daily needs. Planned areas for higher-density, mixed use development and frequent public transit. The goal is to improve livability and accommodate growth.

On mixed use corridors on neighborhood nodes, which Grand and Fairview is one, 2040 Plan guides density for the nodes from 20 units per acre up to 200 units per acre.

MGCC Community Plan Goals:

H2.5 Support multi-unit mixed-use development on the following corridors: Snelling, Grand, St. Clair; and Randolph Avenues

LU1 Support land use that preserves Macalester-Groveland as a uniquely connected, walkable, mixed-use sustainable neighborhood with a pedestrian-oriented human-scale streetscape

LU3 Preserve the well-kept, traditional feel and scale of the neighborhood

E4 Promote and increase the use of alternative energy within our community and the City
Using solar energy

E6 Promote use/ease of non-motorized or alternative transportation

T1-4a Support bicycle and car-sharing programs as an alternative to private automobile use

T3.3 Encourage more secure bike parking at schools, businesses and multifamily units concurrent with new development. Request that the City of St. Paul allow for alternatives to parking requirements to allow for on-street bicycle parking as permitted by MN Statute 169.22 Subd.9b

Overall incentivize people to use alternative means of transportation other than cars.

Facts and Figures

Lot area: 995 Square feet of 0.23 acres

Lot coverage: 28.2% (includes ½ alley) Rm2 Zoning allows for 34% Lot coverage

Height 50 Feet - Rm2 allows for 50 feet

Unit Mix 12 three and four bedroom units

Front Yard Setback: 12 feet off Grand Ave. Current Duplex sits 25 feet off which creates an inconsistent streetscape.

Proposed Side yard Setbacks; Six feet from either property line. More than either neighbor provides.

Rear Setback: 111 feet from alley. Duplex is 101 feet now.

Parking: 12 surface car parking stalls (one van-accessible) and secured bicycle parking in rear for 8+ bikes.

Landscaping: Pollinator-friendly flora and garden boxes for the residents.

Solar power with 107% Electrical Offset. Over 25 years the system's energy savings are equivalent to CO2 from 743 tons of coal, driving a car 1,824,046 miles, and 877 acres of forest.

Site plan shows the 12 parking spots, bike storage the trash enclosure and the neighbors' garages and large paved areas for parking.

With the Building itself Mr. Wiborg pointed out the goals of bring indigenous materials and colors to the building's exterior envelop to tie into what currently exists today. He believes the brick base does a good job of contributing to the masonry component on Grand Avenue. There's a lot of window openings with a variety of glass. There's an awning to extend the feeling of the structure out to the street to create a more consistent and pedestrian streetscape on Grand Avenue.

Interior of the building has large multi-level floor plans. Seven units have interior staircases to act more like a single-family house. This is to add a relatively unique housing choice to Grand Avenue's mostly studio, one and two bedroom apartments. The developers believe this housing choice mimics the flexibility of a single-family house and will attract the range of tenancies and populations that utilize this housing choice. The plans show every room as a bedroom to represent the most conservative case but they can be used for offices, workout area, children's play area. It's providing flexibility to populations who currently live in Macalester Groveland and will call it home in the future.

Rent levels at \$2,550 - \$3,400 a month are comparable to new home ownership in the area when considering a down-payment. Looking at new construction in the neighborhood at Selby and Snelling and St. Clair and Snelling are compelling compared to the rents they offer.

The proposed building would require three variances. RM2 Zoning Code and the Parking Code today require:

Lot size minimum of 1,500 square feet (SF) per unit. The request is 866 SF per unit.

Mr. Wiborg states that every multi-family residential property on the block is non-conforming, with density that would not fit into today's zoning code. This variance arises from the desire to match the density that's there and bring a new housing choice. The average density of the seven surrounding multifamily buildings is 50.2 units per acre. The average density for surrounding multifamily on lots less than 10,000 SF, more comparable to this project, is 73.0 units per acre. At 52.3 units per acre this project is 4% more dense than the block average and 39% less dense than the peer average. Mr. Wiborg's presentation includes a Density Analysis Graph of surrounding apartments to demonstrate these figures. He gives a reminder that the 2040

Comprehensive Plan is guiding increased density and transit to neighborhood nodes, up to 200 units per acre at those nodes.

Side yard setback of 9 feet. The request is 6 feet.

Mr. Wiborg states that all residential structures on the block have established no-conforming side yards, including the subject's. The 6 feet they are requesting is more than either of the neighboring properties, 1775 Grand provides 5'1" and 1759 Grand provides 4'7". The objective of 6' is to reflect the existing streetscape. Slides of Grand Avenue are used to demonstrate this objective and show that the 6 feet request provides more space between buildings than any other building provides on our part of the block. Bringing the building forward to bring consistency to match what currently exists today on the block. They believe this variance allows for that consistency.

Parking of 19 stalls. The request is 12 stalls.

Mr. Wiborg states that the property is located at a Neighborhood Node. The project is a 10 minute walk to Grand and Snelling Metro A-Line which is a BRT line. It's a 10 minute walk to Macalester College. There are a ton of retail goods and service providers up and down Grand Avenue. The University of St. Thomas is a 10 minute bike ride away. They believe this development will be attracting tenants who are drawn to the walkability of the area and the building will not have as large of a parking load as RM2 parcels in other parts of the City. They are working with a really tight lot. At 50' wide it isn't typical for RM2. Mr. Wiborg said the lot is substandard width which doesn't allow us to park 19 cars on grade. Looking at doing parking underground would not yield any more stalls than they are proposing. Secured bike storage will be provided in the rear in anticipation of demand for bike parking. He noted that the MGCC's Transportation Committee requested removal of parking minimums last year from the St. Paul Zoning Code, largely driven by the City's plans to reduce vehicle miles travelled. The building will provide a location that allows tenants to accomplish all their daily needs and services without having a car.

Mr Wiborg summarized his presentation with Key Purposes and Intentions of this development: Encourage a compatible mix of land uses, at densities that support transit, that reflect the scale, character and urban design of St. Paul's existing traditional neighborhoods; provide housing choice and housing affordability; and promote the conservation of energy and the utilization of renewable energy resources.

Project Partners: Tanek Architecture Design; Rehder & Associates, Inc, Civil Engineers, Planners & Land Surveyors; VAA Engineering, Planning and Design; and JET Structures.

Questions/Comments:

Floor Plan Request

Lucas Wiborg:

Five story structure. First floor: front entry coming in from Grand, with 2 units accessible off of the corridor, one being an accessible unit with 3 rooms and the other the first multi-level unit

with the living, kitchen, dining and bathroom on the first floor and a staircase leading to a flexible space below. There are 2 multi-level units accessed via private entrances on the side of the building and a rear entry from the parking lot leading to another corridor that heads upstairs. The multilevel units on the first floor have staircases that lead down to the bedrooms/flex space and bathrooms with egress windows. All units have in-unit washers and dryers. Second floor units are mirrored on the second and third stories. All units are accessible to two staircases, front and rear. Fourth floor units have living, kitchen, dining, half-bath laundry and stair cases up to the fifth floor bedroom/flexible space. and bathroom.

Square footage of bedrooms and bed size shown in rendering?

Ken Piper, Architect:

Units range from 11,000 up to 13,000 SF

Bedrooms showing full-size beds.

Bedroom size varies in 100-150 SF range.

There are a total of 12 units with 6 variations of units.

Elevators? Leases per unit, subleasing? More on solar installation?

Lucas Wiborg: No elevator. Solar: working with a number of providers. The panels centered on roof with set-backs that should prevent them from being visible from the streetscape.

Ken Piper: Experience with solar options that allows for flat installations with 2-10 degrees.

Interior mechanical gives room on roof.

Art Punyko, HLU: It would be helpful to describe why the 6' side yard setback is required.

Wiborg: The current code would provide for a 6 unit 50' high structure. This felt out of place given the surrounding medium-density multi-family structures with horizontal bases. 6 units is not medium-density multi-family. 9' setbacks on a 50' lot leaves 32' feet to build a structure and we could not find a unit mix to provide medium-density.

Art Punyko : I'm struggling to think that you couldn't get more than 6 units.

Wiborg: It's a competition between the building and the parking, The zoning code today requires a tremendous amount of parking. We decided on a footprint of 28% of the lot which is below the 35% provided by RM2 today. The floor plans or the amount of bedrooms don't make much of a difference on the size of the floor plates but we couldn't extend into the depth because of the parking code.

Julie Kaupa, HLU: Will the front of the building be even with the other buildings? Have you contacted the neighbors on both sides about the light impact on their buildings?

Wiborg: Both neighbors have been contacted.

Piper: The front 12' setback is an average of what exists on the block. Relative within 1' of the two immediate buildings. Illustrated with the slide.

Art Punyko: Would having two bedroom units affect the viability of the project?

Wibog: Floor plans were designed for flexibility in line with single family houses. Families and empty nesters can use the rooms for a variety of purposes. We want to differentiate in a competitive market for one and two bedrooms to provide an option of threes and fours to attract tenants who don't have that in Macalester Groveland.

Bake Baker, Owner of Curious if you had taken a look at the comparative density of bedrooms/acre in your analysis. Given the higher number of bedrooms per unit in the proposed development than typical surrounding properties the units/acre may not be the most useful density metric.

Wiborg: We defaulted to the metric used by the City of St.Paul. RM2 Zoning uses Units per Acre.

Amy Gage, University of St. Thomas Director of Neighbor Relations: What's your expectation for student occupancy of this property?

Wiborg: We don't have an expectation. Anyone is free to apply. We prefer to keep it open to the diverse population of Macalester Groveland.

Sara Jost, HLU: What impact do you anticipate on the neighborhood during construction?

Ken Piper: The City makes it incumbent on us to work in the safest manner within the confines of that site. Construction will be staged, monitored and managed like any urban construction.

Dani and Suzi Scott,

Thank you for your interest in our area. Here is the big issue, you have the skinniest lot on the block, it's a duplex, and purely from the perspective of height, size, scale, massing, form and density it just seems like totally a disproportionate proposal. In terms of proportionality you are jamming a lot of human beings into a tiny space. I think the fact that you've got three different variances, to the East, To the West and then to the back with parking, is indicative of the out of scale proposal that you've submitted. That's a distillation of the eight homeowners who wrote the letter we submitted. I'd like to touch on the impact that this proposal will have on the parking will surely come from this. I appreciate that you're trying to target your market to people that aren't using vehicles, but most people, no matter the marketing are using vehicles. We're short on parking already, how does that impact the district to the North? How does that impact the run-off with the grade of the alley that runs to the West? There are already water distribution problems that accumulates. down on Fairview. How does that impact traffic and noise and pollution, lack of green space, when you're putting that many human beings into that little space? Simply put, it seems like there's a great disconnect and disharmony with the immediate neighborhood. One other question to you as the applicant and homeowner and to the Council and the the City itself, what impact does the world-wide pandemic have in terms of policy thinking on this? I know that there's been a tremendous trend on density in urban, but does this not give us pause to say, is it wise to prioritize and privilege density over all of the other human environment conditions? My suggestion is that it ought to give a great deal of pause. And how does maximizing density contribute to the concerns that we're seeing with the pandemic?

Wiborg: Thank you for your comments, Right now this is a dense area already. It is a mixed use area already. Every one of the multi-family buildings on the block would need a variance for density and side-yard setback according to today's zoning code. What we tried to do with our project is look at what exists and try to improve the livability. I understand that it's a tall structure. That's something that the City has zoned all RM2 for is 50' feet in height. This is adjacent to a neighborhood node where the City has goals to add density and transit. A slide of the block was used to illustrate.

Chat Comments:

Amy Gage: Four bedrooms usually means it's attractive to students.

Cody Fischer, 1995 Grand Ave.: I live 2 blocks down the street at 1995 Grand Avenue with my wife and 3 children. I strongly support the project as proposed and feel that the three variances requested are reasonable when considering the multitude of benefits this project brings to the neighborhood and its alignment both with the character of the block, the city's comprehensive plan and MGCC's plan goals. If we can't support modest projects like this in our community, we cannot expect to address our housing affordability and climate change goals.

Board Discussion

Brian Baird: I request that we keep comments focused on the requested variances.

Wendy Merrell: Thank you very much for the presentation. It was very good. I have a few concerns. First, the building seems too high with the neighborhood buildings, You are two stories higher than everybody else. You may not need a variance for that but I just don't think it fits into the buildings next door. I think parking is an issue. It's nice to think everyone is going to walk but they don't. Friends come over. There will be parking in places that are inconvenient for the neighbors. Even with the new zoning you would still need variances for the side yard and parking.

Art Punyko: I still don't understand the answer to the project's viability related to the side yard setbacks. It had to do with the type of units they wanted to build. I appreciate the neighbor's comment about the unit but I struggle with how families could ever rent in this building and afford it.

Elizabeth Wefel: I'm in favor of this project. I think it's a good investment in the community. I came with some concerns but compared to the non-conformities existing on this street I don't think these variances are out of line. I view everything through the goals of our Comprehensive Plan and Neighborhood Nodes. I think this is exactly the kind of building we are looking for on Grand Avenue. Given the awkwardness of the lot, this variance makes sense.

Marc Manderscheid: I'm not going to repeat what I wrote in my letter to all of you yesterday. I want to emphasize that when this goes to the BZA on Monday, and if it should go to the City Council, both the BZA and the City are required to apply the requirements of the current code. The legal side of this comes down to, is there something about this lot which requires variances or changes from the code. As members of the Housing and Land Use we should all understand that, as the City develops more, as we go more dense in development, that there are dozens of 40, 50 and 60 foot lots the whole length of Grand Avenue. We're going to have lots more variance requests coming up so I think precedence and consistency are important things to consider. Within the last few years there have been a number of new apartment buildings built on smaller lots and none of the developers of these have come in seeking variances. They built, in many instances, three-and-a-half story buildings. A half level in a basement, a half above and three

levels above that. There are private developers who are developing on lots of this size without variances. I think that's really important. This particular lot, I believe, is not a neighborhood node. Nodes tend to be the intersections, the corners, like Snelling and St. Clair, Selby and Snelling, things of that sort. So it's not there. By my count there were 43 bedrooms on 6 levels of housing. To make comparisons to neighbors that are studios and 1 bedroom, I just don't think that's a fair comparison. Art, your question about side setbacks, I've been a lawyer for a long time and I do land use law and I've never seen a public body accept the argument, "Well my neighbor didn't have to comply with the code so I shouldn't have to." In fact, it is all the more reason why strict the language of the code apply, particularly on side yard setbacks. One of the main reasons for side yard setbacks is fire safety. And if the other buildings are already crowding the lot line, then you don't want to make a potentially unsafe situation even worse. Setbacks also provide for light, air and view. Those are things that go on there. On a more technical level, I'm really just kind of concerned with basement housing. If this is going to have handicap accessible units on the first level and no elevator, what this would mean is, the basement units are entirely below grade in order to get there in below grade, the bedroom windows, which are the way out of this space, are all going to be below grade. That sounds like a particularly poor time to have a lesser side yard setback when you are having so many basement windows in this unit. I think there's twelve bedrooms in the basement on this building.

Colin Fesser: Marc is right, we are going to see a lot more situations like this come to us in the future. The reason for that, as I see it, is the RM zoning guidelines are fundamentally , out of date, compared to every other sort of guideline the City has given us on housing going forward, on transportation going forward and on environment going forward. We're already seeing the City deep into the process of reviewing, changing those guidelines. I think a lot of that is because of situations like this where we are told that we need a certain lot size for a certain number of units, but we also need to fit the neighborhood character. I think there's a strong case to be made that the neighborhood character is better reflected in this new structure than the old structure in terms of side yard setbacks, front yard setbacks, the very nature of the building as an apartment building rather than a duplex. So when we are asked to maintain the character of the neighborhood and make sure that developments fit in, while also accounting for these very specific geometric requirements, that's why we have zoning variances. That's exactly why this process is there so that we can correctly balance, or attempt to correctly balance those concerns. Giving precedence entirely to one over the other, to my mind, doesn't do justice to what the City expects or, what we're here for, our residents expect. So striking a balance is really what I think we should be aiming for. This, to me, strikes a much better balance than a duplex would. I think this is a good step forward in terms of better fitting the intent of the RM zoning both now and after those changes may or may not be made. I'd like to say as a physically handicapped person, I would love to see elevators in the building. I appreciate that there's the legally mandated handicap parking space. There is, unfortunately no legal mandate that you have elevators or that any units in a building like this have handicap accessibility once you're out of your car. I look forward to supporting the proposal. It stinks but I don't think we can hold any developer accountable for doing better than any other body in that regard. Would I live in one of these basement units? No, I would be physically incapable. But other people can, and that's the great thing about having housing choices. I think this is a good step forward in terms of better fitting the intent of the RM Zoning Code now, and after proposed changes that may or may not be made. I look forward to supporting the proposal

Mike Sonn: Thank you for doing your research. It helps all of us when a developer comes in prepared and makes for a more robust conversation. A couple things I wanted to note; a node in the 20/40 Plan is actually out a quarter mile from the intersection so this falls squarely within the Node so it isn't just adjacent to that intersection. We've done variances on projects similar, slightly smaller but something that was just recently appealed to the City Council was a four-flex on Grand Avenue. I think there was a parking variance, there may have been square foot per unit variance as well with that. We have seen this and I think we'll see more. I glad RM zoning in general is being addressed because these infill projects on narrower lots are great. They are exactly what we need to be doing as a city to provide the missing middle density that we need to provide more housing options, which this project does. Speaking to the side yard setbacks, I know that what adjacent properties are doing doesn't impact but this 6 foot variance request does fit the feel of the street better. Also, a 32 foot wide building isn't very feasible to provide a decent number of units, especially when we need to have over half of the lot coverage be surface parking. Are we housing people, or are we housing cars? That's another whole discussion but, because of where our hands are tied and this developer's hand are tied, we're housing cars on half of the lot. This is asinine to me. This applied to the side-yard setback This applies to the side yard variance because I think a 32 foot building isn't very feasible. Speaking of the parking variance, I know that the City has it in the code that if you provide a certain amount of bike parking you can offset your car parking minimum. I'm wondering, has the developer has looked into that? If side yard setback is a major safety issue, let's let the professionals, the Fire Marshall, comment on that. If it is a serious situation with this building that there's only 11 feet between this building and the other next door on both sides, then the Fire Marshall needs to speak to that. I don't think we are capable of speaking to the safety requirements. I do believe that site plans are reviewed by the appropriate people at the City and if this is a concern, the Fire Marshall can speak to it. I'd like to ask the developer to jump in and speak to the bike parking.

Wiborg: We did get a 10% reduction for providing secure spots. That's the maximum we can get. There's no transit reduction in RM today. We had a discussion with the property managers in an adjacent 18 unit buildings whit 18 spots who thought they were over parked. We want to avoid being over parked since this building will be here for the next 100 years. As related to the side yard setbacks, we had our Site Plan Review yesterday and there's Zoning Code and Building Code. The Building Code for fire reasons, that setback is less than what we're proposing.

Tom Dietsch: I agree with Marc Manderscheid that from a legal and zoning perspective, the argument that since the neighbors are all non conforming that we can do something. That is clearly not a reason. That's raised over and over again as a reason and a justification and I believe that carries no weight whatsoever. As to the practical difficulty arguments, all the reasons seem to be that this is the only way we can build as big of a building as we want. That really is an economic argument. I think it's a great design. I think it was a great presentation. I think many of these features are wonderful. It would be great on a bigger lot where it fits correctly. It's just jamming 12 feet into a 6 foot area, whatever that analogy is or metaphor. To Colin's point, we definitely want this kind of housing, we're just jamming too much into a small area here. The choice is not keeping the duplex or having this particular project. There could be a middle ground to build a smaller structure that does not require any of these variances, that allows enough parking for the people who will realistically live there, and that to me would be

something that we would all be in agreement with. It would be more in harmony with the neighborhood. It wouldn't tower all the adjacent buildings, and it wouldn't need any of these variances, And finally to Dan Scott and all the neighbors to the North, Wendy Merrell and Amy Gage, let's get real. In practice this is going to be jammed with students. Students will have cars, they will have friends coming over for parties and they will be a huge impact on the neighborhood as a result. That's just reality. So, taking all these things together, as I say it would be a great design if it was on a lot twice as big like a lot of the neighboring buildings are. As it is, I like it but not on that lot so I would have to oppose it.

Brian Baird: I think one of the main things here is that the variance is unique to the property and in this case, if circumstances were different, they would be allowed to build if it was just a little wider. I think that's a fair question. We look at the floor plan and, to Mike Sonn's point, you're really getting things crammed. More importantly, again it goes to the very arbitrary nature of a lot of the zoning regulations we have. Not that that's an argument to grant something but I think the counter argument is, why wouldn't we, when so many other buildings in the neighborhood would have to have similar variances? The things I hear people talking about a lot, elevation, students, people living in the basement, these aren't really not what we're asked to decide. When we're talking about variance requests we're asked to decide three things here and not even really three. At a certain point one of them goes away in the RM2 Study and the other one gets significantly reduced. So, to me it comes down to width. I don't think that you could build a suitable building of any size, really, and keep the nine foot setback. Parking, I think my views on this are pretty well known, I don't care. I'm in support of this. I think this is the type of infill project that we're going to see more of and there's not going to be an infill project on one of these none standard lots that isn't going to require a variance. I don't think we should look at a variance as a bad thing. We shouldn't try to convince ourselves that the merits of the project are less than what they are based on the potential occupant. This is Macalester Groveland in the United States of America and if someone's a student and they want to rent an apartment with three of their friends, they're more than welcome to.

Wendy Merrel: Can we put an agenda item on a future meeting where we can discuss what is going to be our path moving forward with variances? There's a lot that going to come up with this issue.

Alexa Golemo: We can definitely have that conversation at a future meeting when there's time on the agenda.

Jack Fei: I move approval of the three variances. The reason I move approval is, this is the kind of proposal that we need to be supporting, I say that with the understanding that a variance is a set of codes and the variance process is intended to provide flexibility around some codes necessary to handle a specific situation. I think the developers have done a great job of explaining what they can do given the constraints. Frankly, I think it's the best presentation I've ever seen put before us. Not that that's a reason to why I'm supporting. It's that they've really tried to optimize value of this property going forward. This is a fifty to one hundred year decision that we're making. And we're going to have chances to do more variance requests, probably, rightfully so. Each one needs to be decided, not with what's comfortable today, but thinking forward what the legacy to our community will be fifty to one hundred years from now.

Motion seconded by Colin Fesser

Mike Moore request for the language of the motion:

*The Housing and Land Use Committee of the Macalester-Groveland Community Council **recommends approval** of the three (3) requested variances: (1) lot size variance of 634 sq. ft. per unit, (2) side yard setback variance of 3 ft per side, (3) and off-street parking space variance of 7 parking spaces, for the property at 1769 Grand Avenue, Reference No. 20-024086.*

The motion passed. The final vote was 12-4-0.

8:10 V. 1770 Grand Avenue Potential Property Redevelopment & New Construction,
Patrick Flanagan, Potential Property Buyer

Very preliminary stage of looking at buying the lot to create a brand new build for full-time college students living in recovery.

Owns a sober house in Como area.

There isn't a lot of supportive housing for students in Macalester Groveland My project would address that.

The opposite of addition is connection. Housing with programs to help that is a great project, from both a real-estate and social perspective.

It's a thought process right now. Alexa has all my information.

8:15 VII. Updates/Announcement
None

Mike declares the meeting adjourned

]

Guests:

Amy Gage, UST Director of Neighbor Relations, Deanna Seppenau, Director of Macalester College' High Winds Fund, Bob Morrison, SARPA, Bake Baker, Michael Cassidy, Dani and Suzi Scott, Paul Padratzik and Debra Asplund, Ross Gregerson, Cody Fischer 1995 Grand, Ann Geisser, Melinda Aljabry Tim Vanderholden, Patrick Flanagan,