

From: [Mimi](#)
To: [Matthew Bachler](#)
Subject: Pres Homes project #14-031
Date: Saturday, September 20, 2014 12:19:32 AM

Dear Mr. Bachler:

RE: Project: PC#: 14-031 Presbyterian Homes 3200 Lake Johanna Boulevard

I'm writing to state my objection to Presbyterian Homes building four more Assisted Living apartment buildings on the subject property located at 3200 Lake Johanna Boulevard. The currently planned setback for the Brownstones, without these additional rental units, would help to create an "illusion" that we still live in a residentially zoned neighborhood. Ample open space, particularly public parks, between multifamily and single family developments create value for everyone. Future home buyers, I believe, will judge our neighborhood by it's surrounding land use impacts and this development is a big one! Why make the problem bigger?

The negative visual, traffic and decreased property value impacts that surrounding homeowners are feeling as a result of this tall, sprawling, multifamily complex are significant without the Brownstones or apartments.

The speed bumps also need to stay in place, in addition to the Wheeler street closure, since this complex has, in effect, been inserted into the middle of our low density, long established, single family neighborhood.

The construction of more apartment buildings will further hurt our residential property values, while Presbyterian Homes rakes in \$big rents. This PUD amendment, if approved, will represent poor community planning where, once again, corporate profits take precedence, over property rights of taxpaying citizens!

Sincerely,

**Marian Stewart
Latest Homes LLC
3088 Shorewood Lane
Roseville, MN 55103
mimistewartellis@gmail.com**

I am disappointed that we have to be here again to address the same subject. I am disappointed that my neighbors at the Presbyterian Homes have chosen not to honor the contract that they have entered into with their neighbors and the township of Arden Hills.

I think I understand that corporate development people have a primary task of asking for more units and for larger buildings, and they have proven to be exceptionally good at what they do, to the angst of many of us. In this case they want four more units, an increase of over 11 percent, and they want an increase in footprint of over 6300 square feet, an increase of approximately 20%. They would in essence like to reopen negotiations on a PUD that was put in place a few years back to stop the piecemeal approach that has been taking place on this piece of property for the last half century. But that sausage has already been made. It was a difficult, confusing, and enlightening process. And it is over. The sausage, as distasteful as it may be, is a finished product. We have moved well beyond the negotiation stage and have progressed to the implementation stage. I understand that there are times when some corporations regard a final negotiated contract as merely a pause in negotiations. I would hope that our planning commission will take a very different view of the matter and communicate effectively to our neighbors that this PUD is in place and there is not an extenuating circumstance that would call for it to be jettisoned. The agreement is an apartment complex of 36 units with a footprint of under 31,000 square feet.

So what circumstances have caused them to desire to circumvent the PUD? I cannot find one. There is nothing in the community that has changed to prompt such a proposal. No one took back any of the footage of the main building, though they chose not to use the full allotment of occupancy units. I understand that was their choice and did not result in a reduction in square footage. And consider that they were granted 14 units above what they requested when the city council decided that an apartment building was inappropriate in the residential area on the west side of Lake Johanna Boulevard. And when granted these fourteen units they were still permitted to keep the two residents that were on that property. In essence they were a gift from the township to the corporation. I was hopeful at that point that the apartment buildings on the east side of Lake Johanna Boulevard may also be eliminated, but that was not the case due to the occupancy permits that had been accumulated over the last 50 years. There was a legal basis that permitted them to keep these two large apartment buildings in a residential area and there was absolutely nothing that we could do to oppose it, even though this piece of property was zoned residential at that time.

I continue to hold to something that Ms. Beckman shared with us as this process was being completed. I don't have the exact wording, but in essence she told us that we may have felt like we lost at every turn of the way and that our voices went unheard, but in the end we would have a PUD and it would be there to protect us in the future. *Protect* was her word. And I sincerely hope that she was correct in her understanding of the process.

I also understand that the corporation can file as many amendments as they choose. And there may come a day when we all just tire of this and grant them what they want. I hope you can send my neighbors a message today that we have completed the PUD process and that there is a limit of 36 units that will be granted and the building will not have a footprint in excess of 31,000 feet. At the end of the day I am sure their architects are quite capable of creating a couple of buildings within those parameters.

Thank you for your time in giving consideration to our problem.

I have a question as it relates to the landscaping of borders between the Presbyterian Homes and the home owners. I am at 3151 Shorewood drive and to date nothing has happened in this regard. I did have a meeting with two representatives of Presbyterian Homes at the end of the summer of 2013. At that time, I was pleased that they agreed that two of the nicer trees had come down during a storm and that much work needed to be done on the property. They also agreed that the chain link fence should be removed and that the buckthorn which had come to dominate the lower regions needed to be eliminated. I raised the issue of the four cottonwoods some of which extended beyond my driveway and another 20 plus feet over my yard. And I was pleasantly surprised that they said they would discuss the issue with Arden Hills and put together a comprehensive plan and get back to me. Is there someone or a committee that could help us get back on track with this piece of the PUD and who would have the authority to negotiate a tree removal replacement plan?

Thank you for your assistance.

Peter Dybvad

3151 Shorewood Dr.