

**From:** [Bennett, Juliana](#)  
**To:** [Plan Commission Comments](#)  
**Cc:** [Peter Beeson](#)  
**Subject:** D2 Alder on 310-322 E Washington Ave Amendment  
**Date:** Monday, September 23, 2024 11:43:36 AM

---

Good afternoon Plan Commissioners,

I am writing to share my support for the amendment for the St. John's development at 310-322 E Washington Ave. As you may know, the St. John's development is an amazing example of the fortitude and ingenuity necessary to complete a community-oriented, multi-dimensional affordable housing development. Affordable housing development is extremely difficult, particularly because it is difficult to make the financing work for such a development. We, as a city, have not made it any easier on developing affordable housing with all the rules and regulations we enforce that make development cost prohibitive. I know that St. John's has had a rough go at it to find the financing to begin construction. However, through good faith and perseverance, we still have hope for the St. John's development.

I understand that one of the larger concerns with the amendment might be the shift in parking. I understand that moving from 63 to 10 parking stalls might sound like a lot; however, within the context of my district and this area it is a reasonable. As the staff report notes, the development is well connected to public transportation, including the new BRT line (happy BRT day to those that celebrate). Additionally, there are plenty of parking garages in the area that residents and parishioners have access to. Overall, this area is absolutely not lacking in transportation and parking options.

Moreover, I think that this proposal should be viewed as a good thing — we have done such a good job at connecting our residents that we can consider housing without parking. Speaking for myself, I currently live in a development just a few blocks from the St. John's site that houses about 100 or so residents, has only about 10 parking stalls, and those that do not use those parking stalls, including myself, make use of residential permit program (RP3). I can point to plenty of other similar apartment buildings in the district that — before parking became a pseudo-requirement to development in the city — have limited parking options. I think that this development begs City Parking Utility to re-evaluate the RP3 program and is an invitation to

Pastor Benson said it best in our phone call this morning, "it is better to have housing without park, than no housing at all." I truly believe that if people want/need to find parking in the area, they can. Considering these factors, I strongly encourage Plan Commissioners to support the amendment.

Best,

Juliana