



FW: Special Meeting Agenda Item: PLUMA-2512-0007

From: Jill N. Crawford-Nichols [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, January 21, 2026 1:06 PM
To: planning <planning@DuluthMN.gov>
Cc: David Clanaugh <dclanaugh@DuluthMN.gov>
Subject: Special Meeting Agenda Item: PLUMA-2512-0007

Dear Commissioners,

Please vote no on the rezoning proposal before you tonight. This rezoning to R-P is arbitrary and capricious and needs to be denied because it is unnecessary according to the application.

The proposal states the "Applicant is requesting a UDC Map Amendment (rezoning) from R-1 to Residential-Planned (R-P) to construct townhomes on the property."

According to the UDC, R-1 already allows the construction of townhomes.

The R-1 district is established to accommodate traditional neighborhoods of single-family detached residences, duplexes and townhouses on moderately sized lots.


This does not warrant a rezoning and only sets a precedent that rezoning will be considered for reasons that are not being properly vetted. If there is a different reason that requires this rezoning to R-P, it needs to be fully described, transparent, and easy to find within the City's application. And if those details are revealed in tonight's meeting, that does not warrant approval. You are voting on the application in front of you, not an amended version in the moment. The fact that the City staff is recommending an unnecessary rezoning is extremely bothersome. This needs to be denied.

Should the applicant want to have public space and trails within their existing R-1 zone, that is commendable, but does not warrant a change to R-P.

Additionally, there is no reason for this to be rushed via a Special Meeting as construction would be impossible to start for months. It is very disrespectful to your time.

Thank you,
Jill Crawford-Nichols
District 4

--



FW: Tonight's special meeting

From: Judy Gibbs [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, January 21, 2026 1:27 PM
To: planning <planning@DuluthMN.gov>
Cc: Wendy Durrwachter <wdurrwachter@DuluthMN.gov>
Subject: Tonight's special meeting

Dear Commissioners,

Please vote no on the rezoning proposal before you tonight. This rezoning to R-P needs to be denied because it is unnecessary according to the application that I have read.

The developer can be quite imaginative with the current R1 zoning: *The R-1 district is established to accommodate traditional neighborhoods of single-family detached residences, duplexes and townhouses on moderately sized lots.*


I am concerned with how so many developments within the city have fallen through. Rezoning doesn't mean this developer will follow through and then we are left with a zoning that may or may not be compatible with future developments.

I know that density along Central Entrance is desirable and makes good sense to mix housing with the commercial along that corridor.

The fact that this is being rushed with a special meeting is also disrespectful of your time as citizens. The hurried sense also raises questions in my mind - why the hurry? Why can't this wait until your meeting in February?

Thank you,
Judy Gibbs
District 1

Judy Gibbs
[REDACTED]



FW: Wednesday public hearing for Arris E Palm St

From: Susan Nash [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 19, 2026 2:37 PM
To: planning <planning@DuluthMN.gov>
Subject: Wednesday public hearing for Arris E Palm St

To the City Council and Planning Commission,

We are writing in advance of the upcoming meeting scheduled for this Wednesday regarding the proposed map amendment and rezoning affecting the area near E. Orange Street and E. Palm Street.

We would like to formally express our concerns about how these proposed changes may directly and negatively impact our property, our business operations, and our ability to safely and effectively use our land.

Our primary concern is the potential relocation of our driveway. As proposed, this change would significantly limit — or eliminate entirely — our ability to park our trailers and additional vehicles that are essential to the daily operations of our business. At present, our driveway and parking configuration have been thoughtfully designed and invested in to accommodate this need. Any relocation would disrupt that functionality.

Additionally, we are deeply concerned about snow management. With a relocated driveway and reduced usable space, we would no longer have a safe or practical location to plow and store snow removed from our driveway. This creates both a logistical challenge and a safety concern, particularly during winter months.

We are also concerned that relocating our driveway could result in a change to our property address. We do not want our address to change. An address change would create unnecessary complications for our household and our business, including impacts to deliveries, services, permitting, licensing, and overall continuity. This is another significant consequence that should be carefully considered as part of this process.

We are also concerned that these changes would require the construction of an additional parking pad at the top of our property. This would necessitate further grading of the land, installation of Class 5 material, and modifications to our existing fence so that it can open and allow access to our

equipment and vehicles. These changes would come at a significant financial cost to us. We have already invested substantial funds into building and maintaining our current parking pad and site layout. We do not believe it is reasonable or fair to require additional out-of-pocket expenses in order to accommodate changes that are being imposed upon us through rezoning and roadway development. These added costs would directly impact our ability to operate our business smoothly and responsibly.


Finally, we remain very concerned about the loss of privacy and safety associated with a roadway being constructed so close to our property. Increased traffic, proximity to our home and business equipment, and reduced buffer space all raise serious concerns that should be carefully considered before any approvals are granted.

We respectfully ask that the City Council and Planning Commission take these concerns into serious consideration and evaluate alternatives that would avoid placing additional financial, logistical, and safety burdens on our family and business. We appreciate the opportunity to share our perspective and thank you for your time and attention.

Susan & Derek Nash

302 E Palm St, Duluth, MN 55811

Susan Nash
Nash Construction
[REDACTED]



FW: Rezoning for East Orange-East Palm from R-1 to R-P

From: Peggy Radosevich [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 8, 2026 7:53 PM
To: planning <planning@DuluthMN.gov>
Subject: Rezoning for East Orange-East Palm from R-1 to R-P

Dear Jason Mozol,

Good evening. I am writing in response to the letter I received regarding the proposed rezoning on E. Palm and E. Orange St. As a resident at 303 S. Blackman Ave, I would like to formally voice my opposition to this matter.

Our neighborhood previously raised concerns regarding a prior development, citing potential issues with increased traffic, loss of privacy, and the displacement of local wildlife. Unfortunately, those concerns have since become a reality. Traffic has become significantly heavier, and cars are frequently parked along South Blackman Ave. Since the road consists of only two lanes, residents must often wait for a clear pass to navigate their own street.

Additionally, the lack of privacy is a major concern, as noise from the existing complex is clearly audible in our backyards. The displacement of wildlife has also been a significant loss; one of the primary reasons I purchased my home ten years ago was the presence of the woods and the deer. Had the complex existed then, I would not have moved here.

Since the initial construction, several neighbors have sold their homes. We have also seen an increase in foot traffic on South Blackman Ave, which has coincided with incidents of vehicle tampering in our neighborhood.

Based on these ongoing issues, my proposal is to vote against the construction of another complex. Thank you for your time and for considering the concerns of the residents.

Best regards,

Peggy Radosevich



Public Hearing Notice - PLUMA-2512-0007

From Larry Theivagt [REDACTED]

Date Mon 1/19/2026 11:51 AM

To planning <planning@DuluthMN.gov>; Jason Mozol <jmozol@DuluthMN.gov>

Cc [REDACTED] Leah Theivagt

January 19, 2026

RE: Public Hearing for a UDC Map Amendment/Rezoning on E Orange and E Palm Streets, from R-1 to R-P, by Arris III Duluth LLC (PLUMA-2512-0007)

Mr. Mozol,


We understand that the above referenced Public Hearing has been rescheduled for this Wednesday, January 21, 2026 at 5:00 pm. We still respectfully request that the Harding Avenue ROW be vacated and a smaller, private road with no cul-de-sac be constructed.

But if the proposed plan moves forward to extend Harding Avenue up the hill from Palm Street, ending in a cul-de-sac, we request that the street and cul-de-sac be ended at the midpoint of the Overland ROW so that we have more of a buffer and retain full use of the 33' of vacated ROW that adjoins our property. Terminating the public street at the midpoint of the Overland ROW would nearly double the distance between our house and the cul-de-sac.

Thank you for considering our request.

Sincerely,

Larry & Leah Theivagt



FW: Harding Avenue extension

From: Larry Theivagt [REDACTED]**Sent:** Friday, December 19, 2025 10:42 AM**To:** [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] planning <planning@DuluthMN.gov>; Leah Theivagt

Subject: Harding Avenue extension

Mr. Gonzalo Medina Perez,

We attended the December 3rd neighborhood meeting about development plans to build access roads and additional housing in the area next to our property at 233 E. Orange Street. We were told by one of the speakers that the City of Duluth would be extending Harding Avenue up the hill from Palm Street and constructing a cul-de-sac. He also said that the original plan was to vacate the Harding Avenue ROW but that the neighbors to the east, Mr. & Mrs. Derek Nash, declined to vacate. However, Mrs. Nash informed us they have contacted the City of Duluth wanting to vacate the ROW.

Plans show the cul-de-sac would be built adjacent to our property—a short distance from our house. This would be a major impact on our privacy and we have no need whatsoever of public road access to the back of our property. This would also significantly lower the value of our property--especially the placement of a cul-de-sac so near our home.

The speaker at the neighborhood meeting also informed that plans are to seek to vacate the Overland ROW which we are very much in favor of. The additional 33' we would gain from vacating the ROW would provide us a buffer to the proposed development.

We understand the need for additional housing in Duluth and do not oppose the project, but we respectfully request that you reconsider vacating the Harding Avenue ROW and construct a smaller, private road with no cul-de-sac. This would significantly lessen the impact to our privacy and the value of our property.

Sincerely,

Larry & Leah Theivagt

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]