

## October 20, 2013 Public Open House - Comments Summary

### Four General Categories of Comments

#### Access

44 + comments. Some included multiple responses and wide ranging.

Want street ends left as is as they feel these are public access points to the water, that's what we have always done for access to water, see adjoining property owner of a vacated street benefiting, increase use of beach/waterfront, and need for trash barrels/restrooms, support for Tier I is strong with Tier II a bit weaker, concerns of pedestrian conflicts near 9<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup> and at Franklin, clear views of lake & harbor are desired, signage for access would be helpful, impact of hotel guests maybe greater than anticipated.

#### Transportation

33 + comments. Most on S curve and bike movements.

Most who commented on the proposed S curve change opposed it, traffic backups are caused by Lift Bridge, need better statistics on traffic and study, bike lanes generated suggestions on changes at 8<sup>th</sup>, 12<sup>th</sup> 13<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> Streets, and wayfinding would help.

#### Land Use

8 + comments. Support for proposed land use and zoning changes.

Who pays for improvements, commercial uses are not consistent with Comp Plan, no mixed use, support for recreational area by Bay and change from industrial, and wayfinding.

#### Other

17 + comments. A catch all of comments.

Preferred a different meeting format, need for life guards at certain sites, at Corps park add trash barrels, rest rooms and improve site, sell airport, and emergency services.

*[The page contains extremely faint, illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the document. The text is too light to transcribe accurately.]*

**Park Point Small Area Plan**  
**Public Open House**  
**Comments (October 30, 2013)**

**Access**

1. Captain Tom Mackay – 2233 Minn Ave – 722-1834 – [oriskany65@msn.com](mailto:oriskany65@msn.com)
  - a. I would like to see the recreation area including a pavilion building as the main destination for visitors to park point. I think the rec. area could return to the “place to be” just like it was in the 50’s when I was growing up on 41<sup>st</sup> and Lake ave So. Life guards, rentals, concessions etc. Why advertise the 12<sup>th</sup> st. turn access, fire hall and community club areas when we have such a great thing going down at the end. Lifeguards...
2. Mary Vanderwerp – [mvanderwerp@gmail.com](mailto:mvanderwerp@gmail.com)
  - a. I don’t think any streets should be vacated and spending huge amounts of \$ on upgrading them is ridiculous!
3. Leila Jindeel – [wumps7@gmail.com](mailto:wumps7@gmail.com) – 310-220-9043
  - a. I support the improvement of public access points that have been proposed. However, I do not feel that accesses (properties) that have not been slated for improvement should be vacated. If planned are made, the public will notice and understand that they may access in designated areas. The area not improved will not be noticed and will likely only be used by neighbors of Park Point, if at all. To relinquish these areas and allow neighbors adjacent to them purchase them will lead to a feeling of exclusivity in the neighborhood. At that point, “walls” will go up and the warm feeling of the neighborhood will be compromised. Please do not vacate any street ends.
4.
  - a. In favor of a walkway. Wants street ends open, has one by her house and does not mind people using it.
5.
  - a. I think it is a bad idea to have so many beach access street ends because there are no life guards for swimming. We have had a major problem behind Lafayette because of no life guard. Plus there will be no bathrooms at all street ends.
6.
  - a. Never, ever vacate public access to our waters. Post small public sign, small gravel (2’) path if necessary to establish access and done. Plus if you have greater

# of access and people are made aware of them to use them, it will spread the people out so the proposed non vacated tier 2 aren't included- spread the access people around.

7. Steve Sola – [stevensola@rocketmail.com](mailto:stevensola@rocketmail.com)

- a. Simple idea: ? existing parking lot at 13<sup>th</sup>. Extend southward, this would add the "req'd" parking and keep roadway ad existing and vacate tot lot (Franklin Park). Sell tot lot as and R-1 site. All parking would be on the lakeside of street and eliminate pedestrian crosswalks. Et.

8. William Lynch – 218-755-7489 – [Lighthousebill@hotmail.com](mailto:Lighthousebill@hotmail.com)

- a. Why remove code allowing public dockage at all street ends? Tourism is our #1 moneymaker!
- b. Why give up public access that has existed for many years? The tax value would be minimal and the loss to Duluth citizens enormous.
- c. If the access is lost, why give it to adjoining land owners? It should be up for bid as all tax forfeit land. Someone would pay well for water access for a dock.

9. Lyn Clark Pegg – (348-3048)

- a. I recommend that streets ends should not be vacated to property owners on a permanent basis. Rather property owners next to street easement can "enjoy" that land (gardens, paths) but not "own" it. The city/public should not relinquish it's rights that land and retain the possibility of future plans and assure public access to the lake and the bay. I would be very disappointed to see Park Point become a "gated community" with very limited access for our neighborhood. Duluth/area residents and tourists. I've lived on the east coast and its shoreline is notorious for preservation of recreational areas, fees and residential passes. I've valued the Midwestern values of common land and public good being foremost.
- b. To maintain the street ends (tiers 1, 2, and 3 which would a very simple access) I recommend that volunteer crews be organized ( as has happened in the maintenance of the superior trail) as a community we can maintain a system of open public access.

10. Walter Pietrowski – 3702 Lake ave S. 55802 – 727-3316

- a. If we as Park Point residents open more public access, does that mean that we can insist that folks living on London Road or along the river in the western part of the city should open all their paper streets to public access? All of it seems kind of ridiculous to me. Keep the public and their trash limited to the current areas. Who's going to police and or clean up any more access areas? The city cannot afford any unnecessary rules. Thank you!

11. Mara Jindeel – [mkhlo@aol.com](mailto:mkhlo@aol.com)

- a. Public access to street ends is an integral part of what makes park point the community that it is. People can (and do) easily access both bodies of water for numerous outdoor activities. Please consider not vacating street ends and leaving them open to the public. Having many areas of public access has been a right that the public has had for years and it should remain so. Park Point has a special feel of inclusiveness, community, and sharing and closing off these key areas of land would adversely affect these qualities. Please do not vacate any street ends!

12. Najeeb Jindeel – [ploppalopp@gmail.com](mailto:ploppalopp@gmail.com)

- a. I would like all of the street ends in question to become public access trails. I live on the Point, and have only went through one of the street ends. I do not know where the other street ends are, so I have no way of knowing if I am trespassing unless I go and look up weather the land is open to the public. If certain trails were opened and clearly marked giving permission to the public to use, I and others would make much better use of this land.

13. -218-391-4242 - 3215 Lake ave south

- a. I use or have used most all street ends to access the lake and baby shorelines for both summer and winter recreation, trail, and sightseeing. As an owner of property within the plot of lower Duluth, I strongly object to any limitation to my rights of passage and trail at all street and avenues within the plot, whether improved or not. Future needs will be limited if any streets are vacated and such an action violates the rights of all property owners on Park Point. This is a very bad idea and will cause more problems, and solve none!
- b. It is great to be able to walk on the beach and if necessary get back on the street via street openings- should stay open
- c. If any emergency access and one is on the bay in a boat it is necessary to have plans when people get off and have a safe street end opening to get help or whatever and not have to go into people's private yard.
- d. People living on the lakeside should be able to get their boats-sailboats etc to the bay for a sail- has been that way for years. Again not through yards but street ends.

14. Gale Kerns – 726-1958

- a. Public street ends (not tier 1) should all have a narrow access way to the beach/bay. It does not have to be ? and thus is no need for solutions. They just have to be there.

15. Judith Ann Trolander – [Stroland@d.umn.edu](mailto:Stroland@d.umn.edu) 727-4828

- a. Easements on the bayside are used by people to put in and take out their canoes and kayaks. These can be difficult to move, I have a wheel device (Canadian boat walker) that I use to transport my canoe to the closest entry point on the bay. It would be a hardship for others as well to have to haul canoes and kayaks several blocks or half a mile or more to a bayside, open street end. I think all street ends need to be marked as such, both on the road and on the bay or lake side. In addition we need some standards as to what is permitted, for example, today the 37<sup>th</sup> bayside street ends is junked up with- parked car, a trailer with a "for sale" sign on it, another trailer with a boat on it and a fence blocking access to a dock that someone put there. This kind of "junking up" of street ends detracts from the neighborhood. The visual access to the water is a plus for people and also adds value to those homes that currently have that access. I also think blocking off legitimate street ends will increase trespassing on private property without easements. The city needs a set of standards as to what people can do with those public easements. They are an asset to the city and should be treated as such. None should be vacated. Public officials should defend and enhance each and every one of these street ends with signs and enforced standards as to how they may be used. For maintenance I suggest an "adopt a street end" program with volunteers similar to the "adopt a highway" program. What are our public officials doing when talking about giving away public easements? They should be defending the rights of the public instead.

16. Tom Rauscheufels

- a. Whoa! Those vacate areas seem incredibly unfair to public access areas. First offer public access to all street ends to local/adjacent property owners. Then chose from remaining parcels.

17. Tom Rauscheufels – [magic3711@gmail.com](mailto:magic3711@gmail.com)

- a. Just to make sure on a land-use clarification: The Rowing Club on 39<sup>th</sup> is privately owned. The use map showed it as public access. The Rowing Club property had paid lots of taxes every year and to all of a sudden turn it to a public entry point to the bay is not acceptable. Please show that land to the south is public. Not Duluth Rowing Club property. There is a large amount of monetary value in both club-owned and private-owned equipment that the public should not have any near access towards. Thank You.

18. Ken Kollodge – 390-3929 1409 Minn. Ave, Duluth, MN 55802

- a. I am in favor of vacating the smallest number of street ends as possible.

19. Bob Peters – 1-727-481-6718

- a. I do not want the street ends to change. What we have is a beautiful neighborhood and it is not a problem. If you must make some street ends available to the public, please do so. Do not make all of them open.

20. S-Peters – 218-260-2149

- a. Regarding developing Park Point street ends as improved public access to the Lake and Bay: The current access points on the Lakeside are sufficient: S-curve Lafayette and Park Point. At the s-curve and Lafayette square more parking and facilities are needed- even on the busiest summer days, the park at the end of the point is not fully utilized. I agree more access to the bayside is needed, but instead of taking over unimproved street ends, couldn't other spots be found that would have less impact on residents whose homes are close to the street ends. None of us want hoards of people over-running our private property. When appropriate, street ends should be vacated- but at a price. Adjacent property owners should be offered the property first, perhaps at a price below the market price- this would help lower the density of Park Point if the property owners could combine the vacated property with what they already own, but could not use the vacated property to build new homes.

21. Lyn Clark Pegg – 348-3048

- a. Question the lack of access on the bayside between 19<sup>th</sup> and 37<sup>th</sup> streets. Kayakers and canoeists need more options putting in and finding refuge if on the water.
- b. I recommend their 3 access for other street ends (i.e. 22<sup>nd</sup> st 29<sup>th</sup>, 31<sup>st</sup>/32<sup>nd</sup>, 36<sup>th</sup>) for simply putting in or taking out paddle boats.

22. Nancy Olson – [parkpoint-624@yahoo.com](mailto:parkpoint-624@yahoo.com)

- a. Leave street ends as is

23. Pam Gustaveson

- a. Don't open street ends to the public. We have so many problems as is. Stealing, vandalism, garbage, etc. All one has to do is look at other coastal towns to see the problems. Please protect the citizens of PP.

24.

- a. Keep the street ends open. The lake and bay belong to all of us.

25.

- a. Maintain Public Access at ALL available street ends. Improve bicycle and recreational lanes. Add more trash and bathroom (portable) for public use. No 2 lane one-way streets at beginning of PP.

26. Tom Rauschenfels, DRC Bd member – [magic3711@gmail.com](mailto:magic3711@gmail.com)

- a. Turning the Duluth Rowing Club property @ 3911 Minn Ave to public access better have some understanding regarding insurance. Presently the DRC carries

a liability policy on the property. If the city allows anyone on DRC property that is privately owned, they must also carry some insurance coverage so that DRC isn't liable. \*Other

27. Judy Anne ? – 2627 Minnesota Avenue

- a. Park Point is our unique "island" for all of us who live on PP and in Duluth. We welcome visitors. Let's preserve what we have- make it more accessible without hurting our island.

28.

- a. No city land should be sold. Access is important to everyone.

29.

- a. The city's plan to achieve goal 5 "define public access/use of improved and unimproved rights-of-way (street-ends)" is a prudent plan. Removal of the antiquated public dockage section of the city code will remove confusion among the public. The vacation of "useless" street ends will improve security, privacy, for residents minimize potential for crime in residential areas. Access every 4 blocks is more than adequate and probably not needed. The city's plan should eliminate Tier 2 and focus resources instead of enhancing tier 1 access on improved facilities, parking, bathrooms, and signs directing the public throughout the point to the Tier 1 access points.

30.

- a. Allow vacations of useless paper streets-please

31. Robert S. Poworney

- a. I oppose any and all limitations to public access on the bay and lake sides of Park Point.

32. JC Curtis – 3302 Minn Ave – 218-393-6187

- a. I'm a lifelong resident – my family has been in the house since 1916, never had a problem getting to bay or beach on the lake until my neighbor behind (3301?) built up (4-5 railroad ties high) the street end. If not for the Thompsons, we couldn't get to the beach. Neighbor behind me call the police often (on anything/excuse) and harasses my sisters, nieces and nephews about going to the beach on our street end. Does he have the right to close off our access? Denny's motor home means we have to walk on his deck to get to the beach, no problem if ¾ of street end wasn't completely blocked off...
- b. People on Park Point should have access to the beach- Not right to block our access. However, for flow (traffic and otherwise) visitors should use the 4 spots designated ( s-curve, St. Andrews, Lafayette and beach house)

33. Dennis Johnson – 4019 S. Lake – [mnahah@aol.com](mailto:mnahah@aol.com)

- a. I am opposed to opening up additional access points to the beach for these primary reasons.
- i. Liability- The city is concerned about present liability as evidenced by the flag system and other signage-increased. City planned access certainly increases liability exposure.
  - ii. Expense- It will be costly to develop the new access points and an ongoing expense to maintain them- the city barely maintains the three sites now (s-curve, Lafayette, and main beach) where will the money come from?
  - iii. Trash- Anyone that lives on the Point knows the level of trash left now at the three primary sites. Increasing the access points will increase the level of trash left on the beach. Who's going to clean it up? The present situation isn't broken- Don't change it!!

34.

- a. 34th street- Bayside. We own property on both sides of unused street- all rock?- 5ft above water

35. Pam Griggs – 3429 Minnesota Ave – 218-260-6032

- a. It is my recommendation that street ends remain open for public access. Signs could be added to direct the public to stay on public property and not go onto private property. No other funds need to be spent.

36. Tom Griggs – 3429 Minnesota Ave – 218-260-6056

- a. On October 2, 2013 after months of meetings with community neighbors and concerned citizens as part of a Small Area Planning Committee, the City Planning Division issued a surprising City Policy Proposal which would vacate 14 street ends as well as 3 other lakeside public easements. This action was never discussed with the citizen committee members and left them stunned. It is also in contradiction to the recommendation of the Parks and Recreation Commission which "does not endorse street end vacations of city property to Park Point residents."

Understand that the Planning Commission's policy proposal would, through a process, convey the street end property to the adjoining property owners, unjustly enriching them, lowering property value of their neighbors, and denying all Duluth citizens enjoyment of the Bay while serving no public purpose. These street ends have been a public easement since the land was platted in the late 1800's. They have been and continue to be enjoyed by the public for the view of the bay and the many activities thereon, for birding, canoeing, photography, sailing, and yes, even kayaking.

We, the citizens of Duluth, deserve better. This policy proposal is not just a Park Point issue. It affects the rights and privileges of every citizen in the city. This property belongs to all of us as do the parks and other city streets. We pay for them, and it is unreasonable to recommend giving valuable waterfront property to private individuals and thereby denying the public its rightful access and use. If this is the administration position, then only the City Council can stop this. Contact your city councilor or candidate and vote November 5.

37. Phyllis Sherman -938 S. Lave Ave. – 727-1343

- a. I am a Park Point resident and own a home on the corner of 10<sup>th</sup> and Lake Ave next to the street end that is designated as "Tier II". I understand that the beach should be available for residents of Duluth and not just for us living here but I have some concerns that I would hope you will consider.

I was told by the planning department that this was proposed so that the neighborhood would have access without going through people's yards. We have never had an issue with the neighbors but, please understand that our neighborhood also includes one 52-room hotel, 30+ spots for parking RV's and another hotel possible in the future, all of which are only one block from our house. The number of people coming through this street end could be huge. There is not proposal for port-a-potties and so we are concerned as to where these people will go to the bathroom. Mr. Judd said he would expect that they would walk down to 13<sup>th</sup> to use the port-a-potties there but I doubt if this is a realistic assumption. Being that the public access at the s-curve is only 3 blocks away, it would seem that the hotel and marinas could have their guests go there instead of funneling them through the easement at 10<sup>th</sup>.

Another issue with that many people using the beach here is the trash that is left behind and the city not maintaining this as a public park. We already have a significant amount of trash left after a busy weekend and it is up to the residents to pick it up.

As it is now, we have people building fires on the beach and staying until well into the night. There is no one enforcing the 10 o'clock rule and there is no proposal for that now.

Parking has been an issue here and opening up 10<sup>th</sup> as an access would only make it worse because there is no off-street parking on the easement. The employees of Canal Park here because it's free and anytime there is an event at Bayfront, there are no spots left on the street to park. The other Tier II street ends down the point have off street parking available but we do not.

I was told that any fencing currently on the easement would have to come down. As you know, the sand that was put on the beach between the

bridge and 13<sup>th</sup> is a much finer sand and has already destroyed most yards in this area. The boardwalk at 13<sup>th</sup> street beach is usually covered with sand and this is what would happen at 10<sup>th</sup> by creating a "blow hole".

Between the bridge and 13<sup>th</sup>, our backyards are right directly on the beach and so we would not have a buffer between us and all the people coming from down by the marinas. Farther down the Point where the other Tier II street ends are, the homes are a block or more through the dunes before the beach so they would not be dealing with the people right in their backyard. We feel that this will have a huge negative impact on us and our neighbors.

We are respectfully requesting that you look closely at the plan as it pertains to the street end at 10<sup>th</sup> and consider eliminating it as a Tier II access.

38. Jan Truel – 2521 Minnesota Ave.

a. I have lived in Duluth for 45 years and on Park Point for over 15 years. My husband has lived on Park Point for over 65 years, his entire life. It's a wonderful place to live with so many opportunities for freely enjoying the great outdoors.

We have also spent time in Texas, and find a heartbreaking situation there in terms of outdoor freedoms. While we in Minnesota have a wealth of public land open for all to enjoy, in Texas, nearly all land is privately owned. Lots of fences and private property signs. Very few state and city parks, and almost no public national forest service land. Sadly, this situation was a result of land being given away or sold to individuals.

I am very dismayed to see the potential for a give-away of use of publicly accessible land on Park Point. I am referring to the proposal by the City of Duluth to vacate many street ends, ultimately closing off access on these street ends to use by Park Pointers, residents of Duluth, and visitors. I know several people who live adjacent to bay-side street ends, who are graciously welcoming to people who use the right-of-way to enter the bay with their kayaks, to bird-watch, to skate, to enjoy a sunset. Unfortunately not all are so neighborly, and some have even told visitors that they are not allowed to be on the street end property—that it is theirs. (I personally have been told that.)

The city's proposal to create a limited number of access points to the bay and the beach, eliminating the rest through vacation, seems unfair. The few home owners who live by these new access points could find themselves over-run by foot traffic (and see a decrease in property value) while those next to vacated street ends would find their property expanded by many feet and see increased property values. By leaving rights-of-way open to all street ends the number of users in spread out over many more locations.

Please, let's preserve the rights of the masses and not cave in to a give-away to few residents whose land is adjacent to street ends. Land is precious everywhere, but on Park Point, where the majority of homes are built on 40-foot lots, every inch counts. Please leave the street-ends open for use by all. Let's not take the step towards becoming more like Texas.

39. Vicki McNabney – 1123 Minnesota Ave.

- a. Please continue to implement the 1990 City Council resolution: preserving access to street ends on Park Point.
- b. Privatization of 17 street ends puts an overload on the already overused trails and walkways that invite the public to enjoy the beauty of our unique natural resources. An example of this negative impact is the s-curve entrance. Please visit this popular spot and see what has happened to the walkway, not from vandalism, but from too many visitors crowded into a small lane. This has been so detrimental to the plants and animals that make our beach areas so magnificent and enhance the quality of life on Park Point. This is just one example of what overuse can do and there are several areas of concern along the sand bar.
- c. Reducing the number of entrances to Lake Superior and St. Louis Bay would pose more of a problem for public safety. What would occur is more traffic congestion at the remaining accesses leading to dangerous safety issues when entering and leaving Minnesota Ave. If we reduce the number of accesses, it would exacerbate an already dangerous traffic quagmire. We all know the severe problems that arise with the increased car traffic and pedestrian crossings our busy summer months and the hazardous road conditions in the winter.
- d. As a member of this community, I feel we need to focus on protecting the walkways and trails we presently utilize by monitoring the changes that are taking place at those locations and implementing methods which will ensure the preservation of our pristine ecosystem for all- the general public, residents-adjacent landowners, visitors and especially the young people. It is the young people and their hands-on knowledge and appreciation of our unique environment who will be the stewards that keep to ensure a lasting and truly amazing experience for generations to come.
- e. Limiting the access to our beaches and waterways would open-up the floodgates of degradation of the wonderful treasures we all get to experience every day and limit the freedom of the public to enjoy what we are so fortunate to cherish daily. Do you really want to give up our ability to provide for future pathways to our treasures? Thank you for hearing my concerns.

40. 2 Submissions

a. The Park Point Small Area Plan (SAP) committee is considering a proposal for establishing improved beach access by developing certain street end easements. The proposal aims to provide convenient beach access for all Duluth residents and visitors while minimizing the impact on Park Point residents' quality of life and property values. Currently, the proposal includes Tier 2 access points at 10<sup>th</sup> Street, which would provide an improved trail/boardwalk and signage but no trash or toilets. The other Tier 2 access points are proposed at 16<sup>th</sup>, 18<sup>th</sup>, 19<sup>th</sup> (bayside market), 22<sup>nd</sup> (church), 28<sup>th</sup> (church), 34<sup>th</sup>, and 38<sup>th</sup>.

Our property is adjacent to the 10<sup>th</sup> street easement on the north side, and we have some concerns about developing an access point there:

It will be the most accessible point for visitors to the Park Point Marina Hotel and Lakehead Boat Basin RV park. At full capacity, these two facilities could house 200-300 visitors. Many of them already visit the beach through the Tenth Street easement by using our neighbor's gate to the beach.

It will be the first official access point to the beach on Park Point, and it will likely draw many visitors in cars.

The potential number of visitors utilizing the Tenth Street access is similar to those who will utilize the Tier 1 access points, yet the facilities will not be present to handle them.

Because there will be no trash or toilets, the number of visitors could be expected to substantially increase the problems we have already experienced on the public beach near our house and on our private property: trash left behind including fast food bags, dirty diapers, cans, cigarette packs and butts, clothing, condoms, etc; people urinating and defecating on the easement (I have to clean up human feces at least one every year); and people crossing our private property.

We expect parking to become an even greater issue that it already is with visitors parking near our house on Lake Ave. and 10<sup>th</sup> St. The Grandma's employees already park as far down as 10<sup>th</sup> Street, and I often cannot find street parking in the summer when returning from work.

If many cars utilize 10<sup>th</sup> street for parking, RV's turning from Lake onto 10<sup>th</sup> may find the turn quite narrow, creating even greater traffic problems.

Creating an opening to the beach so close to the sand will likely result in duning even on Lake Street. This can be expected based on duning which occurs at 13<sup>th</sup> street beach and at the end of Park Point near the airport.

We support a well-managed public beach with good access points for everyone, and we also support a plan that represents the private property and quality of life of Park Point residents. We are asking that the 10<sup>th</sup> street easement remain

undeveloped so that the large amount of traffic expected there will be diverted to the 13<sup>th</sup> street beach where space and facilities can handle it. Our Park Point neighbors off the beach will still have access through 10<sup>th</sup> street as they always have. This arrangement has worked well in the past and we would like to continue.

41. Deanna Erickson – [Deanna.erickson@uwex.edu](mailto:Deanna.erickson@uwex.edu)

- a. I am opposed to the vacation of street ends. Closing access points will narrow the pressure of public use on the habitat, as well as greatly reduce close access for Park Point residents. Being close to the water and having ready access to it is why we live here! Having my 65 lb kayak on my car and take it 4 blocks to reach the bay may not sound like a big deal, but it would tremendously alter my experience of living here. I value my access very much!

42. Dan-

I have been following the Park Point Small Area Plan with interest. I am not able to make the meetings as I work out of town but I did feel it important to participate in the process and have my voice heard. After reviewing the plan for Park Point Street Ends and driving by and looking at current land use and considering the the importance of maintaining the great natural environment we have on the Point I have to say I support the current plan to have some Tier 1 and 2 access points while vacating others. The plan as I see it will improve some access points where it makes sense to do so while providing some protection to other access points and allowing homeowners along vacated street ends more flexibility. It will also help with maintaining the natural environment on the point.

I appreciate that you are looking at the potential long term impacts and land use and taking steps to plan ahead. I also appreciate your willingness to have an open forum and discussion and hope you will continue to consider everyone's input not just the voices of a few vocal persons.

43.

- a. If Park Point is opened then London Rd street end would be opened!

44.

- a. Leave street end open

**Transportation/S-Curve**

1. **Mary Vanderwerp – [mvanderwerp@gmail.com](mailto:mvanderwerp@gmail.com)**
  - a. Straightening Minnesota Ave would be a very expensive plan which would benefit some residents (and harm others). Who paid someone off?
2.
  - a. Let's not build a new driving area at the bridge area until we see a need and a traffic pattern.
3.
  - a. I'd like to see documented numbers of all the accidents at the s curve and how those numbers compare to other intersections before you use that as a reason for a huge multimillion dollar road change. The other reason given tonight was to improve and expand Park Point area to Franklin tot lot. Way to much \$ and road changes to add a park alone. The "do nothing" gets my vote.
4.
  - a. The only people benefiting from moving the s curve would be the hotel.
5.
  - a. Plans one and nine should be eliminated.
6.
  - a. Plans 1 and 9 do not make any sense. Leave the road the way it is.
7. **Burke Edgerton**
  - a. I strongly recommend keeping the s curve what it is. All the reasons given for the changing of the road were shot down by the data from the transportation and engineering study. Traffic calming is not needed, speeding is not an issue. The infrastructure is in good shape, the streets and avenues are at an A, A- rating and can handle all added development and traffic increase through 2035. Park Point had 75 days of traffic a year and you want to tear down people's houses and decrease the tax base for 75 days of traffic. You say long range planning, I disagree. Use Minnesota state aid funding for projects that need it not want it.
8. **Lyn Clark Pegg – (348-3048)**
  - a. Questions about the proposed bike path between 13<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> streets- Put it on/next to St. Louis Ave and not within the "traditional" neighborhood. I like the boat club property being designated a "park" – it's a gem and should be protected. The property owners between 13<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> need to have clear transparent and accurate information about the sale of lots east of St. Louis Ave. and they should have 1<sup>st</sup> option to any sales.
9. **Najeeb Jindeel – [ploppalopp@gmail.com](mailto:ploppalopp@gmail.com)**

- a. Also I would like the new s-curve to be constructed. For the people who own the house that would need to be demolished, they should be given a reasonable amount of money so that they can buy another home on Park Point.

10. 218-391-4242 - 3215 Lake ave south

- a. Travel to and from Park Point is slowed by the congestion in Canal Park and by poor traffic movement due to crowding and scheduled events that slow and stop traffic flow. Events that slow or block traffic should be moved to venues that can handle the crowds and excessive traffic.
- b. The Tall Ships event was great for the city but poor for traffic to and from Park Point. Better traffic planning is needed for large events. ? (races) on PP should be eliminated or omitted to one side of the road, not permitted to stop or block passage of the residents.

11.

- a. NO. Neither 1 or 9 please! That is a lot of expense for new roads- No more \$ please!

12. John Schmidt – 2330 Minnesota Ave – 390-3945 – [johnonsand@aol.com](mailto:johnonsand@aol.com)

- a. This will not do anything to solve the traffic back up. The representative told us the traffic issue begins in Canal Park. We were also told neither of the recommendations was the best solution to the problem. Why are we sticking with them? We are not reviewing proposals that have not been voted on by our small area community committee. That does not seem to be an ethical method. What is the protocol that is to be followed here and what part does the committee play in the decision making?

13. Gale Kerns 218-726-1958

- a. When there is a double bridge in the summer people will be backed up into the hotel, and the people ? a Lake Ave bridge to s curve will not be able to move either. This seems a lot of ? so the hotel traffic as is “currently” proposed.
- b. Cars- >80% came off the bridge at 20 – 30 MPH, not 15. They will not slow down for a 20 MPH corner.

14. Ken Kollodge – 390-3929 1409 Minn. Ave, Duluth, MN 55802

- a. We are ok with land toward the bay from St. Louis ave being designated for recreational use and St. Louis ave itself designated as a bike path. \*Land-use
- b. I am against modifying Lake Ave up to the S curve on 12<sup>th</sup>.

15. Kathy Kollodge, 1409 MN Ave

- a. The bike path on St. Louis Ave is fine too, but I don't really see the necessity of destroying homes to make the 1 way route to the curve.

16. Warren Howe – 722-7200

- a. It is not clear how bicycle lanes are distinguished between the 8<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> street lake ave and the 13<sup>th</sup> st- recreation area Minnesota ave. will the former have 2 bike lanes and the latter only one? And will the May 1 – Oct 31 present designation be continued? And bicycles traveling against motorized traffic be (illegally) encouraged?
- b. The suggested one-way pairs as Lake Ave and Minnesota ave between 8<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> streets does not reduce speeds of motor vehicles and seems foolish otherwise.

17. Lyn Clark Pegg – 348-3048

- a. Include exploratory signage on street end and on the bay. Also signage on beach indicating access to tier 1 and 2 sites. So walkers can find way to legitimate paths.

18. Nancy Olson – [parkpoint-624@yahoo.com](mailto:parkpoint-624@yahoo.com)

- a. I oppose any rerouting of traffic from bridge through the s-curve. Very disruptive to our neighborhood.

19. Pam Gustaveson

- a. Leave the streets the way they are! It is really worth it to dislocate neighbors and add to the problem? And is there really a problem?

20. Shannon Stevens – [codydexter@hotmail.com](mailto:codydexter@hotmail.com) – 218-390-5533

- a. I have been coming to these meetings all year and very closely listening to the transportation parts of the meetings in regards to rerouting the traffic. I am most concerned about this because it directly affects my house. I live at one of the houses that would be taken to reroute the road. I have heard no good reason to reroute it. There is one way on and one way off of Park Point and moving that s-curve doesn't change this fact. The SEA engineer that did the traffic study said that the road as is could handle traffic with the hotel(s) until 2035. I can understand the need to make it safer for bikers and pedestrians, but why not make a bike/walking path go down Minnesota Ave? I see no positive reasons other than safety for pedestrians to move an entire road and change the entire infrastructure of Park Point. I do however see many negatives: the biggest being that you will take people's houses. I grew up on Park Point and have been trying for 15 years to be able to buy my own house down here, now that I finally live back on Park Point, you guys want to put a road through my house. As a longtime resident, I have watched tourists my whole life slow down traffic and completely stop it even when they have an opening through the houses to look directly at the bay. As of now that first clear opening is way down Park Point past Lafayette with a reroute strait to MN ave on 8<sup>th</sup> street, you could see the bay immediately and tourists in cars would be stopping traffic constantly at its

busiest spots along the first few blocks after the bridge. Also, semi's going to the Corps of Engineers, Coast Guard and hotels will now slow down traffic trying to make the turns to deliver. Plus the road on MN ave would be narrower than Lake Ave. I don't see how a narrower road "helps" traffic at all. I do agree with developing bike and walk ways. I do not agree with changing the curve location, I believe it will cause nothing but problems. Please do not change the road. Leave it as is!

21. Travis Schwartz – [tschwartz320@hotmail.com](mailto:tschwartz320@hotmail.com)

- a. I recommend leaving the road and s-curve the same. All the facts as traffic, speeding, and future have been proven to be fine as they are. People's homes will be affected in bad way. Saying only two homes being torn down with 20ft variance does not tell the full effect of other peoples properties.

22.

- a. New to the area.- traffic is huge concern! Increasing traffic without emergency services on the island is a dangerous proposition.

23. Rachel Wagner – 2302 Minnesota Ave – [rachelsusan.311@gmail.com](mailto:rachelsusan.311@gmail.com)

- a. Regarding transportation, I am opposed to both alternatives presented that show a new s-curve built closer to the bridge. I do not believe houses should be eliminated to "solve" a problem that does not exist. Franklin Square Park can be improved without dramatically changing the current flows of traffic.

24. Lyn Clark Pegg – 348-3048

- a. The changes on MN Ave and Solace Ave are unclear. Not in favor of wiping out homes @ 8<sup>th</sup> st. for questionable improvements. The traffic problems occur @ the bridge and these street alterations would not solve bridge problems.
- b. If hotel traffic in the catalyst, perhaps hotel guests could be turned to the hotel @ the marina.

25.

- b. The city engineer stated the existing road is more the capable of handling traffic thru 2035. There is no valid reason to more the s-curve and take people's homes from them.

26.

- a. The S curve should remain as is. Primary traffic should remain on Lake Avenue.

27.

- a. Most traffic over the bridge should be kept on Lake.
- b. Goal 2- The land use and zoning map designations proposed sound very important.

- c. Goal 3- The way finding signage to the tier 1 locations- particularly Franklin and Lafayette and Sand Point will be helpful in funneling people to where they can enjoy the park. "Reclaiming and restoring" Franklin will be great for visitors.

28. JC Curtis – 3302 Minn Ave – 218-393-6187

- a. Don't mess with s-curve – it ain't broke- don't fix it

29.

- a. I really like figure 1 for flow of traffic on the point. The plan you have developed seems reasonable to me. I like the idea of the walking path and more clear notice to the public about how to access the beach and bay. Right now people really have to guess. Thanks for having this informational session.

30. Pam Griggs – 3429 Minnesota Ave – 218-260-6032

- a. Discussion had included options to improve traffic flow from the lift bridge to the new hotel and back. Traffic backup I have experienced on each side of the bridge has resulted from the bridge being up. No matter how fast or slow traffic is allowed to move, when the bridge is up, traffic will stall.
- b. If traffic patterns remain as they are, people will learn to come to Park Point when traffic is less, slow down, and enjoy the scenery. It is not necessary to spend funds in this area.

31. Tom Griggs – 3429 Minnesota Ave – 218-260-6056

- a. I listened with interest to the report regarding changing the streets just south of the lift bridge. It seemed a lot of thought and professional engineering had gone into the presentation.

After reflecting on the efficacy of the plan, I have concluded it really would not relieve traffic congestion and would be an unnecessary expenditure of funds in addition to disrupting a number of lives by the taking of houses and property.

Traffic congestion moves well going south from the bridge onto Park Point. Backups going into Canal Park from the bridge are not going to be relieved by the plan presented.

I would like to see a simpler, less disruptive plan that might include a traffic circle by the s-curve and improvement of 11<sup>th</sup> or 12<sup>th</sup> street for access to the hotel.

32. Vicki McNabney – 1123 Minnesota Ave.

- c. Mr. Judd- senior planner- City of Duluth

It was very nice to meet you at the Oct. 30, 2013 Park Point Small Area Planning meeting. I had talked with you several times on the phone previously concerning Park Point land and water matters.

I have always felt the s-curve is very dangerous- see my correspondence to you dated 3/1/12 and 3/22/13. I feel with today's technology and advancements in road designs the s-curve can be made safe at 13<sup>th</sup> street. We do not need to redesign the entire roadway system and put people out of their homes. Please use the up-to-date research and new strategies to make a safe roadway for residents, motorists, walkers, bikers- all who will utilize it without "pushing" people out of their homes. There are other alternatives (other than the two you displayed at the meeting.)

Why would you take Lake Ave's problems and give them to the residents of Minn. Ave?? Many of the homes on Minn. Ave. have recently been rezoned (mixed use-residential-recreational-just like Lake Ave.)??? Please revisit this issue- As I stated at the beginning, there are other strategies which would improve the safety of all who reside here and visit our unique Park Point area without shifting the traffic and infrastructure problems from one group of residents to another. We do not need a complete overhaul, just a safe environment. Minn. Ave. residents have put-up with their share of problems over the years. We deserve a quieter life also!

Just a few examples of our quagmire on Minn. Ave.

- Overflow traffic from Lake Ave
- No environmentally sound drainage system
- No sidewalks
- Overdevelopment (hotels-warehouses-businesses)
- RV's and large boats trying to navigate our narrow Ave.
- Huge trucks bringing in supplies
- Noise-noise-noise (boat transport)

Thanks for hearing my concerns. Thanks so much for all your work on these matters.

33. Deanna Erickson – [Deanna.erickson@uwex.edu](mailto:Deanna.erickson@uwex.edu)

- a. I am opposed to the addition of the new s-curve development. Not only does this plan eliminate residences, it will allow for increased development and traffic on the point, increasing stress on the crucial habitat while increasing sedimentation and runoff in the St. Louis River Estuary.

## Land Use

1. Mary Vanderwerp – [mvanderwerp@gmail.com](mailto:mvanderwerp@gmail.com)
  - a. When I'm driving I enjoy seeing the Bay and don't want to lose that view to more huge houses or to fences.
2.
  - a. 3 areas to be rezoned
    - i. I'm concerned about multiuse in this area. Residential would seem a better use in terms of traffic, impact on other residential.
3.
  - a. Why was the hotel allowed to be built without having to make improvements to 11<sup>th</sup> ave. Will the adjacent property owners have to pay for said improvements that benefit the hotel? Is one of the owners of the hotel (Maki, Bob) an attorney who also does work for the city Duluth? \*Transportation
4. John Schmidt – 2330 Minnesota Ave – 390-3945 – [johnonsand@aol.com](mailto:johnonsand@aol.com)
  - a. Goal #1
    - i. We were told by city engineers when the hotel proposal came to the planning commission and the city council that the present water and roads and sewage were more than adequate.
  - b. Goal #2
    - i. Allowing for more commercial use of that industrial shoreline is not consistent with the city Comprehensive Plan.
  - c. Goal #3
    - i. Electric-lighted signs would not be appropriate
5. Kathy Kollodge, 1409 MN Ave
  - a. I live at 1409 and don't oppose the designation of the recreational area by the bay.
  - b. There needs to be clear signage for public access
  - c. The rezoning of 1-w to P-1 from the curve to 14<sup>th</sup> plus- should include the bike path! \*Transportation
6. Pam Gustaveson
  - a. I hope folks are aware of what "mixed use" means. Restaurants, gas stations, hotels. Why not make it park or residential. NO MIXED USE
7.
  - a. Goal 2- The land use and zoning map designations proposed sound very important.

- b. Goal 3- The way finding signage to the tier 1 locations- particularly Franklin and Lafayette and Sand Point will be helpful in funneling people to where they can enjoy the park. "Reclaiming and restoring" Franklin will be great for visitors.

8. Deanna Erickson – [Deanna.erickson@uwex.edu](mailto:Deanna.erickson@uwex.edu)

- a. I support re-zoning efforts, especially the industrial to P-1 change near the UMD boathouse. I would prefer if the recreation zone near the park were altered to preservation to expand habitat availability at the wetlands preserve. Minnesota and Wisconsin point constitute vital migratory habitat, especially for warblers in the spring.

### Other

1. Mary Vanderwerp – [mvanderwerp@gmail.com](mailto:mvanderwerp@gmail.com)

- a. A different format may have been much better for a meeting.

2. 218-391-4242 - 3215 Lake ave south

- a. Where are the problems defined that the small area plan is addressing???  
Without specifically defining the problem, how can these so-call solutions be justified???
- b. The oldest park in Duluth is Lafayette square- this is where the community votes in elections, holds its monthly meetings, and conducts children's programs in the summer and winter. These programs require access to both the lake shore and bay shorelines for children and parents and property owners- to limit or close the bay access at 30th and 31<sup>st</sup> sts will severely limit all future programs using L.S. facilities, parking site, and is a poor use of public resources.
- c. Life guards necessary at Lafayette square, the tot lot area 12<sup>th</sup>.

3. Gale Kerns – 726-1958

- a. Could the city work with the Corps of Engineers to put some sort of facility and trash receptacle at the Point where the lot under the bridge on the point side junctions with the beach. A lot of tourist foot traffic walk across the bridge and gets to the beach that way- and use the beach for a bathroom. \*Access

4.

- a. How about individual property owners changing fees to members of the public who currently cross private property to access the beach or water, and additional fees for dog leaving behind piles?! Personally we tolerate A LOT to live here. It requires tremendous patience.

5. Ken Kollodge – 390-3929 1409 Minn. Ave, Duluth, MN 55802

- a. We live @ 1409 Minnesota Ave. (Bay side) and want 1<sup>st</sup> right of refusal to the tax forfeit land adjacent to our back property line, if and when it goes up for sale.

6. Kathy Kollodge, 1409 MN Ave

- a. I think homeowners with adjacent tax forfeited land should absolutely be offered any land for sale first. Before any commercial option (hotels etc) or other potential home owners.
- b. I also think homeowners should not get street ends for free.

7. Warren Howe – 722-7200

- a. Titling this draft recommendation as Park Point Small Area Plan is very misleading, as it does not reflect the Small Area Plan Committee's recommendation- which requests there be no vacating of Park Point streets.
- b. The city seems to be rushing this plan. Please reconsider presenting these recommendations until you have received the Small Area Plan Committee's final recommendations. At the very least do not ignore the recommendations already made by the committee, as you clearly have done. The residents of Park Point need to see that the City is not taking the committee seriously. We need to see that the city will seriously and respectfully, honor the residents of Park Point.

8.

- a. Why does the 911 want all my info after I tell them where the party at 2am is or the fire is instead of going to the area mentioned?
- b. Will we get assessed again after a few years of this extra use of Minn ave.?
- c. The hotel and restaurants benefit from the increase traffic- will our taxes be lowered or increased?
- d. What about emergency-medical needs?
- e. The mess created-even after reading the rules, will enforce 10 pm closing-we get patrolled at 8am?
- f. We only need one brush fire and the answer will be what can we the city do? Its too late.
- g. Act for the PP people not react when its too late

9. Nancy Olson – [parkpoint-624@yahoo.com](mailto:parkpoint-624@yahoo.com)

- a. Leave the Coast Guard/12<sup>th</sup> street neighborhood alone. NO HOTELS NO GAS STATIONS NO LIQUIR NO MIXED USE
- b. Fix superior st and infrastructure underneath first.
- c. Leave us alone.

10. Pam Gustaveson

- a. Go to other neighborhoods

11.

- a. Save the city development money for infrastructure improvements.
- b. The ecosystem around the point seems to be at max usage.
- c. What's driving this? City wanting money? Do local people demand more access?

- d. My hope is the decision makers really look at the big picture of this unique fragile ecosystem.
12. Lynn Megner – 464-4565
  - a. Stop this stupid planning for Park Point
  - b. Open Access to Lake on London Road.
13.
  - a. Goal 1- These water and sewage infrastructure improvements are really needed.
14. Dick Gould – 348-3768
  - a. Sell airport to users. Retain first Bldg for and EMT team of Two- Put airport on the tax rolls.
15. Pam Griggs – 3429 Minnesota Ave – 218-260-6032
  - i. Ships are beautiful and bring in much needed revenue into the community.
16. Deanna Erickson – [Deanna.erickson@uwex.edu](mailto:Deanna.erickson@uwex.edu)
  - a. Please consider the St. Louis River Habitat plan and our collective public efforts to delist the St. Louis River area of concern, especially in regard to the Fish and Wildlife Habitat Beneficial Use Impairment. Increasing development on the sand bar will not aid on efforts.
17.
  - a. Park Point has been neglected by the city: fire and police. There already are 3 perfect access places: s-curve, Lafayette, Rec center. Why, when the city entities are already stressed to the max, would you want to open more? Do a better job @ the 3 that already are open (garbage, toilets, monitoring). No more needed!  
\*Access

## **Park Point Neighborhood Street End Coalition**

(7 Submissions)

We are fortunate that we are able to live on Park Point. We enjoy the natural beauty and recreational opportunities that this unique location provides. We also value our neighborhood.

We recognize that during the 10 o'clock news on October 28<sup>th</sup>, 2013, it was stated that city officials are working to "protect park point residents" with their proposed plan.

- Improving and focusing development on the designated Tier 1 access points will help funnel tourists and visitors (sometimes nearly 10,000 cars per day) away from peoples' homes

- Allowing legal “fee-owners” to have the option of applying for vacations of useless “paper streets” will help preserve the privacy and security of our neighborhood.
- There is concern over the signed and improved Tier 2 access points because there are many potential adverse effects associated with increased traffic between homes.

**Our Goal:** Communicate with our neighbors, and together, influence the City of Duluth to help direct Park Point visitors away from peoples’ homes and private property.

**What can you do?**

Please join our coalition. We are open to your input and advice.

[parkpointneighbors@gmail.com](mailto:parkpointneighbors@gmail.com)

Please consider also endorsing the proposal to leave Lake Ave and the s-curve as they are (and not create a new s-curve just after the bridge). Perhaps more parking for beach access and a bike path at the s-curve would be welcomed by visitors of Park Point.

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

...