

Silas, Lindsey

From: Jeanine Marchessault <jmb55404@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2026 1:20 PM
To: Silas, Lindsey
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to 2026-00535

You don't often get email from jmb55404@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

I do not endorse the passage of the Interim Use Permit for the building located at 2222 Blaisdell Avenue, Minneapolis, MN, 55404.

It is troubling that the applications and summaries meet the letter of the law, but not the spirit of community involvement. I don't know when the Land Use Application Summary was written, but it states that no public comments have been received as the writing of the Staff Report. Public comments cannot be received if the public has not been informed. The Notice of Public Hearing was written on May 1, 2026 and we received it on Friday, May 8, 2026. The public hearing will be held early afternoon on May 12, 2026 allowing two working days for response. This timeline does not give much time for introspection, gathering information, nor public interaction. Checking in with neighbors and the Whittier Alliance staff it appears that they received the same Notice of Public Hearing, in the same timeframe as myself and were completely in the dark about the Interim Use Permit.

Communication is a key to success and it is troubling that it has been nonexistent. To date, neither the owner of the building nor the owner/authorized agent of Pathway to Recovery has made any attempt to talk to neighbors to share their vision, proposal and garner support. Without communication with adjoining neighbors, without communication with us as properties that share a legal easement and no public involvement through the Neighbourhood Association, Whittier Alliance, this proposal can only be seen through the light of no community interaction. Without community interaction, this program will exist within a vacuum that does not add to the neighborhood or community. It could be seen as a program that does not see themselves as integral to the whole, placing themselves outside the flow of interaction and commitment to enhance the community. That is a solid reason for this proposal to be denied.

Throughout the operation of the building by the current owner, we are the ones to initiate communication. At no time has he called, texted or written about the use and maintenance of the building. I recognize that the owner may merely be renting the building to the proposed state credentialed care facility, yet he has an active role in how this change impacts adjacent neighbors, and the neighborhood. We observed the property going through changes this winter. Speaking to tenants they shared that the owner was going to kick everyone out so he could get better tenants. We were told eviction proceedings were underway for everyone in the building. In late March, my husband talked to the owner in the parking lot and asked what was happening and if the property could be cleaned up better. The owner stated that he wants more rent. Subsequent texts are as follows. From my husband to owner: "Here's an update on your property, looks like giving people notice has pissed some of them off and you now have even more trash on your property than usual and there are several broken windows on the driveway side. Is there any chance you could get some clean up done so it doesn't look so much like a slum? Response: "Yes some body will come tomorrow." I called 311 to report the broken windows, the abandoned vehicles and the food and furniture strewn throughout their yard and ours. I was told city

inspectors would be informed. This would have been the perfect time to inform us of proposed change of use of building from rental to community members to a social service program providing homeless living quarters.

In the absence of information people identify the gaps and the negative aspects. From the proposal, it appears there is scant information other than identification of who would receive services. It is not clear how this will be done, other than stating the number of people receiving the services and that “parents will be actively enrolled in treatment programming at the main facility.” What is not clear is what will happen on site. There is mention of staff 24/7, but are they fully qualified and trained for a position that means they must effectively interact with people in crisis by preventing and responding to daily interactions and emergencies? How and who will deal with the safety and security of people within the building and outside of the building? How long will people be housed within the building? How will minor children be protected from the effects of potential relapse of parents or other residents. Where in the recovery process will residents be while they reside onsite? Will drug testing be administered if there are questions about the recovery process or will it have to be referred to the main facility? So many questions without any answers.

Other questions that emerge deal with licensing and following regulations. Has the building been inspected to determine if it’s an effective use for the type of program? Has Pathway to Recovery applied for Board and Lodge licensure through the City of Minneapolis? Has Pathway to Recovery applied for any licensure through the state of Minnesota? If they are in the process of application, what is the license being requested? Is it for medical recuperative care, is for transitional housing, etc.? The type of licensure regarding initial service plans, comprehensive assessment, determines the rules and regulations that will govern the provision of services. The provision of services will determine how the building will be used and how it may impact adjacent properties and the neighborhood. Without these questions answered, I do not believe that this Interim Use Permit should be approved.

A facility of this type can be an asset to a community only if it is well run. I have concerns about Pathway to Recovery being the principal to provide the services. Their current facility that provides detox and treatment had a scheduled licensing review May 13-16, 2025 by the state of Minnesota Department of Human Services. The findings determined nine separate licensing violations regarding such issues as initial service plans, clients not meeting requirements, Individual Treatment Plans not completed in a timely manner, nor including the appropriate information, plans to provide services and treatment strategy, client record documentation and whether treatment plan reviews identified methods continue to be effective for the treatment plan being conducted per regulation. The DHS review showed 30% violation to 100% violations, depending on the citation, for files reviewed. That is a significant number.

This proposal could cause unreasonable interference with the enjoyment of our property and its value. It potentially poses to amplify discomfort and exacerbate safety concerns for those living in the area. Community support is crucial for the success of a homeless shelter, and a well-placed facility is more likely to receive this support. Establishing the shelter in an area meant for such purposes can help build positive relations with the community, avoiding potential conflicts and opposition from residents, and alleviate concerns for public safety on city streets. How will the program add to the improvement that we so desperately need?

In the Staff Report under the section Analysis, it is stated that interim use approval is subject to three additional findings per section 525.440 of the zoning code.

Condition 1

The establishment, maintenance or operation of the conditional use will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, and comfort or general welfare.

Response:

Our property is not merely as described on the tax roles or application as a two unit duplex. The main building is a 1904 mansion identified by the city of Minneapolis as one of 500 historically significant buildings. We have been owners living in our home since October 1990 while we have renovated and maintained the property at the highest of standards possible. Additionally, we have a carriage house that is licensed as a rental.

Our two properties have a legal easement agreement with responsibilities and well defined ingress/egress along the drive aisle that runs from the alley through the parking lot and exits from the driveway onto Blaisdell Avenue. We cannot exit our parking area except through this legal drive aisle.

2222 tenants, guests and visiting caregivers have been nightmare parkers. We had to repeatedly speak to drivers and put notes on cars blocking access to our property. The owner or his representatives rarely responded to our concerns and the issue continues to this day. I doubt that this legal agreement will be communicated to users of the building and followed as required in the future.

For background, the 2222 property was purchased in January 2023 by LIBIN V, LLC. At the time of purchase, it had been run by the previous owner as a condominium and rental building. (Dover Condominiums CIC NO. 1359). Under the new owner's initial rental use of the building, it was filled with friendly individuals who barbecued together, sat outside and shared stories and life experiences.

Then the social services started. Healthy Living Home Health Care, LLC is licensed to provide 245D Home and Community-Based Services at 2222 Blaisdell Ave (License Number: 1110201) at present. Per their licensing public documents they received state of Minnesota Correction Orders in both 2024 and 2025. In 2025, they were issued eight citations per Minnesota Statutes that included issues such as not providing services in response to identified needs, interests, preferences or desired outcomes, that individuals did not meet initial service planning requirements and that they did not document methods or actions to support outcomes. If they are going to continue to operate as stated in their license at 2222 Blaisdell, their next licensing visit will be in October, 2026. Will they continue to operate at the same time as Pathway to Recovery in the same building?

They are one of several, difficult to identify, community or government based services that were provided to tenants in the building. What this has meant for the last few years is that we have had a myriad of difficulties with tenants, service providers and lack of response by the building's owner. We would see people coming at all hours of the day and night, observed drug use and abuse, dealing and several times people wandering the parking lot under the influence. Just last week, we found a syringe next to our side door and other drug paraphernalia in the 2222 parking lot. There were many kind and generous tenants who expressed frustration with lack of management in the building and how supportive services were conducted. We got to know many of the neighbors well, yet from others we suffered verbal abuse, parking violations, and mistreatment of our property. Some tenants complained about the lack of services from their caregivers and their frustration with the building owner not responding to identified repair needs. For example, one man's window screens, as he stated were damaged from "someone trying to get in," and he asked my husband for help as he had not received any from the owner. My husband helped him with the screens and noticed at that time an intense mold smell emanating throughout the apartment and in the hallways. All of these behaviors and actions (and more) were observed during the time that social service organizations and government agencies were providing care and money to help people

with substance abuse disorders and mental health disorders. Why would any of this change if an interim use permit was granted to another social service group installed in the building? The Staff Report states that the facility will staff 24/7 by program staff. Will this be a condition of the Interim Use Permit or simply implied? Qualified and well trained staff appropriate for the position would be essential for maintaining public safety and comfort. 24/7 staff could ensure that residents are safe as well as be responsive to us as an adjacent property and others in the neighborhood. We would need a consistent and constant method to communicate with staff.

Condition 2

The conditional use will not be dangerous to the use and enjoyment of other property in the vicinity and will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of surrounding property for uses npermitted in the district.

Response:

Our neighborhood has gone through many changes throughout our residence. We have seen violence and drug use that dissipated due to properties that appeared to be well run, and a belief that a strong community was a healthy community.

Of the seven licensed rental properties on Blaisdell Avenue, between 22nd and 24th, we are the only owners that live in the building and in fact in the city of Minneapolis. All other principles are located in other cities, and for the bulk of the rental buildings are located in Utah. In fact, the proposed director/owner requesting the interim use permit lives in Mankato Minnesota, where he operates his internal medical practice (at least what can be found on MediFind).

What this has meant is that property owners, schools and businesses on the block have had to make complaints to management companies and the police to try to have these buildings run in a safer more stable manner. The physical distance of ownership has resulted in a lack of care and consideration for the community since it is not their community. Active oversight and maintenance of the properties is fair yet improvements to buildings and surrounding exteriors do not seem to be anticipated nor completed. Response to tenant complaints and about tenants is not timely and sometimes is nonexistent. Arguments and fighting within the buildings can be heard and sometimes spills out into the street. There are times that it seems to be getting better but other times it feels, unless there is management attention and intervention, it is out of control. The momentum forward to a stable community was completely blown apart by the incident on May 30, 2024. Officer Jamal Mitchell was murdered, two others were killed and four others were injured in a devastating occurrence of gun use. We experienced zero response from property management that operates the building at 2221 Blaisdell and have not seen significant changes to how they do business.

Adding an unwanted homeless program in a neighborhood that has a downturn will not add significantly to the positive growth of the neighborhood. It would seem that a greater potential for adverse outcomes is likely. Especially since the owner of the building and the owner of the facility do not live in the city of Minneapolis. It is unclear whether this facility will have nonprofit or for-profit status. This will determine how likely the facility will see themselves as a positive change in the community and will develop efforts and opportunities to achieve such an outcome.

Adding another social service program to the neighborhood does not ensure stability. The Report states that the proposal meets the required 350 foot spacing requirement from other established state credentialed care facilities, serving seven or more residents. However, I feel this is a bit of

misinformation. Granted there are no established state credentialed care facilities within the area defined. However, there is a facility with a Board and Lodge license through the city of Minneapolis. Deputat Board and Lodge located at 2304 Pillsbury has operated since the 1970s providing housing for elderly men and ensuring medical services are provided. Also located within the spacing requirement is One Love Housing, LLC at 2311 Pillsbury which “provides housing for people in recovery, trying to find their way to a life without drugs and alcohol.” Located at 2118 Blaisdell, NuWay Counseling Center, is “a non-profit organization, serving individuals recovering from co-occurring substance use and mental health disorders since 1966.” Admittedly this facility is located just outside the parameters at 500 feet yet they provide similar services onsite. “Our clients often struggle with co-occurring substance use and mental health disorders, lack supportive recovery environments and need extended care to establish their recovery in the community.” Their website further states that they are “in the heart of the recovery community.” This is a very accurate statement, pulled from their website, as to the high density of treatment centers and supportive environments that are scattered throughout our neighborhood and Whittier.

Condition 3

Adequate utilities, access roads, drainage, necessary facilities, or other measures have been or will be provided.

Response:

The applicant is not proposing any exterior changes that would impact the facilities. The exterior of the building is poorly maintained at present. There is different color paint on the same types of building features such as the balconies, paint is peeling off the fascia, and brickwork is spalling off on the south side. There have been broken windows and there there are torn and missing screens. Adding to the potential of loss of life, the main electrical service weatherhead/mast is situated too close to an upper balcony. It is within reach and would be potentially fatal if someone did not know what they were doing. There is mention in documents supporting the Interim Use Permit, that no interior work will be done. As stated earlier, there may indeed be a mold problem. Evidence of mold could be smelled within the halls and lower apartments. When 2222 tenants were having to dispose of all of their belongings as they became homeless, you could see the mold growing on the mattresses and other pieces of furniture.

In conclusion, overall there has been a lack of transparency and involvement. I find most significant that in order to allow this change in usage to occur, the owner evicted medically fragile and vulnerable people suffering from substance abuse and mental health issues. Pushing out onto the streets people who were already being served by DHS licensed programs and other organizations and potentially making them homeless. One individual relapsed in his alcoholic recovery journey as he was not getting assistance to find new lodging and services. In a poorly run building, another social service program wants to provide housing and similar services to new residents. All in the search for more money.

[EXTERNAL] This email originated from outside of the City of Minneapolis. Please exercise caution when opening links or attachments.

Silas, Lindsey

From: Tamar Bagley <tamarbagley@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2026 3:39 PM
To: Silas, Lindsey
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 2222 Blaisdell Ave - interim use permit /PLAN21331

You don't often get email from tamarbagley@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi Lindsey,

I am writing to submit public comment regarding PLAN21331 / the interim use permit request for 2222 Blaisdell Ave, submitted by Sadik Ali on behalf of Pathway to Recovery.

I respectfully oppose approval of the interim use permit unless the applicant can clearly demonstrate compliance with all applicable Minneapolis zoning requirements and conditional use findings. In particular, I ask CPED and the City Council to closely review whether the proposed state credentialed care facility serving up to 16 persons satisfies the required findings related to public health, safety, comfort, general welfare, compatibility with nearby properties, safe access and transportation interface, and conformity with all applicable zoning regulations.

I also ask that the record specifically address the following:

1. Whether any existing state credentialed care facilities serving seven or more residents are located within 350 feet of the property, and whether the proposed use satisfies the applicable spacing requirement.
2. The exact state or city license type for the proposed operation, including whether the use is properly classified as a state credentialed care facility and not another use category.
3. Whether all services will be limited to residents of the facility, or whether non-resident clients will come to the property.
4. Whether the building has the required occupancy, fire, life-safety, accessibility, staffing, and operational approvals for this use and number of residents.
5. Whether the applicant has provided an adequate transportation, pickup/drop-off, parking, security, and neighborhood operations plan.
6. Why the maximum five-year interim use period is necessary, and whether a shorter approval period or stricter operating conditions would be more appropriate.

If the City Council is not prepared to deny the permit, I ask that approval be conditioned on strict operating requirements, including a maximum of 16 residents, no walk-in or outpatient services unless expressly authorized by zoning, 24/7 qualified and well trained staff, a transportation and parking plan, resident-only on-site services, proof of all required licenses and inspections before occupancy, and review or revocation if the use violates permit conditions.

Thank you for including this comment in the public record.

Best,

David Bagley & Tamar Herman

2316 Pillsbury Ave S

[EXTERNAL] This email originated from outside of the City of Minneapolis. Please exercise caution when opening links or attachments.

I am in opposition to the Interim Use Permit to establish a state credentialed care facility at 2222 Blaisdale Avenue.

I have already submitted a written document through the public comment section of the City of Minneapolis website and to Senior City Planner, Lindsey Silas.

My written comments go further in depth about what I will share to you in this short time.

I am the owner of the adjacent the property that shares legal easement for ingress, egress, maintenance and parking.

My background is in nonprofit and educational social service programs. I have as staff or a consultant originated, developed operating principles, staffed, licensed, and overseen programs within the city of Minneapolis, Hennepin County and even nationally. One such program served homeless families in their journey to achieve economic stability within a family and child development program.

First and foremost, my objection is not about who is going to be served by the program. It's about the structure of the organization, program policies and procedures, and the staff who are going to administer the program. I am troubled that a DHS licensed program Healthy Living Home Care LLC provided services within 2222 Blaisdell building with documented issues with service provided and appropriate outcomes for the clients. Recordkeeping and documentation are a snapshot of how programs treat their clients. DHS Citations are a review into how well the program is run and whether or not they can achieve the outcomes that are part of their program plan. Pathway to Recovery has had citations regarding their main medical site. Developing a social service program is entirely different in scope. I would like the city council to review whether they have the capacity to develop and operate a completely different kind of program prior to approval. Good intentions and vision must be accompanied by strong local administration and commitment to meeting 100% of required regulations on a daily basis.

Secondly, this program is going to be placed in a problem building with a distant and uninvolved owner. They have maintained, only in a barely adequate level with negative issues that have affected their tenants and us as an adjacent neighbor. They did not provide safe and stable housing to current residents. In order for Pathway to Recovery to operate within this building, the owner has been evicting the same type of people with the same life issues that Pathway wants to serve. I don't know if Pathway is aware of how the previous tenants were treated or evicted but making people homeless to treat people who are homeless is not acceptable.

Thirdly, a state credentialed designation means nothing in terminology. It could be seen as an umbrella classification for saying what kind of license is required. That is like saying I want to sell

fruit, but the real emphasis of the work is selling oranges. There is a protocol for residential facility licensing that needs to be followed. Pathway to Recovery's application, specifies that they would operate under a Board and Lodge license authorized by the city of Minneapolis as well as a Department of Health or Department of Human Services license. How they provide services will determine the kind of license they must acquire in order to operate. Before this proposal is approved it must be clear how they will operate i.e. medically recuperative license, transitional housing, etc.. All required licensure must be a condition of any approval.

Additionally, it was stated in the summary that there are no state credentialed programs within the stated boundary. There are already two residential programs located within 350 feet of the proposed site with one of them offering housing for people on their substance abuse recovery journey. The second facility holds a Board and Lodge license, the same as Pathway to Recovery wants to acquire. If this proposal is approved, that means there will be three residential programs within a stones throw of each other. That type of density is what the Whittier community has been addressing for decades. It would put undo strain and economic impact on adjacent properties and the neighborhood. Having three similar programs in such a small space is a valid reason to deny the Interim Use Permit.

Finally, the planning and discussions by interested parties appears to have been completed in a vacuum without community awareness or support. A level of transparency in sharing vision and methods would have been an appropriate step in the planning process. Without that transparency, operational standards and accountability do not seem like a desired goal. How easily all of this confusion and concern could have been addressed through communication.

Dr. Ali I honor the commitment you have the people you serve. I am open anytime to talk with you or to work with you for you to achieve success.