

## Consider the Alternatives at River's Edge

Presented by Friends of the Mississippi River and University of Minnesota  
Metropolitan Design Center. St. Paul Park, July 19, 2005.

Number of attendees (*from sign-in sheet*): 53

Number of forms returned: 17

### COMMUNITY FEEDBACK FORM RESPONSES

#### Alternative Design Option 1 (1930 units; 90 in critical area):

##### Pros

- No road access to river
- River area respected better than Horton did. Numbers of housing units more acceptable
- Drive along park, business close to St Paul Park
- Road along railroad tracks is good
- Like the grid plan, the commercial area away from the critical area, center parkway
- Less homes west of 75
- Do like multiple outlet streets into St Paul Park
- Like the grid streets
- Higher density housing is aligned along main roadways and near commercial areas, which produces better transit opportunities in the future, better traffic now
- Respects critical area

##### Cons

- Too many units, small lot sizes, units in critical area
- This design allows too many housing units and not adequate recreation space
- The units west of 75 – I question if that would be desirable
- 40' lot size is too small. Too many small lots, apartments close to St Paul Park, too much density, too many roads
- Do not like the layout of this particular plan because of the amount of units
- Too many small lots
- Should be no homes in critical area
- Too big – insufferable
- Don't like, too dense, not environmentally sound
- Too much impervious surface; no vistas from major roads; insufficient buffer on southern end of the back bay. Homes and development invade the critical area and mar the views along the river.
- Does not deal with traffic, small lots, low value housing. Very urban look and not consistent with rural small town.

### **Alternative Design Option 2 (1920 units; 0 in critical area):**

#### Pros

- No dwellings in the critical area, no road access to river
- Road along railroad tracks is good
- Drive along park, street design, combination of different housing next to each other
- More green space in critical area
- No homes in corridor
- Must protect critical area. Expensive homes along edge of critical area is a good idea. Like idea of mixed housing.
- Quieter, safer streets. Safer for children, pets, older residents. Connected greenspace along backyards adds property values.
- More rural/suburban than #1. North-south flow superior to DR Horton plan

#### Cons

- Too many units, need for infrastructure
- Too many housing units and not adequate recreation space
- Any 40' lots are too small. Our city code currently states that 75' is the minimum
- Roads hard to get to that don't go through
- Trail doesn't join together
- Too much maintained green space (lawn)
- Too big – unbearable
- Don't like, too dense, not environmentally sound
- Street design may confuse visitors; too much impervious surface means too much stormwater runoff; too much “developed open space” near the river
- Does not deal with traffic, still not consistent with rural/small town

### **Alternative Design Option 3 (1200 units; 0 in critical area):**

#### Pros

- Preferred smaller number of dwellings with none in critical area. No road access to river. Good foliage protection along railroad and major commuter roads.
- Least number of units, most amount of greenspace
- Limited number of units would provide benefits in many ways. This is the design I would strongly favor.
- Lowered density would benefit all of the surrounding communities. Clusters of development are fine!
- I like this the best because of the number of units planned
- Parkway, green spaces, park system connects, drive along park and road along tracks
- This option is favorable because of the 1200 units, less housing along the critical area.
- More green space in critical area, green space along railroad tracks, fewer homes
- Good plan
- Almost bearable
- Big improvement over developer's plan. Like street arrangements, recreation and natural areas

**(Continued) Alternative Design Option 3 (1200 units; 0 in critical area):**

- Best of the three but would like to see less.
- Keeps wildlife corridor intact. Nice buffers along existing roadway
- No units in the critical area – good job! Houses clustered and pulled back from railroad; less infrastructure building and maintenance costs; better density distribution for future transit
- This design will be the best for the community long-term because of lower infrastructure maintenance, better views, more open space, better protection for the river, habitat, corridors.
- More high value housing, less impact on traffic and environment. Most consistent with rural/small town.

Cons

- Still too many units, infrastructure
- None
- Less housing for DR Horton who will take care of the greenspace; add density to this option
- Too much greenspace that needs mowing. I like the trees on the south edge.
- Builder will never go for it
- Density – this will have an effect on the migratory flyway, wild turkeys and coyotes, but hopefully less than the others
- Could have been 600 units or smaller
- Does not deal with traffic

**Original Proposed Site Plan (1920 units; 520 in critical area):**

Pros

- None
- Pleasant arrangement of parks and roads on east side of Co Rd 75

Cons

- Violates critical area rules: no application by developer to change state or congressional mandates
- Too many units, too much infrastructure costs, no regard for impacts on citizens of either St Paul Park or Grey Cloud.
- Horton was too eager to build too many units for that area. Traffic flow, etc. wasn't thought through in a rational manner. I question making Pullman a main exit street when it goes by a large grade school.
- Bad road system with loops and traffic aimed at 3<sup>rd</sup> Street – move business district towards railroad off main road and roundabout
- Should show trail system; buildings in too close to river
- Do not want roads widened as 12 old trees would need to be cut down.
- Too much development in critical area. Town center on 75.
- Homes in corridor
- Too close to critical area. Unacceptable.
- The original plan is greedy and immoral
- Does not deal with traffic, abuses critical area, not consistent with rural/small town character.

**Other Comments:**

- I think all these alternative designs are superior to any that Horton provided. You did a wonderful job.
- Concerned for wildlife
- The fewer units the better. Traffic problems even at 1200 units. No septic tanks, only build with city water and septic lines. Move as much as possible away from the river. Shopping center closer to St Paul Park.
- Opposed to any plan that doesn't include municipal water and sewer
- In all of the presentations you did not answer the problem of added traffic
- Annexation of area west of County Rd 75 should be denied
- Keep area rural! 1.5-2 acre-lots minimum, small community atmosphere, community wells, homeowners put in their own septic, no cost to St Paul Park residents for infrastructure
- The staff has given an excellent presentation tonight.
- Main road sidewalks; options 1-3 have better in and out roads than DR Horton map (the loops); need bridge into Cottage Grove; keep 75' lots.
- Would like to see different options for roadways so 75 is not so heavily driven. I do not want any commercial buildings.
- I dislike DR Horton's plan. You did a great job on all the plans – my favorite taking into consideration DR Horton's 1900 units is plan #1.
- Please do not build in corridor. We only have so much green land.
- Thanks a lot – good work.
- Thanks
- Don't want to see any commercial development
- Thank you for all your hard work!
- Good use of roads along railroad tracks
- Move parkway in option 3 east sufficient to allow large high value lots between parkway and critical area. Add 19 units in critical area. Move business north to draw from St Paul Park. Provide for walking path connections to existing city paths. Plan must yield the same cost/profit margin and risk to be acceptable to Horton.