

Corridor Development Initiative

Minnetonka – Mills Church

Evaluation – February 11, 2020

Tonight was the second of five meetings with community members to explore options for redeveloping the Mills Church site.

1. What worked well or were good parts of the session for you?
 - Speakers didn't talk into the mic well enough. (Loren)
 - More basic info provided about zoning rules was needed beforehand.
 - Review of questions/surveys from Saturday's meeting.
 - Outside architect? Who brought him in? Was he paid?
 - Professional input.
 - (3) Small group discussion.
 - (2) Explanation by Todd Rhoades.
 - Great presentation by architect.
 - Process over content.
 - Thank you for the water and snacks.
 - We need to ask more questions and get more answers.
 - Small group brainstorming offered opportunities to consider many opportunities.
 - The opportunity to share our ideas and concerns.
 - The table discussions on the 5 main questions
 - Time taken to listen to more concerns.
 - (2) Stayed on schedule/on time.
 - I loved my neighbors for standing up against this "guided" decision meeting.
 - (2) Talking with neighbors.
 - Common thoughts – "keys": reduce traffic; more pedestrian friendly: "proud of."
 - I felt Pastor Landt did a bit of a song-&-dance last time and took control. He was on neutral turf this time and had to answer tough questions.
 - People started forming ideas of what they wanted.
 - When questions were answered by presenters.
 - Was hugged in a small group.
 - Nice to meet neighbors.
 - I thought the groups came up with excellent ideas. So far from what was proposed at the 1st meeting I pray the church and city really do hear our desires as a neighbor.
 - (2) Q&A.
 - I liked the recap of the 2/8 eval.
 - I was anticipating a "rough time". I thought Barbara & Loren kept it under control. Good job!
 - Todd did a great job!!

2. What could have been improved?

- (4) More time for questions and answers.
- Also, need questions answered.
- I would like Q&A with Pastor David – a paragraph from Pastor David about the church's vision and desired outcome from developing their property.
- More information.
- Get an opening statement of church's needs, bottom line, what has to be achieved i.e. then we can start the process.
- More and longer Q&As and/or more appropriate first presentation which was largely urban developments.
- Making it all clearer as to what the city expects at location and what they desire.
- Listen to us.
- Sound – it was difficult to hear.
- (2) Direct answers to questions/be able to answer questions.
- More time.
- Why is “affordable housing” only option being pushed?
- Please be honest and tell hidden agenda from the beginning. Very intelligent community in Minnetonka Mills!
- What is happening to the church? No one has ever said.
- Correct information about what is really happening. Is the church trying to make a lot of money by selling the property for the most money?
- Keeping people on track.
- If this process is truly open for discussion, why do the presenters and especially the moderator keep referencing “the building.” This implies that this is the sole vision.
- Moderating respect.
- Answer questions in detail.
- I am having trouble hearing speakers due to hearing /sight impairment
- More clarity on what is driving this overall process. What are the goals of the church?
- Loren wasn't speaking loud enough. Would have been nice for the people asking questions to have a microphone. There are hearing impaired people attending these meetings. Very distracting having people coming in and out the doors. Could only hear Barbara speak.
- Take questions in advance, come with answers.
- Stop using words that imply development = housing. Post answers to the last meeting's questions before the next meeting. We can't read all the answers when we arrive and are supposed to be participating in the process.
- More honesty from the church with regards to what they really want. Clarity from the city on what would not be acceptable.

- Provide uneducated citizens how taxes fund project when/how city council/meetings work as well as committees (planning.)

3. Check the box that most represents your opinion: 1 = Excellent and 4 = Poor.

Question	Excellent 1	Good 2	Fair 3	Poor 4
You gained information about the questions people asked at the Saturday meeting.	4	10	8	8
You gained information about design principles and considerations when developing a site.	4	6	15*	7
You were able to express your ideas and concerns about developing the site	4	14%	5	5#
The small groups helped you better understand the ideas your neighbors have for the site and needs of the community.	13	14	4	2

- **Todd helped*
- *#Not enough time*
- *Your previous questions were answered – poor*
- *% great ideas from the groups – please hear them!!!*

4. What had you hoped to get from today’s session?

- More options.
- (2) Answers.
- More time for questions.
- Exactly what happened.
- Overview.
- More information about the overall process.
- Reason for selling property to a developer by Mills Church.
- Expectations satisfied.
- More information than we received. It seems to be foggy as presented but only one goal.
- (3) Clarity (on what the plan is.)
- What is the initial Intent, need, goal, is for the church ownership itself?
- Get a feel for where my neighbors are at.
- More explanation from Mills Church.
- What is the city and church’s agenda? Feels like we are being steered.
- Answers to questions, more information about what is wanted and planned.
- Clarity of motivation.

- I hoped it would calm this whole group down. I think things will get better going forward.
- How church + city would be involved with each other.
- To not have to deal with scared/frustrated neighbors. Ha, ha! Kidding! I liked the table exercise.
- Better understanding of plans.
- I actually wanted to hear others’ opinions and others’ questions and get a feel for what others thought.
- Better understanding of the church’s vision.
- Respectful discussion.
- Understanding motivations of what is behind this desire to build – financial?
- More information.
- A better understanding about what is really happening.

5. How satisfied are you overall with tonight’s session? (Please circle the answer that best describes your experience.)

Two	Twenty-One*	Eight	Two
Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied

Note: When a respondent checks two options or checks on the line between two options, I record the higher option.

- *I do feel a little better than on Saturday.*
 - *But I am afraid these good ideas won't be heard due to the powers talk*
6. What additional information would you like to have included in the next meeting?
- Can the city purchase the property?
 - Re-zoning documentation and control.
 - How is success gauged?
 - Will there be metrics to measure resident’s satisfaction to whatever goes there 1 year, 5 years, 10 years 15 and 20 years out?
 - More definitive insight of what the bottom-line need is for this church – minimum/maximum project scope.
 - What would be the impact of development on the site’s eligibility for the National Register?
 - Are you aware that the 671 bus (I take it) only goes toward downtown in the mornings and from downtown in the p.m.? NO connection to Ridgedale at present (614 eliminated) and 671 does not run on weekends.
 - Again – what zoning rules = need to define.
 - The church is final decision process.
 - Clarity of church’s needs? Is money needed for them to stay there? Do they need proceeds from selling parcels to a developer?

- Is church building going to remain if high density housing comes in?
- Who will be management/own property?
- Who pays taxes on non-profit property?
- More time for David to let us know what he wants as the property owner, \$? development of “x” acres.
- What existing structures are acceptable to move/remove or renovate.
- Can you webinar for people disable and unable to attend sessions?
- Why do we need “affordable housing” here? Really, why? What happens if we don’t build “affordable housing?”
- What is the protocol for changing the zoning status of a specific site?
- Who determines financial viability of the project beyond the developer? What is the city’s role is evaluating the financial viability?
- What is the specific process/steps required to change the zoning from R-1? Does the process require a traffic study?
- Traffic/pedestrian studies.
- Answers from the church.
- Providers need to provide correct information. Architect had wrong drawings. Did not know there was a coffee shop across the street. Took someone in the neighborhood to put it in drawing. Are you trying to take over more of the neighborhood?
- Take the time to address real concerns – don’t bulldoze over people’s concerns.
- More detail about what the city needs to fit this into the comp plan.
- More information on what the church wants and what is planned.
- What portion of the land is available? How much land does the church want to keep for their own purposes?
- How set or determined Mills Church is and if they are willing to consider ideas other than a 3-story high-rise.
- (3) More Answers (to questions) from last week (real answers.)
- True motivations and intentions of the city and church with regard to the development opportunity.
- What is the legal standard for the city to change rezoning and change guide plan?
- Under the code, is it the city’s obligation to consider “financial viability” in an application?
- Perhaps take 5 minutes at the beginning of next meeting to gain alignment on ground rules such as: Step up/step back, stay curious, don’t talk over each other, no side conversations, don’t make assumptions.
- Expectations from church and city.
- How does this fit into the 2030 plan?
- Questions regarding the church’s intentions for the space. What is it they need to get out of the “development” of this property?
- What is the church’s agenda? Very suspicious.
- Make all info available online.

- Safety due to the pedestrian traffic during every season.

7. How long have you lived or worked in the area? Circle the answer that best applies.

One 1-3 Years	Seven 4-9 Years	Five 10-19 Years	Twenty-Two 20+ Years	Not Apply
--------------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------

8. What age bracket do you represent?

Zero Teen	One Young Adult	Twenty-Two Adult	Ten Senior/Retired
--------------	--------------------	---------------------	-----------------------

9. What cultural/ethnic heritage do you represent?

- (3) Not appropriate
- Caucasian – Nordic
- Scandinavian
- What bearing does this question have to do with the outcomes of the meeting or process?
- (7) N/A; not relevant; doesn't matter, stop asking
- African American & Caucasian
Why does this matter to you? Why is this question here? For the record: Polish, French, German, Austrian, Hungarian
- German
- Why does this matter?
- (4) White
- White/Europe/German/English
- White, (2) Norwegian
- Caucasian
- (2) USA/American

10. How did learn about tonight's session?

- (6) Attended Saturday meeting
- Mailings and previous session (Feb 8)
- (4) Email
- Next-door app, previous session on 2/8, website
- (3) From a neighbor
- Neighbors who attended the 1st session
- (3) Mail
- Neighborhood communication

- (2) Website
- Common sense
- (5) Mailer
- Letter
- (3) flyer
- The better questions is how could you not know?
- Next-door
- Watched the city council meeting
- I live next door to the property
- Many people feel passionate about it
- Posted online
- Social media
- From Saturday's meeting
- Changed location – by digging and calling

11. Would you recommend the next session to your neighbors/colleagues?

Thirty-Two	Zero &
Yes	No

Note: & not if LISC is involved.

Other Comments (Optional)

- City ignoring audience basic questions from audience
- City is trying to move residents to accept low income housing
- Dangerous to move Zoning off on R1
- In the future, meetings that ask for community input should be held prior to employing outside agencies.
- Please, please, please hear the collective voice of the room – affordable housing is not the need or best option for this location.
- Have audience members state name and address before comments or questions are asked.
- There were great ideas – green space ideas – park – gathering spaces
- So much easier for audience to be reactive instead of creative – might help to give them concepts to react to. Tonight's exercise was good.
- I really feel it is important to get a larger space to continue this process. Also – this seems very rushed – making people feel like they are not heard, and things are already decided. Pushing an agenda.
- I have participated in a similar process in St. Louis Park and they ended up developing something the residents asked them not to build.

- Very concerned about the city and the church becoming involved in a building project together and the influence they have on each other. Seems like a fishing expedition to assist the church at the expense of the taxpayer.
- Is the church chapel (built 1924) eligible for Historic Register? What is needed to do so?
- No more input. The city is selling us on this project
- Ridiculous to do this group discussion exercise without more time for questions and understand what the church wants.
- Who determines how much money for development? It has been repeatedly stated “if there is enough money” – who determined that level?
- Hospice housing is a possible consideration. R1 housing with mother in law units.
- If it does lead to a development, I recommend you talk with Corey Wright on Farmington Road who spoke about single family homes.
- City needs to control what is going on - city feels passive
- I do not want re-zoning. I moved out of south Minneapolis to get away from “affordable housing.”
- Good job at staying on track.
- I am against having “affordable housing” being built in my area. I want it to be market rate. I don’t want a church on the site either.
- Little frustrating when there were questions that were repeated (a lot of good info was on Saturday 2/8)
- I am so happy and excited to be a part of this process.
- Saturday session freaked everyone out – city needs to explicitly state no high rise
- I feel strongly that if density is going to be pursued, that it be built out in a manner where there is an intermediate density (or single-family density) as a buffer against the more dense. Use new urbanist principles.
- Is there an increase in crime with any density of low income?
- What is the effect on property values with such housing developments of different density?
- It still feels as though there is an agenda at work, and this is the softest steamroller to a high-rise development.
- “Affordable housing” seems to have people thinking big high risers and low-income housing. I think a definition of what affordable housing means for our area would be helpful. And, I think the three panelists at the first meeting put fear and concern with people that the vision is a tall high-rise. I think that needs to be addressed and maybe even said out loud that they were only examples.
- I just retired and am planning to live in my house in Minnetonka Mills for the next 30+ years. I do not want to have to leave my house to make room for more houses so the city can make more money through taxes.

- I do not want any more trees cut down to make more housing. Minnetonka has changed so much. At the present time the population is a very good size (just right.) That is why I like living here and other people do, too. I have been very involved with the Minnetonka community. People stay living here because we like it. I do best in the metro area. We have a wonderful city. I want to keep it this way. I am very proud to live in Minnetonka Mills. Please don't ruin it.
- People that the city hires should be knowledgeable about what they are talking about. They have not studied the area very well. They refused to answer questions and had their own agenda.
- Is this development driven by David Landt wanting to "limit" his congregation to twice what is currently is? If ISAIH is not involved, why the coincidence of inviting that group for a "forum" as advertised on FB?
- I sense a disconnect between the Mills Church and its social agenda and the community. (I say this as a liberal Democrat.) Perhaps pull back on the SJW agenda.
- Road rage on Minnetonka Blvd, Baker Road, Plymouth Road etc. is a big issue: tailgating, speeding, texting, distracted driving.
- It would be nice to have monthly community meetings for residents to discuss issues regularly.
- Are there any plans to restore a transit option from Minnetonka Mills to Ridgedale Library/Service Center which was lost (614)? Transit desert – 671-DT-645 to Ridgedale is cumbersome – 1.5-hour trip.
- Best scenario/speculation ideas for the space + neighborhood + church

For more information contact:

- Loren Gordon at 952-939-8296 or lgordon@minnetonkamn.gov
- Gretchen Nicholls at 651-265-2280 or gnicholls@lisc.org