

SUMMARY OF NEIGHBORHOOD SURVEY
 LEXINGTON LARPENTEUR NODE STUDY DESIGN AD HOC COMMITTEE
 DISTRICT 10 COMMUNITY COUNCIL

Question 1: Addresses of neighbors not provided (39 surveys received)

Question 2: What is the most important to you concerning new development on the south side of Larpenteur at the Lexington – Larpenteur intersection (traffic, greenspace, stability of the neighborhood, parking and access, zoning, etc.). (Note: some persons listed more than one major concern, and all have been included.)

Issue	1	Total
Traffic		22
Stability of Neighborhood		20
Increase Greenspace		7
Encourage Responsible Development		1
Zoning (Residential to Commercial)		13
Parking & Access		1
Tax Base		1

Question 3: On a scale of 1-5, how do you feel about redevelopment on the south sides of the Lexington-Larpenteur intersection that would include stand-alone buildings housing national chain retail?

1 Welcome It	2	3 Neutral	4	5 Strongly Opposed
3	7	4	5	20

Question 4: Please add any additional comments or feedback concerning all issues/concerns.

NON-SUPPORTIVE COMMENTS:

This should be considered first and foremost a residential area, with commercial concerns being secondary.

I would love to see the entire corner turned into greenspace with a large covered bus shelter, for the numerous busses that travel on Larpenteur. I have very strong concerns about my street (Dunlap) turning into an alternate north-south route for Lexington. There are many children in this area and I routinely see people running the stop sign (Dunlap and Iowa) already.

The most important issue to me is to maintain the residential character of California and Idaho avenues. I am afraid that if commerce begins encroaching, that will negatively affect these areas of the neighborhood in terms of being quiet, low traffic areas to raise my children.

I have a hard time justifying any plan that would encroach on to California to build an already existing pharmacy at an intersection where there are already two pharmacies. Especially considering a third pharmacy at the intersection recently went out of business...and there is vacant retail space at the many strip malls at all 4 corners of this intersection. When we purchased our home on Idaho, we specifically did not want to be on California because we did not want to be "one block away" from all of the strip mall retail...this would potentially open the door to the commercialization of California and could encroach into the residential character of the neighborhood...I do not want to see that happen in the name of a big-box pharmacy war...in driving around suburbs, I see numerous intersections ringed with 3 big box pharmacy stores, one on each corner...and eventually one is driven out of business, leaving a hulking empty store...if I wanted to live by that, I could have bought a much bigger home in Maple Grove..we chose to live in St. Paul to not be around that type of development.

MGM took a lot of the community's concerns into consideration. The only comment I have is that I do not think the exit/entrance on Lexington will work and that it will cause accidents.

Any retail space should serve the neighborhood, not those traveling through it.

Turning left on Lex from Walgreens is virtually impossible – lots of accidents & more traffic on California. Asking for trouble.

As it is now, MGM has to be reminded to shovel in the winter, rake and keep up the properties in general in the summer. Keep the houses as they are. We don't want Walgreens or MGM in the neighborhood.

We are concerned that Walgreens customers will not be able to turn left onto Lexington they will turn right and then turn right again onto California to reach Dunlap to access Carpenter and access the left turn lane onto Lexington.

Cutting off backyards and adding traffic will not lead to owners staying in our neighborhood. I think it will lower home values on California. A big box store does not fit this neighborhood at all.

I do not think this adds one thing to our neighborhood. It will also encourage another big box store on the East side of Lex on Larp. There is no way this neighborhood should have to put up with all the traffic and noise. Let's not fix something that is not broken.

Losing intimacy of "small town" feel of the neighborhood. Bigger is not better. Pedestrian and bike traffic getting lost.

It is very disturbing that developers are buying up residential properties with the hopes of rezoning our neighborhood. There is retail space available on the other side of the intersection. I don't think the neighborhood needs another large chain retail store. Redeveloping the unsafe and quite frankly ugly corners on the south side of the intersection would be great, but not to the detriment of the neighborhood. Something similar to the unique shop/restaurant area on Como Ave by the Finnish Bistrow and Muffuletta's would be great. The shop buildings tie in with the architecture of the surrounding homes. The shops are unique to the area and encourage getting out of your car and walking around.

Take the extra time to develop a plan that better serves the needs of all. We can do better than this but not faster than this.

The proposed building is just too big for the site. Redevelopment should fit without sacrificing residential property or the livability of the neighborhood.

Traffic and parking are bound to increase with either plan. I am still concerned about an increase in cut through traffic as a result of the addition of a big-box drug store. If a plan is approved I would like the neighborhood to set some assistance from St. Paul transit for traffic calming strategies. I also believe the neighborhood should be insistent in holding Walgreens/development companies to details such as building style/materials, planting/greenspace and delivery schedules.

I am very concerned about the decrease in my property value due to less desirable neighborhood aesthetics such as traffic, noise, light pollution, etc. I am also concerned about the precedence that is set once business development is allowed to encroach on the neighborhood (i.e., more development to follow). I feel that, during this economic climate, it is particularly hard on residents whose home values have already decreased and are harder to sell. I have also noticed that the properties abutting such "residential businesses" all too often turn into rentals or apartment complexes. This further negatively affects the climate and appeal of the neighborhood.

As a Mother of a young child, I am very concerned about traffic levels and safety on California Ave. and at the Lex/Larp intersection. There is already cut-through traffic on our block and with the proposed development, the issue of backed-up traffic can only worsen, forcing more traffic to cut-through. Our family has put down roots in this wonderful community, but if that sense of safe and charming community leaves, we and others who value the quality of the neighborhood, may be pressed to leave also.

Why are we accommodating to everything that MGM Liquor wants done on Lexington and Larpenteur? We're fighting for residential property rights against commercializing parts of California Avenue. This all began when MGM tore down the fence in the alley. It was almost like they were testing the waters to see how far they could go. They should have left the alley alone and used their own commercial property for expansions, etc. Now they are trying to take over portions of residential property and make them commercial property. They are also eliminating half of the alley. Why can they decide what's right for our neighborhood? They didn't have to take parts of the properties they paid over \$200,000 for each of five (5) homes and make them commercial. Why would the City of St. Paul allow a commercial property owner to purchase 5 residential properties and allow a portion of them to be vacant for so long? Tearing down one or two of the houses and putting in two two-loane driveways changes the look of California Ave and takes away parking spaces.

I am not opposed to any specific company/chain, etc. I do oppose a business that would define its success as hundreds of short term customers driving in and out of its parking lot throughout the day, especially during rush hour.

I have lived on my block for 30 of my 42 years and have seen numerous near accidents when traveling south on Lexington just after crossing Larpenteur, when drivers attempt to turn in or out of the driveway or alley behind MGM. Adding any traffic to this location seems ridiculous if safety is a concern. Left turn into Flowerama or onto California from that same block is also a danger with a shared turn lane.

We have a beautiful neighborhood. The southern corner of Lex-Larp intersection needs a face-lift, but should be done in concert with the neighborhood. Como Park is a wonderful retreat of greenspace and water for many people not only homeowners in the area. Please do not let it be paved over for a mall/business.

Feel that if Walgreens footprint does not fit into the existing commercial space. Property owners should look for new renter/buyer.

I greatly oppose the removal of houses for business development. They can do what they want in commercial zones, but our neighborhood is vibrant. There is no reason to remove a home that is not dilapidated. While I oppose the project, the last design that was presented was more in line with the neighborhood (brick, etc.). My family does not favor box stores/chains. We support small, local businesses to the greatest extent possible. In our opinion, a chain store on the corner(s) does not improve the neighborhood.

I don't see a big box store adding anything to this middle class community of small homes. The traffic problem is bad now and it will become horrible. Thus new home owners will go elsewhere to buy. The corner is not broken let's not fix it.

Strongly opposed to 24-hour commercial enterprises and a drive-thru pharmacy. We feel this is not in keeping with the tenor of the neighborhood.

Ok with Walgreens as long as they don't have alley access, is not open 24 hours, and do not rezone the neighborhood to commercial. Leaving the houses that border its lot.

NEUTRAL COMMENTS:

Walgreens isn't the worst neighbor one could envision.

I think the recent (April 19) plan demonstrated that the neighborhood was heard in the development of the MGM site. It will be important that the same attention be given to the east side of Lexington since the Flowerama lot and adjacent lots are critically important to maintaining a strong neighborhood.

Moving forward with a good plan that can incorporate both sides of Lexington at the same time will be more beneficial for the neighborhood to bring the issues to conclusion is also important.

I have reviewed the committee's recommendations and I fully support the findings/recommendations and concerns. Thank you for your thorough review of the issues and voicing the community member's concerns.

If the MGM to Walgreens is already made accommodating the neighborhood input, it seems important to not put a national chain on both sides of Lexington – or if a national chain, then one which can be more accommodating to a variety of neighborhood needs, e.g., coffee shop, bakery, flower shop, etc.

I think the proposal and design will look much better than it does now.

I prefer having a Walgreens to a liquor store. I am concerned about how traffic into and out of parking lot will flow. Important to have good barriers/fences between commercial and residential spaces. MGM

might gain some goodwill with the community if it converted one or more of the house lots it owns on California into a small community park or garden.

I don't live close enough to this area to have huge concerns, but I would be interested to know if there are any ideas regarding development near Bandana Square and areas South of Como Park on Lexington.

New businesses will be good provided that the traffic flow will work. I have no problem with fast food, gas, whatever.

The current buildings do not particularly add to the aesthetics of the neighborhood, so I welcome change as long as it is done with adequate additional landscaping and then is well taken care of.

For access I believe access needs of residences to their homes, others (non-customers) traveling by on those streets, customers to stores, customers back to the direction in which they wish to travel, business owners and vendors servicing any businesses on the corner are all important.

I am concerned with how close the corner house will be to the fence and maintenance of the fence and what type of fence. What is going to be done about traffic on Lexington? How much will this drop my home value?

Some sort of redevelopment will obviously happen at the MGM site – MGM, Walgreens or something we have not met yet. I think it's important to collaborate with the developers and get the best possible outcome for the neighborhood. Blocking any development will get us nowhere – let's try to identify the best development for the neighborhood.

The best possible outcome includes establishing a clear and seemingly permanent boundary between the residential development and commercial development alley. Larpenteur is commercial. Lexington is not.

Any developments should improve the corner's walkability. The Flowerama area is currently walkable – good sightlines for autos and people. The MGM corner is not walkable – cars swing around the MGM building without a clear view of pedestrians on the sidewalk.

The current MGM building is a complete eyesore and I do not appreciate the cliental a liquor store brings to the neighborhood. The current MGM site does not promote living in the neighborhood and provides zero greenspace. I hope the new proposal treats the neighbors affected very well. While I do not necessarily think a drug store is the most appropriate use of the space I do feel the proposal is better than what is there now and a drug store would service the neighbors in a more appropriate fashion. I worry that we have too many strip malls and vacant spaces like the Ron Paul TV building such that we definitely need to keep commercial zoning to a minimum and do not allow any further commercial sprawl south of where it is already established.

SUPPORTIVE COMMENTS:

I think the revised Walgreens site plan is a good step. I prefer a Walgreens to a liquor store on the SW corner, if the alley is terminated at the Walgreen's lot. I think signage needs to be placed at the alley's Dunlap entrance indicating there is no alley access to the commercial property.

I feel Walgreens is a social responsible corporation and welcome it in the neighborhood. I will use it often.

I like the current Walgreens plan. I would like the houses on California currently owned by MGM to be sold or rented, occupied instead of empty and abandoned looking.

I agree with the current plan. Liquor store and headquarters need to go.

In terms of who should occupy any new development, I think it's any commercial enterprise that benefits the neighborhood – chain or otherwise – and I think an improved Walgreen's is a positive. (And maybe if Ted's closes, someone could pick up that liquor license and open a charming neighborhood bistro or a wine bar in the area. That's what we really need.