

Full Block

- Land assembly would be difficult
- Street frontage is important

Power Plant

- Site to get housing near downtown
- Possible site for senior housing
- Reuse of structure could provide "legacy"
- Students would enjoy location park/downtown

Working Group – Discussion Notes

Halliday – Max Rental

- Could MSUM own property/maintain homes?
- How could parking be controlled?
- Best use is townhomes, because it fits with neighborhood
- 4th Avenue has emergency route access
- Privately owned condo would lead to better maintenance
- Good area for rental versus T&C

T&C Flowers

- Lower density, preferably townhomes
- Vacating Elm Street might cause problems with fire, garbage, plowing
- Flood issues?
- High site reclamation cost
- Might explore commercial option

MU

- Should be half-block, to protect neighborhood
- 2 stories
- Reconsider Comp Plan
- Is MSUM/Concordia enough to support business
- Students don't need additional retail
- What is the intention of the gateway
- Infrastructure issues with mixed use
- Redevelop single-family homes
- IN favor of half-block development, but opposed to anything off of 8th
- Nice bookstore, operated by college and U

Power Plant – Residential Option

- Creative arts center – theater
- Should be a slow process to determine site use
- Block north of power plant may be separate of PP. Could be different use.
- Residential would generate most tax base

- Moorhead has a lot of exempt property
- Ideal location for senior housing

Power Plant – Community Center Concept

- Sewer lift station where Woodlawn Road located
- Good sledding hill
- Woodlawn P. Dr. could flood
- Should be park land for the City
- Creative reuse is most interesting
- Hotel and water park
- Warming house for sled hill

Working Group – Feedback Forms

Halliday Property

- Either the medium density proposal or high density proposal
- Would provide more adequately for student for alumni housing
- Medium or low density to blend into neighborhood and 2? Story brick apt. bldg. On west side of 8th Street
- No commercial space. Not needed except as income to support building
- High density student housing provides more opportunities for students to live close to campus
- Townhomes – condos
- I like the look of the low density townhome drawing – it adds interest by having a curving driveway. Could be a co-housing project.
- I favor lower density housing – the new/10 townhomes. If it is going to be marketed for students, I think MSUM should buy it and control it. I'm afraid parking will be a problem in any of these plans. If you have students in the housing they don't use garages (at least in my neighborhood) and there will be 4 cars outside.
- 4th Ave. S. is a main route – emergency route – on street parking is not a good idea. Rental 20 units too dense for neighborhood. Medium or low concepts Ok but I think access of 16 St. better than using 4th Avenue.
- "Low density". Current as with a low income neighborhood. Parking big issue. Streets are narrow, not consistent with neighborhood.
- Housing development should stay within current zoning code with maybe the possibility of moving to medium density use (townhouses).
- 10 unit concept would enable adequate screening from adjacent properties – use for student housing.
- 16th Street entry only – lowest density option best
- High density won't work because of parking. 20 2-bedroom units = 80 students = 80 cars. The 13 townhomes might increase affordable housing.
- Prefer low density plan – more "in time" with neighborhood
- 10 townhouses – 1st choice – let's keep families. 13 townhouses 2nd choice. 20 apartment units 3rd choice.
- Low density – because it minimizes the potential for negative impact on the surrounding neighborhood.

- Low density townhome. As a property owner in that area, I might consider that as future housing for myself.
- Good place for rental between low and medium density
- Medium density seems best – provides high number of units that seem to fit the neighborhood; the HD plan doesn't fit well, and the LD is too few units.
- Use lowest density option.
- 10 townhome
- Townhomes to blend in with neighborhood rental or condos if neighborhood approves

Power Plant Site

- 1st choice – community center + townhomes. Nicely connects Woodlawn Park with River Park. Is realistic given limited road access to area
- 2nd choice – medium density, high density unacceptable. Limited road access especially during times of flooding are serious problems for these plans
- Keep space as open as possible with view of Fargo
- Community center concept. In conjunction with the trollwood move to S. Moorhead provides a big boost for the arts in Moorhead. Housing increases shouldn't be Moorhead's only concern.
- Housing – high end condos
- Possible hotel/water park
- Senior housing makes sense
- Condo tower is an attractive idea for great use of views and location – not reuse of plant probably to difficult after the discussion started "what about an arboretum?"
- I'm personally interested in upscale condos but these buildings seem huge. After I have seen the plans, I guess I'm more interested in some community center concepts. Would it be possible to have some aspects of the community center but a little more housing on the community center concept? Could we have riverfront parkland and some housing backed away from the river? I love the amphitheater idea.
- This is the most interesting site, but I'm not sure what to make of it. If I thought Moorhead needed a 40,000 c.c., I'd back that but I'm not sure.
- Community center option best - public use for power plant site maintained – only sledding hill in town is to east of site – could incorporate "warming house" at top of hill and parking there would help. The north townhouses are a good idea.
- Concerns for river bank stability – affordability – lower density – senior
- It would be irresponsible to use this entire property for anything but city park. The recreational potential of this land is too valuable to waste on housing.
- Medium density – pull housing back and leave park space along the river. We need to address senior housing
- Zoned park land should stay park land. Drawing shows reroute of WP drive. This is not possible due to sewer lift station and loss of best sledding hill. Community center best.
- Prefer medium density – allows for expanded tax base but doesn't overdo size of development. Against community center plan – city has enough heritage center and upcoming trollwood – there is enough tax exempt property in Moorhead.
- Community center concept – Moorhead needs some focus as a community
- Community center.
- High density residential – would provide increased tax base.
- Retain land as park (current zoning) consider an amphitheater.

- I like the condo building (MD) or community center, but not the condo tower (HD). The former fits the neighborhood while still giving ample housing. Flooding issues – area is highly prone, will thus affect development? However, I do agree that the center map detracts from downtown. I see no demand for its facilities.
- Like condo/townhouse concept (4-story version)
- I prefer the fourteen townhome option
- Condominiums – riverfront views. 3-500K each

Town and Country Flowers

- I like either of the townhome proposals along with reducing open asphalt area and increasing park
- Low – 1 or 2 stories apt. or senior citizen housing
- 10 townhomes plan. Provides adequate green space for any new development and adds to the existing park has best option for street redevelopment'
- 200,000-300,000 property acquisition
- 100,000 demolition
- 30-40,000/unit cost – not feasible for neighborhood
- 12 townhome view with vacating of street to increase the green space of the park. Could also be a co-housing project
- It all looks good to me
- 12 townhomes or single homes – we need more of the first type of housing – don't like cul-de-sacs so lukewarm on vacating street
- Thoughts of senior housing, affordable, flooding water issue not discussed.
- Housing development should stay consistent with the single family unit surroundings.
- 10 or 12 unit townhomes would be an efficient use of the property
- Townhomes or single homes; townhomes preferred. I think you will have trouble vacating Elm Street.
- A couple of those cul-de-sacs are pretty long; what do the EB and snow plowers think?
- Prefer single family concept. Most fair to neighborhood.
- Reconfiguration of the street, Option 2, Housing – 10 townhouses
- Single family concept and expansion of park to cover asphalt (as depicted in "Option 1")
- Not a definite opinion as I do not know that area well enough to form an opinion
- Owner occupied townhomes the best fit, could be attached.
- I hate the idea of blocking Elm to create more park space. We need all the roadway we can get for proper traffic flow. The island is a great idea to reduce pavement. Both designs are fine, I have no preference.
- Like 12 townhome concept. Could be faculty housing also.
- I prefer the seven single family lots.
- Keep as commercial. Need high density housing to be cost competitive. Building demo site prep high.

Sample Mixed-Use Block

- Anything more than a half-block plan is unacceptable.
- Prefer attractive quiet apartments with lots of green space, trees and possibly patios. Only two story bldg. With apartments (rental)
- Full block concept. Can increase commercial desirability of 8th Street and downtown Moorhead. Close proximity to main avenue is crucial.

- Sound issues – exhaust fans to exhaust car fumes – echos from closing doors, due to open windows for air flow, lighting disruptive
- Mixed use block issue is missing the front setbacks that would be a downtown look. Will be an expensive project to do and some residents (owners) will be displaced in any case – what about higher density condo? No retail? Not mixed use but “interesting” higher rise. Is there city help to rebuild the homes on 8th Street as was suggested? Boutique hotel/condo?
- The only thing that I think should be considered is the half block plan. I think there should be attractive, upscale condos with some green space. I realize that it is zoned mixed use but I don’t see why each block has to be mixed use. I am surprised that Moorhead thinks they need any more retail space. We have empty retail space downtown at the old BJ’s decorating and in the Holiday Mall area. What I think would be more interesting would be to restore those old houses (if possible) for offices, etc. and keeping the green space.
- 8th Street – between 5th and 7th Avenue – ½ block best in order to preserve 7th St. and 9th St. historic neighborhoods. Most needed redevelopment between 6th and 7th Ave./east side of 8th.
- 8th Street – w/o location undetermined, 4th to 17th Ave. ½ block low density, no commercial, clean up and preserve area.
- Mixed use should stay strictly within the ½ block of 8th St. I don’t think MSUM and Concordia have the populations to support mixed use off of 8th Street.
- I think that the half-block concept along 8th Street should be extended along 7th Avenue from 8th Street to 11th.
- 8th Street from 4th Ave. to 7th Ave. Whole block idea is a non-starter. The Knapp Park (west side of 8th) and Comstock (east side) neighborhoods will never go for it and the Comp Plan should be changed. No mixed use on 7th Avenue. ½ block development would have to be smaller. 2 story max. ½ block would only work between 6th Ave. and 7th Ave. and only if the residents behind were absolutely happy with it. Comp Plan needs serious reconsideration. Perhaps the city needs to consider registering on street parking?
- I can’t imagine any business plan that would make either site plan work.
- Preference would depend on location. Do not feel any need in area of 9th and 10th Streets. If continued to 8th Street, preference would be ½ block concept.
- ½ block concept only otherwise 9th and 7th Streets will be lost.
- Full block.
- ½ block concept
- Full block development is unacceptable. Also not economically feasible.
- I like the full block – better transition spaces, since we don’t directly go to existing houses, and seems to provide more options overall.
- Appears half block idea is only feasible option per current zoning. Anything would be better than what is there.
- I prefer the full block concept that has commercial as part of it.
- Retain historic neighborhood. College students around 8 months, gone weekends.

Additional Concerns

- Road noise – hard surface acoustic problems – keep residential
- Mixed use is a great idea if the area is not impacted by the addition of a disharmonious neighbor – the 8th Street question does not have a clean ½ block to work with unless some owners – occupied homes are included. I think the owner-occupants might not want either the additional parking problems or the change in the look of the neighborhood. We have 3 of the bad houses in the area and would look favorably on a new project with the cities ideas.

- The one business both colleges and the community needs is a bookstore – why not operate one together on 8th?
- Wish for greater information to make informed decision.
- Start on the Halliday property and hang fire on the rest.
- Overriding all concepts must be the thought that any development must be with a willing seller and a willing buyer - no use of eminent domain on part of city.
- Student populations expected to decline, senior population will grow, both schools have land they could develop for students.
- Is there any option, other than townhomes, to utilize the spaces with the same density?