

## **“It’s all about parking!” – John Goodhue**

When I first heard about that the River Center was putting their property up for sale, I thought, “O Lord, no! Anything but!” Yet, now, I think God has a plan (typical with God’s sense of humor), which is gift wrapped in this parking lot. Yes, it’s all about parking- no doubt, but this gift is also about the opportunity for us to focus on the future of All Saints’. In my wildest imagination did I ever think God’s presence would come to us through a parking lot, but here we are with this wonderful opportunity to see how God’s dream for us is revealing itself. No matter what we decide to do with this new property, it is intrinsically linked with our next steps in launching a necessary capital campaign.

I have outlined seven different scenarios, with pros (opportunities) and cons (concerns) and additional questions associated with each option; hopefully they can be used to inform our discussions and guide our decisions. As you read these scenarios, please keep the following issues in mind as you discern: (1) it’s about parking; (2) it’s about our vision and future for All Saints’; and (3) it’s about launching a capital campaign. We are all in agreement that this time for discernment (until July 31<sup>st</sup>) is very important to listen to God, to each other, and to possible opportunities for our future. Amen to that!

The order of the scenarios is random.

### ***SCENARIO #1:***

This option (after removal of the rear shed portion) involves placing **both building #44 (small house) and building #46 (larger house)** on the real estate market, sometime following our purchase of the River Center property.

#### **Pros:**

- The sale of both buildings should provide funds to satisfy the \$200,000 bank loan and possibly restore a portion of the monies we pulled from our own reserve fund. This would eliminate the significant loan debt and restore a possible portion of the loss of interest incurred by the depletion of the reserve fund.
- The sale of the buildings will avoid ongoing expenses associated with the cost for maintenance, utilities, insurance, etc
- Gives clear direction for capital campaign that does not involve buildings.

#### **Cons:**

- Sale of the buildings eliminates the opportunity for the parish to integrate these facilities into the church's ongoing activities.
- Could we have eliminated an important aspect of a capital campaign- expanding ASC mission?
- The removal of the rear portion of the building (shed), in order to maximize parking, will involve costs for demolition (a given) and maybe partial restoration of the remaining portion of the building in order to sell #44.
- With the sale of the buildings, All Saints' relinquishes future control of how the buildings are used and maintained. The agreement of sale with the first buyers can include conditions regarding the use and maintenance of the buildings. If we make these conditions binding for any subsequent buyers, would that limit who would want to buy?

**Additional questions:**

How do we balance our need for discernment, with the possible need to sell, not losing a possible current buyer in hand? Should we be concerned about losing a “potential buyer”?

How can we do an analysis of current space used? Are we “short” space? Can we use current space more effectively? (do we need RC buildings?)

How do we balance a sense of “relief” in selling the buildings, (especially in the way a sale would address much of our debt) with possibilities of future plans involving the buildings?

Do we have bandwidth/capacity (ie people) to take on extra ministry/buildings?

Should we be concerned about how we will “limit” our parking space for only ASC parishioners? Do we want to share joint costs with Methodists (plowing, maintaining)?

**SCENARIO #2**

This option involves placing **only building #44** "*after demolition of the shed structure*" on the real estate market, sometime following our purchase of the River Center property.

**Pros:**

- The sale of the building 44 would provide funds to satisfy a portion of the \$200,000 bank loan.
- Not in the “center” of our property, so “relinquishing control” doesn’t feel as critical
- The sale of the building may avoid some of the ongoing expenses associated with costs for maintenance, utilities, insurance, etc,

**Cons:**

- Sale of the one building limits the opportunity for the parish to integrate this facility into the church's ongoing activities.
- With the sale of the building, All Saints' relinquishes future control of the how the building will be used and maintained. The agreement of sale with the first buyers can include conditions regarding the use and maintenance of the building. If we make these conditions binding for any subsequent buyers, would that limit who would want to buy?

**Additional questions:**

Selling the smaller house helps us focus on just the larger house... a sharper focus could be helpful?

**SCENARIO #3:**

This option involves placing **only building #46** "*as is*" on the real estate market, sometime following our purchase of the River Center property.

**Pros:**

- The sale of the building would provide funds to satisfy a portion of the \$200,000 bank loan. The sale of the building "as is" avoids expense for demolition or repair of the structure.

- The sale of the building will avoid ongoing expenses associated with the cost for maintenance, utilities, insurance, etc

**Cons:**

- Sale of the building eliminates the opportunity for the parish to integrate this facility into the church's ongoing activities
- With the sale of the building, All Saints' relinquishes future control of the how the building is used and maintained. The agreement of sale with the first buyers can include conditions regarding the use and maintenance of the building. If we make these conditions binding for any subsequent buyers, would that limit who would want to buy?

**Additional questions:** The focus on the smaller house could be easier to imagine, for a new ongoing ministry- transitional housing, or housing for sexton? interns? On site person? Could provide inexpensive housing in a very interesting way.

**SCENARIO #4:**

This option involves placing **only building #46** "*after the removal of the lower portion of the structure*" (adjusting the boundary of the house to allow for a small yard) on the real estate market as a single family dwelling, sometime following our purchase of the River Center property.

**Pros:**

- The sale of building #46, following removal of the lower portion of the building, will provide funds to satisfy a portion of the \$200,000 bank loan.
- The removal of the lower level portion of building #46 will result in additional parking spaces dedicated to the use for parishioner parking.
- Keeping #44 gives us opportunity to move the Serendipity Shop or create Youth Hang Out Center.

**Cons:**

- The removal of the lower level portion of building #46 will result in costs for demolition / restoration costs.
- Loss of a portion of the basement
- With the sale of the buildings, All Saints' relinquishes future control of the how the building is used and maintained. The agreement of sale with the first buyers can include conditions regarding the use and maintenance of the building. If we make these conditions binding for any subsequent buyers, would that limit who would want to buy?

**Additional questions:**

Could removing the lower later addition to the house, make the "original" house easier to sell. How would we know? Is the basement (if the Dip were to be moved) all that attractive?

**SCENARIO #5:**

This option involves retaining possession of both buildings for future use or rental by the parish.

**Pros:**

- The acquisition of the buildings will provide additional space to support the reorganization and expansion of current ministries. (Possible movement of Dip). In addition, the buildings would provide new facilities to support 'dreams' regarding future initiatives within the parish and outreach to the community.

**Cons:**

- While the buildings will provide additional space to support current and future ministries, their acquisition will add ongoing and potentially significant expenses to the operating budget.

**Additional questions:**

How do we discern if it is buildings we need?

**SCENARIO #6**

This option involves demolishing all the buildings.

**Pros:**

- Maximizes most parking, most control over our new property
- After demolition, there will be no “ongoing maintenance” insurance, etc of buildings-

**Cons:**

- Church incurs all the cost, with no opportunities to make money on either sale or use of buildings.

**Additional questions:**

What would it cost to demolish everything? Could plantings be done to protect the look of the campus? How much more parking could we get? Findings support that church parking is critical to growth, so does this gives us best potential to grow?

**SCENARIO #7**

This option involves demolishing #46, and keeping the smaller building #44

**Pros:**

- Maximizes the “next best” parking availability/control of property  
#44 is pretty solid building with lots of possible uses- for sexton, interns, Serendipity Shop, MAFB, etc.
- Could be sold later, easy to part with as it is “outside” the center of the action

**Cons:**

Cost of demolition #46

**Additional questions:**

How do we prioritize our needs/visions in determining use of #44

### **Overarching Questions Related to all Seven Scenarios:**

How do all of these scenarios work with our efforts for a capital campaign? Do we think that a capital campaign for a “longer term vision” for ASC is a better way to frame our “ask” vs. “money for a parking lot?”

What would be our vision of “saying Yes to God” for a capital campaign? (paying back loan, restoring our endowment), a longer view of maintenance and B&G needs which allow us to plan and not just react when things become emergencies, IT infrastructure.

Would our vision include a rethinking of how our spaces are allocated and used for attracting families? Does our space now limit ministries that we see as possibilities?

What about online/communication/building community? Could having more buildings be inspiring?

How can a parking lot create a “launching pad” for a capital campaign?

Is it about hospitality? Easy access? All are welcome, whoever you are, wherever you are.... Many obstacles in coming back to church.. at least parking won’t be one of the issues, so we start with a commitment to easy access.... Maybe that leads to new ministries, new use of buildings.... Better use of Reynolds Hall (underused)?

Further Ideas: