



PUBLIC MEETING #2 RESULTS

FEEDBACK FORM SUMMARY

JULY 9, 2013

This results report summarizes all of the feedback received during the second round of public input. It includes the 102 total feedback forms that were turned in before the July 3 deadline. The 102 feedback forms were comprised of 46 turned in at the Public Meeting, 9 mailed in to our office and 47 completed online.

The report shows the number of individual responses for each level of support or agreement for every question asked. It also provides an average weighted score that represents the overall level of support or agreement.

Each response was weighted as follows:

Do Not Support = 1

Neutral = 3


Strongly Support = 5

EXAMPLE:

Goal A
Preserve farmland

Do Not Support	Neutral	Strongly Support
1	2	15
	2	81

Average Score
4.7



LAND USE

VISION FOR THE FUTURE

A “rural-residential” landscape and lifestyle
 Limited, attractive businesses that serve residents
 Preserved open spaces that enhance environmental quality

Goal	Do Not Support	Neutral	Strongly Support	Average Score	Visual Scale
Goal A Preserve farmland	1	2	15	4.7	
Goal B Maintain rural residential character	2	0	8	4.8	
Goal C Ensure commercial development preserves rural character	5	2	8	4.5	
Goal D Protect the natural environment	0	2	9	4.8	

COMMENTS: I would like to see smaller farms (<50 acres) preserved as well. Strictly limit commercial development. Hilliard-Rome Rd. satisfies my consumer needs. Increase flood protection and drainage throughout the township. Landowners should be able to decide how to use their land. Existing farmland needs preserved.

COMMUNITY

VISION FOR THE FUTURE

A strong community identity
 An economically viable agricultural community
 Well-established partnerships with neighboring jurisdictions

Goal	Do Not Support	Neutral	Strongly Support	Average Score	Visual Scale
Goal A Promote the township’s unique characteristics	2	0	14	4.8	
Goal B Support a viable local food system	9	2	23	4.1	
Goal C Encourage cooperative and complementary development in the Hilliard Growth Area	10	5	21	3.8	

COMMENTS: Preserve Brown’s current state. I dislike what is happening in the Hilliard Growth Area, but feel helpless to stop it. I support farm and produce operations, like Kuhlweins. Need a better definition of local “food system.”

TRANSPORTATION

VISION FOR THE FUTURE

A road system that preserves rural character and safely accommodates all users

Goal	Do Not Support	Neutral	Strongly Support	Average Score	Support Scale
Goal A Improve the safety of the road network	5	8	18	4.0	
Goal B Ensure that roadways reinforce the rural character of the township	2	0	7	4.6	
Goal C Create a roadway network that allows for orderly development and traffic management	15	8	11	3.7	
Goal D Improve bicycle and pedestrian safety and accessibility	29	5	18	3.2	

COMMENTS: Do not use retaining rural character as an excuse to sacrifice safety. Lower speed limits. Do not improve roadways to encourage development. This is a rural community – not focused around pedestrian and bike traffic.


ADDITIONAL GOALS

SUGGESTED GOALS

- Stormwater management and flooding
- Historic preservation
- Property tax relief


FARMLAND PRESERVATION OVERLAY

Do you agree with the criteria used to create the Farmland Preservation Overlay?



COMMENTS: Not conducive to the future of Brown Township. 50 acres to too large of an area. More farmland should be preserved.

Do you support 20-acre minimum lot sizes in the farmland preservation overlay area?




COMMENTS: I would support a 10 acre minimum.

Do you support the transfer of development rights to compensate landowners for preserving farmland?



COMMENTS: This is unclear. How is it enforced? Are there any examples of this elsewhere? This is the only way to preserve farmland into the future.

If state legislation does not enable us to implement a transfer of development rights program, do you still support revising zoning regulations to require 20-acre minimum lot sizes in the Farmland Preservation Overlay?



COMMENTS: This will hurt/destroy small farms. I support a 10 acre minimum.

What kinds of agricultural support businesses are appropriate for this area? (check all that apply)



COMMENTS: Small, home-based businesses should be allowed, like kennels, landscapers, and home-renovators. Would prefer things that don't leave a large footprint on the landscape like grain mills would.

CONSERVATION DEVELOPMENT

If development were to occur, would you prefer conventional development or conservation development?




If conservation development is not feasible, would you prefer conventional development or preserved farmland?



COMMENTS: Both options should be available to landowners. Are there examples of conservation development? Storm water control and traffic impacts need to be considered.

RURAL COMMERCIAL DESIGN GUIDELINES

Do you agree with these guidelines?




If development were to occur, what kinds of commercial uses are appropriate? (check all that apply)



COMMENTS: If commercial development cannot be prevented, these are good guidelines to maintain rural character. Should consist of all small businesses – no chains or retail. Commercial development will make traffic even worse.

FUTURE LAND USE MAP


If development occurs in the future, these land uses are appropriate for the areas shown on the map.



COMMENTS: The commercial area is too close to the school. There should be no commercial development in the township. More farmland should be included in the Farmland Preservation Overlay.

RURAL ROAD DESIGN GUIDELINES

Do you agree with these guidelines?



COMMENTS: Maintain rural roadway character when improving roads. Need more speed limit and curve warning signs on roadways. Safety should be the top consideration.

** These questions were not offered in the online survey.*

TELL US HOW WE'RE DOING

What interests or concerns caused you to attend this meeting?

COMMENTS: Development pressure, preserving rural character, protecting the natural environment, traffic issues and wanting a voice in the planning process.

Do you feel that your interests or concerns were adequately addressed? Yes **34** No **8**

If no, please explain: Not enough information provided on some topics.

Did you feel the information was presented in a clear manner? Yes **42** No **5**

If no, please explain: Somewhat, some things were hard to understand.

Was tonight's meeting valuable to you? Yes **44** No **4**

If no, please explain: Frustrating, feels like we can't stop development.

Please rate the length of tonight's meeting: Too Long **5** Too Short **2** Just Right **34**

Will you continue to participate in the planning process? Yes **47** No **0**

GENERAL COMMENTS

- We feel somewhat helpless, like what we suggest doesn't change anything
- Not enough time to digest information before filling out survey
- Spent too much time on planning process
- Surveys should go out to residents that couldn't come to the meeting
- More questions by residents would help
- Flooding issues need to be addressed
- Plan needs a historic preservation component