

## *APPENDIX 7-2*

### *COMMENTS FROM TOUR OF DEVELOPMENT SITES*

September 30, 2008

#### **When considering today's tour, which three (3) ideas or concepts would you like to see incorporated as we plan for Kenosha County's future, and why?**

- Concentrate on redevelopment of brown field areas before developing new areas.
- Use utilities, sewer, water wisely – create density around those improvements.
- My observation about rural McHenry County was that they did a good job at limiting “isolated” residential subdivisions. The concept of expanding existing cities, villages and town centers should be promoted.
  
- Promote residential development closer to mass transit routes and/or closer to jobs to allow for walking, bus riding, trains or biking to work and stores.
- Encourage higher density transit-oriented development at appropriate sites.
- Woodstock Station – The vision is excellent.
  
- We need to plan for the interconnection of non-motorized trails (i.e., bike, pedestrian) on a countywide basis.
- Walking trails – road profiles – wide enough.
  
- Rethink how storm water management is handled. Consider redirecting and absorbing the energy of storm water over rip rap etc. instead of storm sewers or retention ponds.
- Ponds – detention – using natural features/wetlands for storage.
- Natural stormwater management.
- Rock waterfall – drainage – tile? No gutters, rainfall soaks into grassy areas.
- Some interesting stormwater concepts.
- Open ditch conservancy and clustering of homes for more affordable housing; preservation of open space.
- Loved the waterfall feature for the retention pond at Bull Valley and the entire look of the pond.
  
- Encourage agricultural use in areas not served by municipal utilities.
- Green space requirements approach. Saving wetlands and corridor spaces seem like a good concept.
- Provide accelerated review/approval (like Chicago) as incentive for environmentally sensitive design.
- Allowed wetlands, environmental areas to count towards density or allow more density in building area.
  
- Integration of living/recreation/conservation in single planned development.
- Public parkland – reasonable developer contributions for the benefit of the whole public.
  
- Set standards for development - if developer cannot or will not meet standards, approval will be denied, not renegotiated.
  
- More flexibility to allow innovative solutions to land development vs. standard “cookie cutter” approach which will pass (get approval) without controversy or thought.

- I really liked the feel for the first subdivisions around the Bull Valley Golf Course. Not necessarily because of the size and value of the homes but the densities and amount of green space between and around the homes. This is in direct contrast to what is happening at Strawberry Creek which is, in my opinion, very poorly done. The idea of using a maximum percentage of the lot size that can be covered by the home is very appealing to me. Conservancy land with costs shared by all homeowners is a way to ensure things are properly maintained.
- The Reserve and Sanctuary had the most desirable. Streets need to be wide. People should be able to decide if they want side entry garages or in front of the house.
- The Ponds at Bull Valley parks look more attractive.
- Ridgeview looked fresh and wholesome.
  
- Shared driveway for 3-4 homes – affordable housing, zero lot line idea.
  
- Subdivision plans have continually improved over the last 15 years – simply because developers have migrated north in many scenarios – just like people have in Kenosha County, whom have brought their designs from past projects. Joint cooperation between all City, villages and unincorporated townships must remain top priority for the whole of Kenosha County.
- As a whole, my preference is in Kenosha thanks.
  
- We did not address non-residential development on today’s tour. Development standards for commercial and industrial land use need to be addressed and appropriate policies considered.

**Which three (3) ideas or concepts do you like the least, and why?**

- Both “conservation” subdivisions in Walworth were prime examples of how not to do it. Open space may have been preserved, but the land is now of no use to future generations. The first subdivision used up a disproportionate amount of land for roadway, exposing every house to the ag land, increasing likelihood of conflicts, likelihood of trespassing into fields. Prime example of poor planning. We should be planning on how to live with fewer resources - both of these constitute unsustainable lifestyles - located far from transportation and services. By Nancy’s own statement - located on prime soils.
- We saw a lot of sprawl today. Woodstock is using up a lot of land for a city of its population.
- The two “conservation” subdivisions in Walworth County did preserve natural environmental features, but I was not impressed by the lot layout and site design... Big lots and big houses in rural areas with the environmental areas preserved which should happen regardless.
- I don’t like the idea of converting a lot of open space to a subdivision for only a few houses, like the one subdivision we toured with 5-acre lots for only a “handful” of homes. Although beautiful, it isn’t the most efficient use of land.
- Large lots are not cluster sites.
  
- Poor architecture and design. We saw a lot of unattractive housing today. Will be dated soon. We should be avoiding cookie cutter designs. The developments at Bull Valley showed what Strawberry Creek could have been with some architectural design integrity.
- Single-sided architecture – encourage “design” on all four facades.
  
- The vast majority of the housing that was viewed today was not “affordable.” This is something that will need to be addressed more effectively in the Kenosha Plan.
- Conservation developments are great, but are they affordable when the dirt is so expensive?

- Be careful what you wish for. Know the price range of your homeowners and their limits. Wisconsin is conservative. People can't justify huge monthly or yearly expenses to preserve open space, yet want to enjoy them.
- Street grid solutions on rolling sites.
- Too narrow of roads, especially at entrance of developments.
- Too narrow of roads in some of the subdivisions, with trees planted too close to the roads.
- Make trees far enough away when planting streetscape for school buses, garbage trucks.
- Applewood was a disaster as far as I was concerned. Garages were absolutely terrible and it was way too populated. School buses couldn't come in and God forbid you have a fire.
- The large common driveways with parking areas in the Kimball Hill development.
- Side-load garages were inconvenient – hard to pull into or back out of.
- While interconnecting the various Woodstock subdivisions was accomplished, the creation of "neighborhoods" was not.
- Housing quality in Illinois subdivisions vary greatly. Life cycle would be of concern to me.

\* \* \* \* \*