

Summary of Responses from May 29, 2003 Workshop Comprehensive Plan Update, Village of Hampshire

The following is a summary of responses received by individuals who participated in the May 29, 2003 Comprehensive Planning workshop. The purpose of the meeting was to present four plans prepared for a subarea of the Comprehensive Plan and to collect feedback from the audience. The items listed below were identified as important assets, problems or opportunities for improvement of two Subarea plans selected for the workshop exercise. One of the plans represents the first draft plan (PAC Plan) prepared at the April 23rd Planning Advisory Committee meeting and the other represents an alternative prepared by Planning Resources, Inc. (Plan "B"). The Planning Advisory Committee will use these responses to help determine a final land use pattern for the Subarea encompassing approximately a mile wide corridor along U.S. Route 20 from the Tollway to Starks Corner.

Question #1 – *What are the assets and strengths of each plan?*

Plan B	PAC Plan
Non-residential Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Presence of business park and commercial space ▪ No industrial strip along Route 20 ▪ Clustering and distribution of commercial 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Presence of business park and commercial space ▪ More concentration of industry along tollway
Transportation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Direct access to highway near commercial uses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Disperses traffic flow
Forest Preserve <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recognition of open space expansion ▪ Transition between forest preserve and commercial 	
Open Space <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Appearance of open space ▪ Greenway corridors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Appearance of open space ▪ Greenway corridors
Residential <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Large residential lots 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Large residential lots ▪ Less housing density

Question #2 – *What do you believe are potential problems that might result from the plans?*

Plan B	PAC Plan
<p>Commercial Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Commercial development at Starks Corner might compromise the aesthetic value of Hampshire’s gateway 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Commercial development at Starks Corner might compromise the aesthetic value of Hampshire’s gateway ▪ Retail at Tollway will compromise the forest preserve’s natural setting ▪ Commercial uses provide less open space ▪ Too much commercial density
<p>Residential</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ High residential densities ▪ Schools will face overcrowding ▪ High density residential is too close to estate and business park uses ▪ Too much population generated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ High residential densities ▪ Schools will face overcrowding ▪ High density residential is too close to estate and business park uses
<p>Forest Preserve</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does not provide a transition for the forest preserve
<p>Transportation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Roads as they exist today will become more dangerous as development increases 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Roads as they exist today will become more dangerous as development increases ▪ Presents traffic congestion problems
<p>Strip Development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Extensive “Randall Road” type development ▪ Strip development is monotonous and provides poor aesthetic value ▪ Strip development promotes traffic problems

177
~~176~~

Question #3 – Identify areas where you would change the land use or the intensity of development proposed.

Plan B	PAC Plan
<p>Growth Limits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Limit development of vacant land to 3% per year 	
<p>Starks Corners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Deemphasize commercial and business ▪ Plan for High School location to act as a community gateway ▪ Use landscape buffers to soften commercial uses ▪ Move approximately 80 acres of business park to the Tollway 	
<p>Parks/Open Space</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use utility ROW's to create greenways with bike and walking paths ▪ Add golf course southwest of Brier Hill and Big Timber ▪ Extend forest preserve north to U.S. Route 20 	
<p>Residential</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduce high density residential to medium density ▪ Reduce low density residential to estate ▪ Establish low density as residential standard 	
<p>Regional Shopping Mall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Move regional shopping mall to Allens Corners ▪ Convert commercial northeast of U.S. Route 20 into business park/industrial 	
<p>Mixed Use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Allow the entire area north of U.S. Route 20 to develop into commercial, office, industrial and residential uses as markets permit 	

178
179

Summary of Responses from July 23, 2003 Workshop Comprehensive Plan Update, Village of Hampshire

The following is a summary of responses, both written and verbal, received from individuals who participated in the July 23, 2003 Comprehensive Planning workshop. The purpose of the meeting was to present a Draft Future Land Use Map for the 41 square mile Comprehensive Planning area and to obtain feedback from the audience regarding the plan. A majority of the feedback received came from residents living just west of the forest preserve. Items listed below were identified as important assets, problems or opportunities for improvement of the land use plan presented.

The Draft Future Land Use Map represents the progress made at previous Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) meetings where the PAC and Planning Resources developed a land use map for the entire planning area. The draft plan takes into account the Subarea Plan, which was presented to the public at the May 29, 2003 Town Hall Meeting. The Planning Advisory Committee will use the responses collected at this workshop to help determine a final land use plan to be presented at a tentatively scheduled September 10, 2003 Town Hall Meeting.

Question #1 – What are the assets and strengths of the Draft Future Land Use Map?

1. **Non-residential Development**
 - Tax base created by non-residential uses, particularly the commercial, office, industrial and business along I-90
 - Commercial and industrial mix
 - Abundant opportunity for commercial development provided by the 41 sq. mile planning area
 - Clustered commercial, versus strip development (Randall Road)
 - Non-residential land uses that take tax burden off of homeowners
2. **Transportation**
 - Several N-S connector roads
 - Clustered non-residential development that keeps truck traffic out of Estate Residential
 - Commuter station hubs that present commercial development opportunity and alternative transportation choices
 - Outer Belt location west of Walker Road to allow Hampshire to grow further west
3. **Open Space**
 - Connected greenway corridors that provide a convenient separation of land uses as well as protection for local wildlife

Question #2 – What are potential problems that might result from implementing the plan?

1. **Agriculture**
 - Change, from agriculture to another land use doesn't necessarily represent the property owners intentions
 - Impact on wetlands and major stands of trees

2. **Residential**
 - Change in rural character of the community caused by high density residential
 - Traffic impact on the community caused by Multi-family residential
 - Deterioration of multi-family housing due to a lack of maintenance
 - Low-density residential at Big Timber and Ketchum inconsistent with residential to South
3. **Forest Preserve**
 - Lack of horse paths leading to the Forest Preserve
 - Residents will no longer be able to ride safely to the equestrian trails if traffic along Ketchum Road is increased
 - Medium density residential north of the Forest Preserve takes away from the preserve's character
4. **Transportation**
 - The amount of traffic generated will present safety issues, particularly for those riding horses on local roads
 - Connection between Brier Hill and Ketchum will increase traffic along Ketchum thereby cutting off people from the Forest Preserve
 - Existing roads will not be able to support the increase in population
 - Horse owners will be hurt by changing Ketchum to a major road
5. **Other**
 - Pollution, litter and congestion that comes with increased density
 - Compromising property rights of current land owners.
 - Municipal services that are diminished by new development
 - Lack of commercial needed to support schools

Question #3 – Identify areas where you would change the type, pattern or intensity of land use?

1. **Transportation**
 - Consider an underpass at major roads that intersect the rail road tracks
 - Remove the Brier Hill / Ketchum Road connection to benefit equestrian uses
2. **Residential**
 - Reduce densities at corner of Kelley and Harmony to Estate
 - Reduce densities near Ketchum and Big Timber to Estate
 - Reduce densities near Route 72 and Romke to Estate
 - Reduce densities between Allen and SOO Line to Estate to reduce traffic along Allen
 - Propose residential densities similar to the existing residential densities
 - Propose residential densities near Ketchum and Big Timber consistent with Estate shown in the current plan
 - Keep areas outside of the Village rural and open
 - Preserve the rural atmosphere of Hampshire with Large Lot Residential
3. **Forest Preserve**
 - Add horse trails that lead from Kelley Road to the Forest Preserve
 - Use pipeline easements to create greenways with bike and walking paths
 - Create connections between the higher residential areas and the Forest Preserve

- Kelly Road will be destroyed by making it a collector
- Existing wells will not support projected population (2)
- The non-residential uses won't be able to support themselves
- Non-residential properties won't increase tax revenue due to tax abatement incentives
- Plan assumes development is a inevitability
- No passenger rail service to downtown
- Downtown will die
- Alternatives to the Ketchum road Brier Hill N-S connection should be reviewed

Question #3 – *What changes would you make to the Draft Comprehensive Plan?*

- More Estate Lots (29)
- Decrease densities as the distance from the downtown increases
- Establish larger min. lot size in rural areas (4)
- Use Estate Residential land uses from the current Comprehensive Plan (2)
- Change min. lot size to 15,000 sq. ft.
- Change min. lot size to 18,000 sq. ft. (2)
- Estate Residential should surround large developments (2)
- Establish min. lot sizes as opposed to maximum densities (7)
- Require larger lot size minimums to allow for porches, pools and 3-car garages
- Allow well and septic everywhere (2)
- Reduce amount of residential land (population)
- Less Density to preserve character
- More open space to preserve existing landscape (6)
- Define open space (no golf course or manicured field)
- Location of park and open space dedication needs to be absolute, rather than requested by Village
- Preserve more farmland (4)
- Forest preserve should be expanded
- Develop tree preservation ordinance
- Fewer large parks and no small parks to keep maintenance costs down
- Remove townhomes from entire plan/reduce amount (11/1)
- Don't allow conservation design subdivisions which place homes closer together, thereby creating a ghetto
- Multifamily housing should be mixing into other types of residential, not segregated.
- Multifamily units should all be owner occupied
- Limit the amount and class of people moving here
- Prohibit signage at the entrance to subdivisions
- No homeowners associations
- Reduce amount of residential and replace with land uses that will provide tax revenue
- Impact fees need to be added and increased (6)
- Residential development should be delayed until there is enough tax generating uses to support residential development (4)
- Growth should be controlled and slow (i.e. Barrington Hills, limit permits) (9)
- Move TOD west of French/Harmony overpass, closer to downtown that proposed
- Remove the link between Ketchum Road and Brier Hill Road (4)
- 120' of ROW needed on all roads

182
781

- Required 30' setback from the road for all housing and garages
- Public transportation plan should be added
- New development will pollute air quality and water will no longer be available
- Require developers to have structural warranty for 10-15 years
- Reduce the size of commercial areas to be more rural in character
- Keep old plan
- Allow farm zoning in town (horse farms, hobby farms) (3)

Question #4 – Additional comments

- Township residents have had no say in the Plan (4)
- Representative are not listening to the resident's vision for Hampshire (12)
- Plan is not in the best interest of the current residents (4)
- The plan has developer interests in mind
- We were not given a chance to be represented (2)
- Developers should not have been interviewed (2)
- Residents should have been interviewed
- The planning process should be substantially restarted to allow more input
- Meetings were not advertised well enough (3)
- Try to broadcast email and use the internet
- Hampshire residents don't want to be "rural-like", they want to stay rural (6)
- Even though it might take years for this development to occur, many residents don't want it to ever occur (2)
- We need to prepare for development and not react to it
- Plan should consider fifty years into future rather than 20-30
- Business will come without rooftops (i.e. Plano/I-55 interchange) (4)
- Follow suit of similar community that has had success
- Marengo has a minimum lot size of 15,000 sq. ft. and they still have developers wanting to develop
- Conservation Subdivision design does not create open space nor decrease densities
- 85' wide lots is not a good idea
- Reducing lot width to 85' will result in a loss of trees
- Density bonuses should not be allowed because guidelines are too loosely formed
- You are asking us to quadruple our size in four years
- The plan needs to present creative ways to plan for a rural country town
- Development is not inevitable (3)
- Marengo was able to stop a developer (Kennedy Homes)
- Eliminate all new proposed development (2)
- The impact of traffic on quality of life has been under-emphasized (2)
- Existing roads shouldn't be connected
- Higgins will be the main shortcut off Harmony Road for major development, however it won't be able to support a 10 fold increase in traffic
- Connection of Melms to Big Timber goes through an old farmstead
- Water is a limited resource with the existing development
- Developers need to be willing to respect our standards of living and be supportive of our educational funding problem
- Developers should pay 100% of impacts

- Current impact fee is too low (2)
- Major sewer and water lines need to be added
- Remove from District 300
- What good is a plan if it can be so easily changed
- What is the legal bearing of this Plan
- How about an oil refinery
- How likely is locating a school at the Tamms Farm

E:\Comprehensive Planning\203006-00 Hampshire\Town Meetings\Meeting #4\Summary of Responses.doc

184
~~183~~