

# **Scenario Comment Form Aggregate Results**

**1. After examining the six core scenarios at Station Three, as well as the impacts that each one would have on the Township, which of these scenarios appeals to you the most? Why?**

*(NOTE: Because some individuals listed more than one scenario in their answer, results are broken down into “first choice” [the first scenario listed] and “second choice” [if a second scenario was listed]. Percentages are for first choice only.)*

### **First Choice:**

- #1 Current Zoning—14 responses (35%)
- #2 Town Center—11 responses (27.5%)
- #4 Residential Cluster—6 responses (15%)
- #3 10-Acre Buildout—4 responses (10%)
- #6 2.5-Acre Rural Estate—3 responses (7.5%)
- #5 Suburban Progression—2 responses (5%)

### **Second Choice:**

- #4 Residential Cluster—7 responses
- #2 Town Center—3 responses
- #3 10-Acre Buildout—2 responses
- #5 Suburban Progression—1 response

**2. Which scenario appeals to you the least? Why?**

*(NOTE: Because some individuals listed more than one scenario in their answer, results are broken down into “first choice” [the first scenario listed] and “second choice” [if a second scenario was listed]. Percentages are for first choice only.)*

### **First Choice:**

- #6 2.5-Acre Rural Estate—14 responses (36%)
- #5 Suburban Progression—12 responses (31%)
- #1 Current Zoning—5 responses (13%)
- #3 10-Acre Buildout—4 responses (10%)
- #2 Town Center—3 responses (8%)
- #4 Residential Cluster—1 response (3%)

### **Second Choice:**

- #6 2.5-Acre Rural Estate—6 responses
- #5 Suburban Progression—6
- #4 Residential Cluster—1 response

## **Scenario Comment Form Individual Responses**

### **1. After examining the six core scenarios at Station Three, as well as the impacts that each one would have on the Township, which of these scenarios appeals to you the most? Why?**

#1 Current Zoning—because it retains the agricultural nature of the Township. However, I believe more density is inevitable, so my second choice would be #2 Town Center, in the northern part of the Township, perhaps coupled with #4 Residential Cluster Development in the southern part of the Township.

#3 10 Acre Buildout and #4 Residential Cluster—Would really like to see residents/homeowners make their own decision—free enterprise.

#1 Current Zoning—I favor “what is,” but realistically I will not prevail. #2 Town Center—has the greatest appeal since it confines growth in a way consistent with my outlook.

#1 Current Zoning—It will allow Eureka to remain rural.

#2 Town Center—Maintains current status of Township and rural character. Second choice #4 Residential Cluster—if this were chosen, it would be important to zone or eliminate areas to lessen impact on sensitive areas (natural areas, watershed quality, etc.).

#1 Current Zoning—More farmland. I wanted to escape the city.

#2 Town Center and #4 Residential Cluster—Preserving farmland is essential if we want Eureka Township to continue in agriculture. If we become a suburb of Lakeville, farming will no longer be economically viable.

#2 Town Center—Most variety, so should please the most people. #4 Residential Cluster is also good, because it seems to allow development while preserving landscape.

#3 10-Acre Buildout and #5 Suburban Progression—least impact on farmland, gives landowner some capital if needed.

#2 Town Center and #4 Residential Cluster—don’t like monopoly in one area.

#2 Town Center—because it preserves the integrity of the rural lifestyle in Eureka,

#1 Current Zoning—it keeps the rural, low population density of the Township.

#1 Current Zoning—to preserve the natural beauty of our Township.

#4 Residential Cluster—moderate growth, more flexibility of development to take advantage of site terrain and features.

#1 Current Zoning—maintain ag and natural resources and minimize growth and development. #2 Town Center is second choice.

#5 Suburban Progression

#5 Suburban Progression

#6 2.5-Acre Rural Estate—throughout the county. #3 10-Acre Buildout—throughout the county.

#2 Town Center—this allows more development in one area without the whole Township developing. I like the TDR option at town center—more fair because other landowners can benefit too. We need a town center for a community identity—like a main street.

#2 Town Center—because it limits growth but still allows commercial growth.

#1 Current Zoning—that's why we live here. If I wanted to live in suburbia, I would move to Lakeville, Burnsville, Eagan, etc. I would consider looking at #4 Residential Cluster development—it is an idea to look at further.

#6 2.5-Acre Rural Estate or #3 10-Acre Buildout or #4 Residential Cluster—development throughout the Township.

#2 Town Center—sense of community, least impact on farmland, grocery store in center of Township.

#1 Current Zoning (with clustering)—That's why I moved here. Save what we love.

#3 10-Acre Buildout—The successes of Credit River and surrounding areas are extreme benefit to the economy. Conserving green space and allowing individual choices and freedoms to do with the parcel as one chooses—hobby, natural, horses.

#2 Town Center (with hybrid of clustering)—I would like farming to continue in the Township as well as some conveniences close by.

#4 Residential Cluster or TDR—The Township as a whole could benefit from growth.

#4 Residential Cluster

#1 Current Zoning—Protects agricultural land, easier to protect more natural area acres, lowest cost/taxes to provide services, higher quality of life, protects water quality

## #2 Town Center

#1 Current Zoning—Quality of life and land. We need to protect all the ag type related businesses from nursery/horticultural to farming that are thriving in our Township. We need to value and protect the Township's soil, wildlife, water resources. Only land pays for itself—people require services and never catch up.

#1 Current Zoning—Preserves valuable farmland—a shrinking resource, Conservation is maximized over other scenarios. Environmental issues. Quieter. Less pollution. Less traffic. Requires less government services and therefore less taxes.

#1 Current Zoning—Quality of life, Eureka is rapidly becoming an island of green in [a sea of] developing communities.

#4 Residential Cluster—Could be done without sewer problems.

#4 Residential Cluster—I like the idea of allowing development, but also keeping farmland tracts intact.

#2 Town Center—leaves more farmland still usable.

## #6 2.5-Acre Rural Estate

#3 10-Acre Buildout—better because you have your own septic and well.

#1 Current Zoning—Like the openness, wildlife, etc.

#4 Allows landowners to develop while preserving open space. Best balance of interests. Minimizes cost of infrastructure.

## **2. Which scenario appeals to you the least? Why?**

#3 10-Acre Buildout—it is a terrible waste of land. Also #5 Suburban Progression and #6 2.5-Acre Rural Estate are not only not appealing, they are appalling!

#2 Town Center and #5 Suburban Progression—afraid roads will just spring up here and there without some guidelines.

#6 2.5-Acre Rural Estate—It is contrary to why I purchased my home in Eureka!

#5 Suburban Progression—Eureka ends up looking like everyone else.

#5 Suburban Progression and #6 2.5-Acre Rural Estate—Too many people, houses, children, waste, water consumption; too little natural and farm areas.

#6 2.5-Acre Rural Estate—too little open space and farmland.

#5 Suburban Progression and #6 2.5-Acre Rural Estate—Eureka Township will simply be a suburb of Lakeville and Farmington.

#5 Suburban Progression and #6 2.5-Acre Rural Estate—Because it would kill the character of Eureka, both visually and culturally/historically,

#1 Current Zoning—Restricts landowner while taxes are increasing at 10 to 31%.

#1 Current Zoning—move toward the future, plan for growth that's coming.

#6 2.5-Acre Rural Estate—and #5 Suburban Progression—too many homes, no commercial, destroys farmland—too much like Burnsville.

#5 Suburban Progression—the progression won't stop until the entire Township is suburban.

#6 2.5-Acre Rural Estate—it is the greatest waste of land.

#5 Suburban Progression—inefficient, destroys beauty of area, too high density.

#5 Suburban Progression and #6 2.5-Acre Rural Estate—Suburban Progression would not stop and would eventually spread throughout the Township. 2.5-acre lots are a waste of land.

#1 Current Zoning

#1 Current Zoning

#2 Town Center

#6 2.5-Acre Rural Estate and #5 Suburban Progression—Way too much development. This is still an agricultural community. Let's preserve what we have as much as possible instead of throwing it away and turning into another suburb of the Twin Cities.

#6 2.5-Acre Rural Estate—I love the wide open spaces which is why I moved here in the first place.

#3 10-Acre Buildout—loss of farmland

#2 Town Center

#6 2.5-Acre Rural Estate—lose all farmland.

#5 Suburban Progression—might be OK if only in the area shown. #6 2.5-Acre Rural Estate

#3 10-Acre Buildout, #4 Residential Cluster, #5 Suburban Progression—Met Council has a open ticket to direct roads, sewer, services, development restrictions.

#3 10-Acre Buildout—waste of land, junk yards tend to form over time

#5 Suburban Progression and #6 2.5-Acre Rural Estate—Yuk!

#6 2.5-Acre Rural Estate—Does not provide for preserving ag land or natural areas, will not pay its way for services required, lower water quality (impervious cover), lower (urban) quality of life, great need for services such as roads, sewer, schools, etc.

#6 2.5-Acre Rural Estate—we do need a little open space.

#6 2.5-Acre Rural Estate and #5 Suburban Progression—rural estate is a hyperbole—it would simply become suburbia in spades with no protection of our resources, open space, or wildlife.

#5 Suburban Progression—we will become another Apple Valley; we will be just another suburb.

#6 2.5-Acre Rural Estate—land will not stand the septic or water demands.

#5 Suburban Progression—too many houses and no greenery.

#6 2.5-Acre Rural Estate—typically haven't liked other examples of this that I've seen.

#6 2.5-Acre Rural Estate

#1 Current Zoning

#4 Residential Cluster—appeals to me the least because you share the well and have to pay into it like you're in a townhome and have like association fees. Also, wouldn't the well water run dry sooner?

#5 Suburban Progression—If I wanted to live in Lakeville, I would.

#6 The Township would become a lawn

**3. Do you have any other comments or questions about the scenarios presented at tonight's open house?**

Kudos to all the members of the task force for all their hard work, time, etc. An excellent presentation.

Nothing said about Airlake.

I believe that we should allow the Township to grow based upon free market demand. Supply and demand will indicate the type of growth that occurs. People should be allowed to do with their property as they see fit. I believe that the Met Council has overstepped their original charter and be abolished. It seems to me that the Envisioning Task Force is just an extension of the Met Council.

I would like even greater explanations of each and every scenario.

I would like to see a comparison of Eureka Township area to that of Farmington and Lakeville (maps superimposed or area comparisons).

Some are appealing, but I'm not so sure they are fair [to] the landowner.

They are well presented and easily understandable.

Who pays for roads if we go with transfer of development rights? Taxes should not go up to fund costs of neighboring development.

Very concerned about unintended consequences about TDR—not sure we know how it will impact taxes, neighbors—not sure it's a great idea.

Appreciate the effort to present a wide range of scenarios to help us understand impacts and tradeoffs. Excellent work!!!

Residential Cluster scenario was interesting too, but will this really save farmland? If we want to preserve farmland then we need to find ways to help farmers stay profitable. Otherwise, what's the point? Why would you ever do the 1 per 10? What a waste of land!

Thank you for all of the work.

Let's move off the 1 in 40.

Get moving!

The costs of infrastructure should be borne by the land owner exclusive[ly]. Roads, maintenance—it's common for the parcels to be private and the owners share expenses on road maintenance, construction, repair.

Will we get to vote on the growth scenarios?

The scenarios were exemplary! Professionally done, colorful, and clear—much information. Congrats on all your committed research and efforts made on behalf of our Township. Thank you all for your time and efforts! We hope the citizenry will be inspired to make good choices so your hard work becomes fruitful and results in a controlled future for the Township.

The Envisioning Task Force should remain active. It is important that they keep the people of Eureka aware that there are choices and that we do not need to lose the open space we now have.

The scenarios don't seem to take into account any commercial development that typically comes with expanding residential areas. Also, how does industrial expansion of Lakeville industrial park figure in? Would like to see expansion of the park for a tax base.

Thank you to the Envisioning Task Force. Great job!

**4. Are there other alternative growth scenarios you would like to see the Township investigate? If yes, please describe them.**

Low growth plus commercial zoning. It is essential to zone or limit commercial before it gets away from us. (I could envision 235th W. as being all commercial—it almost is now.)

I just don't want to see us develop anything like Elko/New Market—haphazard and thoughtless. This was a nice discussion to have—it should continue.

OK to consider 5-acre lots cluster development

I would like to see other low-development options. Isn't there a way to let the few landowners who want or need to sell their land to do so without throwing out the 1 on 40 altogether?

1 in 5 acres clustered