

CITY OF MUSKEGO

# 2008 COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING SURVEY SUMMARY

FOR THE 2020 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Prepared by:  
The 2020 Comprehensive  
Planning Committee & The  
Muskego Planning Department  
September 2008



# 2008 COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING SURVEY SUMMARY

## CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Present/Future Development	1
Economic Development	3
Housing	6
Transportation	9
Parks, Recreation, & Conservation	11
Other Information	13
Appendix A – Full Survey	15
Appendix B – Detailed Text Results	17

## **Introduction**

The City of Muskego 2020 Comprehensive Plan Survey was orchestrated and designed by the City's appointed Comprehensive Planning Committee in August 2008. The 2008 survey was the second survey completed solely for the formulation of recommendations for the 2020 Comprehensive Plan. The first survey was completed in 2005, tackled a broader spectrum of issues, and was sent to a random sample of 1500 property owners. The 2008 survey was tailored by the Comprehensive Planning Committee to gather information specific to the main issues that the Committee believed was going to affect the community in the next decade. The survey was sent to all property owners in the community in order to attain as many points of view as possible.

The survey was conducted by a mailing to all possible property addresses in the City in August 2008. The mailing included owners and tenants alike. Further, the survey was publicized in the City's newspapers and an on-line version of the survey was posted on the City's website for further convenience. Five dinner gift certificates, from Muskego restaurants, were awarded at random to the respondents filling out the survey. After factoring out duplicate addresses, multiple owned properties, and various commercial/industrial properties, it was approximated that a total of 8,439 surveys could have been returned. A total of 983 surveys were received, which results in a 12% return. It was determined that seven hundred nine (709) or 72% were submitted via mail and two hundred seventy-four (274) or 28% were submitted via the Internet. The amount of data received from the residents is substantial as the 983 surveys are 472 more than received in the 2005 survey. Further, as the results indicate below, almost all participants provided a wealth of written data for the City to observe what types of opinions are within the community.

## **Present/Future Development**

The first section of the survey directed questions relating to how the public perceived future development patterns taking place in the community in relation to preservation of open spaces and farmland. Further, questioning concerned the public's perception on how 'rural character' is defined and if people agree with promoting different mechanisms to promote preserving the rural character of Muskego.

Overall, the responses showed that a majority (67%) of individuals believed that the City should do all they can to preserve the amount of workable farmland and rural open spaces as possible. Many (56%) thought that the existing zoning of allowing 2.75-acre parcels by right in the rural portions of Muskego should continue to be allowed. However, even though the 2.75-acre designation was favored, an overwhelming majority (64%) believed that the City should make mechanisms, such as cluster developments, mandatory when individuals look to subdivide their lots, in order to preserve larger tracts of open lands and open space. Lastly, a majority (64%) believed that the City should not look to promote new areas that allow high-density residential lots (1/2 acre or smaller).

The set of questions began with the following synopsis:

*One of the main discussion topics the 2020 Comprehensive Planning Committee is having is in regards to preserving the City's urban to rural character for decades to come. The definition of rural character, in this sense, being those larger lots, agricultural, and open spaces that are predominantly found in the southern areas of Muskego. One of the ideas to ensure that this rural character is preserved into the future is to make any future land division meet cluster development techniques. By doing this, a landowner would still be allowed to get the same density (amount of lots) they are entitled to now, but they would have to cluster development into smaller lots and then divide the remaining land so a majority is preserved as agricultural workable lands or conservation lands. Thus, large open tracts of land would still be found in the community years from now. Currently, zoning codes allow much of the City's rural lands to divide at a rate of 1 lot per 2.75 acres by right. In light of this information, please answer the following statements:*

The questions asked along with their response rates were as followed:

**1.1 The City should try and maintain the amount of workable farmland currently found in the community.**

Responses: Agree 67% (654/983) Neutral 17% (168/983)  
Disagree 13% (131/983) No Opinion 3% (30/983)  
Average Response = 2.47  
Highest Response = Agree (654 – 67%)

**1.2 A 2.75-acre parcel is considered rural character.**

Responses: Agree 56% (550/983) Neutral 16% (160/983)  
Disagree 20% (195/983) No Opinion 8% (78/983)  
Average Response = 2.20  
Highest Response = Agree (550 – 56%)

**1.3 Zoning for our agricultural and rural areas should continue to allow a 2.75-acre lot by right.**

Responses: Agree 54% (534/983) Neutral 13% (126/983)  
Disagree 22% (216/983) No Opinion 11% (107/983)  
Average Response = 2.11  
Highest Response = Agree (534 – 54%)

**1.3a If you disagree with the above statement, what minimum lot size do you think should be encouraged (5, 10, 20 acre or other)?**

Verbatim responses in Appendix B. Majority of the responses are broken down below:

Responses: ½ acre 2% (5/245) 1 acre 6% (15/245)  
5 acres 44% (108/245) 5 to 10 acres 4% (10/245)  
10 acres 16% (38/245) 20 acres 9% (21/245)  
50 acres 1% (2/245)

Highest Response = 5 acre 44% (108 – 44%)

**1.4 As long as an existing landowner is entitled to the same density (amount of lots) they are today, the City should make cluster developments mandatory in order to assure that larger lots and rural open spaces will be found in the decades to come.**

Responses: Agree 64% (632/983) Neutral 12% (119/983)  
Disagree 16% (161/983) No Opinion 7% (71/983)

Average Response = 2.33

Highest Response = Agree (632 – 64%)

**1.5 The City should allow new areas for denser single-family conventional development in the 2020 Land Use Plan (denser single family development in this case meaning allowing lots of a 1/2 acre size or smaller)?**

Responses: Agree 23% (224/983) Neutral 10% (98/983)  
Disagree 64% (625/983) No Opinion 4% (36/983)

Average Response = 1.52

Highest Response = Disagree (625 – 64%)

**1.6 Other opinions on development? What should the City be doing more or less of in regards to promoting/controlling future development?**

Verbatim responses in Appendix B.

## **Economic Development**

The second section of the survey related to the future of economic development and where the City should be concentrating these efforts. The 2020 Planning Committee requested questions directly related to economic development efforts in order to best gauge where recommendations should fall in the next decade. The City's Community Development Authority and Mayor's Task Force on Economic Development primarily serve the City's economic development functions. Questions also considered what types of businesses residents desired in the community and what are the most important issues surrounding economic development in the City.

While responses varied, the Moorland Corridor and Janesville Road received the most attention to where the residents felt economic development efforts should be concentrated upon. Aiding the industrial parks received considerable favoritism as well.

The types of businesses people desired also varied, but the opinions indicated that a huge majority wanted to see more chain restaurants (not fast food) in the community. Further, a need for an alternative higher end grocery store was evident. The opinions suggested that a chain home improvement store was also appealing.

Lastly, a large amount of responses were found in regards to questions 2.3 and 2.4 (most important issue facing economic development and other opinions on economic development). The re-occurring answers are found below, however, it should be noted that making something happen with the former Parkland Mall property was an

overwhelming response:

- Need development vision
- Taxes/rents too high
- Maintaining urban to rural mix
- Infrastructure planning
- Bringing more business into City
- Increase tax base
- Creating identity solely for Muskego
- Creating a downtown
- Water supply
- Developing Parkland Mall
- Being “business friendly”
- Traffic concerns on main roads
- Rebuilding Janesville Road
- No good restaurants
- Balancing commercial/residential tax base
- Need more business development
- More industry
- Increase architecture awareness
- Keep existing properties clean
- Create demographic attractive to retailers
- Need public transportation
- Controlling growth
- Promote business park
- Add more skilled jobs to community
- Preserve small town feeling
- Make the City more inviting
- Decorate for the seasons
- Need industry on Moorland
- Market community, Moorland Road, Janesville Road, Industrial Parks
- Bring lakes back to community
- Less apartments and condominiums
- Bring in business and light manufacturing
- Need cultural and sporting activities
- Add aesthetic signage of City facilities
- Slow down single-family residential homebuilding
- Offer incentives to businesses for locating in Muskego
- Be cognizant of green space when developing
- Update older business structures
- Provide significant budget for City economic development activities
- Keep roads maintained first
- Need to create destination
- Utilize/encourage green development

The economic development set of questions began with the following synopsis:

*The City currently has many individuals working on the state of economic development in the City, including the Community Development Authority and the Mayor's Task Force. Please answer the statements/questions below in regards to where the City should direct their continued economic development efforts.*

The questions asked along with their response rates were as followed:

**2.1 Please rank where you believe the City should focus Economic Development efforts in the next 10 years (circle number shown with 1 being highest priority)**

**Moorland Corridor**

Responses: 1's 42% (414/983) 2's 17% (170/983) 3's 14% (135/983)  
4's 8% (86/983) 5's 18% (178/983)

Average Response = 2.43

Highest Response = 1 (414 – 42%)

**Janesville Road (Downtown: Pioneer to Bay Lane Drive)**

Responses: 1's 49% (480/983) 2's 19% (189/983) 3's 10% (97/983)  
4's 7% (66/983) 5's 15% (151/983)

Average Response = 2.21

Highest Response = 1 (480 – 49%)

**Janesville Road (Downtown: Racine Avenue Area)**

Responses: 1's 22% (220/983) 2's 21% (206/983) 3's 23% (223/983)  
4's 12% (116/983) 5's 22% (218/983)

Average Response = 2.90

Highest Response = 3 (223 – 23%)

**Janesville Road (Tess Corners Area)**

Responses: 1's 10% (100/983) 2's 13% (124/983) 3's 21% (211/983)  
4's 18% (180/983) 5's 37% (368/983)

Average Response = 3.60

Highest Response = 5 (368 – 37%)

**Racine Avenue/I-43 Gateway**

Responses: 1's 16% (159/983) 2's 16% (162/983) 3's 19% (183/983)  
4's 15% (148/983) 5's 34% (331/983)

Average Response = 3.34

Highest Response = 5 (331 – 34%)

**Industrial Parks**

Responses: 1's 28% (279/983) 2's 17% (168/983) 3's 18% (178/983)  
4's 9% (87/983) 5's 28% (271/983)

Average Response = 2.90

Highest Response = 1 (279 – 28%) & 5 (271 – 28%)

**Other**

Verbatim responses, with the stated rankings, in Appendix B.

**2.2 What types of businesses would you like to see in Muskego (Apparel, restaurants, etc. OR actual names of businesses)?**

Verbatim responses in Appendix B.

**2.3 What is the most important issue facing economic development in Muskego?**

Verbatim responses in Appendix B.

**2.4 Other opinions on economic development? What should the City be doing more or less of in regards to economic development?**

Verbatim responses in Appendix B.

## **Housing**

The housing section of the survey concentrated on what people thought in regards to encouraging more apartment, condominium, and senior housing development in the community in the next decade. Basically, should the community be making new land opportunities available for these types of multi-family development.

Overall, the responses showed that a majority of individuals (64%) believed that the City should not encourage new apartment living developments. A mix of opinions was found in relation to allowing new condominium developments (Agree-29%, Neutral-30%, Disagree-34%, No Opinion-7%), however again, the highest response (34%) felt that promoting new areas for condos was not in the City's best interest. One area that the citizens did highly agree to was promoting new areas for senior housing (39%).

A question was asked in relation to where people might want to see new apartment, condominium, or senior housing developments in the City. The verbatim responses can be found in Appendix B and the re-occurring responses are found below. However, it should be noted that the majority of the responses were to place these types of uses next to where existing services are located. Thus, the downtown and along the City's major arterial roads was discussed to be the primary location for future placing of these multi-family uses due to the existing businesses present (grocery, banking, pharmacy, clinics, etc.).

### General

- Keep all away from single-family housing
- Diversified throughout City
- Near downtown, next to services
- Ensure any is constructed at a high end
- Racine/43 gateway
- Near Hwy 36, southeast corner of City
- Along Racine Avenue
- Tess Corners
- Where existing multi-family housing exists
- Parkland Mall property
- Moorland Road-Moorland corridor
- Around Big Muskego Lake
- Janesville Road east of Salentine Auto

- Only look to attract full-time residents (senior or condos, not apartment living)
- Not in established residential areas/subdivisions
- College Avenue
- Along with clustered planned developments

#### Apartments

- Multi-family should be next to main thoroughfares, not through residential areas
- Multi-family close to schools
- Above businesses

#### Condominiums

- Condos/senior housing close to grocery or medical facilities
- Near schools/parks
- Little Muskego lakefront
- Above businesses

#### Senior Housing

- Condos/senior housing close to grocery or medical facilities
- Near Janesville/Downtown
- Anywhere in City due to small impact, but should be a planned development like Regency
- Near schools/parks
- Close to rescue services

Lastly, a question was asked in regards to the public's general thoughts on housing in Muskego and what the City should be doing more or less of in regards to housing. The verbatim responses can be found in Appendix B and the more re-occurring responses are found below.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When approving single-family developments, keep to high standards like those in Belle Chasse, Candlewood, etc.</li> <li>• No new apartment developments anywhere</li> <li>• Keep in mind school space when approving future housing</li> <li>• Keep open space in mind when approving future housing</li> <li>• Keep infrastructure in mind when approving future housing</li> <li>• Promote business, not housing, due to impacts on budget with new housing</li> <li>• Cut back on housing as a whole</li> <li>• Zoning on upkeep of existing housing should be enforced</li> <li>• More walk ability (paths) and</li> </ul> | <p>alternative transportation (bike/battery operated vehicles paths) should be approved with new/existing housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disagreement with any new multi-family uses, stick to single-family</li> <li>• Housing that demonstrates less strain on services</li> <li>• More affordable single-family homes</li> <li>• Increase architectural requirements for all new housing</li> <li>• Larger lots, keep rural feel, less-density</li> <li>• Limit residential housing, possible moratorium on housing</li> <li>• Encourage ownership types of housing (single-family, condos,</li> </ul> |
|---|---|

- etc.)
- Build efficient houses, built to last
- More low/moderate income housing

The set of questions began with the following synopsis:

*The City currently has multi-family, condominium, and senior housing developments along the more urban areas in the northern parts of Muskego. Please answer the following statements to aid the Comprehensive Planning Committee in determining where Muskego should progress in relation to these uses in the next decade.*

The questions asked along with their response rates were as followed:

**3.1 The City should promote new areas for multi-family development.**

Responses: Agree 13% (126/983) Neutral 16% (161/983)  
Disagree 64% (625/983) No Opinion 7% (71/983)

Average Response = 2.09

Highest Response = Disagree (625 – 64%)

**3.2 The City should promote new areas for condominium development.**

Responses: Agree 29% (283/983) Neutral 30% (297/983)  
Disagree 34% (335/983) No Opinion 7% (68/983)

Average Response = 2.80

Highest Response = Disagree (335 – 34%)

**3.3 The City should promote new areas for apartment development.**

Responses: Agree 8% (82/983) Neutral 18% (179/983)  
Disagree 65% (642/983) No Opinion 8% (80/983)

Average Response = 1.97

Highest Response = Disagree (642 – 65%)

**3.4 The City should promote new areas for senior housing.**

Responses: Agree 39% (379/983) Neutral 35% (346/983)  
Disagree 19% (182/983) No Opinion 8% (76/983)

Average Response = 3.17

Highest Response = Agree (379 – 39%)

**3.5 If you agree to any of the statements above, any ideas on where that type of housing should be located?**

Verbatim responses in Appendix B.

**3.6 Other opinions on housing? What should the City be doing more or less of in regards to housing?**

Verbatim responses in Appendix B.

## **Transportation**

Transportation is a major smart growth element of the new 2020 Comprehensive Plan and the 2020 Committee requested aid from the citizens, via the survey, in order to determine the perceived problem transportation areas in Muskego. Further, the survey directed questioning as to the public's thoughts on the interconnection and promotion of recreation trails.

The survey returned that a majority (65%) of respondents desired that the City continue to interconnect corridors of bike and pedestrian paths throughout Muskego. Only a small portion of individuals disagreed (9%) with this question. Of those agreeing to interconnect path corridors, the most predominant responses stressed by respondents to construct sooner rather than later are found below (Find verbatim responses to this in appendix B).

- Durham Drive from McShane south
- Janesville Road from Racine Avenue east
- Along Janesville Road from County Park to Big Bend
- All along Janesville Road
- Around Big Muskego Lake
- Racine Avenue from Janesville Road north to I-43
- Racine Avenue from Janesville Road south to High School
- Racine Avenue from High School south to County border
- North Cape Road
- Field Drive
- Bay Lane Drive
- Connecting schools to neighborhoods
- Connect Denoon Middle School to Muskego High School
- Crowbar Road from Racine County line to Janesville (bike lane)
- All along Woods Road
- Around lakes in general
- Tess Corners Road from College to Woods
- Muskego Dam Drive
- Path connecting Candlewood/Quietwood subdivisions to Moorland Park/Moorland Road
- McShane Drive
- Lannon Drive
- Martin Drive
- Country Brook estates to Meadow Green West Subdivision

The questionnaire referred an inquiry to the community on perceived problem transportation areas within the City as well. The 2020 Committee is looking to formulate specific recommendations that might involve capital projects and knowing where vital traffic infrastructure improvements may be required was critical. The most common responses were found (Find verbatim responses to this in appendix B).

### Roads

- Upgrade Durham Road
- Sidewalk or bike path along Racine Avenue and Janesville Road
- Re-open Durham at Janesville Road

- Difficult leaving Muskego Elementary on Janesville Road
- Trails on roads around High School – To get Cross Country runners safe

#### Intersections

- Signals at Janesville/Martin
- Signals at Janesville/Parkland
- Hwy 36/'OO' intersection needs turn arrows on signals
- Intersection upgrade Lannon/Janesville
- Intersection upgrade to Woods /Janesville
- Intersection upgrade to Racine /College
- Intersection upgrade to Field Drive / Hillendale Drive
- Intersection upgrade Racine /Saturn
- Intersection upgrade to Kelsey /Racine
- Signals at Woods/Moorland
- Intersection upgrade to Pioneer /Janesville
- Intersection upgrade to Tans /Racine

#### Enforcement

- Crowbar Road in front of Lake Denoon Middle School speed enforcement
- Hi-View Drive speed enforcement due to people crossing from Durham to North Cape
- Hwy 36 and Muskego Dam Road speed enforcement
- Woods Road speed enforcement
- Ryan Road speed enforcement
- Mystic Drive speed enforcement
- Speed limit reduction on Janesville Road west of Muskego Industrial Park

#### General

- No roundabouts
- Encourage roundabouts

Lastly, a question was asked in regards to the public's general thoughts on transportation in Muskego and what the City should be doing more or less of in regards to transportation. The verbatim responses can be found in Appendix B and the more re-occurring responses are found below.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve Durham Drive</li> <li>• No roundabouts</li> <li>• Encourage roundabouts</li> <li>• Include bike lanes when updating roads</li> <li>• More recreation paths</li> <li>• No money towards public transportation</li> <li>• Add alternative/public transportation</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keep adding trails</li> <li>• Maintain road surfaces</li> <li>• Larger park and ride at Racine Avenue</li> <li>• Plow bike paths in winter</li> <li>• Keep supporting senior taxi</li> <li>• Update Janesville Road</li> </ul> |
|---|---|

The set of transportation questions began with the following synopsis:

*The City is progressing in making trail corridor connections in many locations throughout the City. Further, problem transportation areas (intersections, degrading roadways, etc.) have become a popular issue over the past years. Please answer the following statements in relation to these areas of concern.*

The questions asked along with their response rates were as followed:

**4.1 The City should look to interconnect corridors of bike and pedestrian paths in the City.**

Responses: Agree 65% (635/983) Neutral 17% (169/983)  
Disagree 9% (86/983) No Opinion 9% (93/983)

Average Response = 3.67

Highest Response = Agree (635 – 65%)

**4.2 Is there an area in the City that could use a bike/pedestrian path connection or corridor?**

Verbatim responses in Appendix B.

**4.3 Are there specific "problem" roads or intersections you see in Muskego? If so, where and what do you believe are the issues?**

Verbatim responses in Appendix B.

**4.4 Other opinions on transportation? What should the City be doing more or less of in regards to transportation?**

Verbatim responses in Appendix B.

## **Parks, Recreation, & Conservation**

The fifth section of the survey related to the current and future status of the City's Parks, Recreation, and Conservation facilities and lands. Planning for the year 2020 largely depends on what types of recreational options are available for the City's residents and which facilities/lands are attainable for the majority of the population. The first question inquired if current park facilities and lands were sufficient in the respondent's minds. The majority of the respondents agreed (49%) with this statement with only a small portion disagreeing (18%).

The second question asked if there is areas in the City that people felt were underserved by parks. Further, if the respondent believed there were underserved areas, where those areas might be and what facilities may be needed. Only 15% of the people felt that there were areas underserved by parks. Of those 15%, the following re-occurring responses were mentioned (Verbatim responses are found in Appendix B).

- Southeast corner of Muskego
- East side of Muskego
- Parks and access enhancements to Big Muskego Lake
- Lighted softball/hardball diamonds
- Need sledding hill
- More recreational fields in

- general (softball, baseball, football, soccer, etc.)
- More paved biking trails (College and Martin)
- Dog park
- Community outdoor pool
- More facilities at Moorland Park
- Park near Martin/Janesville area
- Develop Park Arthur
- More basketball hoops at parks
- Enhancements and identification of lake access/view points
- Bluhm Park upgrades
- A community center or downtown park (open space, city center, playgrounds)
- More beaches or enhance Idle Isle beach

The survey requested if respondents believed that current conservation land facilities were sufficient as well. While the highest response agreed (31%), many were neutral (29%) or shared no opinion (16%) indicating many new little about the City's conservation facilities. When asked if people believe the City should continue to pursue acquiring conservation lands, however, the respondent's overwhelming agreed (44%) to accomplish this task. Some opinions for and against acquiring new conservation lands can be found further below.

Lastly, a question was asked in regards to the public's general thoughts on parks, recreation, and conservation in Muskego and what the City should be doing more or less of in regards to parks and conservation. The verbatim responses can be found in Appendix B and the more re-occurring responses are found below.

- Market the lakes, make them visible/usable
- Need dog park
- Manage lands we currently have; don't take off more land on tax rolls
- More public access to lakes
- More land conservation around lakes and waterways
- Save land around Big Muskego Lake
- Set aside as much parks/conservation lands as possible
- Mountain bike trails
- Cross-country ski/ice skate areas
- Add outdoor pool/water park
- Rehabilitate existing areas; higher quality is better than quantity
- Preserve green space
- Need swimming pool
- Conserve as much land as possible
- No charges for residents in Muskego County Park
- Bow range facility needed
- Unknown where conservation facilities are
- ATV/snowmobile areas
- More facilities for teens; teen center
- Have a Community Center
- Limit boating on Little Muskego Lake
- Market parks and conservation area locations
- More parks in District 7

The set of questions began with the following synopsis:

*Usage of the City's conservation and parklands is at an all-time high as many residents seek alternative outdoor activities. Please answer the following statements/questions relating to Parks, Recreation, and Conservation.*

The questions asked along with their response rates were as followed:

**5.1 Current park facilities and lands are sufficient.**

Responses: Agree 49% (483/983) Neutral 22% (221/983)  
Disagree 18% (180/983) No Opinion 10% (99/983)  
Average Response = 3.27  
Highest Response = Agree (483 – 49%)

**5.2 There are areas in the City underserved by parks.**

Responses: Agree 15% (144/983) Neutral 31% (304/983)  
Disagree 27% (264/983) No Opinion 28% (271/983)  
Average Response = 2.06  
Highest Response = No Opinion (271 – 28%) & Disagree (264 – 27%)

**5.2a If so, where and what is needed?**

Verbatim responses in Appendix B.

**5.3 Current conservation land facilities are sufficient.**

Responses: Agree 31% (302/983) Neutral 29% (287/983)  
Disagree 24% (237/983) No Opinion 16% (157/983)  
Average Response = 2.71  
Highest Response = Agree (302 – 31%)

**5.4 The City should continue to pursue acquiring more conservation lands.**

Responses: Agree 44% (437/983) Neutral 21% (210/983)  
Disagree 20% (198/983) No Opinion 14% (138/983)  
Average Response = 3.04  
Highest Response = Agree (437 – 44%)

**5.5 Other opinions on parks, recreation, and conservation? What should the City be doing more or less of in regards to the parks and conservation?**

Verbatim responses in Appendix B.

**Other**

Lastly, the survey included a section requesting any other information someone would like the 2020 Planning Committee and elected officials to know during the formulation of the new 2020 Comprehensive Plan. The verbatim responses can be found in Appendix B, however, an assemblage of some of the re-occurring points is found herein:

- Something needs to be done about Parkland mall site
- Do nothing about Parkland Mall site, leave it to private development/owner
- Skateboard park in wrong place
- Control tax base
- Develop and identify downtown (Janesville Road)
- Develop Moorland Road

- Keep rural feel of community
- Encourage slow population growth
- Promote commercial/industrial, not residential growth
- Balance growth
- Preserve lakes
- Promote regional stormwater planning
- More sidewalks on main roads
- Community park would be nice
- Don't amend plans so easily
- Complete bike/path corridors
- No roundabouts
- High end businesses needed
- Restaurants needed
- Re-vamp old landfill along

Crowbar Drive – Park/trails, not residential housing

- Be weary of water resources
- Beautify industrial park
- Beautify Janesville Road
- Improve Idle Isle beach or add additional more accessible beach to showcase community
- Go smoke free
- Be cognizant of phosphorus fertilizers, ban them
- Ban burning in denser residential areas
- Have walk lights and pedestrian pavement lines at main intersections

# Appendix A – Full Survey

City of Muskego - 2020 Comprehensive Plan Survey						
Please have the survey completed and sent in by September 21st, 2008 OR feel free to complete the survey online at <a href="http://webapps.ci.muskego.wi.us/2020Survey">http://webapps.ci.muskego.wi.us/2020Survey</a>						
YOUR INFORMATION						
NAME(S): _____		ADDRESS: _____				
1. PRESENT/FUTURE DEVELOPMENT						
One of the main discussion topics the 2020 Comprehensive Planning Committee is having is in regards to preserving the City's urban to rural character for decades to come. The definition of rural character, in this sense, being those larger lots, agricultural, and open spaces that are predominantly found in the southern areas of Muskego. One of the ideas to ensure that this rural character is preserved into the future is to make any future land division meet cluster development techniques. By doing this, a landowner would still be allowed to get the same density (amount of lots) they are entitled to now, but they would have to cluster development into smaller lots and then divide the remaining land so a majority is preserved as agricultural workable lands or conservation lands. Thus, large open tracts of land would still be found in the community years from now. Currently, zoning codes allow much of the City's rural lands to divide at a rate of 1 lot per 2.75 acres by right. In light of this information, please answer the following statements:						
		Agree	Neutral	Disagree	No Opinion	
1.1	The City should try and maintain the amount of workable farmland currently found in the community.	3	2	1	0	
1.2	A 2.75 acre parcel is considered rural character.	3	2	1	0	
1.3	Zoning for our agricultural and rural areas should continue to allow a 2.75 acre lot by right.	3	2	1	0	
1.3a	If you disagree with the above statement, what minimum lot size do you think should be encouraged (5, 10, 20 acre or other)? _____					
1.4	As long as an existing landowner is entitled to the same density (amount of lots) they are today, the City should make cluster developments mandatory in order to assure that larger lots and rural open spaces will be found in the decades to come.	3	2	1	0	
Currently, over half of the City's total parcels of land are a 1/2 acre or less. Many of which are used for single-family residential uses. Further, there are only a handful of parcels left in the City that will allow a higher density single family development by right (1/2 acre parcels or less). In light of this information, please answer the following statements:						
		Agree	Neutral	Disagree	No Opinion	
1.5	The City should allow <u>new</u> areas for denser single family conventional development in the 2020 Land Use Plan (denser single family development in this case meaning allowing lots of a 1/2 acre size or smaller)?	3	2	1	0	
1.6	Other opinions on development? What should the City be doing more or less of in regards to promoting/controlling future development? _____ _____ _____					
2. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT						
The City currently has many individuals working on the state of economic development in the City, including the Community Development Authority and the Mayor's Task Force. Please answer the statements/questions below in regards to where the City should direct their continued economic development efforts.						
2.1	Please rank where you believe the City should focus Economic Development efforts in the next 10 years (circle number shown with 1 being highest priority)					
	Moorland Corridor	1	2	3	4	5
	Janesville Road (Downtown: Pioneer to Bay Lane Drive)	1	2	3	4	5
	Janesville Road (Downtown: Racine Avenue Area)	1	2	3	4	5
	Janesville Road (Tess Corners Area)	1	2	3	4	5
	Racine Avenue/I-43 Gateway	1	2	3	4	5
	Industrial Parks	1	2	3	4	5
	Other _____	1	2	3	4	5
2.2	What types of businesses would you like to see in Muskego (Apparel, restaurants, etc. OR actual names of businesses)? _____ _____					
2.3	What is the most important issue facing economic development in Muskego? _____ _____					
2.4	Other opinions on economic development? What should the City be doing more or less of in regards to economic development? _____ _____					

**3. HOUSING**

The City currently has multi-family, condominium, and senior housing developments along the more urban areas in the northern parts of Muskego. Please answer the following statements to aid the Comprehensive Planning Committee in determining where Muskego should progress in relation to these uses in the next decade.

	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>No Opinion</u>
3.1 The City should promote new areas for multi-family development.	3	2	1	0
3.2 The City should promote new areas for condominium development.	3	2	1	0
3.3 The City should promote new areas for apartment development.	3	2	1	0
3.4 The City should promote new areas for senior housing.	3	2	1	0
3.5 If you agree to any of the statements above, any ideas on where that type of housing should be located?	_____			
3.6 Other opinions on housing? What should the City be doing more or less of in regards to housing?	_____			

**4. TRANSPORTATION**

The City is progressing in making trail corridor connections in many locations throughout the City. Further, problem transportation areas (intersections, degrading roadways, etc.) have become a popular issue over the past years. Please answer the following statements in relation to these areas of concern.

	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>No Opinion</u>
4.1 The City should look to interconnect corridors of bike and pedestrian paths in the City.	3	2	1	0
4.2 Is there an area in the City that could use a bike/pedestrian path connection or corridor?	_____			
4.3 Are there specific "problem" roads or intersections you see in Muskego? If so, where and what do you believe are the issues?	_____			
4.4 Other opinions on transportation? What should the City be doing more or less of in regards to transportation?	_____			

**5. PARKS, RECREATION, & CONSERVATION**

Usage of the City's conservation and park lands is at an all-time high as many residents seek alternative outdoor activities. Please answer the following statements/questions relating to Parks, Recreation, and Conservation.

	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>No Opinion</u>
5.1 Current park facilities and lands are sufficient.	3	2	1	0
5.2 There are areas in the City underserved by parks.	3	2	1	0
5.2a If so, where and what is needed?	_____			
5.3 Current conservation land facilities are sufficient.	3	2	1	0
5.4 The City should continue to pursue acquiring more conservation lands.	3	2	1	0
5.5 Other opinions on parks, recreation, and conservation? What should the City be doing more or less of in regards to the parks and conservation?	_____			

**6. OTHER**

Any other information you'd like the 2020 Planning Committee and elected officials to know during the formulation of the new 2020 Comprehensive Plan?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Please have the survey completed and sent in by September 21st, 2008 OR feel free to complete the survey online at <http://webapps.ci.muskego.wi.us/2020Survey>

Send surveys to:  
 Attn: Planning Department  
 W182 S8200 Racine Avenue  
 PO Box 749  
 Muskego, WI 53150-0749

**Appendix B – Detailed Text Results**  
(Only shown in full copy of survey summary due to length)