Town of Star Prairie
Interactive Land Use Workshop Results

First Night Visual Preference Exercise – Slides
37 attended and 37 handouts turned in. Not all attendees marked a preference on all slides.
Not all comments are noted, most handouts did not contain any comments/reasons.
General comment on the lack of younger residents in attendance. Felt those were the people who would live here in the future.

Slide	Yes	No	Depends	Reasons: Y, N or D
1	21	9	6	Out of scale. Doesn't fit in area. Big house, lots of taxes. Mansion doesn't fit rural character of our town.
2	23	5	9	Too close to river. Enough acres. Noise, 24-hr disruption.
3	1	30	7	Ugly poverty.
4	35	0	1	Great rural character.
5	11	11	16	Uses too much farmland. No trees. Out of place in field.
6	19	3	14	On open fields, too noisy. Clean, non-polluting energy.
7	35	0	1	Beautiful. Good wildlife habitat.
8	26	4	7	Not near a 4-lane hwy. Alternate transportation, safer separate from road. Needs trees.
9	19	6	11	Too much space. Fits the landscape. Too many cul-de-sacs. More taxes.
10	28	4	4	Property rights. Private wild areas are good.
11	27	0	10	Small operations. No factory farms.
12	21	3	12	Nice. Wasted land.
13	5	23	10	Ugly, urban, Hudson
14	16	3	17	Character
15	26	1	9	Farming is good. Too big a farm. Family farm.
16	16	6	13	Too many driveways, too big. Too big for homes, too small to farm.
17	25	1	10	Close to city.
18	33	0	3	Idyllic. Quaint.
19	23	7	7	Open green space. Don't mix housing and ag. Rural feel. Yes with common sewer. School taxes will increase.
20	6	20	11	Poor parking. Too close. Affordable.
21	20	5	13	Corporate ag in right location for food and energy. Not near housing.
22	19	4	12	Too commercial. Not enough farm support. With proper zoning. Jobs & taxes.
23	8	13	15	Too close to housing. With zoning & pollution control. NIMBY
24	15	14	10	Lot too large. Need small business. Nice gas station. NIMBY
25	35	0	1	Need open space.
26	5	23	8	Eyesore. Our heritage.
27	33	0	4	Nice trail.
28	29	2	5	Nice. Needs landscaping.
29	35	1	0	Protect wetlands.
30	19	7	10	Small businesses help pay taxes. Better downtown, not spread out on highway.
31	33	0	3	Nice.
32	12	15	8	Too commercial for rural character. Only along Hwy. 64.
33	8	12	16	Bad land use. No trees. Noisy.
34	30	3	3	No more. Tourism.

Slide	Yes	No	Depends	Reasons: Y, N or D
35	26	3	8	Good use of poor farmland.
36	15	10	11	Poor roads & safety issue. Roads need improvement.
37	36	0	1	Beautiful. Protect wild areas, water.
38	35	0	1	Classic architecture. Quaint.
39	12	10	14	Suburban, too close to the road. Cookie cutter architecture. Houses too close to each other. Need greenspace.
40	22	5	12	With open space. No apartments.
41	17	10	10	Managed right. Nice.
42	21	7	9	Ugly business, signs, architecture.
43	26	5	7	Trees look good. Rural.
44	15	16	6	Ag & residential too close. Houses too close to each other. Townhomes affordable, not crowded.
45	8	12	18	In a business district. No industrial. Necessary ugliness.
46	34	0	3	Beautiful. Needed.
47	12	15	11	Greenspace needed. Need affordable housing.
48	19	6	12	Conflicting use, misuse of farmland
49	36	0	1	Farming is good.
50	35	1	0	Historic.
51	17	7	11	Eyesore.
52	32	0	4	Public land important.
53	16	6	16	Too many houses sharing driveways on town road.
54	31	1	5	Depends on size of fields.
55	33	1	3	Beautiful, needed.

General Comment at end of one evaluation: "Need lot sizes of at least 15 acres. This meeting is not representative of our township – too few people and not diverse! This type of thing can easily be done via internet survey/discussion blog."

Groups Results: All group comments are included. Some groups could not reach consensus on a slide so the votes were recorded as split.
Group 3 consistently liked park and recreation land but was concerned about funding, especially maintenance.
All groups consistently like slides with trees and landscaping. Stated that they like to see the trees left when development occurs.

Slide	Always	Never	Depends on Location	Reasons: A, N or D
1		1	4	D: Near land that can't be farmed, should be on better road. D: Not in middle of farm field, loss of productive land. N: Home too small for landscape.
2	2		2	D: Make sure enough acres to support. No new large-scale, okay to expand existing, make sure manure pits are not contributing to ground water. D: Runoff pollution, modern operation okay.
3		4		
4	4			

Slide	Always	Never	Depends on Location	Reasons: A, N or D
5	1		3	D: Near more trees and poorer farmland. D: Only if family member is currently farming land. D: Unplanned, only if son or daughter.
6	1		2	D: Too close to residential. D: If economically feasible, no noisy, low numbers, low density, no harm to wildlife, then support renewable energy. No vote, not applicable??
7	4			
8	3		1	D: Pedestrian/Bike/Snowmobile conflicts & funding.
9	1		3	D: On lot size and road costs. A: Like large lots of 5+ acres. D: Too much land used. D: How houses fit into larger area in details of design.
10	4			
11	3		1	D: Needs to be zoned. A: Proper management.
12	1		3	D: Size of lot and terrain. A: Too much to take care of, good use of poor farm land, likes large lots for horses/trails. D: Marginal farmland.
13		2	2	D: If further from highway and not so cluttered. D: Poor planning, needs to be cleaned up.
14	2		2	D: Historic, if it was already there.
15	4			
16	1	1	3	D: Only on County roads. Dangerous driveways at high speeds. D: Wasted land, driveway safety.
17	3		1	
18	4			
19	3		1	A: With water, sewer, covenants, maintained sewers, and if near wildlife land. Don't like mix of farming and residential. D: Adjacent to city, not mixed with farmland.
20		4		N: Too close, parking problems, dangerous for kids. N: Needs better design.
21	3		1	
22	2		2	D: Shouldn't be near homes because of safety & noise.
23		1	4	D: With a buffer to the houses. D: location, safety, restoration, eyesore to neighboring houses. D: Safety, traffic, adjoining uses. D: Noise, dust, trees, buffer, design.
24	1	2	1	D: Only on poor farmland, close to village/city, blend design into the landscape. N: Should be close to other commercial.
25	4			
26	2	2	2	N: Eyesore, dangerous, cleanup. D: It will fall down on its own.
27	4			
28	3		1	D: Consistent with surroundings
29	4			
30	1	1	2	D: Should be on like zoned land.
31	4			

Slide	Always	Never	Depends on Location	Reasons: A, N or D
32	2		2	D: Diamond interchange only! A: Along 64 only.
33		1	3	D: Only with enough acres and distance from neighbors. D: Depends on how close to homes and noise control.
34	3		1	D: 9 hole, 3 par only. A: Nutrient run-off control.
35	4			A: Does not appear to be good farmland. A: Nice sized lots, buffered. A: Trees important, design, location.
36	1	2	1	N: Too many driveways. A: Roads too narrow. D: Road too narrow. N: Needs better road and driveways.
37	4			
38	4			
39	1	1	2	N: Sidewalks too close, streets too close to houses, speeds too fast on wide streets, too many houses, needs curbs. D: Setbacks an issue, snow removal, too urban move to city. D: Too close to road.
40	3		1	N: Okay in city.
41	1	1	3	D: Limited number of trailers and locations for trailer parks. A: Like greenspace. N: Already have enough trailers.
42	3	2	2	
43	2	1	1	N: Road too costly on this size lot. A: Like large lots. D: Poor farmland, large lots okay.
44	1	1	2	D: Not near farmland, near other residential clusters.
45		2	3	D: With landscaping, buffers and greater distance from the road. D: Too close to road. N: Put in industrial park. D: Design, traffic. N: Do it right.
46	4			
47		2	2	D: Only in the city/village limits. N: In city/village need high volume sewer & water. D: Better than a trailer park if well designed.
48	2		2	D: Needs buffer space and screening. A: Yes if farmed, no if boat lifts.
49	4			
50	4			
51	2		2	
52	4			
53	1	2	1	N: Unplanned
54	4			
55	4			A: Concerned about expensive upkeep.

Second Night Mapping Exercise – 4 Groups/Maps
25 signed in, about 30 attended, about 8 per group.

Group 1 Report: Preferred Historical Growth Level.
Residential Development:

- Strong support for Conservation Design Development. Preferred conservation design and when ran out, converted developments into conservation design.
- Strongly protected farmland. Filled in poor land with housing and mostly near the city of New Richmond.
- Centralize development and stay away from agriculture. As town grows fill in on the poorest ground and use conservation design development.
- High density urban should be annexed.
- Long-time residents acknowledged the natural problems with travelling through the town – divided by the Apple River.
- Recognized higher density urban within the city and along the waterline. Also south of the Village of Star Prairie where it would be near sewer and water and probably annexed.

Open Space:

- Protected open space in conservation design development and along the Apple River.
- Left the U.S. Fish and Wildlife land and surrounding land alone. Felt USF&W would acquire and protect more land if the development was kept away from it.

Commercial & Industrial:

- Strip commercial and industrial along highway 65.
- Some industrial at the railroad line.
- Some commercial and industrial at the new highway interchange.
- Some next to the city, expect annexation.

Group 2 Report: No preferred growth level. Felt growth would come regardless and should be directed as shown on their map.
Residential Development:

- Used conservation design development extensively, especially around wet or poorer lands.
- Tried to avoid the best farmland.
- Used a variety of lot sizes, felt larger lots more appropriate in some areas.
- Infilled around the water line and existing development.
- Generally if parcel was largely environmental corridor used conservation design.

Open Space:

- Protected open space along the Apple River.
- Protected land around Strand Lake.
- Protected land along Cedar Creek between the County property and the Star Prairie Land Preservation Trust land.
- Protected the wetlands and estuary on Cedar Lake.
- Placed open space between all the higher density residential near the water line.
- Added several hundred acres of additional open space as they felt there was not enough resource protection and not enough open space for the developments.

Commercial & Industrial:

- Commercial and industrial around the airport, but expected to be annexed.
- Commercial at the new diamond interchange.
- Industrial near rail line.

- Commercial and industrial near Somerset and west of the City of New Richmond, expected much of it to be annexed.

Group 3 Report: Preferred Historical Growth Level.

Residential Development:

- Good discussion of residential development.
- Strong support for protecting farmland. Generally did not place any development on farmland if possible.
- Placed residential away from airport and corrections center and mostly south of the Apple River. Felt there should be nothing north of the Apple River for as long as possible to protect agriculture and the US Fish and Wildlife service lands.
- Used conservation design development used extensively. But would have preferred examples of conservation design on 40 or 80 acres as would prefer not to have larger subdivisions developed or allowed.
- Converted conventional subdivisions to CDD when ran out. Used extensively around water and wetlands.

Open Space:

- Protected open space along the Apple River and Strand Lake.

Commercial & Industrial:

- Commercial and industrial around new diamond interchange.
- Industrial around airport and expected to be annexed.
- Industrial around Somerset concerts.
- Created a small area of commercial around a town center at the town hall, maybe 50 acres.
- Did not use all of the commercial and industrial for accelerated growth. Did not want that much in the town. Will occur in the city/villages.

Group 4 Report: Preferred Historical Growth Level.

Residential Development:

- Recognition of conservation design development as preferred development type because of water and topography of the town. Was a way to allow development around water.
- Wanted more of it available and wanted to put more on the map.
- Left the U.S. Fish and Wildlife land and surrounding land alone. Felt USF&W would acquire and protect more land if the development was kept away from it.
- Was spread out somewhat due to number in the group. Didn't consolidate ideas as much as did for commercial/industrial/open space.

Open Space:

- Open space protection focused on water resources, mostly the Apple River. Open space adjoining the Apple River and north of River's Edge.
- Comments and clear focus on wanting better stewardship of the Apple River.
- Protected 100 acres around Strand Lake.
- Added to the conservancy land for Star Prairie Land Preservation Trust.
- Protected the SW corner of Cedar Lake and its estuary and wetlands.
- Protected the headwaters of Squaw Lake.

Commercial & Industrial:

- Commercial around new diamond interchange and along Hwy. 64.
- Industrial next to railroad line and around airport.

None of the groups removed development, probably ran out of time. Two groups moved development around a little bit at the end. None of the groups actually put development in the city/villages but there were consistent comments about annexation. With smaller examples of conservation design there would have been more of it shown.