

## *PRELIMINARY DRAFT*

# **WALWORTH COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN PUBLIC OPINION SURVEY**

## **INTRODUCTION**

As part of the County comprehensive planning process, a countywide public opinion survey was conducted to identify perspectives on a range of issues related to the future of Walworth County. Included in the survey were questions about the overall character of the County and quality of life, population growth, preferred land uses, housing types and lot sizes, the relative importance of preserving farmland and environmentally sensitive lands, and the role of government in shaping future County directions, among other items. The survey was designed to provide County and local officials and interested parties with insight into attitudes and preferences of County residents and landowners, so that those factors may be taken into account in the preparation of the County comprehensive plan.

After considering various public participation techniques designed to elicit information, the Walworth County Smart Growth Technical Advisory Committee decided to administer a return-by-mail survey. Such a survey can obtain broad public participation in a fairly equitable, objective, convenient, confidential, and comprehensive way. All recipients, for example, can uniformly be asked the same set of questions, at the same time, in the same way, without apprehension from any perspective about what might be said by whom. As a public participation technique, it thereby helps avoid peer or political pressures sometimes associated with public forums, while cost-effectively receiving input from a larger group.

This report presents a description of the survey methodology and a summary of the survey findings.

## **METHODOLOGY**

The survey was planned and carried out by the University of Wisconsin-Extension working with the Regional Planning Commission. The chosen instrument was a questionnaire designed by the UW-Extension/Commission staff, with input from the Walworth County Land Use and Resource Management Department and the Advisory Committee (see Appendix A).

The survey was designed as a probability sample survey, conducted on a mail-out/mail-back basis. In its deliberations, the Advisory Committee sought to be inclusive in sampling methodology. It elected to sample a portion of all resident households – both rented and owner-occupied – as well as non-resident property owners. The questionnaire recipients were thus randomly selected from two lists: all households in the County having a named addressee (“good addresses” from a sampling standpoint); and all non-resident owners of residential property, with duplicate names removed in cases of multiple property ownerships.

A stratified random sample of 15 percent was drawn from each list – resident households, and non-resident addressees on local property tax assessment roles. This sampling methodology was specifically designed to involve a larger number of respondents and broader stakeholder interests than would a number of alternative countywide probability samples, thereby helping to ensure adequate representation. The samples were drawn in a manner to avoid any selection bias and give each potential survey recipient an equal chance of being selected.

Between May 25 and May 30, 2007, a total of 4,605 survey questionnaires were mailed to individuals included in the sample group of resident households and 1,880 survey questionnaires were mailed to the sample group of non-resident property owners, for a total of 6,485. Of these, 265 were ultimately returned as undeliverable – 240 resident households and 25 non-resident property owners – as well as 2 of each returned without any data, effectively resulting in an actual sample number of 6,216. No direct follow-up contacts were made with survey recipients; however, a news release was prepared and distributed in an attempt to underscore survey importance and to encourage responses.

In total, slightly over 18 percent of the sampled resident households and almost 20 percent of the sampled non-resident property owners completed and returned the survey, for a combined response rate of about 19 percent.

After the surveys were returned, they were visually inspected for completeness and accuracy. Responses were then tabulated in a confidential manner for questionnaires returned through July 13, 2007. This resulted in 1,159 completed surveys – 790 from resident households and 369 from non-resident property owners - and becomes the basis for the findings which follow.

The balance of this report summarizes the major findings of the survey on a topical basis. The detailed survey results for the majority of analyses presented are found in Appendix B. Included in these results is information regarding the demographic characteristics of the survey respondents as indicated by the respondents themselves in Questions 40 to 46 of the survey questionnaire.

The results of the survey are in general presented collectively—that is, combined for resident households and non-resident property owners—as the intent was to obtain broad participation from major stakeholders in portraying attitudes and preferences regarding Walworth County. All parties sampled have valid and meaningful input regarding the directions Walworth County should pursue in planning comprehensively. Thus, the presentation of results is generally most meaningful as a combined perspective of and for the County. In that regard, it may be noted that an analysis showed considerable accord in response patterns among resident households and non-resident property owners. In part that is because the non-resident property owners not declaring Walworth County as their principal place of residence may nevertheless live in the County during periods of the year.

There are also instances, however, where the natural and expected differences of year-round residency vs. seasonal residency or non-residency produced differing response trends. Where notable, these are discussed within the topics and specific trends below. Again, there was considerable accord on many matters, and importantly, on most questions having bearing on planning and policy choices for the future of Walworth County. Many of the differences centered on respondents' perspectives on the importance of key characteristics in decisions about living, locating, or investing in the County; and, whether recent growth in the County has brought about positive or negative changes regarding key indicators. The discrete data by survey question for resident households and non-resident property owners are provided in Appendix C.

## **SURVEY RESULTS**

### **Growth Rate and County Character**

Preferences related to the rate of growth—and resulting or preferred County character—are derived from questions within the survey sections addressing County trends and values, and quality of life.

**77%** of respondents prefer either slower or no population growth (64% and 13%, respectively); 21% prefer the present (recently experienced) growth; and 2% would like to see faster population growth. (Q2)<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> “Q2” denotes a reference to question number 2 in the survey questionnaire. Similar references to other questions follow throughout. The survey questionnaire is included in Appendix A.

- 43%** say population growth has had a negative or very negative effect on the quality of life in Walworth County (37% and 7%, respectively); 32% say population growth has had a positive or very positive effect (28% and 4%, respectively); 15% say population growth has had no effect, while 10% say they have no opinion. (Q36)
- 71%** identify mixed agricultural/residential as their preferred future for Walworth County in 25 years; 18% say the County should be a rural, agricultural community; 9% prefer a mixed residential/business future for the County; 2% say the County should be a residential community. (Q1)
- 59%** say the impact of County growth in recent years related to scenic beauty has been positive or very positive (38% and 20% respectively); 25% say the impact has been negative or very negative (21% and 4%, respectively); 17% observe little change/no opinion. (Q39)
- 55%** say development should be allowed but not encouraged in Walworth County; 24% say development should be discouraged; 19% say encouraged. (Q3)
- 84%** on average, say Walworth County government should encourage environmental and farmland preservation as it plans for future development (88% and 81%, respectively); 13% say remain neutral; 1% say discourage such preservation. (Q38)
- 49%** on average, say the County should remain neutral on industrial and retail development, or residential housing; 27% say encourage these items; 22% say discourage such future development. (Q38)

**Conclusions:** Most respondents would prefer to have the County slow down with respect to its population growth, saying that development should be allowed but not encouraged, resulting in a preferred agricultural/residential future. Preservation of farmland and environmental features, while accommodating some growth, are very strongly supported (see also subsequent headings on these matters).

### **Farmland Issues**

Preferences related to farmland issues are derived from questions within the survey sections addressing farmland preservation issues and quality of life.

- 91%** of respondents strongly agree or agree that preservation of farmland in Walworth County is important (68% and 23%, respectively); 3% disagree or strongly disagree. (Q5)
- 83%** strongly agree or agree that Walworth County should set agricultural land preservation as a priority goal and implement policies to achieve it (56% and 27%, respectively); 6% disagree or strongly disagree; 12% are neutral. (Q6)
- 70%** would like to see farmland which is sold kept agricultural or agricultural related; 18% say it should be used however the owner desires; 7% say allow it to be subdivided for development. (Q10)
- 81%** say Walworth County government should encourage farmland preservation as it plans for future development, rather than remaining neutral (16%) or discouraging farmland preservation (<1%). (Q38)
- 44%** may support, depending on the cost, and 27% would support spending property tax dollars for the preservation of agricultural land by compensating landowners who agree to preserve their farmland. 27% of respondents would not support such action. (Q11)

**72%** of possible supporters would favor a property tax increase of at least \$.10 per \$1,000 of assessed valuation to preserve agricultural land (53% of all survey respondents); 39% would favor an increase of at least \$.25 per \$1,000 (29% of all respondents); 28% of possible supporters say the program should be funded by other means. (Q12)

**Conclusions:** Support for the preservation and continued active use of farmland in Walworth County is very strong (support/opposition ratio of 14:1 through goal- and policy-setting prospects). That support prevails, though in somewhat lower percentages, even when farmland preservation is cast against private property owner decisions. Opinions regarding the use of property tax dollars to compensate agricultural landowners who agree not to develop their land are mixed, though a majority (53%) would support a property tax increase of at least \$.10 per \$1,000 of assessed valuation being used for such purposes.

### **The Future of Farming**

Preferences related to the future of farming are allied with, though somewhat distinct from, the issues of farmland. They are derived from questions within the survey sections addressing County trends and values, farmland preservation issues, and quality of life in Walworth County.

**95%** of respondents say the continued existence of remaining family farms is very important or somewhat important to the County's future (74% and 21%, respectively); 4% say this is not important. (Q9)

**91%** identify the rural atmosphere as being very important or somewhat important in influencing their decision to live, locate, or invest in Walworth County (59% and 32%, respectively); 9% say it is not so important or not important at all. Natural environment (a possible component of rural atmosphere along with farming) was a separate category. (Q37)

**89%** include agriculture in the selection of their preferred future for Walworth County in 25 years (71% mixed agricultural/residential and 18% rural/agricultural community). (Q1)

**65%** of those who believe Walworth County should continue to grow would like to see growth in family farms (50% of all respondents); 39% would like to see growth in hobby farms (30% of all respondents); 6% would favor large corporate farms. (Q4)

**Conclusions:** When analyzed from the standpoint of rural lifestyle, livelihood, and atmosphere, the continuation of family farming is as important to survey respondents as farmland, per se. Rural residential uses (see subsequent sections) are not seen by most as incompatible with the vision for agriculture.

### **Rural Lot Sizes**

Preferences for rural lot sizes to accommodate residential development are derived from survey sections addressing farmland preservation issues and residential land use issues.

**61%** of respondents say the current lot size of 35 acres for building a house on A-1 zoned (prime) farmland in Walworth County should be maintained; 14%, say it should be decreased; 11% say it should be increased; 3% say eliminated; 12% have no opinion. (Q7)

**80%** of the survey respondents who say the A-1 zoned lot size should be decreased, would prefer lots of 5 to 20 acres (10% of all respondents). 100% of those who say the A-1 zoned lot size should be increased, would prefer lots of 40 to 100+ acres (11% of all respondents) and 76% would prefer 50 to 100+ acres (8% of all respondents). (Q7)

**59%** of respondents say the current lot size of 20 acres for building a house on A-2 zoned farmland should be maintained; 16% say it should be decreased; 10% say it should be increased; 3% say eliminated; 12% have no opinion. (Q8)

- 79% of the survey respondents who say the A-2 lot size should be decreased, would prefer lots of 5 to 15 acres (12% of total survey respondents). 100% of those who say the A-2 zoned lot size should be increased, would prefer lots of 25 to 50+ acres (10% of all survey respondents) and 79% would prefer 35 to 50+ acres (8% of all respondents). (Q8)
- 29% of respondents would prefer one dwelling unit per 5 acres as the minimum lot size for rural land not considered to be prime farmland; 29% would prefer 1 acre lots for such rural land; 21% say 2 -3 acre lots; 9% say 10 acre lots; 5% say 20 acre lots; 7% say 35+ acre lots. (Q16)<sup>2</sup>

**Conclusions:** Regarding A-1 zoned (prime) farmland, support for the current buildable lot size of 35 acres outweighs the support for a smaller lot size (4:1 ratio). Regarding A-2 zoned farmland, support for the current buildable lot size of 20 acres, or larger, similarly outweighs support for a smaller lot size. When the issue of minimum lot size is cast in terms of undifferentiated “rural land” not considered to be prime farmland, then preferences vary considerably, with half preferring lots smaller than 5 acres, and half favoring lots 5 acres or larger.

### **Residential Land Use in General**

Preferences regarding residential land use in general are derived from questions within survey sections addressing residential land use issues, County trends and values, and quality of life in Walworth County.

- 47% of respondents indicate new housing development in Walworth County should be located in urban areas; 32% prefer both urban and rural areas; 2% prefer rural areas; 20% disfavor new housing. (Q13)<sup>3</sup>
- 51% say Walworth County government should remain neutral regarding residential housing as it plans for future development; 30% say the County should encourage residential housing; 18% say housing should be discouraged. (Q38)
- 48% of the respondents who believe Walworth County should continue to grow would like to see rural residential growth (37% of total survey respondents). (Q4)
- 48% agree or strongly agree with the County guiding new residential development through use of conservation or cluster subdivisions (32% and 15% respectively); 30% disagree or strongly disagree (15% each); 23% are neutral to this concept. (Q17)

**Note:** Non-resident property owners compared to resident households, agree more with the County guiding new residential development via conservation subdivisions (54% vs. 45%, respectively), and disagree with the concept less (23% vs. 33%). (Q17)

**Conclusions:** Considerably more respondents indicate that residential growth (housing development) should take place in urban areas than in rural areas of Walworth County. Somewhat over a third of all respondents would like to see rural residential growth. Nevertheless, about half of respondents indicate a neutral view regarding general residential development in the County and agree with the County guiding residential development through conservation or cluster subdivisions. (see also Housing Types, by Area).

### **Housing Types, By Area**

Preferences regarding types of housing and whether they are appropriate to urban and/or rural areas are derived from questions in survey sections addressing residential land use issues, County trends and values, and quality of life in Walworth County.

<sup>2</sup> For questions 13 – 16 the term “urban areas” was defined in the survey questionnaire as areas served by public sanitary sewer service. The term “rural areas” was defined as areas not served by public sanitary sewer service.

<sup>3</sup> See Footnote 2

**88%** of respondents say single-family housing should be provided in urban areas; 71% say it should be provided in rural areas. (Q14 and 15)<sup>4</sup> Other related findings, as abbreviated from questions 14 and 15 in the survey, include:

**36%** say provide duplexes in urban areas; 11% say rural areas.

**25%** say provide multi-family housing in urban areas; 6% say rural areas.

**5%** say provide mobile home parks in urban areas; 4% say rural areas.

**36%** say provide condominiums in urban areas; 9% say rural areas.

**61%** say provide senior housing complexes in urban areas; 25% say rural areas.

**41%** say provide retirement home complexes in urban areas; 24% say rural areas.

**21%** say provide low-moderate income housing in urban areas; 9% say rural areas.

**10%** disfavor new housing in urban areas; 27% disfavor it in rural areas.

**73%** of the respondents who feel Walworth County should continue to grow would like to see growth in single-family residential (57% of total survey respondents); 15% would like to see growth in condominiums and 13% would like to see growth in multi-family residential (12% and 10% of total survey respondents, respectively). (Q4)

**46%** of respondents say Walworth County government should remain neutral regarding vacation homes as it plans for future development; 26% say the County should encourage vacation homes; 25% say vacation homes should be discouraged. (Q38)

*Note:* Though resident households and non-resident property owners are very similar in neutral responses regarding vacation homes (46% and 45%, respectively), 17% of resident households vs. 43% of non-resident property owners feel local officials should encourage them; 32% vs. 9%, respectively, say vacation homes should be discouraged. (Q38)

**41%** disagree or strongly disagree with a statement that there is a shortage of affordable housing in Walworth county (28% and 13% respectively); 26% agree or strongly agree that there is a shortage (16% and 10%, respectively); 33% are neutral. (Q18)

*Note:* 31% of resident households and 16% of non-resident property owners agree that a shortage of affordable housing exists; 41% of both groups disagree that a shortage of affordable housing exists; 28% of resident households and 43% of non-resident property owners are neutral. (Q18)

**39%** agree or strongly agree that there is a shortage of housing for seniors in the County; 17% disagree or strongly disagree; 45% are neutral. (Q19)

**Conclusions:** Like residential land uses in general, there is greater support for all types of housing in urban areas than in rural areas. In both urban and rural areas, single-family housing is convincingly favored over all other types. However, there is considerably more support for duplexes, multi-family housing, and condominiums in urban areas than in rural areas. Overall, respondents feel that the County should remain largely neutral regarding

---

<sup>4</sup>See Footnote 2.

vacation homes; non-resident property owners are more supportive of vacation homes than resident households. Opinions are mixed on whether shortages in affordable housing and housing for seniors exist.

### **Business Development in General**

Preferences regarding business development in general, including its prospective concentration and location, are derived from questions in survey sections addressing commercial and industrial development and quality of life in Walworth County.

**50%** of respondents say commercial and industrial development should be allowed but not encouraged in Walworth County; 29% say such development should be encouraged; 19% say it should be discouraged. (Q20)

**63%** of the survey respondents who feel commercial and industrial development should be encouraged in the County say that there should be no property tax increase for such a program and that the program should be funded by other means; 37% of such respondents (13% of total respondents) would support a tax increase of at least \$.10 per \$1,000 of assessed valuation. (Q21)

**70%** of the survey respondents who feel commercial and industrial development should be encouraged or allowed in the County would like to see light industry; 53% would like to see growth in services; 51% would like more agricultural-related businesses; and 39% would like office parks (54%, 41%, 39% and 30% of all survey respondents, respectively). (Q22)

*Note:* Regarding the business growth types highlighted above, resident households compared to non-resident property owners would like to see slightly more light industry development (71% vs. 67%), less services development (48% vs. 64%), and less office park development (34% vs. 51%). (Q22)

**67%** of respondents identify employment opportunities as being very important or somewhat important in influencing their decision to live, locate, or invest in Walworth County (35% and 32%, respectively); 33% say employment opportunities are not very important or not at all important to this decision (20% and 13%, respectively). (Q37)

*Note:* 72% of resident households compared to 56% of non-resident property owners feel that employment opportunities are very important or somewhat important in influencing their decision to live, locate, or invest in the County. Respectively, 28% vs. 45% feel that employment opportunities are not so important or not important at all. (Q37)

**54%** feel businesses should be concentrated in a few areas; 34% feel businesses should be dispersed throughout the County; 11% have no opinion. (Q23)

**84%** of the respondents who feel businesses should be concentrated indicate that the location should be in currently zoned commercial and industrial areas (49% of all respondents). 41% of the respondents favoring business concentration say the location should be where public sewer service is available; 36% say in cities and villages; 34% say near or adjacent to existing development; 4% say businesses can be concentrated in any location (24%, 21%, 20%, and 2% of all respondents, respectively). (Q24)

**Conclusions:** Many more respondents indicate that commercial and industrial development should be allowed instead of being encouraged; and there is little support for a property tax increase to encourage such development. Support for concentrating businesses is greater than for dispersing them; and by far the greatest number of supporters favor concentrations in zoned commercial and industrial areas.

## Commercial Development

Preferences regarding commercial development are derived from questions in survey sections addressing commercial and industrial issues, quality of life in Walworth County, and County trends and values.

- 77%** of respondents say that the local impact of County growth in recent years regarding availability of shopping has been positive or very positive (62% and 15%, respectively); 12% say impact has been negative or very negative (10% and 3%, respectively); 11% observe little change/no opinion. (Q39)
- 49%** say local officials should remain neutral regarding retail development as the County plans for future development; 27% say retail development should be encouraged; 22% say it should be discouraged. Preferences for tourism facilities are similar: 49% say remain neutral, 35% say encourage, and 13% say discourage. (Q38)  
  
*Note:* Resident households compared to non-resident property owners show more neutrality on tourism facilities (51% vs. 43%, respectively), and less support for encouragement as the County plans for future development (30% vs. 44%). (Q38)
- 53%** of those who indicate that commercial and industrial development should be encouraged or allowed, favor services (41% of all total survey respondents). 51% favor agricultural-related development, 39% favor office parks, 28% favor shopping centers, and 30% favor other retail (respectively, 39%, 30%, 22%, and 23% of all survey respondents). (Q22)
- 46%** of those who believe Walworth County should continue to grow would like to see tourist-related businesses (35% of all respondents). 30% would like to see office-type businesses, 29% would like to see convenience stores and services, 21% would like to see large retail outlet centers (respectively, 23%, 23%, and 16% of all respondents). (Q4)

**Conclusions:** A majority feel that the impact of County growth in recent years has been positive regarding shopping. Nevertheless, a neutral policy regarding retail development and tourism facilities is supported by the largest number of respondents, while lesser percentages would either encourage or discourage such growth. Among commercial and industrial development supporters, a majority would encourage or allow growth in services. Agricultural related businesses, some of which could be industrial, office parks, and “other retail” receive the next levels of support. About a third of all respondents indicated support for tourist-related businesses.

## Industrial Development

Preferences regarding industrial development are derived from questions in survey sections addressing commercial and industrial issues, quality of life in Walworth County, and County trends and values.

- 46%** of respondents say Walworth County government should remain neutral regarding industrial development as it plans for future development, 26% say industrial development should be discouraged, 25% say it should be encouraged. (Q38)
- 70%** of those who indicate that commercial and industrial development should be encouraged or allowed, favor light industry (54% of all respondents); 13% favor heavy industry (10% of all respondents). (Q22)
- 55%** of those who believe Walworth County should continue to grow, would like to see light industry (43% of all respondents); 10% would like to see heavy industry (8% of all respondents). (Q4)

**Conclusions:** A neutral policy regarding industrial development is supported by the largest number of respondents, while a little over half as many would encourage or discourage such growth (similar to commercial development). But among commercial and industrial development supporters, and growth supporters in general,

there is a dichotomy between light and heavy industry. Light industry is favored over heavy industry by a margin greater than 5:1 (also capturing around half of total survey respondents).

### **Natural Resource Features**

Preferences regarding natural resource features (apart from farmland) are derived from questions in survey sections addressing environmental issues and quality of life in Walworth County.

**95%** of respondents say the natural environment is very important or somewhat important in influencing their decision to live, locate, or invest in Walworth County (68% and 28%, respectively); 5% say the natural environment is not very important or not important at all to that decision. (Q37)

**77%** say lake access/quality is very important or somewhat important in influencing their decision to live, locate, or invest in Walworth County (49% and 29%, respectively); 23% say lake access/quality is not so important or not at all important to that decision (17% and 6%, respectively). (Q37)

*Note:* Non-resident property owners compared to resident households feel that lake access/quality is much more important in their decision to live, locate, or invest in the County (92% vs. 70%, respectively); further, 69% of non-resident property owners say it is very important and only 8% say unimportant. (Q37)

**86%** of respondents say Walworth County should actively pursue the protection of woodlands; 82% say the County should actively pursue wetland protection. (Q25)

**80%** say Walworth County should actively pursue protection of significant groundwater recharge areas, which replenish well water. (Q25)

**76%** say Walworth County should actively pursue protection of park land, existing and future; 67% say the County should actively pursue the protection of open spaces. (Q25)

*Note:* Non-resident property owners compared to resident households more strongly support the County actively pursuing the protection of both park land (83% vs. 73%) and open spaces (74% vs. 64%). (Q25)

**64%** of respondents say Walworth County should actively pursue protection of endangered species habitat. (Q25)

**3%** say Walworth County should not pursue the protection of any of the resources mentioned in the four points above, nor historic sites. (Q25)

**68%** of respondents favoring the protection of the resources specified above would support a property tax increase of at least \$.10 per \$1,000 of assessed valuation to carry it out (63% of all survey respondents); 35% would support an increase of at least \$.25 per \$1,000. Conversely, 32% would not support a property tax increase, saying it should be funded by other means (30% of all respondents). (Q26)

**62%** think the best use of land along river and stream corridors within rural areas of the County is to leave it in its natural state; 58% think recreational uses are best; 30% think agricultural uses are best; 15% think residential development, if not floodlands or wetlands. (Q27)

**Conclusions:** Natural resource features are highly valued and their protection is strongly supported by survey respondents. Almost all (95%) say that the natural environment positively influences their decision to live, locate, or invest in Walworth County. Over three-quarters say lake access/quality is important in their decision to live,

locate, or invest in the County. Three-fifths think the best use of land along rural stream corridors is to leave it in its natural state. Most say the County should actively pursue the protection of woodlands, wetlands, open spaces, park land, groundwater recharge areas, and endangered species habitat. At \$.10 per \$1,000 of assessed valuation, a property tax increase to carry out a protection program for these features is supported by nearly two-thirds of all respondents; higher assessments are not as well supported.

### County Ordinances and Regulatory Issues

Preferences related to County ordinances and regulatory issues are derived from questions in the survey section by that name.

**44%** of respondents say they are not familiar with Walworth County’s existing zoning ordinance, when asked about its status; 15% say the ordinance should be maintained as is; 12% say it should be turned over to the towns (except shoreland-floodland); 12% say the ordinance should be slightly revised; 8% say it should be completely redone; 8% have no opinion. (Q30)

**43%** say the requirements and enforcement of the County Zoning Ordinance, should be stricter; 37% say maintain the requirements and enforcement as is; 14% say relaxed; 7% have no opinion. (Q31)

**64%** say the requirements and enforcement of the County’s Subdivision Control Ordinance should be stricter; 24% say the requirements and enforcement should be maintained as is; 8% say relaxed; 4% have no opinion. For the requirements and enforcement of Sanitation and Erosion Control/Stormwater Management Ordinances, 52% of respondents *on average* say application should be stricter; 37% say maintained as is; 5% say relaxed; 7% have no opinion. (Q31)

**49%** disagree or strongly disagree that the use of private lands should be based on the owners’ preferences rather than being restricted by zoning (34% and 15%, respectively); 32% agree or strongly agree with owners’ preferences being the basis for use of private lands (21% and 11%, respectively); 20% are neutral. (Q32)

*Note:* Resident households compared to non-resident property owners express more agreement that use of private land should be based on owners’ preferences (33% vs. 28%, respectively), and less disagreement (45% vs. 57%). (Q32)

**77%** of respondents agree or strongly agree that local units of government have the responsibility to protect property owners and the community by regulating land use (47% and 29%, respectively); 8% disagree or strongly disagree. (Q33)

**83%** agree or strongly agree that the use of zoning regulations is beneficial (51% and 31%, respectively); 3% disagree or strongly disagree. (Q34)

**Conclusions:** Despite some limited familiarity with zoning, there is widespread agreement that local units of government have a responsibility to provide protection by regulating land use, and that zoning regulations are beneficial (10:1 and 28:1 ratios of agreement over disagreement, respectively). Support for zoning is lower, but still strong, when the question is posed in terms of whether the use of private land should be based on zoning or owners’ preferences. Stricter requirements and enforcement of existing ordinances—or maintaining them as is—all substantially outweigh a low level of support for relaxed requirements and enforcement.

### Other Policies Affecting Environmental Protection

Preferences related to other environmental protection policies are derived from questions in survey sections addressing environmental issues and quality of life in Walworth County.

- 88%** of respondents say Walworth County government should encourage environmental preservation as it plans for future development, rather than remaining neutral (11%) or discouraging it (<1%). (Q38)
- 82%** indicate that Walworth County government should regulate land uses that would adversely impact groundwater; 13% say to provide compensation to owners of significant groundwater recharge areas for good management; 9% say provide information only; 5% prefer no County involvement. (Q28)
- 70%** say the County should actively pursue the protection of historic sites—a component of the cultural environment. (Q25) 52% say historic features are very important or somewhat important in influencing their decision to live, locate, or invest in Walworth County (19% and 32%, respectively); 49% say historic features are not so important or not at all important to their decision (36% and 12%, respectively). (Q37)
- 49%** say the impact of County growth in recent years regarding environmental quality has been positive or very positive (38% and 11%, respectively); 29% say the impact has been negative or very negative (24% and 4%, respectively); 22% observe little change/no opinion. (Q39)
- 50%** feel each property owner in rural areas of Walworth County should install and maintain their own septic system; 36% feel residents should link up with municipal sewer systems if nearby and available; 8% feel non-sewered development should not be allowed; 6% feel large-scale septic systems serving multiple homes should be allowed to address the issue. (Q29)

*Note:* Resident households compared to non-resident property owners feel more strongly that each property owner should install and maintain their own septic system (55% vs. 40%), and less strongly that residents should link up with municipal sewer systems if nearby and available (31% vs. 45%). (Q29)

**Conclusions:** Support for environmental protection policies and preferences—beyond those discussed previously—is very strong. The ratio of those who feel Walworth County government should encourage environmental preservation over those who feel the County should remain neutral or discourage it is 8:1. Regulation of land uses that would adversely impact groundwater is also strongly supported over no involvement (18:1), as is protection of historic sites (23:1). Regarding sewage disposal in rural areas, about half favor individual disposal systems—and a little over one-third favor linking up with nearby municipal sewer systems if nearby and available (with non-resident property owners more inclined toward the latter).

### **Quality of Life**

Preferences related to quality of life are contained indirectly in a number of survey sections, but, particularly as analyzed below, are derived from the survey section directly addressing quality of life in Walworth County.

- 84%** of respondents indicate that they are satisfied or completely satisfied with Walworth County as a place to live (65% and 20%, respectively); 6% are dissatisfied or completely dissatisfied. (Q35)
- 43%** of respondents believed that population growth has had a negative or very negative effect on the quality of life in the County (37% and 7%, respectively); 32% thought the effect of population growth on the quality of life has been positive or very positive (28% and 4%, respectively); 15% said population growth had no effect on the quality of life and 10% had no opinion. (Q36)
- 70%** say the local impact of County growth in recent years regarding overall quality of life has been positive or very positive (54% and 16% respectively); 14% say the impact has been negative or very negative (13% and 1%, respectively); 16% observe little change/no opinion. (Q39)

**77%** indicate positive responses regarding County growth in recent years and changes in health care access (vs. 5% negative), which leads a grouping of favorable impacts observed; some other largely positive impacts include the library system (56% positive vs. 9% negative), law enforcement needs (53% positive vs. 21% negative), sense of community (53% positive vs. 22% negative), school system (49% positive vs. 14% negative), and energy supplies (44% positive vs. 17% negative). (Q39)

**67%** of respondents observing little change/no opinion regarding County growth in recent years and child care facilities (vs. 26% positive and 7% negative responses), leads a grouping of neutral impacts; some other largely neutral impacts include 48% observing little change/no opinion regarding wages/job market (vs. 27% negative and 25% positive), and 46% for non-automobile transportation alternatives (vs. 43% negative and 11% positive). (Q39)

**67%** negative responses regarding County growth in recent years and changes in traffic volume (vs. 21% positive), leads a grouping of negative impacts observed; some other largely negative impacts include cost of living (47% negative vs. 30% positive), and housing costs (45% negative vs. 36% positive). (Q39)

**Note:** For the preceding three points, resident households compared to non-resident property owners tend to view differently the impacts of change due to growth: more positively regarding the library system (60% vs. 47% positive) and school system (56% vs. 36%); with less neutrality regarding wages/job market (40% vs. 64% little change/no opinion); and more negatively regarding cost of living (53% vs. 35% negative) and housing costs (50% vs. 35%). (Q39)

**99%** of respondents say low crime rate is very important or somewhat important in influencing their decision to live, locate, or invest in Walworth County. Some other quality of life characteristics highlighting County attributes, institutions and services available, and personal needs met include (by overall importance cited): (Q37)

- 95%** natural environment
- 94%** friendly communities
- 91%** suitable residence found
- 91%** rural atmosphere
- 89%** good place to raise a family
- 89%** pace of life
- 80%** recreational opportunities
- 77%** lake access
- 76%** government services
- 75%** educational system
- 67%** utilities available (public sewer/water)
- 67%** proximity of family
- 67%** employment opportunities
- 60%** proximity to Chicago and Milwaukee
- 51%** historic features

**Note:** Resident households compared to non-resident property owners, respectively, placed: less importance on recreational opportunities (75% vs. 90%) and lake access (70% vs. 92%); more importance on the educational system (80% vs. 64%) and employment opportunities (72% vs. 56%); less importance on utilities available (64% vs. 75%); and much less importance on proximity to Chicago and Milwaukee (52% vs. 77%). (Q37)

**Conclusions:** Respondents are generally very satisfied with the quality of life in Walworth County. The natural environment, low crime rate, friendly communities, suitable residence, good place to raise family, and pace of life

are strongly supported. Many respondents feel that growth in the County has positively impacted the County in a number of ways (access to health care, availability of shopping, library system, sense of community) and negatively impacted the County in other ways (traffic volumes, cost of living, housing costs). When asked specifically and directly about the impacts of population growth on the quality of life in the County, more respondents answered negatively than positively. When asked a related question in a broader context about the local impacts of past growth on the overall quality of life, more responded positively than negatively.

## **SUMMARY**

A comprehensive plan survey of randomly selected resident households and non-resident owners of real property in Walworth County was undertaken in spring and summer 2007 in an effort to identify the range of viewpoints which might exist on key issues, thereby broadening citizen participation. A stratified random selection technique was used to draw a 15% sample from each of the sample groups, respectively inside and outside of the County. A return-by-mail questionnaire was sent and received by 6,216 parties total. A total of 1,159 respondents completed and returned the questionnaire by an identified cutoff point, a 19% response rate.

This report has presented an overview of the survey results. The survey questionnaire and the detailed results of the survey are presented in Appendices A through C. When analyzed and greatly distilled, the results from these 1,159 survey respondents form the basis for the following general conclusions:

- Respondents are generally very satisfied with the quality of life in Walworth County. Among reasons for choosing to live in Walworth County, frequently cited factors include friendly communities, good place to raise a family, low crime rate, natural environment, pace of life, recreational opportunities, rural atmosphere, and suitable residence found.
- Most respondents would prefer to have the County slow down with respect to its population growth, saying that development should be allowed but not encouraged, resulting in a preferred agricultural/residential future.
- Strong support exists for the preservation and continued active use of farmland in Walworth County. That support prevails, though in somewhat lower percentages, even when farmland preservation is cast against private property owner decisions.
- The continuation of family farming is as important to survey respondents as farmland, per se. Rural residential uses, however, are seen as compatible with the vision for agriculture.
- Regarding prime farmland, support for the current minimum buildable lot size of 35 acres for A-1 zoned land substantially outweighs the support for a smaller lot size. Regarding A-2 zoned land, the same is true for maintaining the current minimum buildable lot size of 20 acres. Preferences vary considerably on the matter of lot size for rural land not considered to be prime farmland.
- Considerably more respondents indicate that residential growth should take place in urban areas than in rural areas of Walworth County. Among growth supporters, nearly half would like to see rural residential growth. A majority of respondents indicate that the County should remain neutral regarding residential housing as it plans for future development.
- There is greater support for all types of housing in urban areas than in rural areas. In both urban and rural areas, single-family housing is convincingly favored over all other types. However, there is considerably more support for duplexes, multi-family housing, and condominiums in urban areas.
- Respondents do not seem to favor encouragement of commercial and industrial development, as almost twice as many respondents indicate that, while they believe commercial and industrial development should

be allowed, they are opposed to having that development encouraged. Support exists for concentrating businesses, and for zoned commercial and industrial areas.

- A neutral policy regarding retail development and tourism facilities is supported by a majority, while lesser percentages would either encourage or discourage such growth. Among commercial and industrial development supporters, a majority would encourage or allow both services and agricultural related businesses.
- A neutral policy regarding industrial development is supported by a majority of respondents. Among survey respondents in general, and commercial and industrial development growth supporters in particular, light industry is greatly favored over heavy industry.
- Natural resource features are very highly valued and their protection is strongly supported. Almost all respondents say that the natural environment positively influences their decision to live, locate, or invest in Walworth County. Three-fifths think the best use of land along rural stream corridors is to leave it in its natural state. Most say the County should actively pursue the protection of woodlands, wetlands, open spaces, park land, groundwater recharge areas, and endangered species habitat.
- A substantial number of respondents feel Walworth County government should encourage environmental preservation compared to those who feel the County should remain neutral or discourage it. Regulation of land uses that would adversely impact groundwater is also strongly supported, as is protection of historic sites.
- There is widespread agreement that local units of government have a responsibility to protect property owners and the community by regulating land use and that zoning regulations are beneficial. Support for zoning is lower, but still over twice as strong as opposition, when the matter is cast in terms of zoning vs. private landowner preferences. Stricter requirements and enforcement of existing ordinances—or maintaining them as is—all substantially outweigh a low level of support for relaxed requirements and enforcement.
- Opinions regarding the impacts of growth in the County are mixed. Many respondents feel that growth has positively impacted the County in a number of ways (access to health care, availability of shopping, library system, sense of community) and negatively impacted the County in other ways (traffic volumes, cost of living, housing costs). When asked specifically and directly about the effect of population growth on the quality of life in Walworth County, more responded negatively than positively. However, when asked a related question in a broader context about the local impact of past growth on the overall quality of life, more responded positively than negatively.
- Resident households and non-resident property owners exhibited basically the same responses to trends but to different degrees – as well as some differences – on various issues. However, the survey responses of these two groups were often in accord. Beyond the findings summarized above, Walworth County characteristics of low crime rate, friendly communities, suitable residences, good place to raise a family, and pace of life were very strongly and somewhat universally supported.

# Appendix A

## Dear Walworth County residents and property owners:

What does the future hold for Walworth County? Like so many other areas throughout our country, change is inevitable. Family farms, once the driving force behind local economies, are decreasing in number. Improved transportation networks make it possible for residents to commute to other communities to work, attend school, or shop. Amenities such as clean air and water, open spaces, scenic beauty, and the quality of life will likely attract new residents and development.

**To help address changes and identify future directions and goals, it is important to hear from Walworth County residents and property owners. Thus, you have been randomly selected to receive this survey.** The questions were developed by the University of Wisconsin-Extension in cooperation with the Walworth County Land Use and Resource Management Department, the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC), and an Advisory Committee of local officials, working together to prepare a County comprehensive plan. Through the survey and upcoming public meetings, we hope to obtain your opinions and concerns about land uses and other issues within the County.

Please take a few minutes to answer the questions to help ensure that Walworth County continues to be an attractive place to live, work, invest, and play. While the data from respondents will be grouped and analyzed by UW-Extension and SEWRPC, responses from individual surveys will remain confidential. **Your input is important!** Results from this survey will help guide future county decisions and directions for years to come.

**After completion, please refold and seal the form so that the return address and prepaid postage are showing. Then simply drop it in the U.S. mail.**

**PLEASE RETURN WITHIN 3 WEEKS:**

**Thank you!**

**Note:** Staff tabulating the data will not link any responses to you personally, and you may remove your mailing label if you wish. To verify that surveys are being returned from cities, villages, and towns across Walworth County, **please circle the number tied to the community you live in, or, if a non-resident, the community containing your most significant property:**

City of Delavan.....	1	Town of Delavan.....	15
City of Elkhorn.....	2	Town of East Troy.....	16
City of Lake Geneva.....	3	Town of Geneva.....	17
City of Whitewater.....	4	Town of LaGrange.....	18
Village of Darien.....	5	Town of LaFayette.....	19
Village of East Troy.....	6	Town of Linn.....	20
Village of Fontana-on-Geneva Lake.....	7	Town of Lyons.....	21
Village of Genoa City.....	8	Town of Richmond.....	22
Village of Mukwonago.....	9	Town of Sharon.....	23
Village of Sharon.....	10	Town of Spring Prairie.....	24
Village of Walworth.....	11	Town of Sugar Creek.....	25
Village of Williams Bay.....	12	Town of Troy.....	26
Town of Bloomfield.....	13	Town of Walworth.....	27
Town of Darien.....	14	Town of Whitewater.....	28

## Walworth County Comprehensive Plan Survey

- Help shape the future of the County
- Participate in the comprehensive planning process
- Please fill out and return within 3 weeks
- Your views will anonymously be heard
- Simply refold and seal the form, showing prepaid postage and business reply address, then mail
- For more information: [www.sewrpc.org/smartgrowth](http://www.sewrpc.org/smartgrowth)
- Thank you for responding



University of Wisconsin-Extension  
 County Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee  
 Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission  
 Walworth County Land Use and Resource Management Department



**WALWORTH COUNTY  
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN SURVEY**

**PLEASE: Circle the corresponding number of only one answer per question unless otherwise instructed.**

**I. COUNTY TRENDS AND VALUES**

1. **Which one term** would you select to describe Walworth County, as you want to see it, 25 years from today?
 

Rural, agricultural community.....1	Mixed agricultural/residential.....3
Residential community.....2	Mixed residential/business.....4
  
2. Between 1990 and 2006, Walworth County's population grew from 75,000 to an estimated 99,800 or 33.1 percent. At what rate would you like to see growth continue to occur?
 

Faster rate.....1
Present (recently experienced) rate.....2
Slower rate.....3
No growth.....4
  
3. Should development be encouraged or discouraged in Walworth County?
 

Encouraged.....1
Allowed but not encouraged.....2
Discouraged.....3
No opinion.....4

If you answered either *Discouraged* or *No Opinion* please skip to Question 5.

4. If you believe Walworth County should continue to grow, what kind(s) of growth and/or business development would you like to see? (**Circle all that apply**)
 

Single-family residential.....1	Tourist-related businesses.....8
Multi-family residential.....2	Office-type businesses.....9
Rural residential.....3	Convenience stores and services.....10
Condominiums.....4	Large retail outlets/centers.....11
Hobby farms.....5	Light industry.....12
Family farms.....6	Heavy industry.....13
Large corporate farms.....7	

**II. FARMLAND PRESERVATION ISSUES**

5. Do you agree or disagree that preservation of farmland in Walworth County is important?
 

Strongly agree.....1
Agree.....2
Neutral.....3
Disagree.....4
Strongly disagree.....5
  
6. Do you agree or disagree that Walworth County government should set agricultural land preservation as a priority goal and implement policies to achieve it?
 

Strongly agree.....1
Agree.....2
Neutral.....3
Disagree.....4
Strongly disagree.....5
  
7. The current lot size for building a house on A-1 zoned (Prime) farmland in Walworth County is 35 acres. This standard should be:
 

Maintained.....1
Eliminated.....2
Increased to ___40, ___50, ___80, or ___100+ acres (Please check one if you favor an increase).....3
Decreased to ___1, ___2, ___5, ___10, or ___20 acres (Please check one if you favor a decrease).....4
No opinion.....5
  
8. The current lot size for building a house on A-2 zoned farmland (smaller farmland blocks than A-1 zoning and/or soils not quite as productive) is 20 acres. This lot size should be:
 

Maintained.....1
Eliminated.....2
Increased to ___25, ___35, ___40, or ___50+ acres (Please check one if you favor an increase).....3
Decreased to ___1, ___2, ___5, ___10, or ___15 acres (Please check one if you favor a decrease).....4
No opinion.....5
  
9. In your opinion, is the continued existence of the remaining family farms important to the county's future?
 

Very important.....1
Somewhat important.....2
Not important.....3
No opinion.....4

10. Given a situation where a farm is sold, which one of the following best describes how you would like to see the land used after the sale?

- The land should be allowed to be subdivided for development purposes.....1
- The land should be kept agricultural or agricultural-related.....2
- The land should be used however the new owner desires.....3
- No opinion.....4

11. Would you support spending property tax dollars for the preservation of agricultural land by compensating land owners who agree to preserve their farmland?

- Yes.....1
- Maybe, depending upon the cost.....2
- No.....3
- No opinion.....4

If you answered *No or No opinion*, please skip to Question 13.

12. If you are potentially receptive to preserving agricultural land with tax dollars, how much of a property tax increase would you be willing to support to carry out such a program?

- 10¢ per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$20/yr. on \$200,000 property).....1
- 25¢ per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$50/yr. on \$200,000 property).....2
- 50¢ per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$100/yr. on \$200,000 property).....3
- 75¢ per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$150/yr. on \$200,000 property).....4
- \$1.00 per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$200/yr. on \$200,000 property).....5
- No property tax increase, the program should be funded by other means.....6

**III. RESIDENTIAL LAND USE ISSUES**

**NOTE:** For questions 13-18, the term “**urban areas**” refers to areas served by public sanitary sewer service; the term “**rural areas**” refers to areas that are not served by public sanitary sewer service.

13. Where should new housing development be located in Walworth County?

- Urban areas.....1
- Rural areas.....2
- Both urban and rural areas.....3
- Disfavor new housing.....4

14. What types of housing should be provided in urban areas? (*Circle all that apply*)

- Single-family.....1
- Duplexes.....2
- Multi-family.....3
- Mobile home parks.....4
- Condominiums.....5
- Senior housing complexes.....6

- Retirement home complexes.....7
- Low-moderate income housing.....8
- Disfavor new housing.....9

15. Other than farm residences, what type of housing should be provided in rural areas? (*Circle all that apply*)

- Single-family.....1
- Duplexes.....2
- Multi-family.....3
- Mobile home parks.....4
- Condominiums.....5
- Senior housing complexes.....6
- Retirement home complexes.....7
- Low-moderate income housing.....8
- Disfavor non-farm housing in rural areas.....9

16. What should be the minimum lot size requirement for rural land which is **not** considered to be prime farmland?

- One dwelling unit per acre.....1
- One dwelling unit per 2-3 acres.....2
- One dwelling unit per 5 acres.....3
- One dwelling unit per 10 acres.....4
- One dwelling unit per 20 acres.....5
- One dwelling unit per 35 acres.....6

17. Would you agree or disagree with the County guiding new residential development through use of conservation or cluster subdivisions? These subdivisions may permit smaller lots on suitable portions of affected land parcels, but then preserve open space on the remainder of such parcels.

- Strongly agree.....1
- Agree.....2
- Neutral.....3
- Disagree.....4
- Strongly disagree.....5

18. Do you agree or disagree that there is a shortage of affordable housing in Walworth County?

- Strongly agree.....1
- Agree.....2
- Neutral.....3
- Disagree.....4
- Strongly disagree.....5

19. Do you agree or disagree that there is a shortage of housing for seniors in Walworth County?

- Strongly agree.....1
- Agree.....2
- Neutral.....3
- Disagree.....4
- Strongly disagree.....5

**IV. COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL ISSUES**

20. Should commercial and industrial development be encouraged or discouraged in Walworth County?

- Encouraged.....1
- Allowed but not encouraged.....2
- Discouraged.....3
- No opinion.....4

If you answered **Allowed but not encouraged**, please skip to Question 22.

If you answered **Discouraged or No opinion**, please skip to Question 23.

21. If you feel that commercial and industrial development should be encouraged in Walworth County, how much of a property tax increase would you be willing to support to carry out such a program?

- 10¢ per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$20/yr. on \$200,000 property).....1
- 25¢ per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$50/yr. on \$200,000 property).....2
- 50¢ per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$100/yr. on \$200,000 property).....3
- 75¢ per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$150/yr. on \$200,000 property).....4
- \$1.00 per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$200/yr. on \$200,000 property).....5
- No property tax increase, the program should be funded by other means.....6

22. If you feel that commercial and industrial development should either be encouraged or allowed in Walworth County, what type of business growth would you like to occur? **(Circle all that apply)**

- |                        |                            |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Services.....1         | Light industry.....5       |
| Office parks.....2     | Heavy industry.....6       |
| Shopping centers.....3 | Agricultural related.....7 |
| Other retail.....4     | No preference.....8        |

23. Should businesses be concentrated in a few areas or dispersed throughout the County?

- Concentrated.....1
- Dispersed.....2
- No opinion.....3

If you answered **Dispersed or No opinion**, please skip to Question 25.

24. If you feel that businesses should be concentrated in a few areas of Walworth County, where should the concentration(s) occur? **(Circle all that apply)**

- In currently zoned commercial and industrial areas.....1
- In cities and villages.....2
- Where public sewer service is available.....3
- Near or adjacent to existing development.....4
- They can be concentrated in any location.....5

**V. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES**

25. Should Walworth County actively pursue the protection of any of the following? **(Circle all that apply)**

- Woodlands.....1
- Wetlands.....2
- Open spaces.....3
- Significant groundwater recharge areas, which replenish well water.....4
- Endangered species habitat.....5
- Park land, existing and future.....6
- Historic sites.....7
- None, the County should not pursue the protection of any of these.....8

If you answered **None**, please skip to Question 27.

26. If you answered that Walworth County should actively protect certain environmental features, how much of a property tax increase would you be willing to support to carry out such a program?

- 10¢ per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$20/yr. on \$200,000 property).....1
- 25¢ per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$50/yr. on \$200,000 property).....2
- 50¢ per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$100/yr. on \$200,000 property).....3
- 75¢ per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$150/yr. on \$200,000 property).....4
- \$1.00 per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$200/yr. on \$200,000 property).....5
- No property tax increase, the program should be funded by other means.....6

27. What do you think is the best use of land along river and stream corridors within rural areas of the County? **(Circle all that apply)**

- Residential development\*, if not floodlands or wetlands.....1
  - Agricultural uses, if presently farmed.....2
  - Passive recreational uses, like hunting, fishing, and hiking.....3
  - Leave it in its natural state.....4
- \* Setback regulations apply

28. What involvement should Walworth County government have in the protection of groundwater quality and drinking water supplies?

- Regulate land uses that would adversely impact groundwater.....1
- Provide compensation to owners of significant groundwater recharge areas for good management.....2
- Provide information only.....3
- No involvement.....4

29. Which one of the following best describes your opinion on the issue of sewage disposal in rural areas of Walworth County?

- Each property owner should install and maintain their own septic system.....1
- Large-scale septic systems serving multiple homes should be allowed to address this issue.....2
- Residents should link up with municipal sewer systems if nearby and available.....3
- Non-sewered development should not be allowed.....4

**VI. COUNTY ORDINANCES AND REGULATORY ISSUES**

30. To address future development, Walworth County's existing zoning ordinance—which governs unincorporated areas including towns, but not cities or villages—should be:

- Completely redone.....1
- Slightly revised.....2
- Maintained as is.....3
- Eliminated.....4
- Turned over to the towns\*.....5
- No opinion.....6
- Not familiar with the ordinance.....7

\* Under state law, shoreland areas within 300 feet of streams or 1,000 feet of lakes, plus adjoining floodlands, would still be regulated by the County.

31. Should the requirements and enforcement of the following existing County Ordinances be stricter, relaxed or maintained as is? *(Circle one for each category)*

	Stricter	Relaxed	As Is	No Opinion
Zoning.....	1	2	3	4
Subdivision Control.....	1	2	3	4
Sanitation.....	1	2	3	4
Erosion Control/Stormwater Management.....	1	2	3	4
Not familiar enough to judge any of the above.....				5

32. Do you agree or disagree that the use of private land should be based on owners' preferences rather than being restricted by zoning?

- Strongly agree.....1
- Agree.....2
- Neutral.....3
- Disagree.....4
- Strongly disagree.....5

33. Do you agree or disagree that local units of government have the responsibility to protect property owners and the community by regulating land use?

- Strongly agree.....1
- Agree.....2
- Neutral.....3
- Disagree.....4
- Strongly disagree.....5

34. Do you agree or disagree that the use of zoning regulations are beneficial?

- Strongly agree.....1
- Agree.....2
- Neutral.....3
- Disagree.....4
- Strongly disagree.....5

**VII. QUALITY OF LIFE IN WALWORTH COUNTY**

35. How satisfied are you with Walworth County as to quality of life?

- Completely satisfied.....1
- Satisfied.....2
- Neutral.....3
- Dissatisfied.....4
- Completely dissatisfied.....5

36. What effect has population growth had on the quality of life in Walworth County?

- Very positive.....1
- Positive.....2
- No effect.....3
- Negative.....4
- Very negative.....5
- No opinion.....6

37. A variety of local characteristics influence a person's choice of where to live. **How important** is each of the following in influencing your decision to live, locate, or invest in Walworth County?

*(Circle one for each characteristic that applies)*

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not So Important	Not At All Important
Educational system.....	1	2	3	4
Employment opportunities.....	1	2	3	4
Friendly communities.....	1	2	3	4
Good place to raise a family.....	1	2	3	4
Government services.....	1	2	3	4
Historic features.....	1	2	3	4
Lake access/quality.....	1	2	3	4
Low crime rate.....	1	2	3	4
Natural environment.....	1	2	3	4
Pace of life.....	1	2	3	4
Proximity of family.....	1	2	3	4
Proximity to Chicago and Milwaukee... ..	1	2	3	4
Recreational opportunities.....	1	2	3	4
Rural atmosphere.....	1	2	3	4
Suitable residence found.....	1	2	3	4
Utilities available (public sewer/water).....	1	2	3	4

38. As Walworth County plans for future development, should local officials **discourage, encourage, or remain neutral** regarding each of the following? (*Circle one for each category*)

	Encourage	Remain Neutral	Discourage	No Opinion
Environmental preservation.....	1	2	3	4
Farmland preservation.....	1	2	3	4
Industrial development.....	1	2	3	4
Residential housing.....	1	2	3	4
Retail development.....	1	2	3	4
Tourism facilities.....	1	2	3	4
Vacation homes.....	1	2	3	4

39. The growth of Walworth County in recent years has brought about some changes. For each of the following which you may have observed, please indicate whether the local impact has been **positive or negative**. (*Circle one for each impact that applies*)

	Very Positive	Positive	Negative	Very Negative	Little Change/No Opinion
Access to health care.....	1	2	3	4	5
Availability of shopping.....	1	2	3	4	5
Child care facilities.....	1	2	3	4	5
Cost of living.....	1	2	3	4	5
Energy supplies.....	1	2	3	4	5
Environmental quality.....	1	2	3	4	5
Housing costs.....	1	2	3	4	5
Law enforcement needs.....	1	2	3	4	5
Library system.....	1	2	3	4	5
Overall quality of life.....	1	2	3	4	5
School system.....	1	2	3	4	5
Scenic beauty.....	1	2	3	4	5
Sense of community.....	1	2	3	4	5
Traffic volume.....	1	2	3	4	5
Transportation alternatives (non-automobile).....	1	2	3	4	5
Wages/job market.....	1	2	3	4	5

**VIII. SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION**

40. What is your age?

Less than 20 years.....	1	50-59 years.....	5
20-29 years.....	2	60-69 years.....	6
30-39 years.....	3	70-79 years.....	7
40-49 years.....	4	80 years or greater.....	8

41. What is your resident status with respect to Walworth County?

Permanent.....	1
Seasonal.....	2
Non-resident property owner.....	3

42. How long have you been a resident of, and/or owned land in, Walworth County? (*Circle longest duration*)

Less than 1 year.....	1	16-20 years.....	5
1-5 years.....	2	21-25 years.....	6
6-10 years.....	3	Greater than 25 years.....	7
11-15 years.....	4		

43. What best describes your primary place of residence, and its location? (*Circle all that apply*)

Owner-occupied home.....	1
Rental property.....	2
Farm.....	3
Hobby farm.....	4
City or village location.....	5
Town location.....	6
Own only land in Walworth County, residence is elsewhere.....	7

44. What is your occupation?

Homemaker.....	1	Farmer.....	8
Service worker.....	2	Sales worker.....	9
Laborer.....	3	Manager/administrator.....	10
Truck/delivery van driver.....	4	Professional/technical worker.....	11
Craftsman.....	5	Self-employed.....	12
Clerical worker.....	6	Retired.....	13
Factory worker.....	7	Unemployed.....	14

If you answered **Retired** or **Unemployed** please skip Questions 45 and 46.

45. Is your primary place of employment located in Walworth County?

Yes.....	1
No.....	2
Based in the County, but job mostly involves travel beyond.....	3

46. Approximately how many miles do you travel to your place of employment **one way**?

Less than one mile.....	1	Greater than 30 miles.....	5
1-10 miles.....	2	Work at home.....	6
11-20 miles.....	3	Always traveling for business.....	7
21-30 miles.....	4		

**Thank you!**

## Appendix B

# WALWORTH COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN SURVEY RESPONSES QUESTION BY QUESTION FREQUENCY RESPONSES

NOTE: UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED, PERCENTAGES ARE BASED ON THE  
NUMBER OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS THAT ANSWERED EACH QUESTION

### COUNTY TRENDS AND VALUES

1. Which one term would you select to describe Walworth County, as you want to see it, 25 years from today?

	Frequency	Percent
Rural, agricultural community .....	208	18.3
Residential community .....	22	1.9
Mixed agricultural/residential .....	806	70.8
Mixed residential/business .....	102	9.0
Total	1,138	100.0

2. Between 1990 and 2006, Walworth County's population grew from 75,000 to an estimated 99,800 or 33.1 percent. At what rate would you like to see growth continue to occur?

	Frequency	Percent
Faster rate .....	26	2.3
Present (recently experienced) rate ...	238	20.7
Slower rate .....	729	63.6
No growth .....	154	13.4
Total	1,147	100.0

3. Should development be encouraged or discouraged in Walworth County?

	Frequency	Percent
Encouraged .....	216	18.8
Allowed but not encouraged .....	638	55.4
Discouraged .....	270	23.5
No opinion .....	27	2.3
Total	1,151	100.0

4. If you believe Walworth County should continue to grow, what kind(s) of growth and/or business development would you like to see? (Circle all that apply)

*NOTE: This question was to be answered by those who indicated in Question 3 that development should be “encouraged” or “allowed but not encouraged.” Additional responses to this question were also included in this table.*

	Frequency	Percent <sup>a</sup>	Percent of All Survey Respondents (1,159)
Single-family residential.....	655	72.9	56.5
Multi-family residential.....	118	13.1	10.2
Rural residential.....	428	47.7	36.9
Condominiums .....	138	15.4	11.9
Hobby farms .....	350	39.0	30.2
Family farms.....	581	64.7	50.1
Large corporate farms.....	52	5.8	4.5
Tourist-related businesses.....	410	45.7	35.4
Office-type businesses .....	268	29.8	23.1
Convenience stores and services .....	262	29.2	22.6
Large retail outlets/centers.....	184	20.5	15.9
Light industry .....	493	54.9	42.5
Heavy industry.....	88	9.8	7.6
Total	4,027	--	--

<sup>a</sup>Percent of survey respondents that answered Question 4 (898).

**FARMLAND PRESERVATION ISSUES**

5. Do you agree or disagree that preservation of farmland in Walworth County is important?

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree .....	785	68.0
Agree.....	270	23.4
Neutral .....	66	5.7
Disagree .....	25	2.2
Strongly disagree.....	8	0.7
Total	1,154	100.0

6. Do you agree or disagree that Walworth County government should set agricultural land preservation as a priority goal and implement policies to achieve it?

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree .....	646	55.9
Agree.....	310	26.8
Neutral .....	133	11.5
Disagree .....	47	4.1
Strongly disagree.....	20	1.7
Total	1,156	100.0

7. The current lot size for building a house on A-1 zoned (Prime) farmland in Walworth County is 35 acres. This standard should be:

	Frequency	Percent
Maintained.....	674	60.6
Eliminated.....	29	2.6
Increased to.....	124	11.2
Decreased to .....	152	13.7
No opinion.....	132	11.9
Total	1,111	100.0

The lot size for building a house on A-1 zoned (Prime) farmland should be *increased* to [?] acres. (For those so indicating an increase in Question 7)

	Frequency	Percent	Percent of All Survey Respondents (1,159)
40 acres.....	29	23.6	2.5
50 acres.....	42	34.1	3.6
80 acres.....	15	12.2	1.3
100+ acres.....	37	30.1	3.2
Total	123	100.0	--

The lot size for building a house on A-1 zoned (prime) farmland in Walworth County should be *decreased* to [?] acres. (For those so indicating a decrease in Question 7)

	Frequency	Percent	Percent of All Survey Respondents (1,159)
1 acre.....	15	10.1	1.3
2 acres .....	14	9.5	1.2
5 acres .....	36	24.3	3.1
10 acres .....	35	23.7	3.0
20 acres .....	48	32.4	4.1
Total	148	100.0	--

8. The current lot size for building a house on A-2 zoned farmland (smaller farmland blocks than A-1 zoning and/or soils not quite as productive) is 20 acres. This lot size should be:

	Frequency	Percent
Maintained .....	657	58.9
Eliminated .....	29	2.6
Increased to .....	112	10.0
Decreased to.....	180	16.1
No opinion .....	139	12.4
Total	1,117	100.0

The lot size for building a house on A-2 zoned farmland should be increased to [?] acres. (For those so indicating an increase in Question 8)

	Frequency	Percent	Percent of All Survey Respondents (1,159)
25 acres .....	23	20.7	2.0
35 acres .....	43	38.8	3.7
40 acres .....	20	18.0	1.7
50+ acres .....	25	22.5	2.2
Total	111	100.0	--

The lot size for building a house on A-2 zoned farmland should be decreased to [?] acres. (For those so indicating a decrease in Question 8)

	Frequency	Percent	Percent of All Survey Respondents (1,159)
1 acres.....	21	11.8	1.8
2 acres.....	17	9.6	1.5
5 acres.....	66	37.0	5.7
10 acres.....	58	32.6	5.0
15 acres.....	16	9.0	1.4
Total	178	100.0	--

9. In your opinion, is the continued existence of the remaining family farms important to the County's future?

	Frequency	Percent
Very important .....	850	73.6
Somewhat important .....	241	20.9
Not important .....	47	4.1
No opinion .....	16	1.4
Total	1,154	100.0

10. Given a situation where a farm is sold, which one of the following best describes how you would like to see the land used after the sale?

	Frequency	Percent
The land should be allowed to be subdivided for development purposes .....	84	7.4
The land should be kept agricultural or agricultural-related .....	793	70.2
The land should be used however the new owner desires .	207	18.3
No opinion .....	46	4.1
Total	1,130	100.0

11. Would you support spending property tax dollars for the preservation of agricultural land by compensating land owners who agree to preserve their farmland?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes .....	313	27.2
Maybe, depending upon the cost .....	504	43.8
No .....	307	26.7
No opinion .....	27	2.3
Total	1,151	100.0

12. If you are potentially receptive to preserving agricultural land with tax dollars, how much of a property tax increase would you be willing to support to carry out such a program?

*NOTE: This question was to be answered by those who responded “yes” or “maybe, depending upon the cost” to Question 11. Additional responses to this question were also included.*

	Frequency	Percent	Percent of All Survey Respondents (1,159)
10¢ per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$20/yr. on \$200,000 property).....	279	32.8	24.1
25¢ per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$50/yr. on \$200,000 property).....	189	22.2	16.3
50¢ per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$100/yr. on \$200,000 property).....	94	11.1	8.1
75¢ per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$150/yr. on \$200,000 property).....	12	1.4	1.0
\$1.00 per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$200/yr. on \$200,000 property).....	40	4.7	3.5
No property tax increase, the program should be funded by other means .....	236	27.8	20.4
Total	850	100.0	--

## RESIDENTIAL LAND USE ISSUES

*NOTE: For questions 13-18, the term “urban areas” refers to areas served by public sanitary sewer service; the term “rural areas” refers to areas that are not served by public sanitary sewer service.*

13. Where should new housing development be located in Walworth County?

	Frequency	Percent
Urban areas .....	536	47.2
Rural areas .....	19	1.7
Both urban and rural areas .....	357	31.5
Disfavor new housing .....	222	19.6
Total	1,134	100.0

14. What types of housing should be provided in urban areas? (Circle all that apply)

	Frequency	Percent <sup>a</sup>
Single-family .....	1,024	89.0
Duplexes .....	413	35.9
Multi-family.....	283	24.6
Mobile home parks .....	58	5.0
Condominiums.....	419	36.4
Senior housing complexes .....	699	60.7
Retirement home complexes.....	477	41.4
Low-moderate income housing .....	236	20.5
Disfavor new housing .....	113	9.8
Total	3,722	--

<sup>a</sup>Percent of survey respondents that answered Question 14 (1,151).

15. Other than farm residences, what type of housing should be provided in rural areas? (Circle all that apply)

	Frequency	Percent <sup>a</sup>
Single-family .....	818	71.4
Duplexes .....	125	10.9
Multi-family.....	70	6.1
Mobile home parks .....	41	3.6
Condominiums.....	104	9.1
Senior housing complexes .....	283	24.7
Retirement home complexes.....	279	24.3
Low-moderate income housing .....	108	9.4
Disfavor new housing .....	306	26.7
Total	2,134	--

<sup>a</sup>Percent of survey respondents that answered Question 15 (1,146).

16. What should be the minimum lot size requirement for rural land which is not considered to be prime farmland?

	Frequency	Percent
One dwelling unit per acre.....	325	29.0
One dwelling unit per 2-3 acres.....	238	21.2
One dwelling unit per 5 acres.....	328	29.3
One dwelling unit per 10 acres.....	97	8.7
One dwelling unit per 20 acres.....	56	5.0
One dwelling unit per 35 acres.....	76	6.8
Total	1,120	100.0

17. Would you agree or disagree with the County guiding new residential development through use of conservation or cluster subdivisions? These subdivisions may permit smaller lots on suitable portions of affected land parcels, but then preserve open space on the remainder of such parcels.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree.....	175	15.4
Agree.....	367	32.3
Neutral.....	256	22.6
Disagree.....	173	15.2
Strongly disagree.....	165	14.5
Total	1,136	100.0

18. Do you agree or disagree that there is a shortage of affordable housing in Walworth County?

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree.....	117	10.2
Agree.....	186	16.2
Neutral.....	377	32.9
Disagree.....	320	27.9
Strongly disagree.....	147	12.8
Total	1,147	100.0

19. Do you agree or disagree that there is a shortage of housing for seniors in Walworth County?

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree.....	148	12.9
Agree.....	298	26.0
Neutral.....	511	44.6
Disagree.....	129	11.3
Strongly disagree.....	59	5.2
Total	1,145	100.0

## COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL ISSUES

20. Should commercial and industrial development be encouraged or discouraged in Walworth County?

	Frequency	Percent
Encouraged .....	329	28.7
Allowed but not encouraged .....	571	49.7
Discouraged .....	215	18.7
No opinion .....	33	2.9
Total	1,148	100.0

21. If you feel that commercial and industrial development should be encouraged in Walworth County, how much of a property tax increase would you be willing to support to carry out such a program?

*NOTE: This question was to be answered by those who indicated in Question 20 that commercial and industrial development should be “encouraged”. Additional responses to this question were also included.*

	Frequency	Percent	Percent of All Survey Respondents (1,159)
10¢ per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$20/yr. on \$200,000 property) .....	84	21.3	7.2
25¢ per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$50/yr. on \$200,000 property) .....	38	9.6	3.3
50¢ per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$100/yr. on \$200,000 property) .....	21	5.3	1.8
75¢ per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$150/yr. on \$200,000 property) .....	1	0.3	0.1
\$1.00 per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$200/yr. on \$200,000 property) .....	4	1.0	0.3
No property tax increase, the program should be funded by other means .....	246	62.5	21.2
Total	394	100.0	--

22. If you feel that commercial and industrial development should either be encouraged or allowed in Walworth County, what type of business growth would you like to occur? (Circle all that apply)

*NOTE: This question was to be answered by those who indicated “encouraged” or “allowed but not encouraged” in Question 20. Additional responses to this question were also included.*

	Frequency	Percent <sup>a</sup>	Percent of All Survey Respondents (1,159)
Services .....	474	52.5	40.9
Office parks .....	352	39.0	30.4
Shopping centers .....	250	27.7	21.6
Other retail.....	270	29.9	23.3
Light industry .....	629	69.7	54.3
Heavy industry .....	113	12.5	9.7
Agricultural related.....	456	50.6	39.3
No preference .....	75	8.3	6.5
Total	2,619	--	--

<sup>a</sup>Percent of survey respondents that answered Question 22 (902).

23. Should businesses be concentrated in a few areas or dispersed throughout the County?

	Frequency	Percent
Concentrated.....	615	54.4
Dispersed .....	388	34.4
No opinion .....	127	11.2
Total	1,130	100.0

24. If you feel that businesses should be concentrated in a few areas of Walworth County, where should the concentration(s) occur? (Circle all that apply)

*NOTE: This question was to be answered by those who indicated in Question 23 that businesses should be concentrated in a few areas of Walworth County. Additional responses to this question were also included.*

	Frequency	Percent <sup>a</sup>	Percent of All Survey Respondents (1,159)
In currently zoned commercial and industrial areas.....	563	83.5	48.6
In cities and villages .....	242	35.9	20.9
Where public sewer service is available.....	278	41.2	24.0
Near or adjacent to existing development .....	231	34.3	19.9
They can be concentrated in any location .....	27	4.0	2.3
Total	1,341	--	--

<sup>a</sup>Percent of survey respondents that answered Question 24 (674).

**ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES**

25. Should Walworth County actively pursue the protection of any of the following? (Circle all that apply)

	Frequency	Percent <sup>a</sup>
Woodlands .....	987	86.1
Wetlands .....	942	82.1
Open spaces .....	773	67.4
Significant groundwater recharge areas, which replenish well water .....	919	80.1
Endangered species habitat .....	728	63.5
Park land, existing and future .....	872	76.0
Historic sites .....	808	70.4
None, the County should not pursue the protection of any of these .....	36	3.1
Total	6,065	--

<sup>a</sup>Percent of survey respondents that answered Question 25 (1,147).

26. If you answered that Walworth County should actively protect certain environmental features, how much of a property tax increase would you be willing to support to carry out such a program?

*NOTE: This question was to be answered by those who indicated in Question 25 that the County should actively pursue the protection of one or more types of the features listed.*

	Frequency	Percent	Percent of All Survey Respondents (1,159)
10¢ per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$20/yr. on \$200,000 property) .....	351	32.4	30.3
25¢ per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$50/yr. on \$200,000 property) .....	198	18.2	17.1
50¢ per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$100/yr. on \$200,000 property) .....	122	11.2	10.5
75¢ per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$150/yr. on \$200,000 property) .....	5	0.5	0.4
\$1.00 per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$200/yr. on \$200,000 property) .....	57	5.3	4.9
No property tax increase, the program should be funded by other means .....	351	32.4	30.3
Total	1,084	100.0	--

27. What do you think is the best use of land along river and stream corridors within rural areas of the County? (Circle all that apply)

	Frequency	Percent <sup>a</sup>
Residential development*, if not floodlands or wetlands .....	175	15.4
Agricultural uses, if presently farmed.....	347	30.4
Passive recreational uses, like hunting, fishing, and hiking .....	665	58.3
Leave it in its natural state .....	706	61.9
Total	1,893	--

<sup>a</sup>Percent of survey respondents that answered Question 27 (1,140).

\* Setback regulations apply

28. What involvement should Walworth County government have in the protection of groundwater quality and drinking water supplies?

NOTE: Some respondents chose more than one response.

	Frequency	Percent <sup>a</sup>
Regulate land uses that would adversely impact groundwater .....	931	82.2
Provide compensation to owners of significant groundwater recharge areas for good management.....	149	13.2
Provide information only.....	96	8.5
No involvement .....	52	4.6
Total	1,228	--

<sup>a</sup>Percent of survey respondents that answered Question 28 (1,133).

29. Which one of the following best describes your opinion on the issue of sewage disposal in rural areas of Walworth County?

	Frequency	Percent
Each property owner should install and maintain their own septic system.....	509	50.4
Large-scale septic systems serving multiple homes should be allowed to address this issue .....	58	5.7
Residents should link up with municipal sewer systems if nearby and available .....	358	35.6
Non-sewered development should not be allowed ..	84	8.3
Total	1,009	100.0

## COUNTY ORDINANCES AND REGULATORY ISSUES

30. To address future development, Walworth County's existing zoning ordinance—which governs unincorporated areas including towns, but not cities or villages—should be:

	Frequency	Percent
Completely redone.....	86	7.7
Slightly revised.....	131	11.8
Maintained as is.....	162	14.6
Eliminated.....	12	1.1
Turned over to the towns*.....	137	12.3
No opinion.....	92	8.3
Not familiar with the ordinance.....	491	44.2
Total	1,111	100.0

\*Under state law, shoreland areas within 300 feet of streams or 1,000 feet of lakes, plus adjoining floodlands, would still be regulated by the County.

31. Should the requirements and enforcement of the following existing County Ordinances be stricter, relaxed or maintained as is? (Circle one for each category)

	Stricter		Relaxed		As Is		No Opinion		Total	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Zoning.....	313	43.3	98	13.5	266	36.7	47	6.5	724	100.0
Subdivision Control.....	462	63.6	59	8.1	174	24.0	31	4.3	726	100.0
Sanitation.....	345	48.3	37	5.2	296	41.5	36	5.0	714	100.0
Erosion Control/Stormwater Management.....	373	54.8	35	5.1	227	33.3	46	6.8	681	100.0

*NOTE: 409 respondents (35 percent of all 1,159 survey respondents) indicated that they are not familiar enough with any of the ordinances to make a judgment in this regard.*

32. Do you agree or disagree that the use of private land should be based on owners' preferences rather than being restricted by zoning?

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree.....	122	10.7
Agree.....	239	20.9
Neutral.....	224	19.6
Disagree.....	383	33.5
Strongly disagree.....	175	15.3
Total	1,143	100.0

33. Do you agree or disagree that local units of government have the responsibility to protect property owners and the community by regulating land use?

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree.....	337	29.4
Agree .....	540	47.1
Neutral .....	182	15.9
Disagree .....	64	5.6
Strongly agree.....	23	2.0
Total	1,146	100.0

34. Do you agree or disagree that the use of zoning regulations are beneficial?

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree.....	359	31.2
Agree .....	591	51.3
Neutral .....	165	14.3
Disagree .....	25	2.2
Strongly agree.....	11	1.0
Total	1,151	100.0

**QUALITY OF LIFE IN WALWORTH COUNTY**

35. How satisfied are you with Walworth County as to quality of life?

	Frequency	Percent
Completely satisfied .....	226	19.7
Satisfied .....	741	64.6
Neutral .....	111	9.7
Dissatisfied .....	63	5.5
Completely dissatisfied.....	6	0.5
Total	1,147	100.0

36. What effect has population growth had on the quality of life in Walworth County?

	Frequency	Percent
Very positive.....	45	3.9
Positive .....	317	27.8
No effect .....	175	15.3
Negative.....	417	36.6
Very negative.....	78	6.8
No opinion .....	109	9.6
Total	1,141	100.0

37. A variety of local characteristics influence a person's choice of where to live. How important is each of the following in influencing your decision to live, locate, or invest in Walworth County?

	Very Important		Somewhat Important		Not So Important		Not At All Important		Total	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Educational System.....	576	52.1	251	22.7	149	13.5	129	11.7	1,105	100.0
Employment opportunities.....	386	35.3	348	31.8	222	20.3	138	12.6	1,094	100.0
Friendly communities .....	689	61.8	355	31.9	56	5.0	14	1.3	1,114	100.0
Good place to raise a family .....	721	65.8	257	23.5	60	5.5	57	5.2	1,095	100.0
Government services.....	338	30.9	496	45.4	206	18.9	53	4.8	1,093	100.0
Historic features .....	211	19.3	352	32.2	396	36.2	135	12.3	1,094	100.0
Lake access/quality .....	538	48.5	318	28.6	188	17.0	65	5.9	1,109	100.0
Low crime rate .....	945	84.4	166	14.8	8	0.7	1	0.1	1,120	100.0
Natural environment .....	757	67.5	309	27.5	52	4.6	4	0.4	1,122	100.0
Pace of life .....	574	51.7	414	37.3	107	9.6	15	1.4	1,110	100.0
Proximity of family.....	339	31.4	378	35.1	251	23.3	110	10.2	1,078	100.0
Proximity to Chicago and Milwaukee.....	287	25.8	381	34.2	258	23.2	187	16.8	1,113	100.0
Recreational opportunities .....	397	35.9	487	44.0	183	16.5	40	3.6	1,107	100.0
Rural atmosphere .....	660	58.8	361	32.2	87	7.8	14	1.2	1,122	100.0
Suitable residence found.....	588	53.5	415	37.7	76	6.9	21	1.9	1,100	100.0
Utilities available (public sewer/water).....	406	36.8	336	30.4	230	20.8	132	12.0	1,104	100.0

38. As Walworth County plans for future development, should local officials **discourage, encourage, or remain neutral** regarding each of the following?

	Encourage		Remain Neutral		Discourage		No Opinion		Total	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Environmental preservation .....	993	87.7	123	10.9	4	0.3	12	1.1	1,132	100.0
Farmland preservation.....	919	81.1	179	15.8	22	1.9	13	1.2	1,133	100.0
Industrial development.....	280	25.2	509	45.7	293	26.3	31	2.8	1,113	100.0
Residential housing ..	329	29.2	572	50.9	202	18.0	21	1.9	1,124	100.0
Retail development...	299	26.8	548	49.1	244	21.9	24	2.2	1,115	100.0
Tourism facilities .....	385	34.6	542	48.7	142	12.8	43	3.9	1,112	100.0
Vacation homes .....	286	25.5	513	45.6	279	24.8	46	4.1	1,124	100.0

39. The growth of Walworth County in recent years has brought about some changes. For each of the following which you may have observed, please indicate whether the local impact has been positive or negative. (Circle one for each impact that applies)

	Very Positive		Positive		Negative		Very Negative		Little change/no opinion		Total	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Access to health care .....	283	25.2	578	51.4	41	3.7	19	1.7	202	18.0	1,123	100.0
Availability of shopping...	165	14.8	694	62.3	109	9.8	28	2.5	118	10.6	1,114	100.0
Child care facilities.....	31	2.9	248	23.2	64	6.0	13	1.2	711	66.7	1,067	100.0
Cost of living .....	51	4.7	274	25.1	399	36.5	114	10.4	255	23.3	1,093	100.0
Energy supplies .....	69	6.5	403	37.7	155	14.5	28	2.6	414	38.7	1,069	100.0
Environmental quality .....	120	11.0	414	38.0	265	24.4	48	4.4	242	22.2	1,089	100.0
Housing costs .....	60	5.6	328	30.4	380	35.2	107	9.9	204	18.9	1,079	100.0
Law enforcement needs...	105	9.6	468	43.0	184	16.9	39	3.6	293	26.9	1,089	100.0
Library system.....	131	12.1	474	43.9	77	7.1	18	1.7	381	35.2	1,081	100.0
Overall quality of life .....	180	16.4	587	53.6	142	13.0	10	0.9	176	16.1	1,095	100.0
School system.....	122	11.3	408	37.9	122	11.3	29	2.7	395	36.8	1,076	100.0
Scenic beauty.....	223	20.2	422	38.3	228	20.7	43	3.9	186	16.9	1,102	100.0
Sense of community .....	120	11.1	448	41.6	199	18.5	38	3.5	273	25.3	1,078	100.0
Traffic volume.....	39	3.6	188	17.2	472	43.3	255	23.4	136	12.5	1,090	100.0
Transportation alternatives (non-automobile).....	27	2.5	89	8.4	277	26.1	177	16.6	493	46.4	1,063	100.0
Wages/job market.....	30	2.8	244	22.5	223	20.5	71	6.5	518	47.7	1,086	100.0

**SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION**

40. What is your age?

	Frequency	Percent
Less than 20 years.....	2	0.2
20-29 years .....	27	2.4
30-39 years .....	118	10.3
40-49 years .....	189	16.5
50-59 years .....	318	27.9
60-69 years .....	260	22.8
70-79 years .....	171	15.0
80 years or greater .....	56	4.9
Total	1,141	100.0

41. What is your resident status with respect to Walworth County?

	Frequency	Percent
Permanent.....	764	67.4
Seasonal.....	217	19.1
Non-resident property owner.....	153	13.5
Total	1,134	100.0

42. How long have you been a resident of, and/or owned land in, Walworth County? (Circle longest duration)

	Frequency	Percent
Less than 1 year .....	28	2.5
1-5 years .....	188	16.5
6-10 years .....	153	13.4
11-15 years .....	125	11.0
16-20 years .....	127	11.1
21-25 years .....	77	6.8
Greater than 25 years .....	441	38.7
Total	1,139	100.0

43. What best describes your primary place of residence, and its location? (Circle all that apply)

	Frequency	Percent <sup>a</sup>
Owner-occupied home .....	909	79.5
Rental property .....	74	6.5
Farm.....	36	3.1
Hobby farm.....	45	3.9
City or village location .....	278	24.3
Town location .....	264	23.1
Own only land in Walworth County, residence is elsewhere .....	89	7.8
Total	1,695	--

<sup>a</sup>Percent of survey respondents that answered Question 43 (1,143).

44. What is your occupation?

	Frequency	Percent
Homemaker .....	35	3.2
Service worker.....	29	2.7
Laborer .....	10	0.9
Truck/delivery van driver .....	7	0.7
Craftsman .....	31	2.9
Clerical worker .....	22	2.0
Factory worker.....	23	2.1
Farmer.....	14	1.3
Sales worker .....	37	3.4
Manager/administrator.....	131	12.1
Professional/technical worker.....	231	21.3
Self-employed.....	137	12.7
Retired .....	368	34.0
Unemployed.....	7	0.7
Total	1,082	100.0

45. Is your primary place of employment located in Walworth County?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes.....	258	35.0
No.....	459	62.4
Based in the County, but job mostly involves travel beyond.....	19	2.6
Total	736	100.0

46. Approximately how many miles do you travel to your place of employment one way?

	Frequency	Percent
Less than one mile.....	59	8.4
1-10 miles.....	215	30.6
11-20 miles.....	123	17.5
21-30 miles.....	97	13.8
Greater than 30 miles.....	136	19.4
Work at home.....	39	5.6
Always traveling for business.....	33	4.7
Total	702	100.0

#129847 v2  
WJS/LRB/KES  
8/29/07  
Rev. 11/2/07; Rev. 1/15/08

## Appendix C

# CROSS-TABULATIONS OF SURVEY RESPONSES FOR RESIDENT HOUSEHOLDS AND NON-RESIDENT PROPERTY OWNERS QUESTION BY QUESTION FREQUENCY RESPONSES

NOTE: UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED, PERCENTAGES ARE BASED ON THE  
NUMBER OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS THAT ANSWERED EACH QUESTION

### COUNTY TRENDS AND VALUES

1. **Which one term** would you select to describe Walworth County, as you want to see it, 25 years from today?

	Resident Households		Non-Resident Property Owners	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Rural, agricultural community .....	146	18.8	62	17.2
Residential community .....	14	1.8	8	2.2
Mixed agricultural/residential .....	560	72.0	246	68.4
Mixed residential/business .....	58	7.4	44	12.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>778</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>360</b>	<b>100.0</b>

2. Between 1990 and 2006, Walworth County's population grew from 75,000 to an estimated 99,800 or 33.1 percent. At what rate would you like to see growth continue to occur?

	Resident Households		Non-Resident Property Owners	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Faster rate .....	15	1.9	11	3.0
Present (recently experienced) rate...	156	20.0	82	22.3
Slower rate .....	505	64.8	224	61.1
No growth .....	104	13.3	50	13.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>780</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>367</b>	<b>100.0</b>

3. Should development be encouraged or discouraged in Walworth County?

	Resident Households		Non-Resident Property Owners	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Encouraged .....	135	17.2	81	22.0
Allowed but not encouraged .....	437	55.8	201	54.6
Discouraged .....	191	24.4	79	21.5
No opinion .....	20	2.6	7	1.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>783</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>368</b>	<b>100.0</b>

4. If you believe Walworth County should continue to grow, what kind(s) of growth and/or business development would you like to see? (Circle all that apply)

*NOTE: This question was to be answered by those who indicated in Question 3 that development should be “encouraged” or “allowed but not encouraged.” Additional responses to this question were also included in this table.*

	Resident Households			Non-Resident Property Owners		
	Frequency	Percent <sup>a</sup>	Percent of All Resident Household Respondents (790)	Frequency	Percent <sup>b</sup>	Percent of All Non-Resident Property Owner Respondents (369)
Single-family residential .....	440	73.3	55.7	215	72.1	58.3
Multi-family residential .....	79	13.2	10.0	39	13.1	10.6
Rural residential .....	276	46.0	34.9	152	51.0	41.2
Condominiums .....	86	14.3	10.9	52	17.4	14.1
Hobby farms.....	233	38.8	29.5	117	39.3	31.7
Family farms .....	397	66.2	50.3	184	61.7	49.9
Large corporate farms .....	39	6.5	4.9	13	4.4	3.5
Tourist-related businesses .....	251	41.8	31.8	159	53.4	43.1
Office-type businesses .....	177	29.5	22.4	91	30.5	24.7
Convenience stores and services.....	176	29.3	22.3	86	28.9	23.3
Large retail outlets/centers .....	130	21.7	16.5	54	18.1	14.6
Light industry.....	347	57.8	43.9	146	49.0	39.6
Heavy industry .....	69	11.5	8.7	19	6.4	5.1
Total	2,700	--	--	1,327	--	--

<sup>a</sup>Percent of resident household respondents that answered Question 4 (600)

<sup>b</sup>Percent of non-resident property owner respondents that answered Question 4 (298).

## FARMLAND PRESERVATION ISSUES

5. Do you agree or disagree that preservation of farmland in Walworth County is important?

	Resident Households		Non-Resident Property Owners	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree.....	539	68.6	246	66.7
Agree .....	182	23.2	88	23.8
Neutral .....	43	5.5	23	6.2
Disagree .....	17	2.2	8	2.2
Strongly disagree .....	4	0.5	4	1.1
Total	785	100.0	369	100.0

6. Do you agree or disagree that Walworth County government should set agricultural land preservation as a priority goal and implement policies to achieve it?

	Resident Households		Non-Resident Property Owners	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree .....	446	56.6	200	54.4
Agree.....	212	26.9	98	26.6
Neutral.....	87	11.0	46	12.5
Disagree .....	33	4.2	14	3.8
Strongly disagree.....	10	1.3	10	2.7
Total	788	100.0	368	100.0

7. The current lot size for building a house on A-1 zoned (Prime) farmland in Walworth County is 35 acres. This standard should be:

	Resident Households		Non-Resident Property Owners	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Maintained.....	471	62.4	203	57.0
Eliminated .....	19	2.5	10	2.8
Increased to.....	90	11.9	34	9.6
Decreased to .....	98	13.0	54	15.2
No opinion.....	77	10.2	55	15.4
Total	755	100.0	356	100.0

The lot size for building a house on A-1 zoned (Prime) farmland should be *increased* to [?] acres. (For those so indicating an increase in Question 7)

	Resident Households			Non-Resident Property Owners		
	Frequency	Percent	Percent of All Resident Household Respondents (790)	Frequency	Percent	Percent of All Non-Resident Property Owner Respondents (369)
40 acres .....	25	28.1	3.2	4	11.8	1.1
50 acres .....	29	32.6	3.7	13	38.2	3.5
80 acres .....	12	13.5	1.5	3	8.8	0.8
100+ acres .....	23	25.8	2.9	14	41.2	3.8
Total	89	100.0	--	34	100.0	--

The lot size for building a house on A-1 zoned (prime) farmland in Walworth County should be *decreased* to [?] acres. (For those so indicating a decrease in Question 7)

	Resident Households			Non-Resident Property Owners		
	Frequency	Percent	Percent of All Resident Household Respondents (790)	Frequency	Percent	Percent of All Non-Resident Property Owner Respondents (369)
1 acre .....	10	10.2	1.3	5	10.0	1.4
2 acres .....	13	13.3	1.6	1	2.0	0.3
5 acres .....	23	23.5	2.9	13	26.0	3.5
10 acres .....	24	24.5	3.0	11	22.0	3.0
20 acres .....	28	28.5	3.5	20	40.0	5.4
Total	98	100.0	--	50	100.0	--

8. The current lot size for building a house on A-2 zoned farmland (smaller farmland blocks than A-1 zoning and/or soils not quite as productive) is 20 acres. This lot size should be:

	Resident Households		Non-Resident Property Owners	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Maintained.....	448	59.1	209	58.2
Eliminated.....	18	2.4	11	3.1
Increased to.....	85	11.2	27	7.5
Decreased to.....	128	16.9	52	14.5
No opinion.....	79	10.4	60	16.7
Total	758	100.0	359	100.0

The lot size for building a house on A-2 zoned farmland should be increased to [?] acres. (For those so indicating an increase in Question 8)

	Resident Households			Non-Resident Property Owners		
	Frequency	Percent	Percent of All Resident Household Respondents (790)	Frequency	Percent	Percent of All Non-Resident Property Owner Respondents (369)
25 acres.....	20	23.8	2.5	3	11.1	0.8
35 acres.....	32	38.1	4.1	11	40.8	3.0
40 acres.....	15	17.9	1.9	5	18.5	1.4
50+ acres.....	17	20.2	2.2	8	29.6	2.2
Total	84	100.0	--	27	100.0	--

The lot size for building a house on A-2 zoned farmland should be decreased to [?] acres. (For those so indicating a decrease in Question 8)

	Resident Households			Non-Resident Property Owners		
	Frequency	Percent	Percent of All Resident Household Respondents (790)	Frequency	Percent	Percent of All Non-Resident Property Owner Respondents (369)
1 acres.....	13	10.2	1.6	8	15.7	2.2
2 acres.....	16	12.6	2.0	1	2.0	0.3
5 acres.....	45	35.4	5.7	21	41.1	5.7
10 acres.....	42	33.1	5.3	16	31.4	4.3
15 acres.....	11	8.7	1.4	5	9.8	1.4
Total	127	100.0	--	51	100.0	--

9. In your opinion, is the continued existence of the remaining family farms important to the County's future?

	Resident Households		Non-Resident Property Owners	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Very important.....	579	73.8	271	73.4
Somewhat important.....	162	20.6	79	21.4
Not important.....	33	4.2	14	3.8
No opinion .....	11	1.4	5	1.4
Total	785	100.0	369	100.0

10. Given a situation where a farm is sold, which one of the following best describes how you would like to see the land used after the sale?

	Resident Households		Non-Resident Property Owners	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
The land should be allowed to be subdivided for development purposes.....	49	6.4	35	9.7
The land should be kept agricultural or agricultural-related.....	548	71.1	245	68.1
The land should be used however the new owner desires..	144	18.7	63	17.5
No opinion .....	29	3.8	17	4.7
Total	770	100.0	360	100.0

11. Would you support spending property tax dollars for the preservation of agricultural land by compensating land owners who agree to preserve their farmland?

	Resident Households		Non-Resident Property Owners	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Yes.....	213	27.2	100	27.2
Maybe, depending upon the cost .....	349	44.5	155	42.3
No .....	207	26.4	100	27.2
No opinion .....	15	1.9	12	3.3
Total	784	100.0	367	100.0

12. If you are potentially receptive to preserving agricultural land with tax dollars, how much of a property tax increase would you be willing to support to carry out such a program?

*NOTE: This question was to be answered by those who responded “yes” or “maybe, depending upon the cost” to Question 11. Additional responses to this question were also included.*

	Resident Households			Non-Resident Property Owners		
	Frequency	Percent	Percent of All Resident Household Respondents (790)	Frequency	Percent	Percent of All Non-Resident Property Owner Respondents (369)
10¢ per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$20/yr. on \$200,000 property).....	199	34.4	25.2	80	29.3	21.7
25¢ per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$50/yr. on \$200,000 property).....	133	23.1	16.8	56	20.5	15.2
50¢ per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$100/yr. on \$200,000 property).....	55	9.5	7.0	39	14.3	10.6
75¢ per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$150/yr. on \$200,000 property).....	5	0.9	0.6	7	2.6	1.9
\$1.00 per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$200/yr. on \$200,000 property).....	24	4.2	3.0	16	5.9	4.3
No property tax increase, the program should be funded by other means .....	161	27.9	20.4	75	27.4	20.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>577</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>273</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>--</b>

## RESIDENTIAL LAND USE ISSUES

*NOTE: For questions 13-18, the term “urban areas” refers to areas served by public sanitary sewer service; the term “rural areas” refers to areas that are not served by public sanitary sewer service.*

13. Where should new housing development be located in Walworth County?

	Resident Households		Non-Resident Property Owners	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Urban areas.....	360	46.5	176	48.9
Rural areas.....	14	1.8	5	1.4
Both urban and rural areas.....	244	31.5	113	31.4
Disfavor new housing.....	156	20.2	66	18.3
Total	774	100.0	360	100.0

14. What types of housing should be provided in urban areas? (Circle all that apply)

	Resident Households		Non-Resident Property Owners	
	Frequency	Percent <sup>a</sup>	Frequency	Percent <sup>b</sup>
Single-family.....	688	87.8	336	91.6
Duplexes.....	292	37.2	121	33.0
Multi-family.....	188	24.0	95	25.9
Mobile home parks.....	39	5.0	19	5.2
Condominiums.....	269	34.3	150	40.9
Senior housing complexes.....	480	61.2	219	59.7
Retirement home complexes.....	314	40.1	163	44.4
Low-moderate income housing.....	175	22.3	61	16.6
Disfavor new housing.....	80	10.2	33	9.0
Total	2,525	--	1,197	--

<sup>a</sup>Percent of resident household respondents that answered Question 14 (784).

<sup>b</sup>Percent of non-resident property owner respondents that answered Question 14 (367).

15. Other than farm residences, what type of housing should be provided in rural areas? (Circle all that apply)

	Resident Households		Non-Resident Property Owners	
	Frequency	Percent <sup>a</sup>	Frequency	Percent <sup>b</sup>
Single-family.....	563	72.2	255	69.7
Duplexes.....	78	10.0	47	12.8
Multi-family.....	45	5.8	25	6.8
Mobile home parks.....	29	3.7	12	3.3
Condominiums.....	69	8.8	35	9.6
Senior housing complexes.....	184	23.6	99	27.0
Retirement home complexes.....	180	23.1	99	27.0
Low-moderate income housing.....	73	9.4	35	9.6
Disfavor new housing.....	207	26.5	99	27.0
Total	1,428	--	706	--

<sup>a</sup>Percent of resident household respondents that answered Question 15 (780).

<sup>b</sup>Percent of non-resident property owner respondents that answered Question 15 (366).

16. What should be the minimum lot size requirement for rural land which is not considered to be prime farmland?

	Resident Households		Non-Resident Property Owners	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
One dwelling unit per acre.....	209	27.4	116	32.3
One dwelling unit per 2-3 acres.....	162	21.3	76	21.2
One dwelling unit per 5 acres.....	239	31.4	89	24.8
One dwelling unit per 10 acres.....	56	7.4	41	11.4
One dwelling unit per 20 acres.....	44	5.8	12	3.3
One dwelling unit per 35 acres.....	51	6.7	25	7.0
Total	761	100.0	359	100.0

17. Would you agree or disagree with the County guiding new residential development through use of conservation or cluster subdivisions? These subdivisions may permit smaller lots on suitable portions of affected land parcels, but then preserve open space on the remainder of such parcels.

	Resident Households		Non-Resident Property Owners	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree.....	109	14.1	66	18.3
Agree.....	237	30.6	130	36.0
Neutral.....	173	22.3	83	23.0
Disagree.....	131	16.9	42	11.6
Strongly disagree.....	125	16.1	40	11.1
Total	775	100.0	361	100.0

18. Do you agree or disagree that there is a shortage of affordable housing in Walworth County?

	Resident Households		Non-Resident Property Owners	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree.....	100	12.7	17	4.7
Agree.....	145	18.5	41	11.3
Neutral.....	222	28.3	155	42.7
Disagree.....	220	28.1	100	27.5
Strongly disagree.....	97	12.4	50	13.8
Total	784	100.0	363	100.0

19. Do you agree or disagree that there is a shortage of housing for seniors in Walworth County?

	Resident Households		Non-Resident Property Owners	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree.....	122	15.6	26	7.2
Agree.....	217	27.6	81	22.4
Neutral.....	309	39.4	202	56.0
Disagree.....	100	12.8	29	8.0
Strongly disagree.....	36	4.6	23	6.4
Total	784	100.0	361	100.0

## COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL ISSUES

20. Should commercial and industrial development be encouraged or discouraged in Walworth County?

	Resident Households		Non-Resident Property Owners	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Encouraged .....	234	29.9	95	26.0
Allowed but not encouraged .....	396	50.5	175	47.9
Discouraged .....	129	16.5	86	23.6
No opinion .....	24	3.1	9	2.5
Total	783	100.0	365	100.0

21. If you feel that commercial and industrial development should be encouraged in Walworth County, how much of a property tax increase would you be willing to support to carry out such a program?

*NOTE: This question was to be answered by those who indicated in Question 20 that commercial and industrial development should be “encouraged”. Additional responses to this question were also included.*

	Resident Households			Non-Resident Property Owners		
	Frequency	Percent	Percent of All Resident Household Respondents (790)	Frequency	Percent	Percent of All Non-Resident Property Owner Respondents (369)
10¢ per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$20/yr. on \$200,000 property) .....	64	22.3	8.1	20	18.7	5.4
25¢ per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$50/yr. on \$200,000 property) .....	28	9.8	3.5	10	9.3	2.7
50¢ per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$100/yr. on \$200,000 property) .....	12	4.2	1.5	9	8.4	2.4
75¢ per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$150/yr. on \$200,000 property) .....	0	0.0	0.0	1	0.9	0.3
\$1.00 per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$200/yr. on \$200,000 property) .....	4	1.4	0.5	0	0.0	0.0
No property tax increase, the program should be funded by other means .....	179	62.3	22.7	67	62.7	18.2
Total	287	100.0	--	107	100.0	--

22. If you feel that commercial and industrial development should either be encouraged or allowed in Walworth County, what type of business growth would you like to occur? (Circle all that apply)

*NOTE: This question was to be answered by those who indicated “encouraged” or “allowed but not encouraged” in Question 20. Additional responses to this question were also included.*

	Resident Households			Non-Resident Property Owners		
	Frequency	Percent <sup>a</sup>	Percent of All Resident Household Respondents (790)	Frequency	Percent <sup>b</sup>	Percent of All Non-Resident Property Owner Respondents (369)
Services .....	298	47.5	37.7	176	64.0	47.7
Office parks .....	212	33.8	26.8	140	50.9	37.9
Shopping centers .....	160	25.5	20.3	90	32.7	24.4
Other retail.....	177	28.2	22.4	93	33.8	25.2
Light industry .....	445	71.0	56.3	184	66.9	49.9
Heavy industry .....	95	15.2	12.0	18	6.5	4.9
Agricultural related.....	322	51.4	40.8	134	48.7	36.3
No preference .....	55	8.8	7.0	20	7.3	5.4
Total	1,764	--	--	855	--	--

<sup>a</sup>Percent of resident household respondents that answered Question 22 (627).

<sup>b</sup>Percent of non-resident property owner respondents that answered Question 22 (275).

23. Should businesses be concentrated in a few areas or dispersed throughout the County?

	Resident Households		Non-Resident Property Owners	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Concentrated .....	411	53.6	204	56.0
Dispersed .....	261	34.1	127	34.9
No opinion .....	94	12.3	33	9.1
Total	766	100.0	364	100.0

24. If you feel that businesses should be concentrated in a few areas of Walworth County, where should the concentration(s) occur? (Circle all that apply)

*NOTE: This question was to be answered by those who indicated in Question 23 that businesses should be concentrated in a few areas of Walworth County. Additional responses to this question were also included.*

	Resident Households			Non-Resident Property Owners		
	Frequency	Percent <sup>a</sup>	Percent of All Resident Household Respondents (790)	Frequency	Percent <sup>b</sup>	Percent of All Non-Resident Property Owner Respondents (369)
In currently zoned commercial and industrial areas .....	381	83.2	48.2	182	84.3	49.3
In cities and villages .....	152	33.2	19.2	90	41.7	24.4
Where public sewer service is available .....	190	41.5	24.1	88	40.7	23.8
Near or adjacent to existing development.....	155	33.8	19.6	76	35.2	20.6
They can be concentrated in any location.....	19	4.1	2.4	8	3.7	2.2
Total	897	--	--	444	--	--

<sup>a</sup>Percent of resident household respondents that answered Question 24 (458).

<sup>b</sup>Percent of non-resident property owner respondents that answered Question 24 (216).

**ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES**

25. Should Walworth County actively pursue the protection of any of the following? (Circle all that apply)

	Resident Households		Non-Resident Property Owners	
	Frequency	Percent <sup>a</sup>	Frequency	Percent <sup>b</sup>
Woodlands.....	672	86.0	315	86.1
Wetlands.....	641	82.1	301	82.2
Open spaces.....	502	64.3	271	74.0
Significant groundwater recharge areas, which replenish well water.....	630	80.7	289	79.0
Endangered species habitat.....	484	62.0	244	66.7
Park land, existing and future.....	569	72.9	303	82.8
Historic sites.....	542	69.4	266	72.7
None, the County should not pursue the protection of any of these.....	26	3.3	10	2.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,066</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>1,999</b>	<b>--</b>

<sup>a</sup>Percent of resident household respondents that answered Question 25 (781).

<sup>b</sup>Percent of survey respondents that answered Question 25 (366).

26. If you answered that Walworth County should actively protect certain environmental features, how much of a property tax increase would you be willing to support to carry out such a program?

*NOTE: This question was to be answered by those who indicated in Question 25 that the County should actively pursue the protection of one or more types of the features listed.*

	Resident Households			Non-Resident Property Owners		
	Frequency	Percent	Percent of All Resident Household Respondents (790)	Frequency	Percent	Percent of All Non-Resident Property Owner Respondents (369)
10¢ per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$20/yr. on \$200,000 property).....	250	34.0	31.6	101	29.0	27.4
25¢ per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$50/yr. on \$200,000 property).....	141	19.1	17.8	57	16.4	15.4
50¢ per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$100/yr. on \$200,000 property).....	75	10.2	9.5	47	13.5	12.7
75¢ per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$150/yr. on \$200,000 property).....	2	0.3	0.3	3	0.9	0.8
\$1.00 per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$200/yr. on \$200,000 property).....	33	4.5	4.2	24	6.9	6.5
No property tax increase, the program should be funded by other means.....	235	31.9	29.7	116	33.3	31.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>736</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>348</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>--</b>

27. What do you think is the best use of land along river and stream corridors within rural areas of the County? (Circle all that apply)

	Resident Households		Non-Resident Property Owners	
	Frequency	Percent <sup>a</sup>	Frequency	Percent <sup>b</sup>
Residential development*, if not floodlands or wetlands.....	106	13.6	69	19.1
Agricultural uses, if presently farmed.....	246	31.6	101	28.0
Passive recreational uses, like hunting, fishing, and hiking.....	453	58.2	212	58.7
Leave it in its natural state.....	486	62.4	220	60.9
Total	1,291	--	602	--

<sup>a</sup>Percent of resident household respondents that answered Question 27 (779).

<sup>b</sup>Percent of non-resident property owner respondents that answered Question 27 (361).

\* Setback regulations apply

28. What involvement should Walworth County government have in the protection of groundwater quality and drinking water supplies?

*NOTE: Some respondents chose more than one response.*

	Resident Households		Non-Resident Property Owners	
	Frequency	Percent <sup>a</sup>	Frequency	Percent <sup>b</sup>
Regulate land uses that would adversely impact groundwater.....	620	80.5	311	85.7
Provide compensation to owners of significant groundwater recharge areas for good management.....	107	13.9	42	11.6
Provide information only.....	73	9.5	23	6.3
No involvement.....	37	4.8	15	4.1
Total	837	--	391	--

<sup>a</sup>Percent of resident household respondents that answered Question 28 (770).

<sup>b</sup>Percent of non-resident property owner respondents that answered Question 28 (363).

29. Which one of the following best describes your opinion on the issue of sewage disposal in rural areas of Walworth County?

	Resident Households		Non-Resident Property Owners	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Each property owner should install and maintain their own septic system.....	381	55.1	128	40.4
Large-scale septic systems serving multiple homes should be allowed to address this issue.....	45	6.5	13	4.1
Residents should link up with municipal sewer systems if nearby and available.....	216	31.2	142	44.8
Non-sewered development should not be allowed.....	50	7.2	34	10.7
Total	692	100.0	317	100.0

## COUNTY ORDINANCES AND REGULATORY ISSUES

30. To address future development, Walworth County's existing zoning ordinance—which governs unincorporated areas including towns, but not cities or villages—should be:

	Resident Households		Non-Resident Property Owners	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Completely redone.....	61	8.1	25	7.0
Slightly revised.....	99	13.1	32	9.0
Maintained as is.....	125	16.5	37	10.4
Eliminated.....	9	1.2	3	0.8
Turned over to the towns*.....	95	12.6	42	11.9
No opinion.....	58	7.7	34	9.6
Not familiar with the ordinance.....	309	40.8	182	51.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>756</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>100.0</b>

\*Under state law, shoreland areas within 300 feet of streams or 1,000 feet of lakes, plus adjoining floodlands, would still be regulated by the County.

31. Should the requirements and enforcement of the following existing County Ordinances be stricter, relaxed or maintained as is? (Circle one for each category)

	Stricter		Relaxed		As Is		No Opinion		Total	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
<b>Zoning</b>										
Resident Households.....	213	41.8	75	14.7	193	37.8	29	5.7	510	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners.....	100	46.7	23	10.8	73	34.1	18	8.4	214	100.0
<b>Subdivision Control</b>										
Resident Households.....	332	64.9	37	7.2	124	24.2	19	3.7	512	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners.....	130	60.7	22	10.3	50	23.4	12	5.6	214	100.0
<b>Sanitation</b>										
Resident Households.....	235	46.6	26	5.2	218	43.2	25	5.0	504	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners.....	110	52.4	11	5.2	78	37.2	11	5.2	210	100.0
<b>Erosion Control/Stormwater Management</b>										
Resident Households.....	251	52.3	23	4.8	173	36.0	33	6.9	480	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners.....	122	60.7	12	6.0	54	26.8	13	6.5	201	100.0

*NOTE: 257 resident household respondents (33 percent of all 790 resident household survey respondents) and 152 non-resident property owner respondents (41 percent of all 369 non-resident property owner respondents) indicated that they are not familiar enough with any of the ordinances to make a judgment in this regard.*

32. Do you agree or disagree that the use of private land should be based on owners' preferences rather than being restricted by zoning?

	Resident Households		Non-Resident Property Owners	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree.....	92	11.8	30	8.3
Agree.....	167	21.4	72	19.9
Neutral.....	171	21.9	53	14.6
Disagree.....	245	31.3	138	38.1
Strongly disagree.....	106	13.6	69	19.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>781</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>362</b>	<b>100.0</b>

33. Do you agree or disagree that local units of government have the responsibility to protect property owners and the community by regulating land use?

	Resident Households		Non-Resident Property Owners	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree.....	219	28.0	118	32.5
Agree .....	359	45.8	181	49.9
Neutral .....	139	17.7	43	11.8
Disagree.....	49	6.3	15	4.1
Strongly agree.....	17	2.2	6	1.7
Total	783	100.0	363	100.0

34. Do you agree or disagree that the use of zoning regulations are beneficial?

	Resident Households		Non-Resident Property Owners	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree.....	229	29.2	130	35.5
Agree .....	405	51.6	186	50.8
Neutral .....	126	16.1	39	10.7
Disagree.....	16	2.0	9	2.5
Strongly agree.....	9	1.1	2	0.5
Total	785	100.0	366	100.0

### QUALITY OF LIFE IN WALWORTH COUNTY

35. How satisfied are you with Walworth County as to quality of life?

	Resident Households		Non-Resident Property Owners	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Completely satisfied .....	156	19.9	70	19.3
Satisfied .....	495	63.2	246	67.7
Neutral .....	78	9.9	33	9.1
Dissatisfied .....	50	6.4	13	3.6
Completely dissatisfied.....	5	0.6	1	0.3
Total	784	100.0	363	100.0

36. What effect has population growth had on the quality of life in Walworth County?

	Resident Households		Non-Resident Property Owners	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Very positive .....	29	3.7	16	4.4
Positive .....	211	27.1	106	29.2
No effect .....	121	15.6	54	14.9
Negative.....	293	37.7	124	34.1
Very negative.....	61	7.8	17	4.7
No opinion.....	63	8.1	46	12.7
Total	778	100.0	363	100.0

37. A variety of local characteristics influence a person's choice of where to live. How important is each of the following in influencing your decision to live, locate, or invest in Walworth County?

	Very Important		Somewhat Important		Not So Important		Not At All Important		Total	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Educational System										
Resident Households.....	445	58.8	158	20.9	84	11.1	70	9.2	757	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners.....	131	37.6	93	26.7	65	18.7	59	17.0	348	100.0
Employment opportunities										
Resident Households.....	298	39.7	245	32.7	137	18.3	70	9.3	750	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners.....	88	25.6	103	29.9	85	24.7	68	19.8	344	100.0
Friendly communities										
Resident Households.....	472	61.9	237	31.1	42	5.5	11	1.5	762	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners.....	217	61.6	118	33.5	14	4.0	3	.9	352	100.0
Good place to raise a family										
Resident Households.....	532	70.8	151	20.1	30	4.0	38	5.1	751	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners.....	189	54.9	106	30.9	30	8.7	19	5.5	344	100.0
Government services										
Resident Households.....	236	31.5	328	43.8	153	20.4	32	4.3	749	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners.....	102	29.7	168	48.8	53	15.4	21	6.1	344	100.0
Historic features										
Resident Households.....	128	17.1	237	31.7	283	37.8	100	13.4	748	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners.....	83	24.0	115	33.2	113	32.7	35	10.1	346	100.0
Lake access/quality										
Resident Households.....	291	38.8	235	31.4	166	22.1	58	7.7	750	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners.....	247	68.8	83	23.2	22	6.1	7	1.9	359	100.0
Low crime rate										
Resident Households.....	652	85.0	108	14.1	6	.8	1	.1	767	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners.....	293	83.0	58	16.4	2	.6	0	.0	353	100.0
Natural environment										
Resident Households.....	499	65.3	220	28.8	42	5.5	3	.4	764	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners.....	258	72.0	89	24.9	10	2.8	1	.3	358	100.0
Pace of life										
Resident Households.....	382	50.5	275	36.4	89	11.8	10	1.3	756	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners.....	192	54.2	139	39.3	18	5.1	5	1.4	354	100.0
Proximity of family										
Resident Households.....	233	31.6	245	33.2	184	25.0	75	10.2	737	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners.....	106	31.1	133	39.0	67	19.6	35	10.3	341	100.0
Proximity to Chicago and Milwaukee										
Resident Households.....	138	18.2	256	33.8	207	27.3	157	20.7	758	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners.....	149	42.0	125	35.2	51	14.3	30	8.5	355	100.0
Recreational opportunities										
Resident Households.....	210	27.8	356	47.2	155	20.5	34	4.5	755	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners.....	187	53.1	131	37.2	28	8.0	6	1.7	352	100.0
Rural atmosphere										
Resident Households.....	453	59.3	248	32.5	56	7.3	7	.9	764	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners.....	207	57.8	113	31.5	31	8.7	7	2.0	358	100.0
Suitable residence found										
Resident Households.....	407	54.0	283	37.5	51	6.8	13	1.7	754	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners.....	181	52.3	132	38.2	25	7.2	8	2.3	346	100.0
Utilities available (public sewer/water)										
Resident Households.....	247	32.7	233	30.9	172	22.8	103	13.6	755	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners.....	159	45.6	103	29.5	58	16.6	29	8.3	349	100.0

38. As Walworth County plans for future development, should local officials **discourage, encourage, or remain neutral** regarding each of the following?

	Encourage		Remain Neutral		Discourage		No Opinion		Total	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Environmental preservation										
Resident Households...	671	87.2	87	11.3	2	.3	9	1.2	769	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners .....	322	88.7	36	9.9	2	.6	3	.8	363	100.0
Farmland preservation										
Resident Households...	633	81.9	120	15.5	12	1.6	8	1.0	773	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners .....	286	79.4	59	16.4	10	2.8	5	1.4	360	100.0
Industrial development										
Resident Households...	201	26.5	352	46.4	186	24.5	20	2.6	759	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners .....	79	22.3	157	44.4	107	30.2	11	3.1	354	100.0
Residential housing										
Resident Households...	213	27.7	391	50.9	148	19.3	16	2.1	768	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners .....	116	32.6	181	50.8	54	15.2	5	1.4	356	100.0
Retail development										
Resident Households...	196	25.9	381	50.2	163	21.5	18	2.4	758	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners .....	103	28.9	167	46.7	81	22.7	6	1.7	357	100.0
Tourism facilities										
Resident Households...	229	30.2	389	51.4	108	14.3	31	4.1	757	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners .....	156	43.9	153	43.1	34	9.6	12	3.4	355	100.0
Vacation homes										
Resident Households...	131	17.1	351	45.9	246	32.2	37	4.8	765	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners .....	155	43.2	162	45.1	33	9.2	9	2.5	359	100.0

39. The growth of Walworth County in recent years has brought about some changes. For each of the following which you may have observed, please indicate whether the local impact has been positive or negative. (Circle one for each impact that applies)

	Very Positive		Positive		Negative		Very Negative		Little change/no opinion		Total	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Access to health care												
Resident Households .....	192	25.0	417	54.3	30	3.9	15	2.0	114	14.8	768	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners .....	91	25.6	161	45.4	11	3.1	4	1.1	88	24.8	355	100.0
Availability of shopping												
Resident Households .....	108	14.2	477	62.6	84	11.0	19	2.5	74	9.7	762	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners .....	57	16.2	217	61.6	25	7.1	9	2.6	44	12.5	352	100.0
Child care facilities												
Resident Households .....	26	3.6	199	27.2	49	6.7	11	1.5	446	61.0	731	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners .....	5	1.5	49	14.6	15	4.5	2	.6	265	78.8	336	100.0
Cost of living												
Resident Households .....	31	4.1	182	24.2	303	40.4	92	12.3	143	19.0	751	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners .....	20	5.8	92	26.9	96	28.1	22	6.4	112	32.8	342	100.0
Energy supplies												
Resident Households .....	50	6.8	284	38.6	121	16.4	19	2.6	262	35.6	736	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners .....	19	5.7	119	35.7	34	10.2	9	2.7	152	45.7	333	100.0
Environmental quality												
Resident Households .....	78	10.5	285	38.4	191	25.7	36	4.8	153	20.6	743	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners .....	42	12.1	129	37.3	74	21.4	12	3.5	89	25.7	346	100.0
Housing costs												
Resident Households .....	39	5.3	220	29.7	287	38.7	83	11.2	112	15.1	741	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners .....	21	6.2	108	32.0	93	27.5	24	7.1	92	27.2	338	100.0
Law enforcement needs												
Resident Households .....	72	9.6	341	45.5	144	19.2	28	3.7	165	22.0	750	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners .....	33	9.7	127	37.5	40	11.8	11	3.2	128	37.8	339	100.0
Library system												
Resident Households .....	91	12.2	357	47.9	57	7.7	13	1.7	227	30.5	745	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners .....	40	11.9	117	34.8	20	6.0	5	1.5	154	45.8	336	100.0
Overall quality of life												
Resident Households .....	117	15.6	411	54.8	103	13.7	8	1.1	111	14.8	750	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners .....	63	18.3	176	51.0	39	11.3	2	.6	65	18.8	345	100.0
School system												
Resident Households .....	105	14.2	306	41.4	94	12.7	24	3.2	211	28.5	740	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners .....	17	5.1	102	30.4	28	8.3	5	1.5	184	54.7	336	100.0
Scenic beauty												
Resident Households .....	141	18.7	295	39.0	159	21.1	35	4.6	125	16.6	755	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners .....	82	23.6	127	36.6	69	19.9	8	2.3	61	17.6	347	100.0
Sense of community												
Resident Households .....	80	10.8	304	41.0	153	20.6	28	3.8	177	23.8	742	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners .....	40	11.9	144	42.8	46	13.7	10	3.0	96	28.6	336	100.0
Traffic volume												
Resident Households .....	29	3.9	132	17.6	322	43.0	183	24.5	82	11.0	748	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners .....	10	2.9	56	16.4	150	43.8	72	21.1	54	15.8	342	100.0
Transportation alternatives (non-automobile)												
Resident Households .....	18	2.5	58	7.9	210	28.7	144	19.6	303	41.3	733	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners .....	9	2.7	31	9.4	67	20.3	33	10.0	190	57.6	330	100.0
Wages/job market												
Resident Households .....	21	2.8	178	23.9	190	25.5	56	7.5	301	40.3	746	100.0
Non-Resident Property Owners .....	9	2.6	66	19.4	33	9.7	15	4.4	217	63.9	340	100.0

**SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION**

40. What is your age?

	Resident Households		Non-Resident Property Owners	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Less than 20 years .....	2	0.3	0	0.0
20-29 years .....	23	3.0	4	1.1
30-39 years .....	98	12.6	20	5.5
40-49 years .....	129	16.7	60	16.4
50-59 years .....	204	26.3	114	31.1
60-69 years .....	156	20.1	104	28.4
70-79 years .....	118	15.2	53	14.5
80 years or greater .....	45	5.8	11	3.0
Total	775	100.0	366	100.0

41. What is your resident status with respect to Walworth County?

	Resident Households		Non-Resident Property Owners	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Permanent .....	733	93.7	31	8.8
Seasonal .....	29	3.7	188	53.4
Non-resident property owner .....	20	2.6	133	37.8
Total	782	100.0	352	100.0

42. How long have you been a resident of, and/or owned land in, Walworth County? (Circle longest duration)

	Resident Households		Non-Resident Property Owners	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Less than 1 year .....	18	2.3	10	2.7
1-5 years .....	107	13.8	81	22.2
6-10 years .....	99	12.8	54	14.8
11-15 years .....	82	10.6	43	11.8
16-20 years .....	83	10.7	44	12.1
21-25 years .....	48	6.2	29	7.9
Greater than 25 years .....	337	43.5	104	28.5
Total	774	100.0	365	100.0

43. What best describes your primary place of residence, and its location? (Circle all that apply)

	Resident Households		Non-Resident Property Owners	
	Frequency	Percent <sup>a</sup>	Frequency	Percent <sup>b</sup>
Owner-occupied home.....	651	83.2	258	71.5
Rental property .....	57	7.3	17	4.7
Farm.....	34	4.3	2	0.6
Hobby farm.....	43	5.5	2	0.6
City or village location .....	184	23.5	94	26.0
Town location.....	216	27.6	48	13.3
Own only land in Walworth County, residence is elsewhere .....	8	1.0	81	22.4
Total	1,193	--	502	--

<sup>a</sup>Percent of resident household respondents that answered Question 43 (782).

<sup>b</sup>Percent of non-resident property owner respondents that answered Question 43 (361).

44. What is your occupation?

	Resident Households		Non-Resident Property Owners	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Homemaker .....	22	3.0	13	3.7
Service worker.....	24	3.3	5	1.4
Laborer .....	9	1.2	1	0.3
Truck/delivery van driver .....	7	1.0	0	0.0
Craftsman .....	24	3.3	7	2.0
Clerical worker .....	18	2.5	4	1.1
Factory worker.....	23	3.1	0	0.0
Farmer .....	14	1.9	0	0.0
Sales worker .....	25	3.4	12	3.4
Manager/administrator.....	75	10.2	56	16.1
Professional/technical worker.....	148	20.1	83	23.9
Self-employed.....	87	11.9	50	14.4
Retired .....	253	34.4	115	33.1
Unemployed .....	5	0.7	2	0.6
Total	734	100.0	348	100.0

45. Is your primary place of employment located in Walworth County?

	Resident Households		Non-Resident Property Owners	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Yes .....	248	49.8	10	4.2
No.....	232	46.6	227	95.4
Based in the County, but job mostly involves travel beyond.....	18	3.6	1	0.4
Total	498	100.0	238	100.0

46. Approximately how many miles do you travel to your place of employment one way?

	Resident Households		Non-Resident Property Owners	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Less than one mile .....	39	7.9	20	9.7
1-10 miles .....	155	31.3	60	29.1
11-20 miles .....	81	16.3	42	20.4
21-30 miles .....	77	15.5	20	9.7
Greater than 30 miles.....	102	20.6	34	16.5
Work at home .....	17	3.4	22	10.7
Always traveling for business.....	25	5.0	8	3.9
Total	496	100.0	206	100.0

#131060  
WJS/LRB  
9/18/07