

Community Survey – Narrative Summary of Responses (by Plan Element)

A City-wide survey was conducted in the fall of 2008. The survey was sent out in the October to approximately 4,261 postal addresses (both residences and businesses) in the City. Approximately 449 responses were returned, for a response rate of 10.5%. The following is a summary of the 2008 survey results. The majority of survey respondents (91%) were year-round Delavan residents. On average, the respondents to the 2008 survey were more likely to be older, homeowners (verses renters), and long term residents of the City. The number of responses to individual questions varied. Below is a summary of key findings from the survey as they relate to various aspects of this *Plan*. A full summary of the survey results (questions and responses) can be found in Appendix A:

Overall Community Character and Quality of Life

1. When asked to compare Delavan to other communities in Wisconsin based on image and identity, the majority of those responding rated Delavan favorably (53% “good” and 8.7% “very good”). 31% of respondents rate the City’s image as “Fair”, and 6.5% rated it “Poor”.
2. When asked to choose from a list of statements that best reflects their future vision for Delavan, the most common response (43%) was the following: “Delavan should be a full-service city where nearly all working, shopping, service, housing, healthcare, and educational needs can be met.” The second most common response (with 28%), was “Delavan should be a fairly diverse communities with some commercial, job, and housing opportunities.”
3. When asked to rate the population growth over the past fifteen years (approximately 150 people per year between 1990 and 2005), nearly two-thirds (65%) reported they felt this rate was “about right.” About one-third of respondents (30%) believe the City is experiencing too much growth, where as very few, (5%) feel there is not enough growth.
4. Survey respondents were asked “are there particular areas in the City that stand out as being especially pleasant or attractive?” Common responses included “parks,” “arboretum,” “flower basket and flag displays,” “the lakes,” “brick streets,” “Walworth Avenue,”(Downtown Area) and “nature/walking trails.”
5. Survey respondents were asked “are there particular areas in the City that stand out as being especially unpleasant or unattractive?” The most common responses included, “homes/buildings in disrepair/with unkempt yards,” “Delavan Hotel,” “dog track,” “current condition of downtown,” “the Borg (Street area,” and the “Ann Street corridor.”

6. When asked the three most common important reasons to live in Delavan, “small town atmosphere” received the most responses, with 192 people listing it as their first, second, or third most important reason for living in Delavan. Of those listing “small town atmosphere” as an important reason for living in Delavan, approximately 80% listed it as their second or third most important reason. The second and third most frequent reasons for living in Delavan were living “near job” (171 responses) and living “near friends and relatives” (170 responses). Of those selecting these responses, just over half of respondents for each listed these as their single most important reason for living in Delavan. “Affordable housing” was the fourth most common response as a top three reason for living in Delavan (106 responses) and was the single most important reason for 64% of those selecting this response. That Delavan provided a generally “convenient location” was the fifth most common response (103 responses).

Reason for Living in Delavan	First Reason (Percentage of Respondents)	Second Reason (Percentage of Respondents)	Third Reason (Percentage of Respondents)	Response Count
Small town atmosphere	20.8	40.6	38.5	192
Near job	54.4	29.8	15.8	171
Near relatives and friends	50.6	32.9	16.5	170
Affordable housing	64.2	19.8	16	106
Convenient location	12.6	35	52.4	103
Good schools	34.5	38.2	27.3	55
Other	36.5	3.8	59.6	52
Close to shopping opportunities	28.6	34.7	36.7	49
Low crime	26.5	36.7	36.7	49
Sense of community	15.9	31.8	52.3	44
Good housing choices	21.1	36.8	42.1	38
Close to Chicago metro area	36.4	45.5	18.2	33
Close to Milwaukee metro area	30	40	30	30
Close to Janesville/Beloit area	36	36	28	25
Good health care facilities	4.3	43.5	52.2	23
Parks and recreational opportunities	8.7	26.1	65.2	23
Good transportation access	23.8	42.9	33.3	21
Tax rate	15	35	50	20
Community services	0	53.3	46.7	15
Resort & tourism amenities	15.4	30.8	53.8	13
Close to Racine/Kenosha area	0	50	50	2

Community Facilities and Services

1. Generally, respondents were satisfied with most community services. When asked to describe their level of satisfaction with 26 categories of City services and community facilities, the most common rating for most services was “good” except for the “transportation/transit options” and “bicycle lanes and paths” for which the most common rating was “fair” or “poor.” For the “disaster plans/services,” “older adult care services” and “older adult activities” categories, the most common rating was “no opinion.” The table below provides a list of services included in the survey along with their weighted mean score (4= Excellent, 3=Good, 2= Fair, 1=Poor. *Average Rating excludes those responding "No Opinion". Most common response is in bold)

Service/Facility	Excellent (Percent)	Good (Percent)	Fair (Percent)	Poor (Percent)	Average Rating*	Response Count
	4	3	2	1		
Ambulance service	35.6	40.2	2.1	0.9	3.40	433
Fire protection	36.3	45.3	2.8	0.5	3.38	433
Trash collection	38.2	46.4	7.2	2.1	3.29	429
Park facilities	27.8	54.4	11	0.7	3.16	428
Police protection	30.1	51.3	10.6	2.1	3.16	435
Library services	27.2	52.1	10.2	1.4	3.16	430
Recycling services	28.3	50.6	10	3	3.13	431
Health services	17.8	50.7	18.8	2.8	2.93	432
Recreational programs	14.9	49.8	19.5	2.1	2.90	430
Yard waste services	16	46.5	20.9	4.7	2.84	430
Drinking water quality	13.3	54.2	21.4	9.1	2.73	430
Community events	11.2	47	26.5	4.9	2.72	430
Snow removal	15.9	47.1	24.2	9.5	2.72	433
Internet	10.4	33.1	19.1	7.3	2.67	423
Sidewalks	8.7	50.4	29.5	7	2.64	427
Public schools	8	43	20.4	9.2	2.62	429
Public meeting facilities	6.5	36.6	24.2	5.8	2.60	426
Youth activities	8.2	33	21.5	10.1	2.54	427
Street maintenance	10.9	41.6	33.3	11.8	2.53	433
Code enforcement/ property maintenance	7.7	36.4	30.3	12.4	2.45	429
Animal control	2.8	32.9	25.9	11.4	2.37	429
Older adult care services	3.3	23.9	18.4	10.4	2.36	428
Disaster plans/services	1.4	18.4	17.3	7.3	2.31	423
Older adult activities	3.7	19.6	21	13.3	2.24	428
Bicycle lanes and paths	2.8	22.4	27.1	27.3	2.01	425
Transportation options (e.g. taxi, senior transit)	1.9	18.8	31.1	22.4	2.00	425

2. Approximately half of the respondents indicated they felt that the City should provide city-wide wireless internet service.

Residential and Neighborhood Development

1. Respondents expressed a range of preferences on the types of new housing they would prefer to see in the future. The most preferred housing type was “Single-Family, Mid-Sized Homes,” with 65% of respondents in favor. “Older Adult Housing,” and “Single-Family, Starter Homes ” were each viewed favorably by approximately 37% of respondents. Other housing types and the percentage of respondents in favor is listed below.

	Response Percent	Response Count
Single-family, mid-size homes	65.5%	272
Older adult housing	37.1%	154
Single-family, starter homes	36.9%	153
Assisted living/congregate care	26.5%	110
Townhouses/Condominiums	21.9%	91
Single-family, large homes	20.7%	86
Duplexes	18.1%	75
Apartments, 3-4 per building	11.6%	48
Downtown housing	11.1%	46
Other	10.6%	44
Apartments, more than 4 units per building	5.1%	21
Seasonal housing	4.3%	18
Manufacture homes	3.9%	16
Mobile homes	1.7%	7

2. The majority of respondents (87%) reported that they have had no problems in finding safe, affordable housing in Delavan.
3. Of the respondents who reported they did have difficulty finding safe, affordable housing; the majority reported various measures of affordability as the main reasons.

	Response Percent	Response Count
Too expensive	68.9%	42
High utility costs	42.6%	26
Could not afford security deposit/down payment	24.6%	15
Other	21.3%	13
Lack of accessibility for persons with disabilities	18.0%	11
Available housing was too small	13.1%	8
Poor location	11.5%	7
Available housing was too large	3.3%	2

4. When asked if the City should promote good quality housing for area workers with modest household incomes, 60% of respondents agreed and 25% strongly agreed.
5. Two-thirds (66%) of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the City should encourage housing options that will attract a young professional workforce (e.g. condos).

6. Asked if the City should promote smaller lot sizes and redevelopment to use less land for future growth, 43% of those responding disagreed, 16% of respondents strongly disagreed. Of those respondents who were favorable, 21.7 % agreed, and 8.4% strongly agreed.
7. Nearly 80% of respondents were in favor of the City providing parks in new residential neighborhoods.
8. When asked which features were supported in residential neighborhoods, all of the following received a high level of support (in order from most to least): Street trees, neighborhood parks, off-street bicycle/pedestrian paths, sidewalks, shopping within walking distance, neighborhood schools, greenway corridors, decorative street lighting, architectural standards for houses, front porches, and on-street bicycle lanes. The majority of respondents indicated that they did not support design standards for narrower streets or alleys.

Economic Development

1. When asked to rate the job opportunities in Delavan today, fifty percent of the 406 people responding rated the availability of job opportunities in Delavan as “fair” while an additional 33.% rated job opportunities as “good.” Sixty two of respondents (15.3%) rated job opportunities as “poor.”
2. When asked to rate the shopping opportunities in the City, 58% of the 406 responses received stated “good” and additional 20.3% stated “excellent.” Only 3.7% stated the response as poor.
3. When asked which types of non-residential development respondents would like to see more of in the City, the two most popular choices were “entertainment uses, such as theaters, bowling alleys, and miniature golf” (54.5%) and “sit-down restaurants” (40%). Other responses covered a range of economic activities.

	Response Percent	Response Count
Entertainment uses, such as theaters, bowling alleys, and miniature golf	54.5%	231
Sit-down restaurants	38.9%	165
Industrial/manufacturing development	35.1%	149
Healthcare facilities	33.3%	141
Community facilities, such as churches, schools, and community centers	31.8%	135
Specialty stores, such as art shops, gift shops, and antique shops	31.8%	135
Mixed-use developments, including a mixture of offices, retail, and industrial	31.6%	134
Fine dining restaurants	30.7%	130
Neighborhood retail uses, such as a small hardware store, convenience store, or video store	29.5%	125
Supermarkets	23.8%	101
Large-scale commercial (department stores, shopping centers, “super centers,” etc.	16.7%	71
Office development	16.5%	70
Service uses, such as drycleaners and hair salons	14.9%	63
Hotels, motels, and other highway commercial uses	14.4%	61
Fast food restaurants	8.5%	36
Government offices	8.0%	34
None	7.3%	31

4. When asked where the City should future commercial/retail development, the majority of respondents (61%) indicated that they would prefer to see this occur “Downtown” (Walworth Avenue area.)” Approximately 39% of respondents also thought “Geneva Street at STH 50, west of I-43,” and in the “eastern portion of the City (east of I-43)” were appropriate locations. Approximately 24% of respondents thought the “western portion of the City between I-43 and CTH M” was appropriate. Other areas received less support.
5. When asked where the City should future industrial development, about a third of respondents (35%) indicated in the “northeastern portion of the City (between CTH O and I-43),” a third (33%) reported in the “eastern portion of the City (east of I-43),” and about a third (30%) reported “southeast of I-43 (between Wright Street and CTH O).

6. When asked to respond to the statement: the City should to continue to invest resources into revitalization of downtown and other areas of existing development,” 58.1 % of respondents agreed and 26.9 % strongly agreed. Only 10.7 % disagreed or strongly disagreed.
7. When asked if the City should invest resources in attracting commercial and industrial development to new areas, 47% of respondents agreed, and 29.5% strongly agreed. Only 17.7% disagreed or strongly disagreed.
8. Respondents were generally supportive of various design standards for commercial and industrial development.

Design Criteria	Support	Do Not Support	Response Count
Sustainable building/construction requirements that reduce the impact on the natural environment (natural and recycled building materials, energy efficient, water efficient, etc.)	89.1%	10.9%	375
Landscaping requirements	87.0%	13.0%	386
Improved architectural design standards for new buildings	82.5%	17.5%	382
Signage limitations	82.2%	17.8%	376
Lighting limitations	81.1%	18.9%	370
Building material requirements (brick, block, cedar, etc.)	77.2%	22.8%	356
Payment for off-site impacts (e.g. roads or sewers)	76.8%	23.2%	358
Maximum building size limits for retail development	68.4%	31.6%	370

9. When asked to rate the quality of features in the downtown, the responses varied. The most common response for most features was “Good”, though “mix of businesses” and “bike accessibility” were generally rated only “Fair.” The table below provides a list of services included in the survey along with their weighted mean score (4= Excellent, 3=Good, 2= Fair, 1=Poor. Average Rating includes only those responding. Most common response is in bold print)

Downtown Attribute	Excellent (Percent)	Good (Percent)	Fair (Percent)	Poor (Percent)	Average Rating	Response Count
	4	3	2	1		
Lighting	30	61	7.1	1.9	3.19	420
Street trees	30.9	56.8	10.9	1.4	3.17	421
Sidewalks	18.6	67.9	12.1	1.4	3.04	420
Historic character	24.7	57.6	14.1	3.6	3.03	417
Street signs	11.2	74.9	12.7	1.2	2.96	418
Overall layout	12.5	72.3	13.7	1.4	2.96	415
Pedestrian-friendly design	13.3	68.4	16.9	1.4	2.94	414
Parking availability	10	66.5	20	3.6	2.83	421
Interconnections to the surrounding neighborhoods	8	68.4	19.5	4.1	2.80	411
Traffic flow/circulation	8.3	63.7	23.2	4.7	2.76	421
Business signs	6.8	61.4	25.8	6	2.69	414
Building appearance	7.3	57.8	28	6.9	2.66	422
Presence of public gathering spaces	9.1	44.9	34.8	11.3	2.52	408
Creek access	4.6	53.5	28.1	13.8	2.49	370
Mix of businesses	7.5	38.3	39.3	14.9	2.38	415
Bike accessibility	3.3	32.9	41.6	22.2	2.17	392

Open Space, Agriculture, Natural Resource, and Cultural Resource Preservation

1. More than half (55%) of respondents felt that the City should maintain a community separation area between Delavan and Elkhorn, while 25% disagreed and 20% had “no opinion.”
2. Under half (47%) of respondents felt that the City should maintain a community separation area between Delavan and Darien, while 33% disagreed, and 20% had “no opinion.”
3. A large majority of respondents indicated that it was “very important” to preserve most natural and cultural resources in the Delavan planning area. Preservation of hunting areas within the City’s Planning area received a more mixed response, with 22.5% deeming it “very important,” 38.0% deeming it “somewhat important,” while 39.5% deeming it “not at all important.” (NOTE: The average rating is based on the following scoring: 2= “Very Important”; 1= “Somewhat Important”; 0= “Not at All Important”. Most common response is in bold print)

Resource	Very Important (Percent)	Somewhat Important (Percent)	Not at all Important (Percent)	Average Rating	Response Count
	2	1	0		
Woodlands	74	24.1	1.9	1.72	419
Rivers and streams	73.8	23.2	2.9	1.71	413
Downtown Delavan	72.9	23.1	4	1.69	424
Public parklands	68	29.6	2.4	1.66	415
Wildlife habitat	66.9	28	5.1	1.62	414
Wetlands	64.2	30.8	5.1	1.59	413
Floodplains	62.8	32.8	4.4	1.58	409
Farmland	63.9	29.9	6.2	1.58	421
Scenic views	61.2	33.4	5.4	1.56	410
Historic sites (e.g. Phoenix Hall, Allyn House, etc.)	61.8	31.5	6.7	1.55	416
Hillsides	47.8	42.3	9.9	1.38	404
Hunting areas	22.5	38	39.5	0.83	405

4. A large majority of respondents supported the statement that “agriculture is an important part of the area’s future character and economy” with 44% percent of survey respondents agreeing and 34% strongly agreeing.
5. Over half of survey respondents strongly agree (46%) or agreed (22%) that the City should pursue the development of a multi-use trail system with the vision of someday connecting to a regional trail system.
6. When asked to respond to the statement “The City should allow additional development along Delavan Lake, Lake Comus, and area streams,” most respondents disagreed, with 40% disagreeing and 27% strongly disagreeing.
7. When asked to rate the importance of preserving the City’s Downtown, 72.9% of those responding rated it as “very important ” and 23.1% rated it as “somewhat important.” Only 4% rated it as “not at all important.” The remainder had no opinion.
8. When asked to rate the importance of preserving the City’s historic sites, 61.8% of those responding stated it was “very important” and 31.5% rated it as “somewhat important.” Only 6.7% rated it as “not at all important.” The remainder had no opinion.