

TOWN OF NEW LEBANON PLANNING SURVEY RESULTS

Total Surveys Returned: 569

Questions and Responses:

1. What is your gender? Total responses - 562
male - 48% female - 52%
2. What is your age group? Total responses - 564
18-35 - 6% 36-59 - 55% 60 & over - 38%
3. What is the size of your household? Total responses - 561
one person - 13% two people - 52% three or four - 29% five or more - 6%
4. Do any young people under age 18 live in your home? Total responses - 558
yes - 25% no - 75%
5. Do you rent or own your home? Total responses - 560
own - 91% rent - 8%
6. How long have you lived in the Town of New Lebanon? Total responses - 564
5 years or less - 14% 6-15 years - 24% more than 15 years - 62%
7. What is your residential status? Total responses - 563
full-time - 80% weekender - 10% seasonal - 5% landowner only - 5%
8. How many acres do you own? Total responses - 562
0-1 acre - 10% 1-2 acres - 7% 2-5 acres - 22% 5-10 acres - 20%
more than 10 acres - 33% do not own - 7%
9. Which of the following describes your current home? Total responses - 547
single family - 91% two-family building - 3% boarding house - 1%
three+ family building - 2% mobile home in park - 2%
mobile home not in park - 1% other - 1%

10. Please indicate where you work. Total responses - 553
 Pittsfield - 7% Albany - 10% Troy - 1% New Lebanon - 13%
 Hudson - 1% Retired - 23% home business - 9% not working - 12%
 Other - 24% (Distributed among: NYC - 33%, Other Berkshire County - 18%,
 Other Capital District - 10%, Canaan - 7%, CT - 6%, Chatham - 4%, Boston - 2%)

11. What reason primarily influenced your original decision to live here? Total responses - 556
 born/raised here - 21% quality of schools - 2% rural atmosphere - 48%
 close to work - 6% affordable housing - 5% other - 18%

12. Do you feel the Town of New Lebanon has changed since you have lived here? Total responses - 545
 yes - 65% no - 24% unsure - 11%

17. Do you feel there is enough affordable housing in the Town of New Lebanon? Total responses - 543
 yes - 33% no - 26% unsure - 41%

18. Should New Lebanon encourage, prohibit, allow, or allow with conditions the following types of new residential development? Total responses per item - ranged from 514 to 551

	<u>encourage</u>	<u>prohibit</u>	<u>allow</u>	<u>allow with conditions</u>
single family housing	70%	0%	19%	11%
mobile home parks	5%	35%	6%	54%
condominiums	14%	26%	18%	42%
single mobile homes				
on individual lots	10%	39%	17%	35%
apartment buildings				
(1 to 2 stories)	13%	23%	24%	40%
manufactured housing				
other than mobile homes	20%	7%	46%	27%
senior citizen housing	40%	4%	34%	22%
low income housing	17%	26%	16%	40%
cluster housing	14%	43%	13%	29%
combined residential/ commercial	12%	24%	20%	44%

19. Currently, individual mobile homes are allowed in mobile home parks, RA1 zone, and elsewhere only by special permit. Which of the following do you favor? Total responses - 549

1. allowing mobile home in all areas without a special permit - 14%
2. continuing existing rules - 36%
3. prohibiting mobile home in all areas except in mobile home parks (excepting those homes already in existence) - 50%

20. Currently, the Zoning Ordinance requires minimum lot sizes (1 acre, 2 acres, 5 acres) for residential development. Minimum lot sizes determine the density of development allowed to occur. Which of the following do you favor? Total responses - 547

1. maintaining current minimum lot sizes - 66%
2. increasing minimum lot sizes - 25%
3. decreasing minimum lot sizes - 4%
4. eliminating minimum lot sizes - 4%

21. How important is it for the community to be concerned with:

Total responses per item - ranged from 539 to 555

	<u>important</u>	<u>not important</u>	<u>no opinion</u>
architectural design	59%	27%	13%
building scale	71%	15%	14%
building height	76%	15%	8%
business signs	83%	10%	6%
landscaping	71%	21%	8%
farmland	85%	9%	6%
site design	70%	18%	12%
density (residential)	86%	7%	7%
density (commercial)	84%	9%	6%
proximity of commercial development to residential	82%	11%	6%
tourism	79%	13%	8%
water quality	95%	3%	2%
noise levels	87%	7%	6%
stream protections	95%	3%	2%
traffic patterns	86%	7%	6%
wetland protection	86%	8%	6%
visual character	87%	8%	5%

22. How important is it for the community to preserve the following:

Total responses per item - ranged from 550 to 558

	<u>important</u>	<u>not important</u>	<u>no opinion</u>
historic character	89%	6%	5%
mature trees	86%	9%	5%
farmland	89%	5%	6%
undeveloped land	74%	15%	11%
scenic views	91%	6%	3%
unpaved roads	48%	40%	12%

23. Do you feel there is a need for the following? Total responses per item - ranged from 552 to 563

	<u>yes</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>undecided</u>
public water system	13%	69%	18%
public sewer system	18%	65%	17%
sidewalk system in the center of town	52%	37%	11%
public transportation	34%	46%	20%
waste/junk pick-up	63%	26%	11%

24. Do you feel there is a need for the following recreation or leisure activities to be available in the town? Total responses per item - ranged from 518 to 552

	<u>yes</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>undecided</u>
indoor basketball	42%	37%	21%
bicycle trails	71%	19%	9%
hiking paths	73%	17%	9%
golf course	18%	66%	15%
indoor ice skating rink	23%	55%	21%
senior citizens center	69%	17%	14%
youth center	73%	15%	12%
bowling	38%	43%	18%
movie theater	39%	44%	15%
community center	61%	23%	16%
snowmobile trail	25%	60%	14%

25. Should the community encourage, prohibit, allow, or allow with conditions the following types of commercial and/or industrial development? Total responses per item - ranged from 526 to 558

	<u>encourage</u>	<u>prohibit</u>	<u>allow</u>	<u>allow with conditions</u>
professional offices	55%	3%	21%	21%
corporate office park	27%	25%	14%	21%
hotel/motel	30%	9%	23%	38%
tourism	66%	2%	22%	11%
industrial or business park	17%	33%	11%	39%
light manufacturing	26%	11%	18%	45%
heavy manufacturing	8%	55%	9%	29%
warehouses / distribution centers	9%	43%	13%	35%
fast food franchises	14%	46%	15%	25%
big box stores	9%	60%	7%	24%
	<u>encourage</u>	<u>prohibit</u>	<u>allow</u>	<u>allow with conditions</u>
flea markets	16%	9%	24%	50%
used car lots	3%	32%	11%	54%
junkyards	3%	74%	2%	20%
mining gravel and rock	3%	53%	9%	35%
truck depot	3%	65%	6%	26%
bars	3%	27%	16%	54%
home based businesses	39%	3%	30%	28%
retail stores	41%	6%	26%	27%
transfer station	20%	23%	17%	40%

26. Currently, visitors from other areas come to New Lebanon for several reasons: recreational, historic sites, and cultural attractions (examples: Mt Lebanon Shaker Community, Lebanon Valley speedway, Theater Barn, Tannery Pond). Do you feel the Town should encourage tourism? Total responses - 554

yes - 88% no - 4% unsure - 8%

29. Currently, industry (manufacturers, such as Ceramaseal) with the Town is located in certain areas along Route 20. Would you support:

Total responses per item - ranged from 522 to 547

	<u>yes</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>undecided</u>
more industry located in same area	59%	25%	16%
more industry located in additional areas along Route 20	41%	38%	21%
more industry located in areas other than Route 20	28%	44%	27%
less industry than currently exists	10%	68%	22%
no new industry along Route 20	26%	54%	19%
no new industry	17%	65%	18%

30. Should new industrial development be allowed in areas currently zoned for:

Total responses per item - 548

	<u>yes</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>undecided</u>
residential	6%	87%	6%
commercial	36%	46%	18%
industrial	67%	15%	18%

31. Should new industrial development be discouraged in areas currently zoned for:

Total responses per item - 543

	<u>yes</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>undecided</u>
residential	84%	11%	5%
commercial	46%	37%	17%
industrial	20%	62%	18%

32. Currently, commercial uses (retail, restaurants) within the Town are concentrated on Route 20. Are you in favor of:

Total responses per item - ranged from 520 to 544

	<u>yes</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>undecided</u>
more commercial establishments located in same area	74%	14%	12%
more commercial establishments in other areas	40%	41%	19%
no new commercial establishments	10%	74%	16%
fewer commercial establishments	8%	76%	16%

33. Should new commercial establishments be allowed in areas currently zoned for:
 Total responses per item - ranged from 530 to 538

	<u>yes</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>undecided</u>
residential 1 acre	10%	81%	9%
residential 2 acres	8%	83%	9%
residential 5 acres	14%	75%	12%
commercial	81%	8%	11%
industrial	69%	18%	14%

34. Should new commercial establishments be discouraged in areas currently zoned
 Total responses per item - ranged from 530 to 537

	<u>yes</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>undecided</u>
residential 1 acre	80%	11%	9%
residential 2 acres	83%	9%	8%
residential 5 acres	76%	14%	10%
commercial	13%	77%	10%
industrial	18%	69%	13%

High School Survey Results

A survey was developed to involve high school aged youth in the planning process. Eighty-one responses were received (from about 220 students from New Lebanon). They were asked to identify the features of New Lebanon that were positive and negative, and were also asked to offer ideas on how to improve the negative characteristics and maintain the positive ones. Additionally, students were asked to imagine what New Lebanon would be like if it was an award-winning town in the year 2012. Students were also asked to identify special places and places of concern. Overall, the majority of students who participated in this survey were very oriented towards recreational activities, shopping, and the area's restaurants. The following is a summary of these results:

Negative Features

Overall, most of the characteristics that were given as negative fell in three categories of features: lack of places to recreate; lack of activities; and shopping. Lack of places to find a recreational activity was the most important negative feature identified by the students. Some of the specific responses in this category included lack of a community center, not enough parks, no movie theater, no gym or other athletic facilities, and no pool hall or video game arcade. Negative features related to shopping included lack of pharmacy, no bookstore or clothing store, and lack of restaurants. Some students mentioned that the issue was that New Lebanon is too far from existing shopping centers. Some students felt the school was a negative feature especially related to school food, teachers and principals lack of computers, and school rules. There were a variety of other negative features identified including lack of jobs, cows and the smell of cows, lack of a good transportation system, no cell towers, and too few people.

When asked how to improve these negatives, most of the responses were to provide for those features that were missing. For example, the solution to the lack of a community center was to build a community center.

Positive Features

Positive features included restaurants, the park, New Lebanon's small town atmosphere, its quiet nature, the speedway, school, basketball courts, stores, and the video store. Other positive characteristics included swimming holes and the springs, nice people, the safety of the area, a clean environment, and the thought that New Lebanon is a close-knit community.

Some of their ideas to further improve these positives included provision of more stores, provide for more recreational facilities, and to encourage a variety of more stores. There were also some ideas generated related to the broader character of New Lebanon, and some students offered ideas such as to renovate the pavilion, make existing buildings look better, provide for a building for town history, keep a strong police presence, and provide more parking at the library.

Award-Winning Features

An award-winning future New Lebanon has an abundance of recreational activities. When asked what the award-winning town would be like in the future, the most common response was that it had a diversity of recreational places and activities. Also at the top of the list included better stores, maintenance of a small town character, more restaurants and places to eat, a clean environment, welcoming and nice people, traffic lights, a good school, sports teams, public transportation, low crime, no farm smells, scenic views, and more jobs, among others.

Places of Concern

Not many responses were in this category, but some students mentioned concern about the IGA, cow pastures, pollution from fertilizers, rebuilding of the EZ Mart, and Stewarts gas pumps.

Special Places

The top four responses (by at 6 students) included the basketball and baseball courts, Indian Spring Fountain, Shatford Park, and their house or friends' houses. Others included farms, views from West Street and Old Post Road, Lebanon Springs, restaurants, and the school. Mountains, scenic views, forests, creeks, lakes, ponds, and other environmental features were mentioned by individual students as being special.

New Lebanon Planning Issues Survey

Summary

DEMOGRAPHICS (Questions 1-10)

Responses were almost evenly balanced between women and men (52% and 48% respectively). Most responses came from those 36-59 years old (55%) with a strong response from the 60 years and older group (38%). A modest response from the younger 18-35 year old group (8%) *<is / is not>* reflective of community demographics. ***<This may indicate a possible underreporting of issues of concern to this group.>***

Most households responding were comprised of two people (52%). Larger households were well represented with 35% of total responses (3-4 people 29%, 5 or more 6% respectively). Single person households responded at a lower rate (13%). A strong majority of households (75%) did not have children under 18 years old living there.

The vast majority of respondents (91%) owned their homes with the remainder (8%) renting. This *<is / is not>* reflective of demographic census data. ***<This may indicate a possible underreporting of issues of concern to this group.>*** Most respondents (62%) have been in New Lebanon for more than 15 years. Respondents living in the community for 6-15 years and 5 years or less were fairly well represented (24% and 14% respectively). Most respondents (80%) were full-time residents, but weekenders and seasonal residents responded strongly (10% and 5% respectively). A small number of respondents (5%) owned land in the Town without a home.

Among homeowners responding, property sizes tended to be fairly large with the majority falling into the 10 acres or more or 5-10 acres owned (33% and 20% respectively) categories. The remaining respondents fell into the 0-1 acre, 1-2 acre, and 'do not own' categories (10%, 7%, and 7% respectively). Respondents primarily (91%) lived in single-family dwellings. Smaller numbers lived in two-family residences (3%), mobile homes (3%), three or more family dwelling (2%), boarding houses (1%), or owned a vacant lot (1%).

A fairly large percentage (23%) of respondents indicated they are retired. This is a significantly lower percentage than those indicating they were in the 60 years and over age group. This would indicate a fairly large number of senior citizens living in New Lebanon remain in the work force out of personal choice or need. This group may need special support or services from local government to support their continued participation in the workforce. New Lebanon provided work to a healthy portion (22%) of respondents divided between Town businesses and at-home businesses (13% and 9% respectively). Albany, Troy, and other Capital District locations provided the largest concentration (13%) of employment outside the town. Berkshire County locations provided an equal number (13%) of employment opportunities with most (7%) concentrated in Pittsfield. New York City provided jobs to a significant group (6%) of respondents. Other less significant employment centers indicated in survey responses were Chatham (1%), Canaan (1%), Connecticut (1%),

Hudson (1%), and Boston (0.4%). A fairly large number of respondents indicated they are not working, which **<is / is not>** in agreement with the census employment data for the town.

COMMUNITY IDENTITY & VALUES (Questions 11-16)

Almost half (49%) of the survey respondents indicated the rural atmosphere of New Lebanon as the primary reason they decided to live there. A significant number (21%) of respondents were born and/or raised in the town. Family-related moves accounted for a further seven percent of settlement choices between marriage and family moves (4% and 3% respectively). Being close to work was cited by many (6%) as a primary reason for choosing to live in New Lebanon. Affordable housing was another significant (6%) settlement choice. Quality of schools was not a very strong factor (2%) among respondents. Other reasons cited for choosing to live in New Lebanon included, new job (1%), liked the house (1%), the Abode of the Message (1%), cultural resources (0.4%), and hunting opportunities (0.4%).

A strong majority (65%) of those surveyed felt the town had changed since they lived here. The rest of respondents indicated it had not changed (24%) or they were unsure (11%).

Those observing town change pointed out a wide number of areas where it was significant. The largest factor (21%) in town change was the general growth of the population, and corresponding development. A further 10 percent of respondents indicated that ugly commercial development (primarily the Route 20 strip) as a significant change. The rising number of part-time residents was indicated as a change in the community by 8 percent of responses. Loss of farmland was a factor for 6 percent of those who noticed change. A further 4 percent of respondents indicated the loss of general rural character in the community. Poor zoning control and/or enforcement was a factor for 6 percent. Many (5%) noted a larger racetrack as a changed aspect of the town. Community appearance was a specific factor for 9 percent of respondents, but there was almost an even split whether the change was negative (5%) or positive (4%). Traffic and noise increases were each identified as factors by 4 percent of responses. Change in the business community was a significant factor for 5 percent, but as with appearance there was almost an even split among those who thought the number of businesses had grown (3%) or decreased (2%). Other change factors identified in the surveys included, more taxes (2%), more zoning (2%), better government (1%), and less open space (1%).

When asked to list three of the best things about New Lebanon, over one third of responses assigned a priority to the rural, scenic, quiet, and open space character of the community (17%, 12%, 4%, and 2% respectively). The location of the town near metropolitan areas and the Berkshires was the third most (12%) single community factor among respondents. Living in a friendly and small community was the best attribute for a significant number of respondents (6% and 5% respectively). Historic and cultural resources were important to many (4% and 2% respectively). Other factors indicated as the best qualities of New Lebanon were the good restaurants (4%), speedway (2%), low crime (2%), clean air / water (2%), good roads (1%), diverse population (1%), and the library (1%).

Responses identifying the worst qualities of life in New Lebanon were more widely distributed than the positive qualities. The single most (12%) identified negative factor was the speedway. Several factors identified individually can be grouped thematically under stronger planning and zoning, with a focus on community appearance. Taken as a whole about forty percent of survey respondents indicated this as a priority issue. The individual factors in this planning/zoning theme are: ugly commercial development - particularly Route 20 strip (10%), junk / antique shops (10%), poor zoning control (8%), unattractive / undefined town center (6%), lack or shared community vision (3%), and eyesore / abandoned properties (3%).

Many respondents (7%) identified the lack of retail diversity as a significant negative quality. The lack of a pharmacy was particularly noted in the surveys. Respondents also noted higher taxes with the same degree (6%) of importance. A number of other unpleasant features of community life identified were: traffic on Route 20 (3%), lack of public services (3%), wealthy 'city people' (3%), poor cell phone service (2%), mobile homes (2%), bad supermarket (2%), the OTB (2%), flea markets (1%), lack of youth activities (1%), community apathy (0.7%), lack of jobs (0.5%), and farm smells (0.5%).

Survey respondents singled out a few attractive points in the community when asked. The Mount Lebanon Shaker settlement around the Darrow School was the most (13%) strongly identified attractive feature. The Tilden Mansion received almost as many (11%) positive responses. The various churches (Catholic, Congregational, and Episcopal) in the community as a whole were noted by 16 percent of respondents, with a particular focus (6%) on the Catholic Church and its associated shrine. Shatford Town Park received a significant (5%) amount of responses as an attractive feature. The Strong value placed on rural and scenic character by community residents expressed in other parts of the survey was reinforced by 6 percent of responses (rural countryside – 4%, views of/from hills & ridges – 4%). Six percent of residents generally rated all school buildings as attractive, with half of those responses focused on the high school. The Angel Trumpet Florist was also noted as an attractive feature by a number (4%) of the responses. Other areas that were identified by the surveys were: Lebanon Springs (3%), Cemetery Road area (3%), West Street (3%), Pillar's Restaurant (3%), County Road 5 (2%), Mario's Restaurant (2%), the new building at Samantha's (1.2%), Hitching Post (0.9%), Spencer House (0.7%), library (0.6%), Lebanon Valley Speedway (0.6%), and the Indian Fountain (0.6%).

There were also a large number of negative features identified in the survey responses. However, a very clear priority (19%) was given to the cluster of 'antique' or 'junk' shops within the community. Respondents selected the area surrounding the speedway as the second-most (10%) unattractive community feature or area. A further 1.4 percent disliked the Speedway Diner (many noted the abandoned junk surrounding it). Nine percent of residents surveyed found the Capone property was their most memorable negative building or area in the Town. The Route 20 corridor as a whole was unappealing to another significant (8%) group. Mobile homes and parks in general were a negative visual feature for many (5%) respondents, with several of them singling out the Ski Lodge and Riverdale mobile home parks. The large number of used car lots and their visibility from the roadways was important for (4%) a number of residents. The Midtown Mall, Darcy Construction, and the OTB parlor were each identified by 3 percent of those surveyed as unattractive. Several other sites each

were singled out by 2 percent of write-in responses, Bobbie's Closet (the old Schell's Propane – described in many responses as the 'yellow building'), the Ward Hatch mall and surrounding area, strip malls in general, tractor trailer storage, and unkempt properties. The following buildings or areas each received less than 2 percent of the responses: the old/abandoned elementary school, downtown, vacant businesses, Route 22 South, 'none', go-cart places, old asphalt plant, Chittenden Farm, Fairweather Farm, area at junction of Routes 20/22, Consolidated Fabricators, the old dumpster factory, area around Hess gas station, Gideon Equipment, and the Griffin House.

HOUSING MIX (Questions 17-19)

Most respondents (41%) were unsure whether there was enough affordable housing in the town. The remainder were fairly evenly split whether there was or was not (33% and 26% respectively).

A significant majority (70%) identified single-family housing as a type that should be encouraged by the town. Only a small number (11%) suggested placing conditions on this housing type.

Very few (5%) felt mobile home parks should be encouraged. Many respondents (35%) wanted to prohibit this housing type. The largest percentage (54%) of respondents felt it should be allowed with conditions.

Opinion was widely spread regarding condominiums, likely because there are limited or no examples in the community for comparison. About the same number of respondents felt they should be allowed or encouraged (18% and 14% respectively). Some (26%) felt they should be prohibited. However, most respondents (42%) felt condominiums should be allowed with conditions.

Mobile homes on individual lots were the housing type least desired by respondents. Almost three-fourths felt they should be prohibited or allowed only with conditions (39% and 35% respectively). Only a few felt they should be allowed (17%) or encouraged (10%).

Apartment buildings of one to two stories were not a strongly desired housing type. Most respondents (40%) felt they should be allowed with conditions. About equal numbers felt they should be allowed or prohibited (24% and 23% respectively). Only very few (13%) would want them encouraged.

Manufactured housing other than mobile homes seems to be preferred as the means to provide for low and moderate income housing in the community. Very few (7%) respondents felt it should be prohibited. Almost half (46%) would allow it, and a further third (27%) would allow it with conditions. A significant number (20%) felt it should be encouraged.

Many (40%) identified senior housing as an important type to encourage in the community. This is reinforced by the demographic spread of responses indicating the large number of older retirees in the community.

Respondents did not strongly favor low-income housing as a category. Few (17% and 16% respectively) felt it should be encouraged or allowed. Over two-thirds felt it should either be allowed with conditions (40%) or prohibited (26%).

Cluster housing was similarly lacking in priority for respondents. Few (14% and 13% respectively) felt it should be encouraged or allowed. Many respondents (43%) felt it should be prohibited, while a strong number (29%) would allow it with conditions.

Very few respondents (12%) wanted to encourage mixed-use development. This is somewhat in opposition to the many other aspects of community feedback that indicate the desire for a centralized downtown (typically mixed use structures are important components in traditional downtown business districts). However, most respondents would allow (20%) or allow with conditions (44%) this type of residential development.

When asked to specify half (50%) of respondents felt the rules for mobile home location should be amended to permitted to allow them only in permitted mobile home parks (except those already sited). About one-third (36%) of respondents wanted to continue the existing rules, and the remainder (14%) felt they should be allowed in all areas.

ZONING ISSUES (Questions 20-22, 25, 29-34)

Zoning Code Elements

One-third (66%) of the respondents to the survey were content to maintain the current minimum lot sizes. One-quarter (25%) wanted to see an increase to minimum lot sizes, indicating a preference for a less densely developed community. Only a very few wanted to decrease or eliminate minimum lot sizes (4% for each).

Survey recipients were asked to indicate certain common zoning factors (architectural design, building scale, building height, business signs, landscaping, farmland, site design, residential density, commercial density, commercial-residential proximity, tourism, water quality, noise levels, stream protections, traffic patterns, wetland protection, & visual character) were important, unimportant, or if they had no opinion. There was not a strong identification of a few central items of importance. In fact all items were rated by a large majority (60% or greater) of respondents as important. The factors that received the strongest number of 'not important' responses were architectural design (27%), landscaping (21%), and residential density (18%). The weaker support for landscaping concerns was surprising considering the high degree of dissatisfaction with the appearance of the commercial / downtown area. However, the question did not distinguish between residential and commercial landscaping and residents may rate the latter higher than the former as important. Many items received extremely strong support with eighty percent or more of respondents rating them as

important. These factors were in order of 'important' responses: water quality (95%), stream protections (95%), noise levels (86%), visual character (87%), wetland protection (86%), traffic patterns (86%), residential density (86%), farmland (85%), commercial density (84%), business signs (83%), and residential-commercial proximity (82%).

There was a similarly strong level of 'important' responses for elements to preserve in the community. Only one item, unpaved roads had close to an even balance between 'important' and 'not important' responses (48% and 40% respectively). Preservation of undeveloped land was a bit more strongly favored with about three-fourths (74%) considering it important. The rest of the items (scenic views, historic character, farmland, and mature trees) were all rated as important by about 90 percent of respondents. One thing the slight difference in importance open space items received is that active farmland, ridgelines, and particular scenic vistas should be used to develop open space preservation priorities.

Commercial / Industrial Uses - Types

Among responses in the commercial and industrial development area, tourism and professional office development were clear leaders in support. Response levels to 'prohibit' these uses were extremely low (2% and 3% respectively). They also receive the two highest 'encourage' response levels (66% and 55% respectively). Other uses receiving strong support were retail stores and home based businesses with each receiving about 40 percent 'encourage' responses, about 30 percent 'allow', and about 30 percent 'allow with conditions' responses.

Light manufacturing and hotel / motel development were both supported fairly well, though respondents showed a desire to regulate them more. Each received about 30 percent 'encourage', about 20 percent 'allow', and about 40 percent 'allow with conditions' responses. Flea markets were slightly less supported with positive response levels of 'encourage'-16 percent, 'allow'-24 percent, and 'allow with conditions'-50 percent respectively.

Responses were rather mixed for a transfer station or corporate office park. They received similar 'prohibit' response levels of about 25 percent. About 40 percent of respondents would allow these uses with conditions or regulations. The remainder of responses for each would encourage or allow the uses.

Survey respondents indicated a desire to limit used car lots and bars. Response levels of 'prohibit' were about 30 percent for each. Most respondents (about 13% and 54% respectively) wanted to 'allow' or 'allow with conditions.' Fast food franchises and warehouses/distribution centers 'prohibit' response levels were just a bit lower (46% and 43% respectively), with slightly higher percentages of 'encourage' and 'allow' responses.

Several uses were strongly discouraged by respondents. Response levels of 'prohibit' were above 50 percent for junkyards (74%), truck depots (65%), big box stores (60%), heavy manufacturing (55%), and gravel / rock mines (53%). 'Allow with conditions' typically made up the remainder (about 20-30%) of responses for these uses, though there was some more 'encourage' support for heavy manufacturing.

Respondents clearly indicated support for maintaining current levels of industrial uses in the community. Strong 'no' responses were offered for "less industry than exists," "no new industry," and "no new industry along Route 20" (68%, 65%, and 54% respectively). The location options of the question primarily focused on industrial development along the Route 20 corridor.

Industrial Uses - Location

Although more respondents indicated support for industry along Route 20, about one-third of respondents indicated a preference for less industry in this corridor. About a further 25 percent were undecided. An interpretation to reconcile these responses is that respondents favor the current focus of industrial uses in a certain area along Route 20, but with greater buffering of the uses from the roadway and limitation of a 'sprawled' extension of these uses along the whole corridor.

A strong majority (87%) of those surveyed did not want to see industrial development in current residential districts. Most (67%) respondents would allow industrial development in districts currently zoned for that use. Though most (46%) respondents did not want to see industrial uses in commercial districts, an almost equal number (36%) would allow this use while a significant number (18%) were undecided. It is likely that some allowance for light industrial/manufacturing development in current commercial zones would be supported, if adequate conditions and regulations were in place. Responses were almost identical when asked where new industrial development should be discouraged.

Commercial Uses - Location

Responses indicated a strong interest (above 75%) in expanding commercial establishments. The majority (74%) favored locating such uses along Route 20. However, when asked about commercial establishments in other areas a large number (40%) indicated they would support it with a significant number (19%) undecided and the remainder (41%) against the idea.

There was almost no support for location of commercial establishments areas zoned residential, though there was slight openness (yes-14% and undecided-12%) to commercial development in 5-acre residential zones. Most respondents (80%) favored locating new commercial uses in current commercial zones. There also strong (69%) support for locating commercial uses in established industrial zones.

Most survey respondents (80%) favored discouraging new commercial establishments in all types of residential zones. Support for locating this use in established commercial or industrial zones was strong (77% and 69% respectively).

Overall the responses about industrial and commercial uses indicate a potential willingness to establish a mixed commercial-industrial zone. There may also be limited support for expanding the commercial districts into adjacent undeveloped land within 5-acre residential

zones. Creation of new commercial areas within 5-acre residential zones might also receive very limited support.

FACILITIES (Question 23)

A strong majority of survey responses did not support a public water system or sewer system with 'no' response levels of 69 percent and 65 percent respectively. A large number (46%) of respondents did not support public transportation, however, there were significant levels of supporting (34%) and undecided (20%) responses.

A strong majority (63%) did support establishment of a public waste collection service. A simple majority (52%) also supported creation of a sidewalk system in the town center, though a significant number (37%) did not feel there was a need.

RECREATION (Question 24)

Large majorities of respondents believed there was a need for hiking paths (73%), bicycle trails (71%), a youth center (73%), a senior center (69%), and a community center (61%). Given the number of workshop and survey responses that indicate a need for greater community interaction, the development of a combined purpose center to meet the needs of young and old should be actively pursued by the community. Creation of an integrated biking and walking path network will also reinforce community-building social opportunities, particularly if it is designed to link significant community destinations like the downtown commercial area, a new community center, parks, and schools.

A majority of respondents did not support a golf course, snowmobile trail, or an indoor skating rink. These activities received 'no' response levels of 66 percent, 60 percent, and 55 percent respectively.

A number of activities received balanced positive and negative response levels. This would indicate that there may be a possibility of pursuing them at some time in the future or if easy low-cost opportunities arise. However, they should not be significant priorities for now. These activities include indoor basketball, bowling, and a movie theater (each about 40%-no, 40%-yes, 20%-undecided).

TOURISM (Question 27-28)

A few key existing and potential attractions were identified by survey responses for both encouragement and discouragement with several secondary elements identified.

The primary tourist attractions (28%) respondents wanted to encourage were cultural events and concerts such as those occurring at the Theater Barn and Tannery Pond. A close second (28%) was the Mt. Lebanon area and the town's Shaker heritage. The Lebanon

Valley Speedway received a fair level (6%) of support. Eleven percent of responses indicated enjoyment of the outdoors as a significant theme (biking/hiking trails-5%, open spaces-4%, and winter sports-2%). Other attractions identified by less than 3 percent of responses included: restaurants, all tourism, flea markets, antiques, fairs/festivals, retail, museum, arts, movie house, farmers' market, crafts, and an improved town center.

The primary tourist attraction respondents wished to discourage was clearly the Lebanon Valley Speedway with 36 percent of the total 615 responses to this question. There is not absolute community consensus on this issue. As stated above, 6 percent (of 1062 total) responses indicated a desire to encourage this use. This translates into about 220 'discourage' comments and about 60 'encourage' comments. It is clear from response to this question and others in the survey that many residents consider the speedway to have negative impacts on the community. However, it does have notable support for many survey respondents. It is worth noting that many of the comments to discourage the speedway as an attraction expressed the desire to mitigate or limit its community impact and not eliminate it altogether.

Three other existing or potential tourist attractions were identified for discouragement at roughly equal (about 8%) levels of response. They are the antique / junk dealers, flea markets, and gambling (primarily OTB). Other attractions identified to be discouraged by less than 4 percent of responses included: amusement parks, 'none', congestion / noise creating uses, bars (especially with late hours), tattoo parlors, malls, fast food franchises, loud concerts, adult uses, hunting, motorized recreation, used car lots, and a golf course.