

Appendix A

Public Guidance

The public played an essential role the defining the context for planning. Everyone knows something about Faribault. Everyone has thoughts on the future of the community. The guidance from these local “planning experts” provides valuable part of the foundation of information needed to create a comprehensive plan. The following section summarizes the public guidance produced in two public meeting.

Public Meeting 1

Public Meeting #1 was held on December 6, 2001. Approximately 77 people participated in the meeting. The participants divided into ten small groups. This memo summarizes the results of the three small group discussion exercises.

Best of Faribault

Each group was asked to identify the five things that represent the best of Faribault. The nature of the characteristic was not specified. The best could be places, physical characteristics, qualities or other items determined by the group. The highlights of the responses include:

- People identified various aspects of parks and recreational facilities as the largest single grouping of responses.
- Faribault’s location and the access to other parts of the region was the second highest category.
- Participants valued the diversity of educational opportunities in Faribault.
- A caring and diverse population was viewed as strength of the community.

The groups submitted 49 total responses. These responses are summarized in Figure A-1 below.

Characteristic	Total	Percent
Parks/recreation	10	20%
Location/access	9	18%
Education system	6	12%
People factors	6	12%
Health care	3	6%
History/heritage	3	6%
Setting	3	6%
Businesses	2	4%
Other	7	14%

*Figure A-1
Response Summary – Best of Faribault
Public Meeting #1*

Changes

The groups were asked to describe how Faribault has changed over the past 10 to 20 years. The groups reported on a “change card”. The card asked for three pieces of information: (1) key words describing the change; (2) an additional description of the change; and (3) the impact of the change on the quality of life in Faribault. Some observations about the 52 responses submitted in this exercise include:

- Diversification of the community was the largest single change. Over 21% of the responses dealt with diversity issues. The groups viewed this change as having mixed impacts on the community – part positive and part negative.
- The groups identified a wide range of development issues as key changes. Not quite half (46%) of the responses dealt with change related to development.
- Faribault has grown; taking on more characteristics of a bedroom suburb of the Twin Cities. This change was primarily seen as positive.
- People feel that the Downtown area has suffered – businesses leaving Downtown, fewer local businesses and owners, more housing.
- A positive change is expansion of businesses and jobs through industrial growth.
- Improvements in parks and recreation facilities enhanced the community over the past 10 to 20 years.

To Do List

In the final exercise, the groups were asked to make a list of those things that need to be fixed or improved. The groups submitted 50 total responses. These responses are in Figure A-2.

Item	Total	Percent
Affordable housing	10	20%
Other housing	1	2%
Highway/access	7	14%
Other traffic	4	8%
Diversity	6	12%
Downtown	4	8%
Economic development	4	8%
Jobs	2	4%
Retail	2	4%
Safety	2	4%
Other	8	16%

Figure A-2
Response Summary – To Do List
Public Meeting #1

Meeting #2

Public Meeting #2 was held on January 17, 2002. Approximately 130 people attended this meeting, including a large contingent of high school students. The youth perspective is often missing from these forums. On average, the participants have resided in Faribault for 22 years. Meeting participants responded to a series of planning issues presented on a “game board”. This section summarizes the responses.

The game board posed a series of statement for response by the all participants. Figure A-3 summarizes the response received to these issue exercises.

Issues	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
Increasing local employment is a priority	69	40	1	2	7
Expanding the tax base is a priority	49	39	5	2	12
Retail development should be focused in the Downtown	18	53	24	18	5
Future retail should occur at Highway (I-35) interchanges	42	43	19	15	7
All goods and services needed by residents should be available in Faribault	53	44	22	2	4
Increased competition for shoppers will come from the Twin Cities	45	55	10	5	5
Faribault’s population will continue to become more ethnically diverse	77	40	2	1	4
It is important to provide services that meet the needs of all people	64	38	10	3	3

Figure A-3
Response Summary – Issues
Public Meeting #2

All participants were asked to indicate the place most in need of traffic improvements. Figure A-4 contains the results of this exercise. Twenty-six other locations scattered throughout the City were identified in this exercise.

Area	Responses
I-35/60 interchange area	45
4 th Street from Lincoln to 1 st Avenue	20
Highway 21 north of 60	16
Highway 60 river crossing	8
I-35 south interchange	7

*Figure A-4
Response Summary – Traffic Improvement Areas
Public Meeting #2*

Groups were asked to reach consensus on the three most important things that define your sense of community. The table in Figure A-5 contains those factors that received more than one response.

Factor	Responses
Community activities and events	9
People factors	8
Schools	6
Churches	6
Parks and recreation facilities	3
Small town	2
Available goods and services	2
Community resources	2

*Figure A-5
Response Summary – Sense of Community
Public Meeting #2*

Groups were asked to reach consensus on the three things that will most influence the future of Faribault. Table in Figure A-6 contains those factors that received more than one response.

Factors	Responses
Diversity	8
Jobs and employment	7
Economic growth and development	6
Growth of metro area	3
Growth of Faribault population	3
Focus on youth	3
Education options	3
State/county issues	2
Housing	2

Figure A-6
Response Summary – Factors Shaping the Future
Public Meeting #2

All participants were asked to evaluate three statement related to the future growth of Faribault:

- Faribault should continue to grow at the same pace as today.
- Faribault should grow at a slower pace than today.
- Faribault should add new homes and businesses at a faster pace.

The responses received in this exercise appear in Figure A-7.

Pace of Growth	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
Same pace	18	46	26	4	6
Slower pace	4	19	33	31	4
Faster pace	57	31	8	4	0

Figure A-7
Response Summary – Pace of Growth
Public Meeting #2

Participants were asked to evaluate high costs, high rents and lack of options as housing barriers in Faribault. The results appear in The responses received in this exercise appear in Figure A-8.

Housing Barriers	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
Costs	41	51	16	2	4
Rent	38	38	16	1	20
Options	48	36	17	3	5

Figure A-8
Response Summary – Housing Barriers
Public Meeting #2

Open House

A total of 23 evaluation forms were collected at the September 5 Open House. This memo summarizes the input received from these forms.

Some overall observations about the results include:

- We received little overall critique of the proposed Plan. Only seven people marked a response for all twelve planning areas. Thirteen forms contained a response to the plan in five or fewer areas.
- Commercial development is clearly the primary issue addressed in the comments. The Highway 60 West issue has two facets. Some people believe that it is logical and desirable to capture the natural inclination to promote commercial development along Highway 60. The other aspect is a concern that infill/redevelopment will not provide enough land to meet needs of the community.
- There is general support for the range of planning objectives throughout the core areas of the City.
- Several people noted the number of activity/traffic generators on the east side. They include State Academies, prison, Shattuck/St. Mary’s, hospital, large elementary school, and assisted living facility.

The remainder of this memo summarizes the specific evaluations and comments for the twelve planning areas depicted at the Open House.

Area 1 - 60/48 Redevelopment

Evaluation

Plan is acceptable as proposed	3
Plan is acceptable with some changes	5
Plan is not acceptable as proposed	3
No response	12

Comments

- Exit to Highway 21 from end 18th Avenue property (Allen property) or Western north to highway
- Improve appearance, pre-light stop light warning system
- Mobile home parks should be called out separately.

- Instead of high density residential, perhaps highway commercial should be considered if the 48/35 interchange made all-way
- Disagree with large area medium density - would like to see it commercial
- Commercial development along I-35 (south of 4th Street) - Good for big box
- Division/Western Ave. should be commercial not residential.

Area 2 - Highway 60 West

Evaluation

Plan is acceptable as proposed	4
Plan is acceptable with some changes	6
Plan is not acceptable as proposed	7
No response	6

Comments

- Should be more commercial
- A natural for some commercial as shown on current plan
- Plan far enough ahead. 60 may need a complete reroute
- Can you develop businesses along old Lyndale to Millersburg?
- There is room for some more commercial on the north side of Highway 60
- Medium/high density residential may be more appropriate adjacent to Highway 60
- I feel that 35/west 60 corridor development is a must for expansion - stay with comp plan of 10 years ago on this area
- Leave residential along river
- Why not develop what we have already started? All the traffic coming in on 60. We need more commercial area
- The early plan is perfectly acceptable the way it was.
- I would not eliminate planned housing south of 60
- Aggressive/tough
- Annexation must be first step! Availability of sewer and water to area is a major concern. Should warrant more consideration as to what will return the best result for the citizens of Faribault. The opportunity for major tax return is enormous is treated properly. There is no reason the environment concerns cannot be met and yet be compatible with positive large commercial development. This would not only bring more commercial base to Faribault but also enhance existing commercial by enlarging the commercial audience

Area 3 - West Expansion

Evaluation

Plan is acceptable as proposed	5
Plan is acceptable with some changes	3
Plan is not acceptable as proposed	4
No response	11

Comments

- I don't see any! Why?
- Perhaps any residential not appropriate adjacent to airport - noise issues
- Have residential between Roberds Lake Road and airport mover further west - have commercial just west of 35
- Need big improvement on malfunction junction by Happy Chef
- Aggressive/tough

Area 4 - Industrial Parks

Evaluation

Plan is acceptable as proposed	10
Plan is acceptable with some changes	2
Plan is not acceptable as proposed	0
No response	11

Comments

- Good start
- North of the present industrial park with new access from north
- If interchange is constructed at County 9 as Rice County Plan advocates this would provide north access to industrial parks
- Work harder to sell Heselton Industrial Park before we start another

Area 5 - 17th Street Neighborhoods

Evaluation

Plan is acceptable as proposed	9
Plan is acceptable with some changes	2
Plan is not acceptable as proposed	3
No response	9

Comments

- Pretty wet
- Continue single family use. Multiple (twin) on large/double size lot.
- Looks good. Neighbors should be happy to see no townhouses
- Need another way to get to Highway 21 from the area south of the Country Club
- There needs to be stop lights on a new improved intersection at 21/3

Area 6 - Highway 21 Corridor

Evaluation

Plan is acceptable as proposed	5
Plan is acceptable with some changes	6
Plan is not acceptable as proposed	6
No response	6

Comments

- What are you going to with the noise from the air planes?
- Why take a very successful older but not too old "Forest Park" and a very new, successful Batchelder Addition and current residential zone SW of Cardinal and rezone with commercial? Not exactly "preserve and protect" the good features of a community
- Ok - beautify
- Good idea
- The airport would affect housing with noise
- Commercial infill/redevelopment good idea. Aesthetics of much of the current commercial development lacking. Should have stronger standards for new development and redevelopment
- I am concerned with the traffic that we already have on 21. At 4:00 in the



afternoon I can't get out of my driveway

- Much room for new commercial on east side of 21 from freeway south to 7th Street
- Possibly add some Community Commercial strips adjacent to single family and Cardinal
- Redevelopment takes more time, is more complicated and very costly. Can and should the City assist in this? Objectives may be too strong

Area 7 - Central Industrial Area

Evaluation

Plan is acceptable as proposed 7
 Plan is acceptable with some changes 2
 Plan is not acceptable as proposed 0
 No response 14

Comments

- Work needs to be done to define what is industrial development and how do we encourage it!
- A beautification plan for this area would be a plus. Not very aesthetically pleasing, especially heavy industrial.

Area 8 - Central Residential Neighborhood

Evaluation

Plan is acceptable as proposed 5
 Plan is acceptable with some changes 4
 Plan is not acceptable as proposed 0
 No response 14

Comments

- Downtown area needs a downtown park area
- Density transition good idea - rather than current scattering trend
- I think the trend is wise to group the medium density residential, however, some single family homes need to be preserves along 7th
- Redevelopment efforts. Increase City's role

Area 9 - Downtown/4th Street Corridor

Evaluation

Plan is acceptable as proposed 6
 Plan is acceptable with some changes 3
 Plan is not acceptable as proposed 0
 No response 14

Comments

- The jail will need to be expanded into an area proposed to be historic
- Continue as is
- Aesthetics need to be addressed on 4th Street Corridor. Eliminate billboards and tougher sign regs would be a place to start
- Concentrate on commercial along 4th Street
- Turn lanes a must. Get rid of some of the older housing that need a lot of

-
- repair
 - Aggressive redevelopment effort. City's assistance needed

Area 10 - South Side

Evaluation

Plan is acceptable as proposed	7
Plan is acceptable with some changes	2
Plan is not acceptable as proposed	0
No response	14

Comments

- This much multiple family dwellings in south Faribault neighborhoods taxes this area. Right now the kinds play in the street by Kwik Trip every day!
- Continue south and get new south access
- The high density housing south of Middle School should be market rate
- I like that it addresses the "rental creep" issue.

Area 11 - Northeast

Evaluation

Plan is acceptable as proposed	8
Plan is acceptable with some changes	1
Plan is not acceptable as proposed	0
No response	14

Comments

- Along old Lyndale
- New Highway 3 corridor should be considered - should provide services to existing residential outside of city limits
- Need park for this area now - before there is any more growth

Area 12 - East Side

Evaluation

Plan is acceptable as proposed	7
Plan is acceptable with some changes	1
Plan is not acceptable as proposed	0
No response	15

Comments

- Why no easterly expansion?
- Residential only
- There is a need for additional bridge to accommodate traffic to 24-7 employers - hospital, residential schools, large elderly care facility and prison; a 800 student elementary school with many enrolled west of river
- New rural type development within city limits should be curtailed - will adversely impact future urban density development
- Need to find a place for new bridge to access east side area
- Perhaps we need to make 2nd Street foot bridge a street again since the east side has so much in school, prison, assisted living

General Comments

- Any proposed use that says “prevent”, “eliminate”, etc. will have a significant impact on land owners, likely a negative impact! Proceed with caution...
- We need people on the committee that are business owners along all of the corridors. We will have a population explosion in this county if the zoning is improved!
- The trails are great, keep adding to them.
- Improve waterway (river) fronts for environmental control and appearance.
- If you travel the freeways of our nation you will find the new commercial development on the edges of cities or out of the city limits.
- I think it is very important to have input from the business owners. There needs to be smaller groups who meet together regarding each of these areas. Our city planner isn't up to speed on the whole situation.
- New housing within established, older neighborhoods should be addressed - especially allowing double wides on historic neighborhoods - ruins aesthetics
- Overall good plan! Caution must be given in the downtown area as to preserve the historic areas and homes. By permitting or encouraging medium density some historic homes may be lost.
- Would prefer single dwellings as opposed to multi where ever possible
- Infill strategy is fine, but doesn't allow for expansion to open new spaces/ areas outside or adjacent city limits. Infill too hard. May not be realistic.