

Appendix A: Specific Comments in response to Question 3, which states “If you do not strongly support this proposal (as outlined in question 2), please choose ONE reason below.”

Question 2 Response: Strongly Support	
Question 3 Response	Specific Comments
Want a different density standard, but the rest of the proposal is acceptable. (specify in "Specific Comments" box below) 4 responses total, 4 Comments	30
	40 acre density standard preferable but otherwise strongly support the 35 acre density standard
	20 acres
	40 acre
Want to continue the complete prohibition of residential development on prime agricultural soil, but the rest of the proposal is acceptable. 1 response total, 0 Comments	
Other reason. (specify in "Specific Comments" box below) 1 response total, 0 Comments	
No response to Question 3, 1 Comment	The effort of everyone on the board is appreciated.

Question 2 Response: Support	
Question 3 Response	Specific Comments
Want a different density standard, but the rest of the proposal is acceptable. (specify in "Specific Comments" box below) 17 responses total, 15 Comments	15 acres for density standard
	Would like to see the density standard to a fewer number of acres. Not sure we need to relax ALL the standards on PRIME ag land.
	Prefer 25 acre density
	prefer 10 acre density
	Density should be 10 acers standard
	10 acre density
	density standard of 20 aceras
	1 acre minimum to a 5 acre density
	0 ACRE DENSITY
	20 acre density
	20 acre density
	No Density
	No density standard at all
	20 Acre Density Standard seems feasible
	Lower the density standard to 15 acres
Want a different lot size acreage for residential lots, but the rest of the proposal is acceptable. (specify in "Specific Comments" box below) 5 responses total, 4 Comments	one acre lot size is big enough
	5 Acres
	Even 2 acres takes away crop/pasture land. I would rather see 1 acre. I also think either everyone should get an extra building site, or lower the density to 20 acres so everyone is treated fairly. I do not think it is fair that a person owning 40 acres can have two building sites and a person owning 80 acres also only gets two building sites. Treat everyone the same.
	5 acre lot size
Want to continue the complete prohibition of residential development on prime agricultural soil, but the rest of the proposal is acceptable. 11 responses total, 3 Comments	No residential development on prime agricultural soil with maybe a reasonable exception for a driveway to cross prime agricultural soil to get to the residential lot.
	I'm a newer landowner with two young kids (6 and 3). We love our farmhouse and the 12.5 acres we were lucky enough to purchase. I'm nervous about people building a house next to us as we moved here to get away from urban locations. Our neighbors also have a little one and I know that there concern is the same. We are nervous as the aging landowner continues to tell us that lots around us are buildable. I know I'd rather not see people build on this beautiful ag land that surrounds us. I'm also not the most educated on this topic. I'm in support of whatever reduces the number of buildable lots/homes moving forward.
	Like to see 40 density std and no building on prime soil
Other reason. (specify in "Specific Comments" box below) 20 responses total, 20 Comments	I support the 2 acre lot size with no soil restrictions and no density standards.
	Haven't studied other alternatives enough; worried about what happens when/if some future board manages to get rid of the density rule altogether. Want to preserve rural character and farmland.

	No cluster sites of adjacent 2 acre lots (ie, small residential subdivisions within a larger property. These are common in western Dane Co.
	keep prime ag soil restriction, only allowing variances for driveway access not houses themselves
	I support the idea, just not knowledgeable on the topic enough to say strongly support
	Concern about building location on property
	Is the "complete prohibition" only on Ag 1 soil ("prime")? Ag 1 soil could be prohibited for residential development if an updated soil assessment is used. I do support the rest of the proposal.
	keep 5 acres no prime ag restrictions
	want to eliminate prime ag soil restrictions keep 5 acres no density
	Relax driveway locations on cropland (prime) but protect cropland (prime) from buildings by using USDA/crop history or other maps/methods. Too loose to state relaxing without knowing what that means.
	We think no further development should be allowed in Brigham Township, ideally. Some exceptions could be made for people adding a bedroom, or building a better dairy barn, etc. A hundred years from now, Brigham Township would be surrounded by development and would look like Central Park in New York City by comparison to built-up neighboring towns. People would drive through it and be amazed at the beauty of the countryside and at the wisdom and vision of the people who stopped development back in 2018.
	There should be at least some prohibition on development of prime agricultural soil, but not complete prohibition. Need clear definition of "reasonable exceptions".
	would like to protect agricultural soil. Also what is listed as ag soil should be re-evaluated, perhaps what is listed as A1 is not actually top growing soils.
	I like the idea of easing restrictions on driveways being built crossing prime farmland but I would prefer that soil restrictions be left in place for house placement.
	Issue of cluster houses
	The statement, "Relaxing the restrictions on residential development on prime agricultural soils to allow reasonable exceptions" doesn't make sense. It is horribly unspecific. I like the idea of the 35 acre density standard and two acre minimum lot size, but this last bit about relaxing the restrictions seems to negate the density and lot size language, or at least open the way to arbitrarily overriding that language.
	Have not had time to digest all information
	People should be able to develop their land for personla residential use without so much government involvement.
	Follow Town of Dodgeville Density Exception, Avoid development on 1,2 or 3 soils when possible
	"reasonable exceptions" for building on prime agricultural land seems too vague and needs to be more specifically defined as to what these exceptions can include
No response to Question 3, 1 Comment	Relative to other close municipalities, I would be in like to see a 3 acre minimum and and density standard equal to 40 acres

Question 2 Response: Don't Know	
Question 3 Response	Specific Comments
Want a different density standard, but the rest of the proposal is acceptable. (specify in "Specific Comments" box below) 2 responses total, 2 Comments	smaller density size 10 or 15 acre density standard
Want a different lot size acreage for residential lots, but the rest of the proposal is acceptable. (specify in "Specific Comments" box below) 2 responses total, 1 Comment	Rural residential lots need to be at least 10A to accomodate water and sewage systems
Want to continue the complete prohibition of residential development on prime agricultural soil, but the rest of the proposal is acceptable. 2 responses total, 0 Comments	
Other reason. (specify in "Specific Comments" box below) 1 response total, 1 Comment	How can I be sure that the density standard won't be reduced in the future after two acre lots are built up there by increasing density further?

Question 2 Response: Oppose	
Question 3 Response	Specific Comments
Want a different density standard, but the rest of the proposal is acceptable. (specify in "Specific Comments" box below) 8 responses total, 5 Comments	Density of first choice,(1) 0 ac. (2) 20 ac.max. Lot size prefer 5 ac. remove Prime soils,maps are outdated and in some case inaccurate, Prime soils with decades of tree planted, remove prime soil and history of crop activity. I dont see how this works for small acreage owners No density standard is needed

	Density of (1) 0 ac. (2) 20 ac.max. Lot size perfer 5 ac. remove Prime soils,maps are outdated and in some case inaccurate, Prime soils with decades of tree planted remove prime soil and history of crop activity. 15-20 acre density
Want a different lot size acreage for residential lots, but the rest of the proposal is acceptable. (specify in "Specific Comments" box below) 4 responses total, 3 Comments	Minimum Lot Size of 5 Acres
	Keep the 5 acre minimum lot size and reduce density standard to 20 acres
	larger lot size such as 5 acres
Want to continue the complete prohibition of residential development on prime agricultural soil, but the rest of the proposal is acceptable. 17 responses total, 2 Comments	I would prefer the minimum of 5 acres, but 2 is tolerable
	Development on environmentally sensitive areas should not be allowed and Industrial Agriculture is not compatible with existing township farming.
Other reason. (specify in "Specific Comments" box below) 7 responses total, 6 Comments	Prime soil restrictions need to be relaxed but "allowing reasonable exceptions" without guidelines allows approval or disapproval to be granted inconsistently.
	keep as is
	density standard 5 acre lot size 1 acre not just for rich
	I only agree with the 35 acre density standard. Minimum lot size should stay 5 acres or larger. Development on prime ag soil should remain restricted.
	Agree with density standard. Maintain minimum lot size of 5 acres and prohibition of building on prime agricultural soil.
	Not sure

Question 2 Response: Strongly Oppose	
Question 3 Response	Specific Comments
Want a different density standard, but the rest of the proposal is acceptable. (specify in "Specific Comments" box below) 11 responses total, 10 Comments	20 acres or less
	20 acres or less
	35 acre density is not fair to many landowners with less than 100 acres.
	Density is not fair to everyone. would like the density lowered.
	35 acres is not fair for everyone. Want a lower density standard.
	35 acres is not fair across the board. Density should be lower acres.
	35 acers only hurt large landowners
	20 acres
	Currently there is not a issue with the existing minimum lot size standard of 5 acres. I would support allowing smaller lots in case by case situations if it saves prime farm soils.
	NO DENSITY - town of Ridgeway just did away with it. It'll cause problems down the road - Don't want to see us go to any density rules!!!
Want a different lot size acreage for residential lots, but the rest of the proposal is acceptable. (specify in "Specific Comments" box below) 2 responses total, 1 Comment	Increase minimum lot size to 10 acres
Want to continue the complete prohibition of residential development on prime agricultural soil, but the rest of the proposal is acceptable. 13 responses total, 2 Comments	the complete in the statement is a bit d=severe, but do not want it to be easy
	Ease up on grade III land. Still not allowing people to put driveways all the way across a parcel just to have a great view. Saving as much cropland as possible, but also allowing some exceptions when the parcel has no good building site on grade III or lower.
Other reason. (specify in "Specific Comments" box below) 25 responses total, 24 Comments	I am for 5 acre lots and no building on prime ag soil
	We need to leave development restrictions on prime soils with regard to the location of housing placement but ease these restrictions with regard to driveway placement across prime soils.
	I don't want standards for prime ag land lowered and oppose the entire proposal.
	Continue the complete prohibition of residential development on prime agricultural soil, minimum 5 acre lot size and 40 acre density standard..
	lot size is fine but i think the density should 5-10 acres and no more then that
	If eliminating the other restrictions, then less density than proposed - different density standard of 40 & different lot size acreage for residential lots of 10. We understand how the committees sees this related to large undeveloped acreage divisions, however additional NEW division of existing 'subdivisions' should also be a concern. thx
	No density at all. If you put a standard density on this property you have caused this land to reach a ceiling and have reduce the value of the property for future generations

	Continue to prohibit development on at soils and raise the minimum lot size to 40 acres.
	Prefer to keep the current rules, they seem to be working fine.
	Oppose all 3
	Want no density standard or prime soil restrictions
	Want to continue with the no density standard, 5 acre minimum lot size and no residential development on prime ag soil.
	As a landowner of a small parcel, I am always at the mercy of the adjacent landowners. These large old farms have the ability to parcel and develop in close proximity to my home, wrecking the beauty of the landscape which subsequently decreases property value. It is frustrating to see small parcels being sold for large sums, at the expense of the neighbors. This is a beautiful area. Please keep it rural, natural, and quiet.
	Density standard too high and lot size too small
	No density requirements. 2 acre lots. Allow building on prime soil.
	No density requirements. 2 acre lots. Allow building on prime soil.
	5 acre parcels..no density and no soil types
	leave as is
	No change at this at all.
	I like the current land use policy, protect prime agriculture land.
	We have some of the best ag land in the US. Once you put houses on it, you never get it back. Think 50 years from now. We can see how dangerously this changes things by looking at our neighbors. I strongly oppose development of any country land. Not good long term. You NEVER get it back. Keep 5 acre minimum.
	I think the comprehensive plan should be left as it is and not be changed just to meet the personal objectives of the current members of the town board.
	Want to continue the policy as it is now. No need to change.
	I don't think the current system is broken

Appendix B: Complete results for Question 4.

The following factors are often taken into consideration for NON-FARM commercial or industrial development. Rank these from 1 to 11, with 1 being most important and 11 being least important.

	1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8		9		10		11		Total	Score
Compatibility with surrounding uses	22.06%	45	22.06%	45	14.22%	29	8.82%	18	8.82%	18	8.82%	18	2.45%	5	4.90%	10	2.94%	6	3.43%	7	1.47%	3	204	8.25
Environmental impact	33.82%	69	19.61%	40	14.71%	30	10.29%	21	4.41%	9	5.88%	12	4.90%	10	1.47%	3	1.47%	3	1.96%	4	1.47%	3	204	8.89
Location	15.69%	32	14.71%	30	21.57%	44	14.22%	29	14.22%	29	7.84%	16	5.39%	11	2.94%	6	1.47%	3	0.98%	2	0.98%	2	204	8.2
Hours of operation	0.49%	1	1.47%	3	4.90%	10	7.84%	16	11.27%	23	14.71%	30	11.76%	24	9.80%	20	17.65%	36	12.25%	25	7.84%	16	204	4.77
Parking availability	0.98%	2	0.98%	2	0.98%	2	2.45%	5	4.90%	10	5.88%	12	9.80%	20	14.71%	30	25.98%	53	14.71%	30	18.63%	38	204	3.52
Proposed signage	0.00%	0	1.47%	3	1.47%	3	4.41%	9	0.98%	2	7.84%	16	6.37%	13	12.25%	25	18.14%	37	24.51%	50	22.55%	46	204	3.24
Noise	4.90%	10	10.29%	21	10.29%	21	16.67%	34	18.63%	38	8.82%	18	11.27%	23	5.88%	12	5.88%	12	5.88%	12	1.47%	3	204	6.77
Site landscaping	0.98%	2	3.92%	8	6.37%	13	7.35%	15	8.33%	17	8.33%	17	13.73%	28	13.24%	27	10.29%	21	15.69%	32	11.76%	24	204	4.7
Tax and town service cost impact	10.29%	21	15.69%	32	12.75%	26	12.75%	26	5.88%	12	9.31%	19	11.27%	23	10.29%	21	3.92%	8	4.90%	10	2.94%	6	204	7.06
Traffic flow	2.45%	5	5.39%	11	8.33%	17	6.37%	13	15.20%	31	11.76%	24	16.18%	33	14.22%	29	4.41%	9	7.84%	16	7.84%	16	204	5.58
Job Creation	8.33%	17	4.41%	9	4.41%	9	8.82%	18	7.35%	15	10.78%	22	6.86%	14	10.29%	21	7.84%	16	7.84%	16	23.04%	47	204	5

Answered 204
Skipped 0