



## Weighing Growth Scenarios

### Open House Public Comments – June 3, 2009

Participants listed pros, cons and tradeoffs for the baseline and adaptive future growth scenarios.  
What qualities do we not want to lose by heading in one direction over the other?  
What are barriers to fully realizing either scenario?

---

#### **BASELINE 2040 SCENARIO:**

##### **Pros**

- Provides more open areas in housing areas.
- The baseline projection represents the continuation of the development patterns that have been driven by market demand (the patterns desired by the majority of the home-buying public). Consequently, they should not be viewed as evil, but some adjustment to those patterns certainly is (sic) appropriate and likely to occur as market demand shifts in the future.

##### **Cons**

- We can't survive as a region with a hole in the middle of the urban core.
- To use baseline 2040 is to go from bad to disastrous, and is socially, environmentally, economically and politically irresponsible bad stewardship
- If we spread a group of people over a larger area, they have to pay higher taxes to support the infrastructure. We're not talking about this.
- High infrastructure costs-private (e.g., elec-gas-etc) as well as private.
- Cost of services for elderly.
- Not sustainable from economic, environmental or tax-base standpoint. Promotes economic segregation and resulting imbalance in property values and quality of education.
- The area lost in decline for baseline scenario is hard to grasp compared to the relative amount of area lost in adaptive scenario. 7,000 acres of land is a great amount of land area to be "saved," especially in an urban environment.
- I don't like this one (baseline) because of all the characteristics listed. It's not good for people or the environment.

##### **Barriers/Other**

- Moving from our 200+ year history of "individual" first to focus more on "society" as the center of discussion.
- Destroys streams, forests, agriculture land, prairies, etc. (MAYBE SHOULD HAVE BEEN A 'CON')
- As the region continues to grow, development trends continuing as they will create infrastructure demands that are tremendous financial drains. Further scattering our population may further "satellite" our region and isolate communities.
- Higher cost to serve with transit.
- Accessibility for the elderly and disabled.
- Mother Nature says no — and she has the final say.
- Affordable workforce housing must be available so people can live near their workplaces.
- Baseline 2040 may cause more problems than improve situation.



## ADAPTIVE 2040 SCENARIO:

### Pros

- We have been developing in a haphazard way...Better land-use planning will promote economic development while creating better communities and preserving at least some of our natural heritage. Let's leave something for the future!
- Frees up 100,000 acres for local food production.
- Protecting natural areas from sprawl allows opportunities for designation of important bird areas in Weston Bend, the Loess Hills and wetland and prairie areas to the south, along with substantial economic gain through ecotourism.
- Increase in agricultural land not developed creates opportunities for local food production
- This is the way to go. Restore nodes as well as Central Business District. Make "complete streets" for pedestrians, bikes and motorized vehicles.
- More resource-effective, sustainable. Embodies "stewardship" of natural resources (creation).
- This is good. I like it. It's more human-friendly (a better way to live) and more sustainable.
- Concentration of population will allow more affordable quality of life, and enhances capabilities to serve with infrastructure, public safety, schools and help restore transit between communities and municipalities.
- Market/brand region as hub of national high-speed rail pass.
- Small community center with mix activity is perfect.
- Choices: migrate, adapt, die
- Need urban growth ring
- Savings in emergency services and infrastructure can pay for the carbon saving, air cleaning superior transportation system
- Clearly there are many reasons to encourage the adaptive scenario. 1. Reduce vehicle miles traveled, reduce fossil fuels, reduce air pollution, etc. 2. Less green field development, less need to expand community services better conservation of natural resources. 3. Easier to integrate transportation systems. Do I really need to go on!
- Infill development and redevelopment will need to be perpetuated over the next 30 years. Sufficient densities for transit will be difficult but necessary at key community nodes. Urban villages at key thoroughfare intersections.
- Provides better "quality" open areas in housing areas.
- Much preferable in terms of conserving natural resources.
- Adaptive method gives hope for sustainable prosperity, growth, and positive progress; minimizes negative causes and results. The placement progressions naturally bring optimal outcomes on every level.
- Types of development that are new to KC will be used.

### Cons

- Adaptive scenario and higher densities creates a need for more emphasis on environmental protection, especially storm water management.
- Not a pro or a con, just a comment: Economic development incentives are widely used for development of green fields (TIF). Everyone looks the other way.



### Barriers/Other

- It will be important to be realistic in developing any final alternative scenario. Development trends do not change quickly, and even if development patterns are modified over time, it will be difficult to see major shifts in population centers.
- Developers and builders will have to get new plans and change building practices (land-use plans, etc.) mixed-use and density take more thought.
- Challenge will be to avoid “gentrification” as infill increases property values, resulting in displacement of low income residents. *(Added by another visitor: Yes! Ditto!)*
- Does the adaptive scenario necessarily promote contiguous land area "tracts" or does it offer many scattered tracts of land. This is important to consider when thinking about changing or promoting health green areas.
- Biggest challenge is virtual: changing small, self-centered mindsets over to more mature mindsets of greater-good-for-all.
- Transit costs unless we use rails.
- Many developers build sprawl because they still think that's what people want.
- Political will to make collective choices.
- School quality in infill areas.
- Gotta get beyond some of the socioeconomic factors that we "can't" talk about.
- Northland needs to be recognized better. Issues for river and barriers. Population and jobs increase in Clay County. Shoal Creek/new town library, etc.
- Many codes still specify sprawl as the default and require variances for true urbanism.
- Need to get suburban officials and developers to give up/change their aspirations for future growth.
- Developers and bankers need to discover they can make money in adaptive scenario. Politicians and citizens are too parochial — they need to recognize benefits and value of regional governments that govern land use and transportation.