

# **Chester Township Survey of Resident Opinion**

## **Final Report**

**April 25, 2003**

**Dr. Jay Lee  
Department of Geography  
Kent State University**

**Dr. Shawn Banasick  
Department of Geography  
Kent State University**

**Dr. James Tyner  
Department of Geography  
Kent State University**

## A. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On October 2, 2002 a written survey was mailed to 4,335 residents of Chester Township. The survey contained fifty-nine "close ended" (multiple choice) survey questions. The survey questions assessed residents' opinions in regards to seven topic areas, including zoning issues (4 questions), development patterns (14 questions), parks (4 questions), commercial/industrial land use (8 questions), water and waste treatment (9 questions), Township roads (8 questions), and government services (8 questions). Also included with the Chester Township survey was a similar type of survey which examined resident opinions regarding West Geauga Local Schools. The response rate for the survey was 33%. The survey was designed so that the residents responded by circling their answers directly on the survey form. The responses of the returned surveys were transferred to computer "bubble" sheets specifically designed for ease of tabulation

Major findings of the Chester Township Survey include:

- There are concerns related to the overall pace and nature of development in the Township.
- There is a need to preserve undeveloped land and historical/cultural features.
- While the current amount of park space seems adequate, more is desired if it could be developed without a tax levy.
- There is little support for the expansion of commercial/industrial activities in the Township, even if it would result in an expansion of the tax base.
- Ground water supplies and well water quality are adequate, and there is little perceived need for a public water system or centralized sewer connections.
- There is general satisfaction with current levels of road maintenance and snow plowing, but on the issue of traffic flow opinion was divided.

- There are relatively high levels of satisfaction with Township emergency, fire, and police services, as well as information provision.

## **B. QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS**

The survey results for all respondents are listed in Appendix A. It is common for survey responses to dramatically differ according to demographic characteristics of the respondent. In order to assess the degree to which demographic factors played a role in the survey, a chi-square test was used. Appendix B is a table of the chi-square test results. The chi-square test can determine if there is a statistically significant relationship between two variables. The responses to each of the survey questions were analyzed according to the demographic questions also included on the survey – location of residence, length of residency and age. A statistically significant result for the chi-square test suggests that there was substantial variation in resident opinion according to that particular demographic characteristic.

One critical issue of chi-square analysis is the number of responses in the analysis table. As part of the analysis procedure, survey question responses are disaggregated into a table according to location of residence (or length of residency or age) and response. However, when there are several table cells that contain with less than 5 respondents the results of the chi-square analysis become unreliable. In the analysis of the Chester Township survey there were several questions which lacked an adequate number of responses for a robust statistical analysis. The questions lacking minimum responses are indicated in the table, and their significance should be interpreted with caution.

## **C. QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS**

The use of qualitative analysis in this report is designed to supplement the larger quantitative, statistical component of the survey. Specifically, this qualitative analysis, based on a reading of open-ended questions, is meant to provide a deeper understanding—empathy, if you will—of the sentiments and attitudes of the respondents. As with all qualitative studies, ‘findings’ are not meant to be generalizable.

Qualitative approaches also enable respondents to express their concerns in an open process. One resident, for example, writes “Thank you for giving residents the chance to voice these opinions.” This attitude was mirrored in the following: “Your enclosed survey is commendable in gathering residents’ opinions.” Admittedly, other respondents took this opportunity to criticize the entire survey process. Monies spent on the questionnaire, for example, could have been better spent elsewhere, according to some residents.

Methodologically, this analysis is based on a grounded theory procedure. The strengths of this approach are three-fold. First, it is possible to provide concrete insights into the complexities and multiplicities of responses. The ‘support’ of a community center, for example, may be predicated on a combination of reasons. Second, it is possible to identify that local concerns may be affected by larger regional, national, or even global events—many of which may not occur to officials. For example, one respondent in this study identified a concern over ground water issues, because of a perceived threat from terrorism. Another resident, for instance, contends that “the country as a whole is so much in debt that we cannot afford any of these luxury items [e.g., community centers].”

Third, these results may shed insight into seemingly contradictory results obtained from the quantitative analysis.

Grounded theory is based on a tripartite process of data coding, including open, axial, and selective coding. Open coding refers to the process where questionnaire results are arranged (coded) by dominant concepts. For each concept, dominant properties (attributes of categories or concepts) are identified. This analytical stage involves the asking of questions of the data, the search for similarities among data, and the characteristics (properties) and ranges (dimensions) of these concepts. The second step consists of axial coding. Here, patterns are sought within the various concepts identified during the open coding stage. The third step, selective coding, provides the principle interpretations. The associated concepts lead to an overall integrated framework. Results of this report are based on the coding of 722 responses. In the following sub-sections we identify the major themes and interpretations that emerged from the coding process.

## **D. SURVEY RESULTS**

### **1. Demographic Characteristics**

Tables 1a and 1b are cross-tabulations of the demographic characteristics of the survey respondents. The five largest sub-groups are as follows:

1. Over 65 years old and resident of Chester Township for over 20 years (20.1%)
2. 56 to 65 years old and resident of Chester Township for over 20 years (14.8%)
3. 46 to 55 years old and resident of Chester Township for 11 to 20 years (10.7%)
4. 36 to 45 years old and resident of Chester Township for 11 to 20 years (6.2%)
5. 36 to 45 years old and resident of Chester Township for 7 to 10 years (4.8%)

Clearly, older and more established residents are disproportionately represented in the survey, an important factor to keep in mind for the interpretation of the results. In terms of the spatial distribution of residents, 42.8% of survey respondents live in northern Chester Township (white survey results), 24.9% live in southeast/central Chester Township (yellow survey results), 22.2% live in south/central Chester Township (blue survey results), and 10.1% live in central Chester Township (green survey results).

**Table 1a. Survey Responses by Age and Length of Residency**

<b>Responses</b> <i>Row Percent</i> <b>Column Percent</b>	<b>Age</b> <b>Under</b> <b>25</b>	<b>26 – 35</b>	<b>36 – 45</b>	<b>46 – 55</b>	<b>56 – 65</b>	<b>Over 65</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Length of Residency</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>28</b>
	<i>3.57</i>	<i>32.14</i>	<i>46.43</i>	<i>7.14</i>	<i>3.57</i>	<i>7.14</i>	
<b>Less than 1 year</b>	10.00	11.25	4.15	0.54	0.31	0.56	1.93
<b>1 – 3 years</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>84</b>
	<i>4.76</i>	<i>21.43</i>	<i>42.86</i>	<i>19.05</i>	<i>8.33</i>	<i>3.57</i>	
	40.00	22.50	11.50	4.32	2.16	0.85	5.79
<b>4 – 6 years</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>110</b>
	<i>0.00</i>	<i>18.18</i>	<i>45.45</i>	<i>20.00</i>	<i>11.82</i>	<i>4.55</i>	
	0.00	25.00	15.97	5.95	4.01	1.41	7.58
<b>7 – 10 years</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>149</b>
	<i>0.67</i>	<i>5.37</i>	<i>46.31</i>	<i>26.85</i>	<i>14.09</i>	<i>6.71</i>	
	10.00	10.00	22.04	10.81	6.48	2.82	10.27
<b>11 – 20 years</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>360</b>
	<i>0.56</i>	<i>0.83</i>	<i>25.00</i>	<i>43.06</i>	<i>18.89</i>	<i>11.67</i>	
	20.00	3.75	28.75	41.89	20.99	11.86	24.81
<b>Over 20 years</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>720</b>
	<i>0.28</i>	<i>3.06</i>	<i>7.64</i>	<i>18.75</i>	<i>29.72</i>	<i>40.56</i>	
	20.00	27.50	17.57	36.49	66.05	82.49	49.62
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>313</b>	<b>370</b>	<b>324</b>	<b>354</b>	
	<i>0.69</i>	<i>5.51</i>	<i>21.57</i>	<i>25.50</i>	<i>22.33</i>	<i>24.40</i>	

**Table 1b. Survey Responses by Age and Length of Residency.**

Responses Percent of Survey	Age Under 25	26 – 35	36 – 45	46 – 55	56 – 65	Over 65	Total
<b><u>Length of Residency</u></b>							
<b>Less than 1 year</b>	<b>1</b> 0.07	<b>9</b> 0.62	<b>13</b> 0.90	<b>2</b> 0.14	<b>1</b> 0.07	<b>2</b> 0.14	<b>28</b> 1.93
<b>1 – 3 years</b>	<b>4</b> 0.28	<b>18</b> 1.24	<b>36</b> 2.48	<b>16</b> 1.10	<b>7</b> 0.48	<b>3</b> 0.21	<b>84</b> 5.79
<b>4 – 6 years</b>	<b>0</b> 0.00	<b>20</b> 1.38	<b>50</b> 3.45	<b>22</b> 1.52	<b>13</b> 0.90	<b>5</b> 0.34	<b>110</b> 7.58
<b>7 – 10 years</b>	<b>1</b> 0.07	<b>8</b> 0.55	<b>69</b> 4.76	<b>40</b> 2.76	<b>21</b> 1.45	<b>10</b> 0.69	<b>149</b> 10.27
<b>11 – 20 years</b>	<b>2</b> 0.14	<b>3</b> 0.21	<b>90</b> 6.20	<b>155</b> 10.68	<b>68</b> 4.69	<b>42</b> 2.89	<b>360</b> 24.81
<b>Over 20 years</b>	<b>2</b> 0.28	<b>22</b> 1.52	<b>55</b> 3.79	<b>135</b> 9.30	<b>214</b> 14.75	<b>292</b> 20.12	<b>720</b> 49.62
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b> 0.69	<b>80</b> 5.51	<b>313</b> 21.57	<b>370</b> 25.50	<b>324</b> 22.33	<b>354</b> 24.40	<b>1451</b> 100

## 2. Zoning Issues

A strong majority of survey respondents felt that **growth control** is necessary for Chester Township (Question 3), and most of the survey respondents felt that current zoning practices are adequate to control residential development (Question 15). However, a strong majority felt that the zoning process should incorporate factors other than economic value as the basis for decision making (Question 26). The chi-square analysis identified significant differences in respondent opinion according to age of the respondents (Appendix B). Specifically, the analysis indicated that younger residents (under 25 years old) tended to express higher levels of agreement that current zoning was adequate (37.0% compared to 23.6% overall).

Survey respondents also felt that the special zoning classification for “Churches and Houses of Worship” should be retained (Question 7). However, in this case there were

substantial differences in opinion by location of residence and age group. A larger proportion of the respondents who reside in central Chester Township (green surveys) “strongly disagree” that churches should remain a use in residentially zoned areas (28.2% compared to 19.8% overall). In addition, a higher proportion of younger respondents (under 25 years old) also tended to strongly disagree (44.4%).

### 3. Development Patterns

In terms of **overall development patterns** most survey respondents were satisfied to some degree with the current development pattern (Question 52), and a strong majority of survey respondents felt that the Township should maintain its semi-rural character (Question 35). However, newcomers tended express higher levels of satisfaction with the current development pattern (31.8% of residents for less than 1 year were “moderately satisfied” compared with 19.7% overall, and 20.0% of those resident in Chester Township for 1 to 3 years were “very satisfied” compared with 13.8% overall). In terms of age divisions, younger residents tended to express less satisfaction (only 5.7% of 26 to 35 year olds and 8.3% of 36 to 45 year olds were “very satisfied” compared to 13.8% for all responses).

A majority of all respondents strongly agreed that living near **undeveloped land** was important, although residents in central Chester Township (green surveys) showed somewhat lower levels of agreement (only 42.4% compared to 56.1% overall - Question 29). Most respondents also strongly agreed with the continued protection of productive farmland from development (Question 39). The preservation of historic and cultural features received strong agreement from most survey respondents, with the exception of

residents under the age of 25 who expressed slightly lower levels of support (Question 14).

In terms of **residential lot sizes**, most survey respondents felt that large residential lots (over five acres) would be the best way to maintain the semi-rural nature of the Township, although residents in central Chester Township tended to express higher levels of dissatisfaction with this method of preservation (13.4% compared to 6.5% overall who “slightly disagree” - Question 28).

The majority also strongly disagreed with attempts to find alternatives to large lot development (Question 1).

However, a majority of survey respondents did express favorable opinions regarding the process of determining lot sizes by the available type of waste disposal (Question 23), and by the supply of ground (well) water (Question 31). Long-term Township residents (over 20 years) demonstrated higher levels of support with 38.3% choosing “strongly agree” for determining lot sizes by type of waste disposal compared to 28.0% overall, and 37.6% “strongly agree” for determining lot sizes by the basis of ground water supply compared to 25.3% overall.

In regards to **developers** and new developments, a strong majority of survey respondents expressed the desire to keep large scale developers (subdivisions of more than 20 homes) out of the Township (Question 18). When asked about the preservation of open space, a

strong majority of survey respondents felt that the Township should collaborate with “others” to preserve open land (Question 22), but survey respondents strongly rejected the idea of rewarding developers with density bonuses if they preserved sensitive areas as open landscape (Question 17).

Survey respondents expressed strong opinions regarding **environmental responsibility** and development in the Township. A strong majority were in agreement with the idea of using conservation easements within new developments to protect flood plains, wetlands, and water ways (Question 33). A strong majority also *disagreed* with the idea that “environmental responsibility should *not* be a primary consideration for new development” (Question 37).

#### 4. Parks

Survey responses regarding the issue of **provision of park spaces** were contradictory and strongly divided according to length of residency and age. While most survey respondents were very satisfied with the number of Township parks for recreational activities (Question 49), levels of **satisfaction were markedly lower for newer residents** (less than one year) and for residents than had lived in the Township for 7 to 10 years. Overall responses showed that a majority also **agreed that additional active (recreational) and passive parks (e.g. nature trails) should be developed in the Township** (Questions 27 and 36). Newcomers to Chester Township (resident for 1 to 3 years) were strongly in **favor of active parks (36.7% “strongly agreed” compared to 24.9% overall)**. Respondents in the **36 to 45 year old age group were also strong supporters of active parks (38.7% “strongly agreed”)**. As for passive parks, newcomers (resident of 1 to 3

years) were again much more in favor relative to the overall responses (37.0% compared to 26.8%).

Surprisingly, however, most survey respondents felt that development of the parks should not be supported by a tax levy (Question 34). When examined by length of residency was a factor in the survey responses, with strongest relative support for a levy from newer residents of Chester Township (17.9% of those resident less than 1 year and 15.0% of those from 1 to 3 years “strongly agreed” compared to 8.4% for all survey responses). The strongest relative levels of resistance to a levy came from older respondents (49.7% of the residents over 65 and 48.5% of residents between the ages of 56 and 65 responded “strongly disagree”, compared to 42.2% overall).

##### 5. Commercial / Industrial land use

Most survey respondents were either “very satisfied” or “moderately satisfied” with the distance to **commercial activities** (Question 48), and a strong majority was satisfied with the amount of commercial (Question 50) and **industrial development** (Question 51). Younger respondents (under 25 years old) were particularly satisfied with the amount of commercial development in the Township, with 50.0% answering “very satisfied” compared to only 32.5% overall.

Most survey respondents felt that commercial development in the Township should not be encouraged (Question 10), even if it helped to expand the tax base (Question 30).

Resistance to expansion for the purpose of expanding the tax base was relatively stronger amongst residents who had lived in the Township for 1 to 3 years, and those who were in

the 26 to 35 year old age group (7.6% and 8.2 percent compared to 16.1% who “strongly agreed” with the expansion).

Given these opinions, it is not surprising that survey respondents were strongly against the expansion of the Commercial District (Question 5) and the Restricted Industrial District (Questions 8 and 16). Newcomers to Chester Township (resident for 1 to 3 years) also expressed relatively lower levels of support for expansion of commercial district, but surprisingly expressed higher levels of support for an increase in the restricted industrial district (23.1% who answered “moderately agree” compared to only 14.8% overall).

#### 6. Water / Waste treatment

Most survey respondents agreed that there is an adequate supply of **ground (well) water** in their area of the Township (Question 24), and survey respondents were satisfied with the quality of ground (well) water (Question 53). Survey responses differed considerably according to length of residency in the township, with newer residents of Chester Township tending to express somewhat lower levels of satisfaction. For example, only 30.7% of residents for less than 1 year were “very satisfied” with the quality of ground water compared to 41.3% of all residents.

Not surprisingly, most survey respondents also felt that there was little need for the replacement of ground (well) water with a public water system (Question 25). However, once again responses differed substantially according to both length of residency in the

township and age of the respondent. In particular, younger and newer residents tended to be much more in favor of a public water system (20.7% of residents for less than 1 year, and 20.0% of residents under 25 years old “strongly agreed” compared to 11.5% overall).

Despite the relatively high levels of satisfaction expressed above, most survey respondents felt that ground (well) water pollution was still a concern in the Township and that water quality should be monitored on an ongoing basis (Questions 9 and 20).

When water resource issues were linked with development concerns, most survey respondents indicated that they strongly agreed with the idea that **septic systems** in the Township provide a viable option for continued residential development (Question 2). However, respondents who have lived in the Township from 4 to 6 years expressed much less agreement over the use of septic systems (only 35.6% “strongly agreed” compared to 46.3% overall). Respondents between the ages of 26 and 35 were also less in agreement (only 28.8% who “strongly agreed”).

Survey Respondents also expressed very strong feelings for the need to have **minimum lot sizes to ensure adequate ground (well) water** and room for septic systems (74.9% “strongly agree” – Question 13), but the lower levels of support from younger residents stood out (only 50.0% of those under 25 years old “strongly agree”). Most survey respondents disagreed with the idea of using centralized sewer connections as the preferred method of residential sewage treatment in the Township, although respondents who had been residents for less than 1 year were much more in favor (25.0% compared to

13.9% overall “strongly agree” - Question 4). In addition, most survey respondents also felt that **stormwater drainage** was not a problem in their area of the Township (Question 11). Responses from long-term residents in particular expressed markedly higher levels of agreement, with 67.5% who “strongly agree” compared to 55.6% overall.

#### 6. Township Roads

A strong majority of survey respondents expressed satisfaction with the Township’s efforts related to **road maintenance** (Question 47). However, respondent opinion was almost evenly split in regards to **traffic flow**, with only a slight majority (52.9%) expressing some degree of satisfaction (Question 40). Not surprisingly, there were strong divisions according to location of residence, length of residence, and age of the respondent. Respondents who had lived in Chester Township for 1 to 3 years expressed higher levels of “very satisfied” (22.9%) and well as those who were under 25 years old (30.0%) compared to the overall level (10.9%). The results for location differences showed that respondents who lived in central Chester Township (green responses) tended to express higher levels of dissatisfaction (20.4% “totally dissatisfied” compared to 13.3% overall).

A slight majority of survey respondents disagreed with the idea that “**unimproved roads** help to maintain the Township’s semi-rural character”, although respondents who live in central Chester Township (green survey results) tended to express higher levels of disagreement (40.5% “strongly disagree” compared to 33.4% for all responses - Question 38). Not surprisingly, most respondents agreed to some degree that all unimproved roads in the Township should be paved (Question 12). However, respondents from northern

Chester Township tended to be less enthusiastic (25.1% “strongly disagreed” compared to 19.8% overall).

As for changes to **Mayfield Road** (State Route 322), most survey respondents disagreed with the idea that it should be widened to five lanes (Question 19).

In relation to the provision of **snow plowing** services, most survey respondents felt that service to State Route 306, State Route 322, and other Township / County roads was satisfactory (Questions 44, 45, and 46). Strong levels of satisfaction with snow plowing on State Route 306 was particularly evident among respondents under the age of 25 (44.4% “very satisfied”) and those over 65 years old (45.0% “very satisfied”).

#### 7. Government Services

Most Chester Township survey respondents disagreed with the idea of changing Chester Township to an incorporated form of government (Question 6), preferring to retain the current government form (Question 32). In terms of service provision, most survey respondents were satisfied with Fire Protection, Emergency Medical, and Township Police services (Questions 41, 42, and 43).

However, most survey respondents felt that there was little obligation for Chester Township to provide affordable housing opportunities (Question 21). Most survey respondents were also satisfied with the Township’s job in providing general information, especially those respondents over age 65 (24.3% “very satisfied” compared to 13.8% overall - Question 54).

Most respondents were also satisfied with the amount of information available regarding the use of residents' tax dollars for the provision of government services (Question 55). The highest levels of satisfaction came from older respondents (over the age of 65) with 23.4% replying "very satisfied" compared to only 13.8% for all responses.

## **E. QUALITATIVE RESULTS**

### 1. A Healthy Environment or Community?

Survey responses indicate a division between those residents who express primary concern with the natural environment and those who express concern with community relations. And whereas these concerns are not inherently exclusive, a general impression is formed that residents perceive the issue from an either/or stand-point.

Those residents concerned primarily with the 'health' and 'vitality' of the environment stress the rural, idyllic atmosphere of the community. One resident explains that the community must "...keep a rural atmosphere. We have enough fast foods, bars, drugstores, etc. We need to encourage more upscale restaurants, churches, conserving open spaces and historical sites." Another resident expressed concern that decisions are "overwhelming the character and natural beauty of [the] community." Still another resident writes that "Preservation of open/green space is high priority to me..." This same individual elaborates: "A 'senior center' and/or 'community center' is a move toward 'commercial development' and hence, I oppose it." For these residents, clearly, development is opposed to the maintenance of a healthy natural community. This is

reflected in this statement: "Too many fast food places have been allowed to spring up... and it looks like a honky-tonk area as you drive through.... It's better to have the trees."

In contrast to those who place a priority on the health of the environment, other respondents indicate the need to address the health of the community. One respondent explains that "We feel [community centers are] important for the provision of positive activities (family, youth and senior)." Another resident contends that "A recreational facility ... would be beneficial for the community over all and to improve the health of our citizens." Echoing these attitudes, one resident writes "A sports/rec. center helps produce a healthier population. Adults would have access to fitness. Students would have a healthy place to be, more fit and less time to spend in 'unhealthy' activities."

To be sure, these sentiments are far from unanimous, as exhibited by this statement "I don't believe [the community center or performing arts center] are necessary or vital to a healthy community." Not surprisingly, it is common for two diametrically opposed arguments to be used for any particular facility, such as a community center. For some respondents, these would improve the residents' quality of life; others believe they would not.

Intangible qualities, such as 'spirit' and 'cohesion' are also identified as positive factors that result from the development of community and senior centers. One resident believes, for example, that "community centers encourage community spirit and cohesion" while

other contends that a “community center is the most desired place to get to know the people in this town and learn about our town.”

Economical rationalizations, not unexpectedly, buttress both views. Those residents not in support of further development believe that “Aggressive residential development, low-cost housing and desecration of open land will create slums.” Other statements echo these sentiments: “We want to keep the semi-rural atmosphere. [The businesses] are rundown and poor visually. We are very concerned about the fast food strip look—this is a very inappropriate use of land in a historical town.” Of interest, also, is the sentiment that the ‘rural’ character that is desired is itself losing its meaning. One resident, for example, writes “Apparently, ‘semi-rural’ has come to be synonymous with ‘shabby’, not maintained...”

These respondents, in general, express concern that the region is becoming more urbanized. As one resident writes, “We moved here to get away from growth and development.” Residents believe that amenities such as community centers are available elsewhere. According to one respondent, “If you want these services I suggest you move to a more populated area...” In agreement, one resident explains that “the reason we moved to Chester Township was to get away from the city and the heavy traffic. Why do you want to destroy this area...?” Yet another resident explains: “If you find them important, move to a big city. We are a small rural community and wish to stay that way. Why do you think we moved out here? You are missing the point.” The following statement perhaps best captures these attitudes: “Quit trying to become a city!”

Residents more amenable to the development of community centers also identify economic reasons. One resident, for example, writes that “A community center/pool for our families.... would offer summer jobs to many of our youth.” In this way, centers would potentially bring needed monies into the communities. Other monies may be saved within the community, as this resident explains: “An outdoor community pool would prevent many home owners from installing their own pools—which use a lot of water.”

Concurrently, these facilities would prevent the movement of monies out of the community. This is identified by the following resident: “It would stop our school district from spending monies to rent other facilities for its commencement/graduation ceremonies.” For example, a number of residents lament that families and schools must go elsewhere and use other facilities. This respondent explains that “It’s a shame commencement has to be held at Lakeland Com. College or Mentor’s School Center.” Another respondent indicated that “It is a shame that a school system the size of West G. has no real stage/auditorium for its students to perform in and for ceremonies such as graduation....” Apart from school facilities, sports parks and pools are also of concern. “It is unfortunate,” one resident writes, “that we must drive out of our home area to swim in the summer....” Of interest is that this issue contributes to broader concerns over community pride. As one respondent indicates, “We have one lighted baseball diamond in all of Chesterland! That is almost unheard of! Look at Munson Twp. and how nice all their fields are with our high taxes.” Another resident writes “It’s a shame that we do not

have these facilities when neighboring communities and communities with comparable housing values do.”

## 2. The Demographic Divide

Survey responses reveal a palpable division based primarily on age cohort, but also income. The statement “It looks like Chester only wants high income people” expresses this latter concern. Consequently, personal decisions are often based on self-interests (e.g., those with children advocate child-related facilities). Residents also exhibit a belief that only selected groups are being addressed by community decisions. One resident feels that “This town is a full spectrum and not just a place for ‘suburbanites’ escaping pressures of a dual income household, that need to raise its disaffected and disrespectful progeny” while another believes that “A community includes all ages in it’s embrace though it seems that those with children ... Have more energy, wealth and natural political power to direct ‘town’ resources towards education.”

The most stark division appears to be between (or those supporting) seniors and those families with small children. Many respondents in both groupings frame issues base on an oppositional, dualistic perspective. For example, one resident explains that “Seniors are the largest population. A senior center would be great.” Another resident suggested that officials “need to pay attention to the demographics of the area. There is a large percentage of residents who are empty nesters.” Arguments framed on broader, national trends are also used a justification, as indicated in the statement: “The population of America, in general, including Chester/Russell is aging. Take care of the ‘needs’ first and

'wants' later." Accordingly, those respondents expressing a 'senior' focus would tend to support 'senior' facilities, thus "A school with a senior center and recreational facility would open the building up to more than the children of this community thus generating funds and interests beyond families with children"

Those respondents with large children, or who favor child-related concerns, identify the need for familial facilities. "The needs of the children should always come first," one resident writes, continuing that "I don't have children of my own—but the community's children are my priority." The statements "Township desperately needs a pool for children and adults" and "A place [like a community pool] for our families to go and interact with each other and our kids can spend time with friends from the area" are also not uncommon responses. Another responded explains forthrightly, "The children should have first priority." This attitude conforms with those respondents who believe that schools should provide for children and not other groups.

These divisions bisect seemingly cohesive groups, such as school-aged children as well. The following statement, for example, reveals a perception that only *some* students benefit from community programs: "The system seems to only cater to the smart students and jocks and not the needs/education of all students to do well after graduating." Another resident is concerned with the allocation of funds toward selected teams or students: "An intramural program in the schools FOR ALL STUDENTS, regardless of their athletic ability, would be a better use of tax dollars and resources...."

Those in support of community centers, conversely, believe that these facilities will help eradicate social divisions. Indeed, a dominant, and often strongly expressed feeling, is a sense of community. One resident laments that "There is nowhere for people to go that represents a sense of community." "Community center would be good for all" and "Community center ... would be great for all in the community: singles, families, retirees" are two responses that also reflect this attitude. Still others write that "Emphasis on culture and community will create cohesion and working compatibility within the community" and that "We as a township will come together as a community better!"

The support for particular facilities, such as swimming pools or performing arts centers, therefore, are framed often within an argument of inclusion rather than exclusion. "A community center which would bring older citizens and younger people together..." and "Community center... all residents benefit" are two representative statements. These attitudes reflect the sentiment that "We need to ask what is good for everyone—young and old.

In opposition to the necessity of community centers are a multitude of viewpoints that coalesce around the belief that other means of community cohesion are available. "This community comes together on a regular basis in so many ways and in many different places," explains one resident. These attitudes are similar to those advocating a need to maintain a separation of education and community issues. One resident explains that "I believe sports, recreational facilities and performing arts should be self-sustaining. I don't understand why schools should be supporting senior centers or community centers. Did

you stick those in with the schools to get more support for raising our tax dollars?" In agreement, another resident responds that "I don't think it is the school's job to build centers for the community in general."

Questions of inclusion and exclusion are often rendered to economics. There is a sense among certain residents that they must pay for the 'benefits' of others. Exhibiting an 'anti-welfare' attitude, these residents believe that some groups are not pulling their fair share. One resident, for example, writes: I am paying way too much every month for these schools. I don't care if there are cut backs in staff and programs. It wouldn't hurt the 'little darlings' to flip burgers at McDonald's to pay for their own sports and extra activities." This response, though, is countered by respondents who criticize that students spend too much time, for example, selling cookies door-to-door, raising funds, to pay for extra-curricular activities.

One issue which seemingly cuts across all spectrums and interests is the condition of the roads. One resident complains that "I can't believe you have not paved all roads for safety reasons if nothing else or charged those residents the cost of maintenance of their gravel roads." A number of respondents identified the ineffectiveness of 'chip-and-seal' practices, as well as 'questionable' salting and snow plowing practices.

### 3. Placing People

Having identified a perception of social divisions, another theme that emerges revolves around the question of 'where' people are believed to belong. The geographies of youth,

for example, permeate the survey responses. Youths sometimes are portrayed as outsiders, deviants, or not as members of the community presumably because they are not paying taxes, hence are excluded). Perhaps the most vitriolic statement against youth was expressed in this statement: "No one has the balls to teach respect of discipline to the kids in this community.... [The youth] are self-indulgent, spoiled and expect everybody owes them, with no responsibility."

It is not uncommon for the problems of the community to be blamed on the youth, as expressed in the following statement: "I do NOT support taxes to fix schools the students have destroyed." However, this respondent also wrote "I have a great interest in education. I am a teacher myself."

The 'proper' place of youth in the community is paramount on the minds of many residents. One resident writes, for example, that "Sports programs and recreational facilities provide activities for the kids which will keep them out of trouble". This statement resonates with other comments, such as "How about a skateboard park to get them off store sidewalks?", "Community center would benefit preteen and teenage population as a place of activity" and finally, "Kids have no place to really go." A dominant theme thus emerges that, as a resident explains, "We need an area for our teens, kids and young adults to go. There is nowhere for them to go to 'hang out' in a safe environment." Accordingly, the provision of these facilities, will "keep kids out of trouble." These arguments are related to questions of socialization, as expressed in the following two statements: "Children need a center for their maturation process—a place

for social activities” and “There is a need for a center for children to ‘hang out’ at which would help them interact positively in a good environment instead of on the street.”

Lastly, one resident writes that “A community center ... can be a gathering place for kids to get together and socialize.”

Interesting, though, it is not just the youth who are perceived to be currently ‘out of place’. One resident, for example, contends that “We definitely need some place for our senior citizens.” These arguments are commonly couched in the health of the community.

For example, one resident writes that “senior centers are great for decreasing depression and social isolation.” Housing for the elderly is also a concern among residents, as typified in the statement that there exists a “Need [for] senior housing and facilities.”

“Senior Center is very important to keep our people in this town to look forward to help the elders and build the hope (for) future seniors.” Admittedly, some respondents may only be concerned with ‘senior’ issues because they recognize that they themselves will someday be elderly. Consider, for example, the sentiment expressed by this resident:

“Let’s not forget our senior citizens—we are going to be one someday.”

#### 4. Neglected Concerns

A benefit of open-ended questions is that respondents have an opportunity to voice their opinion on issues not covered in the questionnaire. Many of these issues are exceptionally specific, as the following two statements indicated: “Really would like to see a traffic light at the intersection of Rt. 306 and Sherman Road” and “Speed radar needed to increase on Wilson Mills.” Other times, though, largely issues do surface.

One resident, for example, asks “Why weren’t there any questions on noise pollution caused by motorcyclists who remove mufflers from their motorcycles?” Still another respondent writes “None of the things listed are needed. [The community] should use cooperative funds to improve infrastructure, retain teachers, and create better programs for handicapped and gifted kids.”

Open-ended responses also suggest that there is an undercurrent of distrust among some residents. Some respondents, for example, express concern that they have been, and continue to be misled on financial issues. Representative statements include “We do not feel the Township Trustees listen to the residents’ wishes on several issues” and “They [township communicators] have not been honest and upfront. They seem to have their own agenda.” Accordingly, other respondents used this opportunity to forward their own solutions: “Our children learn from adults, but adults need to learn like a child. We need communication and a better government.”

## **F. CONCLUSIONS**

It is evident in both the quantitative and qualitative results that there is a general degree of satisfaction with the quality of life in Chester Township, and substantial concern regarding future development patterns. Resident opinion tended to emphasize a desire to preserve the rural nature of the Township, and therefore there was little desire to improve or expand infrastructure that would facilitate rapid growth. There were, however, substantial differences in resident opinion along age and residency divisions. **These divisions were particularly evident in relation to park spaces and ground water issues.**

CHESTER TOWNSHIP COMMUNITY SURVEY

## RESIDENT SATISFACTION, LAND USE AND TOWNSHIP FUTURE

SECTION 1

In this section you are asked if you Agree or Disagree with a statement. Please respond to each statement by using one of the following 6 options:

- |                       |                    |
|-----------------------|--------------------|
| A – Strongly Disagree | D – Slightly Agree |
| B – Slightly Disagree | E – Strongly Agree |
| C – Neutral           | F – Don't Know     |

**LAND USE – ZONING**

7. Churches / Houses of Worship should remain a use in residentially zoned areas.

Strongly Disagree	19.8%
Moderately Disagree	6.4%
Slightly Disagree	6.8%
Slightly Agree	14.9%
Moderately Agree	21.5%
Strongly Agree	29.8%
No Opinion	0.8%

15. Current zoning regulations should be adequate to control new residential development in Chester Township.

Strongly Disagree	12.6%
Moderately Disagree	11.3%
Slightly Disagree	9.5%
Slightly Agree	19.9%
Moderately Agree	23.6%
Strongly Agree	22.2%
No Opinion	0.9%

26. Economic value should be the only consideration for determining zoning in the Township.

Strongly Disagree	52.9%
Moderately Disagree	14.8%
Slightly Disagree	11.3%
Slightly Agree	10.1%
Moderately Agree	4.3%
Strongly Agree	5.7%
No Opinion	0.9%

### LAND USE – DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS

1. Alternatives to large lot residential development should be considered .....

Strongly Disagree	58.0%
Moderately Disagree	11.0%
Slightly Disagree	3.8%
Slightly Agree	8.6%
Moderately Agree	7.0%
Strongly Agree	11.3%
No Opinion	0.3%

3. Growth control is not necessary for Chester Township

Strongly Disagree	65.3%
Moderately Disagree	12.0%
Slightly Disagree	4.6%
Slightly Agree	5.3%
Moderately Agree	3.9%
Strongly Agree	8.8%
No Opinion	0.1%

14. Preservation of historic / cultural features is important.

Strongly Disagree	4.1%
Moderately Disagree	1.4%
Slightly Disagree	2.3%
Slightly Agree	12.8%
Moderately Agree	21.8%
Strongly Agree	57.5%
No Opinion	0.1%

17. Developers should be rewarded with density bonuses (more homes per acre) if they preserve sensitive areas as open landscape.

Strongly Disagree	60.1%
Moderately Disagree	12.3%
Slightly Disagree	5.7%
Slightly Agree	7.4%
Moderately Agree	6.4%
Strongly Agree	7.9%
No Opinion	0.2%

18. Keeping large scale (subdivisions greater than 20 homes) developers out of this Township is important to me.

Strongly Disagree	8.8%
Moderately Disagree	4.6%
Slightly Disagree	4.2%
Slightly Agree	6.5%
Moderately Agree	12.1%
Strongly Agree	63.1%
No Opinion	0.7%

22. The Township should collaborate with others to preserve open land.

Strongly Disagree	4.3%
Moderately Disagree	1.8%
Slightly Disagree	2.1%
Slightly Agree	11.2%
Moderately Agree	19.4%
Strongly Agree	61.1%
No Opinion	0.1%

23. Lot sizes should be determined on the basis of the available type of waste disposal (i.e. septic, sewers, package plants).

Strongly Disagree	22.9%
Moderately Disagree	8.6%
Slightly Disagree	4.4%
Slightly Agree	14.9%
Moderately Agree	20.3%
Strongly Agree	28.0%
No Opinion	0.9%

28. Large residential lots (5 acres +) is the best way to maintain the Township's semi-rural environment.

Strongly Disagree	7.5%
Moderately Disagree	5.3%
Slightly Disagree	6.5%
Slightly Agree	12.2%
Moderately Agree	18.5%
Strongly Agree	49.9%
No Opinion	0.1%

29. Living near undeveloped open land is important to me.

Strongly Disagree	4.0%
Moderately Disagree	3.7%
Slightly Disagree	4.2%
Slightly Agree	12.4%
Moderately Agree	19.3%
Strongly Agree	56.1%
No Opinion	0.3%

31. Lot sizes should be determined on the basis of ground (well) water supply.

Strongly Disagree	20.1%
Moderately Disagree	8.1%
Slightly Disagree	6.5%
Slightly Agree	18.4%
Moderately Agree	21.1%
Strongly Agree	25.3%
No Opinion	0.5%

33. Conservation easements (meant to preserve land) within new developments should be encouraged to protect flood plains, wetlands and water ways.

Strongly Disagree	3.5%
Moderately Disagree	1.3%
Slightly Disagree	1.9%
Slightly Agree	8.6%
Moderately Agree	24.9%
Strongly Agree	59.3%
No Opinion	0.5%

35. The Township should maintain its semi-rural environment.

Strongly Disagree	1.7%
Moderately Disagree	1.3%
Slightly Disagree	2.0%
Slightly Agree	6.3%
Moderately Agree	12.9%
Strongly Agree	75.7%
No Opinion	0.1%

37. Environmental responsibility should not be a primary consideration for new development.

Strongly Disagree	56.3%
Moderately Disagree	14.4%
Slightly Disagree	7.8%
Slightly Agree	7.4%
Moderately Agree	6.2%
Strongly Agree	7.8%
No Opinion	0.1%

39. Productive farm land in the Township should be protected from nonagricultural development.

Strongly Disagree	6.1%
Moderately Disagree	3.1%
Slightly Disagree	3.6%
Slightly Agree	11.8%
Moderately Agree	17.8%
Strongly Agree	57.4%
No Opinion	0.2%

52. Current development pattern in the Township.

Totally Dissatisfied	18.6%
Mostly Dissatisfied	11.4%
Slightly Dissatisfied	13.3%
Slightly Satisfied	22.8%
Moderately Satisfied	19.7%
Very Satisfied	13.8%
No Opinion	0.4%

#### LAND USE – PARK SPACES

27. Additional active (recreational) parks should be developed in the Township.

Strongly Disagree	21.9%
Moderately Disagree	8.3%
Slightly Disagree	7.8%
Slightly Agree	19.7%
Moderately Agree	17.1%
Strongly Agree	24.9%
No Opinion	0.3%

34. Chester Township should consider a tax levy to assist in the development of Township parks.

Strongly Disagree	42.2%
Moderately Disagree	12.6%
Slightly Disagree	9.3%
Slightly Agree	16.5%
Moderately Agree	10.9%
Strongly Agree	8.2%
No Opinion	0.3%

36. Passive parks (e.g. nature trails) should be developed in the Township.

Strongly Disagree	16.5%
Moderately Disagree	7.2%
Slightly Disagree	7.7%
Slightly Agree	23.1%
Moderately Agree	18.3%
Strongly Agree	26.8%
No Opinion	0.3%

49. Number of Township parks for recreational activities.

Totally Dissatisfied	5.8%
Mostly Dissatisfied	5.5%
Slightly Dissatisfied	10.3%
Slightly Satisfied	17.5%
Moderately Satisfied	25.5%
Very Satisfied	34.9%
No Opinion	0.5%

**LAND USE – COMMERCIAL / INDUSTRIAL**

5. Expansion of the Commercial District would be beneficial.

Strongly Disagree	52.7%
Moderately Disagree	10.8%
Slightly Disagree	7.3%
Slightly Agree	11.2%
Moderately Agree	7.2%
Strongly Agree	10.5%
No Opinion	0.3%

8. An increase in the Restricted Industrial District should not be encouraged.

Strongly Disagree	16.1%
Moderately Disagree	7.7%
Slightly Disagree	6.6%
Slightly Agree	11.1%
Moderately Agree	14.8%
Strongly Agree	42.9%
No Opinion	0.8%

10. Commercial development within the Township should not be encouraged.

Strongly Disagree	13.7%
Moderately Disagree	6.4%
Slightly Disagree	10.2%
Slightly Agree	10.9%
Moderately Agree	14.6%
Strongly Agree	44.0%
No Opinion	0.2%

16. Some increase in the Restricted Industrial District would be beneficial.

Strongly Disagree	32.6%
Moderately Disagree	10.5%
Slightly Disagree	7.5%
Slightly Agree	18.0%
Moderately Agree	15.9%
Strongly Agree	14.7%
No Opinion	0.8%

30. The Township should improve the existing tax base by encouraging commercial/light industrial development.

Strongly Disagree	32.8%
Moderately Disagree	11.9%
Slightly Disagree	8.1%
Slightly Agree	18.2%
Moderately Agree	12.6%
Strongly Agree	16.1%
No Opinion	0.3%

48. Distance to commercial activities.

Totally Dissatisfied	2.2%
Mostly Dissatisfied	2.0%
Slightly Dissatisfied	3.7%
Slightly Satisfied	10.7%
Moderately Satisfied	33.8%
Very Satisfied	47.3%
No Opinion	0.5%

50. Amount of commercial development in the Township.

Totally Dissatisfied	10.9%
Mostly Dissatisfied	6.5%
Slightly Dissatisfied	8.9%
Slightly Satisfied	19.7%
Moderately Satisfied	21.3%
Very Satisfied	32.5%
No Opinion	0.2%

51. Amount of industrial development in the Township.

Totally Dissatisfied	7.2%
Mostly Dissatisfied	5.9%
Slightly Dissatisfied	9.6%
Slightly Satisfied	20.4%
Moderately Satisfied	23.9%
Very Satisfied	32.1%
No Opinion	0.9%

**WATER / WASTE TREATMENT****2. Septic systems provide a viable option for continued residential development**

Strongly Disagree	9.9%
Moderately Disagree	5.2%
Slightly Disagree	5.1%
Slightly Agree	11.5%
Moderately Agree	21.6%
Strongly Agree	46.3%
No Opinion	0.4%

**4. Centralized sewer connections should be the preferred method of residential sewage treatment in the Township.**

Strongly Disagree	50.3%
Moderately Disagree	9.9%
Slightly Disagree	7.1%
Slightly Agree	9.8%
Moderately Agree	8.6%
Strongly Agree	13.9%
No Opinion	0.4%

**9. Ground (well) water pollution is a concern in the Township.**

Strongly Disagree	10.3%
Moderately Disagree	8.0%
Slightly Disagree	6.0%
Slightly Agree	16.8%
Moderately Agree	18.3%
Strongly Agree	40.2%
No Opinion	0.4%

11. Stormwater drainage is not a problem in my area of the Township.

Strongly Disagree	8.1%
Moderately Disagree	4.8%
Slightly Disagree	3.8%
Slightly Agree	7.1%
Moderately Agree	20.1%
Strongly Agree	55.6%
No Opinion	0.5%

13. Minimum lot sizes are needed to ensure adequate ground (well) water and room for septic systems.

Strongly Disagree	5.3%
Moderately Disagree	1.0%
Slightly Disagree	1.2%
Slightly Agree	4.6%
Moderately Agree	12.8%
Strongly Agree	74.9%
No Opinion	0.2%

20. The ground (well) water supply should be monitored on an ongoing basis.

Strongly Disagree	7.7%
Moderately Disagree	3.5%
Slightly Disagree	4.2%
Slightly Agree	15.7%
Moderately Agree	21.3%
Strongly Agree	47.4%
No Opinion	0.2%

24. There is an adequate supply of ground (well) water in my area of the Township.

Strongly Disagree	6.0%
Moderately Disagree	3.4%
Slightly Disagree	5.2%
Slightly Agree	14.5%
Moderately Agree	28.1%
Strongly Agree	41.9%
No Opinion	0.9%

25. Chester Township should consider replacing ground (well) water systems with a public water system.

Strongly Disagree	55.5%
Moderately Disagree	9.8%
Slightly Disagree	6.2%
Slightly Agree	9.6%
Moderately Agree	7.2%
Strongly Agree	11.5%
No Opinion	0.2%

53. Quality of ground (well) water in my area of the Township

Totally Dissatisfied	5.7%
Mostly Dissatisfied	3.7%
Slightly Dissatisfied	6.3%
Slightly Satisfied	12.1%
Moderately Satisfied	30.8%
Very Satisfied	41.3%
No Opinion	0.1%

## ROADS

12. All unimproved Township roads should be paved.

Strongly Disagree	19.8%
Moderately Disagree	7.9%
Slightly Disagree	5.4%
Slightly Agree	14.1%
Moderately Agree	13.4%
Strongly Agree	38.9%
No Opinion	0.5%

19. Mayfield Road (State Route 322) should be widened to 5 lanes.

Strongly Disagree	43.7%
Moderately Disagree	9.5%
Slightly Disagree	5.2%
Slightly Agree	8.6%
Moderately Agree	10.0%
Strongly Agree	22.7%
No Opinion	0.3%

38. The unimproved roads in the Township help maintain the semi-rural character.

Strongly Disagree	33.4%
Moderately Disagree	11.3%
Slightly Disagree	8.7%
Slightly Agree	12.5%
Moderately Agree	12.1%
Strongly Agree	21.3%
No Opinion	0.7%

40. Traffic flow in the Township

Totally Dissatisfied	13.3%
Mostly Dissatisfied	13.9%
Slightly Dissatisfied	20.1%
Slightly Satisfied	16.4%
Moderately Satisfied	25.6%
Very Satisfied	10.9%
No Opinion	0.0%

44. Snow plowing on State Route 322

Totally Dissatisfied	5.4%
Mostly Dissatisfied	5.1%
Slightly Dissatisfied	6.2%
Slightly Satisfied	11.9%
Moderately Satisfied	34.0%
Very Satisfied	37.3%
No Opinion	0.1%

## 45. Snow plowing on State Route 306

<b>Totally Dissatisfied</b>	<b>6.6%</b>
<b>Mostly Dissatisfied</b>	<b>5.9%</b>
<b>Slightly Dissatisfied</b>	<b>7.1%</b>
<b>Slightly Satisfied</b>	<b>12.1%</b>
<b>Moderately Satisfied</b>	<b>32.9%</b>
<b>Very Satisfied</b>	<b>35.3%</b>
<b>No Opinion</b>	<b>0.1%</b>

## 46. Snow plowing on Township and County roads

<b>Totally Dissatisfied</b>	<b>4.8%</b>
<b>Mostly Dissatisfied</b>	<b>5.9%</b>
<b>Slightly Dissatisfied</b>	<b>7.1%</b>
<b>Slightly Satisfied</b>	<b>14.4%</b>
<b>Moderately Satisfied</b>	<b>32.4%</b>
<b>Very Satisfied</b>	<b>35.2%</b>
<b>No Opinion</b>	<b>0.2%</b>

## 47. Road maintenance on Township roads

<b>Totally Dissatisfied</b>	<b>3.4%</b>
<b>Mostly Dissatisfied</b>	<b>4.0%</b>
<b>Slightly Dissatisfied</b>	<b>7.0%</b>
<b>Slightly Satisfied</b>	<b>13.7%</b>
<b>Moderately Satisfied</b>	<b>39.0%</b>
<b>Very Satisfied</b>	<b>32.8%</b>
<b>No Opinion</b>	<b>0.1%</b>

**GOVERNMENT STRUCTURE / SERVICE PROVISION**

6. A change to incorporated (city) government should be considered for Chester Township

Strongly Disagree	49.7%
Moderately Disagree	10.1%
Slightly Disagree	6.0%
Slightly Agree	9.7%
Moderately Agree	8.5%
Strongly Agree	15.3%
No Opinion	0.7%

21. Communities such as Chester Township have no obligation to provide affordable housing opportunities.

Strongly Disagree	8.5%
Moderately Disagree	4.9%
Slightly Disagree	5.3%
Slightly Agree	9.3%
Moderately Agree	14.5%
Strongly Agree	56.8%
No Opinion	0.7%

32. Our present Township form of government is preferred.

Strongly Disagree	12.6%
Moderately Disagree	6.2%
Slightly Disagree	7.5%
Slightly Agree	15.3%
Moderately Agree	21.3%
Strongly Agree	36.5%
No Opinion	0.6%

## 41. Fire Protection Service

<b>Totally Dissatisfied</b>	<b>1.7%</b>
<b>Mostly Dissatisfied</b>	<b>1.0%</b>
<b>Slightly Dissatisfied</b>	<b>2.7%</b>
<b>Slightly Satisfied</b>	<b>8.7%</b>
<b>Moderately Satisfied</b>	<b>36.9%</b>
<b>Very Satisfied</b>	<b>48.5%</b>
<b>No Opinion</b>	<b>0.5%</b>

## 42. Emergency Medical Service

<b>Totally Dissatisfied</b>	<b>1.4%</b>
<b>Mostly Dissatisfied</b>	<b>1.1%</b>
<b>Slightly Dissatisfied</b>	<b>2.3%</b>
<b>Slightly Satisfied</b>	<b>9.3%</b>
<b>Moderately Satisfied</b>	<b>32.8%</b>
<b>Very Satisfied</b>	<b>52.3%</b>
<b>No Opinion</b>	<b>0.8%</b>

## 43. Township Police Protection Service

<b>Totally Dissatisfied</b>	<b>4.0%</b>
<b>Mostly Dissatisfied</b>	<b>2.9%</b>
<b>Slightly Dissatisfied</b>	<b>4.4%</b>
<b>Slightly Satisfied</b>	<b>11.0%</b>
<b>Moderately Satisfied</b>	<b>32.8%</b>
<b>Very Satisfied</b>	<b>44.7%</b>
<b>No Opinion</b>	<b>0.2%</b>

## 54. Chester Township officials do a good job of getting information about the Township to the residents.

<b>Totally Dissatisfied</b>	<b>14.0%</b>
<b>Mostly Dissatisfied</b>	<b>9.9%</b>
<b>Slightly Dissatisfied</b>	<b>13.0%</b>
<b>Slightly Satisfied</b>	<b>22.2%</b>
<b>Moderately Satisfied</b>	<b>26.9%</b>
<b>Very Satisfied</b>	<b>13.8%</b>
<b>No Opinion</b>	<b>0.2%</b>

55. I feel well informed about how Chester Township is using my tax dollars for Township public services, such as police, fire, emergency rescue, roads and streets

Totally Dissatisfied	16.1%
Mostly Dissatisfied	10.1%
Slightly Dissatisfied	14.3%
Slightly Satisfied	21.5%
Moderately Satisfied	24.2%
Very Satisfied	13.7%
No Opinion	0.1%

56. What is the approximate size of the parcel on which you live?

0 acres to 1.5 acres	38.6%
1.6 acres to 3 acres	31.7%
3.1 acres to 5 acres	16.1%
5.1 to 10 acres	10.9%
10.1 to 25 acres	1.8%
25.1 acres or more	0.9%

57. How long have you lived in the Township?

Less than 1 year	2.0%
1 to 3 years	5.7%
4 to 6 years	7.6%
7 to 10 years	10.1%
11 to 20 years	24.9%
Over 20 years	49.7%

58. What is your present age?

Under 25 years	0.7%
26 to 35 years	5.5%
36 to 45 years	21.6%
46 to 55 years	25.5%
56 to 65 years	22.3%
Over 65 years	24.4%

59. Do you own or rent?

Own	99.0%
Rent	1.0%

**APPENDIX B CHI-SQUARE TEST RESULTS**

Question	Theme / Topic	Location	Length of Residency	Age
	<b>Land Use - Zoning</b>			
7	Zoning for Churches/Houses of Worship	<b>0.002</b>	0.082	<b>0.000<sup>++</sup></b>
15	Current zoning is adequate	0.328	0.425	<b>0.032</b>
26	Economic value should determine zoning	0.570 <sup>++</sup>	<b>0.003</b>	0.717
	<b>Land Use – Development Patterns</b>			
1	Residential development alternatives	0.082	0.333	0.431
3	Growth control is necessary	0.300	0.614 <sup>++</sup>	0.402 <sup>++</sup>
14	Preserve historic sites	0.782	0.108	<b>0.030</b>
17	Density bonuses for developers	0.560	0.096	0.060
18	Keep out large-scale developers	0.627	<b>0.044<sup>++</sup></b>	<b>0.023<sup>++</sup></b>
22	Collaborate to preserve open land	0.566	0.364	0.069 <sup>++</sup>
23	Lot size based on waste disposal system	0.233	0.890	<b>0.002</b>
28	Large lots will preserve semi-rural environ.	<b>0.019</b>	0.104	0.384
29	Living near undeveloped land important	<b>0.045</b>	0.149 <sup>++</sup>	0.549 <sup>++</sup>
31	Lot sizes determined by well water supply	0.641	0.056	<b>0.000</b>
37	Environ. responsibility & new development	0.692	0.232	0.088
33	Conservation easements to protect environ	0.194 <sup>++</sup>	0.764 <sup>++</sup>	0.100 <sup>++</sup>
35	Maintain semi-rural environment	0.719 <sup>++</sup>	0.659 <sup>++</sup>	0.803 <sup>++</sup>
39	Protect productive farm land from develop.	0.798	0.568 <sup>++</sup>	0.119 <sup>++</sup>
52	Current development pattern	0.255	<b>0.004</b>	<b>0.033</b>
	<b>Land Use – Park Spaces</b>			
27	Recreational parks needed	0.718	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>
34	Levy to develop Township parks	0.707	<b>0.004</b>	<b>0.000</b>
36	Passive parks should be developed	0.444	<b>0.009</b>	<b>0.006</b>
49	Number of parks for recreation	0.314	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000<sup>++</sup></b>
	<b>Land Use – Commercial / Industrial</b>			
5	Expansion of commercial district	0.596	<b>0.000</b>	0.192
8	Restricted industrial district increase	0.660	<b>0.006</b>	0.374
10	Encourage commercial development	0.710	0.134	0.195
16	Increase in restricted indust. dist. beneficial	0.969	<b>0.024</b>	<b>0.005</b>
30	Encourage commercial/light indust. Develop	0.514	<b>0.043</b>	<b>0.038</b>
48	Distance to commercial activities	0.693	0.168 <sup>++</sup>	<b>0.040<sup>++</sup></b>
50	Amount of commercial development	0.285	0.141	<b>0.002</b>
51	Amount of restricted industrial development	0.301	0.122	0.054 <sup>++</sup>

**APPENDIX B CHI-SQUARE TEST RESULTS (Cont.)**

Question	Theme / Topic	Location	Length of Residency	Age
	<b>Water / Waste Treatment</b>			
2	Septic systems are viable	0.383	<b>0.044</b>	<b>0.002</b>
4	Centralized sewer connections	0.487	<b>0.027</b>	<b>0.003</b>
9	Ground water contamination	0.247	<b>0.049</b>	0.109
11	Stormwater drainage	0.772	0.142	<b>0.002</b>
13	Min. lot sizes for septic systems	0.927	0.168	<b>0.001</b>
20	Monitor ground water	0.218	0.608 <sup>++</sup>	0.523 <sup>++</sup>
24	Adequate supply of well (ground) water	0.590	0.365 <sup>++</sup>	<b>0.001<sup>++</sup></b>
25	Add public water system	0.867	<b>0.013</b>	<b>0.017</b>
53	Quality of well (ground) water	0.970	<b>0.026</b>	<b>0.000<sup>++</sup></b>
	<b>Roads</b>			
12	Pave Township roads	<b>0.000</b>	0.607	0.372
19	Widen Mayfield Road	0.494	0.161	0.107
38	Unimproved roads keep rural character	<b>0.004</b>	<b>0.036</b>	0.686
40	Traffic flow	<b>0.001</b>	<b>0.013</b>	<b>0.019</b>
44	Snow plowing on State Route 322	0.902	0.091	0.004 <sup>++</sup>
45	Snow plowing on State Route 306	0.670	0.082	<b>0.000</b>
46	Snow plowing on Township/County roads	0.169	0.222	<b>0.000<sup>++</sup></b>
47	Road maintenance	0.419	0.487 <sup>++</sup>	<b>0.000<sup>++</sup></b>
	<b>Government Services</b>			
6	Incorporation	0.545	0.159	0.446
21	Provide housing opportunities	0.128	0.976	0.192
32	Present Township government preferred	0.055	0.123	0.122 <sup>++</sup>
41	Fire Protection Service	0.379 <sup>++</sup>	0.441 <sup>++</sup>	<b>0.000<sup>++</sup></b>
42	Emergency Medical Service	0.523 <sup>++</sup>	<b>0.031<sup>++</sup></b>	<b>0.000<sup>++</sup></b>
43	Township Police Protection Service	0.051	0.170 <sup>++</sup>	0.002 <sup>++</sup>
54	Township officials provide adequate info.	0.275	0.333	<b>0.000</b>
55	I feel well informed about use of tax dollars	0.563	0.416	<b>0.000</b>

Note: Statistically significant results are in boldface type.

<sup>++</sup> indicates an insufficient number of responses for a reliable chi-square test.