

Online Input Results

Did you go to the public workshop on October 4?	Do you plan to attend the public workshop on October 15?	Have you attended any of the stakeholder group visioning	Have you had a chance to review background materials on the	Is there any background information that we have not provided online that would help you better understand the issues?	What do you like about this intersection/land area today?	What do you not like about this intersection/land area today?
No	No	No	No			
No	No	No	Yes. Also talked with spouse who attended meetings	No.	Nothing particular	Light seems awkward. Business area seems tired.
No	No	No	Yes	No	it's rural characteristics	if anything, the roads could use fresh paving.
No	No	No	Yes	No	Zoned as Residential	Stop light works well with flow of traffic
no	will try to	not yet	yes			
Yes	Yes	No	yes		I like the open green spaces, the feel of entering the agricultural area. Mostly getting off 4 and having the feel of getting away from the hustle and bustle of busy commercial areas.	The traffic that has come from the build up on 102.
no	no	no	yes		the undeveloped status.	it is fine as is
No	No	No	Yes	No.	I think the look and feel fits in with the neighboring areas very well.	Traffic in the summertime is a bit heavy as people use that as a main route to avoid the Rte 4 backups.
no	no	no	yes	no - other than why there seems to be such a strong need to accommodate developers, rather than adhere to the plans previously developed to help enhance a town center in Wickford and preserve green space, such as that acquired by Mr. Shartner.	The main thing I like about the area is the green space. I run frequently through this area and appreciate having grass, trees, and the expanse of Shartner Farms. We selected this area to live for our family because although accessible to roadways, it felt like there were well established trees and green space and it provided a small retreat from urban sprawl.	Vacant and empty unused buildings. The degree of traffic - especially high speed traffic. None of which will be necessarily improved with changes in zoning.
No	Yes	No	No		That it is the gateway to less congested areas	Bald hill garden shop is unsightly.
no	no	no	yes	that was fine	no opinion	busy traffic right by my house on 102
No.	I could not attend due to schedule conflicts. Very interested.	Yes.	Yes.	No.	That the land is mostly residential, quiet, with a small percentage of business. And that business in NOT high volume (i.e. restaurant traffic is slower).	The summertime congestion is extreme, loud, and unsafe.
no	no	no	yes	no	somewhat rural	

Online Input Results

Did you go to the public workshop on October 4?	Do you plan to attend the public workshop on October 15?	Have you attended any of the stakeholder group visioning	Have you had a chance to review background materials on the	Is there any background information that we have not provided online that would help you better understand the issues?	What do you like about this intersection/land area today?	What do you not like about this intersection/land area today?
No	Not Sure	Yes ...three	Yes	No	The rural character that exists is the reason my family decided to move here.	I don't like the fact that NK is becoming overdeveloped and traffic is a concern already. I am also concerned about water quality with a development of this magnitude. Our water supply is already strained and this in not an environmentally friendly proposal. IF this proposal is allowed to proceed it would negatively impact property value, take away form the desired rural character of the area and simply would not have any positive impact for the Town of NK. This serves only to benefit those landowners who have a vested interest in developing the area. I am also angry about the TDR. This area is not zoned commercial (most of it) but the Town has already paid to protect this area and keep it rural. This seems like a waste of Town money, resources and the long term effects can only be viewed as detrimental to the community. Please limit what if any is allowed to be developed.
No	No	No	Yes	No. Godd job of providing all the basic facts.	Nothing. It's an eyesore.	It's, over grown, no landscaping, it's a mess. Look's like a typical 1960's intersection that has been neglected for 50 years.
No	No, prior commitment	Yes	Yes	No	rural character and not built up with box stores like the east side of Route 4	Traffic seems to intensify every year and actually creates back ups some times
no	maybe	yes	yes	would love to browse some of this info online vs. having to download all the files	I can generally continue on Rt 102 without delay. And from Rt 2 onto Rt 102. It's well marked.	Getting busier, more trucks, narrow lanes.
No	No	No	Yes	No		
Yes I did	Yes I will		2 Yes	I looked at teh Preserve for Rolling Greens online, but could not find informatin about the 10 acres that Shartners owns on line.	I like the rural naure of the route 2 & 102 exchange. Particularly the trees and small buildings	I do not like the approach from the west towards Wickford Station. It seems to be promoting excessive speed to get through the Land & 102 light
No	No	No	Yes	No I do not think so. The info supplied has been quite clear.	I am concerned to know there will be a rotary reinstalled at the corner	I like the restaurant/ country store approach.
no	possibly	no	yes	no	orderly and seems to handle the traffic safely	nothing
No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Rural look	Nothing
No	Possibly	Yes	Yes	NO	Not very much	We do not need any further commercial and we got rid of the rotary years ago, we don't need a round about.
no	maybe	no	yes	no	open space, undeveloped	The Bald Hill Nursery area is unattractive and feels abandoned. It needs attention but we DO NOT need more box stores. There is plenty of room for this in Wickford Junction and Quonsett. The intersection itself gets congested at rush hour - the round about plans will address this issue.
No	Yes	No	Yes	No	I have driven through this area at least five times per week for thirteen years. I enjoy driving there because of the rural character which also extends into Exeter. It is a way of living that should not be destroyed, for humans as well as the wildlife there.	Development is encroaching. Wildlife, water source, and residents must be protected. It is mostly farmland and should remain so.

Online Input Results

Did you go to the public workshop on October 4?	Do you plan to attend the public workshop on October 15?	Have you attended any of the stakeholder group visioning	Have you had a chance to review background materials on the	Is there any background information that we have not provided online that would help you better understand the issues?	What do you like about this intersection/land area today?	What do you not like about this intersection/land area today?
I would if my professional schedule allowed.	Traveling for business again.	We have attended three meetings in the past in regard to the issue	Yes	Not at this time	It retains the rural characteristics valued.	The mess left by the closure of Bald Hill Nursery
no	hoping to	no	yes	Yes, What value does the town receive to go against its own comprehensive plan? Taxes, traffic, school enrollment etc.	Rural. Lack of big commercial interests.	Too much traffic. Quickly becoming like rt 2 in warwick at the malls.
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Leave the area as it is!	
no	no	no	yes	no	I think the traffic signal has cut down the number of accidents that occurred there prior.	Seems fine to me. If it ain't broke, no fix it.
No	No	No	Yes	No	I have no problem with the development of the village concept.	I'm not sure that a rotary is going to be the best solution. I remember the rotary that was at Rt 2and Rt 4 and not sure a rotary is the best idea.
No	No	No	Yes	No	The mix of garden center/farm land, commercial properties and residential properties.	The area (102, especially between the Walmart and the Exeter line) is not particularly walkable/bikeable for town residents.
no	no	no	yes	Isn't there consensus that our current model of suburban is seriously flawed, and that other models of development, like complete streets, offer a logical alternative. Also, the NK Healthy Communities by Design process doesn't appear to be mentioned.	It is not typical strip mall development	
No	I have a conflict meeting	Yes	Yes	Water overlay and why the State did not approve changes to the Comp plan. Enough said.	Rural setting. Watershed is not an issue today.	Nothing.
No	Can not attend	No	Yes	Yes, what effects will planned zoning have to groundwater and the aquifer in general?	Verdant scenes all 102 at Rolling Greens and open space along Rt. 2.	Too much traffic and abandoned business buildings (Bald Hill Nursery).
no	yes	no	yes	no	It is rural and 'quiet'	It is increasing in traffic starting to look 'abandoned'
No	I plan to	No	Yes	No	I like the area and intersection just the way it is. I do not agree with the plans for a roundabout. I also do not want any business to be built in this area. North Kingstown has enough business space that is vacant.	I like the intersection and land area the way it is.

Online Input Results

Did you go to the public workshop on October 4?	Do you plan to attend the public workshop on October 15?	Have you attended any of the stakeholder group visioning	Have you had a chance to review background materials on the	Is there any background information that we have not provided online that would help you better understand the issues?	What do you like about this intersection/land area today?	What do you not like about this intersection/land area today?
I was not able to attend this workshop. yes	Yes, I plan to attend. yes	No, but I have been in contact with stakeholder group members about this. yes	Yes. yes	No, except I do not understand the town council's desire to have a quick vote on this.	The rural nature and open space. It is one of the reasons I chose to buy a house in this area, along with the bigger lots.	I don't like Oatley's having two driveway access points. It causes a traffic headache. I also don't like how much traffic goes through this intersection, especially in the summer. Lastly, I don't like the drunks turning out of the Corner Tavern without looking first.
no	yes	yes	yes	no	rural character	nothing
No	Probably not	No	Yes	Not sure	Not much. I drive past it on my way to other destinations, but have never frequented the properties/businesses right at that intersection. I suppose the traffic flow at the intersection is OK, although I would be open to changes to that.	There are no businesses/destinations that interest me. The properties look run down and the whole area is not particularly attractive.
No	No	No	Yes	No		
no	don't know	no	yes		preservation	
No	Yes	No	Yes		That it is a nice, more rural area versus all the sprawling development with large parking areas that has taken over the eastern intersection.	Nothing.
No	No	No	Yes, I just perused the link to the website and I really have no idea from the information included there what the proposed plan is!	How about "front ground" information like what the proposal is in plain English prominently displayed on the website?	Nothing	There is very little shoulder for biking or walking and the traffic is fast paced.
no	I'm out of town	yes	somewhat	IDK	There are no chain stores! Please keep it that way.	As it is now I don't really notice it as it is just an intersection to pass through to somewhere else. I don't really eat at Corner Tavern or Oatly's. Bald Hill is dead and I try to avoid Shartners they have got too full of themselves.
No	No	No	Yes	I can't tell. I do not seem to understand the issues based on what is available online.	I enjoy access to the golf course in the winter and access to wide lanes for cycling south on route 2. I also enjoy the pastoral land.	I do not care for the traffic congestion and for the lifeless business character.
Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Character shift/change from Rte 4 (rush, fast traffic) and Rte 102 big box commercial toward a slower, less commercialized non-built up Rte 2(S) and 102(W).	Beaten down state of disrepair of Oatleys, CT and abandoned property at Bald Hill Nursery
no	no	no	yes	no	I like the rural/agricultural/village type atmosphere	traffic/speed
No	Possibly	Yes, the first one.	Yes	No	I like the small, local businesses and open space.	Safety. Traffic-wise, it's a dangerous intersection.
NO	YES	YES	YES	NO		

Online Input Results

Scenario 1: Conservation Design			Scenario 2: Compact Village District		
What do you like about scenario?	What don't you like about this scenario?	How could this plan be improved?	What do you like about this scenario?	What don't you like about this scenario?	How could this plan be improved?
Like mixed use developments	Rotary may be issue with amount of traffic.	No suggestion	Greater area involved?	Concerned about the traffic at rotary and the new entrances/exits on Rt 2.	No suggestions
nothing	it takes away from the existing charm	Don't make any changes	nothing	focus should be to improve the Post Road corridor and leave this area as is.	do not build here.
Another nice residential cluster development for NK that abuts Exeter.	Nothing	Add a small public area with Tennis Courts and a Basketball Court (similar to the EG Middle Road courts nestled into the residential area near the Western end of Middle Road).	Nothing.	Over-developed and too commercialized.	Locate near Post Road closer to Quonset Business Park.
Keeping the land use consistant with what is already on the west side of rt 4. Giving you the feel that you are entering the rural farming area of town. Keeping green open spaces.	You are showing 14 plus extra houses that NK schools do not have to worry about.	no need to improve on something that looks good.		There is to much commercial build out. Traffic would be a huge problem with all this building. The open space the tax payers just spent \$1 million on, is just wasted.	The Schartner's property should be changed back to residential, making that corner more consistent with the open space voters already decided should not be developed. The commercial on rolling greens is not needed due to huge zoned commercial lots only 5 mins away. No exit onto Rt 2 from Shartner's property.
nothing	housing and commercial lots	no housing needed	nothing	housing and commercial space	don't touch the land
Not alot. I'm concerned about water usage by putting that many people in the area. I don't think we need additional retail when there is capacity in the town today. I think (but am not positive, that there is also an abundance of housing similar to what is being proposed, available in the town today.	See above.	I don't think this plan is viable so it should not be acted upon.	Similar to pror concerns regarding water, retail capacity today, and housing capacity today.	See above	
Like the lack of increased commercial space - but the number of residential units seems high for this amount of land.	See above about the amount of residential units. We left Cumberland due to the overcrowding of homes on small land parcels.	Few homes on larger parcels.	Only positive might be if it limits the size of commercial.	WAY, WAY too many units being built. There is nothing worse for property value than a glut of low-quality units. The increased number of units and increased commercial units would only increase the amount of traffic through this area.	Commit to uphold the initially plan to preserve green space in this area and commit resources for development down the Post Road corridor and Wickford.
No commercial	Too many houses	Fewer houses	Nothing	Commercial buildings. Too congested	Delete it
keeps some green space.	tight houses. smaller houses.			I do not like the expanded commercial areas. we do not need more in this town.	remove commercial on north side of 102, and expand homes to large sizes, better values.
Maintains primary focus of residential, not to expand commercial or retail.	Will home density threaten water overly areas. Smaller tightly packed residential will not raise surrounding property values.	Expand residential home sizes.	There is not a 400 foot windmill on it.	Does not follow initial comprehensive plan. Housing units means apartments, not homes where residents are invested in the community. Expands commercial/retail spaces when there are plenty of open space already available. Realistically - opens the door to more retail than "planned".	Take it off the table.
green buffer from the road	not enough trees preserved			housing density too high	more forest preserved

Online Input Results

Scenario 1: Conservation Design			Scenario 2: Compact Village District		
What do you like about scenario?	What don't you like about this scenario?	How could this plan be improved?	What do you like about this scenario?	What don't you like about this scenario?	How could this plan be improved?
Limited development	Threat to the water supply	Less development	Nothing!	OVER developed far to much housing and commercial.	Reduce development
Well laid out. Not over built.	Nothing		Nothing	Overbuilt with condos. Too may clustered together.	
It keeps the rural charm of the area and stays within the comprehensive plan for the town	Nothing	Not sure it could.... my concern would be with the aquifer that sits near/on the property of Rolling Greens.	Nothing	1) I don't like that it doesn't follow the town's comprehensive plan nor (based on the State's rejection of the Shartner property) does it sit well with the State. 2) One word, WATER. It's on the aquifer and how is water going be provided to these commercial properties and what about waste water/septic? You have one chance to get this right and you can expect new sources of water to open up in town at a taxpayer expense, if we taint the aquifer. 3) Commercial businesses? Really? we have empty storefronts all over town and we want to incorporate more? Not logical to me. 4) Increased traffic. There are already back up along this section of road...has a study been done?	Eliminate the commercial aspect of the project
I think it looks great- I like the concept of indiv. owned properties. I like the additional little neighborhood behind corner tavern and along rt 102 in exter	the density	let us know what the lot sizes are change to rural along 102 in exeter as in scenerio 3.		I don't like the corner properties given other businesses & services in town being underutilized. I like the rural along 102 in exeter as in scenerio 3.	add in the residential along rt 102 /2 like scenerio 1
Maintains rual scenes and give property owner the rights to develop resenditlial properties at minimal impact	Nothing- I find this very acceptable, especiall the residences at the previous Bald Hill Nursery	Eliminate Corner Tavern commercial zone	rural nature of golf course and housing development setback maintained	Too much commercial- and possibility for big box store at Bald Hill Nursery site, too much commercial at Shartner's 10 acres	Eliminate commercial except for small Oatley's restaurant- he needs to e able to still make a living there, if he swishes to.
Residential	Drainage water table concerns for Wickford Highlands		Nothing	Too much development	
Less commercial	Round about	eliminate the round about	Nothing	Far too much commercial	Look at #1
Keeps the area residential - less worry about increased traffic, undesirable box stores, drain on our water.			It could be attractive and improve the look of the area.	Will cause increase in traffic, urban sprawl.	Ensure that any commercial development will be in keeping with the rural, small town character of the area. No BOX STORES, smaller, "garden city" or "south county commons" type construction.
No retail space	Too many homes for rural area	Allow absolute minimum development	Absolutely nothing.	Every single bit of it. This is rural and should be protected as such. Post Road should be addressed to improve business conditions there before any other area of NK is destroyed.	Make it illegal.

Online Input Results

Scenario 1: Conservation Design		Scenario 2: Compact Village District			
What do you like about scenario?	What don't you like about this scenario?	How could this plan be improved?	What do you like about this scenario?	What don't you like about this scenario?	How could this plan be improved?
No major expansion of commercial	Wondering if the businesses already in place at the sight would benefit from the type of work done by Suburban Renewal. Would love to see those already in place make the best of their business by improving their commercial property curb appeal	Renewel/improvements made to the commercially zoned properties already in place. Finding a new tenent for the BALd Hill Center to restructure-re-purpose the property already there. Wondering if some type of fed/state or local incentive's exists to make that financially attractive to potential business.	The residential portion is fine	The intense build up of box style commercial that is so unneeded/unwanted in North Kingstown for so many reasons. Town officials should be working to revitalize the commercial zones already in place. Adding unneeded commercial sprawl changes the character and qualities so highly valued by our community. This is the key issue as to why residents feel unheard and ignored. Incentatives to encourage commercial renewal of the existing Post Rd and Wickford Village business centers is the vision that makes good sense for North Kingstown. Conservation and Preservation of the qualities and characteristics that are treasured. North Kingstown is graced by it's location and history. Community members have been screaming to be heard on this. We do not want to see NK go the way of Warwick/Cranston. This is a crucial time in our communities history. Do we sell out to developers for the quick buck. Do we allow current sitting TC members who have shown their lack of ethics and integrity by accepting generous donations and support from this developer. Residents are all too aware of the friendly relationship between Hueston and Bestwick with Hawkins. The fact that Hawkins is running for a seat on the TC and that the NKGOP endorsed this candidate is a slap in the face to the hundreds and hundreds of residents who have very clearly stated their	see comments above
Maintains non-commercial use of land area. Will not encourage more development	nothing. This allows the property owner appropriate use of his land while maintaining the comprehensive plan	it can't	Nothing	greatly changes the entire region for residential to major commercial area. Further a special exception to one developer will mean all future special exceptions can't be denied without a lawsuit.	Eliminate it.
nice use of the property. hopefully the town will make sure the developer leaves and/or plants trees like Wickford Highlands.	The number of houses putting a strain on the already limited NK Water supply for this area.	fewer houses or describe how the town finds more water. already limited to 2 days watering a week in summer. that hurts the homeowners ability to keep his property looking nice.	nothing	more retail stores where we don't need them. I prefer grass to pavement and cement.	don't allow commercial buildings.
	North Kingstown does not need more sub-developments. The current mixture of commercial and residential is what makes it a vibrant and interesting community.	If more housing is in the future for this area, the town should put some thought into ensuring that a percentage of those homes be built as affordable housing.			
greenspace from cluster development	residential development is a tax drain. Looks like it will rely totally on automobile	Develop some mixed us.	mixed use; better use of land; promotes walking to stores	Add traffic	make sure Shartner farm preserved
Low or low impact to water. keeps the comp plan in place with State	Hmm, no comment on Exeter as we cannot technically recommend anything for them.	It would be fine. What is the definition of improved here? More buildings, bigger buildings, the town can even get post road building occupied. Fewer commercial would be fine.	Not much	Comprehensive plan change!	Make it fit within the current comp plan
Best maintains pastoral qualities on this area.	Too many new residences...	Fewer homes could be built.	Rolling Greens is not developed.	Way too many businesses. Development along Post road and Quonset should be encouraged instead.	Less business development
residential us			mixed use	too much development. Potential for chain type retail	limit scope of commercial
That they build houses and not commercial space.	Concerned about groundwater and the aquifer	Don't build on the Schartner property	Nothing	Don't like the commercial space in the Rolling Greens development. also don't like the Schartner land being developed. Don't like the amount of development at Bald Hill.	

Online Input Results

Scenario 1: Conservation Design			Scenario 2: Compact Village District		
What do you like about scenario?	What don't you like about this scenario?	How could this plan be improved?	What do you like about this scenario?	What don't you like about this scenario?	How could this plan be improved?
It retains the rural charm of the area.	The extra traffic caused by the new homes.	Remove the businesses and lower the density of the new homes.	Nothing	This is going to be a nightmare! We don't need commercial in this area. Get rid of it!	Dump the commercial and lower density housing.
maintains rural character	nothing	Increase the commercial space on the Bald Hill Garden Center	Only that his means keeping the golf course	Too much commercial	Reduce Rolling Green's commercial 50%; eliminate commercial on Schartner's; reduce commercial on the Bald Hill Garden Center by 50%
It would likely make the intersection more attractive and make use of the space.	I would prefer to see some additional commercial development that would serve residents in the area.	Add some small commercial properties... shops, restaurants, etc.	I like the idea of more commercial development at this intersection. I also like what appears to be a traffic circle at the intersection.	The 100 residential housing units appear to be somewhat densely packed into the Rolling Greens property.	Maybe incorporate larger housing units on the Rolling Green property?
green		bike trails		more development	
More residential and fewer huge parking lots. A possible compromise.	I'm afraid of sprawl and vanishing farmland, rural character.		Could be a last resort compromise.	It looks like a fairly typical case of suburban sprawl.	
It looks nice	It would probably cause overcrowding at Stony Lane Elementary	No thoughts on this question	Opens up opportunities for new businesses	100 new housing units could lead to crowding in he schools	Fewer houses
I don't see any chain stores...yet.	Another cluster development? Neighborhood association? What will be the price point on these homes? Who profits?	think about lower income people...perhaps create a variety of housing options with community center	hmmmm...don't think I like this sort of pop up all buildings look alike type planning.	the red roofs are office and retail? Dunkin Donuts, Subway, Shell, CVS, Rite Aid, Daves, Kohls,	Youth Center, Art Center, Aquatic Center
Setbacks from road on RG, low commercial intrusion impact	Dont' know the TYPE of commercial properties involved. If larger stores, don't like. If smaller, local stores, good.		Golf course	Everything else. Too much commerical (way too much). Intrusion back on the roadways with businesses instead of setbacks. This is NOT a COMPACT VILLAGE, this is the beginning of a NEW DOWNTOWN.	Back to basics. NEIGHBORHOOD businesses, local businesses, small businesses fit into the area, not 200,000 sq ft of commercial onto three corners. This would be a NO. This would be very bad
retention of open space/	not interesting/no uniqueness or personality		there is a reason to visit/places to visit	too compact/a bit crowded	a way to "connect" the areas
The developments are mostly set back and large-scale, big-box stores are not present. I also like the rotary.	I have no problem with anything in this scenario.	I think it's fine.	The rotary.	This is way too dense of development for this area. This would cause significant traffic congestion, impact the rural character of this area of NK/Exeter, and also would negatively impact the farms along the Rt 2 corridor as the rural character of the area would be gone. Also, almost none of the developments are in line with the Comp. Plan. Why would we write a Comp. Plan if we're not going to follow it.	Don't change the zoning or Comp. Plan and focus this type of development on the Rt. 1 corridor.

Online Input Results

Scenario 3: TDR Village			Scenario 4: Build Out		
What do you like about this scenario?	What don't you like about this scenario?	How could this plan be improved?	What do you like about this scenario?	What don't you like about this scenario?	How could this plan be improved?
Keeps same general footprint of business/homes.	Not like the rotary due to traffic.	No suggestions.	Nothing particular	Seems like another development - Wickford Highlands, Mountain Laurel Estates. Loose some of the golf course land for walking etc.	No suggestions.
nothing	will create excess traffic in this area. Focus should be on the Post Road corridor	do not build here.,	again, nothing.	do not build here!	can't
Nothing.	Over-developed and too commercialized.	Locate near Post Road closer to Quonset Business Park.	Residential only development of the Rolling Greens land area.	Development of over 100,000 square feet of office or retail on the Schartner property.	Allow for only a Gas Station/Convenience Store property to be built on the Schartner property facing Route 2 (similar to the Shell station in EG at corner of Frenchtown Rd/South County Trail).
	There is way to much build up in a small area. I see problems with traffic and water. Houses are on such small lots it looks more like city living instead of small town living.	Shartner's property being changed back to original zoning, making the density less. Getting rid of the commercial especially that on Rolling Greens that isn't zoned commercial right now. Not putting commercial buildings in a line like a strip mall even though they are in separate buildings.	Zoning is left alone. Not building to much commercial in an area that is only 5 mins away from plenty of commercial. Helping to keep Post Rd alive and keeping business taxes coming in for the town.	This scenario is very deciving to the public due to showing houses build on the Morris farm that is not in North Kingstown. Also, the housing development shown for Rolling Greens is not consistant with the cluster developments in the area. I understand this is what he can build but in the other scenarios the commercial is placed in a nice and pleasant presentation unlike what they can actually build.	Zoning Shartners property back the way it was so the State would approve the Comprehensive Plan. Not having an exit from the Shartners property on to rt 2. That will just add to the traffic problems that already exist on Rt 2.
nothing	housing	don't touch the land	nothing	housing and commercial building	don't touch the land
Similar to prior answers	See above		Similar to prior answers.	See above.	
Presevation of the Morris and Shartner properties through the town's transfer of development rights. (Frankly, if this isn't supported -- it starts feeling like how the "settlers" treated the treaties they formed with Native American communities -- agreeing to anything and then going against promises at first chance.	The high density of development and increased traffic in this area.	See previous responses regarding focusing on Post road and Wickford for greater expansion and development. Work on filling empty buildings in North Kingtown and work on having more of a "recycle/reuse" approach -- using commercial areas that are already established instead of treating them as "trash" and creating more waste.	Size of lots for residential development.	Still don't see the need for further commercial development. Where we lived in michigan - this would have been a town park.	See above.
Preserve farms	Too much commercial. Too many houses are congested	Limithouses. Omit commercial	Big house lots	Too much commercial	
	See previous entry.	See previous entry.	Keeps are as a residential and does not expand commercial since we have unused retail space already.	Would like as today but if not an option then this is the best option.	
Conserving a small portion of retail on the outskirts of town - Exeter will appreciate that ; not NK.	I feel that the density threatens the water supply more. Density does not follow the smaller town charm of why I moved to NK. And again, This opens the door to more commercial/retail than in the initial 'plans'.		Fits the areas identity (yes - this area does have an identity for those that live here). Make this residential, allow the pre-existing portions of town (Wickford Junction, Post Road, Quonset) to expand commercial. The existing retail space is enough to service the residence. This follows the Comprehensive plan.	This will add traffic volume but less that all the other plans. Will miss a bit of the open space, but not much.	common wooded greenspace in the large house lots development
				houses too close to the road (lack of wooded buffer)	

Online Input Results

Scenario 3: TDR Village			Scenario 4: Build Out		
What do you like about this scenario?	What don't you like about this scenario?	How could this plan be improved?	What do you like about this scenario?	What don't you like about this scenario?	How could this plan be improved?
Preserves the Morris and Schartner property	To much commercial development and threat to out water supply. Potential trafficcongestion	Scale back the development	NOTHING	Far to spread out and the entire rural character would be lost. The loss of the golf course would be disaasterous the commercial at 102/2 would great a traffic nightmare.	SCALE back and protect the rural nature
Main entrance to condos is off the rotary.	Nothing		Nothing	Too much, too busy.	
Nothing	1) I don't like that it doesn't follow the town's comprehensive plan nor (based on the State's rejection of the Shartner property) does it sit well with the State. 2) One word, WATER. It's on the aquifer and how is water going be provided to these commercial properties and what about waste water/septic? You have one chance to get this right and you can expect new sources of water to open up in town at a taxpayer expense, if we taint the aquifer. 3) Commercial businesses? Really? we have empty storefronts all over town and we want to incorporate more? Not logical to me. 4) Increased traffic. There are already back up along this section of road...has a study been done?	This is worse than scenario 2 which was unacceptable. You might as well be creating another Route 2 in Warwick at this point. Why have a comprehensive plan if you can constantly change it?	Less commerical development	I worry about the aquifer	Create less commercial, also, would a rotary improve the traffic situation?
I like Rt 102 north of intersection remaining rural	I don't like the extra commercial presence behind existing businesses being so close to the neighborhood street behind the row of trees. Don't like the "condos"	Change "condo"s to look more like scenerio 1 and also change commercial along rt 2 to scenerio 1	lack of density	move businesses to front of Rt. 2 / swap with parking lots	let us know what the lot sizes are, keep rural along rt 102 in exeter as in #3 or to #1, same for rt. 2
Maintains rual nature of intersection with Shartners and preserving golf course.	ALL of the commercial buildings	Eliminate the commercial buildings except for Oatley's restaurant so tha the can still make a living there	Maintains rural nature of intersenction	Way too much commercial development	Eliminate the commercial developmetn
Nothing	Too much development		Nothing	Too large - too much traffic and water table concerns for Wickford highlands.	Smaller.
Nothing	Too much commercial	Look at #!	Nothing	You totally eliminate the golf course	Look at #1
				This will change the character of the area completely. We live here because we like the neighborhood, rural aspect.	Use a different plan.
Preserving through TDRs	Commercial development does not belong here	Make it illegal.	Nothing	Loss of golf course, far too much retail.	Make it illegal.

Online Input Results

Scenario 3: TDR Village			Scenario 4: Build Out		
What do you like about this scenario?	What don't you like about this scenario?	How could this plan be improved?	What do you like about this scenario?	What don't you like about this scenario?	How could this plan be improved?
see comments from last scenario.	see comments from last scenario	see comments fro last scenario	at the very least this is what is currently allowed. If renewal was achieved at the sights already in place some improvement would be achieved	The sprawl of the residential piece. Would prefer to see the residential as shown in the other scenarios	see comments above
Nothing	Same as plan # 2		Its better than 2 and 3.	?	
it would clean up the existing corner next to Corner Tavern.	commercial buildings	develop Rt. 1 and leave the wooded areas alone.	nothing	too many home sites. did the town invent a way to produce water???	limit home sites and eliminate commercial buildings
mixed use; preserved Shartner farm; promotes walking	Adds traffic	Bike path to train station		It's everyting that is wrong with suburban development	Any of the other alternatives is better
A little more residential	More Commercial	Less commercial	More residential	Taking over golf course	Leave golf course.
The concept of transfer of business development rights. The development rights of the commercial stakeholders should be transferred to areas along Post Rd and the Quonset business district.	Way too much development which will lead to more unnecessary urban sprawl.	It would be best to abandon this plan.	Nothing	Too much business development	Abandoning this plan would be best.
Preserve Morris and Schartner properties				too much retail added to North Kingstown's already empty retail/office space.	less retail
Not much	The commercial space in the village development area (Rolling Greens) Also concerned about the groundwater and aquifer	Don't build the commercial space it is not needed or wanted however preserving the Morris and Schartner property would be nice	That it meets groundwater requirements	That you loose the golf course. Also don't like the development of the Schartner prosperity. Also don't like the amount of development on the Bald Hill prosperity.	

Online Input Results

Scenario 3: TDR Village			Scenario 4: Build Out		
What do you like about this scenario?	What don't you like about this scenario?	How could this plan be improved?	What do you like about this scenario?	What don't you like about this scenario?	How could this plan be improved?
Nothing	Another nightmare! We don't need this commercial development. It doesn't fit the area, and we don't need high density housing.	Dump the commercial and lower the housing density.	I like the lower density housing.	I hate all the commercial. We don't want it in a rural area. Look around, it doesn't fit with the neighborhood at all.	Dump the commercial. Keep the low density housing.
Preserves Schartner's as open space and keeps the golf course	Too much commercial	Reduce commercial on both Rolling Green and Bald Hill Garden Center by 75%. Road to housing should have no commercial buildings on it.	Housing density...maintains water usage	Too much commercial, especially Schartner's	Reduce Bald Hill Garden Center commercial by 25% and eliminate Schartner's
I like the commercial development with shops and restaurants to serve local residents.	The housing units appear to be densely packed on the Rolling Green property. Not sure how easy it would be for pedestrians to cross route 102 from one part of the "village" to the other?	Maybe larger housing units?	I like the less densely packed residential units on Rolling Greens property. I like the addition of retail space	I like this one the best!	I would really like it if there were a walking/biking path leading from Rosewood Estates (my neighborhood) to the retail/village spaces proposed in any of these scenarios! Would LOVE to be able to walk from Rosewood Estates to small shops or a village!
				too much development	
Much of the farmland would be permanently preserved.	I'd like to see less development but some compromise is probably inevitable.		There is some green space.	Sprawl, loss of rural character and do we really need more banks and grocery stores with several options within easy walking distance.	I don't think it can be without moving to one of the earlier options listed.
It just seems a little more crowded	I don't think I would choose the crowded housing arrangement, but maybe others would	Is a roundabout really the way to go here? What's wrong with a stop light? Would people be able to safely cross on foot if they wanted to park and visit commercial areas on both sides of 102/2?	Fewer houses likely with higher property value and maybe less impact on area schools	I just don't understand the rotary instead of a traffic light. Oh yeah, nobody walks in this town because there are no sidewalks.	Change the rotary to a traffic light
more contained, less driving	again potential for chains	youth center, arts, skate board park, dog park, water park	looks nice for those who can afford it	a pharmacy really?	affordable housing, a youth center,
Golf course	Everything else again. Same as last only you pitch it differently and show more on two corners with the supposed belief nothing would happen at Schartner's. That's half pregnant. Two sides with big businesses, one with nothing. What's that provide residents??	Setbacks, less build out at Bald Hill (don't really care what they want), add some building at Schartner's. Total cap sqft 25k RG, 25k Bald Hill/CT, 30k Schartner (that's 80k sqft TOTAL)	Limits to commercial, limits to housing. This is a stick in the eye of the town by the RG developer. He COULD build the senior duplexes (and do more of them) and get the same profit without wasting all the land, however he will not provide you that option. He will not build out this scenario as the RE market economics will not allow it.		Keep the golf course or some open land (doesn't need to be 90 acres). Back to a limit on Bald Hill and Schartner sizes, types and scope.
there seems to be a more community feel to this plan - not sure why. both things to see while driving and things to stop for - there is open land left	still lacks the connectivity because of the road.	a way to get there from here without an automobile	nothing	it's an absolute waste of land	where do I start?
I like that the western side of the intersection would remain the same.	This is way too dense of development for this area. This would cause significant traffic congestion, impact the rural character of this area of NK/Exeter, and also would negatively impact the farms along the Rt 2 corridor as the rural character of the area would be gone. Also, almost none of the developments are in line with the Comp. Plan.	Don't allow this and focus this type of development on the Rt. 1 corridor.	The rotary and lack of commercial development at Rolling Greens	The lack of cluster development to preserve some open space, the bib-box retail at the garden center and Schartner property.	Limit large commercial development and utilize cluster development for the residential lots.

Online Input Results

For your highest rated development scenario, how would you improve that development scenario?	For your second highest rated development scenario, how would you improve that development scenario?	Are there any other comments that you would like to pass on to the stakeholders group to consider during this process?
No suggestions	No suggestions	
please do not build here.	see above	
Add a small public area with Tennis Courts and a Basketball Court (similar to the EG Middle Road courts nestled into the residential area near the Western end of Middle Road).	Add a small public area with Tennis Courts and a Basketball Court (similar to the EG Middle Road courts nestled into the residential area near the Western end of Middle Road).	Thank you for making this survey available to NK residents.
Making the rolling greens development a cluster development instead of a grid development. Taking Shartners back to it's old zoning!!! we don't need any of it. There is plenty of empty spaces and unsold houses	Scenario is pretty good the way it is show. we don't need any of it. There is plenty of empty buildings and unsold houses	This is a very important change in our Comprehensive Plan and it shouldn't be taken lightly or rushed thru!! They should not forget the other option on the table, that if the town takes the commercial zoning back from Scharner's, the town would be in compliance with the State. We do not have to zone up but we can keep it the same, there is nothing wrong with that. I cannot see any benefit to the community at all. The only person who will benefit is the owner/builder. We already have brand new empty store fronts at the Walmart plaza. we have many unsold houses in NK. Bringing in lower valued housing would depreciate what is already unsold in NK.
They would all be '4's if I could rate them that way. I am not going to choose something that I am against, if I don't have to.	See above.	Comments - no, but I do have a question for them. What makes this parcel viable for retail and housing when there are many empty retail and housing locations in the town that are not near full capacity?
Committing to preserve green space with increased recreational fields and leisure space for families. Limiting degree of "big box" commercial and helping meet committment for transfer rights.	As above.	
Smaller houses, fewer houses		please stop expanding commercial/retail until we finish already underdeveloped areas of this time. Do not spread to this are also.
We need to follow the Comprehensive Plan. We need to protect our water supply.	expand home size... I suppose that then places this into my option #1	In the end - we have plenty of unused retail/commercial in NK. More retail will lead to more half filled locations. This IS a residential area, that is the identity, and I am becoming more surrounded by commercial every year. This is not why I chose the town of NK to live in. Continued sprawl is would certainly be a reason to take residence elsewhere.

Online Input Results

For your highest rated development scenario, how would you improve that development scenario?	For your second highest rated development scenario, how would you improve that development scenario?	Are there any other comments that you would like to pass on to the stakeholders group to consider during this process?
Better landscape design in common areas	less commercial development	My primary concern is with the scarcity of the water supply and its effect on any development in that area...has a separate study been done on that?
		We're very concerned about stress on infrastructure, namely WATER. I also have seen a smaller scale project in my neighborhood change from what was approved without neighborhood notification so I'm skeptical about the process too. With that project, I don't like the density especially since BONUS density was awarded and although it abutted on one edge, it was NOT in keeping with the current neighborhood which includes the access. The homes are also condos and expensive so we wonder how affordable those bonus units really are and will these properties go unoccupied? Please do not build out the commercial aspects to this area with wickford junction & rt 2 so close, and post road underutilized. IF this project goes forward BIKE/WALKING paths to junction and INTO wickford should be required. Let's link this neighborhood to others! Also, we were told the turning lane on Rt 2 north was an idea and wanted input and before we knew it, it was being constructed and done - this adds to feeling skeptical with govt processes. We are happy with the additional communication this project has been getting from town depts. and the community involvement, thank you for going slowly.
Keep the rural nature of the development. I believe there is also a requirement for 10% subsidized housing, too?	Eliminate commercial buildings or restrict them to two stories	This is the GATEWAY FROM THE WEST into Wickford. Keeping commercial confined to east of route 4 is a good thing. Let it be near the 400 foot wind turbine- an obscene thing to do to Wickford
		Please, please consider that we have chosen where we live for a certain quality of life and the character of the area. There is NO NEED for large box stores or major commercial development with Wickford Junction and Quonsett so close. Attractive, smaller residential and quaint commercial use would be acceptable, but open spaces are most desirable.
Prevent any and all retail	Limit retail. No big box stores	Why do anything at this location that will detract from existing businesses that are already struggling to survive in NK? Rural should be protected.

Online Input Results

For your highest rated development scenario, how would you improve that development scenario?	For your second highest rated development scenario, how would you improve that development scenario?	Are there any other comments that you would like to pass on to the stakeholders group to consider during this process?
<p>Would like to see only "high visual wall" of landscape design to maintain as best as possible to visual character and quality of the area. Would like to see very strict building style/material use to ensure consistent styles. Historic New England/Coastal architectural styles would be preferable. Small wooded signage for the entry as opposed to any large/standard commercial type signage. Would like to see the commercial pieces square footage limited to no more than 1,000 square feet each to ensure only small - no big box - business.</p>	<p>see comment above</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to fully vet this crucially important issue. Placing full value on the preservation of the inherent qualities and characteristics that residents of NK treasure into full consideration is very much appreciated. Please fight and advocate for the voice of the community. We appreciate your efforts very much!!</p>
<p>No improvement needed.</p>	<p>1 & 2 are almost equal</p>	<p>The state has asked us to fund quonset development. The town has asked us to fund post rd development. The town has asked us to fund "open land". This development goes against hundreds of millions in previous investments. The only benefit is increased profit to the developer. No one else benefits.</p>
<p>it's fine as long as the town has a plan for supplying water.</p>	<p>eliminate commercial buildings. let's start thinking about the beauty of the town's undeveloped areas and not who can get rich.</p>	
<p>bike path to train station</p>	<p>bike path to train station</p>	
<p>Nothing, protect the Comp plan and the water supply.</p>	<p>Control the size of the commercial bldgs.</p>	<p>Protect the water supply and CComp plan</p>
<p>Reduce the number of residences and preserve the land as open space.</p>	<p>Reduce size of business related buildings too less than 15,000 sq. ft.</p>	<p>I would like to see the commercial development rights of those with commercial interests transferred to areas of the town where future development makes sense such as Post Rd and Quonset. Any further development of the Rt. 2/102 area will only lead to the type of sprawl observed in much of Warwick, West Warwick, Cranston, etc.</p>
		<p>Don't forget that we have own 'gem', Wickford Village right down the road. Although adding a great 'village' to this area would be an improvement, it might take business away from Wickford.</p>
<p>Don't develop the Schartner property</p>	<p>Don't build it as dense. Leave more common land in the Rolling Greens development. Don't build any commercial space in the Rolling Greens development it is not needed or wanted. Stop being greedy and conserve some open space. If I wanted to live in an area like Bald Hill in Warwick I would have bought a home there. In the past 16 years that I have lived in NK you have developed the Wickford Junction development(which has empty commercial space. You have developed the Home Depot area. You have developed the Stop & Shop area which also has empty commercial space. The people who live in NK do not need or want any more commercial development. You also for some reason are allowing a 365 ft tall wind turbine to be built in a residential area also not wanted. Like I said stop being so greedy and do what is right for the town and the residents it would be a welcomed change. Enough is enough I think I have put up with enough development in less than 20 years.</p>	<p>I already put comments in another section. Do what's right conserve the land there has already been too much development in this area in less than 20 years. It is not needed or wanted. If I wanted to live in an area similar to Bald Hill in Warwick I would have bought in Warwick.</p>

Online Input Results

For your highest rated development scenario, how would you improve that development scenario?	For your second highest rated development scenario, how would you improve that development scenario?	Are there any other comments that you would like to pass on to the stakeholders group to consider during this process?
Lower density housing. No commercial.	No commercial.	This neighborhood is angry with the town council, the developer, and the local restaurants. Our concerns have been pushed aside and this process is largely viewed as a sham. The developer is going to get his way because he is "friends" with the town council. Nobody is fooled by their actions. I wish this process was truly embraced, valued and respected.
Perhaps increase Bald Hill Garden Center to accommodate a service station	Reduce commercial on both Rolling Green and Bald Hill Garden Center by 75%. Road to housing should have no commercial buildings on it.	I would build condos on top of well camouflaged (landscaped) retail/service/restaurant with restricted evening hours; create age restricted housing (preferably duplexes) on the north end of property with space for gardening (raising vegetables), space for a clubhouse, pool and tennis.
Add walking paths allowing pedestrian access from Rosewood Estates and Wickford Highlands.	Add walking paths allowing pedestrian access from Rosewood Estates and Wickford Highlands.	Parking for bicycles would be nice.
Protect the remaining farmland by transferring development rights or some other mechanism.	Lower the density.	I'm mainly interested in a bike trail connecting the Quonset trail with Wickford village Try to keep development concentrated versus sprawling. Find a way to protect what is left of our rural character/famland and also compensate landowners who probably need to take advantage of the increased value of their property for commercial or higher density residential development.
No rotary. Leave a four way traffic light in place	Same as above	I bike and run all over this town and have safety concerns about navigating the rotary as a pedestrian. Please keep a traffic light.
		No Chain Stores! Youth Friendly! Our kids need stuff to do!
		Not sure yet. Keep the open process going...!
maybe a bit more open space but still capturing the feel of being able to get from here to there	ditto	No, I'm one of them and they don't listen anyway!
It's fine to me.	Limit commercial development to smaller footprints.	this road may be destined to be a connector to the south shore - which will mean heavy traffic and speed - this is a factor that must unfortunately be taken into consideration on anything that happens in the area 1.Has a detailed traffic study been conducted for the Rollings Greens proposal yet? The stretch of Route 102 from Oatley's to Route 4 is extremely dangerous and an absolute mess (there was just another major accident there recently). Having a development the scale that has been proposed would have significant traffic impacts in my opinion, and adding one or two lights will not solve the problem. There will be increased traffic entering and leaving the development, bringing more cars to an already congested area. Traffic lights at Rolling Greens would help those cars come on and off Route 102 but by my count there are about a dozen houses that have frontage on 102 - how safe will it be for them to try and pull in or out of their homes? And what about the Mason building? And Plain Road? And Narragansett Bow Hunters? And what about the light at Lang Road - I haven't heard one person who says that light has made the area safer. Will one or more lights for Rolling Greens help or hurt the situation? Who is responsible for major accidents that occur (and they most definitely will) as a result of the developments? 2.I may be wrong, but it seems like a lot of effort is being made to change the zoning and amend the Comprehensive Plan to allow for major developments in an area that has previously been identified as not suitable for something of this scale. The Post Road corridor WELL-DESIGNED SURVEY HOPEFUL THAT WE WILL GET THE INPUT NEEDED