

2017 Corridor Survey – Written Response Summary

Summary Table

<i>Comment Type</i>	<i>Number</i>
Null	50
Support	47
Aesthetics	21
Roadway Concerns	20
Safety Concerns	18
Funding	18
Restaurant, Retail, and Entertainment	18
Pedestrian and Bicycle Infrastructure	13
Hotel Concerns	12
Green Space	10
Opposed	8
Retail Concerns	6
Multi-Family Concerns	6
Public Transit	5
International Plaza	5
Family Friendly Uses	4
Assisted Living/ Senior Housing	3
Industrial/Business Support	3
Residential Support	2
Other Concerns	19

From the survey, Staff collected 226 written responses supplementing the information provided in prior questions. Some of these responses were simple comments, while others were longer paragraphs covering multiple topics. These responses have been generalized into multiple categories in order to analyze which issues were most important to survey respondents. Due to the multi-topic nature of many responses, the total number of comments exceeds the total number of responses. The typography of comments, and a brief explanation of the comments covered by their respective categories, is as follows:

2017 Corridor Survey – Written Response Summary

Null/Not Applicable – 50

Comments in this category were blank, or otherwise indicated that it was a null response.

Support – 47

Comments in this category indicated overall support for the plan, the proposal, or that there was a need for improvement in the corridor.

Aesthetics – 21

These comments specifically expressed displeasure at the current aesthetic condition of the corridor or stated that aesthetic improvements were needed. Many focused on the overhead utility lines, or the condition of existing properties and landscaping.

Roadway Concerns – 20

These comments concerned traffic and roadway design concerns, primarily focused on the impact proposed changes (namely the proposed mid-block traffic signal and landscaped medians) would have on traffic flow. Other comments in this category expressed concern with the existing conditions of the roadway, including ease of turning movements, signage, traffic, and lighting.

Safety Concerns – 18

These comments underscored a concern with security in the corridor. Most comments focused on the aforementioned hotels, while others cited crimes in the area (“armed robbery”, “cars broken into”, and the presence of “riff-raff” were specifically mentioned). Other comments mentioned a lack of traffic safety, and requested better traffic enforcement.

Funding – 18

These comments expressed concern about funding for the project, with the overwhelming majority stating that they would not support an increase in taxes in order to accomplish the goals outlined by the project. One comment specified that they would not support a Special Assessment or TIF District, and another expressed opposition to using the general fund to finance improvements.

Restaurant, Retail, and Entertainment – 18

These comments generally expressed support and desire for additional restaurant, entertainment, and retail establishments on the corridor. Beyond a general wish for more of these establishments, some respondents articulated a desire for a “walking and shopping experience” similar to those afforded by other retail hubs in the Village.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Infrastructure – 13

Comments in this category expressed concerns related to pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, specifically the current lack thereof. A recurring theme in these comments was the lack of a bicycle and pedestrian connection under I-90 to Elk Grove, and an indication that despite the lack of these formal facilities at present many individuals still travel that route, presenting a hazard.

2017 Corridor Survey – Written Response Summary

Hotel Concerns – 12

These comments highlighted opposition to any additional hotel uses being added to the corridor, or expressed displeasure at how existing hotels were being run. The primary reason cited by these respondents was that existing hotels are “seedy”, or that they bring “drugs and prostitution” into the Village. Specific hotels named include Motel 6 and the Red Roof Inn.

Green Space – 10

These comments expressed a desire for additional green space to be incorporated into the corridor. The scale of this desire ranged from coordinated landscaping along the roadway, to the addition of park facilities and plazas.

Opposed – 8

These comments clearly expressed opposition to any changes to the corridor, on the basis of financial cost or citing a lack of necessity.

Retail Concerns – 6

Comments in this category expressed opposition to the addition of new retail uses to the corridor. The common impression shared by these respondents was that there are currently many retail facilities vacant, both along the corridor and in the Village as a whole, and considering market trends this type of use may not be viable. Some respondents suggested greater emphasis on restaurant and/or entertainment uses.

Multi-family Concerns – 6

These comments showed opposition to adding any additional multi-family units. The areas of concern specifically were the impact these units would have on the school districts, on traffic, and the types of units that would be built (for the latter, one respondent stated “no cheap apartments or Section 8”).

Public Transit – 5

These comments related to a desire for increased public transit options. Most expressed a desire for a bus route to and from Downtown, and others suggested that integration with the PACE Bus Rapid Transit line on I-90 through creation of a formal bus stop or park and ride facility.

International Plaza – 5

These comments expressed displeasure at the state of International Plaza specifically, stating that they would like to improvement or demolition of the shopping center.

Family Friendly Uses – 4

These comments specifically mentioned adding “family friendly” use types to the corridor, primarily through business recruitment. Other comments mentioned improving safety (overall and related to transportation) so they would feel safer bringing their children to the area.

2017 Corridor Survey – Written Response Summary

Assisted Living/Senior Housing – 3

These comments mentioned that an assisted living or senior housing facility would be a desired use type on the corridor.

Industrial/Business Support – 3

These comments expressed support for adding additional business or industrial facilities along the corridor, with a focus on the tax-revenue it could generate.

Residential Support – 2

These comments expressed support for adding non-age specific housing to the corridor.

Other Concerns – 19

These comments covered a wide range of topics, many unrelated to the corridor. Comments that did refer to the corridor were not easily generalizable into the other categories, however these observations are listed below:

- “The planning and improvements should go all the way up to Central Road”
- “The Village Design Commission should be part of the review and approval process”
- “For retail, you could build on the big draw to that area, Mitsuwa...this could be an ethnic corridor that draws people from all over”
- “Why doesn’t the Arlington Heights Library put a branch in? The south side has lots of family and low-income [sic] who could benefit from a library branch”
- “I’d love to see some breweries come into the Arlington Heights area”
- “I’d rather have wider lanes in lieu of landscaped islands”