



Comprehensive Development Plan

Shenango Township, Lawrence County, PA

Chapter 11 – Citizen Participation

Previous Planning Efforts - 2004 Lawrence County Comprehensive Plan

These broad community development goals were incorporated into the Lawrence County Comprehensive Plan adopted in 2004. The Shenango Planning Unit consisted of the municipalities within the Shenango Area School District's jurisdiction, Shenango Township and South New Castle Borough.

Shenango Planning Unit – Plan Goals

Community Design

- Promote the general health, safety and welfare of the Shenango Planning Unit residents, and preserve those elements of the planning unit that make it a wholesome environment.

Natural Environment and Open Space

- Promote innovative land use management and building techniques in the region to enhance and preserve the natural environment.

Parks and Recreation

- Encourage adequate recreational opportunities for residents on a local and regional basis.

Greenways

- Develop a greenway system that promotes the preservation of steep slopes, floodplains, wetlands and natural resources identified in the Lawrence County Natural Heritage Inventory.

Historic Preservation

- Encourage new development to be compatible with existing historic structures and/or sites.

Economic Development

- An inventory and database of vacant and under-utilized industrial and commercial structures in the planning unit needs to be created to present a more comprehensive menu of options to potential employers.

Information Technology

- In partnership with the private sector, non-profit organizations and other government entities, the Shenango Planning unit needs to use technology to expand community cohesiveness and to take advantage of technological opportunities, which will enhance public services and make the Planning Unit a model community in use of technology.

Utility Services

- The Shenango Planning Unit should conduct a comprehensive needs assessment to determine what areas would benefit from the introduction and/or expansion of public water and sanitary sewerage.

Transportation

- Prepare corridor design guidelines with standards for signage, building setbacks, underground utilities, landscaping, and combined access points for application to development proposals on land in the State Route 65 corridor.
- Corridor design guidelines based on access, traffic volumes and abutting land use, should be prepared prior to selecting sites for redevelopment within the corridor.

Public Safety

- Promote a safe community by providing the highest quality of public safety services available with first-class equipment and well-trained personnel who are prepared for a wide variety of emergencies, and who serve the community in a personal and effective manner.

Government Relations

- The Shenango Planning Unit should work with the County and the Lawrence County Economic Development Corporation to develop a “prime development sites” database for use as a marketing tool.

Community Facilities and Human Services

- Encourage the provisions of joint services and programs in order to provide for the needs of the community.

Neighborhood Planning

- Promote the organization and enhancement of neighborhoods, and to provide the opportunity for comfortable and well-maintained housing for all citizens.

Focus Group Exercise – July 2015

Strengths/Assets	Weaknesses/Deficiencies
School district	Elderly population
Ease access to Pgh	Lack of public utilities
Ease access to Pgh Airport	Lack of recreation facilities

Land available for development (both business & residential)	Deteriorating infrastructure
Access to public transportation	Lack of jobs/opportunities
Residential loyalty to Twp.	
Access to Pittsburgh & regional areas with greater employment opportunities	(illegible) of infrastructure that (illegible) more road access
School district	Appearance of blight on the primary travel arteries (Rt. 65)
Small town values still visible in neighborhoods	Odd choice of locating industrial park (limited access, etc.)
3 arteries of traffic flow (Rt. 65, Rt. 422 Giant Eagle, Rt. 422 by-pass)	Lack of a centralized community gathering place (e.g. community park – bank side of blighted plaza)
fairly safe	no good shopping areas
good school	area doesn't have high paying jobs
neighborhood feel	need to travel for good work, hospitals, nice restaurants
ease of travel	
3 business corridors	poor appearance retail corridor
excellent school district	aged population
over 100 businesses	Twp. revenue not growing
relatively safe community	no growth/influx of young families/households in Twp.
good police force & emergency services	zoning regulations
(illegible) behind Lawrence Village Plaza	recreation center
	insufficient commercial growth
Location – Roads to Major Highways	Lack of Retail
School System	Sewer & Water
Emergency Services	Too many tax exempt facilities
Tax Rate	No Major Industrial Presence
Sense of Community	Tax Rate
Room for Growth	
School – test scores	Vacant stores – plazas
Schools – grounds	junkyard
residents	community for gathering place for recreation
Land to develop	restaurants
Business corridors	Many Dollar Stores

Taxes	Increase in traffic flow
Access to highways	Jobs in twp.
Emergency services	lack of public utilities
	increase in young households
	utilities
	Exempt facilities – Cascade – CCCTC – Golf Course
School District	lack of commercialism
location	no recreation
safety	stalled growth
rural	limited quality retail
residential well-maintained	no cultural venues
sense of community	infrastructure

Community Survey

Survey Instrument

In the late Spring of 2014, a fifteen (15) category community survey, prepared by the Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee and reviewed by the Board of Supervisors was distributed to 3,100 property owners. This survey response provides “real-time” feedback from residential and business-owning taxpayers on issues of concern in their community. Neutral statements were utilized where attitudes toward broader topics were sought. Further, the format of the survey also provided for individual comments from respondents regarding topics being surveyed while soliciting input on preferred amenities and services. A quadrant map and receipt locator incorporated into the survey facilitates the identification of issues at the neighborhood level. This input supports the drafting of future community development objectives and offers elected officials personal perspectives from Township residents. With 1,182 responses, which equates to a 37.5% return, the survey response is considered excellent and can be assigned a high value.

Response Analysis

Question No. 1 requests information on longevity of residence in the Township. In all four (4) quadrants, A-1 through B-2, the most frequent response ranging from 56.7% in A-1 to 72% in A-2 was “more than 20 years.” This is common in that longtime residents in rural municipalities have purchased homes soon after marriage and raised families, some for generations. The population is much less transient. The highest number of responses was received from the B-1 or northeastern quadrant and the lowest number of responses from the

A-2 or southwestern quadrant where population density is also the lowest. The aggregate average of 64.5% for all quadrants and undetermined quadrant responses is an indication of a population aging in place.

1. How long have you lived in the Township?

	Five or less years	6-10 years	11-20 years	More than 20 years	No Response	Total Responses
A-1	28	36	77	185	0	326
	8.6%	11.0%	23.6%	56.7%	0.0%	100.0%
A-2	9	4	17	77	0	107
	8.4%	3.7%	15.9%	72.0%	0.0%	100.0%
B-1	26	44	51	252	0	373
	7.0%	11.8%	13.7%	67.6%	0.0%	100.0%
B-2	20	20	44	185	1	270
	7.4%	7.4%	16.3%	68.5%	0.4%	100.0%
NR	8	19	14	63	2	106
	7.5%	17.9%	13.2%	59.4%	1.9%	100.0%
Total	91	123	203	762	3	1,182
	7.7%	10.4%	17.2%	64.5%	0.3%	100.0%

Question 2 is informational also and seeks to determine general employment patterns. The aggregate average across all four quadrants and those respondents who did not identify a location, is 80.2% of the total responses recorded indicating they were not employed in Shenango Township. This result demonstrates that the Township can be characterized as a “bedroom community” where most employed persons reside but do not work.

2. Do you work in Shenango Township?

	Yes	No	No Answer	Retired	Total Responses
A-1	48	254	8	16	326
	14.7%	77.9%	2.5%	4.9%	100.0%
A-2	11	91	2	3	107
	10.3%	85.0%	1.9%	2.8%	100.0%
B-1	53	296	11	13	373
	14.2%	79.4%	2.9%	3.5%	100.0%
B-2	38	226	3	3	270
	14.1%	83.7%	1.1%	1.1%	100.0%
NR	16	81	6	3	106
	15.1%	76.4%	5.7%	2.8%	100.0%
Total	166	948	30	38	1,182

	14.0%	80.2%	2.5%	3.2%	100.0%
--	--------------	--------------	-------------	-------------	---------------

Question No. 3 asks about population age ranges and provides further documentation that a plurality of household occupants are aged 56 and over. Each quadrant's total response percentage was within several percentage points of each other with the B-1 and A-1 northern quadrants reporting the highest number of persons in that age range at 358 and 315 respectively. An important point to note was that households with school-aged children represented an aggregate total of 18% of responses while households with persons in the 19-35 year range ranked last at 14%. This could confirm the region-wide trend of working couple families with no children, an increase in persons in that age range attending college or in the military, single parent households, or the lack of employment opportunities. Most likely, it is a combination of several or all characteristics noted.

3. Number of persons in your household by age:

	< 18	19-35	36-55	56 >	No Answer	Total Responses
A-1	137	108	180	315	1	741
	18.5%	14.6%	24.3%	42.5%	0.1%	100.0%
A-2	30	32	67	101	4	234
	12.8%	13.7%	28.6%	43.2%	1.7%	100.0%
B-1	165	115	226	358	5	869
	19.0%	13.2%	26.0%	41.2%	0.6%	100.0%
B-2	120	97	171	272	4	664
	18.1%	14.6%	25.8%	41.0%	0.6%	100.0%
NR	19	14	28	47	4	112
	17.0%	12.5%	25.0%	42.0%	3.6%	100.0%
Total	471	366	672	1093	18	2,620
	18.0%	14.0%	25.6%	41.7%	0.7%	100.0%

Question No. 4 is an interactive inquiry regarding concerns about local neighborhoods. Respondents were asked to choose three (3) of six (6) characteristics the Steering Committee selected as commonly perceived issues. The aggregate percentages of all quadrants and undetermined quadrants reveal that deteriorating infrastructure is the chief concern (23.1%), with traffic safety (19.8%) and crime (19.8%) a close second and third. Respondents in the A-1, A-2 and B-3 quadrant ranked deteriorating infrastructure as the most pressing concern, with crime second. Respondents in the B-1 quadrant ranked traffic safety first and deteriorating businesses second. Deteriorating housing was the least selected concern and the "other"

category was only selected by about 5% of respondents, so the issues chosen by the Steering Committee were legitimate.

The comments provided by respondents added another dimension to this inquiry. As indicated by their selections, respondents in the A-1 quadrant referenced Lawrence Village Plaza and Morrone's Auto Wrecking site as concerns mentioned frequently and drugs and drug houses were also noted. On the other hand, there were positive comments like "nice place to live" and "nothing." Respondents in the A-2 quadrant mentioned maintenance of roadways as a concern and B-2 quadrant respondents echoed that concern as well as junk yards and stormwater drainage. In the B-2 quadrant respondents mentioned the lack of businesses, and business property maintenance as concerns. Respondents not indicating a quadrant also mentioned roadway maintenance, lack of road drainage and junk cars as concerns.

4. What most concerns you about the neighborhood in which you live? Please check three (3).

	Traffic safety	Crime	Deteriorating housing	Deteriorating businesses	Deteriorating infrastructure	Other	Total Responses
A-1	135	144	91	135	160	24	689
	19.6%	20.9%	13.2%	19.6%	23.2%	3.5%	100.0%
A-2	45	47	27	43	53	15	230
	19.6%	20.4%	11.7%	18.7%	23.0%	6.5%	100.0%
B-1	177	151	88	173	170	51	810
	21.9%	18.6%	10.9%	21.4%	21.0%	6.3%	100.0%
B-2	90	105	91	100	140	33	559
	16.1%	18.8%	16.3%	17.9%	25.0%	5.9%	100.0%
NR	39	38	29	7	43	5	161
	24.2%	23.6%	18.0%	4.3%	26.7%	3.1%	100.0%
Total	486	485	326	458	566	128	2,449
	19.8%	19.8%	13.3%	18.7%	23.1%	5.2%	100.0%

Question No. 5 was another interactive inquiry regarding preferred businesses and services. The overwhelming response was the need for a grocery store, sit-down restaurants, and additional businesses. These responses dominated comments received from respondents in all four quadrants, however this question had a significant non-response result with 300 of 1,182 surveys (25.4%) returned unanswered.

No Answer:	
A-1	95
A-2	31
B-1	67
B-2	69

5. What personal services or businesses are most needed for the Township's residents?

NR	38
Total	300

At No. 6 a neutral statement was provided for respondents to express agreement or disagreement. The statement suggests a balance between the Township's rural assets and development should be preserved. More than 7 out of 10 respondents in all four (4) quadrants and undetermined quadrants agreed with that policy of growth management.

6. Preserving a balance between rural character and modern convenience is a priority.

	Agree	Disagree	Not Sure	No Answer	Total Responses
A-1	234	36	52	4	326
	71.8%	11.0%	16.0%	1.2%	100.0%
A-2	75	8	22	2	107
	70.1%	7.5%	20.6%	1.9%	100.0%
B-1	268	32	67	6	373
	71.8%	8.6%	18.0%	1.6%	100.0%
B-2	198	29	36	7	270
	73.3%	10.7%	13.3%	2.6%	100.0%
NR	69	10	23	4	106
	65.1%	9.4%	21.7%	3.8%	100.0%
Total	844	115	200	23	1,182
	71.4%	9.7%	16.9%	1.9%	100.0%

No. 7 on the survey dealt with the type of housing most needed in the Township. A five (5) point range of responses was provided in order to assess attitudes on this issue at the neighborhood level. Three of four quadrants, A-1, B-1 and B-2 respondents ranked housing for seniors in the three to four range or mid to low, while A-2 and no designated quadrant ranked senior housing in the one to two range or high priority. Across the board, respondents in all quadrants ranked housing for young families in the one to two range or high priority as well as single family homes in all price ranges. Single family homes also received the highest aggregate percentage (37.1%) of responses at number one, which demonstrates a clear preference Township-wide.

Condominiums, townhomes and carriage homes received a mid to low three to four range response from the A-1 and B-1 quadrants and a low priority four to five range response from the A-2 and B-2 quadrants. This distinguishes the northern quadrants from the southern quadrants as multi-family housing in any configuration was not considered a priority in the southern half of the Township. Rental housing was ranked low in the four to five range across

the board and the number five ranking, at 51.4% was the highest aggregate percentage of any response indicating a negative perception regarding this housing option.

7. Please mark the type of housing you think is most needed in the Township. Please rank the following from 1 to 5 with 1 being the most needed and 5 the least, using all numbers 1 through 5.

Housing designed for or geared toward senior citizens.								
	1	2	3	4	5	NR	✓	Total
A-1	65	44	85	64	20	42	6	326
	19.9%	13.5%	26.1%	19.6%	6.1%	12.9%	1.8%	100.0%
A-2	30	8	25	11	7	21	5	107
	28.0%	7.5%	23.4%	10.3%	6.5%	19.6%	4.7%	100.0%
B-1	62	50	83	69	43	54	12	373
	16.6%	13.4%	22.3%	18.5%	11.5%	14.5%	3.2%	100.0%
B-2	46	34	58	46	28	50	8	270
	17.0%	12.6%	21.5%	17.0%	10.4%	18.5%	3.0%	100.0%
NR	20	16	17	13	4	25	11	106
	18.9%	15.1%	16.0%	12.3%	3.8%	23.6%	10.4%	100.0%
Total	223	152	268	203	102	192	42	1,182
	18.9%	12.9%	22.7%	17.2%	8.6%	16.2%	3.6%	100.0%
Housing designed for or geared toward younger families								
	1	2	3	4	5	NR	✓	Total
A-1	68	92	67	31	13	45	10	326
	20.9%	28.2%	20.6%	9.5%	4.0%	13.8%	3.1%	100.0%
A-2	18	26	18	14	5	23	3	107
	16.8%	24.3%	16.8%	13.1%	4.7%	21.5%	2.8%	100.0%
B-1	79	95	63	48	20	60	8	373
	21.2%	25.5%	16.9%	12.9%	5.4%	16.1%	2.1%	100.0%
B-2	52	74	47	25	14	50	8	270
	19.3%	27.4%	17.4%	9.3%	5.2%	18.5%	3.0%	100.0%
NR	22	16	15	9	4	35	5	106
	20.8%	15.1%	14.2%	8.5%	3.8%	33.0%	4.7%	100.0%
Total	239	303	210	127	56	213	34	1,182
	20.2%	25.6%	17.8%	10.7%	4.7%	18.0%	2.9%	100.0%
Single family homes in all price ranges								
	1	2	3	4	5	NR	✓	Total
A-1	137	68	36	20	11	28	26	326
	42.0%	20.9%	11.0%	6.1%	3.4%	8.6%	8.0%	100.0%
A-2	18	26	18	14	5	23	3	107
	16.8%	24.3%	16.8%	13.1%	4.7%	21.5%	2.8%	100.0%
B-1	139	88	42	19	17	43	25	373

	37.3%	23.6%	11.3%	5.1%	4.6%	11.5%	6.7%	100.0%
B-2	110	41	36	17	11	30	25	270
	40.7%	15.2%	13.3%	6.3%	4.1%	11.1%	9.3%	100.0%
NR	34	11	18	2	3	26	12	106
	32.1%	10.4%	17.0%	1.9%	2.8%	24.5%	11.3%	100.0%
Total	438	234	150	72	47	150	91	1,182
	37.1%	19.8%	12.7%	6.1%	4.0%	12.7%	7.7%	100.0%
Condominium, townhome, or carriage homes in all price ranges								
	1	2	3	4	5	NR	✓	Total
A-1	25	32	76	87	51	51	4	326
	7.7%	9.8%	23.3%	26.7%	15.6%	15.6%	1.2%	100.0%
A-2	9	10	16	22	21	23	6	107
	8.4%	9.3%	15.0%	20.6%	19.6%	21.5%	5.6%	100.0%
B-1	27	51	85	88	51	64	7	373
	7.2%	13.7%	22.8%	23.6%	13.7%	17.2%	1.9%	100.0%
B-2	23	30	46	58	55	57	1	270
	8.5%	11.1%	17.0%	21.5%	20.4%	21.1%	0.4%	100.0%
NR	9	5	14	17	22	29	10	106
	8.5%	4.7%	13.2%	16.0%	20.8%	27.4%	9.4%	100.0%
Total	93	128	237	272	200	224	28	1,182
	7.9%	10.8%	20.1%	23.0%	16.9%	19.0%	2.4%	100.0%
Rental housing								
	1	2	3	4	5	NR	✓	Total
A-1	23	12	14	27	190	55	5	326
	7.1%	3.7%	4.3%	8.3%	58.3%	16.9%	1.5%	100.0%
A-2	4	7	7	16	46	22	5	107
	3.7%	6.5%	6.5%	15.0%	43.0%	20.6%	4.7%	100.0%
B-1	18	21	26	34	206	64	4	373
	4.8%	5.6%	7.0%	9.1%	55.2%	17.2%	1.1%	100.0%
B-2	12	17	21	31	130	55	4	270
	4.4%	6.3%	7.8%	11.5%	48.1%	20.4%	1.5%	100.0%
NR	8	5	7	10	36	34	6	106
	7.5%	4.7%	6.6%	9.4%	34.0%	32.1%	5.7%	100.0%
Total	65	62	75	118	608	230	24	1,182
	5.5%	5.2%	6.3%	10.0%	51.4%	19.5%	2.0%	100.0%

With Question No. 8, respondents were asked to identify the Township's most positive characteristics on a scale of one to eight. A menu of eight characteristics was provided as a method of prioritizing values. At the highest percentage of one and two rankings, the

Shenango Area School District was the clear preference at a combined 64.5% response from all four quadrants and undetermined quadrants combined. Access to highways was identified as a definite positive as 49.9% combined from all four quadrants and undetermined quadrants gave it a one or two ranking. At the other end of the value scale, parks, recreation and open space was ranked lowest with combined responses from all four quadrants and undetermined quadrants in the six through eight range of 48.1%, followed by road maintenance at 44.1% from all four quadrants and undetermined quadrants. The southern quadrant respondents A-2 and B-2 ranked road maintenance lower than the parks, recreation and open space category with 39.2% and 37.8% respectively in the seven to eight range indicating a strong negative attitude.

Another positive was recorded regarding property values with a combined range of one through three selected by 57.5% of respondents in all four quadrants and undetermined quadrants. Emergency services were ranked medium to high with respondents in the A-1, A-2 and B-2 providing three to four range responses, while B-1 quadrant respondents ranked these services in the one and two range. Township services were ranked medium to low with all four quadrants selecting a five to six range value. With 74.4% of respondents providing no value selection (NA or No Answer), the characteristics surveyed most likely represented commonly perceived attributes. Comments received included low taxes, businesses, and the community atmosphere.

8. What are Shenango Township's most positive characteristics? Please rank the following from 1 to 8 with 1 being the most positive and 8 being the least, using all numbers 1 through 8.

Property values											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	NA	✓	Total
A-1	66	52	73	39	25	18	10	10	26	7	326
	20.2%	16.0%	22.4%	12.0%	7.7%	5.5%	3.1%	3.1%	8.0%	2.1%	100.0%
A-2	29	16	11	9	9	7	5	1	16	4	107
	27.1%	15.0%	10.3%	8.4%	8.4%	6.5%	4.7%	0.9%	15.0%	3.7%	100.0%
B-1	74	74	83	41	27	14	9	5	44	2	373
	19.8%	19.8%	22.3%	11.0%	7.2%	3.8%	2.4%	1.3%	11.8%	0.5%	100.0%
B-2	51	64	42	39	19	19	3	2	28	3	270
	18.9%	23.7%	15.6%	14.4%	7.0%	7.0%	1.1%	0.7%	10.4%	1.1%	100.0%
NR	19	14	12	6	7	10	2	9	26	1	106
	17.9%	13.2%	11.3%	5.7%	6.6%	9.4%	1.9%	8.5%	24.5%	0.9%	100.0%
Total	239	220	221	134	87	68	29	27	140	17	1,182
	20.2%	18.6%	18.7%	11.3%	7.4%	5.8%	2.5%	2.3%	11.8%	1.4%	100.0%
Access to highways											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	NA	✓	Total
A-1	96	83	52	21	12	10	13	8	21	10	326

	29.4%	25.5%	16.0%	6.4%	3.7%	3.1%	4.0%	2.5%	6.4%	3.1%	100.0%
A-2	26	13	21	9	7	7	5	1	14	4	107
	24.3%	12.1%	19.6%	8.4%	6.5%	6.5%	4.7%	0.9%	13.1%	3.7%	100.0%
B-1	117	87	54	39	10	15	7	7	27	10	373
	31.4%	23.3%	14.5%	10.5%	2.7%	4.0%	1.9%	1.9%	7.2%	2.7%	100.0%
B-2	73	42	63	21	15	18	10	2	21	5	270
	27.0%	15.6%	23.3%	7.8%	5.6%	6.7%	3.7%	0.7%	7.8%	1.9%	100.0%
NR	38	15	5	9	4	5	2	5	21	2	106
	35.8%	14.2%	4.7%	8.5%	3.8%	4.7%	1.9%	4.7%	19.8%	1.9%	100.0%
Total	350	240	195	99	48	55	37	23	104	31	1,182
	29.6%	20.3%	16.5%	8.4%	4.1%	4.7%	3.1%	1.9%	8.8%	2.6%	100.0%
Road maintenance											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	NA	✓	Total
A-1	30	8	28	47	46	51	48	32	35	1	326
	9.2%	2.5%	8.6%	14.4%	14.1%	15.6%	14.7%	9.8%	10.7%	0.3%	100.0%
A-2	6	4	4	12	7	17	21	21	14	1	107
	5.6%	3.7%	3.7%	11.2%	6.5%	15.9%	19.6%	19.6%	13.1%	0.9%	100.0%
B-1	7	27	26	49	61	58	66	36	41	2	373
	1.9%	7.2%	7.0%	13.1%	16.4%	15.5%	17.7%	9.7%	11.0%	0.5%	100.0%
B-2	16	11	15	36	26	32	55	47	31	1	270
	5.9%	4.1%	5.6%	13.3%	9.6%	11.9%	20.4%	17.4%	11.5%	0.4%	100.0%
NR	11	8	8	6	11	10	10	18	22	2	106
	10.4%	7.5%	7.5%	5.7%	10.4%	9.4%	9.4%	17.0%	20.8%	1.9%	100.0%
Total	70	58	81	150	151	168	200	154	143	7	1,182
	5.9%	4.9%	6.9%	12.7%	12.8%	14.2%	16.9%	13.0%	12.1%	0.6%	100.0%
Twp. services											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	NA	✓	Total
A-1	26	20	30	52	55	72	22	12	35	2	326
	8.0%	6.1%	9.2%	16.0%	16.9%	22.1%	6.7%	3.7%	10.7%	0.6%	100.0%
A-2	5	6	10	12	18	19	8	4	24	1	107
	4.7%	5.6%	9.3%	11.2%	16.8%	17.8%	7.5%	3.7%	22.4%	0.9%	100.0%
B-1	21	30	27	44	77	76	34	17	45	2	373
	5.6%	8.0%	7.2%	11.8%	20.6%	20.4%	9.1%	4.6%	12.1%	0.5%	100.0%
B-2	11	21	20	37	60	43	28	15	35	0	270
	4.1%	7.8%	7.4%	13.7%	22.2%	15.9%	10.4%	5.6%	13.0%	0.0%	100.0%
NR	11	6	12	10	17	8	6	7	28	1	106
	10.4%	5.7%	11.3%	9.4%	16.0%	7.5%	5.7%	6.6%	26.4%	0.9%	100.0%
Total	74	83	99	155	227	218	98	55	167	6	1,182
	6.3%	7.0%	8.4%	13.1%	19.2%	18.4%	8.3%	4.7%	14.1%	0.5%	100.0%

School District											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	NA	✓	Total
A-1	155	82	25	14	6	2	8	6	18	10	326
	47.5%	25.2%	7.7%	4.3%	1.8%	0.6%	2.5%	1.8%	5.5%	3.1%	100.0%
A-2	43	18	7	8	2	5	3	2	15	4	107
	40.2%	16.8%	6.5%	7.5%	1.9%	4.7%	2.8%	1.9%	14.0%	3.7%	100.0%
B-1	154	75	43	20	16	10	11	9	28	7	373
	41.3%	20.1%	11.5%	5.4%	4.3%	2.7%	2.9%	2.4%	7.5%	1.9%	100.0%
B-2	133	50	22	13	8	9	6	4	19	6	270
	49.3%	18.5%	8.1%	4.8%	3.0%	3.3%	2.2%	1.5%	7.0%	2.2%	100.0%
NR	37	15	9	5	6	2	4	4	22	2	106
	34.9%	14.2%	8.5%	4.7%	5.7%	1.9%	3.8%	3.8%	20.8%	1.9%	100.0%
Total	522	240	106	60	38	28	32	25	102	29	1,182
	44.2%	20.3%	9.0%	5.1%	3.2%	2.4%	2.7%	2.1%	8.6%	2.5%	100.0%
Emergency services											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	NA	✓	Total
A-1	47	41	48	62	44	32	10	6	32	4	326
	14.4%	12.6%	14.7%	19.0%	13.5%	9.8%	3.1%	1.8%	9.8%	1.2%	100.0%
A-2	12	14	13	21	11	9	4	1	21	1	107
	11.2%	13.1%	12.1%	19.6%	10.3%	8.4%	3.7%	0.9%	19.6%	0.9%	100.0%
B-1	52	52	46	75	46	38	13	4	44	3	373
	13.9%	13.9%	12.3%	20.1%	12.3%	10.2%	3.5%	1.1%	11.8%	0.8%	100.0%
B-2	34	34	40	50	34	17	15	11	33	2	270
	12.6%	12.6%	14.8%	18.5%	12.6%	6.3%	5.6%	4.1%	12.2%	0.7%	100.0%
NR	19	9	10	12	9	13	2	6	25	1	106
	17.9%	8.5%	9.4%	11.3%	8.5%	12.3%	1.9%	5.7%	23.6%	0.9%	100.0%
Total	164	150	157	220	144	109	44	28	155	11	1,182
	13.9%	12.7%	13.3%	18.6%	12.2%	9.2%	3.7%	2.4%	13.1%	0.9%	100.0%
Parks, rec. & open space											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	NA	✓	Total
A-1	17	9	18	30	44	44	89	34	39	2	326
	5.2%	2.8%	5.5%	9.2%	13.5%	13.5%	27.3%	10.4%	12.0%	0.6%	100.0%
A-2	9	7	13	5	13	10	23	6	16	5	107
	8.4%	6.5%	12.1%	4.7%	12.1%	9.3%	21.5%	5.6%	15.0%	4.7%	100.0%
B-1	13	9	26	30	45	55	116	29	47	3	373
	3.5%	2.4%	7.0%	8.0%	12.1%	14.7%	31.1%	7.8%	12.6%	0.8%	100.0%
B-2	15	15	15	23	36	53	52	24	37	0	270
	5.6%	5.6%	5.6%	8.5%	13.3%	19.6%	19.3%	8.9%	13.7%	0.0%	100.0%
NR	13	6	6	6	12	7	18	9	28	1	106
	12.3%	5.7%	5.7%	5.7%	11.3%	6.6%	17.0%	8.5%	26.4%	0.9%	100.0%
Total	67	46	78	94	150	169	298	102	167	11	1,182

	5.7%	3.9%	6.6%	8.0%	12.7%	14.3%	25.2%	8.6%	14.1%	0.9%	100.0%
Other											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	NA	✓	Total
A-1	3	2	1	1	4	6	10	55	243	1	326
	0.9%	0.6%	0.3%	0.3%	1.2%	1.8%	3.1%	16.9%	74.5%	0.3%	100.0%
A-2	0	0	0	1	0	0	9	12	85	0	107
	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	8.4%	11.2%	79.4%	0.0%	100.0%
B-1	4	1	3	5	6	2	9	63	274	6	373
	1.1%	0.3%	0.8%	1.3%	1.6%	0.5%	2.4%	16.9%	73.5%	1.6%	100.0%
B-2	3	4	3	3	5	10	8	33	197	4	270
	1.1%	1.5%	1.1%	1.1%	1.9%	3.7%	3.0%	12.2%	73.0%	1.5%	100.0%
NR	2	0	0	1	1	6	5	8	80	3	106
	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.9%	5.7%	4.7%	7.5%	75.5%	2.8%	100.0%
Total	12	7	7	11	16	24	41	171	879	14	1,182
	1.0%	0.6%	0.6%	0.9%	1.4%	2.0%	3.5%	14.5%	74.4%	1.2%	100.0%

At No. 9, a neutral statement regarding encouraging business development was included to which 81% of respondents from all four quadrants and undetermined quadrants answered in the affirmative. This should translate into flexible regulations for land use options in commercial zoning districts.

9. Shenango Township should encourage more business development.

	Agree	Disagree	Not Sure	No Answer	Total Responses
A-1	287	12	22	5	326
	88.0%	3.7%	6.7%	1.5%	100.0%
A-2	99	4	4	0	107
	92.5%	3.7%	3.7%	0.0%	100.0%
B-1	337	6	29	1	373
	90.3%	1.6%	7.8%	0.3%	100.0%
B-2	151	79	37	3	270
	55.9%	29.3%	13.7%	1.1%	100.0%
NR	83	3	15	5	106
	78.3%	2.8%	14.2%	4.7%	100.0%
Total	957	104	107	14	1,182
	81.0%	8.8%	9.1%	1.2%	100.0%

No. 10, also a neutral statement, seeks a response regarding the extension of public water lines into unserved areas of the Township. A positive response was recorded for 55.4% of respondents in all quadrants and undetermined quadrants, while 23.7% were unsure.

10. Extension of public water lines should be considered in areas within the Township.

	Agree	Disagree	Not Sure	No Answer	Total Responses
A-1	197	40	83	6	326
	60.4%	12.3%	25.5%	1.8%	100.0%
A-2	60	22	22	3	107
	56.1%	20.6%	20.6%	2.8%	100.0%
B-1	208	58	102	5	373
	55.8%	15.5%	27.3%	1.3%	100.0%
B-2	144	83	40	3	270
	53.3%	30.7%	14.8%	1.1%	100.0%
NR	46	17	33	10	106
	43.4%	16.0%	31.1%	9.4%	100.0%
Total	655	220	280	27	1,182
	55.4%	18.6%	23.7%	2.3%	100.0%

Question No. 11 asks if the Township should provide additional public recreation facilities. Across all four quadrants and undetermined quadrants, respondents answered yes at a 73.7% rate. The related follow-up question sought to identify preferred facilities and the Steering Committee provided a menu of ten (10) options as choices. As there were no instructions to select any number of facilities listed, the frequency of response to each option indicates the preference of respondents overall. In order, the following facilities were selected: hiking/walking trails 592 responses; picnic areas 500 responses; swimming pool 499 responses; bicycle paths 467 responses; and playgrounds 452 responses.

Soccer and baseball fields (234), an ice rink (188), a skate park (131), deck hockey (83) and other facilities (63) were selected by fewer respondents. Comments received relating to this survey topic included dog and pet parks, indoor facility (gym, Y-zone), bowling and tennis courts.

11. Would you like to see additional recreation facilities developed by the Township?

	Yes	No	No Answer	Total Responses
A-1	252	63	11	326
	77.3%	19.3%	3.4%	100.0%
A-2	77	28	2	107
	72.0%	26.2%	1.9%	100.0%
B-1	285	77	11	373
	76.4%	20.6%	2.9%	100.0%
B-2	180	79	11	270

	66.7%	29.3%	4.1%	100.0%
NR	77	23	6	106
	72.6%	21.7%	5.7%	100.0%
Total	871	270	41	1,182
	73.7%	22.8%	3.5%	100.0%

If you answered yes, what types of facilities would you like developed?

Picnic areas	A1	A2	B1	B2	NR	Total	Swimming pool	A1	A2	B1	B2	NR	Total
	149	54	156	97	44	500		150	44	176	88	41	499
Playgrounds	A1	A2	B1	B2	NR	Total	Ice rink	A1	A2	B1	B2	NR	Total
	128	38	150	95	41	452		51	18	62	40	17	188
Hiking/walking trails	A1	A2	B1	B2	NR	Total	Deck hockey	A1	A2	B1	B2	NR	Total
	168	54	202	116	52	592		22	8	29	17	7	83
Bicycle paths	A1	A2	B1	B2	NR	Total	Skate park	A1	A2	B1	B2	NR	Total
	139	33	165	92	38	467		42	11	42	22	14	131
Soccer, baseball	A1	A2	B1	B2	NR	Total	Other	A1	A2	B1	B2	NR	Total
	70	20	86	41	17	234		17	3	21	14	8	63

Respondents were asked to agree or disagree with a neutral statement at No. 12 regarding Township officials response to resident's concerns. The highest percentage from all four quadrants and undetermined quadrants (42.9%) was the "not sure" option, which likely indicates that respondents have had no interaction with Township officials. However, respondents in the northern quadrants A-1 and B-1 agreed more than disagreed with the statement while respondents in the southern quadrants provided an opposite result, disagreeing more than agreeing at about the same ratio. In the aggregate, the percentage of respondents from all quadrants and undetermined quadrants who agreed with the statement (28.3%) exceeded those who disagreed (24.8%) by about 3.5%, which indicates a somewhat divergent attitude, depending on location.

12. Shenango Township officials are responsive to residents' concerns.

	Agree	Disagree	Not Sure	No Answer	Total Responses
A-1	102	74	142	8	326
	31.3%	22.7%	43.6%	2.5%	100.0%
A-2	22	33	50	2	107
	20.6%	30.8%	46.7%	1.9%	100.0%
B-1	112	82	169	10	373
	30.0%	22.0%	45.3%	2.7%	100.0%

B-2	67	85	115	3	270
	24.8%	31.5%	42.6%	1.1%	100.0%
NR	32	19	31	24	106
	30.2%	17.9%	29.2%	22.6%	100.0%
Total	335	293	507	47	1,182
	28.3%	24.8%	42.9%	4.0%	100.0%

With Question No. 13 the Steering Committee sought to engage respondents on two issues, developing a sense of community and encouraging preferred development. From the menu of six options, clear preferences for a biannual newsletter (529 responses) and special events promotion (439 responses) emerged. Lower numbers chose website improvements and additional public forums.

13. What would you recommend to develop a sense of community and encourage preferred development in Shenango Township?

Biannual newsletter	A1	A2	B1	B2	NR	Total	Special events promotion	A1	A2	B1	B2	NR	Total
	155	46	170	116	42	529		124	42	148	99	26	439
Website improvement	A1	A2	B1	B2	NR	Total	Additional public forums	A1	A2	B1	B2	NR	Total
	83	24	91	67	10	275		64	26	96	62	18	266
No Answer	A1	A2	B1	B2	NR	Total	Other	A1	A2	B1	B2	NR	Total
	36	16	43	38	42	175		4	0	7	5	0	16

At No. 14, a neutral statement relating to zoning and preferred land uses was included in the survey. Three categories of development were provided, commercial development, residential development and industrial development. The threshold response which indicates action, relates to revising or amending the current zoning ordinance to which the overwhelming response from each quadrant was yes for all three options. The category commercial development resulted in an aggregate average percentage of 69.1% yes to 12.6% no across the four quadrants. The residential development category resulted in an aggregate average percentage of 56.5% yes to 15.7% no, and the industrial development category resulted in an aggregate average percentage of 45.8% yes to 26.8% no. As is evident through the comments received, additional commercial, service and entertainment facilities are well supported by respondents Township-wide.

14. The present zoning districts should be revised to permit additional:

	Yes					No					No Answer				
	A1	A2	B1	B2	NR	A1	A2	B1	B2	NR	A1	A2	B1	B2	NR
Commercial Development	227	73	256	189	45	47	10	39	44	13	52	24	78	37	48
	69.6	68.2	68.6	70.0	42.5	14.4	9.3	10.5	16.3	12.3	16.0	22.4	20.9	13.7	45.3
Residential Development	197	56	209	155	43	42	19	55	47	7	87	32	109	68	56
	60.4	52.3	56.0	57.4	40.6	12.9	17.8	14.7	17.4	6.6	26.7	29.9	29.2	25.2	52.8
Industrial Development	145	45	170	138	28	89	27	103	74	20	92	35	100	58	58
	44.5	42.1	45.6	51.1	26.4	27.3	25.2	27.6	27.4	18.9	28.2	32.7	26.8	21.5	54.7

Finally, respondents were asked to indicate the reason they chose to live in Shenango Township. The Steering Committee provided six (6) options from which to choose. Three responses drew similar results, public schools with 492 ranked first, rural character with 473 responses ranked second and housing options with 406 ranked third. This final inquiry demonstrates that the Township's assets are its public schools, rural character, and residential neighborhoods.

15. Why did you choose to live in Shenango Township?

Housing options	A1	A2	B1	B2	NR	Total	Rural character	A1	A2	B1	B2	NR	Total
	115	38	139	71	43	406		121	46	143	133	30	473
Employment	A1	A2	B1	B2	NR	Total	Tax rates	A1	A2	B1	B2	NR	Total
	29	3	21	10	4	67		66	19	56	35	8	184
Public schools	A1	A2	B1	B2	NR	Total	Other	A1	A2	B1	B2	NR	Total
	153	37	151	124	27	492		48	16	57	31	16	168
No Answer	A1	A2	B1	B2	NR	Total	Born Here:	A1	A2	B1	B2	NR	Total
	4	6	8	1	13	32		22	11	35	23	8	99

Summary and Conclusions

As discussed at several work sessions, there are divergent opportunities as well as deficiencies that are a part of the socio-economic fabric of life in Shenango Township. The Western Pennsylvania region is slowly but steadily recovering from a second period of crippling economic conditions in thirty (30) years). The first in the early 1980's with the collapse of the steel manufacturing industry, the second, with the recent housing/credit crisis promulgated by risky bank loans. Through it all rural communities with access to urban employment centers have managed to maintain basic service delivery and some have experienced both residential and commercial growth.

At the outset of the community planning process in Shenango Township, Steering Committee members sought to define the role of their community within the region. Comparisons utilizing primary and secondary source data were made to growth areas where local governments have engaged in pro-active planning to improve the business climate as well as provide the necessary infrastructure support for a variety of quality residential and nonresidential development opportunities. The Township has recognizable assets that have the potential to attract new development if encouraged and supported. The key is to establish realistic objectives and consistently work toward achieving those objectives.

Results of the survey indicate the need for additional businesses in the northern quadrants within the US 422 corridor and in the southeastern quadrant within the SR 65 corridor where existing or planned infrastructure improvements can support new infill development. Specifically, respondents would support additional grocery stores, supermarkets, or similar businesses providing staples, fresh produce, meat and dairy products. Restaurants were also identified as a need, as were indoor and outdoor recreation and entertainment facilities. While respondents indicated a desire to frequent these businesses, market conditions will still dictate their development. However, local land use regulations can be adopted which will facilitate the approval of such development proposals.

Roadway maintenance in the southern quadrant was also identified as a deficiency. The fact that limited development has occurred in areas where extractive industries were dominant at one time and agricultural production is still active means that transportation improvements are not a priority in the southwestern quadrant. This area could benefit from the introduction of agribusiness options through more flexible land use regulations. Preserving the rural character was a common theme occurring throughout the survey, so balancing the introduction of small scale agriculturally related businesses should be done carefully.

There is opportunity to encourage commercial development in high volume corridors which in turn will generate increased tax revenues to lessen the individual tax burden on residential property owners. In addition, increased tax revenues and matching grant programs

or low interest infrastructure loans could be utilized to provide transportation improvements and stimulate the introduction of public utilities in identified growth areas.

Consideration of an approach several communities in the region have taken to attract sustainable development is the establishment of architectural and site design standards. These community-oriented objectives help to set a standard for attractive and value-added construction that most developers are willing to accept if given incentives. These incentives are often a reduction in required parking spaces, additional lot coverage by buildings or a relaxation of restrictive advertising sign regulations. Together with landscaping and lighting plans, new developments, changes of occupancy or expansions and additions to existing facilities can be made more attractive and induce infill development while increasing property values. Township officials should consider the planning objectives while weighing the practical impacts of establishing these types of design standards. It is a discussion worth having.

Conclusion

Marketing the Township's assets through a broadly distributed newsletter and better internet presence will increase its profile in the region. A portion of the annual budget should be committed to these activities when economic conditions permit. These strategies are not financially onerous and the investment could produce results in the near future. It is important to demonstrate to residents and businesses that Shenango Township is moving forward with more support for development in appropriate areas and is intent on protecting residential neighborhoods while encouraging additional residential development in a variety of configurations. Property owners will hold Township officials accountable for future initiatives to improve the overall quality of life. Competition for quality development will only increase in the future so it is important to provide the foundation for sustainable growth now.