Appendix E

Town of Lisbon Comprehensive Plan Updates

Exhibit C Lisbon Planning and Development Updates: 2009 to 2020

Purpose and Scope of the 10-year Plan Update

A Comprehensive Development Plan for the Town of Lisbon – 2035 was adopted Sept. 14, 2009. It was prepared as part of a joint effort by Lisbon, Waukesha County Parks and Land Use staff, UW Extension staff, and the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, and several other local municipalities. The planning effort involved a county-wide effort and the resulting document contains a wealth of county-wide and local data.

The State comprehensive planning law requires that the Comprehensive Plan be updated at least once every ten years. While a plan "update" is often a substantial re-write of the plan document, with updates to community data and maps, an update may also be a more minimal effort. Guidance from the Wisconsin Department of Administration indicates that, at a minimum, "the local government must go through the process outlined in s. 66.1001(4) to adopt the updated plan or readopt the original plan if it still meets the community's needs." (Source: https://doa.wi.gov/Pages/LocalGovtsGrants/Comprehensive-Planning.aspx)

Progress Made Implementing the 2009 Comprehensive Plan

Carrying out long-range goals, policies, and vision: The 2009 Plan contains several objectives and standards for land development, as well as a Recommended Land Use Map (as may be amended from time to time). For the past decade, Lisbon has used these as a guide when reviewing proposals for new development, particularly proposed zoning map amendments and land divisions (subdivision plats and certified survey maps).

In addition, the 2009 Plan included a "Long Range Vision" exhibit that described Lisbon's planning objectives at that time and the ways that Lisbon could achieve its long-range planning and development goals. It recommended that Lisbon remain a town for the immediate future, and pursue boundary agreements with adjoining municipalities. However, it recognized that boundary agreements have limitations and recommended that Lisbon consider incorporation as a long-term strategy.

Importantly, the long-range vision document recognized that the benefits of incorporation include the ability to maintain municipal borders, and the increased independence in land-use decisions afforded to incorporated municipalities. One of the key recommendations made at that time was the following:

"Keep in mind a long-term goal of incorporation to provide Lisbon with a permanent solution to preserving the borders and identity of the Town. The comprehensive plan and all other land-use decisions should be designed with this goal in mind. Future land-use decisions should contribute toward the Town being better able to meet the statutory requirements for incorporation."

Lisbon has continued to build on the existing agreements and planning efforts it has with neighboring municipalities, as part of its strategy for implementing its long-range Comprehensive Plan. This is described in more detail below.

Page C-1

Boundary adjustments – annexations and detachments: Since 2009, Lisbon's land area has been reduced by approximately 469 acres. Several parcels of land have been detached from the town and attached or annexed to adjacent villages, either at the request of a land owner or triggered by the provisions of an intergovernmental agreement. The current municipal boundaries are reflected in the current Recommended Land Use Map.

Improved intergovernmental cooperation: Lisbon has built on the intergovernmental agreements that existed when the 2009 Comprehensive Plan was adopted. Specifically, new agreements have been forged with the Village of Sussex and the Village of Merton, to clarify and improve long-term plans for municipal boundaries, joint planning areas, and shared municipal services. Key features of these agreements are as follows.

- <u>Village of Merton</u> In 2020, Lisbon and Merton established a new intergovernmental cooperative plan agreement under Wis. Stats. 66.0307. It replaces the former stipulation and order agreement done in 2002 under Wis. Stats. 66.0301 and 66.0225. Key provisions of the new agreement include:
 - Updated future boundary maps that identify the lands that both communities agree are to be transferred to Merton by December 31, 2029, upon the incorporation of the Town, or under specified circumstances such as land owner request;
 - Provisions for shared services and a Shared Services Committee to make recommendations on future shared services, including snow plowing, shared use of a municipal compost site, and
- <u>Village of Sussex</u> In 2020, Lisbon and Sussex established a new boundary agreement under Wis. Stats. 66.0301. It replaces the former stipulation and order agreement done in 2001 under 66.0225. Key provisions of the new agreement include:
 - Updated future boundary maps that identify the lands that both communities agree are to be transferred to Sussex by July 22, 2030, upon the incorporation of the Town, or under specified circumstances such as land owner request;
 - Elimination of Joint Planning Areas and Sussex extraterritorial review jurisdiction for lands in Lisbon, greatly simplifying the development review process for much of the land in Lisbon;
 - Updated design standards for "gateway" areas of mutual interest to both communities; and
 - Agreements for the provision of expanded municipal water and sanitary sewer service areas along key community corridors.

Special Planning Districts removed: In past years, stemming from the 2001 intergovernmental agreement with Sussex, Lisbon had identified "Special Planning Areas" or "Special Planning Districts" where special zoning regulations and design standards were applied. These areas had also been shown on the Recommended Land Use Map. With the new intergovernmental agreement approved in 2020, these Special Planning Areas are no longer necessary.

Amendments to the Recommended Land Use Map: Occasionally, Lisbon receives requests from land owners and developers to amend specific areas on the Comprehensive Plan's Recommended Land Use Map. In the past ten years, Lisbon has approved a handful of map amendments. Land use data current as of September 2020 was used for this Plan Update; the current Recommended Land Use Map is attached to this plan, as may be amended from time to time based on landowner requests and after consideration of the various goals and objectives of the plan.

Page C-2

Development Trends

Since 2009, Lisbon has seen sustained growth and development. In this time, Lisbon has issued 346 permits for new single family homes, an average of 30 building permits per year. There are currently several large subdivisions being built, and more are proposed. The newest residential subdivisions are being built out in the western half of the Town, where most of the remaining developable land is located. Lisbon's neighborhoods, and the businesses and community institutions that serve them, are located throughout the town. Urban and suburban development is generally located on upland areas in between natural resource areas such as rivers, and large-scale quarry operations that provide a substantial employment base, and generally follows major transportation routes.

Based on the pace of development in recent years, the availability of buildable lots, Lisbon's location, and the generally high demand for new homes in the region, the community anticipates this level of building activity to continue in the near term. <u>A majority of the Town of Lisbon is now located within the Adjusted Urbanized Area Boundary pursuant to Map P.1 of SEWRPC's Vision 2050.</u>

In addition to continued residential development, Lisbon maintains a Long Range Plan for Parks and Open Spaces that outlines future park and trail improvements to serve all residents in the community. The park plan inventories existing facilities and identifies improvements that will connect important locations across Lisbon.

In addition, Lisbon is planning a new "town center" along the STH 164 corridor, which would be home to a New Town Hall as well as public space and a mix of <u>housing types and land uses</u>, <u>including</u> commercial and higher-density residential development. This new location will provide a more centrally located municipal and community center<u>in a mixed-use setting</u>, which will provide easier access by more town residents, and will build on ready access to amenities like Lisbon's Community Park and the County Bugline Trail, and utilize the growing network of municipal sewer and water infrastructure.

Comprehensive Update to the Plan Post 2020 Census

The Comprehensive Development Plan for Lisbon should be updated no less than once every 10 years. As is indicated in Chapter 9 Implementation for the Countywide plan, Lisbon intends to conduct a full update of this Plan following the availability of the 2020 Census data. This effort is anticipated to begin in 2022 and conclude in 2023, and will involve a substantial public participation effort. Initiating a comprehensive plan review using 2020 Census data will allow the community to reevaluate the planning projections, and land use tablet referencing update.

CCREASE made in 2009 as part of the process to create the 2035 Comprehensive Development Plan for the Town of Lisbon. Formatted: Highlight

Exhibit G Lisbon Population & Household Updates



*Most of the 2020 Census data was not available at the time of this update.

POPULATION GROWTH BY COMMUNITY: 1970-2020

Communities	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020 DOA Estimate	2020 Census
Town of Lisbon	4,709	8,532	8,277	9,359	10,157	10,564	10,477
Village of Lannon	1,056	987	924	1,009	1,107	1,264	1,355
Village of Merton	646	1,045	1,199	1,926	3,346	3,711	3,441
Village of Sussex	2,758	3,482	5,039	8,828	10,518	11,373	11,487
Village of Menomonee							
Falls	31,697	27,845	26,840	32,647	35,626	38,948	38,527
Village of Richfield	5,923	8,390	8,993	10,373	11,300	11,948	11,739
City of Pewaukee	7,551	8,922	9,621	11,783	13,195	14,775	15,914

Source: U.S. Census Bureau and the Wisconsin Department of Administration

The population data used in the Town of Lisbon's 2009 Comprehensive Master Plan came from the 2000 Census. The Town of Lisbon grew approximately 8.53% from 2000 to 2010, and approximately 11.94% from 2000 to 2020.

Place Type and	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040
Name	Census	Projection	Projection	Projection	Projection	Projection	Projection
T Lisbon	10,157	10,230	10,820	11,340	11,790	11,960	11,920
V Lannon	1,107	1,100	1,150	1,195	1,235	1,240	1,225
V Merton	3,346	3,485	3,825	4,145	4,450	4,645	4,750
V Sussex	10,518	10,820	11,830	12,780	13,670	14,230	14,510
V Menomonee							
Falls	35,626	35,820	37,970	39,840	41,510	42,160	42,060
T Richfield	11,300	11,490	12,220	12,860	13,400	13,580	13,540
C Pewaukee	13,195	13,930	15,310	16,590	17,800	18,580	19,010

POPULATION PROJECTIONS BY COMMUNITY: 2010-2040

Source: Wisconsin Department of Administration

These projections are from 2013 and based on 2010 Census data. These are provided as a placeholder. Eventually, the Department of Administration will prepare new projections based on the 2020 Census data.

HOUSEHOLD PROJECTIONS BY COMMUNITY: 2010-2040

Place Type and Name	2010 Census	2015 Projection	2020 Projection	2025 Projection	2030 Projection	2035 Projection	2040 Projection
T Lisbon	3,174	3,850	4,132	4,385	4,603	4,705	4,722
V Lannon	479	490	520	547	571	577	574
V Merton	1,020	1,094	1,218	1,136	1,448	1,523	1,569
V Sussex	4,039	4,277	4,744	5,190	5,605	5,879	6,036
V Menomonee Falls	14,567	14,802	16,203	17,214	18,104	18,516	18,585
V Richfield	4,170	4,343	4,671	4,973	5,234	5,357	5,374
C Pewaukee	5,410	5,875	6,550	7,186	7,782	8,178	8,416

Source: Wisconsin Department of Administration

Households

The 2015-2019 American Community Survey (ACS) estimate for households in the Town of Lisbon is 4,127. This is consistent with the Wisconsin Department of Administration's 2020 projection of 4,132 households. The number of households in Lisbon grew approximately 30% from 2010 to 2019 (based on the ACS's 2019 estimate).

Household Size

From 2000 to 2010, the average household size declined in the Town of Lisbon from 2.9 to 2.73. The 2015-2019 ACS estimate is even lower, at 2.55 persons per household. A growing population with a decreasing household size has implications for development of housing stock, demand for future water and sanitary sewer capacity, land use, and other utilities and community facilities.

Total Housing Units

The 2019 American Community Survey (ACS) estimate for the total occupied housing units in the Town of Lisbon is 4,169. Of the total housing units, 96.6 percent, or 3,989 were owner-occupied and 138 percent, or 3.3 percent were renter-occupied. The estimated number of vacancies in 2019 was 42 units or 1 percent.

Household Projections: 2040

The number of additional housing units needed in the 2040 plan design year is projected by first selecting a population projection. The number is divided by the projected household size (number of persons per household in 2040). This number is then multiplied by the desired vacancy rate of three (3) percent to determine the total number of housing units needed in the Town of Lisbon. The resulting number of housing units is about 4,872. The number of additional housing units needed between 2019 and 2040 to provide an adequate supply is determined by subtracting the number of housing units in 2019 from the projected number of housing units. The type of housing units that ultimately produce this total should be determined based on household income, age distribution, and household size to best meet the needs of Town residents.



RECOMMENDED LAND USE PLAN FOR TOWN OF LISBON - 2035 (EXHIBIT B)

N

LAND USE PLAN CATEGORIES



Medium Density Residential (6,000 to 19,000 SF of area per dwelling unit)

Low Density Residential (20,000 SF to 1.4 AC of area per dwelling unit)

Suburban Density I Residential (1.5 to 2.9 AC of area per dwelling unit)



Suburban Density II Residential (3.0 to 4.9 AC of area per dwelling uint)

Rural Density and Other Agricultural Land (5.0 to 34.9 acres of area per dwelling unit or equiv. density)



Commercial and Office Park



Industrial

Extractive

Transportation, Communication and Utilities

*Areas designated as 'Other Open Lands to be Preserved' found not to be encumbered by wetlands, floodplains, or soil constraints through updated data may be considered under the adjacent land use plan category or categories.

Prepared and Updated by the Waukesha County Department of Parks and Land Use April 2015. Update by the Town of Lisbon October 6, 2020. Update by the Town of Lisbon _____, 2021.



Secondary Environmental Corridor

Isolated Natural Resource Area





WAUKESHA COUNTY









Chapter 2

TRENDS, ISSUES, OPPORTUNITIES AND PLANNING STANDARDS

INTRODUCTION

Information regarding existing conditions and historic trends with respect to the demographic and economic base, the natural environment, and the man-made environment is essential to the comprehensive planning process. An extensive database has been developed by the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC) pertaining to these and other aspects of the Southeastern Wisconsin Region, updating that database periodically. A major inventory update effort was carried out by SEWRPC in the early 2000's in support of the preparation of new land use and transportation plans and other elements of the comprehensive plan for the Region, including Waukesha County and its municipalities. This chapter presents a summary of the results of that inventory update pertaining to the population, land use, water supply, the natural resource base and the agricultural resource base.

Much of the demographic data in this chapter is from the U.S. Bureau of the Census. This data is collected every ten years and is derived from both short and long form questionnaires. The short form provides a complete count of all persons living in the United States along with over 300 tables with counts and cross tabulations of race, ethnicity, gender, and age data. The long form is sent to 1 out of every 6 households in the United States. It provides sample data for topics related to education, housing, income, and other social and economic issues.

DEMOGRAPHIC AND ECONOMIC BASE

Population Growth by County

In 1930, Dodge and Waukesha County each had approximately 52,000 residents (Table II-1). Waukesha County began to experience significant population growth in the 1950s and experienced a population boom since 1940 that resulted in population increases per decade ranging from 23,000 people to 73,000 people (Table II-1). From 1960 to 2005 the county population more than doubled increasing from 158,249 to 377,348 (Table II-1). All of the counties surrounding Waukesha experienced smaller gains in total population since 1960 with the exception of a population decline in Milwaukee County. Between 1970 and 2005, Milwaukee County declined by 115,254 people, as population, business, and industry migrated from the City of Milwaukee.

Waukesha County Community Population Trends

Between 1970 and 1980 the majority of the county's growth in population occurred in cities and towns. In fact, 46 percent took place in cities, 44 percent in towns, and only 10 percent in villages. Between 1990 and 2000 the growth in cities remained the same (46 percent) with a more even distribution of growth between villages (31 percent) and towns (23 percent). In 2005, an estimated 20 percent of the total county population lived in towns (75,626 people), 24 percent resided in villages (91,157 people) and 56 percent were residents of cities (210,565).

The most significant population growth in communities took place in the City of Waukesha where the population increased by 27,915 people since 1970 (Table II-2). The Village of Sussex had the greatest increase in population (7,003 people) for any village within the county from 1970 to 2005. The Town of Mukwonago experienced the largest population growth of any town gaining 5,552 people from 1970 to 2005 (Table II-2).

Components of Population Change

Population change can be attributed to natural increase and net migration. Natural increase is the balance between births and deaths in an area over a given period of time; it can be measured directly from historical records on the number of births and deaths for an area. Net migration is the balance between migration to and from an area over a given period of time; as a practical matter, net migration is often determined as a derived number, obtained by subtracting natural increase from total population change for the time period concerned. Of the total population increase of 56,052 persons in the County between 1990 and 2000, 18,582 can be attributed to natural increase; the balance of 37,470 persons can be attributed to net in-migration. Table II-2 illustrates that the level of natural increase in the County has been relatively stable since the 1970's.

Table II-1

SELECTED COUNTY POPULATION GROWTH TRENDS: 1840-2005

Year County	Dodge County	Jefferson County	Milwaukee County	Racine County	Walworth County	Washington County	Waukesha County
1840	67	914	5,605	3,475	2,611	343	N/A
1850	19,138	15,317	31,077	14,973	17,862	19,485	19,558
1860	42,818	30,438	62,518	21,360	26,496	23,622	26,831
1870	47,035	34,050	89,936	26,742	25,992	28,274	28,258
1880	45,931	32,155	138,523	30,921	26,249	33,270	28,957
1890	44,984	33,530	236,101	36,268	27,802	35,229	33,270
1900	46,631	34,789	330,017	45,644	20,259	23,589	35,229
1910	47,436	34,606	433,187	57,424	29.614	23,784	37.100
1920	49.742	35.022	539,449	78,961	29.327	25.713	42.612
1930	52.092	36.785	725.263	90.217	31.058	26.551	52.358
1940	54 280	38,868	766.885	94 047	33 103	28 430	62,744
1950	57.611	43.069	871.047	109 585	41 584	33 902	85 901
1060	62 170	50.004	1 026 041	141 781	52.269	46 110	158 240
1900	63,170	50,094	1,050,041	141,/81	52,508	40,119	221 228
1970	69,004	60,060	1,054,249	170,838	63,444	63,829	231,338
1980	75,064	66,152	964,988	173,132	71,507	84,848	280,203
1990	76,559	67,783	959,275	175,034	75,000	95,328	304,715
2000	85,897	75,784	940,164	188,831	91,996	117,493	360,767
2005	88,748	79,188	938,995	193,239	98,496	125,940	377,348

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census and the Wisconsin Department of Administration.

POPULATION GROWTH BY COMMUNITY IN WAUKESHA COUNTY: 1970-2005

Community	1970	1980	1990	2000	2005
Town of Brookfield	4,303	4,364	4,232	6,390	6,379
Town of Delafield	3,750	4,597	5,735	7,820	8,286
Town of Eagle	1,250	1,758	2,028	3,117	3,492
Town of Genesee	3,172	5,126	5,986	7,284	7,542
Town of Lisbon	4,709	8,352	8,277	9,359	9,733
Town of Merton	4,424	6,025	6,430	7,988	8,347
Town of Mukwonago	1,930	4,979	5,967	6,868	7,482
Town of Oconomowoc	6,010	7,340	7,323	7,451	7,882
Town of Ottawa	1,698	2,795	2,988	3,758	3,850
Town of Summit	3,809	4,050	4,003	4,999	5,178
Town of Vernon	2,857	6,372	7,549	7,227	7,455
Town of Waukesha	4,408	6,668	7,566	8,596	8,832
Village of Big Bend	1,148	1,345	1,299	1,278	1,285
Village of Butler	2,261	2,059	2,079	1,881	1,835
Village of Chenequa	642	532	601	583	586
Village of Dousman	451	1,153	1,277	1,548	1,808
Village of Eagle	745	1,008	1,182	1,707	1,772
Village of Elm Grove	7,201	6,735	6,261	6,249	6,234
Village of Hartland	2,763	5,559	6,906	7,905	8,365
Village of Lac La Belle	227	289	258	329	333
Village of Lannon	1,056	987	924	1,009	957
Village of Menomonee Falls	31,697	27,845	26,840	32,647	33,939
Village of Merton	646	1,045	1,199	1,926	2,376
Village of Mukwonago	2,367	4,014	4,464	6,162	6,506
Village of Nashotah	410	513	567	1,266	1,372
Village of North Prairie	669	938	1,322	1,571	1,855
Village of Oconomowoc Lake	599	524	493	564	637
Village of Pewaukee	3,271	4,637	5,287	8,170	8,969
Village of Sussex	2,758	3,482	5,039	8,828	9,761
Village of Wales	691	1,992	2,471	2,523	2,567
City of Brookfield	31,761	34,035	35,184	38,649	39,797
City of Delafield	3,182	4,083	5,347	6,472	6,876
City of Muskego	11,573	15,277	16,813	21,397	22,427
City of New Berlin	26,910	30,529	33,592	38,220	38,969
City of Oconomowoc	8,741	9,909	10,993	12,382	13,459
City of Pewaukee	7,551	8,922	9,621	11,783	12,625
City of Waukesha	39,665	50,365	56,894	64,825	67,580
Waukesha County	231,335	280,203	304,715	360,767	377,348

Note: The Town of Pewaukee was incorporated as the City of Pewaukee in 1999. Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and the Wisconsin Department of Administration

Racial Composition

According to the 2000 U.S. Census, almost 96 percent of residents in Waukesha County were Caucasian in 2000. However, the population of Waukesha County continues to grow more diverse. Between 1990 and 2000 the Hispanic population in the County nearly doubled from 5,448 to 9,503. The City of Waukesha experienced the largest growth in the number of Hispanics. Several neighborhood block groups within the City of Waukesha recorded populations that were over 25 percent Hispanic. Asians made up the third largest racial group within Waukesha County with nearly 5,400 people.

Household Trends

In addition to population, the number of households, or occupied housing units, is of importance in land use and public facility planning. Households directly influence the demand for urban land as well as the demand for transportation and other public facilities and services. A household includes all persons who occupy a housing unit-defined by the Census Bureau as a house, an apartment, a mobile home, a group of rooms, or a single-room that is occupied, or intended for occupancy, as separate living quarters.

Table II-3

OWNER VS. RENTER OCCUPIED UNITS IN WAUKESHA COUNTY MUNICIPALITIES: 2000

Community	Owner Occupied	Percent	Renter Occupied	Percent
Town of Brookfield	1,763	63.8	999	36.2
Town of Delafield	2,521	96.0	104	4.0
Town of Eagle	1,049	93.8	69	6.2
Town of Genesee	2,431	98.0	50	2.0
Town of Lisbon	3,104	96.5	114	3.5
Town of Merton	2,706	92.3	226	7.7
Town of Mukwonago	2,184	97.5	57	2.5
Town of Oconomowoc	2,765	90.8	280	9.2
Town of Ottawa	1,232	89.6	143	10.4
Town of Summit	1,747	91.8	157	8.2
Town of Vernon	2,380	99.0	25	1.0
Town of Waukesha	2,891	98.2	54	1.8
Village of Big Bend	448	98.0	9	2.0
Village of Butler	455	49.7	461	50.3
Village of Chenequa	193	86.5	30	13.5
Village of Dousman	315	54.8	260	45.2
Village of Eagle	529	89.4	63	10.6
Village of Elm Grove	2,444	95.6	112	4.4
Village of Hartland	1,746	58.2	1,256	41.8
Village of Lac La Belle	114	97.4	3	2.6
Village of Lannon	361	84.9	64	15.1
Village of Menomonee Falls	9,939	77.4	2,905	22.6
Village of Merton	558	94.4	33	5.6
Village of Mukwonago	1,516	63.4	876	36.6
Village of Nashotah	427	96.0	18	4.0
Village of North Prairie	455	85.7	76	14.3
Village of Oconomowoc Lake	185	88.9	23	11.1
Village of Pewaukee	2,330	64.1	1,305	35.9
Village of Sussex	2,179	65.8	1,131	34.2
Village of Wales	722	85.3	124	14.7
City of Brookfield	12,482	89.9	1,409	10.1
City of Delafield	1,694	66.4	859	33.6
City of Muskego	6,228	82.7	1,305	17.3
City of New Berlin	11,778	81.3	2,717	18.7
City of Oconomowoc	3,102	62.4	1,866	37.6
City of Pewaukee	3,826	84.0	727	16.0
City of Waukesha	14,508	56.5	11,155	43.5
Waukesha County Total	103,373	76.4	31,856	23.6

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

The number of households in the County increased by 29,239 households, or 28 percent, from 105,990 households in 1990 to 135,229 households in 2000.

This follows increases of 17,438 households during the 1980s, 26,617 households during the 1970s, 19,541 households during the 1960s, and 18,795 households during the 1950s. In 2000, slightly over 76 percent (103,373) of the total housing units were owner occupied in Waukesha County. This figure is consistent with neighboring counties with the exception of Milwaukee County which had 52 percent owner occupied homes in 2000. In Waukesha County municipalities, owner occupied housing ranges from 56.5 percent of total housing stock in the City of Waukesha to 99 percent in the Town of Vernon (Table II-3).

Household Size

In 2000, the average household size ranged from 2.05 in the Village of Butler to 3.26 in the Village of Merton (Table II-4). Household size continues to decline slightly in Waukesha County communities. From 1990 to 2000, the average household size declined in Waukesha County from 2.83 to 2.63. This trend is occurring on a regional, state, and national scale as families continue to become smaller. A growing population with a decreasing household size has implications for development of housing stock, demand for future water and sanitary sewer capacity, land use, and other utilities and community facilities. This trend is examined in more detail in the Housing and Utilities and Community Facilities chapters of this report.

Table II-4

AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD SIZE IN WAUKESHA COUNTY: 2000

Community	Average Household Size	Community	Average Household Size	Community	Average Household Size
Town of Brookfield	2.29	Village of Big Bend	2.85	City of Brookfield	2.74
Town of Delafield	2.93	Village of Butler	2.05	City of Delafield	2.52
Town of Eagle	2.97	Village of Chenequa	2.61	City of Muskego	2.80
Town of Genesee	3.00	Village of Dousman	2.58	City of New Berlin	2.62
Town of Lisbon	2.90	Village of Eagle	2.88	City of Oconomowoc	2.40
Town of Merton	2.95	Village of Elm Grove	2.49	City of Pewaukee	2.57
Town of Mukwonago	3.14	Village of Hartland	2.63	City of Waukesha	2.43
Town of Oconomowoc	2.69	Village of Lac La Belle	2.81	Waukesha County	2.63
Town of Ottawa	2.73	Village of Lannon	2.37		
Town of Summit	2.76	Village of Menomonee Falls	2.52		
Town of Vernon	3.00	Village of Merton	3.26		
Town of Waukesha	2.97	Village of Mukwonago	2.54		
		Village of Nashotah	2.84		
		Village of North Prairie	2.96		
		Village of Oconomowoc Lake	2.71		
		Village of Pewaukee	2.19		
		Village of Sussex	2.67		
		Village of Wales	2.98		

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

Median Age

Waukesha County's median age is increasing. The median age in 1970 for the county was 27. The median age increased to 34 in 1990 and in 2000 reached 38.1. The City of Waukesha and villages of Hartland and Sussex had median ages well below the county's median age in 2000 (Table II-5). The towns of Brookfield, Ottawa, the villages of Chenequa, Elm Grove, Lac La Belle, and Oconomowoc Lake and the City of Brookfield were well above the county's median age. Ozaukee County was the only county in southeastern Wisconsin with a higher median age (38.9) than Waukesha County in 2000.

Age Composition The 45 to 64 and 65 and over age groups will continue to grow in number reflecting the aging of the "baby boomers" (people born between 1946 and 1964). The population aged 25 to 44 will begin to decrease as "baby boomers" grow older and fewer numbers of persons born in the 1970s move into this age group. This change in age composition will have implications for school districts, housing, labor, and transportation.

Table II-5

WAUKESHA COUNTY COMMUNITIES: POPULATION BY AGE GROUP AND MEDIAN AGE: 2000

						65 and	Median
	Under 5	5 to 14	15 to 24	25 to 44	45 to 64	Over	Age
Town of Brookfield	368	815	494	1,582	1,551	1,580	44.4
Town of Delafield	488	1,347	1,136	1,933	2,403	513	38.6
Town of Eagle	226	532	326	1,030	799	204	36.9
Town of Genesee	437	1,289	865	2,101	2,121	471	38.7
Town of Lisbon	620	1,542	994	2,716	2,515	982	38.6
Town of Merton	483	1,553	828	2,279	2,159	686	38.3
Town of Mukwonago	426	1,316	856	2,128	1,839	303	36.7
Town of Oconomowoc	402	1,136	817	2,188	2,175	733	39.7
Town of Ottawa	206	596	409	999	1,118	430	41.1
Town of Summit	286	762	569	1,411	1,421	532	39.6
Town of Vernon	346	1,206	1,353	864	2,360	412	39.4
Town of Waukesha	488	1,555	1,020	2,415	2,405	713	38.8
Village of Big Bend	76	236	147	384	320	105	36.8
Village of Butler	82	214	186	580	377	442	40.9
Village of Chenequa	25	69	66	111	217	95	47.6
Village of Dousman	106	262	191	514	268	243	35.4
Village of Eagle	164	306	175	649	301	112	32.8
Village of Elm Grove	320	950	516	1,266	1,789	1,408	45.7
Village of Hartland	550	1,353	1,062	2,647	1,703	590	34.1
Village of Lac La Belle	22	44	24	81	122	36	43.9
Village of Lannon	52	125	114	301	281	136	39.8
Village of Menomonee Falls	2,161	4,709	3,053	9,950	7,650	5,124	39.2
Village of Merton	140	441	213	634	423	75	34.5
Village of Mukwonago	434	864	882	1,980	1,328	674	33.9
Village of Nashotah	91	233	126	366	337	113	37.8
Village of North Prairie	98	296	188	515	392	92	36.3
Village of Oconomowoc Lake	21	92	53	122	216	64	44.5
Village of Pewaukee	578	981	829	3,048	1,742	992	35.5
Village of Sussex	799	1,413	988	3,202	1,695	731	34.1
Village of Wales	151	443	356	732	736	105	37.3
City of Brookfield	2,072	6,311	3,740	8,957	10,760	6,808	42.5
City of Delafield	430	991	669	1,931	1,752	699	38.7
City of Muskego	1,431	1,482	2,232	6,737	5,332	1,781	37.5
City of New Berlin	2,275	5,425	4,222	11,083	10,372	4,843	39.8
City of Oconomowoc	781	1,716	1,757	2,253	2,686	2,092	38.0
City of Pewaukee	669	1,566	1,169	3,482	3,628	1,269	40.4
City of Waukesha	4,792	8,634	9,574	21,813	13,118	6,894	33.4
Waukesha County	23,096	54,805	41,587	107,439	90,406	43,434	38.1

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

Household Income

Waukesha County has a substantially higher median household income than adjacent counties. The median household income was \$62,839 in 2000 for Waukesha County (Table II-6). This figure was over 60 percent higher than the median household income in Milwaukee County. The median household income in Waukesha County communities (Table II-7) ranged from \$33,883 in the Village of Butler to over \$160,000 in the Village of Chenequa.

Table II-6

MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME BY SELECTED COUNTIES: 1999

County	Median Household Income
Milwaukee County	\$38,100
Dodge County	\$45,190
Walworth County	\$46,274
Jefferson County	\$46,901
Racine County	\$48,059
Washington County	\$57,033
Waukesha County	\$62,839

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

Employment Trends

Waukesha County has continued to enhance its economy through new job creation. Waukesha County experienced a 43 percent growth in employment from 1990 to 2000 resulting in a net addition of 81,100 jobs. (Table II-8). Ozaukee County also recorded impressive employment growth during this period. Although, Milwaukee County has nearly three times as many jobs as Waukesha, it recorded only a 2 percent increase in jobs during the 1990's.

Waukesha County like the rest of Wisconsin has experienced a decline in manufacturing as a percent of total employment. Despite this fact, Waukesha County is still above the national average in manufacturing employment. Approximately 21 percent of all jobs in Waukesha County are in manufacturing. Nationally, only about 12 percent of all jobs are in manufacturing. Service employment has increased significantly over the last decade and now is the most important sector for jobs in the county accounting for 28 percent of all jobs within Waukesha County (Table II-9).

Waukesha County has the third highest percentage of people with associate, bachelors, graduate, and professional degrees in Wisconsin (Table II-10). Over 41 percent of people 25 years of age and older have an associate, bachelors, graduate, or professional degree within Waukesha County. Only Dane with 49.5 percent and Ozaukee at 45.6 percent have higher percentages in Wisconsin. Within Waukesha County municipalities, this figure ranges from 18 percent in the Village of Butler to 70 percent in the Village of Chenequa (Table II-11). In the State of Wisconsin, 31 percent of residents age 25 and over have earned an associate, bachelors, graduate, or professional degree.

MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME BY WAUKESHA COUNTY COMMUNITIES: 1999

Community	Median Household Income
Town of Brookfield	\$55,417
Town of Delafield	\$98,779
Town of Eagle	\$69,071
Town of Genesee	\$78,740
Town of Lisbon	\$69,012
Town of Merton	\$78,937
Town of Mukwonago	\$75,067
Town of Oconomowoc	\$68,676
Town of Ottawa	\$69,493
Town of Summit	\$76,859
Town of Vernon	\$71,366
Town of Waukesha	\$73,984
Village of Big Bend	\$61,771
Village of Butler	\$38,333
Village of Chenequa	\$163,428
Village of Dousman	\$53,409
Village of Elm Grove	\$86,212
Village of Hartland	\$58,359
Village of Lac La Belle	\$100,000
Village of Lannon	\$44,375
Village of Menomonee Falls	\$57,952
Village of Merton	\$75,000
Village of Mukwonago	\$56,250
Village of Nashotah	\$82,949
Village of North Prairie	\$70,781
Village of Oconomowoc Lake	\$112,760
Village of Pewaukee	\$53,874
Village of Sussex	\$76,859
Village of Wales	\$75,000
City of Brookfield	\$76,225
City of Delafield	\$71,995
City of Muskego	\$64,247
City of New Berlin	\$67,576
City of Oconomowoc	\$51,250
City of Pewaukee	\$75,589
City of Waukesha	\$50,084
Waukesha County	\$62,839

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

TOTAL EMPLOYMENT TRENDS BY SELECTED COUNTIES: 1990-2000

County	1990	2000	Number Increase In Employment 1990-2000	Percent Increase In Employment 1990-2000
Waukesha County	189,700	270,800	81,100	43%
Milwaukee County	609,800	624,600	14,800	2%
Ozaukee County	35,300	50,800	15,500	44%
Racine County	89,600	94,400	4,800	5%
Washington County	46,100	61,700	15,600	34%
Walworth County	39,900	51,800	11,900	30%

Source: U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis and SEWRPC

Table II-9

WAUKESHA COUNTY EMPLOYMENT INDUSTRY TRENDS: 1990-2000

Waukesha County	1990	2000	1990-2000 Number Change in Employment	2000 Percent of Total Employment
Agriculture	1,191	1,011	-180	1%
Construction	12,679	18,462	5,783	7%
Manufacturing	44,871	56,754	11,883	21%
Transportation, Communication and Utilities	8,185	9,516	2,434	4%
Wholesale Trade	16,128	22,508	6,380	8%
Retail Trade	31,054	43,132	12,078	16%
Finance, Insurance and Real Estate	13,131	22,340	9,209	8%
Services	46,293	76,265	29,979	28%
Government and Government Enterprises	13,994	17,059	3,065	7%
Other	2,135	3,749	1,614	1%

Notes: Services include Business, Repair, Personal, Entertainment, Recreation, Health, Education, Accommodation and Food, Social, and Professional services. Government and Government Enterprises includes all non-military government agencies and enterprises, regardless of SIC code. Other includes agricultural services, forestry, commercial fishing, mining, and unclassified jobs.

Source: U.S Bureau of Economic Analysis and SEWRPC

Educational Attainment Level Number Percent Less than 9th Grade 5.537 23 5.7 High School, No Diploma 14,873 High School Graduate 66,651 27.6 Some College (No Degree) 54,483 22.6 7.7 Associate Degree 18,492 Bachelor's Degree 57,050 23.6 Graduate /Professional Degree 25,213 10.4 Total 241,299 100

WAUKESHA COUNTY EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT FOR PERSONS 25 AND OVER: 2000

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

LAND USE

SEWRPC relies on two types of inventories and analyses in order to monitor urban growth and development in Southeastern Wisconsin—an urban growth ring analysis and a land use inventory. The urban growth ring analysis delineates the outer limits of concentrations of urban development and depicts the urbanization over the past 150 years. When related to urban population levels, the urban growth ring analysis provides a good basis for calculating urban population and household densities. By contrast, SEWRPC's land use inventory is a more detailed inventory that places all land and water areas into one of 66 discrete land use categories, providing a basis for analyzing specific urban and non-urban land uses. Both the urban growth ring analysis and the land use inventory have been updated to the year 2000 under the continuing regional planning program, therefore serve as the basis for the land use the land.

Urban Growth Ring Analysis

The urban growth ring analysis shows the historical pattern of urban settlement, growth, and development since 1850 for selected points in time. Areas identified as urban under this time series analysis include areas where residential structures or other buildings have been constructed in relatively compact groups, thereby indicating a concentration of residential, commercial, industrial, governmental, institutional, or other urban land uses. In addition, the identified urban areas encompass certain open space lands such as urban parks and small areas being preserved for resource conservation purposes within the urban areas.

As part of the urban growth ring analysis, urban growth for the years prior to 1940 was identified using a variety of sources, including the records of local historical societies, land subdivision plat records, farm plat maps, U. S Geological Survey maps, and Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey records. Urban growth for the years 1940, 1950, 1963, 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000 was identified using aerial photographs. Because of limitations inherent in the source materials, information presented for the years prior to 1940 represents the extent of urban development at approximately those points in time, whereas the information presented for later years can be considered precisely representative of those respective points in time. The urban growth ring analysis, updated through 2000, is presented graphically on Map II-1.

Community	Number	Percent
own of Brookfield	2,026	45.6
Town of Eagle	673	34.2
Town of Delafield	2,802	57.5
Town of Genesee	2,100	45.5
Fown of Lisbon	2,149	28.3
Γown of Merton	2,282	44.9
Fown of Mukwonago	1,757	42.3
Fown of Oconomowoc	1,957	38.8
fown of Ottawa	959	37.5
'own of Summit	1,355	40.2
Cown of Vernon	1,428	30.1
Γown of Waukesha	2,247	40.8
Village of Big Bend	228	28.1
Village of Butler	257	18.4
/illage of Chenequa	291	70.4
Village of Dousman	287	27.2
Village of Eagle	309	26.9
Village of Elm Grove	3,058	69.1
/illage of Hartland	2,028	40.9
Village of Lac La Belle	139	58.5
illage of Lannon	111	15.7
'illage of Menomonee Falls	8,566	37.6
illage of Merton	451	37.4
'illage of Mukwonago	1,381	35.0
illage of Nashotah	436	53.7
Village of North Prairie	370	36.6
/illage of Oconomowoc Lake	244	61.6
illage of Pewaukee	2,227	38.3
'illage of Sussex	2,012	36.2
illage of Wales	761	49.3
ity of Brookfield	14,727	55.3
City of Delafield	2,002	45.1
City of Muskego	4,699	33.1
City of New Berlin	11,562	44.0
City of Oconomowoc	3,221	38.5
City of Pewaukee	3,927	46.0
City of Waukesha	3,927	37.6

RESIDENTS OF AGE 25 AND OVER WITH ASSOCIATES, BACHELOR'S, GRADUATE, OR PROFESSIONAL DEGREES BY COMMUNITY IN WAUKESHA COUNTY: 2000

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census



HISTORIC GROWTH RING ANALYSIS IN WAUKESHA COUNTY: 1850-2000 HISTORIC URBAN GROWTH IN WAUKESHA COUNTY: 1850-2000



POPULATION PROJECTIONS BY COMMUNITY IN WAUKESHA COUNTY: 2010-2035

Community	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035	
Town of Brookfield	6,957	7,212	7,468	7,782	8,055	8,349	
Town of Delafield	9,120	9,712	10,295	10,949	11,603	12,313	
Town of Eagle	3,817	4,138	4,451	4,793	5,156	5,554	
Town of Genesee	7,970	8,281	8,593	8,971	9,305	9,664	
Town of Lisbon	9,751	9,926	10,110	10,378	10,565	10,770	
Town of Merton	8,729	9,062	9,397	9,804	10,162	10,546	
Town of Mukwonago	7,631	7,989	8,346	8,765	9,153	9,571	
Town of Oconomowoc	7,400	7,370	7,354	7,404	7,384	7,374	
Town of Ottawa	4,057	4,191	4,327	4,497	4,641	4,795	
Town of Summit	5,308	5,479	5,653	5,870	6,053	6,250	
Town of Vernon	7,209	7,192	7,189	7,250	7,243	7,245	
Town of Waukesha	8,873	9,001	9,139	9,354	9,493	9,646	
Village of Big Bend	1,202	1,165	1,132	1,110	1,078	1,048	
Village of Butler	1,769	1,714	1,666	1,634	1,587	1,543	
Village of Chenequa	573	568	564	566	562	559	
Village of Dousman	1,721	1,781	1,842	1,917	1,981	2,051	
Village of Eagle	1,912	2,005	2,097	2,205	2,306	2,414	
Village of Elm Grove	5,948	5,802	5,672	5,597	5,469	5,351	
Village of Hartland	8,828	9,247	9,662	10,149	10,601	11,088	
Village of Lac La Belle	358	372	385	401	415	431	
Village of Lannon	958	933	911	898	876	856	
Village of Menomonee Falls	34,668	35,565	36,483	37,696	38,651	39,684	
Village of Merton	2,238	2,378	2,517	2,672	2,826	2,994	
Village of Mukwonago	6,839	7,131	7,422	7,770	8,084	8,423	
Village of Nashotah	1,548	1,677	1,803	1,941	2,087	2,247	
Village of North Prairie	1,900	2,048	2,193	2,353	2,520	2,702	
Village of Oconomowoc Lake	651	660	670	686	696	707	
Village of Pewaukee	9,299	9,813	10,320	10,902	11,462	12,068	
Village of Sussex	10,745	11,620	12,475	13,412	14,399	15,480	
Village of Wales	2,537	2,540	2,548	2,578	2,584	2,594	
City of Brookfield	39,577	39,959	40,396	41,179	41,607	42,096	
City of Delafield	7,322	7,707	8,089	8,530	8,950	9,402	
City of Muskego	23,183	23,984	24,791	25,792	26,648	27,570	
City of New Berlin	40,333	41,265	42,228	43,535	44,529	45,607	
City of Oconomowoc	13,190	13,542	13,902	14,375	14,751	15,158	
City of Pewaukee	13,434	14,227	15,009	15,898	16,768	17,708	
City of Waukesha	68,905	70,666	72,471	74,859	76,734	78,762	
Waukesha County	386 460	397 922	409 570	424 472	436 986	450 620	

Source: Wisconsin Department of Administration Note: The projections for years 2030 and 2035 were made with simple trend extrapolation techniques by the University of Wisconsin Applied Population Laboratory. These projections are built upon the Wisconsin Department of Administration's Demographic Services Center's population projections for municipalities (through 2025) and for counties (through 2030).

Population Projections

Projections are estimates of the population for future dates. They illustrate plausible courses of future population change based on assumptions about future births, deaths, international migration, and domestic migration.

While projections and estimates may appear similar, there are some distinct differences between the two measures. Estimates are for the past, while projections are based on assumptions about future demographic trends. Estimates generally use existing data collected from various sources, while projections must assume what demographic trends will be in the future.

In the report, The Population of Southeastern Wisconsin, SEWRPC projected a range of future population and household levels - using high, intermediate, and low growth scenarios for Waukesha County. The analysis uses the cohort-component projection model that projects population based on births, deaths,, and migration rates. (Previously said fertility, survival, and migration rates). After analyzing the data, the intermediate growth projection was used for land use planning purposes. The intermediate population projection predicts a modest increase in birth rates, a slight improvement in death rates, and a relatively stable migration pattern through 2035. The intermediate projection of growth for Waukesha County is slightly higher than projections developed by the Wisconsin Department of Administration (Tables II-13 and II-14). SEWPRC in their study did not attempt to create projections for individual communities in Waukesha County. The Wisconsin Department of Administration developed projections through 2025 for communities within the County (Table II-12). The University of Wisconsin Applied Population Laboratory made the projections for years 2030 and 2035 with simple trend extrapolation techniques. These projections are built upon the Wisconsin Department of Administration's Demographic Services Center's population projections for municipalities (through 2025) and for counties (through 2030). At the community level it is more difficult to project future population growth. There is greater uncertainty with making demographic trend assumptions at the community level. For example, fertility is influenced by many factors including age of residents, income, educational attainment, race, and percentage of married couple families. Domestic migration or movement from one community to another is also difficult to project at a local community level. This variable is influenced by age, marriage, income, housing availability, and percentage of renters vs. homeowners. Between 1995 and 2000 over 66,000 Waukesha County residents moved to different houses within communities in the County. As a result, the projections for communities are a best projection guess, but may end up being quite different at the community level 30 years into the future.

Table II-13

PROJECTED POPULATION IN WAUKESHA COUNTY: 2010-2035 (INTERMEDIATE PROJECTION)

	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035	
Waukesha County	391,499	404,086	417,362	429,635	440,289	446,768	

Source: SEWRPC

Household Projections

Based upon the intermediate projection, SEWRPC estimates that Waukesha County will gain an additional 38,900 households by 2035 (Table II-14). The SEWRPC intermediate population growth projection for the County in 2035 is 446,768. This projected trend would result in a continued decline in household size to 2.50 persons.

		Change from Preceding Year						
Year	Households	Absolute	Percent					
Actual Households:								
2000	135,200							
Projected Households:								
2005	144,300	9,100	6.7					
2010	150,800	6,500	4.5					
2015	156,700	5,900	3.9					
2020	162,300	5,600	3.6					
2025	167,400	5,100	3.1					
2030	171,900	4,500	2.7					
2035	174,100	2,200	1.3					
Change: 2000-2035		38,900	28.8					

ACTUAL AND PROJECTED HOUSEHOLDS IN WAUKESHA COUNTY: 2000-2035 (INTERMEDIATE PROJECTION)

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and SEWRPC.

Population Projections for the Planning Area and Southeastern Wisconsin

The projected population for the Waukesha County planning analysis areas (presented in Map II-2) in 2035 is 446,768 persons. This is a projected increase of 86,000 persons, or about 23.8 percent, over the 2000 population level of 360,800. Existing and projected population, households and job totals for planning analysis areas are set forth in Table II-15. More detailed discussion regarding employment and other economic trends are presented in Chapter 6.

Planned urban service areas generally include the corporate boundaries of cities and villages and additional contiguous lands needed to accommodate anticipated urban development. The 2000 population in each urban service area shown on Table II-16 is therefore greater than the 2000 population in the corresponding city or village corporate boundaries because the planned urban service area includes lands that are now in the towns. Although most cities and villages require land to be annexed before providing sewer, this plan does not assume that annexation is a prerequisite to providing public sewer. Cities and villages may enter into boundary or cooperative agreements that could provide for the extension of sewer and other services without annexation, subject to conditions negotiated between the city or village and the adjacent town as part of an agreement.

Land Use Inventory

SEWRPC land use inventory is intended to serve as a relatively precise record of land use at selected points in time. The land use classification system used in the inventory consists of nine major categories which are divisible into 66 sub-categories, making the inventory suitable for both land use and transportation planning, adaptable to storm water drainage, public utility, and community facility planning, and compatible with other land use classification systems. Aerial photographs serve as the primary basis for identifying existing land use, augmented by field surveys as appropriate.

The first regional land use inventory was prepared by SEWRPC in 1963 and has been updated periodically following the preparation of new aerial photography, with the most recent inventory prepared using aerial photographs taken in spring of 2000. As part of the year 2000 land use inventory, the delineation of existing land use was referenced to real property boundary information not available in prior inventories. This change increases the precision of the land use inventory and makes it more useable to public agencies and private interests. As a result of this change, however, year 2000 land use inventory data are not strictly comparable with data from the 1990 and prior inventories. The data remains suitable for denoting general land use trends. The results of the year 2000 land use inventory are presented along with the results of prior land use inventories in Table II-17.





		Popu	lation		Households				Jobs			
County and Planning		Planned I 2000 -	ncrement: - 2035			Planned I 2000 -	ncrement: - 2035			Planned I 2000 -	ncrement: - 2035	
Analysis Area (See Map II-2)	Existing 2000	Number	Percent	Total 2035	Existing 2000	Number	Percent	Total 2035	Existing 2000	Number	Percent	Total 2035
Waukesha												
1	35,500	9,200	25.9	44,700	14,200	4,300	30.3	18,500	43,800	9,800	22.4	53,600
2	50,900	6,300	12.4	57,200	19,000	3,200	16.8	22,200	58,500	6,500	11.1	65,000
3	38,200	7,200	18.8	45,400	14,500	3,400	23.4	17,900	27,000	7,400	27.4	34,400
4	21,400	9,400	43.9	30,800	7,500	3,800	50.7	11,300	7,400	1,300	17.6	8,700
5	18,400	7,200	39.1	25,600	6,600	3,100	47.0	9,700	9,300	4,300	46.2	13,600
6	59,400	16,300	27.4	75,700	21,800	7,100	32.6	28,900	31,500	13,400	42.5	44,900
7	93,800	20,500	21.9	114,300	36,800	9,600	26.1	46,400	78,900	10,400	13.2	89,300
8	32,900	7,300	22.2	40,200	11,200	3,200	28.6	14,400	11,500	7,800	67.8	19,300
9	10,300	2,600	25.2	12,900	3,600	1,200	33.3	4,800	2,900	2,000	69.0	4,900
Total	360,800	86,000	23.8	446,800	135,200	38,900	28.8	174,100	270,800	62,900	23.2	333,700

Source: SEWRPC.

POPULATION IN THE REGION BY SEWER SERVICE AREA: **EXISTING 2000 AND 2035 RECOMMENDED PLAN**

			Sewered Population:					
County and	Existi	ing Population: 2	2000	2035 Recommended Plan				
Sewer Service Area Name					nge			
	Sewered	Unsewered ^a	Total	2035	Number	Percent		
Waukesha County								
Big Bend	-	1,860	1,860	1,930	1,930	-		
Brookfield East ⁱ	18,430	-	18,430	20,380	1,950	10.6		
Brookfield West ⁱⁱ	27,740	360	28,100	32,580	4,840	17.4		
Butler	1,840	-	1,840	1,880	40	2.2		
Delafield ⁱⁱⁱ	5,940	4,680	10,620	12,800	6,860	115.5		
Dousman ^{iv}	1,960	1,690	3,650	4,960	3,000	153.1		
Eagle Spring Lake/								
Mukwonago Park/								
Rainbow Springs	-	460	460	450	450	-		
Elm Grove	5,570	-	5,570	5,770	200	3.6		
Golden Lake	-	180	180	190	190	-		
Hartland	8,770	260	9,030	11,310	2,540	29.0		
Lake Country ^v	1,280	11,110	12,390	14,080	12,800	>300.0		
Lannon	1,210	80	1,290	1,900	690	57.0		
Menomonee Falls East ^{vi}	28,740	840	29,580	34,410	5,670	19.7		
Menomonee Falls			-	-				
West ^{vii}	480	1,040	1,520	4,910	4,430	>300.0		
Mukwonago (part)	6,260	1,090	7,350	11,260	5,000	79.9		
Muskegoviii	19,090	350	19,440	28,610	9,520	49.9		
Muskego South ^{ix}	1,090	40	1,130	1,240	150	13.8		
New Berlin ^x	31,970	2,500	34,470	41,190	9,220	28.8		
Oconomowoc ^{xi}	13,750	1,810	15,560	21,380	7,630	55.5		
Pewaukee ^{xii}	20,560	1,900	22,460	32,140	11,580	56.3		
Sussex/Lisbon	10,270	1,660	11,930	17,770	7,500	73.0		
Wales	-	1,600	1,600	1,950	1,950	-		
Waukesha	67.300	8.410	75.710	88.440	21,140	31.4		

Source: SEWRPC

¹ Includes area of the City of Brookfield tributary to the Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District ¹¹ Includes area of the City of Brookfield tributary to the Fox River Water Pollution Control Commission sewage treatment plant, along with small areas of the Village of Manomonee Falls and the City of New Berlin tributary to that treatment plant ¹¹ Includes Village of Manohan and Nemahbin Lakes Sewer Service Area ¹² Includes Lower Genessee Lake, Pretty Lake, and School Section Lake Sewer Service Areas ¹³ Includes Lower Genessee Lake, Pretty Lake, and School Section Lake Sever Service Areas

^{iv} Includes Lower Genesee Lake, Pretty Lake, and School Section Lake Sewer Service Areas ^{iv} Includes the following sewer service areas located generally east of the City of Oconomowoc: Ashippun Lake, Beaver Lake, Lake Keesus, North Lake, Oconomowo Lake, Okauchee Lake, Pine Lake, and the Village of Merton ^{iv} Includes area of the Village of Menomonee Falls tributary to the Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District ^{ivi} Includes area of the City of Muskego tributary to the Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District ^{ivi} Includes area of the City of Muskego tributary to the Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District ^{ivi} Includes area of the City of Muskego tributary to the Town of Norway Sanitary District No. 1 sewage treatment plant ^{ivi} Includes area of the City of Newskego tributary to the Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District ^{ivi} Includes area of the City of Newskego tributary to the Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District ^{ivi} Includes area of the City of Newskego tributary to the Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District ^{ivi} Includes area of the City of Newskego tributary to the Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District ^{ivi} Includes area of the City of Newskego tributary to the Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District ^{ivi} Includes area of the City of Newskego tributary to the Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District ^{ivi} Includes area of the City of Newskego tributary to the Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District

³⁴ Includes area of the City of New Berlin tributary to the Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District ³⁴ Includes the Village of Lac la Belle Sewer Service Area ³⁶ Includes the City and Village of Pewaukee and Pewaukee Lake Sewer Service Areas

CHANGE IN LAND USE ACRES IN WAUKESHA COUNTY: 1963-2000

Land Use Category ^a	1963	1970	1980	1990	2000
Urban					
Residential	28,148	35,476	50,745	59,247	75,221
Commercial	1,197	1,831	2,754	3,827	5,351
Industrial	924	1,758	2,747	3,802	5,525
Transportation, Communication, and Utilities	16,079	18,545	21,867	22,805	30,001
Governmental and Institutional	2,550	3,587	4,037	4,215	4,887
Recreational	3,311	4,605	5,756	6,465	8,253
Unused Urban Land	8,509	8,516	8,017	7,025	7,806
Subtotal Urban	60,718	74,318	95,923	107,386	137,044
Non-urban					
Natural Areas					
Surface Water	16,076	16,461	16,753	16,878	16,891
Wetlands	52,588	51,660	51,233	51,978	52,661
Woodlands	31,181	30,818	29,472	29,584	28,931
Subtotal Natural Areas	99,845	98,939	97,458	98,440	98,483
Agricultural	200,241	184,390	161,558	142,428	112,611
Unused Rural and Other Open Lands	10,786	13,943	16,651	23,336	23,397
Subtotal Nonurban	310,872	297,272	275,667	264,204	234,491
Total	371,590	371,590	371,590	371,590	371,535

Note: As part of the regional land use inventory for the year 2000, the delineation of existing land use was referenced to real property boundary information not available for the 1990 and prior inventories. This change increases the precision of the land use inventory and makes it more useable to public agencies and private interests throughout the Region. As a result of the change, however, year 2000 land use inventory data are not strictly comparable with data from the 1990 and prior inventories. At the county and regional level, the most significant effect of the change is to increase the transportation, communication, and utilities category—the result of the use of actual street and highway rights-of-way as part of the 2000 land use inventory, as opposed to the use of narrower estimated rights-of-way in prior inventories. This treatment of streets and highways generally diminishes the area of adjacent land uses traversed by those streets and highways in the 2000 land use inventory relative to prior inventories.

Land Use Change: 1963-2000

Residential development was responsible for the most significant land use change within Waukesha County since 1963. Over 47,000 acres of land was converted to residential use as the county gained over 100,000 households between 1960 and 2000. Agricultural lands experienced the greatest loss of any land use within the county between 1963 and 2000. Nearly 88,000 acres of agricultural lands were converted to other land uses.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Groundwater Supply

The importance of groundwater as a source of water supply in Waukesha County and Southeastern Wisconsin can be shown by analyzing water-use data. According to estimates by the U.S. Geological Survey, water users in the Southeastern Wisconsin Region used about 324 million gallons per day (mgd) of water from surface and groundwater sources in 2000, not including water used for thermoelectric-power production. From this amount, 228 mgd, or about 70 percent, was withdrawn from surface water sources, primarily Lake Michigan; and 96 mgd, or about 30 percent, from groundwater (see Table II-18). In Waukesha County, nearly all of the water supply has historically been obtained from the groundwater system. This has recently changed somewhat with the conversion of the eastern portion of the Village of Menomonee Falls, the Village of Butler, and the eastern portion of the City of New Berlin to Lake Michigan water over the period of 1999 to 2005. Groundwater use and total water use in Waukesha County have risen steadily since 1985, increasing by about 36 percent over the period 1985 to 2000.

TRENDS IN REPORTED SURFACE (SW) AND GROUNDWATER (GW) USE IN SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN: 1979-2000 (IN MILLION GALLONS PER DAY)

County Name		1979			1985			1990			2000		
	SW	GW	Total										
Kenosha	17.81	3.42	21.23	17.87	2.54	20.41	20.41	2.56	22.97	16.04	2.69	18.73	
Milwaukee	172.47	10.18	182.65	213.26	9.91	223.17	184.96	6.17	191.13	183.22	6.32	189.54	
Ozaukee	1.19	6.66	7.85	1.15	6.33	7.48	1.43	6.66	8.09	1.52	7.80	9.32	
Racine	22.55	7.69	30.24	22.55	7.28	29.83	29.32	8.85	38.17	26.24	13.63	39.87	
Walworth	0.14	9.89	10.03	1.16	9.14	10.30	0.08	16.07	16.15	0.07	14.95	15.02	
Washington	0.15	10.11	10.26	0.06	9.37	9.43	0.08	9.76	9.84	0.08	13.30	13.38	
Waukesha	0.02	33.37	33.39	0.12	27.84	27.96	0.04	30.78	30.82	0.35	37.56	37.91	
Total	214.33	81.32	295.65	256.17	72.41	328.58	236.32	80.85	317.17	227.52	96.25	323.77	
Percent of Total	72.5	27.5	100.0	78.0	22.0	100.0	74.5	25.5	100.0	70.3	29.7	100.0	

Note: The trends are based on currently available data, but the sources of information and accuracy of data may vary from one reporting period to another. The USGS obtains most of water-use data from files of state agencies, and makes estimates for categories for which data are not reported (private domestic and agricultural uses). Water used for thermoelectric power is not included. *GW: Groundwater; SW: Surface Water*

Source: SEWRPC and U. S. Geological Survey, 2000.

Recharge to groundwater is derived almost entirely from precipitation. Much of the groundwater in shallow aquifers originates from precipitation that has fallen and infiltrated within a radius of about 20 or more miles from where it is found. The bedrock formations underlying the unconsolidated surficial deposits of Waukesha County consist of Precambrian crystalline rocks; Cambrian sandstone; Ordovician dolomite, sandstone, and shale; and Silurian dolomite. The uppermost bedrock unit throughout most of the county is pervious Silurian dolomite, primarily Niagara dolomite, underlaid by a relatively impervious layer of Maquoketa shale. In some of the pre-Pleistocene valleys in the southwestern and central portions of the county, however, the Niagara dolomite is absent and the uppermost bedrock unit is the Maquoketa shale.

The deeper sandstone aquifers are recharged by downward leakage of water through the Maquoketa Formation from the overlying aquifers or by infiltration of precipitation in western Waukesha County where the sandstone aquifer is not overlain by the Maquoketa Formation and is unconfined. On the average, precipitation annually brings about 32 inches of water to the surface area of the county. It is estimated that approximately 80 percent of that total is lost by evapotranspiration. Of the remaining water, part runs off in streams and part becomes groundwater. It is likely that the average annual groundwater recharge to shallow aquifers is 10 to 15 percent of annual precipitation.

To document the utilization of the shallow aquifers in the county, it may be assumed, for example, that, on the average, 10 percent of the annual precipitation reaches groundwater. Then, the average groundwater recharge in the County would be about 88 mgd. As previously noted, the estimated daily use of groundwater in 2000 was about 38 mgd, which is about 43 percent of the total amount of groundwater assumed to be recharged in a given year. This indicates that there is an adequate annual groundwater recharge to satisfy water demands on the shallow aquifer system in Waukesha County on a countywide basis. However, the availability on a localized area basis will vary depending upon usage, pumping system configuration, and groundwater flow patterns.

The situation is different for the deep aquifers where withdrawals of groundwater cause supply/demand imbalance in areas of concentrated use of groundwater, which has resulted in the declining potentiometric surface and mining of groundwater. For example, Professor Douglas Cherkauer of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, estimated that the demand on groundwater from the deep sandstone aquifer in Waukesha County is greater than the available supply (see Table II-19).

ESTIMATES OF AVAILABLE GROUNDWATER IN WAUKESHA COUNTY, 1999

Aquifer	Recharge Area (square miles)	Estimated Recharge Rate (inches per year)	Average Daily Recharge (mgd)	Average Daily Demand (mgd)
Shallow	400	3.1	59	3.5
Deep	100	3.1	14.8	31.5

Note: mgd: million gallons per day

Source: D.S. Cherkauer, 1999

The imbalanced withdrawal of groundwater has shifted the major pumping center in Southeastern Wisconsin from the City of Milwaukee in the early 1900's to eastern Waukesha County in 2005. As a result of the groundwater use trend, the center of the "cone of depression", a term used to describe the deepest part of the pumping drawdown, has shifted westward about eight miles from Milwaukee to near eastern Waukesha County. Groundwater levels in the "cone of depression" have dropped about 500 feet since the onset of groundwater pumping. Figure II-1 shows how groundwater flows have been influenced as a result of groundwater pumping.

Figure II-1

SIMULATED GROUNDWATER FLOW DIRECTION ALTERATION FROM GROUNDWATER PUMPING



1900



2000

Source: SEWRPC

Surface Water Resources

Waukesha County has or contains portions of 33 lakes that comprise approximately 14,000 acres or almost 4 percent of the total area of the county. Surface water drains into the Fox, Rock, Root, and Menomonee River watersheds. The Menomonee and Root River watersheds lie east of the subcontinental divide and drain into the Great Lakes basin. The Fox and Rock Watersheds are west of the subcontinental divide and drain west into the Mississippi River basin.

FORMULATION OF OBJECTIVES

Planning may be described as a rational process for formulating and achieving objectives. The formulation of objectives is an essential task to be undertaken before plans can be prepared. This chapter presents a set of objectives along with supporting principles and related standards recommended by the Comprehensive Development Plan Advisory Committee as a basis for the preparation of a Comprehensive Development Plan for Waukesha County. The objectives are derived from the objectives contained in the year 2035 Regional Land Use Plan for Southeastern Wisconsin.

The key steps in the comprehensive planning process are 1) formulation of objectives, principles and standards, 2) inventory, 3) analyses and forecasts, 4) plan design, 5) plan evaluation, and 6) plan refinement and plan adoption. Plan implementation, although a step beyond the planning process, is considered throughout the process so that realization of the plan may be achieved.

The terms "objective," "principle," "standard," "plan," "policy," and "program" are subject to a range of interpretations. Although this chapter deals with only the first three of these terms, an understanding of the interrelationship between the foregoing terms and the basic concepts which they represent is essential to any consideration of objectives, principles, and standards. Under the regional planning program, these terms have been defined as follows:

- 1. Objective: a goal or end toward the attainment of which plans and policies are directed.
- Principle: a fundamental, primary, or generally accepted tenet used to support objectives and prepare standards and plans.
- 3. Standard: a criterion used as a basis of comparison to determine the adequacy of plan proposals to attain objectives.
- 4. Plan: a design that seeks to achieve agreed-upon objectives.
- 5. Policy: a rule or course of action used to ensure plan implementation.
- 6. Program: a coordinated series of policies and actions to carry out a plan.

GENERAL DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES

The following general development objectives, presented as part of the year 2035 regional land use plan, have been reaffirmed by the Comprehensive Development Plan Advisory Committee for use in the preparation of the Comprehensive Development Plan for Waukesha County; no ranking is implied by the order in which these objectives are listed:

- 1. Economic growth at a rate consistent with county resources, including land, water, labor, and capital, and primary dependence on free enterprise in order to provide needed employment opportunities for the expanding labor force.
- 2. A wide range of employment opportunities through a broad diversified economic base.
- 3. Preservation and protection of desirable existing residential, commercial, industrial, and agricultural development in order to maintain desirable social and economic values and renewal of obsolete and deteriorating areas; and prevention of slums and blight.
- A broad range of choice among housing designs, sizes, types, and costs, recognizing changing trends in age group composition, income, and family living habits.
- 5. An adequate, flexible, and balanced level of community services and facilities.

Deleted: in both urban and rural areas

- 6. An efficient and equitable allocation of fiscal resources within the public sector of the economy.
- 7. An attractive and healthful physical and social environment with ample opportunities for high-quality education, cultural activities, and outdoor recreation.
- 8. Protection, sound use, and enhancement of the natural resource base.
- 9. Development of communities having distinctive individual character, based on physical conditions, historical factors, and local desires.

SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES

Within the framework established by the general development objectives, a secondary set of more specific objectives, which are directly relatable to physical development plans, and which can be at least crudely quantified has been developed. The specific development objectives are concerned primarily with spatial allocation to, and distribution of, the various land uses; land use compatibility; resource protection; and accessibility.

The following specific development objectives have been formulated by the Comprehensive Development Plan Advisory Committee. No ranking is implied by the order in which these objectives are listed:

- 1. A balanced allocation of space to the various land use categories, which meets the social, physical, and economic needs of the county population.
- 2. A spatial distribution of the various land uses that will result in a convenient and compatible arrangement of land uses.
- 3. A spatial distribution of the various land uses which maintains biodiversity and which will result in the preservation and sustainable management of the natural resources of the County.
- 4. A spatial distribution of the various land uses which is properly related to the supporting transportation, utility, and public facility systems in order to assure the economical provision of transportation, utility, and public facility services.
- 5. The availability of a broad range of choice among housing designs, sizes, types, and costs, recognizing changing trends in age group composition, income, and family living habits.
- The development and preservation of residential areas within a physical environment that is healthy, safe, convenient, and attractive.
- 7. The preservation, development, and redevelopment of a variety of suitable industrial and commercial sites both in terms of physical characteristics and location.
- 8. The conservation, renewal, and full use of existing urban service areas of the Region and the County.
- 9. The preservation of large contiguous tracts of productive agricultural lands.
- 10. The preservation and provision of open space to enhance the total quality of the environment, maximize essential natural resource availability, give form and structure to urban development, and provide opportunities for a full range of outdoor recreational activities.

FORMULATION OF STANDARDS

Complementing each of the foregoing specific development objectives is a set of planning standards. Each set of standards is directly related to the objective. The standards facilitate application of the objectives in plan design and evaluation. The standards related to the ten specific objectives were developed by the subcommittee addressing the particular planning element. The following objective and standards serve as an example for industrial and commercial sites.

Objective

The preservation, development, and redevelopment of a variety of suitable industrial and commercial sites both in terms of physical characteristics and location.

Standards

1. Industrial, retail, and office uses should meet the following standards:

- a. Available adequate water supply, sanitary sewer service, storm water drainage facilities, and power supply.
- b. Ready access to the arterial street and highway system.
- c. Adequate off-street parking (may not be directly on-site) and loading areas.
- d. Provision of properly located points of ingress and egress appropriately controlled to prevent congestion on adjacent arterial streets.
- e. Site design appropriately integrating the site with adjacent land uses.
- f. Served by local transit service.

BALANCING OF PLANNING STANDARDS

In applying the planning standards and preparing the Comprehensive Development Plan for Waukesha County, it should be recognized that it is unlikely that the Plan can meet all of the standards completely. It should also be recognized that some objectives are complementary, with the achievement of one objective supporting the achievement of others. Conversely, some objectives may be conflicting, requiring reconciliation through consensus building and/or compromise.

For example, as part of the planning process, the objectives of preserving agricultural and other open space lands, must be balanced with the need to convert certain lands to urban use in support of the orderly growth and development of the County.

Most of the development objectives, principles, and standards were incorporated without significant change from the set of planning objectives, principles, and standards included in the adopted design year 2035 Regional Land Use Plan.

PLANNING OBJECTIVES AND STANDARDS

Agricultural, Natural and Cultural Resources Objective No. 1

A spatial distribution of the various land uses which maintains biodiversity and which will result in the preservation and sustainable use of the natural resources of the County.

Environmental Corridors and Isolated Natural Resource Areas

Principle

The preservation of environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas in essentially natural, open use yields many benefits, including recharge and discharge of groundwater; maintenance of surface water and groundwater quality; attenuation of flood flows and flood stages; maintenance of base flows of streams and watercourses; reduction of soil erosion; abatement of air and noise pollution; provision of wildlife habitat; protection of plant and animal diversity; protection of rare and endangered species; maintenance of scenic beauty; and provision of opportunities for recreational, educational, and scientific pursuits. Conversely, since some environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas are poorly suited for urban development, their preservation can help avoid serious and costly development problems while protecting the County's most valuable natural resources.

Notes: Environmental corridors are elongated areas in the landscape which contain concentrations of natural resource features (lakes, rivers, streams, and their associated shorelands and floodlands; wetlands; woodlands; prairies; wildlife habitat areas; wet, poorly drained, and organic soils; and rugged terrain and high-relief topography) and natural resource-related features (existing park and open space sites; potential park and open space sites; historic sites; scenic areas and vistas; and natural areas and critical species habitat sites). Primary

environmental corridors include a variety of these features and are at least 400 acres in size, two miles long, and 200 feet in width. Secondary environmental corridors also contain a variety of these features and are at least 100 acres in size and one mile in length. Isolated natural resource areas are smaller concentrations of natural resource features that are physically separated from the environmental corridors by intensive urban or agricultural uses; by definition, such areas are at least five acres in size and 200 feet in width.

Standards

- a. Primary environmental corridors should be preserved in natural, open uses.
- b. Secondary environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas should be preserved in essentially natural, open uses to the extent practicable, as determined in county and local plans.

Uses considered compatible with both planning standards relating to the preservation of environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas are indicated in Table II-20.

Component								Permitted	Development							
Natural Resource and	Trar Gen	nsportation a eral Develor	nd Utility Faci ment Guidelin	lities (see es below)		Recreational Facilities (see General Development Guidelines below)									Rural Density Residential	
Features within Environmental Corridors ^a	Streets and High- ways	Utility Lines and Related Facilities	Engineered Stormwater Manage- ment Facilities	Engineered Flood Control Facilities ^b	Trails ^c	Picnic Areas	Family Camp- ing ^d	Swim- ming Beaches	Boat Access	Ski Hills	Golf	Playfields	Hard- Surface Courts	Parking	Buildings	Development (see General Development Guidelines below)
Lakes, Rivers, and Streams	e	f,g		h	i			Х	х							
Shoreland	Х	х	х	х	Х	Х		Х	Х		х			Х	хj	
Floodplain	k	х		х	Х	х		х	х		х	Х		Х	xl	
Wetland ^m	k	х			X ⁿ				Х		0					
Wet Soils	Х	х	Х	Х	Х			х	Х		х			Х		
Woodland	Х	х	Хр		Х	х	Х		Х	х	Хр	Хр	Хр	Хр	Хр	х
Wildlife Habitat	х	х	х		х	х	х		х	х	x	х	х	х	х	x
Steep Slope	Х	х			q					Xr	х					
Prairie		g			q											
Park	Х	х	Х	Х	Х	х	Х	х	Х	х	х	Х	Х	Х	Х	
Historic Site		g			q									Х		
Scenic Viewpoint	x	х			х	х	х		х	Х	х			х	х	x
Natural Area or Critical Species Habitat Site					q											

GUIDELINES FOR DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERED COMPATIBLE WITH ENVIRONMENTAL CORRIDORS

NOTE: An "X" indicates that facility development is permitted within the specified natural resource feature. In those portions of the environmental corridors having more than one of the listed natural resource features, the natural resource feature with the most restrictive development limitation should take precedence.

Footnotes to Table II-20:

^aThe natural resource and related features are defined as follows:

<u>Lakes, Rivers, and Streams</u>: Includes all lakes greater than five acres in area and all perennial and intermittent streams as shown on U. S. Geological Survey quadrangle maps.

<u>Shoreland</u>: Includes a band 50 feet in depth along both sides of intermittent streams; a band 75 feet in depth along both sides of perennial streams.

<u>Floodplain</u>: Includes areas, excluding stream channels and lake beds, subject to inundation by the 100-year recurrence interval flood event.

<u>Wetlands</u>: Includes areas that are inundated or saturated by surface water or groundwater at a frequency, and with a duration sufficient to support, and under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions.

Wet Soils: Includes areas covered by wet, poorly drained, and organic soils.

<u>Woodlands</u>: Includes areas one acre or more in size having 17 or more deciduous trees per acre with at least a 50 percent canopy cover as well as coniferous tree plantations and reforestation projects; excludes lowland woodlands, such as tamarack swamps, which are classified as wetlands.

<u>Wildlife Habitat</u>: Includes areas devoted to natural open uses of a size and with a vegetative cover capable of supporting a balanced diversity of wildlife.

<u>Steep Slope</u>: Includes areas with land slopes of 12 percent or greater.

<u>Prairies</u>: Includes open, generally treeless areas which are dominated by native grasses; also includes savannas. Park: Includes public and nonpublic park and open space sites.

<u>Historic Site</u>: Includes sites listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Most historic sites located within environmental corridors are archeological features such as American Indian settlements and effigy mounds and cultural features such as small, old cemeteries. On a limited basis, small historic buildings may also be encompassed within delineated corridors.

<u>Scenic Viewpoint</u>: Includes vantage points from which a diversity of natural features such as surface waters, wetlands, woodlands, and agricultural lands can be observed.

<u>Natural Area and Critical Species Habitat Sites</u>: Includes natural areas and critical species habitat sites as identified in the regional natural areas and critical species habitat protection and management plan.

^bIncludes such improvements as stream channel modifications and such facilities as dams.

^cIncludes trails for such activities as hiking, bicycling, cross-country skiing, nature study, and horseback riding, and excludes all motorized trail activities. It should be recognized that trails for motorized activities such as snowmobiling that are located outside the environmental corridors may of necessity have to cross environmental corridor lands. Proposals for such crossings should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, and if it is determined that they are necessary, such trail crossings should be designed to ensure minimum disturbance of the natural resources.

^dIncludes areas intended to accommodate camping in tents, trailers, or recreational vehicles, which remain at the site for short periods of time, typically ranging from an overnight stay to a two-week stay.

^eCertain transportation facilities such as bridges may be constructed over such resources.

fUtility facilities such as sanitary sewers may be located in or under such resources.

SElectric power transmission lines and similar lines may be suspended over such resources.

^hCertain flood control facilities such as dams and channel modifications may need to be provided in such resources to reduce or eliminate flood damage to existing development.

ⁱBridges for trail facilities may be constructed over such resources.

^jConsistent with Chapter NR 115 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code.

^kStreets and highways may cross such resources. Where this occurs, there should be no net loss of flood storage capacity or wetlands. Guidelines for mitigation of impacts on wetlands by Wisconsin Department of Transportation facility projects are set forth in Chapter Trans 400 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code.

¹Consistent with Chapter NR 116 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code.

^mAny development affecting wetlands must adhere to the water quality standards for wetlands established under Chapter NR 103 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code.

ⁿOnly an appropriately designed boardwalk/trail should be permitted.

^oWetlands may be incorporated as part of a golf course, provided there is no disturbance of the wetlands.

POnly if no alternative is available.

9 Only appropriately designed and located hiking and cross-country ski trails should be permitted.

^rOnly an appropriately designed, vegetated, and maintained ski hill should be permitted.

Source: SEWRPC and Waukesha County

GENERAL DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES

<u>Transportation and Utility Facilities</u>: All transportation and utility facilities proposed to be located within the
important natural resources should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis to consider alternative locations for
such facilities. If it is determined that such facilities should be located within natural resources, development
activities should be sensitive to, and minimize disturbance of, these resources, and, to the extent possible
following construction, such resources should be restored to preconstruction conditions.

The above table presents development guidelines for major transportation and utility facilities. These guidelines may be extended to other similar facilities not specifically listed in the table.

 <u>Recreational Facilities</u>: In general, no more than 20 percent of the total environmental corridor area should be developed for recreational facilities. Furthermore, no more than 20 percent of the environmental corridor area consisting of upland wildlife habitat and woodlands should be developed for recreational facilities. It is recognized, however, that in certain cases these percentages may be exceeded in efforts to accommodate needed public recreational and game and fish management facilities within appropriate natural settings.

The above table presents development guidelines for major recreational facilities. These guidelines may be extended to other similar facilities not specifically listed in the table.

• <u>Residential Development</u>: Limited residential development may be accommodated in upland environmental corridors, provided that buildings are kept off steep slopes. The maximum number of housing units accommodated at a proposed development site within the environmental corridor should be limited to the number determined by dividing the total corridor acreage within the site, less the acreage covered by surface water, floodplains and wetlands, by five. The permitted housing units may be in single-family or multi-family structures. When rural residential development is accommodated, conservation subdivision designs are strongly encouraged to locate development outside the corridor while maintaining an overall development density of no more than one dwelling per five acres.

Single-family development on existing lots of record should be permitted as provided for under county or local zoning at the time of adoption of the land use plan.

• <u>Other Development</u>: In lieu of recreational or rural density residential development, up to 10 percent of the upland corridor area in a parcel may be disturbed in order to accommodate urban residential, commercial, or other urban development under the following conditions: 1) the area to be disturbed is compact rather than scattered in nature; 2) the disturbance is located on the edge of a corridor or on marginal resources within a corridor; 3) the development does not threaten the integrity of the remaining corridor; 4) the development does not result in significant adverse water quality impacts; and 5) development of the remaining corridor lands is prohibited by a conservation easement or deed restriction. Each such proposal must be reviewed on a site-by-site basis.

Under this arrangement, while the developed area would no longer be part of the environmental corridor, the entirety of the remaining corridor would be permanently preserved from disturbance. From a resource protection point of view, preserving a minimum of 90 percent of the environmental corridor in this manner may be preferable to accommodating scattered homesites and attendant access roads at an overall density of one dwelling per five acres throughout the upland corridor areas.

- <u>Pre-Existing Lots</u>: Single-family development on existing lots of record should be permitted as provided for under county or local zoning at the time of adoption of the Comprehensive Development Plan or on lands with the Primary Environmental Corridor amended through adopted sewer service plans.
- All permitted development presumes that sound land and water management practices are utilized.

OTHER ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE AREAS

Principle

Standards

- a. Small wetlands, woodlands, and prairies not identified as part of an environmental corridor or isolated natural resource area should be preserved to the extent possible, as determined in county and local plans.
- b. All natural areas and critical species habitat sites identified for preservation in the Regional Natural Areas and Critical Species Habitat Protection and Management Plan should be preserved.
- c. One hundred-year recurrence interval floodlands should not be allocated to any development, which would cause or be subject to flood damage; and no unauthorized structure should be allowed to encroach upon and obstruct the flow of water in perennial stream channels and floodways.
- d. Development should be directed away from areas with steep slopes (12% or greater) or with seasonally high groundwater one foot or less from the surface.
- e. Land use patterns should be designed to discourage development of below grade structures on soils with seasonally high groundwater less than 3 feet from the surface. The intent is to allow development on these marginal soils, providing below grade structures (including basements) maintain a minimum of one foot separation from the seasonally high groundwater level.

RESTORATION/ENHANCEMENT OF NATURAL CONDITIONS

Principle

The restoration of unused farmland and other open space land to more natural conditions, resulting in the reestablishment or enhancement of wetlands, woodlands, prairies, grasslands, and forest interiors, can increase biodiversity and contribute to the overall environmental quality of the County by providing additional functional values as set forth in Objective No. 1 above. Deleted: urban and rural

Deleted: Urban and rural

Deleted: d
Standard

a. Carefully planned efforts to restore unused farmland and other open space land to more natural conditions should be encouraged.

Agricultural, Natural and Cultural Resources Objective No. 2

The preservation of large contiguous tracts of productive agricultural land.

Principle

The preservation of productive agricultural land is important for meeting future needs for food and fiber. Agricultural areas, in addition to providing food and fiber, can provide wildlife habitat and contribute to the maintenance of an ecological balance between plants and animals. Moreover, the preservation of agricultural areas also contributes immeasurably to the maintenance of the scenic beauty and cultural heritage of the County. Maintaining agricultural lands near urban areas can facilitate desirable and efficient production-distribution relationships, including community-supported agriculture operations.

The preservation of agricultural lands can maximize return on investments in agricultural soil and water conservation practices; and minimizes conflicts between farming operations and urban land uses.

Standard

Prime agricultural lands in Waukesha County includes those lands that meet all the following: 1) Land use is agricultural, unused/open (rural), primary/secondary environmental corridor or isolated natural areas, using SEWRPC definitions; 2) The stated land use makes up at least 5 square miles of "contiguous" lands, meaning all connecting lands are at least 1000 lineal feet in width - including adjacent communities, and excluding transportation corridors; 3) 75% of the land ownership parcels within the contiguous area are 35 acres or more; 4) Every parcel is outside of a planned sewer service area boundary; 5) 75% of every parcel is agricultural or open/unused (rural) land uses by SEWRPC definitions; and 6) 50% of the soils for every parcel are Land Capability Class I or II by NRCS definitions.

This standard is a modification of the standard used to prepare the Development Plan for Waukesha County in 1996. The standard in the 1997 Development Plan read "Prime agricultural lands in Waukesha County includes those lands in agricultural use which meet the following criteria: 1) the farm unit must be at least 35 acres in area; 2) at least 50 percent of the farm unit must be covered by soils which meet Natural Resources Conservation Service standards for National prime farmland; and 3) the farm unit must be located within a block of farmland at least five square miles in size". The definition used in 1997 became difficult to map using land information system technology. As a result, the Agriculture, Natural and Cultural Resources Element Subcommittee of the Comprehensive Development Plan Advisory Committee at their August 3, 2005 meeting approved the modification of the standards used for the delineation of prime agricultural lands. The modified standards can be mapped using land information system technology. In general, the modified standards produced the same map results used in the 1997 Development Plan.

The standard utilized in the identification of prime agricultural lands in the design year 2010 regional land use plan, including the criterion indicating that the farm unit be located within a block of farmland at least 100 acres in size, and the criterion indicating that at least 50 percent of the farm unit must be covered by Class I, Class II, or Class III soils was, to a large extent, based upon criteria utilized in the identification of farmland preservation areas in county farmland preservation plans completed within the Region in the early 1980s, including the Waukesha County Agricultural Land Preservation Plan. The 100-acre minimum combined farmland area was chosen for such plans because it was consistent with the State's minimum acreage planning criterion for farmland preservation areas under Wisconsin's Farmland Preservation Program. This relatively small area would enable the largest number of farmers to qualify for tax credits under the State Farmland Preservation Program.

While the recognition in a land use plan of smaller blocks of farmland may enable a larger number of farmers to qualify for tax credits, the maintenance of long-term agricultural use within such smaller blocks in an urbanizing region such as Southeastern Wisconsin has proven to be very difficult. Among those reasons frequently cited to explain that difficulty is the following:

- Relatively large blocks of farmland are necessary to support such agriculture-related businesses as distributors
 of farm machinery and parts and farm supplies. Scattered, relatively smaller blocks of farmland do not provide
 the critical mass necessary for such agribusiness support enterprises. Consequently, farmers remaining in such
 smaller blocks must travel ever-increasing distances for support services.
- 2. In many cases, smaller blocks of farmland are merely remnants of formerly larger blocks which have been subject to intrusion by urban residential development. This intrusion has resulted in significant urban-rural conflicts, including problems associated with the objection by residents of urban-type land subdivision developments to odors associated with farming operations; to the use of fertilizers, herbicides and pesticides, and other agriculturally related chemicals; to the noise associated with the operation of farm machinery during the early and late hours of the day; and to the movement of large farm machinery on rural roads being used increasingly for urban commuting.
- 3. For most farming enterprises, the economies of scale require relatively large tracts of land, frequently involving many hundreds of acres. The breakup of large blocks of farmland by urban intrusion makes it more difficult for farmers to assemble such larger tracts either through ownership or rental arrangements. Tract assembly is thus complicated by scattered field locations, resulting in costly and inconvenient related travel distances and, therefore, in unproductive time and higher fuel consumption.
- 4. In agricultural communities on the fringe of urbanizing areas, there is often a declining interest among the next generation of farmers to continue farm operations. This is particularly true where alternative land uses are perceived to be available. This phenomenon is reinforced by the rigors of day-to-day farm life when compared with urban lifestyles.

The criterion specifying that prime agricultural lands include those areas where 50 percent or more of the farm unit is covered by soils meeting U. S. Natural Resources Conservation Service standards for National prime farmland or farmland of Statewide importance was valid when the first county farmland preservation plans were prepared in the early 1980's. Inclusion of soils of statewide importance, or Class III soils, in the standard was appropriate even though such soils may have had marginal crop production value because a high proportion of the farms within the County then were dairy operations. Dairy operations can be viable even though a relatively large portion of the farm unit may be covered by Class III soils because such soils are suitable for grazing, production of animal feed crops, and the use of cover crops related to the dairy operations. However, increased specialization of farm operations, and loss of smaller "family" farms and dairy farms in Waukesha County has now raised questions concerning continued utilization of statewide importance, or Class III soils, as a criterion in the identification of prime agricultural lands within Waukesha County.

Local public officials, farmers, landowners, and soil scientists stated, at meetings held to review the preliminary 1997 Development Plan for Waukesha County land use plan, that lands covered by Class III soils should not be considered as prime farmland. It was noted that such soils in Waukesha County, being excessively wet, droughty or steep, rendering them unsuitable for the production of cash grain crops such as corn or soybeans. Because Class III soils are not as well-suited for intensive cash grain farming as Class I and Class II soils, and because of the significant loss of dairy farm operations within Waukesha County over the past three decades, lands covered by Class III soils no longer have the same inherent value as an agricultural resource as when dairy farms were prevalent. The criterion for the five square mile farmland block size is not a new criterion. Indeed, the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission utilized the five-square-mile-block criterion in the identification of prime agricultural land under the first-generation, design year 1990, regional land use plan adopted by the Commission in 1966. This criterion was established with direct input from, and utilizing the collective judgment of, University of Wisconsin-Extension agricultural agents working in the Region at that time.

As a practical matter, the application of the "block" standard would involve the delineation of gross areas of at least five square miles containing concentrations of farmland meeting the three criteria cited above. At least 75 percent of the gross area should be comprised of such farmland including adjacent associated environmental corridor lands, that occur within the blocks of such farmland.

In 2005, the Agriculture, Natural and Cultural Resources Subcommittee of the Comprehensive Development Plan Advisory Committee reaffirmed the concerns over the inclusion of Class III soils and using a farmland block size smaller than five square miles in the standards for prime agricultural lands.

Notes: National prime farmland consists of agricultural lands covered by U. S. Natural Resources Conservation Service-designated Class I and Class II soils. Class I soils are deep, well drained, and moderately well drained, nearly level soils with no serious limitation that restrict their use for cultivated crops. Class II soils are generally deep and well drained but may have some limitations that reduce the choice of plants that can be economically produced or require some conservation practices.

Farmland of Statewide importance consists of agricultural lands covered by U. S. Natural Resources Conservation Service-designated Class III soils. Class III soils have moderate limitations due to wetness, steepness or drought conditions that restrict the choice of plants or require special conservation practices or both.

Agricultural, Natural and Cultural Resources Objective No. 3

The preservation and provision of open space to enhance the total quality of the County environment, maximize essential natural resource availability, give form and structure to urban development, and provide opportunities for a full range of outdoor recreational activities.

Principle

Open space is the fundamental element required for the preservation and sustainable use of such natural resources as soil, water, woodlands, wetlands, native vegetation, and wildlife; it provides the opportunity to add to the physical, intellectual, and spiritual growth of the population; it enhances the economic and aesthetic value of certain types of development; and it is essential to outdoor recreational pursuits.

Standards

- a. Major park and recreation sites providing opportunities for a variety of natural resource-oriented, self actualized outdoor recreational activities should be provided by the County within a 4-mile service radius of every dwelling unit in the County, and should have a minimum gross site area of 250 acres. Examples of such uses include: camp site, swimming beach, picnic area, golf course, ski hill, hiking and cross country ski trails, horseback riding, boat launch, nature study area, and play field area.
- b. Other park and recreation sites should be provided within a maximum service radius of one mile of every dwelling unit in an urban area, and should have a minimum gross site area of five acres. <u>Lisbon maintains a five-year Park and Open Space with specific goals and service standards for various types of park and recreational facilities</u>.
- c. Typically local municipalities provide outdoor recreation facilities to afford the resident population of the opportunities to participate in intensive nonresource-oriented outdoor recreation activities. These types of facilities are activity specific such as tennis, baseball, basketball, soccer, skate parks and playgrounds.
- d. Areas having unique scientific, cultural, scenic, or educational value should not be allocated to any urban or agricultural land uses; adjacent surrounding areas should be retained in open space use, such as agricultural or limited recreational uses.
- e. The County should acquire or otherwise protect land and establish Greenways along the following waterways: the Ashippun, Bark, Fox, Mukwonago, Oconomowoc and Pewaukee Rivers and Mill, Pebble, Scuppernong, and Spring Creeks and Pebble Brook. For the purposes of this plan, greenways are located along a stream or river and are intended to provide aesthetic and natural resource continuity and often serve as ideal locations for trail facilities.

Deleted: (Standard to be refined through working with municipalities; SEWRPC standard for neighborhood parks, include a standard for one community park with a min. site area of 25 acres in each Town.) Suggested text from SEWRPC "In rural areas, a minimum of one community park having a minimum gross site area of 25 acres should be provided by each Town."

f. Where open space is mentioned as part of a conservation design residential planned unit development, said open space shall be protected as green or natural open space and no more than five (5) percent of said open space area shall be allowed to have impervious surfaces.

Agricultural, Natural and Cultural Resources Objective No. 4

A spatial distribution of land uses and specific site development designs which protects or enhances the surface and ground water resources of the County.

Principle

Information regarding existing and potential surface and ground water quality and quantity conditions is essential to any comprehensive land use and natural resource planning program. The existing quality condition of the surface and ground water resource provides important baseline data. The potential condition becomes the goal upon which planners and resource managers target their land use efforts.

Standards

- a. Potentially contaminating land uses should not be located in areas where the potential for groundwater contamination is the highest.
- b. Storm water management planning should seek to meet the potential biological use objectives of the streams in the County (presented in Chapter 3 of this Plan).

Notes: The Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR) is required, under Wisconsin Statutes and the State Water Resources Act of 1965, to establish a set of water use objectives and supporting water quality standards applicable to all surface waters of the state. The type of aquatic community a particular surface water resource is capable of supporting is represented by the biological use objectives. The potential biological use of streams indicates the biological use or trout stream class a stream could achieve if it was well managed and pollution sources were controlled.

The Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR) has established Administrative Code NR 140 to establish groundwater quality standards for substances detected in or having a reasonable probability of entering the groundwater resources of the state; to specify scientifically valid procedures for determining if a numerical standard has been attained or exceeded; to specify procedures for establishing points of standards application, and for evaluating groundwater monitoring data; to establish ranges of responses the department may require if a groundwater standard is attained or exceeded; and to provide for exemptions for facilities, practices and activities regulated by the department.

- c. Land use development patterns and practices should be designed to preserve important groundwater recharge areas and should support maintaining the natural surface and groundwater hydrology to the extent possible.
- d. Storm water management planning should seek to encourage ground water recharge to maintain the natural groundwater hydrology.

Notes: As of the writing of this Plan, the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission is engaged in the preparation of a Regional Water Supply Plan. The recommendations contained in the plan will be incorporated into future amendments to this Comprehensive Development Plan for Waukesha County.

Agricultural, Natural and Cultural Resources Objective No. 5

A spatial distribution of the various land uses which maintains biodiversity and clean air and will result in the protection and wise use of the natural resources of the County, including its soils, nonmetallic minerals, inland lakes and streams, groundwater, wetlands, woodlands, prairies, and wildlife.

Principle

The proper allocation of uses to land can assist in maintaining an ecological balance between the activities of man and the natural environment.

1. Soils

Principle

The proper relation of development to soil types and distribution can serve to avoid many environmental problems, ______ aid in the establishment of better regional settlement patterns, and promote the wise use of an irreplaceable resource.

Standards

- 1. Sewered urban development, particularly for residential use, should not be located in areas covered by soils identified in the detailed operational soil survey as having severe limitations for such development.
- 2. Unsewered suburban residential development should not be located in areas covered by soils identified in the detailed operational soil survey as unsuitable for such development.
- 3. Rural development, including agricultural and rural residential development, should not be located in areas covered by soils identified in the detailed operational soil survey as unsuitable for such uses.
- Development should be directed away from areas, with steep slopes (12% or greater) or with seasonally high groundwater one foot or less from the surface.
- 5. Land use patterns should be designed to discourage development of below grade structures on soils with seasonally high groundwater less than 3 feet from the surface. The intent is to allow development on these marginal soils, providing below grade structures (including basements) maintain a minimum of one foot separation from the seasonally high groundwater level.

2. Nonmetallic Minerals

Principle

Nonmetallic minerals, including sand and gravel, dimensional building stone, and organic materials, have significant commercial value and are an important economical supply of the construction materials needed for the continued development of Waukesha County and the Region and for the maintenance of the existing infrastructure. Urban development of lands overlying these resources and urban development located in close proximity to these resources may make it impossible to economically utilize these resources in the future and thus may result in shortages and concomitant increases in the costs of those materials, which would ultimately be reflected in both consumer prices and in the community tax structure.

Standard

All known economically viable nonmetallic mineral deposits should be protected and preserved for future mining.

3. Clean Air

Principle

Air is a particularly important determinant of the quality of the environment for life, providing the vital blend of oxygen and other gases needed to support healthy plant and animal life. Air, however, contains pollutants contributed by both natural and human sources which may be harmful to plant and animal life, that may injure or destroy such life, and that may severely damage personal and real property.

Standards

- 1. Encourage a centralized land use development pattern to minimize automobile travel and related air pollutant emissions.
- 2. Encourage protection of existing woodlands, wetlands, and prairies to enhance atmospheric oxygen supply levels.

Deleted: urban and rural land use

Deleted: Urban and rural

Deleted: d

A balanced allocation of space to the various land use categories which meets the social, physical, and economic needs of the County population.

Principle

The planned supply of urban land use should approximate the known and anticipated demand for that use.

Standards

a. For each additional 100 dwelling units to be accommodated within the County at each urban residential density, the following amounts of residential and related land should be allocated:

Residential	Residential Area (1	Net Area)	Residential Area Plus Supporting Land Uses (Gross Area)				
Density	Acres Per 100Dwelling UnitsAcrDwelling UnitsPer AcreDw		Acres Per 100 Dwelling Units	Dwelling Units Per Acre			
High-Density Urban	8	12.5	13	7.7			
Medium-Density Urban	23	4.3	32	3.1			
Low-Density Urban	83	1.2	109	0.9			
Suburban-Density	167	0.6	204	0.5			
Rural-Density	500	0.2	588	0.17			

- b. For each additional 1,000 persons to be accommodated within the County, at least 5 acres of land should be set aside in major public parks of at least 250 acres in size, and at least 9 acres should be set aside in other public parks.
- c. For each additional 1,000 persons to be accommodated within the County, approximately 12 acres of governmental and institutional land should be allocated.¹
- d. For each additional 100 industrial employees to be accommodated within the County, approximately 12 acres of industrial land should be allocated.²
- e. For each additional 100 commercial employees to be accommodated in retail and service settings within the County, approximately 6 acres of retail and service land should be allocated.²
- f. For each additional 100 commercial employees to be accommodated in office settings within the County, approximately 2.5 acres of commercial office land should be allocated.³

¹ Commercial, industrial, and governmental and institutional area includes the area devoted to the given use, consisting of the ground floor site area occupied by any building, required yards and open space, and parking and loading areas.

² The industrial standard is intended to be representative of typical new single-story industrial development. It should be recognized that the number of industrial employees per acre can vary considerably from site to site, depending upon the nature of the manufacturing activity, the level of automation, the extent to which warehousing or office functions are located at the site, and other factors.

³ The office standard is equivalent to a floor area ratio of 30 percent and a gross building area of about 325 square feet per employee.

A spatial distribution of the various land uses which will result in a convenient and compatible arrangement of land uses.

Principle

The proper allocation of uses to land can avoid or minimize hazards and dangers to health, safety, and welfare and maximize amenity and convenience in terms of accessibility to supporting land uses.

Standards

- Urban high-, medium-, and low-density residential uses should be located within neighborhood and other planning units which are served with centralized public sanitary sewerage and water supply facilities and contain, within a reasonable walking and bicycling distance necessary supporting local service uses, such as park, commercial, and elementary-school facilities.
- Mixed-use development designs should be used, as appropriate, to accommodate urban land uses that are compatible and complimentary in the vicinity of each other. Mixed-use development may consist of residential and compatible business uses together.
- 3. To the extent practicable, residential and employment-generating land uses should be located so as to provide opportunities for living in proximity to work.
- 4. When accommodated, residential development should be located in such a way as to minimize conflicts attendant to dust, odors, and noise associated with farming activity that may arise when residences are located in the vicinity of agricultural operations. Residential development should also be located in such a way as to minimize impacts on the natural resource base including wildlife habitat.

Land Use Development Objective No. 3

A spatial distribution of the various land uses which is properly related to the supporting transportation, utility, and public facility systems in order to assure the economical provision of transportation, utility, and public facility services.

Principle

The transportation and public utility facilities and the land use pattern which these facilities serve and support are mutually interdependent in that the land use pattern determines the demand for, and loading upon, transportation and utility facilities; and these facilities, in turn, are essential to, and form a basic framework for, land use development.

Standards

- 1. Urban development should be located and designed so as to maximize the use of existing transportation and utility systems.
- The transportation system should be located and designed to serve not only all land presently devoted to urban development but to land planned to be used for such urban development.
- 3. The transportation system should be located and designed to minimize the penetration of existing and planned residential neighborhood units by through traffic.
- 4. Transportation terminal facilities, such as off-street parking, off-street truck loading, and public transit stops, should be located in proximity to the principal land uses to which they are accessory.
- 5. Land developed or planned to be developed for urban high-, medium-, and low-density residential use should be located in areas serviceable by an existing or planned public sanitary sewerage system and preferably within the gravity drainage area tributary to such a system.
- 6. Land developed or planned to be developed for urban high-, medium-, and low-density residential use should be located in areas serviceable by an existing or planned public water supply system.
- 7. Land developed or planned to be developed for urban high, medium- density residential and commercial use should be located in areas serviceable by existing or planned public transit facilities.

Deleted: rural

Deleted: Rural r

- 8. Mixed use development should be encouraged to accommodate multi-purpose trips, including pedestrian trips, as a matter of convenience and efficiency.
- In the absence of public sanitary sewer service, onsite sewage disposal systems should be utilized only in accordance with the following:
 - a. Onsite soil absorption sewage disposal systems should be sited and designed in accordance with Chapter Comm 83 of the *Wisconsin Administrative Code*.
 - b. The use of onsite sewage disposal systems should be limited to the following types of development:
 - Rural density residential development.
 - Suburban density residential development, where it is found to be consistent with other land development and resource protection goals of this plan.
 - Urban land uses, which may be, required in unsewered areas limited to agriculture businesses, communication facilities, utility installations, public institutional uses and park and recreation sites.
 - c. New urban development served by onsite sewage disposal systems in areas planned to receive sanitary sewer service is discouraged. Where such development is permitted, it should be designed so that the public and private costs of conversion to public sanitary sewer service are minimized.
 - d. For a private sewage system serving multiple buildings located on a separate property and owned by multiple owners, the private sewage system must be owned and maintained by a governmental entity or agency. For condominium private sewage systems serving multiple units/buildings, owned by multiple owners and located on the same property as the unit/building, the owner/association must accept responsibility for the operation and maintenance of the private sewage system and have the local municipality provide written acceptance of this responsibility should the owner/association fail to do so.

The development and preservation of residential areas within a physical environment that is healthy, safe, convenient, and attractive.⁴

Principle A

Residential development in the form of planned residential neighborhoods can provide a desirable environment for families as well as other household types; can provide efficiency in the provision of neighborhood services and facilities; and can foster safety and convenience.

Standards

- a. Urban high-, medium-, and low-density residential neighborhoods should be designed as cohesive units properly related to the larger community of which they are a part. Such neighborhoods should be physically self-contained within clearly defined and relatively permanent recognizable boundaries, such as arterial streets and highways, major park and open space reservations, or significant natural features, such as rivers, streams, or hills. Desirably, the neighborhoods should contain enough area to provide the following: housing for the population served by one elementary school and one neighborhood park; an interconnected internal street, bicycle-way, and pedestrian system which provides multiple opportunities for access and circulation; and those community and commercial facilities necessary to meet the day-to-day living requirements.⁵
- b. Desirably, urban residential neighborhoods should accommodate a mix of housing sizes, structure types, and lot sizes, resulting in an overall density that is within the planned density range for each neighborhood.

Deleted: limited, however, to areas already committed to such use through subdivision plats or certified surveys.

⁴ This objective does not address suburban density residential development (between 0.2 and 0.6 dwelling units per acre) since new suburban density residential development would be limited to that which is already committed in subdivision plats and certified surveys.

⁵ Neighborhood sizes envisioned under these standards are as follows: high-density—160 acres; medium-density—640 acres; and low-density—2,560 acres. As a practical matter, smaller household sizes and the attendant lower neighborhood population levels often require that an elementary school or retail and service area be provided to serve two or more contiguous neighborhoods, rather than a single neighborhood.

- c. Conservation subdivision design concepts should be incorporated into high-, medium-, and low-density neighborhoods, as appropriate.⁶
- d. To the extent possible, efforts directed at the conservation and renewal of existing residential areas should be undertaken on a neighborhood basis and should seek to preserve those cultural features which contribute to the promotion of neighborhood identity within the larger urban complex.

To meet the foregoing standards, land should typically be allocated as follows:

	Percent of Are	ea in Land Dev	elopment Cate	gory		
Land Use Category	Urban High- Density (7.0-17.9 dwelling units per net residential acre)	Urban Medium- Density (2.3-6.9 dwelling units per net residential acre)	Urban Low-Density (0.7-2.2 dwelling units per net residential acre)	Suburban- Density (0.2-0.6 dwelling units per net residential acre)	Rural- Density (0.1-0.2 dwelling units per net residential acre)	Agricultural (less than 0.2 dwelling units per net residential acre)
Residential	66.0	71.0	76.5	82.0	85.0	6.0
Streets and Utilities	25.0	23.0	20.0	18.0	15.0	4.0
Parks and Playgrounds	3.5	2.5	1.5			
Public Elementary Schools	2.5	1.5	0.5			
Other Governmental and Institutional	1.5	1.0	1.0			
Retail and Service	1.5	1.0	0.5			
Nonurban						90.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Principle B

Residential development in mixed-use settings can provide a desirable environment for a variety of household types seeking the benefits of proximity to places of employment as well as civic, cultural, commercial, and other urban amenities. Examples of mixed use settings include dwellings above the ground floor of commercial uses and residential structures intermixed with, or located adjacent to, compatible commercial, institutional, or civic uses.

Standards

- a. Opportunities should be provided for residential dwellings—particularly in the medium- and high-density range—within a variety of mixed-use settings.
- b. Residential uses should be integrated into, or located in close proximity to, major economic activity centers.

Principle C

Residential development in a rural setting can provide a desirable environment for households seeking proximity to open space.

⁶ Conservation subdivision designs generally involve locating dwelling units in clusters surrounded by open space, thereby achieving the desired density for the site on an overall basis. The layout of individual lots and supporting streets is done in a manner that preserves the most significant existing natural resource features to the extent possible. In a rural setting, conservation subdivisions can include agricultural lands as part of the open space area that is planned to be preserved.

Standards

- The County and regional land use plans seek to maintain the rural character of lands located outside planned a. urban service areas. In Lisbon this is achieved primarily through protecting woodlands and wetlands, providing open space within developed areas, providing greater housing setbacks from roads, and encouraging the preservation of existing farmsteads.
- Continued agricultural and other open space uses are encouraged in such areas. in a manner consistent with b. esidential land uses
- Where residential development is to be accommodated, an overall density of no more than one dwelling unit c. per five acres should be maintained. The use of residential cluster designs, with homes developed in clusters surrounded by agriculture or other open space sufficient to maintain the maximum recommended density of no more than one home per five acres, is encouraged.
- d. A development density of no more than one home per five acres in rural areas is recommended to help accomplish the following;
 - Preserve natural drainage systems insofar as possible and minimize drainage problems and the need for storm water management facilities.
 - Preserve open space and natural amenities, especially through the use of cluster design, to accommodate residential development while avoiding "wall to wall" residential subdivisions.
 - Minimize the risks to the groundwater supply and quality which the widespread use of onsite sewage treatment and wells at higher densities may pose in the long term.
 - Preserve, through careful design, the overall integrity of the rural landscape, including environmental corridors and wildlife habitat areas.
 - Minimize the loss of large contiguous tracts of farmland covered by agricultural soils classified as Class I and Class II soils.

Land Use Development Objective No. 5

Provide for the preservation, development, and redevelopment of a variety of suitable industrial and commercial sites both in terms of physical characteristics and location.

Principle

The production and sale of goods and services are among the principal determinants of the level of economic vitality in any society; the important activities related to these functions require areas and locations suitable to their purposes.

Standards

- 1. Industrial, retail, and office uses should meet the following standards:
 - a. Available adequate water supply, sanitary sewer service, stormwater drainage facilities, and power supply.
 - Ready access to the arterial street and highway system. b.
 - Adequate on-street and off-street parking (may not be directly on-site but within vicinity) and loading areas. d. Provision of properly located points of ingress and egress appropriately controlled to prevent congestion
 - on adjacent arterial streets. Site design emphasizing integrated nodes or centers, rather than linear strips.
 - e.
 - f. Site design appropriately integrating the site with adjacent land uses.
 - Served by local transit service (applies to industrial, retail, and office uses located within, or in proximity g. to, medium- and high-density areas).

Deleted: ¶

Minimize traffic volumes on rural highways and the need to widen highways beyond two lanes

Deleted:

Deleted: rural character

It should be recognized that industrial, retail, and office uses located in outlying areas may not be able to be served by transit service.

- In addition, major centers accommodating industrial, retail, and office development should meet the following standards:⁸
 - a. Served by rapid and express transit service.
 - b. Access within two miles of the freeway system.
 - c. Access to a transport-corporate airport within a maximum travel time of 30 minutes (major office and industrial development).⁹
 - d. Reasonable access through appropriate components of the transportation system to railway and seaport facilities, consistent with the requirements of the industries concerned (major industrial development).
 - e. Residential uses appropriately integrated into, or located in proximity to, the major center.

The conservation, renewal, and full use of existing urban areas of the County.

Principle

The conservation and renewal, as appropriate, of existing urban areas can enhance their viability and desirability as places to live, work, recreate, and participate in cultural activities. Such efforts, along with infill development on vacant land within existing urban service areas, serves to maximize the use of existing public infrastructure and public service systems and can moderate the amount of agricultural and other open space land converted to urban use to accommodate growth in the county and regional population and economy.

Standards

- 1. Existing urban areas should be conserved and renewed, as appropriate.
- 2. To the extent possible, the additional urban land necessary to accommodate growth in the regional population and economy should be met through the renewal or redevelopment as appropriate of older, underutilized urban areas that are in need of revitalization and through the infilling of undeveloped land within existing urban service areas.

Major retail center: A major economic activity center that accommodates at least 2,000 retail employees.

⁸ A major economic activity center is defined as a concentrated area of commercial and/or industrial land having a minimum of 3,500 total employees or 2,000 retail employees. Major economic activity centers are further classified according to the following employment levels, recognizing that a major economic activity center may meet more than one of the indicated thresholds:

<u>Major industrial center</u>: A major economic activity center that accommodates at least 3,500 industrial employees. <u>Major office center</u>: A major economic activity center that accommodates at least 3,500 office employees.

<u>General-purpose major center</u>: A center that qualifies as a major economic activity center having total employment of at least 3,500, but does not meet any of the above individual thresholds for an industrial, office, or retail center.

It should be recognized that major industrial, office, and retail centers generally encompass a mix of uses. A major industrial center may accommodate offices, service operations, and research facilities in addition to manufacturing, wholesaling, and distribution facilities. A major retail center may accommodate office and service uses in addition to retail operations. The mix of uses extends to residential uses—which should be integrated into, or provided in close proximity to, major economic activity centers, as those centers develop or are re-developed.

⁹ A transport-corporate airport is defined as an airport that is intended to serve business and corporate jets as well as virtually all small single- and twin-engine general aviation aircraft. Existing and proposed transport-corporate airports in the Region are identified in the regional airport system plan, documented in SEWRPC Planning Report No. 38 (2nd Edition), A Regional Airport System Plan for Southeastern Wisconsin: 2010, November 1996.

Transportation Objective No. 1

A multi-modal transportation system which, through its location, capacity, and design, will effectively serve the existing regional and County land use pattern and promote the implementation of the regional land use plan and the Comprehensive Development Plan for Waukesha County, meeting and managing the anticipated travel demand generated by the existing and proposed land uses.

Principle

An integrated multi-modal regional transportation system connects major land use activities within the Region and County, providing the accessibility essential to the support of these activities. The transportation system should provide higher accessibility to areas recommended for development and redevelopment, and lower accessibility to areas not recommended for development.

Standards

- 1. The transportation system should be consistent with and serve to support, and promote the implementation of the land use plan.
 - a. Higher relative transportation accessibility should be provided to areas recommended for development than to areas not recommended for development;
 - b. Improvements in accessibility should be provided to areas recommended for development rather than to areas not recommended for development.

Transportation Objective No. 2

A multi-modal transportation system which provides appropriate types of transportation needed by all residents of the County at an adequate level of service; provides choices among transportation modes; and provides inter-modal connectivity.

Principle

A multi-modal regional transportation system is necessary to provide transportation service to all segments of the population and to support and enhance the economy and quality of life. The arterial street and highway system serving personal travel by automobile and freight travel by truck is, has been, and will likely continue to be the dominant element of the transportation system carrying over 90 percent of total daily travel, and serving the overwhelming majority of the population. However, there are substantial reasons for a multi-modal regional traveled corridors, public transit and bicycle and pedestrian facilities can alleviate peak travel loadings on highway facilities and the demand for land for parking facilities. Also, a multi-modal transportation system can support and enhance the quality of life and economy by providing a choice of modes.

Standards

- 1. Arterial Street and Highway System
 - a. A grid of arterial streets and highways should be provided in urban areas of the Region at intervals of no more than one-half mile in each direction in urban high-density areas, at intervals of no more than one mile in each direction in urban medium-density areas, and at intervals of no more than two miles in each direction in urban low-density and suburban-density areas. In rural areas, arterials should be provided at intervals of no less than two miles in each direction.
 - b. In urban areas of the Region, the grid of arterial streets should be direct and understandable.
 - c. Arterial street and highway facilities should be provided with adequate traffic-carrying capacity to minimize traffic congestion.^a

^a Design capacity is the maximum level of traffic volume a facility can carry before beginning to experience morning and afternoon peak traffic hour traffic congestion, and is expressed in terms of number of vehicles per average weekday. The design capacity and level of congestion thresholds are set forth in the following table:

	Average W	eekday Traffic V	olumes (vehicles	per 24 hours)
	Design	Upper Limit	Upper Limit	Entrance
E iliter Terre	Capacity and	of Moderate	of Severe	Extreme
Facility Type	Upper Limit	Congestion	Congestion	Congestion and
	of Level of	and Level of	and Level of	Level of Service
	Service C	Service D	Service E	F
Freeway				
Four-lane	60,000	80,000	90,000	> 90,000
Six-lane	90,000	121,000	135,000	> 135,000
Eight-lane	120,000	161,000	180,000	> 180,000
Standard Arterial				
Two-lane	14,000	18,000	19,000	> 19,000
Four-lane Undivided	18,000	23,000	24,000	> 24,000
Four-lane with Two-way Left Turn Lane	21,000	29,000	31,000	> 31,000
Four-lane Divided	27,000	31,000	32,000	> 32,000
Six-lane Divided	38,000	45,000	48,000	> 48,000
Eight-lane Divided	50,000	60,000	63,000	> 63,000

The level of congestion on arterial streets and highways may summarized by the following operating conditions:

Freeway			
Level of Traffic	Level of	Avaraga Smood	Operating Conditions
Congestion	Service	Average speed	Operating Conditions
None	A and B	Freeway free-	No restrictions on ability to maneuver and change
		flow speed	lanes.
None	С	Freeway free-	Some restrictions on ability to maneuver and change
		flow speed	lanes.
Moderate	D	1 to 2 mph below	Substantial restrictions on ability to maneuver and
		free-flow speed	change lanes.
Severe	Е	Up to 10 mph	Virtually no ability to maneuver and change lanes.
		below free-flow	Operation at maximum capacity. No usable gaps in
		speed	the traffic stream to accommodate lane changing.
Extreme	F	Typically 20 to	Breakdown in vehicular flow with stop-and-go,
		30 mph or less	bumper-to-bumper traffic.

Surface Arterial			
Level of Traffic Congestion	Level of Service	Average Speed	Operating Conditions
None	A and B	70 to 100% of free-flow speed	Ability to maneuver within traffic stream is unimpeded. Control delay at signalized intersections is minimal.
None	С	50 to 100% of free-flow speed	Restricted ability to maneuver and change lanes at mid-block locations.
Moderate	D	40 to 50% of free- flow speed	Restricted ability to maneuver and change lanes. Small increases in flow lead to substantial increases in delay and decreases in travel speed.
Severe	Е	33 to 40 percent of free-flow speed	Significant restrictions on lane changes. Traffic flow approaches instability.
Extreme	F	25 to 33 percent of free-flow speed	Flow at extremely low speeds. Intersection congestion with high delays, high volumes, and extensive queuing.

2. Public Transit

a. The public transit system should serve and connect medium and high density areas of the Region and the Region's major activity centers that currently generate, or have the potential to generate, ridership. The public transit services provided should include rapid, express, local, shuttle, and paratransit services. The detailed planning objectives, principles and standards for the public transit system are documented in SEWRPC Planning Report No. 49, A Regional Transportation System Plan for Southeastern Wisconsin: 2035.

3. Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

- a. All arterial streets and highways (including their bridge and underpass facilities) except freeways should provide accommodation for bicyclists upon construction or reconstruction, or for arterial facilities having a rural cross section if possible, when resurfaced.
- b. A regional system of off-street bicycle paths should be provided in accordance with the recommendations set forth in the adopted park and open space plans. These off-street bicycle paths should provide reasonably direct connections between the urban areas and communities on safe and aesthetically attractive routes with separation from motor vehicle traffic.
- c. The detailed planning objectives, principles and standards for bicycle and pedestrian facilities are documented in SEWRPC Planning Report No. 43, A Regional Bicvcle and Pedestrian Facilities System Plan for Southeastern Wisconsin: 2010, and amendments thereto.

Community Facilities Objective No. 1

To provide police, fire and other emergency service facilities necessary to maintain high-quality protection throughout the County.

Principle

The adequacy of police, fire and other emergency protection in the County is dependent upon the relationship between the distribution of land uses and the location of facilities available to serve those uses.

Standard

The future placement and current use of emergency service facilities needs to be coordinated to optimize emergency response times and to eliminate overlap of service areas and equipment.

Housing Objective No. 1

The provision of an adequate stock of decent, safe, and sanitary housing to meet the county's total housing requirement and, as components of that requirement, the effective market demand and true housing need.

Principle

Increases in the total number of households within the County as a result of new household formations and net inmigration of additional households as well as changing size and composition of existing households require a concomitant increase in housing units. New centers of employment, which accommodate industrial, retail, service, governmental, or other uses, may also prompt the need for additional employee housing.

Standards

- The supply of vacant and available housing units should be sufficient to maintain and facilitate ready housing consumer turnover. Rental and homeowner vacancy rates at the county level and, if possible, within local municipalities should be maintained at a minimum of 4 percent and a maximum of 6 percent for rental units and a minimum of 1 percent and a maximum of 2 percent for homeowner units over a full range of housing types, sizes, and costs.
- The supply of sound housing units should be provided through the working of the private housing sector to the maximum extent possible, with continued assistance, incentives, and cooperation by various Federal, State, and local governmental agencies rendered as necessary.
- 3. A sufficient supply of new housing should be made available within reasonable proximity to new employment centers. To meet this standard, additional housing at a rate of 75 housing units per 100 new jobs should be provided within a six-mile one-way travel distance of such employment centers.

Housing Objective No. 2

The provision of adequate locational choice of housing.

Principle

The Southeastern Wisconsin Region provides a wide variety of employment, educational, cultural, and recreational facilities. Adequate choice in the size, cost, and location of housing units will facilitate the opportunity for all households to utilize and enjoy these facilities. Geographic distribution and price level variety of housing units can also assist in reducing economic and racial imbalances and equalize fiscal disparities and services differences among communities within the Region.

Standard

Communities that seek to attract jobs, as reflected in the accommodation of new commercial and industrial development, should ensure that a broad range of housing styles, types and price ranges are provided so as to provide opportunities to minimize geographic imbalances between job and residence locations. In so doing, a community should examine both its range of housing stock and its range of jobs, with a view toward ensuring that the price range of the existing and planned housing stock compares favorably with the income range of the workers in those jobs.

Chapter 5

PLEASE USE PDF FOR COMPLETE DOCUMENT WITH ALL MAPS, FIGURES, ETC.

HOUSING ELEMENT

INTRODUCTION

The housing element is one of the nine elements of a comprehensive plan required by Section 66.1001 of the *Wisconsin Statutes*. Section 66.1001 (2) (b) of the *Statutes* requires the housing element to assess the age, structural condition, value, and occupancy characteristics of existing housing stock in the County and participating local governments. In addition, specific policies and programs must be identified that:

- Promote the development of housing for residents of the County and participating local governments and provide a range of housing choices that meet the needs of persons of all income levels and age groups and persons with special needs.
- Promote the availability of land for the development or redevelopment of affordable housing.
- Maintain or rehabilitate existing housing stock.

In addition, the following comprehensive planning goals related to the housing element are set forth in Section 16.965 of the *Statutes* and must be addressed as part of the planning process:

- Promotion of the redevelopment of lands with existing infrastructure and public services and the maintenance and rehabilitation of existing residential, commercial, and industrial structures.
- Encouragement of land uses, densities and regulations that promote efficient development patterns and relatively low municipal, state government, and utility costs.
- Provide an adequate supply of affordable housing for individuals of all income levels throughout each community.
- Provide adequate infrastructure and public services and an adequate supply of developable land to meet existing and future market demand for residential, commercial, and industrial uses.

Part 1 of this chapter provides an inventory of existing housing stock, including age, structural condition, value, and occupancy characteristics. This information, along with housing demand inventory data such as household, income, and demographic information presented in Chapter II of this plan, is used to analyze future housing needs for residents of the County and participating local governments.

Part 2 provides a description of government programs which facilitate the provision of housing, including affordable housing and information on community policies established for the percentage distribution of single-family, two-family, and multi-family units.

Part 3 of this chapter sets forth recommendations through the plan design year of 2035. Planning principles, standards, and objectives for the housing element are found in Chapter II.

Census Data

Census 2000 Summary File 1 and Census 2000 Summary File 3 were used in the collection of the existing housing stock data presented in this chapter. This information is collected by the U.S. Bureau of the Census every 10 years. The United States government has collected census data since 1790. Summary File 1 (also known as the short census form) data was used when possible. Data from Summary File 1 is generally more

accurate than Summary File 3 because it is based on 100 percent of the responses to the 2000 Census. In most cases, data from Summary File 3 were used because the data were not available from Summary File 1. Summary File 3 (also known as the long census form) is generally less accurate because the data is based on a sampling of one in six households; however, Summary File 3 covers a greater range of topics. Because the sample sizes are different, the data reported by the Census may differ for each data source. Unfortunately, the Census does not make adjustments to reconcile the discrepancies. In addition, some of the data to follow in this chapter are based on total housing units and some are based on occupied units only, depending on how the Census data were reported. This distinction is footnoted on all applicable tables.

WAUKESHA COUNTY HOUSING STRENGTHS, CONCERNS, AND WEAKNESSES

The Waukesha County Comprehensive Planning Land Use, Housing and Transportation Subcommittee expressed the following housing strengths, concerns, and weaknesses.

Housing Strengths

- Sufficient housing supply for mid-to high-market single-family residential
- · High housing quality
- Diverse housing age and style
- Safe neighborhoods
- Strong neighborhood associations
- · Increasing ethnic and racial diversity
- Public willingness to have cluster design subdivisions

Housing Concerns and Weaknesses

- High cost of land
- A need for increased density
- Densities driven more toward single-family (suburban) densities
- · Need for increased availability of affordable housing
- · Housing affordability needs to be based on projected job growth
- Municipalities pushing for higher value development for tax base purposes
- A lack of diverse housing stock in neighborhoods (ie. two-family or more with single-family homes)
- · A need for more energy and water efficient appliances and continued emphasis on green building concepts
- A need for more education on storm water management and other infiltration techniques
- A need for increased political support to decrease the cost of the land and utilities to achieve affordable
- housing
- Few municipal caps on maximum housing size
- A need for increased understanding regarding the connection between the housing and community and regional economics
- A need for increased ethnic and racial diversity

HOUSING INVENTORY

The characteristics of existing housing in Waukesha County have been inventoried to help determine the number and type of housing units that will best suit the needs of County residents through 2035. The existing housing stock inventory includes:

- · Total housing units
- Vacancy rate
- Value of owner-occupied housing units
- Monthly cost of housing units by tenure

- Number of bedrooms
- Structure type and year built
- · Condition of existing housing stock

Total Housing Units

The quantity and tenure (owner- or renter-occupied) of existing housing units in Waukesha County and each participating local government is one of the key inventory items needed to forecast the number of additional housing units the planning area will require in 2035. Table V-1 sets forth the total number of housing units in the County and each participating local government in 2000. In 2000, there were 140,309 total housing units in the County. Of the total housing units, 79.32 percent, or 103,373, were owner-occupied and 16.13 percent, or 31,856, were renter-occupied. The number of vacancies in 2000 was 5,080 units, or 4.56 percent. The percentage of owner occupied housing units ranged from 48.51 percent in the Village of Butler to 95.09 percent in the Town of Vernon. The percentage of renter occupied units ranged from 2.36 percent in the Village of Lac La Belle to 49.15 percent in the Village of Butler. Over 35 percent of the entire renter, occupied housing units within the County were located within the City of Waukesha in 2000.

Vacancy Rate

Another key housing supply inventory item is the vacancy rate of various housing types. The vacancy rate is the number of vacant and available housing units divided by the total number of housing units within the County. The vacancy rates for owner-occupied units and rental units are shown on Table V-2.

Some vacancies are necessary for a healthy housing market. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) states that an area needs a minimum overall vacancy rate of 3.0 percent to ensure adequate housing choices, which should include a minimum 1.5 percent vacancy rate for owner-occupied housing units and a minimum 5 percent vacancy rate for rental units to ensure adequate housing choices. Vacant units can fall into several categories including for rent; for sale only; for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use; for migrant workers; and other vacant units.

The overall vacancy rate in the County was 3.62 percent in 2000. Although the overall vacancy rate for the County met HUD guidelines, the rate was less than 3 percent in Towns of Genesee, Lisbon, Mukwonago, Vernon, and Waukesha, the Villages of Big Bend, Butler, Dousman, Eagle, Lac La Belle, Lannon, Menomonee Falls, Merton, Nashotah, North Prairie, and Wales, and the Cities of Brookfield, Muskego, and New Berlin. The Village of Oconomowoc Lake (15.45%) and Village of Chenequa (20.36%) each had a particularly high vacancy rate in 2000. Of all vacancies, Oconomowoc Lake had 12.20% in the "rented or sold, but not occupied category". The vacancy rate in Chenequa is largely due to the "seasonal, recreational, or occasional use" homes along Pine Lake.

The vacancy rate in the County for "owner-occupied units"¹ was determined by dividing the number of units for sale (842) from Table V-2 by the total number of owner-occupied units (103,373) in the County from Table V-1. The approximate vacancy rate for rental units was determined by dividing the number of units for rent (1,645) from Table V-2 by the number of rental units (31,856) from Table V-1. The results of these calculations were a vacancy rate of 0.81 percent for owner-occupied units and 5.16 percent for rental units in the County in 2000. The owner-occupied unit vacancy rate was substantially lower than the minimum vacancy rate of 1.5 percent identified by HUD to provide for an adequate choice of owner-occupied units. The rental unit vacancy met HUD guidelines.

¹ The data for specified owner-occupied housing units excludes mobile homes, houses with a business or medical office on the property, houses on 10 or more acres, and housing units in multi-unit buildings.

TOTAL HOUSING UNITS BY TENURE IN WAUKESHA COUNTY COMMUNITIES: 2000

Community	Owner- U	Occupied nits	Renter-O	Occupied hits	Vacan	t Units	Total Housing
Community	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number
Town of Brookfield	1,763	61.58%	999	34.89%	101	3.53%	2,863
Town of Delafield	2,290	87.24%	231	8.80%	104	3.96%	2,625
Town of Eagle	984	88.01%	65	5.81%	69	6.17%	1,118
Town of Genesee	2,248	90.61%	183	7.38%	50	2.02%	2,481
Town of Lisbon	3,104	94.89%	114	3.49%	53	1.62%	3,271
Town of Merton	2,503	85.37%	203	6.92%	226	7.71%	2,932
Town of Mukwonago	2,075	92.59%	109	4.86%	57	2.54%	2,241
Town of Oconomowoc	2,338	76.78%	427	14.02%	280	9.20%	3,045
Town of Ottawa	1,232	85.79%	143	9.96%	61	4.25%	1,436
Town of Summit	1,554	81.62%	193	10.14%	157	8.25%	1,904
Town of Vernon	2,287	95.09%	93	3.87%	25	1.04%	2,405
Town of Waukesha	2,786	94.60%	105	3.57%	54	1.83%	2,945
Village of Big Bend	371	81.18%	77	16.85%	9	1.97%	457
Village of Butler	455	48.51%	461	49.15%	22	2.35%	938
Village of Chenequa	193	68.93%	30	10.71%	57	20.36%	280
Village of Dousman	315	53.66%	260	44.29%	12	2.04%	587
Village of Eagle	529	87.44%	63	10.41%	13	2.15%	605
Village of Elm Grove	2,196	85.92%	248	9.70%	112	4.38%	2,556
Village of Hartland	1,746	55.61%	1,256	40.00%	138	4.39%	3,140
Village of Lac La Belle	114	89.76%	3	2.36%	10	7.87%	127
Village of Lannon	361	83.18%	64	14.75%	9	2.07%	434
Village of Menomonee Falls	9,939	75.64%	2,905	22.11%	296	2.25%	13,140
Village of Merton	558	93.31%	33	5.52%	7	1.17%	598
Village of Mukwonago	1,516	60.59%	876	35.01%	110	4.40%	2,502
Village of Nashotah	427	93.85%	18	3.96%	10	2.20%	455
Village of North Prairie	455	83.64%	76	13.97%	13	2.39%	544
Village of Oconomowoc Lake	185	75.20%	23	9.35%	38	15.45%	246
Village of Pewaukee	2,330	61.95%	1,305	34.70%	126	3.35%	3,761
Village of Sussex	2,179	63.32%	1,131	32.87%	131	3.81%	3,441
Village of Wales	722	83.66%	124	14.37%	17	1.97%	863
City of Brookfield	12,482	87.85%	1,409	9.92%	317	2.23%	14,208
City of Delafield	1,694	63.09%	859	31.99%	132	4.92%	2,685
City of Muskego	6,228	80.89%	1,305	16.95%	166	2.16%	7,699
City of New Berlin	11,778	78.94%	2,717	18.21%	426	2.86%	14,921
City of Oconomowoc	3,102	59.21%	1,866	35.62%	271	5.17%	5,239
City of Pewaukee	3,826	80.36%	727	15.27%	208	4.37%	4,761
City of Waukesha	14,508	54.02%	11,155	41.54%	1,193	4.44%	26,856
Waukesha County	103,373	79.32%	31,856	16.13%	5,080	4.56%	140,309

Totals are based on 100 percent of respondents to the 2000 Census (Summary File 1) Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and SEWRPC.

HOUSING VACANCIES IN WAUKESHA COUNTY COMMUNITIES: 2000^a

	For	For Sale	Rented or Sold,	Seasonal, Recreational,	For Migrant	Other	Total	Total	
Community	Rent	Only	Not Occupied ^b	or Occassional Use	Workers	Vacant ^c	Vacancies	Units	Vacancy Rate
Town of Brookfield	60	8	13	14	6	0	101	2,863	3.53%
Town of Delafield	6	13	1	58	26	0	104	2,625	3.96%
Town of Eagle	2	11	5	48	3	0	69	1,118	6.17%
Town of Genesee	9	8	5	13	15	0	50	2,481	2.02%
Town of Lisbon	5	22	10	11	1	4	53	3,271	1.62%
Town of Merton	7	17	10	170	22	0	226	2,932	7.71%
Town of Mukwonago	5	13	9	20	10	0	57	2,241	2.54%
Town of Oconomowoc	19	22	17	198	24	0	280	3,045	9.20%
Town of Ottawa	6	4	1	43	7	0	61	1,436	4.25%
Town of Summit	1	8	4	121	23	0	157	1,904	8.25%
Town of Vernon	5	7	6	1	6	0	25	2,405	1.04%
Town of Waukesha	2	18	13	4	17	0	54	2,945	1.83%
Village of Big Bend	2	3	1	1	2	0	9	457	1.97%
Village of Butler	12	4	1	5	0	0	22	938	2.35%
Village of Chenequa	1	1	1	50	4	0	57	280	20.36%
Village of Dousman	7	2	3	0	0	0	12	587	2.04%
Village of Eagle	5	2	3	1	2	0	13	605	2.15%
Village of Elm Grove	11	46	12	29	14	0	112	2,556	4.38%
Village of Hartland	38	51	27	6	16	0	138	3,140	4.39%
Village of Lac La Belle	2	8	0	0	0	0	10	127	7.87%
Village of Lannon	6	1	2	0	0	0	9	434	2.07%
Village of Menomonee Falls	84	80	53	35	44	0	296	13,140	2.25%
Village of Merton	1	3	1	2	0	0	7	598	1.17%
Village of Mukwonago	58	19	8	11	14	0	110	2,502	4.40%
Village of Nashotah	1	3	2	3	1	0	10	455	2.20%
Village of North Prairie	4	4	3	2	0	0	13	544	2.39%
Village of Oconomowoc Lake	4	1	30	3	0	0	38	246	15.45%
Village of Pewaukee	53	15	7	33	4	14	126	3,761	3.35%
Village of Sussex	90	10	10	11	10	0	131	3,441	3.81%
Village of Wales	7	3	3	1	3	0	17	863	1.97%
City of Brookfield	56	70	59	86	46	0	317	14,208	2.23%
City of Delafield	25	6	10	72	19	0	132	2,685	4.92%
City of Muskego	39	27	19	49	32	0	166	7,699	2.16%
City of New Berlin	136	129	62	32	67	0	426	14,921	2.86%
City of Oconomowoc	84	68	38	46	35	0	271	5,239	5.17%
City of Pewaukee	39	38	26	78	27	0	208	4,761	4.37%
City of Waukesha	753	97	128	54	161	0	1,193	26,856	4.44%
Waukesha County	1,645	842	603	1,311	661	18	5,080	140,309	3.62%

¹ Totals are based on 100 percent of the responses to the 2000 Census (Summary Fie 1) ^bThe unit is classified "rented or sold, not occupied" if any money towards rent has been paid or the unit has recently been sold but the occupant has not yet moved in. ^cIf a vacant unit does not fall into any of the other categories it is classified as an "other vacant unit." An example would be a unit held for occupancy by a caretaker. Source: U.S. Census and SEWRPC

Value of Owner-Occupied Housing Units

Table V-3 presents the values of specified owner-occupied housing units in the County and each local government in 2000. These values can be used to determine if there are adequate home ownership opportunities for residents of all income levels in the County. Homes that had values between \$50,000 and \$99,999 comprised 4.95 percent of housing units. Homes that had values between \$100,000 and \$149,999 comprised 29.15 percent of all owner-occupied housing units, and 32.63 percent had values between \$150,000 and \$199,999. Owner-occupied homes that had values between \$200,000 and \$249,999 comprised 13.86 percent of housing units, 8.56 percent fell within \$250,000 and \$299,000, and 10.43 percent had values at \$300,000 or more. The median value for owner-occupied housing units in the County in 2000 was \$170,400.

Table V-4 shows the value of owner-occupied housing units for each county in the Southeastern Wisconsin Region and for the State in 2000. The median value of \$170,400 in the County was second highest among counties in the Region. The median value of owner-occupied housing units was \$124,441 in the Region, \$112,200 in the State, and \$119,600 in the Nation. Waukesha County also had the highest household median income of counties in the Region and among adjacent counties (See Chapter II, Table II-6).

More recent data regarding the value of owner-occupied housing units, available from the Wisconsin Realtors Association is presented in Table V-5. These sources provide information regarding the actual selling prices of existing housing in the Region. The selling price data pertains to single-family homes, but does not include condominiums. The data shows there was a significant increase in median selling prices in Waukesha County (42.43 percent) and for the Region (43.56 percent) between 2000 and 2006. In 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003 Ozaukee County had the highest median selling prices of existing housing in the Region. In 2004, 2005, and 2006 Waukesha County experienced the highest median selling prices of existing housing in the Region. This statistic indicated that housing prices escalated at a much higher rate than the increase in wages. It is too early to tell how the downturn in the housing market that began in late 2006 will impact median selling price in the near future. This perceived downturn in the housing market is not yet supported by statistical data that shows that the median selling price of existing home sales is declining substantially.

Monthly Housing Costs

Monthly housing costs for owner-occupied housing units and rental housing units have been inventoried to determine if there is an adequate supply of affordable housing units for each household income level in the planning area. HUD defines affordability as access to decent and safe housing that costs no more than 30 percent of a household's gross monthly income. As shown in Table V-6, over 75 percent of all owner occupied housing units in Waukesha County had a mortgage loan in 2000. Twenty-seven percent had a second mortgage or home equity loan. These were the highest percentages within the Region and adjacent counties. The lowest percentages of owner occupied housing units with a mortgage were in Dodge and Milwaukee counties.

Table V-7 sets forth monthly housing costs² for specified owner-occupied housing units with a mortgage in the planning area and each participating local government in 2000. The median monthly housing cost for homeowners with a mortgage in the County was \$1,366 in 2000. About 22 percent of homeowners with a mortgage spent less than \$1,000 per month. Nearly 40 percent of homeowners in the County with a mortgage spent between \$1,000 and \$1,499 on monthly housing costs. Almost 24 percent spent between \$1,500 and \$2,000 and close to 15 percent of homeowners with a mortgage spent over \$2,000 per month.

Table V-8 shows monthly housing costs for specified owner-occupied housing units with a mortgage for each County in the Region and the State in 2000. The median monthly cost of \$1,366 in Waukesha County was the second highest among counties in the Region. Only Ozaukee County with a median monthly cost of \$1,420 was higher. The median monthly cost for homeowners with a mortgage was \$1,123 in the Region, \$1,024 in the State, and \$1,088 in the Nation.

² Selected monthly owner costs are the sum of mortgage payments or similar debts on the property; real estate taxes; fire, hazard, and flood insurance on the property; and utilities. Costs do not include maintenance.

STRUCTURAL VALUE FOR SPECIFIED OWNER-OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS IN WAUKESHA COUNTY COMMUNITIES: 2000^a

Community	Less that	n \$50,000	\$50,000	- \$99,999	\$100,000	- \$149,999	\$150,000	- \$199,000	\$200,000 -	- \$249,000	\$250,000	- \$299,999	\$300,000	- \$399,000	\$400,00	0 or more	Tetal	Madian
Community	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Totai	Wiedian
Town of Brookfield	9	0.57%	39	2.45%	393	24.70%	570	35.83%	275	17.28%	175	11.00%	110	6.91%	20	1.26%	1,591	\$177,100
Town of Delafield	8	0.38%	26	1.22%	158	7.42%	320	15.02%	304	14.27%	351	16.48%	317	14.88%	646	30.33%	2,130	\$285,500
Town of Eagle	15	1.78%	47	5.57%	133	15.76%	255	30.21%	180	21.33%	130	15.40%	41	4.86%	43	5.09%	844	\$195,400
Town of Genesee	0	0.00%	92	4.53%	259	12.75%	645	31.76%	496	24.42%	306	15.07%	176	8.67%	57	2.81%	2,031	\$202,000
Town of Lisbon	0	0.00%	25	0.94%	545	20.55%	1,163	43.85%	393	14.82%	368	13.88%	139	5.24%	19	0.72%	2,652	\$180,700
Town of Merton	14	0.61%	53	2.31%	182	7.95%	529	23.10%	436	19.04%	358	15.63%	346	15.11%	372	16.24%	2,290	\$242,100
Town of Mukwonago	20	1.06%	38	2.01%	375	19.87%	669	35.45%	436	23.11%	210	11.13%	112	5.94%	27	1.43%	1,887	\$186,800
Town of Oconomowoc	17	0.80%	84	3.96%	433	20.40%	554	26.10%	322	15.17%	170	8.01%	272	12.81%	271	12.76%	2,123	\$197,500
Town of Ottawa	0	0.00%	24	2.22%	200	18.52%	337	31.20%	292	27.04%	138	12.78%	73	6.76%	16	1.48%	1,080	\$197,400
Town of Summit	23	1.63%	47	3.33%	305	21.63%	224	15.89%	194	13.76%	178	12.62%	215	15.25%	224	15.89%	1,410	\$227,300
Town of Vernon	2	0.10%	58	2.76%	405	19.29%	930	44.31%	457	21.77%	177	8.43%	58	2.76%	12	0.57%	2,099	\$178,700
Town of Waukesha	12	0.47%	50	1.94%	534	20.74%	1,001	38.87%	465	18.06%	294	11.42%	145	5.63%	74	2.87%	2,575	\$184,200
Village of Big Bend	3	0.87%	42	12.17%	173	50.14%	111	32.17%	10	2.90%	2	0.58%	2	0.58%	2	0.58%	345	\$137,900
Village of Butler	0	0.00%	108	26.67%	257	63.46%	28	6.91%	12	2.96%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	405	\$115,100
Village of Chenequa	0	0.00%	2	1.16%	6	3.49%	2	1.16%	8	4.65%	2	1.16%	12	6.98%	140	81.40%	172	\$810,000
Village of Dousman	0	0.00%	35	11.59%	181	59.93%	81	26.82%	2	0.66%	2	0.66%	0	0.00%	1	0.33%	302	\$137,000
Village of Eagle	0	0.00%	37	6.88%	321	59.67%	171	31.78%	9	1.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	538	\$139,400
Village of Elm Grove	9	0.48%	5	0.27%	100	5.33%	325	17.31%	383	20.40%	420	22.38%	409	21.79%	226	12.04%	1,877	\$263,900
Village of Hartland	10	0.62%	73	4.51%	570	35.21%	555	34.28%	216	13.34%	87	5.37%	35	2.16%	73	4.51%	1,619	\$161,100
Village of Lac La Belle	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	4	3.54%	7	6.19%	5	4.42%	2	1.77%	16	14.16%	79	69.91%	113	\$483,300
Village of Lannon	2	1.03%	26	13.33%	94	48.21%	63	32.31%	2	1.03%	2	1.03%	2	1.03%	4	2.05%	195	\$133,400
Village of Menomonee Falls	36	0.39%	407	4.41%	4,067	44.05%	2,688	29.11%	950	10.29%	614	6.65%	365	3.95%	106	1.15%	9,233	\$151,600
Village of Merton	4	0.73%	26	4.73%	100	18.18%	144	26.18%	111	20.18%	86	15.64%	68	12.36%	11	2.00%	550	\$200,500
Village of Mukwonago	9	0.62%	136	9.37%	722	49.72%	462	31.82%	54	3.72%	54	3.72%	15	1.03%	0	0.00%	1,452	\$143,000
Village of Nashotah	0	0.00%	4	1.15%	44	12.61%	63	18.05%	75	21.49%	78	22.35%	71	20.34%	14	4.01%	349	\$242,300
Village of North Prairie	0	0.00%	41	9.36%	179	40.87%	144	32.88%	56	12.79%	6	1.37%	0	0.00%	12	2.74%	438	\$149,700
Village of Oconomowoc Lake	0	0.00%	2	1.17%	12	7.02%	15	8.77%	2	1.17%	7	4.09%	19	11.11%	114	66.67%	171	\$713,500
Village of Pewaukee	0	0.00%	143	8.49%	619	36.74%	453	26.88%	318	18.87%	42	2.49%	103	6.11%	7	0.42%	1,685	\$160,700
Village of Sussex	8	0.40%	57	2.85%	568	28.36%	836	41.74%	411	20.52%	106	5.29%	17	0.85%	0	0.00%	2,003	\$171,200
Village of Wales	0	0.00%	45	6.34%	93	13.10%	363	51.13%	121	17.04%	39	5.49%	45	6.34%	4	0.56%	710	\$183,700
City of Brookfield	36	0.30%	184	1.53%	2,244	18.72%	4,464	37.24%	1,771	14.77%	1,224	10.21%	1,150	9.59%	915	7.63%	11,988	\$189,100
City of Delafield	9	0.64%	19	1.36%	304	21.73%	227	16.23%	213	15.23%	230	16.44%	215	15.37%	182	13.01%	1,399	\$233,000
City of Muskego	26	0.44%	278	4.74%	1,699	28.96%	2,179	37.15%	935	15.94%	491	8.37%	205	3.49%	53	0.90%	5,866	\$166,700
City of New Berlin	13	0.12%	370	3.39%	3,567	32.66%	4,467	40.91%	1,180	10.81%	718	6.58%	500	4.58%	105	0.96%	10,920	\$162,100
City of Oconomowoc	7	0.24%	262	9.00%	1,246	42.82%	786	27.01%	248	8.52%	220	7.56%	89	3.06%	52	1.79%	2,910	\$147,900
City of Pewaukee	24	0.72%	113	3.40%	527	15.85%	1,216	36.58%	633	19.04%	401	12.06%	270	8.12%	140	4.21%	3,324	\$190,600
City of Waukesha	82	0.64%	1,662	12.97%	5,805	45.31%	3,656	28.54%	1,064	8.31%	362	2.83%	135	1.05%	45	0.35%	12,811	\$139,900
Waukesha County	398	0.42%	4,660	4.95%	27,424	29.15%	30,703	32.63%	13,039	13.86%	8,050	8.56%	5,747	6.11%	4,066	4.32%	94,087	\$170,400

^aThe data for specified owner-occupied housing units excludes mobile homes, houses with a business or medical office on the property, houses on 10 or more acres, and housing units in multiunit buildings. Totals are based on a sample of one in six respondents to the 2000 Census (Summary File 3). Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and SEWRPC.

Country	Less that	n \$50,000	\$50,000-	\$99,999	\$100,000-	\$149.999	\$150,000-	\$199,999	\$200,000-\$299,999	
County	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Kenosha	485	1.5%	10,050	30.40%	12,560	24.70%	6,180	18.70%	2,958	9.00%
Milwaukee	16,203	9.9%	61,792	37.60%	52,685	7.42%	20,296	12.40%	9,042	5.50%
Ozaukee	67	0.30%	928	4.40%	6,064	15.76%	5,662	27.30%	4,597	22.10%
Racine	1,668	3.80%	16,896	38.90%	13,066	12.75%	7,278	16.80%	3,566	8.20%
Walworth	288	1.50%	5,223	26.40%	7,091	20.55%	3,742	18.90%	2,279	11.50%
Washington	69	0.30%	2,169	7.90%	10,535	7.95%	8,344	30.40%	4,986	18.10%
Waukesha	398	0.40%	4,660	5.00%	27,424	19.87%	30,703	32.60%	21,089	22.40%
Region	19,178	4.80%	101,707	25.30%	129,329	32.10%	82,127	20.40%	48,506	12.00%
Dodge	519	2.90%	7,538	42.50%	6,230	35.10%	2,308	13.00%	988	5.60%
Jefferson	185	1.20%	4,192	27.10%	6,677	43.20%	2,665	17.30%	1,346	8.70%
Wisconsin	73,450	6.50%	396,893	35.40%	343,993	30.60%	173,519	15.50%	95,163	8.50%

VALUE FOR SPECIFIED OWNER-OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS IN THE SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN REGION AND ADJACENT COUNTIES: 2000^a

Country	\$300,000	-\$499,999	\$500,000	or More	То	tal	Madian
County	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Median
Kenosha	696	2.10%	127	1.26%	33,057	100.00%	\$129,900
Milwaukee	2,785	1.70%	1,359	30.33%	164,162	100.00%	\$103,200
Ozaukee	2,636	12.70%	866	5.09%	20,820	100.00%	\$177,300
Racine	780	1.80%	180	2.81%	43,434	100.00%	\$111,000
Walworth	829	4.20%	344	0.72%	19,796	100.00%	\$128,400
Washington	1,108	4.00%	268	16.24%	27,479	100.00%	\$155,000
Waukesha	7,486	8.00%	2,327	1.43%	94,087	100.00%	\$170,400
Region	16,320	4.10%	5,471	12.76%	402,638	100.00%	\$124,441
Dodge	147	0.80%	27	0.20%	17,757	100.00%	\$105,800
Jefferson	326	2.10%	55	0.40%	15,466	100.00%	\$123,800
Wisconsin	30,507	2.70%	8,942	0.90%	1,122,467	100.00%	\$112,200

The data for specified owner-occupied housing units excludes mobile homes, houses with a business or medical office on the property, houses on 10 or more acres, and housing units in multi-unit buildings. Totals are based on a sample of one in six respondents to the 2000 Census (Summary File3). Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and SEWRPC

MEDIAN SELLING PRICE OF EXISTING HOUSING^a IN THE SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN REGION AND ADJACENT COUNTIES : 2000-2007

	Dodg	e County	Jeffers	son County	Kenos	ha County	Milwau	kee County	Ozaul	cee County
N/	Number of	Median Selling								
Year	Sales	Price (dollars)								
2000	560	94,500	N/A	N/A	1,836	116,700	8,666	101,600	929	182,700
2001	539	102,400	604	130,500	1,969	126,000	9,088	110,700	1,062	184,400
2002	606	103,850	832	133,700	2,246	133,000	9,781	118,600	1,177	210,700
2003	789	115,000	995	138,900	2,267	143,100	9,891	128,200	1,146	220,600
2004	675	123,500	849	151,400	2,560	149,300	11,050	138,700	1,274	235,300
2005	707	131,100	984	160,000	2,589	169,200	11,517	153,300	1,349	237,500
2006	703	131,600	810	172,000	2,319	169,200	10,946	158,700	1,166	244,700
2007	593	134,400	794	170,000	2,044	169,200	8,970	161,500	1,090	244,700

	Racine County		Racine County V		Walwo	Walworth County		Washington County		sha County	Total Sales and Median Selling Price for Nine Counties	
									Total			
	Number of	Median Selling	Number of	Median Selling	Number of	Median Selling	Number of	Median Selling	Number of	Median Selling		
Year	Sales	Price (dollars)	Sales	Price (dollars)	Sales	Price (dollars)	Sales	Price (dollars)	Sales	Price ^b (dollars)		
2000	2,012	108,100	1,252	125,900	1,161	148,000	3,860	177,700	20,276	117,244		
2001	2,239	115,400	1,347	132,500	1,412	151,400	4,518	185,500	22,778	137,644		
2002	2,392	118,700	1,613	140,000	1,511	161,700	4,697	202,600	24,855	146,983		
2003	2,187	129,200	1,677	152,900	1,467	175,400	4,590	220,000	24,220	158,144		
2004	2,703	138,700	1,898	163,300	1,709	194,500	4,869	238,100	26,912	170,311		
2005	2,810	150,800	1,873	184,400	1,844	204,500	5,287	250,000	27,269	182,311		
2006	2,449	155,000	1,565	194,000	1,750	204,500	5,107	253,100	25,302	186,977		
2007	2,182	162,000	1,386	198,000	1,483	204,300	4,647	250,000	23,189	188,233		

^aThe price represents only those for single-family homes and does not include condominiums.

^bThe price represents the average sale price of the total seven-county median selling prices divided by 9.

Source: Wisconsin Realtors Association and SEWRPC.

	Dodge County	Jefferson County	Kenosha County	Milwaukee County	Ozaukee County	Racine County	Walworth County	Washington County	Waukesha County
First Mortgage	67.30%	71.22%	72.92%	68.17 %	72.67%	71.49%	70.13%	74.49%	75.58%
Second Mortgage or Home Equity Loan	22.71%	24.69%	22.53%	20.47%	26.42%	23.87%	23.65%	26.43%	27.01%

PERCENTAGE OF OWNER OCCUPIED UNITS WITH A FIRST MORTGAGE, SECOND MORTGAGE, OR HOME EQUITY LOAN IN THE SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN REGION AND ADJACENT COUNTIES: 2000

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Table V-9 displays monthly housing costs for specified owner-occupied housing units without a mortgage in the planning area and each participating local government in 2000. The median monthly housing cost for homeowners without a mortgage in the County was \$442 in 2000. Over 68 percent of homeowners without a mortgage spent under \$500 a month on housing costs in 2000. About 22 percent of homeowners without a mortgage spent between \$500 and \$699 a month on housing costs and 10 percent spent over \$700 per month.

Table V-10 sets forth monthly housing costs for specified owner-occupied housing units without a mortgage for each county in the Region and the State in 2000. The median monthly cost of \$442 in the County was the second highest among Counties in the Region (\$4 behind Ozaukee County). The median monthly housing cost for homeowners without a mortgage was \$388 in the Region, \$333 in the State and \$295 in the Nation.

Table V-11 displays monthly housing costs for rental units, or gross rent, in the County and each participating local government in 2000. Contract rent plus the estimated average monthly cost of utilities (electricity, gas, water, and sewer) and fuels (oil, kerosene, wood, and coal) are included in the calculations of monthly gross rent. These costs are included in the monthly cost calculation if the renter pays them or they are paid for the renter by another party, such as the property owner. Rental units that are occupied without payment of rent are included in the no cash rent category of Table V-11. Median rent per month in 2000 ranged from \$540 in the Village of Lannon to \$1,625 in the Village of Oconomovoc Lake. About 15 percent of all rental housing units within the County in 2000 were below \$500 in rent per month. Over 35 percent of all rental housing units in the County in 2000 were in the City of Waukesha.

According to Table V-12, the median monthly cost for rental housing in Waukesha County was the highest in the Region at \$726 in 2000. Ozaukee County was second with a median monthly gross rent of \$642. The median monthly gross rent was \$596 in the Region, \$540 in the State, and \$602 in the Nation. Over 44 percent of renters in Waukesha County paid more than \$750 per month in gross rent and according to the U.S. Bureau of the Census 27 percent of renters paid more than 30 percent of their household income on gross rent payments in 2000. Within the Region, only Washington County (26.62%) and Ozaukee County had a lower percentage of renters paying more than 30 percent of household income on rent. Milwaukee County had the highest percentage of renters paying more than 30 percent of household income on rent. Outside the Region, the bordering counties of Dodge and Jefferson had slightly lower percentages of renters paying more than 30 percent of household income on rent.

Table V	-7
---------	----

MONTHLY OWNE	R COSTS FOR SPECIFI	ED HOUSING UNITS WIT	TH A MORTGAGE IN	WALIKESHA C	'OUNTY COMMUNITIES-	2000ª
				MAUNDARA C		4000

Community	Less th	an \$700	\$700	-\$999	\$1000	- \$1499	\$1500	- \$1,999	\$2000	- \$2,499	\$2500	or more	Median
Community	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Cost
Town of Brookfield	53	4.57	163	14.05	520	44.83	200	17.24	176	15.17	48	4.14	\$1,360
Town of Delafield	61	3.74	102	6.25	376	23.04	388	23.77	244	14.95	461	28.25	\$1,855
Town of Eagle	45	6.37	153	21.67	236	33.43	166	23.51	82	11.61	24	3.40	\$1,285
Town of Genesee	64	3.80	230	13.66	718	42.64	498	29.57	101	6.00	73	4.33	\$1,404
Town of Lisbon	134	6.26	262	12.23	890	41.55	588	27.45	233	10.88	35	1.63	\$1,388
Town of Merton	72	4.10	163	9.27	509	28.95	615	34.98	210	11.95	189	10.75	\$1,591
Town of Mukwonago	92	5.69	237	14.66	717	44.34	464	28.70	79	4.89	28	1.72	\$1,345
Town of Oconomowoc	118	7.26	218	13.41	624	38.38	357	21.96	182	11.19	127	7.80	\$1,383
Town of Ottawa	55	6.48	139	16.37	347	40.87	203	23.91	78	9.19	27	3.18	\$1,308
Town of Summit	43	3.85	196	17.56	334	29.94	284	25.45	117	10.48	142	12.72	\$1,478
Town of Vernon	119	7.09	203	12.09	867	51.64	379	22.57	86	5.12	25	1.49	\$1,280
Town of Waukesha	151	7.72	317	16.20	672	34.34	570	29.13	191	9.76	56	2.85	\$1,361
Village of Big Bend	40	16.81	53	22.27	115	48.32	28	11.76	2	0.84	0	0	\$1,094
Village of Butler	48	17.98	73	27.34	107	40.07	31	11.61	4	1.50	4	1.50	\$1,036
Village of Chenequa	0	0	0	0	4	4.17	16	16.67	15	15.63	61	63.53	\$3,563
Village of Dousman	35	13.46	60	23.08	133	51.15	24	9.23	7	2.69	1	0.38	\$1,127
Village of Eagle	39	8.55	120	26.32	235	51.54	59	12.94	3	0.65	0	0	\$1,150
Village of Elm Grove	21	1.78	38	3.23	240	20.39	279	23.70	314	26.68	285	24.21	\$2,017
Village of Hartland	69	5.19	218	16.40	630	47.40	252	18.96	101	7.60	59	4.45	\$1,316
Village of Lac La Belle	3	3.53	2	2.35	9	10.59	8	9.41	17	20.00	46	54.12	\$2,792
Village of Lannon	13	9.70	31	23.13	59	44.03	29	21.64	2	1.50	0	0	\$1,147
Village of Menomonee Falls	288	4.42	1,040	15.97	2,824	43.36	1,534	23.55	528	8.11	299	4.59	\$1,335
Village of Merton	19	3.96	74	15.42	159	33.13	163	33.96	49	10.21	16	3.32	\$1,461
Village of Mukwonago	86	7.45	181	15.67	727	62.94	145	12.55	16	1.39	0	0	\$1,201
Village of Nashotah	6	1.92	24	7.67	85	27.16	101	32.27	54	17.25	43	13.73	\$1,696
Village of North Prairie	28	7.93	95	26.91	138	39.09	68	19.26	16	4.53	8	2.28	\$1,188
Village of Oconomowoc Lake	2	1.94	8	7.77	8	7.77	17	16.50	11	10.68	57	55.34	\$2,662
Village of Pewaukee	75	5.35	312	22.24	531	37.85	353	25.16	78	5.55	54	3.85	\$1,287
Village of Sussex	109	6.67	233	14.26	661	40.45	557	34.09	58	3.55	16	0.98	\$1,386
Village of Wales	38	6.13	101	16.29	282	45.48	116	18.71	48	7.74	35	5.65	\$1,303
City of Brookfield	427	5.17	825	9.99	2,779	33.66	2,041	24.72	1,176	14.24	1,009	12.22	\$1,520
City of Delafield	43	4.01	113	10.54	345	32.18	307	28.64	137	12.78	127	11.85	\$1,554
City of Muskego	188	4.03	719	15.42	2,096	44.94	1,205	25.84	290	6.22	166	3.55	\$1,341
City of New Berlin	391	5.08	1,035	13.45	3,150	40.94	2,057	26.74	716	9.31	345	4.48	\$1,385
City of Oconomowoc	216	9.89	393	18.00	959	43.93	473	21.67	79	3.62	63	2.89	\$1,211
City of Pewaukee	127	4.92	381	14.77	910	35.27	621	24.07	373	14.46	168	6.51	\$1,434
City of Waukesha	730	7.21	2,262	22.35	4,283	42.32	2,198	21.72	515	5.09	133	1.31	\$1,223
Waukesha County	4,048	5.69	10,774	15.15	28,279	39.77	17,394	24.46	6,388	8.98	4,230	5.95	\$1,366

^aData for specified owner-occupied housing units excludes mobile homes, houses with a business or medical office on the property, houses on 10 or more acres, and housing units in multiunit buildings. Totals are based on a sample of one in six respondents to the 2000 Census (Summary File 3). Selected monthly owner costs are the sum of mortgage payments or similar debts on the property; real estate taxes; fire, hazard, and flood insurance on the property; and utilities.

MONTHLY OWNER COSTS FOR SPECIFIED HOUSING UNITS WITH A MORTGAGE IN THE SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN REGION

													Median
	Less th	an \$700	\$700 t	o \$999	\$1,000 t	o \$1,499	\$1,500 t	o \$1,999	Over	\$2000	То	tal	Cost
County	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	(dollars)
Kenosha	2,519	10.5	6,902	28.6	9,650	40	3,525	14.6	1,509	6.3	24,105	100	1,11
Milwaukee	19,943	17.8	34,771	31.1	38,320	34.2	12,594	11.3	6,281	5.6	111,909	100	1,01
Ozaukee	784	5.2	2,245	14.8	5,391	35.6	3,513	23.2	3,196	21.2	15,129	100	1,42
Racine	4,752	15.3	9,272	29.9	11,611	37.4	3,822	12.3	1,594	5.1	31,051	100	1,05
Walworth	1,643	11.8	3,586	25.8	5,754	41.4	1,865	13.5	1,035	7.5	13,883	100	1,12
Washington	1,353	6.6	3,910	19.1	9,448	46.2	4,178	20.4	1,586	7.7	20,470	100	1,24
Waukesha	4,048	5.7	10,774	15.2	28,279	39.8	17,394	24.5	10,618	14.8	71,113	100	1,36
Region	35,031	12.2	71,433	25	108,381	37.6	46,854	16.2	25,819	9	287,518	100	1,12
Dodge	1,942	16.2	4,257	35.6	4,230	35.4	1,140	9.5	382	3.2	11,951	100	98
Jefferson	1,290	11.7	3,255	29.6	4,507	41.0	1,488	13.5	461	4.2	11,001	100	1,09
Wisconsin	144,525	18.7	225,805	29.3	260,821	33.8	92,913	12.1	46,932	6.1	770,996	100	1,02

AND ADJACENT COUNTIES: 2000^a

^aData for specified owner-occupied housing units excludes mobile homes, houses with a business or medical office on the property, houses on 10 or more acres, and housing units in multiunit buildings. Totals are based on a sample of one in six respondents to the 2000 Census (Summary File 3). Selected monthly owner costs are the sum of mortgage payments or similar debts on the property; real estate taxes; fire, hazard, and flood insurance on the property; and utilities.

Tabl	e V-	.9
------	------	----

	Less th	an \$300	\$300	- \$399	\$400	- 499	\$500	- \$699	Over	· \$700	Te	otal	Median Cost
Community	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	(dollars)
Town of Brookfield	22	5.10	123	28.54	137	31.79	122	28.31	27	6.26	431	100.00	451
Town of Delafield	30	6.02	93	18.67	126	25.30	127	25.50	122	24.50	498	100.00	500
Town of Eagle	24	17.39	52	37.68	38	27.54	22	15.94	2	1.45	138	100.00	385
Town of Genesee	54	15.56	186	53.60	72	20.75	23	6.63	12	3.46	347	100.00	371
Town of Lisbon	28	5.49	186	36.47	160	31.37	115	22.55	21	4.12	510	100.00	426
Town of Merton	40	7.52	173	32.52	121	22.74	79	14.85	119	22.37	532	100.00	444
Town of Mukwonago	47	17.41	117	43.33	79	29.26	22	8.15	5	1.85	270	100.00	373
Town of Oconomowoc	84	16.90	134	26.96	79	15.90	84	16.90	116	23.34	497	100.00	439
Town of Ottawa	50	21.65	91	39.39	75	32.47	6	2.60	9	3.90	231	100.00	373
Town of Summit	41	13.95	77	26.19	55	18.71	48	16.33	73	24.83	294	100.00	453
Town of Vernon	45	10.71	248	59.05	89	21.19	33	7.86	5	1.19	420	100.00	370
Town of Waukesha	85	13.75	277	44.82	131	21.20	92	14.89	33	5.34	618	100.00	381
Village of Big Bend	15	14.02	58	54.21	28	26.17	6	5.61	0	0.00	107	100.00	371
Village of Butler	16	11.59	79	57.25	31	22.46	12	8.70	0	0.00	138	100.00	365
Village of Chenequa	0	0.00	4	5.26	0	0.00	5	6.58	67	88.16	76	100.00	1,000
Village of Dousman	11	26.19	18	42.86	11	26.19	2	4.76	0	0.00	42	100.00	345
Village of Eagle	26	31.71	54	65.85	2	2.44	0	0.00	0	0.00	82	100.00	328
Village of Elm Grove	9	1.29	18	2.57	107	15.29	250	35.71	316	45.14	700	100.00	669
Village of Hartland	17	5.86	145	50.00	76	26.21	36	12.41	16	5.52	290	100.00	391
Village of Lac La Belle	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	7.14	2	7.14	24	85.71	28	100.00	860
Village of Lannon	6	9.84	20	32.79	18	29.51	14	22.95	3	4.92	61	100.00	425
Village of Menomonee Falls	123	4.52	921	33.86	1,057	38.86	523	19.23	96	3.53	2,720	100.00	430
Village of Merton	25	35.71	19	27.14	10	14.29	14	20.00	2	2.86	70	100.00	338
Village of Mukwonago	61	20.54	111	37.37	51	17.17	66	22.22	8	2.69	297	100.00	384
Village of Nashotah	2	5.56	4	11.11	10	27.78	16	44.44	4	11.11	36	100.00	533
Village of North Prairie	28	32.94	31	36.47	23	27.06	3	3.53	0	0.00	85	100.00	366
Village of Oconomowoc Lake	0	0.00	2	2.94	11	16.18	4	5.88	51	75.00	68	100.00	1,000
Village of Pewaukee	15	5.32	107	37.94	78	27.66	73	25.89	9	3.19	282	100.00	424
Village of Sussex	25	6.78	141	38.21	133	36.04	52	14.09	18	4.88	369	100.00	414
Village of Wales	9	10.00	37	41.11	35	38.89	9	10.00	0	0.00	90	100.00	393
City of Brookfield	101	2.71	836	22.41	1279	34.28	968	25.94	547	14.66	3,731	100.00	473
City of Delafield	17	5.20	75	22.94	106	32.42	86	26.30	43	13.15	327	100.00	467
City of Muskego	34	2.83	310	25.79	457	38.02	320	26.62	81	6.74	1,202	100.00	456
City of New Berlin	110	3.41	568	17.61	1,349	41.82	936	29.01	263	8.15	3,226	100.00	469
City of Oconomowoc	94	12.93	196	26.96	241	33.15	122	16.78	74	10.18	727	100.00	430
City of Pewaukee	90	12.10	227	30.51	156	20.97	199	26.75	72	9.68	744	100.00	435
City of Waukesha	277	10.30	1,081	40.19	758	28.18	515	19.14	59	2.19	2,690	100.00	399
Waukesha County	1,661	7.23	6,819	29.68	7,191	31.30	5,006	21.79	2,297	10.00	22,974	100.00	442

*Data for specified owner-occupied housing units excludes mobile homes, houses with a business or medical office on the property, houses on 10 or more acres, and housing units in multiunit buildings. Totals are based on a sample of one in six respondents to the 2000 Census (Summary File 3). Selected monthly owner costs are the sum of mortgage payments or similar debts on the property; real

estate taxes; fire, hazard, and flood insurance on the property; and utilities.

MONTHLY OWNER COSTS FOR SPECIFIED HOUSING UNITS WITHOUT A MORTGAGE IN THE SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN REGION

													Median
	Less th	an \$300	\$300 t	o \$399	\$400 t	o \$499	\$500 to	o \$699	Over	\$700	То	tal	Cost
County	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	(dollars)
Kenosha	2,010	22.5	3,691	41.2	2,015	22.5	943	10.5	293	3.3	8,952	100	366
Milwaukee	11,800	22.6	18,573	35.5	11,465	21.9	7,575	14.5	2,840	5.4	52,253	100	377
Ozaukee	468	8.2	1,755	30.8	1,393	24.5	1,287	22.7	788	13.8	5,691	100	446
Racine	3,155	25.5	5,262	42.5	2,204	17.8	1,397	11.3	365	2.9	12,383	100	357
Walworth	1,565	26.5	2,282	38.6	1,116	18.9	672	11.4	278	4.6	5,913	100	356
Washington	1,011	14.4	2,903	41.4	1,934	27.6	890	12.7	271	3.9	7,009	100	387
Waukesha	1,661	7.2	6,819	29.7	7,191	31.3	5,006	21.8	2,297	10	22,974	100	442
Region	21,667	18.8	41,246	35.8	27,306	23.7	17,769	15.4	7,132	6.3	115,120	100	388
Dodge	2,405	15.9	2,988	19.7	1,376	9.1	839	5.5	329	2.2	5,806	100	333
Jefferson	1,664	11.9	2,636	18.9	1,189	8.5	616	4.4	199	1.4	4,445	100	343
Wisconsin	134,168	38.2	115,626	32.9	55,830	15.9	33,054	9.4	12,793	3.6	351,471	100	333

AND ADJACENT COUNTIES: 2000^a

^aThe data for specified owner-occupied housing units excludes mobile homes, houses with a business or medical office on the property, houses on 10 or more acres, and housing units in multiunit buildings. Totals are based on a sample of one in six respondents to the 2000 Census (Summary File 3). Selected monthly owner costs are the sum of mortgage payments or similar debts on the property; real estate taxes; fire, hazard, and flood insurance on the property; and utilities.

a	Less th	an \$300	\$300 1	o \$499	\$500 1	to \$749	\$750 (o \$999	\$1,000	to \$1,499	\$1,500 @	or More	No Ca	sh Rent ^b	m	
Community	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Total	Median Rent
Town of Brookfield	20	2.01	24	2.41	84	8.44	436	43.82	370	37.19	40	4.02	21	2.11	995	\$950
Town of Delafield	0	0.00	10	4.50	52	23.42	114	51.35	21	9.46	17	7.66	8	3.60	222	\$839
Town of Eagle	0	0.00	12	22.64	26	49.06	10	18.87	5	9.43	0	0.00	0	0.00	53	\$672
Town of Genesee	0	0.00	11	9.40	44	37.61	30	25.64	11	9.40	0	0.00	21	17.95	117	\$718
Town of Lisbon	0	0.00	29	34.52	20	23.81	3	3.57	11	13.10	0	0.00	21	25.00	84	\$563
Town of Merton	0	0.00	29	14.50	71	35.50	55	27.50	15	7.50	0	0.00	30	15.00	200	\$691
Town of Mukwonago	0	0.00	2	4.08	24	48.98	21	42.86	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	4.08	49	\$732
Town of Oconomowoc	23	5.75	19	4.75	98	24.50	144	36.00	53	13.25	43	10.75	20	5.00	400	\$851
Town of Ottawa	0	0.00	0	0.00	17	15.74	40	37.04	33	30.56	4	3.70	14	12.96	108	\$944
Town of Summit	18	10.11	6	3.37	42	23.60	59	33.15	33	18.54	0	0.00	20	11.24	178	\$822
Town of Vernon	0	0.00	17	19.10	29	32.58	19	21.35	4	4.49	0	0.00	20	22.47	89	\$627
Town of Waukesha	0	0.00	29	49.15	10	16.95	12	20.34	8	13.56	0	0.00	0	0.00	59	\$703
Village of Big Bend	0	0.00	5	5.95	41	48.81	16	19.05	13	15.48	0	0.00	9	10.71	84	\$641
Village of Butler	107	23.26	68	14.78	194	42.17	80	17.39	7	1.52	4	0.87	0	0.00	460	\$590
Village of Chenequa	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	10.53	4	21.05	3	15.79	0	0.00	10	52.63	19	\$825
Village of Dousman	4	1.57	9	3.54	66	25.98	160	62.99	13	5.12	0	0.00	2	0.79	254	\$796
Village of Eagle	4	6.78	17	28.81	33	55.93	2	3.39	1	1.69	0	0.00	2	3.39	59	\$575
Village of Elm Grove	7	2.89	68	28.10	56	23.14	61	25.21	22	9.09	11	4.55	17	7.02	242	\$673
Village of Hartland	72	5.72	110	8.74	549	43.61	418	33.20	105	8.34	0	0.00	5	0.40	1,259	\$692
Village of Lac La Belle	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	50.00	2	50.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	\$950
Village of Lannon	7	10.61	18	27.27	18	27.27	15	22.73	0	0.00	0	0.00	8	12.12	66	\$540
Village of Menomonee Falls	103	3.58	251	8.72	1,263	43.90	710	24.68	267	9.28	177	6.15	106	3.68	2,877	\$702
Village of Merton	4	14.29	4	14.29	10	35.71	4	14.29	2	7.14	0	0.00	4	14.29	28	\$700
Village of Mukwonago	0	0.00	50	5.44	681	74.10	158	17.19	20	2.18	0	0.00	10	1.09	919	\$669
Village of Nashotah	0	0.00	3	17.65	3	17.65	8	47.06	3	17.65	0	0.00	0	0.00	17	\$850
Village of North Prairie	0	0.00	12	16.44	31	42.47	25	34.25	2	2.74	0	0.00	3	4.11	73	\$717
Village of Oconomowoc Lake	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	23.08	3	23.08	7	53.85	13	\$1,625
Village of Pewaukee	31	2.23	106	7.61	760	54.60	225	16.16	252	18.10	9	0.65	9	0.65	1,392	\$695
Village of Sussex	89	7.91	43	3.82	546	48.53	351	31.20	62	5.51	9	0.80	25	2.22	1,125	\$717
Village of Wales	0	0.00	19	14.50	55	41.98	27	20.61	22	16.79	8	6.11	0	0.00	131	\$673
City of Brookfield	19	1.38	59	4.28	163	11.82	388	28.14	545	39.52	131	9.50	74	5.37	1,379	\$1,014
City of Delafield	66	7.52	26	2.96	338	38.50	253	28.82	136	15.49	18	2.05	41	4.67	878	\$745
City of Muskego	30	2.36	26	2.04	365	28.69	582	45.75	168	13.21	50	3.93	51	4.01	1,272	\$785
City of New Berlin	63	2.35	95	3.55	735	27.46	1,131	42.25	459	17.15	112	4.18	82	3.06	2,677	\$830
City of Oconomowoc	97	5.19	184	9.84	939	50.21	475	25.40	65	3.48	57	3.05	53	2.83	1,870	\$674
City of Pewaukee	0	0.00	22	3.56	69	11.17	262	42.39	211	34.14	28	4.53	26	4.21	618	\$942
City of Waukesha	770	6.89	1,606	14.37	4,678	41.85	2,983	26.69	814	7.28	89	0.80	238	2.13	11,178	\$675
Waukesha County	1,534	4.88	2,989	9.5	12,112	38.51	9,283	29.52	3,761	11.96	810	2.58	959	3.05	31,448	\$726

MONTHLY GROSS RENT FOR RENTER-OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS IN WAUKESHA COUNTY COMMUNITIES: 2000*

^aContract rent plus the estimated average monthly cost of utilities (electricity, gas, water, and sewer) and fuels are included in the calculations for monthly gross rent. Totals are based on a sample of one in six respondents to the 2000 Census (Summary File 3).

^bIncludes rental units that are occupied without payment of rent. These units may be occupied by friends or relatives of the owner who do not get charged rent or caretakers, tenant farmers, and others who receive the unit as compensation.

	Less th	ian \$300	\$300 t	o \$499	\$500 t	\$500 to \$749		\$750 to \$999		\$1,000 to \$1,499		\$1,500 or More		sh Rent ^b	Total		Media
County	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Rent
Kenosha	1,511	8.8	3,487	20.3	7,811	45.6	3,022	17.6	676	3.9	40	0.2	594	3.5	17,141	100	589
Milwaukee	16,438	9.2	49,943	28	77,580	43.4	22,434	12.6	6,947	3.9	1,705	1	3,607	2	178,654	100	555
Ozaukee	381	5.2	837	11.5	3,780	51.8	1,514	20.8	485	6.6	56	0.8	241	3.3	7,294	100	642
Racine	1,735	8.4	5,480	26.6	9,724	47.3	2,228	10.8	540	2.6	41	0.2	824	4	20,572	100	548
Walworth	1,021	9.9	2,158	20.9	4,568	44.3	1,803	17.5	296	2.9	47	0.5	428	4.1	10,321	100	588
Washington	576	5.6	1,706	16.5	5,321	51.5	1,943	18.8	400	3.9	16	0.2	361	3.5	10,323	100	620
Waukesha	1,534	4.9	2,989	9.5	12,112	38.5	9,283	29.5	3,761	12	810	2.6	959	3	31,448	100	726
Region	23,192	8.4	66,577	24.2	120,856	43.8	42,200	15.3	13,097	4.8	2,715	1	7,012	2.5	275,649	100	596
Dodge	906	11.4	2,368	29.7	3,521	44.2	693	8.7	71	0.9	4	0.1	409	5.1	7,972	100	528
Jefferson	773	10.0	1,897	24.6	3,505	45.5	1,015	13.2	126	1.6	51	0.7	333	4.3	7,700	100	564
Wisconsin	67,538	10.5	189,366	29.5	254,439	39.7	78,955	12.3	22,527	3.5	4,881	0.8	23,966	3.7	641,672	100	540

MONTHLY GROSS RENT FOR RENTER-OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS IN THE SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN REGION AND ADJACENT COUNTIES: 2000^a

^aContract rent plus the estimated average monthly cost of utilities (electricity, gas, water, and sewer) and fuels are included in the calculations for monthly gross rent. Totals are based on a sample of one in six respondents to the 2000 Census (Summary File 3).

^bIncludes rental units that are occupied without payment of rent. These units may be occupied by friends or relatives of the owner who do not get charged rent or caretakers, tenant farmers, and others who may receive the unit as compensation.

In addition, over 14 percent of renters paid more than 50 percent of their household income on gross rent in Waukesha County in 2000. U.S. Bureau of the Census statistics indicate that this figure was lower in Dodge, Jefferson, Ozaukee, Washington and Walworth counties and higher in Racine, Kenosha, and Milwaukee counties.

Number of Bedrooms

Tables V-13a and 13b set forth the number of housing units by tenure and number of bedrooms in Waukesha County and each community in 2000. This information, when compared with household size information inventoried in Chapter II, provides a greater understanding of what type of housing units will best suit the future needs of Waukesha County residents.

Nearly 83 percent of all owner occupied homes in Waukesha County in 2000 were three or four bedroom units (Table V-13a) The percentage of three bedroom owner occupied units ranged from 20.62% in the Village of Chenequa to 78.15% in the Village of Sussex. The communities with the largest number of owner occupied three bedroom homes in 2000 included the Village of Menomonee Falls, the City of New Berlin, and the City of Waukesha. The percentage of four bedroom units ranged from 11.40% in the Village of Butler to 43.38% in the Village of Lac La Belle. The community with the largest number of four bedroom owner occupied homes in 2000 was the City of Brookfield with 4,260. Two bedroom units comprised over 12 percent of owner occupied housing units. The number of two bedroom units may grow in the County due to the increased incidence of empty nesters as baby boomers continue to age. The community with the largest percentage of two bedroom owner occupied units in 2000 was the Village of Pewaukee with 37.84% in this category. The cities of Brookfield, New Berlin, and Waukesha had the greatest number of two bedroom occupied units in 2000.

Over 80 percent of renter occupied housing units in Waukesha County had two or fewer bedrooms in 2000 (Table V-13b). A family looking for a three bedroom or larger unit to rent has far fewer option in Waukesha County as less than 20 percent of rental occupied units had three, four, or five bedrooms in 2000. The percentage of renter occupied units with one bedroom or less ranged from none in the Town of Mukwonago to 45.87% in the Village of Butler. The largest number of renter occupied units with one bedroom or less were found in the Village of Menomonee Falls or the City of Waukesha. The percentage of renter occupied two bedroom units ranged from 13.33 percent in the Village of Occonomowoc Lake to 63.82% in the Village of Sussex. The largest numbers of two bedroom renter occupied units were found in the Village of Menomonee Falls and the cities of New Berlin and Waukesha. The percentage of renter occupied three bedroom units ranged from none in the Village of Lac La Belle to 44.98 percent in the Town of Merton. The Village of Menomonee Falls and the City of Waukesha had the largest numbers of three bedroom renter occupied housing units in the County in 2000.

Structure Type and Year Built

An inventory of housing units by structure type in the County provides an insight into the number of existing single family, two-family, and multi-family units. The number of units in these types of structures can be compared to resident characteristics to determine the future need for units in each type of structure. An inventory of housing units by structure type also provides insight into the character of the existing housing stock in local governments in the County. Table V-14 sets forth the number of housing units by structure type in Waukesha County and each participating local government in 2000.

Table V-14 includes the number of building permits issued for units in each structure type in the County and local governments from 1970 to 2000 and 2006. The building permit data from the U.S. Bureau of the Census represent the number of new privately-owned housing units authorized by building permits in the United States. A housing unit is defined as a house, an apartment, a group of rooms or a single room intended for occupancy as separate living quarters. Separate living quarters are those in which the occupants live separately from any other individuals in the building and which have a direct access from the outside of the building or through a common hall. In accordance with this definition, each apartment unit in an apartment building is counted as one housing unit. Housing units, as distinguished from "HUD-code" manufactured (mobile) homes, include conventional "site-built" units, prefabricated, panelized, componentized, sectional, and modular units. Housing unit statistics in this table exclude group quarters (such as dormitories and rooming houses), and transient

Table V-13a

a	1 or no	bedroom	2 bed	Irooms	3 bed	rooms	4 bed	rooms	5 or more	e bedrooms	h
Community	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Total
Town of Brookfield	0	0.00	242	14.14	905	52.89	518	30.27	46	2.69	1,711
Town of Delafield	13	0.56	156	6.75	1,021	44.18	908	39.29	213	9.22	2,311
Town of Eagle	22	2.25	89	9.11	619	63.36	223	22.82	24	2.46	977
Town of Genesee	0	0.00	119	5.26	1,315	58.16	712	31.49	115	5.09	2,261
Town of Lisbon	0	0.00	413	13.19	1,977	63.12	669	21.36	73	2.33	3,132
Town of Merton	36	1.45	226	9.09	1,391	55.98	715	28.77	117	4.71	2,485
Town of Mukwonago	26	1.27	36	1.76	1,291	63.25	620	30.38	68	3.33	2,041
Town of Oconomowoc	52	2.24	276	11.89	1,347	58.01	592	25.50	55	2.37	2,322
Town of Ottawa	38	3.06	106	8.53	794	63.93	259	20.85	45	3.62	1,242
Town of Summit	13	0.84	193	12.44	947	61.06	364	23.47	34	2.19	1,551
Town of Vernon	19	0.83	79	3.45	1,430	62.47	694	30.32	67	2.93	2,289
Town of Waukesha	6	0.21	280	10.02	1,636	58.53	755	27.01	118	4.22	2,795
Village of Big Bend	4	1.08	44	11.89	240	64.86	75	20.27	7	1.89	370
Village of Butler	8	1.75	112	24.56	273	59.87	52	11.40	11	2.41	456
Village of Chenequa	2	1.03	15	7.73	40	20.62	82	42.27	55	28.35	194
Village of Dousman	3	0.91	39	11.89	228	69.51	53	16.16	5	1.52	328
Village of Eagle	6	1.08	60	10.81	403	72.61	82	14.77	4	0.72	555
Village of Elm Grove	56	2.54	301	13.67	960	43.60	735	33.38	150	6.81	2,202
Village of Hartland	4	0.23	129	7.31	1,122	63.57	437	24.76	73	4.14	1,765
Village of Lac La Belle	0	0.00	8	6.96	42	36.52	50	43.48	15	13.04	115
Village of Lannon	5	1.43	93	26.65	195	55.87	47	13.47	9	2.58	349
Village of Menomonee Falls	192	1.94	949	9.58	6,472	65.31	2,055	20.74	242	2.44	9,910
Village of Merton	6	1.03	31	5.34	338	58.28	192	33.10	13	2.24	580
Village of Mukwonago	34	2.21	282	18.32	957	62.18	248	16.11	18	1.17	1,539
Village of Nashotah	2	0.46	107	24.77	183	42.36	133	30.79	7	1.62	432
Village of North Prairie	0	0.00	37	8.06	335	72.98	75	16.34	12	2.61	459
Village of Oconomowoc Lake	1	0.53	10	5.35	66	35.29	59	31.55	51	27.27	187
Village of Pewaukee	109	4.69	879	37.84	986	42.45	324	13.95	25	1.08	2,323
Village of Sussex	0	0.00	96	4.40	1,706	78.15	381	17.45	0	0.00	2,183
Village of Wales	0	0.00	73	9.91	384	52.10	255	34.60	25	3.39	737
City of Brookfield	24	0.19	1,365	10.87	6,160	49.06	4,260	33.93	746	5.94	12,555
City of Delafield	44	2.70	316	19.37	798	48.93	398	24.40	75	4.60	1,631
City of Muskego	66	1.06	687	11.03	4,190	67.27	1,165	18.70	121	1.94	6,229
City of New Berlin	197	1.67	1,374	11.66	7,169	60.82	2,757	23.39	290	2.46	11,787
City of Oconomowoc	35	1.13	493	15.89	1,855	59.80	639	20.60	80	2.58	3,102
City of Pewaukee	17	0.44	851	21.97	1,888	48.75	1,033	26.67	84	2.17	3,873
City of Waukesha	293	2.02	2,473	17.08	8,308	57.38	3,171	21.90	235	1.62	14,480
Waukesha County	1,333	1.29	13,039	12.60	59,971	57.97	25,787	24.93	3,328	3.22	103,458

OWNER-OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS BY NUMBER OF BEDROOMS IN WAUKESHA COUNTY COMMUNITIES: 2000^a

 $^{\rm a}Totals$ are based on a sample of one in six responses to the 2000 Census (Summary File 3) $^{\rm b}Totals$ include occupied housing units only.

Table V-13b

Community	1 or no bedroom		2 bedrooms		3 bedrooms		4 bedrooms		5 or more bedrooms		Total ^b
Community	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Total
Town of Brookfield	286	28.74	611	61.41	98	9.85	0	0.00	0	0.00	995
Town of Delafield	24	10.39	143	61.90	56	24.24	8	3.46	0	0.00	231
Town of Eagle	2	3.17	29	46.03	22	34.92	5	7.94	5	7.94	63
Town of Genesee	22	16.06	82	59.85	13	9.49	20	14.60	0	0.00	137
Town of Lisbon	10	10.42	49	51.04	33	34.38	4	4.17	0	0.00	96
Town of Merton	39	17.03	57	24.89	103	44.98	22	9.61	8	3.49	229
Town of Mukwonago	0	0.00	28	47.46	13	22.03	18	30.51	0	0.00	59
Town of Oconomowoc	60	14.67	188	45.97	119	29.10	22	5.38	20	4.89	409
Town of Ottawa	39	34.82	61	54.46	8	7.14	0	0.00	4	3.57	112
Town of Summit	53	27.04	34	17.35	73	37.24	30	15.31	6	3.06	196
Town of Vernon	21	22.83	27	29.35	38	41.30	4	4.35	2	2.17	92
Town of Waukesha	18	26.47	24	35.29	20	29.41	6	8.82	0	0.00	68
Village of Big Bend	2	2.38	46	54.76	21	25.00	12	14.29	3	3.57	84
Village of Butler	211	45.87	177	38.48	69	15.00	3	0.65	0	0.00	460
Village of Chenequa	2	8.33	4	16.67	7	29.17	6	25.00	5	20.83	24
Village of Dousman	83	32.17	89	34.50	83	32.17	3	1.16	0	0.00	258
Village of Eagle	23	37.10	26	41.94	11	17.74	2	3.23	0	0.00	62
Village of Elm Grove	104	42.98	88	36.36	22	9.09	17	7.02	11	4.55	242
Village of Hartland	283	22.48	677	53.77	276	21.92	23	1.83	0	0.00	1,259
Village of Lac La Belle	0	0.00	2	50.00	0	0.00	2	50.00	0	0.00	4
Village of Lannon	24	36.36	9	13.64	26	39.39	2	3.03	5	7.58	66
Village of Menomonee Falls	1,231	41.80	1,228	41.70	418	14.19	49	1.66	19	0.65	2,945
Village of Merton	4	14.29	14	50.00	8	28.57	0	0.00	2	7.14	28
Village of Mukwonago	280	30.47	502	54.62	126	13.71	11	1.20	0	0.00	919
Village of Nashotah	3	17.65	8	47.06	6	35.29	0	0.00	0	0.00	17
Village of North Prairie	20	26.67	39	52.00	9	12.00	7	9.33	0	0.00	75
Village of Oconomowoc Lake	2	13.33	2	13.33	8	53.33	3	20.00	0	0.00	15
Village of Pewaukee	399	28.66	737	52.95	231	16.59	7	0.50	18	1.29	1,392
Village of Sussex	212	18.84	718	63.82	176	15.64	19	1.69	0	0.00	1,125
Village of Wales	14	10.69	51	38.93	48	36.64	18	13.74	0	0.00	131
City of Brookfield	242	17.39	681	48.92	390	28.02	70	5.03	9	0.65	1,392
City of Delafield	177	20.02	456	51.58	211	23.87	19	2.15	21	2.38	884
City of Muskego	310	23.83	695	53.42	270	20.75	26	2.00	0	0.00	1,301
City of New Berlin	823	30.28	1,509	55.52	309	11.37	67	2.47	10	0.37	2,718
City of Oconomowoc	550	29.41	994	53.16	235	12.57	81	4.33	10	0.53	1,870
City of Pewaukee	156	24.84	348	55.41	97	15.45	27	4.30	0	0.00	628
City of Waukesha	4,649	41.56	4,754	42.50	1,580	14.13	161	1.44	41	0.37	11,185
Waukesha County	10,378	32.67	15,187	47.80	5,233	16.47	774	2.44	199	0.63	31,771

RENTER-OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS BY NUMBER OF BEDROOMS IN WAUKESHA COUNTY COMMUNITIES: 2000^a

 a Totals are based on a sample of one in six responses to the 2000 Census (Summary File 3) b Totals include occupied housing units only.

Community	Single-Family Detached		Single-Family Attached		Two-Family		Multi-Family		Mobile Homes and Other		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Town of Brookfield												
1970	873	87.6	0	0.0	80	8.0	44	4.4	0	0.0	997	100.0
1980	1,153	88.7	26	2.0	102	7.8	19	1.5	0	0.0	1,300	100.0
1990	1,224	85.6	52	3.6	61	4.3	93	6.5	0	0.0	1,430	100.0
2000	1,436	50.8	260	9.2	68	2.4	1,050	37.1	15	0.5	2,829	100.0
2006	1,702	59.1	0	0.0	64	2.2	1,102	38.2	15	0.5	2,883	100.0
Town of Delafield												
1970	847	83.7	0	0.0	67	6.6	98	9.7	0	0.0	1,012	100.0
1980	1,287	91.6	0	0.0	57	4.1	61	4.3	0	0.0	1,405	100.0
1990	1,705	89.0	39	2.0	53	2.8	93	4.9	25	1.3	1,915	100.0
2000	2,367	90.2	75	2.9	32	1.2	139	5.3	10	0.4	2,623	100.0
2006	2,760	93.5	0	0.0	44	1.5	139	4.7	10	0.3	2,953	100.0
Town of Eagle												
1970	376	97.0	0	0.0	6	1.5	6	1.5	0	0.0	388	100.0
1980	542	94.5	2	0.3	28	4.9	2	0.3	0	0.0	574	100.0
1990	731	95.7	5	0.7	15	2.0	5	0.7	7	0.9	763	100.0
2000	1,088	98.3	0	0.0	19	1.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1,107	100.0
2006	1,297	98.6	0	0.0	19	1.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	1,316	100.0
Town of Genesee												
1970	765	87.0	0	0.0	72	8.2	42	4.8	0	0.0	879	100.0
1980	1,343	89.6	18	1.2	86	5.7	53	3.5	0	0.0	1,500	100.0
1990	1,742	93.2	14	0.7	68	3.6	39	2.1	8	0.4	1,871	100.0
2000	2,299	95.2	22	0.9	52	2.2	40	1.7	0	0.0	2,413	100.0
2006	2,520	96.5	0	0.0	53	2.0	40	1.5	0	0.0	2,613	100.0
Town of Lisbon												
1970	988	79.9	0	0.0	100	8.1	29	2.3	120	9.7	1,237	100.0
1980	2,131	86.6	13	0.5	63	2.6	32	1.3	222	9.0	2,461	100.0
1990	2,333	85.6	36	1.3	33	1.2	15	0.5	311	11.4	2,728	100.0
2000	2,877	88.1	28	0.9	11	0.3	31	0.9	321	9.8	3,268	100.0
2006	3,234	89.9	0	0.0	11	0.3	31	0.9	321	8.9	3,597	100.0
Town of Merton												
1970	1,212	90.4	0	0.0	65	4.9	27	2.0	36	2.7	1,340	100.0
1980	1,825	92.4	19	1.0	61	3.1	30	1.5	39	2.0	1,974	100.0
1990	2,255	93.2	42	1.7	66	2.7	10	0.4	48	2.0	2,421	100.0
2000	2,776	95.1	39	1.3	60	2.1	12	0.4	33	1.1	2,920	100.0
2006	3,072	96.7	0	0.0	61	1.9	12	0.4	31	1.0	3,176	100.0

HOUSING UNITS BY STRUCTURE TYPE IN WAUKESHA COUNTY MUNICIPALITIES: 1970 – 2006

Table V-14 (Continued)

	Single-Family Detached		Single-Family Attached		Two-Family		Multi-Family		Mobile Homes and Other		Total	
Community	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Town of Mukwonago												
1970	523	93.4	0	0.0	33	5.9	0	0.0	4	0.7	560	100.0
1980	1,387	93.6	5	0.3	70	4.7	13	0.9	8	0.5	1,483	100.0
1990	1,737	94.0	5	0.3	62	3.4	0	0.0	43	2.3	1,847	100.0
2000	2,107	97.8	15	0.7	17	0.8	7	0.3	9	0.4	2,155	100.0
2006	2,470	98.6	0	0.0	17	0.7	7	0.3	9	0.4	2,503	100.0
Town of Oconomowoc												
1970	1,680	86.9	0	0.0	163	8.4	48	2.5	42	2.2	1,933	100.0
1980	2,194	90.0	33	1.4	148	6.1	61	2.5	0	0.0	2,436	100.0
1990	2,537	89.3	80	2.8	119	4.2	64	2.3	41	1.4	2,841	100.0
2000	2,729	91.1	101	3.4	97	3.2	68	2.3	0	0.0	2,995	100.0
2006	3,178	93.0	0	0.0	125	3.7	113	3.3	0	0.0	3,416	100.0
Town of Ottawa												
1970	472	96.9	0	0.0	10	2.1	0	0.0	5	1.0	487	100.0
1980	792	96.5	6	0.7	16	1.9	7	0.9	0	0.0	821	100.0
1990	1,018	98.8	0	0.0	7	0.7	0	0.0	5	0.5	1,030	100.0
2000	1,312	92.3	10	0.7	3	0.2	96	6.8	0	0.0	1,421	100.0
2006	1,406	93.4	0	0.0	3	0.2	96	6.4	0	0.0	1,505	100.0
Town of Summit												
1970	1,017	93.2	0	0.0	48	4.4	21	1.9	5	0.5	1,091	100.0
1980	1,244	92.5	11	0.8	72	5.4	18	1.3	0	0.0	1,345	100.0
1990	1,489	94.5	12	0.8	28	1.8	46	2.9	0	0.0	1,575	100.0
2000	1,839	97.5	4	0.2	8	0.4	26	1.4	9	0.5	1,886	100.0
2006	2,034	97.9	0	0.0	8	0.4	26	1.3	9	0.4	2,077	100.0
Town of Vernon												
1970	665	91.7	0	0.0	39	5.4	21	2.9	0	0.0	725	100.0
1980	1,742	95.3	1	0.1	63	3.4	22	1.2	0	0.0	1,828	100.0
1990	2,219	97.9	7	0.3	17	0.7	22	1.0	2	0.1	2,267	100.0
2000	2,315	96.4	17	0.7	43	1.8	27	1.1	0	0.0	2,402	100.0
2006	2,541	97.4	0	0.0	43	1.6	27	1.0	0	0.0	2,611	100.0
Town of Waukesha												
1970	998	93.3	0	0.0	58	5.4	14	1.3	0	0.0	1,070	100.0
1980	1,917	93.3	0	0.0	61	3.0	75	3.7	0	0.0	2,053	100.0
1990	2,361	94.8	0	0.0	61	2.4	50	2.0	19	0.8	2,491	100.0
2000	2,622	89.5	184	6.3	51	1.7	47	1.6	25	0.9	2,929	100.0
2006	2,948	93.6	0	0.0	51	1.6	125	4.0	25	0.8	3,149	100.0
Village of Big Bend												
1970	270	85.2	0	0.0	28	8.8	19	6.0	0	0.0	317	100.0
1980	343	84.8	3	0.7	41	10.1	18	4.4	0	0.0	405	100.0
1990	362	85.2	8	1.9	37	8.7	15	3.5	3	0.7	425	100.0
2000	402	86.1	14	3.0	42	9.0	9	1.9	0	0.0	467	100.0
2006	426	89.1	0	0.0	43	9.0	9	1.9	0	0.0	478	100.0

HOUSING UNITS BY STRUCTURE TYPE IN WAUKESHA COUNTY MUNICIPALITIES: 1970 – 2006
Community	Single- Deta	Family ched	Single- Atta	Family ched	Two-I	amily	Multi-	Family	Mobile H Ot	omes and her	То	tal
community	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Village of Butler												
1970	375	60.7	0	0.0	215	34.8	28	4.5	0	0.0	618	100.0
1980	410	49.5	5	0.6	200	24.2	213	25.7	0	0.0	828	100.0
1990	414	43.6	22	2.3	175	18.4	327	34.5	11	1.2	949	100.0
2000	443	47.2	8	0.9	175	18.7	308	32.8	4	0.4	938	100.0
2006	455	48.2	0	0.0	177	18.8	308	32.6	4	0.4	944	100.0
Village of Chenequa												
1970	204	92.7	0	0.0	11	5.0	5	2.3	0	0.0	220	100.0
1980	264	94.7	2	0.7	11	3.9	2	0.7	0	0.0	279	100.0
1990	298	95.4	5	1.6	3	1.0	3	1.0	3	1.0	312	100.0
2000	281	99.3	0	0.0	2	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	283	100.0
2006	296	99.3	0	0.0	2	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	298	100.0
Village of Dousman												
1970	123	86.6	0	0.0	14	9.9	5	3.5	0	0.0	142	100.0
1980	244	76.3	24	7.5	41	12.8	11	3.4	0	0.0	320	100.0
1990	266	74.5	26	7.3	44	12.3	15	4.2	6	1.7	357	100.0
2000	312	51.9	52	8.7	61	10.1	176	29.3	0	0.0	601	100.0
2006	502	66.3	0	0.0	61	8.1	194	25.6	0	0.0	757	100.0
Village of Eagle												
1970	217	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	217	100.0
1980	297	91.2	5	1.5	19	5.8	5	1.5	0	0.0	326	100.0
1990	349	87.2	11	2.7	19	4.8	16	4.0	5	1.3	400	100.0
2000	576	91.0	3	0.5	16	2.5	36	5.7	2	0.3	633	100.0
2006	640	91.6	0	0.0	20	2.9	36	5.2	2	0.3	698	100.0
Grove												
1970	1,668	92.9	0	0.0	11	0.6	116	6.5	0	0.0	1,795	100.0
1980	1,829	81.9	27	1.2	21	0.9	357	16.0	0	0.0	2,234	100.0
1990	1,905	79.5	65	2.7	12	0.5	404	16.8	12	0.5	2,398	100.0
2000	1,915	74.9	164	6.4	10	0.4	468	18.3	0	0.0	2,557	100.0
2006 Village of Hartland	2,083	80.4	0	0.0	11	0.4	499	19.2	0	0.0	2,593	100.0
1970	590	73.7	0	0.0	53	6.6	158	19.7	0	0.0	801	100.0
1980	1.041	54.4	66	3.5	156	8.2	649	33.9	0	0.0	1.912	100.0
1990	1.247	51.4	245	10.1	159	6.5	771	31.8	6	0.2	2.428	100.0
2000	1,648	51.9	315	9.9	240	7.6	972	30.6	0	0.0	3,175	100.0
2006	2,335	64.8	0	0.0	248	69	1.020	28.3	0	0.0	3,603	100.0
Village of Lac La Belle	2,000	0.10	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	010	210	0.5	1,020	2010	0	0.0	5,005	10010
1970	83	94.3	0	0.0	5	5.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	88	100.0
1980	80	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	80	100.0
1990	105	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	105	100.0
2000	131	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	131	100.0
2006	139	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	139	100.0

HOUSING UNITS BY STRUCTURE TYPE IN WAUKESHA COUNTY MUNICIPALITIES: 1970 – 2006

	Single- Deta	Family	Single- Atta	Family ched	Two-I	Family	Multi-	Family	Mobile H Ot	omes and her	To	tal
Community	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Village of Lannon												
1970	198	61.3	0	0.0	32	9.9	44	13.6	49	15.2	323	100.0
1980	242	66.8	2	0.6	30	8.3	45	12.4	43	11.9	362	100.0
1990	247	67.2	2	0.5	17	4.6	45	12.2	57	15.5	368	100.0
2000	245	57.7	0	0.0	23	5.4	18	4.2	139	32.7	425	100.0
2006	235	56.0	0	0.0	27	6.4	21	5.0	137	32.6	420	100.0
Village of Menomonee Falls												
1970	6,992	86.5	0	0.0	342	4.2	732	9.0	28	0.3	8,094	100.0
1980	7,272	80.2	269	3.0	298	3.3	1,182	13.0	46	0.5	9,067	100.0
1990	7,617	75.8	309	3.1	291	2.9	1,694	16.9	132	1.3	10,043	100.0
2000	9,602	73.0	535	4.1	294	2.2	2,643	20.1	76	0.6	13,150	100.0
2006	10,880	75.5	0	0.0	374	2.6	3,091	21.4	76	0.5	14,421	100.0
Village of Merton												
1970	145	79.2	0	0.0	28	15.3	10	5.5	0	0.0	183	100.0
1980	286	93.1	0	0.0	14	4.6	5	1.6	2	0.7	307	100.0
1990	314	90.7	2	0.6	18	5.2	10	2.9	2	0.6	346	100.0
2000	584	94.3	13	2.1	14	2.3	6	1.0	2	0.3	619	100.0
2006 Village of Mukwonago	908	97.7	0	0.0	14	1.5	6	0.6	2	0.2	930	100.0
1970	585	85.0	0	0.0	61	8.9	42	6.1	0	0.0	688	100.0
1980	1,042	77.6	19	1.4	171	12.7	111	8.3	0	0.0	1,343	100.0
1990	1,099	66.9	74	4.5	121	7.4	319	19.4	30	1.8	1,643	100.0
2000	1,470	57.2	149	5.8	129	5.0	821	32.0	0	0.0	2,569	100.0
2006 Village of Nashotah	1,833	63.3	0	0.0	152	5.2	912	31.5	0	0.0	2,897	100.0
1970	124	91.2	0	0.0	9	6.6	3	2.2	0	0.0	136	100.0
1980	151	89.9	0	0.0	17	10.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	168	100.0
1990	180	94.2	0	0.0	11	5.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	191	100.0
2000	354	77.1	21	4.6	8	1.7	73	15.9	3	0.7	459	100.0
2006	434	83.8	0	0.0	8	1.5	73	14.1	3	0.6	518	100.0
Village of North Prairie												
1970	170	87.7	0	0.0	15	7.7	9	4.6	0	0.0	194	100.0
1980	278	90.3	2	0.6	15	4.9	13	4.2	0	0.0	308	100.0
1990	380	92.5	0	0.0	12	2.9	17	4.1	2	0.5	411	100.0
2000	485	88.3	6	1.1	13	2.4	45	8.2	0	0.0	549	100.0
2006	628	89.1	0	0.0	32	4.5	45	6.4	0	0.0	705	100.0

HOUSING UNITS BY STRUCTURE TYPE IN WAUKESHA COUNTY MUNICIPALITIES: 1970 – 2006

	Single- Deta	Family	Single- Atta	Family ched	Two-I	amily	Multi-	Family	Mobile H Ot	omes and her	Те	tal
Community	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Village of Oconomowoc Lake												
1970	159	88.9	0	0.0	11	6.1	9	5.0	0	0.0	179	100.0
1980	194	90.7	0	0.0	14	6.5	6	2.8	0	0.0	214	100.0
1990	218	92.0	0	0.0	8	3.4	11	4.6	0	0.0	237	100.0
2000	231	95.5	9	3.7	2	0.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	242	100.0
2006	253	99.2	0	0.0	2	0.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	255	100.0
Village of Pewaukee												
1970	714	77.5	0	0.0	79	8.6	102	11.1	26	2.8	921	100.0
1980	725	40.7	50	2.8	138	7.8	838	47.1	28	1.6	1,779	100.0
1990	874	43.7	159	7.9	147	7.3	721	36.0	103	5.1	2,004	100.0
2000	1,469	38.2	520	13.6	195	5.1	1,632	42.6	18	0.5	3,834	100.0
2006	2,049	46.4	0	0.0	229	5.2	2,113	47.9	20	0.5	4,411	100.0
Village of Sussex												
1970	582	83.1	0	0.0	57	8.1	62	8.8	0	0.0	701	100.0
1980	817	75.5	0	0.0	72	6.7	192	17.8	0	0.0	1,081	100.0
1990	1,152	63.9	55	3.1	67	3.7	512	28.4	17	0.9	1,803	100.0
2000	2,141	62.0	124	3.6	125	3.6	1,052	30.5	9	0.3	3,451	100.0
2006	2,707	66.9	0	0.0	197	4.9	1,132	28.0	9	0.2	4,045	100.0
Village of Wales												
1970	155	89.6	0	0.0	18	10.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	173	100.0
1980	454	80.4	15	2.7	49	8.7	46	8.2	0	0.0	564	100.0
1990	606	82.3	42	5.7	35	4.8	48	6.5	5	0.7	736	100.0
2000	716	79.7	88	9.8	56	6.2	39	4.3	0	0.0	899	100.0
2006	871	89.8	0	0.0	60	6.2	39	4.0	0	0.0	970	100.0
City of Brookfield												
1970	7,999	95.3	0	0.0	112	1.3	287	3.4	0	0.0	8,398	100.0
1980	9,617	91.3	115	1.1	212	2.0	590	5.6	0	0.0	10,534	100.0
1990	10,929	89.1	412	3.4	164	1.3	668	5.5	81	0.7	12,254	100.0
2000	12,104	85.0	869	6.1	132	0.9	1,136	8.0	5	0.0	14,246	100.0
2006	13,219	87.1	0	0.0	150	1.0	1,807	11.9	5	0.0	15,181	100.0
City of Delafield												
1970	895	87.0	0	0.0	63	6.1	71	6.9	0	0.0	1,029	100.0
1980	1,044	70.9	42	2.9	95	6.4	292	19.8	0	0.0	1,473	100.0
1990	1,349	62.1	100	4.6	74	3.4	623	28.7	26	1.2	2,172	100.0
2000	1,672	62.6	211	7.9	124	4.6	666	24.9	0	0.0	2,673	100.0
2006	2,014	67.9	0	0.0	130	4.4	823	27.7	0	0.0	2,967	100.0

HOUSING UNITS BY STRUCTURE TYPE IN WAUKESHA COUNTY MUNICIPALITIES: 1970 – 2006

	Single- Deta	Family ched	Single- Atta	Family ched	Two-l	Family	Multi-	Family	Mobile H Ot	omes and her	To	tal
Community	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
City of Muskego												
1970	2,850	94.9	0	0.0	111	3.7	41	1.4	0	0.0	3,002	100.0
1980	3,988	88.8	97	2.2	214	4.8	189	4.2	0	0.0	4,488	100.0
1990	4,782	83.1	174	3.0	196	3.4	520	9.0	87	1.5	5,759	100.0
2000	6,108	79.4	286	3.7	239	3.1	1,061	13.8	0	0.0	7,694	100.0
2006	7,235	84.4	0	0.0	243	2.8	1,101	12.8	0	0.0	8,579	100.0
City of New Berlin												
1970	6,155	90.0	0	0.0	212	3.1	472	6.9	0	0.0	6,839	100.0
1980	8,157	85.5	154	1.6	175	1.8	1,060	11.1	0	0.0	9,546	100.0
1990	9,682	80.0	367	3.0	121	1.0	1,889	15.6	43	0.4	12,102	100.0
2000	11,310	75.7	603	4.0	193	1.3	2,809	18.8	24	0.2	14,939	100.0
2006	12,237	76.8	0	0.0	263	1.7	3,385	21.3	24	0.2	15,909	100.0
City of Oconomowoc												
1970	2,100	71.7	0	0.0	347	11.8	479	16.3	7	0.2	2,933	100.0
1980	2,459	67.8	58	1.6	435	12.0	673	18.5	4	0.1	3,629	100.0
1990	2,726	62.6	173	4.0	357	8.2	1,057	24.3	37	0.9	4,350	100.0
2000	3,169	60.2	328	6.2	346	6.6	1,420	27.0	0	0.0	5,263	100.0
2006	4,326	68.8	0	0.0	438	7.0	1,521	24.2	0	0.0	6,285	100.0
City of Pewaukee												
1970	1,802	93.5	0	0.0	109	5.7	15	0.8	0	0.0	1,926	100.0
1980	2,460	93.8	1	0.0	111	4.2	53	2.0	0	0.0	2,625	100.0
1990	3,026	88.5	85	2.5	91	2.7	173	5.1	40	1.2	3,415	100.0
2000	3,323	70.6	480	10.2	129	2.7	771	16.4	3	0.1	4,706	100.0
2006	4,058	76.0	0	0.0	282	5.3	990	18.6	3	0.1	5,333	100.0
City of Waukesha												
1970	7,546	62.6	0	0.0	1,819	15.1	2,609	21.6	82	0.7	12,056	100.0
1980	9,869	53.8	325	1.8	2,230	12.2	5,870	32.0	39	0.2	18,333	100.0
1990	10,909	49.4	1,185	5.4	2,024	9.2	7,541	34.2	406	1.8	22,065	100.0
2000	13,155	49.0	1,699	6.3	2,107	7.8	9,769	36.4	128	0.5	26,858	100.0
2006	16,062	55.1	0	0.0	2,451	8.4	10,530	36.1	128	0.4	29,171	100.0
Waukesha County												
1970	53,117	83.4	0	0.0	4,503	7.1	5,668	8.9	404	0.6	63,692	100.0
1980	71,120	77.9	1,415	1.5	5,606	6.1	12,813	14.0	431	0.5	91,385	100.0
1990	82,387	74.6	3,813	3.5	4,793	4.3	17,836	16.1	1,623	1.5	110,452	100.0
2000	99,613	70.9	7,252	5.2	5,136	3.7	27,473	19.6	835	0.6	140,309	100.0
2006	115,987	75.2	0	0.0	6,113	4.0	31,373	20.3	833	0.5	154,306	100.0

HOUSING UNITS BY STRUCTURE TYPE IN WAUKESHA COUNTY MUNICIPALITIES: 1970 – 2006

 $a^{(1)}$ 1000 $a_{(1)}$ 1000 $a_{(2)}$ 1000 $a_{($

^cIncludes mobile homes and living quarters that do not fit into the other categories.

dTotals are based on all housing units, including occupied and vacant units.

eSingle-family attached, two-family, and multi-family structure totals were combined in the 1970 Census. The 1970 multi-family data reflects this combined total.

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census, Wisconsin Department of Administration, and SEWRPC.

accommodations (such as transient hotels, motels, and tourist courts that are primarily engaged in providing lodging, or lodging and meals. Also excluded are "HUD-code" manufactured (mobile) homes, moved or relocated units, and housing units created in an existing residential or nonresidential structure. These numbers provide a general indication of the amount of new housing stock that may have been added to the housing inventory. Since not all permits become actual housing starts and starts lag the permit stage of construction, these numbers do not represent total new construction, but do provide a general indicator on construction activity and the local real estate market.

From 2000 to 2006, Waukesha County has experienced an 8.54 percent increase in single-family homes, a 19.02 percent increase in two-family structures, and a 14.20 percent increase in multi-family developments (which includes 3 or more units per structure). Relative to one another, single-family, two-family and multi-family structures proportionally remain similar.

Table V-14 shows the progression of growth in the number of housing units by structure type in the County between 1970 and 2006. The total number of housing units in the County increased from 63,692 in 1970 to 154,306 in 2006 for a gain of 90,614 housing units during this period. The largest growth in housing units occurred between 1990 and 2000 when 29,857 housing units were constructed. The percentage of housing units constructed during this period was 41.07 percent in cities, 32.91 percent in villages, and 26.02 in towns. The growth in new housing units in cities ranged from 501 in the City of Delafield to 4,793 in the City of Waukesha where 39.09 percent of all new housing unit growth in cities of Oconomowoc Lake to 3,107 in the Village of Menomonee Falls. Menomonee Falls recorded 31.62 percent of all new housing units constructed within villages between 1990 and 2000. The number of new housing units in towns ranged from 135 in the Town of Vernon to 1,399 in the Town of Brookfield where 18.01 percent of all new housing units in towns between 1990 and 2000 where 18.01 percent of all new housing units in towns between 1990 and 2000.

From a County wide perspective, the data in Table V-14 reveals that single family housing is the predominant housing structure type within the County. The second most predominant housing structure type is multi-family housing. The percent of multi-family housing has more than doubled since 1970 from 8.9 percent of all structures to 20.30 percent in 2006. This demand may increase especially as the baby boomer population ages in place and the population of age 65 is projected to double in size within the County between 2000 and 2035. It also is important from a planning perspective to take into account that nationally 28 percent of the population of age 65 and over has a physical disability. As the baby boomers age it is anticipated that the number of people with a physical disability will likely increase. Senior housing options include single family, apartment living, community based residential facilities (CBRF's), group homes, continuing care retirement communities, and nursing homes.

The age of the existing housing stock in the County also provides insight into the character and condition of existing homes. It can be assumed that as housing stock ages, more housing units will need to be rehabilitated or replaced. Table V-15 presents the age of the existing housing stock in the planning area and each local government. The median year built for housing units was 1975 for the County as a whole. The median year built for housing units was 1975 for the County as a whole. The median year built for housing units in cities ranges from 1966 in the City of Brookfield to 1988 in the City of Pewaukee. The median year built for housing units in villages ranges from 1954 in the Village of Oconomowoc Lake to 1993 in the Village of Nashotah. The median year built for towns ranges from 1966 in the Town of Summit to 1990 in the Town of Brookfield.

Structure Type by Community 1970 to 2000

Table V-14 shows the progression of types of housing developed within Waukesha County between 1970 and 2000. This provides insight into the number of existing single family, two-family, multi-family, and mobile home units within the County. The data shows that single family housing is the predominant housing structure type within the County. The second most predominant housing structure type is multi-family housing. This structure type has more than doubled since 1970 from 8.9 percent of all structures to nearly 20 percent in 2000. This shows

	1995 to N	Iarch 2000	1990 thre	ough 1994	1980 thr	ough 1989	1970 thre	ough 1979	1960 thr	ough 1969	1940 thr	ough 1959	Befor	e 1940	h	Median Vear
Community	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Total	Built
Town of Brookfield	325	10.39	1,124	35.93	310	9.91	233	7.45	630	20.14	304	9.72	35	1.12	3,128	1990
Town of Delafield	489	18.64	530	20.21	344	13.11	498	18.99	118	4.50	290	11.06	354	13.50	2,623	1981
Town of Eagle	226	20.42	182	16.44	122	11.02	193	17.43	36	3.25	152	13.73	196	17.71	1,107	1979
Town of Genesee	291	12.06	373	15.46	295	12.23	730	30.25	185	7.67	244	10.11	295	12.23	2,413	1977
Town of Lisbon	365	12.97	273	9.70	327	11.62	1,088	38.65	303	10.76	247	8.77	212	7.53	2,815	1975
Town of Merton	454	14.09	333	10.34	322	9.99	590	18.31	257	7.98	328	10.18	694	21.54	3,222	1974
Town of Mukwonago	315	14.62	430	19.95	352	16.33	722	33.50	77	3.57	114	5.29	145	6.73	2,155	1981
Town of Oconomowoc	260	8.68	250	8.35	215	7.18	683	22.80	425	14.19	605	20.20	557	18.60	2,995	1968
Town of Ottawa	219	15.41	236	16.61	115	8.09	306	21.53	134	9.43	265	18.65	146	10.27	1,421	1975
Town of Summit	245	12.99	152	8.06	138	7.32	310	16.44	220	11.66	455	24.13	366	19.41	1,886	1966
Town of Vernon	213	8.21	235	9.06	418	16.12	1,108	42.73	204	7.87	199	7.67	216	8.33	2,593	1976
Town of Waukesha	243	7.76	361	11.52	448	14.30	836	26.68	390	12.45	423	13.50	193	6.16	3,133	1976
Village of Big Bend	7	1.50	14	3.00	21	4.50	116	24.84	69	14.78	146	31.26	94	20.13	467	1959
Village of Butler	32	3.41	13	1.39	95	10.13	189	20.15	101	10.77	340	36.25	168	17.91	938	1959
Village of Chenequa	20	7.07	20	7.07	29	10.25	31	10.95	34	12.01	41	14.49	108	38.16	283	1957
Village of Dousman	120	19.97	79	13.14	47	7.82	128	21.30	35	5.82	56	9.32	136	22.63	601	1976
Village of Eagle	161	26.18	55	8.94	85	13.82	88	14.31	34	5.53	65	10.57	127	20.65	615	1979
Village of Elm Grove	153	5.98	48	1.88	154	6.02	509	19.91	530	20.73	913	35.71	250	9.78	2,557	1962
Village of Hartland	356	11.21	322	10.14	455	14.33	1,044	32.88	277	8.72	374	11.78	347	10.93	3,175	1976
Village of Lac La Belle	24	18.32	26	19.85	3	2.29	6	4.58	23	17.56	18	13.74	31	23.66	131	1967
Village of Lannon	21	4.94	91	21.41	22	5.18	58	13.65	33	7.76	82	19.29	118	27.76	425	1964
Village of Menomonee Falls	1,786	13.58	1,455	11.06	1,050	7.98	1,285	9.77	3,369	25.62	3,520	26.77	685	5.21	13,150	1967
Village of Merton	134	21.65	137	22.13	49	7.92	147	23.75	32	5.17	40	6.46	80	12.92	619	1982
Village of Mukwonago	483	18.80	461	17.94	250	9.73	569	22.15	203	7.90	257	10.00	346	13.47	2,569	1978
Village of Nashotah	178	38.03	103	22.01	19	4.06	53	11.32	25	5.34	38	8.12	52	11.11	468	1993
Village of North Prairie	52	9.47	74	13.48	118	21.49	99	18.03	39	7.10	75	13.66	92	16.76	549	1977
Village of Oconomowoc Lake	25	10.33	15	6.20	19	7.85	20	8.26	29	11.98	40	16.53	94	38.84	242	1954
Village of Pewaukee	1,168	30.46	531	13.85	317	8.27	762	19.87	283	7.38	351	9.15	422	11.01	3,834	1983
Village of Sussex	848	24.57	772	22.37	676	19.59	476	13.79	391	11.33	185	5.36	103	2.98	3,451	1988
Village of Wales	57	6.34	89	9.90	163	18.13	384	42.71	92	10.23	48	5.34	66	7.34	899	1976
City of Brookfield	904	6.35	1,328	9.33	1,918	13.48	2,238	15.72	3,049	21.42	4,479	31.47	317	2.23	14,233	1966
City of Delafield	355	13.02	301	11.04	559	20.51	520	19.08	205	7.52	308	11.30	319	11.70	2,726	1972
City of Muskego	1,110	14.43	1,423	18.49	823	10.70	1,526	19.83	838	10.89	1,539	20.00	435	5.65	7,694	1977
City of New Berlin	2,433	15.90	1,254	8.20	2,375	15.52	2,635	17.22	2,882	18.84	3,170	20.72	549	3.59	15,298	1973
City of Oconomowoc	440	8.36	347	6.59	728	13.83	943	17.92	629	11.95	871	16.55	1,305	24.80	5,263	1967
City of Pewaukee	1,312	25.78	1,719	33.77	779	15.30	752	14.77	478	9.39	478	9.39	416	8.17	5,090	1988
City of Waukesha	3,124	11.63	2,075	7.73	3,787	14.10	6,351	23.65	3,214	11.97	4,114	15.32	4,193	15.61	26,858	1973
Waukesha County	18,948	13.38	17,231	12.17	17,947	12.67	28,226	19.93	19,873	14.03	25,174	17.77	14,262	10.05	141,626	1975

 Table V-15

 YEAR BUILT FOR HOUSING UNITS IN WAUKESHA COUNTY COMMUNITIES: 2000*

^a Totals are based on a sample of one in six respondents to the 2000 Census.
^b Totals are based on all housing units, including occupied and vacant housing units.
Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and municipalities.

that there may be a growing demand for multi-family housing within the County, especially as the baby boomer population ages in place and the population of age 65 and over more than doubles within the County between 2000 and 2035.

Existing Housing Stock Condition

The condition of individual housing units must be examined to gain a more precise understanding of the number of existing housing units that need to be removed from existing housing stock totals. Generally, this provides a more accurate projection of the number of new housing units that will be needed to serve the projected population of the planning area through 2035.

Municipal assessor's offices and private assessors under contract to provide assessment services generally assign each housing unit within their jurisdiction a condition score. The scores range from excellent to unsound on a sixpoint scale and measure the present physical condition of each housing unit. Excellent/very good or good indicates the dwelling exhibits above average maintenance and upkeep in relation to its age. Average or fair indicates the dwelling shows minor signs of deterioration caused by normal wear and an ordinary standard of upkeep and maintenance in relation to its age. Poor/very poor indicates the dwelling shows signs of deferred maintenance and exhibits a below average standard of maintenance and upkeep in relation to its age. An unsound rating indicates the dwelling is unfit for use and should be removed from the existing housing stock totals. Housing conditions were collected from 27 out of 37 municipalities in Waukesha County. This information is presented in Appendix C. The records show that the vast majority of single family homes in the county have an average, good, very good, or excellent condition score. Two family and multi-family homes tend to have a larger prevalence of average condition ratings and a higher percentage ranked with a score of poor.

HOUSING DEMAND

Household, income, and demographic characteristics of the County and participating local governments have been inventoried and will be analyzed with housing supply inventory items to help determine the number and type of housing units that will best suit the needs of Waukesha County residents through 2035. Housing demand inventory items include:

- Affordable housing need assessment
- Household projection: 2035
- Household income
- Age distribution
- Household size

As with the above housing supply inventory data, Census 2000 Summary File 1 and Summary File 3 were used in the collection of the housing demand inventory data presented in this chapter. Again, Summary File 1 data were used when possible; however, in most cases only Summary File 3 data were available.

Affordable Housing Need Assessment

As previously stated, HUD defines housing affordability as households "paying no more than 30 percent of their income for housing." Households that pay more than 30 percent of their gross monthly income for housing are considered to have a high housing cost burden. The measure is based on gross pre-tax income. Another measure of affordability is implicit in the long-standing mortgage lending practice of limiting borrower's monthly housing costs to 28 or 29 percent of their gross monthly income as a condition of loan approval. Thus, 28 to 30 percent can be considered a cutoff beyond which housing is not affordable. Data show that most households opt for less than that percentage, while others, particularly those with low incomes, are generally unable to find housing that costs less than 30 percent of their monthly income.

Waukesha County Housing Affordability Facts

The following information is based on the HUD recommended affordability standard of paying no more than 30 percent of gross monthly income for housing costs.

- About 19 percent of owner occupied households in Waukesha County spent over 30 percent of their monthly income on housing costs in 2000.
- About 27 percent of all renter occupied households in the County spent more than 30 percent of their monthly income on housing costs in 2000. Although Waukesha County had the highest median rent per month(\$726.00) it had the 16th highest percent paying 30% or more of income for rent when compared to other counties in the state.
 - o 17,810 households in the County were extremely low income (below 30 percent of the County median annual household income) or very low income (between 30 and 50 percent of the County median annual household income) households in 2000.
 - An extremely low income household (earning 30 percent of the 2000 County median annual household income of \$62,839) could afford monthly housing costs of no more than \$471 in 2000.
 - o In 2000, 4,523 households paid less than \$499 a month on gross rent.
 - In 2000, 4,639 households paid less than \$700 a month on housing expenses for owner-occupied housing units with a mortgage.
- The fair market rent in Waukesha County for a one bedroom apartment was \$725 in 2006
 - A worker earning the average hourly wage for the retail trade sector in Waukesha County (\$10.58/hour) would have had to work 53 hours a week to afford the fair market rent for a one bedroom apartment in 2006 or work at one job for 49 hours a week with overtime pay.
- The fair market rent in Waukesha County for a two bedroom apartment was \$830 in 2006
 - A worker earning the average Waukesha County retail trade sector hourly wage would have had to work 63 hours a week to afford the fair market rent for a two bedroom apartment in 2006 or work at one job for 54 hours with overtime pay.
 - Two retail workers sharing a two bedroom apartment and earning the average retail trade sector hourly wage would have to work 32 hours each a week to afford the fair market rent for a two bedroom apartment.
- The cost of a typical starter home in Waukesha County was about \$200,000 in 2006
 - The minimum annual household income needed for a \$200,000 mortgage in Waukesha County was \$73,200, or \$6,100.00 a month, in 2006 (assumption based on a 30 year mortgage at 6.9% with a maximum principal, interest, taxes, and insurance payment of \$1,830.00 per month with less than 5% down payment. Property taxes calculated at \$3,000 per year and home insurance at \$500 per year.)
 - A household with two workers earning the average Waukesha County retail trade sector hourly wage would each have to work 67 hours a week to afford the monthly payments for a \$200,000 home or 58 hours each a week if they each worked one job and earned overtime pay after 40 hours.
 - A police officer earning a typical entry level wage in Waukesha County (\$20.50/hour) would have to work 59 hours a week if they worked one job and earned an average of 19 hours of overtime pay per week to afford the monthly payments for a \$200,000 mortgage.

The housing wage in Waukesha County

- A full-time worker (40 hours per week) had to earn \$14.02 per hour (\$29,158 per year) to afford a onebedroom rental unit at the fair market rent in Waukesha County in 2006.
- A full-time worker (40 hours per week) had to earn \$16.13 per hour (\$33,545 per year) to afford a twobedroom rental unit at the fair market rent in Waukesha County in 2006.
- A full-time worker (40 hours per week) had to earn \$35.20 per hour (\$73,216 per year) to afford a \$200,000, 30 year mortgage in Waukesha County in 2006 (Table V-18).
- o The average hourly wage for jobs located in Waukesha County was \$19.75 per hour in 2006.

Table V-16 presents data for select professional, manufacturing, technical, and service occupations within Waukesha County. The data shows that the median income spent on housing mortgage payments including property insurance and property taxes for a \$200,000 mortgage is above the 30 percent of median income formula used by HUD to define affordable housing. This means that even for professional level employees to live affordably a second worker within the household must secure employment to earn additional income. It also shows that service workers must have an additional household wage earner making a substantially better income to obtain a mortgage, buy a house, and to live affordably within the County. This data shows that the affordability of housing within the County is an issue for families living in the County with incomes below the median and it might be an issue for families at or above the median as well.

Table V-16

PERCENT OF INCOME SPENT ON A \$200,000 MORTGAGE PAYMENT WITH A 30 YEAR LOAN AT 6.9% RATE OF INTEREST IN WAUKESHA COUNTY BY SELECT OCCUPATION TYPES, 2006

Type of Employment	Median Wage Per Hour	Median Income Per Year	30 Percent of Gross Median Income = Monthly Affordable Housing	Actual Affordable Mortgage at 30 Percent of Gross Median Income	Actual Percent of Gross Income Spent on a \$200,000 Mortgage Payment
Civil Engineer	\$29.52	\$61,401	\$1,535.02	\$183,474	40 percent
Urban Planner	\$28.02	\$58,281	\$1,456.80	\$171,517	43 percent
Social Worker	\$26.14	\$54,371	\$1,359.27	\$156,788	45 percent
School Teacher (K-8)	\$24.50	\$50,960	\$1,274.00	\$143,840	49 percent
Manufacturing Worker	\$23.86	\$49,634	\$1,240.85	\$138,807	50 percent
Construction Worker	\$23.63	\$49,152	\$1,228.80	\$136,977	50 percent
Police Officer	\$20.50	\$42,025	\$1,050.62	\$109,924	55 percent
Legal Secretary	\$17.66	\$36,732	\$918.32	\$89,832	67 percent
Roofer	\$17.42	\$36,233	\$905.82	\$87,937	68 percent
Dental Assistant	\$13.32	\$27,705	\$692.64	\$55,566	90 percent
Travel Agent	\$11.88	\$24,710	\$617.76	\$44,197	100 percent
Floral Designer	\$10.82	\$22,505	\$562.62	\$35,827	110 percent
Bank Teller	\$10.44	\$21,715	\$542.88	\$32,828	114 percent
Child Care Worker	\$9.69	\$20,155	\$503.88	\$26,907	123 percent
Fast Food Cook	\$8.00	\$16,640	\$416.00	\$13,564	149 percent

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Table V-16 also reflects upon issues with rental housing prices. In 2006, the average fair market rent for a one bedroom apartment was \$725 a month and the average fair market rent for a two bedroom apartment was \$830 a month in the County. If a person is living alone, they need to make over \$13 an hour to live in an affordable one bedroom apartment at the fair rent price. If this wage level is not being earned with one job, other options are to find a second job, double up with an apartment mate who is working and share expenses, live at home with parents or relatives or commute from outside Waukesha County.

The high school age group has the economic benefit of living with parents and relatives. However, this group is a declining source of labor for retailers and food service industries, and has declined since the late 1970s. In 1978, 49.1 percent of all high school teenagers (almost 1 out of every 2) in the United States worked part-time. In 2007, according to the Center for Labor Market Studies at Northeastern University, 34.1 percent (1 out of every 3) of high school teenagers in the nation worked part-time. High school student labor force participation has experienced a declining trend for nearly 30 years. This decline in the number of high school students in the labor

force has been an issue for employers facing tightening labor market issues. This situation presents a critical workforce challenge for future-focused employers and communities. The high school age group is not projected to grow in number in Waukesha County through the year 2030 (See Table IV-5 school age population projections for Waukesha County). Some of this loss in high school age employees may be offset by hiring immigrants and senior citizens to work in retail and especially food service positions.

In general, it is important for economic stability and growth for workers to have housing opportunities. If a range of housing types is available at a range of prices affordable to workers, a local community will have a better opportunity to attract workers and thus grow local businesses. Policies that support a wide range of housing types are an important economic development tool as well as a route to social inclusion.

Table V-17 shows the number of owner-occupied and renter-occupied households in the Region by County with a high housing cost burden in 2000 based on general Census data. About 19 percent of owner-occupied households in the Region experienced a high housing cost burden and about 31 percent of renter-occupied households in the Region experienced a high housing cost burden. Waukesha County had a slightly lower percentage of homes with a high housing cost burden when compared to the Region.

Table V-18 sets forth the median percentage of monthly income spent on housing costs by owner-occupied and renter-occupied households for each community in Waukesha County in 2000. The median percentage of monthly income spent on owner-occupied housing ranged from 19.9 percent in the Village of Butler to 24.0 percent in the Village of Lanon. The median percentage of monthly income on renter occupied housing ranged from 13.4 percent in the Town of Lisbon to 41.6 percent in the Town of Ottawa. The median percentage of monthly income spent on housing costs in the County by owner-occupied households with a mortgage was 21.4 percent. The median percentage spent by owner-occupied households without a mortgage in the County was 11.3 percent and the percentage spent by renter-occupied households was 22.8 percent. This shows that most households in the County opt to pay substantially less than the 30 percent affordability standard as defined by HUD.

Table V-19 sets forth the median percentage of monthly income spent on housing costs by owner-occupied and renter-occupied households in the Region. The median percentage of income spent on monthly housing costs did not vary significantly across the Region. The percentage of income spent on housing by owner-occupied households with a mortgage ranged from 20.7 in Racine County to 22.8 percent in Walworth County. The percentage of income spent on housing costs without a mortgage ranged from 10.2 in Washington County to 12.5 percent in Kenosha County. Percentage of income spent on housing by renter-occupied households was lowest in Washington County at 21.2 and the highest in Milwaukee County at 24.8 percent.

Tables V-20a and V-20b show in detail the number of persons per room in owner and renter occupied households in Waukesha County in 2000. A housing unit is considered "overcrowded" if there is more than one occupant per room. Rooms considered for this calculation include kitchens, bedrooms, enclosed porches, finished recreation rooms and living and dining rooms. Table V-20a sets forth the number of households with more than 1 occupant per room in the County. Within the County, less than one (1) percent of all owner occupied homes had more than one (1) occupant per room. Approximately 3.61 percent of all renter occupied units had more than one occupant per room in the County. Over half of these renter occupied units were in the City of Waukesha.

Table V-17

County	Owner-O House	Occupied cholds	Renter-O House	Occupied cholds	Total Ho	useholds
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Kenosha	7,855	20.3	5,359	30.9	13,214	23.6
Milwaukee	38,655	19.4	57,025	31.9	95,680	25.3
Ozaukee	4,570	19.4	1,730	23.7	6,300	20.4
Racine	8,615	17.2	6,265	30.1	14,880	21.0
Walworth	5,285	22.2	3,179	29.8	8,464	24.5
Washington	6,075	18.2	2,380	22.6	8,455	19.3
Waukesha	19,100	18.5	8,750	27.5	27,850	20.6
Region	90,155	19.1	84,688	30.5	174,843	23.3

HOUSEHOLDS WITH A HIGH HOUSING COST BURDEN IN THE SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN REGION: 2000^a

^aHigh housing cost burden is defined by HUD as a household spending more than 30 percent of its gross monthly income on housing costs.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau and SEWRPC.

Table V-18	
MEDIAN PERCENTAGE OF MONTHLY INCOME SPENT ON HO	USING IN
WAUKESHA COUNTY COMMUNITIES: 2000	

Community	Owner-Occupied with a Mortgage ^a	Owner-Occupied Without a Mortgage ^b	Renter-Occupied ^c
Town of Brookfield	20.4	11.8	34.7
Town of Delafield	20.7	9.9	17.7
Town of Eagle	21.1	9.9	15.6
Town of Genesee	20.7	9.9	16.2
Town of Lisbon	20.6	9.9	13.4
Town of Merton	22.2	9.9	18.1
Town of Mukwonago	21.7	9.9	23.1
Town of Oconomowoc	21.9	9.9	19.1
Town of Ottawa	19.8	9.9	41.6
Town of Summit	22.9	12.9	19.3
Town of Vernon	21.3	9.9	18.4
Town of Waukesha	20.0	9.9	21.7
Village of Big Bend	20.5	9.9	17.9
Village of Butler	19.9	14.8	24.5
Village of Chenequa	20.9	10.4	16.9
Village of Dousman	22.2	10.6	26.6
Village of Eagle	22.4	11.7	21.1
Village of Elm Grove	21.0	10.6	20.7
Village of Hartland	21.0	10.0	21.5
Village of Lac La Belle	23.9	20.0	25.0
Village of Lannon	24.0	19.2	17.5
Village of Menomonee Falls	21.3	12.5	25.7
Village of Merton	23.1	9.9	29.2
Village of Mukwonago	22.1	9.9	21.7
Village of Nashotah	23.3	9.9	30.8
Village of North Prairie	21.1	9.9	22.0
Village of Oconomowoc Lake	21.6	10.6	22.5
Village of Pewaukee	22.7	18.8	21.4
Village of Sussex	22.0	9.9	22.9
Village of Wales	20.4	9.9	18.8
City of Brookfield	20.9	10.9	24.4
City of Delafield	21.1	12.9	21.8
City of Muskego	22.2	12.1	21.5
City of New Berlin	21.1	11.8	22.0
City of Oconomowoc	21.9	13.7	21.7
City of Pewaukee	20.3	11.9	19.5
City of Waukesha	22.0	11.5	23.2
Waukesha County	21.4	11.3	22.8

^aSpecified owner-occupied housing units: Median selected monthly owner costs as a percentage of household income in 1999 ; Housing units with a mortgage ^bSpecified owner-occupied housing units: Median selected monthly owner costs as a percentage of household income in 1999 ; Housing units without a mortgage ^cSpecified renter-occupied housing units paying cash rent: Median gross rent as a percentage of household income in 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

County	Owner-Occupied with a Mortgage	Owner-Occupied Without a Mortgage	Renter- Occupied
Kenosha	21.4	12.5	24.3
Milwaukee	21.1	12.6	24.8
Ozaukee	21.4	11.3	21.8
Racine	20.7	11.5	24
Walworth	22.8	11.8	24.1
Washington	21.9	10.2	21.2
Waukesha	21.4	11.3	22.8

Table V-19 MEDIAN PERCENTAGE OF MONTHLY INCOME SPENT ON HOUSING IN THE SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN REGION: 2000

Source: U.S. Census Bureau and SEWRPC.

Table V-20a

OWNER-OCCUPIED* HOUSING OCCUPANCY BY NUMBER OF OCCUPANTS PER ROOM
IN WAUKESHA COUNTY COMMUNITIES: 2000 ^b

				Occu	ipants per r	oom			
Community	0.50 a	r less	0.51 t	o 1.00	1.01 t	o 1.50	1.51 or	r more	Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	TOTAL
Town of Brookfield	1,361	79.54	341	19.93	9	0.53	0	0.00	1,711
Town of Delafield	1,903	82.35	408	17.65	0	0.00	0	0.00	2,311
Town of Eagle	682	69.81	286	29.27	9	0.92	0	0.00	977
Town of Genesee	1,636	72.36	596	26.36	20	0.88	9	0.40	2,261
Town of Lisbon	2,160	68.97	956	30.52	16	0.51	0	0.00	3,132
Town of Merton	1,843	74.16	624	25.11	14	0.56	4	0.16	2,485
Town of Mukwonago	1,457	71.39	584	28.61	0	0.00	0	0.00	2,041
Town of Oconomowoc	1,717	73.94	603	25.97	2	0.09	0	0.00	2,322
Town of Ottawa	940	75.68	296	23.83	6	0.48	0	0.00	1,242
Town of Summit	1,164	75.05	374	24.11	13	0.84	0	0.00	1,551
Town of Vernon	1,609	70.29	661	28.88	19	0.83	0	0.00	2,289
Town of Waukesha	2,178	77.92	607	21.72	10	0.36	0	0.00	2,795
Village of Big Bend	257	69.46	102	27.57	11	2.97	0	0.00	370
Village of Butler	352	77.19	92	20.18	12	2.63	0	0.00	456
Village of Chenequa	176	90.72	16	8.25	2	1.03	0	0.00	194
Village of Dousman	234	71.34	94	28.66	0	0.00	0	0.00	328
Village of Eagle	342	61.62	199	35.86	12	2.16	2	0.36	555
Village of Elm Grove	1,932	87.74	270	12.26	0	0.00	0	0.00	2,202
Village of Hartland	1,305	73.94	460	26.06	0	0.00	0	0.00	1,765
Village of Lac La Belle	110	95.65	5	4.35	0	0.00	0	0.00	115
Village of Lannon	262	75.07	79	22.64	6	1.72	2	0.57	349
Village of Menomonee Falls	7,380	74.47	2,467	24.89	45	0.45	18	0.18	9,910
Village of Merton	356	61.38	221	38.10	2	0.34	1	0.17	580
Village of Mukwonago	1,106	71.86	420	27.29	13	0.84	0	0.00	1,539
Village of Nashotah	347	80.32	85	19.68	0	0.00	0	0.00	432
Village of North Prairie	292	63.62	167	36.38	0	0.00	0	0.00	459
Village of Oconomowoc Lake	160	85.56	27	14.44	0	0.00	0	0.00	187
Village of Pewaukee	1,824	78.52	491	21.14	8	0.34	0	0.00	2,323
Village of Sussex	1,485	68.03	679	31.10	19	0.87	0	0.00	2,183
Village of Wales	482	65.40	250	33.92	5	0.68	0	0.00	737
City of Brookfield	10,185	81.12	2,325	18.52	39	0.31	6	0.05	12,555
City of Delafield	1,243	76.21	388	23.79	0	0.00	0	0.00	1,631
City of Muskego	4,313	69.24	1,874	30.09	28	0.45	14	0.22	6,229
City of New Berlin	9,167	77.77	2,530	21.46	74	0.63	16	0.14	11,787
City of Oconomowoc	2,394	77.18	681	21.95	27	0.87	0	0.00	3,102
City of Pewaukee	3,086	79.68	766	19.78	11	0.28	10	0.26	3,873
City of Waukesha	10,855	74.97	3,410	23.55	156	1.08	59	0.41	14,480
County	78,295	75.68	24,434	23.62	588	0.57	141	0.14	103,458

 County
 /8,295
 /5,08
 24,434
 23,02
 588
 0.57
 141
 0.14
 103,430

 ^aA housing unit is considered overcrowded if there is more than one occupant per room. Rooms considered in the calculation include: living room, dining room, kitchen, bedrooms, finished recreation rooms, and enclosed porches suitable for year-round use. ^bTotals are based on a sample of one in six responses to the 2000 Census.

 Source: U.S. Census Bureau and SEWRPC.

	Occupants per room								
Community	0.50 c	or less	0.51 to 1.00		1.01 to 1.50		1.51 or more		T . (.]
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Total
Town of Brookfield	806	81.01	159	15.98	30	3.02	0	0.00	995
Town of Delafield	174	75.32	54	23.38	3	1.30	0	0.00	231
Town of Eagle	36	57.14	25	39.68	0	0.00	2	3.17	63
Town of Genesee	99	72.26	38	27.74	0	0.00	0	0.00	137
Town of Lisbon	72	75.00	24	25.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	96
Town of Merton	178	77.73	51	22.27	0	0.00	0	0.00	229
Town of Mukwonago	31	52.54	21	35.59	7	11.86	0	0.00	59
Town of Oconomowoc	298	72.86	111	27.14	0	0.00	0	0.00	409
Town of Ottawa	100	89.29	12	10.71	0	0.00	0	0.00	112
Town of Summit	152	77.55	38	19.39	6	3.06	0	0.00	196
Town of Vernon	35	38.04	51	55.43	6	6.52	0	0.00	92
Town of Waukesha	28	41.18	30	44.12	10	14.71	0	0.00	68
Village of Big Bend	62	73.81	16	19.05	3	3.57	3	3.57	84
Village of Butler	367	79.78	80	17.39	8	1.74	5	1.09	460
Village of Chenequa	18	75.00	6	25.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	24
Village of Dousman	148	57.36	103	39.92	5	1.94	2	0.78	258
Village of Eagle	47	75.81	13	20.97	2	3.23	0	0.00	62
Village of Elm Grove	148	61.16	77	31.82	0	0.00	17	7.02	242
Village of Hartland	821	65.21	409	32.49	6	0.48	23	1.83	1,259
Village of Lac La Belle	2	50.00	2	50.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	4
Village of Lannon	49	74.24	9	13.64	6	9.09	2	3.03	66
Village of Menomonee Falls	2,165	73.51	767	26.04	13	0.44	0	0.00	2,945
Village of Merton	22	78.57	6	21.43	0	0.00	0	0.00	28
Village of Mukwonago	521	56.69	343	37.32	32	3.48	23	2.50	919
Village of Nashotah	11	64.71	6	35.29	0	0.00	0	0.00	17
Village of North Prairie	47	62.67	25	33.33	3	4.00	0	0.00	75
Village of Oconomowoc Lake	13	86.67	2	13.33	0	0.00	0	0.00	15
Village of Pewaukee	953	68.46	367	26.36	48	3.45	24	1.72	1,392
Village of Sussex	720	64.00	370	32.89	27	2.40	8	0.71	1,125
Village of Wales	67	51.15	64	48.85	0	0.00	0	0.00	131
City of Brookfield	1,074	77.16	286	20.55	32	2.30	0	0.00	1,392
City of Delafield	576	65.16	289	32.69	19	2.15	0	0.00	884
City of Muskego	903	69.41	362	27.82	16	1.23	20	1.54	1,301
City of New Berlin	1,943	71.49	706	25.97	62	2.28	7	0.26	2,718
City of Oconomowoc	1,333	71.28	509	27.22	26	1.39	2	0.11	1,870
City of Pewaukee	436	69.43	182	28.98	10	1.59	0	0.00	628
City of Waukesha	7,157	63.99	3,399	30.39	331	2.96	298	2.66	11,185
County	21,612	68.02	9,012	28.37	711	2.24	436	1.37	31,771

Table V-20b RENTER-OCCUPIED® HOUSING OCCUPANCY BY NUMBER OF OCCUPANTS PER ROOM IN WAUKESHA COUNTY COMMUNITIES: 2000^b

^aA housing unit is considered overcrowded if there is more than one occupant per room. Rooms considered in the calculation include: living room, dining room, kitchen, bedrooms, finished recreation rooms, and enclosed porches suitable ^bTotals are based on a sample of one in six responses to the 2000 Census.
 Source: U.S. Census Bureau and SEWRPC.

Household Projections: 2035

The number of additional housing units needed in the 2035 plan design year is projected by first selecting a population projection. The number of residents expected to reside in "group quarters" (in Waukesha County, this generally will include college dormitories and assisted living facilities) is then subtracted from the projected total population, and the result is divided by the projected household size (number of persons per household in 2035). This number is then multiplied by the desired vacancy rate of three (3) percent to determine the total number of housing units needed in Waukesha County in 2035. The resulting number of housing units is about 174,100.

The number of additional housing units needed between 2000 and 2035 to provide an adequate supply is determined by subtracting the number of housing units in 2000 from the projected number of housing units needed in 2035. The resulting projected demand is about 38,900 additional housing units. The type of housing units that ultimately produce this total should be determined based on household income, age distribution, and household size to best meet the needs of County residents.

Household Income

Household income should be considered when developing policies intended to help provide housing units within a cost range affordable to all income groups. Table II-6 in Chapter II sets forth the number of households in various income ranges and the median household income in the County for each participating local government in 1999. The median household income was \$62,839 in the County and \$46,308 in the Region. However, lower-income households exist in the County and should be provided with affordable housing options.

Households in the County earning less than \$18,851 in 1999, or less than 30 percent of the County median household income, were considered extremely low income households. About 5.99 percent of households in the County, or 8,114 households, earned less than \$15,000. Another 7.16 percent, or 9,696 households, earned between \$15,000 and \$24,999 in 1999. These households were in either the extremely low income group or very low income group. Very low income households earned between \$18,915 and \$31,420 in 1999 (30.1 to 50 percent of the median income). About 8.93 percent of households, or 12,097, earned between \$25,000 and \$34,999. These households were either in the very low income group or the low income group. Low income earnings for the County were between \$31,482 and \$50,271 (50.1 to 80 percent of the County median). An additional 19,686 households, or 14.53 percent, earned between \$35,000 and \$49,999, also placing them in the low-income group. Moderate income earnings for the County were between \$35,007, or between 80 and 95 percent of the median income and 13,532 households, or 10 percent of all households fell within the moderate income group for the County in 1999. This resulted in a total of 63,125 households or 46.61 percent of total households in the County that were extremely low, very low, low, or moderate income in 1999.

The intermediate projection developed by SEWRPC for the number of households within the County in 2035 is 174,100. Projecting that the County continues to have a similar percentage of households (46.61%) that are extremely low, very low, low, and moderate income will result in a total of 81,218 households in the following categories:

- 15,164 households or 8.7 are projected to be extremely low income
- 23,226 households or 13.3 percent are projected to be very low income
- 25,418 households or 14.6 percent are projected to be low income
- 17,410 households or 10.0 percent are projected to be moderate income

Housing Need for Non-Resident Workers

The characteristics of resident and non-resident workers in Waukesha County were analyzed to determine whether non-resident workers could afford to live in Waukesha County if they wanted to do so.

Data Sources

The Public Use Microdata Samples (PUMS), released in 2003 by the U.S. Census Bureau, provide information based on a five (5) percent sample of the population from "long-form" questionnaires completed for the 2000 Census of Population and Housing. The PUMS data are intended to permit the cross-tabulation of variables not possible using other Census products and not available in Census publications, while conforming to requirements to protect the confidentiality of Census respondents. The geography used for the PUMS data is a relatively large scale, being based on groups of counties or single counties with 100,000 or greater population. PUMS data were derived from a five (5) percent sample of the total population-less than that used in other tabulations of the Census. Consequently, the data does not precisely match that published in other Census products.

Place of Residence and Place of Work

Table V-21 provides information on the place of residence for people who work in Waukesha County. Workers who both live and work in the County totaled 58.59 percent in 2000, or 120,484 workers. The largest number of commuters, about 57,412 workers, or 27.44 percent of all workers in the Waukesha County, live in Milwaukee County.

In reviewing the Census 2000 MCD/County-to-MCD/County Worker Flow Files before release, some errors were discovered in a number of the MCD/County-to-MCD/County Flows. These errors have been corrected. However, as a result of the corrections the data in these files may not agree with data previously released in Summary File 3 (SF3) and related products. In particular, there may be differences in the number of people working in the State and/or MCD/County of residence between SF3 and similar estimates derived from these files. Additionally, tract 1010 data that includes the City of Milwaukee, but falls within Waukesha County, has been omitted.

Earnings and Household Incomes of Resident and Non-Resident Workers

As shown by Table V-22, non-resident workers earned slightly less in terms of median earnings than did resident workers in 2000. The median earnings for non-resident workers was \$29,820, while the median earnings for resident workers was about \$30,000--a difference of about \$180.00. The median earnings of workers varied significantly by occupation. Both resident and non-resident workers in service occupations had the lowest median earnings, while workers employed in management, business, and financial operations had the highest median earnings. The median wages of non-resident workers exceeded resident workers in the service and production, transportation, and material moving categories. High demand for workers in these two categories within Waukesha County and the increased worker cost for commuting to work in Waukesha County are the two main factors for these differences.

HOUSING PROGRAMS AVAILABLE IN WAUKESHA COUNTY

Government sponsored housing programs have been inventoried to assess government's potential to help the private sector meet housing needs in Waukesha County. The full array of government sponsored programs and funding availability is almost continually changing, therefore, this section focuses on those programs that have the potential for increasing the availability of lower-cost housing and rehabilitation in Waukesha County. Many of the programs available in Waukesha County are administered through local and statewide nonprofit organizations that receive funding from the Federal Government. Several entities are involved in administering and funding the following programs, including the HOME Consortium, the Wisconsin Housing and Economic Development Authority (WHEDA), and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

Additionally, the Wisconsin Department of Commerce, Division of Housing and Community Development released a Household Housing Guide in February 2007 that provides contacts and a brief description of housing programs available for low- and moderate-income households throughout the State. As of September 2007, the guide could be found at the Department of Commerce website at the following address: http://commerce.wi.gov/CDdocs/BOH-Fact-Sheets/cd-boh-housing.pdf.

Waukcha Dodge Jefferon Kenooth Milwakce Ozaukce Rate Walworth Washington W1countie Countie	Place of Work	County of Residence										Illinois	All Other	Total
Town of Dehnokifield 5,131 70 138 0 3,302 114 128 82 179 180 15 46 9,385 Town of Delafiel 243 4 34 4 20 7 0 49 0 197 0 100 10380 Town of Cincsec 964 2 60 12 149 0 42 80 0 288 0 1.399 Town of Michson 1.111 31 17 0 353 200 14 40 197 28 8 0 1.399 Town of Michsonago 473 1 18 19 0 88 0 11 8 16 19 0 1.45 0 1.479 Town of Okamat 238 107 22.13 316 0 0 1.479 0 1.49 37 0 1.479 0 1.479 0 1.479 0 1.49 0		Waukesha	Dodge	Jefferson	Kenosha	Milwaukee	Ozaukee	Racine	Walworth	Washington	WI Counties	Counties	Areas	Total
Town of Dedafield 800 12 16 0 173 0 8 45 16 7 9 0 108 Town of Gamesec 964 2 60 1/2 149 0 49 0 19 0 0 380 Town of Gamesec 964 2 60 173 14 40 144 30 107 28 8 0 1.809 Town of Markon and 1.143 31 31 0 159 14 4 8 107 5 0 0 165 Town of Markon and 1.03 81 159 0 88 0 11 8 16 19 0 0 1465 Town of Summin 938 107 225 3 136 0 0 127 7 14 37 0 1479 Town of Warkshan 1.638 18 18 25 26 6 26 <td>Town of Brookfield</td> <td>5,131</td> <td>70</td> <td>138</td> <td>0</td> <td>3,302</td> <td>114</td> <td>128</td> <td>82</td> <td>179</td> <td>180</td> <td>15</td> <td>46</td> <td>9,385</td>	Town of Brookfield	5,131	70	138	0	3,302	114	128	82	179	180	15	46	9,385
Town of Granes 944 2 60 12 149 0 44 0 19 0 0.0 380 Town of Grasses 964 2 60 12 149 0 42 80 0.0 28 8 0 1.333 Town of Maxonago 1.111 31 1 18 19 2 4 0 0 1.892 Town of Maxonago 473 1 18 19 71 0 8 107 5 0 0 1.652 Town of Cononowoc 1.083 81 197 0 8 0 11 8 16 19 0 0 1.462 Town of Corono 533 2 11 20 182 0 34 36 0 7 0 0 0 1.477 14 15 2 0 10 2.0 1.0 1.48 1.0 1.1 31 9 0 <td>Town of Delafield</td> <td>800</td> <td>12</td> <td>16</td> <td>0</td> <td>173</td> <td>0</td> <td>8</td> <td>45</td> <td>16</td> <td>7</td> <td>9</td> <td>0</td> <td>1,086</td>	Town of Delafield	800	12	16	0	173	0	8	45	16	7	9	0	1,086
Town of Genesee 964 2 60 12 149 0 42 80 0 24 0 0 1,33 Town of Lison 1,11 31 31 0 533 20 14 30 197 28 8 0 1,809 Town of Mkoron 1,143 31 18 19 7 0 8 197 2 4 0 0 165 Town of Moron 1981 81 159 0 88 0 11 8 16 19 0 0 14 0 0 27 11 37 0 1,479 Town of Varian 293 1 1 20 182 0 34 36 0 7 0 0 83 35 11 319 18 18 18 35 351 11 319 83 12 3 3351 Town of Waukesha 1,584	Town of Eagle	243	4	34	4	20	7	0	49	0	19	0	0	380
Town of Lishon 1,111 31 17 0 353 20 14 30 197 28 8 0 1,800 Town of Mckoonage 473 1 18 197 71 0 8 197 2 4 0 0 0 1,592 Town of Mckoonage 473 1 18 197 0 8 107 2 4 0 0 0 1,66 19 0 0 1,465 Town of Coronon Sommit 938 107 225 3 136 0 0 12 7 14 37 0 1,475 Town of Vernon 533 2 11 20 34 36 0 7 0 0 885 110 23 33 114 1319 0 18 0 33 33 114 139 85 12 3 33 114 1319 0 18 0	Town of Genesee	964	2	60	12	149	0	42	80	0	24	0	0	1,333
Town of Metron 1,143 31 31 0 159 14 4 8 107 5 0 0 1502 Town of Makwang 473 1 18 199 0 88 0 11 8 16 19 0 0 165 Town of Outawa 220 10 14 0 0 0 0 12 7 14 37 0 1,465 Town of Varon 593 2 11 20 182 0 34 36 0 7 0 0 885 Town of Warksha 1,538 18 18 35 236 6 26 44 15 2 0 10 2,0 13 331 139 0 188 0 831 Village of Chenequa 99 0 0 0 7 0 0 0 35 10 0 4 3,723	Town of Lisbon	1,111	31	17	0	353	20	14	30	197	28	8	0	1,809
Town of Makwonago 473 1 18 19 71 0 8 19 2 4 0 0 05 Town of Consmowce 1.03 81 159 0 88 0 11 8 16 19 0 1.46 0 1479 Town of Otawa 220 10 14 0 0 0 0 12 7 14 37 0 1.479 Town of Verno 593 2 11 20 182 0 34 36 0 7 14 37 0 1.479 Town of Verno 538 9 7 2 134 4 87 13 19 0 85 12 3 3.51 Village of Buter 1.268 34 39 7 1.477 41 55 11 319 85 12 3 3.51 Village of Lancau 99 0 0	Town of Merton	1,143	31	31	0	159	14	4	8	107	5	0	0	1,502
Town of Ocenomowe 1,083 81 159 0 88 0 11 8 16 19 0 0 16 Town of Otawa 220 10 14 0 0 0 0 12 7 14 37 0 1,479 Town of Varnon 593 2 11 20 182 0 34 36 0 7 0 0 885 Town of Varkesha 1.638 18 18 35 226 64 15 2 0 10 2.048 Village of Dirage of Big Bend 538 9 7 2 134 4 87 13 19 0 18 0 8.33 Village of Chenequa 99 0 0 0 7 0 0 0 3.51 17 16 0 0 3.51 17 16 0 0 4.32 Village of Chenequa 99 5 <td>Town of Mukwonago</td> <td>473</td> <td>1</td> <td>18</td> <td>19</td> <td>71</td> <td>0</td> <td>8</td> <td>19</td> <td>2</td> <td>4</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>615</td>	Town of Mukwonago	473	1	18	19	71	0	8	19	2	4	0	0	615
Town of Stummit 928 107 122 7 16 0 277 14 0 1479 Town of Summit 938 107 225 3 136 0 0 12 7 144 37 0 1479 Town of Vernon 593 2 11 20 182 0 34 36 0 7 0 0 885 Town of Waukesha 1,638 18 18 35 236 6 26 444 15 2 0 10 2,048 Village of Bulter 1,268 34 39 7 1,477 41 55 11 319 85 12 3 3,351 Village of Eagle 273 5 57 4 27 1 9 51 7 16 0 0 4,50 Village of Landrov 1,778 10 24 0 1,55 101 36 21 <	Town of Oconomowoc	1,083	81	159	0	88	0	11	8	16	19	0	0	1,465
Town of Summit 998 107 225 3 136 0 0 12 7 14 37 0 147 Town of Varnon 593 2 11 20 182 0 34 36 0 7 0 0 885 Town of Varkesha 1,638 18 18 35 236 6 26 444 15 2 0 10 2,048 Village of Big Bend 538 9 7 1,477 41 55 11 319 85 12 3 3,351 Village of Chenequa 99 0 0 0 7 0 0 5 0 0 3,351 Village of Chenequa 99 0 0 0 7 0 5 10 0 460 0 7 14 37 14 3,351 Village of Chenequa 937 1,56 1,674 10 7 16	Town of Ottawa	220	10	14	0	0	0	0	30	7	16	0	0	297
Town of Vernon 593 2 11 20 182 0 34 36 0 7 0 0 885 Village of Big Bend 1538 18 18 135 226 6 26 44 15 2 0 10 2.048 Village of Bufer 1.268 34 39 7 1.477 41 55 11 319 0 18 0 835 Village of Chenequa 99 0 0 0 7 0 7 9 5 28 0 0 790 Village of Engle 2.73 5 57 4 27 1 9 51 7 16 0 0 4 3,723 Village of End Grove 1,778 10 24 0 1,654 10 70 16 101 36 21 4 3,723 Village of Harthand 3,74 78 229 0	Town of Summit	938	107	225	3	136	0	0	12	7	14	37	0	1,479
Town of Waukesha 1,638 18 18 35 236 6 26 44 15 2 0 10 2,048 Village of Big Bend 538 9 7 1,477 41 55 11 319 0 18 0 831 Village of Chenequa 99 0 0 0 7 0 0 0 5 0 0 3 3,351 Village of Chenequa 99 0 0 0 7 0 0 0 5 0 0 3 3,351 Village of Chenequa 7,78 5 57 4 27 1 9 51 7 16 0 0 43 372 Village of Elm Grove 1,778 10 24 0 1,654 10 70 15 101 36 21 44 3,735 Village of Lan Belle 35 4 5 0 0	Town of Vernon	593	2	11	20	182	0	34	36	0	7	0	0	885
Village of Big Bend 538 9 7 2 134 4 87 13 19 0 18 0 831 Village of Butler 1,268 34 39 7 1,477 41 55 11 319 85 12 3 3351 Village of Chenequa 99 0 0 7 0 0 0 5 28 0 0 70 Village of Eng Grove 1,778 10 24 0 1,654 10 70 10 36 21 4 3,723 Village of Hardand 3,754 178 229 0 821 38 59 40 166 61 41 18 5,43 57 Village of Hardand 3,754 178 229 0 821 38 59 40 166 61 41 18 5,455 Village of Menonne Falls 10,095 327 156 25 8,4	Town of Waukesha	1,638	18	18	35	236	6	26	44	15	2	0	10	2,048
Village of Bulter 1.268 34 39 7 1.477 41 55 11 319 85 12 3 3351 Village of Chenequa 99 0 0 0 7 0 0 0 5 0 0 3 114 Village of Chenequa 97 0 0 7 9 5 28 0 0 790 Village of Earle 273 5 57 4 27 1 9 51 7 16 0 0 450 Village of Earle 3754 178 100 24 0 1.654 10 70 15 101 36 21 4 3,723 Village of Larc La Belle 35 4 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 25,327 Village of Annon 400 10 0 4 213 22 0 0 0 25,327 Village of Maxonago 2,219 6 53 17 13 8	Village of Big Bend	538	9	7	2	134	4	87	13	19	0	18	0	831
Village of Chenequa 99 0 0 0 7 0 0 0 5 0 0 3 114 Village of Dousman 547 8 139 0 47 0 7 9 5 28 0 0 790 Village of Eagle 273 5 57 4 271 1 9 51 7 16 00 0 4570 Village of Eagle 273 178 100 24 0 1,634 100 70 15 101 3.6 21 4 3,723 Village of Hartland 3,754 178 229 0 821 38 59 40 166 61 41 18 54,065 Village of Lannon 400 10 0 4 213 22 0 0 92 7 0 97 553 25,277 Village of Menton 1,638 18 18 0 236 64 25 0 0 2 3,550 Vil	Village of Butler	1,268	34	39	7	1,477	41	55	11	319	85	12	3	3,351
Village of Dousman 547 8 139 0 47 0 7 9 5 28 0 0 790 Village of Eagle 273 5 57 4 27 1 9 51 7 16 0 0 440 Village of Eagle 273 5 57 4 27 1 9 51 7 16 0 0 44 3,723 Village of Martand 3.754 178 229 0 821 38 59 40 166 61 411 18 5,405 Village of La La Belle 35 4 5 0 0 0 0 0 92 7 0 975 25,327 Village of Menomonee Falls 10,095 327 156 25 8,468 747 283 97 4,569 404 97 59 25,327 Village of Menomone Falls 10,095 327 156 25 8,468 747 283 97 4,569 404 97 5	Village of Chenequa	99	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	5	0	0	3	114
Village of Eagle 273 5 57 4 27 1 9 51 7 16 0 0 450 Village of Em Grove 1,778 10 24 0 1,654 10 70 15 101 36 21 4 3,723 Village of Laruan 3,754 178 229 0 821 38 59 400 166 61 41 18 5,405 Village of Laruan 400 10 0 4 213 22 0 0 92 7 0 9 757 Village of Merton 1,038 18 18 0 236 747 283 97 4,569 404 97 59 25,327 Village of Merton 1,638 18 18 0 236 6 26 44 15 0 0 0 2 3,650 Village of Markonago 2,219 6 53 17 513 8 212 577 26 177 0 22 3	Village of Dousman	547	8	139	0	47	0	7	9	5	28	0	0	790
Village of Elm Grove1.778102401.654107015101362143,723Village of Hartland3,75417822908213859401666141185,405Village of Lannon4001004213220092709757Village of Manomone Falls10.095327156258,468747283974,569404975925,327Village of Maronone Falls10.095327156258,468747283974,569404975925,327Village of Mukwonago2,2196531751382125772617023,650Village of Nashotah3944947081012644500029Village of North Prairie433054057022392205614Village of Conomowoc Lake2181210090010000029Village of Sussex3,5299714002,0507490596468537426,849Village of Sussex3,5299714002,050749059646853742 </td <td>Village of Eagle</td> <td>273</td> <td>5</td> <td>57</td> <td>4</td> <td>27</td> <td>1</td> <td>9</td> <td>51</td> <td>7</td> <td>16</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>450</td>	Village of Eagle	273	5	57	4	27	1	9	51	7	16	0	0	450
Village of Hartland 3.754 178 229 0 821 38 59 40 166 61 41 18 5,405 Village of La La Belle 35 4 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 1 4 0 54 Village of La La Belle 35 4 5 0 0 0 0 0 5 1 4 0 54 Village of Lanon 400 327 156 25 8,468 747 283 97 4,569 404 97 59 25,327 Village of Merton 1.638 18 18 0 236 6 26 44 15 0 0 2,001 2,001 Village of Mukwonago 2,219 6 53 17 513 8 212 577 26 17 0 2 3,650 201 201 0 0 10 12 6 4 5 0 58 131 81 0 12 10	Village of Elm Grove	1,778	10	24	0	1,654	10	70	15	101	36	21	4	3,723
Village of Lac La Belle 35 45000000514054Village of Lannon4001004213220092709757Village of Menomone Falls10,035327156258.468747283974.569404975925,327Village of Merton1,63818180236626441500023,650Village of Mukwonago2,2196531751382125772617023,650Village of North Praire433054057022392205614Village of Coonomowo Lake21812100190010000269Village of Pawaukee3,2376475078232211936163791294,608Village of Wales616265701180819242700895Village of Wales616265701180819242700895City of Brookfield17,5142333591813,3745485002461,319545759234,823C	Village of Hartland	3,754	178	229	0	821	38	59	40	166	61	41	18	5,405
Village of Lannon 400 10 0 4 213 22 0 0 92 7 0 9 757 Village of Menomone Falls 10,095 327 156 25 8,468 747 283 97 4,569 404 97 59 25,327 Village of Mekwonago 2,219 6 53 17 513 8 212 577 26 17 0 2 3,650 Village of Mukwonago 2,219 6 53 17 513 8 212 577 26 17 0 2 3,650 Village of Mukwonago 2,219 6 53 17 513 8 212 577 26 17 0 2 3,650 Village of North Prairie 433 0 54 0 57 0 22 39 2 2 0 5 614 Village of Conomowoc Lake 218 12 10 0 78 32 119 36 163 79 12 9	Village of Lac La Belle	35	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4	0	54
Village of Menomonee Falls 10,095 327 156 25 8,468 747 283 97 4,569 404 97 59 25,327 Village of Merton 1,638 18 18 0 236 6 26 444 15 0 0 0 2,001 Village of Mukwonago 2,219 6 53 17 513 8 212 577 26 17 0 2 3,650 Village of Nashotah 394 49 47 0 81 0 12 6 44 5 0 0 598 Village of North Prairie 433 0 54 0 57 0 22 39 2 2 0 5 614 Village of North Prairie 433 0 54 0 77 0 12 39 2 2 0 5 614 Village of Coonomowoc Lake 218 12 10 0 19 0 0 10 0 0 8468 V	Village of Lannon	400	10	0	4	213	22	0	0	92	7	0	9	757
Village of Merton 1,638 18 18 0 236 6 26 44 15 0 0 0 2,001 Village of Mukwonago 2,219 6 53 17 513 8 212 577 26 17 0 2 3,650 Village of Nashotah 394 49 47 0 81 0 12 6 4 5 0 0 586 Village of North Prairie 433 0 54 0 57 0 22 39 2 2 0 5 614 Village of Oconomowoc Lake 218 12 10 0 19 0 0 10 0 0 0 269 Village of Oconomowoc Lake 3,237 64 75 0 782 32 119 36 163 79 12 9 4,608 Village of Sussex 3,529 97 140 0 2,050 74 90 59 646 85 37 42 6,849	Village of Menomonee Falls	10,095	327	156	25	8,468	747	283	97	4,569	404	97	59	25,327
Village of Mukwonago 2,219 6 53 17 513 8 212 577 26 17 0 2 3,650 Village of Nashotah 394 49 47 0 81 0 12 6 4 5 0 0 598 Village of North Prairie 433 0 54 0 57 0 22 39 2 2 0 5 614 Village of Coconomovoc Lake 218 12 10 0 19 0 0 10 0 0 0 0 269 4,608 Village of Sussex 3,237 64 75 0 782 32 119 36 163 79 12 9 4,608 Village of Sussex 3,529 97 140 0 2,050 74 90 59 646 85 37 42 6,849 9 24 27 0 0 885 13 13 14 13 8 19 24 27 0 0<	Village of Merton	1,638	18	18	0	236	6	26	44	15	0	0	0	2,001
Village of Nashotah 394 49 47 0 81 0 12 6 4 5 0 0 598 Village of North Prairie 433 0 54 0 57 0 22 39 2 2 0 5 614 Village of North Prairie 433 0 54 0 19 0 0 10 0 0 0 22 39 2 2 0 5 614 Village of Conomowoc Lake 218 12 10 0 19 0 0 10 0 0 0 22 39 2 2 0 0 269 Village of Pewaukce 3,237 64 75 0 782 32 119 36 163 79 12 9 4,608 Village of Sussex 3,529 97 140 0 2,050 74 90 59 646 85 37 42 6,849 Village of Brookfield 17,514 233 359 18 <td>Village of Mukwonago</td> <td>2,219</td> <td>6</td> <td>53</td> <td>17</td> <td>513</td> <td>8</td> <td>212</td> <td>577</td> <td>26</td> <td>17</td> <td>0</td> <td>2</td> <td>3,650</td>	Village of Mukwonago	2,219	6	53	17	513	8	212	577	26	17	0	2	3,650
Village of North Prairie 433 0 54 0 57 0 22 39 2 2 0 5 614 Village of Coconomovoc Lake 218 12 10 0 19 0 0 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Village of Nashotah	394	49	47	0	81	0	12	6	4	5	0	0	598
Village of Oconomowoc Lake 218 12 10 0 19 0 0 10 0 0 0 0 269 Village of Pewaukee 3,237 64 75 0 782 32 119 36 163 79 12 9 4,608 Village of Sussex 3,529 97 140 0 2,050 74 90 59 646 85 37 42 6,849 Village of Wales 616 26 57 0 118 0 8 19 24 27 0 0 895 City of Brookfield 17,514 233 359 18 13,374 548 500 246 1,319 545 75 92 34,823 City of Delafield 2,832 64 179 1 345 32 12 31 89 44 35 7 3,671 City of Muskego 2,909 17 26 47 1,413 8 625 106 31 42 6 3 <td< td=""><td>Village of North Prairie</td><td>433</td><td>0</td><td>54</td><td>0</td><td>57</td><td>0</td><td>22</td><td>39</td><td>2</td><td>2</td><td>0</td><td>5</td><td>614</td></td<>	Village of North Prairie	433	0	54	0	57	0	22	39	2	2	0	5	614
Village of Pewaukee 3.237 64 75 0 782 32 119 36 163 79 12 9 4,608 Village of Sussex 3,529 97 140 0 2,050 74 90 59 646 85 37 42 6,849 Village of Wales 616 26 57 0 118 0 8 19 24 27 0 0 895 City of Brookfield 17,514 233 359 18 13,374 548 500 246 1,319 545 75 92 34,823 City of Delafield 2,832 64 179 1 345 32 12 31 89 44 35 7 3,671 City of Muskego 2,909 17 26 47 1,413 8 625 106 31 42 6 3 5,233 City of New Berlin 10,027 121 174 44 8,532 207 728 357 415 260 50 96<	Village of Oconomowoc Lake	218	12	10	0	19	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	269
Village of Sussex 3,529 97 140 0 2,050 74 90 59 646 85 37 42 6,849 Village of Wales 616 26 57 0 118 0 8 19 24 27 0 0 895 City of Brookfield 17,514 233 359 18 13,374 548 500 246 1,319 545 75 92 34,823 City of Delafield 2,832 64 179 1 345 32 12 31 89 44 35 7 3,671 City of Delafield 2,832 64 179 1 345 32 12 31 89 44 35 7 3,671 City of Muskego 2,909 17 26 47 1,413 8 625 106 31 42 6 3 5,233 City of New Berlin 10.027 121 174 44 8,532 207 728 357 415 260 50 96 <td>Village of Pewaukee</td> <td>3,237</td> <td>64</td> <td>75</td> <td>0</td> <td>782</td> <td>32</td> <td>119</td> <td>36</td> <td>163</td> <td>79</td> <td>12</td> <td>9</td> <td>4,608</td>	Village of Pewaukee	3,237	64	75	0	782	32	119	36	163	79	12	9	4,608
Village of Wales 616 26 57 0 118 0 8 19 24 27 0 0 895 City of Brookfield 17,514 233 359 18 13,374 548 500 246 1,319 545 75 92 34,823 City of Brookfield 2,832 64 179 1 345 32 12 31 89 44 35 7 3,671 City of Makego 2,909 17 26 47 1,413 8 625 106 31 42 6 3 5,233 City of New Berlin 10,027 121 174 44 8,532 207 728 357 415 260 50 96 21,011 City of Oconomowoc 5,607 887 1,486 13 811 33 44 42 167 76 71 31 9,268 City of Pewaukee 8,848 219 <t< td=""><td>Village of Sussex</td><td>3,529</td><td>97</td><td>140</td><td>0</td><td>2,050</td><td>74</td><td>90</td><td>59</td><td>646</td><td>85</td><td>37</td><td>42</td><td>6,849</td></t<>	Village of Sussex	3,529	97	140	0	2,050	74	90	59	646	85	37	42	6,849
City of Brookfield 17,514 233 359 18 13,374 548 500 246 1,319 545 75 92 34,823 City of Delafield 2,832 64 179 1 345 32 12 31 89 44 35 7 3,671 City of Delafield 2,832 64 179 1 345 32 12 31 89 44 35 7 3,671 City of Muskego 2,909 17 26 47 1,413 8 625 106 31 42 6 3 5,233 City of New Berlin 10,027 121 174 44 8,532 207 728 357 415 260 50 96 21,011 City of Oconomowoc 5,607 887 1,486 13 811 33 44 42 167 76 71 31 9,268 City of Powaukee 8,848 219 313 0 4,095 165 305 170 472 377 71<	Village of Wales	616	26	57	0	118	0	8	19	24	27	0	0	895
City of Delafield2,83264179134532123189443573,671City of Muskego2,9091726471,41386251063142635,233City of New Berlin10,027121174448,532207728357415260509621,011City of New Berlin0,027121174448,532207728357415260509621,011City of Oconomowoc5,6078871,486138113344421677671319,268City of Pwaukee8,84821931304,095165305170472377712315,058City of Waukesha27,3392991,019497,2692206327117425329410239,008Total120,4843,0665,40732457,4122,3574,1803,1329,9493,054713564210,642	City of Brookfield	17,514	233	359	18	13,374	548	500	246	1,319	545	75	92	34,823
City of Muskego 2,909 17 26 47 1,413 8 625 106 31 42 6 3 5,233 City of New Berlin 10,027 121 174 44 8,532 207 728 357 415 260 50 96 21,011 City of New Berlin 5,607 887 1,486 13 811 33 44 42 167 76 71 31 9,268 City of Dewaukee 8,848 219 313 0 4,095 165 305 170 472 377 71 23 15,058 City of Waukesha 27,339 299 1,019 49 7,269 220 632 711 742 532 94 102 39,008 Total 120,484 3,066 5,407 324 57,412 2,357 4,180 3,132 9,949 3,054 713 564 210,642	City of Delafield	2,832	64	179	1	345	32	12	31	89	44	35	7	3,671
City of New Berlin 10.027 121 174 44 8,532 207 728 357 415 260 50 96 21,011 City of New Berlin 5,607 887 1,486 13 811 33 44 42 167 76 71 31 9,268 City of Pewaukee 8,848 219 313 0 4,095 165 305 170 472 377 71 23 15,058 City of Pawaukesha 27,339 299 1,019 49 7,269 220 632 711 742 532 94 102 39,008 Total 120,484 3,066 5,407 324 57,412 2,357 4,180 3,132 9,949 3,054 713 564 210,642	City of Muskego	2,909	17	26	47	1,413	8	625	106	31	42	6	3	5,233
City of Oconomowoc 5,607 887 1,486 13 811 33 44 42 167 76 71 31 9,268 City of Pewaukee 8,848 219 313 0 4,095 165 305 170 472 377 71 23 15,058 City of Waukesha 27,339 299 1,019 49 7,269 220 632 711 742 532 94 102 39,008 Total 120,484 3,066 5,407 324 57,412 2,357 4,180 3,132 9,949 3,054 713 564 210,642	City of New Berlin	10,027	121	174	44	8,532	207	728	357	415	260	50	96	21,011
City of Pewaukee 8,848 219 313 0 4,095 165 305 170 472 377 71 23 15,058 City of Waukesha 27,339 299 1,019 49 7,269 220 632 711 742 532 94 102 39,008 Total 120,484 3,066 5,407 324 57,412 2,357 4,180 3,132 9,949 3,054 713 564 210,642	City of Oconomowoc	5,607	887	1,486	13	811	33	44	42	167	76	71	31	9,268
City of Waukesha 27,339 299 1,019 49 7,269 220 632 711 742 532 94 102 39,008 Total 120,484 3,066 5,407 324 57,412 2,357 4,180 3,132 9,949 3,054 713 564 210,642	City of Pewaukee	8,848	219	313	0	4,095	165	305	170	472	377	71	23	15,058
Total 120,484 3,066 5,407 324 57,412 2,357 4,180 3,132 9,949 3,054 713 564 210,642	City of Waukesha	27,339	299	1,019	49	7,269	220	632	711	742	532	94	102	39,008
	Total	120,484	3,066	5,407	324	57,412	2,357	4,180	3,132	9,949	3,054	713	564	210,642

Table V-21 PERSONS WORKING IN WAUKESHA COUNTY MUNICIPALITIES BY PLACE OF RESIDENCE: 2000^a

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and SEWRPC

			Resident and
	Non-Resident	Resident	Non-Resident
Occupation Category	Workers ^a	Workers	Workers
Management, Business, and Financial Operations	\$42,330	\$50,820	\$47,400
Professional and Related	\$37,080	\$38,840	\$37,960
Service Occupations	\$16,190	\$11,730	\$13,550
Sales and Office Occupations	\$24,780	\$23,980	\$24,280
Farming, Forestry, and Fishing ^{b,c}			
Construction, Extraction, and Maintenance	\$35,780	\$38,030	\$36,770
Production, Transportation, and Material Moving	\$28,460	\$27,100	\$28,130
Total	\$29,820	\$30,000	\$29,910

 Table V-22

 MEDIAN EARNINGS BY OCCUPATION OF PERSONS WORKING IN WAUKESHA COUNTY: 2000

^aIncludes persons who worked in Waukesha County but did not live in the County.

^bThe number of data points and the sample size for the Farming, Forestry, and Fishing category was insufficient to enable any meaningful conclusions with respect to median income.

Farmers who farm their own land are included in the Management, Business, and Financial Operations category.

Source: U.S. Census (Public Use Microdata Samples) and SEWRPC.

Housing Program Administrators

The HOME Consortium

The HOME Consortium is a four-county governmental body, which includes Ozaukee, Washington, Waukesha, and Jefferson Counties, whose purpose is to advance homeownership opportunities and programs for households that earn 80 percent or less of the area's median income. Median incomes based on family size are developed annually by HUD (see Table IX-38). The area served by the Consortium receives an annual funding allocation from HUD. The Consortium's programs are administered by C-CAP LLC and the Community Housing Initiative, Inc., which are nonprofit organizations located in the City of Waukesha. In 2007, the HOME grant was \$1,410,000. With the exception of administrative and technical assistance funding, all HOME funds are directed to housing activities. The HOME program is a four county partnership between Waukesha, Washington, Ozaukee and Jefferson counties. Funding is allocated through the HOME Board, an equal representative member board consisting of appointed members by each county. The 2007 allocation follows: \$207,000 (15%) of the grant must be allocated and utilized (by HOME regulation) for housing production by locally approved Community Housing Development Organization (CHDO), \$339,000 was allocated for housing rehabilitation, \$335,000 was allocated for Downpayment Assistance (DPA) for a home purchase and additional allocation of \$100,000 was allocated for Homebuyer Counseling associated with the DPA program. Finally, an allocation of \$55,000 was allocated to each county for a specific project as needed in the county (Waukesha County used its "County allocation" for renovation of Marion House, a group home serving elderly residents with a mental illness).

Wisconsin Housing and Economic Development Authority (WHEDA)

WHEDA was created by the Wisconsin Legislature in 1972 as a nonprofit "public benefit corporation" to help meet the housing needs of lower-income households in the State. This purpose has expanded to include providing housing facilities to meet the needs of disabled and elderly households. The programs are financed through the sale of tax-exempt bonds and receive no State tax support. These programs involve the administration of several federally funded grants and housing tax credits.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)

HUD provides funding for a number of housing programs, including the Section 8 Low-Income Rental Assistance Program and the Home Investment Partnership Act (HOME). In order for units or agencies of government to apply for and receive HUD housing grants or public housing funds, they must prepare a CHAS (Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy) and submit that strategy to HUD for approval. The purpose of the CHAS is to ensure that communities receiving funding from HUD have planned for the housing-related needs of low-and moderate-income households in a way that improves the availability and affordability of adequate housing. The CHAS must also include consideration of persons needing supportive services, identify the manner in which private resources will be incorporated in addressing identified housing needs, and provide for both rental and homeownership options.

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)

CDBG funds can be used to expand the development of decent, accessible, and affordable housing in communities. In all instances, a CDBG assisted activity must meet one of three national objectives: (1) benefiting low and moderate income persons, (2) aiding the prevention or elimination of slums or blight, or (3) meeting a community development need having a particular urgency that a community is unable to finance on its own. For housing, CDBG funds can help with homeownership assistance, rehabilitation and reconstruction, conversion of existing structures for housing, housing counseling, fair housing activities, and new housing construction and related activities. The 2007 Waukesha County CDBG grant was \$1,433,000. The CDBG program allocates funding for public services, public facilities, housing, economic development, accessibility, planning and other smaller categories of funding. A portion of anoul CDBG funding is allocated to participating municipalities and set-aside to the City of Waukesha. In 2007 about \$350,000 was allocated for housing rehabilitation with some additional allocations provided for some smaller housing programs. Past loans for housing production or housing rehabilitation generate about \$500,000 in program income annually, which is used for additional rehab loans or housing developments.

The Federal Housing Administration (FHA)

The FHA was established by Congress in 1934 and became part of HUD's Office of Housing in 1965. The FHA insures mortgage loans for single family and multi-family homes from FHA-approved lenders throughout the Nation, including Waukesha County, and is the largest insurer of mortgages in the world. FHA mortgage insurance provides approved lenders with protection against losses as the result of default on a loan. The lender bears less risk because the FHA will pay a claim to the lender in the event of a homeowner default. This allows FHA insured loans to be made with less cash investment than other loans, which increases accessibly to lower-income households.

U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Rural Development

The USDA administers the Federal Government's primary program addressing America's need for affordable rural housing. USDA Rural Development provides loans and grants to develop rural community facilities in cities, villages, and towns with populations less than 20,000 that are not part of an urban area. The USDA provides several programs for affordable housing opportunities for low-to moderate-income families; however, the only program available for Waukesha County residents is the Guaranteed Rural Housing (GRH) loan program. In general, the GRH loan program excludes the communities in the central and northeast part of the County as well as Lac La Belle and Oconomowoc.

Green Building Programs, Incentives, Associations, Material Re-use, and Project Examples

Energy Star Qualified Homes

Homes that earn the ENERGY STAR must meet guidelines for energy efficiency set by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. ENERGY STAR qualified homes are at least 15 percent more energy efficient than homes built to the 2004 International Residential Code (IRC), and include additional energy-saving features that typically make them 20–30% more efficient than standard homes.

ENERGY STAR qualified homes can include a variety of energy-efficient features, such as effective insulation, high performance windows, efficient heating and cooling equipment, and ENERGY STAR qualified lighting and appliances.

Through ENERGY STAR, builders and other home industry professionals can differentiate themselves in the market. New homes that qualify as ENERGY STAR provide greater comfort and durability for home buyers. For more information on ENERGY STAR homes, products, and incentives, visit: www.energystar.gov.

Energy Star Mortgages-Focus on Energy

Through the Focus on Energy program and participating lenders, Energy Star Mortgages are available to those who purchase a Wisconsin Energy Star home. Benefits include reduced closing costs and qualifying for a slightly higher mortgage due to increased energy savings.

For more information on ENERGY STAR Mortgages, the Wisconsin ENERGY STAR Homes program or other ENERGY STAR programs, call toll-free: 1.800.762.7077 or e-mail: WESHinfo@focusonenergy.com.

Habitat ReStore

Profits from donated left-over building materials purchased at discounted prices are distributed to Habitat for Humanity projects, under the Habitat ReStore program.

Green Built Home

Green Built Home is a national award winning green building initiative that reviews and certifies new homes and remodeling projects that meet sustainable building and energy standards. There are currently nearly forty regional green building programs in existence nationwide. Green Built Home is the only such program in the upper Midwest and was founded in 1999 by Wisconsin Environmental Initiative (WEI) in partnership with the Madison Area Builders Association. The program is implemented by participating builders associations in cooperation with leading utilities and other organizations that promote green building and energy efficiency. As a product of a non-profit organization, Green Built Home provides neutral third party certification of green building practices that meet meaningful environmental, health, and energy standards.

The State of Wisconsin administers Green Built Home throughout the state and reaches thousands of homebuyers and builders through collaborations with builders associations and other affiliated organizations. Support for Green Built Home comes from builder enrollment and home registration fees as well as organizations that promote green building and energy efficiency for Wisconsin.

LEED Program

The Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Green Building Rating SystemTM is the nationally accepted benchmark for the design, construction, and operation of high performance green buildings. LEED gives building owners and operators the tools they need to have an immediate and measurable impact on their buildings' performance. LEED promotes a whole-building approach to sustainability by recognizing performance in five key areas of human and environmental health: sustainable site development, water savings, energy efficiency, materials selection, and indoor environmental quality. LEED provides a roadmap for measuring and documenting success for every building type and phase of a building lifecycle that can be found at: www.usgbc.org. Below is an introduction to various parts of the LEED program.

LEED for Homes

LEED for Homes is a voluntary rating system that promotes the design and construction of high performance "green" homes. A green home uses less energy, water, and natural resources; creates less waste; and is healthier and more comfortable for the occupants. Benefits of a LEED home include lower energy and water bills; reduced greenhouse gas emissions; and less exposure to mold, mildew and other indoor toxins. The net cost of owning a LEED home is comparable to that of owning a conventional home.

The LEED Rating System is the nationally recognized standard for green building. LEED certification recognizes and rewards builders for meeting the highest performance standards and gives homeowners confidence that their home is durable, healthy, and environmentally friendly.

LEED for Homes Initiative for Affordable Housing

The LEED for Homes Initiative for Affordable Housing promotes sustainable building practices specifically for affordable homes. The ultimate goal of this initiative is to recognize and reward the intrinsic resource efficiencies of affordable housing within the LEED for Homes rating system. With generous support from The Home Depot Foundation, and in collaboration with other leaders in this sector, the U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC) is working to develop appropriate tools, educational offerings, and technical assistance for the affordable housing market. USGBC is also partnering with Enterprise Community Partners to promote green affordable housing.

Enterprise Community Partners and the USGBC have partnered to expand the benefits of green building for developers, operators and residents of affordable housing. Through the partnership, Enterprise and USGBC will accelerate the momentum among affordable housing developers to incorporate green building and sustainable development practices into their activities.

LEED for Existing Buildings

LEED for Existing Buildings maximizes operational efficiency while minimizing environmental impacts. It provides a recognized, performance-based benchmark for building owners and operators to measure operations, improvements and maintenance on a consistent scale. The LEED for Existing Buildings Rating System is a set of voluntary performance standards for the sustainable upgrades and operation of existing buildings not undergoing major renovations. It provides sustainable guidelines for building operations, periodic upgrades of building systems, minor space use changes and building processes.

The goal of LEED for Existing Buildings is to help building owners operate their buildings in a sustainable and efficient way over the long term. To achieve this goal, LEED for Existing Buildings will provide certification and re-certification of building operation to recognize building owners' ongoing achievements.

LEED for Homes Providers

In a new approach for LEED, LEED homes are rated by LEED for Homes Providers, local organizations with demonstrated experience and expertise in their region's market. A LEED for Homes Provider has three primary roles in a given market:

- Marketing LEED to builders;
- Providing green home rating support services to builders; and
- Training, coordinating, and overseeing LEED qualified inspectors and builder support staff.

Twelve LEED for Homes Providers have been established throughout the nation. Currently, there is no LEED for Home Provider in Wisconsin. USGBC will be selecting new providers as needed after the national roll-out of LEED for Homes in fall 2007. For a complete list of LEED for Homes Providers, visit the USGBC website: www.usgbc.org.

LEED for Neighborhood Development

The LEED for Neighborhood Development program integrated the principles of smart growth, new urbanism, and green building to create the first national standard for neighborhood design. LEED certification provides independent, third-party verification that a development's location and design meet accepted high standards for environmentally responsible, sustainable development. LEED for Neighborhood Development is a collaborative effort between the USGBC, the Congress for New Urbanism, and the Natural Resources Defense Council. Projects may constitute whole neighborhoods, fractions of neighborhoods, or multiple neighborhoods. Smaller, infill projects that are single use, but complement existing neighborhoods, or multiple neighborhoods. Smaller, infill project size and mixed use developments. In terms of eligibility for the pilot program, there is no minimum or maximum for project size and no strict definition for what would comprise a neighborhood. The only requirement is that projects must be able to meet all prerequisites and anticipate that the minimum number of points through credits to achieve certification can be earned.

Using the framework of other LEED rating systems, LEED for Neighborhood Development recognizes development projects that successfully protect and enhance the overall health, natural environment, and quality of life of communities. The rating system encourages smart growth and new urbanist best practices, promoting the design of neighborhoods that reduce vehicle miles traveled and communities where jobs and services are accessible by foot or public transit. It promotes more efficient energy and water use.

The LEED for Neighborhood Development pilot program is in its infancy. A call for pilot projects took place between February and April 2007. After registration, these projects will submit documentation based on the rating system to be verified by a third-party reviewer in order to become LEED Certified pilot projects. The information learned during the pilot program will be used to make further revisions to the rating system, and the resulting draft will be posted for public comment before it is submitted for final approvals and balloting.

LEED for Neighborhood Development Certification

Although the period for applying to be in the pilot program for LEED for Neighborhood Development Certification has passed, projects will be able to participate in the full program, which should launch in early 2009. For most projects, certification under the full program should offer similar value to pilot certification, since LEED for Neighborhood Development enables projects to certify at both very early and very late stages of development. Stages of development are described below.

• Optional Pre-review (Stage 1)

This stage is available, but not required for projects at any point before the entitlement process begins. If prereview approval of the plan is achieved, USGBC will issue a letter stating that if the project is built as proposed, it will be able to achieve LEED for Neighborhood Development certification. The purpose of this letter is to assist the developer in building a case for entitlement among land use planning authorities, as well as a case for financing and occupant commitments.

• Certification of an Approved Plan (Stage 2)

This stage is available after the project has been granted any necessary approvals and entitlements to be built according to a plan. Any changes to the pre-reviewed plan that could potentially affect prerequisite or credit achievement would be communicated to USGBC as part of this submission. If certification of the approved plan is achieved, USGBC will issue a certificate stating that the approved plan is a LEED for Neighborhood Development Certified Plan and will list it as such on the USGBC website.

• Certification of a Completed Neighborhood Development (Stage 3)

This step takes place when construction is complete or nearly complete. Any changes to the certified approved plan that could potentially affect prerequisite or credit achievement would be communicated to USGBC as part of this submission. If certification of the completed neighborhood development is achieved, USGBC will issue plaques or similar awards for public display at the project site and will list it as such on the USGBC website.

Engaging with LEED projects

Program staff and the LEED for Neighborhood Development Core Committee are developing ways for projects that are interested in pursuing LEED for Neighborhood Development to remain engaged during the pilot phase, even if they missed the pilot application deadline. Joining the LEED for Neighborhood Development Corresponding Committee provides information about future opportunities once they become available. The corresponding committee listserv enables a wider group of experts and interested parties to stay updated and receive notification of opportunities to provide feedback. Corresponding committee members receive minutes from core committee meetings and other announcements. The listserv will also be notified when the full program is open for registration. Directions on how to join the corresponding committee are below:

The corresponding committee is open to USGBC members and nonmembers but there are different ways to join:

- USGBC members can visit <u>www.usgbc.org</u>, log into your account and subscribe to the committee listserv.
- Others can send an e-mail to <u>nd@committees.usgbc.org</u> requesting to be added to the corresponding committee.

LEED for Neighborhood Development Registered Pilot Project List for Wisconsin, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota The complete list of pilot projects can be accessed through the USGBC website: <u>https://www.usgbc.org/ShowFile.aspx?DocumentID=2960</u>.

IMPLEMENTATION RECOMMENDATIONS

The general housing issue identified in this chapter was the need for a variety of housing choices for the County residents and people who work in the County but cannot afford to live in the County. Sufficient housing choices are important as the population ages and new jobs are created. Housing variety is also important to ensure economic viability as housing options are important for the County's workforce.

This general housing issue is supported by the housing inventory data collected in this Chapter, demographic data collected in Chapter II (Trends, Issues, Opportunities and Planning Standards), and the income and employment data collected in Chapter VI (Economic Development). Further analysis of this data refines the general housing issue into the following more specific issues and recommendations.

Housing Supply

- 1. Each community within the County should identify a projected number of additional housing units to meet housing demand through year 2035. Land needed to accommodate additional housing units should be included on the planned land use map based on the population trend information presented in Chapter 2 of this Plan.
- 2. Community comprehensive plans should address the need for adequate consumer housing choices that allow for a full range of housing structure types and sizes including single-family, two-family, and, in sewer service areas, multi-family.
- 3. Promote construction design concepts such as Universal Design³ and Visitability. Visitability is a movement to change home construction practices so that all new homes, not just custom built homes, offer a few specific features that make the home easier for people with mobility impairment to live in at least one zero-step entrance approached by an accessible route on a firm surface no steeper than a 1:12 grade from a driveway or public sidewalk.

³ Accessibility for the disabled can be increased by providing homes with wider doors and hallways, level surfaces, and other features, often referred to as "Universal Design."

Housing Mix

- Communities that seek to attract jobs, as reflected in the accommodation of new commercial and industrial development, should ensure that a broad range of housing styles, types and price ranges are provided to provide opportunities to minimize geographic imbalances between job and residence locations.
- 2. Communities should establish policies concerning housing mix to provide a full range of housing choices. Comparing housing types and affordability to existing and projected jobs and wages will be beneficial to establishing effective housing mix policies.
- 3. Communities should analyze the population trend information presented in Chapter 2 and the employment projection information presented in Chapter 6 to ensure that a range of housing stock to meet the needs of an aging population. This analysis should be repeated annually to determine the effectiveness of the housing mix policy.
- 4. Communities should analyze existing housing stock to establish baseline conditions for the existing affordable housing. As part of this planning project, Waukesha County worked with the Town of Mukwonago to develop a sample methodology to analyze the value of existing housing stock. The following criteria were used to provide more accurate data on the actual housing stock within the municipality.
 - a. Equalized improved value of the property was greater or equal to \$40,000 based on tax and assessment information.
 - b. Equalized total value (land plus improvements) was less than or equal to \$208,700.
 - c. Land area was less than 10 acres to exclude large farms.
 - d. Special attention was given to removing parcels with partial assessments, parcels with only larger accessory structures, and parcels that had multiple living units or multi-family units.

Housing Affordability and Housing Costs

- 1. Households should not have to pay more than 30 percent of their adjusted gross income in order to secure decent, safe, and sanitary housing, including, in addition to the contract rent payment or the payment of the principal, interest, and taxes, the necessary insurance, utility, and other attendant costs.
- 2. Chapter VI (Economic Development) of this Plan, discusses the use of Tax Incremental Financing. Municipalities should consider using Tax Incremental Financing for the redevelopment of properties to higher density residential uses to meet affordable housing needs.
- 3. Communities within the County should consider and explore the creation of incentives for the development of affordable housing units. Options to consider include density bonuses and waiver of fees.
- 4. The County should work with municipalities to study the feasibility of an affordable housing trust fund to assist in meeting the projected employment housing needs.
- 5. Encourage mixed income housing development to avoid concentrating affordable units in a limited number of areas.
- 6. Encourage the adoption and use of "flexible zoning district" regulations such as Traditional Neighborhood Development, Transit-Oriented Development, and Planned Unit Development regulations.
- 7. Develop or encourage the development of rent-to-own programs through public-private partnerships and entrepreneurship to give low-to moderate-income families a chance at homeownership.⁴

⁴ An example of a rent-to-own development is Metcalfe Park in the City of Milwaukee. A private developer, in partnership with the Milwaukee Urban League and using affordable housing tax credits, is developing 30 homes that will be leased to families that qualify for below-market rents of \$675 and \$825 per month. In 15 years, the homes will be available for purchase at discounted prices.

- 8. Study the potential to integrate other types of specialty housing, where applicable, such as "cooperative housing" (sometimes called "coop-housing or co-habiting housing"),⁵ "cohousing"⁶ and university or campus-related housing for seniors,⁷ which may also socially support and help seniors and/or persons with disabilities be self-sufficient.
- 9. Support the inclusion of accessory units and "live-work-units"⁸ (sometimes called "flex units"), where suitable, to help provide affordable housing as well as affordable office or work space for entrepreneurs (i.e. small businesses and home-based businesses).

Household Size

1. The average household size in the County in 1960 was 3.66 persons per household. The projected 2035 household size is 2.48. County projections show that the population of people aged 65 and over will more than double in size increasing from 26,763 people in 2000 to 56,678 in 2035. A higher percentage of smaller housing units, multi-family, independent and assisted living units may be required to better meet the housing needs of smaller households, including the increase in one- and two-person empty nester and elderly households and persons with disabilities.

Transition from Renter to Home Owner Occupied Housing

1. Utilize existing local, state, and federal programs to educate young adults and families in the County to transition from renter to home owner. About 20 percent of housing units in Waukesha County are renter occupied and 80 percent are owner occupied. However, in several communities within the County renter occupied units are over 40 percent of total housing units.

Housing Vacancy

1. The supply of vacant and available housing units should be sufficient to maintain and facilitate ready

⁶ Cohousing communities are communities or "villages" that generally consist of privately-owned individual homes and community-owned areas and buildings. Households participate in social activities centered in a community-owned building, and help to design and manage their "village" consisting of small groups of homes concentrated around a community building which acts as the social center of the "village". Residents own their private dwellings, usually condos or attached single-family homes, but share common areas, such as dining areas, kitchen, lounges, meeting rooms, a recreational facility, a workshop, children's spaces and the like. Group meals are regularly shared where residents manage the property. Other types of cohousing include elderly cohousing which is generally designed for adults 55 or older. Elder cohousing promotes universal design concepts that support active lifestyles and can accommodate accessibility needs.

⁷ Senior housing, rental or homeownership, linked to universities and colleges where services offered to seniors include auditing classes, library and computer privileges, access to healthcare, use of fitness facilities, discount event tickets, and/or reduced meal prices. The universities or colleges may or may not be involved with the development and operation of the retirement community, while providing such services to residents.

⁸ Live-work units contain work space that usually occupies more floor area, up to 50 percent of the total floor area of the unit, than a conventional house containing a home occupation, in which the home-based business typically occupies between 10 to 25 percent of the total floor area. Live-work units may contain more types of business activities than a traditional home occupation, such as more parking, traffic, employees, and/or customer visits. Such units may be detached buildings or attached units (especially townhouses) functioning as potential small business incubators. Units may be rented or owned, including as condominiums, thereby allowing owners to accumulate equity.

⁵ A multi-family dwelling owned and maintained by the residents. The entire structure and real property is under common ownership as contrasted in a condominium dwelling where individual units are under separate ownership. Apartments and dwellings may include shared common areas such as kitchen, dining, and/or living rooms, and services, such as housekeeping, organized social and recreational activities, including seniors and persons with disabilities capable of living "independently" (usually requiring no or minimal medical-care or "Stay at Home" related services). More information on cooperative housing in Wisconsin can be accessed from the University of Wisconsin-Extension Center for Cooperatives at http://www.uwcc.wisc.edu/info/uwcc_pubs/coopHouse02.pdf

housing consumer turnover. Rental and homeowner vacancy rates at the county level should be maintained at a minimum of 4 percent and a maximum of 6 percent for rental units and a minimum of 1 percent and a maximum of 2 percent for homeowner units over a full range of housing types, sizes, and costs.

Land Use Regulation and Other Considerations

- The County and municipalities should examine regulatory codes to identify the extent to which they
 permit or exclude relatively lower cost housing, and make appropriate changes to facilitate the provision
 of such housing. This review should primarily focus on the structure types permitted (single-family, twofamily, multi-family); development densities; minimum lot area requirements; minimum building
 setbacks; and minimum dwelling unit floor area requirements.
- 2. The County should research, study, promote, and educate the use of energy efficient homes and green housing development design concepts.
- 3. Several of the housing recommendations may be implemented using municipal land use regulations. Waukesha County's land use regulations apply to Towns of Genesee, Oconomowoc, Ottawa or Vernon; or the shoreland/floodland areas (generally within 1,000 feet of a lake or 300 feet of a stream), in all of the Towns. In addition, Waukesha County is an approval or objection agency on proposed subdivision plats and certified surveys, limited to the review authority granted under s.236 Wisconsin Statutes.
- 4. The rising cost associated with the purchase and development of land for building sites has a significant impact on the increasing prices and reduced affordability of housing. In addition, occupancy costs (distances to employment, shopping, education and other community services; transportation costs) indirectly affect the affordability of housing. The Housing and Land Use planning standards and objectives, presented in Chapter 2 of this Plan, seek to provide affordable housing by calling for increased residential densities on municipal services (sewer, water and transportation alternatives), and in close proximity of employment, education, shopping and other community services. Cities and villages traditionally provide planned municipal sewer, water and public transportation, accommodating higher densities.

REGIONAL HOUSING PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS

In addition to the aforementioned housing recommendations, Waukesha County supports the following recommendations of the Regional Housing Plan for Southeastern Wisconsin: 2035 (hereinafter Regional Housing Plan).

The Regional Housing Plan was prepared after the completion of the 2009 amendments to A Comprehensive Development Plan for Waukesha County (hereinafter Comprehensive Development Plan). In accordance with the Monitoring and Updating the Plan section of the Comprehensive Development Plan, the refinements recommended below are being advanced as 2014 plan amendments.

The Regional Housing Plan refines the residential component of the Regional Land Use Plan, and provides an additional element of the regional comprehensive plan. The final Regional Housing Plan recommendations from A Regional Housing Plan for Southeastern Wisconsin: 2035 were prepared based on the objectives, principles, and standards outlined in Chapter II of the Regional Housing Plan (http://www.sewrpc.org/SEWRPCFiles/Publications/pr/pr-054-regional-housing-plan-2035.pdf) together with public comments, study findings, and a socio-economic impact analysis.

The recommendations are intended to provide a guide for future housing development to meet the current and future housing needs of the Region's residents. More specifically, the recommendations are intended to address the balance between jobs and housing in the Region; the provision of housing affordable to existing and future households in the Region, including subsidized and non-subsidized housing; the concentration of minority and low-income persons in and near the Region's central cities; and the availability of housing accessible to persons with disabilities.

Commented [SO1]: Not adopted by the Town of Lisbon

Final recommendations were reviewed and approved by the Regional Housing Plan Advisory Committee on January 23, 2013 and were adopted by the Regional Planning Commission on March 13, 2013. The purpose of incorporating the recommendations of the Regional Housing Plan is to update and expand the Comprehensive Development Plan housing recommendations in order to address housing needs and issues identified in the Regional Housing Plan. It is envisioned that the plan recommendations will be considered for implementation in community planning efforts and activities related to housing and land use.

The following Regional Housing Plan recommendations are incorporated into the Town Comprehensiv Development Plan, as guidelines for the County as a whole:

A. Affordable Housing

- 1. Local governments that provide sanitary sewer and other urban services should provide areas within the community for the development of new single-family and two-family homes on lots of 10,000 square feet or smaller, with home sizes less than 1,200 square feet, to accommodate the development of housing affordable to moderate-income households. Communities with sewer service should also provide areas for the development of multi-family housing at a density of at least 10 units per acre, and 18 units or more per acre in highly urbanized communities, to accommodate the development of housing affordable to lower-income households. Such areas should be identified in community comprehensive plans. In addition, communities should include at least one district that allows single-family residential development of this nature and at least one district that allows multi-family residential development of this nature in their zoning ordinance.⁹
- 2. Comprehensive and neighborhood plans and zoning ordinances should encourage a variety of housing types in urban neighborhoods, including apartments, townhomes, duplexes, small single-family homes and lots, and live-work units. Flexible zoning regulations intended to encourage a mix of housing types (single-, two-, and multi-family) and a variety of lot sizes and housing values within a neighborhood, such as planned unit development (PUD), traditional neighborhood developments (TND), density bonuses for affordable housing, and adaptive re-use of buildings for housing should be included in zoning ordinances in communities with sewer service. Accessory dwellings should be considered by all communities to help provide affordable housing in single-family residential zoning districts.
- . Communities should review requirements that apply to new housing development to determine if changes could be made that would reduce the cost of development without compromising the safety, functionality, and aesthetic quality of new development. For example:
 - Communities should strive to keep housing affordable by limiting zoning ordinance restrictions or the size and appearance of housing by reducing or eliminating requirements for masonry (stone or brick) exteriors or minimum home sizes of 1.200 square feet or more in all single-family and twofamily residential zoning districts. Local governments should encourage developers and home builders to limit the use of restrictive covenants that require masonry exteriors and home sizes of 1.200 square feet or more.
 - Public and private housing developers could make use of alternative methods of construction, such as the panelized building process, for affordable and attractive new homes. Local governments should accommodate the use of the panelized building process as a method of providing affordable housing.

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

⁹Counties with general zoning ordinances should also consider revising comprehensive plans and zoning and subdivision ordinances to comply with the recommendations for communities with sewer service if County regulations apply in sewered communities.

- Site improvement standards set forth in land division ordinances and other local governmenta regulations should be reviewed to determine if amendments could be made to reduce the cost of housing to the consumer while preserving the safety, functionality, and aesthetic quality of new development. Particular attention should be paid to street width and landscaping requirements Recommended street cross-sections are provided on Table 69 in Chapter V of the Regional Housing Plan. Landscaping requirements should provide for street trees and modest landscaping to enhance the attractiveness of residential development and the community as a whole. Communities should limit the fees for reviewing construction plans to the actual cost of review, rather than charging a percentage of the estimated cost of improvements.
- Exterior building material, parking, and landscaping requirements for multi-family housing set forth in local zoning ordinances should be reviewed to determine if amendments could be made to reduce the cost of housing to the consumer while preserving the safety, functionality, and aesthetic quality of new development. Communities should work with qualified consultants, such as architects with experience designing affordable multi-family housing, to review these requirements and develop nonprescriptive design guidelines that encourage the development of attractive and affordable multifamily housing. Landscaping requirements should provide for street trees and modest landscaping to enhance the attractiveness of multi-family development and the community as a whole.
- 4. Communities with design review boards or committees should include professional architects on the board to provide expertise and minimize the time and cost associated with multiple concept plan submittals.
- 5. Education and outreach efforts should be conducted throughout the Region by SEWRPC, UW-Extension, and other partners regarding the need for affordable housing, including subsidized housing. These efforts should include plan commissioner and board level training regarding demographic, market, and community perception characteristics that impact communities.
- 6. State and Federal governments should work cooperatively with private partners to provide a housing finance system that includes private, Federal, and State sources of housing capital; offers a reasonable menu of sound mortgage products for both single- and multi-family housing that is governed by prudent underwriting standards and adequate oversight and regulation; and provides a Federal guarantee to ensure that 30-year, fixed-rate mortgages are available at reasonable interest rates and terms.
- 7. Appraisers should consider all three approaches to value (cost, income, and sales comparisons) to ensure that values, building costs, and other unique factors are considered when conducting property appraisals.
- 8. Tax increment financing (TIF) could be used as a mechanism to facilitate the development of affordable housing. Wisconsin TIF law (Section 66.1105(6)(g) of the *Wisconsin Statutes*) allows municipalities to extend the life of a TIF district for one year after paying off the district's project costs. In that year, at least 75 percent of any tax revenue received from the value of the increment must be used to benefit affordable housing in the municipality and the remainder must be used to improve the municipality's housing stock. Communities in subsidized housing priority sub-areas (see Map 130 of the Regional Housing Plan) and sub-areas with a job/housing imbalance are encouraged to use this program to increase the supply of affordable housing.
- 9. County and local governments should consider establishing programs and ordinances to stabilize and improve established neighborhoods with the intent of maintaining the quality and quantity of existing lower- and moderate-cost housing stock. Examples of programs and ordinances include property maintenance ordinances, weatherization and lead paint abatement programs, and use of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and other funding to assist low- and moderate-income households in making needed home repairs. Funds should also be provided to assist landlords in making needed repairs to apartments that would be affordable to low- and moderate-income tenants. Ordinances that limit teardowns and lot consolidations that would remove low- and moderate-cost housing units from a

community, without providing replacement housing affordable to low- and moderate-income households, should be considered by local governments.

10. The Governor and State Legislature should consider funding the Smart Growth Dividend Aid Program established under Section 18zo of 1999 Wisconsin Act 9, under which a city, village, town, or county with an adopted comprehensive plan could receive one aid credit for each new housing unit sold or rented on lots of no more than one-quarter acre and could also receive one credit for each new housing unit sold at no more than 80 percent of the median sale price for new homes in the county in which the city, village, or town is located in the year before the year in which the grant application is made. The program should be amended to specify that eligible new housing units must be located in an area served by a sanitary sewerage system, and that new housing units in developments with a density equivalent to one home per one-quarter acre would also be eligible to receive aid credits.

B. Fair Housing/Opportunity

- 1. Multi-family housing and smaller lot and home size requirements for single-family homes may accommodate new housing that would be more affordable to low-income households. A significantly higher percentage of minority households have low incomes compared to non-minority households. Communities should evaluate comprehensive plan recommendations and zoning requirements to determine if their plans and regulations act to affirmatively further fair housing.
- Entitlement jurisdictions should explicitly require sub-grantees to certify that they will affirmatively further fair housing as a condition of receiving Community Planning and Development (CPD) funds, which include the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME programs.

C. Job/Housing Balance

- 1. Increase the supply of modest single-family and multi-family housing to address job/housing imbalances. Communities with sanitary sewer service in sub-areas identified as having a potential year 2010 or projected year 2035 job/housing imbalance should conduct a more detailed analysis based on specific conditions in their community as part of a comprehensive plan update. The analysis could examine, for example, the specific wages of jobs in the community and the specific price of housing. If the local analysis confirms an existing or future job/housing imbalance, it is recommended that the local government consider changes to their comprehensive plan which would provide housing appropriate for people holding jobs in the community, thereby supporting the availability of a workforce for local businesses and industries:
 - a. Additional lower-cost multi-family housing units, typically those at a density of at least 10 units per acre and modest apartment sizes (800 square feet for a two-bedroom unit), should be provided in communities where the community's analysis indicates a shortage of lower-cost housing in relation to lower wage jobs. The community's comprehensive plan should be updated to identify areas for the development or redevelopment of additional multi-family housing; and zoning ordinance regulations should be updated as necessary.
 - b. Additional moderate-cost single-family housing units, typically those at densities equivalent to lot sizes of 10,000 square feet or less and modest home sizes (less than 1,200 square feet), should be provided in communities where the community's analysis indicates a shortage of moderate-cost housing in relation to moderate wage jobs. The community's comprehensive plan should be updated to identify areas for the development or redevelopment of moderate-cost housing; and zoning ordinance regulations should be updated as necessary.
- 2. State, County, and affected local governments should work to provide better connectivity between affordable housing and job opportunities through transportation options to major employment centers.

- 3. It is recommended that the Wisconsin Housing and Economic Development Authority (WHEDA) or other appropriate State agency conduct a job/housing balance analysis.¹⁰
- 4. Job/housing balance should be a criterion considered by administering agencies during the award of Federal and State economic development incentives. Incentives could be directed to local governments that can demonstrate a current or projected job/housing balance, or to communities that will use the incentive to address an existing or projected job/housing imbalance.
- 5. SEWRPC will provide to communities requesting an expansion of their sanitary sewer service area and amendment of their sanitary sewer service area plan the findings of the job/housing balance analysis conducted under this regional housing plan. For those communities with a job/housing imbalance, recommendations for addressing the job/housing imbalance will be identified.
- 6. Strategies to promote job/housing balance should include the development of affordable housing in areas with sewer service outside central cities and improved transit service throughout the Region to provide increased access to jobs; education and job training to provide the resident workforce with the skills needed by area employers; and increased economic development activities to expand businesses and industries in areas with high unemployment, underemployment, and discouraged workers.
- Encourage the development of employer assisted housing ("walk-to-work") programs through which employers provide resources to employees who wish to become home owners in neighborhoods near their workplaces.

D. Accessible Housing

- 1. Communities with sanitary sewer service in sub-areas identified as having a household income/housing and/or a job/housing imbalance should identify areas for additional multi-family housing in their comprehensive plan, which would help to address both affordability and accessibility needs.
- 2. Local governments should support efforts by private developers and other housing providers to include construction design concepts such as Universal Design and Visitability, including consideration of providing density bonuses or other incentives to encourage such housing. Visitability is a movement to change home construction practices so that all new homes offer a few specific features that make the home easier for people with a mobility impairment to live in or visit. Visitability features include wide passage doors, at least a half-bath on the first floor, and at least one zero-step entrance approached by a useable route on a firm surface with an approximate grade of 1:12 from a driveway or public sidewalk. Other features that promote ease of use for persons with disabilities include wide hallways, a useable ground floor bathroom with reinforced walls for grab bars, and electrical outlets and switches in accessible locations.¹¹
- 3. It is recommended that the Governor and State Legislature continue to support funding for programs that provide the funding for home modifications which allow persons with disabilities and the elderly to maintain their independence in their homes and communities. It is also recommended that State funding be provided to the Department of Health Services (DHS) or other State agency to develop a database to track housing units that have received grants or loans for accessibility improvements and other housing units known to include accessibility features. As an alternative, DHS could work with the Department of

¹⁰ It could be expected that the State's analysis of job/housing balance for each community would be a general analysis, and a community would be permitted to conduct a more detailed analysis to confirm whether a job/housing balance exists in their community.

¹¹ The Wisconsin Uniform Dwelling Code now requires minimum 28-inch wide doorways and zero-step entrances between housing units and attached garages for new one- and two-family housing units.

Revenue to require that accessibility features, including zero-step entrances, accessible bathrooms, hallways at least 36 inches wide, and doorways at least 32 inches wide, be documented in residential property assessments. Information on accessibility features would be collected through the Wisconsin transfer tax form at the time a housing unit is sold, and by local building inspectors in communities that require a building inspection at the time a housing unit is sold, and noted on assessment forms by the local assessor.

- 4. Local governments will have access to estimates regarding accessibility of housing through the American Housing Survey (AHS) beginning in 2012. Local governments should analyze AHS and census data to estimate the number of accessible housing units in the community to help ensure that there are plentiful housing options for persons with mobility disabilities not only to reside in, but also to visit their familie and neighbors.
- Local government code enforcement officers and building inspectors should receive training on the accessibility requirements of State and Federal fair housing laws with regard to multi-family housing construction and rehabilitation.
- 6. A number of government programs refuse to fund accessibility modifications for renters, leaving a large segment of the population with less access than homeowners to funding that may help them remain in their housing. It is recommended that programs be modified to allow renters and landlords to use funding sources for accessibility improvements that are available to homeowners, in consultation with the property owner as provided in Fair Housing laws.

E. Subsidized and Tax Credit Housing

- 1. Support Federal initiatives to simplify subsidized housing programs to make more efficient use of resources. Public Housing Authorities (PHAs) and entitlement jurisdictions should continue working with Federal agencies and Congress to maintain funding levels for housing and related programs.
- 2. Administrators of voucher programs, county and local governments, and housing advocates should continue to work with Federal agencies and Congress to increase funding levels for additional housing vouchers to help meet the demand for housing assistance in the Region. There are 45,676 housing choice vouchers and subsidized housing units in the Region, compared to a potential need for 187,395 vouchers to help provide housing for 100,111 extremely-low income households (incomes less than 30 percent of the Regional median income, or less than \$16,164 per year) and an additional 87,284 very-low income households (incomes between 30 and 50 percent of the Regional median income, or \$16,164 to \$26,940 per year).
- 3. Communities with major employment centers should seek and support new multi-family housing development to provide workforce housing for households earning 50 to 60 percent of the Region's median annual household income.
- 4. Communities in economic need priority sub-areas and subsidized workforce housing need priority subareas should work with HUD or their entitlement jurisdiction to secure HUD Housing and Community Development Program and other available funds to provide additional housing in the community that is affordable to extremely and very low-income households. Communities in economic need should continue to work with HUD to secure Choice Neighborhood Initiative funding for the rehabilitation or replacement of existing public housing units. Local PHAs whose jurisdictions include priority sub-areas shown on Map 130 of the Regional Housing Plan should seek to provide assistance through subsidy programs that can encourage housing development for households at a variety of income levels.
- 5. WHEDA should study models in other States of how to best reach extremely-low income households.

Formatted: Highlight

- 6. HUD should consider modifications to the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher program to remove financial disincentives for administering vouchers regionally. Administrators of voucher programs in the Region should work together to develop a coordinated Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher program.
- 7. It is recommended that the Governor and State Legislature amend the Wisconsin Open Housing Law to recognize housing vouchers as a lawful source of income.
- 8. WHEDA should consider revising the criteria used to determine LIHTC awards to potentially award allocation points based on a lack of affordable housing in a community and/or the type of jobs and associated income levels in the community, to award points in communities identified as priority areas on Map 130 of the Regional Housing Plan, and to award points to non-elderly housing developments in communities with a job/housing imbalance.
- In order to provide housing for very-low income households, communities should develop partnerships with nonprofit organizations to provide affordable housing, and/or assist in assembling small parcels, remediating brownfields.
- 0. Continuum of Care (CoC) organizations should continue to engage individual service providers in community-wide planning and coordination to assist homeless persons, and should continue to develop strategies to prevent homelessness as well as provide services to homeless individuals and families. Programs for the homeless should continue to address the needs of various special populations, including families, veterans, and persons with mental illness.

F. Housing Development Practices

- . Within the context of community-level comprehensive plans, local governments should consider preparing detailed neighborhood plans for each residential neighborhood or special planning district where significant **urban** development or redevelopment is expected. While such plans may vary in format and level of detail, they should generally:
 - a. Designate future collector and land-access (minor) street locations and alignments, pedestrian paths and bicycle ways, and, in communities with transit service, transit stops and associated pedestrian access.
 - <u>b.</u> For areas designated for residential use in the comprehensive plan, more specifically identify areas for multi-, two- and single-family development, with a variety of lot sizes for single-family development, and, potentially, areas for mixed uses (retail, service, or office with residential, and live-work units). The overall density for the neighborhood should be consistent with that recommended in the community comprehensive plan.
 - c. Identify specific sites for neighborhood parks, schools, and retail and service centers which are recommended on a general basis in the community-level plan. Neighborhood commercial centers may contain compact mixed-use developments.
 - d. Identify environmentally significant areas to be preserved consistent with the community-level, county, and regional plans.
 - e. Indicate areas to be reserved for storm water management and utility easements.
- Achievement of communities and neighborhoods that are functional, safe, and attractive ultimately depend on good design of individual development and redevelopment sites. Local governments should promote good site design through the development of design standards to be incorporated into local zoning and subdivision ordinances.

Formatted: Highlight

- 3. Local governments should promote the redevelopment and infill of vacant and underutilized sites, including the cleanup and reuse of brownfields, as a key element in planning for the revitalization of urban areas. Tools such as TIF and State and Federal brownfield remediation grants and loans may assist in these efforts.
- 4. Local governments, PHAs, and developers should consider Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) elements when developing and reviewing site plans for proposed housing developments.
- 5. PHAs and developers (both for profit and nonprofit) should consider the use of green building methods and materials for new and renovated housing where financially feasible, with priority given to energy saving materials and construction practices, such as low-flow water fixtures; energy-star appliances; and high-efficiency furnaces, water heaters, windows, and insulation.

Chapter 7

COMPLETE DOCUMENT WITH ALL MAPS, FIGURES, ETC.

PLEASE USE PDF FOR

LAND USE ELEMENT

INTRODUCTION

Information regarding adopted land use plans and regulations, historic and existing land use and land use development patterns is essential to any sound comprehensive planning effort. This chapter presents the findings of the land use inventories and analyses conducted in support of the preparation of the Comprehensive Development Plan for Waukesha County. Specifically, this chapter describes adopted land use plans and regulations; historic urban growth within the County; the existing land use base and changes in that base; and presents detailed analyses of the planned land uses within the County. During the plan preparation process, data and planning standards and objectives from previous chapters were used to prepare the land use element.

STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES, AND CONCERNS

The Waukesha County Comprehensive Development Plan Land Use, Housing and Transportation Element subcommittee expressed the following land use strengths, concerns, and weaknesses.

Land Use Strengths

- A long history of advanced land use planning in the county and region
- An existing land use pattern that has given consideration to compatible uses
- A strong commitment to preserving environmentally sensitive lands
- An increase in the use of conservation or cluster design development
- A growing interest in intergovernmental discussions on land use
- Many municipalities have a strong sense of place (ie. lakes, downtown)

Land Use Concerns and Weaknesses

- · Continued pressure for development on poor soil conditions
- A need for increased intergovernmental discussions on land use
- A lack of stable community boundaries
- A lack of commitment to previously defined or developed commercial locations
- A lack of consideration of how regulatory expectations impact the cost of projects and housing
- · A lack of willingness by municipalities to re-evaluate existing land use and zoning
- Waukesha County's water supply is finite. The trends show that ground water supply and quality is declining.

LAND USE PLAN DESIGN PROCESS

The process used in preparing the Comprehensive Development Plan for Waukesha County was heavily influenced by statutory requirements with respect to the treatment of locally adopted land use plans. Under the Wisconsin Statutes, counties are required to incorporate into the county development plan all master plans that have been duly adopted by incorporated cities and villages under the State of Wisconsin city planning enabling act. The Statutes do not, however, explicitly prescribe the treatment of plans adopted by towns acting under village powers, nor do the Statutes provide direction in the case of conflicts between any county adopted land use objectives and local master plans. The Statutes do not specifically require that city and village plans for their extraterritorial areas be included in a County comprehensive plan. Therefore, situations in which city or village extraterritorial planning overlays town planning further complicate the preparation of a County development plan. Owing to the considerable number of local master plans adopted to date by the Cities, Villages, and Towns within Waukesha County, the manner in which such plans are taken into account in the preparation of the County development plan is of paramount importance.

In an effort to adhere to both the requirements of the Wisconsin Statutes governing the preparation of county development plans and to sound planning practice, the Waukesha County Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee determined that the following approach should be utilized in the preparation of the Comprehensive Development Plan for Waukesha County:

- 1. All duly adopted local land use plans, whether prepared by incorporated cities and villages or by towns, would be reviewed for consistency with the County development objectives and standards approved by the Advisory Committee, as presented in Chapter 2 of this Plan. All inconsistencies would be identified and described.
- 2. Although State law is ambiguous in terms of incorporating city and village plans for extraterritorial areas into a county comprehensive plan, the consistency requirement in Section 66.1001(3) of the comprehensive planning law clearly states that any local government that engages in official mapping, general or shoreland zoning, or subdivision regulation must carry out those actions in a way that is consistent with "that local governmental unit's comprehensive plan." This requirement applies most directly to the land use element, and the land use plan map, of local comprehensive plans. Because the Statutes require the regulatory decisions of a local government to be consistent with the local government's comprehensive plan, the Advisory Committee at its October 25, 2007 meeting, recommended that the County would not accept extraterritorial plans without extraterritorial zoning or inter-municipal agreements being in place unless the municipalities involved have accepted the designated land use through formal action or resolution. Although subdivision and official mapping ordinances can also regulate the use of land, zoning is the primary regulatory tool used by county and local governments to determine and control land use.

Further, the Advisory Committee recommended that the Waukesha County staff develop a planning conflict resolution process to assist in the preparation of the County comprehensive plan. The issue resolution process should involve the County and SEWRPC staff working with affected municipalities to reach agreement.

- 3. Municipalities will prepare preliminary land use plans in a manner consistent with the Advisory Committee-approved development objectives and standards. Following review of local land use plans, inconsistencies with the development objectives were identified for the municipalities and adjustments were requested. In areas where no duly adopted or preliminary local land use plan exists, a recommended land use pattern was prepared in accordance with the development objectives. Statistical summaries of population, household, and employment levels under planned conditions were prepared through this planning process. Municipal land use plans were compared to the projected population, household, and employment levels contained in this Plan.
- 4. The compiled preliminary County land use plan would be provided to all cities, villages, and towns in the County for review and comment. Where city or village extraterritorial plans were submitted as part of this planning process, conflicts were identified and were addressed through intergovernmental meetings coordinated by the County and SEWRPC staff. In addressing such conflicts, efforts were made to arrive at consensus resolutions of the identified conflicts, in cooperation with the concerned community or communities, using planning standards as a point of departure for the deliberations. Ideally, plan conflict resolution meetings would provide the foundation for intermunicipal or border agreements. If consensus resolutions were not reached, the extraterritorial plans would not be included in the plan as detailed in number 2 above.
ADOPTED LAND USE PLANS AND LAND USE REGULATIONS

The Comprehensive Development Plan for Waukesha County is intended to refine and detail the regional land use plan, taking into account and integrating, as appropriate, existing County and local development objectives. An understanding of both regional development objectives and County and local development objectives is therefore essential to the preparation of a sound County comprehensive development plan. Accordingly, this chapter provides a brief description of the regional land use plan and various supporting functional plan elements that have been prepared to date as they pertain to Waukesha County. In addition, this chapter describes land use plans and land use regulations, which have been adopted by the County and the cities, villages, and towns within the County, which provide an expression of County and local development objectives.

Regional and Area Wide Plans

Since its creation in 1960, the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC), the official area wide planning agency for the seven-county Southeastern Wisconsin Region, which includes Waukesha County, has, in accordance with its statutory charge, pursued the preparation of an advisory comprehensive plan for the physical development of the Region. This has been achieved through the systematic formulation of those elements of such a plan most important to the developmental and environmental problems faced by the units and agencies of government operating in the Region. The regional land use plan, complemented by various functional plans for transportation, parks and open space, water quality management, flood control, airports, and housing, is intended to serve as an overall guide to the physical development of the Region. The findings and recommendations of these regional comprehensive plan elements have important implications for the Comprehensive Development Plan for Waukesha County.

Regional Land Use Plan

The regional land use plan, set forth in SEWRPC Planning Report No. 48, *A Regional Land Use Plan for Southeastern Wisconsin: 2035*, and related amendments thereto, is intended to serve as a guide for land use development and redevelopment within the Region. The plan provides for the attainment of specific area wide land use development objectives formulated in cooperation with the local, State, and Federal units and agencies of government concerned and sets forth recommendations regarding the amount and spatial distribution of the various land uses necessary to serve the needs of the existing and probable future resident population and economic activity levels in the Region through the year 2035.

Regional Transportation System Plan

The regional transportation system plan, as set forth in SEWRPC Planning Report No. 49, *A Regional Transportation System Plan for Southeastern Wisconsin: 2035*, describes how the regional land use plan can best be served by highway and transit facilities. The multimodal plan consists of five principal elements: public transit, transportation systems management, travel demand management, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and arterial streets and highways. Designed to serve and support the regional land use plan, the Regional Transportation System Plan recommends a functional and jurisdictional system of arterial streets and highways to serve the Region through the design year 2035 as well as a functional network of various types of transit lines. The regional transportation system plan was developed on the basis of careful quantitative analyses of existing and probable future traffic movements and of existing highway and transit system capacity and use.

Development Plan for the Interstate Highway (IH) 94 West Freeway Corridor

In 1990, the Wisconsin Department of Transportation requested that the Regional Planning Commission undertake a land use and transportation study of the IH 94 West Freeway Corridor from the CTH T interchange in the City of Waukesha westward to the Jefferson-Waukesha County line. The study was initiated in response to concerns that land use changes were occurring rapidly in the corridor, that such changes were contributing to increased traffic congestion and related problems in the corridor, that cooperative agreement among Waukesha County and the local governments concerned was needed to formulate a future land use pattern for the IH 94 West Freeway Corridor, and to identify needed supporting transportation improvements. Completed in

1994 and documented in SEWRPC Community Assistance Planning Report No. 201, *A Land Use and Transportation System Plan for the IH 94 West Freeway Corridor: 2010*, the corridor plan represents a refinement and amendment of the regional land use plan for that area, which encompasses about 60 square miles of Waukesha County.

Regional Park and Open Space Plan

The adopted regional park and open space plan, described in SEWRPC Planning Report No. 27, *A Regional Park and Open Space Plan for Southeastern Wisconsin: 2000*, identifies existing and probable future park and open space needs in the Region and recommends a system of large regional resource-oriented parks, recreational corridors, and smaller urban parks, together with associated recreational facilities, to meet such needs. That portion of the regional plan that applies to Waukesha County was revised and updated in 1989 and was adopted by both the Waukesha County Board of Supervisors and the Regional Planning Commission in 1990, is documented in SEWRPC Community Assistance Planning Report No. 137, *A Park and Open Space Plan for Waukesha County*. Subsequent amendments to the Park and Open Space Plan were incorporated into Community Assistance Planning Report No. 209, *A Development Plan for Waukesha County Wisconsin* in 1996 and later amended in 1998.

Regional Water Quality Management Plan

The findings and recommendations of the water quality management planning program for Southeastern Wisconsin are described in SEWRPC Planning Report No. 30, *A Regional Water Quality Management Plan for Southeastern Wisconsin: 1979*, and have been periodically amended through 2008. The plan has five basic elements: 1) a land use element, consisting of recommendations for the location of new urban development in the Region and for the preservation of primary environmental corridors and prime agricultural lands, this element being the adopted regional land use plan, 2) a point source pollution abatement element, including recommendations concerning the location and extent of sanitary sewer service areas; the location, type, and capacity of, and the level of treatment to be provided at, sewage treatment facilities; the location and configuration of intercommunity trunk sewers; and the abatement of pollution from sewerage system overflows and from industrial wastewater discharges, 3) a nonpoint source pollution abatement element, consisting of recommendations for the handling and disposal of sludges from sewage treatment facilities, and 5) recommendations for the establishment of continuing water quality monitoring efforts in the Region.

Of particular importance to the preparation of a Comprehensive Development Plan for Waukesha County are the sanitary sewer service area recommendations of the water quality management plan. The adopted regional water quality management plan recommended generalized sanitary sewer service areas attendant to each of the existing and proposed sewage treatment facilities within the Region. That plan also recommended that these areas be refined and detailed through the cooperative efforts of the local units and agencies of government concerned so that the service areas ultimately reflect local, as well as area wide, development objectives. Sewer service area refinement plans continue to be completed for areas in Waukesha County. A more complete discussion of sewer service areas are presented in Chapter 4 of this Plan.

Regional Water Supply Plan

The Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission is conducting a regional water supply study for the Southeastern Wisconsin Region. The regional water supply plan together with the abovementioned groundwater inventories and a groundwater simulation model will form the SEWRPC regional water supply management plan. The preparation of these three elements includes interagency partnerships with the U.S. Geological Survey, the Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey, the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, and many of the area's water supply utilities.

The regional water supply plan will include the following major components:

- Water supply service areas and forecast demand for water use.
- Recommendations for water conservation efforts to reduce water demand.

- Evaluation of alternative sources of supply, recommended sources of supply, and recommendations for development of the basic infrastructure required to deliver that supply.
- Identification of groundwater recharge areas to be protected from incompatible development.
- Specification of new institutional structures necessary to carry out plan recommendations.
- Identification of constraints to development levels in subareas of the Region due to water supply sustainability concerns.

[Note: Information from the regional water supply plan will be incorporated into this comprehensive plan as it becomes available. The plan is expected to be completed in early 2009.]

Previous County Development Plan

The Waukesha County development plan set forth in SEWRPC Community Assistance Planning Report No. 209, *A Development Plan for Waukesha County Wisconsin*, was adopted by the Waukesha County Board in 1996. The plan was prepared in accordance with Section 59.97(3) of the Wisconsin Statutes, under which Wisconsin counties are authorized to prepare comprehensive county development plans addressing a wide range of physical development concerns. It represented the first plan of this kind completed in Wisconsin. The Plan contains a discussion of many of the required elements contained in Wisconsin's comprehensive planning law ("Smart Growth"), under Section 66.1001 Wisconsin Statutes enacted by the Wisconsin Legislature in 1999.

Municipal Plan Refinements

Occasionally municipalities will refine regional land use plans, county development plans or municipal land use plans through a more detailed planning process. These plan refinements may be completed for purposes such as redevelopment areas, business improvement districts or neighborhood planning. Table VII-1 presents local plan refinements developed by municipalities in Waukesha County since 1990.

Redevelopment Areas

Cities and villages are authorized under Section 66.1333 of the Wisconsin Statutes to create redevelopment authorities for the purposes of carrying out renewal programs. Such authorities have the power to prepare and administer redevelopment plans and renewal projects within the corporate limits of the community.

Business Improvement Districts

Section 66.1109 of the Wisconsin Statutes authorizes cities, villages, and towns to create one or more business improvement districts to allow businesses in those districts to undertake activities to develop, redevelop, manage and promote the districts, and, importantly to establish an assessment method to fund such activities. An operating plan for the district must be prepared at the time the district is established.

Table VII-1

NEIGHBORHOOD, SUB AREA AND REDEVELOPMENT AREA PLANS COMPLETED BY WAUKESHA COUNTY MUNICIPALITIES SINCE 1990

Municipality	Plan Title	Year Adopted
Town of Brookfield	Redevelopment Plan for the Bluemound Road Corridor	2008
Village of Hartland	A Hartland and Merton Cluster Development Plan	2004
-	Business Improvement District	2007
	Hartland Village Center Revitalization Plan	2007
Village of Menomonee Falls	Village Centre Menomonee River Parkway Master Plan	1993
	Village Center Business Improvement District	1993
	Village Centre Redevelopment Plan	1996
	North Hills Neighborhood Plan	2002
	Northeast Area Plan	2005
	Main Street Redevelopment Plan	2005
City of Broolefield	Capitol Drive Corridor Study- Land Use Plan #2	1999
City of Brookneid	Brookfield Road and Capitol Drive Neighborhood Plan	1999
	Calhoun Road and Capitol Drive Neighborhood Plan	2000
	Moorland Road Plan	2000
	Calhoun Road South Neighborhood Plan	2001
	Lilly Road and Capitol Drive Neighborhood Plan	2001
	Brookfield Square Neighborhood Development Strategy	2002
	124th Street and Capitol Drive Neighborhood Plan	2004
	Tax Increment District #3 Project Plan	2004
	Village Area Neighborhood Plan	2006
	124th Street and Bluemound Road Neighborhood Plan	2007
	124th Street and Lisbon Road Neighborhood Plan	2007
	Northwest Gateway Neighborhood Plan	2008
City of Musleage	Redevelopment District #1 Plan	2003
City of Muskego	Redevelopment District #2 Plan	2003
City of Oconomowoc	Peripheral Area Plan	1996
-	Downtown Revitalization Plan and Market Analysis	2004
	Comprehensive Plan of Redevelopment: St. Paul - East	2004
	Wisconsin Avenue	
	Southwest Summit Avenue Land Use Plan	2007
	Comprehensive Downtown / Central City Plan	1998
	Redevelopment District # 3 Plan	1999
City of Waukesha	Redevelopment District # 5 Plan	2001
	Redevelopment District # 6 Plan	2006
	Redevelopment District # 7 Plan	2007
	Redevelopment District # 8 Plan	2007

Source: Municipal Data

Municipal Boundary Agreements and Consolidations

The Wisconsin Statutes provide several options for neighboring cities, villages, and towns to cooperatively determine common boundaries. Section 66.0307 of the Wisconsin Statutes allows any combination of cities, villages, and towns to determine the boundary lines between themselves under a cooperative plan. Section 66.0307 envisions the cooperative preparation of a comprehensive plan for the affected area by the concerned local units of government and prescribes in detail the contents of the cooperative plan. Importantly, the cooperative plan must identify any boundary change and any existing boundary that may not be changed during

the planning period; identify any conditions that must be met before a boundary change may occur; include a schedule of the period during which a boundary change shall or may occur; and specify arrangements for the provision of urban services to the territory covered by the plan. A boundary agreement can also be achieved under Section 66.0225, which allows two abutting communities that are parties to a court action to enter into a written stipulation determining a common boundary. In addition, communities can agree upon common boundaries under Section 66.0301, the "intergovernmental cooperation" statute.

In 2007, the Wisconsin Legislature enacted Act 43 that clarified the determination of common municipal (city, village and town) boundaries by agreement and the use of alternative dispute resolution in annexation and other boundary disputes.

Communities in the County, which have entered into municipal boundary agreements under any of the aforementioned Statutes as of 2007, are listed in Table VII-2.

Occasionally, municipalities will agree to transfer properties between jurisdictions. Such transfers may be made in an effort to reorganize or more clearly define municipal boundaries.

Under Wisconsin Statutes, adjacent municipalities can pursue consolidation of jurisdictions for the purpose of creating efficiencies and effectiveness in the delivery of services or for the homogeneity of communities. To date, consolidation studies have been undertaken between the City and Village of Pewaukee, the City and Town of Brookfield (the Town did not participate in the study) and the Village of Big Bend and Town of Vernon.

Communities With Boundary Agreements	Year Agreement Signed	Statute
Village of Pewaukee/Former	1989	66.0225
Town of Pewaukee	1989	00.0225
City of Delafield/Village of	1998	66.0227
Hartland/Town of Delafield	1990	00.0227
City of Waukesha/Former	1998	66.0307
Town of Pewaukee		
City of Oconomowoc/Town of	1999	66.0307
Summit	Amended 2007	
Village of North Prairie/Town	1999	66.0225
of Genesee		
Village of Oconomowoc	2000	66.0301
Lake/Town of Summit		66.0225
Village of Mukwonago/Town	2000	66.0225
of Mukwonago		
Village of Wales/Town of	2000	66.0225
Genesee		
Village of North Prairie/Town	2000	66.0225
of Mukwonago		
Village of Sussex/Town of	2001	66.0227
Lisbon		
Village of Merton/Town of	2002	66.0301
Lisbon		66.0225
Village of Wales/Town of	2002	66.0225
Delafield		
Village of Dousman/Town of	2004	66.0225
Ottawa		
Village of North Prairie/Town	2004	66.0225
of Ottawa		

Table VII-2 BOUNDARY AGREEMENTS IN WAUKESHA COUNTY: 2007

Source: SEWRPC and Waukesha County

Note: Additional information regarding the boundary agreements are available on the Wisconsin Department of Administration website at

http://www.doa.state.wi.us/category.asp?linkcatid=735&linkid=132&locid=9.

LAND USE REGULATIONS

The preparation of a land use plan for Waukesha County also requires consideration of existing land use regulations, including general zoning ordinances and special purpose floodplain and shoreland zoning ordinances, land division ordinances, and official maps. Each of these regulatory tools, as currently applied in Waukesha County, is described in this section. For ease of reference, a tabular summary of the status of these regulations is presented in Table VII-3 for the Cities, Villages and Towns in Waukesha County.

Table VII-3

LAND USE REGULATIONS IN WAUKESHA COUNTY BY MUNICIPALITY: 2007

	Type of Ordinance								
Community	General Zoning	Floodplain Zoning	Shoreland or Shoreland-Wetland Zoning	Subdivision Control	Official Map				
Cities									
Brookfield	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted & DNR approved	Adopted	Adopted				
Delafield	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted				
Muskego	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted & DNR approved	Adopted	County map in force				
New Berlin	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted & DNR approved	Adopted	Adopted				
Oconomowoc	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted & DNR approved	Adopted	Adopted				
Pewaukee	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted	County map in force				
Waukesha	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted & DNR approved	Adopted	Adopted				
Villages									
Big Bend	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted & DNR approved	Adopted	Adopted				
Butler	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted	County map in force				
Chenequa	Adopted	None ^a	Adopted	None	None				
Dousman	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted & DNR approved	Adopted	County map in force				
Eagle	Adopted	None ^a	Not required	Adopted	County map in force				
Elm Grove	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted	None	Adopted				
Hartland	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted				
Lac La Belle	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted				
Lannon	Adopted	Adopted	None	Adopted	None				
Menomonee Falls	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted & DNR approved	Adopted	None				
Merton	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted				
Mukwonago	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted	None				
Nashotah	Adopted	None ^a	Adopted & DNR approved	Adopted	County map in force				
North Prairie	Adopted	None ^b	Not required	Adopted	County map in force				
Oconomowoc Lake	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted & DNR approved	Adopted	County map in force				
Pewaukee	Adopted	Adopted	None	Adopted	Adopted				
Sussex	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted & DNR approved	Adopted	County map in force				
Wales	Adopted	None ^a	Not required	Adopted	None				
Towns									
Brookfield	Adopted	County ordinance	County ordinance	Adopted	County map in force				
Delafield	Adopted	County ordinance	County ordinance	Adopted	County map in force				
Eagle	Adopted	County ordinance	County ordinance	Adopted	County map in force				
Genesee	County ordinance	County ordinance	County ordinance	Adopted	County map in force				
Lisbon	Adopted	County ordinance	County ordinance	Adopted	Adopted				
Merton	Adopted	County ordinance	County ordinance	Adopted	County map in force				
Mukwonago	Adopted	County ordinance	County ordinance	Adopted	Adopted				
Oconomowoc	County ordinance	County ordinance	County ordinance	Adopted	County map in force				
Ottawa	County ordinance	County ordinance	County ordinance	Adopted	County map in force				
Summit	Adopted	County ordinance	County ordinance	Adopted	County map in force				
Vernon	County ordinance	County ordinance	County ordinance	Adopted	Adopted				
Waukesha	Adopted	County ordinance	County ordinance	Adopted	County map in force				
Waukesha County	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted & DNR approved	Floodland and shoreland only	County highway width map				

^aFlood hazard areas have been identified or mapped on year 2007 proposed FEMA floodplain maps. ^bNo flood hazard areas have been identified or mapped.

Source: SEWRPC, FEMA and municipalities

Local Zoning Regulations

A zoning ordinance is a public law which regulates and restricts the use of property in order to advance the public health, safety, and welfare. A zoning ordinance divides a community into districts for the purpose of regulating the use of land and structures; the height, size, shape, and placement of structures; and the density of population. Zoning seeks to confine certain land uses to areas of the community, which are particularly well suited to those uses, thereby encouraging the most appropriate use of land throughout the community. Zoning seeks to assure adequate light, air, and open space for each building; to reduce fire hazard; and to prevent the overcrowding of

land, traffic congestion, and the overloading of the utility systems. Zoning also provides an important means for protecting and preserving the natural resource base.

Local zoning regulations include general, or comprehensive, zoning regulations and special-purpose regulations governing floodland and shoreland areas. General zoning and special-purpose zoning regulations may be adopted as a single ordinance or as separate ordinances; they may or may not be contained in the same document. Any analysis of locally proposed land use must take into consideration the provisions of both general and special-purpose zoning.

It should be noted that, in addition to general zoning and special-purpose floodland and shoreland zoning, any county, city, village, or town in Wisconsin that owns Federal- or State-approved airport facilities has the authority under Section 114.136 of the Wisconsin Statutes to adopt a special-purpose height zoning ordinance in the vicinity of the airport to protect aerial approaches to the site. The only airport in Waukesha County subject to special regulations is Waukesha County-Crites Field. The Waukesha County Board of Supervisors adopted a height limitation zoning ordinance in 1964. That ordinance establishes height restrictions for structures in areas within three miles of the airport.

General Zoning

Cities in Wisconsin are granted comprehensive, or general, zoning powers under Section 62.23 of the Wisconsin Statutes. The same powers are granted to villages under Section 61.35 of the Statutes. Counties are granted general zoning powers within their unincorporated areas under Section 59.97 of the Statutes. However, a county zoning ordinance becomes effective only in those towns which ratify the county ordinance. Towns which have not adopted a county zoning ordinance may adopt village powers and subsequently utilize the city and village zoning authority conferred in Section 62.23 subject, however, to county board approval where a general purpose county zoning ordinance exists.

General zoning was in effect in all communities in Waukesha County in 2007. Four Towns in the County, Towns of Genesee, Oconomowoc, Ottawa, and Vernon, were under the jurisdiction of the County zoning ordinance, while the remaining eight towns have adopted their own zoning ordinances under village powers.

Floodplain Zoning

Section 87.30 of the Wisconsin Statutes requires that cities, villages, and counties, with respect to their unincorporated areas, adopt floodplain zoning to preserve the floodwater conveyance and storage capacity of floodplain areas and to prevent the location of new flood damage-prone development in flood hazard areas. The minimum standards, which such ordinances must meet, are set forth in Chapter NR 116 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code. The required regulations govern filling and development within a regulatory floodplain, which is defined as the area subject to inundation by the 100-year recurrence interval flood event, the event which has a one percent probability of occurring in any given year. Under Chapter NR 116, local floodplain zoning regulations must prohibit nearly all forms of development within the floodway, which is that portion of the floodplain required to convey the 100-year recurrence peak flood flow. Local regulations must also restrict filling and development within the flood within the floodway that would be covered by floodwater during the 100-year recurrence flood. Permitting the filling and development of the flood fringe area reduces the floodwater storage capacity of the natural floodplain, and may thereby increase downstream flood flows and stages. It should be noted that towns in Waukesha County may enact floodplain zoning regulations which may be more restrictive than those in the Waukesha County Shoreland and Floodland Protection Zoning Ordinance.

In 2007, floodplain ordinances were in effect in most parts of Waukesha County where flood hazard areas have been identified. The Villages of Chenequa, Eagle, Nashotah, North Prairie and Wales, do not have floodland ordinances. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR), in 2007, released preliminary drafts of new Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) for Waukesha County. These maps not only serve to identify properties eligible for FEMA's Flood Insurance program, but also serve as the basis for county and municipal floodplain zoning ordinances. Based on the proposed FEMA

floodplain maps, the Villages of Chenequa, Nashotah and Wales have certain areas within their boundaries which do have flood hazard areas.

Shoreland and Shoreland Wetland Zoning

Under Section 59.971 of the Wisconsin Statutes, counties in Wisconsin are required to adopt zoning regulations within statutorily defined shoreland areas. Shoreland areas are those lands within 1,000 feet of a navigable lake, pond, or flowage; or 300 feet of a navigable stream, or to the landward side of the floodplain, whichever distance is greater. Minimum standards for county shoreland zoning ordinances are set forth in Chapter NR 115 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code. Chapter NR 115 sets forth minimum requirements regarding lot sizes and building setbacks; restrictions on cutting of trees and shrubbery; and restrictions on filling, grading, lagooning, dredging, ditching, and excavating that must be incorporated into county shoreland zoning regulations.

In addition, Chapter NR 115 for Cities and Villages and Chapter NR 117 for Counties, requires that all wetlands five acres or larger within the statutory shoreland zoning jurisdiction area be placed into a wetland conservancy zoning district to ensure their preservation after completion of appropriate wetland inventories by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. In 1982, the State Legislature extended shoreland-wetland zoning requirements to cities and villages in Wisconsin. Under Sections 62.231 and 61.351, respectively, of the Wisconsin Statutes, cities and villages in Wisconsin are required to place wetlands five acres or larger and located in statutory shorelands into a shoreland-wetland conservancy zoning district to ensure their preservation. Minimum standards for city and village shoreland-wetland zoning ordinances are set forth in Chapter NR 117 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code.

In 2007, the Waukesha County Shoreland and Floodland Protection Ordinance was in effect in all unincorporated areas of the County. Table VII-3 indicates 21 of the 25 Cities and Villages in the County had adopted shoreland-wetland zoning ordinances. Of the remaining four Villages, two, the Villages of Eagle and North Prairie, did not contain shoreland-wetlands and were thus not required to adopt such ordinances; two, the Villages of Lannon and Pewaukee, had not yet adopted such ordinances. The Waukesha County Shoreland and Floodland Protection Ordinance and 11 of the 19 local shoreland-wetland zoning ordinances have been approved by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources.

Land Division Regulations

Chapter 236 of the Wisconsin Statutes requires the preparation of a subdivision plat whenever five or more lots of 1.5 acres or less in area are created either at one time or by successive divisions within a period of five years. The Statutes set forth requirements for surveying lots and streets, for plat review and approval by State and local agencies, and for recording approved plats. Section 236.45 of the Statutes allows any city, village, town, or county that has established a planning agency to adopt a land division ordinance, provided the local ordinance is at least as restrictive as the State platting requirements. Local land division ordinances may include the review of other land divisions not defined as "subdivisions" under Chapter 236, such as when fewer than five lots are created or when lots larger than 1.5 acres are created.

The subdivision regulatory powers of Towns are confined to their respective unincorporated areas. City and village subdivision control ordinances may be applied to extraterritorial areas as well as to their respective incorporated areas. In accordance with Chapter 236 Wisconsin Statutes, counties have subdivision regulatory authority in Towns, Cities and Villages. The County has approval authority in Towns but is limited to objection authority in cities and villages. It is possible for both a county and a town to have concurrent jurisdiction over land divisions in unincorporated areas, or for a city or village to have concurrent jurisdiction, Chapter 66.0105 Wisconsin Statutes states the jurisdiction over the overlapping area shall be divided on a line all points of which are equidistant from the boundaries of each municipality concerned so that not more than one municipality shall exercise power over any area. Furthermore, a municipality may waive their extraterritorial review authority. Table VII-3 indicates communities that have adopted land division ordinances.

Official Mapping and Highway Width Maps

Official mapping powers, granted to local units of government under Section 62.23(6) of the Wisconsin Statutes, are an important but historically under-utilized plan implementation tool. An official map prepared under Section 62.23(6) can be used to identify precisely, the location and width of existing and proposed streets, highways, historic districts, parkways, railroad rights-of-way, waterways, public transit facilities, airports, and the location and extent of parks and playgrounds. The official map prohibits the construction of buildings and associated improvements on lands that are for future public use identified on the map.

Under Section 80.64 of the Statutes, counties may adopt highway-width maps showing the location and width of proposed new highways and the widths of any highways proposed to be expanded. Such maps serve a function similar to local official maps, but with jurisdiction limited to streets and highways. By statute, a county highway-width map is in effect only in those municipalities, which act to approve it. Table VII-3 identifies "county map in force" where the municipality has adopted the Waukesha County Street and Highway width map in place of a complete official map.

Extraterritorial Zoning Regulations

The Statutes authorize cities and villages to adopt extraterritorial zoning regulations for adjacent unincorporated areas, in cooperation with the adjacent town, within three miles of a city of the first, second, or third class, and within 1.5 miles of a city of the fourth class or a village. A city or village can initiate preparation of an extraterritorial zoning ordinance and map at any time. Initiation of the extraterritorial zoning ordinance freezes existing zoning in the extraterritorial (town) area for two years, while the city or village and affected town or towns jointly develop an extraterritorial zoning ordinance and map. A joint committee made up of three representatives from the city or village and three representatives from each affected town is formed to develop the ordinance. The time period can be extended for one additional year at the end of the two-year period.

POPULATION, HOUSEHOLD AND EMPLOYMENT PROJECTIONS

Under the previous year 2020 regional land use plan and county development plan, three projections—low, intermediate, and high growth scenarios—were prepared for population, households, and employment in the Region and County. The intermediate projection was considered the most likely to be achieved and constituted the forecast which was used as the basis for the preparation of the year 2020 regional land use plan and county development plan. The high and low projections were intended to provide an indication of population, household, and employment levels which could conceivably be achieved under significantly higher and lower, but nevertheless plausible, growth scenarios.

Review of Previous County Development Plan Projections

The Waukesha County development plan presented in SEWRPC Community Assistance Planning Report No. 209, <u>A Development Plan for Waukesha County, Wisconsin</u>, dated August 1996, set forth population, household, and employment levels anticipated under buildout conditions (about the year 2050) and as envisioned under a 2010 plan stage. The 2010 plan stage envisioned that the County population would increase from 304,700 persons in 1990 to 384,800 persons in 2010; that the number of households would increase from 106,000 in 1990 to 143,400 in 2010; and that the number of jobs would increase from 172,300 in 1990 to 248,800 jobs in 2010. Based upon straight-line interpolation of the anticipated change between 1990 and 2010, the County development plan envisioned 356,800 persons, 130,300 households, and 222,000 jobs in the County in 2003.

The estimated County population of 371,200 persons in 2003 from the Wisconsin Department of Administration exceeded the population of 356,800 persons envisioned under the County development plan by 14,400 persons, or 4 percent. The estimated number of households in the County in 2003 (142,300) from the Wisconsin Department of Administration exceeded the number of households envisioned under the County plan (130,300) by 12,000 households, or 9 percent. The estimated number of jobs in the County in 2003 (266,400) from the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis exceeded the number of jobs envisioned under the County plan (222,000) by 44,400 jobs, or 20 percent.

Year 2035 Projections

Chapter 2 of this Plan provides a more detailed description of the trends associated with population, household and employment change in the County. The methodology and assumptions that underlie the new population, household, and employment projections, along with the projections themselves are fully documented in SEWRPC Technical Report No. 10 (4th Edition), *The Economy of Southeastern Wisconsin* and in SEWRPC Technical Report No. 11 (4th Edition), *The Population of Southeastern Wisconsin*. These two reports were prepared in tandem to ensure consistency between the Commission's long-range population, household, and employment projections.

As indicated in Chapter 2, based on the methodology and assumptions presented in the afore-referenced technical reports, the intermediate growth scenario for population, households and employment will be used to make projections to the plan design year of 2035.

Population Projections

The intermediate projection envisions that the County population would increase by 86,000 persons, or 24 percent, from about 360,800 persons in 2000 to 446,800 persons in 2035. The high projection indicates that the population of the County could be as high as 504,900 persons in 2035, an increase of about 144,100 persons, or 40 percent, over the 2000 level. Conversely, the low projection indicates that the County population could be as low as 411,000 persons in 2035, an increase of 50,200 persons, or 14 percent, over the 2000 level. The SEWRPC-adopted year 2035 regional land use plan and this plan reflect the intermediate population projection of 446,800 persons for Waukesha County in 2035.

Household Projections

The intermediate projection envisions that the number of households in the County would increase by 38,900, or 29 percent, from 135,200 households in 2000 to 174,100 households in 2035, the same projection envisioned under the SEWRPC adopted year 2035 Regional Land Use Plan. The high projection indicates that the number of households in the County could be as high as 196,700 in 2035, an increase of 61,500 households, or 45 percent, over the 2000 level. The low projection indicates that the number of households could be as low as 160,100 in 2035, an increase of 24,900 households, or 18 percent, over the 2000 level. The intermediate projections envision a significant increase in the number of households, however as detailed in Chapter 2, the household sizes are projected to continue to decline from an average of 2.63 persons per household in 2000 to 2.50 persons per household in 2035.

Employment Projections

The intermediate projection envisions total employment of 347,200 jobs in the County in 2035, an increase of 76,400 jobs, or 28 percent, over the 2000 level of 270,800 jobs. The high projection indicates that employment in the County could be as high as 383,100 jobs in 2035, an increase of about 112,300 jobs, or 41 percent, over the 2000 level. The low projection indicates that employment in the County could be as low as 321,600 jobs in 2035, about 50,800 jobs, or 19 percent, over the 2000 level. The SEWRPC adopted year 2035 Regional Land Use Plan, envisions a total of 333,700 jobs in the County in the year 2035, rather than the year 2035 intermediate projection of 347,200 jobs. The slightly lower job level in the regional plan reflects community land use plans in place at the time the regional plan was prepared.

HISTORIC LAND USE GROWTH AND LAND USE TRENDS ANALYSIS

The SEWRPC land use inventory is intended to serve as a relatively precise record of land use at selected points in time. The land use classification system used in the inventory consists of nine major categories which are divisible into 66 sub-categories, making the inventory suitable for both land use and transportation planning; adaptable to storm water drainage, public utility, and community facility planning; and compatible with other land use classification systems. Aerial photographs serve as the primary basis for identifying existing land use, augmented by field surveys as appropriate. The first regional land use inventory was prepared by SEWRPC in 1963 and has been updated periodically following the preparation of new aerial photography, with the most recent inventory prepared using aerial photographs taken in spring of 2000. As part of the year 2000 land use inventory, the delineation of existing land use was referenced to real property boundary information not available in prior inventories. This change increases the precision of the land use inventory and makes it more useable to public agencies and private interests. As a result of this change, however, year 2000 land use inventory data are not strictly comparable with data from the 1990 and prior inventories. The data remains suitable for denoting general land use trends. The results of the year 2000 land use inventory are presented along with the results of prior land use inventories in Table VII-4 and Map II-1.

Land Use Category	1963	1970	1980	1990	2000
Urban				-//*	
Residential	28,148	35,476	50,745	59,247	75,221
Commercial	1,197	1,831	2,754	3,827	5,351
Industrial	924	1,758	2,747	3,802	5,525
Transportation, Communication, and Utilities	16,079	18,545	21,867	22,805	30,001
Governmental and Institutional	2,550	3,587	4,037	4,215	4,887
Recreational	3,311	4,605	5,756	6,465	8,253
Unused Urban Land	8,509	8,516	8,017	7,025	7,806
Subtotal Urban	60,718	74,318	95,923	107,386	137,044
Non-urban					
Natural Areas					
Surface Water	16,076	16,461	16,753	16,878	16,891
Wetlands	52,588	51,660	51,233	51,978	52,661
Woodlands	31,181	30,818	29,472	29,584	28,931
Subtotal Natural Areas	99,845	98,939	97,458	98,440	98,483
Agricultural	200,241	184,390	161,558	142,428	112,611
Unused Rural and Other Open Lands	10,786	13,943	16,651	23,336	23,397
Subtotal Nonurban	310,872	297,272	275,667	264,204	234,491
Fotal	371,590	371,590	371,590	371,590	371,535

Table VII-4 CHANGE IN LAND USE ACRES IN WAUKESHA COUNTY: 1963-2000

Source: SEWRPC

Residential development was responsible for the most significant land use change within Waukesha County since 1963. Over 47,000 acres of land was converted to residential use as the County gained over 100,000 households between 1960 and 2000. Agricultural lands experienced the greatest loss of any land use within the County between 1963 and 2000. Nearly 88,000 acres of agricultural lands were converted to other land uses.

Urban Land Uses

In 1990, urban land uses, consisting of residential, commercial, industrial, recreational, governmental, institutional, transportation, communication, and utility uses, encompassed about 107,386 acres, equivalent to 160 square miles, or about 28 percent of the County. Residential land comprised the largest urban land use category in the County in 1990, encompassing about 59,247 acres, or about 55 percent of all urban land and 16 percent of the total area of the County. Commercial and industrial lands each encompassed about 7,629 acres, about seven (7) percent of all urban land use and about two (2) percent of the total County area. Land used for governmental and institutional purposes encompassed about 4,200 acres, or about four (4) percent of all urban uses and about one (1) percent of the total area of the County. Lands devoted to intensive recreational uses encompassed about 6,500 acres, some six (6) percent of all urban uses and about two (2) percent of the County. Lands devoted to transportation, communication, and utility uses, including areas used for streets and highways, railways, airports, and utility and communication facilities, totaled about 22,900 acres, or about 22 percent of all urban uses and about six (6) percent of the total County area.

Between 1963 and 1990, urban land uses in the County increased from about 60,718 acres to about 107,386 acres, an increase of about 46,668 acres or about 77 percent. Each of the major urban land use categories increased significantly during this time. The residential land area approximately doubled, the commercial land area approximately tripled, and the industrial land area quadrupled. The transportation, governmental-institutional, and recreational land use categories also increased significantly, by 42 percent, 65 percent, and 86 percent, respectively.

Existing urban land use for cities, villages, and towns in the County is summarized in Table VII-5.

Nonurban Land Uses

In 1990, nonurban lands, consisting of agricultural lands, wetlands, woodlands, and surface water, quarries, landfill sites, and other open lands, comprised about 264,204 acres, the equivalent of 421 square miles, or about 72 percent of the total area of the County. Agricultural land comprised the largest nonurban land use category, encompassing about 142,400 acres, or about 53 percent of all nonurban land and 38 percent of the total area of the County. Wetlands, woodlands, and surface water, in combination, encompassed about 98,400 acres, representing about 37 percent of all nonurban lands and about 27 percent of the County. Quarries and landfill sites, taken together, encompassed about 4,000 acres, representing about two (2) percent of all nonurban lands and about one (1) percent of the total area of the County. Unused lands, consisting of open lands other than wetlands and woodlands and agricultural lands, encompassed about 23,300 acres, representing about nine (9) percent of all nonurban lands and about 23,300 acres, representing about nine (9) percent of all anonurban lands and about seven (7) percent of the total area of the County. Unused lands include extractive uses and landfills.

Nonurban lands in the County decreased by about 46,668 acres, or about 15 percent between 1963 and 1990. Most of this loss resulted from the conversion of agricultural land to urban use. Modest losses in wetlands and woodlands also occurred during this time. The wetland acreage declined by about 600 acres, or about one (1) percent, between 1963 and 1990, while the woodland acreage declined by about 1,600 acres, or five (5) percent.

It should be noted that the change in wetland and woodland acreages between 1963 and 1990, like the change in all land use categories, represents the net change within the County. In this respect, the change in the wetland acreage reported between two inventory years is the net result of decreases in certain areas of the County, due, for example, to drainage or filling activity, and increases in other areas, due, for example, to the abandonment of agricultural drainage systems or to planned wetland restoration efforts. Similarly, the change in the woodland acreage between two inventory years reflects the net effect of the clearing of woodlands in certain areas and the reforestation of other areas.

Nonurban land use for cities, villages, and towns in the County is summarized in Table VII-5.

Table VII-5

LAND USE IN WAUKESHA COUNTY BY MUNICIPALITY: 1990

	Urban													
Community	Resid	lential	Comn	nercial	Indu	strial	Transpo Commu and U	ortation, nication, tilities	Goverr and Inst	nmental itutional	Recre	ational	Sub	total
	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total
Cities (Subtotal)	23,186	27.2	2,163	2.5	1,739	2.0	7,955	9.3	2,087	2.5	2,078	2.4	39,208	45.9
Brookfield	7,533	44.5	894	5.3	230	1.4	2,144	12.6	646	3.8	398	2.3	11,845	69.9
Delafield	1,256	18.3	71	1.0	33	0.5	536	7.8	122	1.8	235	3.4	2,253	32.8
Milwaukee	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.9
Muskego	3,324	14.4	143	0.6	87	0.4	1,002	4.4	193	0.8	406	1.8	5,155	22.4
New Berlin	6,227	26.4	364	1.5	586	2.5	2,061	8.7	422	1.8	384	1.6	10,044	42.6
Oconomowoc	1,049	26.3	135	3.4	83	2.1	428	10.7	153	3.8	280	7.0	2,128	53.3
Waukesha	3,797	34.8	556	5.1	720	6.6	1,783	16.3	551	5.0	375	3.4	7,782	71.2
Villages (Subtotal)	11,245	24.1	873	1.9	1,335	2.9	4,078	8.7	1,165	2.5	1,378	3.0	20,074	43.1
Big Bend	198	41.4	22	4.6	38	7.9	54	11.4	13	2.7	14	2.9	339	70.9
Butler	135	26.6	40	7.9	111	21.9	86	17.0	11	2.2	24	4.7	407	80.3
Chenequa	480	16.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	129	4.4	3	0.1	80	2.7	699	23.4
Dousman	126	15.5	14	1.7	22	2.7	51	6.3	61	7.6	19	2.3	293	36.1
Eagle	222	32.0	5	0.7	6	0.9	74	10.7	24	3.5	30	4.3	361	52.1
Elm Grove	1,354	64.4	68	3.2	13	0.6	377	17.9	129	6.1	58	2.8	1,999	95.0
Hartland	574	27.6	63	3.0	72	3.5	279	13.4	68	3.3	47	2.3	1,103	53.1
Lac La Belle	91	32.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	18	6.4	0	0.0	24	8.5	133	47.1
Lannon	194	12.2	24	1.5	32	2.0	82	5.1	24	1.5	41	2.6	397	24.9
Menomonee Falls	4,539	21.3	402	1.9	728	3.4	1,674	7.9	331	1.6	787	3.7	8,461	39.8
Merton	270	18.7	7	0.5	13	0.9	76	5.3	25	1.7	10	0.7	401	27.8
Mukwonago	431	26.3	65	4.0	35	2.1	196	12.0	124	7.6	54	3.3	905	55.3
Nashotah	186	17.0	9	0.8	10	0.9	123	11.2	5	0.5	4	0.4	337	30.8
North Prairie	332	38.6	18	2.1	25	2.9	84	9.7	11	1.3	11	1.3	481	55.9
Oconomowoc	375	18.9	30	1.5	2	0.1	92	4.6	3	0.2	2	0.1	504	25.4
Pewaukee	427	15.4	51	1.8	85	31	288	10.4	203	73	37	13	1 091	393
Sussex	569	22.9	45	1.8	134	5.4	255	10.3	47	1.9	104	4.2	1,154	46.5
Wales	738	51.0	10	0.7	9	0.6	137	9.5	83	5.7	32	2.2	1,009	69.7
Tourne (Subtetal)	26 704	11.2	804	0.2	722	0.3	10.921	4.5	063	0.4	3 000	1.2	42 122	18.0
Brookfield	032	23.3	221	5.5	0/	2.4	10,001	11.1	56	1.4	3,007	0.8	1 777	10.0
Delafield	1 9/1	14.0	15	0.1	74	0.0	661	18	100	0.7	335	2.4	3 050	22.1
Eagle	1,021	4 5	18	0.1	12	0.0	569	2.5	9	0.0	200	0.9	1 829	8.1
Genesee	2 919	14.1	38	0.2	51	0.2	780	3.8	50	0.2	157	0.8	3 995	19.3
Lisbon	2 511	12.1	25	0.1	38	0.2	906	4.4	132	0.6	90	0.4	3 702	17.8
Merton	2,066	11.2	42	0.2	25	0.1	813	4.4	156	0.9	214	1.2	3,309	18.0
Mukwonago	2,198	10.0	35	0.2	6	0.0	771	3.5	34	0.1	371	1.7	3,415	15.5
Oconomowoc	1,879	8.8	57	0.2	37	0.2	852	4.0	52	0.2	296	1.4	3,173	14.8
Ottawa	1,608	7.0	8	0.0	11	0.0	495	2.2	38	0.2	326	1.4	2,486	10.8
Pewaukee	2,526	15.5	215	1.3	378	2.3	1,810	11.1	126	0.8	261	1.6	5,316	32.6
Summit	1,503	8.1	25	0.1	23	0.1	847	4.6	84	0.5	190	1.0	2,672	14.4
Vernon	2,827	12.9	54	0.3	20	0.1	1,106	5.0	69	0.3	269	1.2	4,345	19.8
Waukesha	2,864	17.4	51	0.3	33	0.2	780	4.8	57	0.4	270	1.6	4,055	24.7
Waukesha County	61,225	16.5	3,840	1.0	3,806	1.0	22,864	6.2	4,215	1.1	6,465	1.8	102,415	27.6

7-16

Table VII-5 (Continued)

LAND USE IN WAUKESHA COUNTY BY MUNICIPALITY: 1990

							Non	ırhan						
Committee	Agric	ultural	Wet	lands	Wood	llands	Surface	e Water	Oth	ner ^a	Sub	total	Total	Area
Community	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total
Cities (Subtotal)	20,516	24.0	8,434	9.9	3,942	4.6	4,523	5.3	8,760	10.3	46,175	54.1	85,383	100.0
Brookfield	852	5.0	1,976	11.7	416	2.4	129	0.8	1,722	10.2	5,095	30.1	16,940	100.0
Delafield	1,804	26.2	265	3.9	902	13.1	997	14.5	651	9.5	4,619	67.2	6,872	100.0
Milwaukee	42	79.2	6	11.3	4	7.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	52	98.1	53	100.0
Muskego	9,596	41.7	2,806	12.2	1,140	4.9	2,802	12.2	1,519	6.6	17,863	77.6	23,018	100.0
New Berlin	6,817	28.9	2,323	9.8	1,283	5.4	128	0.6	2,997	12.7	13,548	57.4	23,592	100.0
Oconomowoc	805	20.2	277	6.9	90	2.3	369	9.2	322	8.1	1,863	46.7	3,991	100.0
Waukesha	600	5.5	781	7.2	107	1.0	98	0.9	1,549	14.2	3,135	28.8	10,917	100.0
Villages (Subtotal)	12,817	27.5	4,478	9.6	2,510	5.4	2,045	4.4	4,663	10.0	26,513	56.9	46,560	100.0
Big Bend	34	7.1	35	7.3	2	0.4	18	3.8	50	10.5	139	29.1	478	100.0
Butler	0	0.0	21	4.1	5	1.0	3	0.6	71	14.0	100	19.7	507	100.0
Chenequa	586	19.8	36	1.2	748	25.2	739	24.9	162	5.5	2,291	76.6	2,963	100.0
Dousman	283	34.9	122	15.0	56	7.0	32	3.9	25	3.1	518	63.9	811	100.0
Eagle	292	42.1	1	0.1	3	0.4	0	0.0	37	5.3	333	47.9	694	100.0
Elm Grove	0	0.0	37	1.8	8	0.4	8	0.4	51	2.4	104	5.0	2,103	100.0
Hartland	203	9.8	195	9.4	125	6.0	4	0.2	447	21.5	974	46.9	2,077	100.0
Lac La Belle	35	12.4	74	26.1	6	2.1	0	0.0	35	12.3	150	52.9	283	100.0
Lannon	461	28.9	187	11.7	71	4.5	5	0.3	473	29.7	1,197	75.1	1,594	100.0
Menomonee Falls	7,255	34.0	2,865	13.4	784	3.7	91	0.4	1,863	8.7	12,858	60.2	21,319	100.0
Merton	886	61.4	42	2.9	67	4.6	17	1.2	31	2.1	1,043	72.2	1,444	100.0
Mukwonago	284	17.4	124	7.6	98	6.0	43	2.6	182	11.1	731	44.7	1,636	100.0
Nashotah	420	38.3	43	3.9	98	8.9	55	5.0	143	13.1	759	69.2	1,096	100.0
North Prairie	186	21.6	16	1.9	21	2.4	0	0.0	157	18.2	380	44.1	861	100.0
Oconomowoc Lake	221	11.1	126	6.4	211	10.6	813	40.9	111	5.6	1,482	74.6	1,986	100.0
Pewaukee	806	29.0	351	12.6	53	1.9	214	7.7	263	9.5	1,687	60.7	2,778	100.0
Sussex	740	29.8	176	7.1	64	2.6	2	0.1	346	13.9	1,328	53.5	2,482	100.0
Wales	105	7.3	27	1.8	90	6.2	1	0.1	216	14.9	439	30.3	1,448	100.0
Towns (Subtotal)	109,096	45.5	39,066	16.3	23,132	9.7	10,310	4.3	14,884	6.2	196,488	82.0	239,648	100.0
Brookfield	322	8.1	1,206	30.1	56	1.4	60	1.5	576	14.4	2,220	55.5	3,997	100.0
Delafield	5,235	37.8	1,023	7.4	1,982	14.3	1,378	10.0	1,165	8.4	10,783	77.9	13,842	100.0
Eagle	11,053	49.1	4,243	18.9	4,073	18.1	322	1.4	982	4.4	20,673	91.9	22,502	100.0
Genesee	9,065	43.6	3,272	15.8	1,832	8.8	106	0.5	2,499	12.0	16,774	80.7	20,769	100.0
Lisbon	11,287	54.4	2,612	12.6	1,138	5.5	76	0.4	1,922	9.3	17,035	82.2	20,737	100.0
Merton	9,134	49.6	1,228	6.7	1,966	10.7	1,611	8.8	1,142	6.2	15,061	82.0	18,397	100.0
Mukwonago	10,793	49.1	4,048	18.4	2,355	10.7	672	3.1	694	3.2	18,562	84.5	21,977	100.0
Oconomowoc	11,909	55.6	2,890	13.5	656	3.0	2,225	10.4	576	2.7	18,256	85.2	21,429	100.0
Ottawa	9,422	41.3	5,075	22.2	4,355	19.1	471	2.1	1,032	4.5	20,355	89.2	22,841	100.0
Pewaukee	5,501	33.7	1,990	12.2	687	4.2	1,040	6.4	1,768	10.9	10,986	67.4	16,302	100.0
Summit	8,193	44.4	3,721	20.1	1,378	7.5	1,838	10.0	658	3.6	15,788	85.6	18,460	100.0
Vernon	10,613	48.3	4,495	20.5	1,481	6.7	395	1.8	643	2.9	17,627	80.2	21,972	100.0
Waukesha	6,589	40.1	3,263	19.9	1,173	7.1	116	0.7	1,227	7.5	12,368	75.3	16,423	100.0
Waukesha County	142,429	38.3	51,978	14.0	29,584	8.0	16,878	4.5	28,307	7.6	269,176	72.4	371,591	100.0

Note: Data for urban land uses includes related off-street parking areas of more than 10 spaces.

^aIncludes extractive, landfill and unused land.

Source: SEWRPC

EXISTING LAND USE INVENTORY

While the previous section of this chapter provides an overview of the historic growth and trends of Waukesha County, this section provides a more detailed description and analysis of the existing land use of the County. For the purposes of this Plan, existing land use is based upon year 2000 data, the most recent detailed inventory of land use completed by SEWRPC. The pattern of land use that existed within the County in 2000, including formal land use amendments approved by Waukesha County through year 2008, is shown on Map VII-1.

Urban Land Uses

As indicated in Table VII-6, urban land uses, consisting of residential, commercial, industrial, recreational, governmental, institutional, and transportation, communication, and utility uses, encompassed about 130,425 acres, equivalent to about 35 percent of the County, in 2000. Residential land comprised the largest urban land use category in the County in 2000, encompassing about 76,075 acres, or about 59 percent of all urban land and 20 percent of the total area of the County. Commercial and industrial lands each encompassed about 5,500 acres, about four (4) percent of all urban land use and about two (2) percent of the total County area. Land used for governmental and institutional purposes encompassed about 4,900 acres, or about four (4) percent of all urban uses and about two (1) percent of the total area of the County. Lands devoted to intensive recreational uses encompassed about 8,416 acres, or about six (6) percent of all urban uses and about two (2) percent of the County. Lands devoted to transportation, communication, and utility uses, including areas used for streets and highways, railways, airports, and utility and communication facilities, totaled about 30,045 acres, or about 26 percent of all urban uses and about sight (8) percent of the total County area.

Nonurban Land Uses

Nonurban lands, consisting of agricultural lands, wetlands, woodlands, and surface water, quarries, landfill sites, and other open lands, comprised about 241,112 acres, the equivalent of about 65 percent of the total area of the County, in 2000. Agricultural land comprised the largest nonurban land use category, encompassing about 112,620 acres, or about 47 percent of all nonurban land and 30 percent of the total area of the County. Wetlands, woodlands, and surface water, in combination, encompassed about 98,400 acres, representing about 41 percent of all nonurban lands and about 27 percent of the County. Other lands consisting of quarries, landfill sites, and unused lands, consisting of open lands other than wetlands and woodlands and agricultural lands, encompassed about 30,017 acres, representing about 12 percent of all nonurban lands and about 30,017 acres, representing about 12 percent of all nonurban lands and about 8 percent of the total area of the County.

Map VII-1 Existing Land Use in Waukesha County: 2000



							U	rban						
Community	Resid	lential	Com	mercial	Indu	ıstrial	Transp Commu and U	ortation, mication Itilities	Gover and Ins	nmental titutional	Recre	eational	Subt	otal
	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total
Cities (Subtotal)	28,968	27.4	3,343	3.2	3,097	2.9	13,007	12.3	2,644	2.5	2,721	2.6	53,781	50.9
Brookfield	7,760	44.5	1,082	6.2	322	1.8	2,768	15.9	689	3.9	540	3.1	13,160	75.4
Delafield	1,655	23.6	172	2.4	32	0.5	714	10.2	182	2.6	223	3.2	2,978	42.5
Milwaukee	0	0.0	0	0.0	32	65.1	3	7.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	36	72.1
Muskego	4,121	17.9	168	0.7	140	0.6	1,521	6.6	222	1.0	459	2.0	6,632	28.8
New Berlin	6,863	29.1	505	2.1	764	3.2	2,681	11.4	473	2.0	494	2.1	11,779	49.9
Oconomowoc	1,209	21.2	180	3.1	239	4.2	693	12.1	175	3.1	274	4.8	2,769	48.5
Pewaukee	2,826	18.9	467	3.1	647	4.3	1,921	12.9	146	1.0	232	1.6	6,239	41.8
Waukesha	4,535	32.5	770	5.5	921	6.6	2,705	19.4	756	5.4	500	3.6	10,188	73.1
Villages (Subtotal)	13,805	26.3	1,337	2.5	2,002	3.8	5,947	11.3	1,327	2.5	2,193	4.2	26,612	50.7
Big Bend	223	16.4	60	4.4	68	5.0	159	11.7	14	1.0	22	1.6	546	40.3
Butler	123	24.2	49	9.6	155	30.4	108	21.2	10	2.0	22	4.3	467	91.7
Chenequa	470	15.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	135	4.6	2	0.1	82	2.8	688	23.3
Dousman	161	17.2	14	1.5	25	2.6	71	7.6	74	7.9	21	2.2	365	39.2
Eagle	289	37.2	5	0.6	23	3.0	110	14.2	30	3.9	31	4.1	488	62.9
Elm Grove	1,309	62.1	60	2.8	14	0.7	441	20.9	126	6.0	57	2.7	2,007	95.3
Hartland	766	26.4	118	4.1	131	4.5	466	16.1	115	4.0	232	8.0	1,827	63.0
Lac La Belle	120	28.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	15	3.5	0	0.0	142	33.5	277	65.5
Lannon	201	12.6	35	2.2	86	5.4	94	5.9	23	1.5	40	2.5	479	30.1
Menomonee Falls	5,250	24.6	596	2.8	969	4.5	2,259	10.6	344	1.6	991	4.6	10,409	48.8
Merton	555	35.3	6	0.4	18	1.1	114	7.2	39	2.5	13	0.8	744	47.4
Mukwonago	599	18.8	114	3.6	69	2.2	461	14.4	136	4.3	89	2.8	1,469	46.0
Nashotah	349	32.0	10	0.9	12	1.1	155	14.2	6	0.5	11	1.0	543	49.8
North Prairie	481	31.7	22	1.4	39	2.5	160	10.6	11	0.7	225	14.8	938	61.7
Oconomowoc Lake	448	22.0	24	1.2	6	0.3	117	5.7	2	0.1	3	0.1	599	29.4
Pewaukee	644	22.3	125	4.3	83	2.9	437	15.1	213	7.4	41	1.4	1,543	53.5
Sussex	1,008	26.6	84	2.2	296	7.8	467	12.3	83	2.2	145	3.8	2,083	55.0
Wales	809	52.8	16	1.1	10	0.7	178	11.7	99	6.5	27	1.7	1,140	74.4
Towns (Subtotal)	33,301	15.6	763	0.4	447	0.2	11,091	5.2	929	0.4	3,502	1.6	50,033	23.5
Brookfield	1,049	29.7	309	8.7	119	3.4	512	14.5	69	1.9	51	1.4	2,110	59.7
Delafield	3,034	22.8	28	0.2	5	0.0	974	7.3	108	0.8	360	2.7	4,508	33.9
Eagle	1,757	7.8	21	0.1	19	0.1	776	3.5	8	0.0	250	1.1	2,832	12.6
Genesee	4,326	21.2	58	0.3	53	0.3	1,071	5.2	57	0.3	197	1.0	5,761	28.2
Lisbon	3,376	17.5	59	0.3	73	0.4	1,181	6.1	135	0.7	512	2.7	5,335	27.6
Merton	3,271	18.2	40	0.2	25	0.1	1,000	5.6	209	1.2	324	1.8	4,869	27.0
Mukwonago	3,156	15.5	37	0.2	5	0.0	839	4.1	39	0.2	385	1.9	4,460	21.9
Oconomowoc	2,266	10.8	60	0.3	59	0.3	1,010	4.8	53	0.3	199	1.0	3,647	17.4
Ottawa	2,277	10.1	9	0.0	14	0.1	612	2.7	35	0.2	390	1.7	3,337	14.9
Summit	2,161	12.7	24	0.1	19	0.1	896	5.3	83	0.5	189	1.1	3,373	19.8
Vernon	3,306	15.7	39	0.2	17	0.1	1,265	6.0	76	0.4	383	1.8	5,085	24.2
Waukesha	3,323	22.8	79	0.5	39	0.3	956	6.6	57	0.4	261	1.8	4,715	32.3
Waukesha County	76,075	20.5	5,443	1.5	5,546	1.5	30,045	8.1	4,900	1.3	8,416	2.3	130,425	35.1

Table VII-6 EXISTING LAND USE IN WAUKESHA COUNTY BY MUNICIPALITY: 2000

Description Description Description Surface Surface <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>Nor</th> <th>nurban</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>								Nor	nurban						
heres braces braces </td <td>Community</td> <td>Agrice</td> <td>ultural</td> <td>Wet</td> <td>lands</td> <td>Woo</td> <td>dlands</td> <td>Surfac</td> <td>e Water</td> <td>Ot</td> <td>ther</td> <td>Sub</td> <td>total</td> <td>Total</td> <td>Area</td>	Community	Agrice	ultural	Wet	lands	Woo	dlands	Surfac	e Water	Ot	ther	Sub	total	Total	Area
Chins Gaitonal) 20,316 19.22 11,320 10.7 4,266 5,677 5,4 10,36 9,85 4,924 4,916 10,000 Brookfield 127 12,2 271 13,3 312 18,8 154 0,9 8,5 4,034 2,75 10,00 Minkacep 0 0.00 6 120 11 16,6 3 5,3 4 9,90 8,5 4,034 7,12 2,00 0,00 Markacep 7974 34,6 2,227 10,08 44 2,81 124 16,3 7,1 15,36 7,12 2,93 1,05 1,00 1,00 Perswake 3,552 42,4 124 140 10,40 1,15 1,10 1,14 5,48 16,0 1,02 1,10 1,10 1,10 1,10 1,10 1,10 1,10 1,10 1,10 1,10 1,10 1,10 1,10 1,10 1,10 1,10 1,10 1,10		Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total
Browkfield 1405 2.3 2.31 3.12 1.8 154 0.00 1.13 6.5 4.23 2.40 1.43 1.50 1.000 Milwauke 0 0 6 1.20 1 1.6 3.53 4 9.00 1.4 2.79 5.00 1000 Milwauke 7.14 3.46 2.922 1.27 1.008 4.4 2.851 1.2.4 1.6.38 7.12 2.3.00 1000 New Berlin 5.12 2.44 4.49 4.61 4.58 1.62 1.44 0.51 5.03 4.00 1.05 1.64 5.01 2.69 3.33 10.00 Vaukesha 500 4.04 1.47 4.2 1.6 1.6 1.4 4.4 1.43 5.00 1.03 3.00 1.00 1.03 3.00 1.00 1.03 3.00 1.00 1.03 3.00 1.00 1.03 3.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00<	Cities (Subtotal)	20,316	19.2	11,330	10.7	4,266	4.0	5,677	5.4	10,336	9.8	51,924	49.1	105,704	100.0
Denindid 1.277 18.2 2.97 1.2.9 997 1.4.2 599 8.5 4.0.41 2.7.5 7.0.12 100.0 Milwaukce 0 0.0 6 12.0 1.0 4.4 2.551 1.6.3 7.1 1.6.38 7.1 2.3.00 100.0 New Berlin 5.1.24 2.1.7 2.0.0 4.4 2.2.1 3.44 6.7 5.48 9.6 2.3.93 5.1.5 7.00 1.0.5 8.697 5.82 14.93 10.0.0 Oconomowore 1.424 2.44 4.4 4.64 1.2 1.24 0.1.567 10.5 8.697 5.82 14.93 10.00 Villages(Subtah) 10.48 2.00 5.10 9.7 2.42 1.6 5.6 4.2 2.809 9.7 1.55 10.00 Buter 0 0.0 0.43 1.3 7.11 2.11 1.21 1.24 1.24 2.81 1.14 2.72 1.21 1.41	Brookfield	405	2.3	2,291	13.1	312	1.8	154	0.9	1,131	6.5	4,293	24.6	17,453	100.0
Minkucke 0 0 6 12.0 11 1.6 3 5.3 4 9.0 1.4 1.7.9 5.00 0000 Muskegin 7.7.7 3.4.6 2.2.2 12.7 1.008 4.4 2.8.51 12.4 13.33 11.814 5.01 2.3.594 10000 Denomewore 1.4.24 2.4.2 4.61 8.1 122 1.2.1 1.3.4 6.7 5.4.8 9.6 2.3.9 5.7.05 10.00 Wankeaha 5.60 4.0 1.65 1.2 1.2.1 1.2.4 0.9 1.7.2 1.2.4 3.7.5 2.6.9 1.3.5 10.00 Wankeaha 5.00 1.1.6 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.3 3.1 3.3 2.4 3.00 1.1 3.3 1.2	Delafield	1,277	18.2	257	3.7	903	12.9	997	14.2	599	8.5	4,034	57.5	7,012	100.0
Maskego 79/4 34.6 2.922 12.7 10.08 4.4 2.851 12.4 1.633 7.1 16.388 7.12 2.3020 1000 New Berlin 5.124 21.7 3.44 6.7 5.48 9.6 2.9 51.5 57.08 100.0 Pewanke 3.552 2.38 1.925 1.29 601 4.0 1.052 7.0 1.567 10.5 8.097 5.2.2 1.333 100.0 Village (Subtal) 10.483 2.02 5.0 4.2 2.2 1.6 2.1 1.6 5.6 4.2 2.8.09 10.0 1.557 10.0 1.55 10.0 Buller 0 0.0 0.21 4.2 2.4 10.2 1.4 2.8 4.2 8.0 2.5.69 4.9.3 5.09 10.0 Cheneya 5.1 1.33 1.13 7.1 2.6.1 10.2 1.4 2.8 4.2 8.0 9.0 4.7 2.1.6	Milwaukee	0	0.0	6	12.0	1	1.6	3	5.3	4	9.0	14	27.9	50	100.0
NewBerlin 5,124 21,24 23,01 9.8 1,154 4.9 112 0.5 3,124 132 11,24 5.7,08 1000 Oconomowo 1,424 24.9 461 8.1 122 160 40 1,567 10.5 70.6 71.55 11.68 12.9 10.0 Wankesha 5.05 4.0 1,167 8.4 165 12.1 14.1 5.46 10.5 5.42 2.60 14.3 5.42 2.60 14.2 5.42 1.6 5.42 2.80 9.9 1.35 10.00 Big Bend 653 4.82 5.7 4.2 4.6 8.4 2.8 4.2 8.3 50.0 10.00 Chenceua 5.21 1.76 3.83 1.33 7.17 2.61 5.71 2.61 2.73 7.7 2.706 1.03 1.24 2.73 7.7 7.7 1.00 Chenceua 0.00 4.3 2.00 1.5 2	Muskego	7,974	34.6	2,922	12.7	1,008	4.4	2,851	12.4	1,633	7.1	16,388	71.2	23,020	100.0
	New Berlin	5,124	21.7	2,301	9.8	1,154	4.9	112	0.5	3,124	13.2	11,814	50.1	23,594	100.0
Personace 3.552 22.8 1.925 1.29 601 1.052 7.0 1.567 1.05 8.697 58.2 1.4,305 100.0 Wankeha 500 4.0 1.167 8.44 165 1.2 124 1.47 5.486 10.5 5.869 5.8.2 1.4,30 100.0 Binder 0 0.0 21 4.2 24 0.4 0.8 2 0.55 1.4 2.8 4.2 8.3 509 100.0 Chenequa 521 1.76 38 1.33 7.01 2.61 7.01 2.15 1.92 6.5 4.2 8.03 509 60.3 1.355 100.0 Chenequa 3.06 2.39 1 0.2 4 0.5 0 0.0 9.0 1.2 1.05 1.07 2.03 7.0 1.05 Eale 6.00 0.0 4.3 2.0 1.0 2.0 2.63 <th2.1< th=""> 1.21 1.00</th2.1<>	Oconomowoc	1,424	24.9	461	8.1	122	2.1	384	6.7	548	9.6	2,939	51.5	5,708	100.0
Watteshan 560 4.0 1,177 8.4 165 1.2 124 0.90 1.729 12.4 3.755 2.69 1.3933 100.0 Villages (Subtotal) 10.83 20.0 5,105 9.7 1.25 10.0 10.0 12.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 <td>Pewaukee</td> <td>3,552</td> <td>23.8</td> <td>1,925</td> <td>12.9</td> <td>601</td> <td>4.0</td> <td>1,052</td> <td>7.0</td> <td>1,567</td> <td>10.5</td> <td>8,697</td> <td>58.2</td> <td>14,936</td> <td>100.0</td>	Pewaukee	3,552	23.8	1,925	12.9	601	4.0	1,052	7.0	1,567	10.5	8,697	58.2	14,936	100.0
village Subtoral) 10.483 20.0 51.05 9.7 2.647 5.0 2.147 4.1 5.486 10.5 25.869 49.3 52.480 100.0 Big Bend 653 48.2 57 4.2 22 1.6 21 1.4 5.8 21 1.35 100.0 Chenequa 521 17.6 3.8 1.3 771 26.1 741 25.1 192 6.5 2.263 76.7 2.952 100.0 Dousman 326 35.0 133 14.3 50 5.3 2.8 3.0 31 3.3 56.6 6.0 0.0 96 12.4 2.7 100.0 Eagle 30 7.2 84 19.9 162 5.6 8 0.3 6.22 2.15 1.071 37.0 2.899 100.0 Lance La Belle 30 7.2 84 19.9 2.02 12.7 65 131 0.6 1.90 5.1 <	Waukesha	560	4.0	1,167	8.4	165	1.2	124	0.9	1,729	12.4	3,745	26.9	13,933	100.0
Big Bard65348.2574.2221.6211.6564.28099.71.3551000Butler00.0214.24.24.00.82.20.51.42.84.28.35091000Chenequa5211.7.6381.37712.7.17712.7.11721.1026.52.83.03.13.356860.89.33100.0Eagle1862.3.910.240.500.09.01.22.89.001.001.00Hartland511.72.297.91625.680.36222.151.013.702.3.91000Lac La Belle307.28419.9661.520.50.36428.181.446.91.5.32.9Menomere Falls5.1512.422.9.5013.87.783.613.10.61.9069.09.165.122.1.25100.0Mexonago7602.3.83.9912.51003.18.72.737611.81.725.403.1.90100.0Makwonago7602.3.83.9912.51003.18.72.737611.81.725.403.1.91100.0Nathah2.581547.62.0610.18.153.991477.21.407.6 <td>Villages (Subtotal)</td> <td>10,483</td> <td>20.0</td> <td>5,105</td> <td>9.7</td> <td>2,647</td> <td>5.0</td> <td>2,147</td> <td>4.1</td> <td>5,486</td> <td>10.5</td> <td>25,869</td> <td>49.3</td> <td>52,480</td> <td>100.0</td>	Villages (Subtotal)	10,483	20.0	5,105	9.7	2,647	5.0	2,147	4.1	5,486	10.5	25,869	49.3	52,480	100.0
Butler00.0214.24.24.70.8220.5142.84.228.35.091000Chenequa52117.63.81.377126.174125.11926.52.26376.72.9521000Engle18623.9110.2440.500.09612.428737.177.5100.0End Gove00.0432.0120.670.3381.8994.72.106100.0Hartland511.72.997.901625.680.362221.51.07137.02.899100.0Lac La Belle307.28419.9161.520.34472.811.11449.94.721.503100.0Merion6392.492.0212.7634.050.34472.811.11449.91.533100.0Mukwonago76023.839912.51003.1872.737611.81.72254.03.190100.0North Parine20213.31910.2604.490.62.851813.835.1512.042.041Mukwonago76023.839912.51003.1872.737611.81.7254.03.190North Parine20.2	Big Bend	653	48.2	57	4.2	22	1.6	21	1.6	56	4.2	809	59.7	1,355	100.0
Chenequa 521 17.6 38 1.3 771 26.1 741 25.1 192 6.5 2.263 76.7 2.952 100.0 Dousman 326 35.0 133 143 50 5.3 28 3.0 31 33 568 60.8 933 100.0 Engle 186 23.9 1 0.2 4 0.5 0 0.0 96 12.4 28.7 37.1 77.5 100.0 Hartland 51 1.7.7 22.9 7.9 162 5.6 8 0.3 622 1.5 1.071 37.0 2.89 100.0 Lannon 397 24.9 202 12.7 63 4.0 5 13 4.1 63 4.7 36 1.31 0.6 1.36 4.9 1.01 1.43 2.8 1.01 1.43 1.9 1.00.0 Marcomance Fals 2.4.5 1.5 1.01 1.4.6 <td>Butler</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0</td> <td>21</td> <td>4.2</td> <td>4</td> <td>0.8</td> <td>2</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>14</td> <td>2.8</td> <td>42</td> <td>8.3</td> <td>509</td> <td>100.0</td>	Butler	0	0.0	21	4.2	4	0.8	2	0.5	14	2.8	42	8.3	509	100.0
Douman32635.013314.3505.3283.03113.356860.891.3100.0Eagle18623.910.240.500.09612.42.873.71775100.0Hartland511.722.97.91625.6880.362221.51.0713.702.899100.0Lac La Belle307.28.419.961.520.58.80.364221.51.0713.702.899100.0Lannon39724.920.212.7634.050.34.4728.11.114.654.251.00.0Menomonee Falls5.15124.22.95013.87783.61310.61.068.910.91651.221.325100.0Menomonee Falls5.15124.22.95013.8913.56111.4432.882752.61.571100.0Makonago76023.839912.51003.1872.771.114332.882752.61.571100.0Nashotah25823.61.547.620.61.1187.53.991.477.21.4407.062.0491100.0North Pairie20.213.3191.226.61.41371.32.041.413.58 <th< td=""><td>Chenequa</td><td>521</td><td>17.6</td><td>38</td><td>1.3</td><td>771</td><td>26.1</td><td>741</td><td>25.1</td><td>192</td><td>6.5</td><td>2,263</td><td>76.7</td><td>2,952</td><td>100.0</td></th<>	Chenequa	521	17.6	38	1.3	771	26.1	741	25.1	192	6.5	2,263	76.7	2,952	100.0
Eagle 186 23.9 1 0.2 4 0.5 0 0.0 96 12.4 2.87 37.1 177.5 100.0 Elm Grove 0 0.0 43 2.0 12 0.6 7 0.3 38 1.8 99 4.7 2,106 100.0 Lac La Belle 30 7.2 84 19.9 6 1.5 2 0.5 2.3 5.4 1.46 34.5 422 100.0 Lannon 397 24.9 202 12.7 6.3 4.0 5 0.3 447 2.81 1.114 69.9 1.53 100.0 Merton 639 40.7 36 2.3 92 5.8 17 1.1 1.43 2.8 827 5.2.6 1.571 100.0 Makvonago 760 23.8 399 12.5 100 3.1 87 2.7 376 11.8 1.72 5.0.2 1.091 100.0	Dousman	326	35.0	133	14.3	50	5.3	28	3.0	31	3.3	568	60.8	933	100.0
Elm Grove 0 0.0 43 2.0 12 0.6 7 0.3 38 1.8 99 4.7 2.106 1000 Hariland 51 1.7 229 7.9 162 5.6 8 0.3 622 21.5 1.071 37.0 2.899 100.0 Lanc La Belle 30 7.2 84 19.9 6 1.5 2 0.5 2.3 5.4 1.14 6.99 1.5 21.0 1.0.0 3.45 1.11 4.3 2.8 8.27 5.2.6 1.571 100.0 Menome Falls 5.151 24.2 2.950 13.8 778 3.6 1.11 4.3 2.8 8.27 5.2.6 1.571 100.0 Mashath 258 23.6 43 3.9 91 8.3 5.6 5.1 101 9.2 547 50.2 1.001 North Pairie 202 13.3 19 1.2 66 4.4	Eagle	186	23.9	1	0.2	4	0.5	0	0.0	96	12.4	287	37.1	775	100.0
Hartland 51 1.7 229 7.9 162 5.6 8 0.3 622 21.5 1.071 37.0 2,899 100.0 Lac La Belle 30 7.2 84 19.9 6 1.5 2 0.5 23 5.4 1.16 34.5 422 100.0 Lannon 397 24.9 202 12.7 6.3 4.0 5 0.3 447 28.1 1.11 6.99 1.252 100.0 Meromonee Falls 5.151 24.2 2.950 13.8 77.8 3.6 131 0.6 1.06 8.8 18.8 10.1 1.1 43 2.8 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 <td< td=""><td>Elm Grove</td><td>0</td><td>0.0</td><td>43</td><td>2.0</td><td>12</td><td>0.6</td><td>7</td><td>0.3</td><td>38</td><td>1.8</td><td>99</td><td>4.7</td><td>2,106</td><td>100.0</td></td<>	Elm Grove	0	0.0	43	2.0	12	0.6	7	0.3	38	1.8	99	4.7	2,106	100.0
	Hartland	51	1.7	229	7.9	162	5.6	8	0.3	622	21.5	1,071	37.0	2,899	100.0
Lannon 397 24.9 202 12.7 63 4.0 5 0.3 447 28.1 1,114 69.9 1,593 100.0 Menomonee Falls 5,151 24.2 2,950 13.8 778 3.6 131 0.6 1,906 8.9 10,916 51.2 21,325 100.0 Methom 639 40.7 36 2.3 92 5.8 17 1.1 43 2.8 827 52.6 1,571 100.0 Nashotah 258 23.6 43 3.9 91 8.3 56 5.1 101 9.2 547 50.2 1.091 100.0 North Pairie 202 13.3 19 1.2 66 4.4 9 0.6 285 18.8 581 38.3 1,519 100.0 Lake 119 5.8 154 7.6 20.06 10.1 815 39.9 147 7.2 1,440 7.5 2.84	Lac La Belle	30	7.2	84	19.9	6	1.5	2	0.5	23	5.4	146	34.5	422	100.0
Menomone Falls 5,151 24.2 2,950 13.8 778 3.6 131 0.6 1,906 8.9 10,916 51.2 21,325 100.0 Merton 639 40.7 36 2.3 92 5.8 17 1.1 43 2.8 827 52.6 1,571 100.0 Mukwonago 760 23.8 399 12.5 100 3.1 87 2.7 376 11.8 1,722 54.0 3,190 100.0 Nashotah 258 2.36 43 3.9 91 8.3 56 5.1 101 9.2 54.7 50.2 1,001 100.0 North Pririe 202 13.3 19 1.2 66 4.4 9 0.6 285 18.8 581 3.8.3 1,519 100.0 Coconomowce 116 1.0 81.5 39.9 14.7 7.2 1,440 7.6 2,848 1000.0 Sussex	Lannon	397	24.9	202	12.7	63	4.0	5	0.3	447	28.1	1,114	69.9	1,593	100.0
Merton 639 40.7 36 2.3 92 5.8 17 1.1 43 2.8 827 52.6 1,571 100.0 Mukwonago 760 23.8 399 12.5 100 3.1 87 2.7 376 11.8 1,722 54.0 3,190 100.0 Nashotah 258 23.6 43 3.9 91 8.3 56 5.1 101 9.2 547 50.2 1,091 100.0 North Prairie 202 13.3 19 1.2 66 4.4 9 0.6 285 18.8 581 38.3 1,519 100.0 Oconomowoc 119 5.8 154 7.6 206 10.1 815 39.9 147 7.2 1,440 7.6 2,040 100.0 Sussex 757 20.0 266 7.0 112 3.0 16 0.4 551 14.6 1,72 64 1,532 <	Menomonee Falls	5,151	24.2	2,950	13.8	778	3.6	131	0.6	1,906	8.9	10,916	51.2	21,325	100.0
Mukwonago 760 23.8 399 12.5 100 3.1 87 2.7 376 11.8 1,722 54.0 3,190 100.0 Nashotah 258 23.6 43 3.9 91 8.3 56 5.1 101 9.2 547 50.2 1,091 100.0 North Prairie 202 13.3 19 1.2 66 4.4 9 0.6 285 18.8 581 38.3 1,519 100.0 Coonomowoc 119 5.8 154 7.6 206 10.1 815 39.9 147 7.2 1,440 70.6 2,040 100.0 Sussex 757 20.0 266 7.0 112 3.0 16 0.4 551 14.6 1,702 45.0 3,785 100.0 Wales 126 8.2 23 1.5 72 4.7 1 0.1 170 11.1 392 25.6 1,532	Merton	639	40.7	36	2.3	92	5.8	17	1.1	43	2.8	827	52.6	1,571	100.0
Nashotah 258 23.6 43 3.9 91 8.3 56 5.1 101 9.2 547 50.2 1,091 100.0 North Prairie Oconomovoc 202 13.3 19 1.2 66 4.4 9 0.6 285 18.8 581 38.3 1,519 100.0 Oconomovoc 119 5.8 154 7.6 206 10.1 815 39.9 147 7.2 1,440 70.6 2,040 100.0 Pewaukee 307 10.6 406 14.1 37 1.3 204 7.1 388 13.4 1,341 46.5 2,844 100.0 Sussex 757 20.0 266 7.0 112 3.0 16 0.4 551 14.6 1,702 45.0 3,785 100.0 Wales 126 8.2 233 1.5 72 4.7 1 0.1 170 11.1 392 25.6 15.32<	Mukwonago	760	23.8	399	12.5	100	3.1	87	2.7	376	11.8	1,722	54.0	3,190	100.0
North Prairie 202 13.3 19 1.2 66 4.4 9 0.6 285 18.8 581 38.3 1,519 100.0 Oconomowe 119 5.8 154 7.6 206 10.1 815 39.9 147 7.2 1,440 70.6 2,040 100.0 Pewaukee 307 10.6 406 14.1 37 1.3 204 7.1 388 13.4 1,341 46.5 2,844 100.0 Sussex 757 20.0 266 7.0 112 3.0 16 0.4 551 14.6 1,702 45.0 3,785 100.0 Wales 126 8.2 23 1.5 72 4.7 1 0.1 170 11.1 392 25.6 1,532 100.0 Gwns (Subtotal) 81,822 38.4 36,216 17.0 22,019 10.3 9,068 4.3 14,195 6.7 163,319 7.5	Nashotah	258	23.6	43	3.9	91	8.3	56	5.1	101	9.2	547	50.2	1,091	100.0
Occommowce Lake 119 5.8 154 7.6 206 10.1 815 39.9 147 7.2 1.440 70.6 2.040 100.0 Pewaukee 307 10.6 406 14.1 37 1.3 204 7.1 388 13.4 1.341 46.5 2.844 100.0 Sussex 757 20.0 266 7.0 112 3.0 16 0.4 551 14.6 1.702 45.0 3.785 100.0 Wales 126 8.2 23 1.5 72 4.7 1 0.1 170 11.1 392 25.6 1,532 100.0 Brookfield 169 4.8 911 25.8 39 1.1 37 1.1 268 7.6 1,426 40.3 3,536 100.0 Brookfield 169 4.8 911 25.8 39 1.1 37 1.1 268 7.6 1,426 40.3 3,536 <td>North Prairie</td> <td>202</td> <td>13.3</td> <td>19</td> <td>1.2</td> <td>66</td> <td>4.4</td> <td>9</td> <td>0.6</td> <td>285</td> <td>18.8</td> <td>581</td> <td>38.3</td> <td>1,519</td> <td>100.0</td>	North Prairie	202	13.3	19	1.2	66	4.4	9	0.6	285	18.8	581	38.3	1,519	100.0
Pewaukee 307 10.6 406 14.1 37 1.3 204 7.1 388 13.4 1,341 46.5 2,884 100.0 Sussex 757 20.0 266 7.0 112 3.0 16 0.4 551 14.6 1,702 45.0 3,785 100.0 Wales 126 8.2 23 1.5 72 4.7 1 0.1 170 11.1 392 25.6 1,532 100.0 Towns (Subtotal) 81,822 38.4 36,216 17.0 22,019 10.3 9,068 4.3 14,195 6.7 163,319 7.6.5 213,352 100.0 Brookfield 169 4.8 911 25.8 39 1.1 37 1.1 268 7.6 1,426 40.3 3,536 100.0 Brookfield 169 4.4.3 1,617 18.6 313 1.4 1,426 6.4 19,570 87.4 22,402	Oconomowoc Lake	119	5.8	154	7.6	206	10.1	815	39.9	147	7.2	1.440	70.6	2.040	100.0
Sussex 757 20.0 266 7.0 112 3.0 16 0.4 551 14.6 1.702 45.0 3.785 100.0 Wales 126 8.2 23 1.5 72 4.7 1 0.1 170 11.1 392 25.6 1,532 100.0 Towns (Subtotal) 81,822 38.4 36,216 17.0 22,019 10.3 9,068 4.3 14,195 6.7 163,319 7.6.5 213,352 100.0 Brookfield 169 4.8 911 25.8 39 1.1 37 1.1 268 7.6 1,426 40.3 3,536 100.0 Brookfield 3.235 24.4 1,039 7.8 2,046 15.4 1,387 10.4 1,064 8.0 8,772 66.1 13,280 100.0 Genesee 7,226 35.4 3,298 16.1 1,752 8.6 112 0.5 2,287 11.2 14,675 <td>Pewaukee</td> <td>307</td> <td>10.6</td> <td>406</td> <td>14.1</td> <td>37</td> <td>1.3</td> <td>204</td> <td>7.1</td> <td>388</td> <td>13.4</td> <td>1.341</td> <td>46.5</td> <td>2.884</td> <td>100.0</td>	Pewaukee	307	10.6	406	14.1	37	1.3	204	7.1	388	13.4	1.341	46.5	2.884	100.0
Wales 126 8.2 2.3 1.5 72 4.7 1 0.1 170 11.1 392 25.6 1,532 100.0 Towns (Subtotal) 81,822 38.4 36,216 17.0 22,019 10.3 9,068 4.3 14,195 6.7 163,319 76.5 213,352 100.0 Brookfield 169 4.8 911 25.8 39 1.1 37 1.1 268 7.6 1426 40.3 3,536 100.0 Delafield 3,235 24.4 1,039 7.8 2,046 15.4 1,387 10.4 1,064 8.0 8,772 66.1 13,280 100.0 Genesee 7,226 35.4 3,298 16.1 1,752 8.6 112 0.5 2,287 11.2 14,675 71.8 20,436 100.0 Lisbon 8,162 42.3 2,603 13.5 944 4.9 82 0.4 2,175 11.3 13	Sussex	757	20.0	266	7.0	112	3.0	16	0.4	551	14.6	1.702	45.0	3.785	100.0
Towns (Subtotal) 81,822 38.4 36,216 17.0 22,019 10.3 9,068 4.3 14,195 6.7 163,319 76.5 213,352 100.0 Brookfield 169 4.8 911 25.8 39 1.1 37 1.1 268 7.6 1.426 40.3 3,536 100.0 Delafield 3.235 24.4 1,039 7.8 2,046 15.4 1,387 10.4 1,064 8.0 8,772 66.1 13,280 100.0 Eagle 9,463 42.2 4,194 18.7 4,173 18.6 313 1.4 1,426 6.4 19,570 87.4 22,402 100.0 Genesee 7,226 35.4 3,298 16.1 1,752 8.6 112 0.5 2,287 11.2 14,675 71.8 20,436 100.0 Merton 6,896 38.3 1,265 7.0 1,987 11.0 1,613 9.0 1,381 7	Wales	126	8.2	23	1.5	72	4.7	1	0.1	170	11.1	392	25.6	1,532	100.0
Brookfield 169 4.8 911 25.8 39 1.1 37 1.1 268 7.6 1.426 40.3 3,536 100.0 Delafield 3.235 24.4 1,039 7.8 2,046 15.4 1,387 10.4 1,064 8.0 8,772 66.1 13,280 100.0 Eagle 9,463 42.2 4,194 18.7 4,173 18.6 313 1.4 1,426 6.4 19,570 87.4 22,402 100.0 Genesee 7,226 35.4 3,298 16.1 1,752 8.6 112 0.5 2,287 11.2 14,675 71.8 20,436 100.0 Lisbon 8,162 42.3 2,603 13.5 944 4.9 82 0.4 2,175 11.3 13,966 72.4 19,301 100.0 Mukwonago 8,288 40.7 3,879 19.0 2,185 10.7 635 3.1 931 4.6 1	Towns (Subtotal)	81.822	38.4	36,216	17.0	22,019	10.3	9,068	4.3	14,195	6.7	163,319	76.5	213,352	100.0
Delafield 3,235 24.4 1,039 7.8 2,046 15.4 1,387 10.4 1,064 8.0 8,772 66.1 13,280 100.0 Eagle 9,463 42.2 4,194 18.7 4,173 18.6 313 1.4 1,426 6.4 19,570 87.4 22,402 100.0 Genesee 7,226 35.4 3,298 16.1 1,752 8.6 112 0.5 2,287 11.2 14,675 71.8 20,436 100.0 Lisbon 8,162 42.3 2,603 13.5 944 4.9 82 0.4 2,175 11.3 13,966 72.4 19,301 100.0 Merton 6,896 38.3 1,265 7.0 1,987 11.0 1,613 9.0 1,381 7.7 13,143 73.0 18,013 100.0 Mukwonago 8,288 40.7 3,879 19.0 2,185 10.7 635 3.1 931 4.6	Brookfield	169	4.8	911	25.8	39	1.1	37	1.1	268	7.6	1,426	40.3	3,536	100.0
Eagle 9,463 4.2.2 4,194 18.7 4,173 18.6 313 1.4 1,426 6.4 19,570 87.4 22,402 100.0 Genesee 7,226 35.4 3,298 16.1 1,752 8.6 112 0.5 2,287 11.2 14,675 71.8 20,436 100.0 Lisbon 8,162 42.3 2,603 13.5 944 4.9 82 0.4 2,175 11.3 13,966 72.4 19,301 100.0 Merton 6,896 38.3 1,265 7.0 1,987 11.0 1,613 9.0 1,381 7.7 13,143 73.0 18,013 100.0 Mukwonago 8,288 40.7 3,879 19.0 2,185 10.7 635 3.1 931 4.6 15,918 78.1 20,378 100.0 Oconomowoc 10,685 51.1 2,880 13.8 691 3.3 2,199 10.5 828 4.0	Delafield	3,235	24.4	1.039	7.8	2.046	15.4	1,387	10.4	1.064	8.0	8,772	66.1	13,280	100.0
Genesee 7,226 35.4 3,298 16.1 1,752 8.6 112 0.5 2,287 11.2 14,675 71.8 20,436 100.0 Lisbon 8,162 42.3 2,603 13.5 944 4.9 82 0.4 2,175 11.3 13,966 72.4 19,301 100.0 Merton 6,896 38.3 1,265 7.0 1,987 11.0 1,613 9.0 1,381 7.7 13,143 73.0 18,013 100.0 Mukwonago 8,288 40.7 3,879 19.0 2,185 10.7 635 3.1 931 4.6 15,918 78.1 20,378 100.0 Oconomowoc 10,685 51.1 2,880 13.8 691 3.3 2,199 10.5 828 4.0 17,284 82.6 20,931 100.0 Ottawa 8,058 35.9 5,028 22.4 4,516 20.1 496 2.2 1,011 4.5	Eagle	9,463	42.2	4,194	18.7	4,173	18.6	313	1.4	1,426	6.4	19,570	87.4	22,402	100.0
Lisbon 8,162 42.3 2,603 13.5 944 4.9 82 0.4 2,175 11.3 13,966 72.4 19,301 100.0 Merton 6,896 38.3 1,265 7.0 1,987 11.0 1,613 9.0 1,381 7.7 13,143 73.0 18,013 100.0 Mukwonago 8,288 40.7 3,879 19.0 2,185 10.7 635 3.1 931 4.6 15,918 78.1 20,378 100.0 Oconomowoc 10,685 51.1 2,880 13.8 691 3.3 2,199 10.5 828 4.0 17,284 82.6 20,931 100.0 Ottawa 8,058 35.9 5,028 22.4 4,516 20.1 496 2.2 1,011 4.5 19,110 85.1 22,447 100.0 Summit 6,025 35.4 3,642 21.4 1,315 7.7 1,780 10.5 891 5.2	Genesee	7,226	35.4	3,298	16.1	1,752	8.6	112	0.5	2,287	11.2	14,675	71.8	20,436	100.0
Merton 6,896 38.3 1,265 7.0 1,987 11.0 1,613 9.0 1,381 7.7 13,143 73.0 18,013 100.0 Mukwonago 8,288 40.7 3,879 19.0 2,185 10.7 635 3.1 931 4.6 15,918 78.1 20,378 100.0 Oconomowoc 10,685 51.1 2,880 13.8 691 3.3 2,199 10.5 828 4.0 17,284 82.6 20,931 100.0 Ottawa 8,058 35.9 5,028 22.4 4,516 20.1 496 2.2 1,011 4.5 19,110 85.1 22,447 100.0 Summit 6,025 35.4 3,642 21.4 1,315 7.7 1,780 10.5 891 5.2 13,653 80.2 17,026 100.0 Vernon 8,855 42.1 4,474 21.3 1,340 6.4 336 1.6 928 4.4	Lisbon	8,162	42.3	2,603	13.5	944	4.9	82	0.4	2,175	11.3	13,966	72.4	19,301	100.0
Mukwonago 8,288 40.7 3,879 19.0 2,185 10.7 635 3.1 931 4.6 15,918 78.1 20,378 100.0 Oconomowoe 10,685 51.1 2,880 13.8 691 3.3 2,199 10.5 828 4.0 17,284 82.6 20,391 100.0 Ottawa 8,058 35.9 5,028 22.4 4,516 20.1 496 2.2 1,011 4.5 19,110 85.1 22,447 100.0 Summit 6,025 35.4 3,642 21.4 1,315 7.7 1,780 10.5 891 5.2 13,653 80.2 17,026 100.0 Vernon 8,855 42.1 4,474 21.3 1,340 6.4 336 1.6 928 4.4 15,934 75.8 21,019 100.0 Waukesha 4,758 32.6 3,001 20.6 1,030 7.1 76 0.5 1,002 6.9	Merton	6,896	38.3	1,265	7.0	1,987	11.0	1,613	9.0	1,381	7.7	13,143	73.0	18,013	100.0
Oconomowoe 10,685 51.1 2,880 13.8 691 3.3 2,199 10.5 828 4.0 17,284 82.6 20,931 100.0 Ottawa 8,058 35.9 5,028 22.4 4,516 20.1 496 2.2 1,011 4.5 19,110 85.1 22,447 100.0 Summit 6,025 35.4 3,642 21.4 1,315 7.7 1,780 10.5 891 5.2 13,653 80.2 17,026 100.0 Vernon 8,855 42.1 4,474 21.3 1,340 6.4 336 1.6 928 4.4 15,934 75.8 21,019 100.0 Waukesha 4,758 32.6 3,001 20.6 1,030 7.1 76 0.5 1,002 6.9 9,868 67.7 14,584 100.0 Waukesha 4,758 32.6 3,001 20.6 1,030 7.1 76 0.5 1,002 6.9	Mukwonago	8,288	40.7	3,879	19.0	2,185	10.7	635	3.1	931	4.6	15,918	78.1	20,378	100.0
Ottawa 8,058 35.9 5,028 22.4 4,516 20.1 496 2.2 1,011 4.5 19,110 85.1 22,447 100.0 Summit 6,025 35.4 3,642 21.4 1,315 7.7 1,780 10.5 891 5.2 13,653 80.2 17,026 100.0 Vernon 8,855 42.1 4,474 21.3 1,340 6.4 336 1.6 928 4.4 15,934 75.8 21,019 100.0 Waukesha 4,758 32.6 3,001 20.6 1,030 7.1 76 0.5 1,002 6.9 9,868 67.7 14,584 100.0 Waukesha 4,758 32.6 3,001 20.6 1,030 7.1 76 0.5 1,002 6.9 9,868 67.7 14,584 100.0	Oconomowoc	10,685	51.1	2,880	13.8	691	3.3	2,199	10.5	828	4.0	17,284	82.6	20,931	100.0
Summit 6,025 35.4 3,642 21.4 1,315 7.7 1,780 10.5 891 5.2 13,653 80.2 17,026 100.0 Vernon 8,855 42.1 4,474 21.3 1,340 6.4 336 1.6 928 4.4 15,934 75.8 21,019 100.0 Waukesha 4,758 32.6 3,001 20.6 1,030 7.1 76 0.5 1,002 6.9 9,868 67.7 14,584 100.0 Waukesha 4,758 32.6 3,001 20.6 1,030 7.1 76 0.5 1,002 6.9 9,868 67.7 14,584 100.0	Ottawa	8,058	35.9	5,028	22.4	4,516	20.1	496	2.2	1,011	4.5	19,110	85.1	22,447	100.0
Vernon 8,855 42.1 4,474 21.3 1,340 6.4 336 1.6 928 4.4 15,934 75.8 21,019 100.0 Waukesha 4,758 32.6 3,001 20.6 1,030 7.1 76 0.5 1,002 6.9 9,868 67.7 14,584 100.0 Waukesha 4,758 32.6 3,001 20.6 1,030 7.1 76 0.5 1,002 6.9 9,868 67.7 14,584 100.0 Waukesha 4,758 32.6 51.651 14.2 28,923 7.8 16,893 4.5 30,017 8.1 241,113 6.40 271,837 100.0	Summit	6,025	35.4	3,642	21.4	1,315	7.7	1,780	10.5	891	5.2	13,653	80.2	17,026	100.0
Waukesha 4,758 32.6 3,001 20.6 1,030 7.1 76 0.5 1,002 6.9 9,868 67.7 14,584 100.0 Waukesha 4,758 32.6 3,001 20.6 1,030 7.1 76 0.5 1,002 6.9 9,868 67.7 14,584 100.0 Waukesha County 112,620 30.3 52,651 14.2 28,032 7.8 16,602 4.5 30,017 8.1 241,112 6.40 271,627 100.0	Vernon	8,855	42.1	4,474	21.3	1,340	6.4	336	1.6	928	4.4	15,934	75.8	21,019	100.0
Waykasha Causty 112 620 20.2 52 651 142 28 022 7.8 16 002 4.5 20 017 81 241 112 64.0 271 527 100.0	Waukesha	4,758	32.6	3,001	20.6	1,030	7.1	76	0.5	1,002	6.9	9,868	67.7	14,584	100.0
waukesha county 112,020 50.3 52,031 14.2 20,352 7.6 10,052 4.5 50,017 6.1 241,112 64.9 571,557 100.0	Waukesha County	112,620	30.3	52,651	14.2	28,932	7.8	16,892	4.5	30,017	8.1	241,112	64.9	371,537	100.0

Table VII-6 (Continued) EXISTING LAND USE IN WAUKESHA COUNTY BY MUNICIPALITY: 2000

Note: In 1999, the Town of Pewaukee incorporated as a City. Source: SEWRPC

RECOMMENDED LAND USE PLAN

The year 2035 county land use plan was developed to meet the established planning objectives and standards presented in Chapter 2 of this Plan insofar as practicable, using the information and plan design concepts set forth in the previous sections of this Chapter. The plan was designed to accommodate the intermediate population, household and employment projections for the County. Map VII -2 presents the recommended land use plan for Waukesha County for the year 2035. The map shows urban areas in the County as envisioned under the plan including suburban areas, which are neither truly urban or rural in character; primary environmental corridorsi.e., areas containing concentrations of the best remaining elements of the natural resource base-which are recommended for preservation in essentially natural open uses; and rural areas consisting of prime agricultural land, other agricultural land, rural-density residential land, and other open lands. The various components of the land use plan, as depicted on Map VII-2, are described in this section. Table VII-8 presents the planned land uses by municipality for year 2035.

Basic Definitions

Urban Land and Urban Development

For purposes of the 2035 recommended land use plan, "urban land" or "urban development" is defined as intensively developed areas devoted to urban-density residential, commercial, industrial, governmental and institutional, recreational, mixed use, transportation and utility and communication uses, that are serviced by public infrastructure such as sewer, water and public transit.

"Commercial and/or Office Park" development is defined as land devoted to retail, office, service activities, general business activities, and/or research and development and related off-street parking.

"Governmental and Institutional" development is defined as areas for government and public and private institutional buildings, facilities and grounds such as schools, churches, libraries, cultural facilities, nonprofit charitable organizations, hospitals, and police and fire stations, that have a direct bearing on the quality of life and on public safety.

"Highway and Railway Rights-of-Way" are federal, state and county highways, railroad rights-of-way, and parking associated with transportation systems.

"Industrial" development is defined as land devoted to manufacturing, wholesaling, storage activities, attendant offices and related off-street parking and may include office uses or take the form of a business park.



"Recreational" land use is defined as area devoted to public and private general use recreation including golf, baseball, swimming, tennis, ice skating. In addition, recreational lands include natural resource-based education and self-actualized recreational activities such as hiking, camping, picnicking, skiing and horseback riding.

"Suburban Density" residential development is defined as residential development at a densities ranging from 1.5 to 4.9 acres of area per dwelling unit. Such development is neither truly urban nor rural in character. Development at these densities generally precludes the provision of centralized sewer and water supply service and other urban amenities. While such development occurs and accordingly must be accommodated in the land use plan, it is only recommended while maintaining an overall residential density of 5 acres in "rural

Deleted: development is defined as development ain residential and could contain a combination of ublic, institutional, office, retail, service, light industria earch and development, and/or other commercial us cluding off street parking and may take the form ss park.¶

development" areas. "Suburban I Density" is residential development at 1.5 to 2.9 acres per dwelling unit. "Suburban II Density" is residential development at 3.0 to 4.9 acres per dwelling unit.

"Transportation, Communication and Utilities" land uses include areas used for airports, and utility and communication facilities.

"Urban Density Residential Development" includes the following density ranges: "high density" (less than 6,000 square feet of area per dwelling unit); "medium-density" (6,000 - 19,999 square feet of area per dwelling unit); and "low-density" (20,000 square feet to 1.4 acres of area per dwelling unit). The term "urban service area" refers to areas that are intended to accommodate urban development insofar as they are served by basic urban services and facilities, including public sanitary sewer service, public water supply service and a local park, school, and shopping area.

Rural Land and Rural Development

For the purposes of the land use plan, "rural land" or "rural development" is defined as sparsely developed areas where land is used primarily for farming, resource extraction, landfills, very low density residential uses (no more than one dwelling unit per five acres), or other open spaces uses, and includes environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas.

"Extractive" land use is defined as area devoted primarily to the extraction of sand, gravel and stone and related activities. Mineral extraction is recognized as an interim land use. Future land use following the extraction activity will be subject to future plan amendments consistent with the planning standards and objectives contained in Chapter 2 and adjoining land uses.

"Isolated Natural Resource Areas" are smaller pockets of natural resource elements that are isolated from primary and secondary environmental corridors, and have environmental value in the areas in which they are located and are more specifically defined in SEWRPC Technical Record Vol. 4, No. 2, March 1981.

"Landfill" development is area devoted to licensed waste disposal operations.

"Other Open Lands to be Preserved" are defined as lands usually adjacent to, but outside, identified primary and secondary environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas, including lands within the 100-year recurrence interval floodplain, open lands within existing County or State park and open space sites, and other lands covered by soils with a high water table, poorly drained soils, or organic soils.

"Prime Agricultural" are lands in agricultural use, unused/open lands, and primary/secondary environmental corridor or isolated natural areas and are within a five (5) square mile contiguous area (including adjacent counties) that meet all of the following criteria: 1) is outside of any planned sewer service area boundary; 2) 75% is agricultural or open/unused land use; 3) 50% is Class I or Class II soils which meet Natural Resources Conservation Service standards; and 4) 75% consists of land ownership parcels of 35 acres or more. A description of the origin of this definition is presented in Chapter 2. Residential development can occur on prime agricultural lands at a density of no more than one dwelling unit per 35 acres.

"Primary Environmental Corridors" are areas of woodlands, wetlands, prairies, surface water, and wildlife habitat that represent a composite of the best remaining elements of the natural resource base and are more specifically defined in SEWRPC Technical Record Vol. 4, No. 2, March 1981.

"Rural Density and Other Agricultural Land" consist primarily of farm and related open lands which do not meet the criteria for classification as prime agricultural lands, but which are nonetheless proposed to be retained in rural land uses. Rural land uses include continuation of existing farming activity; creation of smaller farms, including hobby farms, horse farms, or other specialty farms; and rural density residential development. Rural density residential development occurs at a density of no more than one dwelling unit per five acres (5 to 34.9 acres of area per dwelling unit or equivalent density). When accommodated through conservation subdivision designs, only a fraction of the total site area is intensively developed as homesites, the balance being retained in permanent open space use, achieving the overall rural density.

"Secondary Environmental Corridors" are areas containing a variety of natural resource elements, often remnant resources from primary environmental corridors, which have been developed for intensive urban or agricultural purposes, creating these smaller, yet significant corridors and are more specifically defined in SEWRPC Technical Record Vol. 4, No. 2, March 1981.

Planned Land Use

The pattern of land use recommended under the Comprehensive Development Plan for Waukesha County is shown graphically on Map VII-2 and presented by municipality in Table VII-8. A description of the various urban and nonurban land uses in the County, as envisioned under the plan, follows.

Urban Land Use

The recommended land use plan envisions a substantial increase in urban land use within the County. Urban land uses, consisting of lands devoted to residential, commercial, industrial, governmental and institutional, recreational, landfill highway and railway rights-of-way and transportation, communication, and utility uses, encompassed about 130,425 acres and comprised about 35 percent of the total area of the County in 2000. Under the plan, the area devoted to urban uses would increase to about 190,978 acres, or about 51 percent of the County by the plan design year 2035. Table VII-7 presents the change in residential, commercial and industrial lands from the year 2000 to 2035, including the five (5) year increment.

Recreational Land

Under the recommended land use plan, recreational land use would increase from 8416 acres in 2000 to 15,548 acres by the year 2035.

Residential Land

Under the recommended land use plan, urban residential land use would increase by about 70 percent, from 76,075 acres in 2000 to about 129,346 acres by the year 2035. Under the plan, the proportion of the County devoted to urban residential use would increase from 21 percent to 35 percent.

Of the total planned urban residential land, about 44 percent (57,416 acres) would occur at low density (20,000 square feet to 1.4 acres of area per dwelling unit), 12 percent (14,918 acres) at suburban density I (1.5 to 2.9 acres per dwelling unit), and 13 percent (17,418 acres) at suburban density II (3.0 to 4.9 acres per dwelling unit). About 28 percent (36,275 acres) of the urban residential land would occur at medium density with 6,000 to 19,999 square feet of lot area per dwelling unit. The remaining three (3) percent (3,316 acres) of the additional urban residential land would occur at high density, with less than 6,000 square feet of lot area per dwelling unit.

Commercial, Industrial and Mixed Use

The recommended land use plan also envisions a substantial increase in economic activity areas, as represented by the commercial and industrial uses on Map VII-2. Under the plan, commercial business and office park land uses, which includes areas proposed to be utilized for retail, office, service activities, general business activities, and/or research and development and related off-street parking, individually or in various combinations would increase to about 8,897 acres by the year 2035 from 5,443 acres in 2000. The proportion of the total County area devoted to commercial and office park use would accordingly increase from 1.5 percent to 2.4 percent.

Under the plan, industrial land use would increase by from about 5,546 acres in 2000 to 13,038 by the year 2035. The proportion of the total County area devoted to industrial use would accordingly increase from 1.5 percent to 3.5 percent.

Under the plan, mixed use development, which may contain residential and could contain a combination of public, institutional, office, retail, service, light industrial, research and development, and/or other commercial uses, and may take the form of a business park would represent 1,962 acres, or less than 1 percent of the land uses, by year 2035. Since this is a new land use category in this comprehensive development plan, no comparison can be made to year 2000 conditions.

Governmental and Institutional

Governmental and institutional lands represent areas for government and public and private institutional buildings, facilities and grounds such as schools, churches, libraries, cultural facilities, nonprofit charitable organizations, hospitals, and police and fire stations, that have a direct bearing on the quality of life and on public safety. The recommended land use plan identifies governmental and institutional lands would increase from 4,900 acres in year 2000 to 8,354 acres in year 2035.

Other Urban Land

Increases in other urban land uses, including governmental and institutional; recreational; highway and railway rights-of-way and transportation, communication, and utility lands, are also envisioned under the recommended land use plan.

Under the plan, the transportation, communication, and utility land use category, which includes areas used for airports, and utility and communication facilities, would represent 12,850 acres, or 3.5 percent of the county wide land use. Of this acreage, 11,754 acres are identified as highway right-of-ways. Map VII-2 depicts the highway right-of-ways separate from other transportation, communication and utility lands.

Table VII-7 INCREMENTAL LAND USE PROJECTIONS FOR SPECIFIC URBAN LAND USES: 2000-2035

Land Use	Existing I 2000	and Uses:	Future Lan 2035	d Uses:	Change 200	0 - 2035	5-Year
Category	Acres	Percent of County	Acres	Percent of County	Acres	Percent Change	(acres)
Residential	76,075	20.5	129,346	34.8	53,271	70	7,610
Commercial	5,443	1.5	8,897	2.4	3,454	63	493
Industrial	5,546	1.5	13,038	3.5	7,492	135	1,070

Nonurban Land Uses

Under the recommended land use plan, nonurban land uses, consisting of environmentally sensitive lands, other open lands to be preserved, landfills, extractive uses, prime agricultural lands and rural density residential and other agricultural lands, would comprise about 180,567 acres, or about 49 percent of the total area of the County. Owing to the amount of urban development envisioned under the plan, the area dedicated to nonurban land uses would decrease from about 241,112 acres in 2000 to the planned 180,567 acres by the year 2035.

Environmentally Sensitive Lands

The most important remaining elements of the natural resource base are concentrated within areas identified on the recommended land use plan map as primary environmental corridors, secondary environmental corridors, and isolated natural resource areas. The environmental corridor concept and the pattern of existing environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas in the County are described in Chapter 3 of this Plan.

Primary environmental corridors are linear areas in the landscape that contain concentrations of high-value elements of the natural resource base, including almost all of the best remaining floodlands, woodlands, wetlands, and wildlife habitat areas. By definition, these corridors are at least 400 acres in area, two miles long, and 200 feet in width. The plan proposes the preservation of all remaining primary environmental corridors in essentially natural, open uses. Under the plan, development within these corridors would be limited to that needed to accommodate required transportation and utility facilities, compatible outdoor recreation facilities, and, on a limited basis, carefully sited rural-density residential use. The plan further envisions that certain adjacent flood-lands within planned sewer service areas that are currently in agricultural or other open uses will over time be allowed to revert to a natural condition, becoming part of the environmental corridor network as urbanization of abutting upland areas proceeds. Under the recommended land use plan, the primary environmental corridor area in the County would consist of about 73,024 acres, or about 19 percent of the total land area in the year 2035.

Secondary environmental corridors also contain a variety of resource elements, often being remnants of primary corridors that have been partially converted to intensive urban use or agricultural use. By definition, secondary environmental corridors are at least one mile long and 100 acres in area. The County land use plan recommends that secondary environmental corridors be considered for preservation in natural, open uses or incorporated as drainage ways or local parks within developing areas. Such areas may, at the discretion of local units of government, also accommodate intensive urban uses. Caution must be exercised when considering development within such areas, however, since Federal, State, or local natural resource protection regulations concerning wetlands, floodplains, shorelands, storm water management, and erosion control, among others, may effectively preclude development within lowland portions of such corridor areas. Under the recommended land use plan, the secondary environmental corridor area would consist of about 6,759 acres, or about 2 percent of the total land area in the year 2035.

Isolated natural resource areas consist of smaller pockets of wetlands, woodlands, or surface water that are isolated from the primary and secondary environmental corridors. By definition, isolated natural resource areas are at least five acres in size. The land use plan recommends that these areas be preserved in natural, open uses insofar as is practicable, recognizing that such areas are often well suited for use as public or private parks and open space reservation. Such areas may, at the discretion of local units of government, also accommodate intensive urban uses. Caution must be exercised when considering development within such areas, however, since Federal, State, or local natural resource protection regulations concerning wetlands, floodplains, shorelands, storm water management, and erosion control, among others, may effectively preclude development within lowland portions of isolated natural resource areas. Under the recommended land use plan, the isolated natural resource areas would consist of about 7,688 acres, or about 2 percent of the total land area in the year 2035.

As indicated in Chapter 3 of this Plan, the preservation of these environmentally sensitive areas, particularly the primary environmental corridors, is essential to the maintenance of the overall quality of the environment. Moreover, because these areas are typically unsuitable for urban development, their preservation in natural, open uses can help to prevent such new developmental problems as failing foundations for pavement and structures, wet basements, excessive clear water infiltration into sanitary sewerage systems, and poor drainage.

Extractive

As noted in Chapter 3, Waukesha County contains an abundance of nonmetallic mineral resources, the mining of which may be necessary to provide the sand, gravel, and dimensional stone needed in support of the continued development of the area. This recommended land use plan recognizes that while the County contains an abundance of such resources, efforts to extract sand and gravel or dimensional stone are increasingly constrained by the continued urbanization of the County. The plan seeks to preserve and protect lands for mineral extraction purposes before the lands are developed for urban use or effectively precluded from extractive use by further urban development of adjacent areas.

For this aspect of the plan, input from the Aggregate Producers of Waukesha County, an association of mineral extraction operators in the County was sought. Members of that association provided information regarding the extent of lands now owned or leased for mineral extraction purposes as well as adjacent lands having the potential

for mining activity. The areas so identified are shown on the recommended County land use plan (Map VII-2). In incorporating these areas into the land use plan, adjustments were made as necessary to ensure that the proposed activity would not encroach upon environmental corridors or isolated natural resource areas.

The areas identified for extractive use under the recommended plan encompass about 1.3 percent of the total area of the County. It should be recognized in this respect that mineral extractive activity is an interim use, and further, that mining activity at any given site usually proceeds in phases, with early phases undergoing restoration while later phases are being mined. Accordingly, the total area of the County being actively mined at any point in time may be expected to be significantly less than 4,930 acres.

Landfill

The recommended land use plan envisions the continued operation of existing sanitary landfill sites in the Village of Menomonee Falls and City of Muskego with modest expansions of each of the sites. The sanitary landfill sites shown on the land use plan map together encompass about 1,091 acres or less than one (1) percent of the total area of the County.

Other Open Lands to Be Preserved

Other open lands to be preserved under the recommended land use plan are lands usually adjacent to, but outside, identified primary and secondary environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas, including lands within the 100-year recurrence interval floodplain, open lands within existing County or State park and open space sites, small wetlands less than five acres in size, and other lands covered by soils with a high water table, poorly drained soils, or organic soils. Such lands, which should be considered unsuitable for development of any kind, amount to about 16,018 acres, or about 4.3 percent of the total area of the County under the year 2035 plan conditions.

Prime Agricultural

The recommended land use plan envisions, to the extent still practicable, the preservation of the best remaining prime agricultural lands in agricultural use. As shown on Map VII-2, prime agricultural lands envisioned under the recommended plan are located primarily in the northwest and southwest areas of the County. Under the plan, these areas would be developed at a minimum of a 35-acre density in order to preserve workable farm units and to prevent the intrusion of incompatible urban development. Structures would be limited to those consistent with agricultural use, with residences limited to homes for the farmer, farm laborers, or parents or children of the farmer.

Under the recommended land use plan, prime agricultural lands in the County would amount to about 10,341 acres, or about 2.8 percent of the total area of the County under year 2035 plan conditions. Anticipated losses in prime agricultural lands would occur as a result of planned additional urban development, primarily around expanding urban service areas, and as a result these prime agricultural lands have been reclassified to rural-density residential and other agricultural lands, or to other open lands to be preserved. Such areas would be reclassified because they no longer meet the criteria for designation as prime agricultural lands, owing to the intrusion of residential development that disrupts the extensive blocks of farmland, which once occurred throughout the County.

Rural Density and Other Agricultural Land

Areas shown in white on the recommended land use plan map consist primarily of farm and related open lands which do not meet the criteria for classification as prime agricultural lands, but which are nonetheless proposed to be retained in rural land uses. Rural land uses envisioned under the plan for these areas include continuation of existing farming activity; creation of smaller farms, including hobby farms, horse farms, or other specialty farms; and rural-density residential development. In Lisbon, significant fragmentation and loses of lands classified as "rural density and other agricultural land" has occurred and is anticipated to continue. Because of this trend, a

majority of the remaining lands classified as "rural density and other agricultural land" have been reclassified to other uses to allow infill development consistent with adjacent development.

Rural-density residential development is defined for the purpose of the land use plan as residential development at a gross density of no more than one dwelling unit per five acres of land. It is envisioned that agricultural uses would be encouraged to continue in the rural-residential and other agricultural areas delineated on the plan map to the greatest extent possible, and that rural residential development be allowed to occur in those areas only at such time as the agricultural uses are discontinued. The determination of permitted gross residential density residential and other agricultural lands, primary or secondary environmental corridors, isolated natural resource areas, and other open lands to be preserved and major public land holdings, as designated under the recommended plan, and excluding major lakes.

Rural-density residential development could take the form of large lots for single-family dwelling units, with each lot being five acres or more in area, or could use density transfer, planned unit development, or cluster development design techniques to achieve the recommended overall gross residential density. Dwelling units could be concentrated on carefully located groupings of smaller lots, possibly as small as one acre in size, on a portion of a site to be developed, while retaining the balance of the site in agricultural or other open uses. The clusters of residential lots should be sited to preserve the rural appearance of the landscape, to facilitate the provision of sewage disposal and water supply, and to avoid the creation of problems such as poor drainage and foundation failures. This development option could include transfer of development rights between parcels of land throughout the community or adjacent to each other, resulting in higher densities of dwelling units at the development site while maintaining large areas of the landscape in open uses. Many options exist with respect to the use and ownership of the preserved open areas of a rural development, as well as for the design of the portion of the site where dwelling units are to be clustered. These options and the manner in which they are implemented are considered later in this chapter.

Under the recommended land use plan, the rural-density residential and other agricultural land use category would amount to about 44,273 acres, or about 12 percent of the total area of the County under the year 2035 plan conditions. As shown on Map VII-2, lands in this category would be widely distributed in the outlying areas of the County.

Map VII-2 Recommended Land Use Plan for Waukesha County: 2035



			Urban							
Community	Comm Offi	ercial and ce Park	Gover and Ins	rnmental stitutional	Highw of	ay Rights Way	Ind	ustrial	La	ndfill
	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total
Cities (Subtotal)	4,695	4.3	3,945	3.7	0	0.0	7,040	6.5	629	0.6
Brookfield	1,243	7.0	793	4.5	0	0.0	504	2.9	0	0.0
Delafield	144	2.0	524	7.4	0	0.0	60	0.8	0	0.0
Milwaukee	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	37	72.5	0	0.0
Muskego	570	2.5	336	1.5	0	0.0	276	1.2	629	2.7
New Berlin	640	2.7	616	2.6	0	0.0	2,138	9.1	0	0.0
Oconomowoc	516	7.3	331	4.7	0	0.0	643	9.1	0	0.0
Pewaukee	623	4.6	273	2.0	0	0.0	1,439	10.6	0	0.0
Waukesha	958	6.0	1,072	6.7	0	0.0	1,943	12.1	0	0.0
Villages (Subtotal)	2,754	4.8	2,203	3.9	0	0.0	3,919	6.9	462	0.8
Big Bend	351	21.2	24	1.5	0	0.0	133	8.0	0	0.0
Butler	13	2.6	6	1.2	0	0.0	251	49.3	0	0.0
Chenequa	0	0.0	5	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Dousman	31	1.9	94	5.8	0	0.0	134	8.3	0	0.0
Eagle	41	4.6	71	8.0	0	0.0	65	7.3	0	0.0
Elm Grove	78	3.7	130	6.2	0	0.0	25	1.2	0	0.0
Hartland	54	1.6	240	7.2	0	0.0	441	5.5	0	0.0
Lac La Belle	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Lannon	76	4.8	36	2.3	0	0.0	161	10.1	0	0.0
Menomonee Falls	878	4.1	797	3.7	0	0.0	1,724	8.1	462	2.2
Merton	14	0.7	54	2.8	0	0.0	32	1.6	0	0.0
Mukwonago	515	12.9	146	3.7	0	0.0	285	7.1	0	0.0
Nashotah	28	2.7	16	1.5	0	0.0	15	1.4	0	0.0
North Prairie	44	2.5	22	1.2	0	0.0	176	10.0	0	0.0
Oconomowoc Lake	35	1.7	51	2.5	0	0.0	5	0.2	0	0.0
Pewaukee	266	9.2	298	10.3	0	0.0	198	6.8	0	0.0
Sussex	226	4.8	106	2.2	0	0.0	524	11.1	0	0.0
Wales	104	5.1	107	5.2	0	0.0	10	0.5	0	0.0
Towns (Subtotal)	1,427	0.7	2,215	1.1	0	0.0	1,800	0.9	0	0.0
Brookfield	340	10.2	74	2.2	0	0.0	98	2.9	0	0.0
Delafield	163	1.2	221	1.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Eagle	11	0.0	52	0.2	0	0.0	124	0.6	0	0.0
Genesee	181	0.9	100	0.5	0	0.0	504	2.6	0	0.0
Lisbon	170	0.9	247	1.4	0	0.0	318	1.8	0	0.0
Merton	58	0.3	269	1.5	0	0.0	140	0.8	0	0.0
Mukwonago	63	0.3	52	0.3	0	0.0	2	0.0	0	0.0
Oconomowoc	137	0.7	148	0.7	0	0.0	92	0.5	0	0.0
Ottawa	11	0.1	193	0.9	0	0.0	6	0.0	0	0.0
Summit	4	0.0	273	1.7	0	0.0	231	1.4	0	0.0
Vernon	127	0.6	421	2.1	0	0.0	126	0.6	0	0.0
Waukesha	162	1.2	165	1.2	0	0.0	159	1.2	0	0.0
Waukesha County	8,876	2.4	8,351	2.2	0	0.0	12,759	3.4	1,091	0.3

Table VII-8 PLANNED LAND USE IN WAUKESHA COUNTY BY MUNICIPALITY: 2035

Γ

Т

					U	rban				
Community	Mix	ed Use	Recre	eational	Resid	lential	Transp Comm and U	ortation, unication Utilities	Sub	total
	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total
Cities (Subtotal)	490	0.5	4,480	4.1	48,803	45.2	5,123	4.7	75,206	69.6
Brookfield	105	0.6	590	3.3	10,276	58.2	818	4.6	14,329	81.2
Delafield	358	5.1	484	6.8	3,886	54.9	419	5.9	5,875	83.1
Milwaukee	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	37	72.5
Muskego	0	0.0	807	3.5	8,533	37.1	421	1.8	11,573	50.3
New Berlin	0	0.0	1,056	4.5	9,080	38.5	924	3.9	14,454	61.3
Oconomowoc	27	0.4	438	6.2	3,440	48.9	217	3.1	5,613	79.8
Pewaukee	0	0.0	446	3.3	5,609	41.2	1,017	7.5	9,407	69.1
Waukesha	0	0.0	659	4.1	7,979	49.8	1,307	8.2	13,919	86.8
Villages (Subtotal)	719	1.3	2,878	5.1	25,440	44.7	2,336	4.1	40,711	71.5
Big Bend	19	1.1	9	0.5	851	51.4	102	6.2	1,489	90.0
Butler	0	0.0	12	2.4	159	31.2	24	4.7	465	91.4
Chenequa	0	0.0	84	2.8	57	1.9	96	3.2	242	8.1
Dousman	0	0.0	23	1.4	956	59.4	31	1.9	1,269	78.9
Eagle	0	0.0	33	3.7	624	70.1	45	5.1	879	98.8
Elm Grove	10	0.5	62	2.9	1,624	77.1	80	3.8	2,009	95.3
Hartland	348	10.5	225	6.8	1,418	42.7	207	6.2	2,673	80.5
Lac La Belle	0	0.0	108	25.5	201	47.5	0	0.0	309	73.0
Lannon	0	0.0	82	5.1	627	39.3	57	3.6	1,039	65.2
Menomonee Falls	144	0.7	952	4.5	9,133	42.8	769	3.6	14,859	69.7
Merton	48	2.5	106	5.4	1,410	72.3	39	2.0	1,703	87.3
Mukwonago	0	0.0	179	4.5	1,782	44.6	262	6.6	3,169	79.4
Nashotah	4	0.4	40	3.8	622	59.4	98	9.4	823	78.6
North Prairie	105	6.0	263	14.9	984	55.8	49	2.8	1,643	93.2
Oconomowoc Lake	0	0.0	0	0.0	415	20.2	29	1.4	535	26.0
Pewaukee	0	0.0	53	1.8	1,102	38.1	188	6.5	2,105	72.7
Sussex	0	0.0	401	8.5	2,265	47.8	217	4.6	3,739	78.9
Wales	41	2.0	246	12.0	1,210	58.9	43	2.1	1,761	85.7
Towns (Subtotal)	1,082	0.5	8,190	4.0	55,110	26.7	5,391	2.6	75,215	36.4
Brookfield	116	3.5	64	1.9	1,316	39.4	231	6.9	2,239	67.1
Delafield	67	0.5	646	4.9	5,151	38.8	430	3.2	6,678	50.3
Eagle	196	0.9	1,792	8.0	3,349	15.0	471	2.1	5,995	26.9
Genesee	159	0.8	298	1.5	6,672	33.8	475	2.4	8,389	42.5
Lisbon	0	0.0	647	3.6	6,023	33.5	475	2.6	7,880	43.9
Merton	65	0.4	639	3.6	5,892	33.6	384	2.2	7,447	42.4
Mukwonago	21	0.1	918	4.6	5,396	27.1	314	1.6	6,766	33.9
Oconomowoc	29	0.1	556	2.7	3,404	16.8	708	3.5	5,074	25.0
Ottawa	0	0.0	862	4.0	3,129	14.4	290	1.3	4,491	20.6
Summit	187	1.1	363	2.2	4,664	28.6	549	3.4	6,271	38.4
Vernon	151	0.7	909	4.5	4,173	20.5	602	3.0	6,509	32.0
Waukesha	96	0.7	496	3.6	5,941	43.1	462	3.3	7,481	54.2
Waukesha County	2,291	0.6	15,548	4.2	129,353	34.8	12,850	3.5	191,132	51.4

Table VII-8 (Continued) PLANNED LAND USE IN WAUKESHA COUNTY BY MUNICIPALITY: 2035

					Non-Urba	n			
Community	Ext	ractive	Other Land Pres	r Open s to be erved	Prim Sec Enviro Corridor Natural A	ary and ondary onmental and Isolated Resource reas	Prime Agricultural		
	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total	
Cities (Subtotal)	1,019	0.9	1,445	1.3	16,609	15.4	0	0.0	
Brookfield	0	0.0	226	1.3	2,736	15.5	0	0.0	
Delafield	0	0.0	17	0.2	152	2.1	0	0.0	
Milwaukee	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	21.6	0	0.0	
Muskego	319	1.4	0	0.0	4,448	19.3	0	0.0	
New Berlin	700	3.0	583	2.5	3,993	16.9	0	0.0	
Oconomowoc	0	0.0	0	0.0	809	11.5	0	0.0	
Pewaukee	0	0.0	434	3.2	2.655	19.5	0	0.0	
Waukesha	Ő	0.0	185	1.2	1 805	11.3	0	0.0	
Villages (Subtotal)	452	0.8	607	1.2	9.007	16.0	0	0.0	
Pig Pand	452	0.0	0,77	0.5	127	9.2	0	0.0	
Dig Denu Dutlar	0	0.0	0	0.5	137	0.5	0	0.0	
Gluer	0	0.0	0	0.0	42	0.5	0	0.0	
Chenequa	0	0.0	0	0.0	967	32.4	0	0.0	
Dousman	0	0.0	0	0.0	289	18.0	0	0.0	
Eagle	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	1.0	0	0.0	
Elm Grove	0	0.0	0	0.0	91	4.3	0	0.0	
Hartland	0	0.0	199	6.0	347	10.5	0	0.0	
Lac La Belle	0	0.0	0	0.0	112	26.5	0	0.0	
Lannon	268	16.8	0	0.0	282	17.7	0	0.0	
Menomonee Falls	0	0.0	85	0.4	4,071	19.1	0	0.0	
Merton	0	0.0	0	0.0	212	10.9	0	0.0	
Mukwonago	0	0.0	1,102	5.5	582	14.6	0	0.0	
Nashotah	0	0.0	46	4.4	139	13.3	0	0.0	
North Prairie	0	0.0	0	0.0	103	5.8	0	0.0	
Oconomowoc Lake	0	0.0	0	0.0	402	19.6	0	0.0	
Pewaukee	0	0.0	119	4.1	468	16.2	0	0.0	
Sussex	184	3.9	25	0.5	611	12.9	0	0.0	
Wales	0	0.0	59	2.9	233	11.3	0	0.0	
Towns (Subtotal)	3,459	1.7	13,758	6.7	61,737	29.9	10,341	5.0	
Brookfield	0	0.0	118	3.5	954	28.6	0	0.0	
Delafield	0	0.0	95	0.7	3,251	24.5	0	0.0	
Eagle	0	0.0	788	3.5	9,475	42.5	1,445	6.5	
Genesee	898	4.5	2,276	11.5	5,651	28.6	0	0.0	
Lisbon	1,611	9.0	1,766	9.8	3,659	20.4	0	0.0	
Merton	150	0.9	612	3.5	3,428	19.5	0	0.0	
Mukwonago	0	0.0	1,097	5.5	6,470	32.5	0	0.0	
Oconomowoc	0	0.0	205	1.0	3,670	18.1	7,778	38.4	
Ottawa	720	3,3	1.836	8.4	9,939	45.6	1.118	5.1	
Summit	80	0.5	1.044	6.4	4,896	30.0	0	0.0	
Vernon	0	0.0	2,727	13.4	6,181	30.4	0	0.0	
Waukesha	0	0.0	1,194	8.7	4.163	30.2	0	0.0	
Waukesha County	4,930	1.3	15,900	4.3	87,443	23.5	10,341	2.8	

Table VII-8 (Continued) PLANNED LAND USE IN WAUKESHA COUNTY BY MUNICIPALITY: 2035

7-32

	Non-Urban								
Community	Rural Density and Other Agricultural Land		Surface Water		Subtotal		Total Area		
	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total	
Cities (Subtotal)	7,871	7.3	5,927	5.5	32,871	30.4	108,077	100.0	
Brookfield	0	0.0	363	2.1	3,325	18.8	17,654	100.0	
Delafield	0	0.0	1,029	14.5	1,198	16.9	7,073	100.0	
Milwaukee	0	0.0	3	5.9	14	27.5	51	100.0	
Muskego	3,879	16.8	2,802	12.2	11,448	49.7	23,021	100.0	
New Berlin	3,783	16.0	82	0.3	9,141	38.7	23,595	100.0	
Oconomowoc	209	3.0	405	5.8	1,423	20.2	7,036	100.0	
Pewaukee	0	0.0	1,118	8.2	4,207	30.9	13,614	100.0	
Waukesha	0	0.0	125	0.8	2,115	13.2	16,034	100.0	
Villages (Subtotal)	3,691	6.5	2,262	4.0	16,190	28.5	56,910	100.0	
Big Bend	0	0.0	21	1.3	166	10.0	1,655	100.0	
Butler	0	0.0	2	0.4	44	8.6	509	100.0	
Chenequa	1,032	34.6	741	24.8	2,740	91.9	2,982	100.0	
Dousman	0	0.0	51	3.2	340	21.1	1,609	100.0	
Eagle	0	0.0	2	0.2	11	1.2	890	100.0	
Elm Grove	0	0.0	7	0.3	98	4.7	2,107	100.0	
Hartland	0	0.0	100	3.0	646	19.5	3,319	100.0	
Lac La Belle	0	0.0	2	0.5	114	27.0	423	100.0	
Lannon	0	0.0	5	0.3	555	34.8	1,594	100.0	
Menomonee Falls	2,180	10.2	131	0.6	6,467	30.3	21,326	100.0	
Merton	0	0.0	35	1.8	247	12.7	1,950	100.0	
Mukwonago	0	0.0	86	2.2	824	20.6	3,993	100.0	
Nashotah	21	2.0	18	1.7	224	21.4	1,047	100.0	
North Prairie	0	0.0	17	1.0	120	6.8	1,763	100.0	
Oconomowoc Lake	295	14.4	822	40.0	1,519	74.0	2,054	100.0	
Pewaukee	0	0.0	204	7.0	791	27.3	2,896	100.0	
Sussex	163	3.4	17	0.4	1,000	21.1	4,739	100.0	
Wales	0	0.0	1	0.0	293	14.3	2,054	100.0	
Towns (Subtotal)	32,696	15.8	9,347	4.5	131,338	63.6	206,553	100.0	
Brookfield	0	0.0	26	0.8	1,098	32.9	3,337	100.0	
Delafield	1,853	14.0	1,387	10.5	6,586	49.7	13,264	100.0	
Eagle	4,269	19.2	315	1.4	16,292	73.1	22,287	100.0	
Genesee	2,407	12.2	119	0.6	11,351	57.5	19,740	100.0	
Lisbon	2,992	16.7	60	0.3	10,088	56.1	17,968	100.0	
Merton	4,306	24.5	1,615	9.2	10,111	57.6	17,558	100.0	
Mukwonago	4,889	24.6	690	3.5	13,146	66.1	19,913	100.0	
Oconomowoc	1,219	6.0	2,327	11.5	15,199	75.0	20,273	100.0	
Ottawa	3,211	14.7	482	2.2	17,306	79.4	21,797	100.0	
Summit	2,099	12.9	1,925	11.8	10,044	61.6	16,315	100.0	
Vernon	4,572	22.5	325	1.6	13,805	68.0	20,314	100.0	
Waukesha	879	6.4	76	0.6	6,312	45.8	13,793	100.0	
Waukesha County	44,258	11.9	17,536	4.7	180,408	48.6	371,540	100.0	

Table VII-8 (Continued) PLANNED LAND USE IN WAUKESHA COUNTY BY MUNICIPALITY: 2035

Source: SEWRPC, Waukesha County and municipalities

IMPLEMENTATION RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommended land use plan presented in this chapter provides a design for the attainment of the <u>development</u> and open space preservation objectives contained in the comprehensive development plan. The implementation recommendations pertaining to the urban development areas, rural development areas, environmentally sensitive areas and other land use plan implementation measures are summarized below.

Implementation Recommendations for Urban Development Areas

One of the initial steps recommended for implementation of the County land use plan as it pertains to the proposed urban development areas is the preparation of detailed development and redevelopment plans for the residential neighborhoods and special-purpose districts which comprise the proposed urban service areas.

Within the context of community-level plans, detailed neighborhood development plans should be prepared for each residential neighborhood or special district where significant growth is expected. While such plans may also vary in format and level of detail, they should generally do the following:

- Designate future collector and land access street locations and alignments, pedestrian paths and bicycle ways, and, as appropriate, the configuration of individual blocks and lots.
- Further classify residential areas as to structure type and density, with the mix of housing structure types and lot sizes resulting in an overall density for the neighborhood consistent with that recommended in the community-level and county plan.
- Identify specific sites for neighborhood parks, schools, and retail and service centers which are recommended on a general-site-location basis in the community-level plan.
- Identify environmentally significant areas to be preserved consistent with the community-level plan and county and regional plans.
- Indicate areas to be reserved for storm water management and utility easements.
- The neighborhood planning process should make full use of the many design concepts that can enhance the living environment and increase efficiency in the provision of urban services and facilities and in travel patterns. Among these design concepts are the following:
- 1. *Mixed-Used Development*: Residential development in mixed-use settings can provide a desirable environment for a variety of household types seeking the benefits of proximity to places of employment as well as civic, cultural, commercial, and other urban amenities. Examples of mixed-use settings include dwellings above the ground floor of commercial uses and residential structures intermixed with, or located adjacent to, compatible commercial, institutional, or other civic uses.
- Traditional Neighborhood Development: The term "traditional neighborhood development" refers to very
 compact, pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use neighborhoods typically characterized by a grid like street system
 and street-oriented setbacks and building designs. The overall design, including the layout of streets and
 sidewalks, encourages walking and bicycling as alternatives to automobile transportation within the
 neighborhood.
- 3. Transit-Oriented Development: The term "transit-oriented development" refers to compact, mixed-use development whose internal design is intended to maximize access to a transit stop located within or adjacent to the development. Within the development, commercial uses and higher-density residential uses are located near the transit stop. The layout of streets and sidewalks provides convenient walking and bicycling access to the transit stop.
- 4. Residential Cluster Development: A residential development pattern characterized by a unified site design for a number of housing units, clustering buildings and providing common open space, potential density increases, and a mix of building types. It permits the planning of a project and the calculation of densities over the entire development, rather than on an individual lot-by-lot basis.

In addition to plans for developing neighborhoods, detailed plans should also be prepared for mature neighborhoods or special-purpose districts showing signs of land use instability or deterioration. Such plans

Deleted: urban and rural

should identify areas recommended for redevelopment to a different use, areas recommended for rehabilitation, any local street realignments or improvements, and other public utility and facility improvements. Special consideration should be given in such planning to overcoming contamination problems at, and reuse of, brownfields. Redevelopment plans should seek to preserve those historic, cultural, and natural features and features of the urban landscape which provide for neighborhood identity within the larger urban complex. Such plans should maximize opportunities for the provision of living arrangements and amenities that are unique to older cities in the County, such as "downtown" housing development.

Although "suburban density" development, as described previously in this chapter, is not consistent with many of the planning standards and objectives, it is recognized that a community may desire infill between existing subdivision plats consistent with adjacent developments and, also, in growth areas adjacent to incorporated municipalities, where services may be available in the future, without utilizing the cluster design concept, which may not be compatible with adjacent existing developments. In addition, for municipalities to maintain an overall residential density of no more than one dwelling unit per five (5) acres in "rural development" areas, suburban densities may be planned.

In addition, in order to support open space or conservation design developments and to preserve rural character, it would be appropriate to permit lands in the Rural Density and Other Agricultural Land category to develop at an overall density of 3.5 acres per dwelling unit, rather than no more than five (5) acres per dwelling unit, if said lands will be developed as Planned Unit Developments (PUD) or conservation design developments utilizing conservation design standards. The standard density bonus option is not applicable in the Towns of Mukwonago and Delafield, as both Towns achieve five-acre rural density using local PUD provisions. The Town of Mukwonago Land Use Plan and the Town of Delafield Land Use Plan Unit Determination Chart are referenced accordingly by Table VII-10 and Figure VII-2. The idea is that a slight increase in density in otherwise rural areas is a reasonable trade-off in order to achieve more sustainable development design that conserves natural features, creates more open space within developments, protects the rural atmosphere and causes less need for infrastructure, such as roads and storm water management facilities. In order for a development to qualify for the 3.5 acre Rural Density option, the following criteria must be met.

- 1. The development plan for a given site must incorporate an absolute minimum of 40 percent of the site in open space owned by the property owners or recreational use or public open space. In calculating open space, not more than 20 percent of the required open areas may be floodplain or wetland (80 percent of open space must be upland).
- 2. The community in which the development is located must create and map an Upland Environmental Corridor District for all upland primary and secondary environmental corridors, which allows for development at a density not greater than one unit per five acres. It is recommended that communities also include isolated natural resource areas within the Upland Environmental Corridor District.
- 3. Individual development projects must be developed as Planned Unit Developments or conservation design developments, which allows the community an opportunity to properly analyze project design. Communities must adopt Planned Unit Development standards within their zoning and subdivision ordinances.
- 4. Primary environmental corridors, secondary environmental corridors, isolated natural resource areas, wetlands and floodplains must be protected to the greatest extent possible and shall be incorporated into protected open space. If any portion of the above resources will be located on a private lot, said resource must be protected with a protective covenant or restriction. Sites that do not contain significant natural features may be conducive to prairie or wetland restorations or may be enhanced with the establishment of landscaped open spaces.
- 5. Where open space is mentioned as part of a conservation design residential planned unit development, said open space shall be protected as green or natural open space and no more than five (5) percent of said open space area shall be allowed to have impervious surfaces.

Conservation design development can be equally valuable within any of the residential land use categories. As detailed above, the Rural Density and Other Agricultural Land category allows for a 30 percent increase (3.5 acres per dwelling unit vs. five (5) acres per dwelling unit) in density if certain conservation design criteria are met. In order to promote conservation design in the urban and suburban residential categories, it is recommended that a 30 percent density bonus also be made available to development projects that conform with development standards #1-4 above. The following list details the resultant maximum densities that could be offered when utilizing a 30 percent density bonus for conservation designs:

Suburban II Density	2.1 acres per dwelling unit (DU)	(3.0-4.9 conventional)
Suburban I Density	1.05 acres per DU	(1.5-2.9 conventional)
Low-Density Residential	14,000 sq. ft. per DU	(20,000 s.f1.4 acres conventional)
Medium-Density Residential	4,200 sq. ft. per DU	(6,000-19,999 s.f. conventional)
High-Density Residential	< 4,200 sq. ft. per DU	(<6,000 s.f. conventional)

Zoning regulations should be reviewed and adjusted, as necessary, to ensure the proper staging of development over time. In this respect, the application of urban zoning districts should proceed incrementally. The **premature zoning of lands for urban use should be avoided** so as to prevent inefficient use of public infrastructures, the creation of additional isolated urban enclaves and incomplete neighborhoods. Accordingly, the **areas concerned should be placed in zoning districts consistent with their existing use and should be rezoned into appropriate urban districts only when development has been proposed and approved and essential facilities and services can be efficiently readily provided.**

Implementation Recommendations for Rural Development Areas

As defined previously in this Chapter, rural development areas are *sparsely developed areas where land is used primarily for farming, resource extraction, landfills, very low density residential uses (one unit per five acres or less), or other open spaces uses, and includes environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas.* Rural development areas exist in several cities, villages and towns in Waukesha County. Planning and Zoning should be carried out in such a manner as to respect the areas, character. First, new residential development should be limited to an overall density of no more than one dwelling unit per five acres of open land within the planning area unless a density bonus is allowed as a result of utilizing the open space or cluster design concept as discussed earlier. This density is intended to provide a basis for determining the maximum number of additional dwelling units, which could be accommodated. Table VII-9 presents a methodology for calculating the overall density within the rural development areas. The overall density is calculated by dividing by five the total acreage within the rural development area currently in open use, including primary and secondary environmental corridors, isolated natural resource areas, and other open lands to be preserved and major public land holdings, but excluding major water bodies 50 acres or more in size. Table VII-10 presents the overall density within rural development areas.

Second, to the maximum extent possible, the dwelling units, which may be accommodated in accordance with the overall five-acre density, should be developed by using residential cluster designs, in which dwelling units are grouped together on a relatively small portion of the site. The residential clusters should be limited in size, surrounded by open space, and, as may be necessary, contain open space. The clustered lots should be no larger than necessary to accommodate the residential structures, driveways, and desired yards, including, as necessary, space for an onsite soil-absorption sewage-disposal system and replacement system area. This can usually be accomplished on lots no greater than one acre in size.

Third, to the extent possible, residential clusters should be located <u>or buffered so as to be visually screened from</u> public roadways, so that existing vistas are maintained; should be carefully adjusted to topographic and other natural features, taking full advantage of the settings provided by those features without causing undue disturbance; and should be buffered from nearby agricultural and mineral extraction lands, as appropriate, so as to minimize conflicts between farming or mining and residential uses.

Formatted: Highlight Deleted: preserve rural

Deleted: in areas which are

Deleted: rural

Fourth, other intensive land uses should be limited to uses which are consistent with the character of the surrounding area or otherwise essential to the area

Fifth, lands within the rural development areas, which are not designated for residential or other compatible intensive use, may be retained in general agricultural and other open space use. Land in these areas often serves as a transition between environmental corridors and more developed areas. Land not used for farming may be most

suitable for recreational facilities and access facilities

It should be noted that, in many cases, it will be necessary to revise zoning and subdivision control ordinances to accommodate the recommended residential cluster development designs. Clustering may be accommodated in rural areas through a variety of zoning approaches. Clustering may be permitted by conditional use or by right in a basic district or through an overlay district. In addition, when the concept of the transfer of development rights is used, residential clustering principles can be used on a community wide basis to achieve better site designs and preserve open space. Subdivision regulations regarding street improvement standards, sewer and water facilities, storm water management, landscaping, and open space preservation may also need revision to adequately promote and regulate cluster development. Residential cluster zoning provisions should require the use of legal restrictions to ensure the preservation of lands, which are to be permanently preserved in agricultural or other open space use.

Because density bonuses, are increasing densities from 5 to 3.5 residential acres per unit, the density increase may outpace projected population and projected housing needs in the municipality. Therefore, the municipalities should consider additional growth management tools, such as an allotment system.

Implementation Recommendations for Environmentally Sensitive Lands

Areas identified as primary environmental corridors, secondary environmental corridors, and isolated natural resource areas occur within both urban and rural development areas and within prime agricultural areas. Environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas should be placed in one of several zoning districts, depending upon the type and character of the natural resource features to be preserved and protected. All lakes, rivers, streams, and wetlands should be placed in lowland conservancy or floodplain protection districts. Undeveloped floodplains and shorelands should be protected in accordance the shoreland and floodplain zoning ordinances. Upland woodlands and areas of steep slopes should generally be placed in appropriate upland conservancy, rural-density residential, or park and recreation districts. Through proper zoning, residential development should be confined to upland portions of environmental corridors, excluding areas of steep slopes, and should be limited to a density of no more than one dwelling unit per five acres, with provisions made as may be appropriate for clustering. Zoning applied to the environmental corridors should, however, accommodate necessary public facilities, such as crossings by streets and highways, utility lines, and engineered flood control facilities, but should require that the location, design, and development of the facilities concerned be sensitive to the protection of the existing resource features, and require that, to the extent possible following construction, disturbed areas be restored to preconstruction conditions.

Deleted: rural

Deleted: , including

Deleted:, among others, animal hospitals and veterinary clinics, riding stables, and plant nurseries. In general, office, commercial, industrial, and storage uses and the types of retail and service uses that are provided as a matter of convenience and necessity in urban residential neighborhoods should not be considered appropriate within rural development areas....

Deleted: should

Deleted: Potential agricultural uses include traditional farming, hobby farms, and community supported agriculture.

Deleted: should be kept free of development, except

Deleted: trail

Deleted: for the benefit of those who own an interest in the land \P

Deleted:

Deleted: 3.5 Deleted: 5

Table VII-9

METHODOLOGY FOR CALCULATING THE NUMBER OF DWELLING UNITS ALLOWED IN RURAL DEVELOPMENT AREAS

Target for Rural Development Area 5 Acre Density Standard	Total Rural Development Area (acres)	minus	Water Bodies Exceeding 50 Acres in Size	minus	Existing and Planned Urban Development (Evaluate Border Agreements containing a land use component and Sewer Service Areas)	equals	Area Used to Determine Number of Dwelling Units (acres)	divided by five	equals	Number of Dwelling Units Allowed Under the County Development Plan (not counting any zoning)		
Planned Conditions	Total Rural Development Area (acres)	minus	Water Bodies Exceeding 50 Acres in Size	minus	Existing and Planned Urban Development (Evaluate Border Agreements containing a land use component and Sewer Service Areas)	equals	Area Used to Determine Number of Dwelling Units (acres)	divided	by	Planned 2035 land use categories (See note per assumptions)	equals	Number of Dwelling Units To Be Accommodated at Planned 2035 land use categories

How Actual Density of 2035 Town Land Use Categories is Determined

Acres of Rural Development Area Under 2035 County Development Plan	divided by	Number of Dwelling Units Allowed Under Proposed Land Use Categories (need to consider impact of offering density bonuses)	Equals	Density of Proposed Land Use Categories	
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------	--------------------------------------------	--

Assumptions

- 1. Lot sizes are calculated under current zoning where conventional subdivisions are permitted. When calculating land use categories, public road right-of-ways were taken into account (1.23 acre for 1 acre zoning, 3.6 acres for 3 acre zoning, 5.7 acres for 5 acre zoning, and 10 acres at 10 acre zoning).
- 2. The "Total Rural Development Area" includes primary and secondary environmental corridors, isolated natural resource areas, and other open lands to be preserved and major public land holdings.
- 3. For the Town of Oconomowoc, the majority is in Ag Preservation or Urban Land Use categories.
- 4. Where development is only allowed as conservation design or planned unit development/open space development, the density allowed under the development plan was used.
- 5. For Suburban Density I (1.4-2.9 AC/DU), a 2.5 AC density shall be used. For Suburban Density II (3-4.9 AC/DU), a 3.6 AC density shall be used.
Table VII-10

EVALUATION OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT AREA WITH AN **OVERALL 5-ACRE DENSITY STANDARD**

Rural Development Area	Area Including Public Lands, Rural Density Lands and Environmental Corridors (Acres)	Year 1996 County Development Plan Density (Acres/Dwelling Unit) ^a	Year 2000 Conditions Density (Acres/Dwelling Unit)	Year 2035 Maximum Permissible New Rural Area Lots	
Delafield ^b	4,435	4.8	4.5	887	
Eagle	16,289	5.6	7.0	2,964	
Genesee	10,740	6.9	5.1	1,865	
Lisbon	9,066	2.2	1.3	1,439	
Merton	9,099	3.4	2.9	1,566	
Mukwonago ^c	7,476	4.8	4.5	1,931	
Oconomowoc ^d					
Ottawa	16,089	6.8	11.2	2,939	
Summit	8,777	5.7	3.8	1,493	
Vernon	14,375	11.3	8.9	2,526	
Waukesha	6,751	13.1	6.6	1,185	
Total	103,097	6.5	5.6	18,741	
Source: Waukesha County					

 ^a Based on Zoning in effect at the time.
 ^b Town of Delafield Rural Area calculations include lands in Sections 25-36 only.
 ^c Town of Mukwonago calculations derived from Town of Mukwonago Land Use Plan.
 ^d The majority of the Town of Oconomowoc is in the Agricultural Preservation or Urban Use categories.

Implementation Measures for Other Open Lands to be Preserved

Areas which have been identified in the Other Open Lands to be Preserved category are being mapped in both Urban and Rural areas. Lands identified in this category are mapped in part due to severe to very severe limitations for development of structures from high seasonal groundwater conditions, unstable soils, hydric or organic soil conditions or are generally poorly drained. For planning purposes, soil data available through the Soil Survey of Milwaukee and Waukesha Counties from the United States Department of Agriculture – Natural Resources Conservation Service was used.

Since the soil survey data is generalized, additional site-specific soil data analysis is necessary for individual development project review. It is recommended that the County and municipalities, through regulatory processes, provide a procedure to allow infield detailed investigation and soils analysis using the COMM 85 procedures, established in the Wisconsin Administrative Code, to assist in determining actual on-site soil conditions. Such procedures should identify and document whether or not seasonal high groundwater, soil instability, hydric or organic conditions exist. Where site-specific soil analysis indicates that soil conditions are suitable to accommodate development, an adjustment to the land use category or associated development density may be warranted and would not require a formal amendment request to an adjacent upland development land use category through the annual amendment process outlined in Chapter 9. The land use category which should be used for adjustment from the Other Lands to be Preserved category should be the adjacent upland land use category mapped on the Proposed Land Use Plan. For example, the land being adjusted from the Other Open Lands to be Preserved category are surrounded by lands in the Suburban I category and are found to be acceptable for development, not having the hydric soil conditions and high groundwater table conditions, the subject Open Lands category could be modified to the Suburban I category. There would, however, have to be a recognition and documentation of such change and the information used to justify the change so that appropriate measures are taken to incorporate the changes on the land use maps being maintained by the County and the affected municipality. A record of the documentation and information used to justify the change shall be filed with the County and the community, and an appropriate notation or identification on the Land Use Plan maps made with a reference to the location of the documentation shown on the map should be provided. It should also be noted that the new land use category, which has been modified, from the Other Lands to be Preserved category, can utilize similar densities as used for this new category as if the land were originally all designated in the new land use category.

Lands with soil conditions determined to be unsuitable for development, consistent with the planning standards detailed in Chapter 2 of this Plan, should be retained in open space uses, but can be included within lot boundaries. In addition, these lands may also be included in calculation for density standards as set forth in the Planned Unit Development or Cluster Development standards identified above. It is recommended that the County and municipalities establish, through regulatory processes, a density credit for retaining these lands in open space use. For years, the County used 20 percent of the acreage of lands in this category when calculating densities for proposed developments in the attached or adjoining upland areas. It would be appropriate that a range of 20 percent to 40 percent be used for these lands, subject to specific local community regulations. Further, it may be appropriate to grant a density of one (1) unit per five (5) acres for those lands in the Other Open Lands to be Preserved category.

Regulatory Implementation Measures

Land use regulatory ordinances are an important tool available to county and local units of government to shape growth and development in accordance with adopted land use objectives. Under the State comprehensive planning law (S.66.1001 of the Wisconsin Statutes), "beginning on January 1, 2010, if a local governmental unit engages in official mapping, subdivision regulation, zoning ordinance enacted or amended and zoning of shorelands or wetlands in shorelands, those actions shall be consistent with that local governmental unit's comprehensive plan". Accordingly, upon adoption of their comprehensive plans, the county, cities, villages, and towns should review the text of their ordinances and adjust as necessary to carry out the various implementation recommendations contained in this Plan. Such changes should include rezoning to use districts consistent with present uses so as not to prezone, consider allotment system to evaluate and grade proposed developments which carry out the recommendations in this Plan and review of proposed developments for consistency with the recommendations of this Plan.

Zoning in Urban Areas

Zoning in urban areas should be administered in accordance with county and local comprehensive plans which refine the urban-area recommendations of the regional land use plan. The application of zoning districts that accommodate residential, commercial, industrial, and other urban development should be done in a manner that is consistent with any recommendations in the local comprehensive plan regarding the staging of development over the course of the plan period. Where the local comprehensive plan includes staging provisions, the application of zoning districts that accommodate the planned urban uses should be done incrementally in accordance with the timeframe set forth in the comprehensive plan. Lands should be placed in zoning districts consistent with their existing use, or, alternatively, placed in an urban land holding district or transition district. This approach allows municipalities to determine whether the proposed development is consistent with the Comprehensive Development Plan for Waukesha County or its goals, standards and objectives at the time a project is proposed. Specifically, a development plan needs to be periodically amended to adjust to changing conditions and updated data such as population and economic projections. Prezoning lands to match a particular land use plan, can limit a municipality's ability to respond to changing conditions and should be avoided wherever possible. Evaluations of new project developments should be reviewed and recommended on the basis of the recommendations contained in this and the local communities plan and allow development to occur where it is consistent with the recommendations contained herein.

Zoning in Rural Areas

Zoning in rural areas should be administered in accordance with county and local comprehensive plans which refine the rural-area recommendations of this Comprehensive Development Plan for Waukesha County. The following is recommended:

- Prime agricultural lands identified in county and local comprehensive plans should be placed into an exclusive agricultural zoning district, which essentially permits only agricultural and agriculture-related uses. Such a district should provide for a residential density of no more than one dwelling unit per 35 acres and should prohibit incompatible urban development.
- Other areas identified for continued agricultural use in county and local comprehensive plans should be placed into exclusive agricultural districts as defined above or into general agricultural districts with smaller minimum parcel sizes as may be appropriate for smaller agricultural operations, such as hobby farms or other specialty farms.
- Areas recommended in county and local comprehensive plans for rural residential development should be
 placed into a rural residential zoning district that limits development to no more than one dwelling unit per
 five acres and that encourages, or even requires, the use of conservation subdivision designs to accommodate
 the permitted development.
- Non-farmed wetlands should be placed in a lowland conservancy or shoreland-wetland zoning district, as appropriate. Farmed wetlands should remain in an agricultural zoning district as long as the parcel remains in agricultural use; with consideration given to placing a conservancy overlay zone on the wetland. Wetlands identified as farmed wetlands should be placed in a lowland conservancy district at the time farming activities on the wetland parcel cease and an application for residential or other urban development of the upland portion of the parcel is approved by the unit of government having zoning authority. Floodplains should be placed in the appropriate floodplain zoning district (floodway, floodfringe, flood storage, or general floodplain). Primary environmental corridors should be placed, and other natural resource areas, including secondary environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas, may be placed, in a conservancy or other appropriate zoning district (such as a park or rural residential zoning district).

Official Mapping

Adoption of local official maps can contribute significantly to the implementation of the recommended County land use plan. Local units of government should prepare and adopt local official maps pursuant to Section 62.23(6) of the Wisconsin Statutes, showing thereon lands needed for future public use as streets, highways, transit ways, parkways, drainage ways, parks and playgrounds. The official map should be amended from time to time to incorporate the additional street and other public land requirements identified in detailed neighborhood unit development plans or rural area development plans, as those plans are prepared over time.

Land Division Ordinances

Land division ordinances should be adopted by the County and local units of government as a basis for the review and approval of subdivision plats and certified survey maps. Any proposed departure from adopted land use plans should be carefully considered and approved only if such departures are found to be in the public interest and the land use plan map is amended to a category that would allow the proposed subdivision. It should be noted that the existing Waukesha County subdivision control ordinance applies only to the statutory shorelands within the unincorporated areas of the County.

In 1999, Waukesha County created a Land Development Workgroup to analyze and address issues created by land division and development processes being used at that time. The Workgroup recommended:

- 1. The County should modify existing county transportation related ordinances to require pre-review of potential access points prior to recording of certified survey maps and subdivision plats.
- 2. Municipalities and the County should uniformly apply a development review checklist prepared by the Workgroup. The intent of the checklist is to set forth consistent standards for the review of development proposals by county municipalities, and to clearly express to development sponsors what should be contained in a proper development proposal. The Workgroup further recommended that each municipality in the County amend appropriate local codes incorporating and adhering to the checklist or a more stringent version in development reviews.
- 3. Another issue raised by the Workgroup was the variety of subdivision definitions used by Waukesha County municipalities. The variety in definitions has led to larger scale residential developments proceeding as certified surveys as opposed to a platted subdivision.

To address this issue, the Workgroup developed a minimum definition of a subdivision to be applied in Waukesha County. The definition reads "<u>A subdivision is the division of land by the owner, subdivider, or his successor in title, for the purpose of transfer of ownership or building development where the division creates more than four (4) residential lots less than 1.5 acres in five (5) years or where the division creates more than six (6) residential parcels or building sites of any size within five (5) years." A remnant parcel in excess of 10 acres in size may be excluded from the plat by action of the municipality upon application by the owner. Upon receipt of an application, the municipality will notify the County.</u>

- 4. County staff should continue to host training workshops on land use planning and development review topics for local officials.
- 5. The County should define a Development Review Team process to enhance communication between the County, Towns, Cities, Villages and developers regarding land development projects and issues.
- 6. The County should evaluate the existing County Storm Water Management Ordinance and Program to identify opportunities for addressing watershed based storm water issues.
- 7. The County should engage in a process to comprehensively update the Street and Highway Width Map and Jurisdictional System Plan.

This Plan recommends that municipalities and the County continue to follow the recommendations made by the Land Development Workgroup.

Regulation of Public Sanitary Sewerage Systems

In Wisconsin, the comprehensive water quality management planning program has led to the development of State regulations which have the effect of requiring the preparation of sanitary sewer service area plans for each public sewage treatment plant. In the Region, these plans are prepared cooperatively by the concerned local unit of government and the Regional Planning Commission, with ultimate approval authority resting with the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. Sewer service area plans have now been prepared for nearly all of the public sanitary sewerage systems in the Region. These plans define sewer service limits and delineate environmentally sensitive lands within those service limits to which service should not be provided. Chapter NR 110 and Chapter Comm 82 of the *Wisconsin Administrative Code* require that the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, with respect to public sanitary sewers, and the Wisconsin Department of Commerce, with adopted area wide water quality management plans and the sanitary sewer service areas identified in such plans before approving such extensions.

Under Chapter NR 121, sewer service areas must be sized in a manner that is consistent with long-range population projections. As a practical matter, this requirement is considered to be met if the buildout population of the sewer service area—that is, the population that could be accommodated if the sewer service area were completely developed at locally planned residential densities—is within the projection range envisioned under the regional land use plan. In sizing their sewer service areas, many communities choose to plan for the high end of the projected population range in order to retain flexibility in terms of the location of future urban growth.

Historically, communities in the Region, with the assistance of SEWRPC, have amended their sewer service area plans from time to time in response to changing needs and conditions. This may be expected to continue in the years ahead, particularly as communities complete their required local comprehensive plans.

As noted above, sanitary sewer service area plans are an important part of the basis for State agency review and approval of proposed sewer extensions. Policies adhered to by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources and Department of Commerce prohibit or otherwise limit the extension of sanitary sewers to serve development in certain environmentally significant lands identified in local sewer service area plans. The following restrictions were in effect in 2007:

- The extension of sanitary sewers to serve new development in primary environmental corridors is confined to limited recreational and institutional uses and rural-density residential development (maximum of one dwelling unit per five acres) in areas other than wetlands, floodplain, shorelands, and steep slope (12 percent or greater).
- The extension of sanitary sewers to serve development in portions of secondary environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas comprised of wetlands, floodplains, shorelands, or steep slopes is not permitted.

Park and Open Space Plan Implementation

Achievement of the outdoor park and recreation and open space preservation objectives of the land use plan requires continued public interest acquisition of land for outdoor recreation and open space uses. The county park and open space plan recommends public interest acquisition (that is, acquisition by local, county, State and Federal government and by private conservancy interests) of land for recreation and resource protection purposes. The regional natural areas and critical species habitat protection and management plan also includes recommendations for public interest acquisition for most of the natural areas and critical species habitat sites identified in that plan. Moreover, cities, villages, and towns may acquire other lands for park and open space purposes as recommended in local comprehensive or park and open space plans. Each of the concerned units and

agencies of government should continue or begin land acquisition programs in accordance with such plans. Private conservancy organizations are encouraged to supplement public open space acquisition efforts, as appropriate, to ensure the preservation of important natural areas. The detailed County Park and Open Space Plan is presented in Appendix A of this Plan.

Transfer of Development Rights

Under transfer-of-development-rights programs, or "TDR" programs, the right to develop a specified number of dwelling units under existing zoning may be transferred from one parcel, which would be maintained in open space use, to a different parcel, where the number of dwelling units permitted would be correspondingly increased. When the parcels are held by the same owner, the development rights are, in effect, simply transferred from one parcel to the other by the owner; when the parcels are held by different landowners, the transfer of development rights involves a sale of rights from one owner to another, at fair market value. In either case, the result is a shift in density away from areas proposed to be maintained in farming or other open use toward areas recommended for development. The transfer of development rights may be permanent or may be for a specific period of time or set of conditions.

The transfer of development rights may be implemented only if authorized under county or local zoning. To enable the transfer of development rights, the zoning ordinance must establish procedures by which the TDR technique will be administered, including the formula for calculating the number of residential dwelling units which may be transferred from the "sending" area to the "receiving" area. The zoning district map must identify the sending and receiving areas, or at least identify the districts within which development rights can be transferred from one parcel to another. As of 2007, the Waukesha County Zoning Code contains provisions for the transfer of development rights.

Municipal Boundary and Utility Extension Agreements

The recommendations of the land use plan concerning the location and density of new urban development are formulated without regard to the location of city, village, and town boundaries. Rather, those plan recommendations are based upon a consideration of such factors as the location of existing utility infrastructure, including public sanitary sewer and water supply systems; the location of environmentally sensitive lands; and the availability of lands considered to be suitable for urban development. Where cities and villages own and operate essential public utilities not provided by adjacent towns, the plan assumes that cities and villages will either annex unincorporated territory recommended in the plan for urban development and provide extensions of essential utility services to serve such development, or that the cities and villages will reach agreement with adjacent unincorporated towns on the extension of those essential services without the need for annexation and municipal boundary change.

The *Wisconsin Statutes* establish a number of arrangements for cooperation among communities with regard to sharing of municipal services and cooperatively determining community boundaries, as indicated below:

- Section 66.0301: This section of the Statutes provides broad authority for intergovernmental cooperation among local units of government with respect to the provision and receipt of services and the joint exercise of their powers and duties.
- Section 66.0307: This section of the Statutes allows any combination of cities, villages, and towns to determine the boundary lines between themselves under a cooperative plan, subject to oversight by the Wisconsin Department of Administration. Section 66.0307 envisions the cooperative preparation of a comprehensive plan for the affected area by the concerned local units of government and prescribes in detail the contents of the cooperative plan. Importantly, the cooperative plan must identify any boundary change and any existing boundary that may not be changed during the planning period; identify any conditions that must be met before a boundary change may occur; include a schedule of the period during which a boundary change shall or may occur; and specify arrangements for the provision of urban services to the territory covered by the plan.

• Section 66.0225: This section of the Statutes allows two abutting communities that are parties to a court action regarding an annexation, incorporation, consolidation, or detachment, to enter into a written stipulation compromising and settling the litigation and determining a common boundary between the communities.

Cooperative approaches to the identification of future corporate limits and the extension of urban services can contribute significantly to attainment of the compact, centralized urban growth recommended in the land use plan. Conversely, failure of neighboring civil divisions to reach agreement on boundary and service extension matters may result in development at variance with the plan—for example, by causing new development to leap past logical urban growth areas where corporate limits are contested, to outlying areas where sewer and water supply service are not available. Accordingly, it is recommended that neighboring incorporated and unincorporated communities cooperatively plan for future land use, civil division boundaries, and the provision of urban services, as provided for under the *Wisconsin Statutes*, within the framework of the land use plan.

Municipal Revenue Sharing

Additional opportunity for intergovernmental cooperation is provided under Section 66.0305 of the *Wisconsin Statutes*, entitled "Municipal Revenue Sharing." Under this statute, two or more cities, villages, and towns may enter into revenue sharing agreements, providing for the sharing of revenues derived from taxes and special charges. The agreements may address matters other than revenue sharing, including municipal services and municipal boundaries. Municipal revenue sharing can provide for a more equitable distribution of the property tax revenue generated from new commercial and industrial development within urban areas and help reduce tax-base competition among communities, competition that can work against the best interests of the area as a whole.

A good example of municipal revenue sharing under this statute is the revenue sharing agreement included in the Racine Area Intergovernmental Sanitary Sewer Service, Revenue Sharing, Cooperation and Settlement Agreement entered into by the City of Racine and neighboring communities in 2002. Under this agreement, the City of Racine receives shared revenue payments from neighboring communities for use in renovating older residential areas, redeveloping brownfield sites, and supporting regional facilities like the City zoo, fine arts museum, and library. In return, the City of Racine agreed to support the incorporation of the adjacent Towns of Caledonia and Mt. Pleasant; refrain from annexations without the consent of the Towns; refrain from using extraterritorial zoning and plat review powers; and move ahead with sewerage system improvements that will accommodate growth in the Towns. It should be noted that the Towns of Mt. Pleasant and Caledonia were incorporated as villages in 2003 and 2005, respectively.

Brownfield Redevelopment

Factors contributing to the abandonment or underutilization of older commercial and industrial sites vary from site to site, but often include structures which are obsolete in terms of accommodating current manufacturing, warehousing, and office needs; inadequate site access to the freeway system; and insufficient site area for horizontally-oriented structures, contemporary parking and loading requirements, and possible future plant expansion needs.

Once abandoned, the re-use of former commercial and industrial sites is frequently constrained by contamination problems created by past industrial and commercial activities, giving rise to the term "brownfields"—sites which are underutilized or abandoned due to known or suspected environmental contamination. While brownfields tend to be concentrated in older areas, they also occur in outlying areas. Redevelopment of brownfields is often hindered by high cleanup costs, and, even where contamination is only suspected, the potential for high cleanup costs tends to dampen private-sector interest in redevelopment.

In order to maintain the viability of existing urban areas, special efforts to promote the reuse of brownfields are required. Local units of government should include the cleanup and re-use of brownfields as a key element in their planning for the revitalization of urban areas and promote such re-use through such tools as tax-incremental financing. Limited State and Federal financial assistance has been made available in support of the cleanup and re-use of contaminated sites. Local units of government should make full use of, and assist private developers in securing, available State and Federal financial assistance.

The re-use of brownfield sites need not be limited to industrial use, but may include a mix of residential, commercial, recreational, and other development, in accordance with local development objectives. Properly carried out, the cleanup and re-use of brownfields has many potential benefits in addition to the underlying environmental benefits: elimination of blight, increase in the property-tax base, expansion of the housing stock, provision of jobs in close proximity to concentrations of the labor force, and increased use of existing public infrastructure.

Storm Water System Planning

Storm water runoff pollution performance standards for new development, existing urban areas, and transportation facilities are set forth in Chapters NR 151 and NR 216 of the *Wisconsin Administrative Code*. The County should coordinate with municipalities to develop a storm water management plan to coordinate the management of storm water within defined watersheds which often transcend municipal boundaries. Storm water management plan. These practices should be developed in a manner that integrates development needs and environmental protection, including integrated water resources protection. Such practices should reflect both storm water runoff quantity and quality considerations, as well as groundwater quantity and quality protection. Practices that are designed to maintain the natural hydrology should be encouraged.

Chapter 9

IMPLEMENTATION AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION

IMPLEMENTATION RECOMMENDATIONS OVERVIEW

The recommended plan provides a design for the attainment of the specific development objectives set forth in Chapter 2. In a practical sense, however, the plan is not complete until the steps required to implement the plan—that is, to convert the plan into action policies and initiatives are specified. Accordingly, this chapter is presented as a guide for use in the implementation of the Comprehensive Development Plan for Waukesha County. More specifically, this chapter outlines the actions that should be taken by various agencies and units of government in efforts to implement the Comprehensive Development Plan for Waukesha County.

Throughout the planning process, various subcommittees participated in a facilitated discussion to identify the strengths, concerns and weaknesses associated the various elements of a comprehensive plan such as the agricultural, natural and cultural resources; community facilities and utilities; economy; transportation; housing; and land use elements. The comments provided by the various subcommittees are presented in the applicable chapters.

In addition, each subcommittee was asked to develop a series of implementation recommendations. The recommendations were based upon the results of the public opinion survey, an analysis of the issues and consideration of the data presented in the chapters. The following is a list of the implementation recommendations contained in the various chapters of this Plan.

CONSISTENCY AMONG PLAN ELEMENTS

The comprehensive planning law requires that the implementation element "describe how each of the elements of the comprehensive plan shall be integrated and made consistent with the other elements of the plan." All elements of this comprehensive plan were prepared simultaneously by the same staff with great care given to ensure internal consistency among the various elements. All element chapters were reviewed by the Comprehensive Planning Advisory Committee. In addition, the Development Plan for Waukesha County simultaneously prepared the planning objectives and standards described in Chapter 2. It should be recognized that it is unlikely that the Plan can meet all of the standards completely. It should also be recognized that some objectives are complementary, with the achievement of one objective supporting the achievement of others. Conversely, some objectives may be conflicting, requiring reconciliation through consensus building and/or compromise.

AGRICULTURAL, NATURAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

Chapter 3 of this Plan presents an inventory and analysis of the agricultural, natural and cultural resource base of Waukesha County. Included is descriptive information pertaining to climate, air quality, physiography, bedrock geology, topography, soils, groundwater resources, surface water resources, wetlands, woodlands, natural areas and critical species habitat sites, park and open space sites, environmental corridors, historic and cultural resources and agricultural lands.

The Agricultural, Natural and Cultural Resources Element chapter presented the following implementation recommendations:

- 1. Following completion of the Regional Water Supply Plan or availability of sufficient data, the planning objectives and standards used to prepare this plan may need to be refined to address groundwater supply and recharge issues.
- 2. Amend land use categories to direct development away from areas with seasonally high groundwater one-foot or less from the surface and steep slopes (12% or greater) and to discourage development of below grade structures on soils with groundwater limitations less than three (3) feet from the surface. Amend applicable zoning and land division codes to establish a minimum of one foot separation between structures (including basements) and the seasonally high groundwater level.
- 3. Amend applicable zoning codes, land division and storm water management ordinances to more stringent site design and storm water management requirements necessary to address thermal and other runoff impacts detail to cold-water communities, outstanding water resources and exceptional water resources.
- 4. Provide to the municipalities in Waukesha County the lists of historical sites that are eligible for historic designation but have not been designated and the list of potentially eligible sites that need additional evaluation for inclusion as eligible sites.
- 5. Amend the planned land use map and appropriate zoning codes and maps to reflect lands identified as prime agricultural areas using the planning standards contained in Chapter 3.
- 6. To protect and encourage the preservation of high quality agricultural tillable lands, (U.S.D.A. Class I and II soils) contained in the Prime Agricultural and Rural Density and Other Agricultural Land plan categories, discourage residential development on agriculturally productive and environmentally sensitive areas, provide for some marketability of such lands, and encourage more economical use of lands suited to limited and controlled residential development by permitting more intensive use of such lands without changing overall rural character, it is recommended land use tools such as residential density transfer opportunities be provided. Within land use regulatory codes these opportunities, with the following components, should be provided:
 - a. Through development design techniques, including but not limited to Planned Unit Developments and conservation design developments, high quality agricultural tillable lands can be preserved.
 - b. The density transfer technique would permit variable lot sizes in the utilization of the most desirable terrain for housing sites while encouraging preservation of high quality agricultural tillable lands worthy of such preservation.
 - c. To transfer residential density opportunities to promote the preservation of the rural character of the County by encouraging farm fields, pastures, orchards, and natural open spaces to be retained either as common open spaces, or as part of a farm operation. The transfer of residential development rights from one area of a parcel to another, from one tract of land to another, and from the Prime Agricultural and Rural Density and Other Agricultural Land plan categories is recommended, thereby allowing the increase in density of development on suitable lands for development in exchange for establishing the preservation of more desirable agriculturally productive lands.
 - d. In order to preserve the rural character as well as the efficiency and safety of existing road systems, the inappropriate development of lots strung out along such roads with individual driveway accesses from each lot should be minimized. The goal of this objective is to encourage grouping of lots on an interior street, which will then access the existing road system.
 - e. Any land claimed in addition to the actual described residential lots, for credit toward meeting the density factor requirement, would have its status established, and guaranteed, either by dedication to the public, or by appropriate covenants running with the lands, through the conveyance of agricultural easements. Such covenants and easements would be recorded in the office of the Register of Deeds and would restrict the property against any development or use except as is

consistent with its preservation as high quality agricultural tillable land or as a form of common open space unless the zoning of the property is changed in accordance with an update to the Comprehensive Development Plan for Waukesha County. The preserved land status of any parcel would be indicated on official zoning maps.

- 7. To protect and encourage the preservation of primary and secondary environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas, discourage residential development in environmentally sensitive areas, provide for some marketability of such lands, encourage more economical use of lands suited to limited and controlled residential development by permitting more intensive use of such lands without impacting the environmentally sensitive areas, it is recommended residential density transfer opportunities be provided. Within land use regulatory codes, these opportunities, with the following components, should be provided:
 - a. Through development design techniques, including but not limited to Planned Unit Developments and conservation design developments, primary and secondary environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas should be preserved.
 - b. The density transfer technique would permit variable lot sizes while encouraging preservation of primary and secondary environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas.
 - c. To transfer residential density opportunities to promote the preservation of the rural character of the County by preserving primary and secondary environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas to be retained as common open spaces.
- 8. In an effort to prevent land use conflicts with nonmetallic mining operations in the County, the Waukesha County Mineral Extraction Advisory Committee developed a series of recommendations. They are:
 - a. Within appropriate land use regulatory codes, create a Mineral Extraction Notification Overlay District that extends beyond the property lines of nonmetallic mining operations. Creation of the Overlay District would require notifications to appear on recorded documents associated with land divisions within the District denoting the parcel's proximity to an active or planned mining operation. Loudoun County, Virginia is an example of the use of overlay districts.
 - b. Within appropriate land use regulatory codes, a minimum setback from nonmetallic mining operations and adjoining properties should be established. Landscape berms and vegetative screening could be provided in the setback area.
 - c. New wells placed on properties immediately adjacent to nonmetallic mining operations should be constructed to minimize the impacts from mining operations.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND UTILITIES

Chapter 4 of this Plan presents a discussion of the major community facilities and utilities within the county including telecommunications infrastructure, public and private utilities, school districts, libraries, cemeteries, healthcare facilities, childcare facilities, and public safety. The Community Facilities and Utilities chapter presented the following implementation recommendations facilities:

- 1. The County should work with the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC) as part of the regional water supply planning process to identify groundwater aquifers that can sustain planned development.
- 2. The County should consider modifying its Park and Open Space Planning process to identify lands that may need to be preserved for municipal groundwater supplies, specifically meeting the use isolation distances required for high capacity wells.
- Municipalities should be encouraged to work on a county-wide basis to plan for the future placement and current use of emergency service facilities to optimize emergency response times and to eliminate overlap of service areas and equipment.

- 4. Since watershed boundaries rarely follow municipal boundaries, municipalities and Waukesha County should work to develop storm water system plans based on watershed areas.
- 5. Where unique surface water resources exist in Waukesha County (Outstanding or Exceptional Resource Waters or Cold Water Streams), local and County planning efforts should combine land use and storm water planning together with a review of related local regulatory and educational efforts to prepare watershed protection plans.
- Waukesha County, in cooperation with SEWRPC and local municipalities, should develop a long-range wireless facilities plan to enhance business competitiveness, public safety and government communications.
- 7. School Districts should be encouraged to work with Waukesha County to use the demographic data and land use projections contained in this Plan for facility and sub-district planning. Often, School Districts are in a reactionary mode in responding to increases and decreases in the school age population. The population and trend data as well as the land use projections contained in a comprehensive development plan can be invaluable information to forecast facility demands for the school age population. In addition, it is suggested that school districts use the information contained in this Plan as baseline and conduct an annual assessment of actual enrollment to verify projections contained in this Plan.
- 8. In 2000, the Waukesha County Land Development Workgroup, consisting of many of the municipalities in the County, addressed several issues created by current land division and development processes. The goal was to create a consistent definition for land development projects to be considered subdivisions as well as a uniform checklist for the review of subdivisions. Municipalities in the County should continue to consistently use and cooperatively amend the review checklist as necessary.

HOUSING

Chapter 5 of this Plan presents an analysis of the age, structural condition, value, and occupancy characteristics of existing housing stock in the County and local governments that participated in this planning process. In addition, the chapter provided a description of government programs which facilitate the provision of housing, including affordable housing and information on community policies established for the percentage distribution of single-family, two-family, and multi-family units. The chapter also includes the recommendations Waukesha County supports from the Regional Housing Plan. The Housing chapter presented the following implementation recommendations:

Housing Supply

- 1. Each community within the County should identify a projected number of additional housing units to meet housing demand through year 2035. Land needed to accommodate additional housing units should be included on the planned land use map based on the population trend information presented in Chapter 2 of this Plan.
- Community comprehensive plans should address the need for adequate consumer housing choices that allow for a full range of housing structure types and sizes including single-family, two-family, and, in sewer service areas, multi-family.
- 3. Promote construction design concepts such as Universal Design¹ and Visitability. Visitability is a movement to change home construction practices so that all new homes, not just custom built homes, offer a few specific features that make the home easier for people with mobility impairment to live in at least one zero-step entrance approached by an accessible route on a firm surface no steeper than a 1:12 grade from a driveway or public sidewalk.

¹ Accessibility for the disabled can be increased by providing homes with wider doors and hallways, level surfaces, and other features, often referred to as "Universal Design."

Housing Mix

- 1. Communities that seek to attract jobs, as reflected in the accommodation of new commercial and industrial development, should ensure that a broad range of housing styles, types and price ranges are provided to provide opportunities to minimize geographic imbalances between job and residence locations.
- Communities should establish policies concerning housing mix to provide a full range of housing choices. Comparing housing types and affordability to existing and projected jobs and wages will be beneficial to establishing effective housing mix policies.
- 3. Communities should analyze the population trend information presented in Chapter 2 and the employment projection information presented in Chapter 6 to ensure that a range of housing stock to meet the needs of an aging population. This analysis should be repeated annually to determine the effectiveness of the housing mix policy.
- 4. Communities should analyze existing housing stock to establish baseline conditions for the existing affordable housing. As part of this planning project, Waukesha County worked with the Town of Mukwonago to develop a sample methodology to analyze the value of existing housing stock. The following criteria were used to provide more accurate data on the actual housing stock within the municipality.
 - a. Equalized improved value of the property was greater or equal to \$40,000 based on tax and assessment information.
 - b. Equalized total value (land plus improvements) was less than or equal to \$208,700.
 - c. Land area was less than 10 acres to exclude large farms.
 - d. Special attention was given to removing parcels with partial assessments, parcels with only larger accessory structures, and parcels that had multiple living units or multi-family units.

Housing Affordability and Housing Costs

- 1. Households should not have to pay more than 30 percent of their adjusted gross income in order to secure decent, safe, and sanitary housing, including, in addition to the contract rent payment or the payment of the principal, interest, and taxes, the necessary insurance, utility, and other attendant costs.
- Chapter 6 (Economic Development) of this Plan discusses the use of Tax Incremental Financing. Municipalities should consider using Tax Incremental Financing for the redevelopment of properties to higher density residential uses to meet affordable housing needs.
- 3. Communities within the County should consider and explore the creation of incentives for the development of affordable housing units. Options to consider include density bonuses and waiver of fees.
- 4. The County should work with municipalities to study the feasibility of an affordable housing trust fund to assist in meeting the projected employment housing needs.
- 5. Encourage mixed income housing development to avoid concentrating affordable units in a limited number of areas.
- 6. Encourage the adoption and use of "flexible zoning district" regulations such as Traditional Neighborhood Development, Transit-Oriented Development, and Planned Unit Development regulations.
- 7. Develop or encourage the development of rent-to-own programs through public-private partnerships and entrepreneurship to give low-to moderate-income families a chance at homeownership.²
- 8. Study the potential to integrate other types of specialty housing, where applicable, such as "cooperative housing" (sometimes called "coop-housing or co-habiting housing"),³ "cohousing"⁴ and university or

 $^{^{2}}$ An example of a rent-to-own development is Metcalfe Park in the City of Milwaukee. A private developer, in partnership with the Milwaukee Urban League and using affordable housing tax credits, is developing 30 homes that will be leased to families that qualify for below-market rents of \$675 and \$825 per month. In 15 years, the homes will be available for purchase at discounted prices.

³ A multi-family dwelling owned and maintained by the residents. The entire structure and real property is under common ownership as contrasted with a condominium dwelling where individual units are under separate ownership. Apartments and dwellings may include shared common areas such as kitchen, dining, and/or living rooms, and services, such as housekeeping, organized social and recreational activities, including seniors and persons with disabilities capable of living

campus-related housing for seniors,⁵ which may also socially support and help seniors and/or persons with disabilities be self-sufficient.

 Support the inclusion of accessory units and "live-work-units"⁶ (sometimes called "flex units"), where suitable, to help provide affordable housing as well as affordable office or work space for entrepreneurs (i.e. small businesses and home-based businesses).

Household Size

The average household size in the County in 1960 was 3.66 persons per household. The projected 2035 household size is 2.48. County projections show that the population of people aged 65 and over will more than double in size increasing from 26,763 people in 2000 to 56,678 in 2035. A higher percentage of smaller housing units, multi-family, independent and assisted living units may be required to better meet the housing needs of smaller households, including the increase in one- and two-person empty nester and elderly households and persons with disabilities.

Transition from Renter to Home Owner Occupied Housing

Utilize existing local, state, and federal programs to educate young adults and families in the County to transition from renter to home owner. About 20 percent of housing units in Waukesha County are renter occupied and 80 percent are owner occupied. However, in several communities within the County renter occupied units are over 40 percent of total housing units.

Housing Vacancy

The supply of vacant and available housing units should be sufficient to maintain and facilitate ready housing consumer turnover. Rental and homeowner vacancy rates at the county level should be maintained at a minimum of four (4) percent and a maximum of six (6) percent for rental units and a minimum of one (1) percent and a maximum of two (2) percent for homeowner units over a full range of housing types, sizes, and costs.

⁵ Senior housing, rental or homeownership, linked to universities and colleges where services offered to seniors include auditing classes, library and computer privileges, access to healthcare, use of fitness facilities, discount event tickets, and/or reduced meal prices. The universities or colleges may or may not be involved with the development and operation of the retirement community, while providing such services to residents.

⁶ Live-work units contain work space that usually occupies more floor area, up to 50 percent of the total floor area of the unit, than a conventional house containing a home occupation, in which the home-based business typically occupies between 10 to 25 percent of the total floor area. Live-work units may contain more types of business activities than a traditional home occupation, such as more parking, traffic, employees, and/or customer visits. Such units may be detached buildings or attached units (especially townhouses) functioning as potential small business incubators. Units may be rented or owned, including as condominiums, thereby allowing owners to accumulate equity.

[&]quot;independently" (usually requiring no or minimal medical-care or "Stay at Home" related services). More information on cooperative housing in Wisconsin can be accessed from the University of Wisconsin-Extension Center for Cooperatives at http://www.uwcc.wisc.edu/info/uwcc_pubs/coopHouse02.pdf

⁴ Cohousing communities are communities or "villages" that generally consist of privately-owned individual homes and community-owned areas and buildings. Households participate in social activities centered in a community-owned building, and help to design and manage their "village" consisting of small groups of homes concentrated around a community building which acts as the social center of the "village". Residents own their private dwellings, usually condos or attached single-family homes, but share common areas, such as dining areas, kitchen, lounges, meeting rooms, a recreational facility, a workshop, children's spaces and the like. Group meals are regularly shared where residents manage the property. Other types of cohousing include elderly cohousing which is generally designed for adults 55 or older. Elder cohousing promotes universal design concepts that support active lifestyles and can accommodate accessibility needs.

Land Use Regulation

- 1. The County and municipalities should examine regulatory codes to identify the extent to which they permit or exclude relatively lower cost housing, and make appropriate changes to facilitate the provision of such housing. This review should primarily focus on the structure types permitted (single-family, two-family, multi-family); development densities; minimum lot area requirements; and minimum dwelling unit floor area requirements.
- 2. The County should research, study, promote, and educate the use of energy efficient homes and green housing development design concepts.

REGIONAL HOUSING PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS Commented [SO1]: Not adopted by the Town of Lisbon The following Regional Housing Plan recommendations are incorporated into the Town Comprehensive --- (Formatted: Highlight Development Plan, as guidance for the County as a whole: --- (Formatted: Highlight A. Affordable Housing

- 1. Local governments that provide sanitary sewer and other urban services should provide areas within the community for the development of new single-family and two-family homes on lots of 10,000 square feet or smaller, with home sizes less than 1,200 square feet, to accommodate the development of housing affordable to moderate-income households. Communities with sewer service should also provide areas for the development of multi-family housing at a density of at least 10 units per acre, and 18 units or more per acre in highly urbanized communities, to accommodate the development of housing affordable to lower-income households. Such areas should be identified in community comprehensive plans. In addition, communities should include at least one district that allows single-family residential development of this nature and at least one district that allows multi-family residential development of this nature in their zoning ordinance.⁷
- 2. Comprehensive and neighborhood plans and zoning ordinances should encourage a variety of housing types in urban neighborhoods, including apartments, townhomes, duplexes, small single-family homes and lots, and live-work units. Flexible zoning regulations intended to encourage a mix of housing types (single-, two-, and multi-family) and a variety of lot sizes and housing values within a neighborhood, such as planned unit development (PUD), traditional neighborhood developments (TND), density bonuses for affordable housing, and adaptive re-use of buildings for housing should be included in zoning ordinances in communities with sewer service. Accessory dwellings should be considered by all communities to help provide affordable housing in single-family residential zoning districts.
- B. Communities should review requirements that apply to new housing development to determine if changes could be made that would reduce the cost of development without compromising the safety, functionality, and aesthetic quality of new development. For example:
 - Communities should strive to keep housing affordable by limiting zoning ordinance restrictions on the size and appearance of housing by reducing or eliminating requirements for masonry (stone or brick) exteriors or minimum home sizes of 1,200 square feet or more in all single-family and twofamily residential zoning districts. Local governments should encourage developers and home builders to limit the use of restrictive covenants that require masonry exteriors and home sizes of 1,200 square feet or more.
- ⁷Counties with general zoning ordinances should also consider revising comprehensive plans and zoning and subdivision ordinances to comply with the recommendations for communities with sewer service if County regulations apply in sewered communities.

Formatted: Highlight

- Public and private housing developers could make use of alternative methods of construction, such as the panelized building process, for affordable and attractive new homes. Local governments should accommodate the use of the panelized building process as a method of providing affordable housing.
- Site improvement standards set forth in land division ordinances and other local governmental regulations should be reviewed to determine if amendments could be made to reduce the cost of housing to the consumer while preserving the safety, functionality, and aesthetic quality of new development. Particular attention should be paid to street width and landscaping requirements. Recommended street cross-sections are provided on Table 69 in Chapter V of the Regional Housing Plan. Landscaping requirements should provide for street trees and modest landscaping to enhance the attractiveness of residential development and the community as a whole. Communities should limit the fees for reviewing construction plans to the actual cost of review, rather than charging a percentage of the estimated cost of improvements.
- d. Exterior building material, parking, and landscaping requirements for multi-family housing set forth in local zoning ordinances should be reviewed to determine if amendments could be made to reduce the cost of housing to the consumer while preserving the safety, functionality, and aesthetic quality of new development. Communities should work with qualified consultants, such as architects with experience designing affordable multi-family housing, to review these requirements and develop nonprescriptive design guidelines that encourage the development of attractive and affordable multifamily housing. Landscaping requirements should provide for street trees and modest landscaping to enhance the attractiveness of multi-family development and the community as a whole.
- 4. Communities with design review boards or committees should include professional architects on the board to provide expertise and minimize the time and cost associated with multiple concept plan submittals.
- 5. Education and outreach efforts should be conducted throughout the Region by SEWRPC, UW-Extension, and other partners regarding the need for affordable housing, including subsidized housing. These efforts should include plan commissioner and board level training regarding demographic, market, and community perception characteristics that impact communities.
- 6. State and Federal governments should work cooperatively with private partners to provide a housing finance system that includes private, Federal, and State sources of housing capital; offers a reasonable menu of sound mortgage products for both single- and multi-family housing that is governed by prudent underwriting standards and adequate oversight and regulation; and provides a Federal guarantee to ensure that 30-year, fixed-rate mortgages are available at reasonable interest rates and terms.
- Appraisers should consider all three approaches to value (cost, income, and sales comparisons) to ensure that values, building costs, and other unique factors are considered when conducting property appraisals.
- 8. Tax increment financing (TIF) could be used as a mechanism to facilitate the development of affordable housing. Wisconsin TIF law (Section 66.1105(6)(g) of the *Wisconsin Statutes*) allows municipalities to extend the life of a TIF district for one year after paying off the district's project costs. In that year, at least 75 percent of any tax revenue received from the value of the increment must be used to benefit affordable housing in the municipality and the remainder must be used to improve the municipality's housing stock. Communities in subsidized housing priority sub-areas (see Map 130 of the Regional Housing Plan) and sub-areas with a job/housing imbalance are encouraged to use this program to increase the supply of affordable housing.
- 9. County and local governments should consider establishing programs and ordinances to stabilize and improve established neighborhoods with the intent of maintaining the quality and quantity of existing lower- and moderate-cost housing stock. Examples of programs and ordinances include property maintenance ordinances, weatherization and lead paint abatement programs, and use of Community

Development Block Grant (CDBG) and other funding to assist low- and moderate-income households in making needed home repairs. Funds should also be provided to assist landlords in making needed repairs to apartments that would be affordable to low- and moderate-income tenants. Ordinances that limit teardowns and lot consolidations that would remove low- and moderate-cost housing units from a community, without providing replacement housing affordable to low- and moderate-income households, should be considered by local governments.

10. The Governor and State Legislature should consider funding the Smart Growth Dividend Aid Program established under Section 18zo of 1999 Wisconsin Act 9, under which a city, village, town, or county with an adopted comprehensive plan could receive one aid credit for each new housing unit sold or rented on lots of no more than one-quarter acre and could also receive one credit for each new housing unit sold at no more than 80 percent of the median sale price for new homes in the county in which the city, village, or town is located in the year before the year in which the grant application is made. The program should be amended to specify that eligible new housing units must be located in an area served by a sanitary sewerage system, and that new housing units in developments with a density equivalent to one home per one-quarter acre would also be eligible to receive aid credits.

B. Fair Housing/Opportunity

- 1. Multi-family housing and smaller lot and home size requirements for single-family homes may accommodate new housing that would be more affordable to low-income households. A significantly higher percentage of minority households have low incomes compared to non-minority households. Communities should evaluate comprehensive plan recommendations and zoning requirements to determine if their plans and regulations act to affirmatively further fair housing.
- Entitlement jurisdictions should explicitly require sub-grantees to certify that they will affirmatively further fair housing as a condition of receiving Community Planning and Development (CPD) funds, which include the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME programs.

C. Job/Housing Balance

- Increase the supply of modest single-family and multi-family housing to address job/housing imbalances. <u>Communities with sanitary sewer service</u> in sub-areas identified as having a potential year 2010 or projected year 2035 job/housing imbalance should conduct a more detailed analysis based on specific conditions in their community as part of a comprehensive plan update. The analysis could examine, for example, the specific wages of jobs in the community and the specific price of housing. If the local analysis confirms an existing or future job/housing imbalance, it is recommended that the local government consider changes to their comprehensive plan which would provide housing appropriate for people holding jobs in the community, thereby supporting the availability of a workforce for local businesses and industries:
 - a. Additional lower-cost multi-family housing units, typically those at a density of at least 10 units per acre and modest apartment sizes (800 square feet for a two-bedroom unit), should be provided in communities where the community's analysis indicates a shortage of lower-cost housing in relation to lower wage jobs. The community's comprehensive plan should be updated to identify areas for the development or redevelopment of additional multi-family housing; and zoning ordinance regulations should be updated as necessary.
 - b. Additional moderate-cost single-family housing units, typically those at densities equivalent to lot sizes of 10,000 square feet or less and modest home sizes (less than 1,200 square feet), should be provided in communities where the community's analysis indicates a shortage of moderate-cost housing in relation to moderate wage jobs. The community's comprehensive plan should be updated to identify areas for the development or redevelopment of moderate-cost housing; and zoning ordinance regulations should be updated as necessary.

- 2. State, County, and affected local governments should work to provide better connectivity between affordable housing and job opportunities through transportation options to major employment centers.
- 3. It is recommended that the Wisconsin Housing and Economic Development Authority (WHEDA) or other appropriate State agency conduct a job/housing balance analysis.⁸
- 4. Job/housing balance should be a criterion considered by administering agencies during the award of Federal and State economic development incentives. Incentives could be directed to local governments that can demonstrate a current or projected job/housing balance, or to communities that will use the incentive to address an existing or projected job/housing imbalance.
- 5. SEWRPC will provide to communities requesting an expansion of their sanitary sewer service area and amendment of their sanitary sewer service area plan the findings of the job/housing balance analysis conducted under this regional housing plan. For those communities with a job/housing imbalance, recommendations for addressing the job/housing imbalance will be identified.
- 6. Strategies to promote job/housing balance should include the development of affordable housing in areas with sewer service outside central cities and improved transit service throughout the Region to provide increased access to jobs; education and job training to provide the resident workforce with the skills needed by area employers; and increased economic development activities to expand businesses and industries in areas with high unemployment, underemployment, and discouraged workers.
- Encourage the development of employer assisted housing ("walk-to-work") programs through which employers provide resources to employees who wish to become home owners in neighborhoods near their workplaces.

D. Accessible Housing

- 1. Communities with sanitary sewer service in sub-areas identified as having a household income/housing and/or a job/housing imbalance should identify areas for additional multi-family housing in their comprehensive plan, which would help to address both affordability and accessibility needs.
- 2. Local governments should support efforts by private developers and other housing providers to include construction design concepts such as Universal Design and Visitability, including consideration of providing density bonuses or other incentives to encourage such housing. Visitability is a movement to change home construction practices so that all new homes offer a few specific features that make the home easier for people with a mobility impairment to live in or visit. Visitability features include wide passage doors, at least a half-bath on the first floor, and at least one zero-step entrance approached by a useable route on a firm surface with an approximate grade of 1:12 from a driveway or public sidewalk. Other features that promote ease of use for persons with disabilities include wide hallways, a useable ground floor bathroom with reinforced walls for grab bars, and electrical outlets and switches in accessible locations.⁹
- 3. It is recommended that the Governor and State Legislature continue to support funding for programs that provide the funding for home modifications which allow persons with disabilities and the elderly to

⁸ It could be expected that the State's analysis of job/housing balance for each community would be a general analysis, and a community would be permitted to conduct a more detailed analysis to confirm whether a job/housing balance exists in their community.

⁹ The Wisconsin Uniform Dwelling Code now requires minimum 28-inch wide doorways and zero-step entrances between housing units and attached garages for new one- and two-family housing units. maintain their independence in their homes and communities. It is also recommended that State funding be provided to the Department of Health Services (DHS) or other State agency to develop a database to track housing units that have received grants or loans for accessibility improvements and other housing units known to include accessibility features. As an alternative, DHS could work with the Department of Revenue to require that accessibility features, including zero-step entrances, accessible bathrooms, hallways at least 36 inches wide, and doorways at least 32 inches wide, be documented in residential property assessments. Information on accessibility features would be collected through the Wisconsin transfer tax form at the time a housing unit is sold, and by local building inspectors in communities that require a building inspection at the time a housing unit is sold, and noted on assessment forms by the local assessor.

- 4. Local governments will have access to estimates regarding accessibility of housing through the American Housing Survey (AHS) beginning in 2012. Local governments should analyze AHS and census data to estimate the number of accessible housing units in the community to help ensure that there are plentiful housing options for persons with mobility disabilities not only to reside in, but also to visit their families and neighbors.
- 5. Local government code enforcement officers and building inspectors should receive training on the accessibility requirements of State and Federal fair housing laws with regard to multi-family housing construction and rehabilitation.
- 6. A number of government programs refuse to fund accessibility modifications for renters, leaving a large segment of the population with less access than homeowners to funding that may help them remain in their housing. It is recommended that programs be modified to allow renters and landlords to use funding sources for accessibility improvements that are available to homeowners, in consultation with the property owner as provided in Fair Housing laws.

E. Subsidized and Tax Credit Housing

- 1. Support Federal initiatives to simplify subsidized housing programs to make more efficient use of resources. Public Housing Authorities (PHAs) and entitlement jurisdictions should continue working with Federal agencies and Congress to maintain funding levels for housing and related programs.
- 2. Administrators of voucher programs, county and local governments, and housing advocates should continue to work with Federal agencies and Congress to increase funding levels for additional housing vouchers to help meet the demand for housing assistance in the Region. There are 45,676 housing choice vouchers and subsidized housing units in the Region, compared to a potential need for 187,395 vouchers to help provide housing for 100,111 extremely-low income households (incomes less than 30 percent of the Regional median income, or less than \$16,164 per year) and an additional 87,284 very-low income households (incomes between 30 and 50 percent of the Regional median income, or \$16,164 to \$26,940 per year).
- 3. Communities with major employment centers should seek and support new multi-family housing development to provide workforce housing for households earning 50 to 60 percent of the Region's median annual household income.
- 4. Communities in economic need priority sub-areas and subsidized workforce housing need priority subareas should work with HUD or their entitlement jurisdiction to secure HUD Housing and Community Development Program and other available funds to provide additional housing in the community that is affordable to extremely and very low-income households. Communities in economic need should continue to work with HUD to secure Choice Neighborhood Initiative funding for the rehabilitation or replacement of existing public housing units. Local PHAs whose jurisdictions include priority sub-areas shown on Map 130 of the Regional Housing Plan should seek to provide assistance through subsidy programs that can encourage housing development for households at a variety of income levels.

Formatted: Highlight

- 5. WHEDA should study models in other States of how to best reach extremely-low income households.
- 6. HUD should consider modifications to the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher program to remove financial disincentives for administering vouchers regionally. Administrators of voucher programs in the Region should work together to develop a coordinated Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher program.
- 7. It is recommended that the Governor and State Legislature amend the Wisconsin Open Housing Law to recognize housing vouchers as a lawful source of income.
- 8. WHEDA should consider revising the criteria used to determine LIHTC awards to potentially award allocation points based on a lack of affordable housing in a community and/or the type of jobs and associated income levels in the community, to award points in communities identified as priority areas on Map 130 of the Regional Housing Plan, and to award points to non-elderly housing developments in communities with a job/housing imbalance.
- In order to provide housing for very-low income households, communities should develop partnerships with nonprofit organizations to provide affordable housing, and/or assist in assembling small parcels, remediating brownfields.
- 10. Continuum of Care (CoC) organizations should continue to engage individual service providers in community-wide planning and coordination to assist homeless persons, and should continue to develop strategies to prevent homeless as well as provide services to homeless individuals and families. Programs for the homeless should continue to address the needs of various special populations, including families, veterans, and persons with mental illness.

F. Housing Development Practices

- . Within the context of community-level comprehensive plans, local governments should consider preparing detailed neighborhood plans for each residential neighborhood or special planning district where significant **urban** development or redevelopment is expected. While such plans may vary in format and level of detail, they should generally:
 - a. Designate future collector and land-access (minor) street locations and alignments, pedestrian paths and bicycle ways, and, in communities with transit service, transit stops and associated pedestrian access.
 - b. For areas designated for residential use in the comprehensive plan, more specifically identify areas for multi-, two- and single-family development, with a variety of lot sizes for single-family development, and, potentially, areas for mixed uses (retail, service, or office with residential, and live-work units). The overall density for the neighborhood should be consistent with that recommended in the community comprehensive plan.
 - c. Identify specific sites for neighborhood parks, schools, and retail and service centers which are recommended on a general basis in the community-level plan. Neighborhood commercial centers may contain compact mixed-use developments.
 - d. Identify environmentally significant areas to be preserved consistent with the community-level, county, and regional plans.
 - e. Indicate areas to be reserved for storm water management and utility easements.

Formatted: Highlight

- Achievement of communities and neighborhoods that are functional, safe, and attractive ultimately depend on good design of individual development and redevelopment sites. Local governments should promote good site design through the development of design standards to be incorporated into local zoning and subdivision ordinances.
- 3. Local governments should promote the redevelopment and infill of vacant and underutilized sites, including the cleanup and reuse of brownfields, as a key element in planning for the revitalization of urban areas. Tools such as TIF and State and Federal brownfield remediation grants and loans may assist in these efforts.
- 4. Local governments, PHAs, and developers should consider Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) elements when developing and reviewing site plans for proposed housing developments.
- 5. PHAs and developers (both for profit and nonprofit) should consider the use of green building methods and materials for new and renovated housing where financially feasible, with priority given to energy saving materials and construction practices, such as low-flow water fixtures; energy-star appliances; and high-efficiency furnaces, water heaters, windows, and insulation.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Chapter 6 of this Plan provides an overview of the methodology and assumptions that underlie the economic and employment projections of southeastern Wisconsin and Waukesha County. Included is descriptive information pertaining to measures of economic activity and employment projections. The Economic Development chapter presented the following implementation recommendations:

- 1. In order to enhance the viability of existing industrial, office and retail centers, the following standards shall be included in the Land Use Chapter of this Plan (Chapter 7), to guide the placement of new industrial, retail and office uses, such as:
 - a. Access to available adequate water supply, sanitary sewer service, storm water drainage facilities, and power supply.
 - b. Ready access to the arterial street and highway system.
 - c. Adequate on-street and off-street parking and loading areas.
 - d. Provision for properly located points of ingress and egress appropriately controlled to prevent congestion on adjacent arterial streets.
 - e. Site design emphasizing integrated nodes or centers, rather than linear strips.
 - f. Site design appropriately integrating the site with adjacent land uses.
 - g. Served by a transit service. (This standard applies to industrial, retail, and office uses located within, or in proximity to, medium- and high-density areas).
- To address cyclical overdevelopment of commercial space or buildings, in particular office space, municipalities should avoid pre-zoning lands. For example, communities should not create zoning patterns within a community that are not justifiable in the marketplace or for which the above standards have not been met.
- 3. Promote the use of other comprehensive land development tools and techniques in advising communities regarding planning and zoning actions and decisions.
- 4. Officials in the County should annually review the capital improvement plans or programs of local governments in an effort to coordinate transportation and other improvements that aid in the delivery of goods, services, and employment.
- Officials in the County should coordinate access to state and federal resources to assist in funding County and local transportation improvements.

Tax Increment Financing

- 1. The conservation and renewal of viable urban areas can enhance their viability.
- 2. Tax Incremental Financing should be used for brownfield and other redevelopment projects.
- 3. To encourage viable urban centers, increase the use of Tax Incremental Financing in cities and villages.
- 4. To discourage public subsidizing of development that can occur with lower development costs that cannot be justified. Discourage use of Tax Incremental Financing for development of agricultural lands.

Housing Development

1. In anticipation of projected employment sector growth, promote and provide an adequate supply of new housing of sufficient quantity and density within reasonable proximity to new and existing employment centers (Refer to Chapter 5).

Education, Jobs and Business Growth

- 1. In response to existing and projected skilled workforce needs, Waukesha County, in cooperation with appropriate business and community organizations, should work with the University of Wisconsin and other higher education systems to provide greater access to bachelor degree programs in Waukesha County.
- 2. To enhance higher paying jobs, support initiatives to increase development of the bioscience manufacturing industry, especially in the area of medical equipment.
- 3. Create partnerships between local economic development organizations and colleges and universities to promote entrepreneurial programs, industry collaborations, technology transfer and seed capital.
- 4. Collaborate with the Milwaukee 7, the Waukesha County Economic Development Corporation, Waukesha County Technical College and UW-Extension to conduct a labor market analysis for Waukesha County and the Region that assesses the existing and anticipated supply and demand for labor as well as employer and employee training needs.
- 5. To add to the livability of the County and enhance an employer's ability to attract workforce, update the County Park and Open Space Plan in cooperation with municipalities in the County to provide sufficient recreational facilities, including comprehensive trail system, to the resident population.

Government Services and Taxes

1. In an effort to reduce property taxes in Waukesha County, consider consolidations, mergers, shared services or legislative measures to reduce the number of governmental jurisdictions.

LAND USE

The recommended land use plan presented in Chapter 7 provides a design for the attainment of the development and open space preservation objectives contained in this comprehensive development plan. The implementation recommendations pertaining to the urban development areas, rural development areas, environmentally sensitive areas and other land use plan implementation measures are summarized below:

Implementation for Urban Development Areas

One of the initial steps recommended for implementation of the County land use plan as it pertains to the proposed urban development areas is the preparation of detailed development and redevelopment plans for the residential neighborhoods and special-purpose districts which comprise the proposed urban service areas.

Within the context of community-level plans, detailed neighborhood development plans should be prepared for each residential neighborhood or special district where significant growth is expected. While such plans may also vary in format and level of detail, they should generally do the following:

Deleted: urban and rural

- Designate future collector and land access street locations and alignments, pedestrian paths and bicycle ways, and, as appropriate, the configuration of individual blocks and lots.
- Further classify residential areas as to structure type and density, with the mix of housing structure types and lot sizes resulting in an overall density for the neighborhood consistent with that recommended in the community-level and county plan.
- Identify specific sites for neighborhood parks, schools, and retail and service centers, which are recommended
 on a general-site-location basis in the community-level plan.
- Identify environmentally significant areas to be preserved consistent with the community-level plan and county and regional plans.
- · Indicate areas to be reserved for storm water management and utility easements.
- The neighborhood planning process should make full use of the many design concepts that can enhance the living environment and increase efficiency in the provision of urban services and facilities and in travel patterns. Among these design concepts are the following:
- 1. Mixed-Used Development: Residential development in mixed-use settings can provide a desirable environment for a variety of household types seeking the benefits of proximity to places of employment as well as civic, cultural, commercial, and other urban amenities. Examples of mixed-use settings include dwellings above the ground floor of commercial uses and residential structures intermixed with, or located adjacent to, compatible commercial, institutional, or other civic uses.
- 2. Traditional Neighborhood Development: The term "traditional neighborhood development" refers to very compact, pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use neighborhoods typically characterized by a grid like street system and street-oriented setbacks and building designs. The overall design, including the layout of streets and sidewalks, encourages walking and bicycling as alternatives to automobile transportation within the neighborhood.
- 3. Transit-Oriented Development: The term "transit-oriented development" refers to compact, mixed-use development whose internal design is intended to maximize access to a transit stop located within or adjacent to the development. Within the development, commercial uses and higher-density residential uses are located near the transit stop. The layout of streets and sidewalks provides convenient walking and bicycling access to the transit stop.
- 4. Residential Cluster Development: A residential development pattern characterized by a unified site design for a number of housing units, clustering buildings and providing common open space, potential density increases, and a mix of building types. It permits the planning of a project and the calculation of densities over the entire development, rather than on an individual lot-by-lot basis.

In addition to plans for developing neighborhoods, detailed plans should also be prepared for mature neighborhoods or special-purpose districts showing signs of land use instability or deterioration. Such plans should identify areas recommended for redevelopment to a different use, areas recommended for rehabilitation, any local street realignments or improvements, and other public utility and facility improvements. Special consideration should be given in such planning to overcoming contamination problems at, and reuse of, brownfields. Redevelopment plans should seek to preserve those historic, cultural, and natural features and features of the urban landscape, which provide for neighborhood identity within the larger urban complex. Such plans should maximize opportunities for the provision of living arrangements and amenities that are unique to older cities in the County, such as "downtown" housing development.

Although "suburban density" development, as described previously in this chapter, is not consistent with many of the planning standards and objectives, it is recognized that a community may desire infill between existing subdivision plats consistent with adjacent developments and, also, in growth areas adjacent to incorporated municipalities, where services may be available in the future, without the necessity of going through a cluster concept, which may not be compatible with adjacent existing developments. In addition for municipalities to maintain an overall residential density of 5 acres in "rural development" areas suburban densities may be planned.

In addition, in order to support open space or conservation design developments and to preserve rural character, it would be appropriate to permit lands in the Rural Density and Other Agricultural Land category to develop at an overall density of 3.5 acres per dwelling unit, rather than five (5) acres per dwelling unit, if said lands will be developed as Planned Unit Developments (PUD) or conservation design developments utilizing conservation design standards. The standard density bonus option is not applicable in the Towns of Mukwonago and Delafield, as both Towns achieve five-acre rural density using local PUD provisions. The Town of Mukwonago Land Use Plan and the Town of Delafield Land Use Plan Unit Determination Chart are referenced accordingly by Table VII-10 and Figure VII-2. The idea is that a slight increase in density in otherwise rural areas is a reasonable trade-off in order to achieve more sustainable development design that conserves natural features, creates more open space within developments, protects the rural atmosphere and causes less need for infrastructure, such as roads and storm water management facilities. In order for a development to qualify for the 3.5 acre Rural Density option, the following criteria must be met.

- 1. The development plan for a given site must incorporate an absolute minimum of 40 percent of the site in open space owned by the property owners or recreational use or public open space. In calculating open space, not more than 20 percent of the required open areas may be floodplain or wetland (80 percent if open space must be upland).
- 2. The community in which the development is located must create and map an Upland Environmental Corridor District for all Upland Primary and Secondary Environmental Corridors, which allows for development at a density not greater than one unit per five acres. It is recommended that communities also include Isolated Natural Resource Areas within the Upland Environmental Corridor District.
- 3. Individual development projects must be developed as Planned Unit Developments or conservation design developments, which allow the community an opportunity to fully analyze project design. Communities must adopt Planned Unit Development standards within their zoning and subdivision ordinances to achieve this end.
- 4. Primary Environmental Corridors, Secondary Environmental Corridors, Isolated Natural Resource Areas, wetlands and floodplains must be protected to the greatest extent possible and shall be incorporated into protected open space. If any portion of the above resources will be located on a private lot, said resource must be protected with a protective covenant or restriction. Sites that do not contain significant natural features may be conducive to prairie or wetland restorations or may be enhanced with the establishment of landscaped open spaces.
- 5. Where open space is mentioned as part of a conservation design residential planned unit development, said open space shall be protected as green or natural open space and no more than five (5) percent of said open space area shall be allowed to have impervious surfaces.

Conservation design development can be equally valuable within any of the residential land use categories. As detailed above, the Rural Density and Other Agricultural Land category allows for a 30 percent increase (3.5 acres per dwelling unit vs. 5 acres per dwelling unit) in density if certain conservation design criteria are met. In order to promote conservation design in the urban and suburban residential categories, it is recommended that a 30 percent density bonus also be made available to development projects that conform with development standards #1-4 above. The following list details the resultant maximum densities that could be offered when utilizing a 30 percent density bonus for conservation design:

Suburban II Density	2.1 acres per dwelling unit (DU)	(3.0-4.9 conventional)
Suburban I Density	1.05 acres per DU	(1.5-2.9 conventional)
Low-Density Residential	14,000 sq. ft. per DU	(20,000 s.f1.4 acres conventional)
Medium-Density Residential	4,200 sq. ft. per DU	(6,000-19,999 s.f. conventional)
High-Density Residential	< 4,200 sq. ft. per DU	(<6,000 s.f. conventional)

Zoning regulations should be reviewed and adjusted, as necessary, to ensure the proper staging of development over time. In this respect, the application of urban zoning districts should proceed incrementally. The **premature zoning of lands for urban use should be avoided** so as to prevent the creation of additional isolated urban enclaves and incomplete neighborhoods. Accordingly, the **areas concerned should be placed in zoning**

districts consistent with their existing use and should be rezoned into appropriate urban districts only when development has been proposed and approved and essential facilities and services can be readily provided.

Implementation for Rural Development Areas

As defined in Chapter 7, rural development areas are *sparsely developed areas where land is used primarily for farming, resource extraction, landfills, very low density residential uses (one unit per five acres or less), or other open spaces uses, and includes corridors and isolated natural resource areas. Rural development areas exist in several cities, villages and towns in Waukesha County. In Lisbon, in accordance with the Recommended land use*

plan map, rural development areas are limited to those lands within the remnant portion of the Merton/Lisbon Unrefined Future AEA Map Unit in the northwest corner of the Town, the north portion of Section 1 in the

northeast corner of the Town, and existing cuclutes of pural residential development. Planning and Zoning should be carried out in such a manner as to respect the area character. First, new residential development should be limited to an overall density of no more than one dwelling unit per five acres of open land within the planning area unless a density bonus is allowed as a result of utilizing the open space or cluster design concept discussed in Chapter 7. This density is intended to provide a basis for determining the maximum number of additional dwelling units, which should be accommodated. Within the implementation recommendations, Chapter 7 presents the methodology for calculating the overall density within rural development areas and the status of the five (5) acre density standard at various planning stages.

Second, to the maximum extent possible, the dwelling units, which may be accommodated in accordance with the overall five-acre density, should be developed by using residential cluster designs, in which dwelling units are grouped together on a relatively small portion of the site. The residential clusters should be limited in size, surrounded by open space, and, as may be necessary, contain open space. The clustered lots should be no larger than necessary to accommodate the residential structures, driveways, and desired yards, including, as necessary, space for an onsite soil-absorption sewage-disposal system and replacement system area. This can usually be accomplished on lots no greater than one acre in size.

Third, to the extent possible, residential clusters should be located or <u>buffered so as to be visually screened from</u> public roadways, so that existing vistas are maintained; should be carefully adjusted to topographic and other natural features, taking full advantage of the settings provided by those features without causing undue disturbance; and should be buffered from nearby agricultural and mineral extraction lands, as appropriate, so as to minimize conflicts between farming or mining and residential uses.

Fifth, lands within the rural development areas, which are not designated for residential or other compatible intensive use, may be retained in general agricultural and other open space use. Land not used for farming may be most suitable for recreational facilities and access facilities.

Finally, where open space is mentioned as part of a conservation design residential planned unit development, said open space shall be protected as green or natural open space and no more than five (5) percent of said open space area shall be allowed to have impervious surfaces.

It should be noted that, in many cases, it will be necessary to revise zoning and subdivision control ordinances to accommodate the recommended residential cluster development designs. Clustering may be accommodated in rural areas through a variety of zoning approaches. Clustering may be permitted by conditional use or by right in a basic district or through an overlay district. In addition, when the concept of the transfer of development rights is used, residential clustering principles can be used on a community wide basis to achieve better site designs and preserve open space. Subdivision regulations regarding street improvement standards, sewer and water facilities, storm water management, landscaping, and open space preservation may also need revision to adequately promote

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Deleted: preserve rural Formatted: Highlight

Deleted: in areas which are **Deleted:** rural

Deleted: rural

Deleted: , including, among others, animal hospitals and veterinary clinics, riding stables, and garden shops. In general, office, commercial, industrial, and storage uses and the types of retail and service uses that are provided as a matter of convenience and necessity in urban residential neighborhoods should not be considered appropriate within rural development areas...

Deleted: should

Deleted: Potential agricultural uses include traditional farming, hobby farms, and community supported agriculture. ...

Deleted: should be kept free of development, except

Deleted: trail

Deleted: for the benefit of those who own an interest in the land

and regulate cluster development. Residential cluster zoning provisions should require the use of legal restrictions to ensure the preservation of lands, which are to be permanently preserved in agricultural or other open space use.

Because density bonuses are increasing densities from 5 to 3.5 residential acres per unit, the density increase may outpace projected population and projected housing needs in the municipality. Therefore, the municipalities should consider additional growth management tools, such as an allotment system.

Implementation for Environmentally Sensitive Lands

Areas which have been identified as primary environmental corridors, secondary environmental corridors, and isolated natural resource areas occur within both urban and rural development areas and within prime agricultural areas. Environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas should be placed in one of several zoning districts, depending upon the type and character of the natural resource features to be preserved and protected. All lakes, rivers, streams, wetlands, and associated undeveloped floodlands and shorelands should be placed in lowland conservancy or floodplain protection districts. Upland woodlands and areas of steep slopes should generally be placed in appropriate upland conservancy, rural-density residential, or park and recreation districts. Through proper zoning, residential development should be limited to a density of no more than one dwelling unit per five acres, with provisions made as may be appropriate for clustering. Zoning applied to the environmental corridors should, however, accommodate necessary public facilities, such as crossings by streets and highways, utility lines, and engineered flood control facilities, but should require that the location, design, and development of the facilities concerned be sensitive to the protection of the existing resource features, and require that, to the extent possible following construction, disturbed areas be restored to preconstruction conditions.

Implementation Measures for Other Open Lands to be Preserved

Areas which have been identified in the Other Open Lands to be Preserved category are being mapped in both Urban and Rural areas. Lands identified in this category are mapped in part due to severe to very severe limitations for development of structures from high seasonal groundwater conditions, unstable soils, hydric or organic soil conditions or are generally poorly drained. For planning purposes, soil data available through the Soil Survey of Milwaukee and Waukesha Counties from the United States Department of Agriculture – Natural Resources Conservation Service was used.

Since the soil survey data is generalized, additional site-specific soil data analysis is necessary for individual development project review. It is recommended that the County and municipalities, through regulatory processes, provide a procedure to allow infield detailed investigation and soils analysis using the COMM 85 procedures, established in the Wisconsin Administrative Code, to assist in determining actual on-site soil conditions. Such procedures should identify and document whether or not seasonal high groundwater, soil instability, hydric or organic conditions exist. Where site-specific soil analysis indicates that soil conditions are suitable to accommodate development, an adjustment to the land use category or associated development density may be warranted and would not require a formal amendment request to an adjacent upland development land use category through the annual amendment process outlined in Chapter 9. The land use category which should be used for adjustment from the Other Lands to be Preserved category should be the adjacent upland land use category mapped on the Proposed Land Use Plan. For example, the land being adjusted from the Other Open Lands to be Preserved category are surrounded by lands in the Suburban I category and are found to be acceptable for development, not having the hydric soil conditions and high groundwater table conditions, the subject Open Lands category could be modified to the Suburban I category. There would, however, have to be a recognition and documentation of such change and the information used to justify the change so that appropriate measures are taken to incorporate the changes on the land use maps being maintained by the County and the affected municipality. A record of the documentation and information used to justify the change shall be filed with the County and the community, and an appropriate notation or identification on the Land Use Plan maps made with a reference to the location of the documentation shown on the map should be provided. It should also be noted that

Deleted: '	
Deleted: 3.5	
Deleted: 5	

the new land use category, which has been modified, from the Other Lands to be Preserved category, can utilize similar densities as used for this new category as if the land were originally all designated in the new land use category.

Lands with soil conditions determined to be unsuitable for development, consistent with the planning standards detailed in Chapter 2 of this Plan, should be retained in open space uses, but can be included within lot boundaries. In addition, these lands may also be included in calculation for density standards as set forth in the Planned Unit Development or Cluster Development standards identified above. It is recommended that the County and municipalities establish, through regulatory processes, a density credit for retaining these lands in open space use. For years, the County used 20 percent of the acreage of lands in this category when calculating densities for proposed developments in the attached or adjoining upland areas. It would be appropriate that a range of 20 percent to 40 percent be used for these lands, subject to specific local community regulations. Further, it may be appropriate to grant a density of one (1) unit per five (5) acres for those lands in the Other Open Lands to be Preserved category.

Regulatory Implementation

Land use regulatory ordinances are an important tool available to county and local units of government to shape growth and development in accordance with adopted land use objectives. Under the State comprehensive planning law (S.66.1001 of the Wisconsin Statutes), "beginning on January 1, 2010, if a local governmental unit engages in official mapping, subdivision regulation, zoning ordinance enacted or amended and zoning of shorelands or wetlands in shorelands, those actions shall be consistent with that local governmental unit's comprehensive plan". Accordingly, upon adoption of their comprehensive plans, the county, cities, villages, and towns should review the text of their ordinances and adjust as necessary to carry out the various implementation recommendations contained in this Plan. Such changes should include rezoning to use districts consistent with present uses so as not to prezone, consider allotment system to evaluate and grade proposed developments, which carry out the recommendations in this Plan and review of developments for consistency with the recommendations of this Plan.

Zoning in Urban Areas

Zoning in urban areas should be administered in accordance with county and local comprehensive plans, which refine the urban-area recommendations of the regional land use plan. The application of zoning districts that accommodate residential, commercial, industrial, and other urban development should be done in a manner that is consistent with any recommendations in the local comprehensive plan regarding the staging of development over the course of the plan period. Where the local comprehensive plan includes staging provisions, the application of zoning districts that accommodate the planned urban uses should be done incrementally in accordance with the timeframe set forth in the comprehensive plan. Lands should be placed in zoning districts consistent with their existing use, or, alternatively, placed in an urban land holding district or transition district. This approach allows municipalities to determine whether the proposed development is consistent with the Comprehensive Development Plan for Waukesha County or its goals, standards and objectives at the time a project is proposed. Specifically, a development plan needs to be periodically amended to adjust to changing conditions and updated data such as population and economic projections. Prezoning lands to match a particular land use plan, can limit a municipality's ability to respond to changing conditions and should be avoided wherever possible. Evaluations of new project developments should be reviewed and recommended on the basis of the recommendations contained in this and the local communities plan and allow development to occur where it is consistent with the recommendations contained herein.

Zoning in Rural Areas

Zoning in rural areas should be administered in accordance with county and local comprehensive plans, which refine the rural-area recommendations of this Comprehensive Development Plan. The following is recommended:

Prime agricultural lands identified in county and local comprehensive plans should be placed into an
exclusive agricultural zoning district, which essentially permits only agricultural and agriculture-related uses.

Such a district should provide for a residential density of no more than one dwelling unit per 35 acres and should prohibit incompatible urban development. According to the Waukesha County Farmland Preservation Plan, there are no prime agricultural lands located within the Town of Lisbon.

Other areas identified for continued agricultural use in county and local comprehensive plans should be placed into exclusive agricultural districts as defined above or into general agricultural districts with smaller minimum parcel sizes as may be appropriate for smaller agricultural operations, such as hobby farms or other specialty farms. In Lisbon, in accordance with the Recommended Land Use Plan Map, the remnant portions of the Merton/Lisbon Unrefined Future AEA Map Unit from the Waukesha County Farmland Preservation Plan and the north portion of Section 1 in the northeast corner of the Town comprises the majority of "other areas identified for continued agricultural use".

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

- Areas recommended in county and local comprehensive plans for rural residential development should be placed into a rural residential zoning district that limits development to no more than one dwelling unit per five acres and that encourages, or even requires, the use of conservation subdivision designs to accommodate the permitted development.
- Non-farmed wetlands should be placed in a lowland conservancy or shoreland-wetland zoning district, as appropriate. Farmed wetlands should remain in an agricultural zoning district as long as the parcel remains in agricultural use; with consideration given to placing a conservancy overlay zone on the wetland. Wetlands identified as farmed wetlands should be placed in a lowland conservancy district at the time farming activities on the wetland parcel cease and an application for residential or other urban development of the upland portion of the parcel is approved by the unit of government having zoning authority. Floodplains should be placed in the appropriate floodplain zoning district (floodway, floodfringe, flood storage, or general floodplain). Primary environmental corridors should be placed, and other natural resource areas, including secondary environmental corridors and isolated natural residential zoning district).

Official Mapping

Adoption of local official maps can contribute significantly to the implementation of the recommended County land use plan. Local units of government should prepare and adopt local official maps pursuant to Section 62.23(6) of the Wisconsin Statutes, showing thereon lands needed for future public use as streets, highways, transit ways, parkways, drainage ways, parks and playgrounds. The official map should be amended from time to time to incorporate the additional street and other public land requirements identified in detailed neighborhood unit development plans or rural area development plans, as those plans are prepared over time.

Land Division Ordinances

Land division ordinances should be adopted by the County and local units of government as a basis for the review and approval of subdivision plats and certified survey maps. Any proposed departure from adopted land use plans should be carefully considered and approved only if such departures are found to be in the public interest and the land use plan map is amended to a category that would allow the proposed subdivision. It should be noted that the existing Waukesha County subdivision control ordinance applies only to the statutory shorelands within the unincorporated areas of the County.

In 1999, Waukesha County created a Land Development Workgroup to analyze and address issues created by land division and development processes being used at that time. The Workgroup recommended:

- 1. The County should modify existing county transportation related ordinances to require pre-review of potential access points prior to recording of certified survey maps and subdivision plats.
- 2. Municipalities and the County should uniformly apply a development review checklist prepared by the Workgroup. The intent of the checklist is to set forth consistent standards for the review of

development proposals by county municipalities, and to clearly express to development sponsors what should be contained in a proper development proposal. The Workgroup further recommended that each municipality in the County amend appropriate local codes incorporating and adhering to the checklist or a more stringent version in development reviews.

3. Another issue raised by the Workgroup was the variety of subdivision definitions used by Waukesha County municipalities. The variety in definitions has led to larger scale residential developments proceeding as certified surveys as opposed to a platted subdivision.

To address this issue, the Workgroup developed a minimum definition of a subdivision to be applied in Waukesha County. The definition reads "<u>A subdivision is the division of land by the</u> owner, subdivider, or his successor in title, for the purpose of transfer of ownership or building development where the division creates more than four (4) residential lots less than 1.5 acres in five (5) years or where the division creates more than six (6) residential parcels or building sites of any size within five (5) years." A remnant parcel in excess of 10 acres in size may be excluded from the plat by action of the municipality upon application by the owner. Upon receipt of an application, the municipality will notify the County.

- 4. County staff should continue to host training workshops on land use planning and development review topics for local officials.
- 5. The County should define a Development Review Team process to enhance communication between the county, towns, cities, villages and developers regarding land development projects and issues.
- 6. The County should evaluate the existing County Storm Water Management Ordinance and Program to identify opportunities for addressing watershed based storm water issues.
- 7. The County should engage in a process to comprehensively update the Street and Highway Width Map and Jurisdictional System Plan.

This Plan recommends that municipalities and the County continue to follow the recommendations made by the Land Development Workgroup.

Regulation of Public Sanitary Sewerage Systems

In Wisconsin, the comprehensive water quality management planning program has led to the development of State regulations which have the effect of requiring the preparation of sanitary sewer service area plans for each public sewage treatment plant. In the Region, these plans are prepared cooperatively by the concerned local unit of government and the Regional Planning Commission, with ultimate approval authority resting with the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. Sewer service area plans have now been prepared for nearly all of the public sanitary sewerage systems in the Region. These plans define sewer service limits and delineate environmentally sensitive lands within those service limits to which service should not be provided. Chapter NR 110 and Chapter Comm 82 of the *Wisconsin Administrative Code* require that the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, with respect to public sanitary sewers, and the Wisconsin Department of Commerce, with adopted area wide water quality management plans and the sanitary sewer service areas identified in such plans before approving such extensions.

Under Chapter NR 121, sewer service areas must be sized in a manner that is consistent with long-range population projections. As a practical matter, this requirement is considered to be met if the buildout population of the sewer service area—that is, the population that could be accommodated if the sewer service area were completely developed at locally planned residential densities—is within the projection range envisioned under the regional land use plan. In sizing their sewer service areas, many communities choose to plan for the high end of the projected population range in order to retain flexibility in terms of the location of future urban growth.

Historically, communities in the Region, with the assistance of SEWRPC, have amended their sewer service area plans from time to time in response to changing needs and conditions. This may be expected to continue in the years ahead, particularly as communities complete their required local comprehensive plans.

As noted above, sanitary sewer service area plans are an important part of the basis for State agency review and approval of proposed sewer extensions. Policies adhered to by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources and Department of Commerce prohibit or otherwise limit the extension of sanitary sewers to serve development in certain environmentally significant lands identified in local sewer service area plans. The following restrictions were in effect in 2007:

- The extension of sanitary sewers to serve new development in primary environmental corridors is confined to limited recreational and institutional uses and rural-density residential development (maximum of one dwelling unit per five acres) in areas other than wetlands, floodplain, shorelands, and steep slope (12 percent or greater).
- The extension of sanitary sewers to serve development in portions of secondary environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas comprised of wetlands, floodplains, shorelands, or steep slopes is not permitted.

Park and Open Space Plan Implementation

Achievement of the outdoor park and recreation and open space preservation objectives of the land use plan requires continued public interest acquisition of land for outdoor recreation and open space uses. The county park and open space plan, as a refinement of the regional park and open space plan, recommends public interest acquisition (that is, acquisition by local, county, State and Federal government and by private conservancy interests) of land for recreation and resource protection purposes. The regional natural areas and critical species habitat protection and management plan also includes recommendations for public interest acquisition for most of the natural areas and critical species habitat sites identified in that plan. Moreover, cities, villages, and towns may acquire other lands for park and open space purposes as recommended in local comprehensive or park and open space plans. Each of the concerned units and agencies of government should continue or begin land acquisition programs in accordance with such plans. Private conservancy organizations are encouraged to supplement public open space acquisition efforts, as appropriate, to ensure the preservation of important natural areas. The detailed County Park and Open Space Plan is presented in Appendix A of this Plan.

Transfer of Development Rights

Under transfer-of-development-rights programs, or "TDR" programs, the right to develop a specified number of dwelling units under existing zoning may be transferred from one parcel, which would be maintained in open space use, to a different parcel, where the number of dwelling units permitted would be correspondingly increased. When the parcels are held by the same owner, the development rights are, in effect, simply transferred from one parcel to the other by the owner; when the parcels are held by different landowners, the transfer of development rights involves a sale of rights from one owner to another, at fair market value. In either case, the result is a shift in density away from areas proposed to be maintained in farming or other open use toward areas recommended for development. The transfer of development rights may be permanent or may be for a specific period of time or set of conditions.

The transfer of development rights may be implemented only if authorized under county or local zoning. To enable the transfer of development rights, the zoning ordinance must establish procedures by which the TDR technique will be administered, including the formula for calculating the number of residential dwelling units, which may be transferred from the "sending" area to the "receiving" area. The zoning district map must identify the sending and receiving areas, or at least identify the districts within which development rights can be transferred from one parcel to another. As of 2007, the Waukesha County Zoning Code contains provisions for the transfer of development rights.

Municipal Boundary and Utility Extension Agreements

The recommendations of the land use plan concerning the location and density of new urban development are formulated without regard to the location of city, village, and town boundaries. Rather, those plan recommendations are based upon a consideration of such factors as the location of existing utility infrastructure, including public sanitary sewer and water supply systems; the location of environmentally sensitive lands; and the availability of lands considered to be suitable for urban development. Where cities and villages own and operate essential public utilities not provided by adjacent towns, the plan assumes that cities and villages will either annex unincorporated territory recommended in the plan for urban development and provide extensions of essential utility services to serve such development, or that the cities and villages will reach agreement with adjacent unincorporated towns on the extension of those essential services without the need for annexation and municipal boundary change.

The *Wisconsin Statutes* establish a number of arrangements for cooperation among communities with regard to sharing of municipal services and cooperatively determining community boundaries, as indicated below:

- Section 66.0301: This section of the Statutes provides broad authority for intergovernmental cooperation
 among local units of government with respect to the provision and receipt of services and the joint exercise of
 their powers and duties.
- Section 66.0307: This section of the Statutes allows any combination of cities, villages, and towns to determine the boundary lines between themselves under a cooperative plan, subject to oversight by the Wisconsin Department of Administration. Section 66.0307 envisions the cooperative preparation of a comprehensive plan for the affected area by the concerned local units of government and prescribes in detail the contents of the cooperative plan. Importantly, the cooperative plan must identify any boundary change and any existing boundary that may not be changed during the planning period; identify any conditions that must be met before a boundary change may occur; include a schedule of the period during which a boundary change shall or may occur; and specify arrangements for the provision of urban services to the territory covered by the plan.
- Section 66.0225: This section of the Statutes allows two abutting communities that are parties to a court action regarding an annexation, incorporation, consolidation, or detachment, to enter into a written stipulation compromising and settling the litigation and determining a common boundary between the communities.

Cooperative approaches to the identification of future corporate limits and the extension of urban services can contribute significantly to attainment of the compact, centralized urban growth recommended in the land use plan. Conversely, failure of neighboring civil divisions to reach agreement on boundary and service extension matters may result in development at variance with the plan—for example, by causing new development to leap past logical urban growth areas where corporate limits are contested, to outlying areas where sewer and water supply service are not available. Accordingly, it is recommended that neighboring incorporated and unincorporated communities cooperatively plan for future land use, civil division boundaries, and the provision of urban services, as provided for under the *Wisconsin Statutes*, within the framework of the land use plan.

Municipal Revenue Sharing

Additional opportunity for intergovernmental cooperation is provided under Section 66.0305 of the *Wisconsin Statutes*, entitled "Municipal Revenue Sharing." Under this statute, two or more cities, villages, and towns may enter into revenue sharing agreements, providing for the sharing of revenues derived from taxes and special charges. The agreements may address matters other than revenue sharing, including municipal services and municipal boundaries. Municipal revenue sharing can provide for a more equitable distribution of the property tax revenue generated from new commercial and industrial development within urban areas and help reduce tax-base competition among communities, competition that can work against the best interests of the urban area as a whole.

A good example of municipal revenue sharing under this statute is the revenue sharing agreement included in the Racine Area Intergovernmental Sanitary Sewer Service, Revenue Sharing, Cooperation and Settlement Agreement entered into by the City of Racine and neighboring communities in 2002. Under this agreement, the City of Racine receives shared revenue payments from neighboring communities for use in renovating older residential areas, redeveloping brownfield sites, and supporting regional facilities like the City zoo, fine arts museum, and library. In return, the City of Racine agreed to support the incorporation of the adjacent Towns of Caledonia and Mt. Pleasant; refrain from annexations without the consent of the Towns; refrain from using extraterritorial zoning and plat review powers; and move ahead with sewerage system improvements that will accommodate growth in the Towns. It should be noted that the Towns of Mt. Pleasant and Caledonia were incorporated as villages in 2003 and 2005, respectively.

Brownfield Redevelopment

Factors contributing to the abandonment or underutilization of older commercial and industrial sites vary from site to site, but often include structures which are obsolete in terms of accommodating current manufacturing, warehousing, and office needs; inadequate site access to the freeway system; and insufficient site area for horizontally-oriented structures, contemporary parking and loading requirements, and possible future plant expansion needs.

Once abandoned, the re-use of former commercial and industrial sites is frequently constrained by contamination problems created by past industrial and commercial activities, giving rise to the term "brownfields"—sites, which are underutilized or abandoned due to known or suspected environmental contamination. While brownfields tend to be concentrated in older areas, they also occur in outlying areas. Redevelopment of brownfields is often hindered by high cleanup costs, and, even where contamination is only suspected, the potential for high cleanup costs tends to dampen private-sector interest in redevelopment.

In order to maintain the viability of existing urban areas, special efforts to promote the reuse of brownfields are required. Local units of government should include the cleanup and re-use of brownfields as a key element in their planning for the revitalization of urban areas and promote such re-use through such tools as tax-incremental financing. Limited State and Federal financial assistance has been made available in support of the cleanup and re-use of contaminated sites. Local units of government should make full use of, and assist private developers in securing, available State and Federal financial assistance.

The re-use of brownfield sites need not be limited to industrial use, but may include a mix of residential, commercial, recreational, and other development, in accordance with local development objectives. Properly carried out, the cleanup and re-use of brownfields has many potential benefits in addition to the underlying environmental benefits: elimination of blight, increase in the property-tax base, expansion of the housing stock, provision of jobs in close proximity to concentrations of the labor force, and increased use of existing public infrastructure.

Storm water System Planning

Storm water runoff pollution performance standards for new development, existing urban areas, and transportation facilities are set forth in Chapters NR 151 and NR 216 of the *Wisconsin Administrative Code*. The County should coordinate with municipalities to develop a storm water management plan to coordinate the management of storm water within defined watersheds, which often transcend municipal boundaries. Storm water management practices appropriate for each urban area can best be developed through the preparation of a system management plan. These practices should be developed in a manner that integrates development needs and environmental protection, including integrated water resources protection. Such practices should reflect both storm water runoff quantity and quality considerations, as well as groundwater quantity and quality protection. Practices that are designed to maintain the natural hydrology should be encouraged.

TRANSPORTATION

The 2035 Regional Transportation System Plan for Southeastern Wisconsin is multi-modal in nature, dealing with public transit, bicycle and pedestrian, travel demand management, transportation systems management, and arterial streets and highways. The plan is designed to serve, and be consistent with, the Year 2035 Regional Land Use Plan drafted by the SEWRPC. The process for the development of the recommended multi-modal program began with consideration and development of the travel demand management, transportation systems management, bicycle and pedestrian, and public transit elements of the plan. Arterial street and highway improvement and expansion was then considered only to address the residual high traffic volumes and attendant traffic congestion, which may not be expected to be alleviated by travel demand management, transportation systems management, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and public transit.

Chapter 8 of this Plan contains a series of recommendations set forth in the Year 2035 Regional Transportation System Plan for Southeastern Wisconsin.

The following additional recommendations were developed based upon inventory data, a public opinion survey, and transportation development objectives, principles, and standards presented in Chapter 2:

- 1. Waukesha County should work with the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC) to conduct a major review and reevaluation of the jurisdictional transfer recommendations in the year 2035 Regional Transportation System Plan.
- 2. Waukesha County should refine the proposed system of off street bicycle paths and surface arterial streets and highway system accommodation of bicycles contained in the 2035 Regional Transportation System Plan. In addition, the County should integrate bikeway accommodations into planning for upgrades and modifications to the county trunk highway system consistent with the refined county transportation plan and facilitate communication with local municipalities and bordering counties to address bikeway linkages and connectivity.
- 3. Discuss with Jefferson County opportunities to expand the Lake Country Recreation Trail from Oconomowoc to Watertown in Jefferson County.
- 4. The County and municipalities should implement the transportation system development planning objectives, principles and standards contained in Chapter 2.
- 5. The County and municipalities should evaluate dedicated funding sources for county wide shared taxi service to meet the needs of a growing elderly population in all 37 municipalities.
- 6. As a consequence of increasing rail freight traffic, the County should establish additional rail quiet zones and invest in railroad grade separations as a safety priority at county trunk highway crossings.
- 7. The County should work with local municipalities and the Wisconsin Department of Transportation's Bureau of Aeronautics to determine if maintaining Capitol Airport as an aviation facility is consistent with future transportation and land use plans.
- 8. Evaluate for implementation the public transit recommendations contained in the 2035 Regional Transportation System Plan for Southeastern Wisconsin such as car pool lanes, van pool and bus guide ways.

PLAN ADOPTION

Upon initiation of the cooperative planning process used to prepare this Comprehensive Development Plan for Waukesha County, several municipalities inquired as to whether individual municipal plans would have to be prepared or if a municipality could adopt this Plan to satisfy the provisions of Chapter 66.1001 Wisconsin Statutes. In August 7, 2002 correspondence to Waukesha County, staff from the Wisconsin Department of Administration – Office of Land Information Services opined: "If a municipality chooses to plan with Waukesha County two different outcomes will ensue as part of the planning process. First, a municipality may choose to adopt the plan document developed by the county as its own comprehensive plan provided it has sufficient local detail. Second, some municipality. The plan document adopted by this municipality would include additional addenda."

As presented in Chapter 1, the Wisconsin comprehensive planning law, set forth in Section 66.1001 of the Wisconsin Statutes, requires that comprehensive plans be completed and adopted by local governing bodies by January 1, 2010 in order for a county, city, village, or town to enforce its zoning, subdivision, or official mapping ordinances. According to this law, a comprehensive plan means:

- 1. For a county, a development plan that is prepared or amended under s.59.69 (2) or (3).
- 2. For a city or a village, or for a town that exercises village powers under s. 60.22 (3), or a master plan that is adopted or amended under s. 62.23 (2) or (3).

It is the intent of this Plan to satisfy the comprehensive planning requirements contained in s.66.1001 of the Wisconsin Statutes.

MONITORING AND UPDATING THE PLAN

Annual Plan Amendment

Amendments will be made to the Comprehensive Development Plan for Waukesha County on an annual basis. The Department of Parks and Land Use will make available a plan amendment request form for property owners and towns wishing to propose a change to the Plan. The deadline for plan amendment request forms will be the end of the workday on January 15th. If that date falls on a weekend, the submittal deadline will be extended to the end of the workday on the following Monday. All applications for plan amendments will be scheduled for a public hearing and advertised according to statutory procedures. As with proposed zoning changes, property owners within a minimum of 300 feet of the property subject to the plan amendment will be notified in writing by regular mail. A review and recommendation for each request will be prepared and submitted to the Park and Planning Commission, Land Use, Parks and Environment Committee and County Board for consideration. Under special circumstances, the Waukesha County Park and Planning Commission may authorize plan amendments to be processed in addition to the schedule outlined herein.

Regional or Countywide Plan Refinements

Due to the complexity of comprehensive planning, it is very difficult to complete all detailed planning initiatives in advance of comprehensive amendments to a Development Plan for Waukesha County. As identified in the implementation recommendations, it is anticipated that the Regional Water Supply Plan, Jurisdictional Highway System Plan and Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities System Plan will be updated or completed following the adoption of this Plan. The products of those regional or countywide planning initiatives will be evaluated and appropriate amendments to this comprehensive development plan will be proposed.

Amendments by Cities and Villages

When cities and villages amend land use plans, the adopted plan amendments will be forwarded digitally to the Department of Parks and Land Use in a timely manner to provide for updating of the planned land use map on the Waukesha County Land Information System.

Comprehensive Amendment

The Comprehensive Development Plan for Waukesha County should be updated no less than once every 10 years. In anticipation of the continued development of the County, it is recommended a comprehensive reevaluation, update, and revision, as appropriate, of this Plan be conducted following the availability of the Year 2020 Census data. Initiating a comprehensive plan review using Year 2020 data will allow for the evaluation of planning projections made as part of the Year 2020 Regional Land Use Plan adopted in 1997 and the first generation Waukesha County Development Plan adopted in 1996, as well as this Plan. It is further recommended that the comprehensive reevaluation use a similar intermunicipal cooperative approach used in the preparation of this Plan.

Land Development Plan Monitoring

On an annual basis, the staff of the Waukesha County Department of Parks and Land Use will evaluate plan amendment requests for consistency with the planning objectives and standards contained in Chapter 2 of the Plan. Staff recommendations to the County Park and Planning Commission and County Board will be consistent with the planning standards. On an on-going basis, the staff will evaluate rezoning requests for their consistency with Plan. For rezoning requests inconsistent with the Plan, the applicant will be advised of the inconsistency and recommended to request a plan amendment. Plan amendments and data associated with the Plan will be made available through the County's website.