

SOUTH	EASTERN V	VISCONSIN
REGIONAL	PLANNING	COMMISSION

KENOSHA COUNTY

Leon T. Dreger Thomas J. Gorlinski Sheila M. Siegler

MILWAUKEE COUNTY

Daniel J. Diliberti William R. Drew, Vice Chairman William Heinemann

OZAUKEE COUNTY

Leroy A. Bley Thomas H. Buestrin, Chairman Gus W. Wirth, Jr.

WAUKESHA COUNTY

Duane H. Bluemke Robert F. Hamilton Paul G. Vrakas

RACINE COUNTY Richard A. Hansen Martin J. Itzin Jean M. Jacobson, Secretary

WALWORTH COUNTY

Anthony F. Balestrieri Allen L. Morrison, Treasurer Robert J. Voss

WASHINGTON COUNTY

Lawrence W. Hillman Daniel S. Schmidt Patricia J. Strachota

ROCHESTER LAND USE PLAN COMMITTEE

Robert P. Willard, Commissioner, Rochester Town
Chairman Planning Commission
Peter Laughran, Commissioner, Rochester Village
Vice-Chairman Planning Commission
Charles Ahler Trustee, Rochester Village Board
Jane A. Babik Commissioner, Rochester Town
Planning Commission
Gary J. Beck Chairman, Rochester Town Board
Dennis Crombie Commissioner, Rochester Village
Planning Commission
Kenneth R. Dahlstrom Commissioner, Rochester Town
Planning Commission
Donald J. Eckert Commissioner, Rochester Town
Planning Commission
Charles O. Haubrich Citizen, Town of Rochester
James Henning Trustee, Rochester Village Board
Patrick T. Hinke Citizen, Town of Rochester
Rudi Hosni Rochester
Village Planning Commission
Patricia A. Hurley Citizen, Town of Rochester
Roger E. Kieffer President, Rochester Village Board
Thomas Lukas Commissioner, Rochester
Village Planning Commission
Mary Jo Mathers Commissioner, Rochester Town
Planning Commission
Richard J. Mogensen Supervisor, Rochester Town Board
Wayne M. Schrader Supervisor, Rochester Town Board
Brian R. Wanasek Citizen, Town of Rochester

SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF

Philip C. Evenson, AICP Executive Director		
Kenneth R. Yunker, PE Assistant Director		
Nancy M. Anderson Chief Community Assistance Planner		
Robert P. Biebel, PE Chief Environmental Engineer		
Leland H. Kreblin, RLS Chief Planning Illustrator		
Elizabeth A. Larsen Administrative Officer		
Donald R. Martinson, PE Chief Transportation Engineer		
John G. McDougall Geographic Information Systems Manager		
John R. Meland Chief Economic Development Planner		
Donald M. ReedChief Biologist		
William J. Stauber, AICP Chief Land Use Planner		
RACINE COUNTY DIVISION OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT STAFF		
Arnold C. Clement		
Julie A. Anderson		

Special acknowledgment is due Nancee A. Nejedlo, Principal Planning Draftsman, and David A. Schilling, SEWRPC Principal Planner, for their contributions to the preparation of this report.

COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE PLANNING REPORT NUMBER 237

A LAND USE PLAN FOR THE TOWN AND VILLAGE OF ROCHESTER: 2020 RACINE COUNTY, WISCONSIN

Prepared by the

Racine County Division of Planning and Development 14200 Washington Avenue Sturtevant, Wisconsin 53177

and

Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission P.O. Box 1607 Old Courthouse 916 N. East Avenue Waukesha, Wisconsin 53187-1607

November 1999

(This page intentionally left blank)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Chapter I—INTRODUCTION	1
The Planning Area	1
Early Town History	1
Regional Influences	3
Study Purpose	6
The Community I and Use Planning Process	6
Inventory and Analysis	6
Environmentation of Community	Ų
	- 7
Land Use Planning Objectives	/
Identification of Community Land Use	
and Facility Requirements	7
Development and Adoption	
of Recommended Plan	8
Plan Implementation	8
Report Structure	8
Chanter IL PODULATION HOUSEHOLDS	
AND EMPLOYMENT INVENTORY	
AND EMPLOYMENT INVENTORY,	•
ANALYSIS, AND FORECASI	9
Introduction	9
Historic and Forecast Population,	
Household, and Employment Levels	9
Population	- 9
Households	12
Employment	13
Population and Housing Characteristics	14
Education	14
Income Levels	15
Desidential Desidence Activity	15
Residential Building Activity	15
Housing Value	15
Housing Characteristics	15
Labor Force	17
Summary	17
Population, Household, and	
Employment Forecasts	17
Population and Housing Characteristics	19
F	
Chapter III _NATURAL RESOURCE BASE	
INVENTORY AND ANALVSIS	21
Invelvetion	21
	21
Soils	21
General Soil Groups	21
Soil Suitability Interpretations	21
Soil Suitability for Residential	
Development Served by Public	
Sanitary Sewers	22
Soil Suitability for Onsite	
Sewage Disposal Systems	22
Agricultural Soil Suitability	24
g	

Soil Suitability for Sand	
and Gravel Extraction	25
Topographic and	
Topographic-Related Features	27
Watersheds, Subwatersheds, and Subbasins	27
Surface Water Resources	27
Lakes	27
Streams	27
Floodlands	27
Wetlands	30
Woodlands	31
Prairie Vegetation	31
Wildlife Habitat Areas	31
Natural Areas and Critical	
Species Habitat Sites	32
Natural Areas	32
Critical Species Habitat Sites	33
Resource-Related Elements	34
Existing Outdoor Recreation	
and Open Space Sites	34
Recreational Trails and Rustic Roads	35
Historic Sites	35
Environmental Corridors and Isolated	
Natural Resource Areas	35
Primary Environmental Corridors	38
Secondary Environmental Corridors	38
Isolated Natural Resource Areas	38
Summary	38
Summary	
Chapter IV-MAN-MADE	
ENVIRONMENT	41
Introduction	41
Existing I and Use	41
Lirban I and Uses	41
Nonurban Land Uses	41
Transportation Facilities	42
Arterial Streets and Highways	42
Freight Railway Facilities	42
Dublic I Itilities	43
Sonitary Sewer Service	43
Public Water Supply System	46
Engineered Stormwater Drainage System	46
Community Facilities and Services	46
Schools	46
L ihrary Services	48
Fire Protection Emergency Medical	
Services and Police Service	48
Solid Waste Disposal	49
Summary	49

Page

iii

Chapter V—EXISTING	
LAND USE REGULATIONS	53
Introduction	53
Zoning	53
Town of Rochester Zoning	53
Village of Rochester Zoning	59
Land Subdivision and Land	
Improvement Regulations	62
Racine County Sanitary Code	63
Federal Wetland Regulations	63
Other State Resource Regulatory Programs	63
Summary	64
Chapter VI—LAND USE PLAN	67
Introduction	67
Plan Determinants	67
Existing Conditions	67
Objectives	67
Delineated Waterford/Rochester	
Sanitary Sewer Service Area	68
Future Population and Household Levels	69
Public Informational Meetings	69
Recommended Land Use Plan for the	
Town and Village of Rochester	70
Residential Development	70
Commercial and Industrial Development	70
Other Urban Development	71
Urban Reserve	72
Agricultural Lands	72
Rural Residential and Agriculture Lands	73
Environmentally Significant Areas	73
Primary Environmental Corridors	73
Secondary Environmental Corridors and	
Isolated Natural Resource Areas	74
Open Space and Recreation Trails	74
Extractive Uses	75
Recommended Arterial Streets and Highways	76
Summary	77
Chapter VII—PLAN IMPLEMENTATION	79
Introduction	79
Urban Density Residential Development	79
Urban Service Area and	-
Detailed Platting Layouts	80

Community Effort to Save Agricultural	
and Environmental Land	8 0
Incentives for Continued Private Ownership	
of Agricultural and Open Space Lands	81
Rural Density Residential Development	81
Rural Cluster Development	81
Zoning	82
A-2 and R-2 Zoning Districts	82
A-1 and C-1 Zoning Districts	83
Zoning Ordinance Text Changes	83
Town of Rochester	83
Village of Rochester	86
Land Division Ordinance, Subdivision	
and Certified Survey Map Review	86
Official Mapping	87
Precise Neighborhood Unit Development Plans	87
Village-Town Joint Planning	
Efforts and Cooperation	87
Purchase and Transfer of Development Rights	88
Purchase of Development Rights	88
Transfer of Development Rights	89
Plan Adoption	89
Summary	89

Chapter VIII—SUMMARY	91
Introduction	91
Planning Area	91
Existing Conditions	91
Population and Employment Levels	91
Natural Resource Base	91
Land Use	92
Land Use Regulations	92
Objectives	92
Anticipated Growth and Change	92
The Recommended Plan	92
Urban Residential Land Use	93
Other Urban Land Use	93
Urban Reserve	93
Environmental Corridors and	
Isolated Natural Resource Areas	93
Agricultural and Rural Residential Lands	93
Plan Implementation	93
Concluding Remarks	94

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix		Page
Α	List of Citizens Who Regularly Attended Rochester Land Use Plan Committee Meetings	97
В	Recommended Changes to the Racine County Zoning Ordinance	99
	iv .	

AppendixPageCTown Plan Commission Resolution Adopting
the Town and Village of Rochester Land Use Plan101DVillage Plan Commission Resolution Adopting
the Town and Village of Rochester Land Use Plan103ETown Board Resolution Adopting the Town and Village of Rochester Land Use Plan105

F	Village Board	Resolution Adopting the 7	Town and Village of Rochester Land Use Plan 1	07

Page

LIST OF TABLES

Table

Chapter II

1	Historical and Forecast Population Levels for the Region, Racine County,	
	and the Rochester Planning Area: 1850-2020	10
2	Existing and Forecast Population by Age Group in the Region,	
	Racine County, and the Rochester Planning Area: 1990 and 2020	11
3	Historical and Forecast Households in the Region,	
	Racine County, and the Rochester Planning Area: 1960-2020	12
4	Historical and Forecast Population per Occupied Housing Unit in the Region,	
	Racine County, and the Rochester Planning Area: 1960-2020	13
5	Historical and Forecast Employment Levels for the Region,	
	Racine County, and the Rochester Planning Area: 1970-2020	14
6	Educational Attainment of Persons 25 Years and Over in the Region,	
	Racine County, the Town of Rochester, and the Village of Rochester: 1990	15
7	Household and Family Income in the Region, Racine County,	
	the Town of Rochester, and the Village of Rochester: 1989	16
8	Residential Building Activity in the Town and Village of Rochester: 1977-1996	17
9	Value of Owner-Occupied Housing Units in the Region, Racine County,	
	the Town of Rochester, and the Village of Rochester: 1990	18
10	Housing Characteristics of the Region, Racine County,	
	the Town of Rochester, and the Village of Rochester: 1990	18
11	Employed Persons 16 Years and Older by Class of Worker in the Region,	
	Racine County, the Town of Rochester, and the Village of Rochester: 1990	19
12	Employed Persons 16 Years and Older by Occupation in the Region,	
	Racine County, the Town of Rochester, and the Village of Rochester: 1990	19

Chapter III

13	Soil Suitability for Onsite Sewage Disposal Systems in the Rochester Planning Area	26
14	Natural Areas and Critical Species Habitat Sites in the Rochester Planning Area: 1995	35
15	Existing Park and Open Space Sites in the Rochester Planning Area: 1996	37
16	Point Values for Natural Resource Base and Natural Resource Base-Related Elements	38

Chapter IV

17	Existing Land Use in the Rochester Planning Area: 1995	43
18	Land Use in the Rochester Planning Area: 1963 and 1995	44

Chapter V

19	Summary of Basic Zoning Regulations: Racine County Ordinance	55
20	Existing Zoning in the Town of Rochester: 1995	58
21	Summary of Zoning Regulations: Village of Rochester	61
22	Existing Zoning in the Village of Rochester: 1995	62

Chapter VI

23	Planned Land Use in the Rochester Planning Area: 2020	72	2
----	---	----	---

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure

Chapter II

1	Historical and Forecast Population Levels for the Rochester Planning Area: 1920-2020	10
2	Historical and Forecast Household Levels for the Rochester Planning Area: 1960-2020	12
3	Historical and Forecast Employment Levels for the Rochester Planning Area: 1970-2020	14

Chapter VII

4	Example of a Cluster Development in the Town of Rochester	83
5	Example of a Cluster Development in the Town of Rochester	84
6	Preservation of Primary Environmental Corridor: Five-Acre Lot Design	85
7	Preservation of Primary Environmental Corridor: Cluster Development on One-Acre Lots	85
8	Preservation of Primary Environmental Corridor: Condominium Development	85

LIST OF MAPS

Map

Chapter I

1	Location of the Rochester Planning Area in the Southeastern Wisconsin Region	2
2	Historic Urban Growth in the Rochester Planning Area: 1850-1995	4
3	2020 Regional Land Use Plan as It Pertains to the Rochester Planning Area	5
4	2020 Regional Transportation System Plan as It Pertains to the Rochester Planning Area	7

Chapter III

5	General Soil Associations in the Rochester Planning Area	22
6	Soil Suitability for Residential Development Served by	· ·
	Public Sanitary Sewers in the Rochester Planning Area	23
7	Soil Suitability for Conventional Onsite Sewage	
	Disposal Systems in the Rochester Planning Area	24
8	Soil Suitability for Mound Sewage Disposal Systems in the Rochester Planning Area	25
9	Agricultural Soil Capability in the Rochester Planning Area	26
10	Areas where Soil Survey Data Indicate that Potential	
	Sand and Gravel Deposits May Occur in the Rochester Planning Area	28

vi

Page

Page

Мар

11	Surface Drainage, Wetlands, Floodlands, and	
	Watershed Features in the Rochester Planning Area: 1995	29
12	Slope Analysis in the Rochester Planning Area	30
13	Woodlands in the Rochester Planning Area	32
14	Wildlife Habitat Areas in the Rochester Planning Area	33
15	Natural Areas and Critical Species Habitat Sites in the Rochester Planning Area: 1996	34
16	Existing Park and Open Space Sites in the Rochester Planning Area: 1996	36
17	Environmental Corridors and Isolated Natural	
	Resource Areas in the Rochester Planning Area: 1995	37

Chapter IV

18	Existing Land Use in the Rochester Planning Area: 1995	42
19	Prime Agricultural Lands in the Rochester Planning Area: 1995	45
20	Arterial Street and Highway System in the Rochester Planning Area: 1995	46
21	Planned Sanitary Sewer Service Areas Tributary to the Western	
	Racine County Sewerage District Sewage-Treatment Facility	47
22	Existing Sanitary Sewer Service in the Rochester Planning Area: 1995	48
23	Village of Rochester Engineered Stormwater Drainage System: 1995	49
24	School Districts and Schools Serving the Rochester Planning Area: 1995	50

Chapter V

25	Existing Zoning in the Town of Rochester: 1995	54
26	Shoreland Areas in the Rochester Planning Area: 1995	59
27	Existing Zoning in the Village of Rochester: 1995	60
28	Areas in the Town of Rochester Subject to Extraterritorial Plat Review Authority	64

Chapter VI

29	Recommended Land Use Plan for the Town and Village of Rochester: 2020	71
30	State Project Areas and Proposed County Trails in the Rochester Planning Area	76
31	Arterial Street and Highway System for the Rochester Planning Area: 2020	77

(This page intentionally left blank)

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

The municipal planning enabling act, as set forth in Section 62.23 of the Wisconsin Statutes, provides for the creation of plan commissions and charges those commissions with the duty and function of making and adopting a "master"-or comprehensive-plan for the physical development of the municipality. The scope and content of the comprehensive plan, as set forth in the Statutes, is very broad, extending to all aspects of the physical development of a community. The Statutes indicate that the comprehensive plan shall be made with the general purpose of guiding and accomplishing a coordinated, adjusted, and harmonious development of the community which will, in accordance with existing and future needs, best promote the public health, safety, morals, order, prosperity, and general welfare, as well as efficiency and economy in the process of development. Section 60.10(2)(c) of the Statutes, provides that town boards may adopt village powers, including comprehensive planning powers delegated to cities and villages under Section 62.23. The Town of Rochester has adopted such powers.

In 1994, the Town of Rochester requested that Racine County and the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission assist the Town in the preparation of a Town land use plan. That same year the Town Board appointed a land use plan committee to oversee the preparation of the plan. The first meeting of that committee was held on May 16, 1994. Subsequently, on October 21, 1996, Town and Village officials determined that it was in the best interest of both communities to prepare a joint Town and Village plan. The plan was to provide Town and Village officials with a tool to better guide and shape land use development in the planning area. This report sets forth the findings and recommendations of the planning effort undertaken in response to that request. It is intended to assist in defining the land use development objectives of the planning area and in identifying means for achieving those objectives over time.

The planning effort involved extensive inventories and analyses of the factors and conditions affecting development in the planning area, including the preparation of projections of the possible range of future population and economic activity levels within the planning area; extensive inventories of the natural and man-made bases of the planning area—including existing land use, soils, flood hazard areas, woodlands, wildlife habitat, wetlands, and transportation facilities, public utilities and other community facilities and services; an inventory of existing local plan implementation devices; careful analyses of the inventory findings; and the development and adoption of a plan which may be expected to accommodate probable future population and employment levels in a manner consistent with the local land use development objectives of the planning area. The plan, when adopted by the Town and Village Plan Commissions and Town and Village Boards, is intended to serve as a guide for use by Town and Village officials in making better development decisions over time that will promote public health, safety, and general welfare.

THE PLANNING AREA

The planning area considered consists of the Town and Village of Rochester. The planning area is located in western Racine County and encompasses an area of about 17.7 square miles. As shown on Map 1, the planning area is bounded on the north by the Town and Village of Waterford, on the east by the Town of Dover, on the south by the Town of Burlington, and on the west by the Town of Spring Prairie in Walworth County.

EARLY TOWN HISTORY¹

The year 1836 marked the completion of the U.S. Public Land Survey over the area that now comprises the Southeastern Wisconsin Region, including Racine County. The survey, which was established by an act of the Continental Congress in 1785, formed an important basis for defining county and local government civil division boundaries and stands today as the basis for all division of land and for all real property boundary descriptions in the area. The U.S. Public Land Survey permitted the ready transfer of the ownership of land from the Federal government to private citizens, and was

¹The history of the Town and Village of Rochester was derived, in part, from: "Racine—Growth and Change in a Wisconsin County," SEWRPC Technical Record Vol. 4, No. 3, and Session Laws of Wisconsin Territory.



Source: SEWRPC.

essential for settlement and private development of the area.

By an act of the Territorial Legislature on January 2, 1838, the civil Town of Rochester was established, encompassing approximately the western half of Racine County. A portion of the original Town of Rochester was detached in 1839 to create the Town of Burlington. In 1852, by act of the Racine County Board, the civil Town of Rochester was created from lands encompassing portions of the Towns of Burlington and Rochester. The remaining portion of the original Town of Rochester became the Town of Waterford, also in 1852.

Available land, timber, and water-power attracted settlers to what is now the Rochester area following completion of the U.S. Public Land Survey. Levi Brown Godfrey and John B. Wade arrived late in 1835. They chose a site at the confluence of the Pishtaka River and the Musquequack River, later to be called the Fox River and the Wind Lake Drainage Canal (Muskego Creek), establishing the nucleus of what would become the Village of Rochester.

By 1841, settlers had bought up most of the land in the Town. Early Federal Census figures indicate that about two-thirds of the settlers were native-born Americans with the remainder comprised largely of British immigrants. The British settlers in the Town established the English Settlement in the eastern portion of the Town. Settlements were also established at Honey Creek, located along what is now CTH D in the northwestern part of the Town, and Honey Lake (Vienna) at the crossroads of that is now CTH FF and CTH DD in the southwestern part of the Town.

Rochester became the center of services to the surrounding agricultural area as well as a main stop on two welltraveled routes between Racine and Janesville. The U.S. Road of 1840 was paralleled after 1848 by a plank road which joined to pass through what is now the Village of Rochester and over the river before diverging again.

In January, 1840, the settlement included two stores, a post-office, a saw-mill, a fanning mill shop, several carpenter shops, and some two dozen homes, mostly of logs. There soon would be a cabinet shop, a lead pipe foundry, a gristmill, iron foundry, hardware and dry-goods stores, grocers, carriage and plow shops, harness-makers, tailors, coopers, and blacksmiths. Rochester's two inns were frequently filled with travelers and wheat or lead-hauling teamsters. In Rochester, during the winter of 1843-1844, Jerome Increase Case invented a successful grain thresher and separator which he was

soon to manufacture in Racine. A third hotel was begun by Mr. Godfrey in 1844 in anticipation of a railroad.

Rochester's early growth rate declined when the Racine, Janesville, and Mississippi Rail Road Company constructed the first railway line in the area, actually passing six miles south of Rochester through Burlington in 1855. This line later became part of the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul and Pacific Railroad Company, better known as the Milwaukee Road. Construction of a second railway in the area was undertaken between 1854 and 1858 when the Fox River Valley Railroad began grading from Milwaukee through Rochester to Richmond, Illinois before the project was abandoned for lack of funds. The Milwaukee Electric Railway and Light Company used much of this alignment when it constructed an electric interurban railway line from Milwaukee to Burlington in 1909. The interurban line was abandoned in 1938, and today STH 36 parallels much of the interurban railway alignment and remains an important transportation facility in the area.

Along with natural resources and transportation links, educational resources have long impacted the development of the community. Private schooling was offered in a log home in 1838. The District No. 1 school was built in 1840 where the library now stands. A second school served residents on the east side of the river between 1848 and 1892, when the two districts were combined. The brick school which still stands next to the library was built around 1908. Mr. Godfrey's unused stone hotel housed a succession of private schools until 1867 when the Free Will Baptists bought the building and provided private secondary education until 1890. The Congregationalists, in affiliation with Beloit College, continued to operate a secondary school in the same building between 1894 and 1910, known as the Rochester Academy. The Racine County School of Agriculture and Domestic Economy operated from 1912 to 1959 on the southwestern edge of the village, offering a dormitory after 1918 for students from afar.

The Village of Rochester was incorporated in 1912, with the balance of the Town retaining an agricultural economic base. The pattern of urban growth in the planning area is shown on Map 2.

REGIONAL INFLUENCES

Sound planning practice dictates that local plans be prepared within the framework of broader areawide plans. The Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission is the official areawide planning agency for the seven-county Southeastern Wisconsin Region, which includes Racine County and the Town and

3



HISTORIC URBAN GROWTH IN THE ROCHESTER PLANNING AREA: 1850-1995

Source: SEWRPC.

Village of Rochester. The Commission has, since its creation in 1960, pursued the preparation of an advisory plan for the physical development of the Region through the systematic formulation of those elements of such a plan considered most important to the units and agencies of government operating within the Region.

The adopted regional land use plan, as set forth in SEWRPC Planning Report No. 45, *A Regional Land Use Plan for Southeastern Wisconsin: 2020*, provides recommendations with respect to the amount, spatial distribution, and general arrangement of the various land uses required to serve the needs of the existing and anticipated future resident population and economic activity levels within the Region. Particularly pertinent to the preparation of a land use plan for the Town and Village of Rochester are the recommendations contained within the adopted regional land use plan for the preservation of the primary environmental corridors and the most productive farmland of the Region, and for the encouragement of a more compact pattern of urban development in those areas that are covered by soils suitable for urban use; that are not subject to special hazards such as flooding; and that can be readily and economically served by such essential urban facilities and services as public sanitary sewerage and water supply. These salient recommendations of the regional land use plan provide a sound framework for the development of a local land use plan. It should be noted that in Racine County the most productive farmland are generally those areas identified as prime agricultural lands in the Racine County farmland preservation plan. The adopted regional land use plan as it pertains to the Town and Village of Rochester plan-



2020 REGIONAL LAND USE PLAN AS IT PERTAINS TO THE ROCHESTER PLANNING AREA

Source: SEWRPC.

ning area as well as the aforereferenced prime agricultural lands are shown on Map 3.

The adopted regional transportation system plan, as described in SEWRPC Planning Report No. 46, *A Regional Transportation System Plan for Southeastern Wisconsin: 2020*, provides recommendations as to how the regional land use plan can best be served by arterial street and highway and transit facilities. It recommends a functional and jurisdictional system of arterial streets and highways to serve the Region through the design year 2020, together with 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 within the Region, and of existing highway and

transit system capacity and use. The transportation system plan as it pertains to the Town and Village of Rochester planning area is shown on Map 4.

The adopted regional park, outdoor recreation, and related open space plan, as 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 within the Region, and recommends a system of large regional resource-oriented parks, recreational corridors, and smaller urban parks to meet these needs and to provide form and structure to urban development within the Region. The adopted regional plan has been refined and detailed by the Commission for Racine County, as documented in SEWRPC Community Assistance Plan-

ning Report No. 134, A Park and Open Space Plan for Racine County, adopted by Racine County in 1989.

The findings and recommendations of the water quality management planning program for Southeastern Wisconsin are described in Planning Report No. 30, A Regional Water Quality Management Plan for Southeastern Wisconsin: 2000. The plan documented in this report consists of a land use and sanitary sewer service area element, a point source water pollution abatement element, a nonpoint source water pollution abatement element, a wastewater sludge management element, and a water quality monitoring element. The regional water quality management plan includes recommended sanitary sewer service areas attendant to each recommended sewage treatment facility and related trunk sewer facilities in the Region. These initially recommended sanitary sewer service areas were based upon the urban land use configuration identified in the Commissionadopted regional land use plan for the year 2000. The recommended sanitary sewer service area for the Town and Village of Rochester planning area as identified in regional plans, has been refined and detailed by the Commission as documented in SEWRPC Community Assistance Planning Report No. 141, Sanitary Sewer Service Area for the Waterford/Rochester Area.

In addition to the regional plan elements, there is a subregional plan element which is also of importance to the Town and Village of Rochester planning area. This plan element consist of a comprehensive plan for the Fox River watershed, documented in SEWRPC Planning Report No. 12, *A Comprehensive Plan for the Fox River Watershed*. This subregional plan contains recommendations for generalized land use, resource conservation, park and outdoor recreation, flood control, and stream and lake water pollution abatement, as well as water supply plan elements which pertain to the Town and Village of Rochester planning area.

The findings and recommendations of the regional and subregional plan elements all have important implications for any comprehensive planning effort for the Town and Village of Rochester. The pertinent recommendations of these plan elements contained in these reports are included in this plan by reference and are considered further in the inventory and analysis chapters of this report.

STUDY PURPOSE

The purpose of the requested planning effort is to provide the Town and Village of Rochester with one of the key elements of a comprehensive community development plan—a land use plan. This plan, while primarily intended to meet local planning objectives, is also intended to carry related regional and county plan elements into greater depth and detail as necessary for sound regional county and local planning. In conducting this planning effort, every attempt was made to identify the physical constraints imposed upon, and the opportunities open to, the Town and Village of Rochester; to set forth a sound set of land use development objectives for the planning area; and to determine proper locations for the various anticipated land uses within the planning area to the plan design year 2020. Finally, plan implementation measures and devices needed to effectively carry out the recommended plan were identified with particular emphasis upon recommended revisions to the Racine County/ Town of Rochester Zoning Ordinance, the Village of Rochester Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Control Ordinances.

THE COMMUNITY LAND USE PLANNING PROCESS

The recommended plan presented herein was developed through a land use planning process consisting of the following steps: 1) a comprehensive inventory of the factors affecting development in the planning area; 2) a careful analysis of the inventory data; 3) the formulation of community land use objectives; 4) the identification of land use needs in the planning area through the year 2020, based upon the population and economic activity forecasts and the land use objectives; 5) the development and evaluation of the recommended plan; and 6) the recommendation of plan implementation measures. The preparation of the plan was guided by a Land Use Plan Committee representing a wide range of interests in the planning area. Membership of this Committee is listed on the inside front cover of this report.

Inventory and Analysis

Reliable basic planning data are absolutely essential to the formulation of a workable land use plan. Consequently, inventory becomes the first operational step in the planning process. The crucial nature of factual information in the planning process should be evident, since no intelligent forecasts can be made or alternative courses of action evaluated without knowledge of the current state of the system being planned. The sound formulation of a land use plan for the Town and Village of Rochester requires that factual data be developed on historic and existing population and employment levels. The plan will also require data on the existing land use pattern, on the potential demand for each of the various major land use categories, on the major determinants of these demands, and on local planning objectives and constraints, as well as on the underlying natural resource base.



2020 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN AS IT PERTAINS TO THE ROCHESTER PLANNING AREA

Source: SEWRPC.

The necessary inventory and analyses not only provide data describing the existing conditions, but also provide a basis for identifying existing and potential problems in the planning area, as well as opportunities and potentials for urban growth. The inventory data are also crucial to the forecasting of community development needs, and to developing and evaluating the land use plan.

Formulation of Community Land Use Planning Objectives

An objective may be defined as a goal or end toward the attainment of which plans and policies are directed. Planning is a rational process for formulating and attaining objectives. The objectives developed serve as a guide to the preparation of the land use plan. Objectives may change as new information is developed, as objectives are fulfilled through plan implementation, or as objectives fail to be implemented owing to changing public attitudes and values. The formulation of objectives should involve the active participation of officials and citizens. The active participation of the Town and Village citizenry and elected and appointed officials in the planning process was facilitated through public meetings, including several Town and Village land use plan Committee meetings, and the incorporation of the findings of a Town survey completed in 1991.

Identification of Community Land Use and Facility Requirements

Although the preparation of forecasts is not planning, a land use plan must, to the extent possible, anticipate future requirements as a basis for the development of the plan. In the planning effort, forecasts are required of future events and conditions which are outside the scope of the system to be planned. The future demand for land and facilities will depend primarily upon the size of the future population and the nature of future economic activity within the planning area. Control of changes in population and economic activity levels, however, lie largely-although not entirely-outside the scope of government activity at the local level, and therefore outside the scope of the local planning process. Future population and economic activity levels must, therefore, be forecast. These forecasts, in turn, can be used to determine the probable future demand for land uses and facilities. This is not to say that governmental policies at the local level cannot influence the course of development and, consequently, of population and economic activity growth rates.

Development and Adoption of Recommended Plan

Having estimated the probable future demand for land use and facilities, a land use plan which meets the demands can be developed. The plan should be evaluated based on its ability to attain the agreed-upon land use objectives. The evaluation should be made by the Land Use Plan Committee. Such evaluation involves the use of data obtained during the inventory and analysis stages of the planning process, as well as during the later plan design stages.

Plan Implementation

Implementation of the adopted land use plan requires the use of several planning tools of a legal nature. A zoning ordinance and accompanying zoning map should be used to legally assure that private development and redevelopment occur in conformance with the adopted plan. The zoning regulations should govern not only the types of land uses permitted in various parts of the community, but the height and arrangement of buildings on the land, the intensity of the use of land, and the supporting facilities needed to carry out the intent of the land use plan. Land subdivision regulations should be applied to assure that any proposed land subdivision plats and certified survey maps conform to the plan with respect to the proposed land uses to be accommodated. Implementation of the plan should also be furthered by the formulation of public policies that will ensure plan implementation.

REPORT STRUCTURE

This planning report consists of eight chapters. Following this introductory chapter, Chapter II, "Population, Households, and Employment Inventory, Analysis, and Forecasts," presents both the historic and forecast population, household, and employment data for the year 2020 that were used in the planning effort. Chapter III, "Natural Resource Base," presents information pertaining to the natural resource base of the Town and Village of Rochester, including data on soils, topography, drainage, wetlands, floodlands, scenic vistas, woodlands, wildlife habitat, and parks. Chapter IV, "Man-Made Environment," presents relevant data on the significant man-made features of the Town and Village of Rochester, including data on existing land use, and community facilities and services. Chapter V, "Existing land Use Regulations," presents information pertaining to zoning, land subdivision control and other Town, Village, and County ordinances. Chapter VI, "Land Use Plan," presents the community land use objectives upon which the land use plan was based, as well as the community land use needs to the design year 2020 based upon the forecast population and employment levels described in Chapter II. Chapter VII, "Plan Implementation," describes the legal instruments needed to implement the plan. Finally, a complete summary of the plan is provided in Chapter VIII.

Chapter II

POPULATION, HOUSEHOLDS, AND EMPLOYMENT INVENTORY, ANALYSIS, AND FORECAST

INTRODUCTION

The Town and Village of Rochester encompass a specific amount of land (17.7 square miles) and a changing number of people. The interaction of these two factors is a major focus of the land use plan. Information on the size, characteristics and distribution of the resident population, households, and employment levels, and anticipated changes in these socioeconomic factors over time is essential to the preparation of a sound land use plan. This chapter presents relevant data concerning these characteristics of the Rochester planning area.

Population forecasts are a starting point for considering the interaction of people and the land. They do not in themselves determine what a community wishes to work toward, but they can help the community begin to understand factors of change and determine which of those factors the community wants to try to influence.

HISTORIC AND FORECAST POPULATION, HOUSEHOLD, AND EMPLOYMENT LEVELS

The preparation of population, household, and employment forecasts are particularly difficult because of economic uncertainties and are subject to periodic revisions as new information becomes available. The population, household, and employment forecasts presented in this chapter were developed from regional and county forecasts reflecting alternative futures for the Southeastern Wisconsin Region developed by the Regional Planning Commission for the year 2020 and used by the Commission in its regional, county, and local planning efforts. These forecasts are intended to be used as a point of departure in the development of the local land use plan.

Two alternative population, household, and employment forecasts were prepared by the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC). One forecast is based upon an intermediate-growth scenario with a centralized development pattern. This alternative is used in the SEWRPC adopted regional plan for the year 2020. The other forecast is based on a higher-growth scenario with a decentralized development pattern. Because of rapid population growth in the Rochester area between 1988 and 1996, these forecasts, which are based on 1990 data, require some adjustments in the Rochester planning area to make these forecasts more relevant over the plan design period.

Population

Historic and forecast population levels for the Region, Racine County, and the Rochester planning area are set forth in Table 1. Relatively steady and rapid rates of population growth took place in the Region and in Racine County during the period 1850 to 1930. By comparison, population changes experienced in the Rochester planning area during this same period were erratic. During the time period in 1930 to 1960, the Rochester planning area experienced somewhat higher rates of population growth than either the Region or the County. During this time period, regional population levels increased from about 1,006,000 persons in 1930 to about 1,573,000 persons in 1960, an increase of 567,000 persons, or about 56 percent, while the population of Racine County increased from 90,200 persons to 141,800 persons, an increase of 51,600 persons, or about 57 percent. Population levels in the Rochester planning area during this same time period increased from about 700 persons in 1930 to over 1,300 persons in 1960, an increase of about 600 persons, or more than 85 percent. During the 1960s, the rates of population growth in the Rochester planning area were lower than either the Region or the County. This changed during the 1970s and 1980s when the planning area once again experienced significantly higher rates of population growth than the Region or County.

As indicated in Table 1 and shown in Figure 1, envisioned population growth rates based upon the aforereferenced regional plan alternatives as related to the Rochester planning area are higher than those of the Region and Racine County under both the intermediategrowth centralized regional plan and the high-growth decentralized alternative. The resident population of the Region and of the County are both envisioned to increase by about 15 percent and 12 percent, respectively, under the intermediate-growth centralized regional plan—the adopted regional plan; and by about 31 and 42 percent, respectively, under the high-growth decentralized alternative. The Rochester planning area

HISTORICAL AND FORECAST POPULATION LEVELS FOR THE REGION, RACINE COUNTY, AND THE ROCHESTER PLANNING AREA: 1850-2020

		Region		F	acine County	r	Roche	ster Planning	Area	
	Total	Change fro Time F	m Previous Period	Total	Change from Previous Total Time Period		Change from Total Time Pe		n Previous 'eriod	
Year	Population	Number	Percent	Population	Number	Percent	Population	Number	Percent	
1850	113,389	7 0 7 0		14,973			1,672			
1860 ^b	190,409	77,020	67.9	21,360	6,387	42.7	933	-739	-44.2	
1870	223,546	33,137	17.4	26,740	5,380	25.2	876	-57	-6.1	
1880	277,119	53,573	24.0	30,922	4,182	15.6	775	-101	-11.5	
1890	386,774	109,655	39.6	36,268	5,346	17.3	699	-76	-9.8	
1900	501.808	115,034	29.7	45,644	9,376	25.9	750	51	7.3	
1910	631,161	129,353	25.8	57,424	11,780	25.8	766	16	2.1	
1920	783,681	152,520	24.2	78,961	21,537	37.5	659	-107	-14.0	
1930	1.006.118	222,437	28.4	90,217	11,256	14.3	696	37	5.6	
1940	1.067.699	61,581	6.1	94,047	3,830	4.2	748	52	7.5	
1950	1,240,618	172,919	16.2	109,585	15,538	16.5	863	115	15.4	
1960	1.573.614	332,996	26.8	141,781	32,196	29.4	1,332	469	54.3	
1970	1.756.083	182,469	11.6	170,838	29,057	20.5	1,455	123	9.2	
1980	1,764,796	8,713	0.5	173,132	2,294	1.3	2,224	769	52.9	
1990	1,810,364	45,568	2.6	175,034	1,902	1.1	2,822	598	26.9	
2020 Intermediate-Growth Centralized Regional Plan	2,077,900	267,536	14.8	195,600	20,566	11.7	3,389 [°]	567	20.1	
2020 High-Growth Decentralized Alternative	2,367,000	556,636	30.7	248,200	73,166	41.8	4,884	2,062	73.1	

[°]Includes the Town and Village of Rochester.

^bThe civil Town of Waterford detached from the Town of Rochester in 1852.

^c The State estimated population level of the Rochester planning area, as of January 1, 1996, is 3,118 persons, already approaching the population level envisioned under the Commission's 2020 Intermediate-Growth Centralized Regional Plan as related to the planning area.

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

Figure 1

HISTORICAL AND FORECAST POPULATION LEVELS FOR THE ROCHESTER PLANNING AREA:^a 1920-2020



^aIncludes the Town and Village of Rochester.

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

is envisioned to grow by about 570 persons, or by about 20 percent under the intermediate-growth centralized regional plan, and by about 2,060 persons, or by about 73 percent, under the high-growth decentralized alternative.

It should be noted that the State-estimated population level of the Rochester planning area as of January 1, 1996, is 3,118 persons, an increase of approximately 40 percent, or about 56 persons per year, since 1980. This rate of increase is significantly higher than the rate of increase of 20 persons per year envisioned under the 2020 intermediate-growth plan, but still less than the 70 persons per year rate of increase envisioned under the 2020 high-growth plan. If the 1980 to 1996 average annual increase in population were to continue, the population of the planning area could be expected to reach a level of about 4,400 persons by the year 2020. While forecast population levels based upon regional

EXISTING AND FORECAST POPULATION BY AGE GROUP IN THE REGION, RACINE COUNTY, AND THE ROCHESTER PLANNING AREA: 1990 AND 2020

		Region		
	1:	990	Alternative Forecas	st Range: 2020 ^a
Age Group	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Under 5	138,286	7.6	131,020-172,830	6.3-7.3
5 to 14	266,913	14.7	253,428-318,028	12.2-13.4
15 to 19	123,160	6.8	126,439-153,231	6.1-6.5
20 to 64	1,055,633	58.4	1,220,050-1,354,709	58.7-57.2
65 and Older	226,372	12.5	346,954-368,222	16.7-15.6
All Ages	1,810,364	100.0	2,077,891-2,367,020	100.0-100.0

		Racin	ne County				
	199	90	Alternative Forecast Range: 2020 ^a				
Age Group	Number	Percent	Number	Percent			
Under 5	13,664	7.8	12,220-17,870	6.3-7.2			
5 to 14	27,715	15.8	24,290-33,755	12.4-13.6			
15 to 19	11,560	6.6	11,572-15,637	5.9-6.3			
20 to 64	101,093	57.8	112,492-139,737	57.5-56.3			
65 and Older	21,002	12.0	34,987-41,201	17.9-16.6			
All Ages	175,034	100.0	195,561-248,200	100.0-100.0			

		Rochester P	lanning Area ^b			
	19	90	Alternative Forecast Range: 2020			
Age Group	Number	Percent	Number	Percent		
Under 5	234	8.3	216-352	6.4-7.2		
5 to 14	548	19.4	448-691	13.2-14.1		
15 to 19	171	6.1	190-306	5.6-6.3		
20 to 64	1,629	57.7	1,954-2,874	57.7-58.9		
65 and Older	240	8.5	581-661	17.1-13.5		
All Ages	2,822	100.0	3,389 [°] - 4,884	100.0-100.0		

^{*}The first number shown on the range represents the forecast under the Intermediate-Growth Centralized Regional Plan; the second number represents the forecast under the High-Growth Decentralized Alternative.

^bIncludes the Town and Village of Rochester.

^cThe State estimated population level of the Rochester planning area, as of January 1, 1996, is 3,118 persons, already approaching the population level envisioned under the Commission's 2020 Intermediate-Growth Centralized Regional Plan as related to the planning area.

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

plan alternatives may serve as a point of departure in the preparation of a local land use plan, it is clear that these forecasts will have to be reevaluated in the preparation of that plan.

Actual and forecast population levels by age group for the Region, Racine County, and the Rochester planning area are shown in Table 2. Under the high-growth alternative, the percentage of school age population ages 5 through 18—in Racine County relative to the total County population may be expected to decrease slightly from its 1990 level of about 22 percent to about 20 percent by the year 2020. The percentage of school age population in the Rochester planning area relative

HISTORICAL AND FORECAST HOUSEHOLDS IN THE REGION, RACINE COUNTY, AND THE ROCHESTER PLANNING AREA: 1960-2020

		Region		R	acine County		Roche	ster Planning	Area*
		Change from Previous Time Period			Change from Previous Time Period			Change from Previous Time Period	
Year	Households	Number	Percent	Households	Number	Percent	Households	Number	Percent
1960 1970 1980 1990	465,913 536,486 627,955 676,107	70,573 91,469 48,152	15.1 17.0 7.7	40,736 49,796 59,418 63,736	9,060 9,622 4,318	22.2 19.3 7.3	374 406 706 944	32 300 238	8.6 73.9 33.7
2020 Intermediate-Growth Centralized Regional Plan	827,100	150,993	22.3	78,200	14,464	22.7	1,241 ^b	297	31.5
2020 High-Growth Decentralized Alternative	905,100	228,993	33.9	95,800	32,064	50.3	1,788	844	89.4

"Includes the Town and Village of Rochester.

^bThe estimated household level of the Rochester planning area, as of January 1, 1996, is 1,125 households, already approaching the household level envisioned under the Commission's 2020 Intermediate-Growth Centralized Regional Plan as related to the planning area.

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

to the total population in the planning area may be expected to decline from about 26 percent in 1990, to about 20 percent by the year 2020, under this alternative future. The proportion of population 65 years of age and older in Racine County relative to the total County population may be expected to increase from its 1990 level of about 12 percent to about 17 percent by the year 2020 under the high-growth alternative. Similarly, the proportion of this age group in the planning area may be expected to increase from about 9 percent in 1990 to about 14 percent by the year 2020.

Households

Historic and forecast household levels for the Region, Racine County, and the Rochester planning area are set forth in Table 3. Historic household formation rates in the Rochester planning area were significantly greater than such rates in either the Region or the County in the 1970 to 1990 time period. During that period, households in the Region increased by about 139,600, or about 26 percent, from about 536,500 in 1970 to about 676,100 in 1990. During the same time period, household levels in Racine County increased by almost 13,900, or 28 percent, from about 49,800 in 1970 to about 63,700 in 1990. Household levels in the Rochester planning area during this time period, however, increased by almost 540, or 132 percent, from about 410 in 1970 to about 940 in 1990. The trend toward higher rates of growth in households, based upon the aforereferenced regional plan alternatives as related to the Rochester planning area relative to the Region or the County, may be expected to continue under both the intermediate-growth centralized regional plan, as well as

Figure 2

HISTORICAL AND FORECAST HOUSEHOLD LEVELS FOR THE ROCHESTER PLANNING AREA:^a 1960-2020



[°]Includes the Town and Village of Rochester.

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

the high-growth decentralized alternative. As indicated in Table 3 and shown in Figure 2, households in the Rochester planning area may be expected to increase by about 300, or about 32 percent, from a level of 940 in 1990 to 1,240 in the year 2020, under the intermediate-growth centralized regional plan. The rate of growth in the number of households within the Region and the County would approximate 22 and 23 percent

HISTORICAL AND FORECAST POPULATION PER OCCUPIED HOUSING UNIT IN THE REGION, RACINE COUNTY, AND THE ROCHESTER PLANNING AREA: 1960-2020

		Region		R	acine County	<u> </u>	Rochest	ter Planning /	Area*
	Population per Occupied	Change from Previous Time Period		Population per Occupied	Population Per Occupied Change from Previous Time Period		Population Change from P		m Previous Period
Year	Housing Unit	Number	Percent	Housing Unit	Number	Percent	Housing Unit	Number	Percent
1960 1970 1980 1990	3.30 3.20 2.75 2.62	-0.10 -0.45 -0.13	 -3.0 -14.1 -4.7	3.39 3.35 2.86 2.70	-0.04 -0.49 -0.16	 -1.2 -14.6 -5.6	3.56 3.58 3.15 2.99	0.02 -0.43 -0.16	0.6 -12.0 -5.1
2020 Intermediate-Growth Centralized Regional Plan	2.45	-0.17	-6.5	2.46	-0.24	-8.9	2.73	-0.26	-8.7
2020 High-Growth Decentralized Alternative	2.55	-0.07	-2.7	2.56	-0.14	-5.2	2.73	-0.26	-8.7

^{*}Includes the Town and Village of Rochester.

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

respectively, under this plan. Under the high-growth decentralized alternative, households in the Rochester planning area would increase by about 850, about 89 percent, from about 940 households in 1990 to 1,790 in the year 2020. This rate of increase surpasses the envisioned rates of increase of about 34 percent and about 50 percent for the Region and the County, respectively, under this alternative. It should be noted that the estimated household levels of the Rochester planning area, as of January 1, 1996, is 1,125 households, an increase of approximately 59 percent, or about 26 households per year, since 1980. This rate of increase is significantly higher that the rates of increase of 10 households per year envisioned under the 2020 intermediate-growth plan, but still less than the 28 households per year envisioned under the 2020 high-growth plan. If the 1980 to 1996 average annual increase in households were to continue, the planning area could be expected to accommodate a level of about 1,750 households by the year 2020. Consequently, while forecast household levels based upon regional plan alternatives may serve as a point of departure in the preparation of a local land use plan, it is clear that these forecasts will have to be reevaluated in the preparation of that plan.

As indicated in Table 4, the historic increase in the number of households in the Region, Racine County, and in the Rochester planning area has been accompanied by a decrease in the number of persons per occupied housing unit. The most significant decline in the number of persons per housing unit occurred in the time period between 1970 and 1980, when household sizes in the Region, Racine County, and the Rochester planning area declined 12 percent or more. During this time period, the number of persons per housing unit declined from 3.20 to 2.75 in the Region; from 3.35 to 2.86 in the County; and from 3.58 to 3.15 in the Rochester planning area. While the decline in the number of persons per occupied housing unit continued from 1980 to 1990, the rate of decline was significantly less than was experienced in the previous decade. Table 4 also indicates that the Rochester planning area experienced larger household sizes than either Racine County or the Region in each decade 1960 to 1990. The decline in household sizes for the Region, Racine County, and the Rochester planning area may be expected to continue through the year 2020 under both the intermediate-growth centralized regional plan and the high-growth decentralized alternative.

Employment

Historic and forecast employment in the Region, Racine County, and in the Rochester planning area are set forth in Table 5. Employment levels, or "jobs," are enumerated at their location, and are thus often referred to in terms of "place of work" data. Enumeration of jobs does not distinguish between full- and part-time jobs or indicate whether or not the job is held by a resident of the jurisdiction in which the job is enumerated or by someone living outside of the jurisdiction. From 1970 to 1990, employment growth rates in the Rochester planning area were similar to those of the Region and Racine County. Between 1970 and 1990, employment levels in the Region increased by 283,100, or by about 36 percent, from 784,100 in 1970 to 1,067,200 in 1990. During this same time period, employment levels in Racine County increased by 24,300, or by about 38 percent, from 64,500 in 1970 to 88,800 in 1990. Employment levels in the Rochester planning area during this period increased by 140 jobs, or about 30 percent, from 460 in 1970 to 600 in 1990. This trend

HISTORICAL AND FORECAST EMPLOYMENT LEVELS FOR THE REGION, RACINE COUNTY, AND THE ROCHESTER PLANNING AREA: 1970-2020

		Region		F	lacine County		Roche	ster Planning /	Areaª
		Change from Previous Time Period			Change from Previous Time Period			Change from Previous Time Period	
Year	Employment	Number	Percent	Employment	Number	Percent	Employment	Number	Percent
1970 1980 1990	784,100 945,200 1,067,200	161,100 122,000	20.5 12.9	64,500 80,900 88,800	16,400 7,900	25.4 9.8	460 530 600 ^b	70 70	15.2 13.2
2020 Intermediate-Growth Centralized Regional Plan	1,277,100	209,900	19.7	108,700	19,900	22.4	650	50	8.3
2020 High-Growth Decentralized Alternative	1,362,600	295,400	27.7	119,400	30,600	34.5	785	185	30.8

^aIncludes the Town and Village of Rochester.

^bIncludes jobs classified as agricultural-70; industrial-100; retail-220; and government, service, and self-employed-210.

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

of employment growth for the Rochester planning area relative to the Region or Racine County may be expected to continue under the high-growth decentralized alternative as related to the Rochester planning area but be somewhat lower under the intermediate-growth centralized regional plan. As indicated in Table 5 and shown in Figure 3, employment levels in the Rochester planning area may be expected to increase by 8 percent under the intermediate-growth centralized regional plan, compared to the about 20 percent and 22 percent rates of increase envisioned for the Region and Racine County, respectively, under this plan. Under the high-growth decentralized alternative, employment levels in the planning area would increase by about 31 percent, compared to about 28 percent and about 35 percent, respectively, for the Region and Racine County.

POPULATION AND HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS

This section of the chapter provides pertinent information concerning the characteristics of the resident population and housing units in the Town and Village of Rochester, including information on educational attainment, household and family income, residential building activity, value of owner-occupied housing units, characteristics of the housing stock, and occupation characteristics of the employed labor force in the Town and Village.

Education

Table 6 provides information on the educational attainment of persons 25 years of age and older in the

Figure 3



HISTORICAL AND FORECAST EMPLOYMENT LEVELS FOR THE ROCHESTER PLANNING AREA:^a 1970-2020

^aIncludes the Town and Village of Rochester.

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

Region, Racine County, and the Town and Village of Rochester. In 1990, the Town and Village of Rochester both had a larger percentage of persons with a high school diploma or higher level of educational attainment, about 82 and 87 percent, respectively, than the Region, 79 percent, or Racine County, about 76 percent. Approximately 42 percent of those persons 25 years of age and older in the Town and Village of Rochester had

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF PERSONS 25 YEARS AND OVER IN THE REGION, RACINE COUNTY, THE TOWN OF ROCHESTER, AND THE VILLAGE OF ROCHESTER: 1990

	Reg	gion	Racine	County	Town of	Rochester	Village of I	Rochester
Education Level Attained	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total
Less than 9th Grade	87,026	7.6	9,567	8.7	71	6.3	17	2.9
9th to 12th Grade, No Diploma	154,773	13.4	16,554	15.0	132	11.7	61	10.3
High School Diploma (includes GED)	378,384	32.9	38,863	35.1	442	39.3	262	44.4
Some College, No Degree	222,708	19.3	20,276	18.3	214	19.0	107	18.1
Associate Degree	77,221	6.7	7,134	6.5	103	9.1	49	8.3
Bachelor's Degree	159,775	13.9	12,740	11.5	99	8.8	79	13.4
Graduate Degree	71,258	6.2	5,459	4.9	65	5.8	15	2.6
Total	1,151,145	100.0	110,593	100.0	1,126	100.0	590	100.0

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

some college, or a degree, compared to 46 percent for the Region and 41 percent for Racine County.

Income Levels

Household and family income levels in the Region, Racine County, and the Town and Village of Rochester in 1989 are set forth in Table 7. The 1989 household and family income levels for the Town and Village of Rochester, with the exception of mean family income for the Village of Rochester, exceeded the 1989 income levels of households and of families in the Region and in Racine County. Indeed, the 1989 mean household income of \$43,800 for Town of Rochester households was about \$5,200, or 14 percent, more than the mean household income in the Region. The mean household income in the Town was also about \$5,700, or 15 percent, more than the mean household income in Racine County. Similarly, the 1989 mean household income of about \$40,200 for the Village of Rochester was about \$1,700, or about 4 percent higher than the mean household income in the Region, and about \$2,100, or more than 5 percent higher than the mean household income level in Racine County.

Residential Building Activity

Residential building activity in the Town and Village of Rochester during the time period 1977 to 1996, as evidenced by the number of single-family housing units authorized by zoning permits, is set forth in Table 8. As indicated in this table, 422 zoning permits for singlefamily housing units were authorized during this 19-year time period, ranging from a low of 10 permits in 1995 to a high of 42 permits in 1992. Readily apparent is the significantly higher number of zoning permits authorized in the time period 1988 to 1994, when the Region, as well as the Town and Village of Rochester, were experiencing significant residential development activity. During the 1988 to 1994 time period, a total of 201 permits were authorized, representing about 48 percent of the total number of permits authorized during the entire 19-year time period.

Housing Value

Table 9 sets forth the value of owner-occupied housing units in the Region, Racine County, and the Town and Village of Rochester for 1990. The mean value of owner-occupied housing units in the Town of Rochester, about \$88,700, is about \$14,700, or about 20 percent higher than the mean value of \$74,000 for Racine County, and about \$3,000, or about 4 percent higher than the mean value of \$85,700 for the Region. The mean value in the Village of Rochester, about \$83,100, is about \$9,100, or about 12 percent higher than the mean value for Racine County, and about \$2,600, or about 3 percent lower than the mean value for the Region. Almost 86 percent of the total number of owneroccupied housing units in the Town of Rochester and about 91 percent in the Village of Rochester were valued less than \$125,000.

Housing Characteristics

Selected housing characteristics for the Region, Racine County, and the Town and Village of Rochester are set forth in Table 10. In 1990, about 95 percent of the total number of housing units in the Town of Rochester and 98 percent in the Village of Rochester were occupied, compared to 94 percent and 95 percent, respectively, for the Region and Racine County. Renter-occupied housing units made up a significantly smaller percentage of the housing stock in the Town of Rochester—about 15 percent, compared to the Village of Rochester—about

HOUSEHOLD AND FAMILY INCOME IN THE REGION, RACINE COUNTY, THE TOWN OF ROCHESTER, AND THE VILLAGE OF ROCHESTER: 1989

		Reg	jion			Racine	County			Town of	Rochester			Village of	Rochester	
	House	eholds	Farr	ilies	House	holds	Farr	ilies	House	eholds	Farr	nilies	House	eholds	Farr	nilies
Range	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total
Less than \$5,000	24,879	3.7	11,757	2.5	2,117	3.3	1,179	2.5	11	1.8	9	1.7	3	0.9	3	1.1
\$5,000 to \$9,999	63,191	9.2	26,032	5.5	5,543	8.7	2,308	4.9	23	3.8	8	1.5	13	3.8	2	0.7
\$10,000 to \$12,499	29,465	4.4	13,128	2.8	2,886	4.5	1,426	3.0	15	2.5	6	1.2	8	2.3	4	1.4
\$12,500 to \$14,999	26,147	3.9	12,932	2.7	2,369	3.7	1,280	2.7	9	1.5	9	1.7	Ó	0.0	2	0.7
\$15,000 to \$17,499	29,003	4.3	15,821	3.3	2,836	4.4	1,639	3.5	14	2.3	11	2.1	14	4.1	10	3.6
\$17,500 to \$19,999	27,707	4.1	15,741	3.3	2,545	4.0	1,639	3.5	22	3.7	17	3.3	15	4.3	13	4.6
\$20,000 to \$22,499	30,503	4.5	17,930	3.8	2,862	4.5	1,896	4.0	23	3.8	19	3.7	20	5.8	14	5.0
\$22,500 to \$24,999	26,473	3.9	17,313	3.7	2,428	3.8	1,685	3.6	17	2.8	17	3.3	18	5.2	14	5.0
\$25,000 to \$27,499	30,020	4.4	19,757	4.2	2,647	4.1	1,877	4.0	19	3.2	17	3.3	8	2.3	5	1.8
\$27,500 to \$29,999	24,880	3.7	17,590	3.7	2,355	3.7	1,794	3.8	24	4.0	16	3.1	21	6.1	11	3.9
\$30,000 to \$32,499	30,327	4.5	21,487	4.5	3,070	4.8	2,420	5.1	26	4.3	25	4.8	14	4.1	11	3. 9
\$32,500 to \$34,999	24,118	3.6	18,614	3.9	2,354	3.7	1,845	3.9	50	8.3	43	8.3	11	3.2	11	3.9
\$35,000 to \$37,499	27,610	4.1	20,837	4.4	2,715	4.3	2,298	4.9	36	6.0	34	6.6	22	6.4	17	6.1
\$37,500 to \$39,999	23,380	3.5	18,537	3.9	2,365	3.7	2,022	4.3	21	3.5	21	4.1	13	3.8	10	3.6
\$40,000 to \$42,499	27,513	4.1	22,056	4.7	2,776	4.4	2,334	4.9	26	4.3	24	4.6	24	6.9	24	8.6
\$42,500 to \$44,999	21,174	3.1	18,038	3.8	2,190	3.4	1,923	4.1	30	5.0	29	5.6	11	3.2	6	2.1
\$45,000 to \$47,499	22,261	3.3	18,788	4.0	2,138	3.4	1,928	4.1	14	2.3	12	2.3	16	4.6	16	5.7
\$47,500 to \$49,999	18,646	2.8	16,070	3.4	1,789	2.8	1,547	3.3	19	3.2	16	3.1	11	3.2	9	3.2
\$50,000 to \$54,999	34,933	5.1	30,624	6.5	3,564	5.6	3,192	6.6	47	7.8	44	8.5	38	11.0	38	13.6
\$55,000 to \$59,999	26,800	4.0	23,617	5.0	2,545	4.0	2,341	4.9	43	7.1	41	7.9	16	4.6	14	5.0
\$60,000 to \$74,999	52,685	7.7	47,097	10.0	4,915	7.7	4,475	9.3	59	9.8	50	9.7	30	8.7	27	9.7
\$75,000 to \$99,999	31,826	4.7	28,301	6.0	2,918	4.6	2,625	5.5	40	6.6	36	6.9	12	3.5	12	4.3
\$100,000 to \$124,999	10,308	1.5	9,347	2.0	906	1.4	812	1.7	3	0.5	3	0.6	2	0.6	2	0.7
\$125,000 to \$149,999	4,091	0.6	3,777	0.8	326	0.5	308	0.7	4	0.7	4	0.8	5	1.4	5	1.8
\$150,000 or More	8,653	1.3	7,755	1.6	629	1.0	574	1.2	7	1.2	7	1.3	0	0.0	. 0	0.0
Total	676,593	100.0	472,946	100.0	63,788	100.0	47,367	100.0	602	100.0	518	100.0	345	100.0	280	100.0
Mean Income	\$38,541	 ¹	\$44,401		\$38,129		\$43,058		\$43,752		\$45,785		\$40,188		\$43,006	
Median Income	\$32,146		\$38,516		\$32,751		\$37,991	·	\$38,929		\$40,729		\$38,558		\$41,354	

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

RESIDENTIAL BUILDING ACTIVITY IN THE TOWN AND VILLAGE OF ROCHESTER: 1977-1996

	Numt I Authori	er of Single-I Housing Unit zed by Zoning	Family s g Permit
Year	Town	Village	Total
1977	22	6	28
1978	15	7	22
1979	5	8	13
1980	9	7	16
1981	6	5	11
1982	5	6	11
1983	19	8	27
1984	9	8	17
1985	· 10	10	20
1986	7	11	18
1987	6	6	12
1988	18	7	25
1989	17	6	23
1990	22	7	29
1991	20	4	24
1992	29	13	42
1993	16	10	26
1994	22	10	32
1995	6	4	10
1996	11	5	16
Total	274	148	422
Mean Annual	14	7	21

Source: Racine County Planning and Zoning Department and SEWRPC.

35 percent, the Region—about 37 percent, and Racine County—about 30 percent.

Labor Force

Employed persons 16 years or older by class of worker in the Region, Racine County, and the Town and Village of Rochester in 1990, are set forth in Table 11. Employed persons, the "civilian labor force," are enumerated where they reside and are thus often referred to as "place of residence" employment data. This table indicates that Racine County and the Region have about 84 percent of the employed persons 16 years and older classified as private wage and salary workers, while the Town and Village of Rochester has about 82 percent of persons 16 years and older in this classification. When compared to the Region and Racine County, the Town and Village of Rochester has a higher proportion of employed persons classified as self-employed. Table 12 sets forth information for employed persons 16 years of age and older by occupation in the Region, Racine County, and the Town and Village of Rochester. This table indicates that when compared to the Region and Racine County, the Town and Village of Rochester has a lower proportion of the employed labor force classified as sales and administrative support. Conversely, they have a higher proportion of their employed labor force classified as farming, forestry, and fishing; precision production, craft, and repair; and transportation and material moving.

SUMMARY

Population, Household, and Employment Forecasts

Forecasts of population, household, and employment levels for use as a point of departure in the preparation of a land use plan for the Town and Village of Rochester were based upon consideration of alternative population, household, and employment forecasts to the design year 2020 prepared by the Regional Planning Commission and used by the Commission in its regional and local planning efforts. Two alternative population, household, and employment forecasts were developed, one based upon the intermediate-growth centralized regional plan-the adopted regional plan, and one based on a high-growth decentralized alternative thereto. The Rochester planning area population level, which stood at 2,820 persons in 1990, is envisioned to increase by about 570 persons, or by about 20 percent, to a level of about 3,390 persons under the intermediate-growth centralized regional plan; and by 2,060 persons, or by about 73 percent, to about 4,880 persons under the high-growth decentralized alternative. The household level, which stood at about 940 in 1990, is envisioned to increase by about 300, or by about 32 percent, to a level of about 1,240 under the intermediate-growth centralized regional plan; and to increase by about 850, or by about 89 percent, to a level of 1,790 under the high-growth decentralized alternative. Estimated 1996 levels of population and households for the planning area are already approaching the levels envisioned under the 2020 adopted regional plan. Consequently, the regional plan forecasts need to be reevaluated in the preparation of the land use plan for the Rochester planning area. The employment level in the Rochester planning area, which stood at about 600 jobs in 1990, is envisioned to increase by about 50, or by about 8 percent, to a level of 650 under the intermediategrowth centralized regional plan and to increase by 190, or about 31 percent, to a level of about 790 under the high-growth decentralized alternative.

VALUE OF OWNER-OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS IN THE REGION, RACINE COUNTY, THE TOWN OF ROCHESTER, AND THE VILLAGE OF ROCHESTER: 1990

	Reg	ion	Racine	County	Town of	Rochester	Village of	Rochester
Range	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total
Less than \$15.000	1,263	0.4	160	0.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
\$15,000 to \$19,999	1,506	0.4	268	0.7	Ō	0.0	ō	0.0
\$20,000 to \$24,999	3,092	0.9	409	1.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
\$25,000 to \$29,999	4,548	1.3	607	1.6	5	1.3	0	0.0
\$30,000 to \$34,999	8,719	2.5	1,230	3.3	13	3.3	0	0.0
\$35,000 to \$39,999	11,952	3.5	2,072	5.6	0	0.0) 0	0.0
\$40,000 to \$44,999	14,254	4.1	2,494	6.7	8	2.0	0	0.0
\$45,000 to \$49,999	17,887	5.2	3,114	8.4	29	7.3	13	6.6
\$50,000 to \$59,999	45,791	13.3	6,402	17.2	40	10.1	29	14.8
\$60,000 to \$74,999	72,105	20.9	7,746	20.8	63	15.9	44	22.5
\$75,000 to \$99,999	80,918	23.5	6,638	17.9	117	29.6	82	41.8
\$100,000 to \$124,999	36,619	10.6	2,847	7.7	64	16.2	10	5.1
\$125,000 to \$149,999	19,829	5.8	1,396	3.8	34	8.6	15	7.7
\$150,000 to \$174,999	9,248	2.7	634	1.7	16	4.1	0	0.0
\$175,000 to \$199,999	5,446	1.6	392	1.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
\$200,000 to \$249,999	5,393	1.6	356	1.0	5	1.3	3	1.5
\$250,000 to \$299,999	2,527	0.7	138	0.4	1	0.3	0	0.0
\$300,000 to \$399,999	2,195	0.6	156	0.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
\$400,000 to \$499,999	708	0.2	43	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
\$500,000 or More	638	0.2	32	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	344,638	100.0	37,134	100.0	395	100.0	196	100.0
Mean Value	\$85,749		\$74,004		\$88,652		\$83,125	

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

Table 10

HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS OF THE REGION, RACINE COUNTY, THE TOWN OF ROCHESTER, AND THE VILLAGE OF ROCHESTER: 1990

	Reg	jion	Racine	County	Town of	Rochester	Village of	Rochester
Characteristic	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Occupied Housing Units Owner-Occupied Renter-Occupied	414,049 262,058	57.8 36.5	43,555 20,181	65.1 30.1	512 93	80.6 14.6	217 122	62.7 35.3
Total	676,107	94.3	63,736	95.2	605	95.2	339	98.0
Vacant Housing Units For Rent, For Sale, Rented or Sold but Not Occupied For Seasonal, Recreational,	20,126	2.8	1,672	2.5	4	0.6	5	1.4
or Occasional Use Other Vacant	13,690 7,252	1.9 1.0	951 586	1.4 0.9	16 11	2.5 1.7	0 2	0.0 0.6
Total	41,068	5.7	3,209	4.8	31	4.8	7	2.0
Total Housing Units	717,175	100.0	66,945	100.0	636	100.0	346	100.0

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

EMPLOYED PERSONS 16 YEARS AND OLDER BY CLASS OF WORKER IN THE REGION, RACINE COUNTY, THE TOWN OF ROCHESTER, AND THE VILLAGE OF ROCHESTER: 1990

	Region		Racine	Racine County		Rochester	Village of Rochester	
Class	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Private Wage and Salary Worker	739,155	83.6	71,123	84.6	776	82.2	410	81.7
Federal Government Worker	15,469	1.8	1,117	1.3	12	1.3	6	1.2
State Government Worker	16,486	1.9	2,006	2.4	17	1.8	21	4.2
Local Government Worker	69,574	7.9	5,784	6.9	64	6.8	27	5.4
Self-Employed Worker	39,608	4.5	3,790	4.5	71	7.5	35	6.9
Unpaid Family Worker	2,424	0.3	239	0.3	4	0.4	3	0.6
Total	882,716	100.0	84,059	100.0	944	100.0	502	100.0

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

Table 12

Racine County Region **Town of Rochester** Village of Rochester Percent Percent Percent Percent Number of Total Number of Total Number Number Class of Total of Total Managerial and Professional Specialty Executive, Administrative, and Managerial 103,680 11.7 8,645 10.3 94 10.0 58 11.6 Professional Specialty 122,673 13.9 10,656 12.7 135 14.3 64 12.7 Technical, Sales, Administrative Support 2,846 Technicians and Related Support 31,301 3.5 3.4 24 2.5 7 1.4 103,033 11.7 8,517 10.1 43 8.6 Sales 69 7.3 150,205 17.0 12.807 15.3 148 15.7 68 Administrative Support, including Clerical 13.5 Service Private Household 1,758 0.2 176 0.2 2 0.2 ۵ 0.0 Protective Service 12,724 1,171 10 1.4 1.4 8 0.8 2.0 9,662 107 Service, except Protective and Household..... 98,458 11.2 11.5 11.3 55 11.0 Farming, Forestry, and Fishing... 9,288 1,260 1.1 1.5 34 3.6 9 1.8 Precision Production, Craft, Repair 103,690 11.7 11,777 14.0 145 15.4 83 16.5 **Operators, Fabricators, and Laborers** 80,106 9.1 9.410 11.2 80 8.5 61 Machine Operators, Assemblers, Inspectors..... 12.1 Transportation and Material Moving 32,522 3.7 3,395 4.0 54 23 5.7 4.6 Handlers, Equipment Cleaners, Helpers, Laborers 33,278 3.8 3,737 4.4 44 4.7 21 4.2 Total 882,716 100.0 84,059 100.0 944 100.0 502 100.0

EMPLOYED PERSONS 16 YEARS AND OLDER BY OCCUPATION IN THE REGION, RACINE COUNTY, THE TOWN OF ROCHESTER, AND THE VILLAGE OF ROCHESTER: 1990

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

Population and Housing Characteristics

Of the approximately 1,720 persons in the Town and Village of Rochester 25 years of age and older, about 280, or 16 percent, have less than a 12th grade education; about 710, or 41 percent, have a high school diploma; and about 730, or 43 percent, have some college or a degree. The 1989 household and family income levels in the Town and Village of Rochester generally exceed the income levels of households and families in the Region and in Racine County. The 1989 mean household income within the Town totaled almost \$43,800, while mean family income in the Town approximated \$45,800. Similarly, 1989 mean household income levels in the Village totaled about \$40,200,

while mean family income levels in the Village exceeded \$43,000. During the 19-year time period 1977 to 1996, 422 zoning permits for single-family housing units in the Rochester planning area were authorized, ranging from a low of 10 permits in 1995, to a high of 42 permits in 1992. Building activity has recently increased, as evidenced by the number of zoning permits authorized during the 1988-1994 time period—a total of 201 permits, or about 48 percent of the total number of permits authorized during the 19-year time period. The 1990 mean values of owner-occupied housing units in the Town and Village of Rochester are about \$88,700, and 83,100, respectively, or more than 12 percent higher than the mean value of owner-occupied housing

units in Racine County. About 940 housing units, or about 96 percent of the 980 housing units in the Rochester planning area, are classified as occupied. Renteroccupied comprise about 22 percent of the total housing stock, significantly lower than the proportion of renteroccupied housing units for the Region or Racine County.

Of the 1,450 employed persons 16 years or older in the planning area, about 1,190, or about 82 percent, are

classified as private wage and salaried workers. When compared to the Region and Racine County, the Town and Village of Rochester has a lower proportion of their employed labor force classified as sales and administrative support. Conversely, they have a higher proportion of their employed labor force classified as farming, forestry, and fishing; precision production, craft, and repair; and transportation and material moving.

Chapter III

NATURAL RESOURCE BASE INVENTORY AND ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION

The conservation and wise use of the natural resource base is vital to the sound physical, social, and economic development of an area and to the continued ability of an area to provide a pleasant and habitable environment for life. Any meaningful land use planning effort must, therefore, recognize the existence of a limited natural resource base to which urban and rural development must be properly adjusted in order that the resource base is properly maintained and protected and in order that serious environmental problems are avoided. A sound evaluation and analysis of the natural resource base is, therefore, particularly important to planning for the physical development of an area.

This chapter, then, presents the results of an inventory and analysis of the natural resource base of the Rochester planning area. Included is descriptive information regarding soils, topography, water resources, vegetation, wildlife habitat, and natural areas. Also included is a description of items closely related to the natural resource base, including outdoor recreation and historic sites. This chapter concludes with a description of the environmental corridors that have been identified within the planning area. These corridors represent concentrations of the most important remaining elements of the natural resource base.

SOILS

Soil properties exert a strong influence on the use of land and on the impacts of changes in land use. Soils are an irreplaceable resource and mounting pressures upon land are constantly making this resource more and more valuable. A need exists in any land use planning program to examine how soils can best be used and managed.

In order to assess the significance of the diverse soils found in Southeastern Wisconsin, the Regional Planning Commission in 1963 negotiated a cooperative agreement with the U. S. Soil Conservation Service¹ under which detailed operational soil surveys were completed for the entire seven-county Region. The

¹Now known as the U.S. Department of Agriculture-Natural Resource Conservation Service. survey reports were published in SEWRPC Planning Report No. 8 and in soil survey reports subsequently prepared by the Soil Conservation Service.² The surveys have provided sound, definitive data on the physical, chemical, and biological properties of the soils and have provided interpretations of the soil properties for planning, engineering, agricultural, and resource conservation purposes.

General Soil Groups

Map 5 provides an overview of the pattern of soils that exists within the planning area. As shown, six broad groups of soils, or soil associations, occur within the area: the Casco-Rodman association, Fox-Casco association, Hebron-Montgomery-Aztalan association, Houghton-Palms association, Miami association, and the Morley-Beecher-Ashkum association. The Fox Casco association and the Morley-Beecher-Ashkum association predominate.

The Fox-Casco association consists of well-drained soils that have a clay loam and silty clay loam subsoil. The soils are nearly level to rolling and occur mainly on terraces and hills. Most of this association is well suited for farming, although the steeper slopes may erode if cropped.

The Morely-Beecher-Ashkum association consists of well-drained to poorly drained soils with a silty clay or silty clay loam subsoil. The soils are nearly level to moderately steep. The soils in this association are also generally well suited for farming. The Morely-Beecher-Ashkum association is predominant in the eastern portion of the planning area.

Soil Suitability Interpretations

The soil surveys provide important information regarding the suitability of the land for various urban and rural uses. Interpreting soil surveys in this manner involves evaluating those characteristics of a soil which influence the particular use and assessing the kinds and degrees of limitations those soil properties and qualities, taken together, are likely to impose on the land use in

²SEWRPC Planning Report No. 8, Soils of Southeastern Wisconsin, 1966; and U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, Soil Survey of Kenosha and Racine Counties, Wisconsin, 1970.



GENERAL SOIL ASSOCIATIONS IN THE ROCHESTER PLANNING AREA

Source: U. S. Natural Resources Conservation Service and SEWRPC.

question. Of particular importance in preparing a land use plan for the Rochester planning area are suitability interpretations for residential development with public sanitary sewer service, for residential development with onsite sewage disposal systems, and for agriculture.

Soil Suitability for Residential Development Served by Public Sanitary Sewers

In view of the fact that public sanitary sewer service is provided within a portion of the planning area, it is important to consider the suitability of soils for residential development served by public sanitary sewers. The detailed soil survey indicates that about 5.1 square miles, or about 29 percent of the planning area, are covered by soils that have severe limitations for residential development with public sanitary sewer service, or stated differently, are poorly suited for residential development of any kind. These soils occur in widely dispersed enclaves intermixed with other soils throughout the planning area (See Map 6).

Soil Suitability for Onsite Sewage Disposal Systems

The suitability of soils in the planning area for onsite sewage disposal systems is indicated on Maps 7 and 8. Map 7 indicates suitability for conventional onsite sewage disposal systems; Map 8 indicates suitability for mound type onsite sewage disposal systems. The ratings are expressed in terms of the probability of meeting the criteria governing the siting of onsite sewage disposal systems set forth in Chapter Comm 83 of the *Wisconsin Administrative Code*. On these maps, areas shown as "suitable" have a high probability of meeting the code requirements for the system concerned, and areas shown as "unsuitable" have a high probability of

SOIL SUITABILITY FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SERVED BY PUBLIC SANITARY SEWERS IN THE ROCHESTER PLANNING AREA



Source: U. S. Natural Resources Conservation Service and SEWRPC.

not meeting the requirements. Areas shown as "undetermined" include soils having a range of characteristics which spans the applicable administrative code criteria, so that no classification can be assigned without more detailed field investigation. It should be noted that Maps 7 and 8 are intended to illustrate the overall pattern of soil suitability for onsite sewage disposal systems. Detailed site investigations based upon the requirements of Chapter Comm 83 are essential to the determination of whether or not the soils on any specific tract of land are suitable for development served by onsite sewage disposal systems. As indicated in Table 13, about 8.1 square miles, or about 46 percent of the planning area, are covered by soils classified as unsuitable for conventional onsite sewage disposal systems; about 6.0 square miles, or about 34 percent, are classified as suitable; and about 3.2 square miles, or about 18 percent, are covered by soils of undetermined suitability. The remaining 0.4 square mile, or about 2 percent of the planning area, consist of areas for which, because of disturbed condition, no soil survey data are available, or consist of surface water. Further review of Table 13 and a comparison of Maps 7 and 8, indicates that the development of the mound type

SOIL SUITABILITY FOR CONVENTIONAL ONSITE SEWAGE DISPOSAL SYSTEMS IN THE ROCHESTER PLANNING AREA



Source: U. S. Natural Resources Conservation Service and SEWRPC.

onsite sewage disposal systems and other alternative systems has significantly increased the proportion of the planning area which may be able to accommodate development served by onsite sewage disposal systems. In this regard, it should be noted that almost 8 square miles, or about 44 percent of the soils in the planning area are classified as potentially suitable for the use of mound type onsite sewage disposal systems; while about 5 square miles, or about 29 percent, are classified as unsuitable. Approximately 4 square miles, or about 25 percent of the planning area, are covered by soils of undetermined suitability, that is, which may prove suitable for mound type systems upon the completion of detailed field investigations. The soil ratings for onsite sewage disposal systems presented on Maps 7 and 8 reflect the requirements of Chapter Comm 83 of the *Wisconsin Administrative Code* as it existed in 1998. The Wisconsin Department of Commerce, the State agency responsible for the regulation of such systems, has proposed new rules which would significantly alter the existing regulatory framework, potentially increasing the area in which onsite disposal systems may be utilized.

Agricultural Soil Suitability

Much of the planning area is covered by soils which are well suited for agricultural use. Soil suitability for

SOIL SUITABILITY FOR MOUND SEWAGE DISPOSAL SYSTEMS IN THE ROCHESTER PLANNING AREA



Source: U. S. Natural Resources Conservation Service and SEWRPC.

agricultural use within the undeveloped portion of the Town, based upon the U. S. Natural Resources Conservation Service classification system, is shown on Map 9. National prime farmland is defined as land that is well suited for the production of food, feed, forage, fiber, and oilseed crops. Such farmland has the soil quality, growing season, and moisture supply needed to economically produce sustained high yields of crops when properly treated and managed. Farmland of statewide importance includes land in addition to national prime farmland which are important for the production of food and fiber, but have some limitations that restrict the choice of plants or require special conservation practices or both. Areas identified on Map 9 as national prime farmland encompass 8.5 square miles, or 52 percent of the undeveloped area of the planning area. Areas identified as farmland of statewide importance encompasses 2.6 square miles, or 16 percent of the undeveloped area of the planning area.

Soil Suitability for Sand and Gravel Extraction

Sand and gravel are an important economic resource which should be carefully husbanded. The regional soil survey provides an indication of the location of poten-

SOIL SUITABILITY FOR ONSITE SEWAGE DISPOSAL SYSTEMS IN THE ROCHESTER PLANNING AREA

Classification	Conventional Systems		Mound Systems	
	Square Miles	Percent of Planning Area	Square Miles	Percent of Planning Area
Unsuitable	8.1	45.8	5.1	28.8
Undetermined	3.2	18.1	4.4	24.9
Suitable	6.0	33.9	7.8	44.1
Other ^a	0.4	2.2	0.4	2.2
Total	17.7	100.0	. 17.7	100.0

^{*}Includes disturbed areas for which no soil survey data are available and surface water.

Source: SEWRPC.

Map 9

AGRICULTURAL SOIL CAPABILITY IN THE ROCHESTER PLANNING AREA




tially commercially workable sand and gravel deposits. The regional soil survey rates soil mapping units as "probable" or "improbable" sources of sand and gravel. The rating is intended to indicate the likelihood of the presence of material of suitable quality in workable quantities. As shown on Map 10, about 7.4 square miles, or about 42 percent of the total area of the planning area, are covered by soil mapping units which have been identified as probable sources of sand or gravel. These areas occur primarily in the central and western portions of the planning area.

TOPOGRAPHIC AND TOPOGRAPHIC-RELATED FEATURES

The topography, or the relative elevation of the land surface, in the Rochester planning area is determined, generally, by the configuration of the bedrock geology, and by the overlying glacial deposits. The topography of the planning area shown in ten-foot interval contours, is depicted on Map 11. As shown, the topography ranges from nearly level in certain areas to gently rolling and even hilly in other areas.

Slope is an important determinant of the land uses practicable on a given parcel of land. Lands with steep slopes are generally poorly suited for urban development and for most agricultural purposes and, therefore, should be maintained in natural cover for water quality protection, wildlife habitat, and erosion control purposes. Lands with less severe slopes may be suitable for certain agricultural uses, such as pasture, and for certain urban uses, such as carefully designed low-density residential use. Lands which are gently sloping or nearly level are best suited for agricultural production and for medium-density residential, commercial, or industrial uses. It should also be noted that slope is directly related to water runoff and erosion hazards and, therefore, the type and extent of both urban and rural land uses should be carefully adjusted to the slope of the land. In general, slopes of 12 percent or greater should be considered unsuitable for urban development and most types of agricultural uses and, thus, should for the most part be maintained in essentially natural, open uses. As shown on Map 12, areas having a slope of 12 percent or greater encompass about 2.4 square miles, or about 14 percent of the total planning area.

WATERSHEDS, SUBWATERSHEDS, AND SUBBASINS

The Rochester planning area lies entirely within the Fox River watershed, which is a part of the Mississippi River drainage system. The portion of the Fox River watershed in the planning area can be divided into several subwatersheds, as shown on Map 11. These include the Eagle Creek, the Honey Creek, the Middle Fox River, and the Wind Lake Drainage Canal subwatersheds. The subwatersheds, in turn, may be further subdivided into individual drainage areas, termed subbasins, also displayed on Map 11.

SURFACE WATER RESOURCES

Surface water resources, consisting of lakes, rivers and streams, and associated floodlands and wetlands, form a particularly important element of the natural resource base of the Rochester planning area. Surface water resources influence the physical development of an area, provide recreational opportunities, and enhance the aesthetic quality of the area. Lakes and streams constitute a focal point of water-related recreational activities; provide an attractive setting for properly planned residential development; and, when viewed in the context of the total landscape, greatly enhance the aesthetic quality of the environment. Unfortunately, lakes and streams are readily susceptible to degradation through improper rural, as well as urban, land use development and management. Water quality can be degraded by excessive pollutant loads, including nutrient loads, from malfunctioning and improperly located onsite sewage disposal systems, urban runoff, runoff from construction sites, and careless agricultural practices. The water quality of lakes and streams may also be adversely affected by the excessive development of riverine areas combined with the filling of peripheral wetlands, which removes valuable nutrient and sediment traps and adds nutrient and sediment sources.

Lakes

Lakes have been classified by the Regional Planning Commission as being either major or minor. Major lakes have 50 acres or more of surface water area; minor lakes have less than 50 acres of surface water area. The one major lake located within the planning area is Long Lake, a 102-acre lake located partially in the Town of Rochester and partially in the Town of Burlington. The three named minor lakes located within the planning area are Delmonte Lake and Tahoe Lake located in the southwestern portion of the Town of Rochester and Brock Lake located in the southcentral portion of the Town.

As shown on Map 11, there are, in addition, a limited number of smaller lakes and ponds in the planning area.

Streams

Perennial streams are defined as watercourses that maintain, at a minimum, a small continuous flow throughout the year except under unusual drought



AREAS WHERE SOIL SURVEY DATA INDICATE THAT POTENTIAL SAND AND GRAVEL DEPOSITS MAY OCCUR IN THE ROCHESTER PLANNING AREA

Source: U. S. Natural Resources Conservation Service and SEWRPC,

conditions. The perennial streams in the Rochester planning area are shown on Map 11. Perennial streams in the planning area include Eagle Creek, which traverses the southeastern portion of the planning area in a generally east-west direction, the Fox River, which traverses the eastern portion of the planning area in a generally north-south direction; an unnamed stream in the central portion of the planning area which is tributary to Long Lake; and the Wind Lake Drainage Canal which is tributary to the Fox River.

Floodlands

The floodlands of a river or stream are the wide, gently sloping areas contiguous to, and usually lying on both sides of, a river or stream channel. Rivers and streams occupy their channels most of the time. However, during even minor flood events, stream discharges increase markedly, and the stream channels may not be able to contain and convey all of the flow. As a result, water levels increase and the river or stream spreads laterally over the floodlands. The periodic flow of a river onto its floodlands is a normal phenomenon and, in the absence of costly structural flood control works, will occur regardless of whether or not urban development exists in the floodland.

For planning and regulatory purposes, floodlands are normally defined as those areas, excluding the stream channel, subject to inundation by the 100-year recurrence interval flood event. This is the event that may be expected to be reached or exceeded in severity once in every 100 years; or, stated another way, there is a

SURFACE DRAINAGE, WETLANDS, FLOODLANDS, AND WATERSHED FEATURES IN THE ROCHESTER PLANNING AREA



Source: SEWRPC.

one percent chance of this event being reached or exceeded in severity in any given year. Floodland areas are generally not well suited to urban development, not only because of the flood hazard, but also because of the presence of high water tables and soils poorly suited to urban uses. The floodland areas, however, generally contain important elements of the natural resource base, such as woodlands, wetlands, and wildlife habitat and thus constitute prime locations for needed park and open space areas. Every effort should be made to discourage incompatible urban development on floodlands while encouraging compatible park and open space use.

The identification of the 100-year recurrence interval flood hazard areas in the planning area is important for the preparation of a sound land use plan. Floodland delineations were prepared by the Regional Planning Commission as part of its Fox River watershed planning program, the findings and recommendations of which are set forth in SEWRPC Planning Report No. 12, A Comprehensive Plan for the Fox River Watershed. In addition, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has identified additional areas in the planning area that may be subject to flood hazards. The FEMA study was conducted for flood insurance purposes. Floodlands in the Rochester planning area as currently delineated by the Regional Planning Commission and FEMA are shown on Map 11. These floodlands encompass an area of about 1.1 square miles, or about 6 percent of the planning area. These floodlands are located along Eagle Creek, the Fox River, the unnamed tributary associated with Long Lake, the Wind Lake Drainage





Source: U. S. Natural Resources Conservation Service and SEWRPC.

Canal, and associated with Honey Creek in the Town of Burlington.

Wetlands

Wetlands are areas in which the water table is at, near, or above the land surface and which are characterized by both hydric soils and by the growth of sedges, cattails, and other wetland vegetation. Wetlands generally occur in depressions and near the bottom of slopes, particularly along lakeshores and stream banks, and on large land areas that are poorly drained. Wetlands may, however, under certain conditions, occur on slopes and even on hilltops.

Wetlands perform an important set of natural functions. The functions include support of a wide variety of desirable, and sometimes unique, forms of plant and animal life; stabilization of lake levels and streamflows; entrapment and storage of plant nutrients in runoff, thus reducing the rate of enrichment of surface waters and weed and algae growth; contribution to the atmospheric oxygen and water supplies; reduction in stormwater runoff by providing areas for floodwater impoundment and storage; protection of shorelines from erosion; entrapment of soil particles suspended in runoff and reduction in stream sedimentation; provision of groundwater recharge and discharge areas; and provision of the population with opportunities for certain scientific, education, and recreational pursuits.

Wetlands have severe limitations for residential, commercial, and industrial development. Generally, these limitations are due to the erosive character, high compressibility and instability, low bearing capacity, and high shrink-swell potential of wetland soils, as well as the associated high water table. If ignored in land use planning and development, those limitations may result in flooding, wet basements, unstable foundations, failing pavement, and excessive infiltration of clear water into sanitary sewers. In addition, there is significant onsite preparation and maintenance costs associated with the development of wetland soils, particularly as related to roads, foundations, and public utilities.

Recognizing the important natural functions of wetlands areas, continued efforts should be made to protect these areas by discouraging costly, both in monetary and environmental terms, wetland draining, filling, and urbanization.

Map 11 shows the location of wetlands existing in the Rochester planning area in 1995. Wetlands occupied about 2.3 square miles, or about 13 percent of the planning area. The largest concentrations of wetlands occur within and adjacent to the Honey Creek Wildlife Areas, and in the areas adjacent to Long Lake.

WOODLANDS

Under good management, woodlands can serve a variety of beneficial functions. In addition to contributing to clean air and water and regulating surface water runoff, the woodlands contribute to the maintenance of a diversity of plant and animal life in association with human life. Unfortunately, woodlands which required a century or more to develop, can be destroyed through mismanagement in a comparatively short time. The destruction of woodlands, particularly on hillsides, can contribute to stormwater runoff, the siltation of lakes and streams, and the destruction of wild-life habitat. Woodlands can and should be maintained for their total values—for scenery, wildlife habitat, open space, education, recreation, and air and water quality protection.

Woodlands occupied about 2.4 square miles, or about 14 percent of the Rochester planning area, in 1995. The distribution of these woodlands is shown on Map 13. As shown, woodlands occur in a scattered pattern throughout the planning area.

PRAIRIE VEGETATION

Prairies are open, generally treeless, areas in the landscape that are dominated by native grasses. Such areas have important ecological and scientific values. The two known prairies within the Rochester planning area are the English Settlement Prairie, an approximately 16-acre site located in U.S. Public Land Survey Section 13; and the Fox River Prairie, consisting of two sites, having a combined area of about two acres, located in U. S. Public Land Survey Sections 14 and 15. These two sites, shown on Map 15, are dry and wet-mesic prairie remnants located in the southern portion of the planning area.

WILDLIFE HABITAT AREAS

Wildlife in the Rochester planning area includes both game and nongame species such as rabbit, squirrel, and woodchuck; predators such as mink, fox, and raccoon; game birds including pheasant; and marsh furbearers such as muskrat and beaver. Other species include songbirds and marsh and shorebirds. In addition, waterfowl are present and white-tailed deer are found in many areas. The spectrum of wildlife species has undergone significant alterations since settlement of the area by Europeans. These alterations were the direct result of the changes in land use and wildlife habitat made by the European settlers, beginning with the clearing of forests and the draining of wetlands for agricultural purposes, and, in some areas, ending with the development of intensive urban land uses. This process of change, which began in the early nineteenth century, is still occurring today.

In 1985, the Regional Planning Commission and the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources cooperatively conducted an inventory of wildlife habitat in Southeastern Wisconsin. As part of that inventory, areas were evaluated in terms of the diversity of animal species, the territorial requirements of those species, the composition and structure of existing vegetation, proximity to other wildlife habitat areas, and level of disturbance by man's activities. As part of the inventory, three classes of wildlife habitat were identified: 1) Class I, which consists of areas that contain a good diversity of wildlife, that are of sufficient size to meet all of the habitat requirements for each species, and that are generally located in proximity to other wildlife habitat areas; 2) Class II, which consists of wildlife habitat areas lacking one of the three criteria necessary for a Class I designation; and 3) Class III, which consists of those wildlife habitat areas that are generally remnant in nature and that lack two of the three criteria necessary for Class I designation.

As shown on Map 14, wildlife habitat areas in the Rochester planning area generally occur in association with existing surface water, wetland, and woodland resources. In 1985, wildlife habitat areas occupied about 6.5 square miles, or about 37 percent of the planning area. Of this total area, Class I wildlife habitat area,

WOODLANDS IN THE ROCHESTER PLANNING AREA: 1995



Source: SEWRPC.

comprised about 3.1 square miles, or about 48 percent; Class II wildlife habitat comprised about 2.2 square miles, or about 34 percent; and Class III wildlife habitat, comprised about 1.2 square miles, or about 18 percent. As shown on Map 14, Class I, Class II, and Class III wildlife habitat occur in scattered locations throughout the Rochester planning area.

NATURAL AREAS AND CRITICAL SPECIES HABITAT SITES

A comprehensive inventory of natural areas and critical species habitat areas within the Rochester planning area was conducted by the Regional Planning Commission in 1994 as part of the natural areas and critical species habitat protection and management planning program. The inventory systemically identified all remaining high quality natural areas and critical species habitat then

existing within the planning area as well as all of the Southeastern Wisconsin Region.

Natural Areas

Natural areas were placed into one of three categories utilizing criteria developed by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. These categories are: 1) NA-1, a natural area of Statewide or greater significance. Such areas contain nearly complete and relatively undisturbed plant and animal communities which are believed to resemble closely those of presettlement times; 2) NA-2, a natural area of countywide or regional significance. Such areas contain native biotic communities judged to be lower than NA-1 significance, either because of evidence of a limited amount of human disturbance or because of limited size; and 3) NA-3, a natural area of local significance. Such areas have been substantially altered by human activities, but provide refuge for native



WILDLIFE HABITAT AREAS IN THE ROCHESTER PLANNING AREA: 1985

plant and animal species that no longer exist in the surrounding area because of conflicting land uses and associated activities.

A total of eight such sites have been identified in the Rochester planning area. These sites, which together encompass about 866 acres, or about 8 percent of the planning area, are shown on Map 15 and described in Table 14.

Critical Species Habitat Sites

Critical Species Habitat sites are those areas, outside of natural areas, where the chief value lies in their ability to support rare, threatened or endangered species. Such areas constitute "critical" habitat that is important to ensure survival of a particular species or group of species of special concern.

One site supporting threatened or rare plant and animal species has been identified in the Rochester planning area. The site is known to contain one rare prairie plant species, the kittentail, and one threatened bird species, the Acadian flycatcher. This site, which encompasses an area of about 60 acres, or less than one percent of the planning area, is shown on Map 15 and described in Table 14.

NATURAL AREAS AND CRITICAL SPECIES HABITAT SITES IN THE ROCHESTER PLANNING AREA: 1995



Source: SEWRPC.

RESOURCE-RELATED ELEMENTS

Park and open space sites and historic sites, while not strictly defined as part of the natural resource base, are closely linked to the underlying natural resource base. Park and open space sites and historic sites may be enhanced by the presence of natural resource features; conversely, the commitment of land to park and open space use contributes to the preservation of existing resource features.

Existing Outdoor Recreation and Open Space Sites

Existing outdoor recreation and open space sites in the Rochester planning area in 1996 are shown on Map 16 and described in Table 15. These sites together encompass a total area of about 1,524 acres, or about 13 percent of the planning area. The Honey Creek Wildlife Areas, owned and managed by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, constitute the largest public open space sites in the planning area, encompassing an area of about 980 acres.

The Village of Rochester maintains two park and open space sites. As shown on Map 16, these sites—Pioneer Memorial Park, and Rochester Commons—are located in the western portion of the Village. Pioneer Memorial Park is a wayside facility, while a baseball diamond is provided at the Rochester Commons site. The remaining sites in the planning area shown on Map 16 and Table 15 are all owned by Racine County.

Number on Map 15	Classification	Area (acres)	Location U. S. Public Land Survey Section in Township 3 North, Range 19 East	Existing or Proposed Park or Open Space Site
1	Natural Area of Statewide or Greater Significance	190	10, 15	Cherry Lake and Sedge Meadow
2	Natural Area of Countywide or Regional Significance	77 ^a	17, 18	Honey Lake Marsh and Sedge Meadow
3	Natural Area of Countywide or Regional Significance	219 ^b	15, 16	Brock Lake Fen
4	Natural Area of Local Significance	204	2, 3	Wadewitz Woods
5	Natural Area of Local Significance	74	11, 12	Rowntree Road Woods
. 6	Natural Area of Local Significance	2	14, 15	Fox River Prairie
. 7	Natural Area of Local Significance	84	13, 14	Eagle Creek Woods
8	Natural Area of Local Significance	16	13	English Settlement Prairie
9	Critical Species Habitat Area	60	10, 11	Ela Park Woods

NATURAL AREAS AND CRITICAL SPECIES HABITAT SITES IN THE ROCHESTER PLANNING AREA: 1995

^{*}Does not include approximately 314-acre portion of site located in the Town of Burlington, and the Town of Spring Prairie, Walworth County.

^bDoes not include approximately 12-acre portion of site located in the Town of Burlington.

Source: SEWRPC.

Recreational Trails and Rustic Roads

Racine County has developed bicycling facilities throughout the County, including a four-mile segment of the 100-mile "on-the-road" Racine County bicycle route located in the central portion of the planning area (see Map 16) and a one-mile segment of the five-mile "off-the-road" Racine County Bicycle Trail located in the southeastern portion of the planning area. In addition, as shown on Map 16, two segments of designated rustic roads are located within the planning area. Rustic roads are scenic, lightly traveled country roads designated for the leisurely enjoyment of hikers, bicyclists, and motorists.

Historic Sites

A number of inventories and surveys of historic sites have been conducted by various units and agencies of government in the Southeastern Wisconsin Region. The results of these inventories and surveys, on file at such agencies as the Wisconsin State Historical Society, indicate that there are more than 1,000 historic sites in Racine County. Particularly significant historic sites are listed on the National Register of Historic Places. About 35 historic sites and 4 historic districts in Racine County are listed on the National Register. The National Register lists two historic sites within the planning area. These sites are the Franklyn Hazelo House located on Oak Knoll Road in the western portion of the Town of Rochester, and the Whitman-Belden House on N. State Street in the Village of Rochester.

ENVIRONMENTAL CORRIDORS AND ISOLATED NATURAL RESOURCE AREAS

One of the most important tasks completed under the regional planning program for Southeastern Wisconsin has been the identification and delineation of those areas in the Region in which concentrations of the best remaining elements of the natural resource base occur. It was recognized that preservation of such areas is essential both to the maintenance of the overall environmental quality of the Region and to the continued provision of the amenities required to maintain a high quality of life for the resident population.

Under the regional planning program, seven elements of the natural resource base have been considered essential to the maintenance of both the ecological balance as well as the overall quality of life in the Region: 1) lakes, rivers, and streams and the associated shorelands and



EXISTING PARK AND OPEN SPACE SITES IN THE ROCHESTER PLANNING AREA: 1996

Source: Town and Village of Rochester, Racine County, and SEWRPC.

floodlands; 2) wetlands; 3) woodlands; 4) prairies; 5) wildlife habitat areas; 6) wet, poorly drained, and organic soils; and 7) rugged terrain and high relief topography. In addition, there are certain other features which, although not a part of the natural resource base per se, are closely related to, or centered on, that base and are a determining factor in identifying and delineating areas with recreational, aesthetic, ecological, and cultural value. These features include 1) existing park and open space sites; 2) potential park and open space sites; 3) historic sites; 4) scenic areas and vistas; and 5) and natural area sites.

The delineation of these 12 natural resource and natural resource-related elements on maps results in a concentration of such elements in an essentially linear

pattern of relatively narrow, elongated areas which have been termed "environmental corridors" by the Regional Planning Commission.

The environmental corridors of the Rochester planning area were delineated, using the following natural resource and natural resource-related element criteria:

1. Point values from one to 20 were assigned to each natural resource and natural resource-related element. These point values were based on the premise that those natural resource elements having intrinsic natural resource values and a high degree of natural diversity should be assigned relatively high point values, whereas natural resource-related elements having only implied

Site Name	Number on Map 16	Acreage	Facilities
Public			
Case Eagle Park	1	239	Baseball Diamond, Open Space
Fox River	2	12	Open Space Site
Fox River	3	3	Open Space Site
Honey Creek Wildlife Area	4	980	Open Space Site
Kuecker Property	5	. 7	Undeveloped
Pioneer Memorial Park	6	1	Wayside
Rochester Commons	7	3	Baseball Diamond
Saller Woods	8	91	Open Space Site
Stenhouse/Bobcock Memorial	9	12	Undeveloped
Wadewitz Nature Camp	10	176	Open space Site
Total	10 Sites	1,524	

EXISTING PARK AND OPEN SPACE SITES IN THE ROCHESTER PLANNING AREA: 1996

Source: Racine County Planning and Zoning Department, and SEWRPC.

natural values should be assigned relatively low point values. These values for each element of corridor are shown in Table 16.

- 2. Each natural resource element was mapped, and point values for overlapping resource elements in a given area were totaled.
- 3. Environmental corridors were then delineated on the basis of cumulative point values and the size of the areas containing natural resource and resource-related elements, as follows:
 - Primary environmental corridors include areas with a cumulative point value of 10 or more that are at least 400 acres in size, two miles in length, and 200 feet in width.
 - Secondary environmental corridors include areas with a cumulative point value of 10 or more that are at least 100 acres in size and one mile in length.
 - Isolated natural resource areas also have a cumulative point value of 10 or more, with a minimum size of five acres. Isolated natural resource areas are generally separated physically from primary and secondary environmental corridors by intensive urban or agricultural land uses.

The preservation of the environmental corridors in essentially natural, open uses can assist in flood-flow attenuation, water pollution abatement, noise pollution abatement, and air quality maintenance. Such corridor preservation is also essential to facilitate the movement of wildlife, especially in times of stress, and for the movement and dispersal of seeds for a variety of plant species. In addition, because of the many interacting relationships which exist between living organisms and their environment, the destruction or deterioration of one important element of the total environment may lead to a chain reaction of deterioration and destruction of other elements. The drainage of wetlands, for example, may destroy fish spawning areas, wildlife habitat, groundwater recharge areas, and natural filtration and floodwater storage areas of interconnecting stream systems. The resulting deterioration of surface water quality may, in turn, lead to a deterioration of the quality of groundwater. Similarly, destruction of ground cover may result in soil erosion, stream siltation, more rapid runoff, and increased flooding, as well as the destruction of wildlife habitat. Although the effects of any one of these environmental changes may not by itself be overwhelming, the combined effects may eventually lead to a serious deterioration of the underlying and sustaining natural resource base and of the overall quality of the environment for life. In addition, the intrusion of intensive urban land uses into such areas may result in the creation of serious and costly problems, such as failing foundations for pavements and structures, wet basements, excessive operation of sump pumps, exces-

POINT VALUES FOR NATURAL RESOURCE BASE AND NATURAL RESOURCE BASE-RELATED ELEMENTS

	Point
Element	value
Natural Resource Base	
Lake	
Major (50 acres or more)	20
Minor (5 to 49 acres)	20
Rivers or Streams (perennial)	10
Shoreland	
Lake or Perennial River or Stream	10
Intermittent Stream	5
100-Year Floodland	3
Wetland	10
Woodland	10
Wildlife Habitat	
Class I	10
Class II	7
Class III	5
Steep Slope	
20 Percent or Greater	7
12 Percent to 19 Percent	5
Prairie	10
Natural Resource Base-Related	
Existing Park or Open Space Site	
Rural Open Space Site	5
Other Park and Open Space Site	2
Potential Park Site	
High Value	3
Medium Value	2
Low Value	1
Historic Site	
Structure	1
Other Cultural	1
Archaeological	2
Scenic Viewpoint	5
Scientific and Natural Area	
State Scientific Area	15
Natural Area of Statewide or	
Greater Importance	15
Natural Area of Countywide or	
Regional Significance	10
Natural Area of Local Significance	5

Source: SEWRPC.

sive clear water infiltration into sanitary sewerage systems, and poor drainage. The need to maintain the integrity of the remaining environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas in Southeastern Wisconsin should, thus, be apparent.

Primary Environmental Corridors

As shown on Map 17, the primary environmental corridors are located throughout the planning area and include woodlands, wetlands, significant natural areas, wildlife habitats and undeveloped natural shoreland areas. Primary environmental corridors encompass a total of about 4.8 square miles, representing about 27 percent of the planning area.

Secondary Environmental Corridors

As shown on Map 17, two secondary environmental corridors are located within the planning area. Together, these areas encompass a total of about 0.5 square mile, or about 3 percent of the planning area.

Isolated Natural Resource Areas

Isolated natural resource areas in the planning area consist largely of smaller pockets of wetlands or woodlands. As shown on Map 17, 17 such areas are scattered throughout the planning area. In combination, these areas together occupied for about 0.4 square mile, or about 2 percent of the planning area.

SUMMARY

This chapter has presented the results of an inventory and analysis of the natural resource base of the Rochester planning area undertaken in support of the preparation of a land use plan for the planning area. The major findings of that inventory and analysis are described below.

- 1. Soil limitations for various urban and nonurban uses are an important consideration in any sound land use planning effort. Detailed soil survey data indicate that about 5.1 square miles, or about 29 percent of the Rochester planning area, are covered by soils that have severe limitations for residential development served by public sanitary sewer service, or stated differently, are poorly suited for residential development of any kind. With respect to unsewered development, the soil survey data indicate that about 8.1 square miles, or about 46 percent of the planning area, are covered by soils classified as unsuitable for use of conventional onsite sewage disposal systems: and about 5.1 square miles, or about 29 percent, are classified as unsuitable for moundtype systems.
- 2. The planning area is located entirely within the Fox River watershed, which is part of the Mississippi River drainage system. About 1.1 square miles, or 6 percent of the planning area, lie



ENVIRONMENTAL CORRIDORS AND ISOLATED NATURAL RESOURCE AREAS IN THE ROCHESTER PLANNING AREA: 1995

Source: SEWRPC.

within the 100-year recurrence interval flood hazard area.

- 3. The planning area encompasses a number of significant natural resource base features includeing wetland areas which in 1995 occupied about 2.3 square miles, or about 13 percent of the planning area; woodlands which in 1995 occupied about 2.4 square miles, or about 14 percent of the planning area; and wildlife habitat areas which occupied about 6.5 square miles, or about 37 percent of the planning area. The planning area in 1995 also contained eight sites identified as natural areas.
- 4. The planning area contains 10 outdoor recreation and open space sites, the largest of which is the Honey Creek Wildlife Areas, owned and managed by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources—encompassing about 980

acres, or about 9 percent of the total area of the planning area.

5. The most important elements of the natural resource base and features closely related to that base-including wetlands, woodlands, prairie, wildlife habitat, major lakes and streams and associated shorelands and floodlands, and outdoor recreation sites-when combined, result in an essentially linear pattern in the planning area referred to by the Regional Planning Commission as environmental corridors. Primary environmental corridors include a wide variety of important natural resource and resource related elements and are, by definition, at least 400 acres in size, two miles long, and 200 feet wide. In 1995, primary environmental corridors in the planning area encompassed a total of about 4.8 square miles, representing about 27 percent of the planning area.

(This page intentionally left blank)

Chapter IV

MAN-MADE ENVIRONMENT

INTRODUCTION

Whereas the previous chapter of this report presented a description of the natural resource base of the Rochester planning area, this chapter provides a description of the man-made environment of the planning area. Specifically, this chapter presents information regarding the existing land use pattern and changes in that pattern over the past three decades; the existing transportation system; and the existing utility and community facilities systems. Definitive information regarding existing land use and other related aspects of the man-made environment is essential to any sound land use planning effort.

EXISTING LAND USE

The Regional Planning Commission periodically conducts inventories of existing land use in the Southeastern Wisconsin Region, providing definitive information on the type, amount, and spatial location of the major categories of land use within the Region. The first such inventory was conducted in 1963; the most recent inventory was conducted in 1995. The existing land use pattern in the Rochester planning area, based upon the 1995 land use inventory, is shown on Map 18 and is quantitatively summarized in Table 17. The trend in land use development for the period from 1963 through 1995 is presented for the planning area in Table 18.

As shown on Map 18, existing urban development within the Rochester planning area includes a number of relatively densely developed residential areas located along the Fox River in both the Town and Village of Rochester, and residential uses in the old settlements of Honey Creek and Honey Lake. The planning area encompasses a number of environmentally significant wetland and woodland areas. Despite the scattering of residential homesites that exist within the Town of Rochester, the Town still contains a number of intact blocks of farmland.

Urban Land Uses

In 1995, urban land uses—consisting primarily of residential, commercial, industrial, governmental and institutional, and transportation uses—encompassed about 1,320 acres, or about 12 percent, of the Rochester planning area. Lands devoted to these urban uses increased by about 620 acres, or about 89 percent, between 1963 and 1995.

Residential land uses, comprised the largest urban land use category, encompassing about 823 acres, or about 63 percent of all urban land, and about 7 percent of the planning area. Residential lands occurred both in concentrated enclaves—as noted above—and as scattered homesites in many areas of the Town of Rochester.

By 1995, 765 lots had been created through residential subdivision plats in the Rochester planning area. About 40 of these lots remained vacant in 1995.

Nonurban Land Uses

In 1995, nonurban land uses—consisting of agricultural lands, wetlands, woodlands, other open lands, and surface water—comprised about 10,000 acres, or about 88 percent of the planning area. Nonurban land uses decreased by about 620 acres, or by about 6 percent, between 1963 and 1995.

Agricultural lands encompassed about 6,200 acres in the planning area in 1995, accounting for about 62 percent of all nonurban land, and about 55 percent of the planning area. Woodlands, wetlands, and surface water together encompassed about 3,200 acres, or about 32 percent of all nonurban lands and about 28 percent of the planning area.

Of the 6.200 acres of farmland existing in the planning area in 1995, about 4,000 acres, or about 65 percent, were identified as prime farmland under the Racine County farmland preservation plan, adopted by the Racine County Board in 1982.¹ Under that plan, prime farmlands were identified as consisting of farm units meeting the following criteria: 1) individual farm unit of at least 35 acres in size; 2) at least one-half of the individual farm unit covered by soils meeting U.S. Natural Resources Conservation Service criteria for prime farmland or farmland of statewide importance; and 3) the individual farm units must occur in a farming area of at least 100 acres in size. Map 19 shows those lands which were identified as prime agricultural land under the County farmland preservation plan prepared in 1982, and which still met the criteria and remained in agricultural use in 1995.

¹SEWRPC Planning Report No. 46, A Farmland Preservation Plan for Racine County, Wisconsin, 1981.



EXISTING LAND USE IN THE ROCHESTER PLANNING AREA: 1995

Source: SEWRPC.

TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES

Arterial Streets and Highways

In 1995, the Rochester planning area was served by a 37-mile network of streets and highways (See Map 20). Of this total 22 miles or about 59 percent consisted of arterial streets and highways all of which were under the jurisdiction of the County and State governments. About five miles, or about 23 percent of the arterial street and highway network, consisted of state trunk highways; and about 17 miles, or about 77 percent consisted of streets consist of local streets of which about three miles are located in the Village of Rochester and about 12 miles are located in the Town of Rochester. Traffic volumes on

all of the arterial streets and highways shown on Map 20 are well below design capacity.

Of particular importance to any planning for the area is the proposed construction of the STH 36-Burlington bypass which would connect to existing STH 36 and STH 83 in the southern portion of the planning area (See Map 4 in Chapter 1). The Wisconsin Department of Transportation in 1997 established a recommended location for this facility. A schedule for right-of-way acquisition and construction had not, however, been established.

Freight Railway Facilities

As of 1995, freight railway service was provided over a mainline railway located through the western portion of the

Land Use Category ^a	Acres	Percent of Urban/ Nonurban	Percent of Total
Urban	· · ·		
Residential	823	62.5	7.2
Commercial	19	1.4	0.2
Industrial	33	2.5	0.3
Transportation, Communication and Utilities	417	31.6	3.7
Governmental and Institutional	21	1.6	0.2
Recreational	5	0.4	- <u>-</u> b
Urban Subtotal	1,318	100.0	11.6
Nonurban			
Agricultural	6,230	62.1	54.9
Natural Areas			
Woodlands	1,546	15.4	13.6
Wetlands	1,480	14.8	13.1
Surface Water	171	1.7	1.5
Natural Areas Subtotal	3,197	31.9	28.2
Extractive and Landfill	256	2.6	2.3
Unused Land ^c	342	3.4	3.0
Nonurban Subtotal	10,025	100.0	88.4
Total	11,343		100.0

EXISTING LAND USE IN THE ROCHESTER PLANNING AREA: 1995

^aParking included in associated use.

^bLess than 0.05 percent

^cUnused lands consists of open areas which are not utilized for agricultural purposes, and which do not encompass inportant elements of the natural resource base, such as woodlands, wetlands, and water.

Source: SEWRPC

Rochester planning area by the Wisconsin Central, Ltd. This railway line was formerly owned by the Soo Line Railway. That line provided freight service via a corridor through Southeastern Wisconsin between Chicago and Minneapolis-St. Paul.

PUBLIC UTILITIES

Public utility systems are among the most important and permanent elements influencing the growth and development of a community. Moreover, certain utility facilities are closely linked to surface water and groundwater resources and may, therefore, affect the overall quality of the natural resource base. This is particularly true of sanitary sewerage, water supply, and stormwater drainage facilities, which are, in a sense, modifications or extensions of the natural lake, stream, and water course systems of an area and of the underlying groundwater reservoir. The provision of certain public utilities to a largely rural area is normally impractical. Conversely, the development of areas for intensive urban use without certain utilities may create serious and costly environmental and public health problems.

Sanitary Sewer Service

Public sanitary sewer service within the Rochester planning area became available upon the construction of the Western Racine County Sewerage District sewage treatment plant in 1968. In 1996, the Regional Planning Commission worked with the Town and Village of Rochester to complete a sewer service area plan which identified lands in the planning area anticipated to be tributary to this treatment plant as shown on Map 21. That plan is set forth in SEWRPC Community Assistance

	Land Us	e (Acres)	Change in Land Use		
Land Use Category*	1963	1995	Acres	Percent	
Urban Residential Commercial Industrial Transportation, Communication and Utilities Governmental and Institutional Recreational	339 8 11 320 19 ⁵	823 19 33 417 21 5	484 11 22 97 2 5	142.8 137.5 200.0 30.3 10.5	
Urban Subtotal	697	1,318	621	89.1	
Nonurban Agricultural Natural Areas	7,223	6,230	-993	-13.7	
Woodlands Wetlands Surface Water	1,592 1,357 144	1,546 1,480 171	-46 123 27	9.1 18.8	
Natural Areas Subtotal	3,093	3,197	104	3.4	
Extractive and Landfill Unused Land ^c	80 250	256 342	176 92	220.0 36.8	
Nonurban Subtotal	10,646	10,025	-621	-5.8	
Total	11,343	11,343		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

LAND USE IN THE ROCHESTER PLANNING AREA: 1963 AND 1995

^aParking included in associated use.

^bLess than 0.5 acres

^cUnused lands consists of open areas which are not utilized for agricultural purposes, and which do not encompass inportant elements of the natural resource base, such as woodlands, wetlands, and water

Source: SEWRPC.

Planning Report No. 141 (2nd Edition), Sanitary Sewer Service Area for the Waterford/Rochester Area.

The planned sewer service area as shown on Map 22 encompasses about 1,550 acres, or about 31 percent of the planning area. Of this total, about 350 acres, or about 21 percent, was provided with public sanitary sewer service in 1995. The sewer service area encompasses about 500 acres of environmentally sensitive lands. Thus, about 700 acres of land remain available to accommodate new urban development within the presently planned sewer service area. As shown on Map 22, the lands served by public sanitary sewer within the planning area in 1995 were located within the Village of Rochester and the Town of Rochester Utility District No. 1.

The Western Racine County Sewerage District sewage treatment plant was expanded and upgraded in 1987. The plant expansion provided for a hydraulic capacity of 1.0 million gallons per day (mgd) on an average annual flow basis and about 3.0 mgd on a peak hourly flow basis. In 1994, the District conducted a reevaluation of the plant capacity utilizing the available plant loading and performance data, unit sizing, and current design criteria. That analysis resulted in a conclusion that the plant had a hydraulic capacity of about 1.3 mgd, on a



PRIME AGRICULTURAL LANDS IN THE ROCHESTER PLANNING AREA: 1995

Source: SEWRPC.

sustained wet weather flow basis. This wet weather capacity rating was approved by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, and is reflected in the current Wisconsin Pollution Discharge Elimination System Permit for the plant.

In 1995, the hydraulic loading on the Western Racine County Sewerage District sewage treatment plant was about 0.8 mgd on an average annual basis, and 2.6 mgd on a peak hourly basis; leaving a reserve capacity of about 0.2 mgd on an average annual basis, and 0.4 mgd on a peak hourly basis. This available sewage treatment plant capacity is not specifically allocated to each of the service areas concerned within the District. However, in 1995 estimated wastewater loading from the planning area was about 0.2 mgd on an average annual basis, and about 0.6 mgd on a peak hourly basis, accounting for about 20 percent of the plant capacity. The resident

population currently served within the planning area, about 1,500 persons, also accounted for about 20 percent of the total population currently served by the sewage treatment plant. Under design year 2010 conditions, based upon the Regional Planning Commission's recommended regional land use plan, the population and wastewater loading from the planning area are expected to increase to about 2,300 persons, and to about 0.3 mgd on an average annual basis and about 0.8 on a peak hourly basis. Assuming some planned growth in the Town of Waterford Sanitary District No. 1 and in the Village of Waterford, it is expected that the existing plant capacity will be exceeded and facility planning will need to be initiated for a plant expansion some time prior to the year 2010. Such facility planning should consider the alternatives available for increasing the plant capacity including: interim measures such as providing increased sludge storage capacity and flow detention, as well as a major



ARTERIAL STREET AND HIGHWAY SYSTEM IN THE ROCHESTER PLANNING AREA: 1995

Source: SEWRPC.

expansion to increase the plant capacity by approximately 50 percent. Such facility planning should also consider the needed allocation of plant capacity between the areas served.

Public Water Supply System

In 1995, the Rochester planning area was not served by a public water supply system. Water for domestic and other uses was supplied by groundwater through the use of private on site wells.

Groundwater resources are an extremely valuable element of the natural resource base. Continued development within the Rochester planning area, and within all of Southeastern Wisconsin, can jeopardize this valuable resource. Proper land use planning within groundwater recharge areas will facilitate the protection and wise management of groundwater resources.

Engineered Stormwater Drainage System

In 1995, the Village of Rochester was served by a limited engineered stormwater management system. Map 23 shows the locations of storm sewers in the Village. Stormwater collected by the system was discharged into the Fox River. The Town of Rochester was not served by an engineered stormwater management system. Stormwater drainage was provided by roadside ditches and natural watercourses.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

Schools

In 1995, the Rochester planning area was served by two public high school districts, the Waterford Union High School District and the Burlington K-12 District. As shown on Map 24, the Waterford District served the

PLANNED SANITARY SEWER SERVICE AREAS TRIBUTARY TO THE WESTERN RACINE COUNTY SEWERAGE DISTRICT SEWAGE-TREATMENT FACILITY



Source: SEWRPC.

majority of the planning area and operated Waterford Union High School, a public high school located in the Village of Waterford. The Burlington District served only the southeast and western portions of the planning area and operated Burlington High School, a public high school located in the City of Burlington. Neither of these high schools are located within the planning area.

As shown on Map 24, a number of elementary schools served the Rochester planning area. Within the Waterford District these included: Evergreen Elementary School, Fox River Middle School, and Maple View Elementary School, all located in the Village of Waterford. Within the Burlington District these included: Lyons Kindergarten Center in the unincorporated community of Lyons; Dover Kindergarten Center in the unincorporated community of Kansasville; and Cooper Elementary School, Waller Elementary School and Burlington Middle School all located in the City of Burlington. All of these elementary schools are located outside of the planning area.

Schools are a major planning variable in the growth and development of a community. The quality of schools in an area has a significant impact on the nature of the community. As communities grow and school capacities are reached, large capital expenditures may be required to build facilities to accommodate and educate increasing numbers of students.

Because school districts and local municipal planning groups are separate entities, the impact of population growth on schools is often not considered by local planning groups, despite the fact that school taxes are a significant portion of local taxes.

Detailing precise school capacities is difficult for school officials, since public schools cannot "limit" their enrollments, even if they are beyond their capacity. Architectural design capacities for school buildings, which relate a number of students to the square feet of building space available are not an accurate indicator of functional capacity. Functional capacity of a school is less than its architectural design capacity, and is determined by factors including space required by programs offered by a school, and quality of education factors such as number of students in a classroom, which are determined by school boards and what a community wants of its schools.

Waterford High School which had a 1997 enrollment of about 813 students is building an addition at present to allow it to accommodate about 1,000 students. Administrators indicate that based on present enrollment in the school systems this will be adequate for a number of years. However, they also caution that with an inflow of new students from new housing, the capacity could be filled rapidly.

School Administrators in Waterford and Burlington indicate that Evergreen Elementary School, Mapleview



EXISTING SANITARY SEWER SERVICE IN THE ROCHESTER PLANNING AREA: 1995

School, and Fox River School in the Waterford School District, and schools in the Burlington K-12 district, which serve Rochester and other communities are near their functional capacities now. Population projections of school age children in the School Districts indicate increasing numbers in the coming years. It is expected that the existing capacity of schools will be exceeded and new school facilities will need to be in the planning and building stages by the year 2000 or shortly after.

Decisions which Rochester and the other communities in the School Districts make on how they grow in the coming years will determine the needs for these new facilities.

Library Services

The Rochester planning area is served by the Rochester Public Library. The library expanded its facilities in to the "Old Rochester School Building" in 1995. At that time, using the formula from *Public Library Space Planning Needs: A Planning Outline* and figures from the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, the library facilities were designed to serve a population of 4,071. The design population is an estimate of the number of people the Rochester library will be serving through 2013. The building and the grounds known as the Rochester Commons is owned by the Village of Rochester. The operating budget is funded by both the Town and Village of Rochester.

Fire Protection, Emergency

Medical Services, and Police Service

In 1995, fire protection for the entire planning area was provided by the Rochester Volunteer Fire Company, a private nonprofit corporation under contract to both the Town and Village of Rochester. The Rochester Volun-



VILLAGE OF ROCHESTER ENGINEERED STORMWATER DRAINAGE SYSTEM: 1995

Source: Village of Rochester and SEWRPC.

teer Fire Company owned the fire trucks and equipment, which was housed in a station owned jointly by the Town and Village of Rochester, located on CTH FF approximately one-half mile west of CTH W, in the Town of Rochester.

Emergency medical services were provided to the planning area by the Village of Waterford Fire and Rescue Department.

In 1995, police protection within the planning area was provided by the Racine County Sheriff's Department. Minor infractions of the law in the Town of Rochester such as stray dogs and littering, were handled by the Town Constable.

Solid Waste Disposal

In 1995, the Town and Village of Rochester separately contracted with a private firm for the removal and disposal of solid waste. The private contractor also collected discarded household appliances and other large items by special arrangement. Consequently, neither the Town or Village of Rochester operated a recycling center or transfer station of any type. In 1995, there were no active landfill sites located in the planning area.

SUMMARY

This chapter has presented the findings of inventories of the existing land use pattern and of other aspects of the man-made environment pertinent to land use planning for the Rochester area. A summary of the most important findings of inventories covered include:

- 1. In 1995, existing urban development within the Rochester planning area consists of a number of relatively densely developed residential areas located along the Fox River in both the Town and Village of Rochester; and concentrations of residential uses in the old settlements of Honey Creek and Honey Lake. The planning area also encompassed a number of environmentally significant wetland and woodland areas and a number of relatively large blocks of farmland.
- In 1995, urban land uses—consisting primarily of residential, commercial, governmental and institutional, and transportation uses—encompassed about 1,320 acres, or about 12 percent of the planning area. Lands devoted to these urban uses increased



SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND SCHOOLS SERVING THE ROCHESTER PLANNING AREA: 1995

Source: Racine County and SEWRPC.

by about 620 acres, or about 89 percent, between 1963 and 1995. Residential lands comprised the singularly largest urban land use category, encompassing about 823 acres, or about 63 percent of all urban land, and about 7 percent of the planning area.

- 3. By 1995, 765 lots had been created through residential subdivision plats in the Rochester planning area. Of these lots, about 40 remained vacant in 1995.
- In 1995, nonurban land uses—consisting of agricultural lands, wetlands, woodlands, other open lands, and surface water—comprised about 10,000 acres, or about 88 percent of the planning

area. Nonurban lands decreased by about 620 acres, or about 6 percent, between 1963 and 1995. Agricultural lands encompassed about 6,200 acres in the planning area, accounting for about 62 percent of all nonurban land, and about 55 percent of the planning area. Of the 6,200 acres of agricultural lands, about 4,000 acres, or about 65 percent, were identified as prime agricultural lands in the Racine County farmland preservation plan.

5. In 1995, the planning area was served by a 37 mile network of streets and highways. Of this total network, 22 miles, or about 59 percent consisted of arterial streets and highways, all of which were under the jurisdiction of the County and State governments. A portion of the planned STH 36-Burlington bypass is proposed to be constructed through the southern portion of the planning area.

6. In 1995, public sanitary sewer service within the planning area was provided to the Village of Rochester and the Town of Rochester Utility District No. 1 by the Western Racine County Sewerage District Treatment Plant. The planned service area in the planning area envisioned to be tributary to the District sewerage treatment plant encompassed about 1,550 acres, or about 31 percent of the planning area. Of this area, 350 acres, or about 21 percent are currently provided with public sanitary sewer service. The sewer service area within the Rochester planning area also contains 500 acres of environmentally significant lands. About 700 acres of land thus remain available to accommodate new urban development within the planned sewer service area of the planning area. (This page intentionally left blank)

Chapter V

EXISTING LAND USE REGULATIONS

INTRODUCTION

Good community development depends not only on sound long-range planning at all levels of government, but on practical plan implementation as well. Zoning is one of the major plan implementation devices available to any community. The primary function of zoning should be to implement the community land use plan. A secondary function should be to protect desirable existing development. Zoning should be a major tool for the implementation of community plans and not a substitute for such plans. Other plan implementation devices available to the Town, Village and County include land division ordinances, sanitary code, state and federal wetland regulations, and state water quality regulations.

ZONING

A zoning ordinance is a public law which regulates and restricts the use of private property in the public interest. 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 those areas of the community which are well suited to those uses, and seeks to set aside land for these particular 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; to prevent the overcrowding of land, traffic congestion, and the overloading of the utility systems. Zoning should also seek to protect and preserve the natural resource base.

A zoning ordinance typically consists of two parts: 1) a text setting forth regulations that apply to each of the various zoning districts, together with related procedural, administrative, and legal provisions; and 2) a map delineating the boundaries of the various districts to which the differing regulations apply.

Town of Rochester Zoning

The Town of Rochester is under the jurisdiction of the Racine County general zoning and shoreland/floodplain zoning ordinance. The ordinance currently in effect was adopted by Racine County in 1982 and approved by the Town of Rochester the same year.

The general zoning provisions of the County zoning ordinance are jointly administered by Racine County and the Town of Rochester. As stipulated in Chapter 59 of the *Wisconsin Statutes*, towns which are under the jurisdiction of a county zoning ordinance must be given the opportunity to review and comment upon all county proposed zoning amendments. If a town board formally disapproves a proposed zoning district boundary change within the town—or if a majority of towns disapprove a change in district regulations—a county may not approve the proposed zoning changes without revision. Conversely, zoning changes proposed by a town must be formally approved by the county.

Under Wisconsin Statutes, counties are responsible for the zoning of shoreland areas within civil towns. Shoreland areas are defined in the Statutes as lands within the following distance from the ordinary high-water mark of navigable waters: one thousand feet from a lake, pond, or flowage; and three hundred feet from a river or stream or to the landward side of the floodplain, whichever distance is greater. Zoning amendments within shoreland areas do not require approval of, and are not subject to disapproval by, town boards. In practice, however, Racine County and the Town of Rochester act together to cooperatively implement zoning in the shoreland areas of the Town.

Existing (1995) zoning districts within the Town of Rochester are shown on Map 25. The permitted uses and the lot size, width, and setback requirements for the various districts are summarized in Table 19. A tabular summary of the areal extent of the various districts is presented in Table 20.

As indicated in Table 20, agricultural zoning was in place on about 7,400 acres—about 11.6 square miles—or 68 percent of the Town. The A-2 General Farming and Residential II district, which establishes a minimum parcel size of 40,000 square feet, has been applied to about 6,670 acres—about 10.4 square miles—or about 61 percent of the Town. The A-3 General Farming III district has been applied to about 620 acres—about one square mile—or about 6 percent of the Town. The A-1 General Farming I district, which establishes a minimum parcel size of 35 acres, has been applied to about 150 acres, or about one percent of the total area of the Town.

About 980 acres—about 1.5 square miles—or about 9 percent of the Town, have been placed in C-1 Resource



EXISTING ZONING IN THE TOWN OF ROCHESTER: 1995

Source: Racine County and SEWRPC.

Conservation district to protect the underlying natural resource base.

The balance of the Town has been placed in various residential, commercial, industrial, and institutional or park-recreational districts. Specifically, about 1,170 acres, representing about 11 percent of the Town, have been placed in residential zoning districts; about 90 acres, or less than one percent of the Town, have been placed in commercial districts; about 800 acres, or about 7 percent of

the Town, have been placed in manufacturing districts; and about 400 acres, or about 4 percent of the Town, have been placed in institutional or park-recreational districts.

In addition to the aforereferenced basic zoning districts, the County zoning ordinance includes nine overlay districts, as shown in Table 20. Just two of these, the GFO-General Floodplain Overlay District, and the SWO-Shoreland Wetland Overlay District, are currently applied within the Town of Rochester.

SUMMARY OF BASIC ZONING REGULATIONS: RACINE COUNTY ORDINANCE

							-	
			Minimum	Lot Size	N		Maximum	
District	Typical Principal Uses	Typical Conditional Uses ^{b,c}	Total Area	i otal Width (feet)	Street Yard (feet)	Side Yard (feet)	Hear Yard (feet)	Building Height (feet)
R-1 Country Estate District	One-family dwellings on estate lots and sustained yield forestry	Stables, nurseries, orchards, riding trails, schools and churches	5 acres	300	100	50	100	35
R-2 Suburban Residential District (unsewered)	One-family dwellings on lots not served by public sanitary sewer	Schools and churches	40,000 square feet	150	50	15	50	35
R-2S Suburban Residential District (sewered)	One-family dwellings on larger lots served by public sanitary sewer.	Schools and churches	40,000 square feet	150	50	15	50	28
R-3 Suburban Residential District (sewered)	One-family dwellings on lots served by public sanitary sewer	Schools and churches	20,000 square feet	100	50	10 1	50	35
R-3A Suburban Residential District (sewered)	One-family dwellings on lots served by public sanitary sewer	Schools and churches	13,500 square feet	90	35	10	50	35
R-4 Urban Residential District I	One-family dwellings on lots served by public sanitary sewer	Schools and churches	10,000 square feet	75	25	10	25	35
R-5 Urban Residential District II	One-family dwellings on lots served by public sanitary sewer	Schools and churches	7,200 square feet	60	25	10	25	35
R-5A Urban Residential District III	One-family dwellings on lots served by public sanitary sewer	Schools and churches	10,000 square feet	65	25	10	25	28
R-6 Two-Family Residential District	Two-family dwellings on lots served by public sanitary sewer	Rest homes, nursing homes, clinics, children's nurseries, schools and churches	10,000 square feet	100	25	10	25	35
R-6A Two-Family Residential District II	Two-family dwellings on lots served by public sanitary sewer	Rest homes, nursing homes, clinics, children's nurseries, schools and churches	20,000 square feet	100	50	10	50	28
R-7 Multi-Family Residential District	Multi-family dwellings, not to exceed 8 dwelling units per structure, on lots served by public sanitary sewer	Rest homes, nursing homes, clinics, children's nurseries, clubs, religious and charitable institutions; schools and churches	15,000 square feet ^d	120	35	20	50	35
R-8 Planned Residential District	Two-family dwellings, multi- family dwellings, and clustered one-family lot developments, all served by public sanitary sewer, and park land	Schools and churches	Varies	Varies ^t	30	10	25	35
B-1 Neighborhood Business District	Neighborhood level retail and service	Residential quarters, heli- ports, bus and rail depots, vehicle sales, service sta- tions, garages, taxi stands and public parking lots	15,000 square feet	. 75	25	10	25	35
B-2 Community Business District	All B-1 principal uses, and community level retail, office and service	Residential quarters, heli- port, bus and rail depots, funeral homes, drive-in banks, vehicle sales, service stations, garages, taxi stands, and public parking lots	15,000 square feet	75	25	10	25	35
B-3 Commercial Service District	All B-1 and B-2 principal uses, automotive sales and service, boat sales and service, bicycle sales and service, vending machine sales and service, animal hospitals, auction galleries, employ- ment agencies, exterminating shops, motorcycle sales and service, private clubs and lodges, and taxidermists	Residential quarters, com- mercial recreation facilities, clubs, lodges, heliport, bus and rail depots, funeral homes, drive-in banks, self- service storage facilities, taxi stands and public parking lots	15,000 square feet	75	25	10	25	35
B-4 Planned Business District	All uses are conditional uses	All B-2 principal uses, residential quarters, commercial recreation facilities, heliport, bus and rail depots, drive-in banks, taxi stands and public parking lots	2 acres	200	80	10	40	45

Table 19 (continued)

			Minimum	Lot Size	· N	linimum Yards	a	Maximum
District	Typical Principal Uses	Typical Conditional Uses ^{⊾∞}	Total Area	Total Width (feet)	Street Yard (feet)	Side Yard (feet)	Rear Yard (feet)	Building Height (feet)
B-5 Highway Business District	All uses are conditional uses	All B-1 principal uses, resi- dential quarters, lodges, heliports, bus and rail depots, motels, funeral homes, drive-in banks, tourist homes, truck and bus terminals, self-service storage facilities, public parking lots, places of entertainment, commercial, recreational facilities, drive- in theaters, taxi stands, and public parking lots	4 acres	400	100	40	40	35
B-6 Water-Oriented Business District	Water-oriented commercial uses such as bait shops, bath houses, fishing, boat sales, service and storage, boat launches, dance halls, hotels, motels, resorts, restaurants and taverns	Residential quarters, commercial recreation facilities, tourist homes, service stations, taxi stands and public parking lots	40,000 square feet	150	50	50	50	35
B-7 Adult Entertainment Business District	All uses are conditional uses	Adult bath houses, adult bookstores, adult video stores, adult modeling studios, massage parlors, cabaret, theaters and novelty shops	4 acres	400	100	40	40	35
M-1 Light Industrial and Office District	Offices, laboratories, training centers, wholesalers, light industrial plants	Restaurant, fueling stations, heliport, bus and rail depots		150	100/25°	100/25 [°]	25	35
M-2 General Industrial District	All M-1 principal uses, addi- tional light manufacturing, assembly and packaging	Restaurants, fueling stations, airstrips, animal hospitals, heliport, bus and rail depots, and self-service storage facilities		33	50	20	25	45
M-3 Heavy Industrial District	All M-1 and M-2 principal uses, heavy manufacturing	Same as M-2 District conditional uses		33	50	20	25	60
M-4 Quarrying District	Mineral extraction operations and concrete products manufacturing			•••	200 ^h	200 ^h	200'	45
A-1 General Farming District I	Agriculture, farm dwellings associated to farming operations, roadside stands	Animal hospitals, commer- cial egg production, commercial raising of animals, creameries, airstrips, migratory labor- ers' housing, and sod farming	35 acres		100	100	100	50
A-2 General Farming and Residential District II	All A-1 principal uses, one- and two-family dwellings	Same as A-1 District conditional uses, airport, air-strips, universities, hospitals, cemeteries, storage and maintenance of construction equipment	40,000 square feet	150	75	25	25	28
A-3 General Farming District III	All A-1 principal uses— holding district	Same as A-1 District conditional uses	35 acres		100	100	100	50
A-4 Truck Farming District	Greenhouses, nurseries, orchards, cash crops, road- side stands, farm dwellings associated to principal use	Animal hospitals, airstrips, universities, hospitals, and cemeteries	10 acres	300	50	15	50	50
P-1 Institutional Park District	Public and private institutional uses such as schools, colleges, hospitals, penal institutions, cemeteries and crematories	Airports, airstrips, and churches	20 acres		100	100	100	50
P-2 Recreational Park District	Public and private recreational uses such as arboretums, fishing, boating, swimming, and recreational trails	Private recreational or assembly structures, golf courses, campgrounds, playgrounds, driving ranges, polo fields, swim- ming pools, zoological gardens, athletic fields, lodges, picnic areas, archery ranges, and firearm ranges	10 acres		100	100	100	35

Table 19 (continued)

	المراجع المراجع المراجع		Minimum	Lot Size	N	Ainimum Yard:	3	Maximum
District	Typical Principal Uses	Typical Conditional Uses [™]	Total Area	Total Width (feet)	Street Yard (feet)	Side Yard (feet)	Rear Yard (feet)	Building Height (feet)
C-1 Resource Conservation District	Fishing, floodwater storage, pedestrian and equestrian trails, fish hatcheries, hunt- ing, navigation, preservation of scenic, historic and scientific areas, soil and water conservation practice, sustained yield forestry, stream bank and lake shore protection, wildlife areas	Drainageways, game farms, grazing, orchards, swim- ming, truck farming, and wild crop harvesting	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A+
C-2 Upland Resource Conservation District	Farming and related agricul- tural uses when conducted in accordance with soil conser- vation service standards, hunting and fishing, forest preservation, forest and game management, preser- vation of scenic, historic and scientific areas, park and recreation areas, arboreta, botanical gardens, one single-family dwelling	Hunting and fishing clubs; recreation camps, public or private campgrounds; gardening, tool, and stor- age sheds incidental to the residential use; general farm buildings, including barns, silos,sheds and storage bins; private garages and carports; and clustered residential developments	3 acres	300	100	25	100	28

*In addition to the street, side, and rear yards, most districts specify a minimum shore yard of 75 feet from the ordinary high water mark of any navigable water.

^bUtilities are allowed as conditional uses in all districts provided all principal structures and uses are not less than 50 feet from any residential district lot line.

^cGovernmental and cultural uses such as fire and police stations, community centers, libraries, public emergency shelters, parks and museums are allowed as conditional uses in all but the C-1, M-4 and agricultural districts.

^dNo less than 2,000 square feet per efficiency unit; 2,500 square feet per 1-bedroom unit, and 3,000 square feet per 2 or more bedroom unit.

^e4,000 square feet per row-house; 8,000 square feet for one-family dwellings.

¹120 feet for 1½ story row-houses; 65 feet for one-family dwellings.

⁹The first figure indicates minimum setback when adjacent to residential districts or opposite a more restrictive district; the second figure is the minimum setback in other cases.

^hExtractive operations must be set back at least 200 feet from any road right-of-way or property line; accessory uses must be set back at least 100 feet.

Source: Racine County and SEWRPC.

The GFO district is intended to prevent development in flood hazard areas, as well as to protect the floodwater conveyance and storage capacity of the floodplains. County floodplain regulations apply to all lands within the 100-year recurrence interval flood hazard area (see Map 11 in Chapter III). Such areas encompass about 560 acres, about 6 percent of the Town. The existing floodplain regulations prohibit virtually all new structures within the floodplain, including the floodway and flood fringe areas, in accordance with sound floodland management practice.

The SWO district is intended to protect wetland resources within the regulatory shoreland jurisdictional area. The establishment of a shoreland-wetland zoning district is required under Chapter NR 115 of the *Wisconsin* Administrative Code. Generally permitted uses in the overlay district must be carried out without filling, flooding, draining, dredging, or other disturbing of the wetland resources.

Racine County, under NR 115, has the authority to solely and directly regulate activities in shoreland-wetland areas. These areas are defined as wetlands five acres or larger in size laying within the previously defined shoreland areas. For the purpose of this ordinance, rivers and streams are presumed to be navigable if they are designated as either continuous or intermittent waterways on the United States Geological Survey quadrangle maps until such time that the Wisconsin Department of Natural

District Type		District Name	Area (acres)	Percent of Total
Basic District	Residential	 R-1 Country Estate R-2 Suburban Residential – Unsewered R-2S Suburban Residential – Sewered R-3 Suburban Residential – Sewered R-3A Suburban Residential – Sewered R-4 Urban Residential II R-5 Urban Residential III R-6 Two-Family Residential R-7 Multi-Family Residential R-8 Planned Residential Subtotal 	0 870 0 199 0 85 0 0 6 0 6 0 8 0 1,168	0.0 7.9 0.0 1.8 0.0 0.7 0.0 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.1 0.0
	Commercial	 B-1 Neighborhood Business B-2 Community Business B-3 Commercial Service B-4 Planned Business B-5 Highway Business B-6 Water-Oriented Business B-7 Adult Entertainment Business Subtotal 	0 3 82 2 0 0 0 0 87	0.0 a 0.8 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0
	Industrial	M-1 Light Industrial and Office M-2 General Industrial M-3 Heavy Industrial M-4 Quarrying Subtotal	12 112 0 669 793	0.1 1.0 0.0 6.1 7.2
	Agricultural	 A-1 General Farming I A-2 General Farming and Residential II A-3 General Farming III A-4 Truck Farming Subtotal 	145 6,670 615 0 7,430	1.3 60.6 5.6 0.0 67.5
	Public	P-1 Institutional Park P-2 Recreational Park Subtotal	6 398 404	0.1 3.6 3.7
	Conservancy	C-1 Resource Conservation C-2 Upland Resource Conservation Surface water not included in Basic Zoning District	982 0 144	8.9 0.0 1.3
		Subtotal	1,126	10.2
		Total Town	11,008	100.0
Overlay Districts		FWUrban FloodwayFCOUrban Floodplain ConservancyFFOUrban Floodplain FringeGFOGeneral FloodplainAPOAirport ProtectionSSOStructural SetbackNSONonstructural SetbackSWOShoreland WetlandPUDPlanned Unit Development	0 0 679 0 0 0 561 0	0.0 0.0 6.2 0.0 0.0 0.0 5.1 0.0

EXISTING ZONING IN THE TOWN OF ROCHESTER: 1995

^aLess than 0.05 percent.

Source: SEWRPC.



SHORELAND AREAS IN THE ROCHESTER PLANNING AREA: 1995



Resources has made a determination that the waterway is not, in fact, navigable.

Wetlands subject to SWO district zoning in the Town are shown on Map 26. These wetlands encompass about 560 acres—about 0.9 square mile—or about 5 percent of the Town. Non-shoreland wetlands in the Town are also shown on Map 26. These wetlands, although not subject to regulations through NR 115, along with shoreland wetlands, are subject to other State and Federal regulations discussed later in this chapter.

It should be noted that when a more restrictive overlay district is in place, e.g., GFO, SWO, the restrictions of the overlay district would supersede the requirements of the basic underlying districts.

While not currently mapped within the Town of Rochester, Racine County also has a Planned Unit Development Overlay District (PUD), which may be applied to lands in the Town, on a case-by-case basis when appropriate. This district is intended to permit developments that will, over a period of time, be enhanced by coordinated site planning and diversified location of structures. Such developments are intended to provide a safe and efficient system for pedestrian and vehicle traffic, to provide attractive recreation and open spaces as integral parts of the developments, to enable economic design in the location of public and private utilities and community facilities, and to ensure adequate standards of construction and planning.

Village of Rochester Zoning

The Village of Rochester zoning ordinance adopted by the Village in 1979 establishes 8 basic zoning districts. Existing (1995) zoning districts within the Village of Rochester are shown on Map 27. The permitted uses and the lot size, width, and setback requirements for the

EXISTING ZONING IN THE VILLAGE OF ROCHESTER: 1995



Source: Village of Rochester and SEWRPC.

various districts are summarized in Table 21. A tabular summary of the areal extent of the various districts is presented in Table 22.

As indicated in Table 22, residential zoning was in place on about 260 acres, or about 79 percent of the Village. In addition, 10 acres, or 3 percent of the Village was in the central business zoning district, and 40 acres, or about 12 percent of the Village was in the park district.

In addition to these basic zoning districts, the Village zoning ordinance includes two overlay districts, the FFO-Flood Fringe Overlay District, and the Shoreland-Wetland Overlay District as described in Table 21.

Like the GFO district in the Town, the FFO district is intended to prevent development in flood hazard areas, as well as to protect the floodwater conveyance and storage capacity of the floodplains. Village floodplain regulations apply to all lands within the 100-year recurrence interval flood hazard area (see Map 11 in Chapter III). Such areas encompass about 50 acres, or about 14 percent of the Village. The existing floodplain regulations prohibit virtually all new structures within the floodplain, including the floodway and flood fringe areas, in accordance with sound floodland management practice. The Shoreland-Wetland District is intended to protect wetland resources within the regulatory shoreland jurisdictional area within the Village. The establishment of a shoreland-wetland zoning district is required under Chapter NR 117 of the *Wisconsin Administrative Code*. Generally permitted uses in the overlay district must be carried out without filling, flooding, draining, dredging, or other disturbing of the wetland resources. The definition of these areas are identical to that under the County's SWO district described earlier in this chapter.

Wetlands in the Village subject to SWO district zoning are shown on Map 26. These wetlands encompass about 17 acres, or about 5 percent of the Village. Non-shoreland wetlands in the Village are also shown on Map 26. These wetlands, although not subject to regulations through NR 117, along with shoreland wetlands, are subject to other State and Federal regulations discussed later in this chapter.

As in the Town when a more restrictive overlay district is in place, the restrictions of the overlay district would supersede the requirements of the basic underlying districts.

SUMMARY OF ZONING REGULATIONS: VILLAGE OF ROCHESTER

			Minimum La	ot Size	Ň	Ainimum Yar	đs	Maximum
	_	Turning) Constitutions () (on shi	T	Total Width	Street Yard	Side Yard	Rear Yard	Building Height
District R-1 Single Family Residential District	One-family dwellings on lots served by public sanitary sewer not to exceed a maximum density of 3.6 units per acre	Schools and churches	12,000 square feet	.90	40	8	25	35
R-2 Single Family Residential District	One-family dwellings on lots served by public sanitary sewer not to exceed 4.6 units per acre	Schools and churches	10,000 square feet	66	25	8	25	35
R-3 One and Two Family Residential District	One and Two family dwellings on lots served by public sanitary sewer not to exceed a density of 7.3 units per acre	Schools and churches	10,000/12,000 [°]	66/100 [°]	25	8	25	35
R-4 Multi-Family Residential District	Multi-family dwellings on lots served by public sanitary sewer not to exceed a density of 10.9 units per acre	Rest homes, nursing homes, clinics, children's nurseries, hospitals, schools, and churches	18,000 square feet	120	40	20	40	35
B-1 Central Business District	Community level retail, office and service	Residential quarters, funeral homes, vehicle sales, service stations, garages, taxi stands, public parking lots, and commercial recreational facilities	10,000 square feet	66	25	6	25	45
M-1 Limited Industrial District ^d	Laboratories, wholesalers, light industrial plants and light manufacturing assembly and packaging	Storage, utilization or manufacturing of materials ranging from free to active burning	18,000 square feet	120	25	50/20°	50/25 [°]	35
P-1 Park District	Public and private recreational uses such as fishing, boating, swimming, recreational trails, golf courses, playgrounds, picnic areas, tennis courts, athletic fields, and outdoor skating rinks	Archery ranges, bathhouses, beaches, campgrounds, conservatories, driving ranges, gymnasiums, music halls, museums, riding academies, sportsmen clubs, stadiums, swimming pools, and zoological and botanical gardens			40	40	40	35
F-1 Floodway District	Drainage facilities, floodwater over- flows, navigational structures, streambank protection, horticulture, open parking and loading areas, open markets, open recreational uses, outdoor plant nurseries, utilities, viticulture, wild crop harvesting, and wild crop preserves	Navigational structures, public water measuring and control facilities, bridges, and approaches, marinas, utilities, parking lots and loading areas	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
FFO Flood Fringe Overlay District	Any use of land, except structures, that is permitted in the underlying basic use district such as yards in a residential district or parking or loading areas in a commercial or industrial district	Navigational structures, public water measuring and control facilities, bridges, and approaches, marinas, utilities, parking lots and loading areas	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Shoreland-Wetland District	Hiking, fishing, trapping, hunting, swimming, snowmobiling, boating, harvesting of wild crops, silviculture, pasturing of livestock, cultivation of agricultural crops, the maintenance and construction of drainage systems, fences, piers, docks, walkways, observation decks, trail bridges, duck blinds and the maintenance and repair of existing highways and bridges	Non-residential buildings, public and private parks and recreation areas, outdoor education areas, historic natural and scientific areas, refuges and closed areas, fish and wildlife habitat improvement projects, game bird and animal farms, wildlife preserves, public boat launching ramps, utilities, and the construction of roads	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

* Utilities are allowed as conditional uses in all districts provided all principal structures and uses are not less than 50 feet from any residential district lot line.

^b Governmental and cultural uses such as fire and police stations, community centers, libraries, public emergency shelters, parks, and museums are allowed as conditional uses in all but P-1, F-1, FFO and Shoreland-Wetland districts.

^cThe first figure indicates a minimum lot size for a one-family dwelling; the second figure is the minimum lot size for a two-family dwelling.

^dThe M-1 district will not generally be applied to permit new industrial structures.

*The first figure indicates minimum setback when adjacent to residential districts; the second figure is the minimum setback in other cases.

Source: Village of Rochester and SEWRPC.

District Type			District Name	Area (acres)	Percent of Total
Basic District	Residential	R-1	Single-Family Residential	156	46.6
		R-3	One- and Two-Family Residential	33	9.8
		n-4	Subtotal	263	78.5
	Commercial	B-1	Central Business	10	3.0
	Industrial	M-1	Light Industry	0	0.0
	Public	P-1 F-1 Surfa Bas	Park Floodway ce Water Not Included in ic Zoning District	40 0 22	11.9 0.0 6.6
			Total Village	335	100.0
Overlay Districts		FFO SWO	Flood Fringe Shoreland-Wetland	48 17	14.3 5.1

EXISTING ZONING IN THE VILLAGE OF ROCHESTER: 1995

Source: SEWRPC.

LAND SUBDIVISION AND LAND IMPROVEMENT REGULATIONS

The division and improvement of land in the Town of Rochester is governed by the State of *Wisconsin Statutes*, the Racine County Land Division Control Ordinance, the Town of Rochester Land Division Ordinance, and by the extraterritorial plat review authority of the City of Burlington and the Villages of Rochester and Waterford. The division and improvement of land in the Village of Rochester is governed by the Village of Rochester Land Division Ordinance.

Chapter 236 of the *Wisconsin Statutes* sets forth general regulations governing the platting of land, including, among others, street layout requirements, necessary approvals, recording procedure, and the vacating and altering of plats. The statutes also grant authority to local government units such as Racine County to review the plat with respect to local plans or official maps, areawide water quality management plans, shoreland management regulations, storm water runoff, topography and appropriate lot layouts and street patterns.

The Racine County Land Division Control Ordinance further details the review requirements of those factors designated by the State for local review. It also defines a land subdivision as the division of land for the purpose of transfer of ownership or building development where the act of division creates five or more parcels or building sites of three acres each or less in area: or where the act of division creates five or more parcels or building sites of three acres each or less in area by successive division within a period of five years. The land division ordinance sets forth procedures to be followed in the submittal and review of preliminary and final subdivision plats by the County and establishes certain basic design standards as noted previously. Under the County ordinance, certain improvement requirements, such as those pertaining to road surfacing and to the installation of curbs and gutters, sidewalks, and street lamps, are left to the determination of the Town board of the respective Town. The Racine County ordinance does not apply to lands within the Village. Lands within the Village of Rochester are governed by the Village land division ordinance. However, Racine County is an objecting agency for subdivision plats located within the Village of Rochester. The County staff also provides assistance and recommendations for the design and appropriate planning of developments proposed within the Village.

Importantly, however, the County land division control ordinance does not apply to divisions of tracts of land in the Town resulting in the creation of parcels larger than three acres, nor does the ordinance apply to land divisions which result in the creation of up to four parcels or building sites of any size. Racine County, therefore, does not formally review or have an ordinance for minor land divisions by certified survey maps, resulting in the potential for the creation of new parcels in the Town which
may not conform to the requirements of the County zoning ordinance.

The Town of Rochester and Village of Rochester land division control ordinances include not only the same guidelines and procedures as the County ordinance, but also includes sections on sidewalks, streets, park dedication and construction site erosion control, and do apply to minor land divisions not covered by the County ordinance. Minor land divisions are divisions of land which result in at least two but not more than four parcels or building sites, any one of which is less than 35 acres in size; or not more than four parcels or building sites within a recorded subdivision plat without changing the exterior boundaries of a block, lot, or outlot; or any number of parcels greater than five acres in size into parcels less than 35 acres in size.

As provided by the *Wisconsin Statutes*, the Villages of Rochester and Waterford and the City of Burlington exercise extraterritorial plat review authority in unincorporated areas within one and one-half miles of the corporate limits of these communities, as shown on Map 28. Plats in the Town of Rochester located in the extraterritorial platting jurisdiction of these communities are subject to approval by those municipalities, as well as the Town of Rochester and Racine County.

RACINE COUNTY SANITARY CODE

The Racine County sanitary code and private sewage system ordinance regulates the location, design, construction, alteration, and maintenance of all private waste disposal systems. The private sewage system regulations apply throughout the County and are listed in Chapter19, "Utilities," of the Racine County Code of Ordinances.

Under the sanitary code, a holding tank may be installed in the case of the failure of a conventional private sewage system or mound system. Before obtaining permission for a holding tank, however, the applicant must have exhausted all alternative means of private sewage treatment, such as construction of a mound system.

FEDERAL WETLAND REGULATIONS

Section 404 of the Federal Clean Water Act requires the U.S. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, working in cooperation with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, to regulate the discharge of dredged and fill materials into waters of the United States, including lakes, rivers, and wetlands. In carrying out this responsibility, the Corps of Engineers identifies waters of the United States including wetlands, and determines when permits are required for the discharge of dredged and fill materials. Some silviculture, mining, and agricultural activities in water and wetland areas may be exempt from the individual permit requirement; and certain minor activities, such as boat ramp construction and shore stabilization, may be undertaken under a pre-approved general or nationwide permit.

Under the provisions of Section 401 of the Clean Water Act, the issuance of Federal permits must be consistent with State water quality policies and standards.

OTHER STATE RESOURCE REGULATORY PROGRAMS

Chapter NR 103 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code establishes water quality standards for wetlands. These standards, like the more general policies set forth for wetlands protection under Chapter NR 1.95, are applied by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources in all decision making under existing State authority and in State review for certification of Section 404 permits. The water quality standards for wetlands are intended to provide protection of all waters of the State, including wetlands, for all present and potential future uses, such as for public and private water supply; for use by fish and other aquatic life, as well as wild and domestic animals; for preservation of natural flora and fauna; for domestic and recreational uses; and for agricultural, commercial, industrial, and other uses. In cases where State certification is denied, the U.S. Department of the Army permit would also be denied.

Chapters NR 110 and Comm 82 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code require that the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, in its regulation of public sanitary sewers, and the Wisconsin Department of Commerce, in its regulation of private sanitary sewers, make a finding that all proposed sanitary sewer extensions are in conformance with adopted areawide water quality management plans and the sanitary sewer service areas identified in such plans. If a locally proposed sanitary sewer extension is designed to serve areas not recommended for sewer service in an areawide water quality management plan, the State agencies concerned must deny approval of the extension. More specifically, the State agency concerned must make a finding that the area proposed to be served is located 1) within an approved sewer service area; and 2) outside of areas having physical or environmental constraints which, if developed, would have adverse water quality impacts. Areas having such physical or environmental constraints may include wetlands, shorelands, floodways and floodplains, steep slopes, highly erodible soils and other limiting soil types, and groundwater recharge areas. In the Rochester plan-

Map 28

AREAS IN THE TOWN OF ROCHESTER SUBJECT TO EXTRATERRITORIAL PLAT REVIEW AUTHORITY



Source: SEWRPC.

ning area, these areas are generally found within the environmental corridors as identified on Map 17 in Chapter III.

SUMMARY

This chapter has presented a description of those regulations which have a direct bearing on the use of land in the Rochester planning area. A summary of the major findings of this chapter follows:

 The Town of Rochester is under the jurisdiction of the Racine County general zoning and shoreland/ floodplain zoning ordinance. The general zoning provisions are administered jointly by Racine County and the Town of Rochester. Under countytown general zoning in Wisconsin, towns must be given the opportunity to review and comment upon all County proposed zoning amendments. If a town board formally disapproves a proposed zoning district boundary change, or if a majority of towns disapprove a proposed change in district regulations, a county may not approve the proposed amendment without revision. Under *Wisconsin Statutes*, counties are solely responsible for the zoning of shoreland areas within civil towns. Zoning amendments within shoreland areas do not require approval and are not subject to disapproval by town boards. In practice, however, Racine County and the Town of Rochester act together to cooperatively implement zoning in the shoreland areas.

 Lands in the Village of Rochester are subject to the Village of Rochester zoning ordinance. The Village ordinance contains both basic and overlay zoning districts. 3. County and Village floodplain regulations apply as appropriate to all lands within the 100-year recurrence interval flood hazard area; such areas encompass about 720 acres, or about 6 percent of the planning area. The existing floodplain regulations prohibit virtually all new structures throughout the floodplain, in accordance with sound floodland management practice.

County and Village shoreland-wetland regulations apply as appropriate to wetlands five acres or larger in size within the designated shoreland areas. These shoreland wetlands encompass about 580 acres, or about 5 percent of the planning area and about 39 percent of the wetlands in the planning area. However, all wetlands in the planning area are subject to State and Federal regulations.

4. In addition to State statutes governing land divisions, the division and improvement of land in the planning area is also governed by the Racine County Land Division Control Ordinance, the Town of Rochester Land Division Ordinance and the Village of Rochester Land Division Ordinance. The County Land Division Control Ordinance sets forth procedures to be followed in the preparation of preliminary and final subdivision plats and establishes certain basic design standards. Under that ordinance, basic improvement requirements, such as those pertaining to road surfacing and to the installation of curbs and gutters, sidewalks, and street lamps, are left to the determination of the Town board of the respective towns. It is also important to note that the county ordinance does not apply to minor land divisions by certified survey maps. The Town and Village of Rochester land division ordinances include not only the same guidelines and procedures as the County ordinance but also regulate the dedication and construction of streets and highways to be accepted by the Town or Village as public ways, and do apply to minor land divisions not covered by the County ordinance.

- 5. The discharge of dredged and fill materials into waters of the United States, including certain wetlands, is regulated by the U. S. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers under Section 404 of the Federal Clean Water Act. The issuance of Federal permits for the discharge of dredged or fill materials into surface water and wetland areas must be consistent with State water quality policies and standards.
- 6. A number of policies and regulatory programs of the State of Wisconsin have a direct bearing on the use of land and water resources in the planning area. Under Chapter NR 103 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code, the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources is responsible for the protection of the function of wetlands. Under Chapters NR 110 and Comm 82, the State has the responsibility to ensure that those resources located in the urban and urbanizing areas of the State served by sanitary sewer are protected, thereby assuring the maintenance of water quality within the State.

(This page intentionally left blank)

Chapter VI

LAND USE PLAN

INTRODUCTION

A land use plan is an official statement setting forth a municipality's major objectives concerning the desirable physical development of the community. The land use plan for the Town and Village of Rochester, as set forth in this report, consists of recommendations for the type, amount, and spatial location of the various land uses required to serve the needs of the residents of the Rochester planning area to the year 2020. The plan is intended to be used as a tool to help guide the physical development of the community into a more efficient and attractive pattern and to promote the public health, safety, and general welfare.

The land use plan for the Town and Village of Rochester represents a refinement of the adopted regional land use plan. The regional land use plan, and, as a consequence, the land use plan for the Town and Village of Rochester, recognizes the effects and importance of the urban land market in shaping land use patterns, but also seeks to influence the operation of that market in order to achieve a more healthful, attractive, and efficient settlement pattern. Thus, like the regional land use plan, the Rochester land use plan seeks to accommodate new intensive urban development only in those areas which are not subject to such hazards as flooding; which can be readily served by such essential public services as centralized sanitary sewer service; which lie outside of primary environmental corridors and other environmentally significant lands; and which, to the extent practicable, lie outside of the most productive farmlands in the planning area.

The land use plan should promote the public interest rather than the interests of individuals or special groups within the community. The very nature of the plan contributes to this purpose, for it facilitates consideration of the relationship of any development proposal, whether privately or publicly advanced, to the overall physical development of the entire community.

The land use plan is a long-range plan, providing a means of relating day-to-day development decisions to long-range development needs in order to coordinate development through time and to ensure that development decisions will be consistent with agreed upon community development objectives. In the case of the Rochester planning area, the land use plan is designed for a planning period extending to the year 2020. In this way, the plan is intended to provide for the future as well as present needs of the planning area.

The land use plan, however, should not be considered as setting forth a rigid and unchangeable development pattern to which all development proposals must conform, but rather as a flexible guide to help local officials and concerned citizens efficiently and effectively review development proposals. As conditions change from those assumed as the basis for the preparation of the plan, the plan should be revised. Accordingly, the plan should be reviewed periodically to determine whether the forecasts and land use development objectives on which the plan is based are still valid, as well as to determine the extent to which the objectives are being realized through plan implementation.

The first section of this chapter presents important determinants underlying the Town and Village of Rochester plan, including a set of development objectives intended to guide the preparation of the plan; presents a planned urban service area within the planning area; and presents forecasts of resident population, household, and employment levels for the planning area to the plan design year 2020. The second section of this chapter presents a land use plan for the planning area designed to meet the development objectives consistent with the forecast population, household, and employment levels.

PLAN DETERMINANTS

Existing Conditions

Information regarding the natural, as well as, the manmade environment is essential to any sound land use planning effort. An analysis of the natural resource base and existing land uses of the Rochester planning area was provided in Chapters III and IV of this report. The land use plan for the Rochester planning area properly takes into account the location of important natural features such as wetlands, soils and floodland, as well as areas already committed to urban development.

Objectives

The preparation of the Rochester Land Use Plan was guided by the Rochester Land Use Plan Committee. The

Land Use Plan Committee membership is set forth on the inside front cover of this report.

Land use concerns identified at a series of meetings of the Land Use Plan Committee were used to develop a set of land use development objectives for the planning area. Such objectives relate to the allocation and distribution of the various land uses and the provision of community facilities and supporting services to meet the needs of the existing and probable future resident population, household, and employment levels in the planning area to the plan design year 2020, as well as to protect the natural resource base of the planning area, and the remaining agricultural lands within the planning area.

The land use plan for the Town and Village of Rochester is intended to achieve the following objectives:

- Preserve and conserve irreplaceable resources
 - Preserve productive farmland and maintain agriculture as a significant economic activity and way of life.
 - Preserve environmental and open space lands including woodlands and marshlands.
 - Protect quality of the ground water.
- Encourage orderly development and prevent incompatible land uses
 - Direct development to areas identified for specific land use (e.g. residential, commercial, industrial, mining).
 - Insure that development is compatible and integrated with the community's historic, aesthetic, and infrastructure resources.
 - Consider local development in relation to land use plans and patterns of surrounding communities.
- Address the conflicts between community will and individual rights with tools that are fair.
 - Develop tools and methods to compensate land owners who need to sell their land, while protecting land value for those who wish to maintain their property.
- Maintain and enhance the economic viability of the community.

- Encourage a diversified tax base of agricultural, commercial, industrial, mining, and residential parcels.
- Maintain and improve fiscal viability of community.
 - Balance the rate of development with the expansion of the sewered area, other municipal services, highway infrastructure and educational facilities.
- Coordinate Village-Town planning efforts on shared borders to make effective use of resources and to reduce conflicts.
 - Develop boundary agreements between the Village and the Town as deemed necessary in the best interest of both the Village and Town.
 - Review and update Village and Town Land Division and Zoning Ordinances on a periodic basis as deemed necessary, but at least once every 10 years.
 - Make sure in these reviews that Village and Town Zoning Ordinances are compatible.

The land use plan for the Town and Village of Rochester is intended to provide a balanced allocation of space to the various land uses and provide a logical relationship between existing and new land uses. The plan will achieve a distribution of the various lands needed for transportation, utilities, and community facility systems and allow for the economical provision of these public services. By preserving the most productive farmlands, an agricultural reserve for future generations and an agricultural economy will be encouraged. Preservation of the remaining primary environmental corridor lands, secondary environmental corridor lands and isolated natural resource areas in the planning area is important for maintaining the overall quality of the environment, wildlife habitat and adequate groundwater supply. These preserved lands provide opportunities for recreation and education and will help to avoid serious costly environmental and developmental problems.

Delineated Waterford/Rochester Sanitary Sewer Service Area

The Rochester planning area includes a portion of the Waterford/Rochester planned sanitary sewer service area as that area is identified in SEWRPC Community Assistance Planning Report No. 141 (2nd Edition), Sanitary Sewer Service Area for the Waterford/Rochester Area,

April 1996. Lands within the service area delineated in this report may in the future receive sanitary sewer service through extensions of the Western Racine County Sewerage District sanitary sewage system.

The land use plan presented in this chapter sets forth recommendations regarding land use development within the planning area through the year 2020, including those lands located within the planned sanitary sewer service area of the Waterford/Rochester area¹. It is recommended that the Town and the Village take a cooperative approach to decision-making regarding land use development in the sewer service area in order to achieve both Town and Village development objectives. As appropriate, that effort should be focused on the preparation of neighborhood plans or a detailed platting layout for the area, providing recommendations for the location and configuration of streets and for attendant land uses.

It should be noted that the existing residential development along North River Road south of the currently adopted sewer service area is not specifically proposed to be added to the sewer service area as part of the Rochester land use plan. However, in the event that widespread onsite sewage disposal system failures develop, consideration should be given to providing sewer service to this area, if that would be the most cost effective solution to the identified problem.

Future Population and Household Levels

The range of resident population levels envisioned in the Rochester planning area under the alternative future land use plans prepared by the Commission as part of its regional land use planning program are set forth in Chapter II of this report. Under the alternative land use plans prepared, year 2020 population levels for the planning area would range from about 3,390 persons under the intermediate-growth centralized regional plan, to as high as 4,880 persons under the high-growth decentralized alternative. Similarly year 2020 household levels would range from 1,240 to as high as 1,790, and employment levels would range from 650 to 785 under the alternative land use plans. Current growth trends in the planning area, indicate that the year 2020 population in the planning area would reach a level approximating the level envisioned under the high-growth decentralized alternative. Taking into consideration current development trends (see Table 8, Chapter II), and the planned

residential densities of the remaining developable lands in the defined urban service area, the planning area could achieve a resident population level of about 4,780 persons by the year 2020, an increase of approximately 1,960 persons, or about 69 percent over the 1990 level.

If present population growth trends continue, 800 additional housing units will have to be added to the 1990 stock of 944 housing units in the planning area to accommodate the anticipated increases in population and households. These additional housing units can be accommodated on existing vacant lots, on developable lands within the planned sanitary sewer service area, and through new rural residential development.

While present population growth trends indicate the above possibilities, and this land use plan is designed in the context of such possibilities, the awareness generated by the plan indicates that striving toward lower growth rates is in the interest of the Town and Village of Rochester.

PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL MEETINGS

Public participation and input is critical in the development of a local land use plan. Throughout the planning process many local meetings of the Rochester Land Use Plan Committee were held in addition to the regular meetings of the Committee with Racine County and SEWRPC staff. Announcements of all meetings were posted and notices were sent to all people who expressed an interest in the planning process by attending meetings and signing up on the mailing list. News articles about the progress of the plan appeared in the Racine Journal Times. A working copy of the land use plan draft was available during the process in the Rochester Library for public review, and the attempt was made to get draft copies of the chapters to any citizen who wished to review and comment on them while they were being considered. A list of the citizens who regularly attended the Committee meetings is shown in Appendix A.

In addition the Rochester Land Use Plan Committee held a series of public informational meetings on the proposed land use plan on March 30 and 31, 1998, February 11, 1999, and March 29, 1999, to acquaint residents and landowners with the plan and to solicit public reaction to the plan proposals. Each property owner of record received an invitation to these meetings. Announcements of these meetings were made in the local newspapers.

Each of the informational meetings was very well attended with citizens providing a wide range of opinions on the plan. While many in attendance

¹The currently adopted sanitary sewer service area does not extend south of CTH D immediately west of STH 20. The Rochester plan does envision the sewer service area to extend south of CTH D when urban development occurs. This change should be taken into consideration in the next reevaluation of the Waterford/Rochester sewer service area plan.

responded positively to the land use plan, some citizens expressed a concern over the perceived restrictive nature of the plan.

The Committee took into consideration the comments received at the informational meetings as it developed the concepts of the plan. The recommended plan is described in the following sections of this chapter.

RECOMMENDED LAND USE PLAN FOR THE TOWN AND VILLAGE OF ROCHESTER

The recommended land use plan for the Town and Village of Rochester is presented graphically on Map 29. Quantitative data relative to the plan are provided in Table 23. The plan was developed to accommodate the envisioned increase in population, household, and employment levels in accordance with the previously identified plan determinants. The Rochester land use plan seeks to encourage new intensive urban development within the identified planned urban service area; it envisions that new residential development outside of the planned urban service area would occur primarily at rural densities; and calls for the preservation of the primary environmental corridors and the most productive farmlands remaining within the planning area.

Residential Development

Proper consideration of the land use plan requires an understanding of the residential density concepts involved. For purposes of this study, "urban" residential development was defined as development at gross densities of less than five acres per dwelling unit; while "rural" residential development was defined as development at gross densities of five acres or greater per dwelling unit. Urban residential development was further classified as "suburban-density" development, with lot sizes ranging from about 1.5 acres to five acres; "lowdensity" development, with lot sizes ranging from about 19,000 square feet to 1.49 acres and "medium-density" development with lot ranging from 6,200 feet to about 19,000 square feet.²

Under the plan, additional urban residential land uses would be created through the infilling of existing vacant lots in areas already committed to such use in platted subdivisions, as well as on vacant developable land in designated residential areas located within the planned sanitary sewer service area. As set forth in Table 23, urban residential land uses in the Rochester planning area totaled about 710 acres, or about 6 percent of the planning area, in 1995. By the year 2020, urban residential lands within the planning area are anticipated to increase by about 490 acres, or about 69 percent, and thus, by the year 2020, would total about 1,200 acres, or about 11 percent of the planning area. Map 29 and Table 23 also indicate the amount and spatial distribution of urban residential land by residential density category. These residential density categories are intended to reflect the overall density within a given area. The specific residential density category identified could be comprised of an appropriate mix of housing types and styles, including single-family, two-family, and multifamily structures.

Under the plan, additional rural residential development could be accommodated on lands identified as agricultural or rural residential as described later in this chapter.

Commercial and Industrial Development

The land use plan envisions the following with respect to commercial and industrial development within the planning area:

1. Additional commercial land uses in the planning area would be created through the development of those lands currently zoned for commercial use and through the development of a neighborhood shopping center. Neighborhood shopping centers should provide the day-to-day retail and service needs of nearby residents and should be oriented to residential areas. A grocery store or supermarket typically serves as the anchor for the neighborhood shopping center and services such as banking and dry cleaning are commonly provided. As shown on Map 29, the proposed neighborhood shopping center is recommended to be located within the urban service area in the northeast quadrant of the intersection of STH 36 and CTH D.

As indicated in Table 23, commercial land uses in the Rochester planning area totaled 23 acres, less than 1 percent of the planning area in 1995. By the year 2020, commercial lands within the planning area are anticipated to increase by 33 acres, or about 144 percent, and thus, by the year 2020, commercial lands would total 56 acres, or less than 1 percent of the planning area. Of the anticipated 33-acre increase in commercial lands, about 10 acres, or 30 percent, would be attribut-

²Urban residential development may also include "highdensity" development, which envisions 2,400 to 6,200 square feet of lot area per dwelling unit. No high-density residential development exists, or is expected to exist, within the planning area within the design period of this plan.

Map 29



RECOMMENDED LAND USE PLAN FOR THE TOWN AND VILLAGE OF ROCHESTER: 2020

Source: SEWRPC

able to the neighborhood shopping center. All of the remaining commercial areas are located on lands currently zoned for commercial uses.

2. As indicated in Table 23, industrial land uses in the Rochester planning area totaled 41 acres, less than 1 percent of the planning area in 1995. By the year 2020, industrial lands within the planning area are anticipated to increase by 28 acres, or about 65 percent, and thus by the year 2020, industrial lands would total 71 acres, or less than 1 percent of the planning area. All of the anticipated increase would be attributable to lands currently zoned for industrial uses within the urban service area in the northern portion of the Town of Rochester. Any expansion of existing industrial facilities in other areas of the planning area can be accommodated in areas adjacent to existing uses and would not conflict with plan objectives.

Other Urban Development

Under the plan, increases in park and recreation land uses would occur primarily as a result of the development of recreation facilities on the Case Eagle Park site. Other urban land uses, namely, governmental and institutional, transportation, and utility land uses, are not specifically recommended to be increased over the plan design period under the Rochester land use plan. Such areas, as shown on the plan map, represent a continuation of existing conditions in the planning area.

Table 23

	1995		Planned Change: 1995-2020		2020	
Land Use Category	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent	Acres	Percent of Total
Urban				1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 -		
Residential						
Suburban-density						
(1.5 to 4.99 acres per dwelling)	154	1.4	77	50.0	231	2.0
Low-density (19,000 square						
feet to 1.49 acres per dwelling)	390	3.4	354	90.8	744	6.6
Medium-density (6,200 to						
18,999 square feet per dwelling)	163	1.4	59	36.2	222	1.9
Urban Residential Subtotal	707	6.2	490	69.3	1,197	10.5
Commercial	23	0.2	33	143.5	56	0.5
Industrial	43	0.4	28	65.1	71	0.6
Governmental and Institutional	41	0.4			41	0.4
Recreational	5	b	128	2,560.0	133	1.2
Other Urban	65	0.6			65	0.6
Urban Reserve			264		264	2.3
Urban Subtotal	884	7.8	943	106.7	1,827	16.1
Nonurban						1. Start 1.
Agricultural Lands	5,060	44.6	-944	-18.7	4,116	36.3
Rural Residential and Agricultural Lands						
(5 to 30 acres per dwelling)	989	8.7	-208	-21.0	781	6.9
Primary Environmental Corridor	3,084	27.2	35	1.1	3,119	27.5
Secondary Environmental Corridor	292	2.6			292	2.6
Isolated Natural Resource Area	269	2.4			269	2.4
Other Public Open Space	479	4.2	-30	-6.3	449	3.9
Extractive Uses	286	2.5	204	71.3	490	4.3
Nonurban Subtotal	10,459	92.2	-943	-9.0	9,516	83.9
Total	11,343	100.0	1 		11,343	100.0

PLANNED LAND USE IN THE ROCHESTER PLANNING AREA: 2020

^aStreet and parking areas are included in the associated land use categories.

^bLess than 0.5 percent.

Source: SEWRPC.

Urban Reserve

As noted earlier, the planning area contains certain lands within the Waterford/Rochester planned sanitary sewer service area that, while envisioned for future urban use, may prove difficult to develop due to such constraints as limited highway access and the cost of providing sanitary sewer service. Recognizing such constraints, the Land Use Plan Committee determined that this area should be identified on the plan as "urban reserve." This will allow the Town and Village the flexibility to consider various future land uses as specific development proposals are forwarded to local officials. As set forth on Table 23 and shown on Map 29, this area encompasses approximately 260 acres or about 2 percent of the planning area. Additional development of residential, commercial, industrial, recreational, governmental and institutional, transportation and utility land uses could be accommodated in the urban reserve area if

local officials determine that such uses are deemed appropriate to provide an overall benefit to the community. Dependent upon market demands, the future economic environment of the planning area and the future development of this area, the number of households, population, and jobs could increase beyond forecast levels described earlier in this chapter. Regardless of what specific types of urban development that might be accommodated in this area, the plan recommends that development should occur only with the provision of public sanitary sewer service.

Agricultural Lands

The land use plan envisions the following with respect to agricultural lands in the planning area:

1. The existing agricultural lands located within the planned sanitary sewer service area would, as

market demand dictates, be converted to urban uses during the planning period.

2. The existing agricultural lands in the Town of Rochester outside of the planned sanitary sewer service area are intended to remain in agricultural use. As shown on Map 29, these large blocks of farmland are located throughout the Town.

It should be noted, that in addition to maintaining agricultural resources for future generations, the preservation of agricultural land serves a number of other important public purposes. The preservation of farmlands helps prevent the creation of scattered, incomplete urban residential neighborhoods which are difficult to provide with basic public services and facilities, and can thus help to control local public expenditures. The preservation of farmland, helps maintain the natural beauty and cultural heritage of the Rochester area, and helps avoid creating certain serious and costly development and environmental problems that are often attendant to scattered development.

Agricultural lands which are converted to residential development should be done so at rural densities utilizing cluster development designs where this is feasible. By utilizing cluster development designs, the plan seeks to preserve large blocks of the most productive farmlands within which farming operations can proceed with minimal intrusion from urban land uses. Cluster development will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.

As indicated in Table 23, agricultural lands in the Rochester planning area totaled about 5,060 acres, or about 45 percent of the planning area in 1995. By the plan design year 2020, agricultural lands within the planning area are anticipated to decrease by about 940 acres, or by about 19 percent. Thus, by the year 2020, agricultural lands would total about 4,120 acres, or about 36 percent of the planning area.

Rural Residential and Agriculture Lands

The rural residential and agriculture lands category delineated on the plan consist of agricultural lands which may not be the most productive farmland; areas of rural estate density residential development; and other open lands, such as small wetlands and woodlands not included within an environmental corridor or isolated natural resource area.

The land use plan envisions the following with respect to the rural residential and agriculture lands within the planning area:

- 1. Rural residential and agricultural lands in the planning area within the planned sanitary sewer service area would, as market demand dictates, be converted to urban uses during the planning period.
- Rural residential and agricultural lands outside 2. of the planned sanitary sewer service area are intended to remain in such uses, or could be converted to residential development or small speciality or hobby farm units at gross rural densities ranging from five acres to 30 acres per dwelling unit. Rural residential development can be accommodated in these areas without public sanitary sewer or water supply facilities. The recommended densities increase the likelihood that suitable areas, with good soils and level topography, can be provided on each building site for proper location of private sewage disposal systems, water supply wells, building pads, driveways, and other structures appurtenant to the basic residential use, without destruction or deterioration of the resource base or creation of environmental problems. Rural development should be carefully designed to avoid steep slopes, poorly drained soils, and other physical constraints.

It is important to recognize that rural residential development may occur in the form of individual lots five acres or greater in size or in the form of clustered development described earlier in this chapter.

As indicated in Table 23, rural residential and agricultural lands in the Rochester planning area totaled about 990 acres, or about 9 percent of the planning area in 1995. By the year 2020, these lands within the planning area are anticipated to decrease by about 210 acres, or by about 21 percent, and thus, by the year 2020, these lands would total about 780 acres, or about 7 percent of the planning area.

Environmentally Significant Areas Primary Environmental Corridors

As already noted, primary environmental corridors represent elongated areas in the landscape which contain concentrations of the most important remaining elements of the natural resource base. By definition, these corridors are at least 400 acres in area, two miles long, and at least 200 feet in width. The preservation of these corridors in essentially natural, open uses is critical to the maintenance of the overall quality of the environment of the planning area; and, conversely, since these corridors are generally physically unsuited for urban development, such preservation will help prevent the creation of costly developmental problems. The land use plan envisions the following with respect to primary environmental corridors in the planning area:

1. Existing primary environmental corridors would be preserved in essentially natural, open uses. Development within such corridors would be limited to compatible outdoor recreational facilities, and, on a limited basis, rural-density residential use.

Residential development maintaining an overall density of no more than one housing unit per five acres of land could be permitted within environmental corridors, provided the development is carefully planned to protect the elements of the resource base found in the corridor. Such development should be carefully designed to avoid steep slopes, poorly drained soils and other physical constraints. This density of development will protect the environmental corridor areas, because they allow woodlands, wetlands, and wildlife habitats to be preserved and permit wildlife to sustain itself in the area.

Where residential development takes place in environmental corridors, cluster development designs should be utilized where feasible. The smaller area covered by buildings and appurtenances allows more land to be left as open space, protected from future development through dedication, common ownership, or deed restrictions. Open space in the cluster development provides common areas for recreational use by property owners in the development, and limits development on steep slopes, in wooded areas, in drainageways, and in other areas that should not be developed because of physical or environmental constraints. Cluster development will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.

2. The configuration of primary environmental corridors would under 2020 plan conditions be expanded slightly to encompass agricultural lands within the 100-year floodplain along the major drainage ways which lie within proposed recreation corridors as those lands are restored and are allowed to revert, over time, to natural vegetation. It should be noted that the area of corridor lands could increase even further, depending upon the extent of the implementation of the Honey Creek Wildlife Area project area acquisition discussed later in this chapter.

As indicated in Table 23, primary environmental corridor lands in the Rochester planning area totaled about 3,085 acres, or about 27 percent of

the planning area in 1995. With the additions proposed in the plan, the primary environmental corridor acreage would increase by 35 acres, or by about 1 percent. Thus, by the year 2020, primary environmental corridor lands would total about 3,120 acres, or about 28 percent of the planning area.

Secondary Environmental Corridors and Isolated Natural Resource Areas

Secondary environmental corridors also contain a variety of resource elements, often being remnants of primary environmental corridors that have been partially converted to agricultural or to intensive urban uses. By definition, secondary environmental corridors are at least one mile long and 100 acres in area. Secondary environmental corridor lands encompassed about 290 acres, or about 3 percent of the planning area, in 1995.

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. Seventeen such areas, encompassing a total of about 270 acres, or about 2 percent of the planning area, were identified in 1995. These areas are located throughout the planning area.

The land use plan envisions the following with respect to secondary environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas:

- 1. Secondary environmental corridors should be considered for preservation as the process of urban and rural development proceeds based upon local needs and concerns. While such corridors may serve as an attractive setting for well-planned rural residential developments, they also can provide cost effective sites for drainageways, and stormwater detention basins, and can provide needed open space in developing urban areas.
- 2. Isolated natural resource areas should be preserved in natural, open uses to the extent practicable.

Open Space and Recreation Trails

The land use plan for Rochester envisions implementation of the following recommendations included in the regional natural areas plan and County park and open space plan:

1. The regional natural areas plan as documented in SEWRPC Planning Report No. 42, A Regional Natural Areas and Critical Species Habitat Protection and Management Plan for Southeastern

Wisconsin, September 1997, recommends the protection and preservation of such areas within he Rochester planning area (see Map 15 in Chapter III), through appropriate State, County or private agency ownership.

- The County park and open space plan, as docu-2. mented in SEWRPC Community Assistance Planning Report No. 134, A Park and Open Space Plan for Racine County, September 1988, adopted by Racine County in 1989 recommends the development of a recreational trail along the main stem of the Fox River from the northern County boundary southward through Racine County and the development of a connecting trail through the Wadewitz Nature Camp to the Honey Creek Wildlife Area as shown on Map 30. In the planning area, these recreational trails are approximately 3.8 miles and 4.2 miles in length, respectively. The County park plan recommends that Racine County assume responsibility for the public acquisition of lands for, and the provision of recreational trail facilities within these trail corridors, except for that segment of the trail located within the Honey Creek Wildlife Area, which would be developed by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources.
- 3. The County park and open space plan calls for the additional acquisition of privately held land by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources within its adopted Honey Creek Wildlife Area project boundary as shown on Map 30. The Department currently owns lands encompassing about 980 acres in the Honey Creek Wildlife Area within the Rochester planning area. Within the planning area the Honey Creek Wildlife Area would increase by about 550 acres upon acquisition of the remaining privately held lands with the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources project area.
- 4. The land use plan for the Rochester area identifies lands outside of environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas but within current County and State ownership on "other public open space." The Rochester plan envisions that these areas would remain in open spaces or could be converted to intensive recreational uses as necessary.

As indicated in Table 23, other public open space lands in the Rochester planning area totaled about 480 acres, or about 4 percent of the planning area in 1995. With the development of the Case Eagle park site this acreage would decrease by about 30 acres or about 6 percent. Thus by the year 2020, other public open space lands would total about 450 acres or about 4 percent of the planning area. It should be noted that the area of these lands could increase, depending upon the extent of the implementation of the Honey Creek Wildlife Area project area acquisition discussed above.

Extractive Uses

Nonmetallic minerals, including sand and gravel, dimensional building stone, and organic materials, have significant commercial value and are an important economical source of the construction materials needed for the continued development of the Rochester planning area, Racine County, and the Region and for the maintenance of the existing infrastructure. Permitting urban or rural development of lands overlying these resources, or in close proximity to these resources may make it impossible to utilize such resources economically 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.

The land use plan envisions the following with respect to extractive uses in the planning area:

1. There are several existing sand and gravel extractive operations located in the planning area. The plan recognizes the continued operation of these facilities, as well as the possible expansion of such facilities to adjacent lands subject to appropriate zoning.

As indicated in Table 23, extractive uses in the Rochester planning area totaled 286 acres, or about 3 percent of the planning area in 1995. By the year 2020, extractive uses within the planning area are anticipated to increase by 204 acres, or about 71 percent, and thus, by the year 2020, extractive uses would total 490 acres, or about 4 percent of the planning area. While these projections indicate a large increase in gravel pit operations, this is not intended to indicate a large increase in active mining areas. While gravel operations may cover increased acreage, on-going restoration of areas mined is expected to keep active mining area from increasing significantly from its present level and land which has been mined is expected to be returned to useable open space.

2. Much of the Rochester planning area is underlain by potentially useable sand and gravel deposits, as described in Chapter III of this report. It must be recognized that there will continue to be a need for sand and gravel for public works and private

Map 30



STATE PROJECT AREAS AND PROPOSED COUNTY TRAILS IN THE ROCHESTER PLANNING AREA

development projects in the urbanizing Southeastern Wisconsin Region. Decisions regarding future land development within the Region, including the Rochester planning area, should take into consideration the location of mineral resources. Much of the area underlain by such deposits has been identified on Map 29 as agricultural land. Maintenance of these agricultural lands in open uses would thus also ensure the availability of lands for future mineral extraction purposes.

RECOMMENDED ARTERIAL STREETS AND HIGHWAYS

The arterial highway network needed to serve the existing and probable future traffic demands in the planning area through the year 2020 is shown on Map 31. The recommended plan incorporates the highway system recommendations of the regional transportation system plan as documented in SEWRPC Planning Report No. 46, *A Regional Transportation System Plan for Southeastern Wisconsin: 2020*, December 1997.

Map 31



ARTERIAL STREET AND HIGHWAY SYSTEM FOR THE ROCHESTER PLANNING AREA: 2020

Source: SEWRPC.

The key highway improvement of the regional transportation system plan as it pertains to the Rochester planning area is the proposed construction of the STH 36-Burlington bypass which would connect to existing STH 36 and STH 83 in the southern portion of the planning area.

SUMMARY

This chapter has presented a set of recommended land use development objectives for the Town and Village of Rochester together with a recommended land use plan designed to achieve those objectives. The principal function of the land use plan is to provide information that local officials can use over time in making decisions concerning growth and development in the Town and Village of Rochester. The plan recommends the preservation of existing environmentally sensitive areas and the most productive farmlands. At the same time, the plan provides for growth that is compatible with and reinforces the objectives of the land use plan.

The land use plan should not be considered as rigid or unchangeable. Such a plan is intended to be used as a guide in the public review of development proposals and a tool to help public officials make decisions concerning such proposals. As conditions change from those used as a basis in the plan preparation, the plan should be revised. Accordingly, the plan should be reviewed periodically to determine whether the objectives are still valid and the extent to which these objectives are being realized. This land use plan represents a commitment to work to achieve the agreed upon land use development objectives.

The land use plan is shown graphically on Map 29, while associated tabular data relating to land use are shown in Table 23. The recommended land use plan, together with the supporting implementation measures, provide an important means for promoting the orderly development of the Town and Village of Rochester, as well as providing for a safe, healthful, attractive, and efficient environment. Implementation of the plan will help assure protection of the natural resource base of the planning area, including the remaining environmental corridors and the most productive farmlands, while providing for the needs of the existing and probable future resident population of the planning area.

Chapter VII

PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

INTRODUCTION

The recommended land use plan for the Town and Village of Rochester is described in Chapter VI of this report. The formal adoption of the land use plan is only the beginning of a long term effort to achieve the objectives expressed in Chapter VI. The plan is intended to be used as a guide when making decisions concerning land development in the Town and Village. In addition to its regular use as a reference document, the plan should be reevaluated regularly to ensure that it continues to reflect current conditions properly. It is recommended that such reevaluation take place at five-year intervals, or more frequently if warranted by changing conditions.

In order for the goals of the plan to be met in the coming years, tools must be present to support the plan, and community will must be present to use the tools.

This chapter will discus the following tools and how they will be used to support the Rochester land use plan:

- Urban Density Residential Development
- Urban Service Area and Detailed Platting Layout
- Community Effort to Save Agricultural and Environmental Land
- Incentives for Continued Private Ownership of Agricultural and Open Space Lands
- Rural Density Residential Development
- Rural Cluster Development
- Zoning Zoning Ordinance Text Changes
- Land Division Ordinance Subdivision and Certified Survey Map Review
- Official Mapping
- Precise Neighborhood Development Plans
- Village/Town Joint Planning Efforts and Cooperation

• Purchase and Transfer of Development Rights

It is important in listing these tools that the overall goals of the plan be kept in mind. The Rochester land use plan considers agricultural and environmental lands to be irreplaceable resources and the maintenance of such lands should be encouraged. Maintaining agricultural land allows for a continuing agricultural economy in the planning area and provides an agricultural reserve for future generations. Both of these are considered important goals not only for the Rochester planning area, but for the entire Region as well. Maintaining and reestablishing environmental lands acknowledges the present value, as well as what will be the increasing value of these lands in the fabric of the community and the Region as a whole.

The effort of this plan to maintain these lands begins by trying to keep such lands in large parcels as whole farms, owned by individuals, groups, or government agencies who are committed to the preservation of agricultural and environmental lands. When an owner of a large parcel chooses to sell or needs to sell, the community will make what efforts it can to identify options for the owner to consider which will allow the land to be maintained in agricultural or environmental use.

When this is not accomplished, and development of such land is pursued, the plan recommends that rural residential densities be no more than one dwelling unit per five acres.

URBAN DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

Urban density residential development is defined in the plan in three categories:

- 1. Suburban-density, defined as one dwelling unit per 1.5 acres to 4.99 acres.
- 2. Low-density, defined as one dwelling unit per 19,000 square feet to 1.49 acres.
- 3. Medium-density, defined as one dwelling unit per 6,200 square feet to 18,999 square feet.

The map showing the recommended land use for the Town and Village of Rochester (Map 29 in Chapter VI) identifies areas which are already at such densities, and the proposed density of lands to be developed in the future. The plan recommends that the Planning Commissions and Town and Village Boards use these densities as guides in their review of development proposals in the planned urban service area as shown on Map 29 in Chapter VI. Such urban density residential development in the planned urban service area provides for more efficient use of community services, and will provide for more diverse types of housing in the Rochester planning area.

These urban density residential categories are intended to reflect the overall density within a given area. They could be comprised of varying lot sizes, including substandard lots in the older subdivisions of the planning area, as well as an appropriate mix of housing types and styles. While it is anticipated that most of the new residential development will be in the form of single-family homes, it is possible that cluster developments utilizing two-family and multifamily structures could also achieve the recommended overall densities subject to appropriate zoning.

URBAN SERVICE AREA AND DETAILED PLATTING LAYOUTS

The lands within the planned urban service area, including the urban reserve area as shown on the recommended land use plan map for the Town and Village of Rochester, are recommended for urban density residential development or commercial development as shown. Development within the urban reserve area could also include commercialbusiness park, or light industrial development in addition to urban density residential development. This recommendation is made because of the urban reserve areas location relative to the Village, to the main highways, and its location within the sewer service area.

When a landowner is ready to develop a parcel in the urban service area, a detailed platting layout is required in addition to all other requirements in the land division ordinance.

The property owner or a person purchasing land to be developed must provide a long term plan for the entire parcel of land even when only a portion of it is proposed to be developed. The development plan must also show that drainage ways that affect agricultural fields and open spaces in the same drainage area will not be adversely affected. The Plan Commissions and Town and Village Boards and property owners must assess the impact of the proposed development to insure that it is appropriate in relation to neighboring parcels, avoids congestion, and is compatible with the infrastructure resources of the community, and to insure that development in the urban service area occurs which is beneficial to the entire community. When a landowner is ready to develop land in the urban service area, rezoning of the land may be required to allow urban density residential development or commercial, business or light industrial development. The plan recommends that when plans for development have been approved in the urban service area that the appropriate Plan Commission and the Town or Village Board work with the landowner to get proper zoning changes made.

COMMUNITY EFFORT TO SAVE AGRICULTURAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL LAND

In an effort to preserve agricultural and open space lands the plan recommends the creation of a special working committee which will gather information which will be helpful to landowners who are considering selling their land. This committee, named Community Effort to Save Agricultural and Environmental Lands (CETSAEL) will be established by the Plan Commission and approved by the Town Board.

CETSAEL will work to identify land buyers who are interested in maintaining agricultural and environmental corridor lands in permanent open uses. The list of potential purchasers could include: individuals; neighbors; public or private land trusts; the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources; Racine County; and the Town and Village of Rochester. CETSAEL will establish both a local and regional base of potential buyers.

CETSAEL will also gather information about various types of land sales including, but not limited to, outright sale, installment sale, and sale with a reserved life estate. CETSAEL should have information available concerning the tax implications of the different types of sales which will help the landowners in their consideration of options.

The plan recommends that an individual planning to sell 10 or more acres of land be encouraged to contact CETSAEL. This is a voluntary action by the landowner. CETSAEL will then present options which are in the community interest of maintaining agricultural and environmental corridor lands for the landowners to consider. This could include putting the landowners in contact with an individual or group capable of buying the land. Examples of options include:

- The purchase of lands within the Honey Creek Wildlife area by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources.
- The purchase of lands along the Fox River corridor by Racine County.

- The purchase of lands identified as natural areas in Chapter III by an appropriate private or public agency or individual.
- The purchase or transfer of development rights (discussed later in this chapter).

If CETSAEL identifies an option agreeable to the landowner and the landowner accomplishes a sale through the community options presented, the Town or Village as appropriate will pay the applicable transfer fee otherwise due with the Wisconsin real estate transfer return.

If CETSAEL is not successful in its efforts outlined above, the landowner is still free to sell or develop his or her land consistent with the land use plan recommendations, and the implementation tools described in this chapter.

INCENTIVES FOR CONTINUED PRIVATE OWNERSHIP OF AGRICULTURAL AND OPEN SPACE LANDS

In cases where landowners are not considering the sale of their land in the near future and are planning in maintaining their property in agricultural and open space uses, there are tools available to provide some financial relief for continuing in such uses. These tools include but are not limited to: the Wisconsin Farmland Preservation Program; use-value assessment; the Conservation Reserve Program; Farmland Protection Program; and Woodland Tax Law.

It is anticipated that CETSAEL will be able to provide interested landowners with information relating to these items.

RURAL DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

Rural density residential development is defined as residential development at a density of no more than one dwelling unit per five acres of land.

The land use plan recommends that this concept be a primary factor in Plan Commission and Town Board considerations where development is pursued on agricultural or environmental corridor lands outside of the planned urban service area in the Town.

In a rural density development, an overall density of five acres per dwelling unit can be maintained under a range of approaches. While such development may take the form of large lots for single-family dwelling units with each lot being five acres or more, development may also take the form of smaller lots down to the 40,000 square feet allowed by zoning, mixed with lots greater than five acres, to maintain an average density of no more that one dwelling unit per five acres. The use of rural cluster development which is defined below is recommended as a means of achieving this rural density while minimizing community costs and preserving open space.

In implementing a rural density residential policy the Plan Commission and Town Board are attempting to balance the need for rural residential development and landowners ability to market their land when they are ready to sell, with the community goals of minimizing the long term community costs of scattered developments, and maintaining the rural resources of the community.

Zoning districts specify the minimum lot sizes allowed. They do not indicate the exact number of lots that can be developed on a parcel. That is determined in the platting process and is based on many factors, one of which, is the communities ability to support the proposed development. The policy stated in this plan departs from the idea that the maximum number of lots allowed in a zoning district is always in the best interest of the community, or that the community costs are not to be considered, and moves toward encouraging fewer dwelling units on a given parcel of rural land for the long term benefit of the community. Development policies and practices that respect the limitations of the natural environment and the community fiscal resources will, in the long term not only preserve the overall quality of the environment in the planning area, but will also avoid the creation of serious and costly environmental and developmental problems and will promote the general health and safety of the community.

RURAL CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT

Rural cluster development involves the grouping of dwellings on a portion of a development tract, preserving the remainder of the parcel in open space. Management options for the open space areas include, among others, preservation of existing natural features, restoration of natural conditions, and continued agricultural use. The open space may be owned by a homeowners' association, the local municipality, the State, Racine County, a private conservation organization, or the original landowner. Conservation easements and deed restrictions should be used to protect the common open space from future conversion to more intensive uses.¹

¹See SEWRPC Planning Guide No. 7, Rural Cluster Development Guide, December 1996, for additional information regarding the rural cluster development concept and the manner in which it may be applied as a planning and zoning technique. Cluster development offers many benefits over conventional development involving the same number of dwelling units. Cluster development can help preserve the rural character of the landscape, preserve significant natural features, preserve agricultural land, and achieve better site design. Infrastructure installation costs borne by the developer and public infrastructure maintenance costs may be reduced due to shortened street and utility lengths.

The plan encourages the use of cluster development designs by allowing up to a 25 percent density bonus for clustering. Cluster designs would be required to maintain 70 percent of the parcel in open space or agricultural uses thereby providing for limited residential development while preserving the rural character of the planning area. Examples of cluster designs for parcels within the Town of Rochester are shown on Figures 4 and 5.

Where possible the plan recommends that cluster housing units be located entirely outside of primary and secondary environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas. While calling for such preservation of environmental corridor lands, the plan recognizes that in some cases it may be necessary to allow limited rural residential density development on such lands. It would be desirable for such development to utilize cluster development designs. Figures 6 through 8 show three alternative site design options for rural residential development within a primary environmental corridor. All the design options provide a means of preserving environmentally sensitive areas while maintaining an overall density of no more than one housing unit per five acres of land. Figure 6 shows the site divided into eight five-acre lots. Each housing unit is carefully located to avoid environmentally significant areas. Figure 7 shows the same site with the housing units clustered on eight contiguous one-acre parcels, which allows most of the site to remain undisturbed while still providing each homeowner with a private residence and lot. Figure 8 shows the site with the eight housing units clustered into two buildings, each containing four condominium units. This option would be most appealing to those who prefer living in a relatively undeveloped area, but are unwilling or unable to care for a detached housing unit and attendant yard. Development within environmental corridors will not be eligible for the 25 percent density bonus for clustering. It should be noted that even such limited development will have some impact on the resources concerned. The Plan Commission should carefully take into account such impacts as well as the impacts the development may have on the environmental corridor as a whole in their review of development proposals.

In some cases it may be determined that a cluster development is not appropriate for a particular parcel.

Development may take the form of smaller lots down to the 40,000 square feet allowed under the A-2 and R-2 zoning districts, as long as they are mixed with lots greater than five acres within the development site to maintain an average density of one dwelling unit per five acres. Lots within the development larger than the minimum zoning square footage would be deed restricted to prevent further divisions. Although no common open space is created, the advantage of lot averaging is flexibility of site design and the ability to concentrate some of the permitted dwellings on smaller lots in certain areas of the development parcel while the remaining permitted dwellings would be located on a few larger lots. Features of the rural landscape or environmentally sensitive areas can be preserved, albeit on private lots.

Rural cluster development, where it involves the preservation of agricultural land, should clearly address in the development plan how the conflicts between the agricultural operations on the preserved farmland and residential uses will be avoided or understood and accepted by the people who live there. Consequently, any rural residential development plan or certified survey map which borders agricultural land should also address the potential conflicts of agricultural operations and residential uses, before it is approved.

If it becomes impractical to farm land that has been productive, due to conflicts that arise because of neighboring residential developments, that farm land could be developed following the guidelines in the land use plan and land division ordinances.

ZONING

Zoning is perhaps the most effective method of controlling land use. Regulations and restrictions on land use, as defined in the zoning ordinance are accepted by the community, and a public procedure involving government consideration is followed by an individual who wishes to change the zoning classification of a parcel of land. Land use regulation by zoning in the Town of Rochester is a joint County-Town function, involving the administration of the Racine County Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance and the Racine County Shoreland-Floodplain Zoning Ordinance. Lands in the Village of Rochester are subject to the Village of Rochester zoning ordinance. Maps 25 and 27 in Chapter V of this report show the existing zoning in the Town and Village, respectively.

A-2 and R-2 Zoning Districts

As shown in Chapter V, much of the privately owned agricultural land and environmental corridor land in the Town of Rochester is presently zoned A-2 or R-2. These districts allow for dividing parcels into sizes as small as 40,000 square feet.

Figure 4



EXAMPLE OF A CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT IN THE TOWN OF ROCHESTER

Source: SEWRPC.

As the population in the Town has increased and the random development of 40,000 square foot lots has proliferated, the results of this type of development have become better understood. While many good home sites have been provided, the negative impacts of this type of development include increased costs of services to the community, higher property taxes to individuals, and destruction of agricultural, environmental, and gravel resources.

If a significant portion of A-2 and R-2 land in the Town is developed at this density, these resources will be lost, the costs of living in the community could increase rapidly, and the rural reasons for living in this community will be gone. The A-2 and R-2 zoning districts by themselves will not be an effective tool in achieving the goals of the land use plan.

A-1 and C-1 Zoning Districts

The most effective zoning for protecting and maintaining agricultural, environmental and gravel resources in the Town are A-1 and C-1 zoning districts. The A-1 zoning district provides for minimum parcel sizes of 35 acres. The C-1 district does not allow development of the underlying resources. As shown in Chapter V, the A-1 district has been applied only to about 145 acres, or about 1 percent

of the Town, and the C-1 district has been applied only to DNR land, about 980 acres, or about 9 percent of the Town.

The land use plan is not recommending the rezoning of land against landowner wishes. The land use plan does recommend that individuals or groups of individuals who want to protect their agricultural land and environmental corridor land, be encouraged to request a zoning change to an exclusive agricultural or conservancy zoning district. Furthermore, the land use plan recommends that the Town or County pay the costs of zoning changes for individuals who choose to re-zone their land to an exclusive agricultural or conservancy zoning district. It is recommended that the Town and Village look for other incentives to encourage people to use exclusive agricultural and conservancy zoning to protect these resources.

Zoning Ordinance Text Changes Town of Rochester

An emphasis in the land use plan is placed on future development densities of one dwelling unit per five acres. The current zoning ordinance does not include a zoning district which would directly accommodate this type of development. The plan recommends that such districts be established.

Figure 5



EXAMPLE OF A CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT IN THE TOWN OF ROCHESTER

Source: SEWRPC.

It is envisioned that the availability of such zoning districts will provide more flexibility in the zoning code, which will allow individuals and communities more options. While it is envisioned these districts will not be applied to lands against landowners wishes, it is anticipated that such districts will assist in implementation of the plan.

It is recommended that the Town of Rochester and Racine County initiate action to create an A-5 Agricultural/Rural Residential District, and a PRD, Planned Rural Development Overlay District, in the Racine County Zoning Ordinance. It is also recommended that the minimum parcel size in the C-2, Upland Resource Conservation District, be changed from three to five acres.

The A-5, Agricultural/Rural Residential District, would be intended to provide for the maintenance, preservation, and enhancement within the Town and County of agricultural lands historically utilized for crop production. The district would also permit the creation of large rural residential lots, at densities not to exceed one dwelling unit per five acres. This is intended to accommodate the demand for truly rural single-family residential development by that segment of the population which, while in fact urban in character, nevertheless desires to live in an essentially rural environment. This district could be applied to those areas shown on the adopted land use plan as rural residential and agricultural land. A suggested draft of the district regulations is set forth in Appendix B.

The PRD, Planned Rural Development Overlay District, is intended to work with lands zoned for agricultural uses. This district could be applied to parcels 20 acres or larger in size, provide for a 25 percent density bonus above and beyond what would be allowed under the A-5 district, and require the preservation of 70 percent of the parcel in open space or agricultural uses. Parcels smaller than 20 acres would be subject to the requirements of the A-5 district. A suggested draft of the district regulations is set forth in Appendix B. Figure 6

Figure 7

PRESERVATION OF PRIMARY ENVIRONMENTAL CORRIDOR: FIVE-ACRE LOT DESIGN

PRESERVATION OF PRIMARY ENVIRONMENTAL CORRIDOR: CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT ON ONE-ACRE LOTS



Figure 8

PRESERVATION OF PRIMARY ENVIRONMENTAL CORRIDOR: CONDOMINIUM DEVELOPMENT



Source: SEWRPC.

The C-2, Upland Resource Conservation District, is intended to preserve and protect all significant woodlands, related scenic areas and areas of hilly topography within the Town and County. The current C-2 District provides for limited residential development not to exceed one dwelling unit per three acres. The text of this district should be modified to establish a minimum density of one dwelling unit per five acres. This would be consistent with the recommendations of the Town plan and the regional water quality management plan attendant to development within upland portions of primary environmental corridors. This district could be applied to the upland portions of those areas shown on the adopted Town land use plan as "primary and secondary environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas."

Village of Rochester

Similar to the Town, it is recommended that the Village initiate action to create a C-1 Lowland and a C-2 Upland resource conservation districts, which could be applied to the identified environmental corridor lands in the Village. As in the Town, the plan recommends that the Village Plan Commission work with individual landowners to seek zoning changes where appropriate. As in the Town, it is proposed that such changes would be made at no cost to the landowner.

LAND DIVISION ORDINANCE, SUBDIVISION AND CERTIFIED SURVEY MAP REVIEW

Properly applied, sound land division regulations can be an important means of implementing a land use plan and of coordinating the layout, design, and improvement of private land development proposals within the Rochester planning area. The existing Racine County Land Division Control Ordinance and the Town of Rochester Land Division Control Ordinance, which govern the division of land in the Town of Rochester, and the Village of Rochester Land Division Ordinance are basically sound. At present, the County land division control ordinance does not apply to minor land divisions created by certified survey maps. It is recommended the Town in its review of certified survey maps under the Town ordinance should request a cooperative review by Racine County to ensure that new parcels conform to the requirements of the County Zoning Ordinance, and other County ordinances and comply with this land use plan. It is also recommended that Racine County consider amending its land division ordinance to include the regulation of minor land divisions in cooperation with the towns. Such an amendment when developed should be considered and approved by the Towns, before it is adopted by the County.

It is also recommended that the Town land division control ordinance be amended to allow the Plan Commission the flexibility to require sketch plans or concept plans for entire parcels when reviewing minor land divisions. The sketch plans would identify the future development of the parcel including general road and lot locations. This would ensure the proper planning of, and consequently the orderly development of a parcel consistent with the long term objectives of the plan. The sketch plan would also be subject to review by Racine County. It will be necessary for the Town and County to establish an internal system for tracking such plans to ensure future land divisions are consistent with the sketch plan. It is recommended that a copy of the sketch plan will be kept by the Town Clerk and by the County for 10 years from the date it is accepted.

In addition, it is recommended that the land division ordinance be amended as it relates to subdivision review. In the case of land divisions resulting in the creation of a subdivision, the property owner or developer would be required to submit a proposed cluster development plan for the subject property. The Town Plan Commission will have 60 days to review the proposed cluster development plan, but will otherwise follow the normal plan approval process set forth in the ordinance. As an alternative, the individual may seek an exemption from this requirement by presenting information to the Plan Commission that indicates that a cluster development is not practicable or appropriate for the subject property.

In the case of the division of property into parcels which exceed five acres in size or in cases where the division creates just two parcels, the normal procedures for the approval of a proposed division will apply. Property owners would follow the current procedures of obtaining approval of certified survey maps as amended in the future. In addition, the division of parcels in these cases would be recorded and considered a part of the housing density of the original parcel area for a period of 10 years from the time the division is approved. A record of this would be kept by the Town Clerk and the County.

Following the adoption of the Rochester land use plan, the plan should serve as a basis for the review of all preliminary subdivision plats and certified survey maps in the planning area. The review should ascertain that each proposed land division is properly related to existing and proposed land uses. Land divisions should consider the proper layout of streets, blocks, and lots as well as the topography, soils, and vegetation. The design should achieve internal unity by recognizing that the subdivision is an integral part of the larger community. Land divisions resulting in lots smaller than five acres should not be approved in areas recommended to remain in rural uses, unless a cluster development design is used.

OFFICIAL MAPPING

Following adoption of the recommended land use plan, the existing and proposed streets, highways, parks, parkways, and playgrounds shown on the plan should be incorporated into official maps of the Town and Village. Section 62.23(6) of the *Wisconsin Statutes* provides that a Village Board and a Town Board acting under village powers may establish official maps. Such a map has all the force of law and is deemed to be final and conclusive with respect to the location and width of both existing and proposed streets, highways, and parkways and the location and extent of existing and proposed parks and playgrounds.

One of the basic purposes of the official map is to prohibit the construction of buildings or structures and associated improvements on land that has been designated for current or future public use. The official map is the only arterial street and highway system plan implementation device that operates on a communitywide basis in advance of land development. As such, it can effectively assure the integrated development of the street and highway system. Unlike subdivision control, which operates on a plat-byplat basis, the plan, with the official map as one of its implementation instruments, can operate over a wide planning area well in advance of development proposals. The official map is a useful device to achieve public acceptance of long-range plans in that it serves legal notice of the governments intention to all parties concerned well in advance of any actual improvements. It thereby avoids the all together too common situation of development being undertaken without knowledge or regard for the long-range plan, and thereby does much to avoid local resistance when plan implementation becomes imminent.

PRECISE NEIGHBORHOOD UNIT DEVELOPMENT PLANS

Subsequent to the adoption of the land use plan, steps should be taken by the Town and Village to initiate the preparation of precise neighborhood unit development plans for existing and future urban areas delineated in the land use plan. The preparation of precise neighborhood unit development plans is based on the concept that urban areas should be formed of, and developed in, a number of individual cellular units rather than as a single, large, formless mass. A neighborhood may be defined as that area of a community most closely associated with the daily activities of family life, such as an area served by elementary education and convenience shopping facilities. A group of neighborhoods which functions as a unit may be defined as a community. Through precise planning of neighborhood units, residential environments can be established that are healthy, safe, convenient, and attractive. Such plans greatly assist public officials in guiding and shaping land use development in accordance with the adopted land use plan.

Such plans should provide detailed designs that assure economical and practical land use development, while avoiding the creation of expensive traffic, sewerage, drainage, and water problems. The precise neighborhood design plans should consist of four basic components. The first component of the plans should consist of an inventory and analysis of existing site conditions and other pertinent factors which affect land use development within the delineated neighborhood, including topography and surface drainage, soils, woodlands, wetlands, existing land use, land use regulations, community utilities and facilities, street and highway facilities, and real property ownership. The second component of the plans should describe the design criteria and land use development standards used in the preparation of alternative design plans. The third component of the plans should provide a series of alternative design plans, together with a description of the recommended design plan. The recommended design plan should include precise locations for residential, commercial, governmental and institutional, park and recreational, and industrial land uses; environmental corridors; and arterial, collector, and minor access streets. The final component of the plans should provide specific recommendations as to how the plan should be implemented. The street patterns and park and parkway sites shown on the completed and adjusted neighborhood unit plan should be incorporated into the Town and Village of Rochester Official Maps.

VILLAGE -TOWN JOINT PLANNING EFFORTS AND COOPERATION

The land use plan presented in this report includes land use recommendations for the Town and Village of Rochester. Under Wisconsin law, cities and villages have been granted a considerable measure of influence over development in adjacent town areas. Incorporated communities have extraterritorial subdivision plat approval authority; they may include adjacent unincorporated areas in their local master plans; they may administer extraterritorial zoning jointly with the adjacent town, where the incorporated community and adjacent town agree to such an arrangement; and ultimately, they may annex unincorporated areas.

In the preparation of this plan, the Town of Rochester and the Village of Rochester have taken a cooperative approach to planning and decision-making regarding future land use in areas of mutual concern. It is recommended that such efforts continue, and that other adjacent communities be included in cooperative planning efforts as appropriate. These communities should include but not be limited to the City of Burlington, the Village of Waterford, and the Towns of Burlington, Dover, and Waterford. Additional activities in this respect could range from: the cooperative preparation of detailed neighborhood plans for the areas within the planned sewer service area; to periodic meetings of public officials for the purpose of discussing land use matters; and to preparing and executing formal agreements regarding future boundaries and arrangements for the provision of public services, as provided for under Sections 66.023 and 66.30 of the Wisconsin Statutes. In this regard, it is recommended that the Town and Village of Rochester pursue the development of boundary agreements with each other, as well as, the City of Burlington and the Village of Waterford. Such cooperative efforts increase the likelihood for coordinated development along the boundary areas, achieving, insofar as practicable, both Town and Village land use objectives.

PURCHASE AND TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS

Open space preservation techniques referred to as "purchase of development rights" (PDR) or "transfer of development rights" (TDR) are based upon the premise that development rights are distinct attributes of land ownership which can be sold or otherwise transferred, similar to other rights associated with land, such as mineral rights or air rights. No widespread agreement exists on the nature or extent of development rights that may be inherent in fee-simple ownership of land. There is general agreement that landowners have the right to use their land within the limits set by public regulation. Such regulations must be defensible from a constitutional law standpoint, leaving landowners a reasonable use of their land so as not to constitute a public taking of the land without payment of just compensation.

Some individuals maintain that, since zoning ordinances and other land use regulations may legally be, and indeed, historically have been, amended to become more restrictive, there are no development rights inherent in land ownership, the owner being entitled only to a continuation of the existing use. Others argue that, where zoning and other public land use controls have been in place for a long period of time, a right to develop in accordance with such longstanding zoning regulations becomes effectively attached to the land and that removal of such development rights-rights which are commonly taken for granted by landowners-through downzoning would constitute a taking. While the latter position is frequently taken in a political context-as many local elected officials believe that such a position is fair and equitable-the Wisconsin Supreme Court has taken the position that a landowner has no vested right in zoning until proper development and/or building permit applications have been filed.

Ideally, land should be placed in zoning districts which allow urban development only where it is recommended in locally adopted land use plans and only at such time as the area concerned can be readily provided with basic urban facilities and services and a market demand for the proposed development is evident. Unfortunately, decades ago, many then-rural areas of the Southeastern Wisconsin Region including Racine County and the Town of Rochester were placed in residential zoning districts, even though such "prezoning" constituted poor planning and zoning practice at that time. Some argue that the use of PDR or TDR techniques represents an inappropriate response to such poor planning and zoning practice of the past and that, with respect to the purchase of development rights, the governments should not "buy back" rights to develop land which were inappropriately held out under local zoning. Others view PDR and TDR as potential tools for dealing with expectations created by past zoning practice, particularly within areas that are experiencing significant market demand for development.

It should be noted that PDR programs may, but need not, involve government funding; they may be privately financed by land trusts or other private organizations having an interest in preserving agricultural and other open space lands. Arguments against government-funded PDR programs should not undermine privately financed programs. A description of these techniques is presented here, recognizing that ultimately their application, if permitted and encouraged by public actions, will be determined largely by the operation of the urban land market.

Purchase of Development Rights

Purchase of development rights programs, or PDR programs, are intended to ensure the long-term preservation of agricultural lands. Under a PDR program, the owner of farmland receives a payment for relinquishing rights to development. Deed restrictions are used to ensure that the lands concerned remain in agricultural or other open use. Such restrictions are attached to the land and remain in effect regardless of future sale or other transfer of the land.

PDR programs may be administered and funded by state, county, or local units of government, land trusts and other private organizations, or combinations thereof. The amounts paid to farmland owners under PDR programs may be calculated on the basis of the number of dwelling units permitted under existing zoning, on the basis of the difference between the market value of the land and its value solely for agricultural purposes, or on some other basis. The primary drawback of the PDR programs is the potentially high cost. PDR programs can provide assurance that farmland will be permanently retained in open use. Landowners receive a potentially substantial cash payment, while retaining all other rights to the land, including the right to continue farming. The money paid to the landowner may be used for any purpose, such as debt reduction, capital improvement to the farm, or retirement income. Lands included in a PDR program remain on the tax roll and continue to generate property taxes. Since the land remains in private ownership, the public sector does not incur any land management responsibilities.

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 any event, 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 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.

While the creation and administration of a TDR program is somewhat complicated, the technique remains a potentially effective means for preserving open space and maintaining rural densities, while directing development to areas where it may best be accommodated.

PLAN ADOPTION

An important step in plan implementation is the formal adoption of the recommended land use plan by the Town and Village Plan Commissions and certification of the adopted plan to the Town and Village Boards pursuant to State enabling legislation. Upon such adoption, the recommended plan becomes an official guide for the use of Town and Village officials as decisions are made concerning the development of the Town and Village. The recommended land use plan was adopted by the Town Plan Commission on April 5, 1999 (see Appendix C) and by the Village Plan Commission on May 11, 1999 (see Appendix D). Subsequent to their respective Plan Commission adoption, the recommended land use plan was adopted by the Town Board on April 12, 1999 (see Appendix E) and by the Village Board on May 12, 1999 (see Appendix F). Following adoption of the plan by the Town and Village Plan Commissions and, by the Town and Village Boards, the plan should be submitted to the Racine County Board for adoption upon recommendation of its Planning and Development Committee.

SUMMARY

The recommended land use plan implementation measures available to the Town and Village of Rochester include: the formation of a committee to work with landowners to preserve agricultural and open space lands (CETSAEL); a rural residential density standard of an average density of one dwelling unit per five acres in new developments; rural cluster developments; urban service area standards and procedures; land division ordinances and subdivision and certified survey map review; official mapping; precise neighborhood unit planning; changes to the County Zoning Ordinance to include an A-5 zoning district, PRD overlay district, and modification of the C-2 district in the Town; and changes to the Village zoning ordinance to include the addition of C-1 and C-2 districts. (This page intentionally left blank)

Chapter VIII

SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

In 1994, the Town of Rochester requested that Racine County and the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission assist the Town in the preparation of a land use plan. That same year the Town Board appointed a land use plan committee to oversee the preparation of the plan. The first meeting of that committee was held on May 16, 1994. On October 21, 1996, officials of the Town and Village of Rochester determined that it was in the best interest of both communities to prepare a joint Town and Village plan. The plan was to provide Town and Village officials with a tool to help better guide and shape land use development in the planning area. This report sets forth the findings and recommendations of the planning effort undertaken in response to that request.

The planning effort involved extensive inventories and analyses of the factors and conditions affecting the Town's and Village's land use development, including the population, economic base, natural resource base, land use, and land use regulations. The planning effort further involved the preparation of projections of future population, household, and employment levels; the formulation of land use development objectives; and the design of a plan that could accommodate possible future population, household, and employment levels in a manner consistent with community development objectives. The Rochester land use plan was prepared within the framework of the design year 2020 regional land use plan and represents a refinement and detailing of the regional land use plan.

PLANNING AREA

The planning area consists of the Town and Village of Rochester. The planning area is located in western Racine County and encompasses an area of about 17.7 square miles.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

A description of the population and employment levels, natural resources, land use, and land use regulations within the Town and Village of Rochester is presented in Chapters II through V of this report. A summary of existing conditions in the planning area follows.

Population and Employment Levels

The population of the planning area in 1990, the year of the most recent U.S. Census, was 2,822. The population level increased by 296 persons, to a level of 3,118 persons in 1996, about 10 percent greater than the 1990 level, according to State population estimates.

In 1990, there were about 940 households in the Rochester planning area, representing an increase of almost 540, or 132 percent, from 1970. The increase in the number of households has been accompanied by a decrease in the average household size, from 3.56 persons per households in 1970 to 2.99 persons per household in 1990.

There were about 600 employment opportunities, or jobs, in the planning area in 1990. The planning area has experienced a modest increase in employment over the past two decades, with the number of jobs increasing by about 140, or 30 percent, between 1970 and 1990.

Natural Resource Base

The location and extent of various elements of the natural resource base, including wetlands, woodlands, and surface water resources and associated shorelands and floodplains, were inventoried and mapped under the planning program. The most significant of these features lie within areas referred to as environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas.

Primary environmental corridors include a wide variety of important natural resource and resource-related elements and are, by definition, at least 400 acres in size, two miles in length, and 200 feet in width. Primary environmental corridors are located throughout the planning area. Such corridors in 1995 encompassed about 4.9 square miles, or about 28 percent of the planning area. The preservation of these corridors in essentially natural, open use is important to the overall quality of the environment and natural beauty of the Rochester planning area. Since these corridors are generally poorly suited for urban development, their preservation also helps to avoid the creation of new environmental and developmental problems.

Secondary environmental corridors, often remnants of primary corridors that have been partially converted to intensive urban or agricultural use, also contain a variety of resource elements. By definition, secondary environmental corridors are at least one mile long and 100 acres in area. In 1995, these corridors encompassed about 0.4 square mile, or about 2 percent of the planning area. Maintenance of these corridors in open uses can facilitate natural surface water drainage, and provide corridors for the movement of wildlife.

Isolated natural resource areas represent smaller concentrations of natural resource features that have been separated from the environmental corridors. Such areas, which are by definition at least five acres in size, in combination encompassed 0.4 square mile, or 2 percent of the planning area, in 1995. These areas sometimes serve as the only available wildlife habitat in an area, and may function as surface water retention areas.

Land Use

In 1995, urban land uses—consisting primarily of residential, commercial, industrial, governmental and institutional, and transportation uses—encompassed about 1,320 acres, or about 12 percent of the Rochester planning area. Residential land comprised the largest share of the urban land area. Residential lands, excluding associated streets, encompassed about 820 acres, representing 63 percent of all urban land and about 7 percent of the planning area, in 1995.

In 1995, nonurban land uses—including agricultural lands, wetlands, woodlands, other open lands, and surface water—encompassed about 10,000 acres, or about 88 percent of the planning area. Agricultural land comprised the largest share of the nonurban land area. Agricultural land, excluding associated streets, encompassed about 6,200 acres, accounting for about 62 percent of all nonurban land and about 55 percent of the planning area, in 1995.

Land Use Regulations

The Town of Rochester is under the jurisdiction of the Racine County general zoning and shoreland/floodplain zoning ordinances. Lands in the Village of Rochester are subject to the Village of Rochester zoning ordinance. Existing zoning district regulations in effect within the Town and Village are summarized in Tables 19 and 21 in Chapter V of this report. The application of those districts in 1995 is shown on Maps 25-27 in Chapter V.

Land divisions in the Rochester planning area are governed by the Racine County Land Division Control Ordinance, the Town of Rochester Land Division Ordinance, and the Village of Rochester Land Division Ordinance.

A number of State and Federal laws and regulations govern the use of waters and wetlands. These include Chapters NR 103, NR 110, and Comm 82 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code; and Sections 401 and 404 of the Federal Clean Water Act.

OBJECTIVES

The planning process included the formulation of a set of land use objectives for the planning area, as documented in Chapter VI of this report. Six basic land use objectives were developed by the Land Use Plan Committee to guide the preparation of the land use plan. The objectives relate to the preservation and protection of the natural environment and farmland; the amount and location of development in relation to community facilities and services; balancing community goals with individual rights; maintenance and enhancement of the economic base; and coordination of Village-Town planning efforts.

ANTICIPATED GROWTH AND CHANGE

The population, household, and employment projectionsused as a point of departure in preparing the land use plan for the Town and Village of Rochester are presented in Chapter II of this report. The projections were selected from a range of population, household, and employment projections reflecting alternative future growth scenarios for the Southeastern Wisconsin Region to the year 2020. Two alternative future scenarios—an intermediate growth scenario and a high growth scenario were considered.

Under an intermediate growth scenario, the population of the planning area would increase from 2,820 in 1990 to 3,390 in 2020; the number of households would increase from 940 in 1990 to 1,240 in 2020; and the number of jobs would increase from 600 in 1990 to 650 in 2020. Under a high growth scenario, the population of the planning area would increase to 4,880 by 2020, the number of households would increase to 1,790, and the number of jobs would increase to 785. Current growth trends in the planning area indicate that the year 2020 population, households and employment could reach levels approximating the levels envisioned under the high-growth alternative, and the plan is designed in the context of such possibilities.

THE RECOMMENDED PLAN

The recommended land use plan for the Town and Village of Rochester represents a refinement and detailing of the regional land use plan, in accordance with the Town and Village land use objectives. The land use plan is presented graphically on Map 29 in Chapter VI, while associated data pertaining to planned land use are presented in Table 23 of Chapter VI. The most important recommendations of the plan include the following: 1) that new urban development be encouraged to occur within the planned sanitary sewer service area; 2) that all primary environmental corridor lands be preserved in essentially natural, open use; and 3) that other areas of the Town be maintained in rural use, with development limited to rural residential development at an average density of at least five acres per dwelling unit.

Urban Residential Land Use

For purposes of the plan, "urban" residential development is defined as residential development at a density greater than one dwelling unit per five acres. Under the plan, the area devoted to urban residential use, including associated streets, would increase by about 490 acres, or about 69 percent, from about 710 acres in 1995 to about 1,200 acres in the year 2020. Urban residential development would involve the infilling of existing vacant lots in areas already committed to such uses in platted subdivisions, as well as on vacant developable land in areas located within the planned sanitary sewer service area.

Other Urban Land Use

The land use plan recognizes the development of additional commercial and industrial land uses in the planning area through the development of those lands currently zoned for such uses and through the development of a neighborhood shopping center. Increases in park and recreation land uses would occur primarily as a result of the development of recreation facilities on the Case Eagle Park site. Other urban land uses, namely, governmental and institutional, transportation, and utility land uses are not specifically recommended to be increased over the plan design period.

Urban Reserve

The planning area contains lands within the planned sewer service area that, while envisioned for future urban use, may prove difficult to develop due to highway and sewer service constraints. Recognizing such constraints, the Land Use Plan Committee determined that this area should be identified on the plan as "urban reserve." This will allow flexibility for local officials to consider various future land uses that are deemed appropriate to provide an overall benefit to the community. Regardless of what specific types of urban development that might be accommodated in this area, the plan recommends that development should occur only with the provision of public sanitary sewer service.

Environmental Corridors and Isolated Natural Resource Areas

The Rochester land use plan recommends the preservation of existing primary environmental corridors in essentially natural, open uses. Development within such corridors should be limited to compatible outdoor recreation facilities, and, on a limited basis, rural-density residential use.

Under the plan, secondary environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas would be preserved in natural, open use to the extent practicable, or possibly incorporated as drainageways or stormwater detention basins in developing areas.

Agricultural and Rural Residential Lands

The balance of the planning area-consisting of areas which have been designated neither for future urban use nor for preservation as environmental corridors or isolated natural resource areas-are identified as "agricultural," or "rural-density residential and agricultural land." The plan proposes that these areas be maintained in agricultural and open uses, or perhaps be converted to residential development limited to an average density of at least five acres per dwelling unit. The plan recommends the use of residential cluster designs to achieve the recommended rural density. Such designs involve the grouping of dwellings on a portion of a parcel, preserving the remainder of the parcel in open space. Cluster development can preserve the rural character of the landscape, preserve significant environmental features, preserve agricultural land, achieve better site design, and reduce street and other infrastructure installation and maintenance costs.

PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

Realization of the land use plan will require faithful, longterm dedication to the underlying objectives by the local officials concerned with its implementation. Thus, the adoption of the plan is only the beginning of a series of actions necessary to achieve the plan objectives.

Chapter VII of this report indicates the major steps to be taken in order to implement the Rochester land use plan. Following formal adoption by the Town and Village Plan Commissions and desirably by the Town and Village Boards, important plan implementation measures include: the formation of a committee named Community Effort to Save Agricultural and Environmental Lands (CETSAEL) to work with landowners to preserve agricultural and open space lands; rural cluster developments; establishment of urban service area planning procedures; the application of land division ordinances in accordance with the plan; official mapping; precise neighborhood unit planning; changes to the County Zoning Ordinance to include the addition of an A-5 zoning district, and a Planned Rural Development overlay district, and modification of the C-2 district in the Town; and changes to the Village zoning ordinance to include the addition of C-1 and C-2 districts.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The principal function of the Rochester land use plan is to provide information that the responsible public officials can use and recommendations that such officials can consider over time in making decisions about growth and development in the Town and Village of Rochester. The plan also provides land developers and other private interests a clear indication of community land use objectives, enabling them to take those objectives into account in formulating development proposals.

The recommended land use plan, together with the supporting implementation measures, provides an important means for promoting the orderly development of the Town and Village of Rochester in the public interest. To the degree that the plan is implemented over time, a safer, more healthful and attractive, and more efficient environment for life will be created within the Rochester area. APPENDICES

(This page intentionally left blank)

Appendix A

LIST OF CITIZENS WHO REGULARLY ATTENDED ROCHESTER LAND USE PLAN COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Dennis G. Acker Eugene F. Ball Barbara Beere **Beverly Borucki** Lucille Borucki Leland Buss Edwin F. Ela Wayne Fuller John Garstecki Phyllis Garstecki Tom Greil Mary O. Hoyer Sally Johnson Michael Krall Ben Maze Alex McIlheran Lorraine Meisinger Gene Meyer F.A. Myers **Rick Mianecki**

Harry North LaVon North **Richard North Thomas Peterson** Wayne Raisleger Lowell Rayeske Shirley Rayeske **Reid Runzheimer** Rhoda Runzheimer Gene Sandvig Vicki Sandvig **Everett Squire** Grace Squire **Bonnie Stone Edward Stone** Paul Webber Sheila Webber Arthur Weimer Mike Weinkauf Howard Zabler

(This page intentionally left blank)
Appendix B

RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE RACINE COUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE

1. It is recommended that an A-5, Agricultural/Rural Residential zoning district, and a PRD, Planned Rural Development Overlay zoning district be included in the Racine County Zoning Ordinance.

A-5, AGRICULTURAL/RURAL RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT

The primary purpose of this district is to provide for, maintain, preserve, and enhance agricultural lands historically utilized for crop production but which are not included within the A-1, General Farming I District, and which are generally best suited for smaller farm units, including truck farming, horse farming, hobby farming, orchards, and other similar agricultural-related activity. The district also permits the creation of large rural residential-type lots.

<u>Principal Uses</u>. Apiculture, dairying; floriculture; forestry; grazing; greenhouses; hay; livestock raising; orchards; paddocks; pasturage; plant nurseries; poultry raising; raising of cash grain crops, mint, grass, seed crops, silage, tree fruits, nuts, and berries, and vegetables; stables; truck farming; viticulture; and single-family dwelling with a garage.

<u>Conditional Uses</u>. Animal hospitals; commercial egg production; commercial raising of animals, such as dogs, foxes, goats, mink, pigs and rabbits; condenseries; creameries; feed lots; hatching or butchering of fowl; airports, airstrips, and landing fields for farm or personal use only; migratory laborers' housing; sod farming; and clustered residential developments.

Lot			
Width	Minimum		300 Feet
Area	Minimum		5 Acres
Building			
Dwelling	Height	Maximum	28 Feet
Residential	0		
Accessory Structures	Height	Maximum	15 Feet
Agricultural and Other Structures	Height	Maximum	Two (2) times the distance from the nearest lot line
Yards			
ALL Structures	Rear	Minimum	25 Feet
	Side	Minimum	25 Feet
	Street	Minimum	75 Feet
	Shore	Minimum	75 Feet

PRD, PLANNED RURAL DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY DISTRICT

The purpose of this district is to permit rural residential cluster developments in the A-1, A-2, A-3, A-4, and A-5 agricultural zoning districts. This district could be applied to parcels 20 acres or larger in size, provide for a 25 percent density bonus above and beyond what would be allowed under the A-5 district, and require the preservation of 70 percent of the parcel in open space or agricultural uses. The underlying district regulations may be varied provided that the above requirements are met. The proper preservation, care, and maintenance by the original and all subsequent owners of the exteriors designs; all common structures, facilities, utilities, access, and open spaces shall be assured by deed restrictions enforceable by the Town.

Development			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Area	Minimum	20 acres	
Lot	Minimum	150 Foot	
A ree	Minimum		
Area	Minimum	40,000 Square Feet	
Building			
Dwelling	Height	Maximum	28 Feet
Residential	Ŭ		
Accessory Structures	Height	Maximum	15 Feet
Agricultural and Other Structures	Height	Maximum	Two (2) times the distance from the nearest lot line
Yards	D		60 F
ALL Structures	Rear	Minimum	50 Feet
	Side	Minimum	15 Feet
	Street	Minimum	SU reet
	Shore	Minimum	/S reet

Ĩ,

Appendix C

TOWN PLAN COMMISSION RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE TOWN AND VILLAGE OF ROCHESTER LAND USE PLAN

WHEREAS, The Town of Rochester, pursuant to the provisions of Section 60.10(2)(c) of the Wisconsin Statutes, has been authorized to exercise village powers; and

WHEREAS, The Town of Rochester, pursuant to the provisions of Section 62.23 of the Wisconsin Statutes, has created a Town Plan Commission; and

WHEREAS, it is the duty and function of the Town Plan Commission, pursuant to Section 62.23 (2) of the Wisconsin Statutes, to make and adopt a master plan for the physical development of the Town of Rochester; and

WHEREAS, the governing bodies of the Town and Village of Rochester designated a Rochester Land Use Plan Committee, the membership of that Committee comprised of both public officials and private citizens with a variety of backgrounds, including members of the Town and Village Boards, Town and Village Plan Commissions, and representatives of concerned citizens of the Town; and

WHEREAS, the Town and Village of Rochester requested Racine County and the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission to assist that Committee in the preparation of a land use plan for the Town and Village; which plan includes:

- 1. Collection, compilation, processing, and analyses of various types of demographic, natural resource, recreation and open space, land use, transportation and other information pertaining to the Town and Village.
- 2. A forecast of growth and change.
- 3. A land use and arterial street system plan map.
- 4. Recommended activities to implement the plan; and

WHEREAS, the aforementioned inventories, analyses, objectives, forecasts, land use plan, and implementing ordinance revisions are set forth in a published report entitled SEWRPC Community Assistance Planning Report No. 237, *A Land Use Plan for the Town and Village of Rochester: 2020*; and

WHEREAS, the Town Plan Commission considers the plan to be a guide to the future development of the Town.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that pursuant to Section 62.23 (3) (b) of the Wisconsin Statutes, the Town of Rochester Plan Commission on the 5th day of April, 1999, hereby adopts SEWRPC Community Assistance Planning Report No. 237, *A Land Use Plan for the Town and Village of Rochester: 2020*; as a guide for the future development of the Town of Rochester.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Secretary of the Town of Rochester Plan Commission transmit a certified copy of this resolution to the Town Board of the Town of Rochester.

Chairman

Town of Rochester Plan Commission

ATTEST:

Secretary

Town of Rochester Plan Commission

(This page intentionally left blank)

Appendix D

VILLAGE PLAN COMMISSION RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE TOWN AND VILLAGE OF ROCHESTER LAND USE PLAN

WHEREAS, The Village of Rochester, pursuant to the provisions of Sections 61.35 and 62.23 of the Wisconsin Statutes, has created a Village Plan Commission; and

WHEREAS, it is the duty and function of the Village Plan Commission, pursuant to Section 62.23 (2) of the Wisconsin Statutes, to make and adopt a master plan for the physical development of the Village of Rochester; and

WHEREAS, the governing bodies of the Town and Village of Rochester designated a Rochester Land Use Plan Committee, the membership of that Committee comprised of both public officials and private citizens with a variety of backgrounds, including members of the Town and Village Boards, Town and Village Plan Commissions, and representatives of concerned citizens of the Town; and

WHEREAS, the Town and Village of Rochester requested Racine County and the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission to assist that Committee in the preparation of a land use plan for the Town and Village; which plan includes:

- 1. Collection, compilation, processing, and analyses of various types of demographic, natural resource, recreation and open space, land use, transportation and other information pertaining to the Town and Village.
- 2. A forecast of growth and change.
- 3. A land use and arterial street system plan map.
- 4. Recommended activities to implement the plan; and

WHEREAS, the aforementioned inventories, analyses, objectives, forecasts, land use plan, and implementing ordinance revisions are set forth in a published report entitled SEWRPC Community Assistance Planning Report No. 237, *A Land Use Plan for the Town and Village of Rochester: 2020*; and

WHEREAS, the Village Plan Commission considers the plan to be a guide to the future development of the Village.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that pursuant to Section 62.23 (3) (b) of the Wisconsin Statutes, the Village of Rochester Plan Commission on the 11th day of May, 1999, hereby adopts SEWRPC Community Assistance Planning Report No. 237, *A Land Use Plan for the Town and Village of Rochester: 2020*; as a guide for the future development of the Village of Rochester.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Secretary of the Village of Rochester Plan Commission transmit a certified copy of this resolution to the Village Board of the Village of Rochester.

Chairman

Village of Rochester Plan Commission

ATTEST:

1 Ion Secretary

Village of Rochester Plan Commission

(This page intentionally left blank)

Appendix E

TOWN BOARD RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE TOWN AND VILLAGE OF ROCHESTER LAND USE PLAN

WHEREAS, The Town of Rochester, pursuant to the provisions of Section 60.10(2)(c) of the Wisconsin Statutes, has been authorized to exercise village powers; and

WHEREAS, The Town of Rochester, pursuant to the provisions of Section 62.23 of the Wisconsin Statutes, has created a Town Plan Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Rochester Land Use Plan Committee has prepared, with the assistance of Racine County and the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, a plan for the physical development of the Town and Village of Rochester, said plan embodied in SEWRPC Community Assistance Planning Report No. 237, *A Land Use Plan for the Town and Village of Rochester: 2020*; and

WHEREAS, the Town Plan Commission on the 5th day of April, 1999, did adopt SEWRPC Community Assistance Planning Report No. 237 and has submitted a certified copy of that resolution to the Town Board of the Town of Rochester; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board of the Town of Rochester concurs with the Town Plan Commission and the objectives and recommendations set forth in SEWRPC Community Assistance Planning Report No. 237.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Town Board of the Town of Rochester, on the 12th day of April, 1999, hereby adopts the Land Use Plan for the Town and Village of Rochester; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Town Plan Commission shall review the land use plan every five years, or more frequently if necessary, and shall recommend extensions, changes, or additions to the Plan which the Commission considers necessary. Should the Plan Commission find that no changes are necessary, this finding shall be reported to the Town Board.

bur flack

Chairman Town of Rochester

ATTEST:

Mauren hit ... I

Clerk Town of Rochester

(This page intentionally left blank)

Appendix F

VILLAGE BOARD RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE TOWN AND VILLAGE OF ROCHESTER LAND USE PLAN

WHEREAS, The Village of Rochester, pursuant to the provisions of Sections 61.35 and 62.23 of the Wisconsin Statutes, has created a Village Plan Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Rochester Land Use Plan Committee has prepared, with the assistance of Racine County and the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, a plan for the physical development of the Town and Village of Rochester, said plan embodied in SEWRPC Community Assistance Planning Report No. 237, A Land Use Plan for the Town and Village of Rochester: 2020; and

WHEREAS, the Village Plan Commission on the 11th day of May, 1999, did adopt SEWRPC Community Assistance Planning Report No. 237 and has submitted a certified copy of that resolution to the Village Board of the Village of Rochester; and

WHEREAS, the Village Board of the Village of Rochester concurs with the Village Plan Commission and the objectives and recommendations set forth in SEWRPC Community Assistance Planning Report No. 237.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Village Board of the Village of Rochester, on the 12th day of May, 1999, hereby adopts the Land Use Plan for the Town and Village of Rochester; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Village Plan Commission shall review the land use plan every five years, or more frequently if necessary, and shall recommend extensions, changes, or additions to the Plan which the Commission considers necessary. Should the Plan Commission find that no changes are necessary, this finding shall be reported to the Village Board.

President Village of Rochester

ATTEST:

Clerk // Village of Rochester