

Strengthening a Community's Identity:

Analysis of Discrepancies between the Village of Allouez's
Comprehensive Plan and Zoning ordinance

December, 2010

Authors

Planning Theory and Method's Lecture, Fall 2010
University of Wisconsin- Green Bay

Adjunct Professor, Charles Lucht

Main Author, Stephanie Hummel

Main Presenter, Mark Sonnabend

Supporting Authors:

Kyle Birkholz

Richard Dallaire

Kameron Franz

Carsten Koy

Rebecca Kritz

Trevor Martin

Patrick McGregor

Jacob Miller

Brian Phillips

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Zoning and Planning Committee Duties and Responsibilities	3
Zoning and Planning Committee Training	5
Zoning Ordinance, Major Revisions Required	5
Expertise to Update the Zoning Ordinance	6
A Word On Student Findings and Recommendations	6
Comprehensive Plan Themes	7
Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND) Implementation	7
Elements of Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND) can be Included	8
Economic and Mixed-Use Development	9
Connectivity	10
Comprehensive Plan/Zoning Ordinance Inconsistencies	11
Comprehensive Plan Updates	11
Adjustments to the Classifications for the Land Use Categories	15
Zoning ordinance Updates	16
Setbacks Recommendations	18
Village Suggestions	20
Appendix A	22

Introduction

Steve VandenAvond, Village Board President for the Village of Allouez contacted Adjunct Professor Charles Lucht about having his class at the University of Wisconsin Green Bay, analyze the consistency between the Comprehensive Plan and Village of Allouez Zoning Ordinance. Adjunct Professor Lucht then presented this project to eleven students in an upper-level planning class, Planning Theory and Methods.

To review the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance thoroughly, the students familiarized themselves with both documents as a class. Each student was required to read both the Village of Allouez Comprehensive Plan and the Village of Allouez Chapter 11 Zoning Ordinance. For more in-depth analysis, each student was assigned a chapter of the Comprehensive Plan. Individual chapters were then compared with the zoning ordinance by collectively cross-referencing each chapter against one another. This offered the ability to see discrepancies, subject matter overlap, and the issues having the highest rate of reoccurrence.

Each of the students was in their last year or semester of school. Nine of those students were Urban and Regional Studies or Public Policy majors. None of the students were natives of Allouez or the Green Bay metropolitan area and only 2 of these students had lived in Allouez during their time at the University of Wisconsin Green Bay. On December 14, 2010 eleven students presented the results of their study for the Village of Allouez Comprehensive Plan and their existing Zoning Ordinance for consistency.

The presentation lasted nearly 1:45 minutes. During this time, it became clear that the Village officials were well aware of the various issues. More importantly, the crosstalk taking place between the Village officials shows they have been grappling with the issues for quite a while. They peppered the students with various questions, many of them specific.

The students and Village of Allouez officials largely agree and have identified a number of the same issues. The students had answers to several issues but the real message to the Allouez Village Officials is that there were no quick fixes that could be implemented immediately with great success. The best methods to address most issues are systemic changes.

Zoning and Planning Committee Duties and Responsibilities

Systemic changes start with better defining the role of the Village of Allouez Zoning and Planning Committee. There are 30 references to the Zoning and Planning Committee in the Chapter 11 Zoning Ordinance. In those 30 references, there is not a single description of the duties and responsibilities of the Zoning and Planning Committee. Good planning and decision making at all levels is based on the fundamentals of organization. The Zoning and Planning Committee can not properly review a project or make a confident recommendation to the Village Board if it does not have clearly defined duties and responsibilities they are supposed to accomplish.

Contrast the lack of a Zoning and Planning Committee description of powers and duties with the description for the Board of Appeals in the Zoning Ordinance. At least as much attention should be provided to the Zoning and Planning Committee as to the Board of Appeals.

The village needs a proper fact finding body that understands its duties and responsibilities. The Zoning and Planning Committee needs a proper basis in what they are authorized to do. This can be found in State Statute 62.23 City Planning. The use of this State Statute is by way of State Statute 61.35 Village Planning. The first order of business should be to provide a clear description of the authority of the Zoning and Planning Committee to provide recommendations by placing this description into the Chapter 11 Zoning Ordinance itself.

A good description can be taken from State Statute 62.23 (4) and (5). These paragraphs are included below and they establish accepted expectations of a Plan Commission or equivalent body in the State of Wisconsin.

(4) MISCELLANEOUS POWERS OF THE COMMISSION. The commission may make reports and recommendations relating to the plan and development of the city to public officials and agencies, public utility companies, civic, educational, professional and other organizations, and citizens. It may recommend to the mayor or council, programs for public improvements and the financing thereof. All public officials shall, upon request, furnish to the commission, within a reasonable time, such available information as it may require for its work. The commission, its members and employees, in the performance of its functions, may enter upon any land, make examinations and surveys, and place and maintain necessary monuments and marks thereon. In general, the Commission shall have such powers as may be necessary to enable it to perform its functions and promote municipal planning.

(5) MATTERS REFERRED TO CITY PLAN COMMISSION. The council, or other public body or officer of the city having final authority thereon, shall refer to the city plan commission, for its consideration and report before final action is taken by the council, public body or officer, the following matters: The location and architectural design of any public building; the location of any statue or other memorial; the location, acceptance, extension, alteration, vacation, abandonment, change of use, sale, acquisition of land for or lease of land for any street, alley or other public way, park, playground, airport, area for parking vehicles, or other memorial or public grounds; the location, extension, abandonment or authorization for any public utility whether publicly or privately owned; all plats of lands in the city or within the territory over which the city is given platting jurisdiction by ch. 236; the location, character and extent or acquisition, leasing or sale of lands for public or semipublic housing, slum clearance, relief of congestion, or vacation camps for children; and the amendment or repeal of any ordinance adopted pursuant to this section. Unless such report is made within 30 days, or such longer period as may be stipulated by the common council, the council or other public body or officer, may take final action without it.

Zoning and Planning Committee Training

The Chapter 11 Zoning Ordinance requires a comprehensive overhaul. Clarifying the duties and responsibilities of the Zoning and Planning Committee should be taken prior to such an effort. The Village Board will need to take action as required under State Statute 62.23. Once that action is taken, the Zoning and Planning Committee will require some specialized training.

At the student presentation, the members of the Zoning and Planning Committee stated they had been to a training session within the recent past. At this point the discussion turned to the fact that a lack of a proper description of Zoning and Planning Committee duties and responsibilities reduced the effectiveness of that training.

The specialized training required is not difficult to provide. This can be set up with the help of Charles Lucht, Associate Planner of Portage County or through the University of Wisconsin Stevens Point Extension, Center for Land Use Control. The person to contact at CLUE is Rebecca Roberts. Having the proper description of both the powers of the Zoning and Planning Committee as well as the scope of upcoming projects will help in targeting specific needs for training purposes.

Zoning Ordinance, Major Revisions Required

The major issue the students identified with their study of the Village Comprehensive Plan and Chapter 11 Zoning Ordinance, is that the Zoning Ordinance needs to have major revisions. The existing Ordinance was administered by the Villages building inspector. This may have worked well in the past, but a building inspector is more concerned with how a building is built and not how the land use effects the neighboring community or how several uses in a specific zoning district will develop over time. The Village needs a planner or a zoning administrator with the experience to evaluate a zoning code from scratch.

Changes to the ordinance had taken place as needed. No effort was made to remove past text that was outdated or no longer applied. Nearly 19 pages of 102 pages of text were sign related. This amount of signage text is excessive for even the most rigidly controlling of communities. The text was also anti-business, consistently stating what was not allowed rather than providing a model for what was encouraged.

Other requirements such as setbacks have become disjointed and arbitrary. The students spend a lot of time on pages 18 to 20 in this report on commercial setbacks. The idea the Village should take from their opinion is that setbacks are an issue that should receive major attention when the Zoning Ordinance is reevaluated. Setbacks can be a troublesome issue to deal with, and zero lot line setbacks are not always an answer.

The industrial Zoning District is another example. It lists 4 pages of specific industrial uses you can't have. Nobody is expecting a steel mill to develop in Allouez in this day and age, and nobody can imagine exposed piles of coche for the production of steel being left around in exposed piles. 4 full pages of what you can't have. Limit the districts to what you can have with a caveat that uses similar to those listed can get conditional use approval.

These are the specific types of inconsistencies in the zoning Ordinance we were engaged to identify. What we found was that the Village must do some organizational work, and find a way to rewrite major portions of its Zoning Ordinance in order to make the Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning Ordinance consistent with one another.

Expertise to Update the Zoning Ordinance

Your current Comprehensive Plan seems to match community goals. During the presentation, no Village Officials stated that the Comprehensive Plan was in error. Additionally, when discrepancies with the Zoning Ordinance were compared to the Plan, the Ordinance seemed to be the issue. The various Village officials present asked questions on how to implement the plan or make the zoning support the plan.

The students were able to identify where the plan lacked depth. Almost one quarter of The Village is identified as “Institutional”. This was a concern that was mentioned repeatedly. The students reiterated that there was not much the Village could do about the uses that make up that land use category. They did suggest that the institutional land use category be split up into understandable parts in order for the casual viewer to understand the uses in the Village in more specific detail. This would answer the question in one glance about those land uses and remove those questions about tax roll issues the Village can do little about.

The Tax Exempt Land map on page 37 of the Comprehensive Plan could also be the proper location to show the difference between the various types of tax-exempt land. It presently only shows exempt or non-exempt. Adding a legend of land by type would work perfect on this map.

A Word On Student Findings and Recommendations

The students were pushed to read, understand, and analyze two documents from the Village of Allouez, the Comprehensive Plan and the Chapter 11 Zoning Ordinance. Other chapters of the Village Ordinances may have been consulted, but they were not in themselves reviewed for consistency with the Comprehensive Plan. This is an effort that should be undertaken in the future, after the Chapter 11 Zoning Ordinance has been properly updated.

Reviewing the Comprehensive Plan and the Chapter 11 Zoning Ordinance is an entry level planning function. However, the writing of zoning code is not. Typically, new code may be encouraged and attempted by the new planner, but is always subject to review by someone who has written code in the past. Often, even this is modified if a public outreach process takes place with the changes.

The students felt it was more productive to find the conflicting issues between the Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning Ordinance. This resulted in specific districts receiving less specific attention than would be the case for a redrafting of the Zoning Ordinance would require.

The students have provided a brief write up of a substitute sign ordinance. Appendix A in the final draft has been included because it was a student based effort to produce text for a new section dealing with signs. It is incomplete but it does show an example of

how the sign section could be shortened while maintaining the concept of being business friendly. For instance, it does not deal with the materials that make up the signs themselves. It also does not deal with the possibility of exceptions worked out through the Zoning and Planning Committee.

Comprehensive Plan Themes

There are several themes found throughout the Comprehensive Plan that reoccur repeatedly. Business friendly economic development, mixed-use development, Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND), and a need for a high degree of connectivity between bike and pedestrian facilities are examples. These themes have specific goals and objectives that can be achieved through creating text in the Village of Allouez, Chapter 11 Zoning Ordinance to require specific action to bring them into being. This idea is the definition of the concept of consistency between the two documents.

An example of this is being Business friendly. Page 11-26, 11.09 High Rise District, (2), states that "... In buildings containing not less than 10 dwelling units, said structures may include restaurants, drug stores, delicatessens, valet shops, beauty shops, and barber shops, which are accessible to the public only through the lobby of the building, but provided that no advertising or display for such accessory uses shall be visible from outside said building...". This is an example of exactly the opposite of business friendly. This Zoning Ordinance text was shocking. The class was left wondering in what circumstances such a business could be successful. The class makes an argument for a comprehensive rewrite of the Chapter 11 Zoning Ordinance for exactly these reasons.

In several cases we will argue for the deletion of Land Use Categories through consolidation. The class feels that the amount of changes required to fix a specific ordinance would be more effective if they were to be rewritten.

Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND) Implementation

Chapter 5 discusses housing and introduces the idea of using Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND) for the future redevelopment of housing areas in the Village of Allouez. TND is a great development goal and in keeping with the Comprehensive Plan. As a complete concept, this type of development is not possible for the Village of Allouez as the Village is nearly built out. The following four paragraphs point out the issues preventing the implementation of TND in the Village.

The first concept of a TND is that the garages be located on either the side of or behind the house. This would include utilizing alleys as access ways for entry to garages located on the back of a house. This, however, poses a problem because it would be extremely difficult if not impossible to introduce alleys into the current infrastructure of the housing grid and transportation system.

TND prefers minimal setbacks from the right-of-way to create a strong sense of community. This is currently unattainable as the zoning ordinance calls for a minimum setback of thirty- (30) feet from the right-of-way [11.05.C.1]. Even if this were removed, other regulations maintain near-equal distances from the right-of-way with neighbors to ensure an equal look to front yards of the area [11.05.C.1.a].

Narrow streets are a theme in TNDs. This, like setbacks, is against the zoning ordinance. The Village states in the Municipal Code that the minimum width of street is thirty-two (32) feet [3.03.A.1,2,3]. The TND standards call for streets with a width of eighteen (18) to twenty-four (24) feet. TND standards may also not properly reflect new requirements for bike lanes.

The design standards of TND suggest the narrowing of lots to create a sense of community rather than having large homes on large lots with little interaction to one another. This design concept poses an issue because most of the lots in the Village are already partitioned out and it would be difficult to re-plot the residential land within the village. Along with this, the zoning ordinance prohibits side yards with less than fourteen (14) feet in total setback.

Elements of Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND) can be Included

Sidewalks are essential in TNDs. The inclusion of sidewalks should be a priority for the Village. Increasing sidewalk connectivity is a way to create community by enabling comfortable movement. The Village will have state statutes on their side to make the process of creating new sidewalks easier. The new Complete Streets Law states that the addition of sidewalks and bike facilities will be required along all reconstructed state-funded roads.

Page 12 of the Comprehensive Plan states a main objective of the Village is to “encourage commercial development in smaller neighborhood centers rather than in strips along main thoroughfares.” Mixed use is a major idea in TND. Mixed-use zoning calls for two or three story buildings with commercial/business use on the street level and residential use on the upper floors. This is difficult in Allouez as there are very limited locations zoned “C” Professional Office and Residential. As this type of zoning allows mixed used development, there would need to be an increase in the land zoned this way, as well as possible incentives for businesses and developers to create mixed use spaces.

The Village should add additional “C” Professional Office and Residential zones allowing mixed use. The elements include creating commercial nodes in residential areas, accessible community services and amenities within walking distance of residential areas, and creating and sustaining alternate modes of transportation beside vehicular.

Creating “pocket” areas of commercial development creates definable neighborhoods within a municipality. This helps to foster a strong sense of pride and community. Creating a commercial corridor would not serve the residents as desired in TND. A great example is Greendale, Wisconsin. This community has a commercial center that is connected to the residential sections of the community through an extensive sidewalk system. Not only do these sidewalks line the streets, but often run between lot lines of residential lots. This creates a high amount of connectivity, along with community interactions.

The village should pursue Planned Unit Developments (PUD’s) that would make the creation of commercial nodes a feasible option for future development. By instilling a

zoning ordinance that would further mixed-use development, the Village could potentially have commercial nodes surrounded by residential districts throughout the Village.

On page 82 of the Comprehensive Plan it states, "...redevelopment and rehabilitation can introduce additional multifamily and affordable units into the housing stock." There is a common theme throughout the Comprehensive Plan that desires an increase in the availability of housing choices and affordable housing units. With that, 85% of the housing stock is currently one-unit, single-family housing. An increase in the range of housing choices will also help to bring in a diverse body of residents and help to attract new, younger residents. Having a varied housing stock will allow the Village to embrace certain attainable design aspects of TND development without full implementation.

To make this idea come to fruition, a suggested solution may be to come to an agreement with the City of Green Bay about providing housing rehabilitation services to Allouez. As laid out in the Comprehensive Plan, the northeast corner of the Village is a viable rehabilitation area. However, some development projects might not fit in with the current zoning. The Village will need to change the zoning to accommodate redevelopment of this area.

Economic and Mixed-Use Development

Parking is essential to any businesses. As discussed above, the Village does not have business located in ideal TND style locations. A high number of automobile trips require parking solutions. The following recommendations will help to create the wanted business-friendly environment the Village is aspiring for.

Parking Recommendations

- **Section 11.13 A. 10. page 37** states that *"no attached or unattached carports shall be allowed in the "A", "B", or "C" Professional Offices and Residential Districts, or in High Density or High Rise Districts."*

If designed well and created with the proper materials, carports can add great aesthetic value to an area. The design and materials are within the rights of the Village to control. A committee that deals with architecture and historical structures could deal with these issues or a qualified Village staff member. Ideas for how to control these structures can be borrowed from other municipalities.

- **Section 11.13 C. 5. page 38** states that *"a parking area shall preferably be on the same property as the building to which is the accessory use, but in no case shall it be more than 250 feet from the main entrance of the said building."*

To create the wanted pro-economic development community, the zoning ordinance should address "park-and-walk" opportunities. This also includes the possible uses of parking lot sharing agreements and cross access easements.

- **Section 11.13 C. 6. page 38** states that *"where setback lines are required from the street, the setback area shall not be considered as part of the parking area; except*

this provision will not apply to medical facilities and where handicap requirements set by state and federal laws are applicable.”

Many businesses in the Village account for their parking areas as part of their setback. This ordinance should be reconsidered as compliance has not been consistent.

- **Section 11.13. J. 3. A-B. pg. 40** states that *“in a “C” Professional Office and Residential District that one garage of at least 220 square feet shall be required for every single-family and 2-family dwelling unit.”*

Parking requirements in the Village are based on the square footage of the building. Garages would reduce the amount of parking that would be available for customer parking. In an effort to become more business-friendly, Allouez should reassess the requirement for a garage in the “C” Professional Office and Residential District.

- **Section 11.13. J. 4. A. pg. 40** states that *“in a High Rise District apartment building or multiple family dwellings shall provide 1.5 parking spaces contained within and under the cover of said building for each dwelling unit, plus one additional space located on paved surface parking lot located to the rear of said apartment or multiple family dwelling for each dwelling unit. Two parking spaces must be provided on a paved surface parking lot located to the rear of said apartment building or multiple unit dwelling for each 100 square feet of floor space used for a restaurant, drug store, delicatessen, valet shop, beauty shop, and/or barber shop.”*

Between the parking requirements and the setback requirements, it makes a business locating in a High Rise District very difficult. There could be a reduction in parking needed and setback requirements (detailed in Setback Recommendations).

Connectivity

Community connection is a major theme of the Comprehensive Plan, throughout TND, economic and mixed-use development. Green spaces, residential areas, and commercial districts are uses that the Village would like to see connected via trails, paths, and bikeways as well as the street system. While the street system makes Allouez very automobile accessible, there is a lack of alternative types of transportation infrastructure.

There is discussion concerning the desire for high connectivity between green spaces, residential areas, and places of business and economic development. With the creation of an east-west trail and an increase of sidewalk availability, this overall goal is very achievable.

As connectivity is a large issue for the Village, and there is a large emphasis on multi-modal transportation. The Village states that it would like to see the creation of a continuous sidewalk system. While the Comprehensive Plan gives a general overview of steps needs, and the municipal code provides guidance on how to build them, there has not been any follow through to this project. A more specific plan of action for a continuous sidewalk system is needed. The Village could explore funding through the Safe Routes to School Program for the sidewalk facilities connecting to schools.

There are adequate north to south connections in the Village of Allouez. The Fox River Trail and East River Trail both run in a north-south direction, along with main street corridors and the sidewalk system. There needs to be a stronger emphasis on creating east to west connections. On page 64 and 65 of the Comprehensive Plan, there is discussion about possibly acquiring a railroad corridor if it becomes abandoned. This is a great idea as there is already a state program that funds this type of redevelopment (Rails to Trails). This would create a great east-west connection between the two trails in the north of the Village. If used, extra considerations would need to be taken because of the secluded nature of this rail bed. The introduction of this trail into Allouez would create a major east west bike and pedestrian route useable by the northern third of the village.

In addition to the abandoned rail bed, we have further recommendations to study as possible connections between the Fox River and East River Trails:

- The Woodlawn Cemetery and the Webster Heights Condominiums, running near Beaupre Street to the East River Trail
- South of State Highway 172, using the parks

Comprehensive Plan/Zoning Ordinance Inconsistencies

The zoning ordinance's overall disposition is nearly polar opposite from the Comprehensive Plan's. The zoning ordinance is a creature of time and lack of change through time. It creates barriers and restrictions rather than proper regulation for business and mixed-use development. The zoning ordinance contradicts the basic elements of TND, as well as limiting connectivity between business, residential, and green areas.

If the Comprehensive Plan is the policy document of the community, the Zoning Ordinance is the nuts and bolts of how to achieve that policy. In early 2004, Allouez adopted a new policy document. Unfortunately, the zoning ordinance is a collection of outdated parts for accomplishing the new policy. Listed below are suggested changes to specific areas of the zoning ordinance and Comprehensive Plan, along with general conflicts of the main themes.

Comprehensive Plan Updates

The following items are a list of internally inconsistent issues within the Comprehensive Plan itself or updates that should be applied as part of the review process. The items are listed in the order they appear. In some cases, additions are suggested. Additions will require greater thought to insure they properly reflect the goals, objectives, and policies of the Village of Allouez.

- **New Village Hall (linked to new Village center).** On page 10 of the Comprehensive Plan it states, *"The Village should create a better urban space and identity by developing a village center with a new village hall."*

This needs to be updated as the new village hall has been built.

- **No Future Land Use Map.** Page 63, the object of the Comprehensive Plan is to outline future goals and the policies required to reach those objectives. There is no future land use map. This leads to confusion between land use and zoning. The existing land use map is a snapshot of the land use when the plan was adopted. It should be a reference that can be used to make a decision on future land use. A future land use map needs to be created for decision making as well as legal issues.

This is not necessarily an easy process. It should be tackled after the Zoning and Planning Committee has been clarified with duties and responsibilities and trained. Preferably, after professional help has been acquired to assist.

- **Narrow Streets.** Page 63. *“Once the Village changes its code to enable developers to build narrow streets, it should encourage them to build narrow streets by offering them incentives.”*

Clarification of what type of incentives will be offered is needed. Cooperation with the Economic Development Committee could be beneficial to define and pursue these incentives.

The Village should also consider new state legislation referred to as “Complete Streets” requiring bike and pedestrian facilities on streets be implemented and its effect on developer requests for more narrow streets. While it is a cost savings to developers, the requirement for any street that will receive reconstruction money from state or federal sources will require room for these facilities to be included. Maintaining the current width while planning for future bike pedestrian facilities in the current right of way will accomplish the Comprehensive Plan Goals of community connectivity.

- **Economic Development.** Page 76. *“...consider creating an economic development program to include business attraction and business retention programs.”*

There needs to be further development of this thought in the Comprehensive Plan. It is understood that the Village has an Economic Development section of some type. These efforts should be updated into the Comprehensive Plan.

- **Economic Development Grants.** Page 76. *“The Village should be aware of and investigate the potential for economic development grant funds through the state and federal government.”*

This needs to be updated with progress or completion details of this investigation. It is understood that the Village has an Economic Development section of some type. These efforts should be updated into the Comprehensive Plan.

- **Clarify Housing Boundaries.** Page 82, the last paragraph states the location of possible housing redevelopment. The map details the location, but the wording is confusing. It describes the boundary for the northeastern section of the village with a high density of housing, but does not describe the housing rehabilitation area.

A possible correction would be: “This possible housing rehabilitation area begins at the intersection of Webster Avenue and the railroad, heading north on Webster. The boundary extends east along the village’s north boundary to the East River. It follows the East River south until Joseph Street. It then extends west until Libal Street. It runs on Libal Street north until it meets with the railroad. It runs west on the railroad until it meets the starting point at Webster Avenue again.”

- **Water Authority Update.** Page 90, it discusses the Village’s water supply. This section needs to be updated now that the Village receives their water from Lake Michigan as part of the Central Brown County Water Authority.

In Appendix A of the Comprehensive Plan, documentation from the Public Visioning Session, there are many issues listed that have been addressed since the publication of the Comprehensive Plan. The following should receive a statement that recognizes they have been addressed:

- **Issue 1:** “Need to solve the drinking water problem in the Village”
The Village solved the drinking water problem by obtaining Lake Michigan water from the Water Authority.
- **Issue 3:** “Create a safer community through crime prevention programs and additional policing”
Two directed enforcement officers have been added for additional protection.
- **Issue 6:** “Create better urban space/more Village identity- Village center with new Village Hall”. The hall has been built.
- **Issue 8:** “Increase shared services with other jurisdictions”
The Village has developed service agreements with other jurisdictions for use of water and is currently working towards joint fire/rescue services.
- **Issue 16:** “Village needs emergency/disaster plan”
The Village adopted an emergency disaster plan along with Brown County.
- **Issue 17:** “Not enough sidewalks-unsafe to walk (ex. Riverside Drive)”
Sidewalks have been added on Allouez Avenue and Riverside Drive so far. The Village is working to increase sidewalk capacity.
- **Issue 44:** “Allouez should have a library”
Village of Allouez residents now have access to the Kress Library in De Pere.

There is also clarification needed within Appendix A in order for the Village to act according to its goals set forth in the Comprehensive Plan. Issue 20 states, “maintain existing zoning”; however, in order to “promote business-friendly attitude” as Issue 11 and the Comprehensive Plan as a whole suggests, it may be necessary to rezone areas of the Village. Issue 36 says that the Village would like to “monitor increasing commercialization”. This statement makes it unclear as to what is expected. It seems to contradict the desire to increase business in Allouez.

The items in Appendix A that have not yet been addressed and those that the Village would like to continue improving should be re-evaluated and ranked in order of

importance or necessity. New items could be added to Table 1. Table 1 is a suggested updated list that may be better suited for the current condition of Allouez as described in the Comprehensive Plan:

RANKPOINTS	ISSUE
1	Build a stronger tax base through future development. Keep tax rate low.
2	Promote business-friendly attitude.
3	Promote effective management of traffic problems.
4	Reduce reliance on the autos by improving mass transit, pedestrian walkways, and bike facilities.
5	Keep business area compatible with residences, be flexible.
6	Make better use of existing waterfront.
7	Village should continue its excellent snow removal, garbage collection, fire/rescue, and other services.
8	Need better zoning enforcement (boats, vehicles, trailers) and resident information.
9	Connect Streets better with Fox River Trail, address these safety and access issues.
10	Look for additional ways across the two rivers.
11	Need bike lanes on streets.
12	Create neighborhood districts.
13	Increase lighting in residential areas to improve pedestrian travel.
14	Promote gathering places in the Village.
15	Retain the existing green space of the Village.
16	Promote commercial activity on Libal Street.
17	Provide more passive opportunities in parks: picnic areas, restrooms.
18	Preserve Allouez as a residential community that is quaint and homey.
19	Address declining housing stock while encouraging residents to repair and maintain their homes.
20	Traffic calming needed to reduce vehicle speeds.

21	Encourage resource conservation, waste reduction, and recycling.
22	Support locally owned businesses.
23	Improve and maintain underground utilities.
24	Need more yard waste pickup days.
25	Address aging municipal buildings.
26	Maintain existing housing stock.
27	Need a grocery store in the center of the Village.
28	Zoning regulations should be simplified to encourage upkeep, especially improvements.
29	Address abandoned properties.
30	Find ways to expand the YMCA.
31	Allocate time and equipment better for Village employees.

Adjustments to the Classifications for the Land Use Categories

Since there is no longer agricultural land in the Village, there is no need to have it represented in the Comprehensive Plan. It should be removed. This update would be observable when a new Future Land Use Map is created.

While there is a small amount of industrial land in the Village, it will not be expanded. Since the total area of land is limited and it should be transitioned to a different land use category in the Comprehensive Plan. This update would be observable when a new Future Land Use Map is created.

On page 24 of the comprehensive plan it shows Government/Institutional uses as one category. People understand parks, but they may not understand that cemeteries and other religious uses are grouped with Village facilities. Since this category is hard to understand and it represents 24.5% of the land use, it should be broken into its various parts in some way. It may be beneficial to explain to the community what uses are occupying the non-taxable lands. This update would be observable when a new Future Land Use Map is created.

There is currently a classification on the land use map titled, “Woodlands, Wetlands, and Undeveloped Open Space.” This category should be removed. This could easily be incorporated into the “open space/fallow fields” or “parks and recreation” classifications. These two categories could be further simplified by creating one “Parks/Recreation/Open Space category. This update would be observable when a new Future Land Use Map is created.

Zoning ordinance Updates

The class identified numerous updates that should take place through the compare and contrast method used. In the examples below, the Comprehensive Plan or Subdivision Ordinance is cited and then the method of fixing the Zoning Ordinance is provided. The intent to create compliance is expressed while the exact text is not. The writing of zoning district text was not part of the purview of the original class request. It is also outside of the class capabilities.

Subdivision Ordinance- Currently, Allouez uses the Brown County Subdivision Ordinance for governing its subdivisions. The subdivision ordinance should include more specific instructions on how the right-of-way should be divided up between vehicles, bike, and pedestrian facilities that more closely align with the recommendations in the comp plan. The subdivision ordinance can be found at http://www.co.brown.wi.us/i/f/county_clerk/chap021-updated_2-16-09.pdf.

Zoning Ordinance- The ordinance calls for a fifty- (50) foot right-of-way for local streets and larger right-of-ways for collectors and arterials [21.61(11)]. In addition, the Brown County Subdivision Ordinance conflicts with the Village's street and sidewalk code. There needs to be more clarification on which code is being used.

Comprehensive Plan- On page 63 of the Comprehensive Plan it states, "The parking areas of streets should be defined by curb extensions at many of the Village's intersections, and extensions should also be placed at other points along long uninterrupted blocks. The curb extensions will prohibit drivers from using the parking lanes as passing or turning lanes at intersections and encourage people to drive slowly when parked vehicles are not present. The curb extensions will also minimize pedestrian crossing distances at the Village's intersections."

Zoning Ordinance- The Village currently does not address curb extensions in their Street and Sidewalk Code (Chapter 3).

Comprehensive Plan- On page 63 of the Comprehensive Plan it states, "The Village should utilize street design techniques that reduce vehicle speeds, minimize the possibility of conflicts, and enhance traveler awareness to maximize pedestrian, bicyclist, and motorist safety and accessibility at the Village's intersections. Techniques that should be used include roundabouts, curb extensions at intersections, and other street design features."

Zoning Ordinance- Along with being added to Chapter 3 of the Municipal Code, further detail should be added to clarify what is expect of reconstructed streets.

Comprehensive Plan- On page 65 of the Comprehensive Plan it states, "As commercial and other truck-generating land uses are mixed into various parts of the Village over the next 20 years, the Village should consider identifying streets where heavy trucks are allowed to travel. Once this system is identified, the Village should mark the truck routes with street signs that distinguish them from the other Village streets."

Zoning Ordinance- This should be developed further in Chapter 3 as well. The Village of Ashwaubenon currently employs a system similar to the needs to the Village of Allouez. Ashwaubenon uses yellow colored street signs to signify a route that heavy trucks may travel on. This could be used in Allouez.

Comprehensive Plan- On page 99 of the Comprehensive Plan it states that “there is a great demand for telecommunications.”

Zoning Ordinance- The zoning ordinance (Sections 11.27, A and 11.27, C, 9) enforces powerful restrictions on the development of further telecommunication infrastructure. To build a strong business base, Allouez should find methods to promote modern telecommunications. Restrictions could be loosened, design guidelines created, or towers could be constructed on Village property with the goal of creating revenue for the Village.

Many telecommunications companies are also eager to work with municipal officials to strengthen coverage for their customers. It may take some negotiating, but quality telecommunication facilities can be built that are nearly invisible to the general public. It will also bolster economic development efforts that hinge on those facilities to be successful.

Zoning Ordinance- Chapter 11.46, page 46 of the zoning ordinance discusses the handicapped community. The wording of this section is almost accusatory and is offensive. It gives the impression that handicap accommodations are a burden to the Village. For more positive language, a possible rewrite would be: “A person with a handicap or disability is entitled to the same accommodations as non-handicapped or disabled people.”

Comprehensive Plan- On page 138 of the Comprehensive Plan it states, “...many of Allouez residents told Planning Department staff that the wall that faces Webster Avenue is unattractive” (in reference to the prison).

Zoning Ordinance- The plan suggests painting a mural to make the wall more visually appealing. The zoning ordinance makes no mention of murals and does not clearly state whether a mural is considered a sign. A suggestion would be to amend the zoning ordinance to include a section on murals. This should be located within the signage section of the Zoning Ordinance.

Comprehensive Plan- On page 26 and 70-71, there is discussion of light industrial uses. It states that additional industrial uses should not be developed over the next 20 years.

Zoning Ordinance- The zoning ordinance (11.11, Light Industrial District, A, 6, pages 29-33) gives a very detailed list of uses not allowed. This is quite excessive. Since the Comprehensive Plan states that there is no intention of further industrial development, the zoning ordinance section pertaining to this could be condensed. A list of allowable uses is sufficient.

Zoning Ordinance- In Section 11.08, D, 1, it states that lots with attached garages may have accessory buildings on the lot if they are less than a cumulative 700 square feet

and only if the garage is 528 square feet or larger. Section 11.08, D, 2, states that lots with detached garages may not have a cumulative square footage of accessory buildings, including the garage, of larger than 1,020 square feet. This means that lots with garages attached are allowed to have 208 more square feet than a lot with a detached garage.

Our recommendation would be to provide each style of garage with a unified amount of square footage. This allows for less confusing zoning regulations, and also allows homeowners to choose what style they prefer without limiting their square footage.

Zoning Ordinance- The addition of a section dedicated to mixed-use developments is necessary to the zoning ordinance. It is a major theme of the Comprehensive Plan, yet is not addressed well in the zoning ordinance. While “C” Professional Office and Residential Districts do allow multi-use development, it is very restrictive. A section describing mixed-use developments would be beneficial for the economic development of the Village.

Setbacks Recommendations

Setback requirements play a large part of mixed-use development. Mixed-use development is about creating and fostering a sense of community. Placing a distance between the sidewalks and the building fronts decreases the sense of place. It also creates a perceived barrier or boundary to the public. This does not create a draw to explore on the part of customers that is vital in commercial or mixed-use areas.

- **Section 11.08 C. 1. page 23** states that *“every lot in a “C” Professional Office and Residential District shall have a front yard with a depth of 30 feet”*.

This requirement should be reassessed to possibly allow zero lot line development. Zero lot line development allows “hiding” parking behind the building or to the side of the building.

- **Section 11.08 C. 2. page 23** states that *“every lot in a “C” Professional Office and Residential District shall have two side yards, one on each side of the principal building, with the setback being no less than 10 feet on each side. Each of the proceeding side yard setback stipulations requires a setback of no less than 10 feet except in the instance of a zero foot setback of a duplex”*.

This requirement should be minimized or eliminated with the exception of lots abutting a residential lot.

- **Section 11.08 C. 3. pg. 25** states that *“every lot in a “C” Professional Office and Residential District shall have a rear yard depth of not less than 20 percent of the depth of the lot; provided that such rear yard shall not be required to exceed 30 feet in depth, but shall not in any case be less than 15 feet in depth”*.

This requirement should be minimized or eliminated with the exception of lots abutting a residential lot.

- **Section 11.09 D.1. page 27** states that *“every lot in a High Rise District shall have a front yard with a depth of not less than 75 feet, plus an addition one foot of depth for*

every 10 feet the building height exceeds 40 feet; interior side yards of not less than 50 feet in width, plus an addition one foot of depth for every 10 feet the building height exceeds 40 feet; a corner side yard with a depth of not less than 75 feet, plus an addition one foot of depth for every 10 feet the building height exceeds 40 feet; and rear yard of not less than 30 feet in depth. The rear 25 feet of every lot shall be sodded and landscaped”.

Setback requirements should be reduced to allow for implementation of this type of district. This district should be addressed during a rewrite of the Zoning Ordinance.

- **Section 11.10 D. 1. page 28** states that *“every lot in a Commercial District shall have a front yard with a depth of not less than 25 feet with the maximum variation being 6 feet”.*

This requirement should be minimized with the exception of lots abutting a residential lot. This requirement should be reassessed to possibly allow zero lot line development. Zero lot line development allows “hiding” parking behind the building or to the side of the building.

- **Section 11.10 D. 2. page 29** states *“that in a Commercial District every side yard shall of a width not less than (a.) 6 feet when abutted by a residence district, (b.) 6 feet, and (c.) 15 feet on the street side of corner lots”.*

This requirement should be minimized with the exception of lots abutting a residential lot. This requirement should be reassessed to possibly allow zero lot line development. Zero lot line development allows “hiding” parking behind the building or to the side of the building.

- **Section 11.10 D. 3. page 29** states that *“in a Commercial District every lot shall have a rear yard with a depth of not less than 6 feet, except that if the rear of the lot abuts a lot in a residential district, the rear yard shall be not less than 10 feet in depth”.*

This requirement should be minimized with the exception of lots abutting a residential lot. This requirement should be reassessed to possibly allow zero lot line development. Zero lot line development allows “hiding” parking behind the building or to the side of the building.

- **Section 11.12 C. 2. page 35** states that *“in a Highway Business Use District every lot shall have a side yard with a depth of not less than 6 feet, except when on a corner lot, in which side facing street shall be not less than 15 feet”.*

The setback requirements should be minimized. This requirement should be minimized with the exception of lots abutting a residential lot. This requirement should be reassessed to possibly allow zero lot line development. Zero lot line development allows “hiding” parking behind the building or to the side of the building.

An example of positive setback use is Sconnie’s Pub on Riverside Drive. The unobstructed entrance to this building is inviting to automobile users and pedestrians

alike. The parking is located on the rear and side of the building, which allows for the minimal setback from the right-of-way.

Lox Stock N Bagel on Webster Avenue has a large required setback with parking in the front of the building. This creates a perceived barrier between the visitor and the building. Minimal setbacks increase accessibility, which is highly desired for all mixed-use areas.

Village Suggestions

Throughout this report, we have made recommendations of actions that could be taken. The following points are suggestions from an implementation standpoint, rather than a technical fix to a document. Some include helpful resources, while others offer alternative options to problems.

One important governmental relationship Allouez has is with the Green Bay Public School District. Allouez does not have its own school district, so residents attend Green Bay Public Schools. According to the Comprehensive Plan on pages 131-133, distances and driving times to school are a concern for Allouez residents. Those that live south of STH 172 attend Southwest High and Lombardi Middle, on the far southwest side of Green Bay, being particularly inconvenient to residents. Although De Pere schools would make the most geographic sense for student relocation, this is deemed infeasible because DePere has capacity constraints.

The solution to this would be to redraw district boundaries. Since De Pere schools are already at capacity, Allouez should look into shifting some students to the Ashwaubenon school district. Ashwaubenon is experiencing declining enrollments, so they should have the room to accommodate more students. Ashwaubenon High and Parkview Middle School are located just over the STH 172 Bridge from Allouez and provides a closer location for Allouez student.

The Village would like to improve their existing businesses and attract new businesses that are in compliance with the residential character of the community (page 69). On page 74, Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) are mentioned as an option to create economic development, but there are no specific details on the types of businesses wanted. With the current broad explanation of the types of businesses the Village hopes to attract, it is difficult to create a vision for the future.

Along with this, the Village would like to attract a younger, more diverse crowd. To do this, amenities and activities for a younger population are needed. Shops, cafes, modern bars, and open public space are all things that will attract a younger crowd to Allouez, and these things should be taken in consideration while developing what types of businesses are wanted in the Village's vision for the future.

On page 71 of the Comprehensive Plan it states, "The Village has had a strong history of requiring exceptional design from developers who want to construct commercial buildings on the limited amount of vacant property that exists in the Village." This paragraph goes on to describe a way to achieve this through the Planned Development District (PDD). These PDD areas are for commercial uses, yet the newly constructed high-end assisted living facility located on the corner of Libal Street and St. Joseph

Street is on a lot zoned PDD. This is an example of how land use could have been used more functionally by holding out for a project that fit the Villages land use goals. This is a common trap for many communities. On the one hand, they feel a necessity to allow a project to proceed in order to reap whatever benefits are perceived to follow from a project. On the other hand, the community will give up the possibility of a much better project should they choose to properly market and regulate the desired land use. To further economic development, PDD zones should include commercial uses.

As economic development is important to the Village, we have suggested a possible development option. On the Allouez-De Pere border sits the site of Minahan Stadium, the former stadium for St. Norbert College. This plot of land is between North Broadway and Webster Avenue, and south of Roselawn Boulevard. The Allouez portion of this land is zoned "A" Residence District. The majority of the De Pere portion has a zoning of Institutional/ Governmental, except the northwest corner where the stadium has a land use of Natural Area/Woodlands. This large piece of land appears to be ideal for development due to its location between busy thoroughfares. Allouez and De Pere should work together to possibly create a shared mixed use business park. This ideally would bring in commercial development to the community and attract people to the Village.

Throughout the Comprehensive Plan, there is discussion of creating the community's identity, the utilization of design standards, and emphasis on historic preservation. We are recommending the creation of the Community Identity Advisory Committee. This committee will be in charge of reviewing projects related to the community's identity.

This committee would have an important say in three main components: 1. Historical Preservation, 2. Design Guidelines, and 3. Signage. Each of these duties and responsibilities require detailed descriptions with the support of the Zoning and Planning Committee and the Village Board. This committee would balance community's identity with innovation.

Though there are many conflicting ideas between the Comprehensive Plan and the zoning ordinance, there are many solutions available. Consistency between the two documents is not only for compliance with the law, but also to strengthen the community as a whole. Removal of the discrepancies in turn creates a more in-depth vision of what the Village of Allouez hopes to achieve in the future.

Appendix A

I. General

- a. All signs shall be reviewed by the site plan review committee. Signage shall be limited to name, corporate logo, and address only. Identity ground and wall signs shall have a length to width ratio of 3:1. Lighting, although not required, shall be internal illumination, and intensity shall not exceed one foot-candle at the centerline of any public right-of-way.
- b. No sign shall be so located as to restrict the sight lines and orderly operations and traffic movement within any parking lot.
- c. No sign shall be located closer than four (4) feet from any property line.
- d. Signs may be illuminated but shall not be moving, flashing, blinking, or fluctuating.

II. Identity Ground Sign

- a. An identity ground sign is allowed in all business and industrial districts within the village. It may be two-sided and not closer than four (4) feet from the property line.
- b. The height should not exceed eight feet when placed at least fifteen (15) feet away from any driveway. Signs within fifteen (15) feet of a driveway may not exceed three (3) feet. The maximum square footage for identity signs is seventy-five (75) square feet.

III. Wall Signs

- a. Background area of wall signs shall not exceed thirty (30) percent of the building face or four (4) square feet per lineal foot of the elevation upon which they are placed, whichever is greater. On buildings greater than twenty thousand (20,000) square feet, wall signs shall have a rectangle space of a maximum of eight (8) feet in height and ten (10) percent of the building facade. All other signs on property may not exceed seventy-five (75) square feet for each sign and not exceed five hundred (500) square feet of signage per parcel.
- b. Wall signs shall be fixture signs that are architecturally compatible with the building design. Signs painted on walls or projecting more than twelve (12) inches from a wall are prohibited. A rendering, drawn to scale and showing the wall where it is proposed shall be submitted as part of the site planning process. The SPRC shall review and approve the proposed wall sign or logo.

IV. Information Signs

- a. Informational signs are allowed in all districts as needed. Such signs shall not exceed eight (8) square feet in size.

V. Prohibited Signs

- a. The following signs are prohibited in the Village of Allouez: motion signs; roof signs; projecting signs (greater than twelve (12) inches); flashing signs;
- b. Obsolete signs; unsafe or dangerous signs; signs and/or posters attached to trees, fences, utility poles, or other such permanent supports' signs painted on walls or fences; and banners, pennants, whirling devices, and balloons and/or other apparatus resembling the same.