APPENDIX A

COMMUNITY PROFILE

AND

POPULATION STATISTICS

Table A-1

NUMBER OF PERSONS BY AGE AND SEX - 1970

Age Group	Male	Female	Total Persons	Percent of Total
Under 5	438	420	858	6.39
5	116	115	231	1.72
6	105	120	225	1.67
7- 9	392	431	823	6.13
10-13	604	671	1,275	9.49
14	160	140	300	2.23
15	169	144	313	2.33
16-17	301	269	570	4.24
18	103	94	197	1.47
19	86	66	152	1.13
20	72	74	146	1.09
21-24	200	222	422	3.14
25-34	521	657	1,178	8.77
35-44	884	975	1,859	13.84
45-54	940	984	1,924	14.32
55-59	406	378	784	5.84
60-61	131	113	244	1.82
62-64	158	171	329	2.45
65-74	393	440	833	6.20
75 & Over	253	520	773	5.75
Total	6,432	7,004	13,436	100.00

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

Table A-2

NUMBER OF PERSONS 14 YEARS OLD AND OVER
BY MARITAL STATUS AND SEX - 1960 AND 1970

	Males		Females	
	1960	1970	1960	1970
Married and Separated	2,522	3,278	2,524	3,303
Widowed and Divorced	96	279	309	850
Never Married	670	1,220	501	1,095
Total	3,288	4,777	3,324	5,247
Now Married		3,268		3,274
Widowed		207		735
Divorced		72		115
Separated		10		28
Never Married		1,220		1,095
Total		4,777		5,247

	Total Persons		Change 1960-1970	
	1960	1970	Number	Percent
Married and Separated	5,046	6,580	1,534	30.40
Widowed and Divorced	405	1,129	724	178.77
Never Married	1,171	2,315	1,144	97.69
Total	6,622	10,024	3,402	51.37
Now Married		6,542		
Widowed		942		
Divorced		187		
Separated		38		
Never Married		2,315		
Total		10,024		

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

Table A-3

NUMBER OF PERSONS BY HOUSEHOLD RELATIONSHIP - 1970

Household Relationship	Number of Persons
Family Head of Husband-Wife Household	3,151
Family Head of Household With Other Male Head	56
Family Head of Household with Female Head	183
Wife of Head	3,151
Other Relative of Head	5,764
Male Primary Individual	88
Female Primary Individual	232
Nonrelative of Head of Household (Includes Boarder)	98
Inmate of Institution	710
Other in Group Quarters	3
Total	13,436

Table A-4

NUMBER OF OWNER-OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS BY VALUE - 1970

Value	Number of Housing Units	Percent of Total
Less than $5,000		.00
$5,000 to $9,999	13	.42
$10,000 to $14,999	53	1.70
$15,000 to $19,999	332	10.66
$20,000 to $24,999	634	20.35
$25,000 to $34,999	1,027	32.97
$35,000 to $49,999	721	23.15
$50,000 or More	335	10.75
Total	3,115	100.00

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

Table A-5

NUMBER OF HOUSING UNITS BY MONTHLY CONTRACT RENT FOR RENTER-OCCUPIED UNITS - 1970

Cash Rent	Number of Housing Units	Percent of Total
Less than $40	15	3.55
$40 to $59	13	3.07
$60 to $79	42	9.93
$80 to $99	68	16.08
$100 to $119	73	17.26
$120 to $149	104	24.59
$150 to $199	35	8.27
$200 to $299	68	16.08
$300 or More	5	1.18
Total	423	100.00

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

Table A-6

OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS BY TENURE
BY TYPE OF HOUSEHOLD AND AGE OF HEAD - 1970

City of Glendale, Milwaukee County, Wisconsin

Type of Household and Age of Head	Owner Occupied	Percent of Total	Renter Occupied	Percent of Total
Husband-Wife Family				
Under 25 years	23	.71	39	8.23
25 - 29 Years	76	2.35	60	12.66
30 - 34 Years	204	6.30	54	11.39
35 - 44 Years	788	24.35	42	8.86
45 - 64 Years	1,409	43.54	101	21.31
65 and Over	317	9.80	38	8.02
In Other Family With Male Head				
Under 65 Years	32	.99	7	1.48
65 and Over	14	.43	3	.63
In Family With Female Head				
Under 65 Years	117	3.62	29	6.12
65 and Over	35	1.08	2	.42
Male Primary Individual	62	1.92	26	5.49
Female Primary Individual	159	4.91	73	15.40
Total	3,236	100.00	474	100.00

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

Table A-7

YEAR MOVED INTO UNIT (15 PERCENT)

Year	Number of Persons	Percent of Total
1969-1970	1,465	10.90
1968	1,268	9.44
1967	1,064	7.92
1965-1966	1,708	12.71
1960-1964	3,697	27.52
1950-1959	3,139	23.36
1949 or Earlier	547	4.07
Always Lived Here	548	4.08
Total	13,436	100.00

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

Table A-8

POPULATION 16 YEARS OLD AND OVER BY LABOR FORCE STATUS, SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS, AND SEX

City of Glendale, Milwaukee County, Wisconsin

Category	Male	Female	Total
In Armed Forces	5		5
In Labor Force			
Employed	3,454	1,956	5,410
Unemployed	53	68	121
Not in Labor Force			
Under 65			
Inmate	57	30	87
Enrolled in School	225	313	538
Other	110	1,744	1,854
65 and Over			
Inmate	192	406	598
Enrolled in School		5	5
Other	314	469	783
Total Not in Labor Force	898	2,967	3,865

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

Table A-9

EMPLOYED POPULATION 14 YEARS OLD AND OVER
BY OCCUPATION AND SEX

City of Glendale, Milwaukee County, Wisconsin

Occupation	Male	Percent of Total	Female	Percent of Total	Total	Percent of Total
Professional, Technical and Kindred Workers	740	21.14	299	15.13	1,039	18.97
Managers, Administrators Except Farm	663	18.94	62	3.14	725	13.24
Sales Workers	409	11.68	226	11.44	635	11.59
Clerical and Kindred Workers	171	4.88	778	39.37	949	17.33
Craftsmen, Foremen and Kindred Workers	632	18.05	21	1.06	653	11.92
Operatives, Except Transport	268	7.65	146	7.39	414	7.56
Transport Equipment Operatives	111	3.17		.00	111	2.03
Labor, Except Farm	163	4.66	10	.51	173	3.16
Farmers and Farm Managers	22	.63		.00	22	.40
Farm Laborers and Foremen	12	.34	28	1.42	40	.73
Service Workers, Except Private Household	251	7.17	262	13.26	513	9.37
Private Household Workers	4	.11	73	3.69	77	1.41
Occupation Not Reported	55	1.57	71	3.59	126	2.30
Total	3,501	100.00	1,976	100.00	5,477	100.00

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

Table A-10

FAMILY INCOME

City of Glendale, Milwaukee County, Wisconsin

Income Range	Number of Families	Percent of Total
Under $1,000 (Includes $1 - $999, None, and Loss)	14	.41
$ 1,000 - $ 1,999	14	.41
$ 2,000 - $ 2,999	50	1.47
$ 3,000 - $ 3,999	41	1.20
$ 4,000 - $ 4,999	93	2.73
$ 5,000 - $ 5,999	65	1.91
$ 6,000 - $ 6,999	101	2.96
$ 7,000 - $ 7,999	108	3.17
$ 8,000 - $ 8,999	131	3.84
$ 9,000 - $ 9,999	168	4.93
$10,000 - $11,999	388	11.38
$12,000 - $14,999	691	20.27
$15,000 - $24,999	991	29.07
$25,000 - $49,999	447	13.11
$50,000 and Over	107	3.14
Total	3,409	100.00
Median $14,310		

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

Table A-11

COUNTRY OF ORIGIN AND NATIVITY OF THE FOREIGN STOCK
(15 PERCENT)

City of Glendale, Milwaukee County, Wisconsin

Country	Native of Foreign or Mixed Parentage	Foreign Born	Total	Percent of Total
United Kingdom	126	51	177	4.88
Ireland	20		20	.55
Norway	78	7	85	2.34
Sweden	40	5	45	1.24
Denmark	60	20	80	2.20
Netherlands	18		18	.50
Switzerland	20	13	33	.91
France	7	7	14	.39
Germany	904	212	1,116	30.74
Poland	334	60	394	10.85
Czechoslovakia	83		83	2.29
Austria	106	8	114	3.14
Hungary	63	50	113	3.11
Yugoslavia	79	28	107	2.95
U.S.S.R.	380	27	407	11.21
Lithuania	29	6	35	.96
Finland	18		18	.50
Romania	48	13	61	1.68
Greece	17		17	.47
Italy	235	34	269	7.41
Portugal				.00
Other Europe	14	36	50	1.38
Southwest Asia	38	17	55	1.52
China		13	13	.36
Japan	13	11	24	.66
Other Asia	60	32	92	2.53
Canada	49	33	82	2.26
Mexico	18	6	24	.66
Cuba				.00
Other America	20	12	32	.88
Africa				.00
All Other				.00
Not Reported	45	7	52	1.43
Total	2,922	708	3,630	100.00

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

APPENDIX B

RESIDENT AND BUSINESS ATTITUDE SURVEY ANALYSIS

Appendix B

RESIDENT AND BUSINESS ATTITUDE SURVEY ANALYSIS

A questionnaire was sent to 25 percent of the residents and 25 percent of the businesses and industries in Glendale to determine the views and opinions of Glendale citizens (see following for complete results). The response to the questionnaire was excellent with over 40 percent of the residents surveyed responding to the Resident Attitude Survey and 30 percent of the businesses responding to the Business and Industry Survey. Most respondents indicated they enjoyed Glendale. Many of the businesses liked the atmosphere of Glendale and indicated a desire to remain in Glendale.

Resident Attitude Survey

The Respondent

Although the survey covered a wide range of people, some general conclusions can be drawn about the sample. The male head of the household selected the responses in almost 70 percent of the survey returns. They indicated that they have resided in Glendale for at least five years and prior to moving to Glendale had lived in the Milwaukee area. This indicates that there is long-term residency in Glendale. Most of the respondents are employed in Milwaukee County and they commute to work by private auto. The type of work that the respondent is employed in varies from manufacturing to personal services, and the location of employment for most of the residents is in Milwaukee County.

Neighborhood Conditions

The residents were asked to indicate various problems in their neighborhood rating each physical facility as to whether or not it needs improvement and to what extent it needed to be improved. Many of the residents were pleased with their neighborhoods and the services offered in them. Only a few items were mentioned as either needing much improvement or completely inadequate or unsatisfactory. The inadequacies mentioned most frequently were public transportation, library facilities and pet control. Many of the facilities need some improvement which serves as a guide to setting goals for the community.

Shopping Facilities

Most of the respondents indicated they shopped in Glendale at least twice a week and many said they shopped in Glendale nearly every day. Most Glendale shoppers shop at the Bayshore Shopping Center and in Milwaukee. The respondents rated most of the shopping facilities in Glendale and at

Bayshore Shopping Center as either good or excellent for most kinds of shopping while it is lacking in quality in only a few categories such as major appliances, jewelry and movie theatres.

Growth and Housing

The respondents indicated that they would like Glendale to not exceed a certain size. They felt that the appropriate population should be between 13,427 and 17,775 residents. The survey indicated that Glendale is a stable community. This can be seen from the number of people who have lived in and around Glendale for more than five years. When asked what kind of residential development should be encouraged, single-family housing was dominant and they felt multiple-family housing should be discouraged. Many of the respondents indicated that Glendale should encourage more commercial and industrial development.

Summary

The respondents indicated that they enjoyed living in Glendale because of many of its desirable characteristics, such as the City's medium-density population, the small-town atmosphere it possesses and its nearness to the City of Milwaukee. In addition to describing many of Glendale's desirable characteristics, the survey also indicates some less desirable characteristics. Some significant characteristics were the poor storm sewer system, traffic congestion and the outlook of rising taxes.

From these results, goals for the community can be formulated. It is from these beginnings combined with the inventory and analysis and their review by the Plan Commission, Common Council and Citizens Committee, that a Comprehensive Plan may be prepared to reflect the attitudes of the City's residents, businesses and public officials.

1. Circle number that indicates if respondent is:

Male head of household	1	303
Female head of household	2	54
Housewife	3	53
Other adult - Male	4	4
Other adult - Female	5	9

2. Circle number indicating how long your family has lived in Glendale.

Less than 1 year	1	12
1 to 5 years	2	96
6 to 10 years	3	76
11 to 25 years	4	184
Over 25 years	5	33
Always	6	14

Appendix B

RESIDENT AND BUSINESS ATTITUDE SURVEY ANALYSIS

A questionnaire was sent to 25 percent of the residents and 25 percent of the businesses and industries in Glendale to determine the views and opinions of Glendale citizens (see following for complete results). The response to the questionnaire was excellent with over 40 percent of the residents surveyed responding to the Resident Attitude Survey and 30 percent of the businesses responding to the Business and Industry Survey. Most respondents indicated they enjoyed Glendale. Many of the businesses liked the atmosphere of Glendale and indicated a desire to remain in Glendale.

Resident Attitude Survey

The Respondent

Although the survey covered a wide range of people, some general conclusions can be drawn about the sample. The male head of the household selected the responses in almost 70 percent of the survey returns. They indicated that they have resided in Glendale for at least five years and prior to moving to Glendale had lived in the Milwaukee area. This indicates that there is long-term residency in Glendale. Most of the respondents are employed in Milwaukee County and they commute to work by private auto. The type of work that the respondent is employed in varies from manufacturing to personal services, and the location of employment for most of the residents is in Milwaukee County.

Neighborhood Conditions

The residents were asked to indicate various problems in their neighborhood rating each physical facility as to whether or not it needs improvement and to what extent it needed to be improved. Many of the residents were pleased with their neighborhoods and the services offered in them. Only a few items were mentioned as either needing much improvement or completely inadequate or unsatisfactory. The inadequacies mentioned most frequently were public transportation, library facilities and pet control. Many of the facilities need some improvement which serves as a guide to setting goals for the community.

Shopping Facilities

Most of the respondents indicated they shopped in Glendale at least twice a week and many said they shopped in Glendale nearly every day. Most Glendale shoppers shop at the Bayshore Shopping Center and in Milwaukee. The respondents rated most of the shopping facilities in Glendale and at

Bayshore Shopping Center as either good or excellent for most kinds of shopping while it is lacking in quality in only a few categories such as major appliances, jewelry and movie theatres.

Growth and Housing

The respondents indicated that they would like Glendale to not exceed a certain size. They felt that the appropriate population should be between 13,427 and 17,775 residents. The survey indicated that Glendale is a stable community. This can be seen from the number of people who have lived in and around Glendale for more than five years. When asked what kind of residential development should be encouraged, single-family housing was dominant and they felt multiple-family housing should be discouraged. Many of the respondents indicated that Glendale should encourage more commercial and industrial development.

Summary

The respondents indicated that they enjoyed living in Glendale because of many of its desirable characteristics, such as the City's medium-density population, the small-town atmosphere it possesses and its nearness to the City of Milwaukee. In addition to describing many of Glendale's desirable characteristics, the survey also indicates some less desirable characteristics. Some significant characteristics were the poor storm sewer system, traffic congestion and the outlook of rising taxes.

From these results, goals for the community can be formulated. It is from these beginnings combined with the inventory and analysis and their review by the Plan Commission, Common Council and Citizens Committee, that a Comprehensive Plan may be prepared to reflect the attitudes of the City's residents, businesses and public officials.

1. Circle number that indicates if respondent is:

Male head of household	1	303
Female head of household	2	54
Housewife	3	53
Other adult - Male	4	4
Other adult - Female	5	9

2. Circle number indicating how long your family has lived in Glendale.

Less than 1 year	1	12
1 to 5 years	2	96
6 to 10 years	3	76
11 to 25 years	4	184
Over 25 years	5	33
Always	6	14

3. Circle the number indicating where you lived before you came to Glendale.

Milwaukee	1	257
Elsewhere in the Milwaukee area	2	86
Wisconsin, but outside the Milwaukee area	3	19
Illinois	4	7
Upper Michigan	5	–
Minnesota	6	3

4. Indicate how many persons live in this household at the present time.

1	28	6	21
2	140	7	3
3	67	8	2
4	91	9	5
5	59	More	1

5. Indicate how many persons live in this household of school age at the present time.

1	76	6	3
2	64	7	5
3	43	8	0
4	6	9	0
5	3	More	1

6. Does the head of the household work in: (Circle number that applies)

Glendale	1	75
Downtown Milwaukee	2	102
Elsewhere in Milwaukee County	3	128
Waukesha County	4	10
Ozaukee County	5	5
Other (Specify)	6	68

7. How does the head of the household travel to work? (Circle the number that applies.)

Private Auto	1	323
Car Pool	2	18
Freeway Flyer	3	9
Other Public Transportation	4	4
Walk	5	7
Other (Specify)	6	9

8. Please indicate the number of other employed persons in your household that work in the following areas:

Glendale	95
Downtown Milwaukee	47
Elsewhere in Milwaukee County	105
Waukesha County	4
Ozaukee County	4
Other (Specify)	10

9. Please indicate the number of other employed persons in your household that use each of the following means of travel to work:

Private Auto	230
Car Pool	21
Freeway Flyer	8
Other Public Transportation	2
Walk	11
Other (Specify)	9

10. In which type of business or industry are they employed?

	Head of Household	Number of Other Persons
Agriculture	3	0
Education	25	41
Construction	23	7
Manufacturing	102	41
Transportation, Communication	34	15
Wholesale and Retail Trade	40	35
Finance, Insurance and Real Estate	25	10
Business and Repair Services	15	14
Personal Services	52	43
Entertainment and Recreation	1	5
Public Administration	11	10
Arts	2	3

11. How many miles do they travel to work:

Miles	Head of Household	Number of Other Persons
0- 2	57	65
3-10	176	128
11-20	51	26
over 20	27	4

12. People are often concerned about various problems in their neighborhood. For each item listed below, would you rate it by checking the appropriate blank as "Needing No Improvement", "Needing Some Improvement", "Needing Much Improvement", or "Completely Inadequate or Unsatisfactory".

	Needs no Improvement	Needs Some Improvement	Needs Much Improvement	Completely Inadequate or Unsatisfactory	Don't Know
a. Shopping facilities	182	165	34	9	4
b. Public transportation	81	118	108	70	25
c. Adult education opportunities	277	90	12	4	35
d. Elementary and junior high schools	232	72	30	8	45
e. Senior high schools	234	75	19	2	51
f. College	189	40	13	8	101
g. Parks and playgrounds	237	97	27	13	18
h. Health facilities, hospital, clinics	244	93	28	5	20
i. Library facilities	122	106	72	77	35
j. Police protection	253	101	19	6	15
k. Fire protection	275	74	7	3	32
l. Control of juvenile delinquency	70	185	74	19	52

	Needs no Improvement	Needs Some Improvement	Needs Much Improvement	Completely Inadequate or Unsatisfactory	Don't Know
m. Control of traffic	162	159	50	9	17
n. Care or upkeep of properties	159	181	30	12	14
o. Control of air pollution	101	150	56	6	60
p. Pet control	88	150	101	37	21
q. Sanitation, trash, garbage disposal	287	83	14	4	5
r. Street repair	168	175	38	6	12
s. Organized activities and facilities for children	179	98	31	3	70
t. Street lighting	178	153	43	19	9
u. Organized activities and facilities for teenagers	99	215	61	12	9
v. Snow removal	265	111	17	2	6
w. Organized activities and facilities for adults	197	103	14	5	63
x. Sidewalks	251	64	14	28	23
y. Your Neighborhood	187	148	19	7	3

13. How often does your family shop in Glendale?

Nearly every day	107
3 or 4 times a week	145
1 or 2 times a week	131
Less than once a week	21

14. Where did you last purchase or obtain the following:

	Bayshore	Other Glendale	Milwaukee	Fox Point	North Ridge	Whitefish Bay	Other (Specify)
Dress	153	14	68	1	52	23	22
Suit	124	35	102	3	44	33	24
Shoes	127	19	118	5	64	38	25
Coat	140	11	109	6	47	27	20
Food	215	119	32	22	4	5	5
Restaurant	69	119	114	15	13	4	37
T.V.	27	38	238	1	5	4	29
Appliance	118	26	206	0	9	1	18
Furniture	29	10	260	2	5	0	39
Automobile	18	88	206	2	1	0	63
Medical	32	128	186	0	1	18	25
Legal	9	17	256	2	0	7	30
Dental	37	82	164	8	4	50	47

15. How do you rate Glendale and Bayshore (located in Glendale) on these kinds of shopping?

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Major appliance	43	128	140	58
Men's wear	77	182	101	23
Women's wear	67	194	100	25
Children's wear	65	189	64	25
Shoes	67	165	112	38
Jewelry	44	135	113	48
Liquor	108	193	62	14
Hardware	121	182	67	23
Drugs	122	164	62	31
Movie theaters	19	68	66	181
Children's recreation	69	122	75	50
Teenage recreation	48	106	97	56
Adult recreation	74	138	90	39
Family recreation	57	129	101	36
Restaurants	78	161	113	30
Groceries	202	151	36	6

16. Which of the following are you or your family members interested in doing or watching?

Swimming	251	Roller Skating	78
Golf	168	Ice Hockey	154
Bowling	208	Basketball	152
Camping	83	Pleasure Driving	194
Baseball	157	Skiing	248
Hunting	70	Tennis (outdoor)	216
Horse Riding	87	Tennis (indoor)	96
Boating	130	Hiking	120
Fishing	173	Rifle and Skeet	41
Polo	32	Archery	38
Softball	107	Ice Skating	154
Hobby and Crafts	174	Football	215
Canoeing	61	Soccer	36
Bicycling	13	Water Skiing	2
Other (Specify)	0		

17. What recreation facilities or activities do you feel are needed?

Swimming	102	Ice Hockey	21
Golf	38	Basketball	29
Bowling	69	Pleasure Driving	26
Baseball	24	Teenage Club	92
Horse Riding	57	Tennis (outdoor)	55
Roller Skating	36	Tennis (indoor)	30
Archery	11	Hiking	31
Ice Skating	61	Canoeing	29
Football	19	Rifle and Skeet	31
Playgrounds	62	Fishing	50
Polo	2	Softball	20
Hobby and Crafts	67	Library	162
Soccer	13	Bike Trail	7
Other (Specify)	0		

18. According to the 1970 Census figures, the population of Glendale was 13,426. In 1974, a land use survey was conducted which showed Glendale with 10 percent of the land (375 acres) vacant, and 31 percent (1,160 acres) of the land in residential use. Do you think Glendale should become a City of a certain size?

Yes	No
208	128

Please circle the appropriate population size.

13,426	63
13,427 - 17,775	181
17,776 - 22,050	41
22,051 - 26,550	11
Over 26,551	8

19. Please circle the classification as to how well you are informed about municipal activities in Glendale.

Very Well	Well	Average	Not Well	Poorly
49	97	194	52	10

20. Do you read the Glendale Newsletter?

Yes	No
341	29

21. Do you think Glendale should:

	Yes	No
Encourage more single-family houses?	340	43
Encourage more rental multiple-family units?	42	283
Encourage more condominium multiple-family units?	55	272
Encourage more multiple-family units for young people?	55	261
Encourage more multiple-family units for elderly people?	161	176
Encourage more commercial development?	219	126
Encourage more industry?	254	98

22. What are Glendale's most urgent problems?

Sewer and pumping problems
No library
Insufficient public transportation
Limit multi-family units
Keep taxes low
Control stray pets
Keep children off street
Provide hot school lunch program
Need a master plan
Need bicycle paths
Better traffic control
Control drugs in high school

23. What are Glendale's five most important assets?

Schools
Local Government
City Services
Nice residential character
Parks
Industry
Low taxes
Lack of apartments
Closeness to Milwaukee
Shopping
Nice People
Senior Citizen Club
Good trash collection

24. What feature of Glendale do you DISLIKE the most?

Insufficient sidewalks and bike paths
Stray animals
No hot lunch program in schools
Lack of city planning
Poor sewer system
Traffic on North Green Bay Road and North Port Washington Road
Limited public transportation
Too many apartments
No Post Office
Poor flood control

25. What feature of Glendale do you LIKE the most?

Low taxes
Good city services
Nice residential areas
Close to Milwaukee
Parks
Good shopping
Nice size
Good schools
Responsive city government
Nice people

19. Please circle the classification as to how well you are informed about municipal activities in Glendale.

Very Well	Well	Average	Not Well	Poorly
49	97	194	52	10

20. Do you read the Glendale Newsletter?

Yes	No
341	29

21. Do you think Glendale should:

	Yes	No
Encourage more single-family houses?	340	43
Encourage more rental multiple-family units?	42	283
Encourage more condominium multiple-family units?	55	272
Encourage more multiple-family units for young people?	55	261
Encourage more multiple-family units for elderly people?	161	176
Encourage more commercial development?	219	126
Encourage more industry?	254	98

22. What are Glendale's most urgent problems?

Sewer and pumping problems
No library
Insufficient public transportation
Limit multi-family units
Keep taxes low
Control stray pets
Keep children off street
Provide hot school lunch program
Need a master plan
Need bicycle paths
Better traffic control
Control drugs in high school

Business and Industry Survey

The respondents to the Business and Industry Survey indicated that they enjoy being located in Glendale. Many of them are satisfied with the services provided and they indicate that they are satisfied with their location. In addition, they indicated that if they were to expand, they would do so in Glendale. A good portion of the businesses do their trade in the metropolitan area and throughout the Midwest. The respondents also indicated that laws and regulations affecting businesses in Glendale are reasonable. Concerning neighborhood problems, growth and facilities, the respondents indicate that they are satisfied with the current situation and their views concerning growth are similar to the residents.

1. Type of business or industry varied
   (i.e. grocery, clothing, drugstore, restaurant, etc.)

2. Employment

   Number of full-time employees (including proprietors) 332
   Number of part-time employees 176
   Number of employees on maximum shift 238
   Number of employees living outside Glendale 409
   Number of employees living inside Glendale 51

3. Building Space and Location

   Is your present building adequate in regard to?

	Yes	No
a. Sales or service space	36	2
b. Storage space	29	4
c. Loading space	29	4

   If you were to expand, would you do so in Glendale where you are now located? Yes: 28 No: 5

   What do you consider the most suitable location for your business in the City?

   a. Present location 38
   b. Other 4

4. If you are engaged in a retail business, where do your present customers reside? (Estimate)

	0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76%+
a. Glendale	9	2	0	1
b. Elsewhere in Milwaukee County	3	2	5	4
c. Waukesha County	3	2	0	0
d. Ozaukee County	5	0	0	0

5. If you are engaged in a non-retail business, where are your present customers located? (Estimate)

	0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76%+
a. Milwaukee Metropolitan Area	9	2	3	12
b. Elsewhere in Wisconsin	10	6	0	2
c. Midwest outside Wisconsin	7	5	1	0
d. U.S. outside Midwest	2	2	2	0
e. Outside U.S.	2	0	0	0

6. What is the approximate radius of the trade area of your particular business?

Glendale	7
Metropolitan Area	16
State and Midwest	11
Nation and Worldwide	6

7. Business or Industrial Activity

Please indicate your business activity in Glendale during the past 10 years in percentage terms and in estimated dollars.

	0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76%+
a. Increased in dollars	3	7	1	2
b. Increased in services or products sold	1	5	0	1
c. Remained the same	1	1	0	0
d. Decreased in dollars	1	1	0	0
e. Decreased in services or products sold	0	0	1	0

8. Are laws and regulations affecting businesses in Glendale reasonable?
Yes: 36 No: 2

	Needs No Improvement	Needs Some Improvement	Needs Much Improvement	Completely Inadequate or Unsatisfactory	Don't Know
a. Variety of shopping facilities	18	14	3	1	6
b. Public transportation	7	11	11	6	8
c. Adult education opportunities	19	6	1	0	16
d. Labor force availability and skills	14	9	2	0	16
e. Building appearance	17	18	4	0	3
f. College	13	4	3	0	19
g. Highway access	22	10	4	3	3
h. Health facilities, hospital, clinics	23	12	0	0	6
i. Library facilities	14	9	4	2	13
j. Police protection	32	8	2	0	0
k. Fire protection	33	9	0	0	2
l. Control of juvenile delinquency	14	15	5	1	8
m. Control of traffic	20	14	6	1	3
n. Care of upkeep of properties	20	16	4	0	3
o. Control of air pollution	9	15	4	0	12

	Needs No Improvement	Needs Some Improvement	Needs Much Improvement	Completely Inadequate or Unsatisfactory	Don't Know
p. Pet control	13	10	4	2	11
q. Sanitation, trash, garbage disposal	19	10	3	0	6
r. Street repair	17	16	4	0	4
s. Off-street parking	18	12	3	0	7
t. Street lighting	23	11	4	0	2
u. Adequacy of rail transportation facilities	10	8	0	4	16
v. Snow removal	24	12	0	0	3
w. Availability and cost of energy	14	11	0	0	12
x. Sidewalks	17	11	4	0	6

10. How often do you shop in Glendale?

Nearly every day	0
3 or 4 times a week	0
1 or 2 times a week	0
Less than once a week	0

11. How do you rate Glendale on these kinds of shopping?

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Major appliance	7	16	6	3
Men's wear	13	15	5	0
Women's wear	11	11	8	0
Children's wear	12	11	7	0
Shoes	11	13	6	1
Jewelry	9	12	7	1
Liquor	14	12	3	0
Hardware	15	11	7	0

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Drugs	10	12	6	5
Movie theaters	3	5	5	14
Children's recreation	7	9	6	4
Teenage recreation	7	8	8	4
Adult recreation	8	10	6	4
Family recreation	7	12	7	3
Restaurants	11	17	6	1
Groceries	13	13	3	0

12. Does the owner of your business or industry live in Glendale?

Yes	No
14	28

13. According to the 1970 Census figures, the population of Glendale was 13,426. In 1974, a land use survey was conducted which showed Glendale with 10 percent of the land (375 acres) vacant, and 31 percent (1,160 acres) of the land in residential use. Do you think Glendale should become a City of a certain size?

Yes	No
21	17

Please circle the appropriate population size.

	13,426	4
13,427 -	17,775	8
17,776 -	22,050	4
22,051 -	26,550	7
Over	26,551	1

14. Do you think Glendale should:

	Yes	No
Encourage more single-family houses?	25	9
Encourage more rental multiple-family units?	14	22
Encourage more condominium multiple-family units?	18	18
Encourage more multiple-family units for young people?	14	19
Encourage more multiple-family units for elderly people?	23	11
Encourage more commercial development?	28	7
Encourage more industry?	26	6

15. What are Glendale's most urgent problems?

Bike path
Public transportation
Post Office
Sidewalks
Flooding

16. What are Glendale's five most important assets?

Parks
Schools
Business
Shopping
Low Taxes
City Services
Location to Milwaukee

17. What feature of Glendale do you DISLIKE the most?

Discontinued trash pick-up for businesses
No Central Business District
No public transportation
Sewer System

18. What feature of Glendale do you LIKE the most?

Clean
Quiet
Low taxes

APPENDIX C

SUGGESTED STORM WATER RUNOFF CONTROL ORDINANCE

Appendix C

SUGGESTED STORM WATER RUNOFF CONTROL ORDINANCE

(Final Form to be Determined by City Attorney and Staff)

I. Purpose

To control the flow of storm water from developing areas so as to reduce the flow in natural or man-made channels to volumes equal to the flow from those areas in their undeveloped state, so as to provide for the safety, health and well-being of those living within the developing area as well as those downstream who will be affected by its development. Such control can be accomplished by retention of water in natural bodies of water and artificial impoundments; within man-made features such as parking areas, roof tops, and storm drainage facilities where these features are designed to retain flow; by sizing outlet pipes and structures to reduce flow to tolerable volumes; and by combined use of all of these features.

II. Applicability

The provisions of this ordinance are applicable to:

1. All residential, commercial and industrial developments in excess of four acres.

2. Any development, less than four acres, where the percentage of the impervious area of the lot is 50 percent or greater.

3. Any development, less than four acres, which lacks an adequate outlet for the passage of storm waters.

III. Definition of Terms

The following definitions shall be applicable to this ordinance:

1. Storm Water Runoff - The flow of water resulting from precipitation which is not absorbed by the soil or plant material.

2. Natural Drainage - Channels formed by the existing surface topography prior to changes made by unnatural causes.

3. Excess Storm Water - That portion of storm water runoff which exceeds the transportation capacity of storm sewers or natural drainage channels serving a specific watershed.

4. By-pass Channel - A channel formed in the topography of the earth's surface to carry storm water runoff through a specific area.

5. Storm Water Runoff Release Rate - The rate at which storm water runoff is released from dominant to subservient land.

6. Storm Water Storage Area - Areas designated to store excess storm water.

7. Tributary Watershed - All of the area that contributes storm water runoff to a given point.

8. Dry Bottom Storm Water Storage Area - A facility designed to be normally dry and contain water only when excess storm water runoff occurs.

9. Wet Bottom Storm Water Storage Area - A facility designed to be maintained as a pond or free water surface, and which has capacity to contain excess storm water runoff.

10. Control Structure - A structure designed to control the flow of storm water runoff that passes through it during a specific length of time.

11. Safe Storm Drainage Capacity - The flow of storm water runoff that can be transported by a channel or conduit without causing a rise of the water surface over the conduit or adjacent to the channel.

12. "X" Year Storm - The average recurrence interval within which a rainfall of given intensity and duration will be equalled or exceeded only once. A 100-year storm would have an intensity of rainfall which would, on the average, be equalled or exceeded only once in 100 years. This does not imply that it will occur only once in 100 years, or having occurred, will not happen again for 100 years.

IV. Design Criteria

The design of storm water control and/or retention facilities shall be prepared in accordance with the following:

1. Runoff Calculation - The Rational Formula is to be used to compute the volumes of water to be stored and/or released. The basic formula is: $Q = ciA$, where:

   Q - is the computed rate of runoff in cfs at a specified point;

   c - is the selected ratio of runoff to rainfall depicting the percentage of rainfall expected to appear as runoff at the designated point in a specified time interval;

i - is the average intensity of rainfall, in inches per hour, for a storm of a selected frequency extending over the time period required for the runoff to concentrate at a given point;

A - is the area tributary to a given point, expressed in acres.

a. Runoff Coefficient - In designing sewers and retention facilities, the factor "c" in actual conditions varies from 0.1 to 1.5, depending on the degree of imperviousness (urbanization) of the basin, soils, foliage, etc. Factors greater than unity represent conditions where rain occurs on frozen ground covered by snow. (See Table A-1)

b. Average Rainfall Intensity - The average rainfall intensity factor "i" varies for storms of different frequencies.

2. Release Rate - The release rate of storm water from any detention basin required under this ordinance shall not exceed the storm water runoff rate from the area in its natural state or from a three (3) year frequency storm falling on an area having a runoff coefficient "c" of 0.15, whichever is the smaller amount. Applicants may claim a higher natural rate of runoff if documented by detailed computations to show that higher capacity exists in the natural outlets serving the area. However, only the "safe storm drainage capacity" of the conduit or channel may be included in these calculations.

   Design of the floodway system shall also take into consideration control of storm water velocity to prevent erosion or other damage to the facility which will restrict its primary use. Depths of flow shall be consistent with the "safe storm drainage capacity" of the facility and retention or channel configurations shall be totally under city control.

3. Detention Requirements - The required volume of storm water detention shall be that necessary to handle the runoff of a 100-year rainfall, for any and all durations, from the drainage area tributary to the storm water storage area based on full development of said tributary area, less the volume discharged during the same duration at the approved release rate. The storm water release rate shall be considered when calculating the storm water storage capacity to maintain a relatively uniform flow rate regardless of the depth of storm water in the storage area.

   Thus, the "Required Detention Storage" (RDS) will be that found to be the most critical resulting from the inflow from the runoff of a fully developed tributary area from a 100-year storm and the outflow of the three-year storm with the same area in its unurbanized or natural state.

This can be expressed by the following equation:

$$RDS = \left[\begin{array}{l}\text{Vol. of runoff from 100-yr. storm, fully developed watershed} \\ - \text{ Vol. of runoff from 3-yr. storm, natural watershed*}\end{array}\right] \times \frac{\text{Area (acres)}}{12}$$

Detention storage may be provided as a "Dry Bottom" or "Wet Bottom" storage area.

a. Dry bottom storm water storage areas shall be designed to serve a secondary purpose for recreation, open space or other types of uses that will not be adversely affected by intermittent flooding. A method of carrying the low flow through these areas shall be provided in addition to a system of drains to prevent soggy areas. Both shall be provided with an outlet to a natural channel or storm sewer with adequate capacity as described in Section IV, paragraph 4 (By-pass Channel).

Outlet control structures shall be designed as simply as possible and shall require little or no attention for proper operation. Each storm water storage area shall be provided with a method of emergency overflow in the event that a storm in excess of the 100-year frequency storm occurs. This emergency over-flow facility shall be designed to function without attention and shall become part of the "natural" or surface channel system described in Section IV, paragraph 4. Hydraulic calculations shall be submitted to substantiate all design features.

Both outlet control structures and emergency overflow facilities shall be designed and constructed to fully protect the public health, safety and welfare. Storm water runoff velocities shall be kept at a minimum and turbulent conditions at an outfall control structure will not be permitted without complete protection for the public safety. The use of fences shall be kept to a minimum and used only as a last resort when no other method is feasible.

Paved surfaces that are to serve as storm water storage areas and rooftop storage shall be designed with permanent-type control inlets and retaining or parapet walls to contain runoff on the surface. Emergency overflow areas shall be provided.

*Also see Section IV, paragraph 2 (Release Rate).

b. Wet bottom storm water storage areas shall be designed with all of the items required for dry bottom storm water storage areas, except that the flow conduit and system of drains shall be eliminated. However, the following additional conditions shall be complied with:

(1) Water surface area shall not exceed 1/15 of the tributary drainage area.

(2) Shoreline protection shall be provided to prevent erosion from wave action.

(3) Minimum normal water depth shall be four (4) feet. If fish are to be maintained, some portion of the pond area should be a minimum of nine (9) feet deep.

(4) Control structures for storm water release shall be designed to operate at full capacity with only a minor increase in the water surface level. Hydraulic calculations shall be submitted to substantiate all design features.

(5) Only that portion of the detention area above the normal water level shall be used in calculating the storage capacity.

4. By-pass Channel - A "natural" or surface channel system shall be designed with adequate capacity to convey through the development the storm water runoff from all tributary upstream areas. This "bypass" channel shall be designed to carry the peak rate of runoff from a 100-year storm, assuming all storm sewers are blocked and the upstream areas fully developed. The by-pass flow rate shall be computed utilizing a runoff coefficient of not less than 0.35. An allowance will be made for upstream detention when such upstream detention and release rate has previously been approved by the city and evidence of its construction can be shown.

No habitable structures shall be constructed within this floodway, however, streets and parking, parks, playground or open space areas and utility easements shall be considered compatible primary uses. In the event that the area within a "bypass" channel is reshaped or restricted for use as a floodway, the city will cause the restrictions to be removed at the expense of the party or parties causing said restriction.

Should the development contain an existing "natural" waterway, this land configuration shall be preserved or improved as part of the "by-pass" channel system.

V. Construction

1. Where development of a property presents the threat of flooding or damage by flash runoff to downstream residents, the facilities for storm water runoff control shall be constructed as part of the first phase of construction.

2. The construction of the storm water control system shall be accomplished as part of the cost of land development. If the amount of storage capacity can be increased to provide benefit to the city, negotiations for public participation in the cost of development shall be initiated.

3. During the construction phase of land development, facilities shall be provided to prevent the erosion and washing away of the earth.

4. All flood control items such as earthen embankments, conduits, outlet structures, flood control structures, spillways, by-pass channels, etc., shall be built as permanent facilities and all materials and their manner of construction shall be assembled to accomplish as much permanency as is possible.

5. Provision shall be made for proper maintenance of detention facilities, by-pass channels, outlet structures and related flood control facilities.

VI. Easements

Drainage easements shall be provided for all conduits and those by-pass channels where the 100-year runoff exceeds one (1) cubic foot per second.

VII. Procedure

Plans, specifications and all calculations for storm water runoff control shall be submitted for review and approval prior to the approval of a final plat (in the case of a subdivision or planned unit developments) or issuance of a building permit (in the case of commercial or industrial construction).

Table C-1

RUNOFF COEFFICIENTS

VALUES OF C - $\frac{\text{Runoff}}{\text{Rainfall}}$

	Type of Drainage Area Surfaces		Runoff Coefficient C Min.	Max.
ROOFS	Slag to metal		0.75	0.95
PAVEMENTS	Asphalt		0.70	0.95
	Concrete		0.80	0.95
	Gravel, from clean and loose to clayey and compact		0.25	0.70
R.R. YARDS			0.20	0.40
EARTH	Sand, from uniform grain size, no fines to well graded, some clay or silt	Bare	0.15	0.50
		Light Vegetation	0.10	0.40
		Dense Vegetation	0.05	0.30
	Loam, from sandy or gravelly to clayey	Bare	0.20	0.60
		Light Vegetation	0.10	0.45
		Dense Vegetation	0.05	0.35
	Gravel, from clean gravel and gravel sand mixtures, no silt or clay to high clay or silt content	Bare	0.25	0.65
		Light Vegetation	0.15	0.50
		Dense Vegetation	0.10	0.40
	Clay, from coarse sandy or silty to pure colloidal clays	Bare	0.30	0.75
		Light Vegetation	0.20	0.60
		Dense Vegetation	0.15	0.50
COMPOSITE AREAS	City, business areas		0.70	0.95
	City, dense residential areas, vary as to soil and vegetation		0.50	0.65
	Suburban residential areas, vary as to soil and vegetation		0.35	0.55
	Rural Districts, vary as to soil and vegetation		0.10	0.25
	Parks, Golf Courses, etc. vary as to soil and vegetation		0.10	0.35

	Type of Drainage Area Surfaces	Runoff Coefficient C Min.	Max.
LAWNS	Sandy soil, flat 2%	0.05	0.10
	Sandy soil, average 2% to 7%	0.10	0.15
	Sandy soil, steep 7%	0.15	0.20
	Heavy soil, flat 2%	0.13	0.17
	Heavy soil, average 2% to 7%	0.18	0.22
	Heavy soil, steep 7%	0.25	0.35

NOTE: Values of "C" for earth surfaces are further varied by degree of saturation, compaction, surface irregularity and slope, by character of subsoil, and by presence of front or glazed snow or ice.

APPENDIX D

FINANCIAL IMPACT STUDY

RELATED TO

COMMERCIAL - INDUSTRIAL - RESIDENTIAL
LAND USES

City of Glendale
Wisconsin

Prepared by:

Rudolph Mikulich
City Administrator

May, 1975

FINANCIAL IMPACT STUDY

The basic purpose of a Financial Impact Study is to determine the governmental services and educational costs associated with a particular land use and to further determine the revenues derived from such use. The basic approach to this study is to determine the cost associated with one acre of land zoned and used as residential, commercial or industrial and then determine on a per acre basis the amount of money paid in taxes, fees or permits (revenues) to offset the cost. No two acres of land will produce the same costs and revenues, so the final figure is the average cost per acre vs. the average revenues per acre. The costs and revenues will vary with the size and value of the property and the number of occupants and type of business or use. The Financial Impact Stduy therefore is not a study of any one parcel of land or a specific use, but in order to make intelligent land use decisions, it is necessary to establish certain basic figures associated with a particular land use to serve as a guide in a good Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

Throughout the Financial Impact Study you will note that the City of Glendale has 1,158 acres of land used for residential purposes; 227 acres of land used for commercial uses and 412 acres of land used for industrial or manufacturing purposes. There are more than 300 acres of vacant land remaining in Glendale, and the purpose of the F.I.S. and the Comprehensive Plan is to make the best use of this land. Best use does not mean the most profitable use either to the owner - developer or the City of Glendale. Therefore, the cost-revenue balance per acre will not determine the land use, but it will be a matter to consider along with such factors as the type of land involved, compatability to the surrounding neighborhood and the necessity for the use. For example, a supper club could conceivably be an excellent revenue producer, but is there a need for an additional supper club and is there a license available?

The F.I.S. refers to 1,797 acres devoted to residential, commercial and manufacturing uses. The total taxable real estate in the City of Glendale on February 8, 1974 was 2,075 acres. There are 3,712 total acres in the City and so 55% of the total is taxable and 45% is non-taxable. It is difficult to believe that 737 acres of the total acreage is used for roadways and 140 acres for railroads. In addition to roadway and railroad right of way, the balance of the non-taxable land is used for schools, churchs, parks and the Milwaukee River bed. The F.I.S. only relates to school costs and municipal services provided to the acreage devoted to particular use, since the parks are in the County Park System, and the homeowner and property tax payers pay county taxes to maintain the parks. If we go into municipal parks, the F.I.S. will show what loss or gain is predictable from such use on the basis that there is no revenue and only cost associated with park land. A basic question presents itself, if the City of Glendale has 45% of its land used for purposes that are non-taxable - therefore non-revenue producing, should the City increase this amount by devoting more land to park purposes? Is Glendale's tax base presently able to support the governmental services desired and the educational needs or will it have to be expanded?

The Financial Impact Study is based upon the valuation placed upon the City of Glendale's taxable property on May 1, 1974. This valuation supports the municipal and school budgets for 1975. The importance of a Comprehensive F.I.S. has increased since 1971 because the State of Wisconsin legislative

actions has increased the burden on property taxes to support the City's local government and educational institutions.

All local units of government in the State of Wisconsin rely on three revenue sources to operate and provide municipal services. The City of Glendale municipal budget is supported by: 1. PROPERTY TAXES 2. STATE SHARED TAXES & AIDS 3. ALL OTHER REVENUES (which includes licenses, permits, fines, borrowed money, earned interest and Federal Revenue Sharing). Obviously, if the shared taxes and aids from the State of Wisconsin are decreased, this loss in revenue then has to be shifted to the property tax and the other revenue. The following survey illustrates the change over a 5 year period.

CITY OF GLENDALE BUDGET

YEAR	STATE AIDS & SHARED TAXES	PROPERTY TAX	OTHER REVENUES
1970	55%	8%	37%
1972	36%	35%	29%
1975	26%	38%	34%

The above figures reveal the very obvious fact that as State Aid and Shared Taxes were decreased by the State Legislature in 1971, property taxes increased at a tremendous rate. Therefore, proper use of our land becomes more critical, since this trend will continue. The need for the Financial Impact Study likewise has become imperative, and it shall be necessary to modify the study from time to time.

In 1970, the City of Glendale Budget needed $220,886 in property taxes to provide substantially the same services that need $1,602,420 in property taxes in 1975. During the same 5 year period, State Aids and Shared Taxes dropped by approximately $500,000 in actual dollars and on the old formula for distribution, the City would have realized another $500,000 gain. Prior to 1971, State Aids and Shared Taxes increased about 10% per year by reason of more sales, utility, income and corporate taxes being collected by the State and returned to the communities on the theory that taxes should return to the City where they were collected. The new formula returns $35 per capita plus an additional amount based upon the tax levy to support its local services. In essence, the Shared Taxes are going to the larger cities which "need" more money to operate.

If property taxes have increased and will continue to increase in the City of Glendale, what expectation is there for future development of the vacant lands? Has the City been able to still maintain a comparatively low tax rate which would induce development in Glendale as opposed to the City of Milwaukee or the 17 other suburbs? The answer to both questions is YES.

THE NET TAX RATE FOR 1975
PER $1000 DOLLARS EQUALIZED VALUE

Milwaukee	$37.20	Brown Deer	$26.27
River Hills	33.29	Greendale	26.21
Shorewood	32.70	West Milwaukee	26.03
West Allis	30.12	Hales Corners	25.65
Fox Point	30.03	Wauwatosa	25.43
Bayside	29.94	Greenfield	24.98
St. Francis	28.89	Franklin	24.84
Cudahy	28.64	Glendale	24.29*
So. Milwaukee	26.89	Oak Creek	23.94

*Based upon these figures issued by the Citizens' Governmental Research Bureau, Glendale ranks 2nd lowest of the 19 taxing communities in Milwaukee County.

The City of Glendale has and must continue to adjust its fiscal planning to less State Shared Taxes and State Aids, and future land uses should not be authorized on the basis of providing more than basic governmental and educational needs. In brief, the cost factor is more possible to control than is the revenue per acre factor, and the F.I.S. should be a continuous study to reflect this endeavor.

The Financial Impact Study indicates the municipal function and what part of this function is allocated to residential, commercial and industrial services. For instance, if the need for greater police protection and fire protection to the residential properties increases, then single family development becomes less desirable. The City of Glendale's per capita costs for police and fire protection is above average due to the extensive industrial and commercial development in the City as compared to the other North Shore Communities. Unless there is a change in land use, the established per capita costs should remain quite constant.

The Financial Impact Study is not an exact study of every cost/revenue factor, but it is as close to a correct analysis as one can derive from statistics and experience.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Municipal Function	1975 Budget	% & Cost in Behalf of Residential		% & Cost For Commercial User		% & Cost For Industrial User	
Administr.-Clerk Comptroller-Acc'tg. Treasurer	$ 105,374	70%	$ 73,761.80	20%	$ 21,074.80	10%	$ 10,537
Mayor Common Council	33,900	80%	27,120.00	15%	5,085.00	5%	1,695
Assessor	23,117	70%	16,182.00	20%	4,623.00	10%	2,312
Legal Expense	22,200	75%	16,650.00	15%	3,330.00	10%	2,220
Elections	5,335	100%	5,335.00				
Plan Commission Bd. of Appeals	31.250	70%	21,875.00	15%	4,687.50	15%	4,687.50
Employee Welfare Prop. & Liab. Ins. Unclassified	476,853 42,658 16,550	65%	348,439.65	25%	134,015.25	10%	53,606.10
Municipal Justice	4,220	60%	2,532.00	25%	1,055.00	15%	633.00
Bldgs. & Grounds	30,990	65%	20,143.50	25%	7.747.50	10%	3,099.00
Engineering	51,405	60%	30,843.00	30%	15,421.50	10%	5,140.50
Totals	$ 843,852	66.70%	562,881.00	24.07%	197,040.00	9.23%	83,930.00
Cost per Acre		$562,881 ÷ 1158 acres $486 per acre		$197,040 ÷ 227 acres $868 per acre		$83,930 ÷ 412 acres $204 per acre	

PUBLIC SAFETY

Municipal Function	1975 Budget	% & Cost for Residential Users		% & Cost for Commercial Users		% & Cost for Industrial Users	
Police Traffic Controls Police Commission	$ 629,724	60%	$ 377,876.40	25%	$ 157,448.50	15%	$ 94,469.10
Fire - Fire Comm. ($200)	440,294	55%	242,161.70	25%	110,073.50	20%	88,058.80
Hydrant Rental	123,000	65%	79,950.00	12%	14,760.00	23%	28.290.00
Inspection Dept.	45,837	55%	25,210.35	35%	16,042.95	10%	4,583.70
Sealer of Weights & Measures	1,100			100%	1,100.00		

Municipal Function	1975 Budget	% & Cost for Residential Users	% & Cost for Commercial Users	% & Cost for Industrial Users
Civil Defense	5,999	70% $ 4,199.30	20% $ 1,199.80	10% $ 599.90
Totals	$1,246,024	58.53% 729,397.75	24.14% 300,624.75	17.33% 216,001.50
Cost per acre		$729.397 ÷ 1158 acres $629.87 per acre	$300,624 ÷ 227 acres $1,324.33 per acre	$216,001 ÷ 412 acres $524.27 per acre
	S A N I T A T I O N - - - Nurse, Health Inspector etc.			
Bd. of Health	$ 23,960	90% $ 21,564.00	10% $ 2,396.00	
San. Health Ins.	7,085	70% 4,959.50	25% 1,771.25	5% $ 354.25
Totals	$31,045	85.43% $26,523.50	13.42% $4,167.25	1.15% $354.25
Cost per acre		$26,523 ÷ 1158 acres $22.90 per acre	$4,167 ÷ 227 acres $18.35 per acre	$354 ÷ 412 acres 86¢ per acre
	I N D E B T E D N E S S			
Perm. Imp. Principal & Interest	$358,444	80% $ 286,755.20	10% $ 35,844.40	10% $ 35,844.40
		$286,755.20 ÷ 1158 acres $247.63 per acre	$35,844 ÷ 227 acres $157.90 per acre	$35,844 ÷ 412 acres $87 per acre
	DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS			
Adm. & Supervision	$50,074	67% $ 33,550.00	22% $ 11,016.00	11% $ 5,508.00
Street & Alley Maintenance	96,340	80% 77,072.00	10% 9,634.00	10% 9,634.00
Snow Removal & Ice Control	36,000	80% 28,800.00	10% 3,600.00	10% 3,600.00
Street Lighting	68,700	20% 13,740.00	70% 48,090.00	10% 6,870.00
Machinery & Equip.	120,570	70% 84,399.00	20% 24,114.00	10% 12,057.00
Rubbish & Garbage Removal	190,720	100% 190,720.00		
Metro Sewer Maintenance	115,000	60% 69,000.00	20% 23,000.00	20% 23,000.00
Sanitary Sewer Maint.	70,000	60% 40,000.00	20% 14,000.00	20% 14,000.00
Weed Cutting & Control	4,450	80% 3,560.00	10% 445.00	10% 445.00

PUBLIC WORKS

Municipal Function	1975 Budget	% & Cost for Residential Users	% & Cost for Commercial Users	% & Cost for Industrial Users
Street Signs	$ 11,100	60% $ 6,660.00	30% $ 3,330.00	10% $ 1,110.00
Storm Water Sewers & Drains	10,000	60% 6,000.00	20% 2,000.00	20% 2,000.00
Municipal Serv. Bldg.	12,577	70% 8,803.90	20% 2,515.40	10% 1,257.70
Permanent Improv.	473,300	60% 283,980.00	30% 141,990.00	10% 47,330.00
Totals	$1,258,831	67% $848,785.22	22% $284,235.42	11% $125,810.36
		$848,785 ÷ 1158 acres $732.95 per acre	$284,235÷227 acres $1,252.10/acre	$125,810÷412 a acres $305.36/acre

OTHER ACTIVITIES

Library	$ 69,459	100% $ 69,459.00		
Commissions - Dinners	2,200	80% 1,760.00	15% 330.00	5% 110.00
Contingent Fund	150,000	70% 105,000.00	20% 30,000.00	10% 15,000.00
Totals	$221,659	79.51% $176,219.00	13.68% $ 30,330.00	6.81% $15,110.00

1975 CITY OF GLENDALE BUDGET

General Government	$ 843,852	66.70% $ 562,881.00	24.07% $ 197,040.00	9.23% $ 83,930.00
Public Safety	1,246,024	58.53% 729,397.75	24.14% 300,624.25	17.33% 216,001.50
Sanitation	31,045	85.43% 26,523.50	13.42% 4,167.25	1.15% 354.25
Indebtedness	358,444	80 % 286,755.20	10 % 35,844.40	10 % 35,844.40
Public Works	1,258,831	67 % 848,785.22	22 % 284,235.42	11 % 125,810.36
Other Activities	221,659	79.51% 176,219.00	13.68% 30,330.00	6.81% 15,110.00
Totals	$3,959,855	66.43% $2,630,562.00	21.52% $852,241.00	12.05% $477,051.00
		$2,630,562 ÷ 1158 acres $2,271.64 per acre	$852,241 ÷ 227 acres $3,754.36 per acre	$477,051 ÷ 412 acres $1,157.89 per acre

CITY BUDGET

Total Budget	$4,275,634	
Property (Net City Levy	1,602,420	37.48% of budget
Tax (M & E Exempt.	107,653	.025% of budget
State Aids & Shared Taxes	1,201,653	28.13% of budget
All Other Revenues		34.365% of budget

- FISCAL YEAR 1975 -

1975 Budget	City	JT. 1 School	Nicolet	Total
1974 Levy for 1975 Budget	$11.04/1000 A.V. 24% of $45.90	$19.68/1000 A.V. 43%	$15.28/1000 A.V. 33%	$45.90/1000 A.V. is combined tax levy rate of City, Jt. 1 and Nicolet School District
Residential Valuation per acre X Mill rate $45.90 x $57,747 = $2650.58 per acre	$636.1 per acre	$1,139.75 per acre	$874.70 per acre	
Commercial Valuation per acre X Mill rate $45.90 x $179,550= $8,241.35 per acre	$1,977.92 per acre	$3,543.78 per acre	$2,056.51 per acre	
Industrial Valuation per acre X Mill rate $45.90 x $104,196 = $4,782.59	$1,147.82 per acre*	$2,056.51 per acre	$1,578.25 per acre	

* Add $260.83/acre for M. & E. reimbursement in 1975 ($107,653 for 1975 and this will be decreased by 10% each year until it is phased out).

1975 REVENUE - - COST FIGURES

	CITY	SCHOOL
Residential	$2,271.64/acre	$2,309.25/acre
Commercial	$3,754.36/acre	-
Industrial	$1,157.89/acre	-

COST/REVENUES PER ACRE

	REVENUES		COST
Residential	$2,650.58		$4,580.00/acre
Commercial	$8,241.35		$3,754.36/acre
Industrial (incl - M. & E. reimbursement)	$4,782.59) $ 260.83)	$4,943.42	$1,157.89/acre

LOSS OR GAIN PER ACRE

Residential	($1,930.00)	Loss per acre
Commercial	$4,487.00	Gain per acre
Industrial	$3,785.53	Gain per acre

While 37.73% of the City of Glendale budget for 1975 is supported by a direct property tax associated with a particular land use, the City receives State Shared Taxes and State Aid and Other Revenues that in some respect have a direct relationship to a particular land use. For example, the City has been receiving a $35 per capita payment from the State Shared Tax Fund of which approximately $29.66 goes to the City and $5.34 goes to local schools. Since there are 13,800 people residing in Glendale and there are approximately 11 people per acre, it would be appropriate to allocate 11 X $35 = $385 per acre to residential land use. In addition to the per capita payment the City receives $641,888 in additional aids which is not based upon a population factor but on the levy load carried by the assessable property in the community.

The Financial Impact Statement reveals the following in relationship to the per cent of the total tax levied carried by the three respective land uses. Residential property uses 64% of the 1798 total acres in the three different land uses and it pays 45% of the total levy. Industry occupies or uses 23% of the total land presently used and pays 28% of the levy load, and commercially zoned and used land uses 13% and pays 27% of the load. In essence, the picture appears as follows for Budget Year 1975.

Acres	Use	Assessed Valuation	% of Total Valuation	% of Total Land Use	% of Dollar Contribution to Total Budget
1159	Residential	$ 66.8 mill.	45%	64%	45%
227	Commercial	40.7 mill.	27%	13%	27%
412	Industrial	42.9 mill.	28%	23%	28%

From the foregoing, one can conclude that which was illustrated previously, that the budget benefits from industrial and commercial uses and loses dollars from residential land use. It is a universally accepted opinion that communities strive for industrial and commercial development to support their local institutions, so that the City of Glendale is neither unique or guilty of poor planning - but instead a benefactor from good planning upon which it wants to improve.

Based upon the percentage each use contributes to the total budget, such as the shared tax return of $641,888, I believe it proper to allocate this amount on a 45% - 27% - 28% basis rather than a 33-1/3% each formula. On all other revenues, revenues can be placed into a general category and apportioned on a 1/3 basis, unless a clear connection can be attributed to a particular land use.

If it costs the City and School District $4,580 dollars per acre to provide Municipal and school services to the homes occupying an acre of land, the logical question is, "What market value home must a homeowner have to pay for all the services received?"

An acre of land in the undeveloped areas of Glendale will accommodate 2.3 single family residences per acre. In order to provide $4,580 dollars in taxes, there must be a land and improvement (home) value of $167,000 dollars when the City assesses at 60% of market value. School Districts get $712.00 dollars per acre from residential use in the way of State Aids and Shared Taxes and Other Revenues, a home with a market value of $61,380 dollars pays its own way provided there is no more than one (1) child in the home attending a Glendale public school. Each acre of single family produces 3.2 children for our school system or 1.4 children per dwelling unit.

(I) ALLOCATION OF REVENUES OTHER THAN PROPERTY TAXES - 1975 BUDGET

Revenue Source	Residential	Commercial	Industrial	General
Shared Taxes & Aids from State				
1. 35/capita pay't	$ 408,470 00	$	$	$
2. Utility Tax				34,315.00
3. Fire Ins. Reimb.				6,500.00
4. Road Aids				110,055.00
5. State Aid Based on Local Levy	288,849.60 45%	173,309.76 27%	179,728.64	
Sub-Total	$697,319.60	$173,309.76	$179,728.64	$150,870.00 ÷3
General	50,290.00	50,290.00	50,290.00	$ 50,290.00 per use
	$747,609.60	$223,599.76	$230,018.64	
Other Revenues				
1. Licenses (Bev.) & Other Licenses		6,720.00		
2. Bicycles	3,500.00			
3. Others		5,475.00		
4. Permits:				
Bldg., Elect., Plbg.	4,700.00	9,400.00	9,400.00	
Dance Hall		200.00		750.00
Occupancy				250.00
Public Utility				50.00
Tent				13,500.00
5. D.P.W. Revenue				105,000.00
6. Use of Money				
7. Pound Fees	150 00			
8. Dog License	250 00			
9. Paper Collection	1,000.00			
10. Others				80,150.00
Sub-Total	$ 9,600.00	$ 21,795.00	$ 9,400 00	$199,700.00 ÷3 $ 66,566.00 allocated to each use
Other Revenue	$ 9,600.00	$ 21,795 00	$ 9,400.00	
General	66,566.00	66,566.00	66,566.00	
Other Revenue Total	$76,166.00	$ 88,361.00	$ 75,966.00	
State Shared Taxes & Aids	747,610.00	$223,600 00	$230,019.00	
Other Revenue	76,166 00	88,361.00	75,966.00	
Total	$823,776.00	$311,961.00	$305,985.00	

(II) TOTAL REVENUE - COST PER ACRE

Revenue Source	Residential 1158 Acres	Commercial 227 Acres	Industrial 412 Acres
Property Tax	$ 2,651	$ 8,241	$ 4,943
Shared Taxes & State Aids	646	985	558
Other Revenues	65	389	184
Total Revenues/acre	$ 3,362/acre	$ 9,615/acre	$ 5,685/acre
Total Cost/acre	4,580	3,754	1,158
Gain or (Loss)/acre	($ 1,218)	$ 5,861	$ 4,527

SUPPLEMENT TO THE FINANCIAL IMPACT STUDY

MULTIPLE DWELLINGS

The basic Financial Impact Study was concerned with the revenues and costs developed from the three common land uses identified as residential, commercial and industrial uses. This supplement is an analysis of the revenues and costs associated with multiple dwellings upon municipal and educational services provided by the City of Glendale.

In the F.I.S., the report shows 1,158 acres of land used for residential purposes. Of this total of 1,158 acres, 11.3 acres of land is presently used for 2 family (duplexes) use and 23.8 acres are used for multiple dwelling uses. This supplement will deal with multiple units consisting of 4 or more dwelling units per structure.

As of May 1, 1975, the City of Glendale had 1 - 6 family unit, 9 - 4 family units and 2 planned development projects consisting of 32 and 270 units each. The statistics in the assessor's department further indicates 144 - 2 family units. Except for the 270 unit project, all of these structures are completed and appear on the tax roll accordingly. As for Manchester Village (270 units), this project will not appear on the tax roll as a completed project until 1976, but for the purposes of this report, we shall assume the project as completed since enough of the premises is occupied for making present projections.

The 9 - 4 family units and the 1 - 6 family unit occupy 9.4 acres and the land and building value is approximately $1,140,400 dollars in assessed valuation. This means that for every acre of land developed with 4 family type structures, the assessed value per acre is $120,255 dollars. The dwelling unit density per acre is approximately 23 units per acre, which in turn will produce .74 students per acre based upon the national statistics of students per multiple dwelling unit. The present Glendale statistic for students per multiple dwelling unit is far below the national statistic of .3 students per unit. The Glendale survey indicates .015 students per multiple unit, but this is primarily due to the extremely low student enrollment from the 302 planned development units. I believe it is significant to point out that by limiting multiple dwelling units to 2 or less bedrooms per unit, the City of Glendale can control the revenue - cost factor; whereas, this does not hold true in single family use.

The assessed valuation for the two planned developments is approximately $185,600 dollars per acre. The combined tax rate for the 1975 budget for municipal and school services is $45.90 dollars per $1,000 dollars of assessed valuation. Using the foregoing tax levy times the assessed valuation, the revenue per acre on a planned development is $8,519 dollars. If the same acre of land is used for 4 family development, revenue per acre would be $120,255 A.V./acre times $45.90/$1,000 A.V. or $5,509 dollars per acre.

Based upon a student cost of approximately $722 dollars per student and .74 students per acre in the 4 family units, the educational costs per acre would be $534 dollars per acre. If we assume the national statistic of .3 students per dwelling unit in the planned development units, there would be 9 students in the present 302 units of planned development which occupy 15 acres of land. The educational costs under planned development use would be approximately $433 per acre based on .6 students per acre.

For educational services, the Financial Impact Study appears as follows for 1975.

LAND USE	ASSESSED VALUATION PER ACRE	REVENUE A.V. X $45.90/1,000 A.V.	COSTS (Schools)
Multiple 9.4 Acres 9-4 Family Units 1-6 Family Unit (42 Units)	$120,255/acre	$5,509/acre	$534/acre
Planned Development (2) 15 Acres (302 Units)	185,600/acre	$8,519/acre	$433/acre

The municipal services provided to residential use properties in the City of Glendale vary to some degree as to whether the use is single family, multiple or planned development (residential). It would be difficult and wrong to assume that because there are 20 dwelling units per acre as compared to 3 single family units, that the municipal services are almost 7 times greater in frequency and cost.

One of the most obvious services is refuse collection, which the City does not provide to 4 or more family per unit strucutres. In a planned development project, the owner-developer will construct and maintain the streets within the project; the storm drainage system; the lighting; recreational facilities and provides his own refuse collection. I believe it is safe to state that a multiple dwelling occupant is less demanding of municipal services than is a single family homeowner, thereby creating greater difficulty in ascertaining the cost of services to a multiple dwelling unit on a per acre or unit basis.

The City of Greenfield determined in 1967 that 2.3% of the total emergency calls involved responses to multiple family dwellings. Since approximately 25% of the family units in Greenfield are multiple units, the foregoing statistic indicates the difficulty of apportioning municipal costs to all dwelling units on an equal basis. In Greenfield, there were 698 responses and 16 runs were to multiple units. Our ratio of multiple dwelling units to total units was about 5% prior to Manchester Village. We do not have any experience upon which to predicate a projection of costs for fire, police, health and other services, and in the absence of such information, any allocation of costs would be considered a matter of conjecture.

Previous studies of municipal services indicated that the City of Glendale's per capita costs for police and fire protection were relatively high when compared with the costs incurred by other suburban communities. The per capita cost can be reduced by increasing the City's population without increasing the payrolls, and this is the present policy of the City.

The City can also control its land use costs by strict enforcement of zoning and building regulations. As long as multiple dwelling units are limited to 1 and 2 bedroom units, the municipal costs usually associated with high density use are minimized.

For example, presently there are 302 multiple (P.U.D.) units on approximately 15 acres of land in the City of Glendale. If costs per acre were computed upon dwelling units per acre, one would have to assume that if there are 3.2 dwelling units per acre in single family use, the municipal costs would be more than 6 times greater per acre for multiple use. If the cost factor per acre is approached from the bedroom per acre criteria, then the cost per acre would be about 3 times per acre more than single family, since the 302 units produce 468 bedrooms by contract agreement or 31 bedrooms per acre, whereas the single family produces anywhere from 10 to 12 bedrooms per acre. I believe the bedroom per acre approach on P.U.D.'s produces a more accurate picture and the multiple factor of 3 times is closer to reality.

The municipal services cost per acre for single family use in the F.I.S. came to $2,271.64 dollars per acre. This basic figure cannot be applied to either 4 families or P.U.D.'s multiple, since multiples do not receive the same services as single families. Probably the most obvious differences in services provided to single family and multiple (P.U.D.) is in Public Works.

For all intents and purposes, Manchester Village is a city within a city. It has its own internal streets to construct and maintain. There is no snow removal or maintenance, no lighting, no machinery to purchase, no rubbish collection, no street signs and no permanent improvements to look forward to in the future. Manchester Village provided its own utilities and storm sewer, and the owner-developer is under a strict contract to maintain his property so no weed cutting becomes necessary. While the City expends $732 per acre for single family services, it would be unrealistic to state that the City's services to a P.U.D. are $2,196 per acre or 3 times the cost of single family use.

In analyzing the total cost of municipal services to multiple dwellings, whether such units are 4 family or P.U.D.'s, the City does not have a true experience factor to use even if a formula were available. The City's personal calls for special services - such as police, fire or public works services - have been nominal in demands and infrequent. The experience to date has been more favorable and nowhere near the expected forecast of the opponents of P.U.D.'s.

In order to complete the supplemental F.I.S. for fiscal 1975, it appears reasonable and fair to assign the following costs to single family, multiples of 4 or more families and P.U.D.'s.

RESIDENTIAL COST STUDY

SERVICE	SINGLE FAMILY	MULTIPLE FAMILY (4 or more)	PLANNED DEVELOPMENT
		(20 Units per Acre)	
General Gov't.	$ 486.00/acre	$1,217.00/acre	$1,217.00/acre
Public Safety	$ 630.00/acre	$1,575.00/acre	$1,575.00/acre
Sanitation	$ 23.00/acre	$ 57.50/acre	$ 57.50/acre
Public Works	$ 733.00/acre	$1,099.50/acre	$ 366.50/acre
Indebtedness	$ 248.00/acre	$ 496.00/acre	$ 248.00/acre
Other Activities	$ 152.00/acre	$ 380.00/acre	$ 101.00/acre
Total Cost	$2,272.00/acre	$4,825.00/acre	$3,565.00/acre

REVENUE - COST PER ACRE

REVENUE SOURCE	SINGLE FAMILY	MULTIPLE	P.U.D.
Property Tax	$ 2,651/acre	$ 5,509/acre	$ 8,519/acre
Shared Taxes & State Aids	$ 646/acre	$ 1,540/acre	$ 1,540/acre
Other Revenues	$ 65/acre	$ 65/acre	65/acre
Total Taxes & Revenues/acre	$ 3,362/acre	$ 7,114/acre	$10,124/acre
Total Costs including education costs	$-4,580/acre	$-5,359/acre	$-3,998/acre
Gain or (Loss) Acre	($ 1,218)acre	$+1,755/acre	$+6,126/acre

CONCLUSION

The land use revenue-cost analysis or Financial Impact Study indicates that the various land uses result in the following municipal and educational costs and the acre of land for such use produces the corresponding revenue from local property taxes, state shared taxes and aids, and other local forms of revenue, such as fires, permits, licenses etc.

- 1974 LEVY -

LAND USE	COST/ACRE	REVENUE/ACRE	GAIN OR (LOSS)
Planned Development	$ 3,998	$10,124	$ 6,126
Commercial	$ 3,754	$ 9,615	$ 5,861
Industrial	$ 1,158	$ 5,685	$ 4,527
Multiple (4 Families or More)	$5,359	$ 7,114	$ 1,755
Single Family (Including duplexes)	$4,580	$3,362	($ 1,218)

APPENDIX E

PROPOSED SPECIAL RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT

Appendix E

PROPOSED SPECIAL RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT

a. Intent - The Common Council recognizes that the traditional development controls as set forth in the Zoning Ordinance may restrict because of their regidity responsible imaginative development of the remaining vacant land in Glendale. Consequently, the intent of the Special Residential District procedure is to permit review of the proposals on their own merits rather than on strict compliance with the zoning district regulations while still maintaining the basic protection of all land normally afforded by the zoning and subdivision ordinances. The use of these special procedures shall not be deemed a means to circumvent the presently established Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances and thereby allow a development of lower standard than presently permitted. Rather it is intended by the Common Council that only Special Residential Districts which are uniquely different should be encouraged and further that only a Special Residential District which would, in the judgment of the Plan Commission and Common Council, be a desirable asset to Glendale, be allowed.

Special Residential District projects may depart from conformance with the standard dimension, area, bulk and density regulations of the basic Zoning District. The demonstration of environmental excellence shall determine the degree of departure from standard design, density and use regulations that the Plan Commission and Common Council shall consider. Specifically, the elements by which environmental excellence shall be recognized may include (but not be limited to) outstanding treatment of landscaping including street location, open spaces, plazas, use of natural landscape features, pedestrian ways, hiding of functional elements (such as power lines, garbage containers, parking and storage areas) and design of recreational areas, outstanding treatment of design features including architectural amenity, location of buildings, efficiency and safety of the street system, and satisfactory servicability by all utilities and all public services.

b. Policy Statements - The Plan Commission and Common Council may continuously develop and adopt policy statements and detailed area plans as elements of the continuously evolving Comprehensive City Plan to establish further basis to guide Speical Residence District approval. These statements will be available to all prospective developers and designers of Special Residence Districts, through the City Clerk's Office.

c. Procedure and Requirements

(1) Procedure. The procedure for approval of a Special Residence District project shall comprise preliminary approval, consisting of

approval of the proposed project in principle only, and final approval, consisting of approval of the proposed project in all its terms and details.

(2) Preliminary Approval.

aa. A person desiring to develop a particular site as a Special Residence District project shall notify the Building Inspector of such desire.

bb. The Building Inspector shall inform the Plan Commission of such desire and shall secure a date for a preliminary discussion between the developer and the Plan Commission and shall notify such developer of such date.

cc. The Plan Commission, after such preliminary discussion, may approve or disapprove such proposed development or modify the provisions of the same and approve the same as modified. Such approval shall be known as the Preliminary Approval and shall require Common Council ratification.

(3) Preliminary Plan.

The Preliminary Plan shall:

aa. Be reproduced on 24" x 36" format and 20 copies submitted.

bb. Include a location map.

cc. Show accurate, dimensioned boundaries of property to be developed.

dd. Show soils and soil borings, existing tree cover over 10 inches in diameter, and existing topography, with contour intervals of not less than two feet obtained from a field survey and referred to an approved bench mark.

ee. Indicate location, type and size of structures on adjacent properties within 250 feet of the proposed development.

ff. Show the location and width of proposed streets, entrances and exits, and their relationship to existing streets.

gg. Show all areas to be maintained as permanent public or private open space.

hh. Show the proposed size, location, use and arrangement of all buildings and structures.

ii. Provide a tabulation for each proposed land use area of land coverage factor; usable open space ratios; acres of land; types of use; and each percentage of total land area.

jj. Provide a tabulation by use area and dwelling type of estimated population, number of units, and bedroom ratios.

kk. Show existing and proposed locations for parks, playgrounds, schools, community buildings and other open spaces. Where the Plan provides for open space, such space shall not be used for the construction of any building or structure, nor shall such open space ever be computed as a part of the required minimum lot size or any required yard of any other building or structure. Uncovered tennis courts and swimming pools may also be regarded as open space.

ll. Provide for the dedication of any rights-of-way for the widening, extension, or connection of major streets as shown on the Official Comprehensive Plan.

mm. Show general location of drainage retention and detention facilities.

nn. An economic justification or market analysis of proposed uses in the development may be required.

oo. Indicate the preliminary time schedule for development and construction of the porject.

pp. Shall be accompanied by a tax impact study for all taxing bodies having jurisdiction over the proposed development, population projections establishing anticipated student yields and an environmental impact statement, which discusses the possible environmental effects of the proposed development.

qq. Show the proposed number and arrangement of all off-street parking and loading spaces.

rr. Show proposed landscaping including location and general type of plant materials to be used, and indicating which are existing plant materials to remain on site.

ss. Show location of all proposed underground utilities indicating gas, electric transmission and telephone lines, water distribution lines, hydrants, sanitary sewers and storm sewers, and the pipe size and direction of flow.

tt. Show drainage plan with sufficient control grades to indicate the intent of the developer.

uu. Include a written statement signed by the owner(s) of the property describing the arrangements by which the owner(s) propose to regulate use of the property and otherwise insure development in accordance with the Preliminary Plan. This shall include a draft of proposed covenants and deed restrictions, which include adequate provisions to assure proper maintenance and repair and provisions for maintaining adequate personnel to assure security of all areas and facilities under common ownership, including the payment therefore, and enforceability thereof by or on behalf of the City. It also shall include the proposed charter and bylaws of an association, if any, for owners or tenants within the development. Adequate safeguards, including covenants, shall be provided to prevent the subsequent development of such open space and to prevent the future construction of buildings and structures on such open space.

vv. Contain the written consent of all property owners within the development filed with the petition before the public hearing on the Preliminary Plan and Conditional Use Permit. The statement will provide that the petitioners agree to be bound by the conditions and regulations proposed and further agree to record and to register such agreements with the Milwaukee County Recorder of Deeds.

(4) The Preliminary Approval of a petition and consequent recommendation of the Plan Commission to the Common Council shall be based on and include as conditions thereto the building, site and operational plans for the development as approved as well as all other commitments offered or required with regard to project value, character or other factors pertinent to an assurance that the proposed development will be carried out basically as presented in the official submittal plans. Detailed construction and engineering plans need not necessarily be completed at this time, but the approval of such preliminary plan shall be conditioned upon the subsequent submittal and approval of more specific and detailed plans as the development progresses. Any subsequent change or addition to the plans or use shall first be submitted for approval to the Plan Commission and if, in the opinion of the Plan Commission, such change or addition constitutes a substantial alteration of the original plan, a public hearing shall be required.

(5) Final Approval

aa. If the Plan Commission has approved in principle the proposed plan, pursuant to the provisions of Subsection (4) and the Common Council, pursuant to Subsection (2) cc. hereof, has ratified the same, the developer may file with the City Clerk a petition executed by the owner of the property to be

developed, or his agent, for the required zoning change, stating that he seeks to develop such property under the provisions of this Section. Such petition shall include:

(6) Final Plan

An application for approval of a Final Plan shall be filed with the City Clerk within one year of the approval of the Preliminary Plan. Final approval shall be secured for each phase, stage or section of the development as delineated on the Preliminary Plan approved by the Plan Commission and Common Council. The Final Plan shall be drawn to scale on a 24" x 36" format and shall include:

aa. Location of all buildings and structures, and any other special facility or feature to be constructed.

bb. Location of all parking and loading spaces, driveways, entrances and exits.

cc. Location of all plant materials including type and size.

dd. Location of all common open spaces.

ee. Location of all drainage facilities.

ff. Complete buildable plans for operating systems of water mains, sanitary sewers, storm sewers, streets and drainage retention and detention facilities, prepared, signed and sealed by a qualified professional engineer licensed to practice in the State of Wisconsin.

gg. Include construction specifications in accord with Ordinance No. and subsequent amendments.

hh. The final version of the covenants by which the owner(s) propose(s) to regulate land and building use, assure adequate maintenance and security, and otherwise protect the proposed development, accompanied by the written representation and warranty of the owner(s) in form and substance satisfactory to the Common Council, to the effect that said owner(s) of the real property which is the subject of the proposed development will not sell or otherwise dispose of any interest in said property prior to the filing of record of said covenants in the office of the Recorder of Deeds in Milwaukee County, Wisconsin.

ii. Such deeds or easement agreements, if any, as are required or approved by the Common Council conveying a suitable ownership interest in any parcels within the proposed development which are to be subject to public ownership.

jj. A copy of the Articles of Incorporation of the owners or tenants association, if any, not more than 30 days prior to the submission of the Final Plan; a certificate of good standing for such corporation issued by the Secretary of State of the State of Wisconsin as of a date not more than 30 days prior to the submission of the Final Plan, and a copy of the by-laws of such corporation certified by the Secretary thereof, as being a true, correct and complete copy of such by-laws as of a date not more than 30 days prior to the submission of the Final Plan.

kk. Final construction schedule, stating the date scheduled for Final Completion of construction work on all buildings, structures, facilities and features within one year after the date of approval of the Final Plan, and all construction shall be completed within three years after the date of approval of the Final Plan. Extension of the time schedule may be granted by the Common Council. With the Final Plan, the applicant shall file a surety bond or escrow agreement to insure the construction of the project within the period specified. No such bond or escrow shall be acceptable unless it is enforceable by or payable to the City in a sum at least equal to the estimated costs of all of the site improvements (streets, drives, walks, walls, water mains, storm and sanitary sewers, landscape planting, ornamental features not on a building, and terraces) for the entire project and for the cost of completion of any building for which a building permit is issed. Said bond or escrow shall be in a form and with surety and conditions approved by the Common Council. In the event of default under such bond or escrow, the City shall use the sum defaulted to construct said site improvements.

(7) Plan Commission Hearing

After receipt of a petition and the filing of all the required data and fees, with the necessary study and investigation, the Plan Commission shall hold an open hearing before making its recommendations to the Common Council.

(8) Common Council Hearing

Upon receipt of the recommendations of the Plan Commission, the Common Council shall hold an open hearing on whether or not to give final approval to the proposed project.

(9) Effect of Approval of Plan Commission and Common Council

Approval of the project does not constitute approval for the construction of new buildings or structures on the site. Separate

approval shall be required for each building or structure upon application for a building permit.

(10) Recording of Final Plan

The Final Plan as approved by the Common Council shall constitute the Final Land Use and Zoning Plan and shall be filed with the Milwaukee County Recorder of Deeds. No permit allowing construction of a building or any other improvement shall be issued until the Final Plan is recorded.

d. Design Regulations

For the uses permitted on the approved Preliminary Plan the following standards and provisions shall be required:

(1) Minimum Area - A minimum parcel area of one acre is required. Adjoining dedicated street rights-of-way may not be included for computing total area for qualification.

(2) Residential Density - The total number of dwelling units permitted shall be determined by multiplying the net development area by the maximum density of 8.0 dwelling units per acre except that additional dwelling units may be permitted according to the provisions of Section (8) below. Net development area shall be determined by deducting 15 percent of the gross development area for streets, regardless of the amount of land actually required for streets. The area of land set aside for common open space, or public or recreational use, shall be included in determining the number of dwelling units permitted.

(3) Lot coverage - The maximum lot coverage of residential buildings shall not exceed 30 percent.

Floor Area Ratio - For residential uses there shall be a maximum floor area ratio of 0.4. The total floor area for residential purposes may be increased by two square feet of additional floor area for every one square foot of open space in excess of 25 percent of the total lot area.

(4) Yard Requirements - Yards and open spaces adjoining the boundaries of the development shall not be less than the yard requirements of the adjoining residential districts. A landscaped and land sculptured buffer strip at least 10 feet wide shall be provided along all peripheral lot lines. Spacing between principal buildings in the development shall be at least 12 feet and shall be consistent with recognized site planning principles, due consideration being given to the openness normally afforded by intervening streets and alleys. The net building site area for single-family

detached dwellings shall not be less than 6,600 square feet except when the housing adjoins permanent open space not less than 5,000 square feet will be permitted.

(5) Usable Open Space - There shall be at least 10 percent of the land area in the development provided for park and recreational purposes which shall not be covered by buildings, parking lots, driveways or streets. No more than 50 percent of the useable open space shall be covered by water.

(6) Land Improvements - Sanitary sewer, water and storm water drainage systems, including all appurtenances thereto, curbs, paving, street lights, pedestrian ways, street signs, and landscaping shall be provided in accordance with the standards and specifications of the City of Glendale as set forth in Ordinance Nos. and subsequent amendments.

(7) Private Streets - The designation of private streets in planned developments shall be subject to the approval of the Plan Commission and the Common Council. The design of private streets, including street lights, street signs, and landscaping shall be subject to the approval of the Department of Public Works of the City of Glendale.

(8) Design Incentives - The number of permitted dwelling units may be increased up to 50 percent of the allowed density providing that the incentive points accumulated for each design item be applied cumulatively and not exceed 100 points. The allowed density may be increased by one percent for each two incentive points; however, at least 40 incentive points must be accumulated in order to qualify for any increase in density.

Incentive Points

aa. Open Space

24 Useable open space provided equals 25 percent of site area which is not covered by buildings, parking and streets (private or public).

6-30 Dedication or donation of sites for public purposes such as schools, parks, and public buildings (but not including streets) with the number of incentive points accumulated to be determined as based on the amount of land donated in proportion to the total size of the development as follows:

Incentive Points	Net Percent of Deveolpment Area Donated
6	5
12	10
18	15
24	20
30	25 or more

Incentive Points	
	bb. Site Planning Design
4	Excellence in use of existing topography and/or land recontouring.
8	Excellence in siting buildings and building groups which may include variations in building setbacks.
4	Provision in design for courtyards, gardens and patios.
2	Proper consideration of sun and wind orientation.
2	Right-of-way provisions for riding, hiking and cycling.
	cc. Landscape Planting and Screening
4	Provision of masonry wall or solid fence five feet high on all peripheral lot lines with a less restricted use.
10	Excellence in quality and amount of standard trees and shrub planting, including peripheral and interior screen planting and fencing.
	dd. Facilities and Amenities
10	Swimming pool (five for each pool not to exceed 10).
4	Tennis Courts (one for each court not to exceed five) and playground recreation equipment.
10	Community Center building and/or club.
6	Lakes and water features.
5	Provisions for pedestrian facilities such as plazas, trails, bicycle racks, interior sidewalks, benches, etc.
8	Use of sculpture, fountains, reflecting pools and similar features in design.
	ee. Traffic and Parking
10	Provision of 50 percent of all required parking in an enclosed structure or structures.
20	Provision of 25 percent of required parking in an underground structure.
5	Parking lot design which includes standard tree and shrub planting.