

Fitchburg's Urban Growth Boundary Process

The City of Fitchburg is in the process of establishing the Land Use section of the Comprehensive Plan. With a little over 1,000 acres of developable land within the current urban service area, the public policy officials are going through a process to map out where they want new urban service areas expanded in the future, the time frame and phasing process, and the land uses that will be associated within the growth boundary.

The city is currently in the first step of the process in identifying the area that will be included in the urban growth boundary. The public policy officials started the process by reviewing different growth models for the city along with reviewing background information on *watersheds, hydrology, groundwater recharge, socio-economic resources, and soil productivity* within Fitchburg. From this information the public policy officials formulated considerations that needed to be taken into account while drawing an urban growth boundary. The meetings and steps of the public policy officials are outlined below.

Prior to reviewing the urban growth boundary process, it is important to remember that land uses are not being determined at this time. In addition, the urban growth boundary will not be an entire area of wall to wall development. The Planning Commission and Common Council can pass an urban development boundary, with provisions stating that when a specific neighborhood (neighborhoods, phasing, and land use will be the next step after adoption of a growth boundary) comes forth for a development proposal, that the developer follows an established environmental corridor, community gardening, and/or future parks or open space plan. These provisions can be laid out in the land use section, with the accompanying plans to be completed after the completion of the comprehensive plan.

Beyond the creation of a boundary there will also be the issue of phasing/timing and where resources will be placed to allow development to occur. This will become the next step for the public policy officials to determine after an urban growth boundary is established. The classification of land uses may occur during this process to determine the appropriate phasing along with meeting the demand of the market.

Urban Growth Boundary Process

Prior to the growth boundary process, the city undertook a citywide survey between September and December of 2005 regarding the comprehensive plan. The results of this survey have been used by some public policy officials in assisting them through the urban growth boundary process. A summary of the results include:

- Residents are very supportive of policies that would maintain open- or green-space between Fitchburg and neighboring municipalities (44% strongly agree & 32% agree).
- 56% of Fitchburg residents would prefer to see slower rate of growth (45%) or see growth severely restricted (11%).
- Residents are very supportive of promoting the preservation on open space (79%) and encouraging production agriculture (68%).

- 54% of citizens would like to see landowners who preserve open space receive compensation from Fitchburg or developer for their efforts.

February 20, 2007 – Planning Commission Meeting

Planning Staff prepared 7 Potential Growth Models for Fitchburg for the policy makers to assist them in reaching a consensus on growth options for the Land Use segment of the Comprehensive Plan. Based on Fitchburg's past growth from 1980, the City has been developing, on average, 96 acres per year. Past growth from 1990 shows the City developing at 104 acres per year. In our calculations, staff has decided to show land use model scenarios with both 50 and 100 acres per year development, along with a FUDA model depicting 200 acres per year development. Three separate time periods were represented in each growth model. The first was a 25-year time period from 2005-2030 and the other two were 30-year time periods from 2030-2060 and 2060-2090.

As of 2005, the City has approximately 1,000 acres of developable land within the current urban service area. Because the urban service area has developable land, the 2030 potential growth area only needs to accommodate an additional 250 acres (50 acres per year) or 1,500 acres (100 acres per year) to reach a total of 1,250 or 2,500 acres, respectively, for the 25-year period.

* Under the 50 acres per year scenario, 250 potential growth acres are needed from 2005-2030, 1,500 acres from 2030-2060, and 1,500 acres from 2060-2090.

* Under the 100 acres per year scenario, 1,500 potential growth acres are needed from 2005-2030, 3,000 acres from 2030-2060, and 3,000 acres from 2060-2090.

The calculated acres for the "potential growth areas" are exclusive of existing development and readily identifiable environmental corridors and buffers.

Existing development included roads, right-of-ways, rail corridors, institutions, and developed lots less than 5-acres.

The environmental corridors taken into account were parks, woods, streams, wetlands, and buffer zones. All streams were buffered at the current minimum environmental corridor buffer of 75-feet from the edge. Wetlands within the current urban service area were also buffered at 75-feet; however, wetlands outside the current urban service area were buffered at 300-feet. Increased buffers are necessary to maintain the fecal coliform control, sediment control, and wildlife habitat (RPC 2005).

Growth Models

FUDA – This model follows the established growth pattern of the FUDA neighborhoods, building consecutively out from the current urban core.

- Map 1a shows the FUDA model with 100 acres/yr. development. The three neighborhoods were used for the 2030 projection, resulting in 500 acres more than needed within the 2005-2030 time period. The 2060 acres reflects this change.
- Map 1b shows the FUDA model with 50 acres/yr. development.
- Map 1c shows the FUDA model with 200 acres/yr. development. As you can see, the entire city is developed by the year 2066 with this model.

Concentric Growth – These models develop land out concentrically from a central point (usually a downtown or major activity node). Each of these models expands out from a major intersection within Fitchburg.

- Map 2a shows the Verona & McKee model with 100 acres/yr. development.
- Map 2b shows the Verona & McKee model with 50 acres/yr. development.
- Map 3a shows the Fish Hatchery & McKee model with 100 acres/yr. development.
- Map 3b shows the Fish Hatchery & McKee model with 50 acres/yr. development.
- Map 4a shows the Fish Hatchery & Lacy model with 100 acres/yr. development.
- Map 4b shows the Fish Hatchery & Lacy model with 50 acres/yr. development.
- Map 5a shows the Lacy & Syene model with 100 acres/yr. development.
- Map 5b shows the Lacy & Syene model with 50 acres/yr. development.

Corridor Growth – This model represents development along a major highway/rail corridor. The Fish Hatchery Corridor model expands development out consecutively one mile, one-half mile, and another one-half mile on each side of the road. The Rail Corridor model expands development out one mile on each side of the rail.

- Map 6a shows the Fish Hatchery Highway Corridor model with 100 acres/yr. development.
- Map 6b shows the Fish Hatchery Highway Corridor model with 50 acres/yr. development.
- Map 7a shows the Rail Corridor model with 100 acres/yr. development. This model only accommodates growth out to 2088.
- Map 7b shows the Rail Corridor model with 50 acres/yr. development.

Utility Service – This model represents the availability and costs of extending sewer and water, along with the areas that can be served by gravity flow sewer.

- Map 8a shows the Utility Service model with 100 acres/yr. This model only accommodates growth out to 2075.
- Map 8b shows the Utility Service model with 50 acres/yr.

Agricultural Protection – This model shows three options in preserving productive agricultural land based on soil type. Soil classes 1, 2, and 3 are the top soils suitable for cultivation with proper conservation management.

Developable areas were based off of parcels having less than 50% of the land as the preserved soil class and a continuous development pattern from the current urban service area.

- Supplement Map 9a shows the areas where soil classes 2-8 are located outside the current urban service area
- Map 9a shows the Ag Preservation of Soil Class 1 model, with a total of 3,713 potential developable acres.
- Supplement Map 9b shows the areas where soil classes 3-8 are located outside the current urban service area.
- Map 9b shows the Ag Preservation of Soil Classes 1 & 2 model, with a total of 2,201 potential developable acres.
- Supplement Map 9c shows the areas where soil classes 4-8 are located outside the current urban service area.
- Map 9c shows the Ag Preservation of Soil Classes 1, 2, & 3 models, with a total of 1,183 potential developable acres.

Redevelopment & Infill – this model limits growth to the current urban service area, with a small expansion of the urban service area. Areas for redevelopment were chosen if floor area ratios are less than 25%, 1-story office buildings, dated development patterns, large infill lots, major land use corridors, and the Fish Hatchery Redevelopment Study. In addition, the Town of Madison acquisition slated for 2017 was included in this model.

- Map 10a shows the Redevelopment & Infill model.
- Map 10b shows the Redevelopment & Infill model with potential hamlet developments outside the urban service area.

Resource Based – This model limits the growth by capping the amount of impervious service ratio (ISR) of the watershed. Table 1 displays the 4 watersheds where potential development may occur within this model. The planned ISR (%) are based off of the future land use maps of the municipalities that fall within each watershed (RPC, 2005). The diagram shows the sensitivity range an impervious cover has on the stream/wetland quality.

Badger Mill Creek and Nine Springs Creek have a planned ISR of 30.96% and 35.27%, respectively, which is degraded and beyond improving the stream quality. Fitchburg's possible action would be to develop the remaining acres of land within these two watersheds.

Story Creek has a planned ISR of 4.56%. This classification is sensitive, with a possible increase of 5.44% of impervious cover before a reclassification of impacted. Possible action would be to develop Fitchburg's proportion of the watershed to increase the impervious cover up to 9% (just below the impacted classification). By doing this, the city could develop 377 acres within the Story Creek Watershed. A special note, this watershed is a closed basin, meaning the water does not flow out to a main arterial river or water body.

Swan Creek has a planned ISR of 13.35%. This classification is impacted, with a possible increase of 11.65% of impervious cover before a reclassification of degraded. Possible action would be to develop Fitchburg's proportion of the watershed to increase the impervious cover to

24% (just below the degraded classification). By doing this, the city could develop 600 acres within the Swan Creek Watershed.

- Map 11a shows the Resource Based model, with the breakup of development in each watershed.

February 28, 2007 – Committee of the Whole Meeting

After the presentation to the Planning Commission on February 20, the P.C. members were in majority that they favored the combination of the Rail Corridor (Map 7b), Redevelopment & Infill with Hamlets (Map 10b), and the Agricultural Preservation of Soil Classes 1 & 2 (Map 9b). From this input, Planning Staff prepared a hybrid model series showing the combination of these growth models and presented them to the Committee of the Whole along with the same Growth Model Presentation. The Committee of the Whole discussed there idea regarding the Hybrid Model and the analysis that development should be based around.

March 6, 2007 – Ag & Rural Affairs Meeting

Planning Staff presented the Growth Model presentation and Hybrid Model Series.

March 13, 2007 – Common Council Meeting

Councilmember Horns and Councilmember Potts introduced Resolution R-30-07 at the Common Council meeting on March 13, 2007. This resolution amended the public participation process of the Comprehensive Plan and set guidelines for the Planning Commission to produce a long term growth model. This Resolution was referred out to the Planning Commission, Board of Public Works, Ag & Rural Affairs, Community & Economic Development Authority, and the Transportation and Transit Committee.

March 19, 2007 – Board of Public Works Meeting

The Board of Public Works reviewed the growth model and hybrid maps on their own and revised resolution R-30-07 with additions to look at growth areas that can be sewered by gravity and served by the existing distribution pressure zones.

March 20, 2007 – Fitchburg Chamber of Commerce Presentation

Planning staff gave a presentation to the Chamber of Commerce on the Growth Models and the Hybrid Model Series with an overview of the proposed resolution R-30-07.

March 22, 2007 – Community & Economic Development Authority Meeting

Planning staff gave a presentation to the Authority on the Growth Models and the Hybrid Model Series. Planning staff answered questions on the resolution R-30-07 and CEDA approved the resolution with no amendments.

March 29, 2007 – Transportation & Transit Committee Meeting

Planning staff gave a presentation to TTC on the Growth Models and the Hybrid Model Series and discussed the resolution.

April 3, 2007 – Ag & Rural Affairs Meeting

Ag & Rural Affairs took action on Resolution R-30-07 amending the Board of Public Works recommendations by changing the language to read *favours areas that can be sewerred by gravity* and removing the amendment that stated to limit areas that can be served by the existing distribution pressure zones.

April 9, 2007 – Board of Public Works Meeting

The Board of Public Works approved Resolution R-30-07 with their changes they had made on March 19, 2007.

April 12, 2007 – Transportation & Transit Committee Meeting

TTC took action on Resolution R-30-07 and approved the same version as Ag & Rural Affairs approved.

April 17, 2007 – Planning Commission Meeting

The Planning Commission held a public hearing on Resolution R-30-07, with a few citizens making comments on the resolution. The P.C. approved the resolution with Ag & Rural Affairs amendments along with their amendments to limit the growth to not exceed 75 acres per year, to make the buffer zones 300-foot or wider, to allow the P.C. to recommend a growth boundary to 2057, a later year, or a permanent boundary and to allow them to present an alternate pattern if one becomes present.

April 24, 2007 – Common Council Meeting

The Common Council approved the Resolution R-30-07 that was approved by the Planning Commission with their amendments to delete the addition that allowed the Commission to present an alternate pattern if one became present.

May 15, 2007 – Planning Commission Work Session

The approved Resolution R-30-07 lays out the frame work in which the Planning Commission will map a new FUDA boundary. The considerations to guide the Planning Commission are:

- If a growth rate is to be used, such growth rate will not exceed 75 acres per year.
- It will be assumed that streams will be protected by a 75-foot or wider buffer zone, that wetlands within the current urban services area will be protected by a 75-foot or wider

buffer zone, and that wetlands outside the current urban service area will be protected by a 300-foot or wider buffer zone.

- The proposed FUDA boundary will favor development of land along the Fitchburg-Oregon rail corridor.
- The proposed FUDA boundary will favor protection of groundwater recharge areas.
- The proposed FUDA boundary will favor protection of high-quality agricultural lands.
- All parts of the current FUDA will be considered for inclusion in the proposed FUDA.
- The proposed FUDA boundary favors areas that can be sewered by gravity.

In assisting the Planning Commission with these considerations, staff prepared “Information” and “Product” maps to be referenced when mapping the new FUDA boundary.

As in the previous Growth Models, potential growth areas were exclusive of existing development and readily identifiable environmental corridors and buffers.

Existing development included roads, right-of-ways, rail corridors, institutions, and developed lots less than 5-acres.

The environmental corridors taken into account were parks, woods, streams, wetlands, and buffer zones. All streams were buffered at the current minimum environmental corridor buffer of 75-feet from the edge. Wetlands within the current urban service area were also buffered at 75-feet; however, wetlands outside the current urban service area were buffered at 300-feet.

On some maps, these areas were identified in gray and classified as other in the legend or were broken down into different color patterns and labeled individually.

All of the maps (except the school map) showed a rail corridor boundary of 1-mile from the rail line on both sides and the boundary of the 3 current FUDA neighborhoods. The Oregon rail corridor is to be favored for future development and the current FUDA neighborhoods are to be considered for inclusion in the proposed new FUDA.

Information Maps

R1 - School District Development Pattern – During the presentation of the Growth Models, discussion occurred regarding the development within the three school districts within Fitchburg. This map is a breakdown of development within each school district, based on the 2005 land use data. Land uses not categorized as development were agriculture, open water, outdoor recreation, vacant land/lots, open space, and woodlands. The total assessed value was from the 2006 assessment numbers that were provided within the GIS parcel data.

R2 - Soil Classes – This map depicts the areas of soil classes throughout the non-urban service area in Fitchburg. Soil classes are based on percent of slope, texture of soil, and depth of soil material. For a class rating example, if all of a soil’s properties would place it in Class I – *except one*, which placed it in Class III, then the soil would have a Class III capability. The two main blocks of Class I soils are in the Stoner Prairie area and the Prairie View area (Caine Rd & CTH

M). Class 2 & 3 soils are quite prevalent in other parts of the city. Soils colored in a shade of red are rated very suitable for agricultural production.

R3 - Natural Infiltration – This map depicts the ratings of the permeability within the city. The map was derived from NRCS soil information using relative cumulative scores based on soil permeability, depth to the water table, depth to bedrock, and slope. Table 1 shows the scores for each factor in calculating the natural infiltration measurement. Infiltration scores ranged from 0 (low permeability) to 10 (high permeability) and scores 13 and over were considered undetermined. Undetermined areas are primarily quarry, sand pit and fill site locations. The map is based on information provided by the Community Analysis and Planning Division of the Dane County Regional Planning Commission (former Dane County RPC).

Table 1 Infiltration Rating Factors		
Criterion	Criterion Groups	Score
Permeability	0.06 to 0.15 in./hr.	0
	0.15 to 0.6	1
	0.6 to 2.0	2
	2.0 to 6.0	3
	6+	4
	Highly Variable	13
Depth to Water Table	0 – 3 ft.	1
	3 – 5	2
	5+	3
Depth to Bedrock	0 – 3 ft.	0.5
	3 – 5	1.0
	5+	1.5
Slope	8+ percent	0.5
	4 to 8	1.0
	0 to 4	1.5

R4 - Water Distribution Pressure Areas – This map depicts the areas where water distribution pressure can be met based on elevation. The Board of Public Works added this revision into the resolution, however other committees felt it was not relevant given the three areas that were affected, are rather minor in overall size.

Product Maps

R5 - Gravity Flow Sewer – One of the considerations is for the new boundary to be located within areas that can be served by gravity flow sewer. This map depicts the areas where gravity flow sewer can be met with the current interceptors. If development were to occur in areas outside of the gravity flow sewer boundary, they would have to either be serviced by a new interceptor, a lift station, or an on-site holding tank.

R6 - Soil Classes 1 & 2 – Another consideration is to favor the protection of high-quality agricultural lands. This map depicts the areas of the top 25% of soil classes (which are soil

classes 1 & 2). Class I soils are nearly level and the erosion hazard is minimal. The top soil is deep, generally well-drained, and easily worked. They hold water well and are naturally fertile or responsive to additions of fertilizer. Class II soils require general special tillage methods. They have one or more limitations that limit them from being a Class I soil (*Washington County, MN Soil Survey Manual*).

R7 - High Infiltration Preservation – Proper stormwater management and maintaining a consistent groundwater level strategy for addressing the impacts of development is to infiltrate as much rainfall and snowmelt into the ground as possible, thereby reducing overland runoff and replenishing groundwater supplies. Consideration was given to favor protection of groundwater recharge areas. This map depicts the areas of the top 25% of infiltration opportunities (natural infiltration score of 7.5-10).

R8 - Infiltration & Soil Overlay – This map depicts the areas where the top 25% of infiltration areas overlap the top 25% soil classes (1 & 2) which is the deep red color. The Stoner Prairie area contains the largest contiguous area of both top 25% infiltration and soil classes. This map also shows the areas of the top 25% soil classes (red color) and top 25% of infiltration areas (pink color) that do not overlap. The Stoner Prairie area is

R-9 – Extraterritorial Land Division Review – This map indicates the ETJ areas with the red hash showing the area where the city has adopted ETJ plat authority and the orange areas that have potential ETJ plat authority; ETJ authority has not been adopted for the orange hashed areas. Please note that the information outside of Fitchburg may not be fully correct or up to date as it is based on information the Planning Dept. had available in digital format that is a few years old.

Work Session

During the work session, the Planning Commission broke up into two separate groups to formulate a draft urban growth boundary. Both groups analyzed the Resolution R-30-07 and determined which areas they felt development should not occur and where development should occur. Map R8 took majority of the Resolution considerations into account and was used in opening discussions on where the new growth boundary would be established, along with the other 8 maps.

After each group finished with their draft maps, Planning Staff combined the two maps and distinguished the areas that were of mutual agreement for the growth boundary and separated the differences out with two separate colors. Each group went step by step with the areas that differed from the other groups map. Discussion was held regarding why the areas were included and why they were left out. A consensus was reached on each discrepancy area.

Economic Development Director, Mike Zimmerman, requested that the Planning Commission consider adding the property just south of Sub Zero into the boundary to allow for further expansion of Commerce Park. After lengthy conversation, the Planning Commission agreed to just include the parcel south of Sub Zero into the draft map because of the connectivity to

Commerce Park, the connection to the Seminole Highway Interceptor, and the existing small expansion of Sub Zero's parking lot outside of the current urban service area.

The Planning Commission approved of a public comment period to be held from May 21, 2007 until noon on June 8, 2007. The Planning Commission also set up an Open House on June 5, 2007 to be followed by a Public Hearing.

June 5, 2007 – Planning Commission Meeting

The Planning Commission heard from 29 citizens at the June 5, 2007 public hearing meeting regarding the draft growth boundary map, as well as 15 who registered in opposition, but chose not to speak. The Planning Department received 61 written comments from May 17 – June 8 regarding the draft urban development boundary map.

The overall comments were strongly separated between two groups, those who would like to see the Northeast Neighborhood not developed and those that would like to see the Stoner Prairie area developed, with a few people commenting on other site specific areas or the overall process and analysis.

The reoccurring comments for not wanting development in the Northeast Neighborhood included the preservation of natural resources, the implications development would have on the eutrophication of Lake Waubesa, the effects development would have on the ground water level, and the expense development would have on the Oregon School District. Majority of those that commented wanted the entire northeast portion taken out of the draft urban development boundary.

The comments for wanting development in the Stoner Prairie area included the Verona School Districts commitment to the City of Fitchburg, the close proximity to City Hall, Commerce Park, and other city services, the established transportation systems (highways), and the lack of active farmers in preserving the farmland. Some have suggested extending the urban growth boundary as far south to Whalen Road and east to Caine Road, with a contiguous phasing south that is driven by the market.

There were a few people that voiced their concern with a 50-year plan and would prefer a 10 year plan, one person suggested hiring an independent consultant, and others said slow the development of the city down, with suggestions of even limiting all development to the current urban service area.

June 12, 2007 – Ag & Rural Affairs Meeting

The Ag & Rural Affairs discussed their concerns and ideas for the draft urban growth boundary map and made several recommendations. They added the land north of Lacy Road, the Fahey 80 acres, and a large area of property east of USH 14 from about a ¼ mile north of Irish Lane south Murphy Creek. They also wanted the Planning Commission to consider a permanent growth boundary and institution of a transfer of development rights program that will sunset in 75 years.

June 19, 2007 – Planning Commission Meeting

The Planning Commission members discussed their comments from the public hearing and written comment period. The Planning Commission also moved to ask the Common Council for an extension of the deadline to produce the draft growth boundary map from August to October.

The Planning Commission amended the draft map to include the 602 acres proposed by the Ag & Rural Affairs Committee and remove the 20 acre section (just north of Grandview Rd) that the Public Works had concerns over in providing gravity flow sewer of that site.