

Meeting Minutes

CITY PLAN COMMISSION

(Comprehensive Planning)

Monday, June 30, 2003, 4:00 pm PRESENT: Plan Commission Members: Acting Chairman Mike Phillips; Karen Aldinger; Ann Shannon; Bud Flood (Excused, Mayor Wescott, Lois Feldman, and Fred Steffen)

Other Committee Members: Ald. Sevenich, Walthers, Markham, Molski, Stroik, and Moore; Bob Freckmann; Carl Rasmussen; Mark Seiler; Bill Meyer; (Excused, Liz McDonald, Lee Beveridge & Bill Carlson)

ALSO PRESENT: Comm. Dev. Dir. John Gardner; City Clerk, Victoria Zdroik; Mayoral Assis. Jami Gebert; Bob Woehr; Stephanie Lind

1. COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING

Issues and Opportunities Chapter

Population Projection

Housing Chapter

Mike Phillips, Acting Chairman, noted the Mayor had another commitment and asked him to chair the meeting. He welcomed Stephanie Lind from the University as a new member of the Commission.

Jeff Schuler reviewed the following demographic tables; city population, migration, age distribution, racial make-up, households, income, and poverty. In the year 2000, the city accounted for 37% of Portage County's population. The city is under-represented in the 25-64 year old age group (29% of total Co. population), and over-represented in the under-25 (45% of total Co. population) and over-represented in the over-65 age groups (41% of total Co. population). This is important because the two groups over-represented are typically lower wage earners than the 25-64 year old group. Fifty percent of all county households, 65 years of age and older, reside in the city. Two-thirds of the county's non-white population reside in the city. The city is the most diverse community within the county. The city is becoming a growth area. The city contains 46% of the county's single-mother households and 55% of all county non-family households, including 50% of county householders living alone. The median household income for the city is \$33,178, compared to \$51,238 for Plover and \$43,487 for Portage County. Possible reasons for the difference is the large number of college student population not engaged in full-time work while attending school and the large single-parent population.

Carl Rasmussen questioned if there was ever an attempt to pull out the 6,000 university population from these figures? Possibly many of our students that live in residence halls come from someplace else in the county.

John Gardner noted he worked with the UW extension office and tried to get a handle on the student impact but wasn't successful. We were able to do some analysis by comparing households and families. "Families" include related people living together which typically excludes students while "households" include students as well as elderly living alone. The percentages of family households and non-family households are almost equal in the city.

Stephanie Lind questioned how other university cities compare to us.

John Gardner responded some of the Wisconsin cities that have universities have larger city populations and the university student effect is not as pronounced. In some cities like Whitewater, the university population is a large percentage of the city population and the students have a very large effect. I have not found another Wisconsin city comparable to us.

Ald. Markham questioned regarding Item #11, if we compare jobs vs. population, are we gaining jobs faster than population.

John Gardner responded the City is considered the center of job creation more than the other outlying municipalities, and the rate of job growth in the city seems to be growing faster than the population.

Bob Freckmann noted regarding the #11 Tax Base Growth, you need some language that suggests that we are looking at the tax base growth where the cost to service the growth does not exceed the benefit of the growth.

John Gardner suggested adding the word "net" positive fiscal benefits in item #11.

Commissioners agreed that the word "net" should be included.

Mark Seiler noted the university has contributed much in Items #2, 3, 4, and 7 and it might be worthwhile to note that the university has responsibility in this planning effort.

John Gardner presented slides regarding Population Projections and Housing. Population projections are very important because they will be used to project the amount of city land needed for future development. The projected population for the next 20 years, divided by the number of people per household, equals the number of new houses needed for both apartments and single family. The number of houses times the square footage for lot size, equals the number of acres of development we will have in the next 20 years which, minus existing vacant property, nets out to be what the annexation area is going to be for the next 20 years. The sewer service area ultimately becomes the urban growth boundary. That is why the population number is so important.

We should be thinking about the whole metro region and not just individual municipalities. Each municipality affects the others. In order for the city to grow, the actual boundaries must be elastic and able to change. If development occurs around the edges of the city, that development will not want to annex to the city and that can make it impossible for the to expand whether the city wants to or not. What do we want to be and where do we want to grow. What one community decides to do, affects another community.

Gardner reviewed recent growth trends of the Village of Plover and the City including population increase (90-00), equalized property value increase, single family permit issued, household creation (census), and building permit activity. Several alternative growth projections were discussed. He reviewed the conclusions from the Rusk book Cities Without Suburbs. He reviewed several alternate population projections including the County population projection, continuation of the 90- 00 growth rate, growth equal to the county growth rate, and growth equal to the Village of Plover projected rate. No action was taken at this meeting.

The Commission discussed the importance of increased tax base. Gardner showed slides which indicate that the areas annexed and developed since the early 90's represent almost 14% of the total city value. If these areas were not annexed and if the city levy were the same, the city would have to have an equalized city tax rate of \$12.53/\$1000 instead of \$10.68/\$1000 to raise the same levy. The commission discussed when does the cost of growth exceed the benefits.

Karen Aldinger noted when we talk about growing, we are not talking about greed. We are just trying to have a healthy community.

Meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

The meeting minutes reproduced on this website are derived from the computer files used to produce the official minutes for the City of Stevens Point, but are unofficial. The minutes on this web site cannot be certified under s. 889.08, Wis. Stats., and cannot be considered prima facie evidence under s. 889.04, Wis. Stats. Certain tables, maps, and other documents that are a part of the official minutes are not included in the files reproduced on this website. Please consult the printed minutes, available in the City Clerk's Office, for the official text. The decisions made by City of Stevens Point boards, committees, and commissions (other than the Police & Fire Commission) are advisory only and are not binding on the city until affirmed at a meeting of the Common Council. Some of the minutes on this web site might not be approved by the Common Council as of today.

Bottom of Form