CHAPTER 1

Issues and Opportunities

2013 Brown County Comprehensive Plan Update Prologue

A comprehensive plan is intended to be a living, dynamic document that sets an overall vision while maintaining flexibility to efficiently respond to opportunities and challenges all communities face. A comprehensive plan’s vision is generally considered to be over a 20-year horizon; however, keeping the same plan unchanged for 20 years can lead to the document becoming irrelevant if it is not occasionally updated to reflect current realities for a community. The 2004 Brown County Comprehensive Plan recognized this need and included an implementation recommendation of reviewing and revising the comprehensive plan within 10 years to update background data, review the goals and objectives, and evaluate the overall implementation of the plan. It is this recommendation the 2013 Brown County Comprehensive Plan Update is intended to address.

As this is an update, some of the background data and text from the 2004 plan is still relevant and therefore is not changed. However, over the past 10 years certain issues such as the economic recession, recovery, and resultant shift in housing market dynamics have changed dramatically since 2004. Additionally, with regard to specific instances where more recent or more detailed data is available, such as population estimates, population projections, and existing land uses; the maps, graphs, and recommendations will reflect the new data. Furthermore, this update reviews how the 2004 plan was implemented through policy adjustments or changes to the physical make-up of the County.

It is anticipated within another 10 years, consistent with the recommendation in the 2004 plan, this update will be supplanted by a new Brown County Comprehensive Plan. In the meantime, this comprehensive plan update provides the necessary bridge to ensure development decisions and policies continue to be considered and acted upon in a manner consistent with the original vision in the 2004 plan, while addressing the issues and opportunities of 2013.

Introduction

The Brown County Comprehensive Plan – A Vision for Great Communities was initially developed through an intensive public participation and review process and is intended to be reflective of the values, goals, and vision of the residents and communities that comprise Brown County. The development of this the 2004 plan, along with many of the more detailed comprehensive plans for Brown County’s local communities, was initially made possible through the State of Wisconsin Comprehensive Planning Grant Program administered by the Wisconsin Department of Administration – Division of Intergovernmental Relations. The Land Use and Natural and Cultural Resources Chapter of this 2013 update was funded in part through a grant from the Wisconsin Coastal Management Program.

The Brown County Comprehensive Plan is not intended to pre-empt local comprehensive plans developed under Wis. Stats. 66.1001 that address the 14 State of Wisconsin comprehensive planning goals. Rather, the plan is intended to be a framework or “toolbox,” which can provide local communities with concepts and ideas (tools) to implement the objectives set forth in their
own localized comprehensive plans while still maintaining a coordinated and consistent vision with the Brown County plan.

**Purpose and Intent**

A comprehensive plan is an official public document adopted by ordinance by the local government that sets forth its major policies concerning the future physical development of the community. The primary purposes of this plan are to generate goals for attaining a desirable development pattern, devise strategies and recommendations the County can follow to achieve its desired development pattern, and meet the requirements of the State of Wisconsin Comprehensive Planning Law. It is intended that the recommendations in this plan reflect the 14 local comprehensive planning goals prescribed in state statute and listed below:

1. Promotion of the redevelopment of lands with existing infrastructures and public services and the maintenance and rehabilitation of existing residential, commercial, and industrial areas.
2. Encouragement of neighborhood designs that support a range of transportation choices.
3. Protection of natural areas, including wetlands, wildlife habitats, lakes, woodlands, open spaces, and groundwater resources.
4. Protection of economically productive areas, including farmland and forests.
5. Encouragement of land uses, densities, and regulations that promote efficient development patterns and relatively low municipal, state governmental, and utility costs.
6. Preservation of cultural, historic, and archeological sites.
7. Encouragement of coordination and cooperation among nearby units of government.
8. Building of community identity by revitalizing main streets and enforcing design standards.
9. Providing an adequate supply of affordable housing for individuals of all income levels throughout each community.
10. Providing adequate infrastructure and public services and an adequate supply of developable land to meet existing and future market demand for residential, commercial, and industrial uses.
11. Promoting the expansion or stabilization of the current economic base and the creation of a range of employment opportunities at the state, regional, and local levels.
12. Balancing individual property rights with community interests and goals.
13. Planning and development of land uses that create or preserve varied and unique urban and rural communities.
14. Providing an integrated, efficient, and economical transportation system that affords mobility, convenience, and safety and that meets the needs of all citizens, including transit-dependent and disabled citizens.

The Brown County Comprehensive Plan should be used by County officials when revising and administering its countywide ordinances, as well as when setting priorities for major investments. The plan should be the basis for reviewing future developments, constructing transportation improvements, and extending public services. The plan is designed to be a guiding vision so that there is a consistent policy to follow and a clear goal for the future of the residents of Brown County.

**Comprehensive Planning Process**

The last plan for land and transportation in Brown County was adopted in 1996. Since 1990 (the base population year for the 1996 update), Brown County has experienced very strong residential, commercial, and industrial growth, adding an estimated 37,000 new residents.
County leaders decided to take advantage of the State of Wisconsin Department of Administration – Division of Intergovernmental Relations Comprehensive Planning Grant program to develop a new plan that would meet the requirements of the Comprehensive Planning Law, take into account the changes in the County since 1996, and better reflect Brown County residents’ vision of how the County should develop over the next 20 years. In order to oversee the planning process, the Brown County Planning Commission (BCPC) Board of Directors was given the task of representing the diverse interests of the local communities, residents, and other interested parties, while always keeping in mind what is good for Brown County as a whole over the 20-year timeframe of this plan.

In order to better reflect local trends and knowledge, the staff of the Brown County Planning Commission was contracted to provide professional planning expertise. BCPC staff prepared the background information and the recommendations of this plan based upon the consensus opinions of BCPC Board of Directors, public visioning session, Brown County stakeholder interviews, element discussion groups, and the State of Wisconsin Comprehensive Planning Law.

This document is comprised of ten chapters reflecting the various elements in the Comprehensive Planning Law: Issues and Opportunities; Housing; Transportation; Utilities and Community Facilities; Agriculture; Natural and Cultural Resources; Economic Development; Intergovernmental Cooperation; Land Use; and Implementation. Although all of these chapters have their own goals, objectives, and recommendations, the elements are all interrelated, and therefore, the goals, objectives, and recommendations are also. This plan was developed with the interrelationships of the elements in mind.

Since all local communities in Brown County administer their own local ordinances (zoning, building permits, etc.) and have a strong tradition of local control, it is not appropriate for Brown County to develop a countywide future land use map without including the local communities’ individual future land use maps. Rather, the future land use map for Brown County is actually a “quilt” composed of each local community’s future land use map that meets the Wisconsin Comprehensive Planning Law requirements. In this manner, Brown County’s Future Land Use map provides a big-picture vision of how each local municipality plans to develop and how that vision meshes with neighboring plans. Since all of the local comprehensive plans are not yet completed, it is not possible to create a complete composite map showing the future land uses of all of the Brown County communities. However, the Land Use chapter provides a map (Figure 2-11) that generalizes those local future land use maps in Brown County that meet the requirements of the comprehensive planning law. As additional communities adopt their local comprehensive plans, the future land use maps should be added as new pieces of the overall future land use map of Brown County.

The final part of the plan involves implementing the recommendations. A comprehensive plan is only effective when it is actually used. This includes utilizing the plan on a routine basis when making policy and administrative decisions and when creating or revising County ordinances, such as the subdivision ordinance, to guide development consistent with the plan.

This document is not the end of the planning process. For Brown County to succeed in achieving its vision for the future, planning must be a continual, ongoing exercise. Just as this plan replaces updates the 1996-2004 Brown County Land Use and Transportation Plan Comprehensive Plan, planning within the County must continue to evolve to reflect new trends, concepts, and emerging issues that are most efficiently addressed at the county level.
**Goals and Objectives Development Process**

A major element of the comprehensive planning process is the identification of community-wide goals and objectives. The identification is often difficult as values held by residents are highly elusive and complex. People vary widely in their choice of values and the degree to which they would accept or tolerate differing attitudes.

In 2002, the Brown County Planning Commission facilitated a county-wide visioning session, utilizing the nominal group method, at the then brand-new Resch Center in Ashwaubenon. Approximately 100 residents attended the session to identify their priorities and policies for Brown County development over a 20-year timeframe. The results from the meeting were processed into 72 distinct objective statements, which were then mailed to the attendees and a 350-person mailing list of local elected officials, business owners, interested residents, and other interested parties.

The recipients were asked to rank each issue on a strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, and strongly disagree scale, as well as to identify their top 10 issues out of the 72 total issues. The following are the issues identified the most often in the respondents’ top 10 lists.

**Visioning Session**

In order to identify the County’s priorities for community development, as well as key issues and concerns to be addressed, the Brown County Planning Commission held a public visioning session, which utilized the nominal group method, on September 19, 2002, in the Resch Center lobby in Ashwaubenon. Approximately 100 residents attended and provided input into how they want Brown County to develop over the next 20 years.

The results from this meeting were processed into 72 general objective statements. The objective statements were mailed to all of the original attendees, as well as to a 350-person mailing list of local elected officials, business owners, interested residents, and other interested parties. They were asked to rank each issue on a strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, and strongly disagree scale, as well as to identify their top 10 issues out of the 72 total issues. The following are the issues identified the most often in the respondents’ top ten lists:

**Rank:**

1. Ensure that there is and will always be an adequate supply of high quality public drinking water, such as through the construction of a new pipeline to Lake Michigan.
2. Encourage the preservation of environmental corridors and other sensitive areas, such as waterfronts, streams, and wetlands.
3. Identify, propose, and consolidate government services to the greatest extent possible in an effort to maintain or improve quality, streamline services, and reduce costs.
4. Encourage efficient, compact, and well-balanced land development to control sprawl (inefficient development).
5. Preserve, restore, and improve surface water quality (wetlands, lakes, rivers, and streams) through education, erosion control, buffer strips, easements, land use controls, flood controls, and nutrient/sediment reductions.
6. Promote safe neighborhoods for all residents.
7. Control commercial sprawl and reduce blight by filling and rehabilitating existing structures and vacant lots.
8. Encourage greenspace and open space in planned developments.
9. Reduce the number of governmental jurisdictions.

10T. Promote more transportation options, such as sidewalks, trails, bicycle facilities, and transit.
10T. Retain and attract business and industry.

**Discussion Group Meetings**

After an initial draft of the goals and objectives were developed from the input at the visioning session and survey, two discussion group meetings were held to gain additional insight into the draft goals and objectives, as well as any potential goals or objectives that may have been missed. The discussion group meetings were held on July 17 and July 31, 2003, at the Brown County UW-Extension offices. Local and state experts with knowledge in the pertinent elements were invited and asked for their input regarding the draft goals and objectives. As a result of the discussion group meetings, revisions and further refinement to the draft goals and objectives were completed.

The nominal group workshop, issue ranking survey, discussion group meetings, input from the BCPC Board of Directors, State of Wisconsin Comprehensive Planning Law, and sound planning principles formed the basis for the development of the 2004 comprehensive plan goals and objectives.

**2013 Goals and Objectives Inputs**

In 2011 and 2012, county-wide reports were completed that assessed Brown County residents’ views regarding current and future trends and issues. The *LIFE Study – Leading Indicators for Excellence in Brown County* was sponsored by the Brown County United Way, Greater Green Bay Community Foundation, and Green Bay Area Chamber of Commerce, and was prepared by staff from UW-Green Bay and St. Norbert College in partnership with interested Brown County citizens, government officials, business owners, and non-profit group leaders to, “…spark leaders and community members to take action: action based on an accurate understanding of the community’s strengths and shortcomings across a variety of sectors.” The LIFE Study provides a series of quality of life indicators, and based upon survey input and statistical data, identifies a current status and trend of good, fair, poor, or not rated for each indicator. Since this data is relatively recent and provides a snapshot of current priorities of the community, information from the LIFE Study was utilized as an input to update the goals and objectives of the comprehensive plan.

The second report, *Brown County 20/20: Envisioning the Future*, was prepared by the Bay Area Community Council in conjunction with the Brown County United Way, Greater Green Bay Community Foundation, and Green Bay Area Chamber of Commerce. The report is the result of a two-day conference held in February 2012 and attended by 240 Brown County leaders. According to the report, the ideas generated at the conference were slotted into five areas: education, overcoming division, economic development, personal and community health, and self-sufficiency. The ideas were subsequently ranked in order of importance as determined by a

---

vote during the conference. Similar to the LIFE Study, the Brown County 20/20 report provides a wealth of information on what the Brown County community values. The results of this report were also utilized as an input to update the goals and objectives of the comprehensive plan.

Brown County Comprehensive Plan Goals and Objectives

Goals and objectives each have a distinct and different purpose within the planning process. Goals describe desired situations toward which planning efforts should be directed. They are broad and long-range. They represent an end to be sought; although, they may never actually be fully attained. Objectives describe more specific purposes, which should be sought in order to advance toward the achievement of the overall goals. The third part of the planning process – recommendations (policies) and programs – is discussed in each chapter specific to that comprehensive plan element.

The objectives are broken down into those that Brown County has direct responsibility over, those where responsibility is divided between the local units of government and Brown County, and those where the local units of government have direct responsibility. This was done in order to recognize the limits of Brown County government and to encourage the local units of government to incorporate the relevant objectives into their local plans in order to present a coordinated and consistent vision for the future of Brown County.

The Brown County Comprehensive Plan is based on the following goals and objectives:

**NOTE: The Goals and Objectives will be brought forward in concert with the applicable chapter(s) for review by the BCPC Board of Directors.**

**Land Use Goal #1**

Manage future growth in Brown County by promoting and encouraging the orderly, efficient, compact, and well-balanced development of land, which maintains a balance among the preservation of environmentally sensitive areas, agricultural lands, and continued residential, commercial, and industrial development.

**County Objectives**

- Conduct an inventory and analysis of existing land uses in the County to determine and encourage municipalities to enable the most appropriate use of land.

**County and Local Objectives**

- Promote the development and enforcement of land use, planning, and design standards that are consistent and compatible across municipal boundaries while recognizing the uniqueness of individual communities.
- Designate realistic and flexible growth areas while taking into account economic realities and the provision of efficient services.

---

Provide incentives to developers to use traditional neighborhood developments and planned developments to promote mixed-use development and to use conservation by design subdivisions to preserve greenspace, environmentally sensitive areas, and agricultural land.

Local Objectives

- Encourage higher-density development and promote the development of existing undeveloped and underutilized lots and the rehabilitation of existing structures.
- Promote the compatibility of adjoining land uses for both existing and future development.

Land Use Goal #2

Encourage communities to establish and maintain unique identities and the sense of community through the layout, design, and regulation of new development.

County and Local Objectives

- Balance individual property rights with community interests and goals.
- Promote the design and maintenance of safe neighborhoods and utilize available programs to ensure well-maintained properties.

Local Objectives

- Encourage the development of municipal centers and civic spaces that are integrated into communities to promote neighborhood activities and gatherings.
- Encourage development approaches that establish and maintain community identity.
- Promote the concept of traditional neighborhood design (TND) that focuses on creating walkable neighborhoods with a mix of uses that encourage social interaction.
- Encourage local communities to utilize design standards for commercial, industrial, and multifamily development to promote quality building design and community identity.

Transportation Goal

Develop a safe and efficient multi-modal transportation system that serves all Brown County residents.

County Objectives

- Ensure that major highway and bridge construction projects do not occur until the land use and other impacts associated with these projects are thoroughly studied.
- Ensure that existing and planned land uses are considered when determining the physical characteristics of new and reconstructed Brown County highways.
- Emphasize maintenance of the existing county highway system over the construction of new county highways.
• Work with Brown County’s communities, WisDOT, Green Bay Metro, school districts within the County, and other entities to develop the County’s multi-modal transportation system.

• Continue to implement the recommendations in Austin Straubel International Airport’s recently completed airport master plan and investigate methods of expanding passenger and freight service at the airport.

• Complete the comprehensive plan for the Port of Green Bay and begin implementing the plan’s recommendations.

• Encourage Brown County residents and visitors to utilize the high-speed passenger rail service proposed by the US DOT for Brown County to minimize vehicle traffic on the area’s highways.

• Ensure that all Brown County residents retain access to the transportation system when major highway and other projects occur.

County and Local Objectives

• Maximize safety, efficiency, and accessibility at intersections throughout Brown County.

• Promote safe and continuous pedestrian and bicycle systems throughout Brown County by constructing sidewalks, multi-use trails, bicycle lanes, and other facilities that are linked between communities and destinations.

• Design county highways and local streets within the context of the surrounding land use.

• Encourage traffic calming techniques throughout Brown County to improve safety and minimize the impacts of vehicles on neighborhoods.

• Identify a system of truck routes throughout Brown County and mark them with unique signs to enable them to be easily identified.

• Apply for grants to help fund the development of Brown County’s multi-modal transportation system.

Local Objectives

• Create neighborhoods that contain a mix of residential, commercial, recreational, and institutional uses to make walking and bicycling viable transportation options.

• Promote development with population and employment densities that improve the viability and attractiveness of transit service by developing activity centers within the urbanized area.

• Promote well-connected street patterns to distribute traffic evenly and maximize mobility and accessibility for all residents and facilitate connectivity among neighborhoods. This may include the use of interconnected, curvilinear street patterns.

Agricultural Resources Goal

Balance the use and preservation of agriculture in Brown County in a sustainable manner so as to enhance its long-term viability and maintain the character of the County.

County Objective
Evaluate the economic impact of agriculture and agricultural-related businesses on Brown County’s economy.

County and Local Objectives

- Maintain the rural atmosphere of Brown County’s agricultural areas.
- Prevent the premature extension of utilities and infrastructure in order to retain agricultural lands and land uses as long as appropriate and feasible.
- Provide additional educational, financial, and other types of assistance to Brown County’s agricultural communities and farmers to enable them to become more economically viable.
- Preserve productive agricultural lands through innovative preservation and development techniques, such as purchase or transfer of development rights, farmland preservation, and agricultural planning programs.

Natural and Cultural Resources Goal

Balance the use and preservation of Brown County’s cultural and natural resources in a sustainable manner so as to enhance the character and quality of life found within the County to the greatest extent possible.

County and Local Objectives

- Identify Brown County’s mineral resources (sand, gravel, and dimension stone) and plan for their use accordingly.
- Promote the preservation of Brown County’s irreplaceable resources, such as soils, surface and ground water, and wildlife habitat, through means, such as agricultural best management practices, erosion control, stormwater management, and land acquisition.
- Encourage the preservation and public acquisition of environmentally significant areas, such as shorelands, wetlands, streams, floodlands, upland forests, wildlife habitat, and geological features, such as the Niagara Escarpment.
- Support efforts to preserve threatened and endangered species.
- Promote the preservation of cultural, historic, and archaeological sites through interpretive programs and facilities.
- Encourage the preservation of open space, greenspace, and scenic resources within and adjacent to development through conservation by design development and the public dedication and acquisition of parks and open space.
- Support cultural facilities, such as the Neville Public Museum, Weidner Center, and Heritage Hill State Park, which increase the area’s quality of life.
- Promote and support educational efforts that encourage Brown County residents to learn about and care for the County’s natural and cultural resources.
Utilities and Community Facilities Goal #1

Provide adequate and efficient utilities, such as sewer, water, solid waste, and power, in a cost-effective manner.

County Objective

- Encourage the Green Bay Metropolitan Sewerage District (GBMSD) and Central Brown County Water Authority and other utility providers to minimize the extension of utility lines beyond the metropolitan area to encourage infill and contiguous development.

County and Local Objectives

- Develop and maintain a long-term viable supply and distribution system of high-quality public drinking water, public sewage treatment, and stormwater management.
- Encourage future development to occur only where safe and environmentally sound sewage disposal, drinking water, and other services can be economically and efficiently provided.
- Identify techniques to properly collect and treat stormwater runoff.

Local Objective

- Promote the efficient use of existing streets, sewers, water systems, and other infrastructure through infill development and the planned outward expansion of the County’s communities consistent with the 5-year increment growth areas identified in their plans.

Utilities and Community Facilities Goal #2

Promote a quality living environment through the timely provision of adequate and efficient community facilities, such as recreation, emergency, and other public facilities, and services affecting the health, safety, and well-being of Brown County’s residents.

County Objectives

- Evaluate Brown County’s long-term facility needs in relationship to vacant or underutilized County-owned lands.
- Maintain the County’s existing public facilities and replace aging/obsolete infrastructure, buildings, and equipment in a coordinated fashion.
- Plan, locate, and develop new County-owned recreational facilities and expand the facilities within existing Brown County parks to respond to the needs and desires of all segments of the County’s population.

County and Local Objectives

- Promote the development of community facilities in Brown County’s municipalities that are linked to residential, commercial, institutional, and recreational land uses by trail and pedestrian systems.
- Continue to provide quality police, fire, and rescue services for all residents and businesses and identify sites for future public safety facilities as growth occurs throughout the County.
- Meet the ongoing physical and mental health needs of Brown County residents through the provision of adequate facilities.
- Enhance the Fox River and the Bay of Green Bay as Brown County resources by providing additional public waterfront access through pedestrian-friendly amenities and recreational opportunities at appropriate locations.
- Create an interconnected network of local, county, and state park and recreational facilities that focuses on the County’s natural resource features.

Housing Goal

Work with the local communities to develop neighborhoods that provide a variety of quality housing opportunities for all segments of Brown County's population in such a way that adverse environmental impacts are minimized, public services are efficiently provided, and alternative means of transportation are encouraged.

County and Local Objectives

- Encourage all communities to provide housing and associated services for low and moderate-income people so that no one community must provide for them all.
- Encourage the development of community-based residential facilities to help care for a diverse population.
- Identify and utilize government funding, programs, and agencies, neighborhood associations, non-profit agencies, and private sector industries to implement the housing recommendations contained in the plan.

Local Objectives

- Promote reinvestment into the existing housing stock in order to maintain property values and strong neighborhoods.
- Encourage the development of an adequate supply and mix of housing types for individuals of all income and ability levels.
- Coordinate with local communities, nonprofit organizations, and other charitable organizations to ensure adequate shelter for the homeless.
- Develop residential neighborhoods with mixed land uses that encourage alternative means of transportation to serve all ages and income levels.
- Promote the use of traditional neighborhood design (TND) to create a range of housing options.
- Promote the development and implementation of residential design and building maintenance standards to ensure quality accessible housing.
Economic Development Goal

Broaden the County’s tax base and strengthen its economy and employment base through the retention and attraction of existing businesses, development of new businesses, and continued diversification of industries.

County and Local Objectives:

• Identify processes to encourage cooperation and coordination rather than competition among Brown County communities when locating large economic development projects.

• Identify growing and weakening business sectors of the Brown County economy in order to target local economic development programs and recruitment and to promote the diversification of the local economy.

• Partner with local communities to enhance or redevelop commercial and industrial waterfront uses along the Bay of Green Bay and the Fox River.

• Identify tools and techniques for local communities to preserve or redevelop their downtowns.

• Develop economic development partnerships with agencies, such as Advance, Bay-Lake Regional Planning Commission, and the Wisconsin Department of Commerce.

• Coordinate with local educational institutions, as well as institutions of higher learning, to ensure a qualified workforce.

• Explore the possibility of intercommunity revenue sharing as a way to encourage economic development cooperation between units of government.

• Recognize farming as an economic activity and promote steps to enhance its long-term economic viability.

Local Objectives:

• Encourage compact development and promote the redevelopment of underutilized, vacant, blighted, or brownfield commercial and industrial sites and buildings to efficiently utilize existing public utilities and services.

• Assist businesses in planning for a diverse and aging workforce.

• Encourage the local communities to ensure quality commercial and industrial building designs and site layouts.

• Promote businesses and industries that are good stewards of land, air, and water resources.

• Encourage commercial development in smaller neighborhood nodes and larger downtowns rather than in long strips along main throughfares.

• Ensure that large business park developments include a nearby mix of small commercial ventures and residential uses.

• Encourage commercial and industrial developments that promote alternative modes of transportation.
Intergovernmental Cooperation Goal #1

Consolidate services to the greatest extent possible in an effort to maintain or improve the quality of services, to streamline services, and to reduce overall governmental costs.

County Objectives:

- Review the Kettl Commission report and determine if any recommendations can be used for consolidation and cooperation within Brown County municipalities.

County and Local Objectives:

- Identify existing duplication of services within municipal governments in Brown County to better coordinate services, potentially reduce costs, and improve efficiencies.
- Identify existing conflicts in Brown County within units of government and identify potential ways to resolve these conflicts.
- Promote the reduction in the number of governmental jurisdictions.
- Review privatization as a potential method of providing governmental services if the same or enhanced level of services can be provided at a lower cost.

Intergovernmental Cooperation Goal #2

Improve communication, coordination, and cooperation between and among units of governments.

County Objectives:

- Encourage cooperation between counties in the delivery of services and facilities.

County and Local Objectives:

- Encourage the development of boundary agreements between municipalities to help avoid conflicts, improve land use planning, and encourage cooperation.
- Promote consistent planning, land use, zoning, and design standards across municipal boundaries.
- Promote and encourage compatible land use planning at municipal borders to help avoid land use conflicts between adjacent communities.
- Encourage government consolidation and intergovernmental services agreements when costs would be minimized and efficiencies maximized.
- Promote intergovernmental cooperation and collaboration when planning for the future of Brown County’s natural resources.

Programs and Recommendations

Programs are the means by which a community can achieve and/or implement the recommendations contained in a comprehensive plan. Typically, programs include information
regarding financial aid through grants or loans, ordinance changes, or other creative means for a community to work toward its overall goals and objectives.

The recommendations (where relevant) for each chapter are included throughout each individual chapter and summarized in bulleted form at the end of each chapter. The programs to implement the recommendations are located in the Implementation chapter at the end of the comprehensive plan.

**Demographic Trends**

Over the past 40 years, Brown County has experienced strong population growth with the addition of 101,676 people. Between 1990 and 2000, the County added over 32,000 residents, for a growth rate of 16.5 percent. This is the second largest influx of people to Brown County in a 10-year period, behind only the decade of 1960-1970 when 33,142 people were added.

Over the past 50 years, Brown County has experienced strong population growth as the total county population increased from 125,082 in 1960 to 248,007 in 2010. Between 2000 and 2010, the County added 21,229 residents, for a growth rate of 9.4 percent. On average, Brown County has added just over 20,000 residents per decade over the past 50 years. Figure 1-1 depicts the population growth of Brown County from 1960-2010 and Figure 1-2 compares Brown County’s rate of population growth with the State of Wisconsin.

**Figure 1-1: Brown County Historical Population Growth, 1960-2010**
The largest community in terms of population continues to be the City of Green Bay as it has increased its population from 62,888 people in 1960 to 104,057 people in 2010. However, over the same time period, its relative share of total population in Brown County has decreased from 50.3 percent in 1960 to 42.0 percent in 2010. This trend is indicative of the comparatively faster demographic growth in the suburban communities. Figure 1-3 identifies the historical population growth of the individual municipalities for the time period of 1960-2010.

**Figure 1-3: Brown County Municipality Growth Trends Ranked by 2010 Census Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. Green Bay</td>
<td>62,888</td>
<td>87,809</td>
<td>87,899</td>
<td>96,466</td>
<td>102,313</td>
<td>104,057</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
<td>1,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. De Pere</td>
<td>10,045</td>
<td>13,309</td>
<td>14,892</td>
<td>16,594</td>
<td>20,559</td>
<td>23,800</td>
<td>15.76%</td>
<td>3,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Howard</td>
<td>3,485</td>
<td>4,911</td>
<td>8,240</td>
<td>9,374</td>
<td>13,546</td>
<td>17,399</td>
<td>28.44%</td>
<td>3,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Ashwaubenon</td>
<td>2,657</td>
<td>10,042</td>
<td>14,486</td>
<td>16,376</td>
<td>17,634</td>
<td>16,963</td>
<td>-3.81%</td>
<td>-671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Bellevue</td>
<td>1,007</td>
<td>1,736</td>
<td>4,101</td>
<td>7,541</td>
<td>11,828</td>
<td>14,570</td>
<td>23.18%</td>
<td>2,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Allouez*</td>
<td>9,557</td>
<td>13,753</td>
<td>14,882</td>
<td>14,431</td>
<td>15,443</td>
<td>13,975</td>
<td>-9.51%</td>
<td>-1,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Suamico</td>
<td>2,073</td>
<td>2,830</td>
<td>4,003</td>
<td>5,214</td>
<td>8,686</td>
<td>11,346</td>
<td>30.62%</td>
<td>2,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Ledgeview</td>
<td>1,109</td>
<td>1,365</td>
<td>1,535</td>
<td>1,568</td>
<td>3,363</td>
<td>6,555</td>
<td>94.92%</td>
<td>3,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Hobart</td>
<td>2,343</td>
<td>2,599</td>
<td>3,765</td>
<td>4,284</td>
<td>5,090</td>
<td>6,182</td>
<td>21.45%</td>
<td>1,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Lawrence</td>
<td>1,571</td>
<td>1,622</td>
<td>1,431</td>
<td>1,328</td>
<td>1,548</td>
<td>4,284</td>
<td>176.74%</td>
<td>2,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Scott</td>
<td>1,869</td>
<td>1,969</td>
<td>1,929</td>
<td>2,044</td>
<td>3,712</td>
<td>3,545</td>
<td>-4.49%</td>
<td>-167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Pulaski</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>1,717</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>3,013</td>
<td>3,321</td>
<td>10.22%</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Wrightstown</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>1,169</td>
<td>1,262</td>
<td>1,934</td>
<td>2,676</td>
<td>38.37%</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based upon the data presented, it is evident the suburban communities largely within the Green Bay Metropolitan Area continue to exhibit the strongest numeric gains in population over the past 10 years, with much smaller numeric gains in the non-metro communities. However, it is important to note the rate (percent change) of population growth in the more outlying communities, most notably the Towns of Lawrence and Ledgeview and Village of Wrightstown.

The largest community in terms of population continues to be the City of Green Bay as it has increased its population from 62,888 people in 1960 to 102,313 people in 2000. However, over the same time period, its relative share of population in Brown County has decreased slightly from 50.3 percent in 1960 to 45.1 percent in 2000. This trend is indicative of the comparatively stronger demographic growth in the suburban communities; although, no community has added more population in terms of the number of people between 1990 and 2000 than the City of Green Bay which added 5,847 additional residents. Figure 1-1 displays the historical population growth of Brown County from 1960 to 2000 in terms of the number of residents, and Figure 1-2 compares the growth rate of Brown County with the growth rate of the State of Wisconsin for the same time periods.

**Figure 1-2: Brown County and State of Wisconsin Historical Growth Trends**


### Age Distribution

Census figures indicate that the 2010 median age for Brown County residents was 36.2 years, as compared to 34.2 years in 2000 and 31.4 years in 1990. The continued increase in the median age is largely a result of the “baby boomer” generation continuing to age. This trend is depicted in Figure 1-4, as the census identifies the largest age segment for each decade continuing to age.
The Wisconsin Department of Administration – Demographic Services Center prepared statewide broad age cohort (school-age, work-age, and retirement age) projections through the year 2035. The data is compiled in Figure 1-5 and graphically depicts how the “retirement age” cohort is projected to proportionately increase from 13.0 percent of the state’s population to 22.3 percent by 2035. Considering the Brown County age breakdown largely follows the statewide trends, it can be reasonably expected Brown County’s broad age cohorts will project a similar trend. As the people within the baby boomer generation continue to age, it is necessary to ensure that the social and economic support networks are in place for a comfortable retirement, land uses and transportation facilities account for the aging population, and a highly skilled workforce is ready to replace them.

Census figures indicate that the 2000 median age for Brown County residents was 34.2 years, as compared to 31.4 years in 1990. This is an increase in the median age of 2.8 years, which is largely a result of the “baby boomer” generation continuing to age. This trend is further identified when combining the age groups into the larger blocks of school age (< 5-19), working age (20-59), and retirement age (60+) populations. From 1990 to 2000, the number of people school-age and retirement age declined 1.0 percent and 0.4 percent, respectively. Although the working age population accordingly realized a 1.4 percent increase, as is displayed in Figure 1-3, large portions of the working age group will be retired or approaching retirement within the 20-year timeframe of this plan. As the people within the baby boomer generation continue to age, it is necessary to ensure that the social and economic support networks are in place for a comfortable retirement and to ensure an adequately educated and prepared workforce is ready to replace them.
Figure 1-5: Wisconsin Projected Population by Broad Age Group, 2000-2035

![Figure 1-5: Wisconsin Projected Population by Broad Age Group, 2000-2035](image)


**Education Levels**

As is evident from Figure 1-4, educational attainment rates are very similar between Brown County and the State of Wisconsin, with the largest single group being high school graduates, the second largest being some college with no degree, and the third largest group having a bachelor’s degree. As the national economy continues to shift from a goods-producing economy to a service- and information-based economy, it is necessary to have a highly educated workforce to ensure that Brown County can continue to compete on the state, national, and international stage.
According to the U.S Bureau of Labor Statistics Current Population Survey, higher educational attainment is directly correlated to lower unemployment rates and higher median income. For example, according to the survey, a person with a high school diploma had median 2012 weekly earnings of $652 and an average unemployment rate of 8.3 percent as compared to a person with a bachelor’s degree weekly earnings of $1,066 and an average unemployment rate of 4.5 percent. The median weekly incomes for advanced degrees, such as a master’s degree, professional degree, or doctoral degree similarly increase and average unemployment decreases as one attains a higher degree. Increasing overall educational attainment is one proven way to increase overall income and decrease unemployment in Brown County.

**Income Levels**

According to the Wisconsin Department of Revenue (DOR)-Division of Research and Analysis, Brown County’s adjusted gross income (AGI) per tax return has increased every year since 1997, with the exception of 2009 during the depths of the recession, and but has remained consistently above the state average. According to the DOR, the Brown County AGI per tax return has generally recovered from the drop in 2009 to an average of $52,610 in 2011 for Brown County and $47,640 for the State of Wisconsin. Figure 1-7 depicts the past 14 years of AGI for Brown County and the State of Wisconsin. The most recent year, for which information is available, lists the year 2001 AGI for Brown County at $43,823 as compared to the State of Wisconsin at $40,847. As is evident in Figure 1-5, increases in income have recently slowed along with the sagging state and national economy.

---

http://www.bls.gov/emp/ep_chart_001.htm
Figure 1-51-7: Adjusted Gross Income Per Tax Return, Brown County and State of Wisconsin: 1997-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Brown County</th>
<th>Wisconsin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>$20,000-24,999</td>
<td>$20,000-24,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>$25,000-29,999</td>
<td>$25,000-29,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>$30,000-34,999</td>
<td>$30,000-34,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$35,000-39,999</td>
<td>$35,000-39,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$40,000-44,999</td>
<td>$40,000-44,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$45,000-49,999</td>
<td>$45,000-49,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$50,000-54,999</td>
<td>$50,000-54,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$55,000-59,999</td>
<td>$55,000-59,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$60,000-64,999</td>
<td>$60,000-64,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$65,000-69,999</td>
<td>$65,000-69,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$70,000-74,999</td>
<td>$70,000-74,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$75,000-79,999</td>
<td>$75,000-79,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$80,000-84,999</td>
<td>$80,000-84,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$85,000-89,999</td>
<td>$85,000-89,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$90,000-94,999</td>
<td>$90,000-94,999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Wisconsin Department of Revenue-Division of Research and Analysis, 1997-2011.

Additionally, the year 2000-2010 census provides a detailed snapshot of income ranges for households in Brown County and Wisconsin. Figure 1-6-8 provides a comparison of percentages of households in each broad income range for the county and state.

Figure 1-61-8: 1999-2010 Brown County and State of Wisconsin Household Income

Employment Characteristics

According to the 2000–2007-2011 American Community Survey estimates, of the 174,305,191,981 people Brown County residents considered to be of working age (16 years and older), 125,437,126,676, or 72.6% percent, are currently in the labor force and employed, while 48,868,560,178 or 29.2 percent of people consider themselves to be out of the labor force (student, stay-at-home parent, retiree, etc.). This compares to the 4,774,074 people Brown County residents (3.847 percent of the active labor force) who are currently unemployed and seeking employment, as compared to the estimated state unemployment rate of 7.1 percent.

In terms of employment, the largest industry in Brown County is manufacturing, with 25,449 the educational services, and health care and social assistance sector with 26,995 people, or 14.21.3 percent of the labor force, working in this field. The next largest sector is the educational, health, and social services manufacturing field, with 21,228,223,311 people, or 17.6 percent of the labor force. These two industries are also the largest sectors when analyzing data for the State of Wisconsin. It is interesting to note that in the 2000 Census, these two industry sectors were flipped in the rankings with manufacturing having 21.1 percent of the workforce and educational services, and health care and social assistance having 17.6 percent of the workforce. Figure 1-7-9 displays the industries and their total numbers and percentages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation/Industry</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Brown County Percent</th>
<th>State Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational services, and health care and social assistance</td>
<td>26,995</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>22,331</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>14,219</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, entertainment, and recreation, and accommodation and food services</td>
<td>11,711</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and insurance, and real estate and rental and leasing</td>
<td>9,592</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and warehousing, and utilities</td>
<td>8,954</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, scientific, and management, and administrative and waste management services</td>
<td>8,807</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>6,315</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services, except public administration</td>
<td>5,510</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>4,369</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration</td>
<td>3,630</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>2,230</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining</td>
<td>2,013</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Population Forecasts

In 2008, the Wisconsin Department of Administration (WDOA) released updated population projections for Wisconsin municipalities through the year 2030. According to these projections, the population of Brown County is forecasted to increase by 58,924 persons from the 2010 Census population of 248,007 to 306,931 people by 2030. Figure 1-10 identifies the WDOA projected populations for all Brown County communities, ranked by projected numeric change.

Figure 1-10: Brown County Municipality Growth Trends Ranked by Projected Numeric Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V. Bellevue</td>
<td>11,828</td>
<td>14,570</td>
<td>18,229</td>
<td>20,355</td>
<td>22,394</td>
<td>24,308</td>
<td>12,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Green Bay</td>
<td>102,313</td>
<td>104,057</td>
<td>108,481</td>
<td>110,899</td>
<td>112,879</td>
<td>114,313</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Howard</td>
<td>13,546</td>
<td>17,399</td>
<td>19,050</td>
<td>20,837</td>
<td>22,538</td>
<td>24,116</td>
<td>10,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. De Pere</td>
<td>20,559</td>
<td>23,800</td>
<td>25,805</td>
<td>27,578</td>
<td>29,237</td>
<td>30,742</td>
<td>10,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Suamico</td>
<td>8,686</td>
<td>11,346</td>
<td>13,950</td>
<td>15,639</td>
<td>17,261</td>
<td>18,786</td>
<td>10,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Ledgeview</td>
<td>3,363</td>
<td>6,555</td>
<td>6,131</td>
<td>6,894</td>
<td>7,627</td>
<td>8,319</td>
<td>4,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Hobart</td>
<td>5,090</td>
<td>6,182</td>
<td>6,624</td>
<td>7,104</td>
<td>7,557</td>
<td>7,969</td>
<td>2,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Lawrence</td>
<td>1,548</td>
<td>4,284</td>
<td>3,220</td>
<td>3,620</td>
<td>4,005</td>
<td>4,367</td>
<td>2,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Wrightstown</td>
<td>1,934</td>
<td>2,676</td>
<td>3,011</td>
<td>3,350</td>
<td>3,675</td>
<td>3,979</td>
<td>2,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Scott</td>
<td>3,712</td>
<td>3,545</td>
<td>4,359</td>
<td>4,769</td>
<td>5,160</td>
<td>5,522</td>
<td>1,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Ashwaubenon</td>
<td>17,634</td>
<td>16,963</td>
<td>18,366</td>
<td>18,761</td>
<td>19,082</td>
<td>19,312</td>
<td>1,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Pulaski</td>
<td>3,013</td>
<td>3,321</td>
<td>3,842</td>
<td>4,141</td>
<td>4,422</td>
<td>4,681</td>
<td>1,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Green Bay</td>
<td>1,772</td>
<td>2,035</td>
<td>2,278</td>
<td>2,456</td>
<td>2,625</td>
<td>2,779</td>
<td>1,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Rockland</td>
<td>1,522</td>
<td>1,734</td>
<td>1,996</td>
<td>2,167</td>
<td>2,329</td>
<td>2,479</td>
<td>957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Wrightstown</td>
<td>2,013</td>
<td>2,221</td>
<td>2,326</td>
<td>2,609</td>
<td>2,739</td>
<td>2,856</td>
<td>843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Eaton</td>
<td>1,414</td>
<td>1,508</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>1,913</td>
<td>2,027</td>
<td>2,132</td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Pittsfield</td>
<td>2,433</td>
<td>2,608</td>
<td>2,804</td>
<td>2,920</td>
<td>3,024</td>
<td>3,112</td>
<td>679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Denmark</td>
<td>1,958</td>
<td>2,123</td>
<td>2,256</td>
<td>2,377</td>
<td>2,488</td>
<td>2,587</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Holland</td>
<td>1,339</td>
<td>1,519</td>
<td>1,595</td>
<td>1,668</td>
<td>1,736</td>
<td>1,795</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Allouez</td>
<td>15,443</td>
<td>13,975</td>
<td>15,611</td>
<td>15,747</td>
<td>15,822</td>
<td>15,823</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Humboldt</td>
<td>1,338</td>
<td>1,311</td>
<td>1,538</td>
<td>1,592</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. New Denmark</td>
<td>1,482</td>
<td>1,541</td>
<td>1,676</td>
<td>1,726</td>
<td>1,770</td>
<td>1,806</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Glenmore</td>
<td>1,187</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>1,362</td>
<td>1,419</td>
<td>1,471</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Morrison</td>
<td>1,651</td>
<td>1,599</td>
<td>1,813</td>
<td>1,868</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>1,953</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown County</td>
<td>226,778</td>
<td>248,007</td>
<td>268,113</td>
<td>282,409</td>
<td>295,423</td>
<td>306,931</td>
<td>80,153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011; Wisconsin Department of Administration, 2011; Brown County Planning Commission, 2011.

* In some instances the 2015 Wisconsin Department of Administration estimates are lower than the 2010 U.S. Census total. This is due to the WDOA population projections being completed in 2008, prior to the 2010 Census. Updated WDOA projections are anticipated in 2014.
As identified in Figure 1-10, the Village of Bellevue is projected to add the largest number of new residents, while the City of Green Bay and the other suburbs in the immediate metropolitan area are expected to continue to see strong population growth as well. Numeric population growth is expected to be relatively slow in rural portions of Brown County. However, when viewed as a percentage of total population, there will be some proportional growth in the rural areas as well.

Figure 1-8: Projected Populations for Brown County and Local Governments

*The Village of Wrightstown elected to choose an alternative projection method in their comprehensive plan to reflect a more aggressive growth rate and a 2020 Village population of 5,241 residents.

As the local communities develop their local comprehensive plans that meet the Comprehensive Planning Law, they are to be given an opportunity to adjust their population projections based on localized trends using information, such as WDOA population estimates, building permits, new census or state data, and overall
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Figure 1-11

Source: Brown County Planning and Land Services, 4/19/2013
development activity. For the purposes of this planning effort and to be consistent with the recently revised Brown County Sewage Plan, the population projections listed will be utilized to determine future overall growth in Brown County.

**Household Forecasts**

In order to determine an approximate number of housing units that would be needed to house the Brown County population through the year 2030, an analysis of existing conditions was first completed.

The total number of housing units in Brown County has increased rather dramatically since the 1970 total of 44,798. The total increased to 62,008 in 1980, to 74,740 in 1990, and to 90,199 in 2000, and 104,371 in 2010. Over the course of just 30-40 years, the total number of housing units in Brown County has increased by 59,573 units or 133.0 percent. This averages out to approximately 14,893 new housing units added every decade. It is important to keep in mind that these are “housing units” which include single/two family detached homes, townhouses, apartment units, group homes, and all other variations of housing units in the county. Figure 1-12 illustrates the trend in the number of housing units in Brown County.

**Figure 1-101-12: Number of Housing Units in Brown County, 1970-2010**

![Graph showing the trend in the number of housing units in Brown County from 1970 to 2010.](image)


According to the year 2000 census, Brown County's average household size is currently 2.5±2.45 people. The average household size has continued to decline from 2.9 in 1970 to 2.85 in 1980, and to 2.62 in “1990, and 2.51 in 2010 which reflects the nationwide trends of smaller families and an increasing number of single people living alone. However, over this same period of time, the population of Brown County increased by over 68,500 residents, and an additional 45,401 housing units were constructed. It is important to note the recent trend, particularly during the recession, of extended families living together under one roof. This may include young adults moving back home after college, elderly parents moving in with their kids to avoid costs associated with elderly housing or to provide in-home care for either the elderly parent or
alternatively the elderly relative serving as an in-home caregiver for young children while the parents are working. As new housing units and developments are constructed, it is necessary to keep in mind the changing demographics and the corresponding change in housing preferences. The Housing Chapter provides additional information regarding current and projected housing trends. Figure 1-111-13 displays the average people persons per household trend in Brown County.

Utilizing the current Brown County average of 2.51–2.45 people persons per household in conjunction with the additional 54,57058,924 people projected to reside in Brown County yields a need for approximately 21,80024,000 additional housing units by 20252030. This required number of housing units might increase if the average number of people per household continues to decrease over the next 20 years.

According to the 2007-2011 American Community Survey, Currently in Brown County housing units are estimated to be 63.263.9 percent of the units in structure are 1-unit detached homes (standard, single-family house), while the remaining 36.836.1 percent of units are contained in a variety of other structures, such as duplex units, apartment buildings, group homes, and mobile homes. As a larger percentage of the Brown County population approaches retirement age, and families continue to have fewer children, there will be an increasing demand for a wider variety of housing options. The Housing Chapter provides information relating to the different housing types that Brown County might wish to encourage, as well as the tools that the County and local communities can utilize to encourage a range of housing options for an increasingly diverse population.

Employment Forecasts

Current employment characteristics and trends are discussed in detail in the Economic Development Chapter of the comprehensive plan. However, the forecast section of this chapter
sets the stage for later discussion regarding strengths and weaknesses of Brown County employment sectors.

The 2012 Metropolitan Area Outlook Report (August 30, 2002), produced by the Wisconsin Department of Revenue - Division of Research and Policy, is a quarterly report that discusses and compares current employment trends in the nation, state, and state metropolitan statistical areas, which includes the Green Bay Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA). The report also projects future employment trends by metropolitan statistical area based on local economic conditions and indicators.

As evidenced by the data depicted in Figure 1-14, the rate of economic growth in the Green Bay MSA (composed of Brown, Oconto, and Kewaunee Counties) is expected to slowly rebound from the depths of the recession in 2009. Forecasted rates of employment growth are projected to average approximately 1.7 percent from 2012 through 2014 for the Green Bay MSA and 1.5 percent for the State of Wisconsin.

The Division of Research and Policy projects that between 2001 and 2006 employment will grow but at a much slower rate than occurred between the years of 1996 and 2001. From 1996 to 2001, the Green Bay MSA added approximately 15,900 jobs (12.1 percent growth), which in terms of percentages is behind only the Wausau and Madison MSAs at 12.8 percent and 12.7 percent, respectively. This rate has slowed significantly during the years of 2000 and 2001 to 0.3 percent growth in the Green Bay MSA, as well as slowing significantly statewide. However, the Green Bay MSA is one of only four MSAs reporting employment growth over those two years.

Employment in the Green Bay MSA is forecasted to experience a slight growth of 0.1 percent in 2002, following a 0.3 percent growth in 2001. However, employment is forecasted to grow by 8.2 percent overall between the years 2001 to 2006, which is the highest growth rate among Wisconsin MSAs. The Metropolitan Area Outlook predicts that employment growth in printing and publishing will recover particularly strong, while strong growth is also predicted for the finance, insurance, and real estate sector, as well as the services and wholesale trade. Figure 1-12 displays employment growth by MSA from 1996 to 2001 and forecasted growth from 2001 to 2006.
Closely correlating with the projected rates of positive employment growth, it is expected that the unemployment rate within the Green Bay MSA and State of Wisconsin will also slowly decrease during the forecast period. The actual and forecasted unemployment rate is depicted in Figure 1-15. The Economic Development Chapter in the comprehensive plan provides additional data and analysis related to Brown County’s economy.

Summary

The goals and objectives identified in the Brown County Comprehensive Plan reflect the concepts contained in the 14 State of Wisconsin Comprehensive Planning goals, as well as the thoughts and comments obtained from residents, elected officials, and other interested parties throughout the planning process. Accordingly, the goals and objectives create a framework around which the comprehensive plan is developed.

Brown County is expected to continue its strong population growth by adding 54,570–58,924 residents (a 24.1–23.7 percent increase) for a total projected population of 306,931–281,348 people by 2025–2030. Population growth is projected to be particularly strong in the City of Green Bay and surrounding metropolitan communities. Although not as significant in terms of numbers of people, the relative rate of growth is expected to be high in the Towns of Ledgeview and Lawrence, the suburban communities of Bellevue, Howard, De Pere, and Suamico as these communities are expected to add 33,397 total residents, accounting for over 61 percent of the population growth in the County.

In order to provide shelter for the growing population, approximately 21,800–24,000 additional housing units are required to house the projected increase in population by 2025–2030. As the demographic trends also indicate, the County’s population, while growing, is also aging, and the local communities, in coordination with Brown County, need to ensure that all residents’ needs are met by offering the tools to encourage a range of housing options for an increasingly diverse population.

Although the strong population, employment, and housing growth in the County would/will provide an opportunity to both the County and local communities to implement many of the stated objectives in the comprehensive plan, maintaining those features of Brown County that make it a desirable place to live and do business in the face of increasing development pressure must also be considered and planned.