

Chapter One: Issues and Opportunities

This chapter of the *Plan* includes an overview of demographic trends and background information for the City. This information provides an understanding of the changes taking place in the City of Jefferson. This chapter presents data on population, household and employment trends and forecasts, age distribution, educational attainment levels, and employment and income characteristics. It also includes overall goals and objectives to guide future preservation, development, and redevelopment over the 20-year planning period.

Population Trends and Forecasts

Between 1990 and 2000, the City of Jefferson experienced one of the highest population increases (20.7 percent) compared to neighboring communities, growing from 6,078 residents to 7,338 (Figure 1). Over this same time period, Jefferson County's population increased by 11.8 percent, and Wisconsin's population grew by 9.6 percent. Since 1980, the City's rate of growth has increased, growing by roughly 12 percent between 1980 and 1990. In 2006, the Wisconsin Department of Administration estimated Jefferson's population to be 7,754, indicating a slowing of past trends.

Figure 1: Population Trends

	1970	1980	1990	2000	Percent Population Change 1990-2000
City of Jefferson	5,429	5,687	6,078	7,338	20.7%
Town of Jefferson	3,082	2,891	2,687	2,265	-15.7%
Town of Aztalan	1,306	1,752	1,476	1,447	-2.0%
Town of Farmington	1,391	1,528	1,404	1,498	6.7%
Village of Johnson Creek	790	1,136	1,259	1,581	25.6%
City of Waterloo	2,253	2,393	2,712	3,259	20.2%
City of Lake Mills	3,556	3,670	4,143	4,843	16.9%
City of Fort Atkinson	9,164	9,785	10,213	11,621	13.8%
Jefferson County	60,060	66,152	67,783	75,767	11.8%
State of Wisconsin	4,417,731	4,705,767	4,891,769	5,363,675	9.6%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 1970-2000

Figure 2 shows five population projection scenarios for the City through the year 2030: the DOA's projection; a 25-Year Straight Line Projection that was calculated by determining the City's average annual population change for the last 25 years and projecting that forward for the next 25 years; a 15-Year Straight Line Projection that was calculated by determining the City's average annual population change for the last 15 years and projecting that forward for the next 25 years; a 25-Year Compounded Projection that was calculated by determining the City's percent population change over the last 25 years and projecting that forward for the next 25 years; and a 15-Year Percentage Projection that was calculated by determining the average annual percent change over the last 15 years and projecting that forward for the next 25 years. Based upon these projection scenarios, the City's population is projected to be between 8,442 and 10,213 in the year 2025.

For the purposes of this *Plan*, the City will utilize the 15-Year Percentage Projection scenario (highlighted in Figure 2). This is a conservative approach based on the increasing rate of population growth in recent years and the City's proximity to growing metro areas. This population scenario will be used for housing and land use demand projections later in this *Plan*.

Figure 2: City of Jefferson Population Projection Scenarios

	2000 ¹	2005 ²	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030
DOA Population Projection	5,429	7,569	7,788	7,997	8,218	8,442	NA
25-Year Straight Line Projection ³	5,429	7,569	7,958	8,347	8,736	9,125	9,514
15-Year Straight Line Projection ⁴	5,429	7,569	8,074	8,578	9,083	9,588	10,092
25-Year Percentage Projection ⁵	5,429	7,569	8,055	8,546	9,067	9,620	10,207
15-Year Percentage Projection ⁶	5,429	7,569	8,176	8,805	9,483	10,213	10,999

¹ U.S. Census Bureau, 2000

² U.S. Census Bureau, 2005 population estimate

³ Extrapolated based on the average annual population change from 1980-2005 $((2005 \text{ pop} - 1980 \text{ pop}) / 25)$

⁴ Extrapolated based on the average annual population change from 1990-2005 $((2005 \text{ pop} - 1980 \text{ pop}) / 15)$

⁵ Extrapolated based on the average annual percentage change from 1980-2005 (1.49%)

⁶ Extrapolated based on the average annual percentage change from 1990-2005 (1.19%)

Demographic Trends

Figure 3 shows the City of Jefferson’s age and gender distribution in 2000 compared to the surrounding communities. The City of Jefferson’s median population age of 36.2 is average compared to nearby communities and the County as a whole. The City’s median age has increased from 30.8 in 1990 to 36.2 in 2000. The proportion of residents over the age of 65 has increased from 14.0 percent in 1990 to 16.1 percent in 2000, which follows the trend in most communities in Wisconsin. The current proportion of school-age children residing in the City is slightly less than surrounding communities.

Figure 3: Age and Gender Distribution, 2000

	Median Age	Percent under 18	Percent over 65	Percent Female
City of Jefferson	36.2	22.8	16.1	50.4
Town of Jefferson	40.9	21.9	14.0	49.4
Town of Aztalan	38.5	25.7	12.0	49.8
Town of Farmington	37.1	26.2	10.7	48.9
Village of Johnson Creek	31.9	26.6	9.5	50.5
City of Waterloo	34.5	27.3	11.4	50.3
City of Lake Mills	36.0	27.2	14.5	51.8
City of Fort Atkinson	36.5	24.2	14.5	51.7
Jefferson County	36.6	25.2	12.8	50.4

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000

Household Trends and Forecasts

Figures 4 and 5 present household characteristics for the City of Jefferson as compared to several surrounding communities and Jefferson County. Overall, the City’s housing characteristics are typical of a Wisconsin community of its size. However, in 2000, the City’s percentage of owner-occupied housing units was lower than other nearby communities.

Figure 4: Comparison of Household Characteristics

	Total Housing Units	Total Households	Average Household Size	Average Equalized Value of Residential Property 2005*	Median Rent
City of Jefferson	2,934	2,816	2.41	\$146,523	\$554
Town of Jefferson	805	759	2.67	\$178,506	575
Town of Aztalan	553	530	2.73	\$179,953	\$588
Town of Farmington	561	541	2.77	\$187,062	\$579
Village of Johnson Creek	659	624	2.53	\$160,170	\$683
City of Waterloo	1,293	1,242	2.56	\$141,994	\$581
City of Lake Mills	2,065	1,924	2.49	\$176,834	\$588
City of Fort Atkinson	4,983	4,760	2.40	\$139,360	\$549
Jefferson County	30,109	28,205	2.55	\$163,097	\$564

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 except * Department of Revenue, 2005 (includes land plus improvements)

Figure 5: Comparison of Housing Occupancy Characteristics, 2000

	Percent Single Person Household	Percent of Vacant Housing	Percent Owner-Occupied	Percent Single Family Units
City of Jefferson	28.3	4.0	60.8	60.8
Town of Jefferson	16.5	4.3	83.3	94.0
Town of Aztalan	14.7	4.2	88.5	92.7
Town of Farmington	14.0	3.6	85.2	88.3
Village of Johnson Creek	23.7	5.3	66.7	45.0
City of Waterloo	25.0	3.9	71.7	66.5
City of Lake Mills	26.8	6.8	68.9	66.4
City of Fort Atkinson	29.4	4.5	64.0	66.5
Jefferson County	23.6	6.3	71.7	71.9

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000

Figure 6 shows a household projection for the City through the year 2030, which was calculated using the 15-Year Percentage Projection from Figure 2. Based upon these projections, the City will have 4,248 households in 2030, or an additional 1,538 households more than in 2000.

For the purposes of planning, household projections are translated into an estimated demand for additional housing units. It should be noted that the demand for future housing units will be based not only on increases in population, but also on fluctuations in the City's average household size. For example, as household sizes decrease, more housing units will be needed to meet housing demands. For the purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that the 2000 household size (2.41) will decrease slightly to 2.38 through the planning period.

Figure 6: Household Projections, 2005-2030

	Households 2000 ¹	Projected Households						# of Additional households 2000-2030
		2005	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030	
Projection	2,816	2,921	3,058	3,320	3,602	3,907	4,237	1,527

¹ U.S. Census Bureau, 2000

Education and Employment Trends

Detailed information on education and employment trends can be found in the Economic Development chapter of this *Plan*.

Issues Raised Through Public Participation

The City's planning process was guided by public input that was collected through a variety of approaches, including a Comprehensive Planning Committee survey, a community-wide survey, and regular meetings of the Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee. The following is a summary of those activities:

Key Planning Issues Exercise

The planning consultant surveyed the Comprehensive Planning Committee regarding perceptions of key planning issues in the City and the role those issues may play in the future growth and development of the City. Following is a summary of the issues identified by this process.

Community Character: What features define your community? How does the community look and feel to residents, businesses, and visitors? Is the community growing or changing in a way that improves its character, or diminishes it? What are some examples? What trends may affect the community's character in the future? Does the recent quality of development—both aesthetics and uses—meet with community expectations? Are community decision-makers too demanding or too lax regarding development quality? Does the community Staff understand the expectations of the elected officials?

Overall, respondents felt that the historic Downtown significantly contributes to the character of Jefferson, as does the City's location at the convergence of the Rock and Crawfish Rivers. However, respondents were concerned that the Downtown building stock was in need of rehabilitation. In addition, there was a desire to increase retail activities.

Land Use: What are the issues regarding the type and quality of land use within the community (e.g., agricultural, residential, commercial, industrial, recreational)? Are there areas of conflicting land uses? Is development in the adjacent communities a concern? Which ones? Does the current zoning of properties reflect the community's desires for land use? If not, where are they at odds? Are the existing zoning ordinance and subdivision regulations adequate? What improvements are needed?

In general, respondents felt that the City's existing mix of land uses was appropriate. However, there was a concern that some properties are not at their highest and best use. It was also noted that the City needs to update its zoning regulations to respond to new types of development.

Pace of Development/Redevelopment: Are you satisfied with the pace of housing development in the community? Is it too fast? Too slow? Are you satisfied with the pace of non-residential development in the community? How is the pace of development in the surrounding communities affecting the community? Do you expect that to change? What should the community do to influence the pace of development/redevelopment?

There were mixed responses regarding pace of development. Some respondents were satisfied with the pace of residential development while others felt it was too slow. Respondents also generally felt that non-residential development should be encouraged but not to the point of offering tax incentives.

Environment: What are the key environmental features in/around the community (e.g., rivers, wetlands, forests, etc.)? How are/can they be preserved and enhanced? Are natural resources used appropriately, overused, or underused? Are the features accessible? Are there pollution problems? Are there problems with stormwater or flooding? Where?

Respondents felt that the City needed to capitalize on the Rock and Crawfish Rivers by increasing recreational opportunities and encouraging residential uses. The City's Downtown and Riverfront Redevelopment Plan identifies a strategy for achieving these goals.

Housing: What is the current mixture of housing in the community, in terms of both type and density? Are you satisfied with the current mix? Is the community in need of additional types of housing, or more of any particular types? Are maintenance and rehabilitation of older residential areas issues? Are there neighborhoods of concern? Why?

Generally, respondents were satisfied with the current mix of housing types. One respondent noted a desire for high end housing near the Golf Course.

Economic Development: What is the community's attitude towards economic development? Are you satisfied with the type of industrial development occurring? Commercial? Recreational? Are there key economic development or redevelopment areas? Where? What is being done to encourage the redevelopment of

“brownfield” sites in the community? What incentives has the community provided to encourage development or job creation? Is the community capitalizing on its natural features to encourage economic development?

In general, respondents felt that while positive steps were being taken toward economic development with the Downtown and Riverfront Redevelopment Plan and the formation of the Community Development Authority, a more concentrated effort was needed to encourage economic development.

Transportation: What are the community’s concerns about transportation (roads, bikeways, railroads, public transportation)? Does the current transportation network suit your needs? If not, why? Are there “problem” roads or intersections? What needs improvement? What improvements have recently been completed or scheduled? Is there a capital improvement program in place? Has it been followed? How is the community’s relationship with the Jefferson County DOT and WisDOT?

Overall, respondents felt that the future bypass of Highway 26 would be an improvement to the transportation system. It was noted that the City needs to capitalize on its proximity to the Glacial Drumlin Trail.

Intergovernmental Issues: How are the community’s relationships with each of the surrounding communities? Are there existing problems, or could there be in the future? Does the community have any intergovernmental agreements with surrounding governments regarding land use, boundaries, or shared services? Do these types of agreements interest the community?

Respondents noted that the City has been involved with intergovernmental discussions with the Towns of Jefferson and Aztalan. The City is also developing a working relationship with Jefferson County.

Community Facilities and Services: Is existing space adequate for schools, police, fire, community offices, and other community facilities? What are attitudes regarding community services that the community provides? Is the park system in the community adequate? What is the status of public utilities provided by the community? Is there ample capacity? Are there problems with water quality? Is stormwater management an issue? What areas, facilities, etc. need improvement or greater public assistance?

Generally, respondents felt that the City maintained a high level of services, which is supported by residents. However, the library, fire department, and emergency services facilities are in need of expansion. New school facilities will be needed in the near future.

Community Survey

In March 2007, a community survey was mailed to all households in the City and surrounding area (approximately 5,000). The City provided a return address and funded the return postage. Residents could also opt to fill out the survey online by visiting the City’s comprehensive planning website and entering the unique survey code printed on the front of each mailed survey.

The survey was intended to gauge public opinion on a variety of issues, including, among other things, land use, development patterns, economic development, transportation, and public facilities. The total number of surveys returned was 624, representing a response rate of approximately 12.5 percent. A complete summary of survey responses is located in Appendix A.

Overall, respondents reported that the most important reasons they chose to live in Jefferson was nearness to relatives, friends and jobs as well as affordable housing. While respondents were comfortable with recent population growth, it will be important for the City to work hard to maintain its small town character as it moves into the future.

To enhance the City’s image and identity and to maintain its quaint atmosphere, responses suggest that investments should be made in Jefferson’s historic Downtown. Respondents supported efforts to fix up and

restore older buildings and provide a mix of businesses, such as specialty shops, entertainment, and sit-down restaurants.

Jefferson's parks, especially Stoppenbach and Rotary, were regarded as the City's most significant and attractive asset. Most respondents felt that the City's housing stock should continue to be dominated by single-family homes, with a preference for "starter" and mid-sized houses. Residential neighborhoods should be pedestrian friendly and safe. Bike paths and sidewalks should be provided to allow convenient access to small-scale neighborhood businesses, according to survey input.

Based on survey results, the overall appearance of the community should be of primary concern. Design standards for commercial and residential properties are supported. Respondents also supported street trees and well-maintained roadways and sidewalks.

Respondents generally supported industrial and manufacturing development in Jefferson to ensure employment for residents and to diversify the tax base. While some commercial and retail development is also desired, the majority of residents are content to travel to Madison or other larger cities for their more significant shopping needs. Businesses in Jefferson should be focused on meeting day-to-day needs: grocery stores, laundromats, restaurants, specialty shops, and small-scale entertainment uses (e.g. bowling alley) match the character of Jefferson and would enhance the convenience and comfort of the community.

Draft Plan Open House

On January 31, 2008, the City held an open house event to gauge the public's opinions on the first complete draft of the *Comprehensive Plan*.

Draft Plan Public Hearing

On March 18, 2008, the City Council held a public hearing to receive any comments on the public review draft of the *Comprehensive Plan*.

Goals, Objectives, Policies, Programs, and Recommendations

Each subsequent chapter of this *Comprehensive Plan* includes goals, objectives, policies, programs, and recommendations that will provide direction and policy guidance to Plan Commission members, City Council members, residents, and other interested groups and individuals for the next 20+ years.

Goals, objectives, policies, programs, and recommendations are defined below:

Goals are broad, advisory statements that express general public priorities about how the City should approach development issues. Goals are based on key issues and opportunities that are affecting the City.

Objectives more specifically identify future direction. By accomplishing an objective, the City moves closer to achieving its goals.

Policies are rules or courses of action implemented to achieve specific objectives. City staff and officials should use policies on a day-to-day basis when making decisions.

Programs are specific projects or services that are intended to move the City toward achieving its goals, objectives, and policies.

Recommendations provide detailed information regarding how to implement objectives, policies, and programs.

City of Jefferson Overall Vision and Goals

Vision:

Preserve the “small town” lifestyle within the City through careful planning, design, and placement of land uses; appropriate non-residential development that compliments existing uses; community-sensitive regional transportation solutions; and intergovernmental cooperation to manage growth.

Goals:

- Preserve and enhance natural resources in and around the City, particularly the Rock and Crawfish River corridors and areas adjacent to the Glacial Drumlin State Trail.
- Promote an efficient, sustainable, and high-quality land use pattern consistent with the City’s historic character, avoiding extensive areas of strip commercial development.
- Provide a safe and efficient transportation system that meets the needs of multiple users and minimizes impacts on landowners and farming.
- Support the efficient delivery of community utilities, facilities, and services corresponding with the expectations of residents.
- Provide safe, affordable housing and neighborhood environments for all Jefferson residents, with special attention to providing an appropriate supply of diverse senior and young adult housing.
- Encourage high-quality economic development opportunities appropriate to the City’s resources, character, and service levels.
- Continue and build on mutually beneficial intergovernmental relations with surrounding and overlapping governments.