

Chapter Two: Vision and Opportunities

This chapter provides an overview of demographic trends and background information for the City. This information provides an assessment of the changes taking place in Whitewater. It also explores local and regional opportunities, and concludes with a vision statement to guide future growth and establish the framework for the remainder of the *Plan*.

Population Trends and Forecasts

In recent decades, the City of Whitewater has experienced a moderate rate of population growth. Figure 1.1 compares the City of Whitewater's population trends with trends from several neighboring communities, Jefferson County, Walworth County, and the State of Wisconsin. Between 1990 and 2000, the City experienced a 6.3 percent increase in population. This rate was somewhat lower than that of many nearby communities and Walworth and Jefferson Counties.

The Wisconsin Department of Administration (WisDOA) estimates that the City's population increased by 6.4 percent from 2000 to 2009. Over this same time period, it is estimated that Jefferson County's population increased by 7.3 percent, Walworth County's by 8.6 percent, and the State of Wisconsin's by 6 percent. Most nearby communities surrounding the City of Whitewater also experienced comparable increases in population during this same time period, except the cities of Elkhorn and Milton and the Town of Koshkonong, which were estimated to have increased their populations by 23.5, 10.6, and 11.3 percent, respectively.

THE CITY OF WHITEWATER'S FUTURE OPPORTUNITIES

- Establishing a more sustainable and self-sufficient community.
- Growing the economy and expanding employment opportunities, particularly in the high-tech and university-related sectors, and businesses and jobs that capitalize on the local power plant.
- Capturing a greater share of the regional retail market and minimizing "leakage" of local resident spending to other communities.
- Continuing to enhance the downtown as the social and commercial hub of the City, while also providing retail opportunities in other areas.
- Enhancing and upgrading the City's housing stock, and improving its neighborhoods for all residents.
- Capitalizing on the area's natural resources including Whitewater Creek, Cravath and Trippe Lakes, and the Kettle Moraine.
- Enhancing cooperation with the City's many adjoining and overlapping units of government.
- Continuing to advance and market opportunities for cultural activities and recreation, such as those associated with the University.

Figure 1.1: Population Trends

	1970	1980	1990	2000	2009 Estimate	Percent Population Change 1990-2000	Percent Population Change 2000-2009
City of Whitewater	12,038	11,520	12,636	13,437	14,299	6.3%	6.4%
City of Delavan	5,526	5,684	6,073	7,956	8,442	31.0%	6.1%
City of Elkhorn	3,992	4,605	5,337	7,305	9,021	36.9%	23.5%
City of Fort Atkinson	9,164	9,785	10,213	11,621	12,180	13.8%	4.8%
City of Milton	1,977	4,092	4,444	5,132	5,677	15.5%	10.6%
Town of Cold Spring	1,018	684	683	766	792	12.2%	3.4%
Town of Koshkonong	2,671	2,979	2,984	3,239	3,605	8.5%	11.3%
Town of Lima	1,063	1,179	1,285	1,312	1,333	2.1%	1.6%
Town of Whitewater	1,181	1,270	1,378	1,399	1,501	1.5%	7.3%
Village of Palmyra	1,341	1,515	1,539	1,766	1,786	14.7%	1.1%
Jefferson County	60,060	66,152	67,783	75,767	81,310	11.8%	7.3%
Walworth County	63,444	71,507	75,000	93,759	101,808	25.0%	8.6%
State of Wisconsin	4,417,731	4,705,767	4,891,769	5,363,675	5,688,040	9.6%	6.0%

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

Figure 1.2 shows three alternative population projection scenarios for the City through the year 2030: (1) the WisDOA’s projection; (2) a straight line projection calculated by determining the City’s average annual population change between 1990 and 2009, and projecting it forward to the year 2030; and (3) a compounded projection that was calculated by determining the City’s percentage population change between 1990 and 2009, and projecting that forward to the year 2030. Based upon these three projection scenarios, the City’s population is projected to be a little more than 16,000 people by the year 2030.

For the purposes of this *Plan*, the City will utilize the compounded projection scenario (the third scenario). This population scenario will be used for housing and land use demand projections later in this *Plan*. While it is certainly possible that the City will not grow to this population by 2030, a careful approach to land use planning suggests that this *Plan* show how that amount of growth could be appropriately accommodated. Market conditions and City and University policies will help determine the actual rate of population growth.

Figure 1.2: City of Whitewater Population Projection Scenarios

	2000 ¹	2009 ²	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030
WisDOA Population Projection	13,437	14,299	14,296	14,773	15,249	15,664	15,981
Straight Line Projection ³	13,437	14,299	14,387	14,824	15,262	15,699	16,137
Compounded Projection ⁴	13,437	14,299	14,392	14,868	15,360	15,868	16,393

¹ U.S. Census Bureau, 2000

² Wisconsin Department of Administration 2009 population estimate

³ Extrapolated based on the average annual population change from 1990-2008 $((2009 \text{ pop} - 1990 \text{ pop}) / 19)$

⁴ Extrapolated based on the average annual percent change from 1990-2009 (0.7 percent)

Demographic Trends

Figure 1.3 shows the City of Whitewater’s age and gender distribution in 2000, compared to surrounding communities. The City of Whitewater’s median age is considerably lower than in nearby communities and

Jefferson and Walworth Counties—this is attributable to the City’s significant university student population. The City’s median age increased from 20.7 in 1990, to 21.9 in 2000. The percentages of the population in Whitewater below the age of 18 or over the age of 65 are considerably lower than in surrounding communities, Jefferson County, and Walworth County. These figures are also heavily influenced by the large university student population.

Figure 1.3: Age and Gender Distribution, 2000

	Median Age	Percent under Age 18	Percent over Age 65	Percent Female
City of Whitewater	21.9	12.3%	8.9%	51.1%
City of Delavan	32.6	29.1%	12.5%	51.0%
City of Elkhorn	33.5	28.0%	12.8%	52.0%
City of Fort Atkinson	36.5	24.2%	14.5%	51.7%
City of Milton	34.3	26.3%	11.9%	51.0%
Town of Cold Spring	39.2	25.1%	9.9%	50.9%
Town of Koshkonong	39.9	25.3%	11.1%	48.9%
Town of Lima	38.4	25.9%	11.2%	47.9%
Town of Whitewater	44.0	20.8%	16.2%	48.4%
Village of Palmyra	34.9	27.1%	11.5%	51.1%
Jefferson County	36.6	25.2%	12.8%	50.4%
Walworth County	35.1	24.2%	12.7%	50.0%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000

Household Trends and Forecasts

Figures 1.4 and 1.5 present household characteristics for the City of Whitewater compared to several surrounding communities and Jefferson and Walworth Counties. Whitewater’s housing mix and occupancy statistics are fairly typical of a college community, and therefore atypical of nearby communities. In 2000, Whitewater’s average household size was smaller than all other nearby communities. The City’s average household size decreased significantly from 2.69 persons in 1990, to 2.38 in 2000. The City had a substantially lower percentage of owner-occupied housing and single-family units than all other nearby communities and Walworth and Jefferson Counties. However, the percentage of vacant housing units was lower than most other nearby communities.

Figure 1.4: Household Characteristics Comparison

	Total Housing Units	Total Households	Average Household Size	Average Equalized Value of Residential Property 2007-08*	Median Rent
City of Whitewater	4,340	4,132	2.38	\$180,162	\$504
City of Delavan	3,130	2,931	2.68	\$160,503	\$490
City of Elkhorn	3,023	2,919	2.48	\$185,330	\$581
City of Fort Atkinson	4,983	4,760	2.40	\$155,595	\$549
City of Milton	2,129	2,034	2.51	\$137,903	\$518
Town of Cold Spring	278	269	2.79	\$212,568	\$579
Town of Koshkonong	1,421	1,249	2.69	\$177,016	\$731
Town of Lima	494	472	2.75	\$203,494	\$668
Town of Whitewater	829	552	2.53	\$316,902	\$593
Village of Palmyra	725	689	2.56	\$170,665	\$563
Jefferson County	30,109	28,205	2.55	\$189,723	\$564
Walworth County	43,783	34,522	2.57	\$278,872	\$528

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 except

* Wisconsin Department of Revenue, 2007-08 (includes land plus improvements)

Figure 1.5: Housing Occupancy Characteristics Comparison, 2000

	Percent Single Person Households	Percent of Vacant Housing	Percent Owner-Occupied	Percent Single-Family
City of Whitewater	32.7%	4.8%	36.2%	40.1%
City of Delavan	26.6%	8.8%	54.8%	52.4%
City of Elkhorn	28.5%	3.2%	53.4%	48.2%
City of Fort Atkinson	29.4%	4.5%	64.0%	66.5%
City of Milton	26.5%	16.9%	65.1%	70.7%
Town of Cold Spring	13.4%	3.2%	85.1%	88.1%
Town of Koshkonong	17.4%	12.1%	84.9%	91.5%
Town of Lima	17.8%	4.5%	85.0%	77.5%
Town of Whitewater	15.9%	33.4%	85.5%	94.6%
Village of Palmyra	24.5%	5.0%	67.6%	66.6%
Jefferson County	23.6%	6.3%	71.7%	71.9%
Walworth County	24.7%	21.2%	69.1%	71.7 %

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000

Figure 1.6 shows a household projection for the City through the year 2030, based on the compounded projection scenario for population from Figure 1.2. The City is projected to have 6,888 households in 2030, or 880 households more than in 2009. For the purposes of this calculation, it is assumed that average household size will remain at 2.38.

Figure 1.6: Household Projections, 2009-2030

Households 2000 ¹	Projected Households ²						# of Additional households 2009-2030
	2009	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030	
4,132	6,008	6,047	6,247	6,454	6,667	6,888	880

¹U.S. Census, 2000

² Calculated by dividing the compounded population projection in Figure 1.2 by the 2000 average household size (2.38)

Comparison with Other University Communities

The City of Whitewater has unique demographic and housing characteristics compared to nearby communities because of the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater (UW-W). This section includes statistics for other regional university communities with roughly similar populations. As shown in Figure 1.7, the median age of Whitewater residents is still relatively young when compared to other regional communities with universities. The percentage of the Whitewater population that is between the ages of 20 and 24 is higher than in other university communities. The percentage of Whitewater’s population that is between the ages of 25 and 34 is considerably lower than in other university communities. This may suggest that the UW-W has a smaller graduate student population than at other comparable universities, that most other university communities are larger and have a more significant non-student base, and/or that comparatively few UW-W students remain in Whitewater after they graduate.

Figure 1.7: Age Characteristics Comparison, 2000

	Median Age	Age 15-19	Age 20-24	Age 25-34
City of Whitewater	21.9	19.9%	35.8%	8.4%
City of La Crosse	30.1	10.5%	17.3%	12.6%
City of Menomonie	23.2	14.4%	28.7%	11.4%
City of Oshkosh	32.4	8.9%	12.7%	14.8%
City of Platteville	23.0	16.6%	27.8%	8.3%
City of DeKalb, IL	23.1	14.2%	27.5%	14.0%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000

Figure 1.8 compares household size, home ownership, single person household, and housing value statistics to the other selected regional university communities. The City of Whitewater’s average household size of 2.38 is larger than all comparison communities except DeKalb, Illinois. The percentage of single person households in Whitewater is generally comparable to percentages in other university communities. The percentage of owner-occupied housing units (36 percent) is considerably lower in Whitewater than in all of the comparable university communities. The average equalized value of residential property in Whitewater is significantly greater than values reported for all comparison communities. The reported median rent for Whitewater is also higher than in other Wisconsin-based university communities. Rents in Whitewater are only slightly lower than those reported for DeKalb, Illinois.

Figure 1.8: Housing Occupancy and Value Characteristics Comparison, 2000

	Average Household Size	Percent Single Person Households	Percent Owner-Occupied	Average Equalized Value of Residential Property 2007-08*	Median Rent
City of Whitewater	2.38	32.7%	36.2%	\$180,162	\$504
City of La Crosse	2.23	37.0%	50.9%	\$126,300	\$449
City of Menomonie	2.35	32.7%	43.8%	\$142,369	\$347
City of Oshkosh	2.31	32.4%	57.5%	\$121,437	\$487
City of Platteville	2.31	32.2%	52.1%	\$127,668	\$487
City of DeKalb, IL	2.42	29.6%	41.9%	**	\$565

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000

*Wisconsin Department of Revenue, 2007-08 (includes land plus improvements)

** This figure has not been reported because Illinois uses a different system for calculating equalized value, making it incomparable to the figures for Wisconsin communities.

Education and Employment Trends

Detailed information on education and employment—required under the State’s comprehensive planning legislation—can be found in the Economic Development chapter.

Themes Identified in Past City Planning Efforts

As identified in the Introduction chapter, the City has a rich history of planning, with several detailed plans completed in recent years. The following key themes and directions emerge from these plans:

- Progressively approach economic development and downtown redevelopment.
- Manage impacts of the Highway 12 bypass and take advantage of the opportunities it creates.
- Bring a diversity of land uses to all sides of the City (e.g., bring more shopping to the east side).
- Seek balance and stability in the housing market—advance the development and preservation of single-family housing and cooperate with others on student housing issues.
- Develop and upgrade existing parks and build new trails.
- Ensure that public infrastructure (e.g., roads, sewers, stormwater management) keeps pace with development, and address infrastructure problems in already-developed areas.
- Work with the development community on the quality and creativity of development projects, promoting both improvements to quality in general and consistency in quality across projects.
- Emphasize coordination with neighboring communities, the UW-W, and the School District.

Issues Raised Through Public Participation

While completed in an expedited timeframe, this *Comprehensive Plan* was informed by several opportunities for community input. In addition, public input, visioning, and other opportunities that preceded this planning process helped guide this *Plan*. A summary of key participation results follows. Some results have been included as appendices to this *Plan*.

Whitewater Citizens Survey/Community Visioning Task Force, 2005

In 2005, the Whitewater Citizens Survey/Community Visioning Task Force commissioned the National Research Center to conduct the City of Whitewater 2005 Citizen Survey. The survey questioned residents on issues related to quality of life, community growth, safety, public services and infrastructure, future development, and long range priorities for the City. In general, respondents:

- Cited the City's most positive characteristics as (1) ease of movement around the City; (2) opportunities to attend cultural activities and events; and (3) overall appearance of the community.
- Identified key problems as (1) high taxes; (2) lack of growth; (3) building and yard maintenance; and (4) abundance of junk vehicles.
- Noted as essential community amenities (1) grocery stores; (2) large scale retail stores; (3) parks and open space areas; and (4) pedestrian and bicycle trails.
- Generally supported the following publicly funded City improvements: (1) downtown revitalization; (2) downtown parking; (3) Main Street pedestrian improvements; and (4) park and open space development.
- Felt that commercial and retail growth should be encouraged in the City, particularly in the downtown.
- Noted that new industrial development should be encouraged in the City.

Whitewater Student Housing Survey, February 2009

The Student Housing Survey was developed to gather information from property owners in the City regarding off-campus, student-oriented housing. The survey questionnaire was designed by the UW-W's Center for Fiscal and Economic Research, with input from the Whitewater Student Government, the UW-W administration, and the City Administration. Surveys were mailed to 1,179 randomly selected homeowners in February 2009. A total of 271 surveys were returned, yielding a response rate of 25 percent. In general, respondents:

- Reported that they believe there was an adequate supply of both apartments and single-family housing units in the City.
- Conveyed disagreement about the affordability of single-family homes in the community. However, respondents agreed that the provision of affordable single-family housing should be a priority for the City.
- Articulated that student housing was an important economic development tool for the City. Property tax revenue was reported to be the most important advantage of off-campus housing, followed by spin-off business development.
- Believed that the location of student housing should be restricted, with higher density student living options emphasized in areas closer to campus.
- Thought that rental properties should receive more rigorous inspection than they do currently, and that the City should strive to improve the quality of privately-owned housing geared to students.
- Reported the following challenges related to off-campus housing: (1) unkempt housing, (2) pedestrian traffic, (3) vandalism, (4) garbage, and (5) snow removal from sidewalks.
- Expressed that the City should better enforce residency parking restrictions and on-street parking restrictions, but not limit on-street parking during the day.
- Believed that the City and the UW-W should focus on developing a more pedestrian and bike friendly community in order to reduce student use of automobiles.

Neighborhood Preservation Discussion and Questionnaire, Spring 2009

In late 2008 and early 2009, the community began an informational and educational process on the topic of neighborhood preservation, including a session held at a joint meeting of the Common Council and Plan and Architectural Review Commission in March 2009. During and following that meeting, members of the Plan and Architectural Review Commission, Common Council, and the general public were provided a short questionnaire to assess initial support for or interest in pursuing various possible neighborhood preservation options. In total, there were 28 responses. Respondents were asked to rate each particular option with a “5” if they were strongly in support of that option, a “1” if they were strongly opposed, or numbers in between to reflect gradations of support or opposition between those ends. Figure 1.9 reflects the results. This information assisted the City and its consultants in developing a viable overall Neighborhood Preservation Strategy that focused on options that might receive the greatest support.

Figure 1.9: Results of 2009 Neighborhood Preservation Questionnaire

	Average Rating
1. Distribute notices to the owners of all rental properties in the City reminding them of the City's requirements on the maximum size of non-family households.	4.64
2. Encourage the establishment/activities of neighborhood associations.	4.54
3. Limit upzonings in predefined "neighborhood preservation areas" in the City.	4.43
4. More clearly and obviously present the City's current non-family household limits in the zoning ordinance.	4.41
5. Limit residential density and household size increases in "neighborhood preservation areas."	4.30
6. Modify residential bulk standards to ensure that tear-downs or home additions are consistent with the size and character of the surrounding neighborhood.	4.29
7. Develop a zoning approach to regulate building additions.	4.25
8. Consider various approaches to upgrade homes in a manner that is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.	4.21
9. Invest in neighborhood improvements (lights, sidewalks, better streets).	4.14
10. Consider down-zoning in pre-defined "neighborhood preservation areas" to R-1 or R-2.	4.11
11. Offer home buyer assistance to grow homeownership.	4.04
12. Encourage conversion of renter-occupied homes to owner-occupancy.	3.82
13. Encourage rental properties in predefined "neighborhood preservation areas" to be to be rented to families or non-student residents.	3.79
14. Work to reduce student housing demand in areas that are significantly off-campus.	3.79
15. Help convert two-family or multi-family buildings back to single-family homes.	3.78
16. Consider reductions in the number of unrelated people allowed per non-family household.	3.63

Public Kick-off Meeting, May 2009

In May 2009, the City officially began this comprehensive planning process with a public meeting of the Plan and Architectural Review Commission. At the meeting, the consultant discussed the purpose of the *Comprehensive Plan* and City's long history of planning. He also described how the City's previous planning documents would relate to this *Comprehensive Plan*.

The consultant asked the Plan and Architectural Review Commission to identify the City's opportunities and challenges that should be addressed in the *Plan*. The responses were as follows:

- Small town life is what makes Whitewater a unique place, and should be preserved.
- A vibrant downtown is important to the community.
- The City should work on becoming an even more full-service community, so that people do not have to leave the City for services and employment.
- A challenge will be to increase the growth of employers and jobs in the City.
- It is important for the City to grow wisely at its edges, particularly along the Highway 12 bypass.
- It is important to maintain the affordability of single-family housing.
- The City should maximize use of existing infrastructure throughout the City in the same way it has recently been done on the City's east side.
- Starin Road is very pedestrian friendly and Highway U should be improved as a bypass for that area of the City when Starin Road is extended east to Highway 59.
- The University is underleveraged and underutilized. More links should be built between the City and the University. The University is also an excellent source for planning input.

Community-wide Survey, Summer 2009

The City of Whitewater Comprehensive Plan Community Survey was designed and administered by City personnel. The survey was mailed at the end of June 2009 to all property owners and business owners who receive water bills. The survey was also available on the City's website, and residents who did not receive utility bills could complete the survey at the municipal building or the public library.

In total, 3,050 surveys were mailed, and 360 surveys were returned, for a 12 percent response rate.

High School Focus Group, December 2009

On December 3, 2009, 44 students in Mr. Greg Stewart's and Mr. Chris Zimmerman's government and economics classes at Whitewater High School were engaged in a discussion with community leaders (City Manager Kevin Brunner, Police Chief James Coan and Parks and Recreation Director Matt Amundson) about their opinions regarding the City's future.

Public Hearings, November & January 2010

On November 9, 2009, the City conducted a public hearing in front of the Plan Commission on a draft of the *Comprehensive Plan*. Before making its recommendation to the City Council to adopt the *Plan*, the Plan Commission recommended changes to the document based on public comment at the hearing. On January 19, 2010, the City Council conducted a final public hearing, per legislative requirements. The *Plan* was officially adopted at a subsequent Council meeting on February 2, 2010.

An Overview of the City's Future Opportunities

The City of Whitewater is characterized by a diversity of opportunities that can help shape the future of the community. The following list represents the City's most significant opportunities at the time this *Plan* was written, which have been integrated into the goals, objectives, policies, and recommendations found in later chapters of this plan document.

- Establishing a more sustainable and self-sufficient community.
- Growing the economy and expanding employment opportunities that capitalize on the local power plant, particularly in the areas of high-tech businesses, university-related jobs, and businesses and jobs.

- Capturing a greater share of the regional retail market and minimizing “leakage” of local resident spending to other communities.
- Continuing to enhance the downtown as the social and commercial hub of the City, while also providing retail opportunities in other areas.
- Enhancing and upgrading the City’s housing stock, and protecting and improving its neighborhoods for all residents.
- Capitalizing on the area’s natural resources including Whitewater Creek, Cravath and Trippe Lakes, and the Kettle Moraine.
- Enhancing cooperation with the City’s many adjoining and overlapping units of government.
- Continuing to advance and market opportunities for cultural activities and recreation, such as those associated with the University.

City of Whitewater Vision Statement

The City’s vision statement intends to broadly describe how the community would like the City to look, feel, and function in the future (e.g., in the year 2030—the planning horizon). All goals, objectives, policies, programs, and actions outlined in this *Plan* should move the City towards achieving this vision. The following vision statement was developed during the City’s 2005 visioning/strategic planning process, and was endorsed and adopted during the preparation of this *Comprehensive Plan*.

THE CITY OF WHITEWATER’S VISION

Building upon our rich history, we will continue to be a welcoming, safe, and dynamic community. We will embrace the cultural and educational opportunities that the presence of a thriving university and an increasingly diverse population offers.

We will seek to continually improve and make Whitewater strong by fostering public trust and confidence in our government. We will encourage a community characterized by a spirit of openness and fairness that encourages individuals to participate publicly and prosper personally. We will maintain a high quality of life through careful stewardship of all of our many resources.

Approach for Addressing Sustainability

Wisconsin communities large and small have begun to focus their attention on the concept of sustainability, and have established a variety of initiatives to address sustainability in a comprehensive way. Efforts to achieve community sustainability typically emphasize the preservation of the natural environment. Yet, it has become clear that sustainability initiatives must also involve explicit efforts to maintain a healthy living environment for people. Sustainable societies require a diverse and stable economy, a variety of affordable and comfortable housing options, access to food and education, opportunities for social interaction, and safe and healthy transportation options. Most importantly, advancing sustainability requires that decisions be made based on a consideration of how today’s actions will impact the future, and how local activities ripple outward to affect the greater region and the world.

As home to the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater and, in turn, the many young people who attend this institution, the City feels a unique responsibility to advance community sustainability and to support the next generation of thinking about how every community and individual contributes to the world. The City’s broad

definition of sustainability also serves as a vital complement to its desire to be a full service community that includes a variety of job opportunities and living options.

Recommendations related to promoting sustainability have been woven into every chapter of this document, and the concept of sustainability was taken into consideration when developing all of the *Plan's* goals, objectives, policies, and recommendations.

The City recognizes that isolated decisions and actions will not, in and of themselves, make the community more sustainable. Rather, it will be the combination of all the City's activities over time that will ultimately move Whitewater toward a more sustainable future. In this sense, it could easily be argued that all recommendations and policies in this *Plan* relate in some way to sustainability. Nevertheless, to help advance the City's sustainability initiatives, those policies and recommendations that are more directly and overtly related to community sustainability have been called out using the following symbol:



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 the Plan and Architectural Review Commission, Common Council, residents, and other interested groups and individuals for the next 20+ years.

- Goals are broad, advisory statements that express general public priorities about how the City should approach development issues. Goals attempt to capitalize on the City's key opportunities. Goals were prepared in conjunction with the above vision statement and are presented below.
- Objectives more specifically identify future directions. 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 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 Whitewater Goals

1. Contribute to the preservation of the agricultural economy and productive farmland in the Whitewater area.
2. Preserve our natural resources—including Whitewater Creek, the two lakes, and the Kettle Moraine—to support the strength of the economy, local quality of life, and the health of natural communities in and around Whitewater.
3. Celebrate our City's unique character, historical and archaeological assets, and vibrant culture, which are all enhanced by the University's influence.

4. Ensure that our neighborhoods and housing provide safe, comfortable, affordable, and enriching places for our residents to live.
5. Promote a future land use pattern that provides comfortable neighborhoods for all our residents, promote business development that focuses on a greater sustainability and self-sufficiency, and maximize compatibility among an appropriate mix of different land uses.
6. Provide and support a comprehensive transportation system that safely accommodates motorists, bikers, pedestrians, and rail commuters, and that supports our City's growing economy.
7. Offer a sustainable range of high-quality and energy-efficient services, utilities, facilities, and amenities to support our City's economy and residents.
8. Grow a sustainable local economy that offers a range of careers, shopping, and services; allow our residents to meet their daily needs without leaving the City; and take advantage of existing businesses, new partnerships, and future-oriented economic opportunities.
9. Continue to work with surrounding and overlapping jurisdictions to achieve mutual goals and address issues that transcend municipal boundaries.

