Chapter VI

LAND USE ELEMENT - PARTS 1 AND 2

Note: Tables, figures, and maps are attached at the end of the chapter.

INTRODUCTION

The land use element is one of the nine elements of a comprehensive plan required by Section 66.1001 of the Wisconsin Statutes. Section 66.1001(2)(h) of the Statutes requires an analysis of past land use trends, an inventory of existing land uses, and a compilation of goals, objectives, policies, programs, and maps to guide future development and redevelopment of public and private property. Accordingly, the Land Use Element includes the following:

- Information regarding the amount, type, and intensity or density of existing land uses
- Trends in land use, land supply, land demand, and land price
- Potential land use conflicts
- Projected land use needs in five year increments to the plan design year (2050)
- Maps showing existing and future land uses; productive agricultural soils; natural limitations to building site development; floodplains, wetlands, and other environmentally sensitive lands; and boundaries of areas to which public utility and community services will be provided by the plan design year.

Part 1 of this chapter presents an inventory of historical and existing land uses and an analysis of land use conditions and trends. Part 2 describes the framework for development of the plan, including the supporting maps required by the Statutes. Part 3 presents the County Land Use Plan Map and describes the land use categories included on the map. The land use plan map serves as a visual representation and summary of the comprehensive plan. The land use plan map also serves to support related comprehensive plan goals, objectives, policies, and programs intended to guide the future development of public and private property in Washington County through the plan design year of 2050. The goals, objectives, policies, and programs are set forth in Chapter XII of this report.
PART 1: EXISTING LAND USE AND TRENDS

The Commission utilizes an urban growth analysis and a land use inventory to inventory and monitor urban growth and development in the Region. The urban growth analysis delineates the outer limits of concentrations of urban development and depicts the urbanization of the Region over the past 150 years. The Commission land use inventory is a more detailed inventory that places all land and water areas in the Region into one of 67 land use categories, providing a basis for analyzing specific urban and nonurban land uses.

Urban Growth Analysis and Historical Urban Growth

The urban growth analysis shows the historical pattern of urban settlement, growth, and development of the County since 1850 for selected points in time. Areas identified as urban under this time series analysis include portions of the County where residential structures or other buildings were constructed in relatively compact areas, thereby indicating a concentration of residential, commercial, industrial, governmental, institutional, or other urban uses. These areas must be at least five acres in size. In the case of residential uses, such areas must include at least 10 homes over a maximum distance of one-half mile along a linear feature such as a street or lakeshore, or at least 10 homes located in a relatively compact group within a residential subdivision. Uses such as cemeteries, airports, public parks, and golf courses do not meet the criteria for urban land uses because they lack the required concentration of buildings or structures. However, these land uses are identified as urban uses if they are surrounded on at least three sides by urban land uses that do meet the above criteria.

Historical urban growth in the County between 1850 and 2010 is shown on Map VI-1. Urban growth for the years prior to 1940 was identified using a variety of sources, including the records of local historical societies, subdivision plat records, farm plat maps, U.S. Geological Survey maps, and Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey records. Urban growth for the years 1950 through 2010 was identified using aerial photographs.

In Washington County, small portions of the Cities of West Bend and Hartford, and the Villages of Slinger and Newburg were developed prior to 1850. In 1900, urban development was still largely confined to the Cities of Hartford and West Bend and Villages of Newburg and Slinger, with additional development in the Villages of Germantown, Jackson, and Kewaskum. The period from 1900 to 1963 saw expansion of mainly the Cities of Hartford and West Bend and the Village of Germantown, and the development of lakeshores around Bark Lake, Big Cedar Lake, and Pike Lake. The period from 1963 to 2000 saw significant urban growth in scattered locations throughout the County, particularly in the southern portion of the County in the Village of Germantown and the then-Town of Richfield. Moderate development in and around the City of West Bend and the other established urban centers in the northern portion of the County also occurred during this period. Growth occurred in all of the cities and villages in the County between 2000 and 2010, and in a few isolated areas in many of the towns.
Land Use Trends, Supply, and Demand
As indicated in Table VI-1, every urban land use experienced an increase in acreage between 1990 and 2015. Residential land uses experienced the largest increase of all of the County’s urban and nonurban land uses. The second largest urban land use increase was transportation-related land uses, with street and highway rights-of-way accounting for the majority of the transportation-related land use increase between 1990 and 2015. The third largest increase in urban land use was recreational land uses, while industrial land use accounted for the fourth largest urban land use increase and commercial land use accounted for the fifth largest urban land use increase.

Over the same period, nonurban land uses decreased overall, a change that can be attributed entirely to the decrease in agricultural land use. A portion of the decrease in agricultural land is due to land being taken out of agricultural use but not being developed with urban uses. Such lands are now included in the Unused and Other Open Lands category. All of the other nonurban land uses, including natural resource areas, extractive sites, and open lands, experienced an increase in acreage. In fact, the increase in acreage in Unused and Other Open Lands from 1990 to 2015 amounted to the second largest increase among all urban and nonurban land uses in the County.

These trends indicate a demand for additional land to accommodate urban land uses in the County, especially for single-family residential and the transportation infrastructure that serves residential development. These trends also indicate a decreasing supply of land for agricultural use, which may pose challenges to satisfying the desire of County residents to preserve productive farmland while ensuring there is an adequate supply of land to accommodate the projected increase of approximately _____ households and _____ jobs that is expected in Washington County by 2050.

Land Price
Equalized value trends by real estate class in the County in 2013 and 2016 are set forth in Table VI-2. Residential properties experienced the greatest monetary increase in equalized value while manufacturing properties experienced the greatest proportional increases. Overall, the 10 percent increase in equalized value for the County between 2013 and 2016 was slightly larger than the 8 percent increase in equalized value Statewide over the same period.

Forest land and commercial properties in the County experienced moderate increases in value while agricultural forest land experienced a decrease of similar proportion. Agricultural land in the County also experienced a decrease in value, though very small. Despite this decrease in value, the sale price of agricultural land in the
County that was to continue in agricultural use increased approximately 3 percent between 2010 and 2015.¹ This increase in sale price for the County’s agricultural land that was to continue in agricultural use was small in comparison to the average land sale price of such land within the Southeastern Wisconsin Region (20 percent) or Statewide (39 percent).

**Urban Service Areas**

Urban service areas are identified in the regional land use plan based on the sanitary sewer service areas delineated in the Regional Water Quality Management Plan.² Urban service areas are currently served, or have the capacity and are eventually planned to be served, by a public sanitary sewer system and public sewage treatment plant. These services allow for relatively dense residential, commercial, and industrial uses, which characterize urban areas. Urban service areas are also typically served by public water supply, public parks, local schools, and shopping areas.

All urban service areas include areas to which sewer and water services are not provided; however, sewer services are planned to be provided to all areas within an urban service area within a maximum 20-year period. Urban service areas and areas served by sanitary sewers in Washington County include the Cities of Hartford and West Bend; the Villages of Germantown, Jackson, Kewaskum, Newburg, and Slinger; and the unincorporated hamlet of Allenton in the Town of Addison, as shown on Map IX-__ in the Utilities and Community Facilities Element (Chapter IX).

Portions of every urban service area in Washington County, except the Village of Newburg, are served by public water supply systems. Newburg residents and businesses rely on private wells as their water source.

**Existing Land Uses – Washington County**

Land uses in the County in 2015 are shown on Map VI-2 and quantitatively summarized in Table VI-3. Figure VI-1 illustrates a comparison of the percentage of land uses in each category. Map VI-2 reflects the actual use of land in 2015, rather than zoning or future planned land use. Planned land uses are shown in Part 3 of this chapter.

---

¹ Data is derived from the Wisconsin Department of Revenue through real estate transfer returns. The transfer returns include information pertaining to the parties involved, size of the parcel, the predominant use of the land, and the sale price. The analysis of agricultural land prices includes only arm’s length transactions; sales of agricultural land made under other than normal market conditions (such as family sales or foreclosures) are not included.

The existing land use map is based on the SEWRPC land use inventory conducted in 2015. The land use inventory is intended to serve as a relatively precise record of land use for the entire Region. Aerial photographs serve as the primary basis for identifying existing land uses, augmented by field surveys as appropriate. The most recent land use inventory was based on digital ortho (aerial) photography taken in the spring of 2015.

**Urban Land Uses**

Urban land uses consist of residential; commercial; industrial; governmental and institutional; and transportation, communication, utility, and intensive recreational uses. As indicated in Table VI-3 and on Map VI-2, urban land uses encompassed about 59,338 acres, or about 21 percent of the County, in 2015.

**Residential**

Residential land comprised the largest urban land use category in the County, encompassing 30,812 acres, amounting to about 54 percent of all urban land or about 11 percent of the County in 2015. The land use inventory categorizes residential uses as single-family, two-family, and multi-family structures and mobile homes. Single-family homes occupied 29,001 acres or about 10 percent of the County in 2015. Of the land developed for residential uses, about 94 percent consisted of single-family residential uses. Higher density single-family homes and two- and multi-family dwellings are concentrated in cities and villages with sewer service and in Allenton. Approximately 23 percent of the acreage in single-family residential use, or approximately 22 percent of the County’s remaining residential acreage, was devoted to rural residential single-family development, which occurs at a net density of five acres or more per dwelling and is typically located in rural towns. Two-family dwellings and multi-family dwellings, which have three or more dwellings in a building, each accounted for approximately 0.3 percent of the County’s remaining residential acreage. Mobile homes occupied about 110 acres, or less than 0.05 percent of the County.

**Commercial**

Commercial land encompassed about 1,834 acres, amounting to about 3 percent of all urban land or less than 1 percent of the County in 2015. Commercial development is concentrated in the County’s urban service areas. The Cities of Hartford and West Bend, the Villages of Germantown, Jackson, Kewaskum, Newburg, and Slinger, and the hamlet of Allenton in the Town of Addison each have central business districts with concentrations of office, retail, and service establishments. Commercial development including retail and service establishments and offices are also concentrated along highways and arterial streets on the fringes of the aforementioned communities as well as within the Village of Richfield and the Town of West Bend. There is limited commercial development outside the established urban service areas with a few exceptions, such as the business district in the Village of Richfield.
Industrial

Industrial land encompassed about 2,053 acres, amounting to about 4 percent of all urban land or less than 1 percent of the County in 2015. Much of the industrial land in the County is concentrated in business and industrial parks in cities and villages and on the west side of Allenton. Industrial sites are located outside of urban service areas on a limited basis. Business and industrial parks and other areas with concentrations of industrial land are generally located adjacent to arterial streets and highways to allow for good trucking and freight access. Table X-__ and Map X-__ in the Economic Development Element (Chapter X) depict existing and proposed business and industrial parks in the County.

Transportation, Communication, and Utilities

Land used for transportation, utilities, and communications facilities comprised the second largest urban land use category in 2015. These uses encompassed about 16,894 acres, amounting to about 29 percent of all urban land or about 6 percent of the County. Streets and highways encompassed about 15,577 acres, or about 6 percent of the County, and railroad right-of-ways encompassed about 738 acres, or less than 1 percent of the County.

In 2015, land used for communication facilities, utilities, and other transportation uses encompassed about 579 acres, or less than 1 percent of the County. There is one power plant in the County, located in the Village of Germantown. The power plant, the first plant built by We Energies to be used primarily during hours of high demand, encompassed 75 acres in 2015. The plant used natural gas as its primary source of fuel and had a total net generating capacity of 345 megawatts as of 2012. Additional information about utility uses and facilities is presented in the Utilities and Community Facilities Element (Chapter IX).

Governmental and Institutional

Land used for government and institutional uses encompassed about 1,852 acres, amounting to about 3 percent of all urban land or less than 1 percent of the County in 2015. Governmental and institutional lands in the County generally include the County Courthouse, Public Agency Center, and the Corrections Building in the City of West Bend; the County Highway Department garages in the City of West Bend and Village of Slinger; municipal halls and other municipal facilities; post offices; public and private schools; libraries; colleges; hospitals and other special medical centers; and cemeteries. Information about these government and institutional uses and facilities is presented in the Utilities and Community Facilities Element (Chapter IX).

Recreational

Intensively used recreational land encompassed about 4,057 acres, amounting to about 7 percent of all urban land or almost 2 percent of the County in 2015. Intensively used recreational land only includes parks or portions of parks that have been developed with facilities such as playgrounds, major trails, tennis courts, baseball diamonds,
soccer fields, and other playfields. A complete inventory of park and open space sites in the County is included in the Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources Element (Chapter V).

**Nonurban Land Uses**

Nonurban land uses consist of agricultural lands; natural resource areas, including surface waters, wetlands, and woodlands; extractive sites; and unused and other open lands. As indicated in Table VI-3 and on Map VI-2, nonurban land uses encompassed about 219,419 acres, amounting to about 79 percent of the County in 2015.

**Agricultural Lands**

Agriculture was the predominant land use in the County in 2015. Agricultural lands encompassed 119,134 acres, amounting to about 54 percent of nonurban land uses or about 43 percent of the County. Most of the County’s agricultural land is located outside of urban service areas within the Towns of Addison, Farmington, Germantown, Hartford, Jackson, Trenton, and Wayne and the northern portions of the Town of Barton and the Village of Germantown. Agricultural lands include all croplands, pasture lands, orchards, nurseries, and nonresidential farm buildings. A more detailed inventory of agricultural land in the County is included in the Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources Element (Chapter V).

**Natural Resource Areas**

Natural resource areas consisting of surface water, wetlands, and woodlands combined to encompass 78,062 acres, amounting to about 36 percent of nonurban land uses or about 28 percent of the County in 2015. Natural resource areas are located throughout the County, in both rural areas and within established urban service areas. A complete inventory of natural resource areas is included in the Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources Element (Chapter V).

**Extractive Sites**

Extractive sites encompassed about 1,518 acres, or less than 1 percent of the County in 2015. There were nine operational nonmetallic mining sites in the County in 2015, which have been inventoried and mapped in the Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources Element (Chapter V). Nonmetallic mining includes the extraction of sand, gravel, stone, and peat.

**Unused and Other Open Lands**

Unused and other open lands encompassed about 20,705 acres, amounting to about 9 percent of nonurban land or about 7 percent of the County in 2015. Unused and other open lands in nonurban areas include lands in rural areas that are not utilized for agricultural purposes and do not encompass wetlands, woodlands, or water. Examples of such lands include undeveloped portions of park sites, excess transportation rights-of-way, lots that have been unused, and other open lands.
platted but not yet developed, subdivision outlots, and undeveloped portions of commercial and industrial lots in nonurban areas.

**Former Landfills and Contaminated Sites**

**Former Landfills**

There are no active landfills in Washington County. As of 2016, the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR) had identified 78 former landfills in Washington County in the State registry of waste disposal sites. Former landfill sites are listed in Table VI-4 and shown on Map VI-3, and encompass over 400 acres. The DNR uses a number of sources to identify former landfills, including State databases of registered landfills and demolition disposal permits. The DNR Historic Registry of Waste Disposal Sites includes active, inactive, and abandoned sites where solid or hazardous wastes were known or likely to have been disposed. The inclusion of a site does not mean that environmental contamination has occurred, is occurring, or will occur in the future, but is intended to serve as a general informational source for the public and County and local officials regarding the location of waste disposal sites.

**Contaminated Sites**

The DNR Bureau for Remediation and Redevelopment identifies and monitors contaminated sites. Contaminated sites include leaking underground storage tank (LUST) sites and environmental repair (ERP) sites. A LUST site has soil and/or groundwater contaminated with petroleum, which includes toxic and cancer causing substances. Over time, petroleum contamination naturally breaks down in the environment through biodegradation. This may result in some LUST sites emitting potentially explosive vapors. An ERP site is a site other than a LUST site that has contaminated soil and/or groundwater. Examples include industrial spills (or dumping) that require long-term investigation, buried containers of hazardous substances, and closed landfills that have caused contamination. ERP sites also include areas with petroleum contamination from above-ground (but not from underground) storage tanks. The DNR identified 41 contaminated sites in 2016 that were being monitored. Sites in Washington County are listed in Table VI-5 and shown on Map VI-4.

**Opportunities for Redevelopment**

The greatest opportunities for redevelopment in the County exist where there is available land served by existing infrastructure, typically in the older and underutilized commercial buildings and parcels located in and adjacent to the traditional downtowns, and older shopping centers located in cities and villages. Downtown redevelopment efforts in recent years may be most notable in the Cities of Hartford and West Bend. Several such economic development efforts and programs and others that can help to facilitate downtown commercial district rehabilitation are inventoried in the Economic Development Element (Chapter X).
Additional opportunities for commercial, mixed-use, multi-family, or light industrial redevelopment may occur on environmentally contaminated sites, which are identified on Map VI-4 and in Table VI-5. The DNR administers a number of brownfield redevelopment grant programs that can assist communities and developers with redevelopment efforts. A grant from one such program, the U.S. EPA Brownfield Redevelopment Program, was awarded to a coalition including the County, the Cities of Hartford and West Bend, and the Villages of Jackson, Richfield, and Slinger, and is described in Chapter II. Through 2016, the program has helped coalition communities promote the redevelopment of environmentally contaminated sites within the County by conducting Phase I and Phase II environmental site assessments, completing remedial action and/or redevelopment plans, and performing community outreach and education related to redevelopment opportunities for several environmentally contaminated sites, identified in Table II-4 in Chapter II.

**Existing and Potential Land Use Conflicts**

Land use conflicts between communities in the County are most common in town areas directly adjacent to cities and villages. Conflicts arise as towns allow or plan for residential development near city and village borders at densities that are not cost efficient for cities and villages to provide with urban services, at such time as the city or village might annex that part of the town. Conversely, conflicts arise as cities and villages review and deny proposed subdivisions within extraterritorial plat review areas, which prevents residential development in the towns. A boundary agreement between a town and an adjacent city or village may help address conflicts between towns and adjacent municipalities.³

**PART 2: FRAMEWORK FOR DEVELOPING THE COUNTY LAND USE PLAN MAP**

**Inclusion of City, Town, and Village Plans in the County Plan**

Section 59.69(3)(b) of the Wisconsin Statutes explicitly requires that a county development (comprehensive) plan include, without change, the master (comprehensive) plan of a city or village adopted under Section 62.23(2) or (3), and the official map adopted by a city or village under Section 62.23(6) of the Statutes. Section 59.69(3)(e) of the Statutes further provides that a master plan or official map adopted by a city or village under Section 62.23 “shall control” in unincorporated areas of a county; however, Section 59.69(3)(e) does not specifically require that city and village plans for their extraterritorial areas be included in the County comprehensive plan. Planning areas included in city and village comprehensive plans are shown on Map VI-5.

³ The Wisconsin Statutes grant cities and villages the authority to approve or deny subdivision plats within 1.5 miles of villages and cities of the fourth class, and within three miles of cities of the first, second, or third class (the Cities of Hartford and West Bend are cities of the third class). Cities and villages may also enact extraterritorial zoning regulations for their extraterritorial areas, but must work with the affected town to develop and approve such regulations. See Appendix C for additional information on extraterritorial authorities.
The *Statutes* provide clear guidance that a county plan need not include city and village plans for extraterritorial areas where a county has established a regional planning department. In that case, Section 62.23(2) provides “that in any county where a regional planning department has been established, areas outside the boundaries of a city may not be included in the (city) master plan without the consent of the county board of supervisors.” During the preparation of the initial multi-jurisdictional comprehensive plan, the Washington County Attorney determined that the County Planning and Parks Department is a “regional planning department.” Based on that determination, the County land use plan map does not include city and village land use plan designations for areas outside city or village boundaries. The only exception are areas identified in the boundary agreement between the Town of West Bend and City of West Bend as areas that will be annexed over time into the City. Land use designations from the City of West Bend land use plan map are included on the County plan map for those areas.

On August 10, 2004, the Washington County Board of Supervisors adopted 2004 Resolution 35, which established criteria regarding the incorporation of town land use plans into the County land use element, including the land use plan map, of the Washington County comprehensive plan. The resolution states that the County will accept a Town land use plan if the plan is in “substantial agreement” with the objectives, principles, and standards of the regional land use plan prepared and adopted by SEWRPC. The Planning, Conservation, and Parks Committee (PCPC) of the County Board was assigned the responsibility for determining if each town plan was in substantial agreement with the regional land use plan, based on a recommendation from SEWRPC. The Public Works Committee reviewed each Town land use plan map for this plan update to determine if it could be considered in “substantial agreement” with the regional land use plan by meeting the following key recommendations of the regional plan:

1. Primary environmental corridors should be recommended for preservation in accordance with the guidelines set forth in the regional plan, which are listed in Table II-1 in Chapter II. The regional plan recommends the preservation of primary environmental corridors throughout the seven-county region. As shown in Table II-1, specified limited uses, including residential development at a density of no more than one housing unit per five acres in upland portions of primary environmental corridors, located outside natural areas and critical species habitat sites, are considered compatible with protection of the corridors, provided that buildings are kept off steep slopes. The regional plan also recommends that county and local governments consider protecting isolated natural resource areas as well, exercising the

---

4 *In accordance with Section 61.35 of the Statutes, the same provisions apply to villages.*

5 *Land use plan maps adopted by cities and villages in the County as of [tentatively June 30, 2017] are included in the Intergovernmental Cooperation Element (Chapter IX) to the full extent of the city or village planning area. Town land use plan maps are also included in the Intergovernmental Cooperation Element (Chapter IX).*

6 *The Public Works Committee has assumed the duties of the former Planning, Conservation, and Parks Committee (PCPC).*
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discretion of the county or local governing body in so doing. For the County plan, the Public Works Committee has determined that primary environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas should be protected.

2. Urban-density development should occur within and adjacent to the urban service areas identified in the regional plan. Urban development proposed within one-half mile of a planned sewer service area was considered, for this review, to be in substantial agreement with the regional plan. This flexibility is consistent with a recognition in the regional plan that sewer service areas may be adjusted from time-to-time to meet urban land market and other conditions.

3. Development outside planned urban service areas should be limited to agricultural uses; rural residential uses at a density of no more than one home per five acres; and limited areas of highway-related services and commercial and industrial development to serve farmers, rural residents, and the traveling public. A town plan was considered to be in substantial agreement with the regional land use plan if the average proposed residential density of the town outside the expanded urban service area was no more than one home per five acres, or if no more than about 20 percent of the town outside the expanded urban service area is proposed to be developed for urban uses. The “expanded urban service area” refers to the planned sewer service area plus a one-half mile buffer.

The regional land use plan also recommends preserving prime agricultural lands outside planned urban service areas. Criteria to identify farmland preservation areas in Washington County were established as part of the farmland preservation planning process conducted by the County from 2011 to 2013. The updated Farmland Preservation Plan was approved by the County Board and incorporated into the previous edition of this comprehensive plan as Appendix T as part of Amendment 2013-02. Town plans were considered to be in substantial agreement with the regional plan if they were consistent with the update to the Washington County Farmland Preservation Plan. Both the Farmland Preservation and General Agricultural land use categories were considered when determining substantial agreement with the regional land use plan recommendation to preserve prime agricultural land. All Town plans were reviewed by SEWRPC at the time that Amendment 2013-1 was prepared and were found to be in substantial agreement with the regional land use plan. Town plans were reviewed by SEWRPC in ______ 2017 and by the Public Works Committee in _______. Those determined to be in substantial agreement with the regional land use plan are incorporated into the updated County Land Use Plan Map in Part 3 of this chapter.
Background Data and Maps

Chapters II through X provide background data and maps used to help design the County land use plan map. In addition to the detailed information and inventories included in those chapters, the comprehensive planning law requires that the following maps be included in the land use element:

- **Productive Agricultural Soils**
  Washington County conducted an analysis to identify land that may be most suitable for long-term agricultural use as part of the Farmland Preservation Plan adopted in 2013. Soil type, quality, and productivity were considered in the analysis. County and local governments reviewed the resulting draft Farmland Preservation Areas (FPAs), depicted on Map T-7 of the County Farmland Preservation Plan. FPAs formally adopted as part of the plan, which do not include all of the draft FPAs, are depicted on Map II-2 in Chapter II of this report. Additional information about the farmland preservation plan is provided in the Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources Element (Chapter V).

- **Natural Limitations to Building Site Development and Environmentally Sensitive Lands**
  Natural resources and features within the County are also identified in the Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources Element (Chapter V). These features were reviewed by the local government partners and the Comprehensive Planning Advisory Committee when the first edition of this plan was prepared. Several natural resource features that may limit development were included on a map, “Natural Limitations to Building Site Development in Washington County,” based on approval of the Advisory Committee for the first edition of this plan. An update to that map, Map 82 in the first edition of this plan, is shown on Map VI-6. The map features include 1-percent-annual-probability (100-year recurrence interval) floodplains, bedrock within three feet of the surface, slopes of 12 percent or greater, wetlands, hydric soils, and surface water. Additional constraints to development, or special circumstances that must be carefully addressed when a parcel is developed, such as conservation easements, cemeteries, environmentally contaminated sites, and former landfills, are also included on Map VI-6. All of these conditions affect the construction costs of urban development, and may limit the location of buildings, pavement, utilities, and private onsite wastewater treatment systems (POWTS). In some cases, particularly in wetlands and floodplains, State regulations and County ordinances will also affect site development.

  Environmentally sensitive lands are shown on Map VI-7, and include primary environmental corridors, isolated natural resource areas, natural areas, critical species habitat sites, surface water, wetlands, woodlands, and 1-percent-annual-probability floodplains. Recommendations for the protection and
management of these resources can be found in the Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources Element (Chapter V).

- **Utilities and Community Services**
  The comprehensive planning law requires the land use element to include maps showing boundaries of areas to which public utility and community services will be provided by the plan design year. Such maps are included in the Utilities and Community Facilities Element (Chapter IX).

PART 3: COUNTY LAND USE PLAN (To Be Completed Following Local Plan Updates)