

# issues & opportunities 2

**Village of Greendale Comprehensive Plan: 2010 - 2035**

*Greendale, Wisconsin . Revisiting a Greenbelt Community*





# Issues and Opportunities

The recommendations identified in the Village’s comprehensive plan shall be guided by the community vision, goals, and objectives outlined in this chapter. The purpose of the Issues and Opportunities element, as defined by Wisconsin State Statutes is to:

- *Provide a statement or vision that discusses and defines your community’s desired future.*
- *Provide general demographic and forecasting information for the community.*

Additionally, this chapter allows the community to identify the primary challenges and opportunities currently facing the Village of Greendale. These observations and desires provide the foundation for the community vision statement, goals, and objectives found in this element.

Understanding the issues and opportunities requires examination of current demographics, population trends, and an analysis of public participation efforts throughout the Plan process. These pieces are included for reference towards the end of the Issues and Opportunities chapter.



## COMMUNITY VISION

The Village of Greendale envisions maintaining a balance between the following three aspirations.

- *The preservation of Greendale’s heritage;*
- *The advancement of Greendale’s economic position within the southeastern Wisconsin region;*
- *The provision of long-term guidance to assure the Village maintains its status as an innovative community.*

At the heart of these aspirations is the desire to preserve and strengthen the quality of life found in Greendale.

### *Preservation of Greendale’s Heritage*

With regards to the preservation and maintenance of Greendale’s heritage, the Village intends to retain the basic physical characteristics and layout of the original community. One illustrative example of the community’s unique connection to its development patterns is through the neighborhood names. Greendale residents often refer to their neighborhoods by section, such as the “A-section” or “M-section”, reflecting the alphabetically-ordered street

names that occurred during the community’s development. The identification of neighborhoods by street names alone – just one physical trait of the Village’s neighborhoods– demonstrates the cultural identity uniquely tied to the characteristics and layout of Greendale.

Preservation of heritage shall also include the maintenance of historic sites and buildings, which shall be considered tools for cultural resources and tourism. The Village shall continue to place emphasis on integrated green spaces and pathways, retaining Greendale’s connection to the English Garden City concept.

Preserving and maintaining Greendale’s heritage shall also place an emphasis on continuing the community’s strong social traditions. The recommendations of the comprehensive plan shall highlight and support the many annual social events, civic organizations, and community gathering places integral to the Village.

### *Advancement of Greendale’s Economic Position*

Advancing the economic position of the Village shall involve the support and enhancement of major districts, corridors, and nodes within the community. Southridge Mall, the Village

Center, and the Industrial Park are among the top priorities as key districts in Greendale. The Loomis Road and 76th Street corridors shall be at the forefront of economic development recommendations; special emphasis shall be placed upon the major nodes along these corridors, including the Grange Avenue intersections. Additionally, the intersection of Grange Avenue with Northway shall receive focus as a critical node, as it connects the economic development of Southridge with the historic Village Center.

### *Greendale: An Innovative Community*

The term “innovation” generally refers to the introduction of a new idea, method, or device. For the purposes of this Plan, maintaining Greendale as an innovative community shall involve the fusion of new strategies and concepts with previously established tools for preservation and development. Providing

long-term guidance to support Greendale’s role as an innovative community shall not fall solely on the shoulders of Village officials and staff. Rather, long-term guidance shall require involvement on the part of Village officials, Village staff, regional representatives, stakeholders, business owners, and residents.

## **GOALS AND OBJECTIVES**

The following goals and objectives shall guide the Village of Greendale as it implements recommendations in this Plan:

### *Agricultural, Natural and Cultural Resources*

- *Protect the unique natural and cultural identity of the Village including significant cultural features, natural areas, and environmental corridors that support local flora and fauna;*
- *Achieve a balance between new residential*

*development opportunities and open space preservation;*

- *Protect and wisely utilize the Village’s natural resources, including but not limited to: wetlands, wildlife, lakes, woodlands, open space, parks, and groundwater resources;*
- *Support strategies to preserve the Root River and Dale Creek as significant Village resources.*

### *Economic Development*

- *Maintain and promote a diversified tax base;*
- *Strengthen business development in the Village Center and continue to market the downtown area as a regional attraction;*
- *Promote redevelopment strategies for the Southridge Mall and 76th Street corridor that transform the area into a regional destination and an attractive place to locate businesses;*
- *Support the long-term redevelopment of the Village’s Industrial Park as a destination for highly productive, small-to-medium format industrial and office users.*

### *Land Use*

- *Establish development standards for new residential, commercial, and industrial development and redevelopment based on neighborhoods, districts, and corridors;*
- *Continue to support the Village’s tradition of an integrated community by supporting*





appropriate “transitional uses” and/or buffers between various land uses;

- Manage conflicts arising from the desire to locate residential uses near environmental features.
- Establish Greendale as a regionally-recognized location for incorporating sustainable practices throughout the Village.

### Housing

- Maintain a variety of housing unit types to accommodate diverse household incomes and owner preferences. Ensure that adequate housing is available for all segments of the community, including young families, empty nesters, and seniors.
- Utilize Greendale’s adopted design guidelines in the renovation or construction of any housing within the “Originals” neighborhood;
- Provide flexibility in density standards for new residential development to maintain the Village’s tradition of integrated open space and public access;
- Encourage the preservation and maintenance of all housing units in the “Originals” neighborhood, and explore options for property maintenance enforcement;
- Allow new multi-family housing options (townhouse, multi-unit buildings, etc.) provided that the architectural quality respects the context of the surrounding neighborhood;



- Encourage homeowners to incorporate “green” features (e.g. water efficient landscaping, pervious pavement, stormwater retention, residential energy systems, etc.) on individual properties.

### Transportation

- Enhance pedestrian and bicycle access and safety within the Root River Parkway;
- Maintain access to the historic pedestrian and bicycle pathways throughout the Village, and ensure adequate connectivity between all paths;
- Enhance primary vehicular and pedestrian gateways into the Village with signage, landscaping, and lighting when appropriate;
- Assess the potential impacts of future development along the Grange Avenue corridor;
- Monitor and evaluate the locations of existing and future curb cuts along 76th

Street to minimize undesirable traffic patterns;

- Analyze the need for new public transportation routes, specifically bus or trolley service;
- Monitor and maintain aging infrastructure in the Village, and encourage phased implementation of sustainable infrastructure that uses fewer natural resources, promotes energy efficiencies and cost savings, and requires less frequent maintenance.

### Utilities and Community Facilities

- Ensure that all Village facilities provide adequate square footage and functionality to accommodate governmental, educational, and community needs;
- Develop design standards for future Village facilities that promote sustainable, cost saving features;
- Consider utility system needs for the

*Southridge Mall and 76th Street corridor parcels;*

- *Maintain the Village Center as a major community destination that provides adequate amenities, open space, circulation, and connectivity to neighborhoods.*

### **Intergovernmental Cooperation**

- *Encourage ongoing discussion with neighboring communities regarding land uses, transportation, and services.*
- *Continue coordination with the City of Greenfield regarding site planning and circulation in and around Southridge Mall and the 76th Street corridor;*
- *Continue coordination with Milwaukee County with regards to the Root River Parkway and other County parkland within and adjacent to the Village;*
- *Continue to support the Greendale School District as a valuable community resource.*

## **DEMOGRAPHICS SUMMARY**

Demographic data gathered for the Village of Greendale includes information from the United States Census Bureau, the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC), and the Wisconsin Department of Administration (DOA). To provide a broader picture of the Village's context within the region, demographic data are provided for the communities immediately surrounding Greendale (the Cities of Franklin, Greenfield,

and Oak Creek, and the Village of Hales Corners), Milwaukee County, and Southeastern Wisconsin (defined here as Kenosha, Milwaukee, Ozaukee, Racine, Walworth, Washington, and Waukesha Counties).

In addition to these regional comparisons, demographic data are also included for traditional suburban communities in the region. This analysis is important, as the development patterns – and therefore existing trends and future projections – are more analogous to the Village than the other suburban communities with significant opportunities for greenfield development. As the Village begins to consider long-term goals and objectives, it is important to have an understanding of both adjacent and peer communities in the region.

The enclosed summaries provide information on population including population projections, age, race, educational attainment, and household income.

### **Population**

According to the 2000 U.S. Census, the Village of Greendale's population was 14,405 (Figure 2-1). The estimated population in 2008 according to the Wisconsin Department of Administration (DOA) was 13,995, a 2.8% decrease from 2000. Since 1990, the population of Greendale has been decreasing more rapidly than in Milwaukee County as a whole. The population of Milwaukee County in 2000 was 940,164. The Wisconsin DOA estimate for Milwaukee County's population

in 2008 was 938,490, a decrease of 2.2%. Over the same time span, the population of Southeastern Wisconsin increased by 3.5% from 1,931,165 to 1,998,418.

In the Village of Greendale, the population decrease between 1990 and 2000 was 4.8%, compared to 2.6% in Milwaukee County. The population of Southeastern Wisconsin increased by 6.7% from 1,810,364 to 1,931,165.

The rate of population decline in Greendale was far greater than in its neighboring communities. Between 1990 and 2000, the population of Franklin *increased* by 35.0%, Oak Creek by 45.8%, Greenfield by 6.2%, and Hales Corners by 1.9%.

More recently, between 2000 and 2008, population grew by 13.8% in the City of Franklin, 14.1% in the City of Oak Creek, and 2.2% in the City of Greenfield. The population of the Village of Hales Corners, however, reversed its positive growth trend from the previous decade and declined by 1.5%.

When compared to other traditional suburbs (Figure 2-2), the Village's population decrease was less drastic. Compared to the Village's 2.8% decrease between 2000 and 2008, the cities of Cudahy (1%), Greenfield (2.2%), and St. Francis (3.3%) experienced moderate growth, while other communities declined moderately (Village of Hales Corners by 1.5%; Village of Shorewood by 2.5%; City of Wauwatosa by 2.9%; and Village of Whitefish Bay by 2.0%). These moderate changes in population can be attributed to

the primarily built-out status of the traditional suburbs – leaving few opportunities for significant residential expansion, as well as the relatively stable population base supported by the higher median age of these communities. This trend is especially prominent in the Village of Greendale, where many residents remain in the community throughout their lifetimes.

### Population Projections

The Wisconsin Department of Administration (DOA) provided population projections for Wisconsin counties and municipalities at five year increments through 2030. These projections show the Village of Greendale losing between 2% and 5% of its population at every increment through 2030 (Figure 2-3). Based on these calculations, Village of Greendale is projected to have a net decrease in population of 17.65% from 2000 to 2030. This pattern of steady population loss is far more pronounced in Greendale than in Milwaukee County as a whole. Populations

are also projected to decrease at every five-year interval in Milwaukee County from 2000 to 2030, however the net loss at the end of that time span is projected to total 5.18%. The population of Southeastern Wisconsin is expected to grow at every interval between 2000 and 2030, with a net gain of 11.33%.

Three of Greendale’s neighbors are expected to grow significantly between 2000 and 2030. Franklin is expected to grow by 37.53%, Oak Creek by 38.13%, and Greenfield by 11.83%. Hales Corners is projected to decline in 2005 and 2010, increase in 2015 and 2020, and

Figure 2-1. Population

|                 | Milwaukee County |          | Southeastern Wisconsin |          | Village of Greendale |          | City of Franklin |          | City of Greenfield |          | Village of Hales Corners |          | City of Oak Creek |          |
|-----------------|------------------|----------|------------------------|----------|----------------------|----------|------------------|----------|--------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|-------------------|----------|
|                 | Total            | % Change | Total                  | % Change | Total                | % Change | Total            | % Change | Total              | % Change | Total                    | % Change | Total             | % Change |
| 1970            | 1,054,249        | -        | 1,756,083              | -        | 15,089               | -        | 12,247           | -        | 24,424             | -        | 7,771                    | -        | 13,928            | -        |
| 1980            | 964,988          | -8.5%    | 1,764,796              | 0.5%     | 16,928               | 12.2%    | 16,871           | 37.8%    | 31,353             | 28.4%    | 7,110                    | -8.5%    | 16,932            | 21.6%    |
| 1990            | 959,275          | -0.6%    | 1,810,364              | 2.6%     | 15,128               | -10.6%   | 21,855           | 29.5%    | 33,403             | 6.5%     | 7,623                    | 7.2%     | 19,513            | 15.2%    |
| 2000            | 940,164          | -2.0%    | 1,931,165              | 6.7%     | 14,405               | -4.8%    | 29,494           | 35.0%    | 35,476             | 6.2%     | 7,765                    | 1.9%     | 28,456            | 45.8%    |
| 2008 (estimate) | 938,490          | -0.2%    | 1,998,418              | 3.5%     | 13,995               | -2.8%    | 33,550           | 13.8%    | 36,270             | 2.2%     | 7,646                    | -1.5%    | 32,470            | 14.1%    |

Source: U.S Census Bureau, 2000 & WI DOA

Figure 2-2. Population – Comparable Communities

|                 | Village of Greendale |          | City of Cudahy |          | City of Greenfield |          | Village of Hales Corners |          | Village of Shorewood |          | City of St. Francis |          | City of Wauwatosa |          | Village of Whitefish Bay |          |
|-----------------|----------------------|----------|----------------|----------|--------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|----------------------|----------|---------------------|----------|-------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|
|                 | Total                | % Change | Total          | % Change | Total              | % Change | Total                    | % Change | Total                | % Change | Total               | % Change | Total             | % Change | Total                    | % Change |
| 1970            | 15,089               | -        | 22,078         | -        | 24,424             | -        | 7,771                    | -        | 15,576               | -        | 10,489              | -        | 58,676            | -        | 17,402                   | -        |
| 1980            | 16,928               | 12.2%    | 19,547         | -11.5%   | 31,353             | 28.4%    | 7,110                    | -8.5%    | 14,327               | -8.0%    | 10,095              | -3.8%    | 51,308            | -12.6%   | 14,930                   | -14.2%   |
| 1990            | 15,128               | -10.6%   | 18,659         | -4.5%    | 33,403             | 6.5%     | 7,623                    | 7.2%     | 14,116               | -1.5%    | 9,245               | -8.4%    | 49,366            | -3.8%    | 14,272                   | -4.4%    |
| 2000            | 14,405               | -4.8%    | 18,429         | -1.2%    | 35,476             | 6.2%     | 7,765                    | 1.9%     | 13,763               | -2.5%    | 8,662               | -6.3%    | 47,271            | -4.2%    | 14,163                   | -0.8%    |
| 2008 (estimate) | 13,995               | -2.8%    | 18,620         | 1.0%     | 36,270             | 2.2%     | 7,646                    | -1.5%    | 13,425               | -2.5%    | 8,952               | 3.3%     | 45,880            | -2.9%    | 13,875                   | -2.0%    |

Source: U.S Census Bureau, 2000 & WI DOA

then decline again in 2025. Over the entire time span, Hales Corners is projected to lose 1.30% of its population. Therefore, the rate of Greendale’s population loss is projected to be much greater than that of the surrounding communities according to DOA estimates.

Alternatively, SEWRPC has prepared planned growth rates as a part of their 2035 Regional Land Use Plan. These projections (Figure 2–4) consider a broader range of regional factors than the DOA estimates, and project a moderate population decline of 2.1% in

Greendale between 2000 and 2035. According to the Regional Land Use Plan, Greenfield is projected to grow at a more moderate rate of 6.89%, while the projections for the cities of Franklin (67.30%), Hales Corners (26.94%), and Oak Creek (81.13%) increased dramatically over the DOA estimates.

One reason for the differences between the DOA and SEWRPC estimates, as well as a significant factor separating Greendale from its neighbors, lies in the availability of developable land and the high demand for residential

growth in newer suburban communities. When the Village is compared to the traditional suburban communities (Figures 2–5 and 2–6), the projections are more analogous. Based upon the SEWRPC modeling, the Village of Greendale compares most closely with the City of Cudahy (2.39% increase), City of Wauwatosa (3.88% increase), and Village of Shorewood (2.03% decrease).

For the Village of Greendale, these projections reflect the community’s aging population, the relative stability of the current residents, and

Figure 2–3. Population Projections

|            | Milwaukee County |               | Southeastern Wisconsin |               | Village of Greendale |                | City of Franklin |               | City of Greenfield |               | Village of Hales Corners |               | City of Oak Creek |               |
|------------|------------------|---------------|------------------------|---------------|----------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|--------------------|---------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------------|---------------|
|            | Total            | % Change      | Total                  | % Change      | Total                | % Change       | Total            | % Change      | Total              | % Change      | Total                    | % Change      | Total             | % Change      |
| 2000       | 940,164          | -             | 1,931,165              | -             | 14,405               | -              | 29,494           | -             | 35,476             | -             | 7,765                    | -             | 28,456            | -             |
| 2005       | 938,497          | -0.18%        | 1,979,707              | 2.51%         | 14,075               | -2.3%          | 32,661           | 10.74%        | 36,140             | 1.87%         | 7,644                    | -1.56%        | 31,649            | 11.22%        |
| 2010       | 929,208          | -0.99%        | 2,013,813              | 1.72%         | 13,632               | -3.1%          | 34,530           | 5.72%         | 36,914             | 2.14%         | 7,628                    | -0.21%        | 33,460            | 5.72%         |
| 2015       | 928,077          | -0.12%        | 2,059,827              | 2.28%         | 13,307               | -2.4%          | 36,715           | 6.33%         | 38,017             | 2.99%         | 7,677                    | 0.64%         | 35,577            | 6.33%         |
| 2020       | 923,910          | -0.45%        | 2,102,593              | 2.08%         | 12,935               | -2.8%          | 38,802           | 5.68%         | 39,010             | 2.61%         | 7,704                    | 0.35%         | 37,600            | 5.69%         |
| 2025       | 912,020          | -1.29%        | 2,133,632              | 1.48%         | 12,455               | -3.7%          | 40,564           | 4.54%         | 39,674             | 1.70%         | 7,664                    | -0.52%        | 39,307            | 4.54%         |
| 2030       | 891,445          | -2.26%        | 2,149,885              | 0.76%         | 11,863               | -4.8%          | 41,894           | 3.28%         | 39,938             | 0.67%         | 7,552                    | -1.46%        | 40,596            | 3.28%         |
| <b>Net</b> |                  | <b>-5.18%</b> |                        | <b>11.33%</b> |                      | <b>-17.65%</b> |                  | <b>42.04%</b> |                    | <b>12.58%</b> |                          | <b>-2.74%</b> |                   | <b>42.66%</b> |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 & WI DOA

Figure 2–4. Population Projections (SEWRPC Model)

|      | Village of Greendale |          | City of Franklin |          | City of Greenfield |          | Village of Hales Corners |          | City of Oak Creek |          |
|------|----------------------|----------|------------------|----------|--------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|-------------------|----------|
|      | Total                | % Change | Total            | % Change | Total              | % Change | Total                    | % Change | Total             | % Change |
| 2000 | 14,405               | -        | 29,494           | -        | 35,476             | -        | 7,765                    | -        | 28,456            | -        |
| 2035 | 14,103               | -2.1%    | 49,342           | 67.30%   | 37,921             | 6.89%    | 9,857                    | 26.94%   | 51,541            | 81.13%   |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 & SEWRPC



the built-out nature of development. However, the redevelopment of the Southridge Mall area could significantly impact the Village of Greendale with the incorporation of mixed-use development, including high-quality residential options. In the event of a major redevelopment of the Southridge Commercial District, these projections should be reconsidered in order account for new residential market demands experienced by the Village.

### Age

The population of Greendale tends to be older than that of its neighbors, according to the 2000 Census (Figure 2-7). In Greendale, 33.9% of the population was aged 55 or older. The percentage of persons in this age bracket was slightly smaller in Greenfield (30.4%) and Hales Corners (27.8). The percentage of persons aged 55 or older was much smaller in Franklin (18.6%), Oak Creek (16.7%), Milwaukee County (20.4%), and Southeastern Wisconsin (20.6%).

Meanwhile, Greendale had a smaller percentage of persons aged 20 to 34 than many of its neighbors. In Greendale, 13.1% of the population fell into this category, compared to 16.6% in Hales Corners, 18.6% in Franklin, 19.2% in Greenfield, and 23.5% in Oak Creek. In Milwaukee County 22.4% of the population were aged 20 to 34, while that figure was 20.1% in all of Southeastern Wisconsin. The aging population combined with the relatively small percentage of persons in their prime child bearing years is a major component in Greendale's projected population decline.

Figure 2-5. Population Projections - Comparable Communities

|            | Village of Greendale |                | City of Cudahy |               | City of Greenfield |               | Village of Hales Corners |               | Village of Shorewood |                | City of St. Francis |               | City of Wauwatosa |                | Village of Whitefish Bay |               |
|------------|----------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|--------------------|---------------|--------------------------|---------------|----------------------|----------------|---------------------|---------------|-------------------|----------------|--------------------------|---------------|
|            | Total                | % Change       | Total          | % Change      | Total              | % Change      | Total                    | % Change      | Total                | % Change       | Total               | % Change      | Total             | % Change       | Total                    | % Change      |
| 2000       | 14,405               | -              | 18,429         | -             | 35,476             | -             | 7,765                    | -             | 13,763               | -              | 8,662               | -             | 47,271            | -              | 14,163                   | -             |
| 2005       | 14,075               | -2.3%          | 18,347         | -0.44%        | 36,140             | 1.87%         | 7,644                    | -1.56%        | 13,489               | -1.99%         | 8,795               | 1.54%         | 46,263            | -2.13%         | 13,907                   | -1.81%        |
| 2010       | 13,632               | -3.1%          | 18,170         | -0.96%        | 36,914             | 2.14%         | 7,628                    | -0.21%        | 13,247               | -1.79%         | 8,686               | -1.24%        | 45,160            | -2.38%         | 13,687                   | -1.58%        |
| 2015       | 13,307               | -2.4%          | 18,153         | -0.09%        | 38,017             | 2.99%         | 7,677                    | 0.64%         | 13,120               | -0.96%         | 8,653               | -0.38%        | 44,450            | -1.57%         | 13,587                   | -0.73%        |
| 2020       | 12,935               | -2.8%          | 18,077         | -0.42%        | 39,010             | 2.61%         | 7,704                    | 0.35%         | 12,950               | -1.30%         | 8,592               | -0.70%        | 43,588            | -1.94%         | 13,441                   | -1.07%        |
| 2025       | 12,455               | -3.7%          | 17,850         | -1.26%        | 39,674             | 1.70%         | 7,664                    | -0.52%        | 12,672               | -2.15%         | 8,460               | -1.54%        | 42,363            | -2.81%         | 13,183                   | -1.92%        |
| 2030       | 11,863               | -4.8%          | 17,452         | -2.23%        | 39,938             | 0.67%         | 7,552                    | -1.46%        | 12,275               | -3.13%         | 8,246               | -2.53%        | 40,745            | -3.82%         | 12,801                   | -2.90%        |
| <b>Net</b> |                      | <b>-17.65%</b> |                | <b>-5.30%</b> |                    | <b>12.58%</b> |                          | <b>-2.74%</b> |                      | <b>-10.81%</b> |                     | <b>-4.80%</b> |                   | <b>-13.81%</b> |                          | <b>-9.62%</b> |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 & WI DOA

Figure 2-6. Population Projections (SEWRPC Model) - Comparable Communities

|      | Village of Greendale |          | City of Cudahy |          | City of Greenfield |          | Village of Hales Corners |          | Village of Shorewood |          | City of St. Francis |          | City of Wauwatosa |          |
|------|----------------------|----------|----------------|----------|--------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|----------------------|----------|---------------------|----------|-------------------|----------|
|      | Total                | % Change | Total          | % Change | Total              | % Change | Total                    | % Change | Total                | % Change | Total               | % Change | Total             | % Change |
| 2000 | 14,405               | -        | 18,429         | -        | 35,476             | -        | 7,765                    | -        | 13,763               | -        | 8,662               | -        | 47,271            | -        |
| 2035 | 14,103               | -2.1%    | 18,869         | 2.39%    | 37,921             | 6.89%    | 9,857                    | 26.94%   | 13,484               | -2.03%   | 11,975              | 38.25%   | 49,104            | 3.88%    |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 & SEWRPC

Figure 2-7. Age Distribution

|            | Milwaukee County |            | Southeastern Wisconsin |            | Village of Greendale |              | City of Franklin |            | City of Greenfield |            | Village of Hales Corners |            | City of Oak Creek |            |
|------------|------------------|------------|------------------------|------------|----------------------|--------------|------------------|------------|--------------------|------------|--------------------------|------------|-------------------|------------|
|            | Total            | % of Total | Total                  | % of Total | Total                | % of Total   | Total            | % of Total | Total              | % of Total | Total                    | % of Total | Total             | % of Total |
| 0-9        | 138,394          | 14.7%      | 276,609                | 14.3%      | <b>1,551</b>         | <b>10.8%</b> | 3,499            | 11.9%      | 3,401              | 9.6%       | 823                      | 10.6%      | 3,805             | 13.4%      |
| 10-19      | 137,867          | 14.7%      | 288,787                | 15.0%      | <b>1,974</b>         | <b>13.7%</b> | 4,240            | 14.4%      | 4,008              | 11.3%      | 1,046                    | 13.5%      | 4,037             | 14.2%      |
| 20-34      | 211,003          | 22.4%      | 388,005                | 20.1%      | <b>1,883</b>         | <b>13.1%</b> | 5,490            | 18.6%      | 6,797              | 19.2%      | 1,289                    | 16.6%      | 6,674             | 23.5%      |
| 35-54      | 261,674          | 27.8%      | 580,319                | 30.1%      | <b>4,253</b>         | <b>29.5%</b> | 10,780           | 36.5%      | 10,490             | 29.6%      | 2,450                    | 31.6%      | 9,201             | 32.3%      |
| 55-64      | 69,541           | 7.4%       | 158,164                | 8.2%       | <b>1,851</b>         | <b>12.8%</b> | 2,565            | 8.7%       | 3,512              | 9.9%       | 724                      | 9.3%       | 2,220             | 7.8%       |
| 65-84      | 105,173          | 11.2%      | 209,481                | 10.8%      | <b>2,588</b>         | <b>18.0%</b> | 2,716            | 9.2%       | 6,214              | 17.5%      | 1,224                    | 15.8%      | 2,304             | 8.1%       |
| 85+        | 16,512           | 1.8%       | 31,543                 | 1.6%       | <b>305</b>           | <b>2.1%</b>  | 204              | 0.7%       | 1,054              | 3.0%       | 209                      | 2.7%       | 215               | 0.8%       |
| Median Age | 33.7             | -          | 35.4                   | -          | <b>43.6</b>          | -            | 37.9             | -          | 41.7               | -          | 41.0                     | -          | 34.5              | -          |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau & SEWRPC, 2000

Figure 2-8. Age Distribution – Comparable Communities

|            | Village of Greendale |              | City of Cudahy |            | City of Greenfield |            | Village of Hales Corners |            | Village of Shorewood |            | City of St. Francis |            | City of Wauwatosa |            | Village of Whitefish Bay |            |
|------------|----------------------|--------------|----------------|------------|--------------------|------------|--------------------------|------------|----------------------|------------|---------------------|------------|-------------------|------------|--------------------------|------------|
|            | Total                | % of Total   | Total          | % of Total | Total              | % of Total | Total                    | % of Total | Total                | % of Total | Total               | % of Total | Total             | % of Total | Total                    | % of Total |
| 0-9        | <b>1,551</b>         | <b>10.8%</b> | 2,358          | 12.8%      | 3,401              | 9.6%       | 823                      | 10.6%      | 1,470                | 10.7%      | 855                 | 9.9%       | 5,892             | 12.5%      | 2,307                    | 16.3%      |
| 10-19      | <b>1,974</b>         | <b>13.7%</b> | 2,311          | 12.5%      | 4,008              | 11.3%      | 1,046                    | 13.5%      | 1,654                | 12.0%      | 1,043               | 12.0%      | 5,874             | 12.4%      | 2,077                    | 14.7%      |
| 20-34      | <b>1,883</b>         | <b>13.1%</b> | 3,712          | 20.1%      | 6,797              | 19.2%      | 1,289                    | 16.6%      | 3,177                | 23.1%      | 1,720               | 19.9%      | 8,674             | 18.3%      | 1,947                    | 13.7%      |
| 35-54      | <b>4,253</b>         | <b>29.5%</b> | 5,486          | 29.8%      | 10,490             | 29.6%      | 2,450                    | 31.6%      | 4,322                | 31.4%      | 2,767               | 31.9%      | 14,625            | 30.9%      | 5,026                    | 35.5%      |
| 55-64      | <b>1,851</b>         | <b>12.8%</b> | 1,657          | 9.0%       | 3,512              | 9.9%       | 724                      | 9.3%       | 1,142                | 8.3%       | 728                 | 8.4%       | 3,615             | 7.6%       | 1,129                    | 8.0%       |
| 65-84      | <b>2,588</b>         | <b>18.0%</b> | 2,616          | 14.2%      | 6,214              | 17.5%      | 1,224                    | 15.8%      | 1,712                | 12.4%      | 1,359               | 15.7%      | 6,838             | 14.5%      | 1,495                    | 10.6%      |
| 85+        | <b>305</b>           | <b>2.1%</b>  | 289            | 1.6%       | 1,054              | 3.0%       | 209                      | 2.7%       | 286                  | 2.1%       | 190                 | 2.2%       | 1,753             | 3.7%       | 182                      | 1.3%       |
| Median Age | <b>43.6</b>          | -            | 37.7           | -          | 41.7               | -          | 41.0                     | 0.5%       | 37.8                 | -          | 40.0                | -          | 39.1              | -          | 38.2                     | -          |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau & SEWRPC, 2000

Figure 2-9. Racial Composition

|  | Milwaukee County |            | Southeastern Wisconsin |            | Village of Greendale |              | City of Franklin |            | City of Greenfield |            | Village of Hales Corners |            | City of Oak Creek |            |
|--|------------------|------------|------------------------|------------|----------------------|--------------|------------------|------------|--------------------|------------|--------------------------|------------|-------------------|------------|
|  | Total            | % of Total | Total                  | % of Total | Total                | % of Total   | Total            | % of Total | Total              | % of Total | Total                    | % of Total | Total             | % of Total |
| White                                  | 616,973          | 65.6%      | 1,534,464              | 79.4%      | <b>13,855</b>        | <b>96.2%</b> | 26,775           | 90.8%      | 33,247             | 93.7%      | 7,544                    | 97.2%      | 26,169            | 92.0%      |
| African American                       | 231,157          | 24.6%      | 263,200                | 13.6%      | <b>41</b>            | <b>0.3%</b>  | 1,520            | 5.2%       | 348                | 1.0%       | 17                       | 0.2%       | 519               | 1.8%       |
| American Indian/Alaska Native          | 6,794            | 0.7%       | 9,510                  | 0.5%       | <b>23</b>            | <b>0.2%</b>  | 106              | 0.4%       | 155                | 0.4%       | 38                       | 0.5%       | 169               | 0.6%       |
| Asian                                  | 24,145           | 2.6%       | 34,438                 | 1.8%       | <b>296</b>           | <b>2.1%</b>  | 619              | 2.1%       | 802                | 2.3%       | 75                       | 1.0%       | 680               | 2.4%       |
| Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander | 422              | 0.0%       | 716                    | 0.0%       | <b>1</b>             | <b>0.0%</b>  | 10               | 0.0%       | 7                  | 0.0%       | 3                        | 0.0%       | 1                 | 0.0%       |
| Some Other Race Alone                  | 39,931           | 4.2%       | 58,157                 | 3.0%       | <b>81</b>            | <b>0.6%</b>  | 197              | 0.7%       | 464                | 1.3%       | 44                       | 0.6%       | 484               | 1.7%       |
| Two or More Races                      | 20,742           | 2.2%       | 32,423                 | 1.7%       | <b>108</b>           | <b>0.7%</b>  | 267              | 0.9%       | 453                | 1.3%       | 44                       | 0.6%       | 434               | 1.5%       |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau & SEWRPC, 2000

Figure 2-10. Racial Composition – Comparable Communities

|  | Village of Greendale |              | City of Cudahy |            | City of Greenfield |            | Village of Hales Corners |            | Village of Shorewood |            | City of St. Francis |            | City of Wauwatosa |            | Village of Whitefish Bay |          |
|--|----------------------|--------------|----------------|------------|--------------------|------------|--------------------------|------------|----------------------|------------|---------------------|------------|-------------------|------------|--------------------------|----------|
|  | Total                | % of Total   | Total          | % of Total | Total              | % of Total | Total                    | % of Total | Total                | % of Total | Total               | % of Total | Total             | % of Total | Total                    | % Change |
| White                                  | <b>13,855</b>        | <b>96.2%</b> | 17,303         | 93.9%      | 33,247             | 93.7%      | 7,544                    | 97.2%      | 12,584               | 91.4%      | 8,122               | 93.8%      | 44,422            | 94.0%      | 13,467                   | 95.1%    |
| African American                       | <b>41</b>            | <b>0.3%</b>  | 175            | 0.9%       | 348                | 1.0%       | 17                       | 0.2%       | 332                  | 2.4%       | 84                  | 1.0%       | 965               | 2.0%       | 139                      | 1.0%     |
| American Indian/Alaska Native          | <b>23</b>            | <b>0.2%</b>  | 150            | 0.8%       | 155                | 0.4%       | 38                       | 0.5%       | 32                   | 0.2%       | 76                  | 0.9%       | 128               | 0.3%       | 10                       | 0.1%     |
| Asian                                  | <b>296</b>           | <b>2.1%</b>  | 154            | 0.8%       | 802                | 2.3%       | 75                       | 1.0%       | 439                  | 3.2%       | 91                  | 1.1%       | 918               | 1.9%       | 366                      | 2.6%     |
| Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander | <b>1</b>             | <b>0.0%</b>  | 6              | 0.0%       | 7                  | 0.0%       | 3                        | 0.0%       | 5                    | 0.0%       | 2                   | 0.0%       | 31                | 0.1%       | 8                        | 0.1%     |
| Some Other Race Alone                  | <b>81</b>            | <b>0.6%</b>  | 267            | 1.4%       | 464                | 1.3%       | 44                       | 0.6%       | 116                  | 0.8%       | 130                 | 1.5%       | 254               | 0.5%       | 37                       | 0.3%     |
| Two or More Races                      | <b>108</b>           | <b>0.7%</b>  | 374            | 2.0%       | 453                | 1.3%       | 44                       | 0.6%       | 255                  | 1.9%       | 157                 | 1.8%       | 553               | 1.2%       | 136                      | 1.0%     |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau & SEWRPC, 2000

These trends are also consistent with the age distribution of other traditional suburban communities in the region (Figure 2-8).

### Race

According to the 2000 Census, the Village of Greendale’s population was predominantly white (96.2%), with 2.1% Asian and no more than 1% in any other racial category (Figure 2-9). These characteristics were similar to Greendale’s neighboring municipalities. The population of Franklin was 90.8% white, Oak Creek was 92.0%, Greenfield was 93.7%, and Hales Corners was 97.2%. The racial

characteristics of Milwaukee County and Southeastern Wisconsin were considerably different. Milwaukee County was 65.6% white, 24.6% black, and 4.2% other, while Southeastern Wisconsin was 79.4% white, 13.6% black, and 3.0% other.

The Hispanic or Latino population in the Village of Greendale comprised 2.4% of the total population, compared to 2.6% in Franklin, 3.9% in Greenfield, 2.1% in Hales Corners, and 4.5% in Oak Creek. The Hispanic or Latino population comprised a higher percentage of

the population in Milwaukee County (8.8%) and Southeastern Wisconsin (6.5%).

Greendale’s racial composition is also similar to the other traditional suburban communities.

### Educational Attainment

The Village of Greendale had a higher percentage of persons with at least some post-high school education (62.9%) than Milwaukee County (50.8%) and Southeastern Wisconsin (54.3%) as shown in Figure 2-11. The percentage for Greendale was similar to that for Franklin (62.0%) and Hales Corners (63.3%).

Greenfield (51.5%) and Oak Creek (56.3%) had a much lower percentage of persons with some post-high school education.

Conversely, Greendale (8.7%) had a much lower percentage of persons without a high school diploma than Milwaukee County (19.7%) and Southeastern Wisconsin (15.8%). Greendale's percentage was lower than, but similar to that of Franklin (10.0%), Oak Creek (11.4%), and Hales Corners (9.2%). Greenfield (15.0%) had a much higher percentage of persons without a high school diploma than Greendale.

Educational levels in Greendale were also very similar to those in other traditional suburbs

(Figure 2-12). One notable exception was the percentage of population with bachelor or graduate degrees in the communities of Shorewood (62.9%) and Whitefish Bay (70.9%). These rates were significantly higher than not only Greendale (35.6%), but the other comparison communities. On the whole, the Village's population was as educated, if not more educated, than many of its counterparts.

### Income

According to the 2000 Census, the Village of Greendale's median household income (\$55,553) was higher than that of Milwaukee County (\$38,100), as shown in Figure 2-13.

Greendale's median household income was similar to Hales Corners (\$54,536) and Oak Creek (\$53,779), higher than Greenfield (\$44,230), and lower than Franklin (\$64,315).

Greendale had a lower percentage of households earning less than \$50,000 per year (43.8%) than Milwaukee County (63.4%) and Southeastern Wisconsin (53.9%). Greendale's percentage of households earning less than \$50,000 per year is similar to Hales Corners (43.0%) and Oak Creek (44.6%). Franklin has the lowest percentage of households earning less than \$50,000 per year (34.5%), while Greenfield has the highest percentage (56.1%).

Figure 2-11. Educational Attainment

|                                    | Milwaukee County |            | Southeastern Wisconsin |            | Village of Greendale |              | City of Franklin |            | City of Greenfield |            | Village of Hales Corners |            | City of Oak Creek |            |
|------------------------------------|------------------|------------|------------------------|------------|----------------------|--------------|------------------|------------|--------------------|------------|--------------------------|------------|-------------------|------------|
|                                    | Total            | % of Total | Total                  | % of Total | Total                | % of Total   | Total            | % of Total | Total              | % of Total | Total                    | % of Total | Total             | % of Total |
| Population 25 Years and Over       | 594,387          | 100%       | 1,243,854              | 100.0%     | <b>10,332</b>        | <b>100%</b>  | 20,202           | 100%       | 25,877             | 100%       | 5,507                    | 100%       | 18,810            | 100%       |
| Less Than 9th Grade                | 35,344           | 5.9%       | 59,587                 | 4.8%       | <b>268</b>           | <b>2.6%</b>  | 418              | 2.1%       | 1,114              | 4.3%       | 178                      | 3.2%       | 536               | 2.8%       |
| 9th to 12th (No Diploma)           | 82,070           | 13.8%      | 136,211                | 11.0%      | <b>631</b>           | <b>6.1%</b>  | 1,602            | 7.9%       | 2,780              | 10.7%      | 333                      | 6.0%       | 1,613             | 8.6%       |
| High School Graduate               | 174,794          | 29.4%      | 372,955                | 30.0%      | <b>2,934</b>         | <b>28.4%</b> | 5,659            | 28.0%      | 8,649              | 33.4%      | 1,513                    | 27.5%      | 6,064             | 32.2%      |
| Some College or Associate's Degree | 161,719          | 27.2%      | 358,403                | 28.8%      | <b>2,825</b>         | <b>27.3%</b> | 6,652            | 32.9%      | 8,104              | 31.3%      | 1,556                    | 28.3%      | 6,000             | 31.9%      |
| Bachelor or Graduate Degree        | 140,460          | 23.6%      | 316,698                | 25.5%      | <b>3,674</b>         | <b>35.6%</b> | 5,871            | 29.1%      | 5,230              | 20.2%      | 1,927                    | 35.0%      | 4,597             | 24.4%      |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau & SEWRPC, 2000

Figure 2-12. Educational Attainment - Comparable Communities

|                                    | Village of Greendale |              | City of Cudahy |            | City of Greenfield |            | Village of Hales Corners |            | Village of Shorewood |            | City of St. Francis |            | City of Wauwatosa |            | Village of Whitefish Bay |            |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------|----------------|------------|--------------------|------------|--------------------------|------------|----------------------|------------|---------------------|------------|-------------------|------------|--------------------------|------------|
|                                    | Total                | % of Total   | Total          | % of Total | Total              | % of Total | Total                    | % of Total | Total                | % of Total | Total               | % of Total | Total             | % of Total | Total                    | % of Total |
| Population 25 Years and Over       | <b>10,332</b>        | <b>100%</b>  | 12,718         | 100%       | 25,877             | 100%       | 5,507                    | 100%       | 9,698                | 100%       | 6,217               | 100%       | 33,616            | 100%       | 9,558                    | 100%       |
| Less Than 9th Grade                | <b>268</b>           | <b>2.6%</b>  | 593            | 4.7%       | 1,114              | 4.3%       | 178                      | 3.2%       | 162                  | 1.7%       | 264                 | 4.2%       | 658               | 2.0%       | 44                       | 0.5%       |
| 9th to 12th (No Diploma)           | <b>631</b>           | <b>6.1%</b>  | 1,713          | 13.5%      | 2,780              | 10.7%      | 333                      | 6.0%       | 370                  | 3.8%       | 657                 | 10.6%      | 1,574             | 4.7%       | 152                      | 1.6%       |
| High School Graduate               | <b>2,934</b>         | <b>28.4%</b> | 4,961          | 39.0%      | 8,649              | 33.4%      | 1,513                    | 27.5%      | 1,203                | 12.4%      | 2,472               | 39.8%      | 6,533             | 19.4%      | 799                      | 8.4%       |
| Some College or Associate's Degree | <b>2,825</b>         | <b>27.3%</b> | 3,726          | 29.3%      | 8,104              | 31.3%      | 1,556                    | 28.3%      | 1,862                | 19.2%      | 1,975               | 31.8%      | 8,843             | 26.3%      | 1,785                    | 18.7%      |
| Bachelor or Graduate Degree        | <b>3,674</b>         | <b>35.6%</b> | 1,725          | 13.6%      | 5,230              | 20.2%      | 1,927                    | 35.0%      | 6,101                | 62.9%      | 849                 | 13.7%      | 16,008            | 47.6%      | 6,778                    | 70.9%      |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau & SEWRPC, 2000

Greendale had a much higher percentage of households earning between \$50,000 and \$100,000 per year (40.7%) than Milwaukee County (28.7%) and Southeastern Wisconsin (34.1%). Among its neighbors, Greendale has a higher percentage of households in this category than Greenfield (34.7%), and a lower percentage than Oak Creek (44.1%), Franklin (44.7%), and Hales Corners (46.0%).

Greendale also had a higher percentage of households earning more than \$100,000 per

year (15.5%) than Milwaukee County (7.9%) and Southeastern Wisconsin (12.0%). Greendale had a lower percentage of households in this category than Franklin (15.5%), and a higher percentage than Greenfield (9.2%), Hales Corners (11.0%), and Oak Creek (11.3%).

Among the comparable traditional suburban communities (Figure 2-14), the Village of Greendale's median household income (\$55,553) was similar to Hales Corners (\$54,536) and Wauwatosa (\$54,519); higher

than Shorewood (\$47,224), Greenfield (\$44,230), Cudahy (\$40,157), and St. Francis (\$36,712); and lower than Whitefish Bay (\$80,755).

Figure 2-13. Income Distribution

|                         | Milwaukee County |            | Southeastern Wisconsin |            | Village of Greendale |              | City of Franklin |            | City of Greenfield |            | Village of Hales Corners |            | City of Oak Creek |            |
|-------------------------|------------------|------------|------------------------|------------|----------------------|--------------|------------------|------------|--------------------|------------|--------------------------|------------|-------------------|------------|
|                         | Total            | % of Total | Total                  | % of Total | Total                | % of Total   | Total            | % of Total | Total              | % of Total | Total                    | % of Total | Total             | % of Total |
| Households              | 377,983          | 100%       | 749,634                | 100.0%     | <b>6,054</b>         | <b>100%</b>  | 10,637           | 100%       | 15,702             | 100%       | 3,269                    | 100%       | 11,277            | 100%       |
| Less Than \$10,000      | 40,098           | 10.6%      | 56,195                 | 7.5%       | <b>302</b>           | <b>5.0%</b>  | 271              | 2.5%       | 716                | 4.6%       | 132                      | 4.0%       | 433               | 3.8%       |
| \$10,000 to \$34,999    | 132,865          | 35.2%      | 222,507                | 29.7%      | <b>1,448</b>         | <b>23.9%</b> | 1,963            | 18.5%      | 4,959              | 31.6%      | 778                      | 23.8%      | 2,454             | 21.8%      |
| \$35,000 to \$49,999    | 66,510           | 17.6%      | 125,222                | 16.7%      | <b>903</b>           | <b>14.9%</b> | 1,436            | 13.5%      | 3,135              | 20.0%      | 497                      | 15.2%      | 2,140             | 19.0%      |
| \$50,000 to \$74,999    | 72,565           | 19.2%      | 164,084                | 21.9%      | <b>1,485</b>         | <b>24.5%</b> | 2,497            | 23.5%      | 3,746              | 23.9%      | 897                      | 27.4%      | 2,937             | 26.0%      |
| \$75,000 to \$99,999    | 35,982           | 9.5%       | 91,480                 | 12.2%      | <b>976</b>           | <b>16.1%</b> | 2,261            | 21.3%      | 1,698              | 10.8%      | 607                      | 18.6%      | 2,037             | 18.1%      |
| \$100,000 to \$149,999  | 20,472           | 5.4%       | 60,794                 | 8.1%       | <b>636</b>           | <b>10.5%</b> | 1,621            | 15.2%      | 1,179              | 7.5%       | 290                      | 8.9%       | 1,073             | 9.5%       |
| \$150,000 to \$199,999  | 4,454            | 1.2%       | 14,148                 | 1.9%       | <b>127</b>           | <b>2.1%</b>  | 316              | 3.0%       | 142                | 0.9%       | 47                       | 1.4%       | 145               | 1.3%       |
| \$200,000+              | 5,037            | 1.3%       | 15,204                 | 2.0%       | <b>177</b>           | <b>2.9%</b>  | 272              | 2.6%       | 127                | 0.8%       | 21                       | 0.6%       | 58                | 0.5%       |
| Median Household Income | \$38,100         | -          | n/a                    | -          | <b>\$55,553</b>      | -            | \$64,315         | -          | \$44,230           | -          | \$54,536                 | -          | \$53,779          | -          |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau & SEWRPC, 2000

Figure 2-14. Income Distribution – Comparable Communities

|                         | Village of Greendale |              | City of Cudahy |            | City of Greenfield |            | Village of Hales Corners |            | Village of Shorewood |            | City of St. Francis |            | City of Wauwatosa |            | Village of Whitefish Bay |            |
|-------------------------|----------------------|--------------|----------------|------------|--------------------|------------|--------------------------|------------|----------------------|------------|---------------------|------------|-------------------|------------|--------------------------|------------|
|                         | Total                | % of Total   | Total          | % of Total | Total              | % of Total | Total                    | % of Total | Total                | % of Total | Total               | % of Total | Total             | % of Total | Total                    | % of Total |
| Households              | <b>6,054</b>         | <b>100%</b>  | 7,880          | 100%       | 15,702             | 100%       | 3,269                    | 100%       | 6,541                | 100%       | 4,040               | 100%       | 20,430            | 100%       | 5,442                    | 100%       |
| Less Than \$10,000      | <b>302</b>           | <b>5.0%</b>  | 510            | 6.5%       | 716                | 4.6%       | 132                      | 4.0%       | 512                  | 7.8%       | 299                 | 7.4%       | 813               | 4.0%       | 160                      | 2.9%       |
| \$10,000 to \$34,999    | <b>1,448</b>         | <b>23.9%</b> | 2,770          | 35.2%      | 4,959              | 31.6%      | 778                      | 23.8%      | 1,894                | 29.0%      | 1,584               | 39.2%      | 5059              | 24.8%      | 856                      | 15.7%      |
| \$35,000 to \$49,999    | <b>903</b>           | <b>14.9%</b> | 1,696          | 21.5%      | 3,135              | 20.0%      | 497                      | 15.2%      | 986                  | 15.1%      | 807                 | 20.0%      | 3,386             | 16.6%      | 592                      | 10.9%      |
| \$50,000 to \$74,999    | <b>1,485</b>         | <b>24.5%</b> | 1,719          | 21.8%      | 3,746              | 23.9%      | 897                      | 27.4%      | 1,244                | 19.0%      | 790                 | 19.6%      | 4,786             | 23.4%      | 916                      | 16.8%      |
| \$75,000 to \$99,999    | <b>976</b>           | <b>16.1%</b> | 787            | 10.0%      | 1,698              | 10.8%      | 607                      | 18.6%      | 739                  | 11.3%      | 354                 | 8.8%       | 3,260             | 16.0%      | 876                      | 16.1%      |
| \$100,000 to \$149,999  | <b>636</b>           | <b>10.5%</b> | 349            | 4.4%       | 1,179              | 7.5%       | 290                      | 8.9%       | 665                  | 10.2%      | 143                 | 3.5%       | 2,124             | 10.4%      | 1,060                    | 19.5%      |
| \$150,000 to \$199,999  | <b>127</b>           | <b>2.1%</b>  | 19             | 0.2%       | 142                | 0.9%       | 47                       | 1.4%       | 181                  | 2.8%       | 31                  | 0.8%       | 477               | 2.3%       | 418                      | 7.7%       |
| \$200,000+              | <b>177</b>           | <b>2.9%</b>  | 30             | 0.4%       | 127                | 0.8%       | 21                       | 0.6%       | 320                  | 4.9%       | 32                  | 0.8%       | 525               | 2.6%       | 564                      | 10.4%      |
| Median Household Income | <b>\$55,553</b>      | -            | \$40,157       | -          | \$44,230           | -          | \$54,536                 | -          | \$47,224             | -          | \$36,721            | -          | \$54,519          | -          | \$80,755                 | -          |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau & SEWRPC, 2000



## **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SUMMARY**

The Village of Greendale Comprehensive Plan is the result of a combined effort between consultants, Village staff, elected officials, stakeholders, property owners, and residents. The planning process included several efforts to gather public input, including 10 Plan Commission meetings and a Public Hearing with the Board of Trustees.

The Village determined that the Plan Commission should serve as the steering committee to guide the comprehensive planning process. Frequent meetings were held with the Plan Commission and members of the public throughout the planning process to review draft plan elements and provide feedback.

### ***Stakeholder Interviews***

The following narrative summarizes comments made during the stakeholder interviews for the Village of Greendale Comprehensive Plan. The interviews were held on March 17–19, 2009 and included a cross-section of public and private stakeholders in the community. As the Plan is established, these comments will be incorporated into the recommendations and alternatives outlined in the Comprehensive Plan.

### **COMMUNITY CHARACTER**

The Village of Greendale is considered to have a unique community character that stakeholders felt must be maintained. In order to do so, Greendale should manage its housing, maintain

the overall quality of the Village, provide access to parks and recreation, and continue to focus on the school system. These goals should be integrated with community activities as often as possible. Greendale residents exude a high level of volunteerism and personal sense of community. Stakeholders expressed that Village leaders should tap into this resource and continue to encourage community involvement.

Several stakeholders expressed the desire for a community newspaper, like the Village used to have. Currently, the Village publishes a quarterly newsletter, in addition to a monthly newsletter produced by the “Originals” homeowner association. Stakeholders believed the development of the comprehensive plan was a good sign for the community. Accurately describing Greendale’s current goals and interests will help record previously undocumented community desires, and will guide the community in a cohesive manner.

Stakeholders valued the small town feel of the Village, which is especially visible during the holidays. The Village maintains an identity that is distinct and separate from surrounding municipalities. The community is such that residents quickly feel like they are a part of the Village’s story. Many residents strive to remain in the community throughout their lifetimes or, if they have left, seek to return with their young families. As an example, stakeholders said approximately 30–35% of current community parents are alumni of Greendale High School.

Interviewees identified the Village as a tourist destination and felt this was an important characteristic. Reiman Publications schedules bus tours that bring 10,000+ tourists to Greendale every year. The Village’s convenient location in the region contributes positively to attracting tourists. It is close to both the airport and downtown Milwaukee, and is considered to be a gem within the region. Events currently held in Greendale are a unique asset. Children’s Resale, Village Days, and Gazebo Days are examples of these assets. However, stakeholders felt that businesses are not always positioned to fully benefit from the increased foot traffic that is generated. Many businesses close before the events finish in the evenings, and the level of involvement from businesses could be raised.

### **RESIDENTIAL**

Stakeholders believed housing stock in the “Originals” neighborhood of Greendale provided affordable, diverse options for families of all ages. Residents considered the “Originals” neighborhood housing stock to be “very adequate.” Many residents strive to live in the “G” section of Greendale, which provides an opportunity to move up without leaving the community. In many cases, residents will begin with first-time homes in the “Originals” and over time move through the various “sections” of the Village to accommodate the need for larger homes and/or upgrades. The newer housing stock was considered to be desirable for homeowners who want more flexibility with renovation.

Those who have lived in Greendale for a long time want to preserve the historic character and the sense of community. The homes were designed to serve as integrated living space, so the neighborhoods provide a unique way of life. One significant opportunity to improve the original neighborhood lies in the recently-adopted design guidelines. Stakeholders felt that there is also an opportunity to require a “time of sale” inspection as homes are sold, which would ensure the continued maintenance of the Village’s housing stock. The Village should continue to consider this type of program.

Housing developments are needed for the elderly, particularly in mixed-use areas that provide necessary services. Southridge could serve as a possible site for this type of development, which could accommodate grocery and pharmacy services for residents. Stakeholders believed that multi-family housing is needed throughout the Village, but that targeting multi-family in the Southridge area could establish a strong mixed use center to complement current amenities offered at the Mall. New housing at Southridge may not be most appropriate behind the Mall, but rather integrated in a different orientation.

Greendale lacks high-end condominiums, which stakeholders considered to be highly desirable. Condos would provide an option for empty nesters looking to downsize from their single-family home without leaving the community. Condominiums, as housing units

for the elderly, are considered to be most appropriate in mixed use developments or locations with nearby amenities. Stakeholders recognized that few opportunities are available in Greendale to build infill residential development. One option noted is the intersection of 84th Street and Grange Avenue.

Stakeholders indicated that residents have differing opinions as to whether single-family or multi-family developments are better for new construction. Recommendations for blending the two desires include “condo-neighborhoods,” comprised of single-family or duplex homes that operate like a condo association. Residents live in the homes, but are not required to perform general maintenance. This type of development could be valuable to empty nesters or young professionals wishing to locate in the Village. Areas outside of Greendale currently offer similar options, which stakeholders find to be well-received.

Greenbelt, MD has more green space than the Village, which only retains 70% of its original green space. Stakeholders felt that Greendale should make residential developments conform to a certain character to preserve the remaining open space. Outside of the Village core, neighborhoods lack the same sense of community and are less cohesive than the “Originals” neighborhood. Stakeholders cited the need for connecting pathways and trails as one solution to maintain that sense of community throughout all neighborhoods. Any

new neighborhoods in the Village should focus on open space preservation to blend with the rest of Greendale.

Stakeholders reported Milwaukee County taxes as a deterrent to prospective residents, and that few units are currently on the market in the Village. Price points are higher in Greendale compared to surrounding communities, which stakeholders believe serves as both a positive and a negative. Stakeholders felt that Greendale needed to offer a balance between accommodating empty nesters with high incomes and younger, single parent households.

There have been few teardowns and changes of use throughout the Village. This trend is seen as a great asset, particularly in the single-family neighborhoods. However, some of Greendale’s multi-family developments are in need of rehabilitation. Stakeholders recommended that the Village promote the redevelopment of some the higher density multi-family units. The Eastway apartments have earned a bad stigma, which is common for some of the larger multi-family complexes in Greendale. The Greenway, Crocus Court, and Water Tower apartments are starting to age, but there is no mechanism in State law to improve these areas. Additionally, the complexes near the “R” section are in need of attention.

## **COMMERCIAL**

Greendale is no longer perceived as a developing community, as the land is almost

fully developed. However, areas considered as opportunities for development or redevelopment are often seen as challenges due to various barriers in the Village. Some stakeholders would like to see additional permitted uses added to the commercial zoning districts, although the special use district does allow a great deal of flexibility. Although some concluded that the development challenge stems from a will to maintain historic character, stakeholders cited the process for development as Greendale's real issue. Current zoning policies and Village processes should be updated to reflect the current and more contemporary development needs in Greendale.

Stakeholders identified the Village's biggest commercial successes as the façade renovation at Bed Bath and Beyond, the Ruby Tuesday, and the dividing of the Younkers store. Additionally, interviewees felt businesses in the Village Center market themselves fairly well, which compensates for locating in a smaller community. Lastly, downtown Greendale continues to serve as a tourist destination.

Among new commercial uses, fast food restaurants, a Wal-Mart or other big box stores (depending on the company and the overall design), non-community based retail, or auto-oriented uses were considered "undesirable." Additionally, stakeholders expressed that Greendale has no need for a night club of any kind. Some stakeholders felt that there

are opportunities to improve the quality and aesthetic of strip malls in the Village.

Stakeholders explained that Greendale fails to support the variety of retail needed to meet the needs of all residents. Residents cannot complete their basic shopping needs in the Village, and rely on surrounding communities for grocery shopping and other activities. However, stakeholders were also aware that the Village's population was unable to support all of these uses. Additionally, Greendale lacks mass transit options that would provide additional support for commercial retail.

A grocery store was considered the major priority among the list of desired commercial uses. Stakeholders recall that the Village used to have one or two stores, but now residents travel to Franklin and elsewhere for grocery needs. Greendale could also use a sports bar or related entertainment venue, and an area that provides stores for men. Southridge is known to cater to a younger, female population, and stores in the Village Center offer limited shopping for men. Stakeholders recommend that businesses broaden their reach, and also establish a strong promotional authority to market the goods and services provided. Stakeholders recognized the economy as a temporary obstacle to implementing many ideas desired by residents and business owners.

Three opportunities were cited by stakeholders as opportunities for current and future businesses in Greendale. First, businesses

should capitalize on the parks and open space amenities and the associated potential customers who use those amenities. Linking open space areas with area businesses could provide a unique level of connectivity between the two uses. Second, some stakeholders felt parking areas in Greendale should be constructed in the form of parking structures, not surface parking, where appropriate. Reduction in the amount of surface parking would maintain the quantity of open space in the Village and allow for green linkages to commercial areas, thereby maintaining the Village's characteristics as a greenbelt community. Third, stakeholders wanted to see the Village encourage new types of business models to include more retail services. If done properly, interviewees believed the models could be a "win-win-win" for the municipality, the developers, and the businesses.

## **INDUSTRIAL**

The industrial areas in Greendale have not seen any sort of "mass exit," which contradicts a declining demand for industrial properties seen in many parts of the region. Stakeholders explained that industrial buildings are fully leased with long-term occupants and competitive rates. Greendale's industrial areas are only underutilized due to age, not other factors. The Industrial Park has not received a face lift, and is perceived as an inconsequential area in the community. The Park is aging in terms of architecture and condition; property owners in the Park wish to see businesses focus on property maintenance. If the opportunity

arises for new construction, property owners should work to see the construction through.

Greendale's various types of industrial uses have been successful to date, particularly the creation of plastic injection molds/parts, generators, and the manufacturing and distribution of pressure sensitive tapes.

The Department of Public Works site is the first area people see when they enter the Industrial Park and offers potential to serve as a gateway property. In the long-term, stakeholders would like to see the DPW property upgraded and improved, which could help redevelopment efforts in the remainder of the industrial park. At minimum, the Industrial Park could use gateway signage and/or landscaping to offer a quick face lift.

Those involved with the Industrial Park would like to see more proactive behavior on behalf of the municipality. Education and business assistance has not been a part of the relationship in the past, but implementing these efforts could promote the Park and generate potential tenants. Additionally, design guidelines should be included in the zoning code to provide guidance as the existing industrial properties redevelop.

The Industrial Park is close in proximity to Loomis Road and the freeway spur, and is in a central geographic location. In general, the Village's Industrial Park is competitive with surrounding parks; for example, it is a

competitive alternative to the Franklin Business Park, which is much more expensive.

The Industrial Park is built-out and, because the Park was developed some time ago, the buildings and parcels are small to medium in size compared with other industrial parks. Due to the existing dense development pattern, interviewees expressed some concern that there may be code obstacles, e.g. setbacks and other stormwater requirements, which prevent new construction without parcel consolidation.

#### **INSTITUTIONAL**

The schools in the Village were viewed as a positive aspect of living in Greendale. Among many qualities, the schools specialize in music and arts. Promotion of the exchange student program was viewed as another unique quality of the School District. The District has been encouraging community involvement through volunteer oversight committees. In the future, the School District could expand these opportunities by partnering with the Village on various efforts, such as Greendale's "Clean & Green Day."

The School District is not currently at capacity. Approximately three to four rooms are not utilized, and only 400 graduates are produced each year. Planning activities should consider this situation as development and redevelopment is proposed within the Village. Additionally, the School District owns undeveloped properties at the intersection of 84th Street and Grange Avenue (playing fields)

and the intersection of Broad and Southway. The latter poses a challenge for development, and the School District has no interest in selling the property.

Stakeholders believed the agricultural district should be eliminated and replaced with an institutional zoning district. Greendale has been seeing several church expansions, and there are no guidelines in place for them.

#### **PARKS/OPEN SPACE**

The County parks in Greendale are often viewed as being underutilized, but many see this underutilization as an asset. The parks and pathways through the Village are an integral part of the community. Pedestrians and bicyclists have access to amenities without having to cross a street. Stakeholders suggested several ideas for enhancing the parks and pathways as community assets, including the establishment of a community center (e.g. Polish Center) at Scout Lake. In addition, new pedestrian connections should be incorporated in the Root River Parkway. Bicyclists use the street, and thus should have a dedicated bike lane to recognize them and increase safety. Lastly, the Village needs to encourage increased pedestrian connectivity along and across Grange. The existing sidewalk is not consistent and deters potential users.

Greendale should preserve natural areas as part of its environmental mission. The Village should hold to the original Greenbelt concept as much as possible. Maryland kept its "green"

feeling while accommodating development and the Village should make a similar effort. In the past, Greendale has not held to these expectations, particularly in regards to agriculture. There is some concern over the discussion of cutting into woodland areas near the middle school for parking purposes. Residents did not want development pressures to impact natural areas. Additionally, much of the green space in Greendale is mowed. The Village should encourage conversion of these areas to prairie lands and other natural habitats. Greendale already has a composting system; the Village could use this effort and the conversion of mowed grass as first steps to involve the community in implementing sustainable practices.

### **VILLAGE CENTER**

Stakeholders believed that Greendale needs a community center and that the Village Center is an appropriate place for this type of use. Repurposing the fire/police station as a community center would enhance the Village Center, along with additional specialty retail to support existing businesses. Stakeholders noted a hardware store as one type of commercial use that would be welcome in the Village Center – although this use has not been successful at this location in the past. More importantly, the Village Center could use two small-to-mid-sized anchor uses (between 10,000 and 15,000 square feet) as retail traffic generators.

### **SOUTHRIDGE AND 76TH STREET**

Stakeholders felt strongly that the 76th Street corridor should be improved, perhaps by way of a TIF district. The Bowling Congress is considered a notable site for redevelopment. Stakeholders recommended several ideas, including a college campus, cultural center, dinner theater, or fine arts complex. If a dinner theater were to be established in Greendale, the Historical Society could partner with the theater to complement the activities of one another. The Bowling Congress building could be torn down, but there could also be potential for a land swap with the school for the front piece on 76th Street.

Stakeholders talked about the community activities Southridge used to host that served as a regional draw, but how the Mall no longer offered these events. Greendale should work with the Mall to bring back this effort. Currently, Southridge is not thought of as a part of Greendale. The Village may wish to better integrate the two, but there may not be synergies between the Village Center and the Mall. Southridge could put Greendale on the map, but it is currently a dilemma.

Interviewees believed that the useful life of Southridge Mall is passing, but the Mall has been unable to update its image. Bayshore and Brookfield Square have been constantly improving their appearances, but Southridge has does nothing similar. Implementing a Bayshore-style development in Southridge may not be a good idea, but it could save the existing tax base. Stakeholders felt Southridge

Mall needs to reach full capacity by attaining new tenants. Although the Mall is considered nice to have, it is in need of better maintenance and higher-end retail. The Village needs sit-down restaurants, entertainment, and both small and large offices, all of which are considered appropriate at the Southridge Mall. Interviewees wished to see Southridge better meet market demands.

### **LOOMIS ROAD**

Loomis Road was identified by stakeholders as a wasted piece of land. The corridor at minimum could use some landscaping to make the area more inviting. The corridor carries a high level of traffic, but does not house retail uses. Although development could be a risk, there may be opportunity in building commercial retail. Menomonee Falls created a commercial overlay district to place over their industrial area; this may be an option for Greendale along Loomis Road – replacing industrial properties with commercial/retail uses on the outer edge of the Industrial Park. Related to Loomis Road, College Avenue is in poor condition and should be addressed. Other roads are experiencing the same deterioration due to minimal repair efforts in the past (e.g. patching).

### **GOVERNMENT**

Stakeholders expressed the desire to continue improving the Village's development process. Stakeholders felt that Greendale has the potential to develop a successful vision under current Village management and looked forward to seeing the community evolve.



Development needs to be controlled by the Village, as it should not be located simply anywhere in Greendale. As development occurs in the southern portion of Greendale, the Village should be careful not to allow the widening of through streets. A constant effort should be made to preserve the character of Greendale's streets.

### **A NATIONAL MODEL**

Since its inception, the Village of Greendale has been highly regarded as a national model for community development. From its historic status as a Greenbelt community to its modern

presence as a regional gem, the Village has served and will continue to serve as a model of community development and preservation. Greendale's progressive Plan recommendations will provide other suburban communities with tools for the design of residential developments, the incorporation of green corridors for pedestrian and bicycle access, the establishment of viable commercial centers, and the balance of preservation, maintenance, and growth. This Plan will serve as the document by which other communities can gather the tools, resources, and recommendations needed to emulate the successes of the Village of Greendale.

