



VOLUME 10 | ISSUE 4 | SPRING 2011



► LOCATION EFFICIENCY AND HOUSING TYPE 1



► ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE ZONING BOARD ... 4



► WIND SITING RULES SUSPENDED..... 10

Land Use Tracker

A quarterly publication of the Center for Land Use Education

LOCATION EFFICIENCY AND HOUSING TYPE – BOILING IT DOWN TO BTUs

By Daniel Hernandez, Matthew Lister, and Celine Suarez, Jonathan Rose Companies for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

How and where we construct our communities has an enormous effect on our energy consumption. Buildings and transportation together account for about 70 percent of energy use in the United States and are responsible for about 62 percent of U.S. greenhouse gas emissions. Creating more energy-efficient communities and buildings would reduce our impact on climate change and save people money on household energy costs. It could also help the U.S. to become less reliant on foreign fuel and other non-renewable sources of household energy.¹

People can do many things to reduce their energy use: install energy-efficient light bulbs, carpool or walk, or buy Energy Star appliances, among other things. But the way in which we plan and build our communities also has a significant role to play in creating a more environmentally and economically sustainable future. By understanding the relative share that housing type, location, and "green" (in this case, energy- or fuel-efficient) technology have in energy consumption, communities can begin to align their policies and public investments to support a more sustainable path forward.


A study supported by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) contrasts energy use in conventional, automobile-dependent locations with more location-efficient,² transit-oriented locations; multifamily housing construction with single-family detached and attached houses; and

¹ Energy statistics from the U.S. Energy Information Administration's Annual Energy Review 2009, August 2010. Greenhouse gas statistics from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's 2010 Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks, April 2010.

² The Center for Neighborhood Technology defines location efficiency as: "Compact neighborhoods with walkable streets, access to transit, and a wide variety of stores and services [which] require less time, money, and greenhouse gas emissions for residents to meet their everyday travel requirements."

ON THE WEB

The **H+T Affordability Index** is an online mapping tool that measures the affordability of housing based on both housing and transportation costs: <http://htaindex.cnt.org>



WWW.UWSP.EDU/CNR/LANDCENTER


conventional cars and homes with their energy-efficient counterparts (e.g., Energy Star homes and hybrid cars). The paper finds that housing type and location, along with energy-use features of homes and vehicles, all have an important role to play in achieving greater energy efficiency.

Indeed, the annual household consumption of British Thermal Units (BTUs) of energy varies widely between the most and least energy-efficient homes. As Figure 1 illustrates, an energy-efficient, multifamily home using fuel-efficient vehicles and located in a transit-friendly site uses 67 million BTUs per year – roughly one-quarter of the 240 million BTUs used by a single-family, detached home without energy-efficient features

or cars in an automobile-dependent site. In this comparison, the most effective way to reduce energy consumption is to locate homes of all types in areas where households could replace some automobile use with transit use, leading to reductions of 39 to 50 percent in household energy use. Still greater gains are possible when the location-efficient homes and their cars are energy efficient.

The paper illustrates the relative impact of different development approaches: locating homes where less energy-intensive transportation options are available; constructing homes that use less energy because they share walls, which reduces heat loss; and "greening" homes and cars through energy-

Figure 1: BTU Consumption by Housing Type and Location (million BTU per year)





A streetcar passes in front of multi-family housing in Kenosha, Wisconsin.

efficient home construction techniques and fuel-efficient automobile technology. Its findings suggest that the most significant gains in household energy efficiency can be achieved when all of these efforts are combined.

These findings can help inform discussions underway among federal, state, and local policy-makers; local land use decision-makers; the construction industry; affordable housing advocates; and others on how to reduce the cost and increase the sustainability of new development. It highlights opportunities for communities to better foster this type of development by:

1. Making appropriate public investments in transportation alternatives, including transit;
2. Adopting zoning that encourages attached or multi-family housing, particularly near transit; and
3. Adopting building codes and incentives to encourage more energy-efficient construction.

Communities that adopt these strategies will realize environmental benefits – in the form of reduced per capita energy use – but also economic benefits, as lower energy costs mean more affordable housing and transportation and higher levels of disposable income to invest in the local community.

For More Information

“Location Efficiency and Housing Type – Boiling it Down to BTUs”

Prepared by Jonathon Rose Companies for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
 January 2011
www.epa.gov/smartgrowth/pdf/location_efficiency_BTU.pdf

Figure 2: Evaluating the Impact of Different Development Options on Energy Use

	Energy-efficient home and car	Transit-oriented location	Energy-efficient home and car in a transit-friendly site ³
A household in this type of home in a conventional suburban development can reduce its energy consumption by...			
Single-family detached home	34 percent	39 percent	54 percent
Single-family attached home	35 percent	42 percent	57 percent
Multi-family home	38 percent	50 percent	64 percent
	...by adopting household energy efficiency measures and driving a fuel-efficient car.	...by being located in a transit-friendly site.	...by making its home and car more energy efficient and being in a site that is close to transit.

³ The final column is not the sum of the first two columns, as the marginal benefit of using a fuel-efficient car in a transit-friendly site is not equal to the benefit of doing so in an automobile-dependent site, as the car is used less frequently and for fewer total miles.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE ZONING BOARD

Written by Daniel M. Olson, Assistant Legal Counsel, League of Wisconsin Municipalities. Originally published in the December 2010 Municipality. Revised by Rebecca Roberts to reflect the roles and responsibilities of the zoning board at the town and county level.

Zoning boards of adjustment and zoning boards of appeal (zoning boards) occupy an important role in local land-use policy. Zoning boards possess substantial land use power including the ability to review zoning administrative appeals, grant zoning variances and, in some communities, approve conditional uses/special exceptions. These decisions have the potential to impact land use activity for decades or even generations since zoning variances and conditional use permits are transferable from one owner to the next without any future government approval. Accordingly, it is important that local government officials have some working knowledge of zoning board authority and procedures.

Local governments that enact zoning regulations must by ordinance provide for the appointment of a zoning board. As shown in Table 1, state law further specifies the terms and membership of zoning boards. Zoning board alternates serve only when a member of the board refuses to vote because of conflict of interest or when a member is absent.

There are no statutory qualifications for regular or alternate zoning board members in Wisconsin, which gives governing bodies significant discretion as to zoning board member qualifications.

Terminology

Zoning Board—refers to a county or town board of adjustment or city, village or town board of appeals.

Governing Body—refers to a county board, town board, village board or city council.

Nonetheless, members of the zoning board should be persons whose decisions will not be influenced by personal interest and who are not subject to political pressures.

Given that state law does not establish any qualifications for service, zoning board membership qualifications are probably a matter of local affairs and government. Therefore, local governments probably have general or home rule authority to enact an ordinance limiting the number of terms a person may serve on the zoning board.²

Zoning board members are public officials. As public officials, they must comply with the state ethics law for government officials which prohibits official action or use of their office for personal gain or the benefit of an immediate family member or an organization with which

Table 1: Zoning Board Authority, Membership and Terms

	Zoning Board of Appeals	Zoning Board of Adjustment
Statutory Authority	Cities (62.23(7)(e)), Villages (61.35), Towns with village powers (60.62)	Counties (59.694), Towns without village powers (60.65)
Membership	5 members plus 2 alternates appointed by city mayor, village president or town board chair. Appointment of regular members (not alternates) ¹ is subject to confirmation of governing body.	3-5 county members plus 2 alternates appointed by county executive or county administrator, if present, or county board chair. All appointments subject to confirmation of governing body. 3 town members appointed by town board chair.
Terms	3 year staggered terms.	3 year staggered terms.

they are associated.³ Moreover, like all other public officials, zoning board members are subject to criminal penalties for bribery, self-dealing and misconduct in office.

Zoning Board Decisions

Though vested with others,⁴ a Wisconsin zoning board is typically viewed in light of three main statutory powers:

1. Administrative Appeals - To hear and decide appeals where it is alleged there is error in any order, requirement, decision or determination made by an official in the enforcement of state and local zoning laws;
2. Variances - To hear and decide variances from the terms of the zoning ordinance where, owing to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance will result in practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship and the public interest will not be harmed; and
3. Conditional Uses/Special Exceptions - To hear and decide special exceptions to the terms of the zoning ordinance.

► Administrative Appeals

Despite the somewhat broad language in state statutes granting zoning boards authority to review alleged errors in zoning decisions, state law does not authorize zoning board review of every kind of zoning or land use regulatory decision made in a community. Rather, it is well-established that the power only extends to administrative decisions.

Administrative decisions can be made by local government bodies that exercise both administrative and legislative functions. Therefore, it is critical that zoning boards focus on the character of the decision that it is asked to review, not the person or body making the decision.

In *Brandt v. Pewaukee Town Board*,⁵ the Wisconsin Supreme Court held that the applicant for a nonconforming use permit had a right, under the town's zoning ordinance, to appeal the decision to the board of appeals. In concluding that the

town board was acting as an administrative officer whose decision the applicant had a right to appeal, the court explained that:

It makes no difference that the decision is one by an administrative body or an administrative single officer. The administrative decision is the subject of the grievance and the subject of the appeal. We think the board of appeals had jurisdiction under the ordinance and should have exercised it.⁶

Interpretations of state zoning law or a local zoning code by a zoning administrator are certainly administrative decisions appealable to a zoning board. A building inspector decision based upon state and local zoning laws is also an administrative decision appealable to a zoning board. Administrative decisions of a plan commission are also appealable to a zoning board.⁷

On the other hand, a plan commission decision to recommend amendment of a zoning ordinance or the decision of a governing body to deny a rezoning petition is a quasi-legislative or legislative decision. Accordingly, a zoning board has no power to review them.

Although the zoning board may reverse or affirm, wholly or partly, or may modify a prior decision, its powers are generally limited to determining whether or not the official or body making the administrative decision complied with applicable state or local zoning laws. Accordingly, unless specifically vested with additional power by local ordinance, a zoning board has no authority to grant or deny an appeal based on its interpretation of local subdivision regulations, state groundwater regulations or any other non-zoning law.⁸ The sole function of a zoning board in the exercise of its administrative appeal function is to determine whether a zoning enforcement decision was authorized or supported by state statutes and local zoning ordinances.

► Zoning Variances

Variance power is probably a zoning board's most notorious authority. Notably, this power is exclusively vested in a zoning board by state law and cannot be transferred to a plan commission or other municipal body by local ordinance.⁹

Unless specifically vested with additional variance power by local ordinance, a zoning board only has authority to grant zoning variances, not subdivision or other non-zoning variance relief.¹⁰ Moreover, a zoning board's zoning variance power cannot "legalize" an unauthorized encroachment by one private property owner upon the land of another.¹¹

Almost forty years ago, the Wisconsin Supreme Court defined a variance by distinguishing it from a conditional use as follows:

While a variance authorizes a particular property owner to use his property in a manner which is prohibited by the ordinance when not to be able to do so would be a hardship, a conditional use allows him to put his property to a use which the ordinance expressly permits when certain conditions have been met.¹²

Zoning law makes an additional distinction between types of variances. Area variances provide an increment of relief (normally small) from a dimensional zoning restriction such as building height or setback.¹³ Use variances give a landowner approval to put a property to an otherwise prohibited use.¹⁴

In order to grant a variance, a zoning board must make three essential findings:

1. The proposed variance will not be contrary to the public interest;
2. The property has a special condition; and
3. The special condition creates an unnecessary hardship.¹⁵

Other legal comments have discussed variance standards in some detail, so full comment will not be repeated here.¹⁶ However, the critical role of the "special condition" element in the variance standard is worth highlighting. The term "special condition" is not defined in state law. Accordingly, its meaning has been left in large part for the courts to define. As part of this process, the Wisconsin Supreme Court has exchanged "special condition" for comparable phrases such as "unique condition affecting the land" in its decisions.¹⁷

Proof of a "special condition" or "unique condition affecting the land" is the key to every variance

request.¹⁸ Whether phrased as a "special condition" or "unique condition affecting the property" or "hardship unique to the property," the meaning is the same; the hardship for which either area or use variance relief is sought must flow from a **property** condition that is not common to neighboring properties.¹⁹

It is also important to note the potency of use variances as compared to rezonings. Like a rezoning, a use variance authorizes different land use than previously allowed. However, unlike rezonings, a use variance is not subject to future legislative modification. Instead, since zoning variances run with the land, a use variance essentially grants a permanent use classification protected from legislative action.²⁰

Finally, it should be noted that indiscriminate approval of zoning variances by a zoning board damages public faith in government. A zoning board that routinely grants zoning variances to people who do not legally qualify communicates to the public that zoning regulations adopted by publicly elected governing bodies are worthless laws that can be ignored. The practice also says that government approvals are for sale since the only requirement for variance approval from a zoning board that never says no is payment of the variance application fee. Finally, such behavior conveys disdain for the general public since the public hearing a zoning board must hold for each variance request is a fraud if the variance will be granted despite any public testimony. To avoid these results, a zoning board must faithfully follow and apply the applicable variance law to every application.

► Conditional Uses/Special Exceptions

In an early conditional use case, the Wisconsin Supreme Court noted that the terms "special exception" and "conditional use" are interchangeable.²¹ More recently, the Wisconsin court of appeals found a similar interchangeability between the terms "special use" and conditional use.²² Nonetheless, there is no legal requirement that conditional use and special exception mean the same thing in every zoning code.

While a zoning board is statutorily authorized to

issue special exceptions, state law also allows local governments to vest special exception/conditional use authority in the governing body or plan commission. Therefore, unlike zoning variance power, special exception authority is not the exclusive domain of a zoning board.

In communities where the zoning board does not issue conditional use/special exception approvals, a particularly significant enforcement issue is whether a conditional use or special exception decision is an administrative decision subject to zoning board review. This enforcement issue arises in Wisconsin because the cases regarding the appealability of conditional use/special exception decisions to a zoning board do not consistently treat such decisions as administrative.

In *League of Woman Voters v. Outagamie County*,²³ the Wisconsin Supreme Court held that a county board zoning committee's decision to grant a conditional use permit to a developer under the county's shoreland zoning ordinance constituted a decision by an "administrative official" in the enforcement of the ordinance and, therefore, aggrieved parties had a statutory right to appeal the decision to the county zoning board of adjustment.²⁴ Likewise, in *State ex rel. Brookside Poultry Farms, Inc. v. Jefferson County Board of Adjustment*,²⁵ the Court held that persons who were aggrieved by a county board committee conditional use permit decision, but who did not appear at the committee's hearings, were entitled to appeal the decision to the board of adjustment. Finally, the Court's rulings in two cases involving plan commission decisions, *Nodell Investment Corp. v. City of Glendale*²⁶ and *Master Disposal v. Village of Menomonee Falls*,²⁷ implicitly support zoning board review of conditional use/special exception decisions.

There are two contrasting decisions that suggest conditional use/special exception decisions are not administrative. The first is *Town of Hudson v. Hudson Town Board of Adjustment*,²⁸ wherein the court of appeals concluded that 62.23(7)(e) did not authorize a town zoning board to review the decision of a town board to deny a conditional use permit because the town board was not an administrative "officer." The other is *Magnolia Township v. Town of Magnolia*,²⁹ in which the

court of appeals concluded that the statutory counterpart to 62.23(7)(e) for towns not exercising village powers, 59.694(7)(a), "plainly does not apply to appeals from the decisions of a town board granting or denying a conditional use permit because a town board is not an 'administrative official.'"

The inconsistent treatment of conditional use/special exception decisions by Wisconsin courts produces some uncertainty about whether a conditional use or special exception determination is an administrative decision subject to zoning board administrative review. Nonetheless, the greater weight of authority appears to be that a conditional use/special exception decision is administrative in nature and, therefore, subject to zoning board review on appeal.

Procedural Considerations

While a zoning board decision in a particular matter involves a number of procedural or substantive considerations, three warrant specific comment here: impartiality, deliberation and voting, and findings.

► Impartiality

A zoning board is not a court and is not bound by the same technical rules of legal procedure applicable in traditional courts. Zoning board proceedings are less formal. However, judicial acceptance of zoning board informality should never be considered a free pass to deliberately or irresponsibly ignore legal requirements. A zoning board is a "quasi-judicial" body³⁰ and, as such, a zoning board and all of its members must comply with statutory, constitutional and common law legal requirements that ensure a fair decision.

An essential requirement of constitutional or common law procedural fairness is an impartial decision-maker. The most elaborate zoning board hearing is a meaningless sham if zoning board members are biased in favor of or against an applicant or any other party.

The Wisconsin Supreme Court noted that zoning decisions are particularly vulnerable to bias due to the localized nature of the decisions and the fact

that zoning decisions are made by officials drawn from the immediate area.³¹ Bias can distort judgment and lead to decisions not founded on facts or rational analysis.³² Accordingly, zoning board members need to recuse themselves when they are biased and when there is an impermissibly high risk of bias.³³

At its core, impartiality demands neutrality. This duty to neutrality imposes significant limitations on the legally permissible conduct of Wisconsin zoning board members and associated officials.

Wisconsin law supports the proposition that a zoning board member may not communicate to the zoning board in support of an applicant and then participate in the applicant's proceeding.³⁴ Likewise, an attorney cannot be both an advocate for a zoning board party (i.e., the municipality) and legal advisor for the zoning board.³⁵

Zoning board members simply cannot take sides in a matter they are deciding. They cannot represent the municipality or the applicant without violating their duty to impartiality. A zoning board and its members operate only to fairly apply facts to the law that it is empowered to consider, without favor or preference.

► **Deliberation and Voting**

Once evidence has been received and the public hearing closed, a zoning board must make a decision. In all zoning board cases, it is well established that applicants have the burden of proof and must provide all necessary evidence to show they satisfy the applicable legal standard. If not, the zoning board has no authority to grant the requested relief.

A zoning board's decision must be based on credible evidence in the hearing record. Zoning board decisions based on speculation or information that is not in the record will not be sustained by a reviewing court.³⁶

While a zoning board hearing must be open to the public, there is authority for zoning board deliberation in closed session.³⁷ However, the authority for closed session deliberation is very limited and only applies if the zoning board

hearing would "possess characteristics common to adversarial proceedings."³⁸ Since the vast majority of zoning board hearings lack such characteristics, very few zoning board hearings are likely to qualify, which means deliberation in an open session.

In 2005, the Wisconsin Legislature changed the voting requirements for zoning boards to allow zoning board decisions by a simple majority of a quorum.³⁹ As a result, current law allows three members (a quorum) of a five-member zoning board to issue decisions. Thus, two votes in favor of or against a requested variance can be sufficient to decide a matter heard by only three zoning board members.

Notably, the law provides that a zoning board "may" take action by a majority of members present; it does not require that zoning board decisions be made in such instances. Therefore, a zoning board can adopt provisions in their bylaws to require a greater number of votes for a decision.

► **Findings**

Wis. Stats. ss. 62.23(7)(e)10 and 59.694(10) provide that judicial review of a zoning board may be commenced "within 30 days after the filing of the decision in the office of the board." Thus, some form of written determination from a zoning board is required, but there is no statutory requirement that this written determination contain a detailed statement of findings.

Nonetheless, a zoning board decision comprised only of conclusory statements that an applicant does or does not meet the relevant criteria is insufficient. A decision with such declarations does not provide any evidence that a zoning board actually evaluated any evidence in the hearing record. Accordingly, such a decision fails to show whether a zoning board exercised its will or its judgment.

To demonstrate that it exercised its judgment, a zoning board must provide more than simple conclusions. Instead, the zoning board must specify, either orally on the record or in a written decision, the particular reasons why an applicant has or has not met each statutory or ordinance

criteria for the relief requested.⁴⁰ Otherwise, the zoning board's decision will be deemed an impermissible exercise of its will, rather than a valid exercise of judgment.

Conclusion

Zoning board members hold substantial power to shape land-use policy. Zoning board variance approvals are practically permanent. Moreover, zoning board administrative review and special exception/conditional use decisions can affect the quality of life in communities and neighborhoods for many, many years.

Meanwhile, every person who meets their burden of proof for the zoning board relief they seek should receive it. But, those who do not, should not.

Nonetheless, zoning board decisions are difficult. Land use matters are frequently dynamic and complex, not routine. Moreover, zoning board members will often know the land owners, neighbors or applicants personally. Therefore, it is essential that every zoning board decision be based on a fair and impartial process, rest on credible evidence, and be stated with sufficient specificity, not only to ensure the integrity of the zoning ordinance but the credibility of the zoning board.

Endnotes:

- ¹ League Opinion - Zoning 364.
- ² See League Opinion - Commissions 176.
- ³ See Wis. Stat. sec. 1959(1)(c)1. and 2.
- ⁴ For a full list of zoning board powers see Figure 3 on page 13 of the Zoning Board Handbook, 2nd Edition (2006) Center for Land Use Education.
- ⁵ 15 Wis.2d 6, 112 N.W.2d 157 (1961).
- ⁶ *Id.* at 9-10.
- ⁷ See League Opinion - Zoning 410 (Plan commission denial of development project approval may be appealed to zoning board).
- ⁸ See *Great Lakes Tanning Co. v. Milwaukee*, 250 Wis. 74 (1947).
- ⁹ See League Opinion - Zoning 386.
- ¹⁰ See League Opinion - Platting 147.
- ¹¹ See League Opinion - Zoning 394.
- ¹² *State ex rel. Skelly Oil Co. v. City of Delafield*, 58 Wis. 2d 695, 701, 207 N.W.2d 585 (1973) (citations omitted).
- ¹³ *State ex rel. Ziervogel v. Washington County Bd. of Adjustment*, 2004 WI 23, para. 23, 269 Wis. 2d 549, 676 N.W.2d 401.
- ¹⁴ *Id.*
- ¹⁵ See *State v. Trudeau*, 139 Wis. 2d 91, 110, 408 N.W.2d 337 (1987).
- ¹⁶ See e.g. Olson, Daniel M. "Zoning Variances in Wisconsin: The Ziervogel Decision- Deja Vu All Over Again- With a Twist,"

the Municipality, May 2004. League of Wisconsin Municipalities. pp. 153-163.

¹⁷ See *Arndorfer v. Sauk County Bd. of Adjustment*, 162 Wis. 2d 246, 256, 469 N.W.2d 831 (1991).

¹⁸ One legal commentator suggests that a strict and consistent application of the uniqueness requirement "could help alleviate the wholesale and improvident granting of variances that has resulted in a crazy-quilt pattern of ad-hoc zoning -- the antithesis of zoning according to a comprehensive plan -- that now characterizes some communities." Osborne M. Reynolds, "The Unique Circumstances Rule in Zoning Variances — An Aid in Achieving Greater Prudence and Less Leniency," 31 Urb. Law. 1, 148 (1999).

¹⁹ See *Arndorfer*, 162 Wis. 2d at 256.

²⁰ Although the Wisconsin court of appeals indicated in *Goldberg v. City of Milwaukee Bd. of Zoning Appeals*, 115 Wis. 2d 517, 525 and fn. 6, that a municipality should be able to revoke a zoning variance, revocation of a use variance is very unlikely given that a valid use variance probably prevented an unconstitutional taking of property.

²¹ *State ex rel. Skelly Oil Co., Inc. v. City of Delafield*, 58 Wis. 2d 695, 702, 207 N.W.2d 585 (1973).

²² See *Delta Biological Resources, Inc. v. Board of Zoning Appeals of City of Milwaukee*, 160 Wis.2d 905, fn. 10, 467 N.W.2d 164 (Ct. App. 1991).

²³ 113 Wis.2d 313, 334 N.W.2d 887 (1983).

²⁴ The right to appeal in that case was granted by sec. 59.99(7)(a), which is identical in relevant language to sec. 62.23(7)(e)7.

²⁵ 131 Wis.2d 101, 388 N.W.2d 593 (1984).

²⁶ 78 Wis.2d 416, 254 N.W.2d 310 (1977).

²⁷ 60 Wis.2d 653, 211 N.W.2d 477 (1973).

²⁸ 158 Wis.2d 263, 461 N.W.2d 827 (Ct. App. 1990).

²⁹ 2005 WI App 119, 284 Wis. 2d 361, 701 N.W.2d 60.

³⁰ See *State v. Kenosha County Bd. of Adjustment*, 218 Wis. 2d 396, 415-16, 577 N.W.2d 813 (1998) ("when a Board of Adjustment acts on application for a variance, it acts in a quasi-judicial capacity.") and *Schalow v. Waupaca County*, 139 Wis. 2d 284, 289, 407 N.W.2d 316 (Ct. App. 1987) ("In acting on an application for a variance, a board of appeals or adjustment acts in a quasi-judicial capacity.")

³¹ See *Marris v. City of Cedarburg*, 176 Wis. 2d 14, 25, 498 N.W.2d 842 (1993).

³² See *id.* at 25-26.

³³ See *id.* at 25.

³⁴ See *Keen v. Dane Cty. Bd. of Supervisors*, 2004 WI App 26, 269 Wis. 2d 488, 676 N.W.2d 154 (Letter in support of permit application that was written by a member of county zoning committee and submitted to zoning committee acting on application evidenced an impermissibly high risk of bias).

³⁵ *Nova Services, Inc. v. Village of Saukville*, 211 Wis. 2d 691, 565 N.W.2d 283 (Ct. App. 1997) (Village attorney who acted as prosecutor and decision maker in hearing to consider ordering group home to cease operations violated group home operator's procedural due process rights).

³⁶ See *Schalow v. Waupaca County*, 139 Wis. 2d 284, 289, 407 N.W.2d 316 (Ct. App. 1987).

³⁷ Wis. Stat. sec. 19.85(1)(a) authorizes closed session deliberation "concerning a case which was the subject of any judicial or quasi-judicial trial or hearing before that governmental body."

³⁸ See *State ex rel. Hodge v. Town of Turtle Lake*, 180 Wis.2d 62, 74, 508 N.W.2d 603 (1993).

³⁹ Wis. Stat. sec. 62.23(7)(e)3m and 59.694(3m).

⁴⁰ See *Lamar Central Outdoor, Inc. v. Board of Zoning Appeals of the City of Milwaukee*, 2005 WI 117, 284 Wis. 2d 1, 700 N.W.2d 87.

WIND SITING RULES SUSPENDED

By Rebecca Roberts, Land Use Specialist, Center for Land Use Education

The *Winter 2010 Tracker* reported on new wind siting rules adopted by the Public Service Commission (PSC) in late December. Following publication of that article, Governor Scott Walker introduced a proposal in early January as part of a Special Session of the Legislature to tighten wind siting regulations across the state. The bill would have required wind turbines to be located 1,800 feet from the nearest property line and would have applied to all small wind projects, including those that had been permitted but not yet begun construction. The bill failed to advance beyond the Assembly. On March 1st, the same day the PSC rules were set to go into effect, the Legislature's Joint

Committee for Review of Administrative Rules (JCRAR) voted 5-2 to suspend the wind siting rules. JCRAR now has 30 days to introduce a bill in each house of the Legislature to repeal the suspended rule. If both bills are defeated or fail to be enacted, the rule remains in effect. If either bill is enacted, the rule is repealed and may not be reintroduced by the PSC again unless a subsequent law specifically authorizes such action. On March 29th JCRAR will consider a bill that would send the matter back to the PSC for revision and give the agency six months to complete their work.

STATE BUDGET UPDATE

By Rebecca Roberts, Land Use Specialist, Center for Land Use Education

The 2011-2013 State of Wisconsin Executive Budget Bill (AB40/SB27) was released on Tuesday, March 1. A summary of major provisions related to land use and community planning follows:

Working Lands:

- ▶ Eliminates the conversion fee for rezoning land out of a farmland preservation zoning district.
- ▶ Eliminates the Purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easements (PACE) program and \$12 million of GPR supported bonds.

Stewardship Program:

- ▶ Eliminates payments in lieu of taxes for lands purchased through Stewardship funds.
- ▶ Prohibits purchase of development rights and limits easements except for logging and trails.

Planning Grants:

- ▶ Increases the limit for lake management planning grants from \$10,000 to \$25,000.
- ▶ Provides \$7 million for grants to counties to implement land and water resource management plans, including cost-share grants to landowners.

Water Quality:

- ▶ Provides an additional \$13 million to reduce nonpoint source water pollution through increased nutrient management planning and other practices.
- ▶ Reduces the subsidy on loans in the Clean Water Fund Program by \$14 million.
- ▶ Lowers recently adopted phosphorous standards to a level no more stringent than neighboring states.

- ▶ Lowers municipal stormwater standards to a level no more stringent than federal law.

Recycling:

- ▶ Eliminates the grant program and requirement for local recycling programs, yet retains the ban on landfilling aluminum, paper, glass, plastic, etc.

Transportation/Transit:

- ▶ Increases highway funding by \$410 million (14%).
- ▶ Provides a 3% increase for General Transportation Aids and Transit funding in 2011, a 10% reduction in 2012, and no increase in 2013.
- ▶ Requires binding referenda by Regional Transportation Authorities before imposing taxes or fees.
- ▶ Moves transit funding from the Transportation Fund to the General Fund.

Economic Development/Tourism:

- ▶ Eliminates the Department of Commerce and transfers economic development funds to the new Wisconsin Economic Development Corporation.
- ▶ Increase tourism marketing to \$15 million.

For More Information

The Joint Committee on Finance will hold informational briefings on the budget beginning on March 29. The briefings will likely be broadcast on Wisconsin Eye: www.wiseye.org. A summary of the bill is available at: www.doa.state.wi.us/debf/pdf_files/bib1113.pdf. The full text can be found at: <http://legis.wisconsin.gov/AB40.pdf>.



Center for Land Use Education
University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point
College of Natural Resources
800 Reserve Street
Stevens Point, WI 54481

Phone: 715-346-3783
FAX: 715-346-4038
Email: landcenter@uwsp.edu

▶ ANNA HAINES
Center Director/Associate Professor/
Land Use Specialist
Anna.Haines@uwsp.edu

▶ LYNN MARKHAM
Shoreland/Land Use Specialist
Lynn.Markham@uwsp.edu

▶ REBECCA ROBERTS
Land Use Specialist
Rebecca.Roberts@uwsp.edu

▶ LINDA STOLL
Outreach Specialist
Linda.Stoll@uwsp.edu

▶ DANIEL MCFARLANE
Research Specialist
Daniel.McFarlane@uwsp.edu

▶ KRISTIN FLORESS
Assistant Professor/Specialist
Kristin.Floress@uwsp.edu

▶ AARON THOMPSON
Assistant Professor/Specialist
Aaron.Thompson@uwsp.edu

▶ ROBERT NEWBY
Office Manager
Robert.Newby@uwsp.edu

CALENDAR OF EVENTS

Wisconsin County Code Administrator's Spring Conference

March 31-April 1, 2011 – Stoney Creek Inn, Mosinee, WI
www.wccadm.com/First_conferences_page.htm

Conference on the Small City and Regional Community

April 6-7, 2011 – University Center, Stevens Point, WI
www.uwsp.edu/polisci/smallcity/CENTER.HTML

Wisconsin Lakes Convention

April 12-14, 2011 – KI Convention Center, Green Bay, WI
www.uwsp.edu/cnr/uwexplakes/conventions

Land Use Planning Legislation and Case Law Update

April 13, 2011 – WisLine sites around Wisconsin
<http://lgc.uwex.edu/program/pdf/llupaz2010-11color.pdf>

American Society for Photogrammetry & Remote Sensing Conference

May 1-5, 2011 – Midwest Airlines Center, Milwaukee, WI
www.asprs.org/meetings/calendar.html

National Urban Extension Conference

May 2-5, 2011 – Des Moines, Iowa
www.urbanextensionconference.org

Sustainability in Local Government

May 4, 2011 – Milwaukee County Zoo, Milwaukee, WI
www.regonline.com/builder/site/Default.aspx?EventID=947911

Fox-Wolf Watershed Alliance Stormwater Conference

May 10-11, 2011 – Liberty Hall, Kimberly, WI
www.fwwa.org

Congress for New Urbanism Conference

June 1-4, 2011 – Monona Terrace, Madison, WI
www.cnu.org/cnu19

Wisconsin Towns Association Comprehensive Planning Seminars

June 1, 2, 7 and 9, 2011 – Minocqua, Cable, Richland Center and Green Bay
www.wisctowns.com

International Symposium on Society & Resource Management

June 4-8, 2011 – Memorial Union, Madison, WI
www.issrm2011madison.iasnr.org

22nd Annual Energy Fair

June 17-19, 2011 – Custer, WI
www.midwestrenew.org/energyfair

ESRI International User Conference

July 11-15, 2011 – San Diego, CA
www.esri.com/events/user-conference/index.html

Sign up for the Newsletter

To receive this newsletter by email sign up at: www.uwsp.edu/cnr/landcenter/newsletters.html

Submit an Article!

If you would like to submit an article, please contact the managing editor, Rebecca Roberts. Your article should be 1,000 words or less, of statewide concern, and address a land use or community planning issue.

American Planning Association Monthly Webcasts

April 1, 2011 – New Tools for Public Participation
April 8, 2011 – Ethics: A Framework for Decision-Making
April 15, 2011 – Campus Planning for Pedestrians and Bicyclists
May 6, 2011 – Factors that Influence Rural Land Parcelization
May 13, 2011 – Secrets to Improve Consultant-Client Relations
May 19, 2011 – New Ideas for Bike-friendly Communities
June 10, 2011 – Real Estate Finance from Simple to Complex
July 15, 2011 – Community Erosion: How Traffic Flows Like Water
www.utah-apa.org/webcasts.htm

American Planning Association Audio/Web Conferences

April 20, 2011 – Performance Measures in Transportation Planning
May 11 – Renewable Local Energy
June 8, 2011 – Sustainability Planning for Officials
June 29, 2011 – 2011 Planning Law Review
www.planning.org/audioconference

Conserving Biodiversity in Subdivision Development

May 17, 19, 26 and 31
<https://noncredit.msu.edu/listSections.action?offeringid=569>

Natural Step Network Webinars

May 26, 2011 – Participation in Sustainable Community Planning
July 21, 2011 – Respecting the Principles of Sustainability
September 15, 2011 – Hidden Assets in Plain Sight for Sustainability
November 17, 2011 – Storytelling to Harness Sustainability Efforts
www.naturalstepusa.org/storage/pdfs-training/change-series-2011.pdf

For additional dates and information visit the online calendar of events

www.uwsp.edu/cnr/landcenter/events.html

905014



Center for Land Use Education
University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point
College of Natural Resources
800 Reserve Street
Stevens Point, WI 54481

Phone: 715-346-3783
FAX: 715-346-4038
Email: landcenter@uwsp.edu