



PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

400 LA CROSSE STREET | LA CROSSE, WI 54601 | P: (608) 789-7512 | F: (608) 789-7318

Siting municipal pools and community facilities from the City Planning standpoint.

1. Thank you for the opportunity to address the Committee. I have been asked by several Council members to comment on the accepted standards for community facilities siting from a planning standpoint. There is much written on the subject toward best practices. This is not a full evaluation or critique of the current consultant analysis, but more a supplement of considerations that may have relevance to the determination of the various site rankings on pages 8 and 9 of the report.
2. The American Planning Association's Policy Guide on Neighborhood Collaborative Planning suggests neighborhoods are the strategic building blocks of overall community development, and therefore a jurisdiction's comprehensive plan should reflect neighborhood plans, however, the broader needs of the community must also be considered.
3. The emphasis of the APA policy on neighborhood planning is relevant to public investment in community facilities also, noting:
 - Priority should be given to neighborhoods that are experiencing deterioration and decline, encouragement of innovation and locally tailored solutions, and an emphasis of long term staged improvements toward stated goals of the neighborhood and City.
4. Regarding best practices for the siting of community facilities, including municipal pools, there exists many criteria that can be considered by a community to make the best decision on an investment such as this to maximize social, economic and environmental impact. These criteria typically include:
 - a. Filling a needed service gap
 - b. Projected future demand and market analytics
 - c. Service area considerations, demographics and social equity
 - d. Fiscal impact analysis-considering both qualitative and quantitative return on investment and operating costs
 - i. Public health and enjoyment
 - ii. Programming and user revenues
 - iii. Public safety, swimming lessons, childhood activities,
 - iv. Intergenerational opportunity
 - v. Intergovernmental programming opportunities
 - vi. Philanthropic partnerships and other (P-5 opportunities)
 - vii. Grants (if applicable)

JASON GILMAN, AICP, PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR
TIM ACKLIN, AICP, SENIOR PLANNER - HERITAGE PRESERVATION
LEWIS KUHLMAN, AICP, ASSOCIATE PLANNER - COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
ANDREA SCHNICK, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PLANNER
SARA OLSON, CLERK STENO

CAROLINE GREGERSON, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATOR
DAWN REINHART, NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSING DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATE
TARA FITZGERALD, FEDERAL PROGRAMS ACCOUNTING TECHNICIAN
KEVIN CLEMENTS, HOUSING SPECIALIST
ALAN PAULSON, HOUSING REHABILITATION SPECIALIST

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

400 LA CROSSE STREET | LA CROSSE, WI 54601 | P: (608) 789-7512 | F: (608) 789-7318

- e. Site assets, leveraging existing investment, location, adjacencies, etc.
- f. Infrastructure access
- g. Land use and zoning compatibility
- h. Accessibility-transportation modes, walkability, equity
- i. Public/Neighborhood Input
- j. Environmental Impact
- k. Comprehensive Plan and small area plans
- l. Population density of surrounding area
- m. Secondary impacts-secondary and tertiary
- n. Associated development inducement
- o. Acquisition, demolition, rehab costs

From a planning standpoint then, those sites that have maximum benefit to inclusiveness, advantage social equity, are walkable, bikeable and reachable by transit, serve as catalysts for neighborhood improvement and stabilization, are multi-purposed-offering flexibility, co-location and adaptation for the seasons and revenue streams, offer energy reduction and sustainability targets, make use of existing investment, offer environmental advantages-either in repair, adaptive re-use or improvement to environmental conditions are the preferred options. Of course, planners must also consider the fiscal constraints and opportunities of the City, market trends, etc. It is also important to recognize the past, when cities didn't have nearly the economic infrastructure and service demands, and were able to invest in beautiful public facilities, in part due to civic minded philanthropists towards spaces and buildings with materials that would endure and by design, enhance the lives of the citizenry. Given the challenges and costs of the modern era of public service expectations, correcting a substantial inventory of decaying infrastructure and facilities, stimulating economic growth and sustainable urbanism and rebuilding aging neighborhoods, these projects are perhaps well suited to philanthropic partnerships, for their city and neighborhood legacy, value to children and the aged, and the stewardship of history.

Particulars about the existing Memorial Pool Site (Disclose my neighborhood):

1. Value of Existing Facility-Known Location, Historic Site, site infrastructure adjacencies-parking, bike-ped, transit.
2. Part of a Neighborhood Service Node-Impacting local business investment
3. Population access is substantial-young and old and social equity-reaching downtown and Washburn markets- Estimated 5 minute walk population=1,985 residences within 2,600 feet-10 to 15 minute walk, 4,000+ people.
4. Pedestrian oriented, not a car oriented site
5. P-5 Opportunities, philanthropic opportunities-history, demographic, adjacencies

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

400 LA CROSSE STREET | LA CROSSE, WI 54601 | P: (608) 789-7512 | F: (608) 789-7318

6. Surrounded by area of 5 to 20% minority population per 2010 Census block and tract data and greater minority populations in part due to University influence.