



February 14, 2003

Memorandum

To: Montgomery County Planning Board

From: Karl Moritz, Research Manager, 301-495-1312

Re: Profiles in Growth Management

Part of the Annual Growth Policy's background studies included a survey of communities around the country to get a sense of how they are addressing growth issues. Please find attached a selection of 38 of the profiles that will be included in the report, which we expect to release in about a month.

Staff will be summarizing some of the findings for you in our presentation at the worksession on February 20. These findings include:

- Most communities with adequate public facilities ordinances use them as a means for determining developer contributions toward infrastructure.
- Moratoriums are rare. We identified no County that uses the subdivision moratorium to pace development to the same extent as Montgomery County.
- Communities that have historically avoided traditional growth management programs are taking a second look because of environmental concerns, such as the Clean Air Act, water shortages, and loss of open space.
- Most communities that test for the adequacy of transportation use a test that is closer to our Local Area Transportation Review than to our Policy Area Transportation Review. That is, they rely on testing intersections and place less emphasis on roadway link congestion. However, we did fund several approaches that test link congestion in a variety of ways.

- A number of communities test for the adequacy of many more types of facilities than Montgomery County. Chula Vista, California, for example, tests for 11.
- Impact taxes and fees are common; they are collected for a variety of purposes beyond roads and schools, including parks and recreation, libraries, and public safety.
- Some communities have dismantled or fundamentally changed their growth management systems. These are generally in response to changes in economic conditions that have resulted in a pace of growth the community found manageable.
- Communities have various approaches to the problem of how to maintain APF standards while concentrating growth, but the most common approach is an exemption, rather than graduated standards.
- Some communities have developed growth management goals and objectives but have not yet adopted a regulatory framework for implementing them.

For a quick summary of the most interesting aspects of each community's approach to growth management, please take a look at the "At a Glance" section of each profile.

Chula Vista, California

Approach to Growth Management

Chula Vista's growth management program is evaluated annually using an 11-point "Thresholds Standards System" that measures what progress has been made towards achieving the goals laid out in the General Plan. A permanent Growth Management Oversight Committee (GMOC) conducts an independent annual review.

In 1991 the City adopted a growth management plan outlining 11 standards that would be used to monitor the impact of development on the quality of life within the City. These standards are implemented using the policies outlined in Chapter 19.09 of the Chula Vista Municipal Code. The policy emphasizes the provision of quality housing opportunities for all members of the community, with a balanced approach towards the provision of public services that will serve existing residents as well as new development.

The policy undertakes to "prevent growth unless adequate public facilities and improvements are provided in a phased and logical fashion as required in the general plan;" and to "Control the timing and location of development by tying the pace of development to the provision of public facilities and improvement to conform to the city's threshold standards and to meet the goals and objectives of the growth management program." The GMOC oversees the program.

Contacts

Daniel Forster
 Chula Vista Planning & Building Department
 Planning Division
 276 Fourth Avenue
 Chula Vista, CA, 91910
 Telephone: (919) 691 5254
 Fax: (919) 409 5861
 Email: dforster@ci.chula-vista.ca.us
 Webpage: <http://www.ci.chula-vista.ca.us>

At a Glance

- ✓ Chula Vista has 11 standards to monitor the impact of development on the quality of life.
- ✓ An independent "Growth Management Oversight Committee" prepares an annual review of the progress made toward meeting growth management goals.

Statistical Snapshot

FIPS: 0313392

	2000	Growth*
Population	174,319	22%
Under 18	35,241	20%
Households	57,705	21%
Jobs (1997)	31,728	n/a
		2000
Median Household Income	\$67,571	
Median Housing Value	n/a	
Housing Value Growth*	n/a	
New Housing Units (building permits)	2,639	

*percent change 1990-2000

	2000	
Land Area (square miles)	449	
Persons/Square Mile	336	
Median Age	36.9	
Jobs per Household	0.6	
Metropolitan Area:	San Diego MSA	
	2000	
	Growth*	
Population	2,813,833	12.6%
Jobs	1,500,000	1.3%

Standards and Practices

Chula Vista's "Threshold Standards" are

Air Quality: Annual report required from Air Pollution Control District on impact of growth on air quality

Fiscal: Annual report required to evaluate impacts on growth on city operations, capital improvements, and development impact fee revenues and expenditures

Police: Respond to 84% of the Priority I emergency calls within 7 minutes and maintain average response time of 4.5 minutes.
 Respond to 62% of Priority II urgency calls within 7 minutes and maintain average response time of 7 minutes.

Fire/EMS: Respond to calls within 7 minutes in 85% of all cases.

Schools: Annual report required to evaluate school district's ability to accommodate growth.

Library: Provide 500 square feet of library space adequately equipped and staffed per 1,000 population.

Parks & Recreation: Maintain 3 acres of neighborhood and community parkland with appropriate facilities per 1,000 residents east of Interstate 805.

Water: Annual report from water service agencies on impact of growth and future water availability.

Sewer: Sewage flows and volumes shall not exceed City Engineering Standards. Annual report from Metropolitan Sewer Authority on impact of growth on sewer capacity.

Drainage: Storm flows and volume shall not exceed City Engineering Standards. Annual report reviewing performance of city's storm drain system.

Traffic: Maintain Level of Service (LOS) "C" or better as measured by observed average travel speed on all signalized arterial streets, except, that during peak hours, an LOS "D" can occur for no more than any 2 hours of the day. Those signalized intersections west of Interstate 805 that do not meet the above standard may continue to operate at their 1991 LOS but shall not worsen.

If a threshold standard dealing with a city-provided service is not being complied with, the GMOC can recommend that: "public improvements or operational changes that would resolve the problem be put into place; or in certain cases, that a development moratorium be imposed until the deficiency can be resolved."

Each applicant for development approval is required to prepare a public facilities finance plan, air quality improvement plan and water conservation plan. No development is allowed to proceed until this process is complete.

Glendale, California

Approach to Growth Management

Glendale, California is the third-largest of the 88 cities in Los Angeles County.

According to Glendale planner Jeff Hamilton, the City of Glendale did have a growth management policy that put a limit upon the number of dwelling units that could be built in the City. However, during the economic down-turn in the early 1990s it was found that the quota of dwelling units allocated consistently exceeded the number of development applications that were received. It was therefore decided to abandon the policy and since then, there has been an average of fewer than 50 units (of all types) built each year in Glendale.

The growth management policy was presumably enacted in reaction to an increase in population: in 1990 the City had 180,083 residents, an increase of 40,978, or 29.5%, over the 1980 figure of 139,060. This increase was quite dramatic compared to growth during the previous ten years, when the City grew by approximately 6,000 residents between 1970 and 1980. But the 1980s proved to be an anomaly, and growth reverted to a rate similar to its previous pace: between 1990 and 2000 the City grew by 8.3%, or approximately 15,000 residents.

Contacts

Jeff Hamilton
 Planner, Planning Division
 City of Glendale
 633 East Broadway, Room 103
 Glendale, CA, 91206-4386
 Telephone: (818) 548 2140
 Email: jhamilton@ci.glendale.ca.us
 Webpage:
<http://www.planning.ci.glendale.ca.us>

At a Glance

- ✓ Rapid growth in the 1980s led Glendale to adopt an annual cap on residential development.
- ✓ The early 1990s recession signalled a return to the City's historic growth rates -- below the adopted caps -- so the City discontinued their use.

Statistical Snapshot

FIPS: 24017

	2000	Growth*		2000
Population	194,973	8.3%	Land Area (square miles)	30.65
Under 18	39,077	1.6%	Persons/Square Mile	6,362
Households	71,805	2.6%	Median Age	37.5
Jobs (1997)	49,609	n/a	Jobs per Household	0.7
			Metropolitan Area:	Los Angeles-Long Beach
				PMSA
				2000
Median Household Income	\$41,805			Growth*
Median Housing Value	\$325,000		Population	9,519,338
Housing Value Growth*	-4.7%		Jobs	3,747,755
New Housing Units (building permits)	71			

*annual average growth

Standards and Practices

Glendale has discontinued its growth management system.

Rancho Cucamonga, California

Approach to Growth Management

Rancho Cucamonga is located 37 miles east of downtown Los Angeles in San Bernardino County. The city's residential growth management review system, which serves a similar function as an adequate public facilities ordinance, is established in the City Ordinance as Title 16 *Subdivisions* and Title 17 *Development Code*. Chapter 17.06.010.A.k, l, and m are designed to ensure that no development is allowed that will have an adverse impact upon schools and public services and that development should be encouraged in areas that are easily served by public services.

A second development standard with "APFO-like" characteristics requires developers to convey land or pay fees to the city for the provision of parks and recreational land.

Non-residential development is required to take steps to reduce trip-making. Required steps include shower facilities and on-site video conference facilities.

Contacts

Brad Buller
 City Planner
 Rancho Cucamonga City Hall
 10500 Civic Center Drive
 Rancho Cucamonga, CA, 91730
 Telephone: (909) 477 2750
 Email: bbuller@ci.rancho-cucamonga.ca.us
 Webpage: <http://www.ci.rancho-cucamonga.ca.us>

At a Glance

- ✓ Located in the fastest growth metro area of Southern California, Rancho Cucamonga incorporates a growth management review into its subdivision ordinance.
- ✓ The system most closely resembles an APFO in its assessment of a fee on development when schools are overcrowded.

Statistical Snapshot

FIPS: 0359451

	2000	Growth*		2000
Population	127,743	26%	Land Area (square miles)	37.5
Under 18	38,145	19%	Persons/Square Mile	3,411
Households	40,836	21.5%	Median Age	32.2
Jobs	43,621	n/a	Jobs per Household	1.1
			Metropolitan Area: Riverside-San Bernardino	
				PMSA
				2000
Median Household Income	\$55,906			Growth*
Median Housing Value	\$182,200		Population (millions)	3,254,821
Housing Value Growth*	-0.4%		Jobs	1,049,100
New Housing Units (building permits)	1,411			25.7%
				42.7%

*percent change 1990-2000

Standards and Practices

Rancho Cucamonga's growth management review system is focused on residential development only. Schools, transportation facilities, and parks are three main concerns of the system, along with typical development standards.

The growth management review system has special provisions for the financing of interim schools, or interim school capacity, to alleviate crowding caused by development within an attendance area. In an attendance area that is overcrowded, a developer is responsible for paying fees, or making some other provision, to temporarily mitigate overcrowding. This may be the cost of renting relocatables or other temporary space.

Developers may also be required to dedicate land for a new elementary school.

If the subdivision contains 100 acres or more, or will have 200 dwelling units if developed to maximum capacity the developer may be required to dedicate local transit facilities such as bus turnout, benches etc.

Subdivisions with two hundred or more lots that are required to dedicate roadways may be required to provide bicycle paths.

If the subdivision is in a zone where horses are kept, equestrian access to any existing or master planned equestrian trails may be required.

Developers are required to convey land or pay fees to the city for the provision of parks and recreational land. If a subdivision is less than 50 lots only fees are required. The appropriate amount of land is decided using the following formula:

$$NSP(L+D)/1,000 = \text{minimum fee}$$

Where:

N= number of proposed dwelling units.

S= planned park acreage per 1,000 population.

P= population per dwelling unit on a scale and density set by the responsible public agency.

L= fair market value of parkland per acre is represented by the land being subdivided.

D= average cost per acre to develop park as determined by the public agency.

All requests for subdivision are subject to approval but subdivisions of four or less parcels may be subject to fewer restrictions.

San Jose, California

Approach to Growth Management

The City of San Jose is located in Santa Clara County, in the southern portion of the San Francisco Bay area. It refers to itself the "Capital of Silicon Valley." Santa Clara County has a policy of promoting growth only within incorporated areas and encourages annexation.

In 1950, San Jose had a population of 95,000 and a land area of 17 square miles. By 1970 these had expanded to a population of 445,000 occupying 137 square miles. The philosophy of directing growth to the City had been followed in spirit, but the development was of a sprawling, low-density, nature that encouraged automobile use. By 1975 it was recognized that this type of growth could not continue and the General Plan '75 established an Urban Service Area (USA). City services would only be delivered within the USA. Land was set aside for future expansion.

The City has subsequently updated General Plan '75 twice. Horizon 2000 and San Jose 2020 both follow the guidelines established in 1975. The City is located in a valley surrounded by hills and wetlands and much of the developable land has already been built on. The emphasis is now on redevelopment and infill, with higher density levels being encouraged in the downtown areas, and along transit corridors.

Contacts

Lee Butler
 City of San Jose
 Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement
 San Jose City Hall
 801 N. First Street, Room 400
 San Jose, CA 95110-1795
 Telephone: (408) 277-4576
 Fax: (408) 277-3250
 Email: lee.butler@ci.sj.ca.us

Alternate contact:
 Laurel Prevetti, Acting Deputy Director
 Telephone: 408 277 4576
 Email: laurel.prevetti@ci.sj.ca.us
 Website: <http://www.ci.san-jose.ca.us>

At a Glance

- ✓ The "Capital of Silicon Valley" is focused on limiting sprawl and encouraging infill development.
- ✓ San Jose has no adequate public facilities ordinance but requires developer contributions toward park facilities and other infrastructure.

Statistical Snapshot

FIPS: 68000

	2000	Growth*		2000
Population	894,943	14%	Land Area (square miles)	174.9
Under 18	236,124	13%	Persons/Square Mile	5,118
Households	276,598	11%	Median Age	32.6
Jobs	266,179	n/a	Jobs per Household	1.0
			Metropolitan Area:	San Jose PMSA
			2000	Growth*
Median Household Income	\$72,268		Population (millions)	1,682,585
Median Housing Value	\$394,000		Jobs	1,290,679
Housing Value Growth*	53%			24%
New Housing Units (building permits)	1,057			

*1990-2000 percentage change

Standards and Practices

The San Jose 2020 General Plan focuses upon: the establishment of an *Urban Growth Boundary* to delineate the "ultimate limit" of urbanization in San Jose; an *Urban Services Boundary* that delineates where City services are, or will be, available for urban development; and *Infill Development*, including mixed land use and transit oriented development strategies that encourage "appropriate residential and retail developments with 2,000 feet of a transit station."

The City's transportation policy is coordinated with that of the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), which in turn, works with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC.) MTC was established in 1970 to act as the transportation planning, financing and coordinating agency for the nine-county San Francisco Bay area.

The City does not plan to build any new freeways and is instead emphasizing projects that eliminate bottlenecks by improving interchanges, upgrading streets and sidewalks, and using new technology to control signal lights. Multi-modal mobility is emphasized and paths and bicycle routes are being constructed to encourage bicycle riding and walking. A level of service of D is considered adequate.

The City does not have an adequate public facilities ordinance as such but all new

development is required to dedicate land and/or pay a fee towards the development of parkland and park facilities in the City. In addition City Ordinances require developers to provide the required infrastructure to support the development.

The main document guiding "infill development" is the General Plan. It allows Transit Corridor residential density at 20 units per acre. There is no maximum density; the maximum is defined by height - 50' - with a maximum of 120' within 2000 feet of Transit Stations. In downtown "frame" areas the maximum height is 120'. There are FAA height restrictions in certain areas.

There are several special plan areas - some are geared to infill. The plans allow flexibility, such as with a Discretionary Alternate Use Bonus for all affordable housing. On sites of less than 2 acres density bonuses can be worked out. For example, the zoning may allow for 8 - 12 units but approval could be given for as many as 40 if they are of compatible and of high quality. Design appears to play a very important part in the decision to grant density bonuses..

The City is currently carrying out a three-phase Housing Opportunity Study to identify potential infill development sites along transit corridors.

Santa Ana, California

Approach to Growth Management

The City of Santa Ana lies in Orange County, California. The City has planning and zoning authority but cooperates with the County on transportation matters, which are handled by the Orange County Transportation Authority.

In November 1990 Orange County voters approved a Growth Management Ordinance (known as Measure M.) Measure M put in place a one-half cent sales tax dedicated to countywide transportation improvements and requires all cities to comply with the county growth management program.

To be eligible for Measure M funds the City must:

1. Submit a "Growth Management Element" that includes a program to meet traffic level of service standards, a program for development mitigation program, and a program for development phasing and annual monitoring.
2. Participate in inter-jurisdictional planning forums.
3. Develop a seven year Capital Improvement Program.
4. Consider housing options and job opportunities (e.g., "balanced community development").
5. Adopt a Transportation Demand Management Ordinance.

Contacts

Joseph Edwards
 Planning and Building Agency
 City of Santa Ana
 20 Civic Center Plaza
 Santa Ana, CA, 92701
 Telephone: (714) 667 2724
 Email: jedwards@ci.santa-ana.ca.us
 Web page: <http://www.ci.santa-ana.ca.us/departments/pba/Planning/default.htm>

At a Glance

- ✓ Much of Santa Ana's recent population growth has been among children under 18.
- ✓ The "Growth Management Element" of the General Plan (1991) is organized around themes contained in "Measure M" approved by Orange County voters in 1990.

Statistical Snapshot

FIPS: 69000

	2000	Growth*		2000
Population	337,977	15%	Land Area (square miles)	27.14
Under 18	115,507	29%	Persons/Square Mile	12,452
Households	73,002	2 %	Median Age	26.5
Jobs (1997)	99,765	n/a	Jobs per Household	1.4

		2000		
Median Household Income		\$43,452	Metropolitan Area:	Orange County, CA
Median Housing Value		\$184,500		
Housing Value Growth*		0 %		
New Housing Units (building permits)		329		

	2000	Growth*
Population	2,846,289	0.7%
Jobs	1,193,790	2.4%

*1990-2000 percentage growth

Standards and Practices

For standard traffic circulation in the City, at intersections under the sole control of the City, the LOS is D. This standard should be achieved within three years from the date the first building permit is issued. If the intersection is outside the City's control, is within a major development area of the City, or is on the City's Deficient Intersection List it will be exempt from this standard.

Developers are required to mitigate the impact of their development project under certain circumstances. If a development contributes a "measurable impact" to a Deficient Intersection it will be assessed a mitigation fee. All new development is expected to pay its share of street improvements and traffic mitigation costs.

Revenue from Measure M is not used in place of developer funding. The City has established a Deficient Intersection Fund.

All new development in the City is required to establish a development phasing program which aligns development of the project with the infrastructure improvements that will be required. The City monitors the phasing program on an annual basis.

The City uses a seven-year capital improvements program.

The City relies on Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies to address congestion problems. Among the projects is a regional traveler information system, incorporating both transit and traffic information, developed in cooperation with the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA), the City of Anaheim, and Caltrans. Busses equipped with GPS devices act as probes on selected routes between Anaheim and Santa Ana. Information derived en-route is forwarded to the Anaheim transportation management center (TMC) to determine congestion levels, and to OCTA's TMC, which forwards the real-time information to kiosks at several transit centers. Also, information is used for future planning and scheduling. In 2000, the City won a "Public Agency Transportation Excellence" Award from the Orange County Transportation Authority.

Santa Clara County, California

Approach to Growth Management

Santa Clara County is home to "Silicon Valley" and the high-tech industry surrounding Stanford University. According to Planning Director Ann Draper, "In the 60's and into the 70's, the cities and the county of Santa Clara decided that all of the urban growth should be in cities, not the county. As time went on the agreements and actions taken by the cities and county to strengthen this idea multiplied. There is no single document that tells this story. The County limits urban services and does not supply water or sewer services. The fire services are limited as well as the police services. From a land use perspective, the County's role is to keep the green and rural areas as such. The cities are responsible for urban growth."

Among the other issues facing the County:

- A lack of affordable housing. The population has increased by approximately 60% since 1970 but the number of jobs has increased by approximately 180% in the same period.
- The County is committed to establishing Long Term Urban Growth Boundaries.
- A voter-implemented Transportation Improvement Program that includes both road and transit projects.

Contacts

Ann Draper
 Planning Director,
 Planning Office,
 County Administration Building,
 70 West Hedding Street,
 San Jose, CA 95110
 Telephone: (408) 299-5771
 Email: Ann.Draper@pln.co.santa-clara.ca.us
 Webpage: <http://www.sccplanning.org>

At a Glance

- ✓ Santa Clara County sees its role as stewards of green and rural space; growth is for the incorporated cities.
- ✓ The County is looking at urban growth boundaries and housing affordability is a major issue.

Statistical Snapshot

FIPS: 06085

			2000	
	2000	Growth*		
Population	1,682,585	12%	Land Area (square miles)	1,291
Under 18	416,402	16%	Persons/Square Mile	1,303
Households	565,863	9%	Median Age	34
Jobs	1,290,679	24%	Jobs per Household	2.3
			2000	
Median Household Income	\$76,752		Metropolitan Area:	San Jose PMSA
Median Housing Value	\$446,400			
Housing Value Growth*	55%		2000	Growth*
New Housing Units (building permits)	6,639		Population (millions)	1,682,585
			Jobs	1,290,679
				24%

*1990-2000 percentage growth

Standards and Practices

Through Santa Clara County's General Plan, development for the past thirty years has been focused on the incorporated cities in the county. Before 1970 growth had been allowed in the unincorporated areas and a number of "urban pockets" that were geographically separate from cities were allowed to develop. The General Plan acknowledges that unincorporated urban areas do still exist, and that they need to be provided with services in a timely, cost-effective manner. It is recommended that increased levels of service should be "provided on a cost recovery basis whenever possible." Cities are not expected to provide services to unincorporated areas, although mutually beneficial contracts for the provision of services have been negotiated. These "urban service boundaries" appear to be intended as a precursor to annexation.

The "fiscalization of land use" is a concern in Santa Clara, as it is in much of California. The problem arose after the imposition of Proposition 13 in 1978 limited a jurisdiction's ability to raise taxes without voter agreement. Commercial and retail properties bring few demands for local services and therefore yield higher taxes than residential properties. Counties and cities have subsequently sought to attract the highest net tax yielding developments possible, and have not, until recently,

regarded a jobs/housing balance as a priority. This overall lack of housing stock adds to the difficulty of providing a sufficient quantity of affordable housing. Developing "mixed-use" communities and limiting the rate of condominium conversions are two ways in which jurisdiction can work towards addressing this issue.

Transportation issues are managed by the Valley Transportation Authority (VTC), which in turn, works with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC.) MTC was established in 1970 to act as the transportation planning, financing and coordinating agency for the nine-county San Francisco Bay area.

In November 1996 Santa Clara County voters approved Measures A and B that provide for a one-half cent sales tax that will be devoted to transportation improvements. The Measures will be in place until April 2006. Measure A outlines a list of improvements projects that will be implemented during the Measure's nine year life. There is a mix of road and transit projects. Measure B sought approval for the implementation of the tax. Its validity was challenged in Court but the California Supreme Court determined that the tax was valid in 1998. More information can be found at the County's website.

Santa Clarita, California

Approach to Growth Management

Santa Clarita was incorporated as a City in 1987. It is located in the Santa Clarita Valley, in the northwestern part of Los Angeles County, 35 miles from downtown. The City is responsible for planning and zoning within city limits and the County has responsibility for all unincorporated areas. To add further complication there are six school districts within the Santa Clarita Valley.

The City and County joined together in 2001 in a joint planning effort aimed at determining the future growth of the area. The Santa Clarita Valleywide General Plan ("One Valley One Vision") process resulted in a set of growth management strategies that were presented to the public in February 2002. The four key issues facing the Valley are the provision of roads, schools, parks and open space, and the financing for each of these facilities.

Although there are current mechanisms for developer contributions toward meeting the increases in demand for infrastructure and services, it is not sufficient to allow Valley agencies to "catch up" with demand, according to County reports. The new plan is intended to foster cross-jurisdictional planning by providing consistent policies for land use, density, infrastructure improvements etc. Implementation tools and measurement criteria are still in the development stage.

Contacts

Nathan Gapper
 Assistant Planner I
 Santa Clarita City of California
 23920 Valencia Boulevard, Suite 300
 Santa Clarita, California 91355
 Telephone: (661) 255-4330
 Email: NGAPPER@santa-clarita.com
 Web site: <http://www.santa-clarita.com>

At a Glance

- ✓ Santa Clarita is the third-largest city in Los Angeles County and the fifth fastest-growing.
- ✓ The City and County are now working to implement the growth management strategies contained in a joint planning effort concluded in 2001.

Statistical Snapshot

FIPS: 24017

	2000	Growth*		2000
Population	151,008	37%	Land Area (square miles)	47.8
Under 18	45,774	48%	Persons/Square Mile	3,159
Households	50,787	32%	Median Age	33.4
Jobs	14,213	n/a	Jobs per Household	0.3
	2000		Metropolitan Area:	Los Angeles County
Median Household Income	\$66,717			
Median Housing Value	\$229,200			2000
Housing Value Growth*	-1%			Growth*
New Housing Units (building permits)	826		Population	
			Jobs	

*1990-2000 percentage growth

Standards and Practices

The existing funding mechanisms for building new facilities are tied to new development. Developers pay impact fees according to the improvements that are necessary. Some fees make a contribution towards facilities and others cover the cost: for example intersection improvements, roadway widenings, bikeways adjacent to new roads and medians are fully funded through the Bridge and Thoroughfare fees.

Issue 6 of the "Growth Management Strategies for the Santa Clarita Valley" report focuses on schools and it is noted that there is overcrowding in all grades throughout the Valley. Developers pay impact fees and provide additional mitigation, but the turnover of existing housing is contributing to overcrowding too, and new measures are needed.

The City has identified a need for more park space as well as for additional active park space, including recreational facilities such as soccer and ballfields. The City levies fees on developers for parks, with the amount of the fees is limited by the state Parks Dedication Act.

Sunnyvale, California

Approach to Growth Management

Sunnyvale, California is the fifth largest city in the Bay Area, and the second largest in Santa Clara County. It is largely built-out, but the City of Sunnyvale is engaged in a number of redevelopment and renewal projects including a downtown plan. It is also pursuing a number of traffic improvements - including participation in the San Francisco Bay Comprehensive Ferry Plan.

Like other Bay area and Silicon Valley cities, Sunnyvale suffers from a shortage of affordable housing. It has undertaken several initiatives aimed at addressing the issue, one of which is the Housing For Public School Employees, City Employees and Child Care Teachers Program (HPCC). is comprised of three components, which are the following: rental assistance, education, and home ownership. The rental assistance component assists employees in obtaining rental housing; the Homebuyer Education Program is a series of specialized classes and individual counseling upon referrals for employees, and the Home Ownership Program provides down payment assistance for first time homebuyers.

Contacts

Paula Bradley
 Associate Planner
 City of Sunnyvale
 P.O. Box 3707
 Sunnyvale, CA 94088-3707
 Telephone (408) 730 7440
 Fax: (408) 730 7699
 Email: pbradley@ci.sunnyvale.ca.us
 Webpage: <http://www.ci.sunnyvale.ca.us>

At a Glance

- ✓ Largely built-out, Sunnyvale is a small city focusing on maintaining a high quality of life.
- ✓ The City has embarked on an ambitious program to provide affordable housing for public employees.

Statistical Snapshot

FIPS: 77000

	2000	Growth*		2000
Population	131,760	12%	Land Area (square miles)	24
Under 18	26,897	20%	Persons/Square Mile	6,007
Households	52,539	9%	Median Age	34.3
Jobs	119,187	23%	Jobs per Household	1.8
			Metropolitan Area:	San Francisco PMSA
Median Household Income	\$74,409			
Median Housing Value	\$495,200			
Housing Value Growth*		60%		
New Housing Units (building permits)	189			

*1990-2000 percentage growth

Standards and Practices

As a built-out urban/suburban city, Sunnyvale's focus is on redevelopment. Although transportation congestion is an issue, Sunnyvale is both largely built-out and subject to through traffic from the Bay Area region where it is located. The City's General Plan's goal is to "achieve an operating level of service (LOS) "E" or better for all regional roadways and intersections, as defined by the City functional classification of the street system."

To accomplish this, the City is relying on a number of strategies to minimize region-wide average trip length and single-occupant vehicle trips, including: locating higher intensity land uses and developments so that they have easy access to transit services; supporting regional efforts which promote higher densities near major transit and travel facilities, without increasing the overall density of land usage; and cooperating in efforts to study demand management initiatives including congestion-pricing, flexible schedules, gas taxes, and market-based programs.

Sunnyvale requires all sub-dividers to provide a wide range of improvements as part of the development approval process. Developers are required to supply the usual utilities but also to provide such features as street trees and ornamental street lighting,

fences and landscaping along lot lines and other off-tract improvements as deemed necessary. In addition employers are encouraged to establish transportation demand management policies, in order to comply with Bay Area Air Quality Management regulations.

An unusual feature of the City Ordinance is that all non-residential development projects, including hotels and motels, are required to include artwork in their projects. An extensive list of criteria have been established.

Jacksonville-DuVal County, Florida

Approach to Growth Management

The City of Jacksonville and Duval County consolidated their borders in 1967 and have since operated as one jurisdiction. Approximately 30% of the City's total land is presently developed as either urban or suburban areas.

All local governments in Florida are required by the State to prepare an Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR) that identifies the successes, and failures, that have occurred during implementation of the policies in its Comprehensive Plan. Jurisdictions are also required to implement a Concurrency Management System to regulate the timing and pace of development and ensure that the appropriate facilities are available.

The Jacksonville Plan stipulates that the location and design of infrastructure should complement adjacent development. Development should be prohibited where there is no provision for facilities and services: infrastructure should be in place now, under construction - and thus available to the proposed development - or guaranteed by enforceable development agreement. The Plan recommends that urban-scale projects be limited to the urban and suburban areas identified in the 2010 Plan. However, the Plan does acknowledge that development "in the wrong place" continues and that infrastructure deficiencies, many predating city-county consolidation, remain a concern.

Contacts

Margo Moehring
 Comprehensive Planning Division
 City of Jacksonville
 128 E. Forsyth Street, Suite 700
 Jacksonville, FL 32202
 Telephone: (904) 630 1900
 Email: *MargoM@coj.net*
 Webpage: *http://www.coj.net*

At a Glance

- ✓ Consolidated Jacksonville and DuVal County's 2010 Comprehensive Plan seeks to steer growth to already-developed areas to minimize the need for infrastructure.
- ✓ A sophisticated Concurrency Management System includes level of service standards for roads, transit, water and sewer, drainage, parks and recreation, and solid waste.

Statistical Snapshot

FIPS: 12031

	2000	Growth*
Population	778,879	16%
Under 18	204,991	18%
Households	303,747	18%
Jobs	581,903	20%

	2000
Land Area (square miles)	774
Persons/Square Mile	1,006
Median Age	34.1
Jobs per Household	1.9

	2000
Median Household Income	\$40,703
Median Housing Value	\$89,600
Housing Value Growth*	40%
New Housing Units (building permits)	5,801

Metropolitan Area: Jacksonville MSA

	2000	Growth*
Population	1,100,491	21%
Jobs	563,200	33%

*1990-2000 percentage growth

Standards and Practices

The Concurrency Management System Office (CMSO) - a division of the Planning and Development Department - has responsibility for coordinating the City's Concurrency Management System. Five agencies require a concurrency test and each have their own procedures and methodologies. Concurrency is required at subdivision. De minimis provisions apply. Extensive levels of service (LOS) standards have been established for the following elements:

Roadways: All "functionally classified" roadways within a two-mile radius of the proposed projects access points "on which project traffic is estimated to utilize 1% or more LOS D capacity of the roadway will be described and analyzed.

Transit: Any traffic analysis zone (TAZ) that has a residential population density of 3,000 people per sq.mi and/or an employment population density exceeding 2,500 jobs per sq.mi. should be served by a transit line "within 1 mile of the centroid of that TAZ." LOS should be maintained at "D", or 1.25 persons per seat, with a frequency of service of 30 minutes at peak periods.

Drainage: "If existing facilities are not adequate, the developer may be required to improve the downstream system prior to approving development orders."

Water and Sewer: Residential developments should be able to provide 100 gallons per capita per day. There is an extensive schedule of required capacities for commercial developments.

Recreation standards were established May 31, 1995.

1. Active/Passive Parks: 0.50 acres per/ 1000 population
2. Regional Parks: 2.08 acres per/1000 population.
3. Swimming Pools: 1 week of swimming per 70,000 residents (this is a revised LOS adopted by the City Council, April 1997)
4. Athletic Fields: 1 field per each 3,000 population.
5. Courts: 1 court per each 2,430 population.
6. Trails: 1 mile per each 50,000 population.

Solid Waste: Different LOS standards have been established for differing types of establishment.

The above standards represent a very brief overview of the 145-page Concurrency Management System Handbook.

Miami-Dade County, Florida

Approach to Growth Management

Miami-Dade is an unusual hybrid: a two-tier government structure composed of Dade County and municipalities, the largest of which is the city of Miami. Metropolitan Miami Dade was established in 1957 to coordinate government and services.

The Miami-Dade Department of Planning and Zoning administers a Concurrency Management System for the metropolitan area. All developments must provide the appropriate certificates of concurrency, and pay the appropriate Impact Fees, in order to proceed. This is a complex process, and concurrency regulations are reviewed by seven Miami-Dade County departments, including: the Planning and Zoning, Environmental Resources Management (water supply and wastewater treatment capacity, quality and effluent standards), Fire and Rescue (water supply for fire suppression), Metro-Miami-Dade Transit Agency (adequacy of public transit), Parks and Recreation (park space), Public Works (traffic circulation on streets, roads, highways), and Solid Waste Management (solid waste systems). Flood control is monitored, at various stages throughout the permitting process, by three separate agencies.

Impact fees are paid for road, fire and emergency services, police services, parks and educational facilities. The municipalities may levy impact fees in addition to those levied by Miami Dade.

Contacts

Helen Brown
 Concurrency Administrator
 Department of Planning and Zoning
 Planning Division
 111N.W. 1st Street
 Suite 1220
 Miami, Florida, 33128 1972
 Telephone: (305) 375 2589
 Fax: (305) 375 2560
 Email: hab@co.miami-dade.fl.us
 Webpage: <http://www.co.miami-dade.fl.us/planzone/>

At a Glance

- ✓ Miami-Dade County levies impact fees road, fire and emergency services, police services, parks and educational facilities.
- ✓ The Concurrency Management System is a complex process, involving reviews by seven County departments. Flood protection is reviewed by three County departments.

Statistical Snapshot

FIPS: 12025

	2000	Growth*		2000
Population	2,253,362	16%	Land Area (square miles)	1,946
Under 18	559,213	25%	Persons/Square Mile	1,158
Households	776,774	12%	Median Age	35.6
Jobs	1,019,900	16%	Jobs per Household	1.3
			Metropolitan Area:	Miami FL PMSA
				2000
Median Household Income	\$35,966			Growth*
Median Housing Value	\$124,000		Population	3,876,380
Housing Value Growth*	4.3%		Jobs	1,271,031
New Housing Units (building permits)	12,475			21%
				40%

*1990-2000 percentage growth

Standards and Practices

No development (other than that with a de minimis impact) is allowed to proceed unless it can demonstrate that it is, or will be, in compliance with the levels of service (LOS) that have been adopted in the Comprehensive Development Master Plan. In order to encourage infill and redevelopment LOS standards are more flexible in certain designated areas, but no development that will be allowed that results in a reduction in LOS unless it meets one of the following criteria:

1. Lies in an Urban Infill Area; or
2. Lies in an existing Urban Service Area (USA) within the Urban Development Boundary (UDB) and is located in a Community Development Target Area or Redevelopment Area; or
3. Poses only part time demands on the transportation system and is located in an existing USA inside the UDB; or
4. Is located in a UDB and incorporates transit within the development; or
5. Is an office or residential development in an existing USA within the UDB and is located within one-quarter mile of transit.

There is a 5-year CIP. If current services are insufficient and are not funded within the CIP to meet LOS, developers are

offered a number of different methods by which they can come into compliance.

Waivers are possible at the plat stage - provided that the relevant review agency "states in writing that the proposed impact on the substandard service will be no greater than that of the impact of the existing valid development order."

Phasing of construction and facilities: There is provision for phasing of construction in line with the provision of facilities by either the City or "provided or contracted for construction by the applicant..." At each phase there is a provision that facilities may be "Guaranteed by some other means with assurance of the timely provision of the necessary services or facilities." In addition the applicant is required to "furnish adequate bond of 110% of cost of services of facilities which he is required to construct."

Pinellas County, Florida

Approach to Growth Management

Like all Florida jurisdictions, Pinellas County is required by state statute to maintain a concurrency system. Ordinance #01-48 covers all of the unincorporated areas of the County. The County's 24 incorporated jurisdictions, of which the City of St. Petersburg is the largest, have their own land use and zoning authority, and their own growth management regulations. State laws require that the jurisdictions coordinate with each other to provide the necessary infrastructure.

The State Department of Community Affairs (DCA) administers Florida's growth management systems and requires that Comprehensive Plans should be regularly evaluated and an Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR) submitted not more than seven years after the Plan is adopted. Subsequent EARs should be submitted not be more than five years later. In addition, in a program of "constant update to ensure relevance" the County monitors the status of public facilities, on an annual basis, to ensure that their provision is integrated with the comprehensive plan. Level of Service standards for concurrency roads, sanitary sewer, solid waste, drainage, potable water, recreation and mass transit are established in the comprehensive plan.

The Capital Improvement Program operates on a 6-year cycle.

Contacts

Elizabeth Freeman,
Principal Planner
Pinellas County Planning Department
14 South Fort Harrison Avenue, Suite
2000,
Clearwater, Florida, 33756
Telephone: (727) 464 4751
Fax: (727) 464 4151
Email: efreeman@co.pinellas.fl.us
Webpage: <http://www.co.pinellas.fl.us/bcc/Planning/default.htm>

At a Glance

- ✓ Like all Florida jurisdictions, the state requires Pinellas County to maintain a concurrency system.
- ✓ In "Concurrency Management Corridors," the roadway level of service standard is F. Outside these corridors, the roadway LOS is C for daily traffic and D for the peak hour.

Statistical Snapshot

FIPS: 12103

	2000	Growth*		2000
Population	921,482	8 %	Land Area (square miles)	200
Under 18	177,533	19%	Persons/Square Mile	3,291
Households	414,968	9 %	Median Age	43
Jobs	573,384	29%	Jobs per Household	1.4
			Metropolitan Area: Tampa-St. Petersburg MSA	
	2000		2000	Growth*
Median Household Income	\$37,711		Population	2,395,997
Median Housing Value	\$96,500		Jobs	1,221,100
Housing Value Growth*	31 %			
New Housing Units (building permits)	2,776			

*1990-2000 percentage growth

Standards and Practices

In order to promote the goals of the Comprehensive Plan, Pinellas County has established differing transportation level of service (LOS) standards for different situations in the County. They are:

Concurrency Management Corridors: (designated as either "constrained," "congestion containment" or "long term concurrency management"), are considered adequate if they maintain a LOS of F. This policy is to allow for development in areas where transit is, or could be, available. The "Long Term Concurrency Management System" recognizes that acceptable LOS cannot be achieved...until the facility is improved.

For County and State roads (that are not constrained, congestion containment or long term concurrency management corridors) the standard adopted in July 2001 allowed a LOS C average daily/D peak hour with a volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratio less than 0.9. Roadways that operate below the adopted standard are considered deficient.

LOS standards may be reduced if the County is unable to fund improvements identified in the CIP because of a referendum or an action of the Board of County Commissioners.

Mitigation/Pay and Go: A variety of mitigation provisions are available, from

"developer's fair share" commitments for recreation facilities to "interim demand management strategies" for transportation.

In addition to Concurrency requirements, the County imposes impact fees upon developers to off-set the cost of infrastructure improvements. These are reviewed and amended on an annual basis.

Sarasota, Florida

Approach to Growth Management

The City of Sarasota adopted Concurrency in 1989 in accordance with Florida State law. The Sarasota City Plan of 1998 emphasizes the importance of consistency between all parts of the City's land use and transportation policies, with the concurrency system expected to ensure that all necessary services are available at or soon after the time of development.

Recognizing that concurrency has had the unintended effect of encouraging sprawling development in rural areas, rather than compact urban development in, or adjacent to, existing downtown areas, in 1993 the Florida State Legislature amended concurrency regulations to allow alternatives to concurrency in certain designated exception areas. The 1998 Sarasota City Plan designated the existing downtown Community Redevelopment Area as a Transportation Concurrency Exception Area (TCEA). Relaxing concurrency standards is hoped to encourage urban redevelopment based on accessibility to facilities and services, rather than following the prevailing suburban land-use plan, that focuses on mobility through automobile use.

To mitigate the increased demand for transportation in the TCEA, a Downtown Mobility Initiative was established. Its comprehensive approach includes TDM schemes to improve multi-modal options, improve traffic signage etc.

At a Glance

- ✓ The City of Sarasota designated the existing downtown Community Redevelopment Area as a Transportation Concurrency Exception Area to encourage compact urban development.
- ✓ The City has an extensive list of park and recreation facility level of service standards.

Statistical Snapshot

FIPS: 1264175

	2000	Growth*
Population	52,715	34%
Under 18	9,723	18%
Households	23,427	3%
Jobs (1997)	40,132	n/a

	2000
Land Area (square miles)	15
Persons/Square Mile	3,540
Median Age	41.1
Jobs per Household	1.9

	2000
Median Household Income	\$29,919
Median Housing Value	\$96,000
Housing Value Growth*	34%
New Housing Units (building permits)	187

Metropolitan Area: Sarasota-Bradenton MSA			
	2000	Growth*	
Population	589,959	112%	
Jobs	272,600	44%	

*1990-2000 percentage growth

Standards and Practices

In the City of Sarasota, standards for levels of service have been established for water, sewer, solid waste, stormwater drainage, recreation and open space, and transportation.

The potable water and sanitary sewer standards are both a minimum of 200 gpd per equivalent residential unit (ERU).

The solid waste collection standard is 6.9 pounds of waste per day per capita.

Stormwater drainage should be adequate to maintain LOS C (street and yard flooding only) using a 25-year/24hour design storm.

The City has established level of service standards for 23 recreation and open space facilities. The open space standard is 1 acre per 500 residents. The recreation facility standards include auditoriums and gymnasiums, a variety of specific types of ballfields and courts, jogging and nature trails, swimming pools and beach access, golf courses, fishing piers, and boating facilities. An example is the softball field standard, which is 1 field for every 20,000 population. The softball field must be "a minimum 1.25 acres, with Amateur Softball Association regulation baseline and pitching distances."

Except in the City's Transportation Concurrency Exception Area, the roadway level of service standards are LOS C on all County maintained roads within the City, LOS D on all City maintained roads and all State maintained roads within the City that are classified as major arterials or interstate connectors, and LOS E on all State maintained roads within the City that are not classified as major arterials or interstate connectors.

The transit level of service standard is that no bus route shall experience "standing room only" conditions for more than one trip per day.

Contacts

David Smith AICP
 City of Sarasota
 Planning and Development Department
 1565 1st Street, Room 302A
 Sarasota, Florida, 34236
 Telephone: (941) 954 4195
 Fax: (941) 954 4179
 Email: david_smith@sarasotagov.com
 Webpage: http://www.ci.sarasota.fl.us/
 Planning

Cobb County, Georgia

Approach to Growth Management

Cobb County is a suburban county located north east of the city of Atlanta. Its population has more than tripled since 1970, with growth rates of more than 50% between 1970 and 1980 and again from 1980 to 1990. The rate of growth 'slowed' to approximately 36% during the 1990s.

Despite this rapid rate of growth the County has no formal growth management system: there is no urban growth boundary, no impact fees and no adequate public facilities or transfer of development rights ordinances. The County uses its Comprehensive Plan and Future Land Use Map (FLUM,) together with environmental ordinances, to direct growth. The FLUM is not a development ordinance but gives a general indication of locations that would be suitable for various land uses. There are 13 allowable zoning districts, from the mixed use Regional Activity Center, to single-use low density residential.

The County has responsibility for planning and zoning in all unincorporated areas; each of the six municipalities in Cobb County has its own authority.

Contacts

Robert L. Hosack, Jr., AICP, Director
 Community Development Agency
 Cobb County
 191 Lawrence Street
 Marietta, Georgia, 30060
 Telephone: (770) 528 2125
 Fax: (770) 528 2126
 Email: rhosack@cobbcounty.org
 Webpage: <http://www.cobbcounty.org>

See also the Atlanta Regional Commission webpage at <http://www.atlreg.com/index.html>

At a Glance

- ✓ This fast-growing suburban county does not rely on traditional growth management ordinances.
- ✓ Designation of the Atlanta region as an ozone non-attainment area has drawn Cobb County into a regional planning effort focus on land use, transportation, and air quality.

Statistical Snapshot

FIPS: 13067

	2000	Growth*
Population	607,751	36%
Under 18	158,406	40%
Households	227,487	33%
Jobs	395,761	59%

	2000
Median Household Income	\$56,857
Median Housing Value	\$147,600
Housing Value Growth*	51%
New Housing Units (building permits)	6,642

*1990-2000 percentage growth

	2000
Land Area (square miles)	340
Persons/Square Mile	1,787
Median Age	33.2
Jobs per Household	1.7

Metropolitan Area: Atlanta GA MSA

	2000	Growth*
Population	4,112,198	45%
Jobs	1,991,500	40%

Standards and Practices

Cobb County is one of ten counties that coordinate their plans through the Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC). The Commission has been the regional planning agency for metropolitan Atlanta for more than 50 years and promotes land use and transportation planning as well as resource management and worker training initiatives. It has developed a number of planning and growth management strategies and tools, together with suggested model ordinances, to assist its members. The *Community Choices Quality Growth Toolkit* is available online.

In 1990, following the passage of the Clean Air Act, the 13 counties in and around Atlanta were designated as a non-attainment area for ozone. The U.S. Department of Transportation conditioned its approval of the Atlanta Regional Transportation Plan in June 2000 upon implementation of a regional land use strategy to manage transportation demand and air quality impacts. To comply, the Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) developed the Regional Development Plan (RDP) and, as part of the land use element, has asked local governments to align their comprehensive plans with those of the RDP. Cobb County is in partial compliance with these policies but plans to develop guidelines for transit oriented development, infill development and redevelopment.

RDP policies include:

Encourage new development to be more clustered in portions of the region where such opportunities exist.

Strengthen and enhance the residential and mixed-use character of the Central Business District and City and Town Centers.

Strengthen and enhance the residential and mixed-use character of existing and emerging Activity Centers.

Encourage mixed use redevelopment of corridors where public services are currently available.

Encourage Transit Oriented Development.

Support the preservation of stable single family neighborhoods.

Encourage focused infill and redevelopment where acceptable to communities.

Encourage mixed-use development.

Encourage Traditional Neighborhood Developments.

Protect environmentally sensitive areas.

Align local policy and regulation to support these policies.

Support growth management through local and state institutional arrangements.

Encourage the utilization of Best Development Practices.

Create an on-going regional Land Use Coordinating Committee

Forsyth County, Georgia

Approach to Growth Management

Forsyth County is located north west of the city of Atlanta. Despite being part of metropolitan Atlanta, Forsyth County is not part of the Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC). However, in order to meet Clean Air Act requirements, the County does coordinate its transportation planning with the ARC counties. Forsyth is one of the fastest growing counties in the nation and grew by more than 123% during the 1990s. This increase was helped by the completion of the GA400 highway that enabled Forsyth residents to commute to jobs in suburban Fulton County, as well as downtown Atlanta. Home prices, and taxes, are generally lower than for similar amenities in neighboring Fulton County.

Forsyth County does not have "growth management" ordinances, but manages growth through its Unified Development Code (UDC) and Comprehensive Plan. The systems emphasize environmental protection and resource conservation through the placement of development, rather than affecting its timing. To help offset the cost of infrastructure the county has recently approved a recommendation by a citizen advisory committee that new developments should be charged Impact Fees. The fees would be used to offset the costs of libraries, parks and recreation and public safety facilities. A proposed Ordinance is being drafted and will be submitted in April 2003.

Contacts

Tom Brown, AICP
 Senior Planner
 Forsyth County Department of Planning and Development
 110 E. Main Street, Suite 100
 Cumming, GA, 30040
 Telephone: (770) 886 2761
 Fax: (770) 781 2197
 Email: Twbrown@forsythco.com
 Webpage: <http://www.co.forsyth.ga.us/>

At a Glance

- ✓ Forsyth County coordinates transportation planning with members of the Atlanta Regional Commission in order to meet clean Air Act requirements.
- ✓ The County has recently approved an impact fee for libraries, parks and recreation and public safety facilities

Statistical Snapshot

FIPS: 13117

	2000	Growth*		2000
Population	98,407	123%	Land Area (square miles)	226
Under 18	27,466	141%	Persons/Square Mile	435
Households	34,565	116%	Median Age	34.6
Jobs	44,641	147%	Jobs per Household	1.3
			Metropolitan Area:	Atlanta GA MSA
	2000	Growth*		2000
Median Household Income	\$60,250		Population	4,112,198
Median Housing Value	\$184,600		Jobs	1,991,500
Housing Value Growth*	91%			
New Housing Units (building permits)	3,389			

*1990-2000 percentage growth

Standards and Practices

Forsyth County's Unified Development Code establishes twenty-six zoning districts. Three of the zones - UV "Urban Village District," OR "Office Residential District," and PUD "Planned Unit Development District," allow a mix of uses. The UDC also establishes four overlay districts:

- Protected Water Supply Watershed Overlay Districts;
- Protected Groundwater Recharge Area Overlay Districts;
- The Etowah River Corridor Protection District; and
- Wetland Protection District Overlays.

These provisions establish stream and wetland buffer zones as well as regulating the placement of septic systems.

Forsyth County received a grant of approximately \$1 million from the Georgia Greenspace Commission in January 2001 for land conservation. In a news release announcing the receipt of this grant the County noted that:

"To qualify for funding, Forsyth County along with other rapidly developing counties had to submit greenspace programs to the State. The counties must commit to preserve at least 20% of their geographic

areas as open and connected greenspace that can be used for recreational activities and protection of natural resources. Greenspace consists of permanently protected land and water that protects water quality, scenic areas, wildlife habitat, historic resources, or recreational opportunities such as jogging, biking, walking and camping."

In December 2002 Forsyth County joined other counties in the Atlanta area and imposed a temporary moratorium against the Georgia Transmission Company's plan to erect high-voltage electric transmission lines. The moratorium will hold until routing issues are resolved and the County has put in place an ordinance requiring the lines to be buried.

Fulton County, Georgia

Approach to Growth Management

With a population of more than 816,000 (2000 Census) Fulton County is the largest in Georgia and lies at the heart of the Atlanta metropolitan region. The County lost population during the 1970s, but reversed the downward trend and grew by 57% during the 1980s, and 25% during the 1990s. The County's land use policies apply only to the unincorporated areas and each of the ten municipalities - the largest of which is the City of Atlanta - have their own policies.

Like its neighbors, Fulton County is one of ten counties that coordinate their plans through the Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC). In order to comply with U.S. Department of Transportation requirements the ARC has developed a Regional Development Plan (RDP) and has asked local governments to align their comprehensive plans with those of the RDP. Fulton County is in partial compliance with these policies but is in the process of developing growth management strategies, as well as putting in place the regulatory framework necessary to implement them. Please see the Cobb County profile for additional information on the RDP.

There is currently a moratorium on sewer hook-ups in the Big Creek/Johns Creek areas of the northwest county.

Contacts

Geneasa L. Elias, Planner II
Fulton County Government
Department of Environment & Community Development
Comprehensive Planning Division
141 Pryor Street, Suite 5001
Atlanta, Georgia, 30303
Telephone: (404) 730 8189
Fax: (404) 730 8112
Email: Geneasa.Elias@co.fulton.ga.us
Webpage: <http://www.fultonecd.org>

See also the Atlanta Regional Commission webpage at <http://www.atlreg.com>

At a Glance

- ✓ Fulton County collects impact fees for transportation and has imposed a moratorium on sewer hookups in the northwest part of the County.
- ✓ Proposed development projects are required to submit and follow a written public participation plan.

Statistical Snapshot

FIPS: 13121

	2000	Growth*
Population	816,006	26%
Under 18	199,290	27%
Households	321,242	25%
Jobs	918,600	28%

	2000
Land Area (square miles)	529
Persons/Square Mile	1,542
Median Age	32.7
Jobs per Household	2.9

	2000
Median Household Income	\$41,266
Median Housing Value	\$180,700
Housing Value Growth*	85%
New Housing Units (building permits)	9,621

Metropolitan Area: Atlanta GA MSA

	2000	Growth*
Population	4,112,198	45%
Jobs	1,991,500	40%

*1990-2000 percentage growth

Standards and Practices

In 2001 the Fulton County Board of Commissioners adopted "Smart Growth, Plan and Strategic Policies," winner of the "2002 Outstanding Educational Tool" award given by the Georgia Planning Association. The plan defines Smart Growth as "a development pattern which: provides for the efficient use of land and public infrastructure, provides for future planned population growth, creates communities that incorporate a mix of uses for a diverse population, provides multiple housing and transportation options, and protects the environment."

The Plan contains a series of Policies and Strategies in four areas: land use, environmental, transportation and development. Planning staff is now working towards implementation by amending County Ordinances and the Zoning Resolution. A Public Participation Plan will be required for all future developments, and applicants for rezoning or use permits that require a public hearing must now include a written plan outlining the steps they have taken to ensure public participation. A series of minimum standards is laid out. Informal discussions between the parties are encouraged but not regarded as a substitute for the submission of a written plan. The County is also strengthening its regulations on buffering and landscaping between sites and along streams.

Impact fees for transportation improvements are collected on new developments in the Sandy Springs area and areas west to Route GA400. The county is considering implementing the fees in additional areas, especially in the fast-growing northwest section.

The Northwest area of the county is still largely rural although development is occurring. County-club and golf-course communities are popular. Years of unregulated development and poorly maintained infrastructure have led to declining environmental quality (as measured in stream and slope quality) together with increasing traffic congestion. A plan entitled "2015 North Fulton Comprehensive Plan Amendment "Maintaining Rural Character in Northwest Fulton County, Georgia" was approved by the Board of Commissioners in December 2001, and lays out a series of strategies to address these issues. The plan says that even "conservative estimates" of future travel demand are far beyond the future road capacity, and that only a change in land use patterns can help resolve this issue. It goes on to lay out the arguments for increasing the minimum lot size to preserve agriculture, but notes that as development encroaches and taxes increase, farming becomes uneconomic and additional strategies, such as the purchase or transfer of development rights, might be necessary.

Anne Arundel County, Maryland

Approach to Growth Management

Anne Arundel County, Maryland is home to Annapolis, the capital of Maryland, and, although officially located within the Baltimore MSA, is also a second-tier suburb of Washington, DC. The County is bounded to the west by the Chesapeake Bay. These facts attract growth and help shape the County's approach to managing growth.

The "primary goal" of Anne Arundel County's General Development Plan (1997) is "to balance residential and business land uses by focusing growth in areas which best utilize existing and planned infrastructure in order to protect the natural environment."

The Plan directs "at least 90% of all development into areas that have existing or planned facilities." Growth is to be concentrated in mixed-use Town Centers.

The County has several tax increment financing districts in place to help fund transportation improvements. They also seek voluntary agreements with developers to provide assistance with carpooling, vanpooling, and park and ride spaces.

A special feature of the County's school test is that it allows a subdivision to be approved even if enrollment exceeds capacity if the Board of Education finds that it won't affect the quality of curriculum and programs.

Contacts

Rich Josephson
Administrator
Long Range Planning
Anne Arundel County
Office of Planning and Zoning
2664 Riva Road
Annapolis, MD 21401
410-222-7432
www.aacounty.org

At a Glance

- ✓ Maryland's capital city experiences strong growth pressure as a suburb of Baltimore and Washington, DC.
- ✓ Traditional APFO; covers roads, schools, water, sewer, storm drains, and fire suppression.

Statistical Snapshot

FIPS: 24003

	2000	Growth*		2000
Population	489,656	15%	Land Area (square miles)	416
Under 18	123,656	18%	Persons/Square Mile	1,177
Households	178,670	20%	Median Age	36.0
Jobs	297,043	23%	Jobs per Household	1.7
			Metropolitan Area:	Baltimore, MD PMSA
	2000			
Median Household Income	\$61,688			
Median Housing Value	\$159,300			
Housing Value Growth*	33%			
New Housing Units (building permits)	3,078			
			2000	Growth*
			Population (millions)	2,552,994 7.0%
			Jobs	1,193,790 24%

*percent change 1990-2000

Standards and Practices

Anne Arundel County's growth policies are contained within several documents adopted by the County Council, including the General Development Plan (adopted 1997), Small Area Plans for 16 community planning areas, with plans adopted beginning in 2000 and continuing through 2004), and the Sewer and Water Master Plan (latest plan adopted in 1999).

The County's APFO is contained within the subdivision regulations, Article 26 of the County Code. The APFO tests the adequacy of roads, schools, water, sewer, storm drains, and fire suppression.

The roadway adequacy standard is LOS D (Transportation Research Board standards). The evaluation is from the subdivision intersection with an arterial or major highway, in both directions, to the next intersecting arterial or major highway. Special exceptions are made for peninsulas where all road sections and intersections are tested up to the point where the road is no longer the sole route for the peninsula.

Public schools are considered adequate if "the school population to be generated from the proposed subdivision may be enrolled at each school without causing the enrollment to exceed the State Interagency Committee school capacity guidelines...or the County Board of Education determines that the

enrollment of the additional students...would not be detrimental to the quality of the curriculum and programs being offered at the schools." In other words, the standard is that enrollment must not exceed 100% of capacity, but the test also takes into account the specific circumstances of each case; if there is capacity in adjacent schools, for example. There is currently no mechanism for developers to address a school moratorium, either by paying money or providing facilities. Non-residential development and elderly housing are exempt from the school test.

Water is considered adequate if a public, shared or individual system, that complies with County and State standards, is capable of supplying the maximum daily demand that a subdivision will generate. Sewerage is adequate if there is a public, shared or individual system that complies with State and County standards and can accommodate expected peak flows.

For stormwater, both on and off-site drainage systems are acceptable. County analysis determines the capacity and whether the property system and/or the down-stream can handle the expected flows.

Fire suppression adequacy is determined by the availability of water for fire suppression. The water supply may be public or provided on-site by the developer.

Baltimore County, Maryland

Approach to Growth Management

Baltimore County is a large suburban county surrounding the City of Baltimore, Maryland. Baltimore County's growth policies are contained within three documents:

Baltimore County's Growth Management Legislation, commonly known as "Basic Services," reviews development in areas deficient in water, sewer and transportation facilities.

Baltimore County's Adequate Public Facilities Legislation regulates development in areas that have inadequate schools, open space, water, sewer, and stormwater management facilities.

Baltimore County's Master Plan 2010. One of the main principles of the plan is the Urban/Rural Demarcation Line. The URDL was established in 1967. All lands within the URDL are Urban Land Management Areas and those outside it are Rural Land Management Areas. Public water and sewer services are to be supplied to all areas within the URDL, and growth is concentrated there. The area outside the URDL is to remain rural and private wells and septic systems are allowed. In 1972 the County published its first formal master plan "1980 Guideplan for Baltimore County, Maryland" which upheld the URDL.

The URDL was the first of its kind in the State and has guided development in the Baltimore region since its inception.

At a Glance

- ✓ Baltimore County's Urban/Rural Demarcation Line, established in 1967, was a landmark piece of legislation and guides growth to this day.
- ✓ The County uses "basic services maps" to determine the "reserve capacity" of public facilities to accommodate new development.

Statistical Snapshot

FIPS: 24005

	2000	Growth*		2000
Population	754,292	0.9%	Land Area (square miles)	599
Under 18	178,363	1.8%	Persons/Square Mile	1,259
Households	299,877	1.2%	Median Age	37.7
Jobs	448,010	1.2%	Jobs per Household	1.5
		2000	Metropolitan Area:	Baltimore, MD PMSA
Median Household Income	\$48,858			
Median Housing Value	\$127,300			
Housing Value Growth*	2.7%			
New Housing Units (building permits)	2,707			
			2000	Growth*
			Population	2,552,994 0.7%
			Jobs	1,193,790 2.4%

**percent change 1990-2000*

Standards and Practices

Baltimore County annual prepares three "Basic Services Maps," one each for Water, Sewerage and Transportation services. The standards used to delineate areas on the maps where these services are adequate (where there is "reserve capacity"). These standards are also those applied to non-industrial development applications.

For water supply, residual water pressure at the public fire hydrant nearest the site of the proposed development must meet national fire flow test standards. For sewerage, the County determines how much it can allocate to new nonindustrial development by subtracting from total sewerage capacity the expected quantity of sewerage from industrial development, including any new industrial development expected over the life of the basic services map. In other words, industrial development gets priority for sewerage capacity. The County also uses standard multipliers to estimate sewerage demand from nonindustrial development.

The transportation test restricts non-industrial development where the capacity of intersections is less than that necessary to accommodate existing and expected development. The "reserve capacity" of an area the amount of new development that can be accommodated by the most congested arterial intersection. The congestion

standard is determined using a methodology called the "critical vehicle-trip number" for an intersection that is at the midpoint between the top of LOS D and LOS E. Currently, the South Perry Hall - White Marsh area is in moratorium until a specific set of road improvements are made.

Exceptions to the basic services mapping standards include: projects of 3 or fewer housing units, town centers or community centers, on-site expansion of existing hospitals, and areas with an "official detailed plan" for "revitalization."

An overcrowded school district is one containing a school where enrollment exceeds 115% of state-rated capacity. Development may be granted in overcrowded school districts if any school in an adjacent district has sufficient capacity to render the overcrowded school less than 115% of state-rated capacity. In 2001-2002 seven school districts were rated as over 115% of capacity, but all have adjacent districts with sufficient capacity.

With some exceptions, all residential development is required to provide a minimum of 1,000 s.f. of open space. The developer may meet this requirement by paying a fee, and amenity space provided by the developer may be creditable.

Contacts

Arnold F. 'Pat' Keller, III
 Director
 Baltimore County Office of Planning
 401 Bosley Avenue, Suite 406
 Towson, Maryland, 21204
 Telephone: (410) 887 3211
 Fax: (410) 887 5862
 Email: planning@co.ba.md.us

Baltimore County Office of Planning
 website:
<http://www.co.ba.md.us/p.cfm/agencies/planning/index.cfm>

Charles County, Maryland

Approach to Growth Management

Charles County is a second-tier suburb of Washington, DC, located directly south of the nation's capital. The 1997 Comprehensive Plan proposes that future growth patterns in the County should be in an "efficient and serviceable form." The main points of the plan: growth should be concentrated in areas with public water and sewer; agricultural land should be conserved; rural villages should be protected, but provided with services; and the Comprehensive Plan and the Comprehensive Water and Sewer Plan should be coordinated with one another to ensure cohesive growth patterns.

According to the County, before 1990 the linear form (along routes 301/5 and 210) of land use patterns encouraged low density, sprawling development that hampered the efficient delivery of public services. The 1990 Comprehensive Plan established Development Districts and from 1991-95 74% of lots with final plat approval lay inside the Districts vs. 26% outside. During the same period 95% of the approved preliminary plans lay inside the Districts. Development Districts act as receiving areas for the County's TDR program. The County has identified a problem of "leap frogging" -- development within the Development Districts but beyond the current edge of established service areas -- which has a negative fiscal impact on the County.

Contacts

Steve Magoon
 Planning Director
 Charles County Government
 P.O. Box 2150
 200 Baltimore Street
 La Plata, Maryland, 20646
 Telephone: (301) 645 0547
 Email: MagoonS@govt.co.charles.md.us
 www.charlescounty.org

At a Glance

- ✓ School capacity allocation policy is a national model, recipient of a National Association of Counties 2001 Achievement Award.
- ✓ Comprehensive plan concentrates growth into "development districts."

Statistical Snapshot

FIPS: 24017

	2000	Growth*		2000
Population	120,546	19%	Land Area (square miles)	461
Under 18	34,651	16%	Persons/Square Mile	261
Households	41,688	26%	Median Age	34.6
Jobs	50,050	27%	Jobs per Household	1.2
2000				
Median Household Income	\$54,110		Metropolitan Area: Washington, DC PMSA	
Median Housing Value	\$153,000			
Housing Value Growth*	25%			
New Housing Units (building permits)	1,233			
2000 Growth*				
	Population	4,923,153	25%	
	Jobs	2,758,500	23%	

**percent change 1990-2000*

Standards and Practices

Charles County's APFO covers roads, schools and ground water supply. APF tests are required for any subdivision, site plan or zoning permit application except minor residential or commercial subdivisions of five lots or less, or non-residential development containing less than 1200 square feet of floor area.

The minimum levels of service for multi-lane highways, 2-lane highways, and signalized and unsignalized intersections are more stringent in rural areas and less stringent in urban areas. They are: for Town centers and the Urban Core, LOS D; for Development Districts and Village Centers, LOS C; for rural and agricultural areas and other areas, LOS B. Development may "count" roadway facilities programmed in the CIP, but the development may not proceed until the counted CIP project is scheduled to be in place.

The County uses a system of school capacity allocations to manage the provision of school capacity. Rather than the usual measure of student/classroom ratios, Charles County applied the concept of "core capacity" -- how many students a school's infrastructure can accommodate. This takes into account the ability of core facilities such as libraries, cafeterias, gyms, bathrooms etc. to handle additional students.

The County calculates school capacity in each of their five school districts at the elementary, middle and high school levels. The level with the least capacity is the one adopted for that area for that year. For example, if the calculation for a district shows that there is capacity for an additional 200 housing units at the elementary school level, 300 units at the middle school level, and 400 units at the high school level, then the allocation for that district for that year is 200 housing units.

Capacity is allocated on a first-come, first-served basis, and no single subdivision may receive more than 50 percent of the district's allocations in one year.

The County reports that the system is working well, resulting in slower residential development because of a shortage of school capacity.

In order to help fund school facilities, Charles County has an impact fee of \$5,000 per unit. However, the County recently adopted a replacement tax - an excise tax that will be approximately \$10,000 per unit and dedicated exclusively to schools. Payment is spread over 10 years and appears on the homeowners' property tax bills -- a system the development community prefers to upfront payments of the impact tax.

Frederick County, Maryland

Approach to Growth Management

Frederick County, Maryland is a second-tier suburb of both the Washington, DC and Baltimore metropolitan areas, and is the intersection point for two interstate highways -- I-70 and I-270 -- connecting these two areas to the west. As a result, the County has been experiencing growth pressures that have accelerated in the past decade.

Frederick County adopted its adequate public facilities ordinance in 1991 and it was last amended in 1998. The Frederick County APFO applies to all unincorporated lands within the County. However, there are twelve municipalities, none of which are subject to County planning policies or APFO, and where a significant fraction of Frederick County's growth is occurring. Three have adopted, or are developing, their own growth management policies, including APFOs. The City of Frederick has imposed a building moratorium due to water shortages.

Frederick County's APFO allows developers to provide needed public facilities if they are not available. An escrow account program for road improvements was established May 16, 1995.

Frederick County has impact fees to fund schools and libraries. For a single family detached house, the impact fee for schools is \$6,738 and for libraries is \$406.

Contacts

Michael Thompson
Chief of Development Review
Email: Mthompson@fredco-md.net

Eric Soter
Director of Planning and Zoning
Email: Esoter@fredco-md.net

Frederick County Government
12 East Church Street, Winchester Hall
Frederick, Maryland 21701
Telephone: (301) 694 1134
<http://www.co.frederick.md.us/planning/>

At a Glance

- ✓ Managing growth in Frederick County is complicated by the challenging of coordinating the actions of the County and twelve municipalities.
- ✓ The County imposes an impact fee for schools and libraries; in some cases, developers can meet road APF standards by paying into an escrow account.

Statistical Snapshot

FIPS: 24021

	2000	Growth*		2000	
Population	195,277	30%	Land Area (square miles)	663	
Under 18	53,887	36%	Persons/Square Mile	294	
Households	70,060	33%	Median Age	35.6	
Jobs	104,818	44%	Jobs per Household	1.5	
	2000		Metropolitan Area:	Washington, DC PMSA	
Median Household Income	\$53,415				
Median Housing Value	\$160,200				
Housing Value Growth*	24%			2000	Growth*
New Housing Units (building permits)	2,747		Population	4,923,153	25%
			Jobs	2,758,500	23%

*percent change 1990-2000

Standards and Practices

Frederick County's APFO applies to roads, schools, and water and sewer. Development projects that are not subject to the APFO include *de minimus* projects (minor subdivision containing 5 or fewer lots), schools and public safety facilities.

The standard for roadway adequacy is LOS C for agricultural, rural or conservation areas, and LOS D is adequate in all other areas, including signalized intersections.

The County has developed a mechanism to address situations where a developer with limited impact on a road project would have been required to pay for the entire cost of a road improvement in order to meet APF standards. The County's solution is "escrow accounts" to fund the needed improvements into which a developer can pay funds proportionate to the impact of his development. Eligibility for an escrow account is limited to projects that create no more than 50% of the demand for the road improvement (for projects creating between 25% and 50% of the impact, the Planning Commission has some discretion in approving the escrow account).

The road test does not apply to a development that will generate less than 100 total vehicle trips "during the highest peak hour of the adjacent street traffic." The County

maintains a cumulative data base to monitor the impact of residential projects falling between the *de minimus* and 100 vehicle trips rules.

Public schools are considered adequate if sufficient capacity exists, or is scheduled in the first two years of the current CIP. For elementary schools, enrollment must not exceed 105% of capacity; for secondary schools, 110% of capacity. School redistricting is an option available to ease potential crowding. Development may be phased if elementary capacity is not more than 115% and secondary capacity is not more than 120%, or new capacity is scheduled within the six-year CIP.

The water (and sewer) tests do not apply to individual private wells or (septic systems), respectively. Water service will be deemed adequate if an approved public or private community system that can meet peak hour demand and fire flow, while maintaining adequate pressure. Sewer service is adequate if the existing system is sufficient to accommodate ultimate peak flows, or upgrades to provide sufficient service are scheduled within three years on the current CIP.

Gaithersburg, Maryland

Approach to Growth Management

Located approximately 11 miles from downtown Washington, D.C. the City of Gaithersburg has increased its population 33 % between 1990 and 2000 due to its strategic location along the I-270 growth corridor. Long ago deemed a "Corridor City" and viewed as a moderate sized city, much of the City's new development has been completed, with re-development of aging multi-family housing a prime target for the future.

Through the years, the City has employed a detailed site plan review process as well as a more sophisticated process attached to its mixed use development zone (MXD) that oversees the development process in great detail. During the companion site plan review process, the Planning Commission is empowered to attach conditions to approvals that may include, but not be limited to requiring on and off-site road improvements, delineating development phasing or requiring dedication of school sites. The Mayor and City Council approve schematic development plans in the mixed use development zone (MXD) which encourages staged development, including development phasing as one of its fundamental caveats.

Contacts

Fred Felton
Assistant City Manager

Jennifer Russel
Director of Planning and Code Administration

The City of Gaithersburg
City Hall, 31 South Summit Avenue,
Gaithersburg, Maryland 20877
Telephone: 301-258-6330
Email: plancode@ci.gaithersburg.md.us
Website: <http://www.ci.gaithersburg.md.us>

At a Glance

- ✓ Autonomous planning and zoning powers permit jurisdiction to regulate quality and type of development within its corporate borders.
- ✓ One year residential deferment recently ended as City completes a Master Plan update focused on land use changes that take in account pressing school and transportation capacity issues.

Statistical Snapshot

FIPS: 31175

	2000	Growth*		2000
Population	52,613	33%	Land Area (square miles)	10
Under 18	13,153	35%	Persons/Square Mile	5,261
Households	19,621	19%	Median Age	33.6
Jobs	51,745	35%	Jobs per Household	2.6
			Metropolitan Area: Washington, DC PMSA	
			2000	Growth*
Median Household Income	\$58,879		Population	4,923,153
Median Housing Value	\$171,100		Jobs	2,758,500
Housing Value Growth*	16%			
New Housing Units (building permits)	580			

*percent change 1990-2000

Standards and Practices

The City's adopted Master Plan, which is currently (2003) under review, addresses growth through its detailed land use designations and concurrent comprehensive rezoning actions. In addition, staging elements were inserted in several of the planning neighborhoods in which geographic sections of future development are, of necessity, tied to specific transportation-related improvements. Specific limitations as to unit counts and/or square footage are linked to on and off-site improvements to be completed by the developer or to construction of planned State or County road projects.

Additionally, the City's Planning Commission has stringent site plan review powers in all zones. The Commission is empowered to attach conditions to plan reviews and approvals and often requires dedication, road and or sidewalk improvements, and can impose unit ceilings or limitations on square footage.

The City's MXD zone was specifically designed and adopted to give appointed and elected officials the ability to allow development only in a phased or staged fashion to ensure the adequacy of the provision of public facilities and the concurrent implementation of community amenities.

In October 2002 the Mayor and City Council endorsed a series of Master Plan themes that are the foundation for the current Master Plan revision process. The themes address the following areas of Growth Management concern: Identity, Redevelopment, Town Centers, Environment, Transportation, Community Facilities, Housing, Economic Development and Education.

- The themes incorporate a wide variety of tools in the form of adopted objectives that seek to control and direct growth in a reasonable manner for the future.
- Examples include a requirement that if a development meets Montgomery County's Annual Growth Policy (AGP) schools test, but not the City's more stringent goal of 100 percent of capacity without adjacent cluster borrowing , the developer may be required to contribute to the City's Educational Fund or participate in other mitigation measures deemed appropriate.
- The City will also require phasing schedules for all residential properties according to the adopted themes.
- Pursuant to the transportation theme, the City will not approve development that generates more than fifty (50) peak hour trips if nearby critical intersections have a critical lane volume of 1450 or more.

Harford County, Maryland

Approach to Growth Management

Harford County, Maryland is located northwest of Baltimore along Maryland's boundary with Pennsylvania.

The 1977 Master Plan established the Harford County Development Envelope. Development would be encouraged inside the envelope and higher densities and lower levels of service would be approved than outside the envelope boundary. The envelope has been regularly reviewed and adjusted. The 1996 Land Use Element Plan estimated that there was a capacity of 26,900 units in addition to sufficient residential land capacity for 18 years.

Harford County has three municipalities: Aberdeen, Bel Air and Harve de Grace. Each has its own planning zoning authority and is not covered by County policies. However, Aberdeen has its own APFO.

At a Glance

- ✓ Harford County encourages growth to occur inside a designated "Development envelope" by allowing higher densities and lower level of service than outside.
- ✓ The County's APFO applies to roads, schools, water and sewer.

Statistical Snapshot

FIPS: 24025

	2000	Growth*
Population	218,590	20%
Under 18	60,965	25%
Households	79,667	26%
Jobs	97,818	30%

	2000
Land Area (square miles)	440
Persons/Square Mile	497
Median Age	36.2
Jobs per Household	1.2

	2000
Median Household Income	\$52,231
Median Housing Value	\$149,800
Housing Value Growth*	31%
New Housing Units (building permits)	1,702

Metropolitan Area: Baltimore, MD PMSA

*percent change 1990-2000

	2000	Growth*
Population	2,552,994	7.0%
Jobs	1,193,790	24%

Standards and Practices

Harford County's adequate public facilities ordinance was adopted in 1992 and last amended in 1994. The APFO applies to roads, schools, water and sewer.

The road adequacy measure tests intersection congestion. A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) is required at time of preliminary site plan review for developments that will generate 249 trips per day. In the Route 40 Overlay District a TIA is required for development generating 1,500 trips per day.

Inside the Development Envelope, the adequacy standard is LOS D. A LOS of E or F requires developer mitigation. The TIA study area includes County and State roads from the site entrance of the development to the second intersection of an arterial-type road, in each direction. Developments generating more than 1,500 trips per day may be required to expand the area studied.

Outside the Development Envelope, the adequacy standard is LOS C. A LOS of D or lower requires developer mitigation. The TIA area includes all County and State roads from the site entrance to the first intersection of a major collector road, in all directions. In the year 2000 there were three intersections with unacceptable LOS.

Harford County uses its own data and methodology to rate school capacity. Schools

are considered adequate if enrollment does not exceed 120% of rated capacity within two years for Elementary Schools, and 120% of rated capacity within three years for Secondary Schools. During the year 2000 two school areas were considered full and development projects were put on a waiting list until capacity became available for the year beginning July 1, 2001. Housing for the elderly, continuing-care retirement communities and transient housing are exempt from the school test.

The County water system, or community water system, is adequate if peak hour pressures, flows and fire flows will be sufficient to supply existing development, development under construction and development in the pipeline. Sewer service is adequate if it has sufficient capacity (including downstream capacity) to supply existing development, development under construction and development in the pipeline. The capacity from funded-but-not-yet-built water and sewer projects is counted, and developers may participate in the upgrading of facilities.

If either water or sewer facilities are inadequate, then no preliminary subdivision plans exceeding five lots, site plans for multi-family residential developments exceeding five dwelling units, or extensions of previously approved preliminary subdivision plans will be approved.

Contacts

Mr. Joseph Kocy
 Director of Planning and Zoning
 220 South Main Street
 Bel Air, Maryland, 21014
 Telephone: (410) 638 3103
 Email: jpkocy@co.ha.md.us
<http://www.co.ha.md.us/PlanningZoning/>

Howard County, Maryland

Approach to Growth Management

Howard County, Maryland is located in the center of the state, between the cities of Washington DC and Baltimore, serving as a suburb of both and, increasingly, as an employment center. Growth is guided by the General Plan, the most recent version of which was adopted in 2000. Through the General Plan, the County seeks to direct growth toward its more urban eastern half and to preserve its rural western half. A "planned service boundary" for water and sewer service marks the line between the two halves.

The Density Exchange Option overlay zoning district enables landowners in the Rural Conservation and Rural residential zones to preserve significant areas of farmland by transferring development rights from one parcel to another under certain circumstances.

In addition to its adequate public facilities ordinance (see "Standards and Practices"), seeks to maintain the adequacy of its transportation network through the collection of a Building Excise Tax (BET) that acts as a dedicated revenue source for roads. A new rate schedule went into effect July 1, 2002 that charges 80 cents per square foot of residential, office and retail development, and 40 cents per square foot for distribution, manufacturing, institutional and other non-residential development.

Contacts

Jeffrey P. Bronow,
 Research
 Planning and Zoning Department
 Howard County Government
 3430 Court House Drive
 Ellicott City, MD, 21043
 Telephone: (410) 313 2350
 Fax: (410) 313 3467
 Email: jbrown@co.ho.md.us
<http://www.co.ho.md.us/PZ/planning.html>

At a Glance

- ✓ Howard County uses a "planned service boundary" to concentrate growth in its eastern half.
- ✓ The County's APFO augments adequacy tests with an overall cap on the number of housing units permitted each year.

Statistical Snapshot

FIPS: 24027

	2000	Growth*		2000
Population	247,842	32%	Land Area (square miles)	252
Under 18	69,543	43%	Persons/Square Mile	984
Households	90,043	32%	Median Age	35.5
Jobs	163,009	52%	Jobs per Household	1.8
			Metropolitan Area: Baltimore, MD PMSA	
		2000		
Median Household Income		\$68,024		
Median Housing Value		\$206,300		
Housing Value Growth*		24%		
New Housing Units (building permits)		2,182		
			2000	Growth*
			Population	2,552,994
			Jobs	1,193,790
				7.0%
				24%

*percent change 1990-2000

Standards and Practices

Howard County's adequate public facilities ordinance was adopted in 1992 and requires development projects to pass three tests of adequacy: a housing unit allocations test, a roads test, and a school test. Minor subdivisions (4 lots or less) are exempt from the roads test.

A housing unit allocation is required for each residential lot or apartment unit. The General Plan has a target of 1,500 residential units per year between 2000 and 2020; annual allocations are adjusted upwards or downwards using a rolling average that reflects actual development activity.

The schools test is administered after the tentative housing unit allocation is granted. The Department of Education prepares for County Council adoption, an "open/closed school chart," which indicates for each year in a ten-year period, which elementary school districts, elementary school regions, and middle school districts, are open to new residential development.

A school is deemed adequate if capacity does not exceed 115% of program and region capacity. However, in a region where enrollment exceeds 100%, no single school district can receive more than 300 allocations in one year. If a development project is in an area designated as "closed," the project is

temporarily delayed until the elementary school district, the elementary school region, and the middle school district are open. A development project is delayed until the Department of Education builds a new school, adds on to an existing school, or through redistricting, reassigns students so that the children generated by the new development can be accommodated. If the Department of Education hasn't resolved the problem within four years, the development project may proceed.

The road test uses the critical lane volume method to test the adequacy of intersections. A LOS of D is considered adequate for County controlled intersections, and a LOS of E is considered adequate for State controlled intersections. Within the Planned Service Area Boundary, the impact area for the road test is a distance of 1.5 miles from the development. Outside the Planned Service Area Boundary, the impact area is 2.0 miles from the development.

Montgomery County, Maryland

Approach to Growth Management

Montgomery County is Maryland's largest jurisdiction and is located directly north of Washington, DC. Since the 1960s, growth in the County has been guided by the General Plan which concentrates development into growth corridors while protecting agricultural and open space in the "wedges" between these corridors.

To implement this vision, the County reduced permitted density in agricultural zones and established a transfer of development rights program to help compensate landowners. The County is also an active purchaser of land and development rights. Today, about one-third of the County is protected from overdevelopment through direct ownership or development easements.

In anticipation of the construction of the Washington, DC area's Metrorail system, the County selected station sites with the intent of encouraging higher density, mixed use activity centers at these locations. Bethesda and Silver Spring, near the DC boundary, are examples of stations where such plans have come to fruition. Stations further from the urban core are at various stages of planning and implementation.

A large part of the County's growth is within two cities that are not subject to the County's planning and growth policies. Both are now actively reviewing their adequate public facilities policies.

Contacts

Karl Moritz
Research Manager
Montgomery County Department of Park and Planning
Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission
8787 Georgia Avenue
Silver Spring, MD 20910
Telephone: (301) 495 1312
Fax: (301) 495 1305
Email: karl.moritz@mncppc.org
<http://www.mc-mncppc.org>

At a Glance

- ✓ Growth has been guided since the 1960s by a concept of "wedges and corridors" whereby new development is concentrated in corridors served by public facilities while wedges of agricultural and open space are protected.
- ✓ The two-tier transportation adequacy test measures both auto and non-auto modes.

Statistical Snapshot

FIPS: 24031

	2000	Growth*		2000	
Population	873,341	15%	Land Area (square miles)	496	
Under 18	221,758	24%	Persons/Square Mile	1,761	
Households	324,565	15%	Median Age	36.8	
Jobs	598,008	16%	Jobs per Household	1.8	
2000					
Median Household Income	\$70,794		Metropolitan Area: Washington, DC PMSA		
Median Housing Value	\$221,800				
Housing Value Growth*	11%				
New Housing Units (building permits)	4,950				
		2000		Growth*	
Population	4,923,153			25%	
Jobs	2,758,500			23%	

*percent change 1990-2000

Standards and Practices

Montgomery County implemented its adequate public facilities ordinance in 1973. The ordinance applies at subdivision to transportation, schools, water and sewer, and police, fire and health facilities. A major revision occurred in mid-1980s, when the County established the "Annual Growth Policy" as the mechanism to implement all but the water and sewerage requirements of the APFO (which are implemented in the County's Ten-Year Water and Sewer Plan").

Development projects are tested for transportation adequacy through a two-tier test. The first test uses a transportation model to determine growth ceilings in the 29 subareas of the County where growth is planned. There are separate ceilings for residential and non-residential development in each area. When existing and approved development reaches the ceiling, the area is in moratorium for new subdivisions. Ceilings are set to concentrate development in areas well-served by transit.

The second transportation test evaluates proposed development for its impact on nearby intersections. LOS standards vary by policy area; those with better transit facilities are permitted greater auto congestion.

Subdivisions may be approved in moratorium areas if the developer provides needed facilities or, if residential, provides a

significant component of affordable housing. Near Metro stations, the transportation test is waived upon payment of a tax and execution of a strong trip reduction agreement.

The standard for adequacy in the County's school test is that enrollment should not exceed 100% of capacity. Enrollment and capacity are measured on a cluster basis, and at the elementary, middle, and high school levels. For example, the enrollment and capacity of all of the elementary schools in one cluster are compared in the school test. If a cluster's enrollment is over 100% of capacity, a moratorium is not imposed if there is sufficient capacity in adjacent clusters to make up the difference. Classroom capacity in Montgomery County is 22 students in all-day kindergarten (44 in half-day), 25 students in grades 1-6, and 22.5 students for secondary grades. The school test looks five years into the future: the 5-year enrollment forecast is compared to school capacities in 5 years, which means school facilities are counted if they are fully funded in the first five years of the CIP.

During the 1970s, lack of sewerage facilities resulted in development moratoriums. From the 1980s onward, various areas have been in moratorium due to inadequate transportation facilities. In 2001, an area was placed in moratorium because of inadequate school facilities for the first time.

Prince George's County, Maryland

Approach to Growth Management

Prince George's County, Maryland surrounds the eastern half of the Washington, DC "diamond." It faces both the pressure of providing services to new growth the challenge of maintaining the vitality of its older suburbs.

In 1998 the County Council produced a study entitled *Managing Growth in the 21st Century: A Smart Growth Proposal for Prince George's County* which found that the 1982 General Plan was no longer adequate to guide growth in the County.

A new General Plan is currently under review by the County Council. The Plan divides the County into three tiers: a developed, a developing and a rural tier with linkages maintained by corridors and centers. The first priority for public facilities will be the developed and developing tiers, corridors and centers; the plan de-emphasize the extension of public water and sewer any further in to the rural tier. The plan encourages contiguous development and recommends that developers bear the full cost of on and off-site public facilities if development is non-contiguous.

In the recommended TDR program, sending areas would be the rural tier and green, intact, areas of the developed and developing tiers. An APF for transportation would not be required for any density increment permitted by TDR.

Contacts

John Funk
 Supervisor, Growth Policy and Public Facilities
 Prince George's County Planning Board and Planning Department
 Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission
 14741 Governor Oden Bowie Drive
 Upper Marlboro, MD, 20772
 Telephone: (301) 952 3680
 Email: john.funk@mncppc.org
 http://www.mncppc.org/county/main/htm

At a Glance

- ✓ Prince George's County is reviewing a new General Plan to guide new development and to protect and revitalize older, established areas.
- ✓ School adequacy is a major issue. In 2002, the school APFO test was revised and a School Facilities Surcharge was increased to a flat fee of \$5,000 per dwelling unit.

Statistical Snapshot

FIPS: 24013

	2000	Growth*
Population	801,515	10%
Under 18	214,602	21%
Households	286,610	11%
Jobs	403,532	6.0%

	2000
Land Area (square miles)	485
Persons/Square Mile	1,653
Median Age	33.3
Jobs per Household	1.4

	2000
Median Household Income	\$55,371
Median Housing Value	\$145,600
Housing Value Growth*	19%
New Housing Units (building permits)	3,456

*percent change 1990-2000

Metropolitan Area: Washington, DC PMSA		
	2000	Growth*
Population	4,923,153	25%
Jobs	2,758,500	23%

Standards and Practices

Prince George's County's adequate public facilities ordinance applies to roads, schools, police and fire service. Because the transportation adequacy test is proposed for major revision in the General Plan, County staff suggest any description in this document would soon be out of date.

The schools test was substantially revised in January, 2002. Schools are tested by cluster whereby existing enrollment plus enrollment due to new development is compared to capacity. New development enrollment is calculated by multiplying the number of new dwelling units by the following pupil yield factors: elementary: 0.24; middle: 0.06; high: 0.12. Cluster enrollment is adequate if it is less than 105% of the state rated capacity, as adjusted. If enrollment exceeds capacity by more than 105% the proposed subdivision is subject to a 3 year wait if there is a funded school within the cluster, or a 6 year wait if there is not. A funded school is one for which construction funds are shown within the first two years of the County CIP.

Development may be staged, without a waiting period, providing that each stage does not yield capacity to bring the cluster above 105%. If the number of students generated by the subdivision brings the

school cluster above 105% capacity the developer may mitigate the overcrowding by paying APF fees at the following rates: elementary: \$9,000 per student; middle: \$12,000 per student; high: \$10,000 per student. If enrollment exceeds capacity by more than 130% at any affected school, no permits will be issued until capacity exists below 130% in all the affected schools or four years have passed since preliminary plan approval.

The County also has a Schools Facilities Surcharge which applies to all new residential permits (except senior). As of July 2002, the fee is \$5,000 per dwelling unit. The fee is credited against any APF fees.

The fire and rescue facilities test measures response time and adequacy of equipment. If the subdivision lies within an adequate coverage area for all required services it is deemed adequately served; outside, it is not. The Planning Board makes the determination and the Public Facilities Planning Section determines appropriate mitigation measures.

Police coverage is considered adequate if there are 1.5 patrol officers per 1,000 residents, or 1 per 1,000 of commercial population. If a proposed subdivision will cause these ratios to be exceeded, the developer may pass the test by paying for the proportionate cost of the project's impact.

Rockville, Maryland

Approach to Growth Management

The City of Rockville, Maryland is the county seat of Montgomery County, and a suburb of Washington, D.C. The city is centrally located within Montgomery County along the I-270 corridor. As such, the city has become a major employment center for the region, with number of jobs available is almost double the city's population. Until now, the city has not had a formal growth policy. However, in 2002 the Mayor and Council directed the planning staff to initiate a study to develop an APFO for the city.

Contacts

Bob Spalding
 Chief of Planning
 Department of Community
 Planning and Development
 Services
 111 Maryland Avenue
 Rockville, MD 20850
 240-314-8222

At a Glance

- ✓ The city has experienced strong growth pressure, in both residences and employment, as a result of its central location in the region.
- ✓ The city has initiated a study to develop an APFO, separate from Montgomery County's APFO program.

Statistical Snapshot

FIPS: 67675

	2000	Growth*		2000	
Population	47,388	6%	Land Area (square miles)	13	
Under 18	12,023	10%	Persons/Square Mile	3,645	
Households	17,245	10%	Median Age	37.8	
Jobs	68,739	15%	Jobs per Household	3.9	
		2000	Metropolitan Area:	Washington, DC PMSA	
Median Household Income	\$68,074				
Median Housing Value	\$198,700				
Housing Value Growth*	9%				
New Housing Units (building permits)	1,412				
			2000	Growth*	
			Population	4,923,153	25%
			Jobs	2,758,500	23%

*percent change 1990-2000

Standards and Practices

The City's planning and zoning authority is independent from surrounding Montgomery County. Many major roads within the city are state highways. Many other arterials that serve the City and its immediate surroundings are controlled by the County. In addition, the school system and mass transit system are effectively beyond the City's control.

Currently, the City's Standard Traffic Methodology is used to review the impact of new development on local traffic. The threshold for the analysis is 100 new trips or more. Staff also analyses multi-modal access, although the focus of the Standard Traffic Methodology is on private vehicle trips. The Standard Traffic Methodology is being revised to formalize the review of multi-modal access. Further, the priority growth areas of the City are held to the same standard as non-priority areas.

Traffic studies are required to be submitted for development under the City's special development procedures

for mixed use developments. In such cases the City can deny development approval if the resulting trips are not adequately mitigated or other public facilities are overburdened. The adequacy of water, sewer, and stormwater management are evaluated on each development application. The City's APFO will formalize the standards that have been applied administratively and consolidate standards in one document.

St. Mary's County, Maryland

Approach to Growth Management

St. Mary's County, Maryland is located on a peninsula where the Potomac River meets the Chesapeake Bay. The County is home to the Naval Air Warfare Center-Aircraft Division and the Naval Air Systems Command which has spurred growth in both jobs and housing.

The Comprehensive Plan contains eight strategies for managing growth. These strategies call for concentrating growth in areas most suitable for growth, reducing growth in rural areas by one-half and directing growth in rural areas to existing centers, protecting sensitive areas, and providing public services to areas planned for growth.

The County levies impact fees at the following rates: schools: \$3,375; roads: \$450; and recreation and parks: \$675.

St. Mary's County's one municipality is Leonardtown, which has its own planning and zoning authority. County policies, including the APFO, do not apply to it, although town residents use County facilities, such as schools. The impact of Leonardtown students on County school enrollment is an ongoing issue.

The County has a purchase of development rights (PDR) and transfer of development rights (TDR) program. It is currently (January 2003) undergoing review along with other sections of the zoning ordinance.

Contacts

Jon Grimm
 Director, Department of Planning and Zoning
 22740 Washington Street
 Box 653
 Leonardtown, MD, 20650
 Telephone: (301) 475 4449
 Email: pz_planning@co.saint-marys.md.us
 Webpage: <http://www.co.saint-marys.md.us>

At a Glance

- ✓ St. Mary's County's Comprehensive Plan contains eight growth management strategies consistent with Maryland Smart Growth visions.
- ✓ The County has a new APFO and imposes an impact fee for roads, schools, recreation and parks.

Statistical Snapshot

FIPS: 24037

	2000	Growth*		2000
Population	86,211	13%	Land Area (square miles)	361
Under 18	24,080	12%	Persons/Square Mile	239
Households	30,642	20%	Median Age	34.2
Jobs	49,618	37%	Jobs per Household	1.6
		2000	Metropolitan Area:	N/A
Median Household Income		\$49,495		
Median Housing Value		\$150,000		
Housing Value Growth*		38%		
New Housing Units (building permits)		1,163		

**percent change 1990-2000*

Standards and Practices

A new County APFO policy was adopted on May 13, 2002. It applies to roads, schools, water and sewerage, fire prevention and suppression, and storm drainage. Compliance is required prior to final subdivision plan approval and/or site plan approval.

Except for water and sewer, the APFO exempts non-residential developments of less than 5,000 square feet floor area and residential sub-divisions of five or fewer lots. There is a mitigation fee option on all facilities except schools.

The APFO tests road adequacy in the area from the site of the proposed development to the next major intersection. Developers are required to build all roads on site and to coordinate pedestrian and bicycled access with vehicular access. A Traffic Impact Study is required if the Department of Public Works deems it necessary after examination of vehicle trip generation data.

The roadway adequacy standard is LOS D for residential, commercial and industrial development districts, and LOS C for all other areas. Unbuilt roads may be counted for adequacy if at least 75% funded in the CIP of the current fiscal year.

In addition to the above, the school adequacy test exempts non-residential

developments and dwelling units for those aged 55 and older.

Schools are considered adequate if elementary and secondary schools in the high school attendance zone can absorb the anticipated students without enrollment exceeding 100% of state-rated capacity. Planned schools may be counted for capacity if the additional capacity is funded in the current year of the CIP.

The water adequacy standard requires that all residential subdivision of 25 or more lots be connected to a public water system. All others may connect to individual wells but they must receive State permits and meet all State and County regulations. The sewerage adequacy standard requires that all public, multi-use and individual systems be sufficient to meet the anticipated volume and meet all State and County standards.

Public water systems or private wells are adequate for fire prevention and suppression if they provide sufficient volume and pressure to meet fire flow and storage capabilities.

Storm drainage systems are adequate if they can handle all on and off-site flows and 2, 10 and 100 years floods without erosion, sedimentation or flooding of the receiving channel or downstream properties.

Washington County, Maryland

Approach to Growth Management

Washington County is the easternmost of the three counties that make up the western Maryland panhandle. The pace of growth in the County has accelerated in the past decade as the Baltimore-Washington metropolitan area expands. Recently the County has taken steps to strengthen its approach to managing growth.

In August of 2003, the County approved a revised comprehensive plan which reduced allowable residential densities in agricultural zones from one unit per acre to one unit per five acres.

In November of 2003, County Commissioners voted to impose a one-year moratorium on large residential developments. The moratorium is designed to give the County time to revised its zoning ordinance to reflect the changes to the comprehensive plan.

The comprehensive plan establishes urban and town growth areas where growth is encouraged.

Washington County has nine municipalities: Boonsboro, Clear Spring, Funkstown, Hagerstown, Hancock, Keedysville, Sharpsburg, Smithsburg and Williamsport. All were incorporated in the 19th century and all contain historic structures and/or districts. The municipalities are not subject to the County APFO.

Contacts

Robert Arch
Planning Department
County Administrative Annex
80 West Baltimore Street
Hagerstown, MD, 21740
Telephone: (240) 313 2430
Fax: (249) 313 2431
Email: rarch@washco-md.net
Webpage: <http://www.wc-link.org/washco/plan.html>

At a Glance

- ✓ Washington County has imposed a one-year moratorium on large residential development projects while it completes growth-related revisions to its zoning ordinance
- ✓ The County's APFO features a road test without an explicit level of service standard.

Statistical Snapshot

FIPS: 24043

	2000	Growth*		2000
Population	131,923	9%	Land Area (square miles)	458
Under 18	30,914	12%	Persons/Square Mile	288
Households	49,726	11%	Median Age	37.4
Jobs	76,094	14%	Jobs per Household	1.5
			Metropolitan Area:	N/A
	2000			
Median Household Income	\$37,327			
Median Housing Value	\$115,000			
Housing Value Growth*	39%			
New Housing Units (building permits)	721			

*percent change 1990-2000

Standards and Practices

Washington County's adequate public facilities ordinance was adopted in 1990 and its last revision was in 1995. The APFO applies at subdivision to roads, schools, and water. It applies to fire protection where public or multi-use water system is not available.

New development is tested to see if roads will be adequate to serve the projected volume of traffic, as determined by the County Engineer and/or State Highway Administration (SHA). The road test does not contain LOS standards. If a Traffic Impact Study is required, the study area will be from the site entrance to the nearest designated intersection, with the traffic flow as determined by the Planning Commission or the SHA.

Planned road improvements may be counted for adequacy if they are funded in the County CIP within two years from the anticipated date of the final plat approval, and within the 6 year State capital budget.

Washington County has a number of unusual exemptions to its road adequacy test, including subdivision of land used for agricultural purposes solely for transfer to a member of the immediate family of the owners, and the subdivision of an original tract used for agricultural purposes into no more than 4 lots when "there exists in the

original tract of land 25 acres per each lot subdivided and the road in front of each lot to be subdivided is no less than 16 feet."

The school adequacy tests exempts non-residential development, housing for the elderly, and new development of detached or semi-detached residences in designated Urban Growth Areas or Town Growth areas, according to the Comprehensive Plan.

Public schools are considered adequate if they can accommodate current and projected enrollment without exceeding 105% of capacity, as determined by the Washington County Board of Education. The Planning Department reviews school adequacy every 6 months. For a development to be approved, schools should either be currently adequate, or have sufficient capacity programmed in the Washington County Capital Budget or Six-Year Capital Improvement Program, to be adequate within 6 years of final plat or site plan approval. The Board of Commissioners has the authority to limit the number of building permits in any school district.

There is an interim fire protection water flow requirement when public water will not be available for two years.

Durham, North Carolina

Approach to Growth Management

Durham is located in central North Carolina and is part of the "Research Triangle" area that comprises the counties of Durham (City of Durham,) Wake (City of Raleigh) and Orange (City of Chapel Hill). Durham has City/County government structure and land use regulations apply to both areas. An Urban Growth Area has been established outside city limits and growth is being targeted to land within it. In addition a Purchase of Development Rights (PDR) program has been implemented to offer a provision for the protection of rural land.

The Durham area has seen double-digit rates of growth in both population and jobs during the past twenty years. During the 1980s the population grew by 19% and jobs by a 55%. In the 1990s the situation reversed somewhat with the population growing by 23% and job growth "slowing" to 36%. After twenty years of growth Durham is just beginning to consider implementing growth management practices. The existing Durham 2020 Plan is, according to Planning Director, Frank Duke, more of a land use plan than a comprehensive one, and the department is developing a new Comprehensive Plan to meet the needs of a growing urban/suburban jurisdiction. The City/County has hired Duncan & Associates to work on this project.

Contacts

Frank M. Duke AICP
City/County Planning Director
101 City Hall Plaza
Durham, NC, 27701
Telephone: (919) 560 4137
Fax: (919) 560 4641
Email: fduke@ci.durham.nc.us
Webpage: <http://www.ci.durham.nc.us/departments/planning>

At a Glance

- ✓ Durham's current growth management tools include an urban growth boundary and a purchase of development rights program.
- ✓ Durham is working on a new comprehensive plan. The planning effort includes a "Smart Growth Audit" containing strategy papers for adequate public facilities and infill development.

Statistical Snapshot

FIPS: 37063

	2000	Growth*		2000
Population	223,314	23%	Land Area (square miles)	290
Under 18	51,209	24%	Persons/Square Mile	770
Households	89,015	23%	Median Age	32.2
Jobs	199,162	2%	Jobs per Household	2.2
			Metropolitan Area:	Raleigh-Durham-Chapel Hill MSA
				2000 Growth*
Median Household Income	\$43,337		Population	1,187,941 61%
Median Housing Value	\$129,000		Jobs	683,900 46%
Housing Value Growth*	51%			
New Housing Units (building permits)	2,863			

*percent change 1990-2000

Standards and Practices

Duncan & Associates have compiled a "Smart Growth Audit," to assist in the planning and implementation process. It comprises a draft Unified Development Code (UDC) that was issued in November 2002, and six strategy papers that were issued in June, 2002. The six papers cover Visual Character, Residential Development, Nonresidential Development, Smart Growth, Development Review, and Downtown Strategy. These papers are available online from the Durham website.

Each paper outlines the issues facing Durham and offers strategies for addressing them, as well as strategies for planning for future development. The City/County does not have an APFO in place, but is considering using one in future. The paper on "Smart Growth" gives a comprehensive overview of Adequate Public Facilities, which notes, "The comprehensive plan of a community should provide a definition (or a basis for defining) facility and service capacity." The overview goes on to note, "From a good planning perspective, the Comprehensive Plan should be reviewed to concisely add the level of service standards from other plans, and also ensure that the standards are consistent with long-term future land use planning, and existing land uses."

The new Unified Development Code (UDC) contains a revised Subdivision Ordinance that makes provision for the Reservation of Public Facility Sites and Lands. This provision lays out a timetable for the local authority to decide if it wishes to reserve a site (or sites) for public facilities. In addition, public school authorities are given "18 months from the date of preliminary plat approval to acquire the site by purchase, by receipt of dedication, or by initiating condemnation proceedings." If the school authority does not take any of these actions within the 18 months stipulated the land is no longer subject to reservation. Other public facilities are offered 120 days to exercise similar options.

Part of Durham's strategy for development involves revitalizing existing areas using infill and redevelopment techniques. These plans naturally call for citizen participation, and in the Development Review section Duncan & Associates have recommended a revised approach to citizen participation that requires the creation of a Citizen Participation Plan. Under this Plan developers undertake to work together with surrounding neighbors, and neighborhood associations. The plan emphasizes improving procedures with the aim of "improving the quality of involvement" rather than simply the quantity of involvement.

Forsyth County, North Carolina

Approach to Growth Management

Forsyth County, North Carolina, is home to the city of Winston Salem, and the area has a City/County planning department that was created in 1948 by the State Legislature. It was the first such agency in the State and is responsible for managing growth and planning throughout the County. This, together with countywide management of the road and sewer networks, gives a coordinated approach between the county and its eight municipalities.

The Legacy Development Guide has recently been developed as a comprehensive plan for the entire county. As part of its growth management strategy the Guide establishes boundaries between the rural areas and the urban/suburban/future growth, and sets out six goals for achieving compact, sustainable future growth:

Forsyth County has a Purchase of Development Rights (PDR) program to assist in the preservation of farmland and open space.

Implementation: City and County managers have requested that all departments integrate Legacy recommendations into their work plans. In addition, the Zoning Ordinance, Environmental Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations are all included in the Unified Development Ordinances (UDO) that applies to all jurisdictions in the County, and individual jurisdictions are bringing their own codes and regulations into alignment.

Contacts

Paul Norby
 City-County Planning Board of
 Winston-Salem/Forsyth County, NC
 101 North Main Street, Room 15
 Winston-Salem, NC, 27101
 Telephone: (336) 727 2087
 Email: paln@ci.winston-salem.nc.us
 Webpage: <http://www.co.forsyth.nc.us/ccpb/director.htm>

At a Glance

- ✓ Forsyth County and its eight municipalities have a coordinated approach to planning and growth management
- ✓ The County is working to “add teeth” to its newly-adopted Growth Management Plan by discouraging premature development of land that lacks public facilities.

Statistical Snapshot

FIPS: 37067

	2000	Growth*		2000
Population	306,067	15%	Land Area (square miles)	410
Under 18	73,222	21%	Persons/Square Mile	746
Households	123,851	15%	Median Age	36
Jobs	223,901	17%	Jobs per Household	1.8
			Metropolitan Area: Greensboro-Winston Salem-	
			High Point MSA	
				2000 Growth*
Median Household Income	\$42,097		Population	1,251,509 33%
Median Housing Value	\$114,000		Jobs	554,600 21%
Housing Value Growth*	51%			
New Housing Units (building permits)	2,875			

*percent change 1990-2000

Standards and Practices

Forsyth County’s Legacy Development Guide sets out six goals for achieving compact, sustainable future growth:

1. Higher development densities and mixed-use development within the Municipal Services Area (MSA).
2. Increase infill development within the MSA.
3. A more balanced pattern of growth and development in Forsyth County.
4. Reserve Growth Areas for long-range urban development*
5. Preservation of farmland, open space and rural character within the Rural Area.
6. Adoption and implementation by all municipalities of the Growth Management Plan as part of Legacy.

As part of Goal 4 the Plan has identified the objective as the “Timing of Facilities and Services.” This objective recommends the identification of future development land while, at the same time, discouraging premature development of land that is not served by public facilities. The utility authority is instructed to plan for the provision of services “on a phased basis” to identified growth areas. In addition, the planning department is working with the Utilities Commission to limit the extension of sewer lines further into rural areas unless there is an existing public health problem.

The Legacy plan has identified twenty-three indicators for which data already exists, or that can be easily collected, and has established benchmarks for each indicator to measure progress towards meeting the stated goals and objectives. This will be monitored annually, and a full review will be conducted in 2005. The indicators include measures of:

- Compactness of new development
- “Balanced” development (percentage of development in East Winston-Salem, which has failed to attract redevelopment)
- Transit use and van-pooling
- Vehicle use (reduce increase)
- Downtown economic activity (new office space, vacancy rates, and workers)
- Downtown residential development
- Housing affordability
- Traditional neighborhood development
- Landscaping (number of street trees)
- Air quality, water quality, and waste disposal
- Acres of parks, open space, and miles of greenways
- Subdivisions with “open space design”
- Percentage of classrooms that are portables
- Racial Integration

Huntersville, North Carolina

Approach to Growth Management

The Town of Huntersville is the fastest growing municipality in the State of North Carolina. It is located in the eastern part of the State, in Mecklenburg County, twelve miles north of the city of Charlotte, and has absorbed part of the growth of the metropolitan region.

A valued aspect of the Town is the “open space and agricultural lands that define the eastern and western portions of the Town’s 64-square mile planning jurisdiction...this contrast between city and county largely characterizes Huntersville and presents a significant challenge for local officials: how best to accommodate new development while preserving the open spaces and farmland...”

In 1996 the Town adopted a zoning ordinance that emphasized the principles of traditional town planning, in part to move away from “inefficient suburban sprawl.” A series of ordinances mandate design features that emphasize the same principles. The Town has been nationally recognized for these initiatives. But, despite the emphasis on compact development, the Town acknowledges that the pressures of growth continue, and notes incidences of “leapfrog” development that have benefited from the provision of water and sewer lines by the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Utility Department. The Town is also suffering from traffic congestion.

Contacts

Jack Simoneau
 Director, Planning Department
 Town of Huntersville
 101 Huntersville-Concord Road
 Huntersville, NC, 28070
 Telephone: (704) 875 7000
 Fax: (704) 875 6546
 Email: jsimoneau@huntersville.org
 Webpage: <http://www.huntersville.org>

At a Glance

- ✓ Huntersville’s design-oriented approach has achieved quality compact development, but concern about sprawl and open space remain.
- ✓ The Town is now pursuing a voluntary transfer of development rights program to help achieve its goal of preserving open and agricultural space.

Statistical Snapshot

FIPS: 33120

	2000	Growth*		2000
Population	24,960	728%	Land Area (square miles)	31.5
Under 18	7,075	829%	Persons/Square Mile	801
Households	9,171	630%	Median Age	33
Jobs	N/A	N/A	Jobs per Household	2
			Metropolitan Area:	Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill MSA
				2000 Growth*
Median Household Income	\$71,932		Population	1,499,293 29%
Median Housing Value	\$182,800		Jobs	625,400 35%
Housing Value Growth*	113%			
New Housing Units (building permits)	N/A			

*percent change 1990-2000

Standards and Practices

The Town does not have an adequate public facilities ordinance, or other mechanism for managing the timing of growth. However, a revised Zoning Ordinance has been developed that, among other items, emphasizes the provision of sidewalks, as a means of improving walkability.

The revised Ordinance also creates a Transitional Residential District: this District is intended to act as a buffer between the urban and rural zones and to encourage conservation and cluster subdivisions. A new Subdivision Ordinance is also being considered, and a provision for public facilities has been reserved. Public hearings on these Ordinances are being held at the end of January, 2003, and the Town Board is expected to vote on them on February 17, 2003.

Faced with the need for additional mechanisms to preserve open space, the Town established a task force composed of landowners, developers, and citizens. Following the mayor’s commitment to “voluntary agreements rather than heavy-handed government policies” the task force recommended a voluntary transfer, or purchase, of development rights program. The Town is moving ahead with the proposal which will require State enabling legislation.

Huntersville, in conjunction with two neighboring municipalities—Cornelius and Davidson—has engaged in a number of cooperative long-range projects designed to combat suburban sprawl, encourage light rail connections to surrounding communities, and preserve rural lands. Together these three towns comprise 100 square miles of Mecklenburg County.

Wake County, North Carolina

Approach to Growth Management

Wake County is located in north-central North Carolina and is part of the "Research Triangle" area. The population of the County grew by more than 40% in the 1980s and by 48% during the 1990s. This rapid rate of growth has raised a number of growth management issues and the county's land use policies have focused on conserving and improving the environment, rather than attempting to influence the rate or pace of growth.

The County has formed a Growth Management Task Force that includes the County's twelve municipalities and the School Board, and is in the process of revising growth management policies. A system of multi-tiered Urban Service Areas was established in previous plans. The system delineates areas where services - essentially water and sewer - are currently provided, and where they will be provided within the next ten years. Land outside the Service Areas are intended to remain rural, although there is provision for a buffer zone, between the 10-year line and the rural area, where services are planned but on a timeframe of more than 10 years. This system has guided the placement of development and is in the process of revision, with differing environmental requirements for each area.

The County has a Purchase of Development Rights program to conserve rural land.

At a Glance

- ✓ Environmental concerns have driven constraints on growth in the past.
- ✓ The County has formed a "Growth Management Task Force" that includes representatives from twelve municipalities and the School Board. Managing growth through the provision of public facilities is a central issue.

Statistical Snapshot

FIPS: 37183

	2000	Growth*	2000		
Population	627,846	48%	Land Area (square miles)	831	
Under 18	157,597	61%	Persons/Square Mile	755	
Households	242,040	46%	Median Age	32.9	
Jobs	481,726	52%	Jobs per Household	2.0	
			Metropolitan Area:	Raleigh-Durham-Chapel Hill MSA	
				2000 Growth*	
Median Household Income	\$54,988		Population	1,187,941	61%
Median Housing Value	\$162,000		Jobs	683,900	46%
Housing Value Growth*	66%				
New Housing Units (building permits)	12,913				

*percent change 1990-2000

Standards and Practices

Most of the growth management initiatives that Wake County has undertaken so far have environmental protection as their main objective, although they do have the effect of regulating growth by limiting land supply.

Watershed Protection: In January 2003 the County approved a plan to strengthen regulations regarding land use in watersheds with a view to protecting drinking water supplies and working to prevent flooding and erosion. A number of proposals were put forward, including, the creation of 100-foot buffers on perennial streams within priority watersheds and 50-foot buffers on all other streams, encouraging conservation (clustered) subdivisions that would conserve open space, and the restriction of development on the 100-year floodplain.

Clean air is an emerging critical issue for the area. If present conditions continue the Triangle area will fall out of compliance with the EPA's clean air regulations by December 2004, and in December 2002 Wake County announced that it is working with adjacent counties to seek solutions to the problem.

On the issue of adequacy of recreational facilities, the County encourages cooperation between agencies and there are currently seventeen School Parks and twelve Community Schools. The newly adopted

(October 2002) 7-year plan for Parks and Recreation renews that emphasis as part of its mission to increase the provision of community facilities, and to ensure they are more evenly distributed throughout the county. The annotated Subdivision Ordinance, which was also adopted in October 2002, includes a requirement for developers to make a contribution towards the provision of recreational space. A dedication of 1/35 acre of land per lot, or the monetary equivalent, is required.

Contacts

Mike Jennings,
 Program Coordinator,
 Environmental Services,
 Wake County
 P.O. Box 550
 Raleigh NC 27602 0550
 Telephone: (919) 856 6315
 Fax: (919) 856 6184
 Email: mjennings@co.wake.nc.us
 Webpage: <http://www.wake.nc.us/planning/gmtf.nsf>

