COUNTY-WIDE COORDINATION AND PLANNING

Essential to any successful growth management strategy is county-wide coordination and planning. To ensure the success of growth management, the county should be a conduit for navigation through the hierarchy of governments. Without a common link between various levels of government, one community's growth can become another community's urban sprawl. In general, growth management at the county level can be most effective when there is regional and/or statewide public commitment for their efforts.

Research on coordinated county-wide planning indicates the following factors are necessary to consider in managing growth. These factors are: environmental quality, social and economic considerations, political feasibility, public education, public participation, legal constraints, and team-based management.

Often, a combination of one or more of these factors surfaced in the researched techniques. It is recommended that all these factors be assessed before any county-wide growth management strategy can be implemented and enforced.
COUNTY-WIDE COORDINATION

When governing powers are used to restrict or channel new development, as in growth management, questions arise concerning the rationale, authority, and implementation of those powers. Counties have the unique capacity to serve as an arena to address these questions in a process that involves local officials, legislators, judges, interest groups, and citizens who seek agreement and resolution. As a political unit encompassing diverse populations, land uses, and visions of the future, the county is well suited to coordinate the divergent interests and local efforts necessary to implement effective growth management plans.

The transition from general community concern over unconsolidated development to program implementation is difficult under even the best circumstances. However, successful growth management at the local level requires political commitment, concrete decisions, consistent program design, and strong leadership. A county may assume leadership to accomplish the goals of growth management. Thus the first two principles we discuss pertain to the county's roles in coordinating growth management within its borders. These roles include 1) the facilitator and 2) the director of coordinated local planning efforts. The following techniques warrant examination for any county wanting to foster successful governmental coordination in order to arrest costly sprawl. (Carter, 1977, p. 253.)

The County as Facilitator

Since the county government is the only area-wide government considered to remain at the local level, it has the ability to exercise initiative in developing a growth management plan at the sub-state level. Counties also should recognize the planning needs of larger, multi-county regions and encourage all governmental units within such regions to participate in cooperative regional growth planning. County governments, through their elected officials, can take a leadership role in organizing the institutions and administering the mechanisms that can result in voluntary solutions to regional problems.

To this end, county-facilitated communication between state and local governments aims to establish consistency in planning among various jurisdictions. As facilitator, the county should endorse the idea that land, money, and environmental resources should not be expended at a rate faster than the costs of development can be absorbed and also distribute
growth and its benefits among all segments of the population. This role may arguably be the most important role a county plays in successful growth management plans.

As counties place themselves on the firing line by recommending innovative, progressive growth management techniques, they need to be aware of successful coordination strategies applied in other regions or states to ensure their efforts are sustainable. (Hillenbrand, 1975, pp. 149-151.)

Regional-Local Cooperative Model

In this technique, a county assists in the preparation of growth management plans at the local level, particularly if such planning is voluntary for all communities. A regional body is delegated the responsibility for plan review and approval and is comprised of top elected official of the county—or each county if done at a regional scale—and municipality. This body is also responsible for preparing the regional plan with consideration of local plans. (Innes, 1993, p. 34.)

This method of resolving conflicting jurisdictional issues is used in Georgia and is an element of the state's "bottom-up" planning process. Here, regional plans are drawn up by the Regional Development Centers (RDCs) and take local plans into account. A state Board of Community Affairs (BCA), which is made up of local elected officials and interested citizens, defines regional boundaries and helps the governor develop a state plan that considers regional and local plans. The over-seeing body is the Department of Community Affairs and is responsible for developing broad, state-wide strategies, certifying local governments as qualified to plan, reviewing and commenting on local plans, and mediating conflicts between local governments and their respective RDCs. There is no defined plan or concrete goal in the state's legislation, and this strategy "allows for more variation in local plans among regions according to growth conditions, customs, political trends, environmental constraints, and other circumstances." (Gale, 1992, p. 434.)
Cross-acceptance

In the state of New Jersey, the state-wide growth management legislation designates counties as mediating bodies for the process of cross-acceptance between state and municipalities. (Innes, 1993, p. 37.) As described by Gale,

"Cross-acceptance allows for negotiation between the commission and the local governments over terms and conditions each agree to endorse. Municipalities and counties prepare local plans and regulations consistent with and responding to the state plan. If they choose, however, they could propose alternative terms and conditions and seek to reach accommodation with the commission through cross-acceptance." (1992, p. 434.)

Under cross-acceptance, New Jersey aims to achieve collaboration by insisting localities work together with the county to prepare a report that identifies the localities' own plans, conditions, and projections. This report helps the county identify discrepancies between regional or local plans and the state's plan. The next step is to resolve these discrepancies through give-and-take negotiation among the localities. In using cross-acceptance techniques, members can understand each other's positions and come to care about finding solutions that are acceptable to everyone. "They [the localities] put creative energy into the invention of new strategies that may run counter to their original assumptions." (Innes, 1992, p. 447-450.)

County-Local Planning Requirements

The Washington State Growth Management Plan incorporates a model for planning at the local and county levels, thus removing state responsibility for plan coordination at the local level. In this way, new growth is anticipated and planned for within a county-local context.

In this technique, "county governments, not regional bodies, play a central role, working out differences between county and local plans and among local plans." (Gale, 1992, p. 436.) This model supports the state's overall growth management plan by mandating the local and county plan preparation in rapidly growing jurisdictions. Other communities retain authority for discretion in opting to plan or not.
When a community plans under the county-local model, the state may review and comment on the plan, but the responsibility of negotiation and adoption falls on the county government. This responsibility gives much room to the counties to gain consensus among their communities concerning growth management plans. (Gale, 1992, pp. 425-439.)

Information, Education, Monitoring, and Technical Assistance

Development can be guided by educating the public and improving the market with better information and better communication. This process may include dispersing information on local and regional land values, available public support services, and natural resource problems and opportunities. Development decisions can be improved by communicating the consequences or impacts of a project prior to final approval.

Also, the importance of monitoring developments after their construction is growing due to an inability to accurately predict the consequences of many projects. Monitoring can make use of predetermined standards and criteria to ensure that a development approved under a new growth management system will meet the basic social and fiscal objectives of the area.

The availability of technical assistance from the county can be an important consideration in many small jurisdictions. Development decisions that are made with unsophisticated or out-of-date information could be overcome when support staff could be brought in to handle some of the newer, more complex information management systems, such as Geographic Information Systems. (Einsweiler, 1975, pp. 298-299).

In Wisconsin, the University of Wisconsin operates a community educational service through the counties. The University of Wisconsin-Extension Office provides educational and informational opportunities covering a wide variety of subjects, including resource policy and land-use planning. They have initiated programs to help individuals and organizations (public and private) address urgent questions on land resources.

The County as Director

Coordination is the principal issue the county should address in the process of resolution, implementation, and/or enforcement of a growth management plan. The county’s duty stems
from the necessity to encourage programs that will benefit the area as a whole, yet also maintain each community’s desired quality of life. To fulfill this duty, however, the county needs to do more than facilitate communication among its municipalities. The county also can actively direct the coordination of intergovernmental efforts. Examples of counties having fulfilled the role of director are discussed in the following section and will assist in understanding this role.

Directing growth management involves participation at all levels—the community as a whole, the citizens, and the governmental bodies. The challenge is to preserve reasonable environmental quality, yet also make provisions for commerce and industry. The county typically has the necessary scope or vision to include these diverse needs and wants within a regional context. Although the potential is present for greater county involvement, a county, in reality, is often not empowered to control anything except select services or to conduct mediation.

A full understanding of the county’s authority and control is needed. Depending on the political environment of the county, the lack of formal or legal control can render advisory decisions ineffective if communities value strong political independence. When directed from an advisory position, an effective system of coordinated planning can emerge and address the land speculation game now driving development and inhibiting efforts to facilitate responsible growth. (Harman, 1975, p. 154-155.)

County Comprehensive Plan

Development of a comprehensive plan at the county level must address issues ranging from broad policy to detailed implementation. Included in such plans are housing provisions, appropriate land uses, transportation to accommodate current and projected population, and those facilities or services that promote the general welfare. Coordinated planning with surrounding jurisdictions intends to accommodate regional consistency and is required in Washington, Maine, Florida, and Vermont. Time frames for the planning process and plan updates vary in each state.
Walworth County, Wisconsin adheres to the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission Comprehensive Plan through a process of municipal acceptance and compliance.

In 1990/1991 the State of Washington’s House adopted Bill 2929, Growth Management Act, and House Bill 1025 with Amendments. These programs address the growth management needs of the thirty-nine counties within the State, while maintaining inter-county compatibility and consistency. Updates for Washington’s urban districts are reviewed every 10 years. (Blaesser, 1992, pp. 427-430.) Other states that use county comprehensive planning include Florida, Georgia, and Oregon. (Einsweiler, 1992.)

Implementation of ISTEAP Requirements

The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991 necessitates county and regional cooperation as a basis for the dispersal of federal funds to local jurisdictions. This cooperation must produce a regionally consistent plan to qualify for local, matching-share funds. (SEWRPC, 1992, p. 71.) The idea of improving management planning addresses the long-term goals of ISTEA and the programs needed to carry out all related transportation work. (US Department of Transportation, 1991.) Also of note is the ability of ISTEA to flex with the growth and change occurring in urban areas. (SEWRPC, 23.)

The Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC) has been designated as the metropolitan planning organization, or MPO, for Southeastern Wisconsin, since the 1960s. This MPO status now requires SEWRPC to carry out the regional planning process legislated by ISTEA and involve all appropriate parties, including operators of mass transit to state agencies. (SEWRPC, 1992, p. 25.) This coordination assists the implementation of proactive metropolitan planning in addressing transportation concerns.

Land Acquisition

Government ownership of land provides the greatest potential for direct control or management of land. In this technique, land is acquired only after determining the site’s current land use and evaluating the need or value of preserving that use or the site, in general. If it is determined that the land should be preserved, the cost and political feasibility of that
acquisition are then assessed. For example, acquisition of purchase or development rights can be used to preserve a county’s prime farmland. Buying development rights on farmland also could lower farm taxes, thus enabling farmland to remain agriculturally productive and preserving open space. (Goode, 1975, p. 293.)

Broward County, Florida and Lancaster County, Pennsylvania are two counties that use land acquisition as a technique for growth management. With the outmigration of farm families from Lancaster County, there arose the need to control the rate at which agricultural land turned over to housing developments. Land acquisition was one of the policies adopted by Lancaster County. The estimated cost of preserving one acre of Pennsylvania land, through development rights acquisition, is approximately $100 million. (Einsweiler, 1992, p. 13.)

In Marin County, California, maintenance of tight controls over open space and farmland have resulted in eighty-eight percent of the county remaining undeveloped (Einsweiler, 1992, p. 55.)

Finally, Suffolk County, New York, utilizes development rights acquisition for the preservation of farmland and open space. The main impetus behind this program is the location of this county on the very populated and urbanized Long Island in New York. (Hillenbrand, 1975, p. 150.)

Land Banking

Land banking, though similar to land acquisition, occurs where public acquisition is required as a condition for urban expansion. The land acquired is often held for public or private use at a later time, when other areas of the urban environment have either reached higher, more urban densities. If the land is utilized by a private developer, it is to be leased from public ownership or sold with deed restrictions in place.

Boulder County, Colorado secures the acquisition funds for land banking of recreation and greenbelt areas through sales tax. Sarasota County, Florida issues bonds for the purchasing of scenic easements and recreation areas. Montgomery County, Maryland acquires land through a long-standing revolving funds program—a pseudo-land banking approach. (Goode, 1975, p. 293.)
COUNTY-WIDE PLANNING

The final, physical product of county-wide coordinated planning is frequently a plan approved by each municipal government within the county, as was discussed under the comprehensive plan technique above. The process involved in county-wide planning is now discussed according to three final principles. These principles of county-wide planning are: 1) land use control, 2) compatible and consistent uses of land across municipal boundaries, and 3) public facilities provision as a physical guide to growth. This section provides an overview of the specific techniques used to achieve these principles. These growth management techniques can be classified according to one of the three principle: 1) geographic techniques, 2) negotiation techniques, and 3) infrastructure techniques. The techniques are discussed within the context of county-wide growth management.

Land Use Controls: Geographic Techniques for County-wide Plans

Geographic techniques are designed to control the location of development. Examples of these techniques range from legislated boundaries that designate the extent of future development to seemingly unobtrusive zoning used to preserve agricultural lands. Regardless of the specifics, all geographic techniques attempt to guide growth to land that is best suited for proposed uses.

For geographic techniques to effectively determine the physical location of growth, three important issues should be considered. First, planners should project future land use demands in the local market. Second, municipalities and planners are legally bound to ensure land holders a reasonable use of their property. Finally, as the specific uses allowed in distinct zoning categories evolve, planners should realize that consequences or side effects likely will vary over time. (Einsweiler, 1975, p. 47.) With these considerations in mind, the following geographic techniques are presented with their definitions and examples of municipalities where they are employed.

Urban Growth Boundaries or Urban Service Limits

Many growth management efforts include setting specific geographic boundaries within which the local government plans to provide public services and facilities. Urban
development beyond this service limit either is discouraged or prohibited. Boundaries usually are based on growth projections over ten to twenty years and require periodic reviews and updates. The limits are intended to provide more efficient services to new and existing developments, to preserve undeveloped land, and to protect natural resources. Urban growth boundaries are used extensively in Oregon, Florida, Colorado, Maryland, and California, and usually are accompanied by state legislation.

In Lancaster County, Pennsylvania urban growth boundaries were set to accommodate population growth over twenty years in an area including the City of Lancaster, eighteen county boroughs, and the developed portions of adjacent townships. Future growth was projected based on past trends and an assessment of the communities' ability to, and responsibility in, accepting growth. Rural areas of the county are required to designate specific acreage for non-urban land uses. Other growth management techniques are used in conjunction with urban growth boundaries to manage development in Lancaster County. (Einsweiler, 1992, p. 14.) Other localities where urban growth boundaries are in place include: the City of Cannon Beach and the City of Portland, Oregon; Lexington-Fayette County, Kentucky; and Montgomery County, Maryland.

Designated Development Area or Development Districts

Miles has stated that "[designated development areas are] similar to urban growth boundaries in that certain areas within a community are designated as urbanized, urbanizing, future urban, and/or rural, within which different policies for future development apply. [This strategy is] used to encourage development in an urbanizing area or redevelopment in an urbanized area." (1991, p. 220.)

Similarly, development districts create a public authority with the powers to tax for the development of land, as well as to develop it. This method spreads the costs of development over properties that will benefit from growth. Montgomery County, Maryland is one of many communities that uses this strategy of managing growth in centers of high-activity, such as transit stations and office or shopping complexes. (Einsweiler, 1975, p. 283.) Many other counties and cities designate such development areas, principally in the form of Business Improvement Districts and Tax Incremental Financing Districts.
Farmland Preservation via Exclusive Agriculture Zoning

Single-use zones are one technique used to exclude uses other than agriculture, thus directly limiting new, non-farm development and growing populations. Single-use zones are most effective when communities first determine if the goal is to preserve farmland or to preserve the visual character of open space, as the specific techniques differ between the two goals. Of course, the profitability and future of local farming is an important consideration when setting priorities in zoning restrictions.

In Wisconsin, an existing farmland preservation program provides property-tax relief to owners of farmlands and encourages local governments to develop additional agricultural preservation policies. In this program, tax relief is provided in the form of a credit used to reduce income-tax liability and is based on household income, personal property taxes, and the specific land-use provisions that protect farmland—whether a preservation agreement or exclusive agricultural zoning. Seventy of the State's seventy-two counties have farmland preservation plans. Additionally, most states in the U.S. have some type of farmland preservation program.

Differential Assessment or Preferential Tax Policies

Local property taxes traditionally are based on a property's urban market value. Yet, some states have introduced alternative assessment methods as a strategy for managing growth. Such alternative methods typically are based on current use rather than on urban market value—often believed to be the "highest and best use" for the property. This technique indirectly manages the use of land by strategic tax-rate structuring, thus rewarding particular uses. In such alternative tax policies, a "recapture" provision can be levied if and when a property's use changes, thereby offsetting the difference between the previous preferential rate and the standard market rate. Caution is needed in adopting preferential taxation; "[p]referential taxation can provide a haven for speculators if not carefully tied to a plan, the permanent provision of the use being preferentially treated, or an unearned increment tax." (Einsweiler, 1992, p. 297.)

Typically, differential assessments fall in one of three categories, two of which employ the concept of abatement, or the exemption of tax liability. These categories include a) pure
preferential assessment with full abatement, b) deferred taxation with partial or with no abatement, and 3) restrictive agreements, under which a farm owner contracts to maintain land in farm uses in return for a lower assessment.

One currently used case of strategic taxing is used in Montgomery County, Maryland and intends to preserve rural character. The County created a new zoning category in which five-acre minimum lots are considered to have a rural visual character and are required for residential development. These so-called “rural zones” use preferential assessment for existing farms to preserve existing agricultural land. Counties that currently employ differential assessment taxation include: Dade County, Florida; Loudoun County, Virginia; and Sacramento and Stanislaus Counties, California.

Cluster Zoning and Planned Unit Developments (PUD)

Another direct method of controlling the character and type of future development requires that approved subdivision plats or plans be recorded prior to the sale of available lots. This method regulates the width, depth, density, and size of lots, thereby setting the parameters for allowable development type. Similarly, the recorded plans provide the standards for both the design and construction of utilities, streets, drainage, water and sewer lines, and, in many instances, community recreational facilities. Such plans also may restrict development in sensitive environmental areas or corridors, while some innovative ordinances require open space in all new developments.

Planned Unit Developments combine select qualities of subdivision regulations and zoning into one development ordinance, identifying lot division and permissible mixed land uses. The deliberative planning process of creating Planned Unit Developments can serve as an incentive for better development by allowing complete plans to be negotiated and approved prior to construction. (Einsweiler, 1975, p. 295.) Although used extensively throughout the United States, counties that make use of PUDs include: Boulder County, Colorado; Montgomery and Prince George’s Counties, Maryland; and Sacramento County, California.
Compatible and Consistent Uses of Land Across Municipal Boundaries: Negotiation Techniques for County-wide Plans

This section considers the various techniques used to negotiate or mediate conflicting issues that may arise when planning at the county-wide level. The principal aim of negotiating techniques is to facilitate compatible and consistent land uses. The strategies are usually market-oriented, intending not to restrain development but guide development to evolve consistently with surrounding environments and infrastructure. Negotiation techniques are typically based on the processes of mediation, or conflict resolution. (Butler and Myers, 1984, pp. 447-448.) This give-and-take process, if administered correctly, promotes harmonious development decisions between planners and developers.

Point System

A rather direct technique used to control the character and type of development is to rate the quality of proposed developments on a “point system.” This system awards points to proposed developments according to the degree to which projects will meet predetermined standards and criteria. Typically, various rating factors are weighted to reflect public policies and local development priorities and are applied to the points for specific elements of the development.

Point systems also can be used in conjunction with flexible zoning, a system in which a range of mixed uses are permissible, to better manage the type of growth. More recently, point systems have been used to encourage the development of low- and moderate-income housing. While point systems may deter certain developments, the developer has the option to alter the extent of benefits to offer to a community; the more benefits a development will create, the more points the development is awarded.

Monroe County, Florida has adopted a point system to manage development by linking point rewards to building permit applications. Applications for development are given positive and/or negative points, depending on the suitability—as defined prior to evaluation—of a site for the proposed development. For example, developments that would be served by existing infrastructure, such as water, electricity, and paved roadways, automatically receive a positive 10 points. Positive points are also given to proposals if a developer voluntarily
changes the density of a development to preferential levels, provides affordable housing, or
donates undeveloped land in their possession to the county. Two other county-wide point
systems in use are in Dade County, Florida and Montgomery County, Maryland.

**Performance System**

Another technique used to negotiate desired benefits with developers is a performance
system. This system requires development applicants to demonstrate that current facilities
and infrastructure of the proposed site can and will be maintained or improved after
construction. A typical performance system enables property owners to select from a range
of approved land uses—determined according to suitability for a specific location. The
developer also is bound to contain the development’s externalities within specified
acceptable limits. Performance systems have been applied to meet demands of future traffic,
sewage, utility, and public service levels and use. Also, performance systems have been used
to address environmental concerns by specifying the maximum levels of stress that can be
imposed on a site’s natural resources by a proposed development. Loudoun County, Virginia
has adopted a performance system to manage the type and character of new development.

**Transfer or Purchase of Development Rights**

The Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) and the Purchase of Development Rights (PDR)
are two techniques of private-land acquisition in order to preserve the public good. These
procedures allow owners of property that is restricted from development to recoup some of
the potential income they could receive if the land were developed. Such property owners
capture the lost value by selling, or transferring, their development “rights” to developers of
alternative locations where increased densities are allowed. A county-wide application of
TDR and PDR would be in the preservation of open-space and farmland. Three counties that
have made use of the transfer or purchase of development rights are: Fairfax County,
Maryland; Marin County, California; and Suffolk County, New York. (Daniels, 1992, pp.
421-431.)
User Fees or Charges

In an effort to have developers realize the true costs of development, many municipalities have opted to directly charge them for certain expenses. Such fees or charges are used to cover the full operating expenses of a facility, including infrastructure maintenance and expansion and services such as municipal garbage collection. These fees also are often used to retire public revenue bonds that may have financed construction of a new facility or needed infrastructure. County services impacted by development would be funded via county-wide user fees or charges. (So, 1988, p. 440.)

Land Transfer Tax

Another direct method of preserving certain land uses and preventing certain new uses, is to levy a local tax on the transfer of land. The tax is intended to deter owners from selling rural land to speculative investors and dissuade developers through higher land costs. The amount of such land-transfer taxes is highest when land is held for a short time after a previous transaction and lowest when held for longer periods of time. Revenues raised from a land-transfer tax can also be used to acquire open space or development rights to counteract the sale of land and legislated preferred uses. The State of Vermont uses land-transfer taxes widely in its comprehensive planning and growth management. (Bunnell, 1993, p. 5.)

Covenants and Development Agreements

Covenants and development agreements incorporate deed restrictions, easements, and other negotiated agreements in land title documents. These private agreements are made between developers and land owners and are transferred with ownership. Restrictive covenants are frequently used to tailor the zoning of a specific site or subdivision by prohibiting certain activities or requiring more stringent design elements than those of standard land titles. Such techniques could be used at a county level to preserve undeveloped or agricultural land by preventing the continued redivision of land. Such development agreements could also substitute Planned Unit Development zoning and its associated negotiations to define the character of development over time. (Scott, 1975, p. 294.) Two counties that rely on covenants to manage growth include Marion County, Oregon and Dade County, Florida. (Scott, 1975, p. 294.)
Legislated Environmental Controls

In an effort to enforce compliance with minimum environmental standards, stricter provisions and limits can be imposed on developments that are proposed for environmentally-sensitive areas or in areas of substantial existing development. These controls typically are imposed on facilities and activities that threaten local and/or regional air and water quality or to enforce development that is harmonious with local environments. Counties that have recognized the need for strict enforcement of environmental standards enforcement in controlling growth are Dade County, Florida and Marion County, Oregon.

Required Fair-Share Housing Allocations

Often county or state governments will require local jurisdictions to meet a specified goal of low- to low-to-moderate income housing needs and to be implemented through the use of a county-wide comprehensive plan. These plans encourage local governments to develop a feasible housing plan that meets their “fair-share” allocation for affordable housing, as designated in the county’s plan. Such requirements exist in New Jersey, California, and Florida. Florida, however, is the only state that uses counties to mandate local allocations. (Connery, 1993, pp. 185-199; Gerken, 1988, pp. 51-53.) Many Florida counties allocate fair-share requirements, including Dade, Brevard, Collier, and Citrus. Fairfax County, Maryland has incorporated fair-share allocations in its efforts to combat the lack of affordable housing created by unmanaged growth.

Public Facilities Provision as a Means to Guide Development: Infrastructure Techniques for County-wide Plans

The ability to guide development through the management of infrastructure is an important strategy in county-wide growth management planning. Infrastructure techniques are based on the notion that many of the “adverse effects of rapid growth can be mitigated if it can be phased in terms of time and location” (Cater, 1975, p. 347.) This section examines ways in which infrastructure management has been used to manage the timing and siting of growth at the county level.
Moratoria

The withholding of new building permits in an area of rapid growth is often used to allow a community to "catch up with an infrastructure deficit." (Smith, 1993, p. 49.) This technique prohibits development temporarily and is based on an immediate need to forestall a threat to the public health, safety, or welfare—such as a lack of sewage treatment capacity or extreme traffic congestion. Typically in effect for one to three years, a moratorium allows time for the threat to be eliminated, but it can last for many years if the problem persists.

In Fairfax County, Maryland, the County Board adopted both a short-term planning moratorium and a sewer moratorium during the 1970s. These development restrictions would affect identified areas of the county until treatment facilities could be improved to accommodate new growth. No new applications for rezoning, subdivision, or site plans were accepted during the moratoria and work on approved projects had to start within 180 days. Only approved projects, including public facilities and single-family units that did not require special permits and had an acceptable sewage system, could be built. These moratoria were in place until the comprehensive plan for the County was completed. (Einsweiler, et al, 1975, p. 307.) Four counties having employed development moratoria include: Dade County, Florida; Fairfax County, Virginia; and Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, Maryland.

Concurrency Ordinances or Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance

Concurrency ordinances are a "method of coordinating actions of many participants, not only over spatial areas, but also over time. The concurrency requirement states that development cannot be permitted unless there is funding of services for the development, including transportation, water systems, and parks." (DeGrove & Metzger, 1993, p. 16.)

Florida's requirements for concurrent land and infrastructural development is considered the most stringent. "No other state says flatly that, after a local government has adopted its comprehensive plan and land development regulations, no new development may be permitted unless the concurrency requirement has been met." (DeGrove & Metzger, 1993, p. 7.)
However, if a state is unwilling to finance new infrastructure, as Florida at times has been, the requirement for adequate facilities can encourage sprawl less developed, rural areas where underutilized infrastructure exists. (Innes, 1993, p. 28.) Outside of Florida, Montgomery County, Maryland has adopted adequate facilities requirements.

Urban and Rural Service Areas or Urban Growth Boundaries

The concept of "mapping" a limit to growth is based on "drawing a line around the areas where sewer, water, roads, police, fire, and schools already exist and the lands immediately adjacent to them, and mandating that capital facilities not be extended beyond the line. Thus directly addressing the location and extent of urbanization and the preservation of farmland, and it regulates the location and timing of building community infrastructure." (Einsweiler, 1992, p. 14.) When the specific limits are negotiated, the boundaries for urban growth should include sufficient land to accommodate an urban area's projected population growth for 10 to 20 years.

Urban growth boundaries are considered a technique used to impact the geography of development through limited capital facilities' provision. Therefore, the illustration of this technique is more fully described in the previous section discussing the first principle, land use controls. Examples of counties having set urban growth boundaries include Lexington-Fayette County, Kentucky; Lancaster County, Pennsylvania; and Montgomery County, Maryland.

Withholding of county highway funds

If a county has adopted an infrastructure concurrency agreement that is not met by local municipalities, the county has the option to withhold moneys for new projects and the routine maintenance of roads.

In Kenosha, the County has met with its local governments to develop achievable programs for local road improvement. This program is based primarily on the safety concerns of the County and is not imposed on localities by the County. Local governments submit a list of projects they have planned and that they consider eligible for county funding. After County review and approval, funds for the programs are disbursed.
Determining and limiting the location of new facilities

In an effort to determine the placement and rate of development, counties may strategically plan and limit the placement of roads, sewer, water, and other essential support facilities. (Einsweiler, 1975, p. 293.)

In Sacramento County, California, this technique was used to guide development to designated areas adjacent to existing development and to prevent development on prime-agricultural or natural-resource lands. To effectively achieve the restrictions on facilities, the County had to coordinate all existing authorities for their provision. This approach to coordinated growth management evolved from a county "horizon" plan that was done in conjunction with a regional plan and was approved by the County board. The technique was enforced by the adoption of an urban growth boundary, as previously described. (Einsweiler, 1975, pp. 323-325.) Two intergovernmental applications of facilities' provision restrictions were made in Boulder County, Colorado and Salem County, Oregon. Other applications are found in Dade County, Florida; Loudon County, Virginia; and Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, Maryland.

Limited access to existing facilities

This method takes the concept of limited-access highways and applies it to limited-access sewer and water systems. While such utilities may pass through areas considered unsuitable for immediate development, access can be, and frequently is, determined by the programmed capacity of local sewage treatment facilities. (Einsweiler, 1975, p. 293.)

In 1973, Montgomery County, Maryland banned all further permits for connections to existing sewer lines pending the establishment of a priority-ranking system for use of existing capacity. Ranking the priority to access would allow for the management of development type and character. If a county, such as Kenosha County, Wisconsin, were experiencing rapid suburban and rural growth and simultaneous central-city decline, priority could be given to needed developments, such as low- and moderate-income housing or commercial and industrial developments that will create mid- to high-wage, full-time jobs. (Einsweiler, 1975, p. 313.) A number of counties have made adopted limited-access facilities, including:
Dade County, Florida; Fairfax County, Virginia; Montgomery County, Maryland; and Salem, Oregon—via an intergovernmental project between city and county.
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