NEW PERSPECTIVES ON PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENTS

Daniel R. Mandelker*

Author’s Synopsis: Planned unit developments, also called planned communities, are a major development type. Originally cluster housing projects with common open space, they can be planned today as infill in downtown areas or as a major master-planned community. They require discretionary review, are often dominant in the zoning process, and present a challenge to the zoning system. A threshold question is how municipalities should zone for planned unit developments, and this Article discusses conditional use, base zone, and rezoning alternatives. This Article next discusses the zoning approval process for these developments, which must operate fairly and produce acceptable decisions. Alternatives that can avoid or supplement discretionary review are considered next, and this Article concludes with a discussion of affordable housing as a social responsibility.
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I. INTRODUCTION

North of Atlanta, a major mixed-use development in the shape of a new town, rises on a new site. In Connecticut, a university town builds a new mixed-use town center. The first example is a master-planned community. The second example is infill development in town centers. Both are contemporary examples of a zoning technique called planned unit development.


Storrs Center created a new, mixed-use downtown for the town of Mansfield, Connecticut, replacing a small shopping center adjacent to the University of Connecticut. Its 11 mixed-use buildings house 626 rental apartments and 139,707 square feet of retail and office space; 42 for-sale townhouses and condominiums are also on the site. New retailers, such as a supermarket, restaurants, a medical center, and a bookstore create an eclectic college-town atmosphere, while a half-acre town square and 20 acres of nature preserves provide places for gathering and recreation.

Storrs Center, supra, at 1.
development, a discretionary zoning process for approving development projects also known as planned, or master-planned, communities. These visionary projects are a major change from the original purpose of planned unit development. Planned unit development initially provided

---

3 Planned unit development (PUD) originated in the 1960s. See generally Daniel R. Mandelker, Controlling Planned Unit Development (Am. Soc’y of Planning Official, 1966) [hereinafter 1966 Report]. Planned development (PD) or planned area development (PAD) are examples of contemporary terminology sometimes included in zoning ordinances. Additional acronyms also appear such as PRD, for planned residential development; PCD, for planned commercial development; or PDO, for planned development overlay district. They may also be called planned development districts (PDD) and special development districts (SDD). See, e.g., San Carlos, Cal., Municipal code ch. 18.10, https://www.codepublishing.com/CA/SanCarlos/html/SanCarlos18/SanCarlos1810.html (establishing a PDD); Newtown, Conn., Code §§ 595-158 to 595-163, http://ecode360.com/15304088 (providing for a SDD). This Article uses the term “planned unit development” to describe these development forms. This Article only considers the use of planned unit development for residential or mixed-use developments, though planned unit development is also used for industrial and commercial projects.

4 Whether zoning legislation provided authority for PUD was an initial concern and created an interest in model legislation:

The first model PUD law was drafted in 1965 by the late Chicago land-use lawyer Richard Babcock and other attorneys for a joint project of the Urban Land Institute (ULI) and the National Association of Home Builders. The model was proposed as a means to use “recent planning innovations” to better serve the general objectives of the Standard Zoning Enabling Act and to meet new demands for housing. Daniel R. Mandelker, Planned Unit Developments, Planning Advisory Serv. Rep., No. 545, 118 (Am. Planning Ass’n 2007) [hereinafter 2007 Report]. I spoke at a conference in Washington, D.C., in 1966, that introduced the model PUD law. Since that time, PUD law has evolved, and a lack of statutory authority may not necessarily be a problem. See generally Campion v. Bd. of Aldermen of the City of New Haven, 899 A.2d 542 (Conn. 2006) (approving a PUD district under Standard Zoning Enabling Act and analogizing it to floating zones). Indeed, Connecticut enacted planned unit development enabling legislation and later repealed it as unnecessary. See Conn. Gen. Stat. §§ 8-13b to 8-13K (repealed 1985); see also id. § 8-2d (providing under current statutory law that PUD and PRD regulations promulgated pursuant to the previous statutes “shall continue to be valid,” and that any PUD or PRD that was in compliance under those provisions “shall continue to be governed by the provisions of such regulations”). For discussion of planned unit development legislation, see Daniel R. Mandelker, Legislation for Planned Unit Developments and Master-Planned Communities, 40 Urb. Law. 419 (2008) [hereinafter Legislation].

flexibility in a rigid zoning system and was first used for single-family residential projects, known as cluster housing. Residential densities do not usually increase with clustering because designers lay out homes compactly at higher densities in return for dedicated common, open space elsewhere in the project. This type of development is not possible under traditional regulations.

Practice has moved beyond this limited purpose. Master-planned communities are common, infill projects are done in urban areas, mixed use has become a project objective, and projects include new objectives such as natural resource preservation and sustainability. Planned unit development is a major and sometimes dominant method by which communities manage new projects. Instead of an add-on option when

Modern Master-Planned Communities, URBAN LAND (July 15, 2015), https://urbanland.uli.org/planning-design/new-keys-modern-master-planned-communities/ (discussing changes in development concepts and an increase in urban projects; noting that golf course and large clubhouse projects are becoming outdated).

Zoning and subdivision regulation did not allow this kind of development as they required standardized “cookie cutter” lots, and there was no provision for common open space. Preservation of open space was an important motivation, and William Whyte’s book provided important momentum. See William H. Whyte, CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT (1964); see also NEW APPROACHES TO RESIDENTIAL LAND DEVELOPMENT: A STUDY OF CONCEPTS AND INNOVATIONS, ULI Technical Bulletin No. 40 (1961). Professor Whittemore views cluster development as the reason for adopting planned unit development as a zoning process, and he claims it has failed; he discusses a case study done in Los Angeles in the 1960s about neighborhood opposition to and rejection of this type of development. See generally Andrew H. Whittemore, The New Communalism: The Unrealized Mid-Twentieth Century Vision of Planned Unit Development, 14 J. PLAN. HIST. 244 (2015). This view of planned unit development is too restricted. Cluster development has been successful elsewhere, and planned unit development has taken other forms. See supra notes 1 and 2.

Other types of planned unit development include (1) single-use development, such as residential or nonresidential development, with an increase in density; (2) mixed-use development with or without an increase in density; and (3) a master-planned community. See VT. LAND USE EDUC. & TRAINING COLLABORATIVE, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (2007), http://vpic.info/Publications/Reports/Implementation/PlannedUnitDevelopment.pdf. But see Whittemore, supra note 6. These are mixed-use communities, often of substantial size, that contain one or more residential villages and town centers. Planned unit developments may occur on open greenfield sites in suburban areas or on infill sites where the planned unit development will be surrounded by existing urban development.

traditional zoning does not produce optimal results, planned unit development has become an instrumentality for improvements in site design and development.

Planned unit development today presents challenges to the zoning system that have not been fully resolved. An important concern is the elimination of by-right conventional zoning. Under by-right zoning, an ordinance contains the rules that apply to new development, and a developer can build under them without further review.\(^9\) The developer has an entitlement. There is no need for discretionary approval, and there is no public participation in an approval process. Planned unit development requires a discretionary review that eliminates this entitlement.\(^10\)

This shift to discretionary review is a major and critical change. By-right zoning provides certainty, and planned unit development review removes certainty. This change creates problems for developers who invest in new projects, neighbors affected by project proposals, and municipalities that control project outcomes. The process must be managed so that developers enter with minimal risk, and municipal and citizen concerns are considered. There must be decisions about when and how municipalities review planned unit developments and under what standards. The system must maintain public control while providing opportunities for flexibility and design. Public participation must be constructive, not destructive.

This Article explores the primary issues raised by planned unit development. My reports on planned unit development\(^11\) and my book on

---

\(^9\) However, a land use attorney with forty years of experience stated that he very rarely had a zoning project that his client could develop by right under a zoning ordinance and that these situations occur much less frequently now than they may have twenty years ago. See Telephone Interview with Gary Feder, Husch Blackwell (Jan. 25, 2017); see also infra note 14 and Appendix A.

\(^10\) A PUD developer may be in a stronger position after receiving zoning and development plan approval than she was under the existing zoning. The development plan will govern the project subject to amendment at the developer’s request. See 2007 Report, supra note 4, at 51. A major amendment requiring council action may become necessary, however, and may face opposition. Minor amendments can go to staff. See id. at 50–52 (describing amendment process). Vesting rights for a multi-phase project is difficult. See infra note 264 and accompanying text. Development agreements can provide an alternative. See infra Part IV.C.

\(^11\) See 1966 Report, supra note 3; see also 2007 Report, supra note 4. I was asked to write the 1966 Report, supra note 3, by the American Society of Planning Officials, now the American Planning Association, shortly after model legislation was proposed for planned unit developments, and this kind of development became attractive.
planned community design, which include model ordinances, are a starting point. I update those publications by reviewing planned unit development practice based on an analysis of planned unit development ordinances and telephone interviews with land use lawyers and planners. The major issues are adequate control of the decision-making process and how the process responds to development problems. This Article considers zoning alternatives for planned unit developments and the tradeoffs they create, and suggests improvements for better practice. Neither a simple fix nor perfect model exists—communities must decide what kind of planned unit development they want and how it should be handled.

A threshold question is how municipalities should zone for planned unit developments. Part I introduces planned unit developments. Part II discusses conditional use, base zone, and rezoning alternatives. Approval as a conditional use is suitable for projects that do not require major zoning change. Under a base zone alternative, a planned unit development must comply with the base zone in which it is located. Under a rezoning alternative, a municipality creates a new planned unit development district and then approves the project and its development plan.

The zoning review process, which Part III considers, must operate fairly to produce acceptable decisions. One alternative is review based on a concept plan, followed by approval of a detailed development plan. The

---


13 Appendix B lists the ordinances reviewed with internet addresses. It is a representative, national sample and includes states where planned unit development is active. American Planning Association research staff suggested ordinances from about twenty-five cities and counties where planned unit development is occurring. I collected ordinances from these and other cities that illustrate contemporary planned unit development practice, with an emphasis on Florida, Arizona, and Nevada—states where planned unit development is active. The Article cites ordinances by jurisdiction. All state statutory citations in this Article refer to the current statute unless otherwise indicated. The same applies to state regulations and ordinances.

14 Appendix A lists the interviewees, their job titles, and employers, which the footnotes cite by last name and location of the interviewees. The interviews include a nationwide sample of planners and lawyers with experience in planned unit development practice from representative areas, cities, and counties. The interviews were conducted via telephone in December 2016 through March 2017.

15 In this Article, the term “municipality” includes counties and other local units of government, such as townships and boroughs.
other is approval based on a detailed development plan without concept plan approval. The chosen alternative has important consequences for developer investment, municipal control, and public participation.

Part IV discusses alternatives that can avoid or supplement discretionary review. By-right zoning for infill developments in urban areas is one option. Form-based codes regulate building form, public spaces, and how they relate. Form-based codes can be helpful in regulating design and site detail. Development agreements provide supplementary controls.

Affordable housing, discussed in Part V, is a social responsibility that planned unit developments can meet. One option is inclusionary zoning, which requires a percentage of project housing to be set aside as affordable. Housing elements in comprehensive plans can provide policies for affordable housing, including site designations. A jobs-housing balance requirement, which requires jobs for project residents to reduce commuting, can make housing affordable by reducing transportation costs. Part VI concludes.

II. ZONING FOR PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT

Planned unit developments are usually approved under the zoning ordinance.16 The interviews17 reported they are an active, and sometimes the dominant, form of development in their community.18 Activity occurs in both counties and cities,19 and a wide variety of projects are allowed.20

16 Ordinances may be either long-form or short-form. See 2007 Report, supra note 4, at 14–18, 23 (including a table listing essential provisions of planned unit development ordinances).

17 See supra note 14; infra Appendix A.


19 See, e.g., Telephone Interview with Jeffrey Borchardt, Assoc. Planner, Cnty. Dev. Dep’t, City of Reno, Nev. (Dec. 30, 2016) [hereinafter Borchardt (Reno, Nev.)]; Telephone Interview with Brian Connolly & Tom Ragonetti (Dec. 13, 2016) [hereinafter Connolly & Ragonetti (Denver, Colo.)] (occurring in unincorporated areas of counties and selected cities); Telephone Interview with Bryan Davis, Urban Designer/Principal Planner, Palm Beach Cty. Planning Div., Fla. (Dec. 13, 2016) [hereinafter Davis (Palm Beach Cty., Fla.)] (discussing developers have internalized planned unit development); Telephone Interview with Alan D. Hill, Chief Planner, Orange Cty. Planning Div., Fla. (Dec. 12, 2016) [hereinafter Hill (Orange Cty., Fla.)]; Telephone Interview with Sandy Hoffmann, Dir. of Planning Div., Phoenix, Ariz. (Jan. 4, 2016) [hereinafter Hoffman
There is a mix of both undeveloped greenfield and infill sites,\textsuperscript{21} though infill development was dominant in some cities.\textsuperscript{22} Size is another distinction. Often, ordinances have size limits that are not substantial, so projects can be built on small lots.\textsuperscript{23} Ordinances that require large-scale master-planned community are the other extreme.\textsuperscript{24}

An important factor is whether a project requires a change in use, density, or both.\textsuperscript{25} Ordinances can be simpler when use and density
changes are not required, as with residential cluster development. Project type can affect the way an ordinance is structured, but most ordinances are in a single format that does not distinguish between different types of projects. There are three zoning alternatives: approval as a conditional use, assigning the planned unit development to a base zone, or a rezoning for a new planned unit development district.

A. As a Conditional Use

An ordinance can allow a planned unit development as a conditional use. A conditional use is arguably compatible with uses allowed in a zoning district, but needs review to decide whether it is appropriate. Approval is given under standards contained in the ordinance, and conditions are usually attached. This procedure is intended for only one use. It is not easily applied to planned unit developments, which may require changes in use and density, and a comprehensive review of their

[hereinafter LEGISLATIVE GUIDEBOOK] (defining “development” as “any change in the intensity or use of land”).

26 For discussion of short-form ordinances, see 2007 Report, supra note 4, at 15–17.

27 See, e.g., Balt. City, Md., Code art. 32, § 13-203 (omitting project type as a factor that must be considered in government review of planned unit development); Clark County, Nev., Development Code § 30.24 (choosing not to require project type plan in submitting planned unit development application); Kerrville, Tex., City of Kerrville Zoning Code art. 11-I-15 (making no mention of project type in declining requirements of planned unit development concept plan); Sherwood, Or., Code of Ordinances ch. 16.40 (requiring only details of particular uses in preliminary development plan). Some jurisdictions distinguish between residential and nonresidential developments. See Sherwood, Or. Code, supra; see also Kittitas County, Wash., Kittitas County Zoning Code § 17.36 (applying different requirements inside and outside “Urban Growth” areas).


29 See, e.g., Newark, Cal., Newark Zoning Ordinances § 17.40.020 (allowing conditional use permits); see also 2007 Report, supra note 4, at 30; Jensen (Reno, Nev.), supra note 19 (conditional use approval faster). For a model statute authorizing approval as a conditional use, see LEGISLATIVE GUIDEBOOK, supra note 25, § 8-303(b).


31 For example, local governments may execute development agreements with planned units developed in this manner. See 2007 Report, supra note 4, at 47.

32 See 2007 Report, supra note 4, at 50 (noting complications can arise where there is a change in use, intensity of use, or density of use).
development features. It might be acceptable as a method for approving cluster housing.

B. The Base Zone Alternative

1. How It Is Done

A base zone alternative provides an existing set of regulations that apply to a planned unit development. It has advantages because uses and densities are fixed and only a development plan must be approved, reducing uncertainty and the time needed for approval. Reliance on existing zoning can also lessen or eliminate neighbor opposition, which reduces uncertainty and can prevent project rejection. A base zone alternative works best with single-family residential cluster development where the issue is a map adjustment without a change in use or density. A base zone alternative clusters housing in one part of the development at higher densities in return for offsetting common open space elsewhere, but the overall density remains the same. Several jurisdictions use this development model.

Despite these advantages, some interviews reported problems with this option. It can be clumsy to administer because zoning codes are

33 See id.
34 See, e.g., DAVIS, CAL., MUNICIPAL CODE § 40.32.060 (stipulating that “gross population density and building intensity . . . shall remain unchanged,” but changes can be authorized for lot dimensions, building setbacks, and area to achieve “more functional and desirable use”); LOUISVILLE, COLO., LOUISVILLE MUNICIPAL CODE § 17.14.050 (regulating permitted uses in commercial districts and mixed-use zones); MARICOPA COUNTY, ARIZ., MARICOPA COUNTY, ZONING ORDINANCE art. 1001.3 (describing general conditions required for approval of planned area development); MESA, ARIZ., MESA ZONING ORDINANCE § 11-22-2 (utilizing planned area development overlay to prescribe and limit counties for approval of planned unit development); MOBILE, ALA., CODE OF ORDINANCES § 64-5(B) (regulating but with modifications in ordinance).
35 See Jensen (Reno, Nev.), supra note 19.
36 See 2007 Report, supra note 4, at 60–62.
37 Because the lots are clustered in one part of the development, the ordinance must provide a basis for calculating the number of lots allowed that will not increase the density allowed by the ordinance without clustering. See id.
38 See Connolly & Ragonetti (Denver, Colo.), supra note 19; Hill (Orange Cty., Fla), supra note 19; Mazzocco (Tucson, Ariz.), supra note 22.
39 See Borchardt (Reno, Nev), supra note 19; Telephone Interview with Travis Crane, Assistant Planning Dir., Raleigh, N.C. (Jan. 6, 2017) [hereinafter Crane (Raleigh, N.C.)]; Wilcox (Leon Cty., Fla.), supra note 19.
complicated and all the base restrictions that apply may not be known. Reliance on existing zoning may also limit flexibility and creativity. Many ordinances allow exceptions to the base zoning to provide flexibility, but they are limited because they are back-handed changes to existing restrictions. They may also require support in a quasi-judicial hearing, where flexibility to consider project needs may not be available. Procedures may be time consuming, and numerous exceptions can cause delays and unnecessary expense. Exceptions can also destroy the certainty the base zone provides.

City of Gig Harbor v. North Pacific Design, Inc. illustrates the confusion base zoning can create. A hearing examiner approved a conditional use permit for an 18.8-acre Planned Residential Development (PRD) at a density of 11.75 units per acre as a buffer between high intensity commercial and lower intensity residential areas. The underlying base zone authorized an increase in density from eight units to twelve units per acre if “allowed as a conditional use.” Uses allowed as a PRD in a Planned Residential District could include “conditional uses permitted in the underlying zoning district.” It was not clear whether an increase in density allowed in the base zone was a conditional use allowed in the Planned Residential District.

The city argued the PRD option was not available because the approval was a rezone, even though it did not involve a change in use, because it departed from the base zoning. The court disagreed and

---

40 See Silvyn (Tucson, Ariz.), supra note 22.
41 See McMurry (Anaheim, Cal.), supra note 19.
42 See id.
43 See Telephone Interview with Mark White, White & Smith, Kansas City, Mo. (Dec. 21, 2016) [hereinafter White (Kansas City, Mo.)]. White points out that a decision made in a quasi-judicial hearing requires a public record supported by evidence. See id. He believes neighbors are more likely to participate in an informal legislative process where there is no cross-examination, and where the only recourse is judicial review. See id.
44 See 2007 Report, supra note 4, at 23.
45 See id. at 16–18.
47 See id. at 1097.
48 See id. at 1098.
49 Id.
50 Id. at 1100.
51 See id. at 1100–01.
replied that the “Municipal Code here expressly allowed a density increase of up to 12 dwelling units per acre as a conditional use in the underlying zone.”\textsuperscript{52} There was no “mix-and-match” of the different ordinances.\textsuperscript{53} An ordinance can deal with this problem by making it clear that approval of a planned unit development “designation does not establish an underlying zone or enlarge the uses provided by a zoning classification.”\textsuperscript{54}

2. Exceptions

If exceptions are allowed from the base zone, the ordinance should include standards and procedures for deciding when they should be made. One cautious option for a residential development is to authorize nonresidential uses up to a designated percentage, which limits change.\textsuperscript{55} Most ordinances do not take this approach and instead contain discretionary standards for exceptions, treating them as guarded departures from the base zoning.\textsuperscript{56} Compatibility with uses in the surrounding area

\textsuperscript{52} Id. at 1101. The Code also provided that “PRDs involving ‘primary, accessory and conditional uses permitted in the underlying zoning district’ did not require a rezone application. . . .” Id. There was also a statement of purpose providing that “[t]he intent of the PRD zone is to allow opportunity for more creative and imaginative residential projects than generally possible under strict application of the zoning regulations in order that such projects shall provide substantial additional benefit to the general community.” Id. at 1100. It is not clear whether the statement of intent also was a condition for approval of a PRD.

\textsuperscript{53} Id. at 1103–04.

\textsuperscript{54} Alexandra Croft Moravec, An Analysis of Planned Unit Development (PUD) Regulations and Processes in Washington, DC: A Development Risk Management Case Study, 63 (2009), https://cdr.lib.unc.edu/indexablecontent/uuid:fd4996b3-7a7d-44ee-84fd-a2431a2770eb, [hereinafter Analysis] (detailing a masters project submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Regional Planning in the Department of City and Regional Planning, 2007). Moravec conducted interviews in Washington, D.C., and elsewhere with planners and other participants in the planned unit development process. See id.

\textsuperscript{55} See MOLALLA, OR., MUNICIPAL CODE § 19.20.110(D)(3)(b) (“[A] maximum of 25% of the total gross floor area may be used for multifamily dwellings in those commercial zones that do not list multifamily dwellings as an outright use. Such a use must be located above or behind the central commercial retail.”).

\textsuperscript{56} But see Silvyn (Tucson, Ariz.), supra note 22 (noting decision on exception from base zoning is open-ended political process without criteria).
and design quality are common requirements. For example, the Grand Forks, North Dakota, ordinance provides that exceptions must be consistent with the purposes of the ordinance, provide greater functionality and higher amenity to the neighborhood, and be in the interest of the neighborhood and entire community.

An ordinance can include more detailed standards. Eagle County, Colorado’s ordinance contains standards for several features, stating that “[a] variation may be allowed that permits the integration of mixed

57 See, e.g., AVON, IND., ZONING ORDINANCE § 5-2 (including requirements to achieve purposes of planned unit developments, not violate zoning ordinance or comprehensive plan, not unduly burden adjacent roadways, and provide compensating amenities); DAVIS, CAL., MUNICIPAL CODE § 40.32.060(a) (“[L]ot dimensions, building setbacks and area do not have to meet the specific requirements of this chapter; provided, that a more functional and desirable use of the land is made.”); FORT COLLINS, COLO., LAND USE CODE § 4-29(B) (requiring compatibility with other listed permitted uses, mitigation of impacts, and compliance with land use standards in ordinance); GRAND FORKS, N.D., LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE § 18-0223(3)(D) (stating that zoning must be consistent with the purposes of this section, provide greater functionality and higher amenity to the neighborhood, and be in the interest of the neighborhood and entire community); HENDERSON, NEV., DEVELOPMENT CODE §§ 19.4.5.D(4), 19.7.11(B) (requiring compliance with “a range of site and building design options for sustainability to enhance other mandatory sustainability related requirements integrated throughout this Code” and also requiring that the PUD must include “adequate provisions for utility services and emergency vehicle access”); KANE COUNTY, ILL., COUNTY CODE § 25-3-1 (requiring “assurances of an overall quality of development, including any specific features which will be of exceptional benefit to the County as a whole”); LOUISVILLE, COLO., CODE OF ORDINANCES § 17.28.110 (listing spirit and intent of the development plan criteria, usable open space in common park area in excess of public use dedication requirements, design and amenities, usable or functional open space and buffer areas); MOBILE, ALA., CODE OF ORDINANCES § 64-5(B)(1)(a) (detailing uses incidental and compatible with residential use and compatible business uses providing substantial business services); see also In re Pierce Subdivision Application, 965 A.2d 468 (upholding similar comparability standards); Mazzocco, (Tucson, Ariz.), supra note 22 (explaining that changes from base zoning can be consistent with a comprehensive plan).

58 GRAND FORKS, N.D., LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE § 18-0223(3)(D).

59 See id.

60 EAGLE COUNTY, COLO., LAND USE REGULATIONS § 5-240F.3F(3). Please note that Eagle County, Colorado, uses the term “regulations” in describing its ordinances. The regulations are approved and administered by the elected Eagle County Board of Commissioners, which serve “both as an administrative and policy making body for the county.” See TOWN OF EAGLE, Eagle County, http://www.townofeagle.org/463/Eagle-County (last visited Oct. 3, 2017). Additionally, the municipalities located within Eagle County have incorporated the regulations into their own ordinances. See TOWN OF EAGLE, COLO., LAND USE & DEVELOPMENT CODE § 4.04.040(D).
uses or allows for greater variety in the type, design and layout of buildings."61 Detailed design guidelines are provided, such as “height, mass, scale, orientation and configuration, with other structures.”62 The ordinance should also provide guidance on whether the restrictions in the base zoning should be changed.63

Some ordinances require a showing of benefit to the community in addition to compliance with other standards,64 such as the Model Land Development Code65 prepared by the Oregon Land Conservation and Development Department. It requires a “net benefit” for one or more of the following: housing variety, more receptive useable open space, more protection of natural features than the code requires, avoidance of natural hazards, or improved transportation connectivity.66 A public benefit standard is acceptable if it is appropriate to require a public gain.67
Procedures for the exception decision are needed. Some ordinances authorize approval of an exception when the municipality approves the planned unit development\(^{68}\) or the preliminary plan.\(^{69}\) Procedures will then be in place elsewhere in the ordinance and may be adequate.\(^{70}\) Several ordinances do not explicitly provide procedures, but authorize departures from base district regulations that may possibly require approval in the project review process—though this requirement is not explicit.\(^{71}\) Other ordinances require approval by the city council\(^{72}\) or the planning commission\(^{73}\) but do not specify procedure. The procedure problem requires more attention. The ordinance should provide procedures for the exception decision or apply procedures found elsewhere in the ordinance.

C. The Rezoning Alternative

1. How It Is Done

Rezoning\(^{74}\) is a frequently used method for approving planned unit developments.\(^{75}\) In a typical procedure, the municipality rezones for a require exactions. See Telephone Interview with Lee Einsweiler, Principal Code Studio (Dec. 19, 2016) [hereinafter Einsweiler (Austin, Tex.)] (stating that a PUD is the best exaction tool, which can be used as lever for affordable housing and common open space).

\(^{68}\) See, e.g., LOUISVILLE, COLO., CODE OF ORDINANCES § 17.14.040(A) (citing section 17.28 and noting that an existing regulation may be waived or modified through the approval process of the planned unit development); MESA, ARIZ., ZONING ORDINANCE § 11-22-2 (“Limitations and standards of use also may be established in the overlay district as conditions of approval for individual developments.”).

\(^{69}\) See, e.g., EAGLE COUNTY, COLO., LAND USE REGULATIONS § 5-240F.3.f(3).

\(^{70}\) The type of decision authorized to change base zoning regulations varies, but if it is an exception, most courts put the burden of proof on the applicant. See LAND USE LAW, supra note 30, § 6.53.

\(^{71}\) See DAVIS, CAL., MUNICIPAL CODE § 40.32.060(a); FORT COLLINS, COLO., LAND USE CODE § 4-29(B); GRAND FORKS, N.D., LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE § 18-0223(3)(D); KANE COUNTY, ILL., COUNTY CODE § 25-3-1; MALTA, N.Y., ZONING CODE § 167-26(F).

\(^{72}\) See WILMETTE, ILL., CODE OF ORDINANCES § 20-6.5 (stating that plan commission can recommend and village board can approve); see also HENDERSON, NEV., DEVELOPMENT CODE § 19.4.5.D.4.

\(^{73}\) See MOBILE, ALA., CODE OF ORDINANCES § 64-5(B)(1)(a); see also 2007 Report, supra note 4, at 92 (explaining that city council or planning commission may approve exception to bulk regulations in base zone).

\(^{74}\) See, e.g., D.C., ZONING REGULATIONS, subtit. X, § 300.4 (stating that related zoning is allowed); see also COLUMBUS, IND., ZONING ORDINANCE, § 5.4 (re zoning);
planned unit development district and then applies standards contained in the ordinance to approve a development plan for the project. It can also consider both together. The planning commission will review and provide recommendations for legislative decisions. Development occurs under any regulations that apply and under the development plan.

A zoning amendment, such as an amendment for a planned unit development district, is a legislative act in most states. The

HALLANDALE BEACH, FLA., CODE OF ORDINANCES § 32-186(f) (city-initiated rezoning); KANE COUNTY, ILL., COUNTY CODE, § 12-1-2 (containing rezoning to PUD district). For a description of the planned unit development zoning process in Austin, Texas, with an accompanying chart, see OFF. OF THE CITY AUDITOR, CITY OF AUSTIN, SPECIAL REQUEST REP. ON PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (PUD) APPLICATION PROCESS (2016), https://www.austintexas.gov/sites/default/files/files/Auditor/AS16102.pdf.

75 A municipality may also approve a planned unit development as a floating zone. This is a zone first adopted in the text of the zoning ordinance that the municipality later applies to individual sites. See Campion v. Bd. of Aldermen of the City of New Haven, 899 A.2d 542, 553 (Conn. 2006) (approving use of floating zones for planned unit developments).

76 See, e.g., FRANKLIN, TENN., ZONING ORDINANCE § 2.4.2(7) (maintaining the importance of consistency with plan and ordinance, design, public facilities and infrastructure, open space, and phasing); GRAND PRAIRIE, TEX., LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE § 7.17(A) (containing site plan; includes safety, egress, parking, and landscaping criteria); KITTITATIS COUNTY, WASH., COUNTY CODE § 17.36.045 (requiring PUDs to “make[] economic and efficient use of land, streets, and public services”; “preserve[] usable open space, important natural feature, and other amenities”; “provide[] site design features that reasonably mitigate off-site impacts”; and have the “[p]ublic benefits of [the] PUD outweigh the effect of the modification of underlying zoning standards”).

77 Arizona and California authorize the preparation of specific plans, a subarea element of a comprehensive plan. See ARIZ. REV. STAT., § 9-461.08; see also CALIF. SPECIFIC PLANS CODE §§ 65450–57. The use of specific plans to manage planned unit developments occurs in these states. See 2007 Report, supra note 4, at 25.

78 See, e.g., CONWAY, ARK., ZONING ORDINANCE § 401.10(A). Considering the rezoning and the development plan at the same time may not be advisable if it does not allow an adequate review period for each decision.

79 See, e.g., COLUMBUS, IND., ZONING ORDINANCE art. 5, § 5.1 (including a diagram that shows a good example of the approval process).

80 See, e.g., COLLIER COUNTY, FLA., LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE § 10.02.13(C).

81 See LAND USE LAW, supra note 30.

protections of adjudicatory process, such as reviewable findings of fact, are not available. However, judicial recourse is available if neighbors challenge the amendment as spot zoning. Courts review spot zoning under a multifactor test that considers issues such as consistency with a comprehensive plan and compatibility with adjacent development. Review is usually deferential, and courts have applied the multifactor test to approve or disapprove spot zonings for planned unit developments. Defense of a spot zoning may be the first judicial test of a planned unit development.

A different set of problems arises when the legislative body approves a planned unit development. There is no separation of powers at the local government level, so a local legislative body acts either legislatively or from rural-residential district to planned-residential district was legislative action subject to referendum); Shaheen v. Cuyahoga Falls City Council, No. 24472, 2010 WL 625828, at *8 (Ohio Ct. App. Feb. 24, 2010) (re zoning to conservation overlay district for cluster planned unit development permitted); Lutz v. City of Longview, 520 P.2d 1374, 1376 (Wash. 1974); LAND USE LAW, supra note 30, § 6.26.


84 See id. at 782 (concluding that case law does not provide a disciplined and systematic basis for reviewing spot zoning, and suggesting that consistency with a comprehensive plan is the preferred test).


86 See, e.g., Evans v. Teton Cty., 73 P.3d 84, 89–94 (Idaho 2003) (considering several plan policies before approving a 780-acre golf course and residential resort planned unit development); see also Baumgarten v. Town Bd. of the Town of Northampton, 826 N.Y.S.2d 811, 813–14 (N.Y. App. Div. 2006) (asserting that approval of an 18-acre parcel, located in mixed-use area, had no adverse impact on surrounding properties, and benefited the general welfare of the community by creating seasonal housing to accommodate tourism); Murden Cove Pres. Ass’n v. Kitsap Cty., 704 P.2d 1242, 1246–47 (Wash. Ct. App. 1985) (holding 11.7 acres of land being rezoned from rural undeveloped to light manufacturing, as part of a proposed planned unit development, was consistent with plan for nonresidential use and urban concentration concept because the county had shown there was sufficient change in the neighborhood being rezoned, and rezoning would not be totally inconsistent with surrounding area). None of these developments were on the very small lots that are usually associated with spot zoning.

87 See, e.g., Greater Yellowstone Coal., Inc. v. Bd. of Cty. Comm’rs of Gallatin Cty., 25 P.3d 168, 174 (Mont. 2001) (rejecting spot zoning for 323-acre planned unit development that was incompatible with the surrounding area, which was mainly publicly-owned, and inconsistent with comprehensive plan).
administratively when it makes the decision. Courts divide on whether a decision by a legislative body to approve a planned unit development is legislative or quasi-judicial. They also divide on whether an approval of a development plan, or a rezoning that includes the approval of a development plan, is legislative or quasi-judicial. Compliance with


90 Compare Gray v. Trs., Monclova Twp., 313 N.E.2d 366, 370 (Ohio 1974) (holding that an amendment to a plan that was the equivalent of rezoning was an unreasonable execution of board’s legislative power), Kenwood Gardens Condo., Inc., 144 A.3d at 662 (holding preliminary approval with no fact-intensive findings to be not administrative), and Sheridan Planning Ass’n v. Bd. of Sheridan Cty. Comm’rs, 924 P.2d 988, 990 (Wyo. 1996) (held to be legislative), with State ex rel. Marsalek v. Council of the City of S. Euclid, 855 N.E.2d 811, 815 (Ohio 2006) (approval as conditional use held administrative), and Norris, 792 N.E.2d 186, 192 (Ohio 2003) (held to be administrative).

91 Compare Blakeman, 846 A.2d at 958 (rezoning included consideration of development plans and was held to be legislative), State ex rel. Helujon, Ltd. 964 S.W.2d at 536 (rezoning included approval of site plan and was held to be legislative), and Solove v. Westerville City Council, No. 01AP-1213, 2002 WL 1291797, at *16 (Ohio Ct. App. Oct. 23, 2002) (rezoning included approval of plan and was held to be legislative), with Maryland Overpak Corp. v. Mayor of Balt., 909 A.2d 235, 249 (Md. 2006) (rezoning focused on plans for specific site and was held to be administrative), and Peachtree Dev. Co. v. Paul, 423 N.E.2d 1087, 1092 (Ohio 1981) (stating that board’s action approving plan was functional equivalent of altering zoning classification of sizeable section of township). For a discussion of approval of development plan at time of rezoning, see 2007 Report, supra note 4, at 29.
approval standards is required even if the decision is legislative, 92 but judicial review is more demanding if the decision is quasi-judicial, 93 and constitutional delegation of power and vagueness restrictions apply. 94 When the decision is quasi-judicial, a statute or the ordinance should apply disciplined procedures. 95

2. Approval Standards

Planned unit development ordinances include standards for project approval, and standards that control important development features are common. Most ordinances contain multiple standards, which may be fixed, 96 generally stated approval standards, 97 or only generally stated standards 98—which some practitioners support. 99 There may be a

92 See City of Tuscaloosa v. Bryan, 505 So. 2d 330, 338 (Ala. 1987) (rejecting approval for failure to comply with ordinance standards).
94 See DESIGNING, supra note 12, at 82–86 (stating vagueness restrictions are based on substantive due process).
95 See LEGISLATIVE GUIDEBOOK, supra note 25, at ch. 10 (including a model act trust providing detailed procedures for quasi-judicial decisions).
96 See Davis (Palm Beach Cty., Fla.), supra note 19.
97 See Cobb (Brevard, N.C.), supra note 22; Hill (Orange Cty., Fla.), supra note 19.
98 See Telephone Interview with Anonymous, San Diego Cty., Cal., (Mar. 10, 2017) [hereinafter Anonymous (San Diego Cty., Cal.)] (requiring consistency with the comprehensive plan, compatibility, and other standards); Wilcox (Leon Cty., Fla.), supra note 19.
99 See Connolly & Ragonetti (Denver, Colo.), supra note 19 (advocating for three basic standards: change in the surrounding neighborhood; consistency with the comprehensive plan, and compatibility with neighbors; no difficulties reported in complying with these standards); see also Jensen (Reno, Nev.), supra note 19; Wilcox (Leon Cty., Fla.), supra note 19. Some state statutes require the inclusion of approval criteria in the ordinance. See COLO. REV. STAT. §§ 24-67-104 to -105 (requiring ordinances to include standards and conditions for evaluation and conformity with any comprehensive or master plan); IND. CODE ANN. § 36-7-4-1503 (requiring planned unit development district ordinances to specify “range of uses” and “requirements” for development); NEB. REV. STAT. § 18-3001(2) (requiring an ordinance to include criteria relating to the review of proposed PUDs to ensure “the PUD is compatible with adjacent uses of land and the capacities of public services and utilities affected by such planned unit development and . . . consistent with the public health, safety, and general welfare of the city or village in accordance with the comprehensive plan”); NEV. REV. STAT. §§ 278A.090, .100, .120 (requiring ordinances to include “the standards and conditions” for proposed PUDs to be evaluated; “the uses permitted” in a PUD; and “provisions by which the amount and
minimum size requirement.100 Common open space101 and internal circulation system requirements102 are common and may be fixed or generally

location of any corridor space is determined and its improvement and maintenance secured”); Borchardt (Reno, Nev.), supra note 19 (explaining Nev. statutes). But see R.I. GEN. LAWS ANN. § 45-24-47(c) (stating that ordinances may include minimum area, uses, densities, and buffer areas); VT. STAT. ANN. tit. 24, § 4417(c) (requiring bylaws to include certain provisions, but permitting bylaws to “vary the density or intensity of land use” through: “location and physical characteristics of the proposed planned unit development”; “location, design, type, and use of the lots and structures proposed”; and “amount, location, and proposed use of open space”). For discussion of legislative standards, see Legislation, supra note 4, at 441–44.  

100 Many municipalities have size requirements, which vary from as few as 40,000 square feet to 20 acres. See, e.g., BARTOW COUNTY, GA., CODE OF ORDINANCES § 7.15.2 (requiring 20 acres); BROWARD COUNTY, FLA., CODE OF ORDINANCES § 39-339(a) (requiring 5 acres); HORRY COUNTY, S.C., CODE OF ORDINANCES app. B, art. 7 § 721.1(B) (requiring 2 or 5 acres, depending on whether minor or major uses); WATERTOWN, N.Y., ZONING CODE § 310-12(D) (requiring PUDs to be at least 40,000 square feet).  

101 The interviews reported that requirements for common open space are typical. See Anonymous (San Diego Cty., Cal.), supra note 98 (encouraging common open space); Borchardt (Reno, Nev.), supra note 19 (stating common open spaces are encouraged in sensitive areas, like wetlands); Connolly & Ragonetti (Denver, Colo.), supra note 19; Davis (Palm Beach Cty., Fla.), supra note 19 (stating common space amounts varies with size); Hill (Orange Cty., Fla), supra note 19 (typically required); Jensen (Reno, Nev.), supra note 19; Jorden (Phoenix, Ariz.), supra note 19; Kramer (Orlando, Fla.), supra note 19 (stating common open space varies; definitions and arguments on active versus passive open space; for example, wetlands); Lewis (Jacksonville, Fla.), supra note 19; Mazzocco (Tucson, Ariz.), supra note 22; McMurry (Anaheim, Cal.), supra note 19; Merriam (Hartford, Conn.), supra note 21; Silvyn (Tucson, Ariz.), supra note 22 (some use); White (Kansas City, Mo.), supra note 43 (describing use palette of open space, plazas in urban settings, green space in larger areas, point system, and different typologies).  

102 See, e.g., CONWAY, ARK., ZONING ORDINANCE § 401.10(B); PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLA., LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE § 3.E.1.c.2.a.5 (requiring Street Layout Plan to achieve balance between cul-de-sacs and connectivity). Connectivity is an important circulation design issue. Cul-de-sac development is traditional, but modern practice requires connectivity to provide continuity in circulation systems. See 2007 Report, supra note 4, at 75–78. Some interviews reported connectivity requirements. Borchardt (Reno, Nev.), supra note 19; Cobb (Brevard, N.C.), supra note 22; Connolly & Ragonetti (Denver, Colo.), supra note 19 (stating that cul-de-sacs are reasonably frequent at boundaries); Davis (Palm Beach Cty., Fla.), supra note 19 (discussing non-residential planned development); Hill (Orange Cty., Fla), supra note 19 (stating that policies on this are in the comprehensive plan, and that the county board now supports staff); Jensen (Reno, Nev.), supra note 19 (explaining how Reno’s robust educational program is slow in some communities but turned the corner in Bountiful); McMurry (Anaheim, Cal.), supra note 19 (allowing cul-de-sac only if geography requires). But see Mazzocco (Tucson, Ariz.), supra note 22 (explaining how the comprehensive plan was not as
stated. The ordinance can also specify allowable uses, densities, site treatment, and may allow density increases through bonuses. As an alternative, the legislative body can decide what uses and densities to allow when it approves the development plan. The ordinance can also address social issues, such as affordable housing, preserving natural resources and sustainability, and requirements for adequate public services.

The mix of standards in an ordinance, how they are stated, and whether they confer discretion, determines the character of planned unit developments in a community. An ordinance can require large-scale developments with freedom to increase density or allow any-sized development but limit that freedom. These are only two examples.
Ordinances also contain generally stated standards to guide decisions on whether a planned unit development should be approved. Because they require a compromise of interests, they can be a challenge to draft. An initial concern is the statement of purpose, which recites the objectives the ordinance is intended to achieve. It often reflects concern for design innovation and a flexible zoning process. The statement of purpose in the Brevard, North Carolina, ordinance reflects this dual objective. It states, “The planned development zoning district classification allows projects of innovative design and layout that would not otherwise be permitted under this ordinance because of the strict application of zoning district or general development standards.”


113 A court can rely on a purpose clause if it is part of the ordinance and not a preamble. See Pomeranc-Burke, LLC v. Wicomico Envtl. Tr., Ltd., 14 A.3d 1266, 1286 (Md. App. 2011); cf. Dupont Circle Citizens Ass’n, 426 A.2d at 334 (explaining that the purpose clause did not create a contested issue requiring specific findings of fact and conclusions of law on benefit of the proposed PUD over possible structures permitted under existing zoning; but compliance with purpose clause must be supported by subsidiary findings of basic facts on material issues).

114 See BREVARD, N.C., UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE § 2.1(E)(1).

115 Id. The ordinance reinforces this statement: “[I]n return for greater flexibility in site design requirements, planned developments are expected to deliver exceptional quality community designs that” meet listed design objectives. Id. The statement of purpose also specifies certain design qualities, such as “[a]llowing greater freedom in providing a mix of land uses in the same development.” Id. Purpose statements may contain additional objectives. See HENDERSON, NEV., DEVELOPMENT CODE § 19.3.18(A)(2) (“[T]he PC [planned community] district may be utilized to ensure Comprehensive Planning of large areas of land and to create efficient and stable developments offering a combination of planned land uses.”); TUCSON, ARIZ., UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT CODE § 3.5.6(A)(1), (3)-(4) (stating the purpose is to “[a]ccommodate large-scaled, unified planned developments that conform to the best practices, policies and programs within the City’s General Plan, applicable specific plans, and other sustain-ability and conservation programs”; “[p]rovide a framework to promote sustainable land use patterns and mobility options while being responsive and sensitive to the natural features and topography of the desert environment”; and provide a variety of housing and public facilities). Another good example of a statement of purpose is found in Jacksonville, Florida. See JACKSONVILLE/DUVAL COUNTY, ZONING CODE § 656.340 (“It is the intent and purpose . . . to create living environments that are responsive to the needs of their inhabitants; to provide flexibility in planning, design and development; to encourage innovative approaches to the design of community environments; to encourage the fulfillment of housing needs appropriate to various lifestyles and income levels; to encourage the integration of different housing types within a development; provide an
statements of purpose contain similar policies.\textsuperscript{116} They may also contain other objectives, such as the conservation of natural resources and sustainability,\textsuperscript{117} but the emphasis on design and process is common. A few ordinances require municipalities to consider the statement of purpose when they approve planned unit developments,\textsuperscript{118} and a link between statements of purpose and approval standards is advisable.

Statements of purpose are implemented by standards that control the approval decision. Courts interpret these standards to decide what an ordinance requires. For example, in \textit{Sinkler v. County of Charleston},\textsuperscript{119} the court struck down a rezoning from an agricultural to a planned development (PD) district for a residential project.\textsuperscript{120} The agricultural zoning had maximum densities, and the rezoning reduced lot sizes but left residential uses and maximum densities unchanged.\textsuperscript{121} A state statute...
defined a PD as a mixed-use project, and stated it should “result in improved design, character, and quality of new mixed-use developments.” Similar standards are included in planned unit development ordinances. These directives, the court held, made the rezoning invalid because its only effect was to reduce the size of the lots, a feature of cluster housing.

Sinkler indicates a statute or ordinance can require a design outcome for planned unit developments, not just a change in existing regulations that favors the developer. Some ordinances do this by authorizing a departure from existing zoning only if the planned unit development will produce a superior development. There may be a cap on how extensive a departure the municipality can allow.

Indeterminate standards like these, and those in the Sinkler statute, raise an uncertainty problem because they may be too ambiguous to prevent abusive, arbitrary decision-making. Developers are then at the

---

122 See S.C. CODE ANN. § 6-29-720(C)(4) (“[A] development project comprised of housing of different types and densities and of compatible commercial uses, or shopping centers, office parks, and mixed-use developments. A planned development district is established by rezoning prior to development and is characterized by a unified site design for a mixed use development.”). A planned unit development ordinance can include a similar definition.

123 Id. § 6-29-740. The statute also states that “planned development provisions must encourage innovative site planning for residential, commercial, institutional, and industrial developments within planned development districts.” Id.

124 See Sinkler, 690 S.E.2d at 779, 782.

125 See, e.g., AUSTIN, TEX., LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE, ch. 25-2, subch. B, art. 2, div. 5, subpt. A, § 2.4 (deciding to allow departures based on a list of designated features); DAVIS, CAL., MUNICIPAL CODE § 40.32.070 (“[D]evelopment of a harmonious, integrated plan justifies exceptions.”); HALLANDALE BEACH, FLA., CODE OF ORDINANCES § 32-186(g)(5) (“equal or higher quality”); KALISPELL, MONT., MUNICIPAL CODE § 27.19.020 (indicating they must consider departure from existing regulations); PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLA., UNIFIED LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE § 3.E.2.A.4 (stating it must exceed plan policies and regulatory requirements).

126 See, e.g., NEWARK, CAL., CODE OF ORDINANCES 17.40.040 (“at least equivalent”); BALTIMORE, MD., ZONING CODE § 9-112(a) (2007); DAVIS, CAL. MUNICIPAL CODE § 40.32.070 (“not substantially higher”).


128 See OFFICE OF THE CITY AUDITOR, A REPORT TO THE AUSTIN CITY COUNCIL, SPECIAL REQUEST REPORT ON PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (PUD) APPLICATION PROCESS 3 (2016), https://www.austintexas.gov/sites/default/files/files/Auditor/AS16102.pdf (negotiation and review process judgment-based); Kramer (Orlando, Fla.), supra note 19 (indicating that vague standards create a problem if no shared vision); see also Wilcox
mercy of municipal review, creating time delay and cost uncertainties. These uncertainties are problematic because developers must be able to forecast their project needs accurately before they start a project. Uncertainty prevents them from doing this, and can cause financial loss and project failure. Additionally, judicial help may not be available. Courts will strike down standards that are too vague to meet due process requirements if the approval decision is quasi-judicial, but courts are usually receptive and accept standards even if they have some ambiguities.

Approval standards vary widely. Some ordinances have extensive standards, and some have only a few. Most contain indeterminate standards, which are probably definite enough to pass the constitutional vagueness test but still leave considerable room for an exercise of discretion. Surprisingly, standards that require creative project design and flexibility in applying land use regulations are not as common as might be expected, despite the inclusion of these objectives in purpose clauses. Criteria requiring good design for planned unit developments are infrequent, though some cities have design standards for the entire community.

(Leon Cty., Fla.), supra note 19 (indicating reviewers do not like flexibility because it provides opportunity for abuse).

Developers can also adjust to uncertainty and may prefer negotiation under indeterminate standards for a final approval when they can decide whether to proceed. See Jensen (Reno, Nev.), supra note 19 (reporting successful negotiation process).

See Analysis, supra note 54, at 26 (deciding on the final outcome of benefits and amenities negotiation is a “major and overarching weakness”).


See DAVID ADAMS ET AL., PLANNING, PUBLIC POLICY & PROPERTY MARKETS 38 (2005) (“[A] prime role for public policy is to reduce or contain risk and uncertainty in order to enhance user, developer and investor confidence in new forms of development.”); Analysis, supra note 54, at 36–37.

See, e.g., Pinecrest Homeowners Assn v. Cloninger & Assoc., 87 P.3d 1176, 1183 (Wash. 2004) (approving fourteen policies for mixed-use development); DAVID ADAMS ET AL., PLANNING, PUBLIC POLICY & PROPERTY MARKETS 96–97 (2005); DESIGNING, supra note 12, at 82.

See id. at 60–81 (discussing design standards in zoning ordinances).
Supplementing ordinance standards with additional guidance is recommended. For design issues, an independent set of design standards for planned unit developments can be helpful and can be implemented through design manuals and guidelines. Careful decision-making that includes findings of fact and reasons for the decision and careful record-keeping of decisions to establish precedent, will help establish guidelines for the decision-making process.

Compatibility with the surrounding area is a standard that appears most frequently and is like the compatibility test for spot zoning. A compatibility test is useful for infill development in urban areas, but whether it should apply to all planned unit developments is debatable. Large-scale, master-planned communities can create their own review...[the overall internal integrity of the PUD including the appropriate use of internal design elements].


See Designing, supra note 12, at 37–59 (discussing design standards in comprehensive plans, design manuals, and guidelines).

See Balt., Md., Zoning Ordinance § 9-112(a); Chamblee, Ga., Code of Ordinances § 280-6(c)(3)(a)(1)–(c)(3)(a)(2) (discussing suitability and adverse effect); Collier County, Fla., Land Development Code § 10.02.13(B)(5)(d) (“internal and external compatibility”); Davis, Cal., Municipal Code § 40.32.070 (requiring the project to be “in harmony with the character of the surrounding neighborhood”); D.C., Zoning Regulations tit. 11, subtit. X, § 304.4(b) (requiring that the project “does not result in unacceptable project impacts”); Dublin, Cal., Municipal Code § 8.32.070(B) (requiring the project to be “harmonious and compatible with existing and future development in the surrounding area”); Georgetown Township, Mich., Zoning Ordinance § 22.10(B) (indicating compatibility is the standard); Hallandale Beach, Fla., Code of Ordinances, § 32-186(g)(5) (requiring “compatibility with the adjacent area”); Jacksonville/Duval County, Fla., Code of Ordinances § 656-341(d); Malta, N.Y., Code § 167-26(G) (requiring that the “existing character of the neighborhood in which the use would be located be maintained”); Pleasanton, Cal., Municipal Code 18.68.030 (requiring the project be “compatible with the purposes of this title, the neighborhood and general vicinity of the proposed project”); see also Fla. Stat. Ann. § 163.3177(6)(a)(3)(g) (requiring all comprehensive plans to “[p]rovide for the compatibility of adjacent land uses...”); Fla. Stat. Ann. § 163.3164(9) (defining compatibility).

See Spot Zoning, supra note 83, at 769–75.
environment and provide buffering that protects adjacent areas.¹⁴¹ Mixed-use developments that differ from surrounding areas may be appropriate and can also provide buffering protection.¹⁴² A compatibility test at the rezoning stage may be enough.

Consistency with the comprehensive plan is an essential consideration, especially if consistency is required. Plans contain land use policies for the entire community based on community consensus,¹⁴³ which can provide a basis for approving planned unit developments. Plans can also provide a defense to spot zoning challenges because community consensus on land use policies provides fair and equitable support for zoning amendments.¹⁴⁴

Some planned unit development ordinances require consistency.¹⁴⁵ A minority of states require, by statute or case law, that zoning ordinances and all zoning decisions be consistent with the comprehensive plan.¹⁴⁶ This requirement applies to planned unit developments.¹⁴⁷ How much

---

¹⁴¹ See id. at 771–72.
¹⁴² See id. 769–75 (making these and similar arguments as reasons for not accepting a compatibility test for spot zonings).
¹⁴³ See id. at 775–82.
¹⁴⁴ See supra notes 84–87 and accompanying text.
¹⁴⁵ See Connolly & Ragonetti (Denver, Colo.), supra note 19 (listing three basic standards: change in the surrounding neighborhood, consistency with the comprehensive plan, and compatibility with neighbors).
¹⁴⁷ See, e.g., Anonymous (San Diego Cty., Cal.), supra note 98; Connolly & Ragonetti (Denver, Colo.), supra note 19; see also FAIRFA, CAL., MUNICIPAL CODE § 17.112.040(A) (requiring compliance with comprehensive plan and any specific plans); Conido v. Bd. of Cty. Com’rs of Cty. of La Plata, 983 P.2d 184, 186 (Colo. App. 1999) (explaining when master plans are more than advisory). Some states have statutes modeled on the National Environmental Policy Act that apply to zoning decisions and that require an environmental analysis of the zoning decision. See DANIEL R. MANDELKER ET AL., NEPA LAW AND LITIGATION ch. 12 (2017 ed.) (listing California, New York, and Washington). In these states, compliance with the environmental review process is a major factor in any land use decision, including the approval of planned unit
guidance a comprehensive plan can provide depends on where it applies. Neighborhood plans can provide guidance for infill development in urban areas if they consider context and design issues. Comprehensive plans in suburban and fringe areas can designate areas where planned unit developments are allowed, and can specify land uses and densities, but are not likely to consider design.

III. THE APPROVAL PROCESS

The most important feature of planned unit development is negotiation between the developer and the municipality, often with participation by neighbors and neighborhood associations, at least when review is governed by general standards. In its best form, the approval process is a collaboration between both public and private sectors. All interests at stake should be involved.

After the municipality has adopted the planned unit development zone, the developer begins the process by presenting a development plan for approval. There are usually two alternatives that determine what the developer must provide. Under one alternative, the legislative body approves a generalized concept plan, followed by the approval of a detailed preliminary and final development plan, either by the legislative developments. See, e.g., McMurry (Anaheim, Cal.), supra note 19 (noting the importance of California Environmental Quality Act).


150 A key task is to anticipate the issues to be negotiated and prepare a strategy that will produce favorable outcomes at the end of the process.

151 See Analysis, supra note 54, at 41 (explaining why collaboration between public and private entities is helpful).

152 A good process requires a disciplined notice, hearing, and decision process. See Legislative Guidebook, supra note 25, at ch. 10 (detailing quasi-judicial procedures for zoning decisions in a model act).

153 See 2007 Report, supra note 4, at ch. 3.

154 See id. at 28. It is also possible to approve a final development plan without the approval of a preliminary development plan. See id.
body or the planning commission.\textsuperscript{155} This is a three-step process.\textsuperscript{156} Under the second alternative, a concept plan is not submitted for approval.\textsuperscript{157} The process begins with the approval of a preliminary development plan followed by approval of a final plan if it complies with the preliminary development plan.\textsuperscript{158} This is a two-step process.\textsuperscript{159}

A. Concept and Development Plans

Whether to require a concept plan as a first step in the approval process, or go immediately to the approval of a development plan, affects how the review process is managed, the willingness of developers to enter the process, and the ability of neighbors to participate effectively in project decisions.\textsuperscript{160} A concept plan, sometimes called a sketch or “bubble” plan,\textsuperscript{161} outlines the general concept of the planned unit development.\textsuperscript{162} Concept plans typically show the following: the objectives and character of the development; approximate location of development areas, common open space, public facilities, and other features; generalized uses, densities, and intensities; approximate proposed traffic and circulation plans; and relationship to adjacent areas.\textsuperscript{163} Many planned unit development ordinances require concept plans,\textsuperscript{164} and the interviews indicated that concept plans are extensively used.\textsuperscript{165}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{155} See Cheney v. Vill. 2 at New Hope, Inc., 241 A.2d 81, 89 (Pa. 1968) (upholding delegation to planning commission of authority to approve development plan as authorized by zoning act based on Standard State Zoning Enabling Act); see also Sheridan Planning Ass’n v. Bd. of Sheridan Cty. Comm’rs, 924 P.2d 988, 991 (Wyo. 1996).
\item \textsuperscript{156} See 2007 Report, supra note 4, at 33–40.
\item \textsuperscript{157} See id. at 35–40.
\item \textsuperscript{158} See id.
\item \textsuperscript{159} The legislative body can also approve the development plan when it approves the rezoning. See id. at 29; see also Spot Zoning, supra note 83, at 741.
\item \textsuperscript{160} See 2007 Report, supra note 4, at 28.
\item \textsuperscript{161} The term arose because the plan shows uses and densities in circles, or “bubbles.” See id. at 17.
\item \textsuperscript{162} See DESIGNING, supra note 12, at 6, 89.
\item \textsuperscript{163} See id. at 80.
\item \textsuperscript{164} See, e.g., MESA, ARIZ., ZONING ORDINANCE § 11-22-5(B)(1); see also DUBLIN, CAL., MUNICIPAL CODE § 8.32.040(A) (containing a Stage 1 Development Plan); GLENVILLE, ILL., CODE OF ORDINANCES § 98-493(a)(1); ORANGE COUNTY, FLA., CODE § 38-1204 (detailed requirements).
\item \textsuperscript{165} See Connolly & Ragonetti (Denver, Colo.), supra note 19; Davis (Palm Beach Cty., Fla.), supra note 19 (showing configuration, location, unit type, access points, and
\end{itemize}
If a concept plan is not required, the approval of a more detailed development plan is the final step in the approval of a planned unit development. A development plan is a site plan at the lot level that shows uses, densities and intensities, building elevations, open space, circulation and utility systems, grading, landscaping, circulation systems, and other project features, such as signage and lighting. It may also show floor area and height and include sketches. Documents showing easements and dedications can be added. This kind of plan, with the engineering, time, and resources that go with it, requires a major investment.

There are several advantages to the concept plan approach. A principal advantage is that approving a concept plan as a first step provides flexibility because the developer has a decision on the project before substantial resources are committed to a development plan. Neighbors can participate at the concept plan stage on major design details, an opportunity that can avoid neighbor opposition. Approval at the concept plan stage also provides a legislative judgment on use, density, and road layout. Preparing detailed design plans as the only basis for approval can be counterproductive because it is difficult to design for a

---

166 See 2007 Report, supra note 4, at 28.
167 See id. at 35–38.
168 See id.
169 See id.; see also AUBURN, ALA., ZONING ORDINANCE § 505; FAIRFAX, CAL., MUNICIPAL CODE OF ORDINANCES § 117.112.060; MANHATTAN, KAN., ZONING REGULATIONS § 9-106(A)(B).
170 See Merriam (Hartford, Conn.), supra note 21; Schwanke (Arlington, Va.), supra note 165; White (Kansas City, Mo.), supra note 43; see also Bob Bengford, Planned Unit Developments – Real World Experiences 7 (Nov. 1, 2012), http://www.mrsc.org/Home/Stay-Informed/MRSC-Insight/November-2012/Planned-Unit-Developments-Real-World-Experiences.aspx (explaining that county advocated for conceptual development plan as a means to ensure that property owners and applicants were looking at the big picture).
171 See White (Kansas City, Mo.), supra note 43.
172 See Merriam (Hartford, Conn.), supra note 21.
173 See id.
long buildout, which is required for major developments.\textsuperscript{174} Redesign is common.\textsuperscript{175} These arguments may not apply as forcefully to cluster housing, which is usually limited in size and does not require major departures from existing regulations or major redesign.\textsuperscript{176}

Omitting concept plan approval and beginning immediately with a development plan approval has support. Some municipalities begin the process with development plans,\textsuperscript{177} or at least encourage them.\textsuperscript{178} One advantage of this approach is that it provides more certainty for developers because project details are approved,\textsuperscript{179} and the municipality may want the details a development plan can provide.\textsuperscript{180} Beginning with a development plan also shortens the time for decision. Other comments indicate there is no clear preference, and the alternative used may vary by jurisdiction\textsuperscript{181} and may depend on the size of the project and the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item [174] See McMurry (Anaheim, Cal.), \textit{supra} note 19.
\item [175] See \textit{id.} (noting one master-planned community was redesigned twenty-three times). Beginning with a concept plan supports phasing for large projects because it allows the developer to make changes based on market factors, infrastructure costs, and other considerations without having to renegotiate a detailed development plan before moving on to the next phase. Computer-aided design can assist the presentation of concept plans by providing design options without having to invest resources in physically preparing design alternatives. See Davis (Palm Beach Cty., Fla.), \textit{supra} note 19. Computer-aided design software is used by architects, engineers, and drafters to create precision drawings or technical illustrations. See generally \textsc{Yehuda E. Kalay}, \textit{Architecture's New Media: Principles, Theories, and Methods of Computer-Aided Design} (2004).
\item [176] See \textit{Designing}, \textit{supra} note 12, at 3–4.
\item [177] See Anonymous (San Diego Cty., Cal.), \textit{supra} note 98; Hoffman (Phoenix, Ariz.), \textit{supra} note 19 (discussing corner photos, site plan, building elevations, and landscape palette); Wilcox (Leon Cty., Fla.), \textit{supra} note 19 (explaining that in Leon County the concept and detailed plan are done at same time); see also Borchardt (Reno, Nev.), \textit{supra} note 19 (stating handbook is more specific than bubble plan).
\item [178] See Cobb (Brevard, N.C.), \textit{supra} note 22 (explaining it is up to property owner; can have both at same time); Lewis (Jacksonville, Fla.), \textit{supra} note 19 (prefers detailed plan).
\item [179] See Jorden (Phoenix, Ariz.), \textit{supra} note 19; see also Hoffman (Phoenix, Ariz.), \textit{supra} note 19 (indicating plan can impact other jurisdictions). Approval of a concept plan does not guarantee approval of the details required in the development plan.
\item [180] See Wilcox (Leon Cty., Fla.), \textit{supra} note 19.
\item [181] See Silvyn (Tucson, Ariz.), \textit{supra} note 22 (reporting differences in Arizona where outer areas more likely to use conceptual plans and infill development areas require commitment).
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
client. A concept plan may be used for large projects, while some developers prefer development plans.\textsuperscript{182}

B. The Delay Problem

Zoning reviews of planned unit developments can be problematic, and they can cause delay that creates uncertainty and adds costs. The amount of time a decision takes can vary considerably among jurisdictions, ranging from a few months to several years.\textsuperscript{183} Delay is more likely when there is a three-stage process that includes a concept plan.\textsuperscript{184} Smaller projects should take less time.

There may be no easy remedy for this problem\textsuperscript{185}—a review process takes time to get it right. This problem does not occur only with planned unit developments, and comprehensive redesign of the entire zoning process may be needed.\textsuperscript{186} There are several options. One is to shorten

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{182} See Kramer (Orlando, Fla.), \textit{supra} note 19 (noting the use of a concept plan for projects over 2500 acres); Silvyn (Tucson, Ariz.), \textit{supra} note 22 (explaining a concept plan is not used if project is not a large section of land).

\textsuperscript{183} See Anonymous (San Diego Cty., Cal.), \textit{supra} note 98 (indicating a two and one-half to three years delay for master-planned communities and one and one-half to three years for smaller projects); Connolly & Ragonetti (Denver, Colo.), \textit{supra} note 19 (noting delay can make projects obsolete); Jensen (Reno, Nev.), \textit{supra} note 19 (indicating six to twelve weeks of delay and noting infill as more contentious in urban areas); McMurry (Anaheim, Cal.), \textit{supra} note 19 (noting a three to five year’s delay for compliance with California Environmental Quality Act, three years to litigate, and enormous added cost); see also Analysis, \textit{supra} note 54, at 26 (explaining that a nine to twelve month delay is typical, but can be held up for years by angry community members); Kramer (Orlando, Fla.), \textit{supra} note 19 (noting that implementation of concept plans has been expedient, but has also led to delay when there is no competence in administration and no shared vision, which can cause struggles for small towns). \textit{But see} Hoffman (Phoenix, Ariz.), \textit{supra} note 19 (indicating that planned unit developments take only six to seven months in Phoenix).

\textsuperscript{184} See Cobb (Brevard, N.C.), \textit{supra} note 22 (noting that developers can be obstinate and slow the process).

\textsuperscript{185} See Merriam (Hartford, Conn.), \textit{supra} note 21. One alternative is a statute that sets time limits on applications for approval and provides the application is “deemed approved” if not acted on within the statutory time. \textit{See LEGISLATIVE GUIDEBOOK, \textit{supra} note 25, § 10-201} (containing a model statute with time limits, and providing commentary citing legislation adopting this requirement). Time limits would have to be generous enough to provide enough time for considering major planned unit developments and would not apply to legislative actions such as rezoning for planned unit development districts.

\textsuperscript{186} \textit{See, e.g., MASS. ASS’N OF REGIONAL PLAN. AGENCIES, A BEST PRACTICES MODEL FOR STREAMLINED LOCAL PERMITTING} (2007), \url{http://www.mass.gov/hed/docs/permitting/permitting-bestpracticesguide.pdf}; \textit{LEGISLATIVE GUIDEBOOK, \textit{supra} note 25, § 10-208}
the review process by omitting unnecessary steps. For planned unit developments, for example, some jurisdictions approve the development plan at the same time as the rezoning is approved. Combining these decisions saves time if it is possible to decide both issues adequately in one hearing. Another option is for the decision agency to take a more active role. A simple change would have the agency condition approvals on the developer’s submission of changes, rather than returning the application to allow the developer to make these changes, which can take several months.

C. Neighbor Participation

Neighbor participation in decisions about planned unit development is important, either individually or through neighbor organizations. Problems arise if participation becomes obstinate and unyielding, an example of the Not In My Back Yard (NIMBY) syndrome. Opposition to any kind of zoning changes, often from neighbors, is all too common. Planned unit developments are no exception, as they may require a change in use or density that neighbors oppose. Opposition can delay or prevent the approval of a project, require changes in design, and raise costs.

The interviews with land use lawyers and planners asked whether neighbor opposition to planned unit development was a problem. Responses varied. Some believed the problem was not serious, or at


188 See Analysis, supra note 54, at 60–61; see also Anonymous (San Diego Cty., Cal.), supra note 98 (explaining applicants present a scoping letter with their detailed plan, which speeds up the process); Hoffman (Phoenix, Ariz.), supra note 19 (suggesting that rezoning and pre-application meetings would be combined). By-right alternatives are an option that avoids discretionary review, such as the incentive infill zoning adopted by Tucson. See infra notes 230–37 and accompanying text.

189 See Michael Dear, Understanding and Overcoming the NIMBY Syndrome, 58 J. AM. PLAN. ASS’N 288 (1992); see also Caressa Shively, Understanding the NIMBY and LULU Phenomena: Reassessing Our Knowledge Base and Informing Future Research, 21 J. PLAN. LIT. 255 (2007). Planned unit development can also be a LULU, a Locally Unwanted Land Use. Id.

190 See Hoffman (Phoenix, Ariz.), supra note 19 (stating neighbor opposition not much of a concern).
least no more serious than for other types of development. Opposition also depended on location and may be less for greenfield sites, where projects may be larger. Existing development may not be adjacent to these sites, and larger projects can provide buffering through landscaping and other measures that mitigate impacts on adjacent areas.

Other comments reported that neighbor opposition was a problem. Infill sites in urban areas are one example where there is opposition to increased density, noise, traffic, and other problems. Objection to change may be greater where development patterns are long-established. Other reports were highly negative. Neighbor opposition was reported as inevitable and negative, and planned unit development was described as a bad model for urban growth and change. Almost every major project in California is challenged, sometimes causing years of delay and substantial cost increases.

---

191 Kramer (Orlando, Fla.), supra note 19 (stating that opposition to planned unit development was no more than any other project because neighbors want planned unit developments, which have policies that address their concerns); White (Kansas City, Mo.), supra note 43 (explaining that opposition has not increased or decreased because neighbors have always been against something bigger, denser, or taller, and the pushback on regulations has gotten worse).

192 See Hoffman (Phoenix, Ariz.), supra note 19 (stating that certain neighborhoods with large lot single family zoning do not want change); Lewis (Jacksonville, Fla.), supra note 19 (noting that every area is distinct in Jacksonville); White (Kansas City, Mo.), supra note 43.

193 See Jorden (Phoenix, Ariz.), supra note 19 (noting that, in Arizona, a neighbor opposition to a planned unit development is less of an issue for greenfield sites).

194 See Anonymous (San Diego Cty., Cal.), supra note 98 (noting no problem with big development).

195 See Borchardt (Reno, Nev.), supra note 19 (indicating a lot of neighbor opposition in Reno); Davis (Palm Beach Cty., Fla.), supra note 19 (explaining the density of planned unit development projects is lower, so neighbors in Palm Beach County claim loss in value and object to loss of open space, leading to slowed or changed projects).

196 See Lewis (Jacksonville, Fla.), supra note 19; Wilcox (Leon Cty., Fla.), supra note 19.

197 See Mazzocco (Tucson, Ariz.), supra note 22.

198 But cf. Einsweiler (Austin, Tex.), supra note 67 (noting tolerance for planned unit developments in some communities, especially wealthy communities where there is growth pressure, though planning goals may be lowered).

199 For example, one large master-planned community has lost in litigation three times since the 1990s, has not built a single house, has made major investments over twenty years, and is proposing its fourth design. See McMurry (Anaheim, Cal.), supra note 19. Another project development was defeated and then sold to a developer at an
Neighborhood participation in zoning decisions is needed, but participation should be managed in a way that addresses both developer and neighbor concerns.\textsuperscript{200} The challenge is to find successful practices that will give neighbors a voice, yet prevent the NIMBY syndrome from occurring.\textsuperscript{201} Some cities have a network of neighborhood advisory councils, and municipalities can work through these organizations to get a better understanding of community concerns as a basis for dealing with projects such as planned unit developments.\textsuperscript{202} Land use attorney Dwight

88\%, $8 billion, loss. See id. A small portion of the development has been finally approved, and the carrying costs are $240,000 a day. See id.

\textsuperscript{200} See generally Grace Dawson, No Little Plans: Fairfax County’s Plus Program for Managing Growth (1977) (describing how active citizen organizations in small groups, backed by their local politicians, were effective in blocking unwanted development near homes and limiting the growth management program in Fairfax County, Virginia).

\textsuperscript{201} There may be a ward-courtesy practice in municipalities that elect legislative body members in a ward system. See Kenneth B. Bley, Use of the Civil Rights Acts to Recover Damages in Land Use Cases 811 (2005), Westlaw SK045 ALI-ABA 767 (defining “ward courtesy” as “deferring to the wishes of the legislator who is responsible for the area where land is located...”). All members will support the decision made by the member of the ward where a zoning change is requested, and they will oppose the change if the ward member opposes the change. This practice can give a veto power to residents of the ward if they are powerful enough to influence their representative. Judicial reaction to ward courtesy systems is mixed. Compare Hornsby v. Allen, 326 F.2d 605, 610 (5th Cir. 1964) (invalidating ward courtesy system for obtaining a liquor license), with Arroyo Vista Partners v. City of Santa Barbara, 732 F. Supp. 1046, 1051 (Cal. Dist. Ct. App. 1990) (recognizing the validity of ward courtesy system for denying an application for development plan).

Merriam has outlined a program of community outreach. He suggests ten cardinal principles that can win over opposition, including treating possible opponents as allies, having a plan of action, and knowing the community’s agenda. An outreach program like this is critical to deal effectively with neighbor involvement.

Neighborhood meetings on planned unit development applications are another alternative. They can be mandatory or voluntary, and managed by the developer or the municipality. Whether municipal staff should be present and what their role should be must be decided. For example, the Henderson, Nevada, planned unit development ordinance requires a mandatory neighborhood meeting and details requirements such as the contents of the meeting notification, meeting conduct, and preparation of a summary report. Staff attendance is optional, and staff are there only to advise on code provisions that apply. However, ordinances could allow staff to play a more active role in dealing with neighbor concerns and providing guidance on municipal policy. Neighborhood meetings are a common practice in the jurisdictions surveyed and are reported as helpful “eyes on the ground.”

---

203 See 2007 Report, supra note 4, at 8–9; see also Merriam (Hartford, Conn.), supra note 21.

204 See 2007 Report, supra note 4, at 8–9. The principles also include “being willing to set aside perceptions of what constitutes the public’s agenda when there is better information,” “following negotiation principles, hiring a public relations professional, preventing the community from taking a premature public stance, showing concern, showing gratitude,” and “fight[ing] only for that which makes economic sense.” Id.

205 A pre-application meeting between the developer and planning staff to discuss the project and provide staff feedback is also common. See 2007 Report, supra note 4, at 30–31 (detailing requirements for the meeting). See generally COLIER COUNTY, FLA., LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE § 10.02.13 (detailing meeting requirements); ST. CHARLES, ILL., ZONING ORDINANCE § 17.04.410(A).

206 See HENDERSON, NEV., DEVELOPMENT CODE § 19.6.3(b)(d).

207 See id. § 19.6.3(a)(3). Staff are not to serve as facilitators or become involved in negotiations; the purpose of the meeting is “to receive public suggestions, identify neighborhood concerns, and encourage dialogue at an early stage in the review process.” Id. § 19.6.3(a); see also FRANKLIN, TENN., ZONING ORDINANCE § 2.4.2(d) (detailing requirements for meeting, staff attendance, and summary of neighbor concerns).

208 See Anonymous (San Diego Cty., Cal.), supra note 98 (stating there are twenty-six local planning groups, and that applications are sent to local groups then local meeting held); Borchardt (Reno, Nev.), supra note 19 (indicating that community meetings are required for zoning amendment, staff are present, meetings are very helpful and provide eyes on the ground, changes are usually made at the meetings, there is usually no staff support if no resident support, and the council listens to residents); Cobb
either mandatory\textsuperscript{209} or voluntary, and may be encouraged if not mandatory. \textsuperscript{210} Legislative bodies and staff will not consider project applications in some municipalities without neighborhood support. \textsuperscript{211}

Not all comments were positive, as some indicated that meetings may not be effective and can slow the process. \textsuperscript{212} A study of planned unit development in Washington, D.C., claimed the community involvement process at that time was broken. \textsuperscript{213} Neighborhoods did not know when and how to get and stay involved, neighborhood organizations spoke only for a few, regulations did not specifically specify the roles of the community and the developer, and developers had no way of explaining their efforts with a neighborhood if unable to reach agreement. \textsuperscript{214} The study made a number of suggestions: regulations should clearly state the

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{209} See Merriam (Hartford, Conn.), supra note 21 (suggesting mandatory outreach to neighborhoods).
\textsuperscript{210} See, \textit{e.g.}, \textsc{St. Charles, Ill., Zoning Ordinance} § 17.04.410(B).
\textsuperscript{211} This response has been reported in cities that make use of neighbor participation.
\textsuperscript{212} See Cobb (Brevard, N.C.), supra note 22 (stating that neighborhood meetings in Brevard slow the process and neighbors did not always come to board meeting after the original neighborhood meeting).
\textsuperscript{213} See Analysis, supra note 54, at 6–7.
\textsuperscript{214} See id. at 27–31.
\end{flushright}
rules for community involvement, the agency should educate communities on how the process works, the agency should serve as a facilitator, and it or an independent third party should serve as mediator.\textsuperscript{215} Mediation and arbitration are pre-adjudicatory options that can avoid tensions between a developer and a neighborhood by moving dispute resolution to an independent mediator.\textsuperscript{216} A pre-application or scoping meeting, followed by a notice clearly specifying the issues to be considered, is also strongly recommended.\textsuperscript{217}

Although it cannot completely prevent objection, the comprehensive plan can be helpful in dealing with neighbor concerns. Planning programs typically provide for public participation in preparing and adopting comprehensive plans, which allows citizens and neighborhood organizations to contribute to land use policies.\textsuperscript{218} Participation can ensure consensus on land use policies that can guide zoning for planned unit developments.\textsuperscript{219}

\textsuperscript{215} See id. at 49–54. There should also be a process in which a developer can show it has done its best if agreement with the community is not reached. See id. at 54–55.

\textsuperscript{216} See Merriam (Hartford, Conn.), supra note 21 (indicating that a neutral ombudsman has been effective in Utah, suggesting that the statute of limitations for appealing zoning decisions to court should be suspended if parties agree to pursue alternative dispute resolutions, identifying that short time limits force premature litigation to avoid being closed out by the statute and litigation may harden the positions of the parties, making alternative dispute resolution more difficult, and indicating that suspending time limits will need legislative action).

\textsuperscript{217} See Memorandum on Public Hearing Report for ZC #08-06-12, Proposed Amendments to Zoning Regulations – Planned Unit Developments (PUD) 17–18 (D.C. Office of Planning 2010) (on file with author) (proposing recommendations for securing a clear process for community input, including a pre-application meeting); see also PLANNING & DEV. SERVS., IID NEIGHBORHOOD LIAISON POLICY (2015) (explaining that for downtown incentive district, applicant provides written agenda, including a written request for appointment of neighborhood liaison, and prepares a written summary of meeting to send to neighborhood liaison, who may concur or dissent); McMurry (Anaheim, Cal.), supra note 19 (describing scoping meeting). See generally Schwankie (Arlington, Va.), supra note 165 (indicating the developer for the Avalon development resolved opposition by taking residents on a national tour to see similar projects and by using visualization techniques to show residents what the project would be like, including social media); supra note 208 (discussing methods of pre-application meetings).

\textsuperscript{218} See LEGISLATIVE GUIDEBOOK, supra note 25, § 7-204 (model statute detailing contents of land use element).

\textsuperscript{219} See, e.g., PlanPHX General Plan Update – 2015, CITY OF PHOENIX, https://www.phoenix.gov/pdd/pz/general-plan-update (explaining village summit meetings as part of update process, and listing video presentations); see also LEGISLATIVE GUIDEBOOK, supra
Ultimately, the recourse is to the courts if neighbor opposition blocks project approval, and denials can attract constitutional challenge if based on fear and unsupported complaint. Courts reject neighborhood opposition if it does not have an adequate basis, but persuading a court that opposition is unacceptable can be difficult, and the decisions are mixed.\textsuperscript{220} For a developer of a planned unit development, an opportunity for lengthy litigation is not welcome and increases uncertainty.\textsuperscript{221} A litigation remedy is also limited by the three-fourths vote requirement for zoning amendments, which most state statutes contain, if twenty percent or more of the adjacent owners object.\textsuperscript{222} Neighbor objections over the threshold often require a supermajority vote for approval, which may be difficult.

IV. INFILL PROJECTS, FORM-BASED CODES, AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS

Some observers claim that extensive neighborhood opposition makes planned unit development a dysfunctional strategy and that alternatives are required.\textsuperscript{223} By-right systems that do not require discretionary review are one alternative.\textsuperscript{224} They create an entitlement by allowing a project to move forward once a developer shows compliance with the regulations.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{221} \textit{But see} Merriam (Hartford, Conn.), \textit{supra} note 21 (explaining that developers generally will not abandon a project when faced with neighbor opposition because they have deep pockets and can stick it out).
\item \textsuperscript{222} Many state zoning acts include this provision. \textit{See, e.g.}, Hyland v. City of Mesa, 537 P.2d 936 (Ariz. 1975) (en banc). \textit{See generally} U.S. \textit{Dep’t of Com.}, \textit{A Standard State Zoning Enabling Act} \S\ 5, at 7–8 (1926), https://planning-org-uploaded-media.s3.amazonaws.com/legacy_resources/growingsmart/pdf/SZEnablingAct1926.pdf (proposing this requirement).
\item \textsuperscript{223} \textit{See} Einsweiler (Austin, Tex.), \textit{supra} note 67; White (Kansas City, Mo.), \textit{supra} note 43.
\item \textsuperscript{224} \textit{See} Analysis, \textit{supra} note 54, at 21.
\end{itemize}
Certainty is created, and delays created by discretionary reviews are avoided. Public participation occurs when the municipality adopts the regulations, and neighbor opposition cannot block a project unless neighbors obtain a downzoning.225 These advantages should be balanced against the opportunities discretionary review provides for achieving better design and social objectives, such as affordable housing.226

A. Infill Development

Infill projects227 in town centers and urban areas provide a by-right alternative because the character of the surrounding area provides a basis for standards that can guide project design. Incentive downtown zoning districts for infill development are an example.228 They contain development standards fitted to the area, permit creativity, and use project review to determine compliance. There is some flexibility, but the development plan review typical of planned unit development ordinances does not occur. Design plans for downtown areas can provide important backup.229

225 See LAND USE LAW, supra note 30, §§ 6.34 to 6.36 (noting that down zonings are subject to judicial disapproval if they are arbitrary).

226 See Analysis, supra note 54, at 21–22 (discussing opportunities for design review, citizen input, and higher density development). The report also argues that planned unit developments allow the city to obtain site-specific benefits and amenities, allow the city to rezone properties consistent with the comprehensive plan, and provide a means for allowing more interesting, creative buildings to be built. See Analysis, supra note 54, at 22–23. These benefits may apply only to Washington, D.C.


228 See Mazzocco (Tucson, Ariz.), supra note 22 (noting several Arizona cities have adopted this alternative). These cities may see infill development “as a preferential place to pursue a rezoning through a regular privately-initiated rezoning.” E-mail from Jim Mazzocco, Gov’t Hearing Exam’r, Tucson, Ariz., to author (March 22, 2017, 19:07 CST) [hereinafter Mazzocco, E-mail] (on file with author).

The Downtown Incentive Infill District in Tucson, Arizona, is an example of this approach. It solves contextual design problems while allowing creativity and flexibility through alternate ways of compliance and standards that leave room for design choices. The Unified Development Code establishes and maps the Infill District and its subdistricts, and the Unified Development Code contains both mandatory and optional overlay zone standards and requirements. The Planning and Development Services Department must approve a plan that complies with general development standards, such as Streetscape Design and Development Transition standards, and includes an “urban design best practice option.” The plan must also comply with subdistrict standards, such as those for the Downtown Core Subdistrict. These


A statute authorizes infill incentive districts when three of the following requirements are met:

1. There is a large number of vacant older or dilapidated buildings or structures.
2. There is a large number of vacant or underused parcels of property, obsolete or inappropriate lot or parcel sizes or environmentally contaminated sites.
3. There is a large number of buildings or other places where nuisances exist or occur.
4. There is an absence of development and investment activity compared to other areas in the city or town.
5. There is a high occurrence of crime.
6. There is a continuing decline in population.

_ARIZ. REV. STAT. ANN._ § 9-499.10(A). The governing body “shall adopt an infill incentive plan to encourage redevelopment in the district,” which may include “1. Expedited zoning or rezoning procedures. 2. Expedited processing of plans and proposals. 3. Waivers of municipal fees for development activities as long as the waivers are not funded by other development fees. 4. Relief from development standards.” Id. § 9-499.10(B).

See _TUCSON_, ARIZ., _UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT CODE_ § 1.3 (“The provisions of the UPC are established to . . . encourage the most efficient use of land through site sensitive design . . .”).

See generally id. §§ 5–9. The purpose of the Urban Overlay District and Downtown Area Infill Incentive District is to “provide flexible development options to landowners rather than mandatory requirements.” Id. § 5.1.


See _TUCSON_, ARIZ., _UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT CODE_ § 5.12.10.
include design, use, height, and landscaping standards, subject to exemp-
tions and modifications. Modifications may require judgment. A modifica-
tion for pedestrian access, for example, can allow “[a]lternative pedestrian access that creates connectivity between public entrances to the project and abutting sidewalks . . . as long as no safety hazard is created.”

An alternate approach keeps discretionary review but includes context-specific review standards that are sensitive to the existing environment. The Tallahassee, Florida, Urban Planned Unit Development Zoning District is an example of this approach. One purpose of this district is to “[e]ncourage infill and rehabilitation of existing urban areas with readily available services and infrastructure.” Review criteria require sensitivity to context and that “[b]uilding design shall contribute to making and perceiving downtown and surrounding central core areas as a pattern of spaces and structures rather than a series of unrelated buildings and streets.” The ordinance lists “[c]haracter elements and amenities” for consideration “in determining whether the project design contributes to the public realm” that emphasize context and require design consistent with a downtown environment.

B. Form-Based Codes

Form-based codes are a by-right alternative that has an enthusiastic following. They respond to a concern that traditional zoning is a rigid format that prohibits, rather than encourages, good development. One critical problem is the rigid use separation that prevents mixed-use

235 See id. § 5.12.10(B).
236 See id. § 5.12.10(C).
237 Id. § 5.12.10(D)(1). “In Tucson the first step may involve a review by the Design Review Committee with a recommendation for the decision by the PDSD Director.” Mazzocco, E-mail, supra note 228. “The whole process may be three to four months depending on the complexity of the building plans.” Id.; see also Hoffman (Phoenix, Ariz.), supra note 19 (discussing infill development in Phoenix).
238 See TALLAHASSEE, FLA., LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE § 10-200.
239 Id. § 10-200(a)(1).
240 Id. § 10-200(b)(1).
241 Id. § 10-200(b)(7). For example, the ordinance requires “building mass that relates to the scale of the street” and “ground floor transparency appropriate to use.” Id.
“A form-based code is a land development regulation that fosters predictable built results and a high-quality public realm by using physical form (rather than separation of uses) as the organizing principle for the code.”

In practice, form-based codes regulate land use, but “form is more important than rigid use separation.” The code regulates relationships “between building facades and the public realm, the form and mass of buildings . . . , and the scale and types of streets and blocks,” and it is a highly-detailed list of specifications for these features.

There is no room for discretion. New development must comply with the code, but then the new development has an entitlement. Certainty encourages investment. Nothing could be more different from the discretionary approval process used for planned unit developments.

There is agreement that form-based codes are suitable for redevelopment of downtown areas, buildings, and urban blocks.

---

242 See John M. Barry, Form-Based Codes: Measured Success Through Both Mandatory and Optional Implementation, 41 Conn. L. Rev. 305, 308 (2008).

243 Form-Based Codes Defined, Form-Based Codes Inst., http://formbasedcodes.org/definition/. The web site has a detailed explanation with examples. See id. Form-based codes have a regulating plan that indexes development rules, explains where they apply, and describes development requirements. See Daniel G. Parolek, Karen Parolek, & Paul C. Crawford, Form-Based Codes: A Guide for Planners, Urban Designers, Municipalities, and Developers 17–27 (2008); Barry, supra note 242 (detailing experience with form-based codes in several cities). See generally Richard Rogers, Regional Form-Based Zoning: Repairing and Preventing the Negative Effects of Suburban Sprawl, 40 Zoning & Plan. Rep., No. 4, (2017) (explaining how form-based codes are implemented with examples in selected cities, including downtown and urban areas).

244 E-mail from Nancy Stroud, to author (June 23, 2017, 13:18 CST) (on file with author).

245 Form Based Codes Defined, supra note 243.

246 See generally Barry, supra note 242, at 308.

247 See Kramer (Orlando, Fla.), supra note 19 (adding that planned unit development is a crutch that may discourage investment and cover up bad development regulation); see also Cobb (Brevard, N.C.), supra note 22 (revising ordinance with form-based code emphasis for downtown will extend to neighborhoods later and will not then need planned unit developments that are often tweaked variances).

248 See Cobb (Brevard, N.C.), supra note 22 (revising ordinance with form-based code emphasis in downtown); Hoffman (Phoenix, Ariz.), supra note 19 (discussing character areas downtown; planned unit development not needed); Jensen (Reno, Nev.), supra note 19 (reporting form-based code downtown near transit use); Kramer (Orlando,
concern about applying them to superblocks and planned unit developments. 249 “[T]he most problematic application is on properties that have already been developed in a suburban density and form.” 250 A model Smart Code for form-based codes authorizes a specific district that can be adapted for use with planned unit developments, but critics argue this option is not adequate. 251 Another option is to combine form-based codes with planned unit development to create a hybrid system. 252

Critics of form-based codes point to difficulties with the system that make them challenging to implement. 253 Municipalities have complicated the codes by adding land use regulations and making these disparate regulations work together can be difficult. Design standards can be long, over prescriptive, difficult to verify, and do not deal with the basic concepts raised by planned unit developments, 254 though supporters claim “[a] well-written code is not unwieldy.” 255 Raleigh, North Carolina, is an example of a city that adopted a modified form-based code in its Unified Development Ordinance to reduce reliance on planned unit developments. 256 The code includes

---

249 See Telephone Interview with Don Elliott, Dir., Clarion Associates (Mar. 15, 2017) [hereinafter Elliott (Denver, Colo.)] (stating form-based codes cannot apply to broad concepts of planned unit development); Jensen (Reno, Nev.), supra note 19; White (Kansas City, Mo.), supra note 43.

250 E-mail from George M. Kramer, Dir. of Planning, S&ME, to author (July 5, 2017, 8:46 CST) (on file with author).

251 See SMART CODE VERSION 9.2 § 3.6, http://www.dpz.com/uploads/Books/SmartCode-v9.2.pdf; see also Stroud, supra note 244 (explaining use of specific district). Ms. Stroud participated in the drafting of a form-based code for Miami, Florida. Mr. White argues that specific districts are difficult to use. See White (Kansas City, Mo.), supra note 43.

252 See Merriam (Hartford, Conn.), supra note 21 (noting planned unit development district used with form-based code).

253 See Elliott (Denver, Colo.), supra note 249 (recommending attention to basic issues). Mr. Elliott has extensive experience with land development regulations. For a critique of the use of form-based codes in older suburbs, see Nicole Garnett, Old Suburbs Meets New Urbanism, NOTRE DAME L. SCH. (2015).

254 See Elliott (Denver, Colo.), supra note 249. For example, a code could prescribe a ceiling height that is too high for some developments and too low for others.

255 Stroud, supra note 244 (recommending application to planned unit developments).

form-based elements that regulate mixed-use development in commercial districts\textsuperscript{257} and permit development by right without review.\textsuperscript{258} It regulates building form, adds street frontage and height regulation, and recognizes land use differences by applying different form-based controls to different mixed-use combinations.\textsuperscript{259} Planned unit developments are used occasionally when neighbor opposition is expected because they provide an opportunity to comment on building form.\textsuperscript{260}

C. Development Agreements

Development agreements, which are authorized by statute in some states, are used by some municipalities to supplement development plans for planned unit developments.\textsuperscript{261} A development agreement is a private agreement between a developer and a municipality in which each party agrees on terms that will control the development of the project.\textsuperscript{262} It is

\textsuperscript{257} See Crane (Raleigh, N.C.), supra note 39 (noting that the development community has not caught up with the new ordinance). The ordinance does not include design review because a state statute requires quasi-judicial process for this type of decision. See N.C. GEN. STAT. § 160A-393; Crane (Raleigh, N.C.), supra note 39; see also CODE STUDIO, RALEIGH’S NEW DEVELOPMENT CODE: DIAGNOSTIC AND APPROACH REPORT (Public Review Draft 2010) (on file with author). See generally RALEIGH, N.C., UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE, https://www.raleighnc.gov/content/extra/Books/PlanDev/UnifiedDevelopmentOrdinance/#58 (demonstrating an example of a development ordinance).

\textsuperscript{258} See id. arts. 3.2 to 3.5.

\textsuperscript{259} See id. arts. 3.2 to 3.5.

\textsuperscript{260} See Crane (Raleigh, N.C.), supra note 39 (noting that developers want certainty and to avoid the risk of public comment).


\textsuperscript{262} See 2007 Report, supra note 4, at 47–49; see also Analysis, supra note 54, at 45.
considered necessary in some areas because it protects the developer from a change in rules that applied when the agreement was executed.\textsuperscript{263} These assurances are important because it is difficult to secure vested rights in planned unit developments, especially when they are built over a long period of time.\textsuperscript{264} Without an agreement, changes made in zoning regulations after the development has started will apply and can disrupt a project. Development agreements can also give municipalities private controls not available through zoning that supplement the development plan.\textsuperscript{265} They can be quite extensive and cover all aspects of a project, including land use, design, financing, capital facilities, and affordable housing.\textsuperscript{266}

Despite these advantages, development agreements can create problems when used with planned unit developments. There can be an unclear line between a development agreement and the development plan

\begin{enumerate}
\item Permit local government to require public facilities and improvements beyond those which it may legally require as generated by a proposed land development project.
\item Permit local government greater flexibility in regulating large, multiphase projects extending over many years.
\item Strengthen the public planning process and encourage public and private participation in comprehensive planning.
\item Reduce the economic cost of development and allow for the orderly planning of public facilities and services and the allocation of costs.
\end{enumerate}


\textsuperscript{263} See E-mail from Robert McMurry, to author (July 5, 2017 21:54 CST) (on file with author) (“With the myriad of regulations in California and the increasing use of general plans to contain zoning-like provisions (which removed the greater certainty zoning affords), stakeholders are increasingly using development agreements to customise the regulations and provide enforceable rules for developers.”).

\textsuperscript{264} See 2007 Report, \textit{supra} note 4, at 47, 106–08 (discussing statutes in some states that confer vested rights); \textit{see also} WASH. REV. CODE ANN. § 36.70B.180 (prohibiting “zoning ordinance or development standard or regulation or a new zoning ordinance or development standard or regulation adopted after the effective date of the agreement”).

\textsuperscript{265} See Jorden (Phoenix, Ariz.), \textit{supra} note 19 (stating agreements can cover infrastructure and land use); McMurry (Anaheim, Cal.), \textit{supra} note 19 (noting development agreements avoid problems and are a win-win for both parties).

that makes implementation difficult,\textsuperscript{267} and potential conflicts must be considered in the zoning ordinance.\textsuperscript{268} There is also concern that development agreements violate fundamental public law norms because they are negotiated without the protections of legislative and administrative process.\textsuperscript{269} They are acceptable if negotiation limited to the developer and the municipality is an acceptable way of regulating land development.

V. SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITIES: AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Zoning for planned unit development provides an opportunity to consider social responsibilities. Affordable housing is an example.\textsuperscript{270} Planned unit developments can provide an opportunity for affordable housing, which can be one of the objectives included in a statement of purpose.\textsuperscript{271} Inclusionary zoning is one option. This is a program in which a municipality requires all developers to provide a certain percentage of

\textsuperscript{267} See Jorden (Phoenix, Ariz.), supra note 19.

\textsuperscript{268} It is also common to require a developer to agree to the establishment of private restrictive covenants. A restrictive covenant is a privately imposed restriction on what an owner can do with its land. See \textit{Restatement (Third) of Prop.: Servitudes} § 1.3(3) (AM. LAW INST. 2000). Restrictive covenants have a binding effect if properly done. Restrictive covenants are often required for the dedication and maintenance of common open space in planned unit developments, which can require the creation of a homeowner’s association with enforcement powers. See 2007 Report, supra note 4, at 99–105 (containing model ordinance requirements and commentary for the provision of common open space and creation of a homeowner’s association with enforcement authority). See \textit{generally} GERALD KORNOLD, \textit{PRIVATE LAND ARRANGEMENTS: EASEMENTS, REAL COVENANTS, & EQUITABLE SERVITUDES} chs. 8–11 (3d ed. 2016). Covenants covering other issues can also be included and may overlap with zoning requirements. See Connolly & Ragonetti (Denver, Colo.), supra note 19 (noting that some governments mandate covenants, but most prefer to leave enforcement to private associations and special districts).


\textsuperscript{271} See \textit{Eagle County, Colo., Land Use Regulations} § 5.240A.1f (establishing incentives for provision of long term affordable housing); \textit{Tucson, Ariz., Unified Development Code} § 3.5.6(A) (providing a variety of housing); \textit{see also Osceola County, Fla., Land Development Code} § 3.11(A) (creating a variety of housing types and compatible neighborhood arrangements that provide housing choice).
their housing as affordable. An inclusionary zoning requirement can be included in a planned unit development ordinance. Inclusionary zoning programs are complex. They require decisions on whether the program will be mandatory or voluntary, the size of the developments covered, the amount of affordable housing required, income levels for housing occupants, how affordable housing will be distributed in the project, and controls on resale and rental to keep the housing affordable. Density bonuses may be available and must be calculated. Long-term controls on rents and resale values, which maintain


273 See 2007 Report, supra note 4, at 88–89. As an alternative to providing housing in the development, the ordinance can provide for an optional payment of fees into a housing trust fund to be used for affordable housing, or it can provide density bonuses to offset the cost of providing below-market housing.

274 See MODEL AFFORDABLE HOUSING DENSITY BONUS ORDINANCE (AM. PLANNING ASS’N 2007), https://smartgrowthamerica.org/app/legacy/images/IH-model-ordinance-A PA%20.pdf; see also E-mail from Robert McMurry, to author (July 6, 2017, 09:27 PM PST) (on file with author) (growing pressure to encourage affordable housing has increased density bonuses beyond typical 10% to 15% bonus; for example, 35% bonus
the housing in the affordable market, can be especially difficult to administer. These problems can discourage the adoption of affordable housing requirements for planned unit developments. An affordable housing program is likely to be effective only for large planned communities that have a significant amount of housing, however, unless an in-lieu fee could be charged against smaller developments that cannot develop housing on the site.

The interviews reflect these concerns. Some reported affordable housing requirements for planned unit developments, though they may only apply to larger projects, or were voluntary and offered density or height bonuses. Several reported that affordable housing requirements were not adopted or were included in other ordinances. Some planned unit development ordinances require or authorize the provision of affordable housing.

---

275 See Connolly & Ragonetti (Denver, Colo.), supra note 19 (depending on project and jurisdiction, mountain communities in Colorado have them for employees); Hoffman (Phoenix, Ariz.), supra note 19 (noting that fee required if not provided in development); Schwanke (Arlington, Va.), supra note 165 (requiring affordable housing to be part of the planned unit developments).

276 See Cobb (Brevard, N.C.), supra note 22 (explaining for large sites, it was done in recent planned unit developments); Connolly & Ragonetti (Denver, Colo.), supra note 19 (applying to some big projects in Denver).

277 See Hoffman (Phoenix, Ariz.), supra note 19 (providing height waiver if included in development).

278 See Jensen (Reno, Nev.), supra note 19 (explaining it is not an issue in cities with good supply of older affordable housing); Jorden (Phoenix, Ariz.), supra note 19 (having few affordable options); Mazzocco (Tucson, Ariz.), supra note 22 (explaining it is not usual, but a one-time deal and regularly, do not want to monitor over long period of time); Merriam (Hartford, Conn.), supra note 21. But see Jensen (Reno, Nev.), supra note 19 (stating affordable housing is not an issue in cities with good supply of older housing); White (Kansas City, Mo.), supra note 43 (stating affordable housing is not an issue in his communities).

279 See AUSTIN, TEX., LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE, ch. 25-2, subch. B, art. 2, div. 5, subpt. A, § 2.4 (containing affordable housing part of Tier II requirements); BALTIMORE, MD., ZONING CODE § 9-310(a)(2) (authorizing a density bonus for affordable housing); D.C., ZONING REGULATIONS tit. 11, subtit. X, § 305.5(g) (authorizing affordable housing as public benefit); EAGLE COUNTY, COLO., LAND USE REGULATIONS § 5-240F.3.f (authorizing variation to extend incentives for affordable housing); LOUISVILLE, COLO., CODE OF ORDINANCES § 17.28.040 (authorizing amount to be determined by city
Inclusionary zoning is only one option for providing affordable housing. There are other strategies,\textsuperscript{280} such as including housing elements in comprehensive plans that require the calculation of affordable housing needs and designation of sites to meet those needs.\textsuperscript{281} About one-half of the states require housing elements.\textsuperscript{282} Where states require them, developers may be required to provide affordable housing in planned unit developments to satisfy affordable housing needs and site designations.\textsuperscript{283}

Another alternative is to require a jobs-housing balance, which is a balanced proportion of jobs and housing within a planned unit...
A jobs-housing balance can help make housing affordable because it reduces the commuting time to jobs. Transportation costs are an important part of housing costs and can make housing unaffordable. Lower-cost housing is likely to be on the edge of a metropolitan area, so transportation costs from these locations will be high due to increased commutes. A jobs-housing balance, by bringing jobs within planned unit developments, can decrease transportation costs significantly.

A jobs-housing balance has its own complexities. It can be difficult to calculate because it assumes that housing units are a good representation of the work force. It also requires large-scale planned communities to provide the jobs that make a jobs-housing balance meaningful. The interviews reflect these problems. A few reported jobs-housing balance requirements, but most reported they are not used or are being abandoned.

---

284 See 2007 Report, supra note 4, at 74; PLATT, supra note 8 (discussing economic development and jobs-housing balance in planned communities).
286 It can also decrease infrastructure costs and air pollution by decreasing miles traveled for commuting. See JERRY WEITZ, JOBS-HOUSING BALANCE 1–3 (2003).
287 See id. at 20–21. It also creates a phasing problem because jobs may not be immediately available for residents in the early stages of a community’s development.
289 See Borchardt (Reno, Nev.), supra note 19 (analyzing jobs-housing balance as part of application); McMurry (Anaheim, Cal.), supra note 19 (noting jobs-housing balance is required in environmental reports under California Environmental Quality Act); White (Kansas City, Mo.), supra note 43 (noting jobs-housing balance required in one county he consulted, which did not want giant residential subdivisions).
290 See Anonymous (San Diego Cty., Cal.), supra note 98 (explaining that state has mandatory housing element requirement); Jorden (Phoenix, Ariz.), supra note 19 (seeking to minimize driving); Merriam (Hartford, Conn.), supra note 21 (stating they do not see job-house balance); Schwanke (Arlington, Va.), supra note 165 (noting they are more interested in full range of uses).
291 See Borchardt (Reno, Nev.), supra note 19 (looking at one major scale in the city, will do update on where density and jobs go); Hill (Orange Cty., Fla.), supra note 19 (moving away from this requirement because it is hard to track, using form-based codes, acquiring jobs because of mixed-uses, and more is done in the review process).
VI. CONCLUSION

Planned unit development began as an add-on strategy to conventional zoning that can provide flexibility and better design. As applied originally to single-family residential housing, it can create developments in which housing is clustered on one part of the site in return for common open space elsewhere. Practice has now taken planned unit development beyond this simple form. Mixed-use development is common, as are infill developments in urban areas and master-planned communities.

Planned unit development regulations work reasonably well. The treatment of some issues is not always adequate, but no solution is without its problems and choices must be made. Communities will have to decide how to zone for planned unit development; whether it will consider alternatives to discretionary review; and whether it will meet social obligations, such as providing for affordable housing. Planned unit development has become a dominant zoning strategy that requires major attention as a zoning process.
## APPENDIX A

### INTERVIEWS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Intentionally Omitted</td>
<td>Intentionally Omitted</td>
<td>San Diego County, Cal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Borchardt</td>
<td>City of Reno</td>
<td>Associate Planner</td>
<td>Reno, Nev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Cobb</td>
<td>City of Brevard</td>
<td>Planning Director</td>
<td>Brevard, N.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Connolly &amp;</td>
<td>Otten Johnson Robinson Neff &amp;</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>Denver, Colo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Ragonetti</td>
<td>Ragonetti</td>
<td>Shareholder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis Crane</td>
<td>City of Raleigh</td>
<td>Assistant Planning Director</td>
<td>Raleigh, N.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Davis</td>
<td>Palm Beach County</td>
<td>Urban Designer/Principal Planner</td>
<td>Palm Beach County, Fla.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Einsweiler</td>
<td>Code Studio</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Austin, Tex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Elliott</td>
<td>Clarion Associates</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Denver, Colo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Feder</td>
<td>Husch Blackwell</td>
<td>Senior Counsel</td>
<td>Clayton, Mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olan Hill</td>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>Assistant Manager</td>
<td>Orange County, Fla.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Hoffman</td>
<td>City of Phoenix</td>
<td>Deputy Director, Planning &amp; Development</td>
<td>Phoenix, Ariz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aric Jensen</td>
<td>City of Reno</td>
<td>Director of Community Development</td>
<td>Reno, Nev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George M. Kramer</td>
<td>S&amp;ME</td>
<td>Director of Planning</td>
<td>Orlando, Fla.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce E. Lewis</td>
<td>City of Jacksonville</td>
<td>City Planning Supervisor</td>
<td>Jacksonville, Fla.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>AFFILIATION</td>
<td>POSITION</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Mazzocco</td>
<td>City of Tucson</td>
<td>Zoning Administrator (Retired)</td>
<td>Tucson, Ariz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert L. McMurry</td>
<td>Robert McMurry Law Offices</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Anaheim, Cal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwight Merriam</td>
<td>Robinson &amp; Cole</td>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>Hartford, Conn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Schwanke</td>
<td>Schwanke Consulting &amp; Communications</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Arlington, Va.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark White</td>
<td>White &amp; Smith, LLC</td>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>Kansas City, Mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Wilcox</td>
<td>Florida Development Support &amp; Environmental Management</td>
<td>Chief Development Resources Officer</td>
<td>Leon County, Fla.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Interviews were conducted in December 2016 and January-March 2017*
## APPENDIX B

### CITY & COUNTY PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL JURISDICTION</th>
<th>WEBPAGE</th>
<th>SITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alabama</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td><a href="https://www.auburnalabama.org/planning%5Cdevelopment-services/zoning-ordinance/2017%20March%20ZO.pdf">https://www.auburnalabama.org/planning\development-services/zoning-ordinance/2017%20March%20ZO.pdf</a></td>
<td>auburnalabama.org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td><a href="https://www.municode.com/library/al/mobile/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=CICO_CH64ZO_S64-5PLUNDE">https://www.municode.com/library/al/mobile/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=CICO_CH64ZO_S64-5PLUNDE</a></td>
<td>cityofmobile.org/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arizona</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maricopa County</td>
<td><a href="https://www.maricopa.gov/DocumentCenter/View/4785">https://www.maricopa.gov/DocumentCenter/View/4785</a></td>
<td>maricopa.gov/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td><a href="http://www.mesaaz.gov/home/showdocument?id=12470">http://www.mesaaz.gov/home/showdocument?id=12470</a></td>
<td>mesaaaz.gov/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td><a href="http://www.codepublishing.com/AZ/Phoenix/">http://www.codepublishing.com/AZ/Phoenix/</a></td>
<td>phoenix.gov/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arkansas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conway</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cityofconway.org/media/government/planning-development/ZON_ORD.pdf">http://www.cityofconway.org/media/government/planning-development/ZON_ORD.pdf</a></td>
<td>cityofconway.org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>California</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL JURISDICTION</td>
<td>WEBPAGE</td>
<td>SITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California (cont’d)</td>
<td><img src="https://www.municode.com/library/ca/newark/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=CD_ORD_TIT17ZO_CH17.40PLUNDE" alt="California WEBPAGE" /></td>
<td>ci.newark.ca.us/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td><img src="https://www.municode.com/library/ca/newark/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=CD_ORD_TIT17ZO_CH17.40PLUNDE" alt="Newark WEBPAGE" /></td>
<td>ci.newark.ca.us/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Springs</td>
<td>![Palm Springs WEBPAGE](<a href="http://www.qcode.us/codes/palm">http://www.qcode.us/codes/palm</a> springs/)</td>
<td>ci.palm-springs.ca.us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasanton</td>
<td><img src="http://qcode.us/codes/pleasanton/" alt="Pleasanton WEBPAGE" /></td>
<td>cityofpleasanton.ca.gov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/pds/zoning/z6000.pdf">PUD ordinance</a> – Sandiegocounty.gov</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Eagle</td>
<td>![Eagle WEBPAGE](<a href="http://www.townofeagle.org/Document">http://www.townofeagle.org/Document</a> Center/View/12104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle County</td>
<td><img src="http://www.eaglecounty.us/Planning/Documents/2015_Article_5_Administration_CLEAN_031015/" alt="Eagle County WEBPAGE" /></td>
<td>eaglecounty.us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Collins</td>
<td><img src="https://www.municode.com/library/co/fort_collins/codes/land_use?nodeId=ART4D1_DIV4.29PLDEOVDPD" alt="Fort Collins WEBPAGE" /></td>
<td>fcgov.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td><img src="https://library.municode.com/co/louisville/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=TIT17ZO" alt="Louisville WEBPAGE" /></td>
<td>louisvilleco.gov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="https://deoz.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/deoz/publication/attachments/SubtitleX_0.pdf" alt="District of Columbia WEBPAGE" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Broward County</td>
<td><img src="https://www.municode.com/library/fl/broward_county/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIICOOR_CH39ZO_ARTXXPLDEDI" alt="Broward County WEBPAGE" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay County</td>
<td><img src="http://www.claycountygov.com/Home/ShowDocument?id=1266" alt="Clay County WEBPAGE" /></td>
<td>claycountygov.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL JURISDICTION</td>
<td>WEBPAGE</td>
<td>SITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collier County</td>
<td><a href="https://library.municode.com/FL/Collier_County/codes/land_development_code?nodeId=CH10APREDEKIPR_10.02.00APRE">https://library.municode.com/FL/Collier_County/codes/land_development_code?nodeId=CH10APREDEKIPR_10.02.00APRE</a></td>
<td>colliergov.net</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallandale Beach</td>
<td><a href="https://www.municode.com/library/fl/hallandale_beach/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIICOOR_CH32ZOLADECO_ARTIIIIZO_DIV2ZODIOV_SDIVPVLDEOV">https://www.municode.com/library/fl/hallandale_beach/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIICOOR_CH32ZOLADECO_ARTIIIIZO_DIV2ZODIOV_SDIVPVLDEOV</a></td>
<td>hallandalebeach.org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manatee County</td>
<td><a href="https://www.municode.com/library/fl/manatee_county/codes/land_development_code?nodeId=CH3REAUPR_PTVIIOTAP_S350DEAG">https://www.municode.com/library/fl/manatee_county/codes/land_development_code?nodeId=CH3REAUPR_PTVIIOTAP_S350DEAG</a></td>
<td>mymanatee.org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin County</td>
<td><a href="https://www.municode.com/library/fl/martin_county/codes/land_development_code?nodeId=LADERE_ART3ZODI_DIV5">https://www.municode.com/library/fl/martin_county/codes/land_development_code?nodeId=LADERE_ART3ZODI_DIV5</a> PLUNDE</td>
<td>martin.fl.us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td><a href="https://www.municode.com/library/fl/orange_county/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=ORCOCO_CH38ZO_ARTVIIIPL">https://www.municode.com/library/fl/orange_county/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=ORCOCO_CH38ZO_ARTVIIIPL</a> DEDI</td>
<td>orangecountyfl.net</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td><a href="https://www.municode.com/library/fl/orlando/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=TITIICOCH5ZODIUS_PT2DIRE_2Q">https://www.municode.com/library/fl/orlando/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=TITIICOCH5ZODIUS_PT2DIRE_2Q</a> PDPLDEDI</td>
<td>cityoforlando.net</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach County</td>
<td><a href="http://discover.pbcgov.org/pzb/zoning/ULDC/Articles.aspx">http://discover.pbcgov.org/pzb/zoning/ULDC/Articles.aspx</a></td>
<td>co.palm-beach.fl.us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL JURISDICTION</td>
<td>WEBSITE</td>
<td>SITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Florida (cont’d)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tallahassee</td>
<td><a href="https://library.municode.com/fl/tallahassee/codes/land_development_code?nodeId=LADECO_CH10ZO">https://library.municode.com/fl/tallahassee/codes/land_development_code?nodeId=LADECO_CH10ZO</a></td>
<td>talgov.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Georgia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartow County</td>
<td><a href="https://www.municode.com/library/ga/bartow_county/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=APXAZO_ARTVIIUSREDISPD1_S7.15PUBLUNDEDE">https://www.municode.com/library/ga/bartow_county/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=APXAZO_ARTVIIUSREDISPD1_S7.15PUBLUNDEDE</a></td>
<td>bartowga.org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Illinois</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Charles</td>
<td><a href="https://codebook.stcharlesil.gov/title-17-zoning/c1704/node-2508">https://codebook.stcharlesil.gov/title-17-zoning/c1704/node-2508</a></td>
<td>stcharlesil.gov/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indiana</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td><a href="https://www.dropbox.com/s/nixwv4h7bb9ox/05_Planned%20Unit%20Development.pdf?dl=0">https://www.dropbox.com/s/nixwv4h7bb9ox/05_Planned%20Unit%20Development.pdf?dl=0</a></td>
<td>columbus.in.gov/planning/zoning/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL JURISDICTION</td>
<td>WEBPAGE</td>
<td>SITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indiana (cont’d)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishers</td>
<td><a href="http://www.fishers.in.us/egov/docs/1163779146868.htm">http://www.fishers.in.us/egov/docs/1163779146868.htm</a></td>
<td>fishers.in.us/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.fishers.in.us/DocumentCenter/View/9396">http://www.fishers.in.us/DocumentCenter/View/9396</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kansas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Louisiana</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Tammany Parish</td>
<td><a href="http://www2.stpgov.org/planning/udc/section_6.01_pud_-_planned_unit_development_overlay.pdf">http://www2.stpgov.org/planning/udc/section_6.01_pud_-_planned_unit_development_overlay.pdf</a></td>
<td>stpgov.org/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maryland</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td><a href="http://ca.baltimorecity.gov/codes/Art%2032%20-%20Zoning.pdf">http://ca.baltimorecity.gov/codes/Art%2032%20-%20Zoning.pdf</a></td>
<td>baltimorecity.gov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Massachusetts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Michigan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Montana</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalispell</td>
<td><a href="http://qcode.us/codes/kalispell/">http://qcode.us/codes/kalispell/</a></td>
<td>kalispell.com/home/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nevada</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL JURISDICTION</td>
<td>WEBPAGE</td>
<td>SITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nevada (cont’d)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reno</td>
<td><a href="https://www.municode.com/library/nv/reno/codes/land_development_code?nodeId=LAND_DEVELOPMENT_CODE_CH18.06ADPR_ARTIVZOREAPPR_S18.06.403PLUNDERERE">https://www.municode.com/library/nv/reno/codes/land_development_code?nodeId=LAND_DEVELOPMENT_CODE_CH18.06ADPR_ARTIVZOREAPPR_S18.06.403PLUNDERERE</a></td>
<td>reno.gov/home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparks</td>
<td><a href="https://www.municode.com/library/nv/sparks/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=TIT2OZOCO_CH2O.02ZODI_S20.02.012PLDE">https://www.municode.com/library/nv/sparks/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=TIT2OZOCO_CH2O.02ZODI_S20.02.012PLDE</a></td>
<td>cityofsparks.us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New York</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td><a href="http://ecode360.com/8558875">http://ecode360.com/8558875</a></td>
<td>malta-town.org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watertown</td>
<td><a href="http://ecode360.com/10498649">http://ecode360.com/10498649</a></td>
<td>watertown-ny.gov/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Carolina</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brevard</td>
<td><a href="http://www.municode.com/library/nc/brevard/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=UNDEOR_CH2DIPIR">www.municode.com/library/nc/brevard/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=UNDEOR_CH2DIPIR</a></td>
<td>cityofbrevard.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Dakota</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oregon</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molalla</td>
<td><a href="http://qcode.us/codes/molalla/?view=desktop&amp;topic=17-17_08-17_08_100">http://qcode.us/codes/molalla/?view=desktop&amp;topic=17-17_08-17_08_100</a></td>
<td>cityofmolalla.com/planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Carolina</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horry County</td>
<td><a href="https://library.municode.com/sc/horry_county/codes/code_of_ordinances">https://library.municode.com/sc/horry_county/codes/code_of_ordinances</a></td>
<td>horrycounty.org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL JURISDICTION</td>
<td>WEBPAGE</td>
<td>SITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Prairie</td>
<td><a href="http://www.gptx.org/home/showdocument?id=562">http://www.gptx.org/home/showdocument?id=562</a></td>
<td>gptx.org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anacortes</td>
<td><a href="https://www.municode.com/library/wa/anacortes/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeld=TIT17ZO_CH17.44PLUNDECOHO">https://www.municode.com/library/wa/anacortes/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeld=TIT17ZO_CH17.44PLUNDECOHO</a></td>
<td>cityofanacortes.org/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kittitas County</td>
<td><a href="https://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/boc/countycode/title17.aspx#Chapter_17.36">https://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/boc/countycode/title17.aspx#Chapter_17.36</a></td>
<td>co.kittitas.wa.us/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>