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Planning and Zoning Evaluation

Conceptual Framework

**Comprehensive Plans**
Inform and guide decision making

**Elected Officials / Administrators**
Adopt, interpret and implement plans and zoning ordinance

**Zoning Ordinances**
Enforceable polices for implementing a plan
### Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Content Evaluation</th>
<th>Zoning Code Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of plans</td>
<td>Quality of codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan policy / goal focus</td>
<td>Code policy / goal focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency of plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Surveys

- Use of plans and codes for decision making
- Attitudes and motivations
- Views About Planning and Land Development

### Criteria for Evaluating Plan “Quality”:

- Presentation (including articulation of goals/policies)
- Extent of public participation used in preparing the plan (as evident in the plan)
- Factual basis and analysis
  - Past plan implementation status
  - Current conditions
  - Trends Analysis
  - Infrastructure capacity analysis
  - Land suitability analysis
- Implementation
Example: From Genesee County
Overall Plan Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Category</th>
<th>City/Village</th>
<th>Urban Twp</th>
<th>Rural Twp</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Participation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fact Base</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Suitability</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average of Standardized Scores:
- City/Village: 39
- Urban Twp: 39
- Rural Twp: 36
- Combined: 38

Criteria for Consistency Analysis:

- Vertical – State requirements (Mandate)
- Vertical – Coordination
- Horizontal consultation and coordination
- Internal
  - Inter-policy
  - Spatial
  - Inter-plan
- In implementation (as analyzed by or evident in the plan)
Example: From Genesee County
Plan Consistency

Analysis of Plan Policy and Zoning Code Focus

- General Approach Toward Growth Management
  - (Accommodate growth)
  - Manage growth for good and efficient service provision
  - Manage growth to address a variety of quality of life issues
- Landscape Focus
  - (Maintain or promote low-density suburban or rural residential character)
  - New-urban or urban revitalization
  - Open space and natural area protection
In Sum

- Are administrators and officials committed to planning and development management?
- What are their policy concerns and goals? (Are they consistent with “smart growth”?)
- Are planning and development management efforts (i.e. through plans and codes) consistent with stated goals? Do they advance “smart growth” principles?
- How do local planning efforts fit into larger issues of local governance?
- Given the quality and focus of existing plans and codes, and the concerns and goals of officials, what patterns of future land development and use are we likely to see in the jurisdictions under study?