

Chapter 13

Recommendations

The 2010 Orange Township Comprehensive Land Use Plan uses the sum of all the previous chapters as background material to inform the following recommendations. The following recommendations and Sub-Area descriptions are to be used in conjunction with the Comprehensive Land Use Map. Acreage figures are approximate. Undeveloped area is calculated by using parcels larger than 5 acres in size which are not impacted with critical areas that could hinder development. Current population is an estimate based on the number of units as defined by the County Auditor and the average persons per household, which is a different methodology from the projections presented in Chapter 2.

Southern Gateway - Sub Area 1

Land area: 910 acres

Undeveloped area: 140 acres

Current population: 3 (1 unit)

Southern Gateway is dominated by Highbanks Metro Park, which is permanent open space. The **existing** commercial uses on the west-side of US 23 are automobile-related.

- 1-1. The four undeveloped large tracts of land on the west-side of US 23 may someday become part of the park; if not, they are recommended for Planned Office because:
- 1-2. The west-side of the road is the “morning side”, meaning southbound traffic is greater in the a.m. hours than northbound. Offices are preferred on the west-side of US 23; commercial on the east side.
- 1-3. Office uses are a better transition to Highbanks Metro Park than retail.
- 1-4. If office uses are economically unfeasible within the planning period (2010-2020), then planned commercial would be the alternate proposed use.
- 1-5. Access management principles should be used to keep traffic speeds at current **posted 45** mph in this segment. No **additional** traffic signals are currently anticipated in this area. If a major office complex were constructed on the Butts lands, **it should align with the existing signal.**
- 1-6. An Orange Township sign and landscaping detail should be developed.
- 1-7. **Cross-easements or road connections should be sought for adjacent properties to gain access to the signal at U.S. 23.**

Southern Commercial Corridor - Sub Area 2

Land area: 315 acres

Undeveloped area: 48 acres

Current population: 67 (23 units)

Despite the large tracts of land in this area, most are owned by the Catholic Diocese of Columbus, so there is no urgent pressure for development. The Catholic Resurrection Cemetery occupies much of the road frontage on US 23. This is good for traffic flow, since there are few curb cuts and few commercial uses. A cluster of Office, banking and health care uses are located at the US 23 and Powell Road intersection.

- 2-1. Vacant tracts are recommended for Planned Commercial with access management practices.
- 2-2. An Orange Township sign and landscape detail should be developed.
- 2-3. Cemetery property is recommended to remain FR-1.

Polaris Impact Area - Sub Area 3

Land area: 436 acres

Undeveloped area: 42 acres

Current population: 1,890 (645 units)

This area is bounded by the railroad tracks on the west, Powell Road on the north, Genoa Township on the east, and the Franklin County on the south.

The majority of the land within the Polaris Impact area has been annexed to the city of Columbus or the City of Westerville. With the exception of pockets of undeveloped parcels, the area is fully developed or has approved plans for development. The plan acknowledges parcels exist within this district that are surrounded by the cities, and to whom annexation is a likely option.

Approximately 50 acres at the northwest corner of Lazelle Road and I-71 (including Fox Haven Court) are currently used for large lot single family residential in the township. This land is faced by a church to the south, multi-family to the west, I-71 to the east and commercial to the north. These lots could develop as multi-family. Water service is limited. Recommend multi-family at 5 units per acre.

- 3-1. Recommend planned office use for all remaining infill parcels on Worthington Road. These parcels may be enticed to stay in the township and can be served with sewer from Delaware County.

- 3-2. North side of **County Line** Road, Taylor Way and Caldwell Drive – recommend single family at one unit per acre to hold the line and protect this established neighborhood.
- 3-3. East side of Worthington Road north of Laurel Health Care and east of Powell Road, recommend planned office use.
- 3-4. West side of South Old State Road opposite **J.P. Morgan/Chase** office complex, recommend planned office.
- 3-5. Single family established uses on the south side of Powell Road and the NW corner of Powell and S. Old State, recommend that these areas remain single family at one unit per acre, or 2 units per acre with sewer to protect the existing larger lot homes. This is a transitional edge into Orange Township’s residential core.
- 3-6. Remainder areas - recommend land use consistent with existing zoning.

Olentangy Valley South - Sub Area 4

Land area: 839 acres

Undeveloped area: 35 acres

Current population: 3,097 (1,057 units)

This area is bounded by Liberty Township on the west, US 23 on the east, and West Orange Road on the north. It contains the first large residential subdivisions in the township, Green Meadows and High Meadows.

- 4-1. Recommend one unit per acre single family, or 2 units per acre with sewer for the Klingbiel sheep farm adjacent to Liberty Township. Protect ravines leading to Olentangy River as open space in developments.
- 4-2. Maintain Heather Lane at two units per acre.
- 4-3. Orange Township “detail” for commercial entrance landscaping, signs and colors in planned commercial districts. Avoid “franchise” architecture and signage by using stone, brick, and neutral split face block. Prohibit garish colors to create a cohesive Orange Township super-block of attractive and uncluttered commercial uses.
- 4-4. South side of Orange Road, recommend single family at one unit per acre or 2 units per acre with sewer.
- 4-5. Work with County Engineer to save as much rural edge to Orange Road as possible while keeping it maintained or upgraded to be safe. Save as many trees along edge of road as possible.
- 4-6. **Owen property (11.5 acres south of Riverbend Ave. and west of Owenfield Dr.) should remain as residential, possibly multi-family at a low density while retaining existing natural features of the site.**

- 4-7. Corner of Orange and U.S. 23 is recommended to be Planned Commercial and Office with main access from Orange Road, providing cross-access to the current kennel property to the south.

Central Commercial/Industrial Corridor - Sub Area 5

Land area: 523 acres

Undeveloped area: 43 acres

Current population: 1,403 (479 units)

The area is bounded by US 23 on the west, the railroad tracks on the east, Orange Road on the north, and Powell road on the south.

- 5-1. Planned commercial and office as in-fill to all existing commercial zoning.
- 5-2. Access management techniques to prevent left turns across traffic on US 23 except at signalized intersections.
- 5-3. Orange Township “detail” for commercial entrance landscaping, signs and colors in planned commercial districts. Avoid “franchise” architecture and signage by using stone, brick, and neutral split face block. Prohibit garish colors to create a cohesive Orange Township super-block of attractive and uncluttered commercial uses.
- 5-4. Maintain access road concept by extending Orange Centre Drive to the south, turning toward a limited access with U.S. 23. Additional access should be provided to adjacent properties. Outlots may be used to buffer large-scale development to the east.

Old State Road Heartland - Sub Area 6

Land area: 1,660 acres

Undeveloped area: 130 acres

Current population: 7,404 (2,527 units)

This area is bounded by Powell Road on the south, the railroad tracks on the west, I-71 on the east, and Orange road on the north. This area is the formal heartland of the suburban residential Orange Township.

- 6-1. Single family development throughout, with the exception of multi-family zoning already in place.

- 6-2. Multi-family condominiums for empty nester or exclusive elderly housing may fill in some small pockets that are too oddly-configured for single-family homes.
- 6-3. **Recommended** densities generally of 2 units per acre with centralized sanitary sewer.
- 6-4. Preserve the deep ravines as common open space as part of planned developments.
- 6-5. Work with County Engineer to save as much rural edge to East Orange Road as possible while keeping it maintained or upgraded to be safe. Save as many trees as possible along edge of road.

Lower Alum Creek Valley - Sub Area 7

Land area: 1,252 acres

Undeveloped area: 477 acres

Current population: 1,653 (564 units)

This area is bounded by Powell Road on the south, Genoa Township on the east, and I-71 on the north and west. This is a single-family area with lower densities of one unit per acre along the frontage of Africa Road to conform to existing uses.

- 7-1. Densities of one unit per acre without sanitary sewer or 2 units per acre with centralized sanitary sewer.
- 7-2. Work with **the** County Engineer to save as much rural edge to Bale-Kenyon Road **and Africa Road** as possible while keeping **them** maintained or upgraded to be safe. Retain a two-lane road with shoulders, at least 20 feet of pavement, possibly adding a bike lane. Save as many trees as possible along **the** edge of **the** road.
- 7-3. Seek federal, state, and county funding to design and construct a new rural interchange at Big Walnut and I-71. This should be identified as the entrance to Alum Creek State Park to enhance tourism and reduce meandering lost travelers looking for the beach and boat ramps. No commercial or high-density development adjacent to the interchange. Keep the NW quadrant of the land adjacent to the interchange as undisturbed parkland and the other three quadrants rural residential uses with on-off ramps.
- 7-4. No residential development (new homes) within the 100 year floodplain of Alum Creek.
- 7-5. Preserve the deep ravines as common open space as part of planned developments.

Olentangy Valley Central - Sub Area 8

Land area: 647 acres

Undeveloped area: 73 acres

Current population: 1,210 (413 units)

This area is bounded by West Orange Road on the south, Liberty Township on the west, US 23 on the east, and Home Road on the north. This area is divided north/south by two parallel high-tension power lines.

- 8-1. Retain single-family with 1-acre minimum lot sizes on the immediate north side of West Orange Road.
- 8-2. Preserve the deep ravines that run to the Olentangy River as common open space in planned developments.
- 8-3. Continue backage road Pacer Drive to the south to connect to W. Orange Road. Continue backage road Gooding Blvd. north to connect to a re-aligned Home Road.
- 8-4. Work with the County Engineer to improve Home Road as an arterial street, still keeping its rural character. Relocate the east-end of Home road 900 feet to the south to align with Lewis Center Bypass “D”. Relocate traffic light also. Abandon 800 feet of “old” Home Road west of U.S. 23 except as needed to access new development sites as approved by an approved development plan.
- 8-5. Land on the west side of Gooding Blvd. and approximately 1,500 feet south of Home Road is recommended to be single-family development or condominiums at 2 units per acre with centralized sanitary sewer. Provide for road extension to ridge tops in Liberty Township, have cooperative agreement for road maintenance.
- 8-6. Land on the west side of Gooding Blvd. within 1,500 feet of Home Road is recommended to be residential at 2 units per acre or for office uses, as approved in the Clear Creek Development Plan.
- 8-7. East side of new road “A” first choice is planned office use as transition to residential, second choice is appropriate planned commercial uses which are suitable as transitional to single family. No single-use big box retail in this Subarea.
- 8-8. Create landscape detail to effectively buffer the office/commercial from the residential.
- 8-9. Support access management techniques to prevent left turns across traffic on US 23 except at signalized intersections.
- 8-10. Orange Township “detail” for commercial entrance landscaping, signs and colors in planned commercial districts. Avoid “franchise” architecture and signage by using stone, brick, and neutral split face block.

Prohibit garish colors **in order** to create a cohesive Orange Township super-block of attractive and uncluttered commercial uses.

- 8-11. Condominiums for empty nester or exclusive elderly housing may fill in some small pockets that are too oddly configured for single family homes.

US 23 Northern Corridor - Sub Area 9

Land area: 648 acres

Undeveloped area: 352 acres

Current population: 0 (0 units)

This area is bounded by US 23 on the west, the Lewis Center Village District on the north, Orange Road to the south, and the railroad tracks to the east.

- 9-1. Continue planned commercial **uses** along the frontage of US 23 with strict access management controls.
Where allowed, align new right-in/right-out access points with existing right-in/right-out access.
- 9-2. **Utilize frontage outlots to mask parking and larger uses to rear.**
- 9-3. **Utilize** Orange Township “detail” for commercial entrance landscaping, signs and colors in planned commercial districts. Avoid “franchise” architecture and signage by using stone, brick, and neutral split face block. Prohibit garish colors to create a cohesive Orange Township super-block of attractive and uncluttered commercial uses.
- 9-4. Encourage extension of Green Meadows Drive to new road “E” to be built by developers around **the** AEP power substation on the west side of the railroad tracks.
- 9-5. Continue planned industrial development north from Orange Point to the Lewis Center Village District.
- 9-6. **Encourage extension of** new road “C”, by developers of commercial/industrial lands, to new Bypass “D”.
- 9-7. **Encourage** construction new Lewis Center Bypass “D” from Home Road to east of Lewis center.
Encourage developers of commercial and industrial lands to extend the bypass from Home Road to the railroad tracks.
- 9-8. Work with the County Engineer to construct a grade separation crossing of the **railroad tracks and extension of Bypass “D” to Lewis Center Road using any funding mechanisms available.**

Central Residential Heartland - Sub Area 10

Land area: 986 acres

Undeveloped area: 21 acres

Current population: 3,077 (1,050 units)

This area is bounded by the railroad tracks on the west, the Lewis Center District on the northwest, Lewis Center Road on the north, Orange Road on the south, and South Old State Road on the east.

- 10-1. Continue large lots of one acre or more fronting on Orange, Lewis Center and South Old State Roads.
- 10-2. In-fill remaining lands with planned developments at 2 units per acre if served by centralized sanitary sewer.
- 10-3. Support a leisure path within or adjacent to the railroad easement to connect the Township Hall on Orange Road and the Lewis Center District.
- 10-4. Work with Del-Co water to obtain right of way for the Lewis Center Bypass "D".

Alum Creek Resource Area - Sub Area 11

Land area: 3,940 acres

Undeveloped area: 249 acres

Current population: 4,360 (1,488 units)

This area is bounded by Genoa Township on the east, Berlin Township on the north, South Old State Road on the west and Orange Road and I-71 on the south. The area is dominated by the Alum Creek State Park.

- 11-1. East of the Alum Creek Lake, low density residential at one unit per acre.
- 11-2. Preserve floodplains of Alum Creek, allow no encroachment or fill except for bridges or culverts.
- 11-3. Single-family in-fill remainder areas at one unit per acre without centralized sewer or 2 units per acre with centralized sewer.
- 11-4. Work with ODOT and the County Engineer to secure the I-71 interchange at Big Walnut Road.
- 11-5. Preserve the area around the interchange as non-commercial to preserve the flow of traffic.

Olentangy Valley North - Sub Area 12

Land area: 295 acres

Undeveloped area: 67 acres

Current population: 97 (33 units)

This area is bounded by Liberty Township on the west, Berlin Township on the north, Home Road on the south, and Lewis Center District and US 23 on the east.

- 12-1. Preserve deep ravine that runs from US 23 west to Olentangy River.
- 12-2. Maintain one acre lots along the road frontage of Home Road.
- 12-3. Encourage planned offices as first choice of development along west-side of US 23, planned commercial as second choice, but no big box retail west of US 23.
- 12-4. Create landscape detail to effectively buffer the office/commercial from the residential.
- 12-5. **Encourage** access management techniques to prevent left turns across traffic on US 23 except at signalized intersections.
- 12-6. **Utilize** Orange Township “detail” for commercial entrance landscaping, signs and colors in planned commercial districts. Avoid “franchise” architecture and signage by using stone, brick, and neutral split face block. Prohibit garish colors to create a cohesive Orange Township super-block of attractive and uncluttered commercial uses.
- 12-7. **If access to Preservation Parks within Orange Township is necessary, it should be from Artesian Run and not from a new curb-cut on US 23.**
- 12-8. **Encourage consolidation of access points on existing businesses along US 23 north of the park property.**

New North - Sub Area 13

Land area: 706 acres

Undeveloped area: 304 acres

Current population: 182 (62 units)

This area is bounded by US 23 on the west, railroad tracks on the east, Berlin Township on the north, and the Lewis Center District on the south.

- 13-1. Maintain large lot single family on south side of Lewis Center Road.
- 13-2. Planned office, planned commercial **or multi-family at 2 units per acre south of Shanahan** Road and west of schools. Significant buffering between north and south side of Lewis Center Road. Avoid commercial access opposite residential.
- 13-3. Balance of sub area to be large lot single family residential, one acre lots without sanitary sewer, 2 units per acre with sanitary sewer.

The Northlands - Sub Area 14

Land area: 711 acres

Undeveloped area: 523 acres

Current population: 381 (130 units)

This area is bounded by the railroad tracks on the west, Berlin Township on the north, south Old State Road on the east, and Lewis Center Road on the south.

- 14-1. **Encourage the County Engineer to** improve Lewis Center Road as an arterial street.
- 14-2. **Encourage the** construction new road “H” as part of new developments to connect Lewis Center to Piatt Road.
- 14-3. **Encourage the** construction new road “F” as part of new developments to extend Shanahan Road to Old State Road.
- 14-4. Single family development at one unit per acre without central sanitary sewer, or 2 units per acre with sanitary sewer.
- 14-5. Develop a traditional downtown with 0-foot setbacks, shops and stores on the sidewalks, and angle parking in front on the north side of Lewis Center Road, east of the railroad tracks. Develop a new text for this mixed use district with decorative street lighting, restrictive sign code, architectural standards for materials, scale and mass.
- 14-6. **Work with COTA and/or private interests to creat a park-and-ride lot for possible light rail access on the east side of the railroad north of Lewis Center Road.**

Old Lewis Center - Sub Area 15

Land area: 42 acres

Undeveloped area: 0 acres

Current population: 120 (41 units)

This area represents the old platted portion of Lewis Center on the south side of Lewis Center Road only and between North Road and 1740 Lewis Center Road.

- 15-1. Rehabilitation and reuse of existing structures should be encouraged. New, infill development could include a low-impact mix of uses which is primarily residential with some live/work units. Infill structures should maintain the same character of existing buildings including setbacks and massing.
- 15-2. Develop a traditional downtown with 0-foot setbacks, shops and stores on the sidewalks, on Lewis Center Road, east of the railroad tracks. Develop a new text for this mixed use district with decorative street lighting, restrictive sign code, architectural standards for materials, scale and mass.

New Lewis Center - Sub Area 16

Land area: 229 acres

Undeveloped area: 219 acres

Current population: 3 (1 unit)

This area generally circumscribes the south side of Lewis Center.

- 16-1. Create a “New” Lewis Center District with mixed uses, grid streets, parks and recreation, single family, attached or detached, at 2 units per acre with sanitary sewer. Emulate a Traditional Neighborhood Development utilizing TND elements listed in Chapter 12 and the Design Best Management Practices as demonstrated in the same chapter.
- 16-2. Extend new road “L” from Lewis Center Road to bypass “D”.
- 16-3. Work with the County Engineer to construct a grade separation crossing of the railroad tracks and extension of Bypass “D” to Lewis Center Road using any funding mechanisms available.
- 16-4. Retain a pocket park at the entrance to the Lewis Center Bypass.

INSERT LAND USE PLAN MAP AFTER THIS PAGE

General Recommendations

The following implementation items are general in nature and are not specific to any sub-area.

- 17-1. Continue to work with the township parks committee and encourage development of parks and leisure trails as part of new developments.
- 17-2. Continue to require sidewalks within and pedestrian connections between residential developments.
- 17-3. Encourage pedestrian-oriented commercial development and seek pedestrian connections between commercial and residential developments.
- 17-4. Seek usable open space in developments.
- 17-5. Consider the overall housing mix when reviewing rezoning requests and the township continues to develop.
- 17-6. Encourage the conservation of natural resources (steep slopes, wooded ravines, floodplains) as part of a subdivision's open space while utilizing the current SFPRD and MFPRD zoning language.
- 17-7. Seek multiple entrances to developments and the interconnection of subdivisions to improve safety, reduce travel times and lower maintenance costs.
- 17-8. Seek street connections or cross-easements between commercial uses.
- 17-9. Support ODOT goals for access management along US 23 as well as along existing and proposed arterial roads.
- 17-10. Support the County Engineer by encouraging best practices for stormwater management and by encouraging development that preserved surface and ground water quality.
- 17-11. Keep local agencies informed throughout the development process so they can plan for future service.
- 17-12. Work with agencies to identify new sites for township facilities.
- 17-13. Provide for updates to the Comprehensive Land Use Plan within 5-10 years.

Orange Township 2010 Comprehensive Land Use Plan

The Orange Township Comprehensive Land Use Plan Map incorporates the goals, objectives and planning principles recommended in this text. It is intended to represent the best thinking for future development at the time of its adoption. The plan is subject to change depending on significant new considerations after the plan's adoption or a shift in the basic goals of the community.

Such changes to the plan can be made concurrent with a proposed zoning application. If the plan is not recommended for change, then the zoning should conform to the plan as it stands. If, on the other hand, the plan is found for good and compelling reasons to be in need of amendment in accordance with the thinking of the Zoning Commission and the Trustees, then pursuant to public hearings, the plan should be amended.

Orange Township 2010 Comprehensive Build-out Land Use Mix

The 2010 Orange Township Comprehensive Plan makes site-specific recommendations for every parcel of land in the township. The following table projects the result of the land use recommendations of the Land Use Map.

Figure 13.1 Comparison of Existing Land Use Acreage and Build-Out Acreage

Land Use Type	2010		Build-out	
	Acreage	Percentage	Acreage	Percentage
Agriculture	1,715.43	10.27%	0	0%
Total Residential	3,818.27	22.87%	5,502.93	32.96%
Single Family	3,491.75	20.91%	5,041.83	30.20%
Multi-family	326.51	1.96%	461.10	2.76%
Total Comm. & Industrial	939.09	5.62%	1,467.37	8.79%
Commercial	573.36	3.43%	1,094.87	6.56%
Industrial	365.73	2.19%	372.50	2.23%
Institution	777.25	4.66%	861.73	5.16%
Rivers/Lakes/Seasonal Swales	1,466.32	8.78%	1,466.32	8.78%
Highway/Rail/Right-of-Way	1,257.96	7.53%	2,121.45	12.71%
Golf/Parks	2,139.29	12.81%	2,723.21	16.31%
Agricultural Vacant Land	0	0%	0	0%
Residential Vacant Land	1,525.00	9.13%	0	0%
Industrial Vacant Land	67.69	.42%	0	0%
Commercial Vacant	436.73	2.62%	0	0%
Incorporated Areas	2,553.46	15.29%	2,553.46	15.29%
Total Acreage	16,696.53	100%	16,696.53	100%
(Total Township)	14,143.07		14,143.07	

With a complete build-out scenario, there is no agricultural land left. The township is the location of two regional parks, Highbanks Metro and Alum Creek State Park comprising 14% of the township. For this reason, the amount of parkland far exceeds the more typical 6%.

Figure 13.2 Build-out Population by Sub-Area

Zoning District	2010 Est.	Build-out
1 – Southern Gateway	3	3
2 – Southern Commercial Corridor	67	141
3 – Polaris Impact Area	1,890	1,934
4 – Olentangy Valley South	3,097	3,841
5 – Central Commercial/Industrial Corridor	1,403	1,787
6 – Old State Road Heartland	7,404	8,523
7 – Lower Alum Creek Valley	1,653	2,845
8 – Olentangy Valley Central	1,210	2,452
9 – US 23 Northern Corridor	0	0
10 – Central Residential Heartland	3,077	3,721
11 – Alum Creek Resource Area	4,360	5,629
12 – Olentangy Valley North	97	492
13 – New North	182	1,137
14 – The Northlands	381	3,267
15 – Old Lewis Center	120	340
16 – New Lewis Center	3	929
Current and Future Build-Out Population	24,943	37,038

The build-out number uses the estimated current population and adds recorded vacant lots and approved residential subdivisions and rezonings. Proposed land use is then overlaid, using a net developable acreage which factors out roads and unbuildable areas.

Existing Land Use layer was created based on the County Auditor's Office DALIS parcel layer dated 2/2010. From the existing land use classifications, only Agricultural, Agricultural Vacant, Residential Vacant, Other Uses Vacant and Single Family lots with acreage greater than 10 acres were selected as Vacant Land.

Appendix

A Brief History of Planning

- 1189 England; required stone party walls 1½ feet thick each side, 16-feet tall on houses.
- 1214 Magna Carta; King John of England, prevented the seizure of land by the King without compensation. First land use regulation, restricting forests for hunting.
- 1297 England- Front yards to be cleared and maintained.
- 1400s England- all roofs in urban areas to be stone, lead or tile (fire protection).
- 1565 St. Augustine, Florida, first American planned city, Spanish Law of the Indies.
- 1666 Great fire of London, England- An Act for the Rebuilding of the City of London, divided city housing into 4 classes, required uniform roof lines and balconies, established front setbacks, mandated 3 year reconstruction or seizure by the city for the public good.
- 1690 Annapolis, Maryland, Sir Francis Nicholson, designed it as a new town, with radial spokes.
- 1692 Philadelphia, first major city built on land speculation, used grid pattern for the layout. 1st neighborhood park system.
- 1692 Boston ordinance restricted slaughter, still, curriers and tallow chandler houses to areas of the city less populous and offensive to the public.
- 1699 Williamsburg, Virginia, Sir Francis Nicholson, designed grid with green mall, central avenue.
- 1733 Savannah, Georgia, General James Ogelthorpe, 24 squares, 40 families per square, grid.
- 1777 Vermont, 1780 Massachusetts, 1789 North Carolina Constitutions prevent taking of land without compensation.
- United States Constitution, Article V of the Amendments-** “no person shall...be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.”
- Land Act of 1785-** Established survey grid 36 square mile townships, North West territories, (includes Ohio).
- 1789 Washington D.C. plan, Pierre Charles L'Enfant combined the radial spokes of Annapolis and the green mall of Williamsburg.
- 1811 25 x 100 standard New York City lot.
- 1856 Central Park, New York City, public green space, parks movement. Frederick Law Olmstead, Sr.
- 1860s Public health movement- New York, San Francisco, regulating tenements and slaughterhouses.
- 1869 Riverside, Illinois, English garden style city by Frederick Law Olmstead Sr. Used curving, tree-lined streets, deep setbacks, single family detached houses, exclusively residential neighborhoods. Became the standard for FHA in the 1930s, thus copied in virtually every major city and community in the US. Still the standard suburban style of land plan used today.
- 1871 *Pumpelly V. Green Bay* (1871) - Established a taking by flooding of private property.
- 1890 Jacob Riss writes *How the Other Half Lives*, depicts slum conditions in New York.
- 1893 Chicago, Colombian Exposition, “White City”, Daniel Hudson Burnham, beginning of City Beautiful movement.
- 1898 Ebenezer Howard writes *Tomorrow, a Peaceful Path to Real Reform*, beginning of Garden City movement.
- 1903 Cleveland Plan, Daniel Burnham, civic center, first master plan for an American city to be realized.
- 1904 San Francisco Plan, Daniel Burnham, based on City Beautiful principles.
- 1909 Chicago, first regional plan in US, by Daniel Burnham.

- 1909 Wisconsin passed first state enabling legislation permitting cities to plan.
- 1909 Los Angeles, first zoning ordinance.
- 1909 Harvard, first course in city planning.
- 1915 *Hadacheck V. Sebastian*- 239 US 394 (1915) Determined that a local government can prohibit land uses in certain areas it deems inappropriate, even though this significantly reduces land value.
- 1916 New York adopts first comprehensive zoning ordinance, no mention of master plan.
- 1917 ACPI established, Kansas City.
- 1919 Ohio Planning Conference, precursor of APA established, first citizen based planning organization in US.
- 1920s City Beautiful gives way to legalistic, “city efficient” emphasis on administration, lawyers, and engineers.
- 1922 Standard State Zoning Enabling Act issued by the US Department of Commerce. Mentions a plan as a separate study, but most communities do not realize its importance. Zoning seen as planning. Flawed.
- 1922 *Pennsylvania Coal v. Mahon*, 260 US 393 (1922) Supreme Court rules that if a regulation goes too far, it will be recognized as a taking. The determination as to whether a taking has occurred rests on the facts of the case. Still the basic taking case today.
- 1925 Cincinnati, Ohio, first comprehensive city land use plan in America. Not the New York model. Alfred Bettman.
- 1926 First capital budget, Cincinnati, Ohio.
- 1927 *Village of Euclid (Ohio) v. Ambler Realty* (1926) – upheld zoning as constitutional under the United States Constitution, as a police power of the state. If zoning classifications are reasonable, they will be upheld.
- 1928 Standard City Planning Enabling Act issued by the US Department of Commerce. Enter the modern planning age, where a comprehensive plan is the intended basis of zoning, the implementing tool. Act flawed, not largely followed; most major cities already regulating land use under standard zoning act.
- 1930s Greenbelt cities, including Greenhills, Ohio, Greenbelt, Maryland, Greendale, Wisconsin.
- 1935 Frank Lloyd Wright’s *Broadacre City, A New Community Plan*, lot size varied with family. Did not consider the broad economic spectrum, elitist.
- 1941 Ladislav Segoe, Cincinnati, Ohio writes *Local Planning Administration*, (the “Green” book). The Planning “bible” still used and updated today as the basic manual for planners.
- 1961 Jane Jacobs writes *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*.
- 1964 T.J. Kent writes *The Urban General Plan*. Noted standard City Planning Act of 1928 was faulty: said plan should be:
- 1.) long range and general
 - 2.) one comprehensive document adopted at one time with all elements integrated
 - 3.) focused on the physical development implications of socio-economic policies
 - 4.) be identified as the city council’s (elected official’s) plan
- 1969 *Design with Nature*, Ian McHarg, brings environmental sensitivity to planning movement with overlay of land capability and critical resources.
- 1970s Citizen participation and advocacy planning movements bring power back to the people from the inception of the plan.
- 1970s-90s Land use law cases; Appellate and Supreme Court decisions regarding
- Growth management (*Golden v. Planning Board of Ramapo*; also *Construction Industry Association of Sonoma County (California) v. City of Petaluma*).
 - Affordable Housing and the fair share analysis (*Southern Burlington County NAACP v. Township of Mount Laurel*, 67 N.J. 151, 336 A. 2d 713, 1975)
 - Takings and exactions;

1. *Penn Central Transportation Company et al v. City of New York, 1978*. No taking occurred as a result of the Grand Central Station being placed in a Landmark Preservation District. The use of the terminal was unimpeded, and useful governmental purpose (landmark preservation) was vindicated. The fact that the landmark Preservation commission recommended denial of a 53 story tower over Grand Central Station did not in itself assure that the tower would be denied zoning, nor was it a taking.
 - a.) *First English Evangelical Lutheran Church v County of Los Angeles 482 US 304 (1987)*. The court rejected as a full remedy the declaration of invalidity of the zoning ordinance. Plaintiff could be compensated for time the use of the land was lost due to zoning.
 - b.) *Nollan v. California Coastal Commission 483 US 825 (1987)* Court held that development exaction's are valid so long as there is a reasonable relationship between the imposed exaction and the impact on property. The requirement of an easement for public walkway along the beach was not related to the issuance of a building permit on private property.
 - c.) *Lucas v. South Carolina Coastal Council 505 US 1003 112 S. Ct. 2886 (1992)* Court held that when a regulation goes too far to deny all economic use of a property, it will be considered a taking.
 - d.) *Dolan v. Tigard 114 S. Ct. 2309, 2315 (1994)* City requirement to dedicate land in a floodplain for a bike path as a condition to approval of expansion of an existing hardware store was not reasonable. Must be an essential nexus between the exaction and the use. The benefit to the landowner must be roughly proportional to the impact of the development. The burden is on the community to create this nexus.

1990s Desktop geographic information systems (GIS) allow for inexpensive sophisticated land capability and land use analysis, court decisions relate to reasonableness of environmental preservation (aquifers, endangered species, floodplains, wetlands).

1990s New Urbanist Movement. Return to grid pattern of cities and mixed uses, high densities, mostly centered in the south and west. Making in-roads into central USA as a design alternative. Conservation subdivisions gain momentum in rural areas as an environmentally sensitive replacement for nondescript cluster subdivisions.

END OF PLAN