Urban Development Boundaries
aka Urban Growth Boundary
aka Urban Limit Line
aka Urban Rural Boundary
aka Fill in the Blank Boundary
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Purpose of Discussion

- Compare and contrast Spheres of Influence with different types of Urban Development Boundaries
- Describe methods of Urban Development Boundary establishment and maintenance
- LAFCO's role concerning UDBs and how it could impact decision making
Urban Growth Boundaries in the USA

- The U.S. states of Oregon, Washington, and Tennessee require cities to establish urban growth boundaries.
- California requires each county to have a Local Agency Formation Commission, which sets urban growth boundaries for each city and town in the county.
Urban Growth Boundaries in the USA


- The U.S. states of Oregon, Washington, and Tennessee require cities to establish urban growth boundaries.

- California requires each county to have a Local Agency Formation Commission, which sets SOIs which act as urban growth boundaries for each city and town in the county.
UDB vs SOI

- Are they the same?
- If a City adopts a UDB, should the LAFCo always adopt an SOI that is coterminous to the UDB?
- Which one should get adopted first?
- Why should LAFCOs care about where UDBs are drawn?
Considerations for SOIs

(1) The present and planned land uses in the area, including agricultural and open-space lands.

(2) The present and probable need for public facilities and services in the area.

(3) The present capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services that the agency provides or is authorized to provide.

(4) The existence of any social or economic communities of interest in the area if the commission determines that they are relevant to the agency.

(5) ... the present and probable need for those public facilities and services of any disadvantaged unincorporated communities within the existing sphere of influence.

CKH Section 56425(e)
"Sphere of influence" means a plan for the probable physical boundaries and service area of a local agency, as determined by the commission.

- May also be more refined based on local policies established to reflect unique circumstances
  - Secondary Spheres
  - Service Spheres
  - Urban Service Areas
An Urban Development Boundary is a politically determined “line” that is drawn around an urbanized area, outside of which new urban development is severely restricted or prohibited.
UDB Types

Single jurisdiction Boundary – drawn by a City or County (most in CA)

- Urban Growth Boundary
- Urban Limit Line
- Area/Specific Plan Areas

Regional Boundary – drawn around multiple jurisdictions by a regional agency (Portland metro area, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency)
UDB vs SOI

- SOIs are all about provision of services
- UDBs are all about growth management

- SOIs are required by CA law
- UDBs are not required by CA law

- SOIs adopted by LAFCos
- UDBs adopted by a city or county
UDB’s in California

- **Where:** Mostly in the Central Valley and SF Bay Area. Much less in Southern Cal.
- **When:** 35% before 1990, 55% between 1990 and 2000, 10% after 2000.
- **How:** Most by City Council adoption. Some by Ballot Box. A few by County Board of Supervisors.

Source: University of Michigan, 2004
Determining the Size of a UDB

Hanford Example – Population 45,860

1. Project the population 20 years in 2035 (90,000 people)
2. Project the number of housing units needed (30,000 total)
3. Determine the future density of development
4. Determine the amount of vacant land needed to build 30,000 housing units, including infill sites
5. Add additional land for market flexibility
Hanford Proposed Land Use Map

This draft includes revisions from CAC Meeting on 1-21-2016

Land Use Designations
- Low Density Residential
- Medium Density Residential
- High Density Residential
- Neighborhood Commercial
- Regional Commercial
- Service Commercial
- Highway Commercial
- Office Residential
- Office
- Neighborhood Mixed Use
- Corridor Mixed Use
- Downtown Mixed Use
- Light Industrial
- Heavy Industrial
- Airport Protection
- Open Space
- Educational Facilities
- Public Facilities
- General Plan Study Area

Boundaries
- Hanford City Limits (2014)
- 2035 Growth Boundary
- Planned Area (proposed Primary Sphere of Influence)
- General Plan Study Area
- Area of Interest
Determining the Location of a UDB

Best Practices

1. Along natural physical boundaries
2. Along existing or future major travel ways
3. Along significant changes in topology
4. Any existing features that could buffer urbanized land from rural or agricultural land.
5. Existing parcel lines.

The location of line must be clearly defined.
UDB Along Natural Physical Boundary
UDB Along Major Roadway
UDB Along Existing Features
UDB Along Future Roadway
UDB with No Physical Features
Method of Review

- 5 years or 10 years are typical
- Reviewed when predetermined buildout statistics are met
  - Specified number of acres left undeveloped
  - Specified number of permits pulled
- Review does not always result in an expansion.
Napa County Example – Agricultural Preserve

Proposed by the in order to protect productive agricultural lands and maintain a distinct identity to the community

Estimates in the 1960s had Napa County’s population following the trend within the Santa Clara Valley, with the City of Napa potentially reaching upwards of 200,000 residents by 2000
Voter Established UDB

- Essentially an Urban Limit Line that prevents growth into agricultural areas
- Has limited growth in order to preserve what was seen as the essential industry in the area

  - Napa’s current population was approximately 77,881, according to Napa LAFCo in 2014
  - Approximately 150% lower than otherwise expected growth
LAFCo SOIs must consider the limitations of population growth and extension of services into these areas during MSRs and SOI updates.

Analyzed as part of the “Tertiary Sub-Area” within the 2014 SOI Update by Napa LAFCo for the City of Napa

“...cannot be accurately described as part of the City’s “probable boundary and service area” due to their designation for agricultural and open space use under the County’s General Plan and the absence of City action to amend its General Plan and RUL. The fact that the Tertiary Study Area is also covered by the County’s restrictions against the conversion to urban use of agricultural and open space lands under Measure P further indicates the current improbability of considering these sub-areas as eligible for annexation to the City.“
Agricultural Preserve - Napa

- Multiple impacts as it relates to land use planning and growth
  - General Plans must be consistent
  - Local Zoning ordinances must be consistent
  - All Land Use decisions must essentially mirror the adoption of the Agricultural Preserve.
  - MSRs, SOI Updates and future annexations must then also be consistent
LAFCO’s Role Concerning UDBs

Response Approach – after it is adopted
- Evaluate in Municipal Service Review
- Draw Sphere of Influence Roughly Coterminal

Participatory Approach – before it is adopted
- Observe and/or comment on the establishment of a “UDB,” as it may be named many things
- Provide formal comments on a Draft EIR
- Collaborate with City Staff who are preparing the UDB
URBAN SERVICE AREAS

Unique Growth Management Tool in Santa Clara County

- Neelima Palacherla
  - LAFCO of Santa Clara County
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Santa Clara County
Santa Clara County

15 cities

95% of population lives in cities

Land Area: 1,290 sq. mi.
Population: 1.89 million
Dramatic Growth Statewide & in Santa Clara County

Santa Clara County’s population nearly doubled in the 50s and the 60s
San Jose Annexations 1944-1975
7 New Cities Formed between 1952 and 1957
LAFCO Helps End Cities “Annexation Wars” (1967)

Adopts Boundary Agreement Lines – dividing the County into 15 pieces
Jointly Adopt Countywide Urban Development Policies (1971-1972)

LAFCO, the County, and the 15 cities, jointly developed and adopted the following policies:

• Urban development should occur only on lands annexed to cities – and not within unincorporated areas, urban or rural

• Urban expansion should occur in an orderly, planned manner – with the cities responsible for planning and providing services to urban development, within explicitly adopted “urban service areas” whose expansion is subject to LAFCO approval

• Urban unincorporated islands should eventually be annexed into their surrounding cities – so that the cities have urban service responsibilities and land use authority over those lands
Urban Service Areas (USA)

Definition:

Delineates areas currently provided with urban services, facilities and utilities; or areas proposed to be annexed into a city within 5 years in order to be developed and provided with urban services.

Future amendment of USAs is subject to LAFCO approval, at the request of the city.
Cities Propose & LAFCO Adopts Urban Service Areas (1972-1973)
**SOI vs. USA**

Sphere of influence (SOI) is a plan for the probable physical boundaries and service area of a local agency. In 1985, LAFCO adopted SOIs as required by state law. For cities:

- SOI is an area where the County and city may have a shared interest in preserving non-urban levels of land use

- Inclusion of an area within a SOI does not necessarily indicate areas that will be annexed to a city or provided with urban services

USA boundary indicates whether an area will be annexed and provided with urban services
SOI vs. USA
Special Provisions in CKH Act Recognize Santa Clara LAFCO’s Use of USAs

Government Code Section 56757 allows cities to conduct and approve annexations of land within their USAs, if certain conditions are met.
LAFCO Carefully Reviews USA Amendment Requests

USAs determine where and when future growth will occur and services will be provided.

When LAFCO approves an expansion of a city’s USA, it is in anticipation of city annexing the lands and providing services for the proposed development within five years.
Key Factors LAFCO Considers When Reviewing USA Amendments

- Vacant lands availability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESIDENTIAL LAND USES</th>
<th>VACANT ACREAGE (ACRES)</th>
<th>ALLOWED DENSITY (UNITS/ACRE)</th>
<th>MAX. POTENTIAL UNITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Low</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Medium</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>3-6</td>
<td>1,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family High</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Estate</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Low</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5-14</td>
<td>2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Medium</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14-21</td>
<td>861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family High</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21-40</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,063</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>6,330</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maximum potential units on existing vacant lands = 6,330

Average # of building permits issued per year based on 10-year data = 200

Vacant land within existing boundaries will accommodate 32 years of residential growth
Key Factors LAFCO Considers When Reviewing USA Amendments

- Infill development opportunities
- Conversion of or impacts to agricultural lands or open space
- Financial ability to serve without impacting current city services
- Service and infrastructure capacity to support growth
- Water supply availability
- Other environmental impacts
- Fiscal impacts to affected agencies
43 Years Later: How USAs & Countywide Policies have Helped Managed Growth

From a sprawling patchwork pattern of growth in the 1960s...

...to conserving resource lands and limiting the outward spread of urban development
Accommodating Growth with Limited Outward Expansion

Between 1990 and 2015, Milpitas added 23,000 population with no increase in land area
Accommodating Growth with Limited Outward Expansion

**SUNNYVALE**
Population & Land Area

**SANTA CLARA**
Population & Land Area

**MOUNTAIN VIEW**
Population & Land Area
Preservation of Resource Lands

Allowed for the preservation of an informal “greenbelt” around the urbanized area that consists of protected open space lands, farmlands and scenic hillsides.
By 2040, Santa Clara County is projected to add over half a million in population.

San Jose’s General Plan does not anticipate outward expansion to accommodate growth through 2040.
43 Years Later: USAs and Countywide Policies Impactful & Relevant

- Provide a common framework for cities, the County, and LAFCO to continue to manage growth and development
- Consistent with State mandates targeted at reducing greenhouse gas emission (i.e. SB 375)
- Consistent with regional directives to plan for and accommodate future growth within in-fill areas, near transit (i.e. priority development areas)
SOIs, UDBs, and MOUs
Oh my!

2015 CALAFCO Conference
Sacramento, CA
September 2-4, 2015
Overview

- Tulare County Overview
- What is a UDB?
- City/County MOUs
- Reconciling UDBs and SOIs
- Next steps?
Tulare County Overview

- 8 incorporated cities
- Total population of 462,189 (68% residing in the cities)
- Cow population of 628,000 (#1 dairy county in USA)
- #1 agricultural producing county in USA ($8 billion in 2014)
- Home of Sequoia National Park and Mt. Whitney
Urban Development Boundaries

- Every city in Tulare County has a 20 year UDB or UGB (Urban Growth Boundary) in their general plans
- Some cities have tiered UDBs
- The County also has 20 year UDBs for each of the cities in its general plan
- The City UDBs and County UDBs have been inconsistent
Memorandums of Understanding

- Made necessary by inconsistent planning between the cities and County and the County’s General Plan Update
MOUs – What did they address?

- Challenges to the County GP Update
- Revenue sharing
- County adoption of city land use designations within UDBs
- County application of city development standards within UDBs
- Making UDBs consistent with each other and SOIs
SOIs – Tulare County LAFCO

- Per policy, placed conterminous with the UDB with the addition of any communities of interest
- If the City and County UDB are in conflict, the Commission determines which UDB most closely reflects CKH requirements
- If neither complies with CKH requirements, the Commission independently sets the SOI boundary
Example – City of Dinuba

- City GP Update was completed at the height of the housing bubble

- The City UDB was over double the size of the County UDB and neither was similar to existing SOI

- City and County signed the MOU and had a series of meetings that ended in the development of a compromise UDB to propose to LAFCO as the new SOI
Current Status & Next Steps

- Two cities completed, two cities in process for SOI updates
- Finish remaining four cities MSR updates
- Adopt new SOIs with consideration of joint City/County proposals
- Celebrate the Steelers 7th Super Bowl victory
Questions & Comments

Contact Info:
Ben Giuliani
Tulare County LAFCO
bgiuliani@tularecog.org
http://lafco.co.tulare.ca.us/lafco/