

Comparison of Zoning Reforms⁶⁴

	BALTIMORE	BOSTON	CHICAGO	CINCINNATI	DENVER	DETROIT	MILWAUKEE	MINNEAPOLIS	NEW YORK CITY	PITTSBURGH
	(2001–2004)	(1980 to present)	(2000 to present)	(2000–2003)	(2001 to present)	(1998 to present)	(1997–2002)	(1996–1999)	(1998 to present)	(1997 to present)
Reason for Zoning Code Reform	Needed to simplify development process	City began rewrite in response to 1980s building boom	Antiquated code inefficient; desire for user-friendly code	1963 ordinance and amendments became cumbersome	Code overly complicated; 67 zoning districts and 400 land uses created over 24,000 possible combinations	Code last written in 1968 with minor restructuring in 1984; previous reform attempts have failed	1920 Zoning Code last amended in 1984, complex and discouraging to development; current city buildings not permitted under code; reform needed to preserve neighborhood character	1963 Zoning Code out of date, didn't reflect market	Strong support for modernizing code to remove unpopular provisions from 1961	Antiquated code with outdated residential standards and industrial designations that were too rigid
Reform Process	Identified Zoning Code problems and proposed amendments; remapping process began in 2004; maps to be presented before the Planning Board, County Council and public before the County Council makes them official	Separate zoning created for each neighborhood; city conducts local meeting, then volunteers survey land uses; a planner assigned to the neighborhood recommends zoning and mapping changes and public and Redevelopment Authority review; Zoning Commission (appointed by mayor) makes final decisions	Rewrite being drafted by local consultant and team from the City; draft will go to Zoning Reform Committee, who will hold numerous public hearings, make changes, then pass it to the City Council for final approval	City remapped (with community input), each plat separately; consultants rewrote text with input from city staff; Planning Commission held public meetings to review incorporated changes and approve the text	Local consultants prepared a land-use list and chart of use allowances; staff worked with the City Attorney's office to customize the list and chart; "Zoning Code Working Team", which includes City Council, practitioners, citizens and land-use attorneys, acted as advisors to the effort	Outside consultants critiqued existing code, met with Planning Commission's Zoning Advisory Group to propose changes	Consultants evaluated existing code; rewrite process started in Planning Commission, was assessed by the Zoning Neighborhood and Development Committee and Council; and finally signed by the mayor; 80 percent of text changed, 26 chapters reduced to 10; city held meetings with aldermen to ensure support	First, established committees to amend portions of the code — this failed. Then created one zoning advisory committee. City staff proposed new policies, debated by zoning advisory committee, which also drafted parts of the code	Map is reviewed by community boards, then Planning Commission, and then subjected to public hearings. PC votes on it, then turns it over to City Council for review, public hearing, then vote. Process halted due to lack of support from Real Estate Board	City rewrote Zoning Code; groups from each of 88 neighborhoods worked with a planner to create remapping proposals. Volunteers conduct land-use surveys in their neighborhoods. Planning Commission reviews and recommends a final proposal to the City Council
Key Internal Players	Mayor O'Malley, Department of Planning, City Council	Mayor Menino, Boston Redevelopment Authority, Zoning Commission	Mayor Daley, Zoning Reform Commission, City Council	Mayor Luken, City Planning Commission	Mayor, City Council, Community Planning and Development	Mayor, City Planning Commission	Mayor Norquist, City of Milwaukee Development Center	Zoning Administration	City Council, Planning Commission	Zoning Office
Public Involvement/Information	Input re maps, info on website; created Citizen's Guide to Zoning	Held weekly meetings; surveyed land-use; held workshops	Metropolitan Planning Council (business and civic leadership group) is working extensively with communities to educate (via workshops) about zoning	Reviewed maps (little interest in text changes); mailings to community councils; postings in community centers	Frequent meetings (more involved with Comprehensive Plan than zoning rewrite), workshops, website		Very limited: website, letters sent, televised meetings	Public workshops and hearings, website, newsletter, notices in newspapers	Appointed Community Boards review remappings; public hearings	Three reviews during remapping process; final maps based on neighborhood proposals
Highlights	Open filing period allows petition for reclassification of any property in county	Creating community commercial districts; pedestrian-oriented districts; mixed single-family/apt. district	Did extensive research on precedents; used nonprofit consultants	Used performance zoning; encouraged cluster and mixed-use development	Moved from comprehensive plan to zoning rewrite to zoning remapping	Measurement and performance system monitors departmental services	Established task force of elected officials, community members and building industry oversaw process			Using local and national consultants
Successes and Failures	Increased building permit revenues from \$4,073,951 in FY99 to \$6,527,858 in FY02	Community input process lengthy — averages four years per neighborhood — but removes any opposition	Several prior efforts failed	Few complaints from the public and city staff, and developers were satisfied with reform outcome; Zoning Code text change faced little or no opposition	Positive feedback from development community so far	Still takes six to eight months for a site plan review	Zoning appeal time reduced from 12 to four weeks; ZBA hears fewer cases; lack of comprehensive plan made rezoning difficult; rewrite required considerable staff time	New code has not been immediately embraced by business or community	Process halted due to dispute over building height restrictions	Clear, strong definition of approach
External Consultants			Dyett & Bhattia, MetroPlanning Council	Dyett & Bhattia	Calthorpe	Clarion Assoc., Duncan Assoc.	Dyett & Bhattia			