

## Alternatives to Joint Zoning

There is no doubt that a city's input into future growth patterns and the impact this growth may have beyond the city are important considerations for the county as well. When improperly managed, this growth can pose serious short term problems to the county and result in future long term liabilities for the city. This is not to imply, however, that extraterritorial zoning is the only possible solution. Several options are available and should be seriously considered by a city before requesting joint zoning jurisdiction.

County endorsement of the municipal comprehensive plan pertaining to areas beyond the corporate limits. Development proposals would be reviewed by the county to determine conformance with the plan before final action is taken.

Notification by the county of development proposals around the fringe of the city. The city would be given a specified time to review the proposal and make a recommendation before any action is taken by the county.

Municipal control over platting of land outside the city by filing a major street plan with the register of deeds.

The above options ensure input into county land use decisions without establishing a formal and burdensome process required by extraterritorial zoning. State law mandates joint meetings of planning commissions and governing bodies before decisions are reached in the extraterritorial area. This could be a burden for some cities to assemble a quorum for these meetings.

Final decisions on land use issues outside corporate boundaries would rest exclusively with the county. This removes the argument that landowners in the joint jurisdiction are subject to decisions by city officials who do not represent them. It also ensures that land use issues which may have regional significance are addressed at the county level and not by any one city with self serving interests.