DEKALB COUNTY,
ILLINOIS

LAND EVALUATION and SITE ASSESSMENT

July 20, 2005

DEKALB COUNTY
LAND EVALUATION AND SITE ASSESSMENT SYSTEM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction 1

II. Land Evaluation 2

Table 1 3-4

Table 2 5-6

III. Site Assessment 7

1. Agricultural/Land Uses 7

2. Zoning 8

3. Compatibility/Impact of Use 9

4. Land Use Feasibility 11

5. Compatibility with Comprehensive Development Plans 12

IV. Instructions for Calculating the Total Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Value for a Site 13

1. Land Evaluation Value 13

2. Site Assessment Value 13

3. Assessing a Site for its Agricultural Viability 13

I. Introduction

The DeKalb County Land Evaluation and Site Assessment System (LESA) is designed to evaluate the viability of a site for agricultural uses. Although the framework of the system was developed by the Natural Resources Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the contents of the County's LESA System were prepared locally to utilize soil survey information and interpretations and to incorporate local values and objectives regarding the protection of agricultural land use and the coordination of growth, affecting land development.

The System consists of two parts, the Land Evaluation and the Site Assessment, with a maximum of 300 points. The Land Evaluation has a maximum of 100 points and is used to rate farmland for its agricultural productivity and its prime farmland category. The data for formulating the land evaluation is derived from a soil survey of DeKalb County. Generally, the Land Evaluation arranges the County's soils by their relative values, represented by a score of 0 to 100, with 0 being the worst for agriculture and 100 the best. The Site Assessment considers important factors other than soils relative to a specific parcel, which determine viability for agricultural use. The maximum number of points for the Site Assessment is 200. If a parcel were to receive a total of 215 points or more for the completed evaluation, that would indicate that the site has a high rating for agriculture. In utilizing the LESA System, the higher the point value, the greater the productivity and the more viable the site for agricultural use.

The DeKalb County LESA System is a valuable tool to guide land use decisions for the County. It does not take away the power of local officials to make land use decisions. Rather, it assists them in making rational, consistent, and supportable land use decisions. Applications of the LESA System will generally fall under two types of requests involving conversion of land from agricultural use to non-agricultural use. The most frequent application of LESA will be when a request is made to rezone a tract of land from the County's agricultural districts to another zoning district, districts, or for special uses. The LESA System can also be used to review state and federal projects for compliance with the Illinois Farmland Preservation Act and the Federal Farmland Protection Policy Act and their impact on important farmland.

In applying LESA in DeKalb County, the user of the system must remember that it is one among several tools to assist in making land use decisions; it should not be used alone. This user manual which describes the County's LESA System should be used in conjunction with the County's Land Use Plan, Goals and Objectives, and adopted policies, as a basis for the continued implementation of the County's Comprehensive Plan as part of the application of the Zoning Ordinance and for the overall protection of the public health, safety and welfare of the residents of DeKalb County. Since the County's LESA System is designed to be based on existing conditions, this system requires periodic review and possible modification to adjust for changing needs and conditions. Initial review should occur two years from the system's effective date and subsequent reviews should take place at least every five years.

The following sections of the User Manual provide a detailed description of each part of the LESA System and instructions for calculating the total Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Value.

II. Land Evaluation

In the agricultural Land Evaluation, the soils of DeKalb County have been placed into six groups ranging from the best to the worst, based on their suitability for crop production (See Table I).

For DeKalb County, the soils were ranked according to three criteria: slope, prime farmland identification, and optimum crop productivity ratings. A relative value has been determined for each group; the best group was assigned a relative value of 100 with all other groups being assigned lower relative values. Table II shows the breakdown of the soils groups by three criteria and the relative value for each agricultural group.

The Land Evaluation procedure will help responsible planners and decision makers determine the importance of the County's soil resources in terms of their importance to the agricultural base. In addition, the Land Evaluation portion of the LESA System is intended to meet the following objectives:

(1) It will determine land quality for agricultural uses.
(2) It will distinguish between classes of land of differing quality to enable decision makers to select lands to be protected for agricultural uses.
(3) It will be consistently applicable.
(4) It will be technically sound and compatible with national land classification system.
(5) It will be flexible to reflect differences among areas.
(6) It will be useful to agricultural land protection programs and land use planning.

DEKALB COUNTY LE GROUPS -- 2005
Sorted by Productivity Index within each group

Group1

Map Unit Symbol	Name	Slope %	Prime Farmland	Optimum PI	RV	Group Value	Acres	% of Co.
152A	Drummer	0-2	PRIME 2	144	100	100	42583	10.49049
154A	Flanagan	0-2	PRIME	144	100	100	57007	14.0439
356A	El Paso	0-2	PRIME 2	144	100	100	65011	16.01572
68A	Sable	0-2	PRIME 2	143	99	100	623	0.153479
198A	Elburn	0-2	PRIME	143	99	100	9386	2.312278
679A	Blackberry	0-2	PRIME	142	99	100	774	0.190678
59A	Lisbon	0-2	PRIME	141	98	100	4918	1.211569
679B	Blackberry	2-5	PRIME	141	98	100	2405	0.592481
		Group Value		100			182707	45.0

Group 2

Map Unit Symbol	Name	Slope %	Prime Farmland	Optimum PI	RV	Group Value	Acres	% of Co.
715A	Arrowsmith	0-2	PRIME	140	97	95	1276	0.314348
171A	Catlin	0-2	PRIME	138	96	95	7858	1.935849
512A	Danabrook	0-2	PRIME	138	96	95	1433	0.353025
171B	Catlin	2-5	PRIME	137	95	95	35898	8.843615
512B	Danabrook	2-5	PRIME	137	95	95	56035	13.80444
148A	Proctor	0-2	PRIME	135	94	95	322	0.079326
148B	Proctor	2-5	PRIME	134	93	95	54	0.013303
663A	Clare	0-2	PRIME	134	93	95	553	0.136234
		Group Value		96			103429	25.5

Group 3

Map Unit Symbol	Name	Slope %	Prime Farmland	Optimum PI	RV	Group Value	Acres	% of Co.
67A	Harpster	0-2	PRIME 2	133	92	90	5985	1.474428
663B	Clare	2-5	PRIME	133	92	90	885	0.218023
712A	Spaulding	0-2	PRIME 2	133	92	90	78	0.019216
104A	Virgil	0-2	PRIME 2	132	92	90	2970	0.731671
62A	Herbert	0-2	PRIME 2	131	91	90	4564	1.124359
792A	Bowes	0-2	PRIME	130	90	90	582	0.143378
219A	Millbrook	0-2	PRIME 2	129	90	90	2042	0.503055
791A	Rush	0-2	PRIME	129	90	90	262	0.064545
792B	Bowes	2-4	PRIME	129	90	90	467	0.115047
3076A	Otter	0-2	PRIME 5	129	90	90	11831	2.914614
667A	Kaneville	0-2	PRIME	128	89	90	3147	0.775276
791B	Rush	2-4	PRIME	128	89	90	316	0.077848
3776A	Comfrey	0-2	PRIME 5	128	89	90	320	0.078833
667B	Kaneville	2-5	PRIME	127	88	90	4241	1.044787
206A	Thorp	0-2	PRIME 2	126	88	90	383	0.094354
662A	Barony	0-2	PRIME	125	87	90	1252	0.308435
344B	Harvard	2-5	PRIME	124	86	90	176	0.043358
662B	Barony	2-5	PRIME	124	86	90	2365	0.582627
		Group Value		90			41866	10.3

Group 4

Map Unit Symbol	Name	Slope %	Prime Farmland	Optimum PI	RV	Group Value	Acres	% of Co.
330A	Peotone	0-2	PRIME 2	123	85	80	2845	0.700877
233A	Birbeck	0-2	PRIME	122	85	80	885	0.218023
236A	Sabina	0-2	PRIME 2	122	85	80	1325	0.326419
233B	Birbeck	2-5	PRIME	121	84	80	377	0.092875
348A	Wingate	0-2	PRIME	121	84	80	855	0.210633
488A	Hooppole	0-2	PRIME 2	121	84	80	565	0.13919
348B	Wingate	2-5	PRIME	120	83	80	12197	3.004779
656B	Octagon	2-4	PRIME	117	81	80	2594	0.639042
668A	Somonauk	0-2	PRIME	117	81	80	1949	0.480144
325A	Dresden	0-2	PRIME	116	81	80	6	0.001478
668B	Somonauk	2-5	PRIME	116	81	80	1859	0.457972
325B	Dresden	2-4	PRIME	115	80	80	275	0.067747
527B	Kidami	2-4	PRIME	114	79	80	2505	0.617117
221B2	Parr	2-5	PRIME	113	78	80	7259	1.788283
221C2	Parr	5-10	PRIME	111	77	80	8076	1.989555
656C2	Octagon	4-6	PRIME	111	77	80	3740	0.921364
193A	Mayville	0-2	PRIME	110	76	80	416	0.102483
193B	Mayville	2-5	PRIME	109	76	80	8932	2.200434
325C2	Dresden	4-6	PRIME	109	76	80	412	0.101498
327B	Fox	2-4	PRIME	108	75	80	117	0.028823
527C2	Kidami	4-6	PRIME	108	75	80	3572	0.879976
60C2	LaRose	5-10	PRIME	110	73	80	2469	0.608248
		Group Value		81			63230	15.6

Group 5

Map Unit Symbol	Name	Slope %	Prime Farmland	Optimum PI	RV	Group Value	Acres	% of Co.
103A	Houghton	0-2	IMPORTAN	130	90	78	1467	0.361401
512C2	Danabrook	5-10	IMPORTAN	128	89	78	5809	1.43107
667C2	Kaneville	5-10	IMPORTAN	119	83	78	432	0.106425
662C2	Barony	5-10	IMPORTAN	116	81	78	855	0.210633
348C2	Wingate	5-10	IMPORTAN	113	78	78	910	0.224182
527D2	Kidami	6-12	IMPORTAN	105	73	78	649	0.159884
193C2	Mayville	5-10	IMPORTAN	102	71	78	543	0.13377
60D2	LaRose	10-18	IMPORTAN	101	70	78	1354	0.333563
318D2	Lorenzo	6-12	IMPORTAN	96	67	78	73	0.017984
		Group Value		78			12092	3.0

Group 6

Map Unit Symbol	Name	Slope %	Prime Farmland	Optimum PI	RV	Group Value	Acres	% of Co.
802B	Orthents	1-6	OTHER	0	0	0	884	0.217777
830	Landfills		OTHER	0	0	0	122	0.030055
865	Pits gr		OTHER	0	0	0	387	0.095339
		Group Value		0			1393	0.3

Water	1203	0.3

TABLE 2: DEKALB RV VALUES

Sort#	Map Unit Symbol	Name	Slope %	Prime Farmland	Optimum PI	RV	Acres	% of Co.
0152a	152A	Drummer	0-2	PRIME 2	144	100	42583	10.49049074
0154a	154A	Flanagan	0-2	PRIME	144	100	57007	14.04390028
0356a	356A	El Paso	0-2	PRIME 2	144	100	65011	16.01571738
0068a	68A	Sable	0-2	PRIME 2	143	99	623	0.153478518
0198a	198A	Elburn	0-2	PRIME	143	99	9386	2.312278281
0679a	679A	Blackberry	0-2	PRIME	142	99	774	0.190677966
0059a	59A	Lisbon	0-2	PRIME	141	98	4918	1.211568782
0679b	679B	Blackberry	2-5	PRIME	141	98	2405	0.592481277
0715a	715A	Arrowsmith	0-2	PRIME	140	97	1276	0.314347655
0171a	171A	Catlin	0-2	PRIME	138	96	7858	1.935849428
0512a	512A	Danabrook	0-2	PRIME	138	96	1433	0.353025227
0171b	171B	Catlin	2-5	PRIME	137	95	35898	8.843614505
0512b	512B	Danabrook	2-5	PRIME	137	95	56035	13.80444423
0148a	148A	Proctor	0-2	PRIME	135	94	322	0.079325976
0148b	148B	Proctor	2-5	PRIME	134	93	54	0.013303114
0663a	663A	Clare	0-2	PRIME	134	93	553	0.136233741
0067a	67A	Harpster	0-2	PRIME 2	133	92	5985	1.474428459
0663b	663B	Clare	2-5	PRIME	133	92	885	0.218023256
0712a	712A	Spaulding	0-2	PRIME 2	133	92	78	0.019215609
0104a	104A	Virgil	0-2	PRIME 2	132	92	2970	0.731671265
0062a	62A	Herbert	0-2	PRIME 2	131	91	4564	1.12435948
0103a	103A	Houghton	0-2	IMPORTANT	130	90	1467	0.361401261
0792a	792A	Bowes	0-2	PRIME	130	90	582	0.143378006
0219a	219A	Millbrook	0-2	PRIME 2	129	90	2042	0.503054789
0791a	791A	Rush	0-2	PRIME	129	90	262	0.064544738
0792b	792B	Bowes	2-4	PRIME	129	90	467	0.1150473
3076a	3076A	Otter	0-2	PRIME 5	129	90	11831	2.914613717
0512ca	512C2	Danabrook	5-10	IMPORTANT	128	89	5809	1.431070162
0667a	667A	Kaneville	0-2	PRIME	128	89	3147	0.775275916
0791b	791B	Rush	2-4	PRIME	128	89	316	0.077847852
3776a	3776A	Comfrey	0-2	PRIME 5	128	89	320	0.100906583
0667b	667B	Kaneville	2-5	PRIME	127	88	4241	1.04478715
0206a	206A	Thorp	0-2	PRIME 2	126	88	383	0.094353567
0662a	662A	Barony	0-2	PRIME	125	87	1252	0.30843516
0344b	344B	Harvard	2-5	PRIME	124	86	176	0.043358297
0662b	662B	Barony	2-5	PRIME	124	86	2365	0.582627119
0330a	330A	Peotone	0-2	PRIME 2	123	85	2845	0.70087702
0233a	233A	Birbeck	0-2	PRIME	122	85	885	0.218023256
0236a	236A	Sabina	0-2	PRIME 2	122	85	1325	0.326418999
0233b	233B	Birbeck	2-5	PRIME	121	84	377	0.092875443
0348a	348A	Wingate	0-2	PRIME	121	84	855	0.210632637
0488a	488A	Hooppole	0-2	PRIME 2	121	84	565	0.139189988
0348b	348B	Wingate	2-5	PRIME	120	83	12197	3.004779267
0667c2	667C2	Kaneville	5-10	IMPORTANT	119	83	432	0.106424911
0656b	656B	Octagon	2-4	PRIME	117	81	2594	0.639042176
0668a	668A	Somonauk	0-2	PRIME	117	81	1949	0.480143871
0325a	325A	Dresden	0-2	PRIME	116	81	6	0.001478124
0662c2	662C2	Barony	5-10	IMPORTANT	116	81	855	0.210632637
0668b	668B	Somonauk	2-5	PRIME	116	81	1859	0.457972014
0325b	325B	Dresden	2-4	PRIME	115	80	275	0.067747339
0527b	527B	Kidami	2-4	PRIME	114	79	2505	0.617116673
0221b2	221B2	Parr	2-5	PRIME	113	78	7259	1.788283406
0348c2	348C2	Wingate	5-10	IMPORTANT	113	78	910	0.224182105

TABLE 2 continued

Sort#	Map Unit Symbol	Name	Slope %	Prime Farmland	Optimum PI	RV	Acres	% of Co.
0221c2	221C2	Parr	5-10	PRIME	111	77	8076	1.989554592
0656c2	656C2	Octagon	4-6	PRIME	111	77	3740	0.921363816
0193a	193A	Mayville	0-2	PRIME	110	76	416	0.102483248
0193b	193B	Mayville	2-5	PRIME	109	76	8932	2.200433583
0325c2	325C2	Dresden	4-6	PRIME	109	76	412	0.101497832
0327b	327B	Fox	2-4	PRIME	108	75	117	0.028823413
0527c2	527C2	Kidami	4-6	PRIME	108	75	3572	0.87997635
0060c2	60C2	LaRose	5-10	PRIME	110	76	2469	0.608247931
0527d2	527D2	Kidami	6-12	IMPORTANT	105	73	649	0.159883721
0193c2	193C2	Mayville	5-10	IMPORTANT	102	71	543	0.133770201
0060d2	60D2	LaRose	10-18	IMPORTANT	101	70	1354	0.333563264
0318d2	318D2	Lorenzo	6-12	IMPORTANT	96	67	73	0.017983839
0802b	802B	Orthents	1-6	OTHER	0	0	884	0.217776902
0830	830	Landfills		OTHER	0	0	122	0.030055183
0865	865	Pits gr		OTHER	0	0	387	0.095338983
9999	W	water			0	0	1203	0.296363816
							405920	100.0220733

III. Site Assessment

Agricultural viability of a site cannot be measured in isolation from existing and impending land use needs of DeKalb County. The Site Assessment process provides a system for identifying important factors, other than soils, that affect the quality and viability of a site for agricultural uses.

This section describes each of 15 Site Assessment factors to be considered when a change to another land use is proposed in the agricultural districts. The 15 Site Assessment factors are grouped into the following five major areas of consideration:

1. Agricultural/Land Uses;
2. Zoning;
3. Compatibility and Impact of Uses;
4. Land Use Feasibility; and
5. Compatibility with Comprehensive Development Plans.

Based upon current land use data, land use regulations, site inspection and other pertinent information, a point value is determined by analyzing each site assessment factor and selecting a number value that best reflects the quality of the property in question.

SITE ASSESSMENT FACTORS, VALUES. AND DESCRIPTIONS OF FACTORS

I. Agricultural/Land Uses

1.1 Percent of area within one mile of subject property compatible to agricultural use.

Point Value

20 - ***91 - 100%***	**10** - ***41 - 50%***
18 - ***81 - 90%***	**8** - ***31 - 40%***
16 - ***71 - 80%***	**6** - ***21 - 30%***
14 -***61 - 70%***	**4** - ***11 - 20%***
12 - ***51 - 60%***	**0** - ***1 - 10%***

This factor addresses the long-term viability that agricultural uses may have within an area associated with the site. If an area has a low percentage of compatible agricultural uses, then a request based on an assumption that the site is not suitable for agricultural uses due to non-compatibility may have merit. If the area has a high percentage of compatible agricultural uses, then the area has a high probability of remaining viable and the conversion of the site may have a negative impact on the entire area. The definition of “agricultural uses” should be interpreted to mean all agricultural and related uses that can be considered part of a farm operation. This would include farmland, pastureland, farm residences, barns, out-buildings, and miscellaneous cultural features.

1.2 Percent of land in agricultural uses adjacent to site.

Point Value

20 - ***91 - 100%***	**10** - ***41 - 50%***
18 - ***81 - 90%***	**8** - ***31 - 40%***
16 - ***71 - 80%***	**6** - ***21 - 30%***
14 - ***61 - 70%***	**4** - ***11 - 20%***
12 - ***51 - 60%***	**0** - ***1 - 10%***

This factor assesses the short-term viability of the site's agricultural capacity by recognizing that adjacent non-compatible uses can effectively render agriculture nonproductive. Non-compatible uses primarily consist of residential subdivisions but can include large transportation facilities that have disrupted access to or drainage of the subject property, recreation areas that overflow with patrons, attractive nuisances such as quarry ponds, and successful commercial and industrial concerns.

1.3 Percentage of site suitable for Agricultural Uses

Point Value

20 - ***91 - 100%***	**10** - ***41 - 50%***
18 - ***81 - 90%***	**8** - ***31 - 40%***
16 - ***71 - 80%***	**6** - ***21 - 30%***
14 - ***61 - 70%***	**4** - ***11 - 20%***
12 - ***51 - 60%***	**0** - ***1 - 10%***

This factor assesses the features that exist on the site that can function to make it suitable for farming. Features include trees and other vegetation, slope, internal barriers such as drainage ditches or rocks, configuration resulting in excessive point rows or two few rows, buried foundations, etc.

2. Zoning

2.1 Compatibility of the site's proposed use with the purpose and intent of the Zoning District requested.

Point Value

_____ **20** - ***No***

0 - ***Yes*** _____

The County's Zoning Ordinance is the most important tool for implementing the County's Comprehensive Plan. Each district, including its list of special uses, has its own purpose that is tailored to achieve the Plan's goal as well as reduce conflicts between non-compatible land uses. This factor assesses the proposed land use in light of these objectives.

2.2 Percent of perimeter of site that joins existing zoning districts that are compatible to agricultural uses.

Point Value

12 - ***91 - 100%***	**7** - ***41 - 50%***
11 - ***81 - 90%***	**6** - ***31 - 40%***
10 - ***71 - 80%***	**4** - ***21 - 30%***
9 - ***61 - 70%***	**2** - ***11 - 20%***
8 - ***51 - 60%***	**0** - ***1 - 10%***

This factor assesses both existing and proposed uses that are not compatible to agricultural uses by recognizing that some zoning districts, particularly the medium/high density residential districts, can render agriculture unsuitable. Medium or high density residential districts allow minimum lots sizes of one acre or less. Certain commercial and industrial districts are also incompatible with agriculture.

3. Compatibility/Impact of Use

3.1 Degree to which affected local governments can bear the additional costs the proposed use may generate.

Point Value

10 - ***More than 1.5 miles***
8 - ***More than 1.0 to 1.5 miles***
6 - ***More than .75 to 1.0 miles***
4 - ***More than .50 to .74 miles***
2 - ***More than .25 to .49 miles***
0 - ***0 to .25 miles***

This factor assesses the increased fiscal burden that the local governments must bear when they extend additional services to the site, if the request is granted. Some requests will require few, if any, additional services, whereas others will require many. Some of the local governments are in a position to successfully bear the additional costs whereas others are not. Analyses of Fiscal Impacts of New Developments, conducted by Northern Illinois University, relates these costs to distance from boundaries of incorporated areas. Since factor 3.2 (below) assesses transportation, those costs should not be considered here.

3.2 Degree to which the affected transportation routes can bear the traffic that the proposed use may generate.

Point Value

10 - ***earthen***
8 - ***aggregate***
4 - ***hard surface***
0 - ***traffic/access controlled***

This factor assesses the impact that the proposed use may have on the roads accessing the site. It is separated from factor 3.3 for the purpose of emphasizing the role that roads play in the successful operation of any development. Ideally, the proposed use will generate a fair share of the cost of maintaining or improving the access roads. However, there will be instances when this does not occur and these instances should be evaluated for their impact on those who must pay for the roads, but are not benefitted by their contribution.

3.3 Potential of a site to be annexed to municipality or served by public sewer and water systems.

Point Value

10 - ***More than 1.5 miles***
8 - ***More than 1.0 to 1.5 miles***
6 - ***More than .75 to 1.0 miles***
4 - ***More than .50 to .74 miles***
2 - ***More than .25 to .49 miles***
0 - ***0 to .25 miles***

Annexation of a site to a municipality is the County's most important method of protecting agricultural lands and activities. Most all municipalities in the County have sewer and water systems and ordinances that state that upon either annexation or connection, sites must either connect or be annexed. When connection to a sewer and water systems occurs, the cost dictates that lot size be reduced resulting in more people living on less land.

4. Land Use Feasibility

4.1 Viability of the property as a farm, as represented by the ratio of the acreage of the site over its farm value (as determined by minimum lot size divided by the relative soil values of the site).

Point Value

16 - ***91 - 100%***	**8** - ***41 - 50%***
14 - ***81 - 90%***	**6** - ***31 - 40%***
12 - ***71 - 80%***	**4** - ***21 - 30%***
10 - ***61 - 70%***	**2** - ***11 - 20%***
9 - ***51 - 60%***	**0** - ***1 - 10%***

The agricultural productivity of any given property is dependent on the types of soil. If the site consists of less productive soil, then a petitioner's claim that it is not suitable for agriculture because of soils may be validated. In addition, the County has determined that the viability of a farm is in part dependent on the ability to place a farm house on the site. The largest agricultural zoning district, the A-1 District, requires a minimum of 40 acres for a new farm house. This question relates the minimum lot size required by zoning to the land evaluation (LE) score of the specific site, in order to yield a ratio which is then divided into the actual acreage of the site in order to assess that site's viability for farming in the light of zoning restrictions on farm houses. Example: a 30-acre site consisting entirely of Drummer soil would have an LE of 94; 40 acres divided by 94 is 42.5%; 30 acres (the actual site size) divided by 42.5 is 71% (rounded up), for a score of 12. Even though the site is too small for a farm house, the fact that it consists of a very productive soil yields a high score in this evaluation.

4.2 Ratio of the acreage of site over the required acreage for proposed use.

Point Value

12 - ***2:1 or higher***	**6** - ***1.5/1***
11 - ***1.9/1***	**5** - ***1.4/1***
10 - ***1.8/1***	**4** - ***1.3/1***
8 - ***1.7/1***	**2** - ***1.2/1***
7 - ***1.6/1***	**0** - ***1.1/1 or less***

This factor assesses the size of the site in light of efficient land use. If the acreage of the site over the acreage reasonably required is a high value, then the ratio indicates that an excessive amount of land may be converted. When determining the amount of acreage considered as appropriate, it should include areas for access ways and buffers.

5. Compatibility With Comprehensive Development Plans

5.1 Consistency of proposed use with the recommendations of the County's Land Use Plan.

Point Value

20 - ***Incompatible with Plan.***
10 - ***Compatible with existing use, but not with Plan map.***
0 - ***Totally compatible.***

The Land Use Plan is the element of the County's Comprehensive Plan that makes recommendations regarding where different future land uses should occur. These recommendations are always considered in the light of the two principal goals of the Comprehensive Plan; to preserve agricultural land, and to guide development toward land that adjoins incorporated boundaries. This factor assesses the site's role in achieving those goals. Consistency with the intent of the Plan should be determined when a land use change is proposed. It should be remembered that the Land Use Plan does not reflect every possible use that would be consistent with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan.

5.2 Consistency of the adjoining land uses with the recommendations of the current Land Use Plan of the Comprehensive Plan.

Point Value

20 - ***Incompatible with Plan.***
10 - ***Compatible with municipal plan, but not with County Plan.***
0 - ***Totally compatible.***

Existing uses on adjoining lands can have an impact on the decision regarding a proposed change in land use for a site. For example, the presence of residences on abutting parcels can make the development of new houses on a subject property more likely to be approved. However, certain existing land uses are at odds with the recommendations of the Land Use Plan of the County's Comprehensive Plan. In many cases, the Land Use Plan does not reflect the existing land uses because it is not deemed appropriate for more land in a particular area to be converted to match those existing uses. The compatibility of existing land uses on adjoining lands with the recommendations of the Land Use Plan is, therefore, an important consideration when evaluating the proposed use of a subject property.

5.3 Consistency of proposed use to municipal plan.

Point Value

10 - ***Inconsistent with municipal plan, or parcel is beyond 1.5 mile jurisdictional boundary for municipal planning.***

5 - ***Within 1.5 mile municipal planning area, but no municipal plan recorded.***

0 - ***Consistent with municipal plan.***

To insure the cooperation between municipalities and DeKalb County, the County's Land Use Plan considered the municipal plans recorded at that time. A continuation of this cooperation is reflected in this factor. The weight is relatively low because municipal plans, for the most part, do not include agricultural areas. If the parcel is within two municipal planning areas, the plan from the nearest municipality shall be considered.

IV. Instructions for Calculating the Total Land Evaluation and Site Assess Value for a Site.

The following are instructions to determine the total Land Evaluation and Site Assessment part, each require separate calculations.

1. **Land Evaluation Value** -- The Land Evaluation (LE) value will be provided by the DeKalb County Soil and Water Conservation District office when a petition is filed for a map amendment (rezoning).

2. **Site Assessment Value** -- To establish the Site Assessment point value of the given parcel, work through the following steps:

a). Based upon local land use information, site inspections, and other pertinent data, assess the site for each factor shown in Section III.

b). A point value for each factor is determined by analyzing each Site Assessment factor and choosing the category that best suits the property in question.

c). Add all factor values to arrive at a Site Assessment subtotal. The maximum number of possible points for any given parcel is 200.

3. **Assessing a Site for its Agricultural Viability**

Once the value for the Land Evaluation part and Site Assessment part are obtained, add both values for the total points for each site.

The total maximum points possible for any site are 300. The Land Evaluation may be assigned a maximum of 100 points, and the Site Assessment may be assigned a maximum of 200 points.

The following breakdown should be used in evaluating a site for rezoning in the agricultural district, to another zoning district for protection of agriculture:

215 - 300	**High Rating for Protection**
185 - 214	**Moderate Rating for Protection**
184 - below	**Low Rating for Protection**

The higher the total points accrued for a site, the more agriculturally viable the given site will be. When considering a number of sites for a nonagricultural use, selection of the site with the lowest point score will usually result in protection of the best agricultural land in the most viable locations.