Reprinted with permission from Zoning and Planning Law Report, Volume 45, Number 6, © 2022 Thomson Reuters.
Further reproduction without permission of the publisher is prohibited.
For additional information about this publication, please visit www.legalsolutions.thomsonreuters.com.

ZONING AND PLANNING LAW REPORT

JUNE 2022 | VOLUME 45 | ISSUE 6

REPURPOSING GOLF COURSES: LAND USE REGULATORY HURDLES

*Arthur J. Anderson**

INTRODUCTION

There are numerous obstacles facing developers attempting to repurpose a golf course. Golf course redevelopments are often politically controversial. Not surprisingly many nearby residents oppose replacing a low intensity, visually pleasing natural environment with more traditional developments that could bring an increase in people and traffic. Golf courses are often viewed as open space amenities and homes next to golf courses may be worth more than similar homes not located next to golf courses. In an economic downturn it can be expected that many public golf courses will close. When golf courses fail due to reduced play, then some type of redevelopment must be authorized or else homeowner associations and/or conservation groups must raise enough funds to purchase the course. Otherwise, the course will likely be abandoned and not maintained which is bad for everyone involved.

Every jurisdiction has different statutes and ordinances regulating land use. While the politics in each jurisdiction is different, the legal process is fairly similar. Typically the entitlement process for a new project will be as follows: comprehensive plan, zoning, platting, site improvements, building permit, certificate of occupancy.

Even our neighbors to the north are addressing golf course redevelopment challenges. The Meadowbrook Golf Course was developed in the 1930's and is located on the island of

*Art Anderson is a shareholder at Winstead PC in Dallas. Prior versions of this article were published in the 2019 ACREL papers and the November 2020 Practical Real Estate Lawyer.

Montreal within the boundaries of both the City of Cote St. Luc and the City of Montreal. In 2013, a developer submitted a request to build 1,500 housing units on the Borough of Lachine ("Montreal") side of the island, but the bid was rejected by the Montreal City Council. According to news articles, the council claimed to reject the bid because of high infrastructure costs. As stated in a newspaper article, "it was not interested in covering the costs for a new road, bridge and water and sewage pipes into the development."[1]

In 2015, the land use and development plan for the island of Montreal was revised to redesignate a portion of the Meadowbrook Golf Course on the Lachine side from "residential" to "large green space or recreational."[2] The change was in response to petitioning from multiple conservationists, and the developer then filed a $44 million lawsuit against the city.

In 2017 a Superior Court judge rejected the developer's Lachine lawsuit on the grounds that the City's actions were not the proximate cause for the failed development attempt. The trial court judge pointed to the developer's need to finalize negotiations prior to development with the City, adjoining municipalities, Canadian Pacific, the suburban train authority, and Ministry of the Environment. Under the City's new land development plan, the landowner is still free to operate a golf course or other recreational purposes.[3]

ZONING

From a survey of the zoning statutes in the 50 states, it does not appear that any state legislature has imposed a specific statutory zoning requirement for golf course development or redevelopment. Virtually all U.S. municipalities of consequence have enacted general zoning ordinances that comply in some manner with the Standard Zoning Enabling Act ("SZEA"). The Act was drafted by a committee of the U.S. Department of Commerce and first issued in 1922.[4]

COMPREHENSIVE PLANS

Under the SZEA, local governments should enact zoning ordinances "in accordance with a comprehensive plan."[5] While not expressly defined, it is commonly referred to as an independent long-term plan regulating the future development of land.[6] Comprehensive plans constitute "the general outline of projected development," while zoning is a regulatory tool designed to implement the plan.[7]

The significance of zoning compliance with a local comprehensive plan for golf course development or redevelopment depends largely upon the state where the property is located. For example, the State

Editorial Director
Erbayne W. Jarvis, Esq.
Contributing Editors
Patricia E. Salkin, Esq.

POSTMASTER: send address changes to Zoning and Planning Law Report, 610 Opperman Drive, P.O. Box 64526, St. Paul, MN 55164-0526.

©2022 Thomson Reuters.
ISSN 0161-8113
Customer Service: 610 Opperman Drive, Eagan, MN 55123
Tel.: 800-328-4880 Fax: 800-340-9378

This publication was created to provide you with accurate and authoritative information concerning the subject matter covered; however, this publication was not necessarily prepared by persons licensed to practice law in a particular jurisdiction. The publisher is not engaged in rendering legal or other professional advice and this publication is not a substitute for the advice of an attorney. If you require legal or other expert advice, you should seek the services of a competent attorney or other professional.

of Texas allows but does not require the governing body of a municipality to adopt a comprehensive plan.[8] The contents of the comprehensive plan are left to the local entity, and a map showing future land uses must expressly state that a comprehensive plan does not establish zoning district boundaries.[9]

Many states located on the east and west coasts require that development ordinances adhere strictly to a comprehensive plan.[10] This compliance theory is reinforced by appellate opinions in those states.[11]

For example, the state of Washington's Growth Management Act ("GMA") is a series of state statutes that requires fast-growing cities and counties to develop a comprehensive plan to manage their population growth.[12] The GMA establishes the primacy of the comprehensive plan which must contain the following elements: land use, housing, capital facilities plan, utilities, transportation, economic development, and parks and recreation.[13] Optional plan elements include conservation, solar energy, recreation and sub area plans.[14]

In California the comprehensive plan is called a general plan and is governed by state statute.[15] Each general plan must include the vision, goals, and objectives of the city or county in terms of planning and development within different "elements" defined by the state: land use, housing, transportation, conservation, noise, safety, open space, and environmental justice.[16] Cities have discretion to add elements but can be penalized if their general plan does not adequately address the eight state-mandated elements.[17]

Local government planning in Florida has been guided over the last 27 years by the 1985 Growth Policy Act.[18] It requires that every local government adopt a comprehensive plan that contains both mandatory and optional elements.[19] Virginia has similar comprehensive plan requirements.[20]

The greater the consistency between the comprehensive plan's land use designation and the proposed new use of the golf course property, the smoother the path to obtaining the necessary development approvals. Conversely, a large variance between the proposed use and the comprehensive plan makes it more difficult to navigate local regulatory hurdles.

ZONING DISTRICTS

There are many different types of zoning. While every local land use regulatory entity has a different protocol, the options for golf course property can typically be broken down as follows: (1) no zoning, (2) planned development, (3) specific use permit, (4) overlay district, (5) straight golf course district, and (6) straight district zoning.

(1) No Zoning Option: There are few jurisdictions within the United States where there is no zoning authority. For example, the State of Texas authorizes cities to regulate land use within their boundaries. For land located outside of a corporate limit, zoning does not apply because Texas counties do not have the required statutory authority. However, counties in many states have zoning authority on land outside the city limits.[21] The City of Houston is the largest city in the United States without zoning, but much of the land within the city limits is subject to deed restrictions. Those restrictions can be enforced by the city per statute.[22] For those local jurisdictions without zoning authority, golf course land can

© 2022 Thomson Reuters

be either developed or redeveloped as a matter of right from a land use perspective.

(2) Planned Development District: A planned development district ("PD") or planned unit district is a unique zoning district imposed by separate ordinance to allow a specific project on a particular tract of land. The PD is instigated by the developer and usually includes a site plan and written conditions included in the PD ordinance.[23] No land uses are authorized except for those stated in the PD ordinance. Adoption or rejection of a PD ordinance is typically construed to be a legislative act.[24] Because of the unique nature of golf course developments, they lend themselves to PD zoning.

Many large mixed-use developments with golf course components are zoned PD. An example is Paso Robles which is a 1,338-acre development approved by the City of San Marcos, Texas.[25] The zoning classification authorizes a mixture of commercial and residential uses, along with a 310-acre golf course and open space area. In addition to describing the golf course in the text of the PD ordinance, the conceptual land use and open space plans clearly show each golf course hole's fairways and greens. According to the PD ordinance, treated effluent will be used for golf course irrigation.[26] The ordinance requires that the golf course operation must comply with the standards of the *Audubon International Signature Program* which requires adhering to an environmental plan.[27] In addition, the PD ordinance states that if the golf course closes the land shall revert to open space. Older PD ordinances are often silent as to what happens if the golf course closes.

(3) Specific Use Permits. Many golf courses are allowed by specific or special use permit ("SUP") or conditional use permit. An SUP is a type of overlay on a straight zoning district and is sometimes referred to as a conditional use permit. The use is not allowed as a matter of right but must be approved as a separate permit. Similar to a PD, a SUP ordinance will typically include a site plan and specific conditions. However, the underlying development regulations in the base zoning district in the comprehensive zoning ordinance apply. For example, the setbacks, height and density standards cannot be varied by SUP unless they are made more restrictive. Increases in density and development rights can only be varied in a PD.

For example, the City of Omaha, Nebraska, allows golf course uses under the category of "Outdoor sports and recreation." This use is allowed by Special Use Permit in the Development Reserve (DR) residential zoning district.[28] In one instance a developer proposed using a small portion of the Shadow Ridge Country Club property for 28 residential lots where million dollar houses would be built (the golf course would remain).[29] The redevelopment of that area required some changes to the driving range that necessitated amendment of the Special Use Permit for the golf course. Nearby residents opposed the amendment to the Specific Use Permit as a protest to the development of residential lots, but the Omaha City Council eventually approved the rezoning.

In the City of Escondido, CA golf courses are allowed by major conditional use permit in six of the eight residential zoning districts listed in the city's zoning ordinance (the exceptions being the highest-density multi-family districts).[30] A major conditional use permit requires the approval of the city

 © 2022 Thomson Reuters

planning commission which the commission may grant or deny in its discretion.[31] The denial of a conditional use permit by the planning commission may be appealed to the city council.[32] Decisions granting or denying a conditional use permit must be based upon the following guidelines: (1) sound principles of land use and in response to services required by the community; (2) whether the use will cause deterioration of bordering land uses or create a special problem for the area in which it is located; and (3) consideration of the effect of the proposed land use on the community or neighborhood plan for the area in which it is to be located.[33] For property to be entitled for a golf course use other than by conditional use permit, the property must be rezoned which requires the approval of the city council after a recommendation by the planning commission.[34]

Because both PD and SUP ordinances typically include site plans illustrating the physical development of the property, these types of zoning ordinances can bolster the arguments of either side in a redevelopment situation. For example, if the ordinance and site plan address solely the golf course component, then adjoining residents have a weaker argument that they relied on the golf course when they purchased their property. If the site plan shows the golf course as part of a larger master-planned community that includes houses along fairways and greens, then adjoining landowners have stronger common law and political arguments objecting to the repurposed project.

(4) Golf Course Districts: According to the SZEA, jurisdictions are supposed to be divided into zoning districts. The zoning standards for the particular district are to be uniform according to § 211.005(b), Tex. Loc. Gov't Code. Some cities have created a golf course zoning district which only allows a golf course use.

The Town Council of the Town of Brookhaven, New York approved a change of zoning for Rock Hill Golf and Country Club from a residential zoning district to the Golf Course District ("GCD").[35] According to local news articles, Rock Hill was the first private course to join the newly created GCD.[36] The news articles state that the town created the GCD to protect against residential or commercial redevelopment of golf courses in the town.[37] Other area golf courses had been redeveloped into an apartment project, single-family housing development, and a solar farm.[38] The GCD was created to slow down or prevent more golf course redevelopment.

Rezoning added a hurdle to the redevelopment process because in order to redevelop the property for a use other than a golf course, a developer would have to seek a rezoning from the town. One article quoted the councilmember that sponsored the creation of the golf course district who said that "[s]ingle-family housing will no longer be allowed to be developed on the Mill Pond course in Medford and Rolling Oaks in Rocky Point . . . [i]t's a very positive step in the right direction for residents and the Town of Brookhaven" and "will allow enhancements such as spas, restaurants and catering halls."[39]

Following the proposed sale of the Bent Creek Golf Course to a residential developer in 2006, the City of Eden Prairie, Minnesota, added a GCD that severely limits the permitted uses in that district to ensure the continued open space and recreational nature of golf course land.[40] The stated

© 2022 Thomson Reuters

purpose of that district is to "specify a land use district applicable and consistent with the historical and contractual development and use of the City's golf courses."[41] That district limits the permitted uses only to golf courses, similar recreational uses, and antennas and towers.[42] The redevelopment of Bent Creek was met with opposition from the surrounding homeowners who claimed the course was required to remain as open space pursuant to agreements dating back to the initial development of the course.[43] Following the establishment of the GCD in the comprehensive zoning ordinance, the City surrendered to the neighborhood opposition and rezoned Bent Creek to a GCD.

(5) Straight or Base Zoning Districts: In many cities a golf course use is authorized as a matter of right in all districts included in the comprehensive zoning ordinance. Most jurisdictions view golf courses as beneficial or, at the worse, neutral uses. They serve as open space and aesthetic buffers and generate few adverse externalities. Many cities have golf course use definitions in their comprehensive zoning ordinances. For example, the City of The Colony, Texas, defines a golf course as "a tract of land laid out with at least nine holes, except for miniature golf, for playing a game of golf and improved with tees, greens, fairways, and hazards."[44] A golf course includes a clubhouse, shelters, and other accessory uses.

In Cobb County, Georgia, golf courses are permitted by right in almost all residential and commercial zoning districts.[45] The county's zoning regulations have an entire section of supplemental regulations for golf courses.[46] There are different regulations depending on the type of golf course. The regulations differentiate between a par 3 golf course, public or semipublic golf course, private golf course, executive golf course, and a regulation public nine-hole course.

Relatively intense zoning districts can contain a golf course, single-family, office, commercial and/or industrial uses as a matter of right. A developer looking to repurpose for a use allowed as a matter of right in the base zoning district should not face any rezoning hurdles. If the underlying zoning district does not allow the more intense use, then approval of a rezoning application would be necessary.

(6) Multiple Zoning Districts: Because golf courses often contain more than 100 acres of land there may be numerous base zoning districts on various parts of the course. In order to redevelop the entirety of a closed course, it will probably be necessary to rezone the property to a single district. Depending upon the locations of the respective zoning districts and the development standards in those districts it may be possible to develop within certain districts shown on the golf course property without requiring a zoning change.

(7) Overlay Districts: The City of Austin, Texas provides for a conditional overlay (CO) combining district. The CO overlay is used in conjunction with the city's base zoning districts. Similar to a SUP, the purpose of the CO overlay is "to modify use and site development regulations to address the specific circumstances presented by a site." Thus, the CO overlay is designed to be site specific. The city's Land Development Code provides that "[a] CO combining district may be used to: (1) promote compatibility between competing or potentially incompatible uses; (2) ease the transition from one base district to another; (3) address land uses or sites with special requirements; and (4) guide development in unique

 © 2022 Thomson Reuters

circumstances."[47] The conditional overlay district is used many times as a tool to prohibit certain uses that would otherwise be allowed in the base zoning district.

REZONING

Developers seeking to redevelop golf course land need to understand the underlying zoning standards and how they affect the proposed new use. If the base zoning authorizes the new use as a matter of right, then a rezoning will not be required. Potential commercial and residential developers of closed golf courses will often face daunting political and legal challenges to rezone the land to the new use. Elected officials will usually be more sensitive to the concerns of area residents (i.e. voters) than the monetary success of a potential developer.

In order to repurpose land that does not have broad underlying zoning for a use other than a golf course, a rezoning application must be submitted and approved by the appropriate governing body. Section 5 of the SZEA establishes the procedure for rezoning land which has been adopted by most states. Public hearings are required before the zoning commission and the governing body. Notice is published in the newspaper and mailed to nearby landowners prior to the planning and zoning commission hearing.[48] It requires that written notice of a proposed change be sent to landowners located within a specified distance from the property being rezoned. If owners of 20% or more of the land within the notice area submit written protests to the rezoning, then a supermajority vote of the governing body is triggered.

If the zoning on the closed golf course property must be amended to allow a proposed redevelopment, nearby residents and the relevant municipality have significant leverage. There will be notice of the change, public hearings and a possible 3/4ths vote of the city council required to change the zoning. While local governments are not supposed to act arbitrarily or capriciously, legislative enactments are presumed to be valid by the courts.

Zoning applications are subject to the legislative, discretionary decisions of the city council. For over 90 years, courts have established a strong, almost irrefutable presumption of validity for legislative zoning decisions.[49] If issuable facts support a zoning vote, the court is not to subject the matter to a jury but to uphold the ordinance as a matter of law.[50]

Many times a developer will test the waters before deciding to file a rezoning application. Preparing the necessary studies and hiring land use attorneys and other consultants to facilitate the zoning process can be costly and time-consuming. If there is significant local opposition then the developer may decide to focus his or her resources elsewhere rather than pursue a lost cause. Regardless, each locality and golf course redevelopment will be unique, resulting in different outcomes depending upon the unique circumstances.

For example, in the City of San Antonio, Texas, the city council approved the rezoning of the defunct Pecan Valley Golf Club.[51] The approved plan for the 215-acre site includes a nine-hole championship golf course; market-rate multifamily and single family housing; health, fitness, and sports facilities; entertainment and retail, and a bike trail. All amenities are proposed to be open to the public but the project is primarily designed to assist military veterans' transition to civilian life.[52] San Antonio is

© 2022 Thomson Reuters

home to several military bases and numerous active and retired veterans. Opponents of the project voiced concerns regarding flooding, crime, and overall population and traffic congestion.[53] The developer ultimately agreed to include single family uses, placed a cap on multifamily units, and restricted public access to the local neighborhoods and the application was approved.[54]

In Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio, the city council approved a request to rezone the Sycamore Valley Golf Course to a suburban density residential district to allow the development of 148 townhomes.[55] The council approved the request over substantial opposition from area residents who raised concerns regarding flooding and traffic. One councilmember stated that he voted to approve the request on the basis that the amended zoning provided more protections against flooding and traffic by including trails and less impervious coverage than what was allowed under existing zoning.

Another way in which some cities have handled golf course redevelopment include acquiring the course for city or public purposes. For example, in 2008, after years of financial struggle, the owners of the Woodland Creek Golf Course located in Andover, Minnesota pursued a zoning change that would have permitted residential development of the course.[56] The surrounding residents opposed the rezoning, and the City of Andover refused to approve the request. The course was subsequently closed. Several years later, in 2013, the city purchased the golf course and in 2015 voted to establish a conservation easement over the course to preserve open space.[57]

In the City of Escondido, California, a conflict arose between a landowner proposing to redevelop the golf course portion of a country club and the existing homeowners along the golf course.[58] Because country club memberships had dwindled, the owner proposed to re-develop the property with hundreds of homes.[59] Local residents opposed the plan arguing that the golf course was a negotiated portion of the master-planned community.[60] In response to neighborhood opposition, the City Council downzoned the golf course to open space.[61] The owner filed suit alleging an unconstitutional taking and prevailed.[62] Ultimately, the City approved a plan for 380 single-family dwelling units, "clustered" development to preserve open space, and a clubhouse area with recreational, social, and farm amenities.[63]

A federal regulatory takings claim was addressed in *WG Woodmere LLC v. Town of Hempstead*.[64] The Woodmere Golf Club consisted of 118 acres located within three townships. Plaintiffs purchased the golf course for $12 million and agreed to continue operations as a golf club for a period of time. It was their intent to develop a residential subdivision in accordance with the three townships' comprehensive plan and local zoning. In response to local political pressure, the various governmental entities enacted moratoria and ordinances restricting the property to golf course use. One of the townships proposed a new zoning district called Golf Course Zone which would have decreased the potential density by 60%. The defendants also floated the possibility of creating a public park on the property funded by taxpayer funds.

Following the filing of litigation the defendants filed a Rule 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss. While the plaintiff did not have a general vested right to existing zoning there is an exception when construction is improperly

 © 2022 Thomson Reuters

delayed by local officials in an attempt to prevent vesting. The court held that the special facts exception applied in this case. As a result the trial court refused to dismiss the developer's regulatory takings, substantive due process, and equal protection causes of action.

PLATTING

There are instances in which a closed golf course can be redeveloped without being rezoned because the new use is authorized under the existing zoning. The legal (if not political) leverage then turns in favor of the developer because plat and building permit approval is supposed to be nondiscretionary and ministerial in most localities.

The next step in the development process after zoning typically is to plat the property. Two years after the SZEA was drafted, the Department of Commerce finalized the Standard City Planning Act ("SCPA"). Title II of the Act sets forth the regulatory process for approving land subdivisions. Local governments were supposed to enact subdivision regulations and establish standards for plat submittals. It appears that all 50 states have statutes of some type regulating the subdivision and platting of land. Platting is based on the state's land registration system and is also used to implement a city's comprehensive plan. The planning commission is typically designated as the subdivision control agency.[65] Subdivision ordinances or regulations are initially adopted which specify the standards for infrastructure related to a new development. Most states have a deadline by which a plat must be reviewed and either approved or denied.[66] The subdivision ordinance provides for the dedication of streets, utilities, and parks.[67]

A city's discretion to approve or deny a plat is much more limited than a zoning request.[68] In situations in which the plat applicant complies with relevant ordinances and regulations, the approval of the plat "becomes a mere ministerial duty. . ."[69]

Even if the proposed land use is allowed under the municipality's zoning ordinance, the technical engineering standards contained in the subdivision regulations or other development ordinances may be applied to defeat a proposed golf course repurposing. Virtually every reuse will have considerably more impact on nearby infrastructure than the golf course use.

Because a governmental agency cannot legally deny a plat application that meets all of the ordinance requirements for infrastructure, it is rare that a redevelopment proposal will be denied at the plat stage. However, some jurisdictions have land use regulations that can impact golf course redevelopment in addition to platting requirements.

Such an administrative procedure was addressed in Delaware.[70] In the late 1930's Hercules Powder Company constructed a golf course for its employees in New Castle County. Hercules eventually divested itself of the golf course which continued to be operated under the name "Delaware National Country Club." After the closure of the course in 2010, Toll Brothers made plans to build homes on the former golf course, calling the proposed development "Delaware National." New Castle County's scheme for regulating development is based on the concept of concurrency. In general terms "concurrency" means that infrastructure necessary to support the proposed development must already exist or will exist by the time the development is

© 2022 Thomson Reuters

completed. The idea is to prevent the need for new infrastructure from outstripping the government's ability to provide it. In this case Toll Brothers' plans hit a snag with respect to projected traffic impacts from 263 new single-family houses. Its application was denied on that basis.

GOLF COURSE PLATTING STATUTE

After reviewing the subdivision statutes of the fifty states, we could find only one that specifically and expressly addresses the replatting of golf course land. Chapter 212 of the Texas Local Government Code is the platting enabling statute, and § 212.0155 addresses a golf course redevelopment. It places significant substantive and procedural hurdles to replat a "subdivision golf course" to a new use.

If the new use triggers the applicability of the statute then it becomes very difficult to overcome significant political opposition. The typical nondiscretionary, ministerial platting process then morphs into a legislative discretionary process similar to zoning. For example, a city council is not authorized to approve the § 212.0155 replat until it makes several findings, including that the development of the golf course will not have a "materially adverse effect" on the "health, safety or general welfare" or the "safe, orderly and healthful development of the municipality." These vague and ambiguous requirements are so broad that the City could deny a golf course subdivision replat for virtually any reason.

In addition, the governing body is required to find that the proposed development "will not have a materially adverse effect on existing single-family property values." The neighbors will obviously claim an adverse impact and the temptation will be for the City to deny the replat for political reasons. Because there is no 30-day timeframe for the City to act on or to approve the § 212.0155 replat, the developer may never obtain the necessary governmental approvals to develop the property.

For the developer of a closed golf course it is therefore imperative to avoid any categorization as a "subdivision golf course." A case example of the statute's applicability is the former Great Southwest Golf Course which is a long driver and three wood distance from AT&T Cowboys Stadium, Texas Rangers Ballpark, and Six Flags Over Texas.

Land in the vicinity of the golf course had been zoned "Industrial" since the early 1960's. Golf courses were allowed as a matter of right in the Industrial District. As the golf course was about to close, an industrial developer approached the owner about purchasing the tract for several warehouse buildings. After receiving initial indications of support from city staff, the developer submitted plat and site plan applications. Soon after the applications were filed, significant political opposition erupted. As luck would have it, the city's recently retired mayor lived adjacent to the course.

In written reports to the Planning Commission, city staff recommended approval of the applications with conditions. The Commission, however, voted to postpone taking any action on the applications for an indefinite timeframe until the developer submitted documentation to the City in accordance with § 212.0155, Tex. Loc. Gov't Code.

In response, the developer sent to the City a formal request for a certificate stating the date the plat was filed and that the Com-

 © 2022 Thomson Reuters

mission failed to act on the plat application within the statutory 30-day time period. The City refused to issue the certificate and a lawsuit was filed.[71] A key legal issue in this case was the applicability of the relevant facts to the language in § 212.0155, TEX. LOC. GOV'T CODE. According to § 212.0155(c), "a new plat must conform to the requirements of this section if any of the area subject to the new plat is a subdivision golf course." A subdivision golf course is defined as land "that was originally developed as a golf course or a country club within a common scheme of development for a predominantly residential single-family development project." A new plat must conform to the § 212.0155 requirements if any of the area subject to the new plat is a subdivision golf course. The question was whether the course was "originally developed within a common scheme of development for a predominantly residential single-family development project" according to the plain meaning of these words.

In this case, the property was platted and developed as a golf course in the mid-1960's (completed in 1965) with no residential development in the area. The 1965 golf plat contained no residential, much less single-family, development. All of the surrounding land area was zoned industrial at that time and required rezoning for even the multi-family uses which were developed years after the completion of the golf course.

There were several factors indicating Great Southwest should not be defined as a subdivision golf course. For example, if the original developer of the golf course had truly intended to develop a golf course as part of a predominantly single-family residential development, he or she would have taken steps to rezone the adjacent new residential pods prior to commencing construction of the golf course.[72]

After the trial court judge ruled in favor of the developer that the statutory requirements had not been triggered, the parties entered into settlement discussions. A compromise and settlement agreement was subsequently approved whereby the developer agreed to reduce the size and move buildings closest to the townhouse neighborhood. Title to the floodplain area on the southern portion of the course was conveyed to the City. In addition, a portion of the course adjacent to the townhome community was conveyed to the homeowners association. The developer also agreed to construct a four foot landscaping berm to screen the view of the new buildings from the residents. Following the execution of the settlement agreement, the lawsuit was dismissed by a trial court judgment which approved the developer's site plan and plat application.

CONCLUSION

Redevelopment of golf course land faces numerous political and legal challenges. Before a developer buys a golf course tract for redevelopment it is critical that the deed records be scrutinized and marketing materials obtained to address any legal claims that nearby residents may utilize to prevent the redevelopment. In addition to understanding the base zoning and the local regulatory hurdles to repurposing, the political and legal climate should be analyzed. The developer can then conduct his or her risk analysis (with the assistance of a competent land use attorney of course) to determine whether to pursue what will likely be a controversial and lengthy approval process.

© 2022 Thomson Reuters

ENDNOTES:

[1] https://montrealgazette.com/news/local-news/meadowbrook-developer-suing-city-for-46-million

[2] https://montrealgazette.com/news/city-news/meaarticle81260cbd-adfq53e5-954b-3674clc547ff.html

[3] https://montrealgazette.com/news/local-news/judge-rejects-developers-lawsuit-against-montreal-over-meadowbrook

[4]Ruth Knack, Stuart Meck, and Israel Stollman, "The Real Story Behind the Standard Planning and Zoning Acts of the 1920's, Land Use and Zoning Digest (Feb. 1996).

[5]*Larsen & Siemon*, 1 E. Yokley, *Zoning Law and Practice* § 1-4 (4th Ed. 1978).

[6]*Fasano v. Board of County Com'rs of Washington County*, 264 Or. 574, 507 P.2d 23 (1973) (disapproved of by, *Neuberger v. City of Portland*, 288 Or. 585, 607 P.2d 722 (1980)).

[7]Haar, "In Accordance With A Comprehensive Plan," 68 Harv. L. Rev. 1154, 1156 (1955).

[8]§ 213.002, Tex. Loc. Gov't Code.

[9]§ 213.005, Tex. Loc. Gov't Code.

[10]Haar, "The Master Plan, An Impermanent Constitution," 20 Law & Contemp. Probs, 353, 376 (1955).

[11]*Concerned Citizens of Calaveras County v. Board of Supervisors*, 166 Cal. App. 3d 90, 212 Cal. Rptr. 273, 276-77 (3d Dist. 1985) (citing *O'Loane v. O'Rourke*, 231 Cal. App. 2d 774, 42 Cal. Rptr. 283 (2d Dist. 1965); *Machado v. Musgrove*, 519 So. 2d 629, 632 (Fla. 3d DCA 1987).

[12]RCW Chapter 36.70A.

[13]RCW § 36.70A.070.

[14]RCW § 36.70A.080.

[15]§ 65040.2, Cal. Gov. Code.

[16]§ 65302, Cal Gov. Code.

[17]Fulton & Shigley, *Guide to California Planning*, (4th Ed. 2012).

[18]Ch. 163, Florida Statutes.

[19]§ 163.3177, Florida Statutes.

[20]Ch. 22, § 15.2-2223, Code of Va.

[21]See Chapter 23, Nebraska Revised Civil Statutes; Chapter 278, Nevada Revised Civil Statutes as examples.

[22]Tex. Local Gov't Code § 212.151, *et seq.*

[23]San Jose California Code of Ordinance, Ch. 20.60.

[24]*Weatherford v. City of San Marcos*, 157 S.W.3d 473 (Tex. App. Austin 2004); *Calhoun v. St. Bernard Parish*, 937 F.2d 172 (5th Cir. 1991).

[25]San Marcos City Code Ord. No. 2010-59.

[26]San Marcos City Code Ord. No. 2010-59 at 20.

[27] https//audubonintertaionalwildapricot.org/ac5pgolf.

[28]Omaha Code of Ordinances, Chapter 55.

[29]*Homeowners Fight Zoning Proposals for Shadow Ridge Golf Course*, March 2, 2018, by Taylor Barth, KETV 7 Omaha News (available at Homeowners fight zoning proposals for Shadow Ridge Golf Course (ketv.com)

[30]Section 33-94, Escondido City Code.

[31]Sec's 33-1201-02, Escondido City Code.

[32]Sec. 33-1304, Escondido City Code.

[33]Sec. 33-1203, Escondido City Code.

[34]Sec. 33-1260, Escondido City Code.

[35]Town of Brookhaven Town Council Meeting Minutes for April 27, 2017, Section XVI, No. 4. *See also Rock Hill Golf and Country Club Joins Brookhaven's Golf Course District* by John C. Stellakis, May 22, 2017, Long Island Land Use and Zoning, available at https://www.lilanduseandzoning.com/.

[36]Rock Hill Golf and Country Club Joins Brookhaven's Golf Course District; *see also Rock Hill Latest Course to be Rezoned as Brookhaven "Golf Course District,"* May 13, 2017, Golf On Long Island, available at https://www.golfonlongisland.com/teebox/2017/05/rock-hill-latest-course-to-be-rezoned-as-brookhaven-golf-course-district.html.

[37]Rock Hill Latest Course to be Rezoned as Brookhaven "Golf Course District."

[38]Rock Hill Latest Course to be Rezoned as Brookhaven "Golf Course District." *See*

 © 2022 Thomson Reuters

also Preservation by Law May Become Par for the Course: Brookhaven Town Rezones Golf Courses by John C. Stellakis, April 10, 2017, available at https://www.lilanduseandzoning.com/.

[39]*Brookhaven Town passes measures to preserve golf courses* by Deon J. Hampton and Carl MacGowan March 6, 2017, Newsday, available at https://www.newsday.com/long-island/suffolk/brookhaven-town-passes-measures-to-preserve-golf-courses-1.13212166.

[40]Eden Prairie, MN, Comprehensive Plan Update, Oct. 20, 2009, https://www.edenprairie.org/home/showdocument?id=394

[41]Eden Prairie, MN, Zoning Ord. Sec. 11.36 (2019).

[42]Eden Prairie, MN, Zoning Ord. Sec. 11.36 (2019).

[43] https://www.swnewsmedia.com/eden_prairie_news/news/bent-creek-golf-course——still-a-golf/article_90bae007-73df-5f4d-8ab4-eab7cc87d665.html

[44]§ 10-300 (128), City of The Colony, Texas Zoning Ordinance.

[45]Chapter 134, Cobb County Code of Ordinances, Art. IV.

[46]Chapter 134, Cobb County Code of Ordinances, Section 134-270.

[47]Austin Land Development Code, Section 25-2-164.

[48]§ 211.007(c) Tex. Loc. Gov't Code.

[49]*Village of Euclid, Ohio v. Ambler Realty Co.*, 272 U.S. 365, 47 S. Ct. 114, 71 L. Ed. 303, 4 Ohio L. Abs. 816, 54 A.L.R. 1016 (1926); *City of San Antonio v. TPLP Office Park Properties*, 218 S.W.3d 60 (Tex. 2007).

[50]*City of El Paso v. Donohue*, 163 Tex. 160, 352 S.W.2d 713 (1962); *Richardson v. City of Suffolk*, 252 Va. 336, 477 S.E.2d 512 (1996).

[51]Biediger, Shari; "Rezoning Clears Way for Valor Club's Golf Course Designed for Veterans"; Rivard Report (May 28, 2018); available at https://therivardreport.com/re-zoning-clears-way-for-valor-clubs-golf-course-designed-for-veterans/.

[52]Rezoning Clears Way for Valor Club's Golf Course Designed for Veterans.

[53]Rezoning Clears Way for Valor Club's Golf Course Designed for Veterans.

[54]Rezoning Clears Way for Valor Club's Golf Course Designed for Veterans.

[55]"*Cuyahoga Falls Approves Rezoning of Golf Course Property,*" Phil Keren, Cuyahoga Falls News-Press, (April 9, 2019) https://www.ohio.com/news/20190409/cuyahoga-falls-approves-rezoning-of-golf-course-property.

[56] http://www.startribune.com/former-andover-golf-course-will-be-restored-to-its-native-state/295763391/

[57] http://www.startribune.com/former-andover-golf-course-will-be-restored-to-its-native-state/295763391/

[58]Kuhn, Brad; California Eminent Domain Report (September 1, 2013); available at https://www.californiaeminentdomainreport.com/2013/09/articles/inverse-condemnation-regulatory-takings/can-zoning-a-golf-course-property-as-open-space-result-in-a-taking/.

[59]California Eminent Domain Report.

[60]California Eminent Domain Report.

[61]California Eminent Domain Report.

[62]Stickney, R.; "Judge Rules in Favor of Escondido Developer in Fight Over Country Club Land" (March 13, 2015); available at https://www.nbcsandiego.com/news/local/Escondido-Country-Club-Ruling-Prop-H-San-Diego-296242391.html.

[63]City of Escondido; "Escondido Country Club—The Villages"; available at https://www.escondido.org/ecc.aspx (last viewed March 5, 2019).

[64]2021 US Dist. LEXIS 160290 (E.D.N.Y. August 23, 2021).

[65]"Control of Land Subdivision by Municipal Planning Boards," John Weps, *Cornell Land Review*, Vol. 40, Article 4, p. 258 (Issue 2 Winter 1955).

[66]Control of Land Subdivision by Municipal Planning Boards at 263.

[67]Control of Land Subdivision by Municipal Planning Boards at 264.

[68]Control of Land Subdivision by Municipal Planning Boards at 275.

© 2022 Thomson Reuters

[69]*Howeth Investments, Inc. v. City of Hedwig Village*, 259 S.W.3d 877 (Tex. App. Houston 1st Dist. 2008); *City of Corpus Christi v. Unitarian Church of Corpus Christi*, 436 S.W.2d 923, 927 (Tex. Civ. App. Corpus Christi 1968), writ refused n.r.e., (Apr. 30, 1969).

[70]*Golf Course Assoc, LLC v. New Castle County*, 2016 WL 1425367 (Del. Super. Ct. 2016), judgment aff'd, 152 A.3d 581 (Del. 2016).

[71]*CH Realty VII-Ascendant I Dallas 360 Global Logistics Park, L.P. v. City of Grand Prairie*, Cause No. 17-272860-15, 17th Judicial District, Tarrant County, Texas.

[72]*TF-Harbor, LLC v. City of Rockwall, Tex.*, 18 F. Supp. 3d 810 (N.D. Tex. 2014), aff'd, 592 Fed. Appx. 323 (5th Cir. 2015).

https://legal.thomsonreuters.com/

 © 2022 Thomson Reuters