DAHLGREN
SHARDLOW
AND·UBAN
INCORPORATED

CONSULTING PLANNERS
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS
300 FIRST AVENUE NORTH
SUITE 210
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55401
612·339·3300

MEMORANDUM

DATE: 2/14/2006

TO: Jessica Thomason, Community Development, City of Fargo
Paul Vogel, Director of Community Development, City of Mankato
Lisa Vatnsdal, Neighborhood Services Manager, City of Moorhead
Matt Glaesman, Planning Director, City of Saint Cloud

FROM: John Shardlow, President, DSU
Brendon Slotterback, Planner, DSU

RE: Neighborhood Best Practices Study – Phase II: Research & Analysis

ATTACHMENTS: Research Appendix

This technical memorandum is the second and final in the series for the Neighborhood Best Practices Study. The focus of this memo is "Phase II" of the study. This included a comprehensive search for tools, approaches and strategies that have been used in Minnesota and throughout the country to address the issues that the study communities are facing. This research included:

- Examination and evaluation of approaches and strategies adopted by municipalities facing similar issues
- Standardized definitions of "rent", "rental property", "guest" and "family"
- Strategies for the conversion of rental properties to single-family occupancy including various incentives, licenses and policies
- Strategies to reduce occupancy in existing rental properties to current or new occupancy standards
- Various approaches to related issues including parking, density regulations on rental properties, problem properties, and community responses
- Types of enforcement

This memo will include a summary of the research on practices and approaches being implemented by cities dealing with similar issues across the country. This includes alternative definitions, enforcement methods, and other strategies and policies as listed above. This will be a broad range of approaches, a possible "tool box" from which the study communities can begin to select the strategies appropriate to their specific situations. Not all strategies will be appropriate for every community; rather this is an attempt to highlight the wide spectrum of strategies that have been used across the country.

- **Alternative Definitions**
  A critical piece of any code is the definitions that support it. This section will look at alternative definitions from cities across the country facing similar issues, as well as The Planner's Dictionary, a resource for definitions related to planning issues.

- **Strategies for Addressing Student Housing**
  This section will look specifically at strategies to address rental conversion including rental licensing, overlay districts and other zoning related tools. A strategy that is used in Richfield, Minnesota that could be applied to converting substandard rental properties back to single-family homes or to higher density rental units.

- **Strategies for Addressing External Effects of Student Housing and Neighborhoods**
  This section looks at the other issues associated with student populations beyond housing. Strategies for addressing parking, safety and nuisance issues are identified and reviewed.

- **Recommendations**
  The above information will be developed into a set of recommendations designed to provide all participants with a solid base for developing a set of Neighborhood Best Practices. This will include recommendations on the necessary components of neighborhood policy, the adaptation and appropriate implementation of general practices, and suggestions for essential and effective communication.

In summary, **no one strategy or policy alone is adequate to address the issues faced by the study communities.** National research shows that a broad range of strategies, implemented by the university, the city, and the neighborhood are necessary to begin the process of resolving these issues.

Another key to the process is an inclusive planning and implementation process. In the case of neighborhood planning, residents, students, and college and university representatives must be included in the goal-setting and implementation processes. **Without communication and cooperation, political expediency (buy-in of elected officials and passage of necessary codes and policies), enforcement and the ultimate success of the process will be hampered.**

Definitions

Definitions are used in zoning, housing and other city codes to establish meaning in any ordinance. The actual definition of a word in an ordinance can serve as a tool in and of itself, and definitions therefore become important. For example, the definition of family is often used to limit the number of unrelated individuals living together in a single unit, and can therefore be used in conjunction with zoning to limit population density.

The definitions identified in this study are taken both from national examples of cities who have experienced issues similar to those in the study communities as well as the The Planner's Dictionary, a publication of the Planning Advisory Service and the American Planning Association. The Dictionary provides definitions for each word from many different cities and often includes commentary on its usage. The definitions drawn from national examples are from the cities of Chapel Hill, NC, Columbus, OH, Bloomington, IN, Roseville, MN and Boulder, CO.

Family
Although research into the definition of family was not specifically specified in the contract, it is an important addition as the definition of the term is quite frequently used in city code to establish density limits or limits on the number of unrelated persons that can live together. Two important notes about using a restrictive definition of family are warranted before proceeding further. First, **many state courts have rejected the use of a narrow definition of family to solve problems associated with over-occupancy**. Therefore, instituting such a definition should be done with caution. Second, **the use of these restrictive definitions may not solve the problems that are**

central to this study. According to Craig Raborn in an article in *Zoning News*, "A review of research and planning literature finds no indication of links between density of occupancy and a reduction in the type of disturbances that often lead to the cities narrowing the definition of family."[1] The lesson from the court case Rabon cites and other examples in general is that cities must be careful to establish a nexus between the goals of the ordinance (reducing parking, overcrowding and noise problems) and the rules of the ordinance (limiting occupancy of a home to only those related by blood or marriage). Large families distantly related who are living in small homes may present just as serious a problem to neighbors and the city as a group of unrelated students keeping house together. To avoid this problem, most of the definitions of family identified here employ restrictions on total size of a household as well as how inhabitants are related.

In both the definitions from the dictionary and from the national examples, three distinct categories of family definition emerge. The first is the unrestrictive definition. According to the Planner's Dictionary, Clarkdale, Arizona has an unrestrictive definition of family.

> "Any number of persons living together as a single housekeeping unit
> under a common housekeeping management plan."

This type of family definition would probably not be appropriate for the study communities as it allows an unlimited number of people to live together. The second type of definition includes a restriction by relation, number of inhabitants, or both. Columbus Ohio, home of Ohio State University uses such a definition in its code.

> "…an individual or any number of individuals related by blood, marriage,
> or a group of not more than five (5) individuals not so related, living
> together."

This type of definition might be appropriate for use in the study communities as it limits the total number of inhabitants that can live in one dwelling; however it allows an unlimited number of related individuals to live together, which could, as noted above, present legal problems. This definition would not allow six college students to live in a 6 bedroom house, but would allow 10 related individuals to live in a 2 bedroom house, a situation which would seem to present much greater problems.

The final category of family definition is most restrictive, as exemplified by the definition from Bloomington, Indiana.

> "Means a family consisting of an individual or people related by blood,
> marriage, or legal adoption, and any other dependent children of the
> household. In the RE and RS districts and in the RT7 district except where
> overlaid by a PRO 15 district, "family" also includes a group of no more
> than three adults, and their dependent children, living together as a
> single housekeeping unit in a dwelling unit. In all other districts, "family"
> also includes a group of no more than five adults and their dependent
> children, living together as a single housekeeping unit in a dwelling unit."

This definition ties the maximum number of residents, including related family members, to specific zoning districts. This type of definition may be useful to the study communities as it allows them to identify specific geographic areas in which the number of residents per unit can be limited.

A full list of definitions of the term "family" can be found in the Research Appendix.

---

[1] Raborn, Craig. "Coping with Colleges: How Communities Address the Problems of Students Living Off-Campus". *Zoning News*, May 2002. American Planning Association.

Rent
The term "rent" was not commonly defined in most of the cities identified as national examples. The Planner's Dictionary provided one definition from Woodside, California.

> "Any payment in whole or part cash made in exchange for the human habitation or occupation of a building or dwelling unit."

Guest
"Guest" was also not a term commonly defined. The Planner's Dictionary did include definitions of the term however.

> "Any person, other than a member of a resident family, who occupies quarters for sleeping purposes and who is not required to pay rental of any kind for such occupancy."

This definition from Woodside, California could be useful in the study communities because it specifically excludes persons who are not paying rent for occupancy of a unit.
Additional definitions of "guest" are listed in the Research Appendix.

Rental Property
The term "rental property" was not defined by many of the communities surveyed. Roseville, Minnesota defines the term as follows.

> "The term "residential rental property" means any building, structure, room, enclosure, or mobile home with 1 to 4 units including the real property upon which it is located and which surrounds it, which is rented or offered for rent as living quarters. Residential rental property does not mean on-campus college housing, hospital units, nursing home units, multiple rental property over units or hotels or motels with daily rental units, all of which shall be specifically exempt from registration and license under this Section."

Other definitions that were found that are similar to rental property included "rental unit", "rooming house" and "tenement house". These definitions can be found in the Research Appendix.

Strategies for Addressing Student Housing

Strategies for addressing the occupancy, appearance, and geographic location of student housing are varied. They include rental licensing, overlay districts, and other zoning tools. A strategy for converting rental properties back to owner-occupied properties will also be examined.

Rental Licensing
Rental licensing is another common approach to problems associated with rental conversions. In order to ensure that rental properties meet housing, zoning and other codes, cities can institute a rental licensing system in which owners of rental property must submit an application to be licensed before renting the property.

A licensing program can have many benefits. The health and safety of renters can be protected by ensuring the compliance of all rental properties with city codes. Licensing can also ensure that rental properties meet standards adopted by the city to protect the neighborhood from the negative effects of rental properties. Licensing programs can also provide accurate data on how many rental units exist in the city, allowing city staff to judge the speed and extent of rental conversions.

Roseville Minnesota has a draft rental licensing ordinance that is a good example of how these ordinances may be implemented. The Roseville ordinance requires all rental properties to be licensed, and before a license is granted, each property must be inspected. An annual license fee of $50 is required for each unit, as well as a license transfer fee and a license reinstatement fee. These fees are one method by which cities may recoup the cost of enforcing codes.

In the case of Roseville, a compliance officer inspects the property to make sure it complies with all rules and ordinances that effect dwelling units. Roseville also ensures that owners of rental property enforce city rules regarding disorderly conduct, public nuisances, noise control, parking and others. If three violations of any of these rules occur in a one-year period, an owner's rental license may be revoked. In this way, the city can motivate rental property owners to be involved in the enforcement of the city's rules, and reduce the cost of enforcement.

Challenges to Rental Licensing
A rental licensing program is an enforcement tool, and as such, its success in solving problems associated with overcrowding, dwelling maintenance, public nuisances and other issues depends on the strength of the underlying ordinances. A commitment to the program is also a key to reaching solutions. Campus Partners, the group charged with addressing neighborhood issues around Ohio State University, recognized this, and recommended in its plan hiring two additional code enforcement officers to reduce workload and ensure inspections were completed within a reasonable time period. Roseville also notes that the $50 per-unit fee does not cover all the expenses of inspections process, but any higher fee was deemed unreasonable. Cities who want to implement a rental licensing program will need to designate funds to the program.

Other cities that have a rental licensing program include Mankato, Minnesota, Bloomington, Indiana, and Boulder, Colorado.

Changes in Zoning or Overlay Districts
If a city determines that they want to concentrate student housing in a certain area, this can be accomplished through either a change in zoning, or the adoption of an overlay zoning district. Either approach can allow a city to specify where it will allow student rental housing to be located, and what the character of that housing will be. These approaches can be useful in two capacities, the first is restricting occupancy and the second is permitting higher occupancy to preserve other neighborhoods. In the first case, a community may use a change in zoning in an area near a school to restrict the number of unrelated persons that may live together, or the number of students that live together. This type of rule would require a very robust enforcement scheme, which many cities may find difficult to implement. Allentown, PA is an example of a community with a restrictive overlay district aimed at student populations.

The second and more basic use of a different zoning would be to accommodate student or higher density housing in order to preserve lower density housing elsewhere. College and university campuses will continue to grow, along with student populations, and in contrast to restricting where students can live, a proactive approach may be to identify the most appropriate places for these residents and accommodate growth strictly in those areas. Through a planning process, and then continuing with a zoning process, areas of a city could be identified that are appropriate for student housing, and then an overlay district could be applied in these areas. This zone should allow for increased density to accommodate student populations that may be spilling over into surrounding areas. An infill program in Austin, Texas near the University of Texas is a good example of such a program. The program was received well by residents of surrounding neighborhoods as they saw it taking the pressure to accommodate more housing off their neighborhood. The program introduced 1,500 residential units in the overlay area.[2]

---

[2] Austin Lunday, Elizabeth. "The Power of *Infill*tration". Planning Magazine, January 2006. American Planning Association.

Either changes in underlying zoning districts or overlay districts may be effective because they can help focus student housing in designated areas, while protecting surrounding neighborhoods. There application should be approached comprehensively, including a planning and public involvement process and ensuring that all aspects of a city's codes and ordinances are mutually reinforcing. The benefits of a change in zoning is that it could help to achieve buy-in from neighborhood groups, easier enforcement of codes due to location, and easy access for students to university facilities (depending on the location).

Challenges to Zoning
The first and most obvious challenge to adopting new zoning is the outlay of time and money needed to undertake the planning and ordinance revision required to establish the new zone. The "student" neighborhood will also have to be established somewhere in the city, preferably close to campus, and undoubtedly some residents will be unhappy with the location. Finally, like other strategies, zoning requires an effective enforcement program to oversee construction, inspections and to ensure that zone boundaries are being respected.

Other Zoning Tools
Besides overlay zoning, a number of other zoning tools have been used to try and address problems associated with student housing. Two examples of these tools are accessory dwelling unit guidelines and location regulations for student housing.

Accessory Dwelling Units
Boulder, Colorado has an ordinance that allows accessory dwelling units within certain zoning districts. The ordinance has design guidelines for the unit and prohibits accessory dwelling units from being a duplex or multi-family dwelling. Owners must submit an application for an accessory dwelling unit and an administrative review determines whether it will be allowed.

The purpose of allowing accessory dwelling units is to prevent the full conversion of single-family homes to rental properties. The owners of the homes still reside on the property, and maintain control over the ADU. This can have the effect of limiting the impact of renters on a neighborhood, as it controls population density, increases the property owner's stake in the neighborhood, and can help limit problems like parking through ordinance requirements.

Design/Location Guidelines
Saint Paul, Minnesota attempted to address through an ordinance that would establish a distance requirement between student rental units. The ordinance has not been passed in Saint Paul, but it was based on an ordinance passed in State College, PA the home of Penn State University.

The purpose of a distance requirement is to prevent over-concentration of student housing in certain neighborhoods. Saint Paul's draft ordinance established a 350 foot distance from the lot line of one student rental to the lot line of another. This ordinance would be similar in intent to the restrictive overlay zone, only it would use distance requirements instead of a restriction on the number of unrelated occupants.

A challenge to using this type of ordinance would be identifying what rental properties contain student renters. This would require a great deal of additional enforcement capacity. Restricting occupancy based on whether an individual is a student also may be legally questionable. We advise consultation with the city attorney before pursuing this route.

Richfield Rediscovered
Richfield Rediscovered is a program to build new single-family homes on existing home sites. The website for the program claims that it replaces "small, substandard, functionally obsolete housing with new higher valued homes that have square footage and design features sought by families today". This program is basically intended to facilitate the redevelopment of housing stock. The Richfield HRA provides a $50,000 development credit on the completion of a property.

While this program does not specifically address student housing, it is an example of a program that could be used to convert substandard rental units into either rental units that meet new (or previously unmet) code requirements or simply back into owner-occupied units. This type of program could be paired with an overlay zone that identifies where the credits will be given, and for what type of conversion. For example, in a neighborhood that the city wished to preserve as single-family, it could only give a credit for conversion from rental to a single-family unit. In a neighborhood designated for student housing, credits could be given for the construction of high-quality high-density student housing to replace single-family units that have been converted to rental properties.

External Issues Related to Student Housing

Student housing often creates externalities which go beyond the conversion of single-family housing. These include parking problems and noise, nuisance and upkeep issues. Many of the strategies outlined above can serve to address these issues, but other strategies are also available.

Parking
Parking is a significant problem in University-adjacent neighborhoods for two reasons. First, since students may live at higher densities than other families in the neighborhood and each resident is likely to own a car, rental housing for students is unlikely to contain enough off-street parking to accommodate all residents. This causes neighbors to perceive a lack of on-street parking space in their neighborhood. Second, students commuting to campus from other areas of town may often park in neighborhoods surrounding the campus while they attend classes. This crowds neighborhood streets with cars from students who do not live in the neighborhood and increases traffic around the University.

Transit
Some common methods of dealing with parking problems attempt to decrease demand for parking. The first is transit service and transit passes. By encouraging students to use transit and subsidizing whole or part of their cost to use transit, demand for parking around both the campus and student housing goes down. Transit pass systems are used by many universities across the country to both increase the mobility of their students and reduce parking problems. Many transit pass systems give students free rides on public transit to any destination and at any time. This feature helps eliminate the need for students to keep a car at home while only riding transit to school, effectively reducing parking pressures in the neighborhood.

Transit and transit pass programs could be used with overlay zones to increase their effectiveness. Once student neighborhoods are identified, fixed transit routes can help reinforce the area as one that is meant for student housing and can help solve parking problems.

Permitting
Parking problems can also be addressed through permitting. The City of Bloomington, Indiana has a permitting system which grants parking permits to only the residents of university-adjacent neighborhoods. Only permit holders may park on the street in these neighborhoods from 8 am to 5 pm, Monday through Friday. According to the City's website, "This Ordinance is meant to protect motorists, bicyclists and pedestrians from excessive commuter traffic competing for parking spaces as well as to reduce the amount of traffic in the neighborhoods."

The City of Boulder, Colorado also has a similar permitting system that restricts non-resident parking in specific neighborhoods, including University Hill, a neighborhood near the University of Colorado.

Permitting systems are effective at restricting those who commute to a university from parking in a residential neighborhood. However, permitting systems also require enforcement to be effective.

Enforcement would generally be done by the University of City Police and the fines for parking without a permit would need to be high enough to discourage repeat offenses.

Car Sharing
A strategy that may work in student neighborhoods to reduce parking demand is car sharing. When students live in close proximity to campus, they often need their cars for trips besides going to school each day. Grocery stores or other retail outlets may not be near campus, and students may feel they need to keep a car in order to make these trips, even if they can walk or take transit to campus. Car sharing arrangements through private companies reduce the need for every student to have a car at their residence, provide a cost savings, and reduce parking requirements in student neighborhoods. One shared car may be able to substitute for up to ten parking spaces in an area with higher density.

The University of Minnesota recently partnered with ZipCar to provide students and faculty with access to cars that can be rented by the hour or by the day. Cars are picked up and returned to one of three central campus locations.

Nuisance and Safety Issues
Noise, nuisance and other public safety issues are common concerns among cities with large student populations. There are a number of strategies that can be followed to address these issues.

Neighborhood/Student Groups
Most of the study cities already have some form of neighborhood group that is active in at least one part of the city. These groups can be valuable in addressing public safety issues as they are often the ones who first witness and report any incidents. These groups can work cooperatively with city staff, the police department and the university to find a consensus on important issues. They can also serve as a well-defined stakeholder group during any neighborhood comprehensive planning process. Columbus Ohio has a University Area Safety Coordinating Committee that is composed of representatives of city, state and local law enforcement agencies, neighborhood organizations and university representatives and students. This committee works specifically on issues of safety in the University area.

Student groups can also be involved in improving safety on and around campus. Besides the committee mentioned above, the Campus Partners Student Advisory Board is student committee at Ohio State University that works on campus projects. Some of their main programs include an adopt-a-street program to help clean up and maintain streets in the university area and a University Area crime stoppers program. This program gives students an opportunity to be involved in the policing of their own community and helps them feel like they are in control of what happens in their neighborhood rather than simply subject to police enforcement.

University/City Police Cooperation
Ohio State's revitalization plan calls for the extensive cooperation of City and University police forces to present a unified front against crime and enforce the student code of conduct more broadly throughout the University neighborhoods. This plan includes information sharing, mutual reinforcement and describes moving beyond cooperation only in emergency situations to a more proactive policing approach that brings the organizations together more frequently.

Community Crime Patrol
Community Crime Patrol is a program that has reportedly met with great success in the area around Ohio State University. This system employs part-time trained citizens who patrol non-high crime areas in teams of two. The teams are equipped with walkie-talkies to communicate with City and University police departments. The program has been successful in preventing crime, apprehending criminals and assisting victims for a comparatively small expense.

Recommendations

General Observations Regarding College/University Neighborhood Issues
Experience working with several neighborhoods located in close proximity to colleges, universities and similar institutional uses yields some important observations. The first observation is that by their very nature the problems and issues these neighborhoods must address are constantly changing. Students come and go, properties change hands, tenants change, policies, procedures and practices change. Consequently, the work in response to the problems unique to these neighborhoods is never done. This is an important realization and it should inform the strategies and action plans prepared and implemented in each community.

The second observation may seem obvious, but it also bears saying, every situation is unique and demands a unique approach. This process has exposed several communities to the tools and approaches followed by others and hopefully some good ideas have been identified, but in all likelihood, the total mix and emphasis of one community's approach cannot be successfully transferred to another community.

The third basic observation is that while the circumstances and conditions in each community will vary and the relative emphasis on the components of the overall strategy will need to vary accordingly, each community will need to take a multi-faceted approach. **Just as there is no single, guaranteed successful strategy, every neighborhood plan will require a coordinated and cooperative plan between the city and institution(s), college and university policies and procedures, local codes and ordinances, inspection programs, housing policies and investment, enforcement and neighborhood organizations.**

Elements of a Comprehensive Strategy:

    A.   Coordination between the City and the College and/or University

It is highly unlikely that the adverse secondary effects associated with significant numbers of students living in rental units within city neighborhoods, could ever be successfully addressed by either the city or the institution working alone. It isn't impossible, but it is highly unlikely, certainly in any of the communities included in this study.

There are many factors that work against strong, sustained, collaborative campaigns between cities and colleges and universities. For one thing they are completely separate entities, with fundamentally different purposes and legal authority, not to mention distinct leadership, goals, governance and planning structures and autonomous decision-making systems.

This research has not revealed great models for strong, coordinated and ongoing collaborative working relationships between cities and colleges and universities. We believe that these working relationships will be the most difficult to sustain, but also most likely to yield substantial results. Both the communities and the institutions have acknowledged their stake in the success of these efforts and the damage that will result if these problems are not addressed. Both parties understand the risks and results of disinvestments in neighborhoods surrounding colleges and universities. They both understand that they share a strong common interest in preventing blight and the ways in which poor property maintenance, nuisances and property crime adversely affect each of their interests. What is yet to be seen is if they can overcome the obstacles to work together effectively, over a long time period.

It is beyond the scope of this study to describe the precise steps that each city should take with its respective college, or university. Again, each situation is unique and the best strategies in each instance can only be determined after completing some work together. We will, however, describe the basic elements of a collaborative approach and leave it to each community and its college and/or university to chart its own course.

To be successful, the colleges and universities must come together in a neutral setting and put all of the issues and problems on the table. They should work to understand the tools that each can bring to the process and they should work through an action plan to address each issue and problem. It will not be enough to simply work together to prepare the plan, they must also commit to ongoing communication (at all levels), as well as a monitoring process and a shared commitment to stay the course and adapt new strategies and approaches as necessary.

Communication must be the cornerstone of this collaboration. This communication will have to be the antidote to the autonomy of these organizations. Start by clearly describing the problems and desired outcomes and proceed from there to communicate the plan to achieve the desired results. Then share results and shared experiences, both good and bad. Finally, the communication must reinforce the commitment to continue to work together. When it comes to real estate investment and disinvestment perception can often become reality. Both the cities and the colleges and universities have to send a strong and sustained message to both the neighborhood, including students and the market place that they will not abandon the neighborhood.

B. Work with Neighborhood Organizations

A viable and effective neighborhood organization should be an equal participant in communications as mentioned in the previous section. This is an area where very significant differences exist regarding the existence, scope and quality of organizations. Both the cities and the colleges and universities need to understand that they need viable partners in the neighborhoods and they should take the steps necessary to make them effective.

It is not an exaggeration to say that to be effective these strategies will need the three-legged stool of cities, colleges and universities, and neighborhood organizations. Neighborhood organizations are notoriously inconsistent in quality and leadership. The cities and colleges and universities need to understand they have a strong, shared interest in a representative and effective neighborhood partner. Problems with geographic representation, bias or structure need to be addressed head on at the outset of the process. These things do not automatically get better with time.

The neighborhood organization is in the best possible position to monitor results. They are also a great place for information to be disseminated from and the eyes and ears on the street send a strong message to the market place that this is a good place to invest. Things are under control.

Another area in which neighborhood organizations could help greatly is outreach to students. If the neighborhood organizations make a commitment to meet students who are living in their midst and welcome them, it will be harder for the students to justify behaviors that are careless and insensitive. While the best emphasis is likely *welcome and here is how to be involved*, this invitation can also send a clear, non-threatening message that real people live here, with lives and investment and expectations. This is an area that would take energy and courage to sustain, but it could also provide a tremendous lifetime learning opportunity. It is also an area that could and should be strongly supported by the colleges and universities.

C. Regulations, Enforcement

The first part of this report identifies numerous examples of types of codes and ordinances. Many of the communities participating in this study already have regulations in place and their focus may be on ways to modify and improve these tools, as opposed to starting over. Again, each community and neighborhood context is unique, and it will be an ongoing process to adapt their regulations and enforcement programs to each context.

How to pay for inspection programs and enforcement is one of the key questions. Included in the appendices are examples of community programs that included licensing fees and other means of

generating the money to sustain the program. This aspect of the process is always challenging, but good examples exist. Finally, and particularly with student behavior, consistency of enforcement will be a key component.

D. City Planning, Redevelopment

In all of the cities participating in this study, the neighborhoods in question are fully developed and mature. One of the basic objectives of community planning is to work to achieve compatibility between different land uses. There are potentially a whole host of changes the city could explore within its comprehensive plan to address neighborhood and college/university compatibility.

These potential changes range from policies and implementation strategies (programs), to land use changes, rezonings, park acquisition and improvement, changes in the street system, and physical changes through redevelopment. These types of changes can be relatively modest, or dramatic. Some communities studied took strong stands on housing. Richfield, for example, adopted a practice of purchasing and redeveloping the most blighted and lowest valued unit on a given block and replaced it with the highest valued home on the block. Both Richfield and Brooklyn Park have also implemented programs to favor and support owner occupancy.

Obviously, even more dramatic redevelopment options could also be considered. These are not strategies that we recommend starting with and if they are to emerge they should do so through the process. The support of the neighborhood organization and college and university will be critical to the success of a more ambitious redevelopment project.

In summary, while not likely to be successful as a stand-alone strategy, there are important goals, policies and implementation strategies that can be included within the city's comprehensive plan and/or redevelopment plans. One of the most important ingredients in a successful neighborhood reinvestment strategy is confidence. The city's comprehensive plan can help to bolster confidence by communicating the community's commitment to the neighborhood.

Likewise, with other elements of a comprehensive strategy in place, the city may use its economic development powers to affect positive results and tangible reinvestment in the neighborhood. This could include the removal of blighting influences. It could include the addition of amenities for the neighborhood, or the addition of land uses that will increase the desirability of the neighborhood.

Examples of implementation strategies and programs that have provided incentives for home ownership, for example, have been included for consideration. The City of Richfield stands out as a city that refused to allow its community to sink into decline. Through its Richfield Rediscovered Program, the city has employed multiple programs to remove declining properties and replace them with higher valued units. Over the course of several years and following a sustained commitment, Richfield has reversed the trends of disinvestments and has caused a significant increase in reinvestment and community attitudes.

Brooklyn Park has also adopted several programs to encourage and reward home ownership in its neighborhoods. Examples of these ordinances and programs are attached.

E. College and University Master Plans

Last, but certainly not least among the tools to affect positive change in neighborhoods surrounding colleges and universities are campus master plans. These documents do not need to be limited to physical design plans and can include policy information, references to other programs, campus housing policy, and student codes of conduct (both on and off campus).

Certainly one of the primary issues to be addressed in any campus plan is the question of how to house students. There are examples of colleges and universities around the country that have taken

significant steps and made major investments to bring students back on to campus after years of problems in surrounding neighborhoods. Denison University, in Granville, Ohio has just completed a multi-year program to build new student housing. On campus housing is now mandatory at Denison.

Another basis and fundamental component of campus master plans is the direction and nature of physical expansion that is contemplated and the time frames anticipated. It is almost impossible to foster an atmosphere that encourages maintenance and investment in neighborhood housing if there are reasons to believe that the college or university will be acquiring the land for expansion. This is an area where institutions can often not provide certainty, but anything that can be done to reduce the fear of acquisition for expansion should be done within the master plan.

Of course, the master planning process provides a great opportunity for community outreach and communication. There are many examples of university master plans that were never shared with anyone outside the institution. Particularly in situations where considerable neighborhood problems related to college or university housing, or activities exist, outreach, meaningful opportunities for participation and communication are critical components of campus master planning.