

**University District Zoning and Planning Regulatory Review Task Force  
Major Issues and Strategies – 12/5/08 Draft for Discussion Purposes**

<b>Neighborhood Issues and Strategies</b>	<b>Factors to Consider</b>
<p><b>Development Parking Requirements</b> – Particularly for smaller scale residential buildings, parking requirements are not well-matched with demand, particularly in student housing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A pending zoning text amendment reduces some parking requirements throughout city, though primarily commercial.</li> <li>• Policy direction for pedestrian oriented overlays and LRT stations, both located in this area, supports reduced parking requirements.</li> </ul>
<p>Increase parking requirements for new and expanded residential developments, to bring them more in line with typical number of parking spaces needed</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possibly implement as part of overlay district</li> <li>• Currently 1 space per unit; what would be new threshold (e.g. 0.5 spaces per bedroom)</li> <li>• Which types of new development would this apply? (e.g. 3-4 unit buildings)</li> <li>• Implications for nonconforming uses?</li> <li>• Contrast with proposed reduction of requirements for commercial uses?</li> <li>• Other adjustments needed to avoid unattractive overly paved lots or oversized garages?</li> </ul>
<p><b>On-Street Parking</b> – On-street parking is in heavy demand by residents, businesses, commuters, and students; spillover from areas with restrictions on parking to “free” areas</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking restrictions typically require significant levels of neighborhood assent/cooperation</li> <li>• Enforcing parking restrictions is often challenging and labor intensive</li> </ul>
<p>Increase enforcement of regulations in critical parking areas, including illegal use of permits by ineligible vehicles</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who will staff increased enforcement efforts?</li> <li>• What is the best way to track use of critical parking passes?</li> <li>• Are there ways to modify the permitting/renewal process to make it easier to track violations?</li> </ul>
<p>Pursue new critical parking areas in parts of the District which need them</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will these be identified?</li> <li>• Can the process be made easier than under current ordinance?</li> <li>• What are logical restrictions on non-permit parking (e.g. hours)?</li> <li>• Enforcement of other parking-related issues (e.g. parking on lawns)?</li> <li>• Do we need more data on demand for parking in the District?</li> </ul>
<p>Restrict number of critical parking permits issued for certain types of developments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will these be identified?</li> <li>• How will this be enforced consistently?</li> <li>• Should parking be limited to residents only in some areas?</li> </ul>
<p>Address reduction of on-street parking in commercial areas, particularly</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are parking needs of businesses?</li> <li>• What is best way to accommodate those needs?</li> </ul>

related to the Central Corridor LRT project	
<b>Commuter Parking</b> – Need comprehensive look at how commuter parking is being managed and accommodated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires coordination between City and major employers, particularly U of M</li> <li>• Innovative strategies possibly can mitigate impacts of traffic</li> </ul>
Identify and encourage the use of remote park and ride lots for commuters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will lots be identified/funded?</li> <li>• How will use of these be incentivized to make them attractive option?</li> <li>• Can this be part of Metro Transit system, or U shuttle?</li> </ul>
Encourage carpooling and vanpooling in District area for commuters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How can this be incentivized and promoted?</li> </ul>
Identify and encourage use of remote long-term parking lots for occasional users living near campus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will lots be identified/funded?</li> <li>• How will use of these be incentivized to make them attractive option?</li> <li>• Can this be part of Metro Transit system, or U shuttle?</li> </ul>
Investigate ways to make it easier to operate “pay per use” parking facilities (on or off street) for regular users	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is this feasible?</li> <li>• What kind of technology (e.g. electronic passes) and/or pricing could be useful?</li> <li>• Where would be good pilot locations for new approaches?</li> </ul>
<b>Alternative Modes</b> – Focus on “carrot” rather than “stick” to limit number of car commuters to District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limits to how much this can be encouraged</li> <li>• Builds on many existing programs and facilities, including planned infrastructure</li> </ul>
Increase requirements (or incentives) for accommodating bicycle facilities into new development – racks, lockers, showers, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Which types of new development?</li> <li>• What types of facilities are preferred, and what is a reasonable standard?</li> </ul>
Promote bicycling, walking, and transit as viable options in the District for transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How, and to whom, will these be promoted?</li> <li>• Do new promotional materials need to be produced and circulated?</li> <li>• What are barriers to using these that need to be addressed?</li> <li>• Restrictions on freshmen driving?</li> </ul>
Encourage completion of high quality, well-connected network of bicycle, pedestrian, and transit facilities in District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there major gaps in facilities that need to be addressed?</li> <li>• What facilities are most important?</li> <li>• Does there need to be more readily available information on these?</li> <li>• Should the concept of a free (or reduced) fare zone be explored for transit riders in the District?</li> </ul>
Promote neighborhood-serving development in the area to make it	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What uses are needed?</li> <li>• How can this be conveyed positively to potential</li> </ul>

more convenient to walk, bike, and ride transit to these destinations	developers and business owners?
Support car sharing programs both at the University and in the private sector (Zipcar, Hourcar, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there age restrictions which might limit use by college students?</li> <li>• Where are the most appropriate places to house these vehicles?</li> <li>• Should this be incentivized in new developments?</li> </ul>
Continue to support availability of affordable bus passes for residents, students, and employees in the District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to encourage participation of more individuals and employers?</li> <li>• Ways to “orient” riders who are new to the Twin Cities transit system?</li> </ul>
Ensure that parking for alternative vehicles (e.g. bicycles, motorcycles, scooters, possibly electric vehicles) is incorporated into new and improved parking facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will this be implemented?</li> <li>• What types of facilities are most important?</li> </ul>
<b>Special Events Parking</b> – Especially with new stadium, concern about how this will impact surrounding areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires coordination particularly with event planning at U of M</li> <li>• Ongoing committee work addresses on-campus impacts, off-campus less directly/specifically</li> </ul>
Ensure that there is a consistent and reasonable approach to accommodating off-campus parking during special events	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does tailgating need to be addressed directly?</li> <li>• Is there a need for increased enforcement?</li> <li>• How will this be coordinated with on-campus event parking efforts?</li> </ul>
<b>Planning and Zoning Framework</b> – Need to ensure that underlying planning and zoning is supportive of District goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of coordinated plan for the District, though neighborhood plans do provide guidance</li> <li>• District’s history of rezoning studies reflects iterative process to address concerns</li> </ul>
Rezone properties to better match desired development patterns, in line with neighborhood, district, and citywide objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What parcels need to be targeted?</li> <li>• What will be the criteria for rezoning?</li> <li>• How will this be reconciled with citywide and neighborhood policy guidance?</li> <li>• Would implementing an overlay zoning district help address concerns?</li> </ul>
Evaluate neighborhood, district, and citywide land use plans to determine context for decision making, and support planning efforts to fill in any policy “gaps”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the best approach to implementing this?</li> <li>• How consistent should policies be across the District?</li> <li>• How does this relate to District’s urban design plan (scope now underway)?</li> </ul>
<b>Inspections and Enforcement</b> – Need enforcement of property and license standards to counteract poor property management, discourage illegal occupancy, and promote good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May need to identify additional resources to increase enforcement activities, as this competes with other neighborhoods for funds/priority.</li> <li>• Possibility of special services district could provide needed funding to step up efforts.</li> </ul>

maintenance of sites	
Increase regulatory enforcement actions in District related to livability violations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will additional enforcement be funded to give this area priority over others in the city?</li> <li>• What areas/issues are of the most concern?</li> <li>• What is role of neighborhoods, residents in reporting violations?</li> </ul>
Require disclosure of additional information for landlords regarding occupancy, maintenance, conduct, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When will this be collected?</li> <li>• How much of this can be effectively enforced?</li> </ul>
Review existing and potential penalties for violations (e.g. rental license revocation, loss of nonconforming rights, fines, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are current penalties appropriate and effective as deterrents?</li> <li>• How should landlords and tenants be held accountable?</li> </ul>
Register and/or track landlords – possibly through licensing program – to be able to enforce standards more effectively	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exceptions for small-scale renters (e.g. own just one rental property, or live on the site as primary residence)?</li> <li>• Need to explore legal limitations on this approach</li> <li>• Potential unofficial process to just document who is responsible</li> <li>• Problem: landlord may have both good and bad properties</li> <li>• Could landlord performance be used as a criteria for approval of new projects?</li> </ul>
Improved enforcement in response criminal complaints (drugs, alcohol, noise, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will additional enforcement be funded to give this area priority over others in the city?</li> <li>• What areas/issues are of the most concern?</li> <li>• What is role of neighborhoods, residents in reporting violations?</li> </ul>
Relative homesteads – Ownership structure being used more like a rental property than as originally intended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will changing this require some alterations to legal context?</li> <li>• Can the city single these out for enforcement?</li> </ul>
Prohibit outdoor upholstered furniture – Unattractive feature on some properties in District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How can City ordinances be modified, and on what grounds?</li> <li>• How will this be enforced?</li> </ul>
<b>Design and Development</b> – Current development trends, while better than in the past, don't always create desirable projects or protect neighborhood character	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong force of market trends impacts what is built, and limits ability to preserve low densities</li> <li>• Need to balance community needs/preferences with property owner's ability to use property</li> <li>• Questions about where density should be accommodated and how</li> </ul>
Consider higher standards for building quality and construction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What would be specific standards (materials, architectural elements, etc?)</li> <li>• Need to determine what is enforceable under current building code</li> <li>• Would desired character/style vary by</li> </ul>

	neighborhood?
Make administrative review process more stringent by requiring more points for approval, possibly more points available	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to be aware of 60/120 law for project approval, related constraints</li> <li>• Would this be an attempt to change citywide standards, or just for District?</li> <li>• What are most important criteria?</li> </ul>
Discourage construction of “mini dorm” style developments that create concentrations of unsupervised students, such as disincentives for 3-4 unit buildings with maximum occupancy in bedrooms, or incentives for housing that is more readily convertible to non-student housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are unforeseen consequences of this direction? (e.g. disguising bedrooms, over occupancy, etc.)</li> <li>• What are other strategies for managing these properties?</li> </ul>
Create incentives for the construction and proper maintenance of well-managed and supervised student housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is it better to have students in large buildings with staff, or spread out in low density properties?</li> <li>• How can good management be incentivized, bad penalized?</li> </ul>
Consider use of conservation district or other tools to define community character and encourage development to comply with identified character (somewhat like a historic district, but less restrictive)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would need research, as this would be fairly new direction for the city</li> <li>• What areas of the District would be most appropriate? Unlikely to be a “one size fits all” approach.</li> </ul>
Discourage demolition of existing homes through regulations that incentivize remodeling and reusing these properties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to discourage toll of deferred maintenance?</li> <li>• What sort of reuse would be acceptable for a single family house besides habitation by one family?</li> <li>• What regulatory tools would make it more attractive to remodel than to rebuild?</li> </ul>
Investigate strategies to limit number of unrelated individuals living together in certain areas (NOTE: research suggests there is no direct relationship between reducing occupancy and decreased disturbances)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to avoid unforeseen consequences for larger non-student households which might be caught, including large immigrant households</li> <li>• How to handle difficult legal issues of definition of family or functional family households?</li> <li>• Could this be addressed more effectively through other means?</li> </ul>
<b>Public Process</b> – Desire for more consistent and productive discussions between neighborhoods, developers, students, and other key players	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limits to amount of public input that can be accommodated in development review process</li> <li>• Challenges with maintaining consistent level of engagement from groups, especially ones that are dispersed and/or transitory</li> <li>• Question of how much is enough?</li> </ul>
Incorporate public notification more directly into administrative review process by strengthening requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could this be strengthened by adding admin review points for consultation?</li> <li>• What would be purpose of consultation and/or</li> </ul>

	<p>notification?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How can this be effectively synched with legal limits of review time?</li> </ul>
<p>Improve outreach – through student, neighborhood, and U of M groups – to improve student-community relations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who should take the lead on these initiatives?</li> <li>• What is the most important information to convey?</li> <li>• How can this be used in coordination with enforcement efforts?</li> </ul>
<p>Improved communication with landlords regarding community expectations and standards for development and management</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the appropriate way to work with them, and who initiates?</li> <li>• Is there a way to make this more positive/cooperative, rather than strictly confrontational?</li> </ul>
<p>Support role of District as reviewer of larger projects (i.e. ones that go through public hearing process)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the appropriate role for the District, and what types of projects should be considered? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the relationship between District and neighborhood level review and comments?</li> <li>• How should timing issues be addressed, especially when comments needed with fairly quick turnaround?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

**University District Zoning and Planning Regulatory Review Task Force  
Outline for Preliminary Report – 11/24/08 Draft**

**Overarching Policy/Vision for District**

- General goal of ZPRR planning process
- Impact report
  - Origin and purpose
  - Recommendations for the District
- Comprehensive plan
  - Focus on accommodating growth: activity centers and commercial corridors
  - Sustainability of community: neighborhood character, public facilities, parks, environment, job creation, public safety, etc.
- Small area plans
  - Marcy Holmes Master Plan
  - Cedar Riverside Small Area Plan
  - 29<sup>th</sup> & University
  - SEMI Master Plan
  - University Master Plan
  - NRP Plans for neighborhoods
- Alliance work to date
  - Visioning plans – for coordinated approach to shared concerns
  - Interventions targeting key issues: housing preservation, identity, enforcement issues

**District Background Information**

- Trends
  - Projected growth in people and jobs
  - Unique housing market conditions
  - High demand for rental housing leading to development pressures
  - Rapid change in community character
- Major projects
  - Central Corridor LRT
  - University East Gateway
  - SEMI/Granary Road
  - Larger scale new developments
- Implications
  - Combination of unique conditions and rapid change make for an environment that is challenging to regulate
  - Active involvement in shared effort highlights need to address

## **Current Conditions (SWOT)**

- Build on information in Impact Report
- Assets and strengths of the District area
- Framework for problems/issues
- Keeping community character while accommodating growth
- Trying to respond via institutions (slow) to market (fast) and shifting incentives to better match with community goals
- Balancing established residents with transitory students
- Accommodating major traffic flow into and out of the area
- On/near campus lifestyle as a changing paradigm, and live where you work
- What can be regulated vs. what can't

## **Focus Areas (for each: problem statement/current conditions/work done to date, recommendations)**

- Parking
  - Accommodating both residents and commuters
  - Balancing encouraging transit/bike with adequate off-street parking in city requirements
  - Carrot vs. stick approaches
- Enforcement
  - Noise
  - Over-occupancy
  - Property upkeep
- Design
  - Quality/architectural features
  - Unit/bedroom structure
- Planning and Zoning Framework
  - Appropriate levels and guidance
  - Target areas
- Public involvement
  - In design approval
  - Between campus and community

**University District Zoning and Planning Regulatory Review  
List of Stakeholders (9/9/08 draft for discussion)**

<b>Stakeholder</b>	<b>Level of involvement*</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Neighborhood organizations	Task force	All 5 already involved
Business organizations	Task force	May need additional outreach (focus group?) for associations of “edge” of district
City and University staff	Task force	Provide staff support for process
Dormitory managers	Interview	Need contact information, questions
University Housing and Residential Life	Interview	Need contact information, questions
Fairview Hospital	Interview	Need contact information, questions
Augsburg College	Interview	Need contact information, questions
Developers – Opus, Doran, etc.	Focus group or interview	Will need to determine who should be included
Landlords – possibly from loose association in area	Focus group	Will need to determine who should be included
Students, including MSA and GAPSA	Focus group	Will need to determine who to involve, what topics to focus on
Immigrant communities, possibly through mosques	Notify/inform or focus group	May need focus group to ensure diverse representation
Associations of homeowners, including condos, townhomes, and co-ops	Notify/inform	May need focus group if determined not represented enough
Religious organizations, such as Interfaith Campus Coalition	Notify/inform	Target more specifically if directly impacted
Inter-Fraternity Council and Pan-Hellenic Council	Notify/inform	Target more specifically if directly impacted
Industrial businesses and property owners	Notify/inform	Target more specifically if directly impacted
Central Corridor LRT project	Notify/inform	City and U staff involved in CCLRT
Schools and libraries, including report on status	Notify/inform	Target more specifically if directly impacted
Arts and cultural community	Notify/inform	Target more specifically if directly impacted
St Paul, including St Anthony Park neighborhood	Notify/inform	Target more specifically if directly impacted

\* Potential levels of involvement:

- Task force – active member of biweekly meeting; helps steer process
- Interview – key individuals interviewed on areas of expertise, feedback requested
- Focus group – convened as a group of similar people/organizations to provide feedback to process
- Notify/inform – keep informed as to all major milestones, invited to all public meetings; input solicited as part of general public process