

OSU-Corvallis Collaboration Project

Comparator institution/city data—2/14/2012 Draft

OSU-Corvallis Collaboration Project.....	1
Freshman Car and Residency Requirements	2
Parking Requirements	3
Density of University-Adjacent Neighborhoods	3
Property Maintenance Codes	8
Rental Housing Licensing**	9
Infill Design Standards**	10
Public-Private Partnerships**	13
University Student Conduct Offices.....	14

**=Newer areas of research

Freshman Car and Residency Requirements

Of OSU's comparator institutions, only Penn State and Michigan State require freshmen to live in on-campus housing. Only Michigan State does not allow freshmen to have vehicles on campus. Iowa State allows students living in residence hall to bring a vehicle to campus, but does not allow students who live within the Ames city limits to use campus parking lots during the week.

City	Freshmen required to live on campus?	Cars restricted?	Notes
UC Davis/Davis, CA	N	N	
Penn State/ State College, PA	Y	N	
Texas A & M/College Station, TX	N	N	
Cal Poly/San Luis Obispo, CA	N	N	
Colorado State/Fort Collins, CO	N	N	
Purdue/West Lafayette, IN	N	N	
Univ. of IL/Urbana-Champaign, IL	N	N	
Cornell/Ithaca, NY	N	N	
Michigan State/East Lansing, MI	Y	Y	Freshmen are not allowed to have vehicles on campus
Iowa State/ Ames, IA	N	N	Students who live within the Ames city limits are not allowed to use the campus parking lots during the week. All areas available for parking on campus have signs explaining the restrictions for the parking lot/space. Restrictions apply from 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, unless otherwise posted. Temporary permits are issued to accommodate special circumstances

Parking Requirements

Parking requirements in residential zones generally range from:

- 2-3 spaces per dwelling unit for single family homes and duplexes,
- 0.5-1.0 spaces per resident in fraternities and sororities, and
- 1.0-1.5 spaces per apartment bedroom.
- Dormitories, when called out specifically in municipal codes, required 0.25-0.5 spaces per bed.

Roughly half of comparator cities have parking districts near their universities, but several who do not are considering them.

Interesting points:

- Davis has parking districts near campus where no non-permit parking is allowed at all during the day. Most other cities allow 2 hour parking.
- Several cities have zones or overlay districts with different requirements for areas near their universities:
 - West Lafayette bases parking requirements in its "University-proximate residences) on dwelling unit square footage (as opposed to the number of bedrooms or development type);
 - Ames has a separate "Campustown Service Center Zone" with lower parking requirements
 - Ithaca has a Collegetown Parking Overlay Zone, which requires one space for every two resident occupants, lower than the surrounding neighborhoods.
- In several special overlay zones, there is no parking minimum.
 - Fort Collins has a TOD Overlay Zone, in which there is no minimum parking requirement. Parking standards in general were design-focused, rather than set purely on a space per dwelling unit basis like most cities.
 - Ames does not require parking for dorms, fraternities and sororities in its Collegetown Service Center Zone.
- Ithaca is an outlier, requiring roughly half the spaces other cities, even outside its university overlay zone.
- Corvallis is different from most comparator cities by having apartment parking requirements determined by unit and not by bedroom.

(Summary Table on p. 4)

Density of University-Adjacent Neighborhoods

Several comparator institution campuses have hard edges around parts of their campus, such as railroad lines, greenbelts, or long, low-density commercial strips, providing separation from the adjacent neighborhoods.

Where residential development does border campuses, it is typically low- to medium-density single-family homes. Where there is multifamily housing, it tends to be restricted to one small portion of the surrounding neighborhood. For example, Cal Poly San Luis Obispo has single family homes along part of the campus perimeter, and mid-rise apartments and fraternities and sororities in another. Iowa State University has a designated University Impacted Area with its own development plan.

Densities of neighborhoods adjacent to universities appear to not correlate strongly to the age of the university. If anything, there appears to be some correlation between geography and density. The west, north, and northeast have higher densities than the south, Midwest and mid-Atlantic. In any case, it is difficult to make a characterization of so few data points.

(Summary Table on p. 6)

Figure 1: Parking Requirements

City	Single family home	Duplex	Fraternity/Sorority	Apartment	Dorm	Parking districts?
Cornell/Ithaca, NY	"Dwelling unit": 1 per 3 bedrooms or sleeping rooms, plus 1 per 2 additional bedrooms or sleeping rooms, plus 1 per additional bedroom or sleeping room in excess of 5 such rooms Also has Collegetown Parking Overlay Zone, roughly 20 block area south of university, where off-street parking requirement for residential and business zones is one space for every two resident occupants.	1 per 3 bedrooms or sleeping rooms, plus 1 per 2 additional bedrooms or sleeping rooms, plus 1 per additional bedroom or sleeping room in excess of 5 such rooms	1 per 2 persons housed	Dwelling unit: 1 per 3 bedrooms or sleeping rooms, plus 1 per 2 additional bedrooms or sleeping rooms, plus 1 per additional bedroom or sleeping room in excess of 5 such rooms	1 per 4 persons housed	None, but have discussed in recent years
UC Davis/Davis, CA	Single family home: 1 covered, 1 uncovered off-street space up to 4 br; 5+ br 1 covered, 1 + 1 for each br in excess of 4	1 covered, 1 uncovered space for 3 or fewer br; 1 covered, 1 + 1 uncovered spaces for each br in excess of 3	Two br multifamily: 1.5 spaces Three or more br multifamily: 1 space per br	Two br multifamily: 1.5 spaces Three or more br multifamily: 1 space per br	Two br multifamily: 1.5 spaces Three or more br multifamily: 1 space per br	Parking districts adjacent to UC Davis are no parking without permit 8am-6pm (evening time varies depending on block) OR 2 Hr parking allowed without permit during restricted hours.
Penn State/ State College, PA	1- and 2-Family Dwellings: 2 spaces for each unit	1- and 2-Family Dwellings: 2 spaces for each unit	Dormitories, Fraternities and Sororities: 1 space per 2 occupants, based on maximum capacity	Multiple-Family Dwellings: 2 or fewer br 1.5 spaces/unit; 3 br 2 spaces/unit; 3+ br 2 spaces/unit plus 1 space per br for each br beyond the 3rd br.	Dormitories, Fraternities and Sororities: 1 space per 2 occupants, based on maximum capacity	Two residential parking districts next to campus; two hours parking allowed without permit. Residential Permits cost \$10/year Additionally, has Commuter Parking District, allowing parking longer than two hours
Texas A & M/College Station, TX	Single family DU: 2.0 spaces	Multifamily DUs: 1br 1.5 spaces/unit, 2 br <130 sf 1.0 spaces/unit, 2 br > 130sf or 3 br, 1.25 spaces/unit	Fraternity/Sorority: 1.0 space/person	Multifamily DUs: 1br 1.5 spaces/unit, 2 br <130 sf 1.0 spaces/unit, 2 br > 130sf or 3 br, 1.25 spaces/unit	Dormitory: 0.75 spaces/bed	None
Cal Poly/San Luis Obispo, CA	Off street parking. R-1: 2 spaces per DU, one of which must be covered.	All other zones: 1 per studio apt, 1.5 for first br plus .5 for each add'l br in unit, plus 1 for each five units in developments of more than five units.	Fraternities & sororities: One space per 1.5 occupants or 1.5 spaces per br, whichever is greater.	1 per studio apt, 1.5 for first br plus .5 for each add'l br in unit, plus 1 for each five units in developments of more than five units. High occupancy res. use: Greater of: 1) Number of space required for dwellings or 2) One off-street parking space per adult occupant, less one.		8 parking districts. Each property owner given two permits per year, which can be used by either residents or guests 3 parking districts adjacent to Cal Poly; 2 enforced M-F 2am-10pm, 1 enforced 7 days a week 10pm-10am
Colorado State/Fort Collins, CO	For each single-family dwelling there shall be one parking space on lots with greater than 40 feet of street frontage or two parking spaces on lots with less than 40 feet of street frontage.	Multi-family, Attached or Two-Family Projects Developed with Internal Streets: Parking on an internal street fronting on a lot or tract containing multi-family, attached or two-family dwellings (except for mixed-use dwellings and single-family detached dwellings) may be counted to meet the parking requirements for the development.	Fraternities and sororities: Two spaces per three bedrooms, plus one space per two employees	Multi-family, Attached or Two-Family Projects Developed with Internal Streets: Parking on an internal street fronting on a lot or tract containing multi-family, attached or two-family dwellings (except for mixed-use dwellings and single-family detached dwellings) may be counted to meet the parking requirements for the development.		None, but are considering
Michigan State/East Lansing, MI	Single- and two-family structures: 2.0 spaces per dwelling DU plus 1.0 space per roomer.	Single- and two-family structures: 2.0 spaces per dwelling DU plus 1.0 space per roomer.	Multiple-family structures: Class B units (fraternities, sororities, boarding houses) 0.6 space per person	Multiple-family structures: Class A units (apartments) 1.0 space per efficiency unit, 1.25 spaces per 1-bedroom unit, 2.0 spaces per 2-bedroom unit, 2.5 spaces per unit with 3 or more bedrooms.	Multiple-family structures: Class B units (fraternities, sororities, boarding houses) 0.6 space per person	Four parking districts close to university, issuing 3-4 permits per dwelling unit

Oregon State/Corvallis, OR	Single family residents: 2 spaces	Duplex, townhouse, or apartment: 1 per one bd unit, 1.5 per 2 bd unit, 2.5 per 3+ bd unit	Fraternities, Sororities, Cooperatives, and Boarding Houses: 3 spaces per 5 occupants	Duplex, townhouse, or apartment: 1 per one bd unit, 1.5 per 2 bd unit, 2.5 per 3+ bd unit	Fraternities, Sororities, Cooperatives, and Boarding Houses: 3 spaces per 5	Three parking districts
North Carolina State Univ./Raleigh, NC	Single family detached, duplexes, attached cluster housing: 1 space per unit.	Single family detached, duplexes, attached cluster housing: 1 space per unit.	Fraternities and sororities: 1.5 spaces for every rental or sleeping room greater than 70 square feet, and 1 space for each rental or sleeping room that is 70 square feet or less.	Multifamily dwelling (excluding duplexes) 1 space per efficiency unit, 1.5 spaces per one bedroom unit, 2 spaces per two bedroom unit, 2.5 spaces per three bedroom unit, 3 spaces + one half space per bedroom for units with over four bedrooms.		None
Purdue/West Lafayette, IN	Single-family homes and duplexes: 2 per dwelling unit	Single-family homes and duplexes: 2 per dwelling unit	Fraternities, Sororities, and Cooperatives: 0.75 per occupant at capacity.	Multifamily units: 1.5 per dwelling unit for efficiency and 1 bedroom units; 1.75 per dwelling unit for 2 bedroom units; 2 per dwelling unit for 3 or more bedroom units.		Yes, 7 parking districts near university, allowing 0-3 hour parking. 2 are for neighborhood residents only.
Iowa State/ Ames, IA	Single family houses and duplexes: 2 spaces/unit, 1 space/unit in CSC	Single family houses and duplexes: 2 spaces/unit, 1 space/unit in CSC	Dorms, fraternities and sororities: 1 space/bed, none in CSC	Apartment Dwellings: 1.5 space/on bd unit, 1 space/bedroom for 2 bd units or more, 1.25 space/bedroom for units of 2 bedrooms or more in University-Impacted districts. 1 space/unit in CSC	Dorms, fraternities and sororities: 1 space/bed, none in CSC	None
Univ. of IL/Champaign, IL	Single-Family and Duplex Dwelling: 2 space/DU	Single-Family and Duplex Dwelling: 2 space/DU	Dormitory, Fraternity, and Sorority: 1 per 4 beds for residents. 0.25/bed	Multi-family dwellings: No off-street minimum requirements for apartment units for which a building permit has been issued after June 20, 1990, in structures existing before June 20, 1990	Dormitory, Fraternity, and Sorority: 1 per 4 beds for residents. 0.25/bed	None
Univ. of IL/Urbana, IL	Single and Two-Family or Similar Uses 2 for every dwelling unit	Single and Two-Family or Similar Uses 2 for every dwelling unit		Efficiency, One or Two Bedroom Multiple-Family Dwelling Unit No less than 1 for every dwelling unit Three Bedroom Multiple-Family Dwelling Unit 1.5 for every dwelling unit Four Bedroom Multiple-Family Dwelling Unit 2 for every dwelling unit More Than Four Bedroom Multiple-Family Dwelling Unit 2.5 for every dwelling unit	Dormitory: 1 for every 3 residents	Permit Parking only in West Urbana Neighborhood Residential Parking Zone

Figure 2: Neighborhood Densities

City	Founding date of university	High Density	Med. Density	Low Density	Notes
Cal Poly/San Luis Obispo, CA	1901	0	50	50	Nearby housing is either apartments & Greek houses or single family homes
Colorado State/Fort Collins, CO	1870	20	70	10	Largely surrounded by commercial
Cornell/Ithaca, NY	1865	33	33	33	High density zoning is "R-U" zoning, which includes a wide range of residential types, both single-family and multi-family.
Iowa State/Ames, IA	1858	20	30	50	Low-rise apartments and single family homes, intermixed in areas. Large greenbelt around roughly half of campus, separating it from the town. Campustown Service Center zone south of campus with mid- & high-rise multifamily units & mixed use, close to commercial development. Neighborhood contains parking garages.
Michigan State/East Lansing, MI	1855	33	33	33	High density is mostly apartments and Greek houses mixed in with commercial. Large area of perimeter is bordered by commercial, with large single family homes a few blocks away. Larger homes could be single or multi-unit. Campus is on edge of city limits.
North Carolina State Univ./Raleigh, NC	1887	0	0	100	Roughly 1/3 industrial, 1/3 commercial, and 1/3 residential zoning in the area surrounding the university, but virtually all low density.
Penn State/State College, PA	1855	0	50	50	2 story single family homes on one border, mixed-use medium residential on the other

Purdue/West Lafayette, IN	1869	0	50	50	
Texas A & M/College Station, TX	1876	0	0	100	Where residential borders campus, is small single family homes. Large portion of perimeter is lined with railroad track and wide boulevard.
UC Davis/Davis, CA	1905	20	20	60	
Univ. of IL/Champaign, IL	1867	0	10	90	Bordering blocks are largely low-density commercial, but buffered from university by wide road, railroad line and open space. Hard edge--not woven into town.
Univ. of IL/Urbana, IL	1867	10	20	70	
Washington State Univ./Pullman, WA	1890	20	20	60	
Southern Oregon Univ./Ashland, OR	1872	0	20	80	
Western Washington Univ./Bellingham, WA	1893	25	25	50	
Central Washington Univ./Ellensburg, WA	1891	0	50	50	
Univ. of Idaho/Moscow, ID	1889	0	60	40	
Oregon State/Corvallis, OR	1868	33	33	33	

Property Maintenance Codes

City	Property Maintenance Codes	Penalties
Cal Poly/San Luis Obispo, CA	Yes. Storing couches, other furniture or equipment outside and visible; lawns or weeds over 12", peeling paint, broken windows, other signs of a neglected property	Civil fines and criminal prosecution possible.
Colorado State/Fort Collins, CO	Yes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Junk vehicles in public view * Dirt Yards and Dilapidated Fences * Graffiti * Noise * Occupancy Ordinance * Outdoor Storage/Rubbish in view * Parking on lawns * Improper Trash Disposal * Yards with accumulations of rubbish, furniture meant for indoor use, leaves and branches left out for long periods of time, weeds and grass over 6 inches in yards/alleys, landscaping that is more than 20% dirt. * Unshoveled Sidewalks (after 24 hours of snow accumulating) 	Tickets are issued for properties with chronic nuisance violations
Cornell/Ithaca, NY	Yes. Garbage storage, vehicle storage, grass and weed maintained to under 10 inches, tree pruning, fence and wall maintenance; steps, walkways, driveways must be maintained, kept free of snow and ice. No furniture on roofs.	Fines that get progressively higher with each violation in a 12 month period.
Iowa State/ Ames, IA	Some: Junk vehicles, littering offenses	(unclear)
Michigan State/East Lansing, MI	Some: Noxious weeds, and plants that harm public safety; cars parked in yards, occupancy limits.	Weeds subject to "Abatement by the city", unclear if there are fines involved. Parking in yards received civil infraction/parking ticket.
Penn State/ State College, PA	Yes. Weeds and grass must be <6". Sidewalks must be clear of snow and ice.	Uses points system to track problem properties. If enough violations occur in a 12 month period, rental licenses may be revoked.
Purdue/West Lafayette, IN	Some: Sanitation, yard maintenance, and snow and ice removal	If weeds are not removed within ten days of notice, the city will remove them and send the bill to the property owner.
Texas A & M/College Station, TX	Yes, weeds over 12", parking in yard, junk vehicles, overflowing garbage cans, unsafe buildings, and open storage.	Citations possible.
UC Davis/Davis, CA	Yes. Include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Uncontrolled grass or weeds in public view * Cars parked on the lawn on other unimproved surface * Dry grass and weeds that present a fire hazard * Construction materials and basketball hoops places on the street or sidewalk * Garbage/trash scattered around the property * Indoor furniture in the front of the property in public view (indoor couches in front yard) * Junk cars in public view * Construction activity without required zoning approvals and/or building permits * Loud noise 	Fines.Steps Involved In Enforcing Code Compliance: 1. A Complaint is received by the City. 2. A Notice of Violation is mailed to the property owner. 3. If we receive another complaint regarding the same issue, on the same property, the City will make a site visit to verify the violation. If a violation is verified, the City will issue an Administrative Citation giving a date specific to correct. A re-inspection will be made on the date corrective action was required. If the violation was corrected, the case will be recorded in the Code Compliance database and closed. If the violation has not been corrected, a \$100 Administrative Citation will be imposed. Re-inspections will be made and additional citations will be issued for everyday the violation is not corrected. The 2nd citation is \$200, and any subsequent violations will be \$500 each.

Rental Housing Licensing**

Nearly all of Corvallis' comparator cities require some kind of accountability for rental properties, whether requiring an affidavit confirming the number of occupants in the unit, or regular inspection and certification by the local authorities.

In a survey of other cities with major universities, the City of Urbana, IL found that most of its selected comparator cities (also college towns) have a licensing or registration programs, and that most charge fees for either rental registration, rental inspections or both. Comparator cities average 5.5 FT and 2 PT staff and had populations ranging from 22,000-115,000. Most had a separate schedule of fees for single-family, duplex, small, and large apartment buildings.

(<http://urbanainillinois.us/sites/default/files/attachments/FAQ.pdf>)

Basics:

Municipalities requiring inspection typically review for compliance with basic health and safety codes (i.e. item found in the International Property Maintenance Code). Licenses are ordinarily issued for a limited duration (e.g. 2-4 years) after which the property must be re-inspected in order to continue to be rented. Rental licensing generally applies to small rental units, not big apartment complexes (for which different rules apply). Most municipalities' stated purpose for licensing is the desire to have safe, healthy housing, but a few mention preventing blight and nuisances, preserving character, and neighborhood stability. Another frequently cited reason for licensing is a need to identify the owner of the property quickly should a problem arise.

Owner occupied housing where rooms are rented out may or may not be exempt--there are examples of both in other cities. Rental licenses are not usually transferrable to new owners. Nearly all cities with programs require local agents (i.e. if the property owner lives more than a specified distance away, someone in the area must be designated to take responsibility.)

Revocations:

- State College, PA has a points system to determine revocation: Violations assigned 1-3 points each are tracked for a floating 12 month period. 1 point violations include property maintenance code offenses, 2 point violations include alcohol-related and nuisance offenses, and 3 point violations include drug offenses and assault. When 5 or more points accumulate, a notice is sent to the property owner; when 10 or more points accumulate, permits are suspended. There is an appeals process following suspension. The first suspension is for six months; subsequent suspensions are for a year. Self-reported complaints/requests for assistance do not count toward the point total. Landlords may request a stay of suspension after evicting tenants.
- Burnsville, MN (bedroom community/suburb of Twin Cities) has a three strikes and you're out rule--three instances of disorderly conduct and the license holder must evict the tenants. If they do not, this is a violation by the license holder.
- Other cities may take away landlords' rights to apply for additional licenses for a set period of time if they have had too many licenses revoked previously (e.g. in Minneapolis, two revocations removes the privilege of applying for new rental licenses for five years)

Cost:

- Fees for rental licenses generally range from \$50-100, but can be much higher for large multi-unit buildings. Multifamily buildings of over five units often have a lower per unit rate.
- Some cities charge a fee assessed for the conversion of an owner-occupied unit to rental unit: Minneapolis, MN charges a \$1000 conversion fee, charged when a single family dwelling is being converted to a first time rental.

Enforcement/accountability:

- Sugar Land, TX (suburb of Houston) fines owners of unlicensed rental properties up to \$500/day each day the unit is rented without a license, and shuts off water service to unlicensed rentals.
- Several cities publish lists of rental properties.

- Some cities limit the number of rental licenses that can exist by making properties deed restricted, not allowing the property to be rented.
- Winona MN, and East Lansing MI have ordinances restricting how many properties may be rentals in a given space (e.g. per block or per neighborhood)
- In nearly all cities surveyed, when a rental property is sold, the license expires on the date of sale.

Infill Design Standards**

- **Ames, IA**
 - 2005 University Impacted Area (UIA) Plan for Ames, IA
 - delineates area to be "intensified"
 - identifies positive traits and defines neighborhood character, and
 - defines and describes standards for compatible development.
 - To the extent possible, also seeks to preserve blocks of historical and architectural resources.
 - Plan divides up UIA into districts, each with a distinct character, well-defined by building use, type, scale, setting, intended activity level and other characteristics
 - Core, called the Campustown Service Center, where buildings are the largest and residential densities are the greatest, supporting lively commercial activity at the street level
 - Two transition "RH" districts (east and west), buffering transition to town
 - *Design Standards*
 - Maximum building height to be expressed in feet equivalent to 3.5 stories (except in the Campustown Services District and other specific locations designated by City Council).
 - Clay brick as a primary, (but not necessarily only) exterior building material, although not necessarily on additions to existing buildings where brick is not an exterior material.
 - Windows and visible entrance on the front, emphasized by architectural features.
 - Require opaque fences where parking lots are adjacent Low-Density Residential Zoning District
 - (Additional standards for RH, Campus Service Center, and other specified areas. Policies and recommendations offered for architectural and historical resources)
- **Davenport, IA** has standards that apply to residential structures as well as some additions. Plans are reviewed by the Design Review Committee. Standards include:
 - Keeping spacing between houses consistent with original houses on the block.
 - Preserving trees whenever possible.
 - Keeping massing and design features (porches, fenestration, building materials) similar to existing houses.
 - Multi-family dwellings allowed, but should be proportional to single-family dwellings.
 - Parking for multi-unit housing should be screened and accessed through alleys.
- **Durango, CO** created an "Established Neighborhood" zone (EN) to provide neighborhood stability while still allowing new construction. Standards include:
 - Height, setbacks, and FAR vary depending on lot size. Duplexes and two units on a single lot are allowed.
 - Limits on fence height
 - Guidelines on minimizing cut and fill/grade changes
 - Limits on width of building planes, i.e. dividing facade into modules, or step down height so that there are no large, blank walls in view
- **Villa Rica, GA** has infill design standards focusing on density and spatial dimensions (rather than architectural design features).

- Standards apply to subdivisions and lot splits next to existing development, with the intention of keeping infill compatible with neighborhood character.
- Lot width and setback must be comparable with neighboring lots.
- A minimum amount of open space is required, depending on zone.
- Net density may be increased by up to 100%.
- **Portland, OR** (guidelines only)
 - Spent several years in the 2000s on the **Portland Infill Design Project**
 - The Portland Planning Bureau began the Infill Design Project began in the 2000s because infill projects in established neighborhoods outside of the Central City were not contributing to the community's design objectives and aspirations. The stated objectives of the project were to:
 - Find ways of encouraging desirable development, rather than simply regulating against "bad" design.
 - Minimize regulatory complexity.
 - Think broadly about potential implementation strategies, relying on regulatory approaches only when there are no other realistic strategies.
 - Consider impacts on other issues and priorities, such as environmental sustainability, construction costs, and livability for the residents of new housing. Whenever possible, pursue strategies that can meet multiple community objectives.
 - Identify and promote additional housing types that hold potential to serve as positive contributions to neighborhoods, including owner-occupied alternatives to rowhouses.
 - Focus on basic design principles and patterns, not on architectural style.
 - Solutions should be supportive of Portland's Comprehensive Plan and adopted neighborhood plans.
 - Portland previously had Community Design Standards to serve as and standards-based alternative to design reviews, and these based allowable building heights and facades on adjacent structures, in an attempt to make standards contextual. However, these were removed from code because they were difficult both to administer and follow.
 - *Process*
 - Project **scope** was set ahead of time, and due to limited resources, was focused on medium and high density housing, since those types were having the largest impact on livability.
 - **Identified issues** included:
 - Pedestrian connectivity
 - Building materials that look impermanent and take away from neighborhood character
 - Design that does not minimize privacy concerns
 - A need for more usable open space.
 - Looked for regulatory gaps, and how current regulation shaped design; studied successful projects, and looked at what market and regulatory factors allowed them to be constructed.
 - Created **baseline** of current development trends, including breakdown of permits issued between, SFR, duplexes, rowhouses, apartments, and ADUs.
 - Found **case studies** within Portland of both common infill design problems, as well as more desirable infill designs. The better examples tended to be in up-market neighborhoods or in low-income housing developed by nonprofit community development corporations; the less desirable examples were in more down-market neighborhoods.
 - Identified existing rules and regulations, past efforts at affecting design, and possible regulatory hurdles going forward. One potential area of concern was overlapping and complex zoning and standards, which add to projects' total cost and may cause additional problems. Standards that are too strict may also hamper creative, good design. Standards may also ignore neighborhood context, but context-specific standards add to regulatory complexity for developers.
 - Held **open houses** to both inform the public as well as gather opinions via its **Design Preferences Survey** (where participants rate images of different infill design examples

from around Portland) and **Design Issues and Priorities Questionnaire** (on which residents ranked general design concepts, e.g. "orienting windows to street") from which generalizations about desired features were learned. Open houses were held in three (geographically & socio-economically) different neighborhoods.

- *Issues:*
 - Community "character" is sometimes hard to define
 - Lot dimensions vary based on neighborhood, bringing up design challenges
 - Neighborhood residents often are concerned about large contrasts in scale and massing of infill compared with existing housing.
 - Housing diversity (e.g. rowhouses, cluster housing etc.) is important to residents
 - Different city departments have some competing/conflicting priorities (e.g. Office of Transportation for wide driveways vs. City objectives for minimization of impervious surfaces and design that minimizes the prominence of vehicle areas)
- *Staff Recommendations:*
 - Educate and foster dialogue about design, e.g. by having a neighborhood contact for larger multidwelling projects in order to spur dialogue between residents and developers.
 - Remove barriers to desirable design and development, e.g. bringing different city regulations into alignment, adjust zoning code to facilitate rear parking arrangements
 - Adopt a limited number of regulatory design standards
 - Facilitate a wider range of housing types and configurations
- *Code Amendments based on Infill Design Project*
 - Foster pedestrian-friendly street frontages by:
 - Requiring the street-facing facades of multidwelling projects in all zones to include 15 percent window coverage;
 - Limiting vehicle areas to 50 percent of the street frontage of multidwelling projects; and
 - Eliminating requirements for loading spaces for small residential projects on transit streets.
 - Facilitate rear-parking arrangements by:
 - Allowing narrower driveways and reducing driveway setback requirements to make it easier to access rear parking on small multidwelling sites; and
 - Reducing code barriers to rear-accessed rowhouses.
 - Facilitate courtyard-oriented housing and other alternative housing arrangements by:
 - Adding various provisions to facilitate the use of "common green" housing arrangements, oriented to shared open space, on small infill sites;
 - Creating new provisions to allow residential lots in higher-density zones to front onto a "shared court" designed for both vehicles and pedestrians, characterized by paving blocks and traffic-calming features;
 - Allowing shared open space to meet required outdoor area requirements;
 - Adding provisions to allow small-lot duplexes to serve as a higher-density housing type;
 - Allowing reduced side setbacks within the interior of detached house projects in the multidwelling zones;
 - Providing additional flexibility in the design of rowhouse projects by reducing requirements for the portion of wall area that must be attached; and
 - Allowing accessory dwelling units to count toward minimum density requirements in higher-density zones.
 - Minimize impervious surface area by:
 - Allowing "shared driveways" and "shared courts" designed to accommodate pedestrians and vehicles within the same space, accompanied by requirements for surfacing with paving blocks or bricks, which may provide additional stormwater management opportunities when sand-set pavers are used; and
 - Allowing narrower walkways for portions of pedestrian systems serving no more than 4 units.
 - Provide additional flexibility for front building setbacks to acknowledge site-specific conditions by:

- Allowing buildings on transit streets or in pedestrian districts to continue the established setback patterns of adjacent structures that may be less than currently required (as is currently allowed in all other areas of Portland); and
 - Allowing buildings in most multidwelling zones to be set back up to 20 feet (instead of the current 10 foot requirement) from transit streets and streets in pedestrian districts.
 - Provide additional opportunities for community input regarding the design of multidwelling projects by establishing a neighborhood contact requirement for multidwelling projects with five or more units.
- *Lessons learned for Corvallis:*
- An issue that Portland and Corvallis appear to have in common is perceived problems on the part of the neighborhood residents with infill scaling and massing. Portland worked through this problem by:
 - Asking neighborhood residents what they liked to see and didn't like to see, via the Design Preferences Survey and Design Issues and Priorities Questionnaire
 - Assigning a neighborhood contact for larger multidwelling projects in lieu of design review in order to find a design the neighborhood is happy with
 - Looking for opportunities to change code where needed in order to "legalize" good design
 - Specific design interventions to mitigate issues around scale include:
 - Articulating facades so that multiunit dwellings do not appear to be one monolithic mass, dwarfing neighboring single family units.
 - Dividing up multifamily units in a similar pattern to neighboring single family homes, "disguising" them as houses.
 - Setting back upper stories of multifamily units, or using dormers

Public-Private Partnerships**

- Public/Private partnerships (PPPs) can take many different kinds of ownership and operating schemes, typically either a land lease of university-owned land to a private developer, or the purchase of off-campus land by a nonprofit (may be affiliated with the university or not), which is then developed by a private firm. There are other combinations and structures, all designed to spread out risk and lower the cost to the university.
- *Universities using PPP:*
 - **Arizona State University;**
 - **University of California and California State University systems**
West Village at UC Davis: Below-market rate homes for sale and student residences on UC Davis land, next to campus. UC Davis signed ground lease with West Village Community Partnership LLC, a joint venture of the two developers, Urban Villages of Denver and Carmel Partners of San Francisco. As of January 2012, 800 students, faculty, and staff live in 315 apartments. First phase; roughly one-third of planned project. Developer has a 65-year ground lease with the university for the project.
 - **Portland State University;**
Building a 16-story residence hall in a public-private partnership with American Campus Communities, who will own and manage the building for up to 85 years before it reverts to the university.
 - **University of Kentucky;**
"University of Kentucky is considering handing over all of its student housing, 5,100 beds, to Education Realty Trust, a REIT. As part of the deal, Education Realty would demolish most of the existing buildings to make way for 9,000 new beds in what amounts to \$500 million in new construction." (NY Times)
 - **Montclair State in New Jersey**
"A private developer [built a student housing project], enlisting a [...] nonprofit organization, to finance the \$211 million project with tax-exempt bonds issued by the New Jersey Economic Development Authority. Capstone will manage it for the next 40 years or until the bonds are paid off and the title reverts to the university. The university will retain authority over student conduct within." (NY Times)

- *Off-campus student housing examples:*
 - **Missouri State University**
Springfield, MO. University worked with private developer Beacon Student Housing to construct student housing one block from campus. 3 contiguous parcels were acquired, houses razed, student housing put up. 12 4-bedroom/4 bath units (<http://www.beaconcommons.com/>)
 - **The University of Mary Washington**
Fredericksburg, VA. University partnered with Concord Eastridge to build a mixed-use project adjacent to campus. Only the first phase has been built so far--a 624 bed student housing building. Appears to now be home to other amenities, such as a community center and a business incubator.
 - As both projects have only just opened within the past two years, there is little data on the success of either project.
 - Off-campus projects are singled out as a particularly effective use of PPP by the University of California in a report by its Budget and Capital Resources office.
- *Benefits:*
Cost savings from using the PPP model helps to keep rents competitive (often with stated goals e.g. rents must be no more than on-campus housing, and no more than 90% of comparable off-campus, private housing.) New student housing also offers additional amenities such as wifi, gyms etc. that can draw in students.
- *Risks:*
Long term leases (e.g. 85 years) limit future options. The quality of the housing will deteriorate, and depending on the ownership of operation & maintenance, may or may not result in cost savings compared to traditional models of development & financing. For housing owned by REITs, shareholders may press for greater returns, perhaps leading to cost cuts and rate increases that affect the quality of student life.

University Student Conduct Offices

In general, schools cover the same topics as OSU, and have reserve jurisdiction over off campus conduct for serious offenses that affect the campus community (typically violent crimes and harassment, not property crimes). A couple of schools specifically call out rules regarding large assemblies or demonstrations.

Regarding consequences, some schools emphasize mediation, learning, and restorative justice, others are silent on the issue of punishment vs. rehabilitation.

OSU has a relatively favorable staff to student ratio, when comparing the size of student conduct offices to the size of the student body.

City	Name of Student Conduct Office equivalent	Staff	Student enrollment 2011-2012	Student/Staff ratio	Notes
Texas A & M/College Station, TX	Student Conduct Services	2.5	46422	18568.8	Student Conduct code covers similar incidents as OSU. Texas A&M has on-campus mediation center, which is one possible path for resolution for violations.
Michigan State/East Lansing, MI	http://www.studentlife.msu.edu/current_students/judicial_affairs/contact_us.htm		47800		Student Right & Responsibilities include usual topics, plus specifically call out sanctions for students who participate in illegal downloading of copyright materials, as well as numerous rules about demonstrating/assembling.
Purdue/West Lafayette, IN	Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities		39726		Regulations Governing Student Conduct, Disciplinary Proceedings, and Appeals covers similar student conduct issues, as well as grade appeal processes. Specifically calls out misconduct during student demonstrations. http://www.purdue.edu/univregs/studentconduct/regulations.html
Cal Poly/San Luis Obispo, CA	Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities	2	19325	9662.5	Standards for Student Conduct similar to elsewhere: http://www.osrr.calpoly.edu/standardsforconduct/title5.asp University has jurisdiction over off campus "conduct that threatens the safety or security of the campus community, or substantially disrupts the functions or operation of the University"
Cornell/Ithaca, NY	Office of the Judicial Administrator	5	20939	4187.8	Get between 800 - 1000 cases per year. Jurisdiction off-campus only for serious cases , which include fights, sexual assaults and drug dealing, but don't include property damage, theft, or minor alcohol/drug possession cases
Penn State/ State College, PA	Office of Student Conduct	10	44817	4481.7	Student Conduct Code very similar to OSU's, as well as an Off-campus Misconduct Policy , which lists acts and consequences for behaviors on and off campus. http://studentaffairs.psu.edu/conduct/codeofconduct/ http://studentaffairs.psu.edu/conduct/policies/offcampus.shtml

Iowa State/ Ames, IA	Office of Judicial Affairs	4	29887	7471.75a4	<p>Student Conduct Code addresses off-campus behavior. Within the ISU's interest are off-campus violations that "[p]ose a disruption or threat to the university community."</p> <p>Code includes typical issues, but an interesting inclusion is that students' internet connections can be stop if they download files illegally.</p> <p>Holds registered student organizations responsible for misconduct when members or facility is party to the misconduct: http://policy.iastate.edu/policy/SDR#a417 http://policy.iastate.edu/policy/SDR#a4</p>
Univ. of IL/Urbana, Champaign, IL	Office for Student Conflict Resolution	6	41495	6915.83333	<p>Appears to be strong emphasis on education punishment. Office for Student Conflict Resolution offers classes on alcohol & drugs, and tolerance/ethics. Community Service is mandated in some cases. Office links to interesting tool where students can take an interactive web survey to get feedback about their use of alcohol. http://www.conflictresolution.illinois.edu/common_ed_sanctions/echug/</p>
Colorado State/Fort Collins, CO	Conflict Resolution and Student Conduct Services	9	28417	3157.44444	<p>Student Conduct Code covering typical issues. Jurisdiction of off-campus conduct includes "conduct that adversely affects the University community, poses a threat to safety of persons or property, or damages the institution's reputation or relationship with the greater community" http://www.conflictresolution.colostate.edu/conduct-code Issues resolved by hearing or if both parties agree, by mediation/restorative justice. Conflict Resolution and Student Conduct Services also holds workshops for students on various topics, including a 2-hour class on local codes and ordinances, good neighboring practices, and the responsibilities of being a safe party host. Unclear if attendance is part of a mandatory or voluntary process.</p>
UC Davis/Davis, CA	Office of Student Judicial Affairs	7	32153	4593.28571	<p>Student Responsibilities and Conduct Standards addresses typical issues: http://sja.ucdavis.edu/student-conduct-standards.html Judicial Affairs has jurisdiction over off-campus misconduct if misconduct occurred both on and off campus, or over very serious offenses that affect the campus community, such as violent crimes, harrassment, hate crimes, hazing, identity theft etc.</p>
Oregon State University	Student Conduct and Community Standards	6	23761	3960.16667	

Infill Design Standards Code Examples

Davenport, IA

17.09.070 Standards.

- A. Front Yards.
 - 1. Setback and front door orientation are to be in line and consistent with existing houses on the block.
 - 2. Fencing located in a required front yard shall be picket or wrought iron style, with brick or stone piers, if necessary.
 - 3. Walkways should connect the sidewalk with the front door, perpendicular to street.
 - 4. Healthy trees should be preserved whenever possible.
- B. House Orientation and Side Yards.
 - 1. Proposed infill house is proportional to dimensions of lot and existing houses on the block.
 - 2. Proposed infill house keeps the spacing between houses consistent with original houses on the block.
- C. Alleys, Parking and Services.
 - 1. Proposed infill house has access from alley only (where available) for garage or parking pad.
 - 2. Where an alley is unavailable, proposed garage or parking pad be set back at least eight feet behind front facade of proposed infill house.
 - 3. Proposed parking pads, utility boxes, and waste collection points are to be visually screened by landscaping and/or fencing.
- D. Scale, Mass and Foundation Height.
 - 1. Proposed infill elevation is proportional in scale to original houses on the block.
 - 2. Foundation height is consistent with original houses on block, provided adequate drainage can be achieved.
 - 3. Proposed infill incorporates historic elements of block into design.
- E. Porches.
 - 1. Proposed infill includes a porch in neighborhoods where porches are dominant.
 - 2. Proposed porch is proportional to existing porches on block.
 - 3. Proposed porch maintains consistency with existing porches in setback along the street.
 - 4. Proposed porch materials and details compliment the historic character and style of neighborhood.
- F. Windows and Doors.
 - 1. Proposed window and door size and location are consistent with the historic character and style of block.
 - 2. Proposed window or door positioning does not violate the privacy of neighboring homes.
 - 3. Proposed infill excludes contemporary window styles in pre-1940 areas.
- G. Roof Shapes and Materials.
 - 1. Proposed infill incorporates roof pitch similar to existing houses on the block.
 - 2. Proposed infill incorporates complex roof forms similar to existing houses on the block.
- H. Siding Materials.
 - 1. In a neighborhood dominated by painted wood siding the proposed infill should use clapboard or materials, including vinyl or aluminum, that mimic traditional materials and style.
 - 2. In a neighborhood with mixed architectural styles the proposed infill utilizes appropriate material and detail.
- I. Additions.
 - 1. Proposed additions visible from the street utilize consistent siding and roof materials, as well as door and window styles original to the house.
 - 2. Specified roof line and roofing materials for proposed addition are consistent with existing house.
 - 3. Proposed window or door replacements should respect original style.
 - 4. Proposed addition does not violate openness or character of front porch.
- J. Multi-Unit Housing.
 - 1. Proposed multi-unit housing is proportional to rhythm, height and scale of single-family dwellings existing on the block.
 - 2. Proposed parking for multi-family housing is screened from the street and accesses existing alleys when possible. (Ord. 2008-329 § 1 (part)).

Durango CO

Intent of Ordinance:

The intent of this ordinance is to create new established residential neighborhood zoning districts that limit height and bulk to:

- (a) Assure that buildings are compatible in mass and scale with those of buildings seen traditionally in residential neighborhoods of Durango;
- (b) Maintain the traditional scale of buildings as seen along the street;
- (c) Minimize visual impacts of larger buildings on adjacent properties;
- (d) Promote access to light and air from adjacent properties;
- (e) Encourage the preservation of historically significant structures;
- (f) Reduce the visual impacts of impervious surfaces in the front yard setback area;
- (g) Maintain the perception of the natural slope and promote stepping of building forms to follow site contours in areas with substantial topographic relief;
- (h) Reduce the visual impact of cut and fill;
- (i) Preserve and enhance the existing mature tree canopy in front yards; and
- (j) Encourage design diversity by allowing for approval of alternative approaches to meeting the strict standards of the ordinance through staff-level design review, where appropriate.