

*Clarion Associates*  
621 Broadway, Suite 2250  
Denver, Colorado 80293  
Phone 303.830.2890  
Fax 303.860.1809

*Planning and Zoning*  
*Growth Management*  
*Real Estate Consulting*  
*Market Analysis*  
*Appraisal*

**C L A R I O N**

September 25, 2009

Kevin McDonald, Esq.  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Ann Arbor  
100 N. Fifth Avenue, PO Box 8647  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48107

**RE: Proposed Scope of Work, Schedule, and Budget for  
Integration and Clarification of Ann Arbor Zoning and Land Use Regulations**

Dear Mr. McDonald:

Thank you for requesting a proposed scope of work, schedule, and budget for the integration and clarification of several ordinances related to zoning and land use in Ann Arbor. This letter contains Clarion Associates' response to your request, and we would be happy to answer any questions or discuss this proposal at your convenience. This work will be completed by Senior Consultant Don Elliott, who would be the lead drafter and would attend all meetings in Ann Arbor. Don would be supported by firm Associate Erica Heller and would use formatting assistance from firm support staff. Our firm qualifications and resumes of key personnel are attached to this letter.

## **1. Background**

We understand that Ann Arbor's land use regulations are currently scattered among the following chapters of the municipal code:

- Chapter 26: Placement and Screening of Refuse Containers
- Chapter 47: Streets and Curb Cuts
- Chapter 55: Zoning Ordinance
- Chapter 56: Prohibited Land Uses
- Chapter 57: Subdivision and Land Use Controls (PUDs, site plans, plat standards)
- Chapter 59: Off-Street Parking
- Chapter 60: Wetlands Preservation
- Chapter 61: Signs and Outdoor Advertising
- Chapter 62: Landscaping and Screening
- Chapter 63: Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control
- Chapter 104: Fences

In some cases, a portion of the chapter listed above addresses land development and redevelopment, while other portions address topics beyond zoning and development control. There is also a 28-page

Land Development Regulations document outside the municipal code that was adopted by city council in 1997 and in fact supplements the chapters listed above in substantive ways.

We understand that some of these regulations are currently under revision. Perhaps most importantly, the city is now in the process of revising its downtown zoning districts and related character/overlay districts through the “Ann Arbor Discovering Downtown” process, and has developed an 88 page “A2D2” ordinance that further modifies existing zoning regulations. The city’s sign regulations are also being revised and the city is developing an ordinance regulating floodplains.

Not only does this dispersion of related topics make it difficult for the public and potential investors to know what they (or their neighbors) can do with their land, it also leads to inadvertent repetition and inconsistencies. While Ann Arbor is not alone in this situation – in fact, it is relatively common – there is much that can be done to present this information in a more coherent, consistent, concise, and user-friendly manner. Often, this takes the form of a “Unified Development Code” (UDC). We are currently engaged in an effort to integrate and streamline eight different land use ordinances for the city of Duluth, Minnesota, to achieve that result.

In many communities, efforts to reorganize existing materials in a consistent, user-friendly format often get bogged down or sidetracked in discussions about what the plan or law should be rather than what it is. For that reason, some cities separate their efforts to streamline and integrate land use laws from discussions about substantive changes to those laws, and we understand that Ann Arbor would like to follow that approach. More specifically, we understand that Ann Arbor would like to retain a consultant to integrate those ordinances and documents listed above (although in some cases the integration may cover only part of a chapter if the remainder was determined to be unrelated to zoning, subdivision, or land development. We understand that Ann Arbor would like its code integration project to be jointly managed by the City Attorney’s Office and the Planning and Development Services Unit, and the point of contact would be the City Attorney’s Office. Clarion Associates has completed “code reorganization” projects of this type for Oro Valley, Arizona, and Englewood, Colorado, among others, and we are currently in the final stages of completing a similar project for the affluent, highly educated, and often litigious community of Bainbridge Island, Washington.

In addition to the scattering of development standards over eleven different chapters of the municipal code, the current ordinances include the following changes that we will address during this project

1. **Difficult navigation.** The city’s old-style “pyramid” zoning structure means that users often have to “flip back” to earlier chapters to find key information. For example, in section 5:10-3(2)(a) the list of principal permitted uses in the R-2A zone includes “Any permitted principal use or special exception use allowed in the R1 districts, subject to all the regulations that apply in that district.” Reorganization, good page layout, and the use of graphics, tables, and flowcharts can greatly improve this situation.
2. **“Clean up” changes.** Ann Arbor has compiled a draft working list of minor changes that it would like to see incorporated in the new unified development code where possible. While it is common to include clarifying and “clean up” changes in a code integration project, it will be important to carefully footnote all changes and to avoid any minor changes that may in fact have far-reaching impacts.
3. **Lack of clarity.** Even seasoned code users on the Ann Arbor staff who have studied the code in depth find the answers to specific questions elusive which could lead to inconsistency over time.
4. **Dated and incomplete material.** Many development regulations are out of date and/or have unintended gaps in their coverage. As an example, although Chapter 55 makes several references to “hotel” and “hotel-motel” neither of those terms are defined, and terms like “apartment” and “multi-family” dwelling are also not defined, leading to confusion as to the

intended differences between those terms. Adult foster care, site condominiums, and treatment of various public facilities are among those additional topics that are addressed inadequately.

5. **Minor inconsistencies with state law.** Over time, state enabling laws change, changes in federal law generate new state legislation, and state court decisions interpret or limit municipal land use powers in different ways, and the current regulations may not always be consistent with those laws and decisions.
6. **Inconsistent use of terms.** As the 11 different Ann Arbor development ordinances have been adopted and amended over the years, key terms have been used inconsistently in different chapters – or even within the same chapter. Like other cities, terms like “building”, “structure,” “development”, or “adjacent” may not have the same meanings when used in different contexts. Terms like “floor area ratio” and “usable floor area” use similar phrases for dimensions that may in fact be measured differently.

The goal of our efforts will be to address these weaknesses and to produce an integrated, internally consistent, and user-friendly version of the current development regulations that is:

- **Comprehensive** -- i.e. does not require reference to other ordinances to determine what standards govern development and redevelopment
- **Clear** -- i.e., internally consistent
- **Usable** -- by both seasoned code users and the public at large
- **Enforceable and Legally Defensible** – i.e., based on objective standards and consistent with Michigan enabling laws
- **Adaptable** – i.e., structured to make it easy to amend or to add/delete provisions in the future.

Finally, we understand that Ann Arbor would like to keep its citizens' well informed about this project and draw on their opinions about what would be truly “user-friendly”, but to avoid raising expectations that this effort will include substantive changes to the current regulations. Clarion Associates believes that when cities engage in comprehensive planning efforts or substantive changes to development codes, broad public participation programs are appropriate, but in code reorganization projects a more limited approach is appropriate. In general, we use a three-phase approach to public involvement based on:

- **Initial Comments:** The public needs to be aware that the project is underway and the scope of the project (i.e., no substantive changes), and to have an early opportunity to give their comments on how they would like to see materials integrated and streamlined and clarified;
- **Draft Reviews:** The public needs opportunities to review and respond to draft materials as they are presented; and
- **Final Reviews:** The public needs an opportunity to review and respond to the complete draft Unified Development Code before it is introduced for adoption hearings.

## 2. Proposed Scope of Work

Clarion Associates intends to achieve these goals through the four step work plan outlined below.

### Task 1: Project Kickoff

Project staff will make a two day trip to Ann Arbor to meet with key City staff to discuss specific problems in the use, interpretation, application, and enforcement of the current development regulations. We suggest that the City assemble a Technical Working Group to discuss, help organize, and consolidate comments from various departmental perspectives into consolidated guidance to Clarion throughout the project, and we would meet with that group during this trip. In addition, we will meet with those who use

the development regulations on a regular basis (land developers, surveyors, builders, and citizen groups engaged in regular review and comment of development applications). We will ask the City staff to organize an evening meeting at a public venue to explain the scope of the project and identify future opportunities for public involvement. We recommend that the city create a project update page on its web site to and that it keep an open-ended e-mail list so that anyone who makes an inquiry is automatically added to the list and will receive future notices and draft materials when they are available. If recommendations for substantive changes to development regulations are made, Clarion will collect them in a "Suggestions for Future Changes" document so that the public understands that their ideas are being heard but will not be included in the current UDC work.

Although the goal of this effort is to avoid substantive changes to the current regulations, sometimes that cannot be helped. For example, when we discover inadvertent omissions or resolve an inconsistency between regulations, correcting those minor mistakes may change how future applications are handled and what decisions are made by the City. Since these types of "substantive" changes are unavoidable, we will clarify that they will be footnoted in draft materials as they are produced. This helps keep staff, elected officials, and the public informed and helps defuse later objections during the UDC adoption phase. Our kickoff meetings will clarify this approach for the public.

## **Task 2: Diagnosis and Annotated Outline of the UDC**

Based on the results of Task 1, we will prepare a diagnosis of the city's current regulations and an annotated outline of the new Ann Arbor Unified Development Code. This document will identify weaknesses to be addressed, will reorganize and integrate materials from the existing development regulations, and will identify where each existing regulation will be found in the new UDC. In addition, the annotated outline will indicate where Clarion Associates intends to use tables, flowcharts, or illustrations to consolidate and convey information. Among other changes, the Annotated Outline will recommend that definitions of terms from all 11 chapters be consolidated into a single definitions section of the UDC, and will include those changes required for consistency with Michigan law identified by City staff. We will also include those clarifying changes and indicate where new definitions and standards will be added to improve administration without raising development policy issues.

The Diagnosis and Annotated Outline will also identify cases where we recommend that technical material be removed from the code and placed in an administrative manual. For example, most readers of development codes are looking for information regarding permitted land uses, building dimensions, landscaping, or parking, and are not interested in reading detailed lists of which documents need to be submitted for each type of application. In recent years many cities have moved those types of detailed application lists to an administrative document that can be updated more easily, and to help focus the UDC on larger topics of more general interest.

Finally, the document will explain the pros and cons of the various tools being recommended. For example, almost all cities prefer the use of consolidated tables to identify permitted and special uses available in each district, the dimensional standards applicable to lots in each district, and parking standards applicable to each permitted use (among others), but the use of those tables affects how future amendments need to be made. Instead of simply drafting and adding a freestanding chapter at the end of the UDC, the provisions of a future new district will need to be integrated into revised tables. As a second example, many codes contain repetitive paragraphs or clauses that can instead be stated one time in one place, but that sometimes requires readers to look in a different place for those materials. It is important that City staff understand and agree with the proposed code integration approaches being recommended before we commence the actual drafting of the UDC. Because many cities are now considering the adoption of "form-based" zoning districts, and those districts often differ significantly from more "traditional" districts in both content and structure, we will discuss how those types of districts might be incorporated into the UDC in the future.

We will ask key City staff to review and comment on the Diagnosis and Annotated Outline and will present them in a “webinar” format where we can review and discuss the document while viewing it on a shared screen view. Following the webinar review we will ask City staff to consolidate and return its comments in a consolidated memo or a “markup” of the document itself. The document would then be posted on the city’s project web page and the e-mail list notified of its availability for comment. We would also make a second visit to Ann Arbor to present the Diagnosis and Annotated Outline – as well as staff comments on that document – in a public meeting. Following that meeting, we will ask the city to review any public comments received and forward to Clarion Associates any that it would like addressed in the UDC. Throughout the project, we will be happy to receive and incorporate comments from the public, but only after those comments have been routed through City staff. Not only does this give staff a chance to consider how public recommendations would affect administration of the UDC, but it clarifies to the public that we do not want to have “side conversations” going on between the public (or special interest groups) and the consulting team.

We will not produce a revised version of the Diagnosis and Annotated Outline document, but will instead incorporate requested changes into the UDC itself in Task 3.

### **Task 3: Drafting the UDC**

Once the Annotated Outline has been reviewed and comments received, Clarion Associates will begin to draft the UDC. This document will re-organize the existing materials from the 11 chapters listed above and will be extensively footnoted in two ways. One type of footnote will simply clarify the source of the paragraph or section at hand – for example “This material is carried over from Chapter 5:167 *Required Parking*.” The second type will identify where changes have been made – for example “The current code does not apply this provision to the R6 Mobile Home Park district, but that omission was inadvertent and the new language includes that district” or “The current regulations are inconsistent as to whether this standard applies to multi-family development, but staff’s interpretation has been that it does not apply, and that code language now reflects that interpretation.”

Based on past experience, we know that there will be many cases where we will need City staff’s guidance in order to reconcile inconsistencies, fill inadvertent gaps, or clarify current City practices. We will establish a standing (probably weekly or bi-weekly) phone call schedule to review these issues with staff or (at staff’s option) simply list them in periodic e-mails for staff to respond to.

We will produce three drafts of the UDC: First, we will produce a Staff Draft for internal review by key City staff. This allows staff to correct any misstatements of fact or misunderstandings among staff or between staff and consultants before the document is reviewed by the public. In addition, it gives staff the opportunity to identify changes that Clarion believed were “technical” but that are in fact politically sensitive and should be removed for consideration as part of the “Suggestions for Future Changes” list. The Staff Draft will be reviewed in depth through the use of the webinar format and shared screen view described above.

Second, we will produce a Public Draft of the UDC for posting on the City’s web page and discussion at a public meeting. As noted, this draft will not only reorganize and integrate the ordinances listed above, but will make clarifying changes to improve code understanding and consistency of administration, provided that those changes do not change current development policy, and will footnote those changes. During our third visit to Ann Arbor, our presentation of the Public Draft will include a review of the revised UDC structure, will highlight any unavoidable substantive changes, and will offer an opportunity for questions, clarifications, and suggestions as to how the structure and format of the draft UDC could be changed to make it more consistent and user-friendly.

Finally, based on reaction to the Public Draft, we will prepare an Adoption Draft of the Unified Development Code. This will represent the code that staff intends to introduce for adoption through the

City's standard public hearing process – although further changes can of course be made to the UDC during that process.

Although we sometimes break this type of project down into “Modules” – for example, one module addressing zone districts and uses, another addressing development standards, and a third addressing procedures and definitions, we do not think that is necessary in this case. After reviewing the existing Ann Arbor zoning and development regulation chapters, we believe it would be better to prepare a single draft of the proposed UDC for review by the staff and then the public. Doing so will help reduce project costs, allow us to complete the project within one year, and reinforce the “technical” nature of the work in the eyes of the public. If you want the work divided into “modules”, however, we can do that and can quantify the time and cost tradeoffs for you.

#### **Task 4: Adoption of the UDC**

At this point, the UDC will be ready for consideration by the Planning Commission and by the City Council. Clarion Associates will assist in preparing a PowerPoint presentation for each group identifying the structure of the UDC, the advantages of that structure, how comments from the public have been incorporated, and where unavoidable substantive changes have been made. In addition, we will deliver to the city the final “Suggestions for Future Changes” document discussed above and, at staff’s option, we will be happy to discuss that list with the Planning Commission and/or City Council. In our experience, this often helps with adoption, because last minute requests for substantive changes to the UDC can be added to that list and the public can be assured that the adoption of the UDC does not foreclose opportunities for substantive changes in the future. Clarion would make two trips to Ann Arbor to present these materials during the adoption process.

### **3. Proposed Schedule**

The proposed schedule below illustrates how Clarion Associates will structure the various tasks in order to complete the four tasks outlined above over the next 14 months. This schedule assumes that a contract can be negotiated and signed so that we can start work in October 2009, but if that is not possible then each month listed in the timeline would be adjusted accordingly. Clarion Associates will be available to start work on the review of Ann Arbor regulations and related documents in October 2009, and could make an initial visit to Ann Arbor in October or November 2009.

In addition, this timeline assumes that the integrated code adoption process can be completed in three months, but in practice we find that timeline is sometimes extended if the city decides to provide additional hearings or opportunities for input. Finally, as noted above, if Ann Arbor would like this material prepared and presented in topical “modules,” that would extend the project timeframe. We would be happy to discuss adjustments to this proposed schedule with you and adjust it if necessary to fit in with other City initiatives or timing constraints.

	2009			2010										
	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov
<b>Task 1 Project Kickoff</b>														
1 Trip to Ann Arbor Interviews with staff and stakeholders		M												
<b>Task 2 Annotated Outline</b>														
Deliverable: Diagnosis & Annotated Outline 1 Web conference to review document 1 Trip to Ann Arbor 1 Public Meeting to present document			W	M										
<b>Task 3 Drafting UDC</b>														
Deliverable: Staff Draft 1 Web conference to review document							W	M						
Deliverable: Public Draft 1 Trip to Ann Arbor 1 Public Meeting to present document										M				
Deliverables: Adoption Draft Suggestions for Future Changes														
<b>Task 4 Adoption of UDC</b>														
1 Trip to present UDC at planning comm. 1 Trip to present UDC at city council													M	M
<b>M = Meeting in Ann Arbor W = Web Meeting with Ann Arbor staff</b>														

#### 4. Proposed Budget

Our proposed budget for this work is shown on the following page. The total budget represents a not-to-exceed amount. Clarion Associates will bill consultant time at the rates shown in the budget, and will bill project expenses (primarily travel expenses) at actual cost, subject to the budget cap shown. The budget breakdown between individual tasks would remain subject to discussion and adjustment between Clarion Associates and the city, however, and monies could be reallocated between tasks in order to meet the needs of the project, as long as the total budget shown was not exceeded.

As noted in the text above, this budget includes preparation of the UDC and all related tables and charts. It also includes the integration of any existing graphics or illustrations or those provided to us by the City for insertion (as well as inclusion of illustrations we have in our files). It does not include the drawing of new illustrations or the drafting of new substantive zoning provisions. It assumes that changes required by Michigan law will be provided to us by the City staff (i.e., it does not include funds for us to complete our own research on changes to Michigan zoning, subdivision, or environmental law. We would be happy to discuss this budget with you and to answer any questions you may have about the allocations of work.

TASK	CLARION STAFF			TOTAL
	Elliott	Heller	Support Staff	
Hourly Billing Rate	\$180	\$100	\$55	
<b>TASK 1: PROJECT KICKOFF</b>				
Hours	24	24	0	
Total Fees	\$4,320	\$2,400	\$0	
Number of Trips	1	1		
Travel Expenses*	\$700	\$700		
<b>TASK TOTAL</b>	<b>\$5,020</b>	<b>\$3,100</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$8,120</b>
<b>TASK 2: DIAGNOSIS &amp; ANNOTATED OUTLINE</b>				
Hours	64	32	40	
Total Fees	\$11,520	\$3,200	\$2,200	
Number of Trips	1		1	
Travel Expenses*	\$700	\$0	\$700	
<b>TASK TOTAL</b>	<b>\$12,220</b>	<b>\$3,200</b>	<b>\$2,900</b>	<b>\$18,320</b>
<b>TASK 3: DRAFT UDC</b>				
Staff Draft	72	80	80	
Public Draft	64	40	24	
Adoption Draft	40	40	24	
Hours	176	160	128	
Total Fees	\$31,680	\$16,000	\$7,040	
Number of Trips	1	1	0	
Travel Expenses*	\$700	\$700	\$0	
<b>TASK TOTAL</b>	<b>\$32,380</b>	<b>\$16,700</b>	<b>\$7,040</b>	<b>\$56,120</b>
<b>TASK 4: UDC ADOPTION</b>				
Hours	48		16	
Total Fees	\$8,640	\$0	\$880	
Number of Trips	2	0	0	
Travel Expenses*	\$1,400	\$0	\$0	
<b>TASK TOTAL</b>	<b>\$10,040</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$880</b>	<b>\$10,920</b>
<b>PROJECT SUBTOTALS</b>				
FEES	\$56,160	\$21,600	\$10,120	
TRAVEL	\$3,500	\$1,400	\$700	
OTHER EXPENSES			\$4,000	
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>\$59,660</b>	<b>\$23,000</b>	<b>\$14,820</b>	<b>\$97,480</b>

## 5. Firm Qualifications and Resumes

See attached pages

Once again, we thank the City of Ann Arbor for requesting these materials and look forward to discussing them with you at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,



Donald L. Elliott, FAICP  
Senior Consultant



# Clarion Associates

Clarion Associates is a national land-use consulting firm with offices in Denver and Fort Collins, Colorado; Chapel Hill, North Carolina; and affiliate offices in Chicago, Philadelphia, and Cincinnati. Our unusual combination of talents in land use and urban planning, design, land use law, and real estate economics allows us to develop creative solutions to difficult land use and design questions. Clarion is particularly known for its expertise in land use and plan implementation. Clarion Associates has represented both private and public sector clients on a variety of land-use planning and zoning matters. Its principals have written plans and drafted ordinances, regulations and design standards throughout the United States.

Since its founding in 1992, the firm has developed expertise in a broad range of planning areas, including:

- Community, regional, and neighborhood planning;
- Downtown and suburban zoning systems;
- Design standards and development regulations;
- Historic preservation;
- Development financing;
- Downtown plans and strategies;
- Growth management strategies for cities and regions;
- Sustainable community planning and development codes;
- Citizen participation strategies; and
- Implementation strategies.

Clarion is particularly known for our expertise in:

## **PLANNING AND ZONING**

Clarion Associates has represented both public AND private sector clients on a variety of land-use plans, design guidelines and standards, and ordinances and regulations throughout the United States, with particular emphasis on historic preservation, design standards, natural resource protection, and both downtown and suburban zoning systems. The firm is a leader in developing a model sustainable community development code.

## **MARKET ANALYSIS**

The members of Clarion Associates have diverse backgrounds in finance, economics, marketing, planning, urban design, environmental studies, political science and land use law. With integration of this combination of skills, we develop creative solutions to difficult real estate questions. Clarion Associates has extensive experience in analyzing the market for every type of property—including residential, office, industrial, major mixed-use developments, convention centers, large transportation facilities, tourism complexes—in a variety of locations such as suburban sites, downtowns, lakefronts, and rural areas.

## **DEVELOPMENT ECONOMICS**

Clarion specializes in advising public sector clients on the economics and fiscal impacts of development proposals, incentives needed to encourage development, and other aspects of project feasibility. We have analyzed the economics of numerous types of real estate development in both urban and rural contexts and the impacts of proposed plans and cost recovery systems on different forms of development.

## Donald L. Elliott, FAICP



Don Elliott is a Senior Consultant with Clarion Associates of Colorado, LLC, a national consulting firm with offices in Denver, Fort Collins, and Chapel Hill; and affiliate offices in Chicago, Philadelphia, and Cincinnati. Mr. Elliott's practice focuses on land planning and zoning, growth management, and international land and urban development issues. Prior to joining Clarion, Mr. Elliott was Project Director for the Denver Planning and Community Development Office and was responsible for the Gateway Project and the Downtown Zoning Project. He has also advised numerous local governments in Russia on land use issues, served as Democracy and Governance Advisor for USAID in Uganda, and practiced real estate, zoning, and land use law with the Denver law firm of Davis, Graham & Stubbs. He is the author of [A Better Way to Zone](#) (Island Press 2008).

### Representative Major Projects

- Philadelphia, Pennsylvania | Zoning Code Revision (in process)
- Detroit, Michigan | Zoning Code Revision
- Winnipeg, Manitoba | Zoning Code Revision
- Kalamazoo, Michigan | Zoning Ordinance Revision
- Duluth, Minnesota | Unified Development Code (in process)
- Long Beach, California | Independent Study of Redevelopment
- Nashville, Tennessee | Urban Overlay Zoning Ordinance
- Mesa County, Colorado | Land Development Code
- Routt County, Colorado | Stagecoach Redevelopment Plan
- Cedar Rapids, Iowa | Zoning Ordinance

### Professional History

- Democracy and Governance Advisor, USAID, Kampala, Uganda
- Urbanization Consultant, CHF International, Washington, DC and New Delhi, India
- Real Estate Attorney, Planning and Development Collaborative, Washington, D.C., and St. Petersburg, Russia
- Director of Downtown Zoning and Gateway Projects, City and County of Denver
- Real Estate Attorney and Associate, Davis, Graham & Stubbs, Denver, Colorado

### Education

- Master of City and Regional Planning, Harvard J.F.K. School of Government
- Juris Doctor, Cum Laude, Harvard Law School
- Bachelor of Science, Summa Cum Laude, Yale University
- Nathaniel Rogg Fellowship, Harvard/MIT Joint Center for Urban Studies

### Professional Associations

- Fellow, American Institute of Certified Planners
- American Planning Association: President of Colorado Chapter (1992-1994) -- Outstanding Chapter Project Award; Chairman of National Planning and Law Division (1997-2000) --, Winner, Division Achievement Award, Amicus Curiae Committee (1995-1999), National/State Policy Coordinating Committee (1991-1995), and International Division (1991-)
- Member of American, Colorado, and Denver Bar Associations

## Erica Heller, AICP



Erica Heller is an Associate Planner with Clarion Associates, based in Denver, Colorado. Ms. Heller works in the areas of land use planning, neighborhood planning, redevelopment/revitalization, growth management, and zoning. Prior to joining Clarion Associates, she worked as a Redevelopment Specialist for the Lakewood Reinvestment Authority and as a Long-Range Planner for the City of Lakewood, Colorado. She was involved with redevelopment area designation, redevelopment project planning and implementation, transit mixed use planning and implementation tools, and neighborhood plan development and implementation.

### Representative Major Projects

- Development Code Update | Marana, Arizona
- Blueprint Boise Comprehensive Plan and Development Code Update | Boise, Idaho
- Wind Energy Conversion Systems Ordinance | Anchorage, Alaska
- Redevelopment Governance Structures Study | San Diego, California
- Enhancing Airport Land Use Compatibility Report & Model Code | Transportation Research Board
- Development Code Update | Sacramento County, California
- Community Plan Update Analysis | Bozeman, Montana
- Industrial District Code Revisions | Sparks, Nevada
- 104<sup>th</sup> Street Area Blight Study | Thornton, Colorado
- Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for San Francisco International Airport | San Mateo County Council of Governments, California
- Daniels Garden Neighborhood Plan | Lakewood, Colorado

### Professional History

- Associate, Clarion Associates, 2006 – present
- Redevelopment Specialist, Lakewood Reinvestment Authority, 2004 – 2006
- Neighborhood Planner, City of Lakewood, Colorado 2002 – 2006
- Sustainable Development Research Consultant, San Francisco, CA 1998-1999

### Education

- Masters in Public Policy, University of Colorado 2001
- Certificate in Community Economic Development, San Diego State University 1997
- Bachelor of Arts, Yale University 1994

### Publications

- "Practice Renewable Energy: Urban Wind Turbines." *Zoning Practice*. American Planning Association: July 2008.
- Contributing author, *Sustainable Community Development Code*. Clarion Associates and Rocky Mountain Land Use Institute. (Forthcoming, 2009 - Beta Version released April, 2008).

### Professional Associations

- Member, American Institute of Certified Planners
- Member, American Planning Association
- Member, Local Government Commission