towards a more sustainable Buffalo Niagara

Land Use and Development

Laura Smith, Chair (Buffalo Niagara Partnership)

Jajean Rose-Burney, Facilitator (UB Regional Institute)
Agenda

• Welcomes, introductions and process update

• Review of Goals and Strategies

• Presentation of Case Studies

• Continuing our Strategy Discussion

• Administrative Review and Next steps
Working Team Process and Timeline

6 Meetings/4 Tasks

- **APR** 1 ESTABLISHING GOALS
- **MAY** 2 FRAME STRATEGIES
- **JUNE** 3 IDENTIFY ACTIONS
- **AUG** 4 CONSTRUCT INDICATORS

+2 Additional Meetings

- **SEP** Nov 2013 Community Congress Workshops
- **JAN**

**WINTER 2013** REVIEW & REFINE

At two more meetings in 2014 the working teams will consider feedback from the fall Council and Community Congress sessions.

**REGIONAL PLAN**
FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

DRAFT Plan Spring 2014
1. Maintain and create places in city, suburb, village, and countryside that are vibrant, beautiful, efficient, distinctive, have lasting value, and are loved by the people who live there.

2. Foster a pattern of development that makes wise use of resources—land, existing building stock, transportation, utilities and other infrastructure—to save money and energy and promote economic prosperity and quality of life.

3. Protect or restore our waterfronts, connect them to local communities, make them more accessible to the public, and dedicate them to “water dependent” or “water enhanced” uses.

4. Maintain, improve, expand, and increase access to our parks, recreation areas, trails and open spaces and connect them to each other and the places people live and work.

5. Protect and restore natural resources including rural and agricultural land, natural habitat, biodiversity, watersheds, air quality, water bodies and the quantity and quality of our water, as well as the ecological services that natural resources provide.
6. Promote the adaptive reuse of residential, commercial, industrial, and ecclesiastical building stock to preserve embedded energy, neighborhood integrity, and heritage.

7. Manage abandoned industrial and commercial land and neighborhoods in decline to minimize negative impacts now and prepare their resources for timely and appropriate reuse.

8. Create communities that are resilient and adaptable, that can serve the region’s needs even as population, demographics, climate, and other factors fluctuate.

9. Improve public literacy about planning and build public support for regional planning and smart growth policies.
A: Structure and Process of Land Use Planning

1. Create a regional planning body.*

2. Define a land use concept for the region.

3. Broaden the base of public service provision.

4. Redesign revenue-raising structures to promote land use goals.

5. Build support for regional planning through public engagement and reaching more diverse stakeholders.

*Develop planning capacity at the municipal level.
B: Strategies for Redevelopment

1. Establish mechanisms to manage declining or devalued properties, neighborhoods and districts.

C: Strategies for Protecting Natural Resources

1. Identify important and sensitive natural resources and natural places.

2. Provide incentive to preserve natural areas, rural land, and farms.

3. Plan at the watershed scale considering both land use and water use.
Case Studies

Achieving Smart Growth through:

1. Regional Planning Bodies
2. Provision of Public Services
3. Revenue Raising Structures
Case Studies

1. Regional Planning Bodies
Case Studies

Regional Planning Commissions

Capitol District Regional Planning Council
• Albany, Rensselaer, Saratoga, Schenectady counties
• Established as regional planning board in 1967 by cooperative agreement, evolved to commission
• 20 board members, 5 each county
• Local governments maintain land use planning
• CDRPC provides data, technical assistance, reports
• Financed by state and federal grants, county contributions
Case Studies

Regional Planning Commissions

Portland Metro
• Serves 1.5M+ residents in three counties, 25 cities
• President elected at-large, six district councilors
• Manages state-mandated Urban Growth Boundary
• Operates transportation, waste disposal, zoo, solid waste management and recycling, habitat preservation and restoration, conference center.
• Funded by property taxes, fees, state and federal grants, voter-approved bond issues, other.
Case Studies

2. Provision of Public Services
Case Studies

Regional Special Purpose Districts

• Independent governmental units that exist separately from local government.
• Serve limited areas and have governing boards that accomplish legislatively assigned functions using public funds.
• Most provide only a single service, like airports, mass transit, fire protection, libraries, parks, sewerage, solid waste, water supply.
• There are 9,500 special purpose districts in New York State, although many are not regional. (fire districts, public authorities)
• Nearly all have elected boards empowered to levy taxes or issue debt directly or through another local government.
Case Studies
Regional special purpose districts

Regional Transportation District of Denver-Aurora-Boulder Colorado
• Est. 1969 by Colorado legislature
• Independent entity covers 8 counties
• Operates multi-modal regional transit system
• Leads TOD projects in transit station areas
• 15-member board elected by districts
• 2500+ employees
• Funded by sales + use taxes, fares, federal operating assistance, capital grants, local contributions
Case Studies

Shared Services Agreements

- Cooperative service arrangements between two or more local governments meant to create economic efficiencies.
- Includes mergers of departments, or one government paying another for a service.
- Widespread in New York State: Town and Village highway departments is most common (from sharing equipment to merging). Other services include parks and recreation, public safety,

#oneregionfwd
Case Studies

3. Revenue Raising Structures
Case Studies

Tax-base sharing

• Each municipality shares in the increase in property value that occurs in a specific area after a certain date.
• Aims to balance the cost and benefit of development among local governments in an area.
Case Studies

Tax-base sharing

**Twin Cities (Minneapolis-St.Paul) Minnesota**

- A metropolitan council governing Minnesota’s Twin Cities was created by state legislation.
- Redistributes hundreds of millions of dollars annually to 200 local jurisdictions in seven counties.
- Fiscal Disparities Program takes 40 percent of the growth in commercial-industrial tax base in each municipality in each year into a seven-county, regional pool and then distributes the tax base back to participating municipalities and school districts based on tax base and population.
- Justification: Commercial and industrial development is largely financed by regional and state finding. If the cost is shared, why not the benefit?
- Goal: minimize fiscal disparities
Case Studies

Land Transfer Agreements

• A town may have an economic development project, but no land available with necessary infrastructure. An adjacent town may have land with infrastructure that is underutilized and/or has already been paid for.
• Land with infrastructure is transferred to the town with economic development project.
• Town with economic development project receives tax revenues from new development.
• Town with underutilized infrastructure receives payments or other services.
Case Studies

Cultural Asset Districts

• Collect revenue across a region to support assets that serve the entire region, such as zoos, museums, performing arts, and cultural organizations
Case Studies

Combined Public Services and Revenue Structures

City-County Consolidation: Nashville-Davidson County (TN)

- County, city and seven smaller municipalities merged in 1963 via Charter to combat sprawl; cited as a model of efficiency.
- Smaller municipalities (“Satellite Cities”) typically provides police services and the Metro Nashville government provides most other services.
- Metro government does land use and transportation planning.
- Governed by a Mayor and Legislative Council, which is the 40-member body of elected representatives.
- Revenue raised primarily through property taxes.
A: Structure and Process of Land Use Planning

1. “Create a regional planning body.”

• It was suggested that a practical approach might involve first establishing an Erie County Planning Board similar in form and function to the Niagara County Planning Board, with convening of an Erie-Niagara regional planning council to follow.

• The role of the Erie-Niagara regional planning council would be to conduct research, provide technical assistance, promote intergovernmental cooperation, and promote regional planning on an advisory basis.
A: Structure and Process of Land Use Planning

3. “Broaden the base of public service provision.”

• Provision of infrastructure and public services (transportation, sewer, water, schools, parks) has an impact on both the overall cost of government and on the process of land use and development.

• Such services can be better coordinated; they might also be consolidated.

• Solutions should depend on whether economic efficiencies can be achieved, land use goals can be achieved, and quality of service improved.
A: Structure and Process of Land Use Planning

4. “Redesign revenue-raising structures to promote land use goals.”

• Municipalities often compete with one another for development to secure new tax revenues, a competition that often leads to adverse land use decisions.

• We want to reduce that competition by addressing the incentives that create it.
A: Structure and Process of Land Use Planning

2. “Define a land use concept for the region.”

• The Regional Framework put forward a land use concept (“developed,” “developing,” “rural”), a policy structure (centers, corridors), and targets for development.

• One Region Forward should advance this concept, based on our new set of goals and strategies, if it does not duplicate work or simply repeat what has already been done.
A: Structure and Process of Land Use Planning
A: Structure and Process of Land Use Planning

5. “Build support for regional planning through public engagement and reaching more diverse stakeholders.”

• It’s understood that the ultimate success of planning efforts will depend on better and greater public engagement and education, continuously and as part of planning processes, and for public officials and decision makers as well as the general public.
Tell us who to contact from your organization

Help us get the word out!

1RF would like to utilize existing communication networks as we prepare for our next Community Congress this November.
If you have any questions, please feel free to contact us

Teresa Bosch de Celis  
One Region Forward Project Assistant  
tboschde@buffalo.edu

Bart Roberts  
One Region Forward Project Manager  
bjr8@buffalo.edu