URBAN RENEWAL STUDY

Columbia
TUSCULUM

Documentation of a Blight or Deterioration

The purpose of this study is to determine if the Columbia Tusculum Redevelopment Area qualifies as a blighted or deteriorating area as defined by Chapter 725 of the Cincinnati Municipal Code, Urban Renewal.

1. Boundary Description

The findings of this eligibility study are based on surveys and analysis of the parcels and structures contained in the study area. The boundaries are depicted on the map and described as follows:

Situate in the City of Cincinnati, Hamilton County, State of Ohio:

Beginning at a point, said point being the intersection of the centerlines of Delta Avenue and Eastern Avenue; thence southeastwardly with the centerline of Eastern Avenue to the point of intersection with the westwardly extension of the south parcel line of Parcel 48, Plat Book 27, Page 1, HCAP; thence eastwardly along said parcel line extended and said line to the southeast corner of said Parcel 48; thence northwardly along the east parcel line of said Parcel 48 and said parcel line extended to the centerline of Stanley Avenue; thence eastwardly along the centerline of Stanley Avenue to the point of intersection with the northwestwardly extension of the west parcel line of Parcel 69, Plat Book 27, Page 1, HCAP; thence southeastwardly along said parcel line extended and said parcel line to the southwest corner of said parcel; thence northeastwardly along the south parcel line of said Parcel 69 to the northwest corner of Parcel 13, Plat Book 21, Page 1, HCAP; thence southwardly along the west parcel line of said parcel to the north parcel line of Parcel 170, Plat Book 27, Page 1, HCAP; thence westwardly along said parcel line to the northwest corner of said parcel; thence southeastwardly along the western parcel line of said Parcel 171 and continuing along the west parcel line of Parcels 72, 74, 75, and 156, Plate Book 27, Page 1, HCAP; to the southwest corner of said Parcel 156; thence eastwardly along the south parcel line of said parcel and along said parcel line extended to the centerline of Columbia Parkway; thence northwestwardly with said centerline to

the point of intersection with the southwestwardly extension of the southeast parcel line of Parcel 174, Plat Book 27, Page 1, HCAP; thence northeastwardly along said parcel line extended and said line and continuing along the southeast parcel line of Parcels 83, 84, and 85, Plat Book 27, Page 1, HCAP to the east corner of said Parcel 85; thence northwestwardly along the northeast parcel line of said Parcel 85 and along said parcel line extended to the centerline of Stanley Avenue; thence northeastwardly with said centerline to the point of intersection with the southeastwardly extension of the northeast parcel line of Parcel 41, Plat Book 27, Page 1, HCAP; thence northwestwardly along said parcel line extended and said line to the north corner of said Parcel 41; thence southwestwardly along the northwest parcel line of said parcel to the east corner of Parcel 33, Plat Book 27, Page 1, HCAP; thence northwestwardly along the northeast parcel line of said parcel and along said parcel line extended to the intersection with the centerline of Strafer Street, said point being the point of intersection with the southeastwardly extension of the parcel line of parcel 120, Plat Book 28, Page 5, HCAP; thence northwestwardly along said parcel line extended and continuing along the northeast parcel line of Parcels 118, 117, 116, and 115, Plat Book 28, Page 5, HCAP to the north corner of said Parcel 115; thence southwestwardly along the northwest parcel line of said Parcel 115 to the east corner of Parcel 158, Plat Book 28, page 5, HCAP; thence northwestwardly along the northeast parcel line of said parcel along said parcel line extended to the centerline of McDowell Street; thence southwestwardly with said centerline to the point of intersection with the southeastwardly extension of the northeast parcel line of Parcel 63, Plat Book 28, Page 5, HCAP; thence northwestwardly along said parcel line extended and said parcel line to the east corner of said parcel; thence westwardly along the northeast parcel line of said 63 and continuing along the northeast parcel of Parcels 62 and 59, Plat Book 28, Page 5, HCAP and along said parcel line and extended of said Parcel 59 to the centerline of Hoge Street; thence northwardly along said centerline to the point of intersection with the southeastwardly extension of the northeast parcel line of Parcel 48, Plat Book 28, Page 5, HCAP; thence northwestwardly along said line extended and said parcel line and continuing along the northeast parcel line of Parcels 47, 46, 45, 44, 43, and 42, Plat Book 28, Page 5, HCAP to the point of angle int he existing R-5 and B-4 zone dividing line; thence northwardly along said line to its intersection with the southeast extension of the east parcel line of Parcel 102, Plat Book 26, Page 1, HCAP continuing along the northeast parcel line of Parcels 101, 100, 99, and 98, Plat Book 26, Page

1, HCAP to the intersection with the centerline of Widman Place; thence northwestwardly along said centerline to its intersection with the centerline of Delta Avenue; thence northeastwardly along said centerline to its intersection with the southeastwardly extension of the north parcel line of Parcel 148, Plat Book 28, Page 4, HCAP; thence northwestwardly along said line extended and said parcel line and continuing along the northwest parcel line of Parcel 147, Plat Book 28, Page 4, HCAP to the north corner of said parcel; thence southwestwardly along the northwest parcel line of Parcels 147, 131, 104, 68, 67, and 66 to the north corner of Parcel 65, Plat Book 28, Page 4, HCAP; thence southwestwardly along the irregular northwest parcel line of said parcel following the general directions and distances; thence southeastwardly 14.52 feet; thence southwestwardly 15 feet; thence southeastwardly 28 feet; thence southwestwardly along the northwest parcel line of Parcels 65, 64, and 96, Plat Book 28, Page 4, HCAP; thence northwestwardly along the northeast parcel line of Parcel 44, Plat Book 28, page 4, HCAP to the north corner of said parcel; thence southwestwardly along the northwest parcel line of Parcel 44, Plat Book 28, Page 4, HCAP and continuing along the extension of said northwest parcel line to the point of intersection with the centerline of Columbia Parkway; thence southeastwardly with the centerline of Columbia Parkway to the point of intersection with the centerline of Delta Avenue; thence southwestwardly with the centerline of Delta Avenue to the point of intersection with the centerline of Eastern Avenue, said point being the point and place of beginning.

II. Conditions of Study Area

A. As a whole, fifty-six (56) of sixty-three (63), equaling eighty-nine (89) percent of structures/vacant parcels in the study area fulfilled the criteria identified in the Cincinnati Municipal Code Section 725-1-b (a), Blighted Area. All blocks within the study area show the presence of the following blighted factors.

1. Age

   Fifty-one (51) percent of the buildings in the study area are forty (40) years of age or greater.

2. Obsolescence

   Functional or economic obsolescence occurs in zero (0) percent of the buildings in the area.

3. Dilapidation

   Zero (0) percent of the structures in the study area were found to have dilapidation.

4. Deterioration

   Sixty-four (64) percent of the structures/vacant parcels in the study area exhibited deterioration.

5. Abandonment/Excessive Vacancies

   Abandonment/excessive vacancies (exceeding 1/3 area) were found to be present in eleven (11) percent of the structures/vacant parcels in the area.

6. Periodic Flooding

   Seventy-one (71) percent of the structures/vacant parcels in the area are subject to periodic flooding or located in a designated flood hazard.

7. Faulty Lot Layout/Overcrowding/Inadequate Loading or Parking

   This factor was found in thirty (30) percent of the structures/vacant parcels in the study area.

8. Deleterious or Incompatible Land Use/Inadequate Site Conditions/Environmentally Hazardous Conditions

   This factor was found to be present in sixty-seven (67) percent of the structures/vacant

parcels in the study area.

9. Inadequate Public Facilities or Right-of-Way

This factor was found in fifty-two (52) percent of the structures/vacant parcels in the study area.

10. Diversity of Ownership

Diversity of ownership was not a factor, it included zero (0) percent of the structures/vacant parcels.

11. Illegal Use/Code Violation

These factors were found in fourteen (14) percent of the structures/vacant parcels in the area.

12. Unsuitable Soil Conditions

Two (2) percent of the structures/vacant parcels exhibited this factor.

13. Unused Railroads or Service Stations, Landfills/Junkyards

These factors were not found in any of the structures/vacant parcels in the area.

14. Other factors inhibiting sound private development

Three (3) percent of the structures/vacant parcels exhibited this factor.

B. Structures and vacant parcels meeting the criteria are reasonably distributed throughout the area. At least fifty (50) percent of the total number of structures reasonably distributed throughout the area meet the "blighted area" criteria with three or more factors and vacant parcels with two or more factors (see distribution chart).

C. Additionally, at least fifty (50) percent of the structures, reasonably distributed throughout the area are deteriorated or deteriorating; or the public improvements are in a general state of deterioration (see factor 4 above).

The conclusion drawn from this data is that the number, degree and distribution of blighting factors are documented in this report warrant the designation of the Columbia Tusculum Urban Renewal Area as a "blighted area" as defined by Chapter 725 of the Cincinnati Municipal Code, Urban Renewal.

STREET CONDITIONS

COLUMBIA TUSCULUM - STUDY AREA

STREET	CONDITION
Columbia Parkway	Fair
Eastern Avenue	Fair
Delta Avenue	Good
Hoge Street	Poor
McDowell Street	Fair
Strafer Street	Fair
Stanley Avenue	Poor
Broughton Street	Poor
Morris Place	Poor
Widman Place	Fair

Structural Condition

- Sound
- Minor
- Major
- Critical
- * Structure or Parcel Conrtibuting to Blight

Legend

- 6 Block Area
- 7 Parcel Number
- 5 Building Number
- Flood Plain

0 50 100 200 400 600

Columbia TUSCULUM

Blight Study

Columbia-Tusculum Blight Study
Distribution of Blighted Units by Block

Block No.	Total Units	Eligible Units	Percentage
1	8	7	88%
2	12	12	100%
3	8	8	100%
4	15	14	93%
5	10	8	80%
6	4	3	75%
7	6	4	67%
Totals	**63**	**56**	**89%**

Distribution of Blighting Factors

Block No.	Total Units	1	4	5	6	7	8	9	11	12	14
1	8	4	5	2	7	1	5	7	2		1
2	12	7	7	1	12	4	10		3		
3	8	6	7		8	2	4	8	1		
4	15	10	12	2	6	7	11	9	2	1	
5	10	2	5		6	2	7	4			1
6	4	1	1	2			3	2			
7	6	2	3		6	3	2	3	1		
Totals	**63**	**32**	**40**	**7**	**45**	**19**	**42**	**33**	**9**	**1**	**2**
Percentages		**51%**	**64%**	**11%**	**71%**	**30%**	**67%**	**52%**	**14%**	**2%**	**3%**

Credits

This plan was prepared for the Department of Economic Development by the City Planning Department and the Department of Public Works, Office of Architecture and Urban Design, with the Columbia Tusculum Neighborhood Business District Urban Design Task Force. The task force consisted of the following:

Columbia Tusculum Economic Development Corporation

John S. Van Volkenburgh, Chair

Catherine Herring, Vice Chair & Treasurer

Doug Eisele

Cindy Schrader

Kevin Veenemann

Columbia Tusculum Community Council

Theresa Conover, President

Michael Kovasckitz, Past President

Staff from the City of Cincinnati

Stephen C. Briggs, City Planning Dept.

Ken Bordwell, Neighborhood Services

Caroline Kellam, City Planning Department

Laura Kenney, Economic Development

Michael Moore, Office of Architecture and Urban Design

Tim Sharp, Office of Architecture and Urban Design

Columbia Tusculum