

University Impact Area Solutions Study

A Strategic Plan for the Neighborhoods Surrounding the University of Cincinnati

DRAFT - September 30, 2016

city of CINCINNATI

University Impact Area Solutions Study

A Strategic Plan for the Neighborhoods
Surrounding the University of Cincinnati
DRAFT - September 30, 2016

city of CINCINNATI



Table of Contents

Acknowledgements 6-11

Executive Summary 12-13

Introduction 14-17

Existing Conditions 18-35

Planning Process 36-37

The Vision 38-39

The Five Initiatives 40-41

- Zoning & New Development 42-49
- Housing & Neighborhood Conditions 50-55
- Quality of Life 56-69
- Connectivity 70-79
- Parking 80-85

Implementation 86-127

Appendix 128-133

Acknowledgements

City of Cincinnati Mayor
John Cranley

City of Cincinnati City Manager
Harry Black
Sheila Hill-Christian, Assistant City Manager
John Juech, Assistant City Manager

City of Cincinnati City Council
Vice Mayor David Mann
President Pro-Tem Yvette Simpson
Kevin Flynn
Amy Murray
Chris Seelbach
P.G. Sittenfeld
Christopher Smitherman
Charlie Winburn
Wendell Young

City of Cincinnati City Planning Commission
Daniel Driehaus, Chair
John Schneider, Vice-Chair
City Manager Harry Black
City Councilmember Amy Murray
Rainer vom Hofe
Ronald Koetters
Byron Stallworth

Department of City Planning Director
Charles C. Graves, III

Department of City Planning Supervisor
Katherine Keough-Jurs

Department of City Planning Project Manager
Alex Peppers

Department of City Planning Staff
Ann Marie Kerby
James Weaver
Jared Ellis (Intern)
Justin Lamorella (Former Intern)
Mei Fang (Former Intern)
Nicholas Keeling (Former Intern)
Rachel Culley (Intern)
Samantha McLean (Former Intern)
Stacey Hoffman

City of Cincinnati Administration
Art Dahlberg, Director, Dept. of Buildings and Inspections
Eliot Isaac, Chief, Cincinnati Police Dept.
Maraskeshia S. Smith, Director, Dept. of Public Services
Michael Moore, Director, Dept. of Transportation and Engineering
Oscar Bedolla, Director, Dept. of Community and Economic Development
Richard A. Braun, Chief, Cincinnati Fire Dept.
Willie F. Carden, Jr., Director, Cincinnati Park Board

City of Cincinnati Department Staff
Daniel Rajaiah, Dept. of Public Services
Dennis Lechlak, Dept. of Transportation and Engineering
Diego Jordan, Dept. of Transportation and Engineering
Ed Cunningham, Dept. of Buildings and Inspections
Fred Prather, Cincinnati Fire Dept.
Jason Voelkerding, Cincinnati Police Dept.
Lonnie Wise, Dept. of Buildings and Inspections
Maris Herold, Cincinnati Police Dept. (Former)
Marissa Burroughs, Keep Cincinnati Beautiful
Mark Antrobus, Keep Cincinnati Beautiful
Martha Kelly, Dept. of Transportation and Engineering
Richard Schriewer, Dept. of Buildings and Inspections
Robert Schroer, Parking Facilities
Ross Patten, Dept. of Community and Economic Development
Steve Coldiron, Cincinnati Fire Dept.
Steve Schuckman, Cincinnati Park Board

city of CINCINNATI

University Impact Area Solutions Study Steering Committee

Anthony Carter, University of Cincinnati Police
Arn Bortz, Towne Properties
Beth Robinson, Uptown Consortium
Bill Moeller, Uptown Consortium (Former)
Catherine Ingram, Mt. Auburn Community Council
Charles Tassell, Greater Cincinnati Northern Kentucky Apartment Association
Dan Cummins, University of Cincinnati Police
Dan Schimberg, Uptown Rental Properties
Debra Merchant, University of Cincinnati Student Affairs and Services
Dee Ellingwood, TriHealth
Doug Barclay, Clifton Heights Business Association
Greg Baker, University of Cincinnati Public Safety
Greg Braun, The Heights Community Council
Jackie Mulay, University of Cincinnati Student Government
Linda Ziegler, CUF Neighborhood Association
Mary Beth McGrew, University of Cincinnati Planning + Design + Construction
Matt Bourgeois, Clifton Heights Community Urban Redevelopment Corporation
Michael Arnold, University of Cincinnati Student Government
Michael Moran, Clifton Town Meeting
Michael Santacroce, University of Cincinnati Student Government
Mike Ealy, Corryville Community Council
Rainer vom Hofe, University of Cincinnati School of Planning
Robin Brandon, Cincinnati Public Schools
Sheila Hill-Christian, City of Cincinnati
Stanley Broadnax, Mt. Auburn Community Council
Tom Erbeck, Clifton Heights Business Association

Zoning & New Development Working Group

Adam Hyland, Clifton Town Meeting
Alex Peppers, City Dept. of City Planning
Alison Rosen, CUF Resident
Anthony Carter, University of Cincinnati Police
Arn Bortz, Towne Properties
Beth Robinson, Uptown Consortium
Catherine Ingram, Mt. Auburn Community Council
Chip Holterhoff, Twelve Oaks Properties
Chip Kussmaul, CUF Resident
Christine Celsor, University of Cincinnati Planning + Design + Construction
Dan Deering, Deering Properties, Inc.
Dan Schimberg, Uptown Rental Properties
Doug Barclay, Clifton Heights Business Association
Jack Martin, CUF Resident
James Vestring, University of Cincinnati Police
Jan Checco, Ludlow 21
Jan Kussmaul, CUF Resident
Jared Ellis, City Dept. of City Planning
Jeff Weimer, University of Cincinnati Planning + Design + Construction
Joan Griggs, CUF Resident
Joe Willging, University of Cincinnati Planning + Design + Construction
Joni Torsella, CUF Resident
Jules Rosen, CUF Resident
Julie Zavon, CUF Resident
Julz Brown, CUF Resident, CUF Landlord
Katherine Keough-Jurs, City Dept. of City Planning
Kay Weaks, Corryville Community Council
Linda Ziegler, CUF Neighborhood Association
Mark Bambach, CUF Resident
Mary Beth McGrew, University of Cincinnati Planning + Design + Construction
Matt Bourgeois, Clifton Heights Community Urban Redevelopment Corporation
Matthew Walla, Kingsley + Co.
Michael Arnold, University of Cincinnati Student Government
Mike Morris, CUF Resident, University of Cincinnati Student, CUF Landlord
Patrice Eby Burke, Uptown Rental Properties
Ray Ritchie, Unique Campus Rentals
Ross Patten, City Dept. of Community and Economic Development
Sally Larson, CUF Resident
Sandra Wilson, CUF Resident
Seth Oakley, M+A Architects
Sharon Buckner, CUF Resident
Tim Kling, CUF Resident
Tom Erbeck, Clifton Heights Business Association
William Brown, CUF Landlord

Housing & Neighborhood Conditions Working Group

Alex Peppers, City Dept. of City Planning
Art Dahlberg, City Dept. of Buildings and Inspections
Benjamin Novak, Ben Properties, LLC
Charles Tassell, Greater Cincinnati/Northern Kentucky Apartment Association
Chip Holterhoff, Twelve Oaks Properties
Chip Kussmaul, CUF Resident
Craig Lloyd, CUF Resident
Dan Deering, Deering Properties, Inc.
Dan Schimberg, Uptown Rental Properties
David DelBello, Clifton Quarters
Doug Barclay, Clifton Heights Business Association
Ed Cunningham, City Dept. of Buildings and Inspections
Fred Prather, City Dept. of Fire
James Vestring, University of Cincinnati Police
James Weaver, City Dept. of City Planning
Jared Ellis, City Dept. of City Planning
Joe Willging, University of Cincinnati Planning + Design + Construction
John Wegener, Mt. Auburn Presbyterian Church
Joyce Powdrill, Uptown Consortium
Julz Brown, CUF Resident, CUF Landlord
Kay Weaks, Corryville Community Council
Lonnie Wise, City Dept. of Buildings and Inspections
Mary Beth McGrew, University of Cincinnati Planning + Design + Construction
Mike Morris, CUF Resident, University of Cincinnati Student, CUF Landlord
Monica Hardman, City Dept. of Community and Economic Development
Monte Rovekamp, CUF Landlord
Patrice Eby Burke, Uptown Rental Properties
Patty Braun, Greater Cincinnati/Northern Kentucky Apartment Association
Ray Ritchie, Unique Campus Rentals
Rick Schriewer, City Dept. of Buildings and Inspections
Sally Larson, CUF Resident
Sharon Buckner, CUF Resident
Steve Coldiron, City Dept. of Fire
Steve Gibbs, Mt. Auburn Community Council
Timothy Thornton, University of Cincinnati Police (Former)

Quality of Life Working Group

Anthony Carter, University of Cincinnati Police
Alex Peppers, City Dept. of City Planning
Bridget Bardua, City Dept. of Police
Charles Tassell, Greater Cincinnati/Northern Kentucky Apartment Association
Chip Holterhoff, Twelve Oaks Properties
Christine Celsor, University of Cincinnati Planning + Design + Construction
Dan Deering, Deering Properties, Inc.
Daniel Cummins, University of Cincinnati Student Affairs
Daniel Ogilvie, City Dept. of Police
Daniel Rajaiah, City Dept. of Public Services
Dawn Fosnaugh, Corryville Resident
Doug Barclay, Clifton Heights Business Association
Gregory Baker, University of Cincinnati Public Safety
Jack Martin, CUF Resident
James Vestring, University of Cincinnati Police
Jason Voelkerding, City Dept. of Police
Jim Nordloh, Landlord
Joe Blizzard, University of Cincinnati Alumnus
Joe Willging, University of Cincinnati Planning + Design + Construction
Katherine Keough-Jurs, City Dept. of City Planning
Kay Weaks, Corryville Community Council
Maraskeshia Smith, City Dept. of Public Services
Mariann Quinn, CUF Resident
Maris Herold, City Dept. of Police (Former), University of Cincinnati Police
Marissa Reed, Keep Cincinnati Beautiful
Mark Antrobus, Keep Cincinnati Beautiful
Mary Beth McGrew, University of Cincinnati Planning + Design + Construction
Matt Bourgeois, Clifton Heights Community Urban Redevelopment Corporation
Matt Kiel, Clean Up Cincy
Michael Arnold, University of Cincinnati Student Government
Michael Santacroce, University of Cincinnati Student Government
Mike Mills, Mills Security
Mike Morris, CUF Resident, University of Cincinnati Student, CUF Landlord
Miriam Corney, CUF Resident
Monte Rovekamp, CUF Landlord
Ray Ritchie, Unique Campus Rentals
Sally Larson, CUF Resident
Timothy Thornton, University of Cincinnati Police (Former)

Connectivity Working Group

Alex Peppers, City Dept. of City Planning
Alican Yildiz, University of Cincinnati Student
Amber David, University of Cincinnati Student
Andres De Wet, University of Cincinnati Student
Ann Marie Kerby, City Dept. of City Planning
Anna Snyder, University of Cincinnati Student
Anthony Bridgewater, University of Cincinnati Student
Anthony Pankala, Ohio Department of Transportation
Bill Moeller, Uptown Consortium (Former)
Butch Gaut, Southwest Ohio Regional Transit Authority (SORTA)
Cheryl Hardin, University of Cincinnati Student
Christine Celsor, University of Cincinnati Planning + Design + Construction
Dan Deering, Deering Properties, Inc.
Daniel Luther, Corryville Community Development Corporation
Diego Jordan, City Dept. of Transportation and Engineering
Florence Parker, Ohio/Kentucky/Indiana Regional Council of Governments
Gargi Kadoo, University of Cincinnati Student
Jack Martin, CUF Resident
James Vestring, University of Cincinnati Police
Janell Lundgren, CUF Resident
Joe Willging, University of Cincinnati Planning + Design + Construction
John Stork, CUF Resident
Karyn Loughin, University of Cincinnati Student
Martha Kelly, City Dept. of Transportation and Engineering
Matt Bourgeois, Clifton Heights Community Urban Redevelopment Corporation
Michael Moore, City Dept. of Transportation and Engineering
Mickey Edwards, University of Cincinnati Student
Monte Rovekamp, CUF Landlord
Paul Sohi, Neighborhood Stakeholder
Rainer vom Hofe, University of Cincinnati School of Planning
Rami Churi, CUF Business Owner
Ray Ritchie, Unique Campus Rentals
Samantha McLean, University of Cincinnati Student
Sandra Wilson, CUF Resident
Stefan Bruning, University of Cincinnati Student
Taylor Stephens, University of Cincinnati Student
Timothy Thornton, University of Cincinnati Police
Tony Hamburg, Clifton Heights Tavern
Trevor Smith, University of Cincinnati Student
Wen Zhang, University of Cincinnati Student

Parking Working Group

Alex Peppers, City Dept. of City Planning
Ann Marie Kerby, City Dept. of City Planning
Anne Moss, CUF Resident
Bob Schroer, City Dept. of Community and Economic Development
Chinedum Ndukwe, Kingsley + Co.
Chip Holterhoff, Twelve Oaks Properties
Chris Jenco, Jenco Brother's Candy
Dan Deering, Deering Properties, Inc.
Dennis Lechlak, City Dept. of Transportation and Engineering
Doug Barclay, Clifton Heights Business Association
Han Bo, University of Cincinnati Student
Heather Dodge, University of Cincinnati Student
Jack Martin, CUF Resident
James Vestring, University of Cincinnati Police
Joe Blizzard, University of Cincinnati Alumnus
Joe Willging, University of Cincinnati Planning + Design + Construction
Joey Jenco, Jenco Brother's Candy
Kendra Violet, University of Cincinnati Parking Services
Matt Bourgeois, Clifton Heights Community Urban Redevelopment Corporation
Michael Arnold, University of Cincinnati Student Government
Michael Moore, City Dept. of Transportation and Engineering
Mike Morris, CUF Resident, University of Cincinnati Student, CUF Landlord
Miriam Corney, CUF Resident
Ray Ritchie, Unique Campus Rentals
Sally Larson, CUF Resident
Timothy Thornton, University of Cincinnati Police (Former)

Executive Summary



The University Impact Area Solutions Study is a strategic plan for the neighborhoods surrounding the University of Cincinnati.

The vision for the future of the study area is to preserve the unique character of these diverse, multi-generational neighborhoods through appropriate density of new development, more efficient communication, education, and collaboration between neighborhood stakeholders who identify and resolve problems and issues, while working together to create realistic and implementable solutions, capitalize on existing resources, resulting in safe, clean, attractive, connected, and well-maintained neighborhoods.

There are five Initiative Areas to accomplish the overall Vision. Each Initiative Area is structured with Goals, Strategies, and Action Steps.

Zoning & New Development
To address current and future zoning to protect and enhance long-established residential, commercial, and mixed-use buildings, parks and green space, and guide new development to be in harmony with the unique fabric of the neighborhoods while still allowing them to evolve and improve.

Housing & Neighborhood Conditions
To address housing and property concerns, code violations including Zoning, Housing, Building, and Fire Codes.

Quality of Life
To improve the neighborhood experience by addressing quality of life issues such as crime and safety; trash, litter, and blight; and parties, alcohol use, noise, and public nuisances.

Connectivity
To address concerns relative to bicycle routes and safety; pedestrian mobility and safety; to increase transportation alternatives and options; and to address traffic flow and safety.

Parking
To address on-street and off-street parking.

The overall Goals within the Initiative Areas:

- Establish where growth and density should be located in the areas near the University of Cincinnati.
- Retain and promote unique cultural and architectural characteristics of the older urban neighborhoods surrounding the University of Cincinnati.
- Develop and maintain quality housing.
- Increase communication and collaboration between stakeholders.
- Collaborate between the neighborhood stakeholders and the public safety departments of both the University of Cincinnati and the City of Cincinnati to enforce laws and provide education.
- Decrease the amounts of trash, litter, and blight in the neighborhoods.
- Mitigate negative effects of large or wild parties on the neighborhoods.
- Help create a culture shift by developing new policies and education about expectations of residents and property owners in the City of Cincinnati.
- Expand options for a more efficient and connective transit system.
- Design, implement, and incentivize bicycle solutions.
- Design and implement a safe and integrated pedestrian network.
- Manage the overall flow of traffic and encourage other modes of transportation.
- Enforce parking and revise parking regulations.
- Explore and study a residential permit parking program.
- Create more parking opportunities through revisions of parking regulations and new parking lots/garages.

Introduction



Introduction

In April 2015, the Cincinnati City Planning Commission, Cincinnati City Council, City Manager Harry Black, and Mayor John Cranley asked the Department of City Planning to conduct a study in the University of Cincinnati area and established an Interim Development Control Overlay District in the CUF neighborhood while the study progressed.

After an affirmation from the City Planning Commission, on April 22, 2015, City Council established Interim Development Control (IDC) Overlay District No. 77, University Impact District for a period of three months pursuant to §1431, Interim Development Control District Regulations, of the Cincinnati Zoning Code. According to §1431-01, the purpose of the Interim Development Control Overlay District is to temporarily regulate the establishment of uses, construction of new buildings, and demolition or alteration of existing structures in areas where the City Planning Commission, City Council or the City Manager has directed city administration to study planning, land use, or zoning issues in the proposed IDC Overlay District boundary. City Council approved a nine month extension to IDC No. 77 on June 17, 2015 to allow time to begin the study itself. This was further extended for an additional six month period on April 6, 2016, which leaves IDC No. 77 in effect through October 22, 2016, unless extended for a final six month period.

The University Impact Area Solutions Study (UIASS) main objective is to ensure a high quality of life for all who live, work, play, and study in the area and maintain the unique characteristics for each of the five neighborhoods that are directly impacted by the University of Cincinnati. The five neighborhoods include CUF (Clifton Heights, University Heights, Fairview Heights), The Heights, Corryville, Clifton, and Mt. Auburn. The UIASS was designed to represent the voice of the people of these neighborhoods surrounding and directly impacted by the University of Cincinnati and guide the future of the area. After a year, dozens of meetings, hundreds of conversations, and countless ideas discussed back and forth by community members, business people, city leaders, students and staff from the University of Cincinnati, and property owners, it was found that there are many issues needing positive solutions.

The University of Cincinnati is continually thriving and expanding. There have been and are growing concerns in the surrounding neighborhoods over traffic and parking, the safety of housing, crime, litter, and noise, and the density and character of new development.

Due to their proximity to the University of Cincinnati, which is a highly ranked institution with a continuously growing enrollment, the neighborhoods have been experiencing issues including:

University Growth and Housing Conditions

As the University of Cincinnati has grown and expanded, many students have pushed out into the adjacent residential neighborhood to find affordable housing. There is growing concern about the safety and conditions of renters living in what were once single-family homes that have been carved up into multiple dwelling units and bedrooms. There are concerns that many of these structures may break the Housing and Zoning Codes for the number of unrelated persons, size of bedrooms, parking standards, and other regulations though this is often hard to determine and enforce. Many structures also may not comply with Fire and Health Codes, which are also difficult to determine and enforce.

Parking and Traffic

This density of people living in the neighborhood has impacted on-street parking. Currently, the on-street parking is first-come, first-served throughout the neighborhood. Many houses in the neighborhood do not have off-street parking. A house that has five to six adult inhabitants in it might yield five to six cars on the street. Those who live in large multi-family apartment buildings with attached structured

parking might be offered a space in a parking garage for a monthly fee, but choose to park on the street where it is free. In addition, visitors to the University who not wish to pay for parking on campus will look for free on-street parking in the residential areas adjacent to the University. This amount of cars coming and going and circling looking for parking spots also contributes to traffic concerns.

Quality of Life Concerns
The above mentioned conditions also increase problems with safety, noise, parties, blight, litter in the neighborhood, which have a negative impact on the quality of life.

New Development and Existing Character
The CUF Neighborhood Association is concerned about recent and proposed developments that are not in line with the character of their neighborhood, especially in their commercial district where newer developments are much taller and denser than what had previously existed.

Born from these general topics were five "Initiative Areas," which include Zoning & New Development, Housing & Neighborhood Conditions, Quality of Life, Connectivity, and Parking.

The University Impact Area Solutions Study is consistent with Plan Cincinnati, the City's Comprehensive Plan that was adopted in November 2012 by Cincinnati City Council. As projects and solutions from this plan are implemented, they will be assessed with Plan Cincinnati to make sure they stay consistent with the City's comprehensive direction for moving forward.

Specifically, the University Impact Area Solutions Study is consistent with the all five Initiative Areas of Compete, Connect, Live, Sustain, and Collaborate. In the Compete Initiative Area, it is consistent with the Strategy of "target investment to geographic areas where there is already economic activity" (page 115). In the Connect Initiative Area, it is consistent with the Strategies of "expand options for non-automotive travel" (page 130) and "plan, design, and implement a safe and sustainable transportation system" (135). In the Live Initiative Area, it is consistent with the Strategies of "become more walkable" (page 157), "support and stabilize our neighborhoods" (page 160), "provide quality healthy housing for all income levels" (page 165), and "offer housing options of varied sizes and types for residents at all stages of life" (page 169). In the Sustain Initiative Area, it is consistent with the Strategies of "protect our natural resources" (page 194) and "preserve our built history" (page 197). In the Collaborate Initiative Area, it is consistent with the Strategy of "unite our communities" (page 210).

"All of the stakeholders in this impacted area want the University to succeed, and the University wants the surrounding neighborhoods to succeed as well. The UIASS seeks to address future land use, urban design, and capital improvements, as well as shape the pattern of growth and development in the neighborhoods surrounding the University. It also seeks to provide a policy basis for code enforcement, zoning and related development decisions, and guide potential code additions and/or revisions for implementation."

- Charles C. Graves, III, Director,
Department of City Planning

Existing Conditions

The Study Area

The study area revolves around the University of Cincinnati Uptown Main Campus and encompasses the entirety or portion of the following neighborhoods:

Clifton – Census Tract 72
Corryville
CUF (Clifton Heights, University Heights, and Fairview)
The Heights
Mt. Auburn – Census Tracts 22 and 23

The map shown below comprises an area of approximately 3.5 square miles surrounding the University of Cincinnati Uptown Main Campus.



University Impact Area Solutions Study - Study Area



Zoning

The current zoning map shows a mix of uses within the study area. Most of these uses are consistent with those found near major institutions, such as the University of Cincinnati. The most common zoning districts are residential, institutional, and parks and recreation.

The legend to the right lists all the zoning districts. For more information on the zoning districts, please review the City of Cincinnati's Zoning Code (available at the City of Cincinnati's Website: www.cincinnati-oh.gov).

The study area, at large, is predominately residential in nature (55% of the land is zoned for residential use). The most predominant type of residential use in the neighborhood is Residential Mixed which intends to create, maintain, and enhance areas of the City that have a mix of lot sizes and house types at moderate intensities (one to three dwelling units). In addition to residential zoning districts, institutional, and parks and recreation districts are prevalent. 14% of the land is zoned institutional, which consists of the University of Cincinnati and surrounding hospitals and educational institutions. Burnet Woods, Bellevue Park, Fairview Park, and Innwood Park are part of the 12% of the study area zoned for parks and recreation.



Legend

- CC-A Commercial Community - Auto
- CC-M Commercial Community- Mixed
- CC-P Commercial Community - Pedestrian
- CN-M Commercial Neighborhood - Mixed
- CN-P Commercial Neighborhood - Pedestrian
- IR Institutional-Residential
- MG Manufacturing General
- ML Manufacturing Limited
- OG Office General
- OL Office Limited
- PD Planned Development District
- PR Parks and Recreation
- RM-0.7 Residential Multi-family (700 sf)
- RM-1.2 Residential Multi-family (1,200 sf)
- RM-2.0 Residential Multi-family (2,000 sf)
- RMX - Residential Mixed
- SF-10 Single-family Residential (10,000 sf)
- SF-2 Single-family Residential (2,000 sf)
- SF-20 Single-family Residential (20,000 sf)
- SF-4 Single-family Residential (4,000 sf)
- SF-6 Single-family Residential (6,000 sf)
- UM Urban Mix District

University Impact Area Solutions Study
Existing Zoning



Urban Design Overlay Districts

There are currently two Urban Design Overlay Districts located within the study area. An Urban Design Overlay District has four main purposes according to the Cincinnati Zoning Code:

1. Protect and enhance the physical character of selected business districts that have adopted Urban Design Plans;
2. Prevent the deterioration of property and blighting conditions;
3. Encourage private investment to improve and stimulate the economic vitality and social character of selected business districts; and
4. Ensure that infill development does not adversely affect the physical character of the area.

The Urban Design Overlay Districts within the study area are the UD #2 - Clifton Business District and the UD #6 - University Village Business District and can be viewed in the map below.

Existing Urban Design Overlay Districts



The State of Housing

The study area is diverse in terms of its population, as seen in the demographic data; however, it also is home to an array of housing types, ages, and living arrangements. The state of housing is illustrated using 2010 U.S. Census Data.

The majority of the current housing stock in the study area is zoned Residential Mixed (RMX), Residential Multi-family (RM), and Single-family (SF). According to the Cincinnati Code, these zoning districts are defined as follows:

Residential Mixed (RMX): This subdistrict is intended to create, maintain and enhance areas of the city that have a mix of lot sizes and house types at moderate intensities (one to three dwelling units). Existing multi-family buildings of four or more units are acknowledged but new construction is not permitted.

Residential - Multi-family (RM-2.0): This subdistrict is intended to provide for a medium density mix of residential housing predominantly duplexes and multi-family on lots that have already been platted. The scale of buildings is generally similar to a large single-family home on a small lot. Where land is assembled, the same scale should be maintained. The minimum land area for every dwelling unit is 2,000 square feet.

Residential - Multi-family (RM-1.2): This subdistrict is intended to provide for mixed residential uses at moderately high densities. This is an intense district with an urban character. The minimum land area for every dwelling unit is 1,200 square feet.

Residential - Multi-family (RM-0.7): This subdistrict is the most intense residential district and it will normally consist of tall multi-family or condominium structures. The character is intended to be urban and should be used where high intensity residential is needed to provide a residential base for important commercial areas. The minimum land area for every dwelling unit is 700 square feet.

Single-family (SF-10): This subdistrict allows single-family housing at low densities. The minimum lot size is 10,000 square feet.

Single-family (SF-6): This subdistrict allows medium-density, single-family housing. The minimum lot size is 6,000 square feet.

Single-family (SF-4): This subdistrict allows moderately high density single-family housing. The minimum lot size is 4,000 square feet.

Single-family (SF-2): This district allows high-density, small lot, single-family developments. The minimum lot size is 2,000 square feet.

There are a variety of housing types in the study area, including single-family detached and attached, two-family, and multi-family. The multi-family residential structures range from 3-4 units to 50 or more units. The majority of the multi-family units are located in the CUF neighborhood. CUF is also home to the largest amount of structures compared to Corryville, Clifton – Census 72, and Mt. Auburn – Census Tracts 22 and 23. The most predominant type of structure in the study area is the single-family detached house. The majority of the housing stock (59%) was constructed prior to 1950, based on the Census data. However, there have been 556 structures built in 2000 or later in the CUF and Corryville neighborhoods, compared to only 192 structures in the remaining three areas (Clifton – Census Tract 72 and Mt. Auburn – Census Tracts 22 and 23).

75% of the households in the study area are non-family households. Non-family households may contain only one person or additional persons who are not relatives of the householder, as defined by the U.S. Census. However, in the Mt. Auburn Census Tracts 22 and 23 there is more of an even split between family and non-family households.

The majority of the housing units in the study area are renter occupied (82%). This renter-occupied majority is seen throughout the various study area neighborhoods. 17% of the housing units in the area are vacant. The highest rates of vacancy are seen in the Mt. Auburn Census Tracts 22 and 23 with 26% and 44% of units vacant, respectively. A full chart of housing occupancy can be seen below.



The majority (70%) of householders moved into their units in 2005 or later. This majority is seen throughout the study area neighborhoods; however, the rate is lower in Mt. Auburn – Census Tract 23 with 54% of householders moving into their unit in 2005 or later. With the large amount of renter-occupied units, more turnover can be expected in units leading to these statistics and the majority of householders moving into their unit in more recent years.

Demographics
In order to provide an in-depth analysis of the existing population within the university impact study area, demographic data from the 2010 U.S. Census was compiled.

Age, Sex, & Marital Status
The study area is heavily populated by young adults ages 18 to 29 years old with 36% of the population 18-21 years old and 26% of the population 22-29 years old. The study area population is split evenly between males (55%) and females (45%).



The primary age group of residents differs between the specific neighborhoods. The following chart shows the breakdown of individual's ages in the neighborhoods and census tracts that comprise the study area.

Years old	CUF	Corryville	Clifton 72	Mt. Auburn 22	Mt. Auburn 23	Total
0 - 17	1,042	347	253	538	306	2,486
18 - 21	7,916	692	160	377	105	9,250
22 - 29	4,376	1,139	724	311	174	6,724
30 - 49	2,005	660	594	483	303	4,045
50+	1,650	489	533	579	244	3,495
	16,989	3,327	2,264	2,288	1,132	26,000

As seen, there are many more young adults (18-29 years old) in the CUF neighborhood (72%) compared to Corryville (55%), Census Tract 72 in Clifton (39%), Census Tract 22 in Mt. Auburn (30%), and Census Tract 23 in Mt. Auburn (24%). More specifically, 47% of CUF's population is between the ages of 18-21 years old. While CUF is home to many university students aged 18-21 years old, the census tracts in Mt. Auburn have a more balanced age demographic between youth, adults, and seniors.

Over half (60%) of the study area's population has never been married. This large number can be attributed to the fact that a large amount of the residents in the study area are students and/or young adults (18 – 29 years). 50% of the population is currently married.

Race & Languages Spoken at Home
Race demographics differ drastically between the neighborhoods and portions of neighborhoods included in the study area. The CUF neighborhood is 74% Caucasian and boasts a significantly higher Asian population (1,414 individuals) compared to the other neighborhoods. However, the portion of Mt. Auburn included in the study (Census Tracts 22 and 23) are both 76% African American. Corryville is 50% Caucasian and 37% African American. The following charts show the racial make-up of the study area in more detail.



The vast majority of the study area population (86%) speaks English at home. However, over 2,000 people speak other languages at home, including Spanish, other Indo-European languages, and more, in the CUF neighborhood. This is due to the amount of international students attending the University of Cincinnati.

Educational Attainment & School Enrollment
The study area's population is highly educated overall. Over 40% of the population has a Bachelor's or Graduate level degree. The majority of the population with Bachelor's or Graduate degrees is located in the CUF neighborhood and Clifton – Census Tract 72. In the Mt. Auburn Census tracts, the most prevalent level of education is a high school diploma (or equivalent). However, in Corryville, the most prevalent levels of education are a high school diploma (or equivalent) at 24.88% and a graduate or professional degree at 25.43%.

50% of the study area is enrolled in an educational institution, of which 86% is enrolled in college or graduate school due to the presence of the University of Cincinnati, while 14% is enrolled in pre-K to 12th grade. In the CUF neighborhood, 95% of the enrolled population attends college or graduate school, whereas in Mt. Auburn – Census Tract 23 this majority is the contrary with 72% of the enrolled population attending pre-K to 12th grade. In Mt. Auburn – Census Tract 23, there is a balance between the population enrolled in pre-K to 12th grade (45%) and college/graduate school (55%).

Parking & Car Ownership
The majority of householders in the study area own 0 to 2 vehicles. There is a significantly larger amount of cars in the CUF neighborhood compared to the other neighborhoods in the study area. There are 4.553 car owners with over 7,000 cars in CUF. However, there are also 1,234 people in CUF without a vehicle.

Additional maps related to the existing conditions for the University Impact Area Solutions Study
The maps on the following pages show various existing conditions in the study area. They include: land use; streets; neighborhood business districts; historic resources and overlay districts; hillside overlay districts; and vacant and hazardous buildings.

University Impact Area Solutions Study
Land Use



DRAFT - September 30, 2016

University Impact Area Solutions Study
Streets



DRAFT - September 30, 2016

University Impact Area Solutions Study
Neighborhood Business Districts



DRAFT - September 30, 2016

University Impact Area Solutions Study
Historic Resources and Overlay Districts



DRAFT - September 30, 2016

University Impact Area Solutions Study
Hillside Overlay Districts



University Impact Area Solutions Study
Vacant and Hazardous Buildings

University of Cincinnati Statistics

As of the Fall semester in 2015, the University of Cincinnati provided numbers of students and employees.

34,087 total enrollment Students at the University of Cincinnati Uptown Campus (9,524 Part-Time; 26,563 Full-Time; 5,238 On Campus Residents)

44,251 total enrollment of Students at all University of Cincinnati campuses (33,218 undergraduate; 11,033 graduate and professional)

6554 Employees at the University of Cincinnati Uptown Campus (Excluding Medicine) (2580 Part-Time; 3974 Full-Time)

1856 Faculty Employees in the University of Cincinnati College of Medicine (461 Part-Time; 1395 Full-Time)

There are a total of 379 programs of study with a student to faculty ratio of 18 to 1. The average age of a University of Cincinnati student is 24.3.

The tuition and fees per year per student is roughly $11,000 for in-state and $26,334 for out-of-state. The annual budget total as of the 2015-2016 school year was $1.17 billion.

There are a total of 11,600 parking spaces on the Uptown Main Campus that are leased to students and employees. Metro's statistics show that there are approximately 2,400 riders daily to the Uptown area and the University of Cincinnati estimates that about 1,200 individuals utilize their discounts to incentivize the use of public transportation.

University of Cincinnati Police Department

The University of Cincinnati Police Department is composed of 72 full police officers, 26 security officers, and 2 canines. It is presented with unique safety and policing issues, such as the large student population, active shooter scenarios, and jurisdictional overlap/ memorandum of understanding with the City of Cincinnati Police Department.

In addition to University of Cincinnati Police patrols, the University of Cincinnati contracts with the City of Cincinnati Police Department for additional overtime patrols by their officers since August 2013. These patrols are in addition to routine Cincinnati Police Department patrols, and funded by the University of Cincinnati. There are an additional 12 Cincinnati Police Department officers who patrol between 7:00 p.m. and 3:00 a.m., 7 days a week.

University of Cincinnati Police Department patrols via foot, Segway, vehicle, bicycle, and motorcycle on campus and in the surrounding neighborhoods.



There was a 63% crime incident reduction from 2005-2015 in the Concentration of Student Residents (CSR) area (this boundary is used when looking at crime and activity around the Uptown campus because it was identified by the University of Cincinnati Police Department to contain approximately 80% of students with registered addresses in the 45219 and 45220 zip codes and is where the University tends to concentrate crime reduction strategies). 2008 was the year with the most incidents of crime. Since 2005, there has been a 64.9% reduction in robberies in the CSR area.





Property related crimes deceased by 21.8% compared to the 3 year average between 2012-2015. Violent crimes saw a 41% reduction of the 3 year average between 2012-2015.

A University of Cincinnati Safety and Reform Community Advisory Council was formed in October 2015 to provide community input regarding reform efforts with the University of Cincinnati Police Department. The overall goal is to guide the University of Cincinnati Police Department forward to become a national model for best practices in urban-university

policing.

The purposes of the Community Advisory Council are to advise the University of Cincinnati Vice President for Safety & Reform on developing the University of Cincinnati Police Department's reform agenda as well as tracking its progress and communicating its impact; and to assist the University of Cincinnati Police Department Director of Police Community Relations in building, enhancing and expanding their relationships with the diverse local communities.

The council consists of 19 members including civic leaders, community residents, faith leaders, corporate leaders, law enforcement officials, and UC faculty, staff, students and alumni. Their purpose is to advise development of reform agenda, track progress, and communicate impact; and build, enhance, and expand the University of Cincinnati Police Department's relationships with local communities. The Community Advisory Council's core values include transparency, legitimacy, fairness, collaboration, and innovation.

UC's newly appointed Chief of Police, Anthony Carter (third from left) and Maris Herold (fourth from left), UC's new assistant chief of police, stand with Robin Engel, Gregory Baker and James Whalen

Figure 1. Total Part I Crime Incidents Reported to the Cincinnati Police Department in the Areas Surrounding UC, 2004-2015*



*Part I Crime incidents include homicide, forcible rape, robbery, felonious assault, burglary, theft/larceny, theft from automobile, and auto theft. A single crime incident may include multiple victims. See the *UC Concentration of Student Residents* (CSR) map on http://www.uc.edu/safety-reform/Resources for a visual representation of the geographic area included in this graph.

Figure 2. Violent Part I Crime Incidents Reported to the Cincinnati Police Department in the Areas Surrounding UC, 2004-2015*



* Violent Part I Crime incidents include homicide, forcible rape, robbery, and felonious assault. A single crime incident may include multiple victims. See the *UC Concentration of Student Residents* (CSR) map on http://www.uc.edu/safety-reform/Resources for a visual representation of the geographic area included in this graph.

Figure 3. Property Part I Crime Incidents Reported to the Cincinnati Police Department in the Areas Surrounding UC, 2004-2015*



* Property Part I Crime incidents include burglary, theft/larceny, theft from automobile, and auto theft. A single crime incident may include multiple victims. See the *UC Concentration of Student Residents* (CSR) map on http://www.uc.edu/safety-reform/Resources for a visual representation of the geographic area included in this graph.

Photos, Data, & Information provided by www.uc.edu and the University of Cincinnati

Planning Process



Planning Process

Since the beginning of this overall process, there have been a more than thirty organized meetings. The meetings were as follows:

City Department Meetings: March 18, 2015; June 24, 2015; July 20, 2015.
The reason for these meetings was to convene all of the City Departments involved in various aspects of the University Impact Area Solutions Study. The Departments include: City Planning, Buildings & Inspections, Fire, Police, Public Services, Transportation and Engineering, and Community and Economic Development. The discussions at these meetings included what the initial issues were that prompted the study, initial research, the forthcoming process with the neighborhoods, and potential solutions to some of the issues.

Kick-Off Meeting with Neighborhood Stakeholders: September 16, 2015.
The Kick-Off Meeting was held at the Niehoff Studio in Corryville. It included introductions of the Steering Committee members, an overview of the study scope and timeline, a review of the preliminary survey results, and a break out exercise where tables were set up around issue topics where individuals could also sign-up for Working Groups.

Steering Committee Meetings: September 16, 2015; February 25, 2016; September 8, 2016.
The Steering Committee met three times (to-date). The first was prior to the Kick-Off Meeting where they did introductions, discussed the study overview, process, and their overall objective, signed up for Working Groups, and identified who was missing from the table. The second was a halfway point, where the Steering Committee received a presentation on the first draft of the Vision and the Five Initiative Areas and discussed amongst them that the general direction of the study was on track. The third was a final gathering to hear about the overall planning process, the big ideas from the draft, and review the detailed recommendations in an open house setting where the general public was also invited.

The Working Groups met several times each. The meetings included discussions about all survey data, comments, and information received prior to the first set of meetings; brainstorming for all issues and possible solutions; what types of research that needed to be completed for the study; refining proposed solutions; and determining the level of priority, difficulty, partners, and timelines for implementation. Some Working Groups met more than others, but the aforementioned objectives were met by all five of the Working Groups.

Connectivity Working Group Meetings: October 22, 2015; December 3, 2015; January 20, 2016; March 30, 2016; August 16, 2016.

Parking Working Group Meetings: October 14, 2015; November 12, 2015; January 27, 2016; April 5, 2016; August 17, 2016.

Housing & Neighborhood Conditions Working Group Meetings: October 12, 2015; November 18, 2015; January 19, 2016; April 7, 2016; August 15, 2016.

Quality of Life Working Group Meetings: October 21, 2015; November 16, 2015; January 25, 2016; March 29, 2016, August 18, 2016.

Zoning & New Development Working Group Meetings: October 21, 2015; November 23, 2015; December 15, 2015; January 11, 2016; January 20, 2016; April 11, 2016, August 11, 2016.

There were dozens of other meetings that occurred throughout the planning process. Meetings with various departments at the University of Cincinnati and Uptown Consortium were some of them, to make sure that these stakeholders were aware of and on board with the recommendations that they would be responsible implementing.



The Vision

The Vision

Following the initial kick-off meeting with the neighborhoods and stakeholders as well as the first two rounds of Working Group meetings, the Department of City Planning staff took all of the detailed notes from what was discussed and formulated an overall vision for the University Impact Area Solutions Study. It was presented to the Steering Committee and was generally agreed upon that it encompasses the overall vision for the future of the neighborhoods surrounding the University of Cincinnati.

The University Impact Area Solutions Study is a strategic plan for the neighborhoods surrounding the University of Cincinnati.

The overall vision for the University Impact Area Solutions Study is below.

The vision for the future of the study area is to preserve the unique character of these diverse, multi-generational neighborhoods through appropriate density of new development, more efficient communication, education, and collaboration between neighborhood stakeholders who identify and resolve problems and issues, while working together to create realistic and implementable solutions, capitalize on existing resources, resulting in safe, clean, attractive, connected, and well-maintained neighborhoods.

The Five Initiatives

The Five Initiatives
At the core of the University Impact Area Solutions Study, there are five primary focus areas that stakeholders must collectively work together in order to reach the future that is envisioned.

The Five Initiative Areas were also the five Working Groups. The Working Groups focused in on a mission and recommendations specific to each Initiative Area.

Zoning & New Development: To address current and future zoning to protect and enhance long-established residential, commercial, and mixed-use buildings, parks and green space, and guide new development to be in harmony with the unique fabric of the neighborhoods while still allowing them to evolve and improve.

Housing & Neighborhood Conditions: To address housing and property concerns, code violations including Zoning, Housing, Building, and Fire Codes.

Quality of Life: To improve the neighborhood experience by addressing quality of life issues such as crime and safety; trash, litter, and blight; and parties, alcohol use, noise, and public nuisances.

Connectivity: To address concerns relative to bicycle routes and safety; pedestrian mobility and safety; to increase transportation alternatives and options; and to address traffic flow and safety.

Parking: To address on-street and off-street parking.

Each of the Five Initiative Areas are broken down into general Goals, then Strategies, then specific Action Steps to accomplish them. Each Action Step is accompanied by a priority and difficulty level, responsible partners, and an estimated implementation timeline.

The priority level categories include highest, high, low, or lowest. The difficulty level categories include easy, medium, or hard. The responsible partners include primary and secondary. The implementation timeline will vary between short term and long term.



Zoning & New Development

Introduction

In recent years, there has been a spike in new development in the neighborhoods surrounding the University of Cincinnati, prompting the need to revisit the zoning districts currently in place in the areas surrounding the University. In fact, the Interim Development Control (IDC) Overlay District was established in the CUF neighborhood for this very reason. Specifically, the CUF Neighborhood Association has been concerned about recent and proposed developments that are not particularly in-line with the overall character of their neighborhood, especially in their neighborhood business district where newer development are much taller and denser than what has previously existed.

A Working Group was created specifically to focus on issues related to zoning and new development. Although the Working Group was mainly comprised of CUF neighborhood stakeholders, the discussions and potential solutions could be beneficial for the other neighborhoods surrounding the University of Cincinnati.

The Zoning & New Development Working Group met more often than the other four Working Groups, mainly because they more specific issues that learn about and discuss as they related to zoning. This Working Group met a total of seven times, including October 21, 2015; November 23, 2015; December 15, 2015; January 11, 2016; January 20, 2016; April 11, 2016; and August 11, 2016. Two main goals were developed in this Working Group related to where future growth and density should be located in the neighborhoods surrounding the University of Cincinnati and retaining and promoting the unique cultural and architectural characteristics of the neighborhoods.

Mission

To address current and future zoning to protect and enhance long-established residential, commercial, and mixed-use buildings, parks and green space, and guide new development to be in harmony with the unique fabric of the neighborhoods while still allowing them to evolve and improve.

Goal 1
Establish where growth and density should be located in the areas near the University of Cincinnati.

One of the primary reasons for conducting the University Impact Area Solutions Study was because of the amount of growth and density recently being developed in the area surrounding the University of Cincinnati, particularly in the CUF neighborhood. The zoning districts that are currently in effect in the neighborhoods were asked to be reevaluated by the Mayor, City Council, and City Administration. It was also asked that it be explored if an overlay district would be an appropriate solution to regulate new growth and density in the areas surrounding the University of Cincinnati because of their uniqueness to the rest of Cincinnati.

Strategy A
Evaluate the current Zoning Code and proposed Land Development Code zoning district locations and boundaries.

Action Step A1
Rezone specific areas that are recommended by the Zoning and New Development Working Group of the University Impact Area Solutions Study.
Priority Level: Highest/High
Difficulty Level: Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati; Community Councils; Business Associations; Property Owners
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Uptown Consortium; Cincinnati Public Schools; University of Cincinnati
Implementation Timeline: 1 year minimum

Action Step A2
Reflect the rezoning recommendations in the draft Land Development Code for consistency.
Priority Level: Highest/High
Difficulty Level: Easy
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati; Community Councils; Business Associations; Property Owners
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Uptown Consortium; Cincinnati Public Schools; University of Cincinnati
Implementation Timeline: 2 years minimum

Strategy B
Develop an overlay district to regulate growth and density in a specific area.

Action Step B1
Study further and potentially establish an overlay district with regulations focused on the compatibility of new development and improving the livable environment.
Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Hard
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati; Community Councils; Business Associations; Community Development Corporations; Property Owners
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Uptown Consortium, Cincinnati Public Schools; University of Cincinnati
Implementation Timeline: 1-2 years

Goal 1
Establish where growth and density should be located in the areas near the University of Cincinnati.

Action Step B2
Identify and establish an appropriate boundary for the potential overlay district.
Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Hard
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati; Community Councils; Business Associations; Community Development Corporations; Property Owners
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Uptown Consortium, Cincinnati Public Schools; University of Cincinnati
Implementation Timeline: 1-2 years

Action Step B3
Consider establishing or utilizing an existing review board, which can serve as an architectural review body that considers plans on a case-by-case basis within the potential overlay district.
Priority Level: Low
Difficulty Level: Hard
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): University of Cincinnati; Community Councils; Business Associations; Uptown Consortium
Implementation Timeline: 1-2 years

University Impact Area Solutions Study
Working Group Morphology and Typology

Housing Stock

Italianate (1890)
Single Family
2 Stories
Parking Adjacent

Building: 2,500 Sqft
Lot: 2,000 Sqft

Arts & Crafts (1921)
Single Family
1.5 Stories

Building: 1,100 Sqft
Lot: 2,000 Sqft

Traditional Lg. (1910)
Single Family
2.5 Stories
A-frame Roof
Off-street Parking
Porch

Building: 2,500 Sqft
Lot: 3,500 Sqft

Victorian (1885)
Multi Family
4-6 Units
3 Stories
Off-street Pk

Building: 7,000 Sqft
Lot: 9,000 Sqft

Traditional Sm. (1915)
Single Family
2.5 Stories
A-frame Roof
Porch

Building: 1,500 Sqft
Lot: 2,150 Sqft

Greek Revival (1900)
Multi-family
4 Units
2 Stories
2 Off-street Pk

Building: 4,500 Sqft
Lot: 4,100 Sqft

Swiss Chalet (1910)
Single Family
2.5 Stories
A-frame Roof
Garage Parking
Porch

Building: 3,200 Sqft
Lot: 9,000 Sqft

Apartment Complex (1970)
40+ Units
5 Stories
Studio,1,2 BR
Off-street Pk in Rear

Building: 30,000 Sqft
Lot: .75 Acres

Bungalow (1912)
Single Family
2 Stories
Gambrel Roof
Garage Parking
Porch

Building: 1,200 Sqft
Lot: 2,500 Sqft

Apartment Complex (2011)
130 Units
3 Stories
1-4 BR
Off-street Pk in Rear

Building: 140,000 Sqft
Lot: 5 Acres

Spatial Distribution

Parking

Shared Off-Street Parking

On-Street Parking

Parking Alley

Commercial

200 Block W. McMillan
(1890)
Mixed Use Retail
3 Stories
On-street Parking

U-Square
(2013)
Mixed Use Retail
5 Stories
Parking Garage

Corner Stores
(1875-1915)
Mixed Use Retail
2-3 Stories

Context Map



University Impact Area Solutions Study
Working Group Community Values for New Development

Setbacks

Setbacks should be pedestrian-oriented

In residential areas of the CUF neighborhood, the historic homes that make up the fabric of the neighborhood are set back from the street with small landscaped front yards. In some cases new development has been built up all the way to the front property line or set back too far, which is not consistent with traditional development pattern in the neighborhood. Setbacks for new development should be 12 – 30 feet, consistent with existing setbacks on adjacent traditional properties.

Building Heights

Building heights should keep in-line with surrounding built environment

Existing residential buildings in the CUF neighborhood are two to three stories. New developments should not be more than one story higher than adjacent traditional buildings. If one property is higher than an adjacent property, the highest floor on the high property should not be more than one story higher than the highest floor on the adjacent lower property.

Massing

- Building is no more than one story higher than adjacent buildings
- Top floor is recessed
- Roofline is unobtrusive
- Mass is broken up by shifting portions of building significantly back
- Buildings should not be so large as to create "super blocks" or extend along an entire block without an open area
- Widths of buildings, recesses, and open spaces should respect the traditional rhythm of the neighborhood

Massing should be stepped backed to avoid the "canyon effect" from occurring any further

A very important part of the historic character of the CUF neighborhood is the rhythm of buildings and open space. Historic buildings range from twenty feet wide (for a single family home) to sixty feet wide (for a two or three family home). Side yards between buildings are approximately ten feet to thirty feet from building to building.

To maintain the comfortable pedestrian feel of the neighborhood, it is important to minimize projecting building widths (to not exceed sixty feet) and allow for a small amount of open space or recesses between masses. The neighborhood loses some of its appealing qualities where large continuous apartment buildings have been constructed with flat or bulky facades and intrusive rooflines. For buildings that are three stories or more, the top floor should be stepped back and/or tucked under a roof (such as gable or mansard) to minimize its massing.

Parking

Parking should be included in the rear of development or built into structures

A garage can be incorporated into the lower level of a structure as a single family garage or as a combined garage that serves several units. Parking can also be located behind buildings, preferably combined to minimize curb cuts. Parking lots should be screened by landscaping.

Transparency

Transparency should be provided in business district (windows)

Commercial buildings should not have large expanses of walls. Instead, walls should be broken up with windows. Large windows allow businesses to display their items and provide interest for pedestrians. New or renovated commercial buildings should be consistent with the scale of historic commercial buildings in the neighborhood.

Landscaping & Buffering

Landscaping and buffering should be provided

The small front and side yards in the neighborhood are very important. They contribute to a pleasant pedestrian experience and they provide space for light and air for occupants of the buildings to enjoy.

- Walls should be constructed of natural stone to be consistent with existing historic walls.
- Fences should be low and made of wrought iron to be consistent with the historic fences. The design can be plain or ornate, but special attention should be given to the spacing of the bars and the height.

Signage

Signage should be strictly enforced

- Large banner signs or other large signs attached to the building should not be permitted.
- To advertise properties for rent, temporary real estate yard signs may be placed in yards (exact length of time TBD).

University Impact Area Solutions Study
Working Group Proposed Map



Goal 2
Retain and promote unique cultural and architectural characteristics of the older urban neighborhoods surrounding the University of Cincinnati.

It was generally agreed upon in the Zoning & New Development Working Group meetings that the neighborhoods surrounding the University of Cincinnati were unique to the City of Cincinnati in many different ways, including various cultural and architectural characteristics.

Strategy A

Designate landmarks, districts, and unique cultural and architectural sites in the neighborhoods.

Action Step A1

Identify these with the Zoning & New Development Working Group of the University Impact Area Solutions Study, the City of Cincinnati's Historic Conservation Office, Cincinnati Preservation Associations, and the City's consultant inventory of sites of historic merit.

Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Hard
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati; Community Councils; Property Owners; Zoning & New Development Working Group of the UIASS; Cincinnati Preservation Association
Responsible Partners (Secondary): None
Implementation Timeline: 1 year minimum

Strategy B

Revise the language in the Zoning Code within the potential overlay district related to signage.

Action Step B1

Design and implement stricter regulations and standards for permanent and temporary signage within the potential overlay district.

Priority Level: Highest/High
Difficulty Level: Medium/Easy
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati; Community Councils; Business Associations; Community Development Corporations; Uptown Consortium
Responsible Partners (Secondary): None
Implementation Timeline: 3-6 months

Action Step B2

Reflect the revised regulations and standards in the draft Land Development Code.

Priority Level: Highest/High
Difficulty Level: Medium/Easy
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): None
Implementation Timeline: 1 year minimum

Housing & Neighborhood Conditions



Introduction

Concerns from all of the various stakeholder groups were made at the Housing & Neighborhood Conditions Working Group meetings, including those from the CUF Neighborhood Association, CUF Business Association, students, landlords, property owners, and other residents. One thing that was generally agreed upon was that the housing in the neighborhoods surrounding the University of Cincinnati needs to be safe for all, no matter who is living within it.

Recommendations within the Housing & Neighborhood Conditions Initiative Area directly relate to attempts at minimizing or solving issues related to building, housing, zoning, and fire code violations with the ultimate goal of making the housing stock in the neighborhoods surrounding the University of Cincinnati safer.

The Housing & Neighborhood Conditions Working Group met a total of five times, including October 12, 2015; November 18, 2015; January 19, 2016; April 7, 2016; and August 15, 2016. Two main goals were developed in this Working Group related to quality housing and communication.

Mission

To address housing and property concerns, code violations including Zoning, Housing, Building, and Fire Codes.

Goal 1
Develop and maintain quality housing.

It was generally agreed upon in the Housing & Neighborhood Conditions Working Group that the neighborhoods surrounding the University of Cincinnati needed to focus on making sure the housing was safe for all residents. There was a lot of contention between various stakeholder groups and consensus was not found between them on some of the following Strategies and Action Steps. However, if there is going to be change in this area related to housing, action needs to be taken.

Strategy A
Potentially implement a comprehensive residential rental inspection and certificate program.

Action Step A1
Work with the Hamilton County Auditor, University of Cincinnati, and neighborhood stakeholder groups to generate and maintain a list of landlords with accurate contact information, including phone numbers and email addresses.
Priority Level: Highest/High
Difficulty Level: Hard/Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati; Hamilton County; Landlords
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Property Owners; University of Cincinnati
Implementation Timeline: 6-12 months

Action Step A2
Work with the neighborhoods to identify problem properties and absentee landlords.
Priority Level: Highest/High
Difficulty Level: Easy
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati; Residents
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Tenants; University of Cincinnati; Property Owners
Implementation Timeline: 6 months

Action Step A3
Develop and present a landlord training program geared to the issues specific to this area.
Priority Level: There was not consensus in the Working Group
Difficulty Level: Easy
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati, Landlords; University of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Community Councils; Business Associations
Implementation Timeline: 1 year minimum

Action Step A4
The Department of Buildings & Inspections and the Fire Department will evaluate and potentially pursue an inspection program for residential rental properties in this area. Some of the community strongly supports this being a mandatory program; some of the community strongly opposes this unless it is a voluntary program.
Priority Level: There was not consensus in the Working Group
Difficulty Level: Hard
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati; Landlords
Responsible Partners (Secondary): None
Implementation Timeline: To be determined

Action Step A5
Work with landlords to come up with a plan to bring buildings up to applicable Codes, including creating a hierarchy of importance of what needs to be fixed first.
Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Medium/Hard
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati; Landlords
Responsible Partners (Secondary): None
Implementation Timeline: 1 year minimum

Goal 1
Develop and maintain quality housing.

Strategy B
Raise awareness of existing incentives to improve properties.

Action Step B1
Make landlords aware of existing tax breaks for increased value when making building/property improvements. This could be done through existing meetings such as the regular meetings of the Neighborhoods of Uptown.
Priority Level: Highest/High
Difficulty Level: Medium/Easy
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati; Hamilton County; University of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Landlords; Business Associations; Community Councils; Greater Cincinnati Northern Kentucky Apartment Association
Implementation Timeline: 6 months

Action Step B2
Increase penalties for repeat offenders, such as placing fines as a lien on the property's taxes.
Priority Level: Highest/High
Difficulty Level: Hard
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati, State of Ohio
Responsible Partners (Secondary): None
Implementation Timeline: 6-12 months

Action Step B3
In order to combat chronic blight in the neighborhoods, investigate a possible "Community Redevelopment Tax Incentive" ordinance that creates a process for declaring properties maintained in a chronically blighted condition, and establishes a mechanism to tax those properties at a higher rate until they are brought into compliance.
Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Hard
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati, State of Ohio
Responsible Partners (Secondary): None
Implementation Timeline: To be determined

Goal 1
Develop and maintain quality housing.

Strategy C
Increase homeownership.

Action Step C1
Identify a community development corporation, such as the Clifton Heights Community Urban Redevelopment Corporation (CHCURC), to pursue various initiatives to promote and increase homeownership. CHCURC has an agreement with the CUF Neighborhood Association (CUFNA) to work together in the neighborhood and is considering single-family home renovations and new construction as well as vacant and abandoned lot improvements as a means to make the neighborhood more attractive to potential homeowners.
Priority Level: Highest/High
Difficulty Level: Hard/Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): Community Development Corporations; Community Councils; University of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Uptown Consortium; Port Authority; Homeownership Center
Implementation Timeline: To be determined

Action Step C2
Develop incentives for professors/young professionals to move to the area and work with the major institutions and realtors in the area to discuss the benefits of living in the neighborhood.
Priority Level: Highest/High
Difficulty Level: Hard/Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): University of Cincinnati; Hospitals; Institutions; Board of Realtors; All Employees
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Banks
Implementation Timeline: 2-3 years

Action Step C3
Collaborate with University of Cincinnati students/professors to buy and fix up project houses.
Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): University of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Community Development Corporations; Community Councils; Habitat for Humanity
Implementation Timeline: To be determined

Action Step C4
Work with the Port Authority of Greater Cincinnati to make the university area a target area and go after tax delinquent properties.
Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Hard/Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati; Hamilton County; Port Authority; Community Development Corporations
Responsible Partners (Secondary): None
Implementation Timeline: To be determined

Action Step C5
Coordinate with the City of Cincinnati to be a part of the City's Neighborhood Enhancement Program (NEP).
Priority Level: There was not consensus in the Working Group
Difficulty Level: Hard
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati; Community Councils
Responsible Partners (Secondary): None
Implementation Timeline: To be determined

Goal 2
Increase communication and collaboration between stakeholders.

Communication is key to any relationship. That is no different in this situation between the various stakeholders in the neighborhoods surrounding the University of Cincinnati.

Strategy A
Encourage the University of Cincinnati to develop and implement a public information program about off-campus housing.

Action Step A1
Expand the University of Cincinnati Department of Housing and Food Services to include resources for off-campus housing, including a list of landlords and inspected properties.
Priority Level: There was not consensus in the Working Group
Difficulty Level: Hard/Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): University of Cincinnati; Landlords
Responsible Partners (Secondary): None
Implementation Timeline: 1 year minimum

Action Step A2
Develop information packets for landlords to give to students on move-in day about how to be a good neighbor.
Priority Level: Highest/High
Difficulty Level: Medium/Easy
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati; Landlords
Responsible Partners (Secondary): None
Implementation Timeline: 1 year

Strategy B
Increase stakeholder collaboration.

Action Step B1
Hold a quarterly meeting between the University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati and University of Cincinnati Police, Community Councils, Community Development Corporations, and Business Associations to discuss common goals and issues.
Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Easy
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati; University of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Community Councils; Business Associations; Community Development Corporations
Implementation Timeline: Immediately

Action Step B2
Increase communication between students, parents, landlords, and the University of Cincinnati.
Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): University of Cincinnati; Students; Parents; Landlords
Responsible Partners (Secondary): None
Implementation Timeline: To be determined

Action Step B3
Develop a database for repeat student violators and share the list with landlords and University of Cincinnati Student Affairs.
Priority Level: Low
Difficulty Level: Medium/Easy
Responsible Partners (Primary): University of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Landlords
Implementation Timeline: 1 year

Quality of Life

Introduction

Although the University Impact Area Solutions Study began as a planning process driven by zoning and new development, many other issues were vocalized by various neighborhood stakeholders that were directly related to quality of life. As these issues were being discussed, it was decided to develop a Working Group specific to quality of life issues and solutions.

The Quality of Life Working Group evolved over time into four main categories. Those categories included crime & safety; trash, litter & blight; parties & alcohol/drugs; and education & accountability. Many stakeholders were a part of this Working Group, including members from the University of Cincinnati Police Department and the City of Cincinnati Police Department.

The Quality of Life Working Group met a total of five times, including October 21, 2015; November 16, 2015; January 25, 2016; March 29, 2016; and August 18, 2016. Four main goals were developed in this Working Group directly related to the four categories mentioned earlier.

Mission

To improve the neighborhood experience by addressing quality of life issues such as crime and safety; trash, litter, and blight; and parties, alcohol use, noise, and public nuisances.

Goal 1
Collaborate between the neighborhood stakeholders and the public safety departments of both the University of Cincinnati and the City of Cincinnati to enforce laws and provide education.

One of the most important parts of the University Impact Area Solutions Study is finding the best way to collaborate between the University of Cincinnati Police Department and the City of Cincinnati Police Department on the common goal of public safety for all those in the neighborhoods surrounding the university.

Strategy A

Continue work to approve the Memorandum of Understanding between the University of Cincinnati and the City of Cincinnati to allow their police departments to continue to work together.

Action Step A1

University of Cincinnati Police should continue to patrol the neighborhoods immediately surrounding the University of Cincinnati, especially in areas where students live. This allows an extra level of security and faster response times.

Priority Level: Highest
Difficulty Level: Easy
Responsible Partners (Primary): University of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): City of Cincinnati
Implementation Timeline: Immediately

Strategy B

Continue to educate all neighborhood stakeholders with accurate crime statistics and encourage community involvement in mitigation of crime.

Action Step B1

Both the Cincinnati Police Department and University of Cincinnati Police should continue to attend all appropriate community meetings to discuss statistics, trends, and hot spots.

Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Easy
Responsible Partners (Primary): University of Cincinnati; City of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Community Councils; Neighborhood Stakeholder Organizations
Implementation Timeline: Ongoing

Action Step B2

Crime statistics, prevention tips, and positive marketing about how the neighborhoods surrounding the University of Cincinnati are actually some of the safest neighborhoods in the City of Cincinnati will be available on the web, newsletters, and other forms of communication.

Priority Level: Highest
Difficulty Level: Easy
Responsible Partners (Primary): University of Cincinnati; City of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Community Councils; Business Associations; Community Development Corporations
Implementation Timeline: Immediately and Ongoing

Goal 1
Collaborate between the neighborhood stakeholders and the public safety departments of both the University of Cincinnati and the City of Cincinnati to enforce laws and provide education.

Action Step B3

Continue to use social media (such as Nextdoor and Live Safe) to exchange information with neighborhood stakeholders and law enforcement personnel.

Priority Level: Low
Difficulty Level: Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): University of Cincinnati Public Safety and Police; City of Cincinnati; Community Councils; Business Associations
Responsible Partners (Secondary): University of Cincinnati Students; Property Owners
Implementation Timeline: Ongoing

Strategy C

Enforce the law consistently and fairly in all neighborhoods.

Action Step C1

Enforce all crime and disruption, including noise, parking, litterers, and other quality of life offenses.

Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati; University of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): None
Implementation Timeline: Immediately

Action Step C2

Revisit the City of Cincinnati's noise ordinance and revise it to make it more enforceable. Consider using distance instead of decibels to make it easier for police to enforce without special equipment.

Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): City Council; City of Cincinnati; University of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Property Owners; Students
Implementation Timeline: 1 year minimum

Goal 1
Collaborate between the neighborhood stakeholders and the public safety departments of both the University of Cincinnati and the City of Cincinnati to enforce laws and provide education.

Action Step C3
Revisit the City of Cincinnati's snow removal ordinance and develop a plan to better enforce the policy. Bring together all of the departments involved with this and determine who has the resources to perform this function. Consider whether increasing the fine is necessary and set a more definitive time that properties are in violation.
Priority Level: Lowest
Difficulty Level Hard
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): None
Implementation Timeline: Ongoing

Action Step C4
Educate both property owners and tenants about the importance of snow removal for pedestrian safety. Dispel the myths about snow removal liability.
Priority Level: Lowest
Difficulty Level: Hard
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Property Owners
Implementation Timeline: Ongoing

Action Step C5
Ensure that students are dealt with in the most effective manner for illegal behavior, either by Cincinnati Police or University of Cincinnati Judicial Affairs.
Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati; University of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Students; Property Owners
Implementation Timeline: 3-6 months

Action Step C6
Continue to work with and expand Citizens on Patrol to provide both Cincinnati and University of Cincinnati Police with on-the-ground assistance.
Priority Level: Lowest
Difficulty Level: Easy
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Community Councils
Implementation Timeline: Ongoing



Goal 2
Decrease the amounts of trash, litter, and blight in the neighborhoods.

Trash, litter, and blight are a common thread in many areas of Cincinnati. The neighborhoods surrounding the University of Cincinnati are no different. In fact, due to the density and the transient student population, sometimes litter issues can be worse than other areas. It was agreed upon by the Quality of Life Working Group that there are several efforts to mitigate these types of issues, but they can certainly be improved and expanded upon.

Strategy A
Improve understanding and compliance by both students and residents in the neighborhoods about City policies and good-neighbor expectations.

Action Step A1
Develop marketing/educational materials such as magnets, door-hangers, stickers on trash bins, or other materials with pick-up days, websites, frequently-asked-questions, good-neighbor property maintenance tips and expectations, and important contact information.
Priority Level: Highest
Difficulty Level: Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): University of Cincinnati; City of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Community Councils; Business Associations; Community Development Corporations; Students
Implementation Timeline: 6-12 months

Action Step A2
Create and sell/give away bungee cord kits to help keep lids closed and prevent litter from trash cans being knocked over by individuals, wind, cars, or animals.
Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Easy
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati; Community Councils; Business Associations; Community Development Corporations
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Clean Up Cincy; Student Groups
Implementation Timeline: 3 months

Action Step A3
Ensure that litter on private property is being reported so that enforcement can take place.
Priority Level: Low
Difficulty Level: Easy
Responsible Partners (Primary): Property Owners; All Residents; University of Cincinnati; Community Councils; Business Associations; Community Development Corporations
Responsible Partners (Secondary): City of Cincinnati
Implementation Timeline: Ongoing

Goal 2
Decrease the amounts of trash, litter, and blight in the neighborhoods.

Action Step A4
Enforce litter laws more strictly or consider revising litter laws to make laws easier to enforce.
Priority Level: Lowest
Difficulty Level: Hard
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): None
Implementation Timeline: Long Term

Action Step A5
Increase the number of pick-up days for trash cans in the Neighborhood Business District.
Priority Level: Low
Difficulty Level: Hard
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Business Associations
Implementation Timeline: Long Term

Strategy B
Develop a comprehensive program that utilizes students and residents to help both clean up litter and blighted areas and educate.

Action Step B1
Continue to coordinate with students who need volunteer hours.
Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Easy
Responsible Partners (Primary): Clean Up Cincy; Student Groups
Responsible Partners (Secondary): University of Cincinnati
Implementation Timeline: Ongoing

Action Step B2
Work with Hughes High School to provide continual education/public awareness to their students about litter. University of Cincinnati students would be in an ideal position to educate peer to peer.
Priority Level: Low
Difficulty Level: Easy
Responsible Partners (Primary): Cincinnati Public Schools; University of Cincinnati Center for Community Engagement
Responsible Partners (Secondary): None
Implementation Timeline: 6-12 months

Action Step B3
Design an ambassador program similar to Downtown Cincinnati Inc. to pick up litter, notify about illegal dumping or overflowing corner cans, and help educate both residents and visitors. Consider whether expanding existing student programs (such as Clean Up Cincy) or creation of new program that includes non-students is most appropriate. Clifton Heights Community Urban Redevelopment Corporation has one employee that does some of this work already in the business district at a small-scale level.
Priority Level: Highest
Difficulty Level: Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): University of Cincinnati; University of Cincinnati Student Government; Uptown Consortium
Responsible Partners (Secondary): City of Cincinnati; Clean Up Cincy; Student Groups; Community Councils; Community Development Corporations; Business Associations; All Residents
Implementation Timeline: 2-3 years

Goal 2
Decrease the amounts of trash, litter, and blight in the neighborhoods.

Strategy C
Continue to refine efforts during the University of Cincinnati move-in/move-out time to ensure a seamless transition, resulting in cleaner streets, sidewalks, and yards, and less dumping.

Action Step C1
Continue to analyze the length of the move-in/move-out period, communication with renters about services and expectations, and ensuring that neighborhood stakeholders are engaged in and connected to this process.
Priority Level: Low
Difficulty Level: Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): University of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): City of Cincinnati
Implementation Timeline: Ongoing

Action Step C2
Consider working with utility companies to help communicate to renters.
Priority Level: Low
Difficulty Level: Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): Utility Companies
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Community Councils; Property Owners
Implementation Timeline: Long Term

Action Step C3
Develop education or programs to encourage renters to give away or sell unwanted items (to local charities or other people) instead of throwing away. Consider a “sustainability corral” and encourage a take-and-leave policy for a certain period of time and partner with a local charity to collect on a certain date.
Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): University of Cincinnati; City of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Collection Partners
Implementation Timeline: 3-6 months

Action Step C4
Continue to refine Department of Public Services’ extra collections and dumpster collections that coincide with spring move-out. Because some rental periods end on the 1st of the month, others on the 15th, work with landlords, renters, and donation services to ensure that items are disposed of in the appropriate extra collection week.
Priority Level: Highest
Difficulty Level: Hard
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati; Business Associations; Landlords
Responsible Partners (Secondary): University of Cincinnati
Implementation Timeline: Ongoing

Goal 3
Mitigate negative effects of large or wild parties on the neighborhoods.

Being that many of the residents in the neighborhoods surrounding the University of Cincinnati are students, naturally large and wild parties occur on occasion. Such is the life of a college student living away from their parents for the first time in their life. However, there are many residents within the neighborhoods that see large and wild parties happening on a frequent basis, decreasing the overall quality of life in certain areas. The Quality of Life Working Group generally agreed that all neighborhood stakeholders should try to mitigate the negative effects of continuous large or wild parties.

Strategy A

Continue to develop a "Landlord Notification Policy" related to out of control and reoccurring parties that are disruptive to the neighbors.

Action Step A1

Continue to track and progressively enforce problem parties that are large, wild, or reported by neighbors.

Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Easy
Responsible Partners (Primary): University of Cincinnati; City of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): None
Implementation Timeline: Ongoing

Action Step A2

Work with landlords and law enforcement personnel to reinstate the policy with Cincinnati Police and University Police to keep a list of landlord names, properties, and phone numbers and give law enforcement personnel permission to go onto properties and shut down parties.

Priority Level: Low
Difficulty Level: Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): Landlords
Responsible Partners (Secondary): University of Cincinnati; City of Cincinnati; Greater Cincinnati Northern Kentucky Apartment Association
Implementation Timeline: Long Term

Action Step A3

Contact landlords/property managers/property owners after problem parties occur.

Priority Level: Highest
Difficulty Level: Easy
Responsible Partners (Primary): Landlords; University of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): City of Cincinnati; Greater Cincinnati Northern Kentucky Apartment Association
Implementation Timeline: Immediately

Goal 3
Mitigate negative effects of large or wild parties on the neighborhoods.

Action Step A4

Cite landlords/property managers/property owners if problems persist.

Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): Landlords; University of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): City of Cincinnati
Implementation Timeline: 3-6 months

Action Step A5

Consider legal limit of number of persons allowed for rental properties.

Priority Level: Low
Difficulty Level: Hard
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati; State of Ohio
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Greater Cincinnati Northern Kentucky Apartment Association
Implementation Timeline: Long Term

Strategy B

Continue to develop a "Student Party Amnesty Policy" to allow students to feel safe reporting their own party if it gets out of control.

Action Step B1

Work to further develop the policy and better educate students to help them understand that they can shut down their own party without penalty if it inadvertently gets out of control.

Priority Level: Highest
Difficulty Level: Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): University of Cincinnati Students
Responsible Partners (Secondary): City of Cincinnati; University of Cincinnati
Implementation Timeline: 3-6 months

Goal 3
Mitigate negative effects of large or wild parties on the neighborhoods.

Strategy C

Work together to proactively prevent and appropriately enforce problem parties, excessive use of alcohol and drugs, and use of alcohol by minors.

Action Step C1

Work with University of Cincinnati Police, Cincinnati Police, and Citizens on Patrol to report parties, spillover from parties, and large roaming groups looking for parties in residential areas.

Priority Level: Low
Difficulty Level: Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): University of Cincinnati; City of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Citizens on Patrol
Implementation Timeline: Immediately

Action Step C2

Ensure that students are dealt with in the most effective manner for problem parties, either by the Police or University of Cincinnati Judicial Affairs.

Priority Level: Highest
Difficulty Level: Easy
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): University of Cincinnati
Implementation Timeline: Immediately

Goal 4
Help create a culture shift by developing new policies and education about expectations of residents and property owners in the City of Cincinnati.

One key solution that was brought up over and over again was related to education and accountability of all of the various neighborhood stakeholders in the areas surrounding the University of Cincinnati. Overall, if everybody can be properly educated about the laws, policies, and expectations and be held accountable for any actions, then many of the overarching issues can be resolved in the neighborhoods.

Strategy A

Use a multi-pronged approach to working with University of Cincinnati students through policies and creative education.

Action Step A1

Start by using "Welcome Week" for new students to begin to educate them about their role, whether they live on or off campus, as residents of Cincinnati.

Priority Level: Highest
Difficulty Level: Medium/Easy
Responsible Partners (Primary): University of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Community Councils; All Residents
Implementation Timeline: Immediately

Action Step A2

Use social media and electronic communication whenever possible to emphasize the information, including teaching them about the Live Safe App.

Priority Level: Highest
Difficulty Level: Easy
Responsible Partners (Primary): University of Cincinnati; City of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): None
Implementation Timeline: Immediately

Action Step A3

Provide marketing materials such as magnets, pens, t-shirts, hats, koozies, etc. to help enforce the message.

Priority Level: Lowest
Difficulty Level: Hard
Responsible Partners (Primary): University of Cincinnati; City of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Community Councils; Business Associations; Community Development Corporations
Implementation Timeline: Long Term

Action Step A4

Enforce requirement for all freshmen to live on campus or with their parents. Currently, only students living 50 miles away or more are required to live on campus.

Priority Level: Low
Difficulty Level: Hard
Responsible Partners (Primary): University of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Landlords
Implementation Timeline: Long Term

Goal 4
Help create a culture shift by developing new policies and education about expectations of residents and property owners in the City of Cincinnati.

Action Step A5
Work with students and University officials to develop a "Living in the Neighborhood" course offered to students moving off campus, to teach life skills, good neighbor skills, and impress that they are residents of Cincinnati not just the University of Cincinnati. Involve members of the community, city, police, as guest speakers.
Priority Level: Highest
Difficulty Level: Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): University of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Neighborhood Stakeholder Groups
Implementation Timeline: Long Term

Strategy B
Work together to better educate landlords and property owners about expectations of property owners in neighborhoods surrounding the University of Cincinnati.

Action Step B1
Provide training to landlords/property owners/ property managers about the unique nature of renting to students, including expectations regarding litter, trash, noise, public safety laws, and the student code of conduct. Make sure the trainings are scheduled, advertised, detailed, and feature other local property owners as speakers.
Priority Level: Low
Difficulty Level: Hard
Responsible Partners (Primary): University of Cincinnati; Landlords; University of Cincinnati Police; City of Cincinnati Police
Responsible Partners (Secondary): City of Cincinnati; Greater Cincinnati Northern Kentucky Apartment Association
Implementation Timeline: Long Term

Goal 4
Help create a culture shift by developing new policies and education about expectations of residents and property owners in the City of Cincinnati.

Action Step B2
Develop perks for property owners to go through training such as: free advertisement with students; student referrals (to more than just large facilities); greater/more frequent access to trash/litter clean-ups; access to free student labor; etc.
Priority Level: Low
Difficulty Level: Hard
Responsible Partners (Primary): University of Cincinnati; City of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Business Associations; Greater Cincinnati Northern Kentucky Apartment Association
Implementation Timeline: Long Term

Action Step B3
Survey the neighborhood to see what rental opportunities are available from both larger, institutional products as well as property owners with small numbers of units.
Priority Level: Low
Difficulty Level: Hard
Responsible Partners (Primary): University of Cincinnati; Landlords
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Greater Cincinnati Northern Kentucky Apartment Association
Implementation Timeline: Long Term

Action Step B4
Develop a support network, formally or informally, to mentor newer property owners and encourage better communication among the property owners. Support network could stem from an existing group or meeting or could be new. Communication should include face-to-face, emails, and website.
Priority Level: Low
Difficulty Level: Easy
Responsible Partners (Primary): Community Councils; Landlords; Business Associations; Investors; Greater Cincinnati Northern Kentucky Apartment Association
Responsible Partners (Secondary): None
Implementation Timeline: 3-6 months

Action Step B5
Send letters jointly-signed by neighborhood stakeholders and the University of Cincinnati to property owners/landlords/property managers of properties that are frequent violators of laws or policies.
Priority Level: Low
Difficulty Level: Hard
Responsible Partners (Primary): University of Cincinnati; Neighborhood Stakeholders
Responsible Partners (Secondary): City of Cincinnati
Implementation Timeline: Long Term



Connectivity

Introduction

A Working Group was developed around connectivity solutions in the neighborhoods surrounding the University of Cincinnati, as well as connecting the University itself to the neighborhoods.

The Connectivity Working Group focused their time on four main categories. Those categories included transit, bicycles, pedestrians, and traffic. Many stakeholders were a part of this Working Group, including members from the University of Cincinnati, Southwest Ohio Regional Transit Authority (SORTA), Ohio/Kentucky/Indiana Regional Council of Governments, various neighborhood stakeholder groups, and the City of Cincinnati's Department of Transportation and Engineering.

The Connectivity Working Group met a total of five times, including October 22, 2015; December 3, 2015; January 20, 2016; March 30, 2016; and August 16, 2016 to discuss various solutions to multi-faceted connectivity issues. Four main goals were developed in this Working Group directly related to the transit, bicycles, pedestrians, and traffic.

Mission

To address concerns relative to bicycle routes and safety; pedestrian mobility and safety; to increase transportation alternatives and options; and to address traffic flow and safety.

Goal 1
Expand options for a more efficient and connective transit system.

With the Uptown area being the region's second largest employment center (behind Downtown), an efficient and connective transit system is necessary. There are currently several options, such as shuttles and Metro bus service, but the Connectivity Working Group generally agreed that they could all be improved upon and more options could be provided for all that live, work, and play in the neighborhoods surrounding the University of Cincinnati.

Strategy A

Expand and coordinate a more seamless shuttle service in the study area.

Action Step A1

Use the Uptown Shuttle Review (2015) as a guide to determine a more universal system.

Priority Level: Low
Difficulty Level: Hard
Responsible Partners (Primary): Uptown Consortium; University of Cincinnati; Health Institutions
Responsible Partners (Secondary): None
Implementation Timeline: 1 year minimum

Action Step A2

Coordinate with the Uptown Consortium, the University of Cincinnati, the Cincinnati Zoo and health organizations that operate shuttles to establish a global organization (such as a Transportation Demand Management Association) to oversee shuttles and parking for the area's major employers and coordinate fees.

Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Hard
Responsible Partners (Primary): Uptown Consortium; University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati Zoo; Health Institutions
Responsible Partners (Secondary): None
Implementation Timeline: 1-3 years

Action Step A3

Explore opportunities for residents to use the institutional shuttle service.

Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Hard
Responsible Partners (Primary): Community Councils; Uptown Consortium
Responsible Partners (Secondary): University of Cincinnati; City of Cincinnati; Health Institutions
Implementation Timeline: 1 year minimum

Action Step A4

Expand shuttle services further south to increase ridership.

Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): University of Cincinnati; Students
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Community Councils; Health Institutions
Implementation Timeline: 1-3 years

Goal 1
Expand options for a more efficient and connective transit system.

Strategy B

Coordinate with Southwest Ohio Regional Transit Authority (SORTA) to expand, improve, and market the utilization of transit services.

Action Step B1

Reestablish a more simplified system of using one pass for bus services.

Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Hard
Responsible Partners (Primary): SORTA
Responsible Partners (Secondary): City of Cincinnati; University of Cincinnati
Implementation Timeline: 1-3 years

Action Step B2

Explore the creation or reincorporate various routes including crosstown, east side, and west side bus routes with limited stops.

Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Hard
Responsible Partners (Primary): SORTA; Uptown Consortium
Responsible Partners (Secondary): City of Cincinnati; University of Cincinnati
Implementation Timeline: 1-3 years

Action Step B3

Find ways to increase education and market the Southwest Ohio Regional Transit Authority (SORTA) system.

Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): SORTA
Responsible Partners (Secondary): City of Cincinnati; University of Cincinnati
Implementation Timeline: 1-3 years

Strategy C

Conduct a feasibility study that looks at the overall viability of a streetcar or transportation connection to the Uptown area.

Action Step C1

Implement the next phase of a transportation connection to the Uptown area if deemed feasible following the completion of the study and seek out funding sources.

Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Hard
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati; University of Cincinnati; SORTA; Health Institutions; Community Councils; Business Associations; Community Development Corporations; Uptown Consortium
Responsible Partners (Secondary): None
Implementation Timeline: 2-4 years



Goal 2
Design, implement, and incentivize bicycle solutions.

With the recent addition of Red Bikes in Cincinnati, bicycle transportation is becoming more common, especially in the neighborhoods surrounding the University of Cincinnati. Since bicyclists share the roads with vehicular traffic, there is a constant need to improve bicycle safety and implement various bicycle opportunities.

Strategy A
Advocate and educate for bicycle safety to expand ridership.

Action Step A1
Utilize resources of the City of Cincinnati's Department of Transportation and Engineering and the University of Cincinnati to conduct a survey about existing bike connections and recommendations for safer biking.
Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati; University of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Queen City Bike; Red Bike; OKI
Implementation Timeline: 1 year

Strategy B
Enhance the on & off-street bicycle network and look for opportunities for connections.

Action Step B1
Update the City of Cincinnati Bike Plan in the study area.
Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): University of Cincinnati; Queen City Bike; Red Bike; OKI
Implementation Timeline: 1-2 years

Action Step B2
Coordinate with the Trails Alliance on making connections.
Priority Level: Low
Difficulty Level: Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): Trails Alliance
Responsible Partners (Secondary): City of Cincinnati; University of Cincinnati
Implementation Timeline: 1-3 years

Action Step B3
Implement innovative methods to creating a safer environment for bicycles (i.e. the bike box) on-street and particularly at intersections.
Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati; University of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Queen City Bike; Red Bike; OKI
Implementation Timeline: 1-3 years

Goal 2
Design, implement, and incentivize bicycle solutions.

Strategy C
Encourage biking as an alternative to automobile use.

Action Step C1
Coordinate with the University of Cincinnati and Uptown Consortium to explore incentives for students/employees to use transit/bike/walk to campus/work such as parking bikes in secured locations, showers/locker rooms, and providing maps of the bicycle network.
Priority Level: Low
Difficulty Level: Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): Uptown Consortium; University of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Health Institutions
Implementation Timeline: 5 years

Action Step C2
Work with Red Bike to provide enhanced education on their services in addition to encourage the use of helmets.
Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Easy
Responsible Partners (Primary): Red Bike
Responsible Partners (Secondary): City of Cincinnati; University of Cincinnati
Implementation Timeline: 1 year



Goal 3
Design and implement a safe and integrated pedestrian network.

As with most university areas, there are a high number of pedestrians. That is also the case in the areas around the University of Cincinnati, as many students are walking to and from classes, patronizing local businesses, and attending events. A safe and integrated pedestrian network is vital to the transportation networks around the University.

Strategy A
Exploration and implementation of thoughtful designs of pedestrian crosswalks.

Action Step A1
Coordinate with the Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) to use their accident database to determine high crash locations involving pedestrians.
Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Easy
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati; State of Ohio
Responsible Partners (Secondary): University of Cincinnati; Community Councils
Implementation Timeline: 1 month

Action Step A2
Utilize the resources of the University of Cincinnati to conduct a survey to determine locations where people are concerned for pedestrian safety.
Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Medium/Easy
Responsible Partners (Primary): University of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): City of Cincinnati; Community Councils
Implementation Timeline: 6 months

Action Step A3
Use appropriate methods (i.e. curb bump outs, enhanced crosswalks, etc.) at targeted intersections in the study area to improve safety.
Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Hard
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): University of Cincinnati; Community Councils
Implementation Timeline: 2-3 years

Goal 3
Design and implement a safe and integrated pedestrian network.

Strategy B
Make street improvements to further ensure the safety and accessibility of pedestrians.

Action Step B1
Continue to increase and improve lighting along targeted corridors.
Priority Level: Low
Difficulty Level: Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): University of Cincinnati; City of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Duke Energy
Implementation Timeline: 1-2 years

Action Step B2
Implement increased pedestrian signal clearance times according to the new federal standards.
Priority Level: Low
Difficulty Level: Easy
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): None
Implementation Timeline: 1-5 years

Action Step B3
Develop a public service awareness education campaign to promote safety of all road users, particularly bicycles and pedestrians.
Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati; State of Ohio; University of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Local Media Outlets
Implementation Timeline: 1 year

Goal 4
Manage the overall flow of traffic and encourage other modes of transportation.

The efficient and proper management of vehicular traffic is imperative in the neighborhoods surrounding the University of Cincinnati because of the high density of residents, students, employees, and others in this dense area of the city. Encouragement of other modes of transportation as opposed to automobile will help alleviate some of the congestion issues here.

Strategy A
Update the Uptown Transportation Study (2006).

Action Step A1
Coordinate with Uptown Consortium, Ohio Department of Transportation, City Department of Transportation and Engineering, and Ohio/Kentucky/Indiana Regional Council of Governments in order to update and prioritize recommendations.
Priority Level: Highest
Difficulty Level: Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): Uptown Consortium; State of Ohio; City of Cincinnati; OKI
Responsible Partners (Secondary): None
Implementation Timeline: 2 years

Strategy B
Explore methods of controlling traffic flow of automobiles, transit, bicycles, and pedestrians.

Action Step B1
Determine if a reduction of speed limits are warranted on any roadways.
Priority Level: Low
Difficulty Level: Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): None
Implementation Timeline: 1-2 years

Action Step B2
Consider changes to on-street parking restrictions, such as eliminating the "No Parking" provision from 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Calhoun and McMillan.
Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Community Councils; Business Associations; Community Development Corporations
Implementation Timeline: 6-12 months

Action Step B3
Consider wayfinding in the study area to supplement the Uptown Wayfinding within the larger private campus area.
Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Uptown Consortium
Implementation Timeline: 1 year

Goal 4
Manage the overall flow of traffic and encourage other modes of transportation.

Strategy C
Enhance pedestrian wayfinding around the study area.

Action Step C1
Implement a universally designed area pilot program that elevates wayfinding in areas of the University of Cincinnati campus, neighborhoods surrounding the University of Cincinnati, and the Neighborhood Business Districts.
Priority Level: Low
Difficulty Level: Easy
Responsible Partners (Primary): University of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): None
Implementation Timeline: 1 year minimum

Strategy D
Encourage the use of other modes of transportation through multiple solutions.

Action Step D1
Incentivize carpooling through reducing prices of parking.
Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): University of Cincinnati; Health Institutions
Responsible Partners (Secondary): None
Implementation Timeline: 1 year minimum

Action Step D2
Locate areas to build commuter parking lots and more efficiently use existing parking facilities to connect with the shuttle system and other transportation modes.
Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Hard
Responsible Partners (Primary): Uptown Consortium; University of Cincinnati; Health Institutions
Responsible Partners (Secondary): City of Cincinnati
Implementation Timeline: Long Term

Action Step D3
Consider a car-share program for the neighborhoods surrounding the University of Cincinnati.
Priority Level: Low
Difficulty Level: Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): Community Councils
Responsible Partners (Secondary): City of Cincinnati
Implementation Timeline: Long Term



Parking

Introduction

A Working Group was specifically developed and dedicated around parking solutions in the neighborhoods surrounding the University of Cincinnati due to the extraordinary amount of vehicles in the area on a daily basis.

The Parking Working Group focused their time on Code language about parking regulations and the possibility of bringing a residential permit parking program to some areas. Many stakeholders were a part of this Working Group, including members from the University of Cincinnati Parking Services, Southwest Ohio Regional Transit Authority, various neighborhood stakeholder groups, and the City of Cincinnati's Department of Transportation and Engineering.

The Parking Working Group met a total of five times, including October 14, 2015; November 12, 2015; January 27, 2016; April 5, 2016; and August 17, 2016 to discuss various solutions to multi-faceted parking issues. While these recommendations may help alleviate on-street and off-street parking issues, it will need to be a continued effort from all of the stakeholders to collaborate on resolving them into the future. Three main goals were developed in this Working Group directly related to Code regulations, studying of a permit parking program, and finding creative parking opportunities to solve congestion.

Mission

To address on-street and off-street parking.

Goal 1
Enforce parking and revise parking regulations.

Enforcement of existing parking regulations can be a funding and/or personnel issue. These strategies seek to help resolve those issues and possibly propose some revised parking regulations as well.

Strategy A
Use a multi-pronged approach to cover enforcement of parking.

Action Step A1
Coordinate with the University of Cincinnati Police to delegate enforcement of parking on residential streets to prevent cars blocking driveways, front yard parking, and increase enforcement during special events (i.e. University of Cincinnati football games).
Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): University of Cincinnati; City of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Property Owners
Implementation Timeline: Immediately

Action Step A2
Train a local task force to conduct parking enforcement during peak hours.
Priority Level: Low
Difficulty Level: Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): University of Cincinnati; City of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Property Owners
Implementation Timeline: Immediately

Strategy B
As part of the potential overlay district for the study area, include a revision of parking regulations.

Action Step B1
Consider revising parking standards for multi-family buildings for new development from regulating parking spaces per unit to parking spaces per bed.
Priority Level: Highest
Difficulty Level: Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): None
Implementation Timeline: 6-12 months

Action Step B2
Consider eliminating the "No Parking" provision from 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Calhoun and McMillan.
Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Community Councils; Business Associations; Community Development Corporations
Implementation Timeline: 6-12 months

Goal 2
Explore and study a residential permit parking program.

One issue that has been brought up several times from various stakeholders is the concept of a residential permit parking program in certain areas in the neighborhoods surrounding the University of Cincinnati. This will take time, money, political will, and much patience to evaluate and see if a program such as this will work for these areas.

Strategy A
The community and City will conduct a study to determine the appropriateness of a residential permit parking program.

Action Step A1
Coordinate with and survey residents, business owners, property owners, and the University of Cincinnati to help determine the feasibility of a program.
Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Hard
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): University of Cincinnati; Neighborhood Stakeholders
Implementation Timeline: 1 year

Action Step A2
If a residential permit parking program is deemed appropriate, implement a pilot program on designated streets of the study area.
Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Hard
Responsible Partners (Primary): University of Cincinnati; City of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Property Owners
Implementation Timeline: Immediately following study

Goal 3
Create more parking opportunities through revisions of parking regulations and new parking lots/garages.

Ultimately, the overarching goal of the Parking Working Group is to find creative ways for more parking opportunities.

Strategy A

As part of the potential overlay district, revise parking standards to maximize use of multi-family parking lots.

Action Step A1

Allow multi-family residential parking to be rented to nearby tenants while also revising the landscaping standards for parking lots.

Priority Level: Highest
Difficulty Level: Easy
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Property Owners
Implementation Timeline: 1 year

Action Step A2

Allow tandem parking to count towards parking requirements with a provision that it is properly regulated.

Priority Level: High
Difficulty Level: Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Developers
Implementation Timeline: 1 year

Action Step A3

Add zoning language that increases the distance from 600 feet to ¼ mile for off-site parking on nearby lots to serve a use and where that off-site parking cannot be located in a Single-Family zoning district.

Priority Level: Highest
Difficulty Level: Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): None
Implementation Timeline: 1 year

Action Step A4

Identify vacant lots suitable for adding off-street parking.

Priority Level: Low
Difficulty Level: Easy
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati; Community Development Corporations; Community Councils
Responsible Partners (Secondary): None
Implementation Timeline: 1-2 years

Action Step A5

Explore ways to make parking viable on 25 foot wide lots (current Code requirements are 35 foot wide lots for turnaround purposes).

Priority Level: Highest
Difficulty Level: Medium
Responsible Partners (Primary): City of Cincinnati
Responsible Partners (Secondary): Property Owners
Implementation Timeline: 1-2 years



Implementation

Introduction

The most effective way to implement the University Impact Area Solutions Study and all of the recommendations within is through the consistent advocacy of the neighborhood stakeholders working collaboratively with the City of Cincinnati and University of Cincinnati. This plan serves as the road map for the various solutions to many identified issues in the neighborhoods surrounding the University of Cincinnati. Some of the recommendations are already ongoing, some can be implemented in the short-term, and others are longer-term solutions.

The Steering Committee will transition into an Implementation Committee and use the following implementation chart to track progress.

The Working Groups will continue to meet in order to provide more details within the recommendations and work together at implementation. The Working Groups will report to the Implementation Committee.

The success of the University Impact Area Solutions Study will be based on the dedication of all the responsible parties and neighborhood stakeholders to collaborate and communicate together.

Initiative Area	Goals	Strategies	Action Steps	Primary Partners	Secondary Partners	Level of Difficulty (Hard, Medium, Easy)	Priority Level (Highest, High, Low, Lowest)	Timeline
Zoning & New Development	Establish where growth and density should be located in the areas near the University of Cincinnati.	Evaluate the current Zoning Code and proposed Land Development Code zoning district locations and boundaries.	Rezone specific areas that are recommended by the Zoning and New Development Working Group of the University Impact Area Solutions Study.	City of Cincinnati; Community Councils; Business Associations; Property Owners	Uptown Consortium; Cincinnati Public Schools; University of Cincinnati	Medium	Highest/High	1 year minimum
		Evaluate the current Zoning Code and proposed Land Development Code zoning district locations and boundaries.	Reflect the rezoning recommendations in the draft Land Development Code for consistency.	City of Cincinnati; Community Councils; Business Associations; Property Owners	Uptown Consortium; Cincinnati Public Schools; University of Cincinnati	Easy	Highest/High	2 years minimum
		Develop an overlay district to regulate growth and density in a specific area.	Study further and potentially establish an overlay district with regulations focused on the compatibility of new development and improving the livable environment.	City of Cincinnati; Community Councils; Business Associations; Community Development Corporations; Property Owners	Uptown Consortium; Cincinnati Public Schools; University of Cincinnati	Hard	High	1-2 years
		Develop an overlay district to regulate growth and density in a specific area.	Identify and establish an appropriate boundary for the potential overlay district.	City of Cincinnati; Community Councils; Business Associations; Community Development Corporations; Property Owners	Uptown Consortium; Cincinnati Public Schools; University of Cincinnati	Hard	High	1-2 years
		Develop an overlay district to regulate growth and density in a specific area.	Consider establishing or utilizing an existing review board, which can serve as an architectural review body that considers plans on a case-by-case basis within the potential overlay district.	City of Cincinnati	University of Cincinnati; Community Councils; Business Associations; Uptown Consortium	Hard	Low	1-2 years
	Retain and promote unique cultural and architectural characteristics of the older urban neighborhoods surrounding the University of Cincinnati.	Designate landmarks, districts, and unique cultural and architectural sites in the neighborhoods.	Identify these with the Zoning & New Development Working Group of the University Impact Area Solutions Study, the City of Cincinnati's Historic Conservation Office, Cincinnati Preservation Associations, and the City's consultant inventory of sites of historic merit.	City of Cincinnati; Neighborhoods; All Property Owners	City of Cincinnati; Community Councils; Property Owners; Zoning & New Development Working Group of the UIASS; Cincinnati Preservation Association	Hard	High	1 year minimum
		Revise the language in the Zoning Code within the potential overlay district related to signage.	Design and implement stricter regulations and standards for permanent and temporary signage within the potential overlay district.	City of Cincinnati; Community Councils; Business Associations; Community Development Corporations; Uptown Consortium	None	Medium/ Easy	Highest/High	3-6 months
		Revise the language in the Zoning Code within the residential zoning districts related to signage.	Reflect the revised regulations and standards in the draft Land Development Code.	City of Cincinnati	None	Medium/ Easy	Highest/High	1 year minimum

Initiative Area	Goals	Strategies	Action Steps	Primary Partners	Secondary Partners	Level of Difficulty (Hard, Medium, Easy)	Priority Level (Highest, High, Low, Lowest)	Timeline
Housing & Neighborhood Conditions	Develop and maintain quality housing.	Potentially implement a comprehensive residential rental inspection and certificate program.	Work with the Hamilton County Auditor, University of Cincinnati, and neighborhood stakeholder groups to generate and maintain a list of landlords with accurate contact information, including phone numbers and email addresses.	City of Cincinnati; Hamilton County; Landlords	Property Owners; University of Cincinnati	Hard/ Medium	Highest/High	6-12 months
		Potentially implement a comprehensive residential rental inspection and certificate program.	Work with the neighborhoods to identify problem properties and absentee landlords.	City of Cincinnati; Residents	Tenants; University of Cincinnati; Property Owners	Easy	Highest/High	6 months
		Potentially implement a comprehensive residential rental inspection and certificate program.	Develop and present a landlord training program geared to the issues specific to this area.	City of Cincinnati, Landlords; University of Cincinnati	Community Councils; Business Associations	Easy	There was not consensus in the Working Group	1 year minimum
		Potentially implement a comprehensive residential rental inspection and certificate program.	The Department of Buildings & Inspections and the Fire Department will evaluate and potentially pursue an inspection program for residential rental properties in this area. Some of the community strongly supports this being a mandatory program; some of the community strongly opposes this unless it is a voluntary program.	City of Cincinnati; Landlords	None	Hard	There was not consensus in the Working Group: some of the community supports this Action Step and some of the community does not support this Action Step	To be determined
		Potentially implement a comprehensive residential rental inspection and certificate program.	Work with landlords to come up with a plan to bring buildings up to applicable Codes, including creating a hierarchy of importance of what needs to be fixed first.	City of Cincinnati; Landlords	None	Hard/ Medium	High	1 year minimum
		Raise awareness of existing incentives to improve properties.	Make landlords aware of existing tax breaks for increased value when making building/ property improvements. This could be done through existing meetings such as the regular meetings of the Neighborhoods of Uptown.	City of Cincinnati; Hamilton County; University of Cincinnati	Landlords; Business Associations; Community Councils; Greater Cincinnati Northern Kentucky Apartment Association	Medium/ Easy	Highest/High	6 months
		Raise awareness of existing incentives to improve properties.	Increase penalties for repeat offenders, such as placing fines as a lien on the property's taxes.	City of Cincinnati; State of Ohio	None	Hard	Highest/High	6-12 months

Initiative Area	Goals	Strategies	Action Steps	Primary Partners	Secondary Partners	Level of Difficulty (Hard, Medium, Easy)	Priority Level (Highest, High, Low, Lowest)	Timeline
Housing & Neighborhood Conditions	Develop and maintain quality housing.	Raise awareness of existing incentives to improve properties.	In order to combat chronic blight in the neighborhoods, investigate a possible "Community Redevelopment Tax Incentive" ordinance that creates a process for declaring properties maintained in a chronically blighted condition, and establishes a mechanism to tax those properties at a higher rate until they are brought into compliance.	City of Cincinnati; State of Ohio	None	Hard	High	To be determined
		Increase homeownership.	Identify a community development corporation, such as the Clifton Heights Community Urban Redevelopment Corporation (CHCURC), to pursue various initiatives to promote and increase homeownership. CHCURC has an agreement with the CUF Neighborhood Association (CUFNA) to work together in the neighborhood and is considering single-family home renovations and new construction as well as vacant and abandoned lot improvements as a means to make the neighborhood more attractive to potential homeowners.	Community Development Corporations; Community Councils; University of Cincinnati	Uptown Consortium; Port Authority; Homeownership Center	Hard/ Medium	Highest/High	To be determined
		Increase homeownership.	Develop incentives for professors/young professionals to move to the area and work with the major institutions and realtors in the area to discuss the benefits of living in the neighborhood.	University of Cincinnati; Hospitals; Institutions; Board of Realtors; All Employees	Banks	Hard/ Medium	Highest/High	2-3 years
		Increase homeownership.	Collaborate with University of Cincinnati students/professors to buy and fix up project houses.	University of Cincinnati	Community Development Corporations; Community Councils; Habitat for Humanity	Medium	High	To be determined
		Increase homeownership.	Work with the Port Authority of Greater Cincinnati to make the university area a target area and go after tax delinquent properties.	City of Cincinnati; Hamilton County; Port Authority; Community Development Corporations	None	Hard/ Medium	High	To be determined
		Increase homeownership.	Coordinate with the City of Cincinnati to be a part of the City's Neighborhood Enhancement Program (NEP).	City of Cincinnati; Community Councils	None	Hard	There was not consensus in the Working Group	To be determined

Initiative Area	Goals	Strategies	Action Steps	Primary Partners	Secondary Partners	Level of Difficulty (Hard, Medium, Easy)	Priority Level (Highest, High, Low, Lowest)	Timeline
Housing & Neighborhood Conditions	Increase communication and collaboration between stakeholders.	Encourage the University of Cincinnati to develop and implement a public information program about off-campus housing.	Expand the University of Cincinnati Department of Housing and Food Services to include resources for off-campus housing, including a list of landlords and inspected properties.	University of Cincinnati; Landlords	None	Hard/ Medium	There was not consensus in the Working Group	1 year
		Encourage the University of Cincinnati to develop and implement a public information program about off-campus housing.	Develop information packets for landlords to give to students on move-in day about how to be a good neighbor.	City of Cincinnati; Landlords	None	Medium/ Easy	Highest/ High	1 year
		Increase stakeholder collaboration.	Hold a quarterly meeting between the University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati and University of Cincinnati Police, Community Councils, Community Development Corporations, and Business Associations to discuss common goals and issues.	City of Cincinnati; University of Cincinnati	Community Councils; Business Associations; Community Development Corporations	Easy	High	Immediately
		Increase stakeholder collaboration.	Increase communication between students, parents, landlords, and the University of Cincinnati.	University of Cincinnati; Students; Parents; Landlords	None	Medium	High	To be determined
		Increase stakeholder collaboration.	Develop a database for repeat student violators and share the list with landlords and University of Cincinnati Student Affairs.	University of Cincinnati	Landlords	Medium/ Easy	Low	1 year

Initiative Area	Goals	Strategies	Action Steps	Primary Partners	Secondary Partners	Level of Difficulty (Hard, Medium, Easy)	Priority Level (Highest, High, Low, Lowest)	Timeline
Quality of Life	Collaborate between the neighborhood stakeholders and the public safety departments of both the University of Cincinnati and the City of Cincinnati to enforce laws and provide education.	Continue work to approve the Memorandum of Understanding between the University of Cincinnati and the City of Cincinnati to allow their police departments to continue to work together.	University of Cincinnati Police should continue to patrol the neighborhoods immediately surrounding the University of Cincinnati, especially in areas where students live. This allows an extra level of security and faster response times.	University of Cincinnati	City of Cincinnati	Easy	Highest	Immediately
		Continue to educate all neighborhood stakeholders with accurate crime statistics and encourage community involvement in mitigation of crime.	Both the Cincinnati Police Department and University of Cincinnati Police should continue to attend all appropriate community meetings to discuss statistics, trends, and hot spots.	University of Cincinnati; City of Cincinnati	Community Councils; Neighborhood Stakeholder Organizations	Easy	High	Ongoing
		Continue to educate all neighborhood stakeholders with accurate crime statistics and encourage community involvement in mitigation of crime.	Crime statistics, prevention tips, and positive marketing about how the neighborhoods surrounding the University of Cincinnati are actually some of the safest neighborhoods in the City of Cincinnati will be available on the web, newsletters, and other forms of communication.	University of Cincinnati; City of Cincinnati	Community Councils; Business Associations; Community Development Corporations	Easy	Highest	Immediately and Ongoing
		Continue to educate all neighborhood stakeholders with accurate crime statistics and encourage community involvement in mitigation of crime.	Continue to use social media (such as Nextdoor and Live Safe) to exchange information with neighborhood stakeholders and law enforcement personnel.	University of Cincinnati Public Safety and Police; City of Cincinnati; Community Councils; Business Associations	University of Cincinnati Students; Property Owners	Medium	Low	Ongoing

Initiative Area	Goals	Strategies	Action Steps	Primary Partners	Secondary Partners	Level of Difficulty (Hard, Medium, Easy)	Priority Level (Highest, High, Low, Lowest)	Timeline
Quality of Life	Collaborate between the neighborhood stakeholders and the public safety departments of both the University of Cincinnati and the City of Cincinnati to enforce laws and provide education.	Enforce the law consistently and fairly in all neighborhoods.	Enforce all crime and disruption, including noise, parking, litterers, and other quality of life offenses.	City of Cincinnati; University of Cincinnati	None	Medium	High	Immediately
		Enforce the law consistently and fairly in all neighborhoods.	Revisit the City of Cincinnati's noise ordinance and revise it to make it more enforceable. Consider using distance instead of decibels to make it easier for police to enforce without special equipment.	City Council; City of Cincinnati; University of Cincinnati	Property Owners; Students	Medium	High	1 year minimum
		Enforce the law consistently and fairly in all neighborhoods.	Revisit the City of Cincinnati's snow removal ordinance and develop a plan to better enforce the policy. Bring together all of the departments involved with this and determine who has the resources to perform this function. Consider whether increasing the fine is necessary and set a more definitive time that properties are in violation.	City of Cincinnati	None	Hard	Lowest	Ongoing
		Enforce the law consistently and fairly in all neighborhoods.	Educate both property owners and tenants about the importance of snow removal for pedestrian safety. Dispel the myths about snow removal liability.	City of Cincinnati	Property Owners	Hard	Lowest	Ongoing
		Enforce the law consistently and fairly in all neighborhoods.	Ensure that students are dealt with in the most effective manner for illegal behavior, either by Cincinnati Police or University of Cincinnati Judicial Affairs.	City of Cincinnati; University of Cincinnati	Students; Property Owners	Medium	High	3-6 months
		Enforce the law consistently and fairly in all neighborhoods.	Continue to work with and expand Citizens on Patrol to provide both Cincinnati and University of Cincinnati Police with on-the-ground assistance.	City of Cincinnati	Community Councils	Easy	Lowest	Ongoing

Initiative Area	Goals	Strategies	Action Steps	Primary Partners	Secondary Partners	Level of Difficulty (Hard, Medium, Easy)	Priority Level (Highest, High, Low, Lowest)	Timeline
Quality of Life	Decrease the amounts of trash, litter, and blight in the neighborhoods.	Improve understanding and compliance by both students and residents in the neighborhoods about City policies and good-neighbor expectations.	Develop marketing/educational materials such as magnets, door-hangers, stickers on trash bins, or other materials with pick-up days, websites, frequently-asked-questions, good-neighbor property maintenance tips and expectations, and important contact information.	University of Cincinnati; City of Cincinnati	Community Councils; Business Associations; Community Development Corporations; Students	Medium	Highest	6-12 months
		Improve understanding and compliance by both students and residents in the neighborhoods about City policies and good-neighbor expectations.	Create and sell/give away bungee cord kits to help keep lids closed and prevent litter from trash cans being knocked over by individuals, wind, cars, or animals.	City of Cincinnati; Community Councils; Business Associations; Community Development Corporations	Clean Up Cincy; Student Groups	Easy	High	3 months
		Improve understanding and compliance by both students and residents in the neighborhoods about City policies and good-neighbor expectations.	Ensure that litter on private property is being reported so that enforcement can take place.	Property Owners; All Residents; University of Cincinnati; Community Councils; Business Associations; Community Development Corporations	City of Cincinnati	Easy	Low	Ongoing
		Improve understanding and compliance by both students and residents in the neighborhoods about City policies and good-neighbor expectations.	Enforce litter laws more strictly or consider revising litter laws to make laws easier to enforce.	City of Cincinnati	None	Hard	Lowest	Long Term
		Improve understanding and compliance by both students and residents in the neighborhoods about City policies and good-neighbor expectations.	Increase number of pick-up days for trash cans in the Neighborhood Business District.	City of Cincinnati	Business Associations	Hard	Low	Long Term

Initiative Area	Goals	Strategies	Action Steps	Primary Partners	Secondary Partners	Level of Difficulty (Hard, Medium, Easy)	Priority Level (Highest, High, Low, Lowest)	Timeline
Quality of Life	Decrease the amounts of trash, litter, and blight in the neighborhoods.	Develop a comprehensive program that utilizes students and residents to help both clean up litter and blighted areas and educate.	Continue to coordinate with students who need volunteer hours.	Clean Up Cincy; Student Groups	University of Cincinnati	Easy	High	Ongoing
		Develop a comprehensive program that utilizes students and residents to help both clean up litter and blighted areas and educate.	Work with Hughes High School to provide continual education/ public awareness to their students about litter. University of Cincinnati students would be in an ideal position to educate peer to peer.	Cincinnati Public Schools; University of Cincinnati Center for Community Engagement	None	Easy	Low	6-12 months
		Develop a comprehensive program that utilizes students and residents to help both clean up litter and blighted areas and educate.	Design an ambassador program similar to Downtown Cincinnati Inc. to pick up litter, notify about illegal dumping or overflowing corner cans, and help educate both residents and visitors. Consider whether expanding existing student programs (such as Clean Up Cincy) or creation of new program that includes non-students is most appropriate. Clifton Heights Community Urban Redevelopment Corporation has one employee that does some of this work already in the business district at a small-scale level.	University of Cincinnati; University of Cincinnati Student Government; Uptown Consortium	City of Cincinnati; Clean Up Cincy; Student Groups; Community Councils; Community Development Corporations; Business Associations; All Residents	Medium	Highest	2-3 years

Initiative Area	Goals	Strategies	Action Steps	Primary Partners	Secondary Partners	Level of Difficulty (Hard, Medium, Easy)	Priority Level (Highest, High, Low, Lowest)	Timeline
Quality of Life	Decrease the amounts of trash, litter, and blight in the neighborhoods.	Continue to refine efforts during the University of Cincinnati move-in/move-out time to ensure a seamless transition, resulting in cleaner streets, sidewalks, and yards, and less dumping.	Continue to analyze the length of the move-in/move-out period, communication with renters about services and expectations, and ensuring that neighborhood stakeholders are engaged in and connected to this process.	University of Cincinnati	City of Cincinnati	Medium	Low	Ongoing
		Continue to refine efforts during the University of Cincinnati move-in/move-out time to ensure a seamless transition, resulting in cleaner streets, sidewalks, and yards, and less dumping.	Consider working with utility companies to help communicate to renters.	Utility Companies	Community Councils; Property Owners	Medium	Low	Long Term
		Continue to refine efforts during the University of Cincinnati move-in/move-out time to ensure a seamless transition, resulting in cleaner streets, sidewalks, and yards, and less dumping.	Develop education or programs to encourage renters to give away or sell unwanted items (to local charities or other people) instead of throwing away. Consider a “sustainability corral” and encourage a take-and-leave policy for a certain period of time and partner with a local charity to collect on a certain date.	University of Cincinnati; City of Cincinnati	Collection Partners	Medium	High	3-6 months
		Continue to refine efforts during the University of Cincinnati move-in/move-out time to ensure a seamless transition, resulting in cleaner streets, sidewalks, and yards, and less dumping.	Continue to refine Department of Public Services’ extra collections and dumpster collections that coincide with spring move-out. Because some rental periods end on the 1st of the month, others on the 15th, work with landlords, renters, and donation services to ensure that items are disposed of in the appropriate extra collection week.	City of Cincinnati; Business Associations; Landlords	University of Cincinnati	Hard	Highest	Ongoing

Initiative Area	Goals	Strategies	Action Steps	Primary Partners	Secondary Partners	Level of Difficulty (Hard, Medium, Easy)	Priority Level (Highest, High, Low, Lowest)	Timeline
Quality of Life	Mitigate negative effects of large or wild parties on the neighborhoods.	Continue to develop a "Landlord Notification Policy" related to out of control and reoccurring parties that are disruptive to the neighbors.	Continue to track and progressively enforce problem parties that are large, wild, or reported by neighbors.	University of Cincinnati; City of Cincinnati	None	Easy	High	Ongoing
		Continue to develop a "Landlord Notification Policy" related to out of control and reoccurring parties that are disruptive to the neighbors.	Work with landlords and law enforcement personnel to reinstate the policy with Cincinnati Police and University Police to keep a list of landlord names, properties, and phone numbers and give law enforcement personnel permission to go onto properties and shut down parties.	Landlords	University of Cincinnati; City of Cincinnati; Greater Cincinnati Northern Kentucky Apartment Association	Medium	Low	Long Term
		Continue to develop a "Landlord Notification Policy" related to out of control and reoccurring parties that are disruptive to the neighbors.	Contact landlords/property managers/property owners after problem parties occur.	Landlords; University of Cincinnati	City of Cincinnati; Greater Cincinnati Northern Kentucky Apartment Association	Easy	Highest	Immediately
		Continue to develop a "Landlord Notification Policy" related to out of control and reoccurring parties that are disruptive to the neighbors.	Cite landlords/property managers/property owners if problems persist.	Landlords; University of Cincinnati	City of Cincinnati	Medium	High	3-6 months
		Continue to develop a "Landlord Notification Policy" related to out of control and reoccurring parties that are disruptive to the neighbors.	Consider legal limit of number of persons allowed for rental properties.	City of Cincinnati; State of Ohio	Greater Cincinnati Northern Kentucky Apartment Association	Hard	Low	Long Term

Initiative Area	Goals	Strategies	Action Steps	Primary Partners	Secondary Partners	Level of Difficulty (Hard, Medium, Easy)	Priority Level (Highest, High, Low, Lowest)	Timeline
Quality of Life	Mitigate negative effects of large or wild parties on the neighborhoods.	Continue to develop a "Student Party Amnesty Policy" to allow students to feel safe reporting their own party if it gets out of control.	Work to further develop the policy and better educate students to help understand that they can shut down their own party without penalty if it inadvertently gets out of control.	University of Cincinnati Students	City of Cincinnati; University of Cincinnati	Medium	Highest	3-6 months
		Work together to proactively prevent and appropriately enforce problem parties, excessive use of alcohol and drugs, and use of alcohol by minors.	Work with University of Cincinnati Police, Cincinnati Police, and Citizens on Patrol to report parties, spillover from parties, and large roaming groups looking for parties in residential areas.	University of Cincinnati; City of Cincinnati	Citizens on Patrol	Medium	Low	Immediately
		Work together to proactively prevent and appropriately enforce problem parties, excessive use of alcohol and drugs, and use of alcohol by minors.	Ensure that students are dealt with in the most effective manner for problem parties, either by Cincinnati Police or University of Cincinnati Judicial Affairs.	City of Cincinnati	University of Cincinnati	Easy	Highest	Immediately

Initiative Area	Goals	Strategies	Action Steps	Primary Partners	Secondary Partners	Level of Difficulty (Hard, Medium, Easy)	Priority Level (Highest, High, Low, Lowest)	Timeline
Quality of Life	Help create a culture shift by developing new policies and education about expectations of residents and property owners in the City of Cincinnati.	Use a multi-pronged approach to working with University of Cincinnati students through policies and creative education.	Start by using "Welcome Week" for new students to begin to educate them about their role, whether they live on or off campus, as residents of Cincinnati.	University of Cincinnati	Community Councils; All Residents	Medium/Easy	Highest	Immediately
		Use a multi-pronged approach to working with University of Cincinnati students through policies and creative education.	Use social media and electronic communication whenever possible to emphasize the information, including teaching them about the Live Safe App.	University of Cincinnati; City of Cincinnati	None	Easy	Highest	Immediately
		Use a multi-pronged approach to working with University of Cincinnati students through policies and creative education.	Provide marketing materials such as magnets, pens, t-shirts, hats, koozies, etc. to help enforce the message.	University of Cincinnati; City of Cincinnati	Community Councils; Business Associations; Community Development Corporations	Hard	Lowest	Long Term
		Use a multi-pronged approach to working with University of Cincinnati students through policies and creative education.	Enforce requirement for all freshmen to live on campus or with their parents. Currently, only students living 50 miles away or more are required to live on campus.	University of Cincinnati	Landlords	Hard	Low	Long Term
		Use a multi-pronged approach to working with University of Cincinnati students through policies and creative education.	Work with students and University officials to develop a "Living in the Neighborhood" course offered to students moving off campus, to teach life skills, good neighbor skills, and impress that they are residents of Cincinnati not just the University of Cincinnati. Involve members of the community, city, police, as guest speakers.	University of Cincinnati	Neighborhood Stakeholder Groups	Medium	Highest	Long Term

Initiative Area	Goals	Strategies	Action Steps	Primary Partners	Secondary Partners	Level of Difficulty (Hard, Medium, Easy)	Priority Level (Highest, High, Low, Lowest)	Timeline
Quality of Life	Help create a culture shift by developing new policies and education about expectations of residents and property owners in the City of Cincinnati.	Work together to better educate landlords and property owners about expectations of property owners in neighborhoods surrounding the University of Cincinnati.	Provide training to landlords/ property owners/property managers about the unique nature of renting to students, including expectations regarding litter, trash, noise, public safety laws, and the student code of conduct. Make sure the trainings are scheduled, advertised, detailed, and feature other local property owners as speakers.	University of Cincinnati; Landlords; University of Cincinnati Police; City of Cincinnati Police	City of Cincinnati; Greater Cincinnati Northern Kentucky Apartment Association	Hard	Low	Long Term
		Work together to better educate landlords and property owners about expectations of property owners in neighborhoods surrounding the University of Cincinnati.	Develop perks for property owners to go through training such as: free advertisement with students; student referrals (to more than just large facilities); greater/more frequent access to trash/litter clean-ups; access to free student labor; etc.	University of Cincinnati; City of Cincinnati	Business Associations; Greater Cincinnati Northern Kentucky Apartment Association	Hard	Low	Long Term
		Work together to better educate landlords and property owners about expectations of property owners in neighborhoods surrounding the University of Cincinnati.	Survey the neighborhood to see what rental opportunities are available from both larger, institutional products as well as property owners with small numbers of units.	University of Cincinnati; Landlords	Greater Cincinnati Northern Kentucky Apartment Association	Hard	Low	Long Term
		Work together to better educate landlords and property owners about expectations of property owners in neighborhoods surrounding the University of Cincinnati.	Develop a support network, formally or informally, to mentor newer property owners and encourage better communication among the property owners. Support network could stem from an existing group or meeting or could be new. Communication should include face-to-face, emails, and website.	Community Councils; Landlords; Business Associations; Investors; Greater Cincinnati Northern Kentucky Apartment Association	None	Easy	Low	3-6 months
		Work together to better educate landlords and property owners about expectations of property owners in neighborhoods surrounding the University of Cincinnati.	Send letters jointly-signed by neighborhood stakeholders and the University of Cincinnati to property owners/landlords/ property managers of properties that are frequent violators of laws or policies.	University of Cincinnati; Neighborhood Stakeholders	City of Cincinnati	Hard	Low	Long Term

Initiative Area	Goals	Strategies	Action Steps	Primary Partners	Secondary Partners	Level of Difficulty (Hard, Medium, Easy)	Priority Level (Highest, High, Low, Lowest)	Timeline
Connectivity	Expand options for a more efficient and connective transit system.	Expand and coordinate a more seamless shuttle service in the study area.	Use the Uptown Shuttle Review (2015) as a guide to determine a more universal system.	Uptown Consortium; University of Cincinnati; Health Institutions	None	Hard	Low	1 year minimum
		Expand and coordinate a more seamless shuttle service in the study area.	Coordinate with the Uptown Consortium, the University of Cincinnati, the Cincinnati Zoo and health organizations that operate shuttles to establish a global organization (such as a Transportation Demand Management Association) to oversee shuttles and parking for the area's major employers and coordinate fees.	Uptown Consortium; University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati Zoo; Health Institutions	None	Hard	High	1-3 years
		Expand and coordinate a more seamless shuttle service in the study area.	Explore opportunities for residents to use the institutional shuttle service.	Community Councils; Uptown Consortium	University of Cincinnati; City of Cincinnati; Health Institutions	Hard	High	1 year minimum
		Expand and coordinate a more seamless shuttle service in the study area.	Expand shuttle services further south to increase ridership.	University of Cincinnati; Students	Community Councils; Health Institutions	Medium	High	1-3 years
		Coordinate with Southwest Ohio Regional Transit Authority (SORTA) to expand, improve, and market the utilization of transit services.	Reestablish a more simplified system of using one pass for bus services.	SORTA	City of Cincinnati; University of Cincinnati	Hard	High	1-3 years
		Coordinate with Southwest Ohio Regional Transit Authority (SORTA) to expand, improve, and market the utilization of transit services.	Explore the creation or reincorporate various routes including crosstown, east side, and west side bus routes with limited stops.	SORTA; Uptown Consortium	City of Cincinnati; University of Cincinnati	Hard	High	1-3 years
		Coordinate with Southwest Ohio Regional Transit Authority (SORTA) to expand, improve, and market the utilization of transit services.	Find ways to increase education and market the Southwest Ohio Regional Transit Authority (SORTA) system.	SORTA	City of Cincinnati; University of Cincinnati	Medium	High	1-3 years

Initiative Area	Goals	Strategies	Action Steps	Primary Partners	Secondary Partners	Level of Difficulty (Hard, Medium, Easy)	Priority Level (Highest, High, Low, Lowest)	Timeline
Connectivity	Expand options for a more efficient and connective transit system.	Study and potentially implement the next phase of the streetcar in the Uptown area if feasible.	Study the potential streetcar route and seek out funding sources.	City of Cincinnati; University of Cincinnati; SORTA; Health Institutions; Community Councils; Business Associations; Community Development Corporations	None	Hard	High	2-4 years
		Study and potentially implement the next phase of the streetcar in the Uptown area if feasible.	Implement the next phase of the streetcar to reach the Uptown area if deemed feasible and subject to approval by the City Administration, City Planning Commission, City Council, and the Mayor following the completion of the study.	Wait for results of study	Wait for results of study	Wait for results of study	Wait for results of study	Wait for results of study
	Design, implement, and incentivize bicycle solutions.	Advocate and educate for bicycle safety to expand ridership.	Utilize resources of the City of Cincinnati's Department of Transportation and Engineering and the University of Cincinnati to conduct a study about existing bike connections and recommendations for safer biking.	City of Cincinnati; University of Cincinnati	Queen City Bike; Red Bike; OKI	Medium	High	1 year
		Enhance the off-street bicycle network and look for opportunities for connections.	Update the City of Cincinnati Bike Plan in the study area.	City of Cincinnati	University of Cincinnati; Queen City Bike; Red Bike; OKI	Medium	High	1-2 years
		Enhance the off-street bicycle network and look for opportunities for connections.	Coordinate with the Trails Alliance on making connections.	Trails Alliance	City of Cincinnati; University of Cincinnati	Medium	Low	1-3 years
		Enhance the off-street bicycle network and look for opportunities for connections.	Implement innovative methods to creating a safer environment for bicycles (i.e. the bike box) on-street and particularly at intersections.	City of Cincinnati; University of Cincinnati	Queen City Bike; Red Bike; OKI	Medium	High	1-3 years

Initiative Area	Goals	Strategies	Action Steps	Primary Partners	Secondary Partners	Level of Difficulty (Hard, Medium, Easy)	Priority Level (Highest, High, Low, Lowest)	Timeline
Connectivity	Design, implement, and incentivize bicycle solutions.	Encourage biking as an alternative to automobile use.	Coordinate with the University of Cincinnati and Uptown Consortium to explore incentives for students/ employees to use transit/bike/ walk to campus/work such as parking bikes in secured locations, showers/locker rooms, and providing maps of the bicycle network.	Uptown Consortium; University of Cincinnati	Health Institutions	Medium	Low	5 years
		Encourage biking as an alternative to automobile use.	Work with Red Bike to provide enhanced education on their services in addition to encourage the use of helmets.	Red Bike	City of Cincinnati; University of Cincinnati	Easy	High	1 year
	Design and implement a safe and integrated pedestrian network.	Exploration and implementation of thoughtful designs of pedestrian crosswalks.	Coordinate with the Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) to use their accident database to determine high crash locations involving pedestrians.	City of Cincinnati; State of Ohio	University of Cincinnati; Community Councils	Easy	High	1 month
		Exploration and implementation of thoughtful designs of pedestrian crosswalks.	Utilize the resources of the University of Cincinnati to conduct a survey to determine locations where people are concerned for pedestrian safety.	University of Cincinnati	City of Cincinnati; Community Councils	Medium/Easy	High	6 months
		Exploration and implementation of thoughtful designs of pedestrian crosswalks.	Use appropriate methods (i.e. curb bump outs, enhanced crosswalks, etc.) at targeted intersections in the study area to improve safety.	City of Cincinnati	University of Cincinnati; Community Councils	Hard	High	2-3 years
		Make street improvements to further ensure the safety and accessibility of pedestrians.	Continue to increase and improve lighting along targeted corridors.	University of Cincinnati; City of Cincinnati	Duke Energy	Medium	Low	1-2 years
		Make street improvements to further ensure the safety and accessibility of pedestrians.	Implement increased pedestrian signal clearance times according to the new federal standards.	City of Cincinnati	None	Easy	Low	1-5 years
		Make street improvements to further ensure the safety and accessibility of pedestrians.	Develop a public service awareness education campaign to promote safety of all road users, particularly bicycles and pedestrians.	City of Cincinnati; State of Ohio; University of Cincinnati	Local Media Outlets	Medium	High	1 year

Initiative Area	Goals	Strategies	Action Steps	Primary Partners	Secondary Partners	Level of Difficulty (Hard, Medium, Easy)	Priority Level (Highest, High, Low, Lowest)	Timeline
Connectivity	Manage the overall flow of traffic and encourage other modes of transportation.	Update the Uptown Transportation Study (2006).	Coordinate with Uptown Consortium, Ohio Department of Transportation, City Department of Transportation and Engineering, and Ohio/Kentucky/Indiana (OKI) Regional Council of Governments in order to update and prioritize recommendations.	Uptown Consortium; State of Ohio; City of Cincinnati; OKI	None	Medium	Highest	2 years
		Explore methods of controlling traffic flow of automobiles, transit, bicycles, and pedestrians.	Determine if a reduction of speed limits are warranted on any roadways.	City of Cincinnati	None	Medium	Low	1-2 years
		Explore methods of controlling traffic flow of automobiles, transit, bicycles, and pedestrians.	Consider changes to on-street parking restrictions, such as eliminating the “No Parking” provision from 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Calhoun and McMillan.	City of Cincinnati	Community Councils; Business Associations; Community Development Corporations	Medium	High	6-12 months
		Explore methods of controlling traffic flow of automobiles, transit, bicycles, and pedestrians.	Consider wayfinding in the study area to supplement the Uptown Wayfinding within the larger private campus area.	City of Cincinnati	Uptown Consortium	Medium	High	1 year
		Enhance pedestrian wayfinding around the study area.	Implement a universally designed area pilot program that elevates wayfinding in areas of the University of Cincinnati campus, neighborhoods surrounding the University of Cincinnati, and the Neighborhood Business Districts.	University of Cincinnati	None	Easy	Low	1 year minimum
		Encourage the use of other modes of transportation through multiple solutions.	Incentivize carpooling through reducing prices of parking.	University of Cincinnati; Health Institutions	None	Medium	High	1 year minimum
		Encourage the use of other modes of transportation through multiple solutions.	Locate areas to build commuter parking lots and more efficiently use existing parking facilities to connect with the shuttle system and other transportation modes.	Uptown Consortium; University of Cincinnati; Health Institutions	City of Cincinnati	Hard	High	Long Term
		Encourage the use of other modes of transportation through multiple solutions.	Consider a car-share program for the neighborhoods surrounding the University of Cincinnati.	Community Councils	City of Cincinnati	Medium	Low	Long Term

Initiative Area	Goals	Strategies	Action Steps	Primary Partners	Secondary Partners	Level of Difficulty (Hard, Medium, Easy)	Priority Level (Highest, High, Low, Lowest)	Timeline
Parking	Enforce parking and revise parking regulations.	Use a multi-pronged approach to cover enforcement of parking.	Coordinate with the University of Cincinnati Police to delegate enforcement of parking on residential streets to prevent cars blocking driveways, front yard parking, and increase enforcement during special events (i.e. University of Cincinnati football games).	University of Cincinnati; City of Cincinnati	Property Owners	Medium	High	Immediately
		Use a multi-pronged approach to cover enforcement of parking.	Train a local task force to conduct parking enforcement during peak hours.	University of Cincinnati; City of Cincinnati	Property Owners	Medium	Low	Immediately
		As part of the potential overlay district for the study area, include a revision of parking regulations.	Consider revising parking standards for multi-family buildings for new development from regulating parking spaces per unit to parking spaces per bed.	City of Cincinnati	None	Medium	Highest	6-12 months
		As part of the potential overlay district for the study area, include a revision of parking regulations.	Consider eliminating the “No Parking” provision from 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Calhoun and McMillan.	City of Cincinnati	Community Councils; Business Associations; Community Development Corporations	Medium	High	6-12 months

Initiative Area	Goals	Strategies	Action Steps	Primary Partners	Secondary Partners	Level of Difficulty (Hard, Medium, Easy)	Priority Level (Highest, High, Low, Lowest)	Timeline
Parking	Explore and study a residential permit parking program.	The community and City will conduct a study to determine the appropriateness of a residential permit parking program.	Coordinate with and survey residents, business owners, property owners, and the University of Cincinnati to help determine the feasibility of a program.	City of Cincinnati	University of Cincinnati; Neighborhood Stakeholders	Hard	High	1 year
		The community and City will conduct a study to determine the appropriateness of a residential permit parking program.	If a residential permit parking program is deemed appropriate, implement a pilot program on designated streets of the study area.	University of Cincinnati; City of Cincinnati	Property Owners	Hard	High	Immediately following study

Initiative Area	Goals	Strategies	Action Steps	Primary Partners	Secondary Partners	Level of Difficulty (Hard, Medium, Easy)	Priority Level (Highest, High, Low, Lowest)	Timeline
Parking	Create more parking opportunities through revisions of parking regulations and new parking lots/garages.	As part of the potential overlay district, revise parking standards to maximize use of multi-family parking lots.	Allow multi-family residential parking to be rented to nearby tenants while also improving the landscaping standards for parking lots.	City of Cincinnati	Property Owners	Easy	Highest	1 year
		As part of the potential overlay district, revise parking standards to maximize use of multi-family parking lots.	Allow tandem parking to count towards parking requirements with a provision that it is properly regulated.	City of Cincinnati	Developers	Medium	High	1 year
		As part of the potential overlay district, revise parking standards to maximize use of multi-family parking lots.	Add zoning language that increases the distance from 600 feet to ¼ mile for off-site parking on nearby lots to serve a use and where that off-site parking cannot be located in a Single-Family zoning district.	City of Cincinnati	None	Medium	Highest	1 year
		As part of the potential overlay district, revise parking standards to maximize use of multi-family parking lots.	Identify vacant lots suitable for adding off-street parking.	City of Cincinnati; Community Development Corporations; Community Councils	None	Easy	Low	1-2 years
		As part of the potential overlay district, revise parking standards to maximize use of multi-family parking lots.	Explore ways to make parking viable on 25 foot wide lots (current Code requirements are 35 foot wide lots for turnaround purposes).	City of Cincinnati	Property Owners	Medium	Highest	1-2 years

Appendix



Appendix A: Comparable Overlay Districts Near Universities

Comparison City: Reno, Nevada
Population (2015): 225,221

Educational Institution: University of Nevada-Reno
Enrollment (2015-2016): 20,898

UNRC University of Nevada Regional Center Planning Area Overlay District

Purpose: The purpose of this district is to modify the underlying mixed use zoning land uses, development standards, and development review procedures within the University of Nevada Regional Center Planning Area. This district is intended to maintain and enhance the University of Nevada and promote compatible land uses in the immediate vicinity District-specific standards.

The existing zoning regulations and designations apply to these properties prior to acquisition. Mixed-use development is permitted by the underlying Mixed-use base zoning district. Specific modifications to allowed land uses, development standards, and processing requirements are identified in the University Regional Center Planning Area Overlay. This planning area overlay designation permits continuation of existing uses when a currently established use is going to be maintained. In other words, as long as the use remains the same it is considered a conforming use. Any change in the use must be to a use included in the list of uses allowed by the University Regional Center Planning Area Overlay.

Code Amendments: The Mixed-Use base zoning district and University Regional Center Planning Area Overlay contain a number of provisions to facilitate implementation of this regional plan
Requirement for the URCP, including boundaries, to be adopted in order to utilize the University Regional Center Planning Area Overlay.
Provisions for automatic rezoning of certain areas if and when the University acquires them.
Modifications to the list of uses allowed in the mixed use base zoning district.
Modifications to the requirements for operations between 11 p.m. and 6 a.m.

Source: City of Reno. Mortensen-Garson Overlay District Section 18.081. Establishment and Purpose of Base and Overlay Zoning Districts. Reno, NV: Reno City Planning Commission.

Appendix A: Comparable Overlay Districts Near Universities

Comparison City: Bloomington, Indiana
Population (2015): 80,405

Educational Institution: Indiana University
Enrollment (2015-2016): 48,514

IU University Village Overlay District

Purposes: To ensure that new development is compatible in mass and scale with historic structures in the University Village Character Area; Draw upon the variety of architectural styles combined with diverse land uses and site features to enhance the existing eclectic mix of developments that serves as a dynamic and key transitional activity center that connects the Courthouse Square with Indiana University; Promote infill land redevelopment of sites using moderate residential densities for the University Village area and higher residential densities along the Kirkwood Corridor; Maintain and reinforce the traditional main street character of the Kirkwood Corridor as a strong pedestrian-friendly route; Protect and maintain the unique character of the converted residential structures along Restaurant Row.



Source: City of Bloomington (February, 2007). City of Bloomington Unified Development Ordinance: Overlay Districts. Bloomington, IN.

Comparison City: Oxford, Ohio
Population (2015): 21,470

Educational Institution: Miami University
Enrollment (2015-2016): 18,456

Proposed Miami University Overlay District

Purpose: Oxford residents are working with local officials to limit student housing in eight areas. The proposal is to limit the number of unrelated residents allowed to live in a single house. Without the proposed overlay, a single dwelling unit can house up to four unrelated individuals. With the proposed overlay, a limit of two unrelated individuals living together in a single dwelling unit would go into effect.



Sources: Staff Writer (November, 2014). Overlay Districts to Benefit Local Families. Oxford, OH: The Miami Student.
City of Oxford (February, 2015). City of Oxford Zoning Districts. Oxford, OH: City of Oxford.

Appendix A: Comparable Overlay Districts Near Universities

Comparison City: Columbus, Ohio
Population (2015): 787,033

Educational Institution: Ohio State University
Enrollment (2015-2016): 64,868

OSU University Area Planning Overlay District

Purposes: To create Development and Design Guidelines and a commercial zoning overlay to insure that investments ranging from signs to new buildings contribute to positive and mutually beneficial change.
To extend benefits, similar to the city's Neighborhood Commercial Revitalization (NCR) program, to accelerate the pace of private investment in the roughly 1,300,000 square feet of existing space.
The existing space would continue to house locally owned business, entrepreneurial start-ups, basement bars, funky music stores, ethnic restaurants, and other use that make High Street unique.
To create a new commercial zoning overlay – a partner to Residential overlay that discouraged overbuilding in the neighborhood. In mid-2002, Columbus City Council adopted an urban commercial zoning overlay for High Street.

In addition, the Urban Commercial Overlay (UCO) was established to regulate development in specifically designated areas in order to protect, re-establish and retain the unique architectural and aesthetic characteristics of older, urban commercial corridors. Such corridors are typically characterized by pedestrian-oriented architecture, building setbacks ranging from 0-10 feet, rear parking lots, commercial land uses, a street system that incorporates alleys and lot sizes smaller than 0.5 acre. The provisions of the UCO are intended to encourage pedestrian-oriented development featuring retail display windows, reduced building setbacks, rear parking lots, and other pedestrian-oriented site design elements. Where applied, UCO standards generally require full compliance for new construction, partial compliance for exterior building additions and alterations and minimal or no compliance for routine maintenance and the replacement in-kind of materials.

Sources: Goody, Clancy & Associates (August, 2000). A Plan for High Street: Creating a 21st Century Main Street. Columbus, OH: Campus Partners for Community Urban Redevelopment, Inc.
Department of Development, Planning Division (October, 2005). The Urban Commercial Overlay: Promoting Pedestrian-Oriented Development in the City of Columbus, Ohio. Columbus, OH: City of Columbus.

Appendix A: Comparable Overlay Districts Near Universities

Comparison City: Seattle, Washington
Population (2015): 662,400

Educational Institution: University of Washington
Enrollment (2015-2016): 45,213

Proposed UW Seattle University District

Purposes: A suite of zoning changes proposed for the University District could accommodate an additional 5,000 new dwelling units and 4,800 jobs within a 20-year plan period over base zoning in effect today. At the heart of the changes is a desire to focus growth of housing and jobs centrally in the neighborhood around a major high capacity transit investment.
By 2021, the University District will have an operational subway providing frequent service south to Downtown Seattle and the airport, and north to Northgate. Sound Transit is building the new station close to the neighborhood's core. Naturally, the blocks closest to the station are proposed for the highest intensity zoning options.

Seattle had evaluated a variety of different zoning options. One option would have seen larger swaths of land rezoned at lesser intensities than the current draft proposal while a second option would have seen a nearly equivalent amount of land zoned at slightly higher intensities.

An important understanding from the overall draft zoning proposal is that changes are meant to reflect a "wedding cake" approach. Areas closest to the center have the highest intensity zoning for height and activity. Moving away from the center, allowed heights are reduced and non-residential uses are increasingly limited until only residential uses are permitted.

Interestingly, University Way NE (The Ave) is largely untouched by zoning changes in the draft proposal. This was an intentional move by DPD as community members consistently requested that the general character of The Ave be preserved. Zoning on much of The Ave is already generous allowing a wide spectrum of uses and building heights, yet many of the most popular establishments are only in one-story buildings; just a few buildings actually cap out at the maximum height permitted. Still, two small portions of The Ave will see modest zoning changes.



Source: Fesler, Stephen (December 2015). University District: Draft Proposal for Rezones. Seattle, WA: CC BY-NC-ND 3.0 U.S.