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A Look at Mt. Auburn

The project area is located just north of Downtown Cincinnati along Auburn Avenue in Mt. Auburn.

The area, rich in history, is challenged with topography which hinders some development within the area. However these hills and slopes give great character and views to Mt. Auburn which just add to the identity of the area.

Looking at all of Mt. Auburn, we realized that there were main intervention sites within this area that should be addressed. By addressing these areas we will hopefully breath new life and inspiration within Mt. Auburn and will help to jump start new development within the area.
A Closer Look at Our Intervention Site;

Our intervention site is located in the north-west section of Mt. Auburn. Our street boundaries are William H. Taft, Auburn Avenue, Glencoe Avenue, View St., Leroy, Valencia Avenue, Thill and Vine Street. (see map)

Located within our intervention area is a mixture of housing mostly located on the outer banks of our intervention area. Also located within our site is Inwood Park, which will be one of our main focuses for redevelopment. Also located along Auburn Avenue, a historic district that also leaks into most of the east side of the project area. This will be both a blessing and a curse, because it not only gives us rich historical significance to our site, but it hinders development within that area. Located just south of Inwood park, is Glencoe, which is challenged by crime as well as dilapidated buildings and poor connectivity for vehicular as well as pedestrian traffic. There are existing development plans for this area, which will affect the development of our site as well.
Visual Analysis of Intervention Site

When looking at the existing conditions within our intervention site, it became obvious that the conditions of the buildings were either good or poor condition; there was never a moderate building or site condition. The pictures to the right and the view port map located at the bottom of the page help to give an overall analysis of the site. Most of the poor housing and site conditions were located at the southern end of the site.
Mount Auburn Zoning

Taking a look at the zoning within Mt.. Auburn we can see that most of the area is zoned as single family or mixed residential. The issues within this area is a lack of people living within Mt.. Auburn, so by just looking at the zoning map one might think that the area is quiet populated, where if you look at the vacancy map (see left.) you would see that the area is dealing with the issue of vacancy.

Another issue within Mount Auburn that can be seen by the zoning map, is the lack of commercial within the area. This would help to explain why there are hardly any commercial buildings located within Mt.. Auburn or within our interventions site.

After residential, the next largest zoning district is institutional. Located at the northern part of Auburn Ave. are where most of the offices or institutional buildings are.

Taking a closer look at our intervention site the main zoning within our area are residential (both mixed and single family) and institutional. We would be proposing later on within our document, that the most of the area located along Vines Street would be zoned as commercial. Along with commercial we are also proposing residential across from Inwood Park, and to address the vacancies within our site area.
This subdistrict allows large-lot single-family housing at very low densities found in suburban residential districts. The minimum lot size is 20,000 square feet.
RMX Residential Mixed

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. The minimum land area for every dwelling unit is 2,000 square feet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Form and Location</th>
<th>Lot Area (sq. ft.)</th>
<th>Lot Area/Unit (sq. ft.)</th>
<th>Lot width (ft.)</th>
<th>Front Yard</th>
<th>Side Yard Min./Total</th>
<th>Rear Yard</th>
<th>Maximum Height (ft.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RMX single-family</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0/5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMX rowhouse exterior</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0/5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMX rowhouse interior</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMX two-family</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3/6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMX three-family</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3/6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMX other</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3/6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZONING</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Rooms</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RM-0.7</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM-1.2</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM-2.0</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMX</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional-Residential (IR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulations</th>
<th>IR</th>
<th>Additional Regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Scale - Intensity of Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum floor area ratio</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Form and Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum building height (ft.)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum yards (ft.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Accommodation - Driveways and Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking lot landscaping</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See § 1425-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck docks; loading and service areas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See § 1417-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffering along district</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See § 1417-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory uses and structures</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Chapter 1421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General site standards</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Chapter 1421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping and buffer yards</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Chapter 1423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonconforming uses and structures</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Chapter 1447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking and loading</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Chapter 1425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Chapter 1417-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional development regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Chapter 1419</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Office General (OG)

To provide sites for offices and research and development facilities in a large-scale or campus-like environment. Offices, small-scale government offices and facilities, banks and other financial institutions and supporting non-office uses-business services and personal services-are allowed. Mixed-use developments with residential uses are also allowed.

Min lot area for every dwelling unit 700
Max floor area ratio 1.75
Max building height 100'

Min front yard 20’
An additional two feet of front yard setback is required for each ten feet of building height above 25 feet.

Min side/total 5/20 ft
An additional three feet of side yard setback is required on each side for each ten feet of building height above 25 feet.

Min rear 20 ft
An additional three feet of rear yard setback is required for each ten feet of...
To identify, create, maintain and enhance areas suitable for a wide variety of commercial and institutional uses along major transportation corridors and in shopping districts or centers. Although these centers may reflect elements of both pedestrian- and auto-oriented development, they typically accommodate larger-scale retail and commercial service uses, such as auto-related businesses and recreation and entertainment, as well as a variety of public and semipublic uses. Future development must reflect a complementary and compatible mix of uses, and may include residential uses.

**Mixed.** This district designation is intended to provide for a mix of the pedestrian and auto-oriented development. Older, pedestrian-oriented buildings may be intermixed with newer, auto-oriented uses.

**Auto-oriented.** This district designation is intended for areas that provide for easy automobile access. Large buildings are located on the site with parking in front. Out lots associated with shopping centers often contain auto-oriented businesses. Performance standards are intended to mitigate the impact of the parking lots and buffer adjacent residential areas.

**Regulations (for both unless noted)**

- **Min Lot Area 0**
- **Max building height 85’**
- **Min building height 15’**
- **Max front yard setbacks 12’** (none for auto-oriented)
- **New residential only**
  - Lot area/unit 700 sq ft
  - Front yard setback 0
  - Interior side yard setback 0
  - Corner side yard setback 0
  - Rear yard setback 25

- **Residential development in existing buildings**
  - Lot area/unit 500 sq ft
When looking at the existing conditions of our intervention site, as well as the rest of Mount Auburn, we have developed some goals and objectives for our design ideas. The diagram to the right takes are goals and objectives and connects them to how we plan to address these goals through design and land use.

We also looked at the zoning and historic and hillside districts and created a diagram to show what we considered to be barriers and through that what we considered to be opportunities.

The barriers that were recognized were mostly related to topography as well as the historic/existing buildings along Auburn Avenue. These two main districts, as see on the map, are considered barriers because they are not easily changed, if needed to be, so we will have to work around rather than change what is there.

Our nodes of opportunity came about by what was left after the barriers were realized. The main area for opportunity would be located at the north-west corner of our site. Each node that over laps one another signifies a connections through design and the cohesiveness that we are trying to bring through our ideas and concepts for our intervention site.
Historic Districts & Hillside Overlay District -

The two maps the right are two more districts within Mt. Auburn that affect our site and restrict development within our intervention site.

The Historic District runs mostly along Auburn Avenue and within the east side of our site. This will be a challenge when considering the changes we would like to make within our area.

The Hillside Overlay Districts also restrict our development plans. Looking at where it affects our site the most, one can see that it runs within most of the south-west part of our intervention site. Inwood Park and the Vine Street corridor are affected the most within our site, which makes redevelopment a challenge.
Mt. Auburn Plan - 1992
Taking a look at the 1992 Mt. Auburn plan, we are proposing more uses within the area that has seemingly been isolated for park use. In addition to the historic corridor of Mt. Auburn that has been converted into offices, we would like to integrate more commercial spaces to the NW corner of Mt. Auburn. This will create a core of green living surrounded by thriving homes and business.

Parks Plan - 2006
With the 2006 Parks plan, we are going to adapt some of the suggested areas for residential along the lower outskirts of the park. However, the density of the park doesn't allow for the population transverse through the area. Instead we are hoping to unite Vine St. and Auburn St. by making the park the intermediate connection both on foot and visually.
Conceptual Design Proposal:

When looking at the existing conditions as well as the Parks Plan and Mt. Auburn Community plan of 1992, we have come up with conceptual design ideas for our site that will be further developed as our analysis of our interventions site is done.

What we were hoping to portray through our design was to take what was existing and fill in the vacancies where necessary. We wanted to address our goals and observations of the area through our design. We noticed and addressed through our design, was the need for commercial as well as to introduce new residential homes, which will help to breath new life into the area as well.

Quantities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Units</th>
<th>25 - 50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Types</td>
<td>Mixed Use with residential, business and commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types</td>
<td>Historic, office and retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>1,00 sq. ft. - 3,500 sq. ft. per unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Taking a further look at our site and breaking it down, one can see that within Inwood Park, we had wanted to address the access point to the park as well as the viewpoint of Inwood. What the park is struggling with is having a defined edge as well as defined points of entry to the park. We wanted to control the access points into Inwood not only from a design perspective, but also as a way to deal with safety.

Another aspect of our conceptual design was to address the vacancies within our site and also the circulation. Taking a look at what was purposed for our site within the Park Plan, we wanted to reiterate the necessity of a connection between Hollister St. and Glencoe. We have purposed to have a street added to help with the connectivity and ease of movement within the site. Another aspect that we wanted to add was more residential usage around the park to help keep “eyes on the park” and as a way to help keep a smooth transition between park and commercial. Right now there is very little transition, and it is a crucial part of design to transition in and out of spaces within a community.
Another main point we wanted to establish within our conceptual design was the idea of a gateway that would help to give distinct entry point into Mt. Auburn. We located these points at the main intersections located at the northern point of our site. By adding a gateway feature to Mt. Auburn, we will be able to give this area a district identity that will help to weave the community together.

Another main idea is to help breath life into Vine St. by adding mixed residential as well as commercial usage along the Vine St. Corridor across from Inwood. By filling in the area with business and residential, it will help to start revitalizing Vine St. and will hopefully help to spark more development in the future.
We also looked at Chan Krieger’s work in New Orleans. Looking at the site plan to the left, we thought the way the proposed buildings were laid out and their relationship to the park as well as the buildings behind it help to create a sense of place. There is a transition of spaces within this plan that we also wanted to show in our plan for our intervention site.

Also the idea of integrating spaces between the buildings also was an idea we were inspired by. It helps to buffer one building to another, but also allows for another form of connection between people. It allows for interaction between the buildings, it creates not only seclusion, but inclusion between buildings.
Joynton Park - Australia

Looking at what they had done with Joynton Park, we wanted to take the idea of creating both a serene and inviting place as well as adding a recreational aspect to the park as to address the under utilization of Inwood. Another aspect to Joynton Park that we also inspired us was the idea of creating residential or even commercial near or even within the park as a way to invite people to surround themselves near the park. This would help to keep “eyes on the park” which will help to address the need for security. By maybe adding a commercial aspect to Inwood, this in turn might help to bring people to the park and create it as a destination place.
Recognizing what the site has to offer due to it’s amazing topography, our goals and objectives for our plan are:

- Working with the site topography
- Creating pedestrian movement
- Through those connections creating experiences & destination spots through the use of pods & pockets.

One of the main aspects to our design is the addition of a new road that connects Glencoe Ave to Hollister and then up to McMillian Ave. This road, Terrace Ave, follows the topography rather closely and helps with pedestrian and vehicular movement in Mt. Auburn. It also helps to give an edge to Inwood, which helps to address the current issues with Inwood.

Another aspect to the design that further helps our goals to be realized, is the pedestrian path. This path connects McMillian Ave to Inwood Park. Within Inwood Park the path also brings the pedestrian to two main destination spots within Inwood. The recreational area with tennis courts, basketball courts and a running track. The second pocket or destination spot within the park is called The Nooks. This area contains a seating area and a fountain area with a grove of trees and an existing building located in the south-eastern section of Inwood.

These destination spots were created to help bring people to the park and to help further connect our idea of pedestrian movement having not only an experience through the path, but also having an end point in mind, a place to go.
Residential Design:

Our residential buildings also embrace the road which further creates the connection to keeping with the topography. Within our design there are two main residential areas. The northern section (which is our main residential area and is explained in the next two sections) which is located near McMillian Ave and Terrace Ave helps to further connect this area to the second residential section which is located around Inwood Park. This section was created to help further define the edge of the park. It also keeps eyes on the park, which helps to address the issue of safety within Inwood.

Quantities of Units on Site:

- 42 - Town Homes
- 3 - Apartment Buildings
- 1400 - Parking Spots
- 3 - Commercial Buildings (around 12000 sqft.)
The Bowl Concept:

The natural topography creates an interesting relationship between the existing commercial and proposed single family homes. By redefining the idea of the front and rear of a building both the commercial space and the single family homes utilize the “bowl” as a means to interact but still maintain privacy. With the residential utilizing a shared green space/front yard. Also using the natural landscape, one either crossing path is an amphitheater/terrace to enjoy.

Movement Generator:

The topography influences the path. Being that the path and roads are the main generators of movements, the space in between the homes react to one another to define the interstitial space in between. Opposite reactions create a dynamic experience accentuating the path.
**Propportions:**

Although breaking from the traditional Italianate architecture, the proposed residential units still mimic the proportioning of the historic residences with the roof lines and balcony slabs.

**Movement vs Destination Pods:**

Within the spatial arrangement of the homes, more emphasis is placed on the reception of dynamic elements such as people or the changing of the light. Such movement influences the form of the single family residence. Typical rooms within are then the destination pods.

**Old School Favorites:**

In order to encourage interaction between the families, the idea of a stoop/porch still remain on the lower level. Whether it’s the old grandma on the porch watching her grandchildren or kids just hanging out, the porch still remains a personal domain. The same concept applies to the balcony located on the second floor with the sleeping pods (or bedrooms).

Also, acknowledging the streets as a hazardous means of a playground, the inverted front porch and yard are shared in this interstitial green space.