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Fall 2006: Housing and Urban Form in Mt. Auburn

Winter 2007: Dwelling, Ageing and Living in Clifton Heights

Spring 2007: Affordable Workforce Housing in Uptown

Fall 2007: Urban Development, Housing Systems and Conflict in Corryville

Winter 2008: What is Uptown? What is Avondale?

Spring 2008: Uptown Boomer Community
In 2006-08 the Niehoff Urban Studio considered Housing and its role in Community Development for the Neighborhoods of Uptown.

Settlement patterns, including outward migration and de-densification, occurring since mid-century have decimated the residential infrastructure of the center city. Housing stock in this area, once rich and plentiful with diverse types and forms ranging from low cost tenements to pricey single family estates, has been winnowed down in number and quality to simply low to moderate cost apartment living with a smattering of affordable single family houses and a handful of tony urban condominiums. Most of these offerings exist within a context of vacancy, blight, and neglect that characterizes many inner-city neighborhoods. Other center city uses such as commercial, office, institutional, and to some extent, entertainment continue to function but do so to serve populations primarily from outside the area.

Leaders in local community development have long viewed enhanced housing opportunities as a key to a revitalized and sustained urban center. Improved affordable housing and alternative housing programs promise to enhance the quality of life of existing low-income residents. New workforce housing will support the viability of existing employment centers and residential neighborhoods. Housing for the elderly will permit senior residents to “age in place” and support the social integrity of urban neighborhoods. Moderately priced home-ownership opportunities may be successful at reintroducing the middle class to the urban center. And luxury housing could entice new residents from the upper end of the income spectrum.

With these forces as a background, efforts are underway through various institutional and private development interests to create new housing opportunities throughout the Uptown area. Substantial planning and predevelopment work has taken place in all but one of the Uptown neighborhoods of CUF: Clifton Heights-University Heights-Fairview (Calhoun Street), Corryville (Stetson Square and others, Jefferson Ave, Uptown Crossings), Avondale (Burnet Avenue business district) and Mt Auburn (Auburn Avenue Business District). The Uptown Parks and Development Plan which covers the entire district, makes new housing development a priority with some proposed for existing city park land. In every scenario housing is a key function but not without considerations for civic, retail, recreational, and cultural offerings that benefit the quality of life for current and future residents.
The Niehoff Urban Studio provides opportunities for faculty and students of Urban Planning, Architecture, and related disciplines to address these issues in problem solving exercises conducted with the participation of community stakeholders. The Studio is structured as a joint lecture/lab course offering by the School of Architecture and Interior Design and the School of Planning with interdisciplinary participation by faculty and students from other UC programs such as engineering, sociology, anthropology, and nursing.

The Studio is team-taught by a group of faculty, typically one from Architecture, one from Planning, and the Director of the Community Design Center (who teaches and coordinates the overall Studio program), and includes, on a rotating basis, participating faculty from other colleges and disciplines. The Studio is located off-campus in the Turner Center in Corryville and allows space for faculty and student design and research, meetings and events, and rotating exhibits. Studio content is based on community development priorities and community stakeholders visit the studio and interact with students and faculty throughout the quarter.

Through this academic outreach studio and related research and technical assistance, the University of Cincinnati Niehoff Urban Studio shares the expertise and talents of its students and faculty with community stakeholders to address, together, problematic urban issues in a neighborhood of need. The Studio functions to do this on many levels. Through service learning activities, it introduced more than 135 students to these issues and the community stakeholders that struggle with them. The studio provides a resource for applied research for design projects that address problems and advance solutions for 19 community based organizations. Studio projects are connected to and lead to funded technical outreach work with 11 community based organizations conducted by the UC Community Design Center that provides tangible community development outcomes for the community, e.g. Avondale Habitat Project, Community based restaurant for the Burnet Avenue Business District, Short Vine Streetscape Plan and University Plaza design study, Identity Study for Short Vine. Studio projects are connected to and lead to funded data services projects that facilitate future community development, e.g. Uptown Mapping Database for the Uptown Consortium, Uptown TIF and Improvement District Study, Web site for the Corryville Community Council, Urban Design Concept for the Avondale Community Council. Interactive Uptown development map projects are connected to and complement funded research on urban issues that contributes to the body of knowledge, e.g. Conceptualizing religious action (congregation based community development survey), Social Connections Survey of Non-Profit Organizations. And finally, studio work is the inspiration or backdrop to a valuable Community Education Program that in 15 events involved almost 12 community based organizations and more than 300 community stakeholders who benefited from presentations, forums, and workshops on community asset building, urban design and community development issues timely and relevant to the city.
The Niehoff Urban Studio:

Mission

The Niehoff Urban Studio is a place for the university led, but community driven investigation of urban issues for the benefit of Cincinnati and other urban centers. It is a place where University and non-university participants can come to participate in educational classes, events, symposia, and exhibits that explore these urban issues.

The Niehoff Urban Studio is a unique and innovative off-campus classroom in which an interdisciplinary group of university students and faculty can interact with community stakeholders to study and experience, first-hand all aspects of the urban issues relevant to the center city.

The work of the Niehoff Urban Studio is intended to have a tangible impact on the urban problems under consideration and will contribute to the body of knowledge of research in this area.

Objectives and Outcomes

Research on Urban Issues: Students and faculty engage in academic research on specific urban issues and topics.

Applied Research for Design Projects: Interdisciplinary teams of students explore, develop, and recommend strategies and design solutions to address specific urban problems.

Community Development and Service Learning: Faculty and students work with community groups and stakeholders to collaborate on strategies and design proposals that have a timely and tangible impact.

Public Education: Public symposia, presentations and exhibits are sponsored to provide a forum for public discussion of urban planning, design, and quality of life issues for the urban center.
Collaborating Entities

UC Community Design Center, UC School of Planning, UC School of Architecture and Interior Design, UC School of Design, UC School of Art, UC Anthropology Department-McMicken College of Arts and Sciences, College of Engineering, College of Nursing, College of Business, UC Institute for Community Partnerships, UC College of DAAP CERHAS center, Live Well Consortium, Office of the University Architect, Center for Community Engagement, UC Institute for Policy Research, UC Economics Center for Education and Business.

Collaborating Entities - Community

Corryville Community Council, CUF Community Council, Avondale Community Council, Mt Auburn Community Council, Mt Auburn Business Association, Vine Street Community Urban Redevelopment Corporation, University Village Associates, Uptown Consortium, Clifton Heights Community Urban Redevelopment Corporation, Clifton Heights Improvement Association, Cincinnati Park Board, Cincinnati Planning Department, Cincinnati Department of Transportation and Engineering, Towne Properties, North American Development, Cincinnati Habitat for Humanity, Corryville Faith Based Community Development Corporation, Uptown Properties, Dorian Development.

Sponsorship

This project has been made possible through the generous support of Mr. and Mrs. H.C. Buck Niehoff, the Harriet R. Williams Downey Fund, the Ohio Urban University Program, the Robert and Adele Schiff Family Foundation, and the University of Cincinnati, in collaboration with the Schools of Architecture and Interior Design, Planning and the Taft Research Center. The Niehoff Urban Studio is administered by the UC DAAP Community Design Center.
End of Quarter panel with Community Leaders and Housing experts: Dr. Stanley Broadnax, Mt Auburn Community Council, JJ Gioducci, Corryville Faith Based Community Development Corp, Pauline Van der Haar, Dorian Development, Tony Brown, Uptown Consortium, Maurice Cox, AIA, National Endowment for the Arts.
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Within the Mt Auburn neighborhood important opportunities for community development are under consideration in connection with a community council based business district revitalization vision and a parallel Parks and Development plan led by the Uptown Consortium. These proposals called for rebuilding the neighborhood serving commercial area at Dorchester and Auburn Avenue as well as creating destination restaurant and entertainment functions at the entry to Jackson Hill Park. Complementary rehab, new, and infill housing development is envisioned by these plans throughout the neighborhood to infill vacant areas, to provide a sustaining mix for the commercial district, and to take advantage of neighborhood park frontages. In addition, accommodation of the institutional growth and parking needs of Christ Hospital, an important regional employer, was a key consideration of neighborhood planning activities.

In this planning context, Architecture and Urban Planning students had the opportunity to confer directly with the various interest groups including community civic leadership, hospital management, development corporation managers, and city department staff to interpret, synthesize, and test various comprehensive community development and urban design applications. The student proposals provided a mediating visual forum for debate among the relevant interest groups as to common desired outcomes. An end of quarter panel was hosted which included representatives from each of the interest groups to consider the merits of the student options for inclusion in future planning efforts.

In every case, student teams provided comprehensive community development scenarios that addressed all aspects of community life, including neighborhood commercial services, cultural programs, recreational options, environmental image, and green infrastructure with relevant economic development and implementation provisions. Fundamental to each plan is a comprehensive housing program designed to include the full spectrum of residential needs ranging from affordable to market rate types.

As a background to their work, students conducted research into a variety of issues through leadership interviews, on-site reconnaissance, demographic analysis, review of available housing financing programs, past planning activity, best practices in sustainable community development, and other issues. Each team synthesized an “Urban Framework” that defined the community planning, urban design, and programmatic components of their plans at the neighborhood scale. Finally students selected individual urban design areas for detailed study.
**Urban Redevelopment/ Tax Increment Financing**

Program: City financing for the construction of public improvements, funding acquisition costs and/or defraying the cost of the City being involved in a development project.

Program Examples: Taft Broadcasting Corp., Atrium 1, Shillito Lofts, Westin Hotel

---

**Impacted Cities Program**

Program: Community Urban Redevelopment Corporation (CURC) is formed within a specific, “blighted” area. The City enters into a financial agreement with the CURC. Undertakes redevelopment projects within the specified area. Permits the City to exempt total redevelopment value of improvements added to existing property. Improvements must have a “public purpose”.

Program Goal: A mechanism for cooperation between the City and private redevelopers.

Program Examples: Garfield Place

---

**Cincinnati Land Use Re-utilization Program (CLRP)**

Program: Use an interdepartmental team to identify sites (abandoned property) available through the Hamilton County Delinquent Real Estate Tax Roll that can be acquired by the City and made available for redevelopment.

Program Examples: Potterhill Homes is constructing single family homes on two CLRP sites in Evanston in late 2002. A parking lot expansion is being accomplished in Mt. Auburn for an attorney’s office. Four homes are proposed for three former CLRP sites on the Mt. Auburn hillside in 2003.

---

**Enterprise Zone Program [ Real and Personal Property ]**

Program: Provides for real and/or personal property tax exemption of 36% for up to 10 years

Program Goal: Create and retain jobs and stimulate private investment primarily in the commercial/industrial sector.

Program Examples: Madisonville Fifth Third Processing Center, Harlan Typographics, Mutual Manufacturing

---

**Neighborhood Revitalization**

Program: Locate, acquire, clear, assemble vacant, blighted, and under utilized property concentrated in Mt. Auburn, Evanston, and East End, but available citywide.

Program Examples: 222, 237-239, 313 McGregor. Vacant parcels acquired through Sheriff Sales and the CLRP: 6 in Evanston, 11 in Mt.Auburn, 2 in East End, 4 in Westwood, 9 in CUF, 2 in Mt.Airy
American Dream Down-Payment Initiative (Addi)
Assists first time home buyers with limited income to purchase a home within City of Cincinnati limits.

Down payment Assistance Program
(Shuttlesworth Housing Foundation- Better Housing League of Greater Cincinnati) Grants of up to $2,000 available for moderate income first-time home buyers.

Homeowner Rehab Loan Program
City + Home Ownership Center (HOC) contract: low interest loans to qualified low & moderate income homeowners
Goal: Rehabilitate single family owner occupied homes of 1 to 3 units in the City of Cincinnati.

Rental Rehab
A forgivable deferred loan program designed to increase availability of affordable, quality rental housing for low income families within City limits. Funds can be used to finance repair and renovation work only.

Tax Abatement
Goals: Stimulate revitalization; Retain residents; Attract new homeowners. Provides a benefit for residents who improve their homes or purchased newly constructed homes.

Cincinnati Homeowner Infill & Rehab Program (Chirp)
Pilot program for profit and non-profit DEVELOPERS interested in developing home ownership units in single or two family buildings in the City. This program is for new construction and rehabilitation projects in Cincinnati neighborhoods.

Source: www.cincinnati-oh.gov
In 1993, the Amsterdam borough of Westerpark announced the realization of a 600-unit car-free housing project. The low allocation of space for car parks, combined with the inaccessibility of the site to motorized vehicles, enabled an interconnected system of high-quality open spaces penetrating the entire development.

References:
The Hannover Principles of Sustainability

Insist on rights of humanity and nature to coexist in a healthy, supportive, diverse and sustainable condition. Recognize interdependence. The elements of human design interact with and depend upon the natural world, with broad and diverse implications at every scale. Expand design considerations to recognizing even distant effects. Respect relationships between spirit and matter. Consider all aspects of human settlement including community, dwelling, industry and trade in terms of existing and evolving connections between spiritual and material consciousness. Accept responsibility for the consequences of design decisions upon human well-being, the viability of natural systems, and their right to coexist. Create safe objects of long-term value. Eliminate the concept of waste. Rely on natural energy flows. Understand the limitations of design. Seek constant improvement by the sharing of knowledge.

Case Studies

Santa Monica, California

Celebrates 10 years of progress by harnessing the power of community to conserve and enhance their local resources, safeguard human health and the environment, maintain a vibrant and diverse economy, and improve the livability and quality of life for all community members in Santa Monica.

Portland, Oregon

City of Portland will promote a sustainable future that meets today’s needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs, and accepts its responsibility to:
- Support a stable, diverse and equitable economy.
- Protect the quality of the air, water, land and other natural resources
- Conserve native vegetation, fish, wildlife habitat and other ecosystems.
- Minimize human impacts on local and worldwide ecosystems.
Mt. Auburn

The natural formation of Mt. Auburn's topography and slopes lends itself to interesting sites. The most sought after redevelopment areas are emerging along the natural ridge such as Dorsey Street or streets off the bottom of the steep slope of Highland. Although these areas are also heavily wooded, they provide some of the best views of Downtown Cincinnati. In addition, they provide enough coverage for privacy from the next terraced street. The steep topography is also used as a natural divider creating different groups of built environment. The natural land formation combined with crime on the west border of Mt. Auburn at Vine Street influences the lack of usage of Inwood and Jackson Hill Park. Mostly residential, Mt. Auburn doesn't have very many offices or commercial property. The bulk of any services can be found at Christ Hospital and along Auburn Avenue. The core of Mt Auburn is Christ Hospital and school/juvenile detention where the topography is the flattest and trees are cleared.

Vine & McMillan

Glencoe's current vacant and run-down physical condition directly affects the usage of Inwood Park and threatens the surrounding physical conditions of Christ Hospital located directly behind it.

1. Christ Hospital 2. Inwood Park 3. Glencoe Place

McMillan & Reading

Because of the nature of the detention center, the area surrounding it seems to be well maintained. However the streets north of this area; McGregor and Highland become subject to vandalism and poor-up keep of building conditions.


Reading & Liberty

The physical character of this area is changing due to the new housing development at the southern end of Auburn Ave. Both streets located near this redevelopment and the institutions such as the Bible College will be positively influenced.

1. Auburn & Bigelow, 2. God's Bible College, 3. Liberty Hill

Liberty, Main, Mulberry and Vine

Site conditions in this area are very unique because it exploits the visual opportunities of the terrain starting with Dorsey St. because of it's close location to the top. Because of the lack of development and an increase in vacancies along the most direct route into Jackson Hill Park, this recreational space is highly under utilized.

* Provide proper zoning to the area and insure an appropriate type and mix of use and ensure the quality of development
* Use transition zones where conflicting land uses abut
* Mt Auburn already has existing buildings in good shape and the necessary infrastructure to support housing, exploit that with revitalization
* Preserve significant land marks
* Develop attractions to enhance community image, e.g., rebuild the tramway over the incline
* Have a safer, cleaner environment to live by inviting a variety of people to live in Mt Auburn
* Encourage private and public contribution to focus on public improvements

**Recreation, Parks & Open Space**
* Maintain parks and recreational areas usable and attractive
* Encourage residents to use the parks by redesigning the main entrances
* Connect parks to all major public areas and institutions

**Housing**
* Encourage quality housing
* Upgrade low income housing through government participation
* Encourage lending by financial institutions
* Retain existing housing stock by encouraging selected demolitions, rehabilitation and infill housing
* Increase owner occupancy ratio by encouraging people to move into Mt Auburn

**Traffic & Circulation**
* Avoid increasing level of traffic congestion within the community and discourage through traffic
* Reduce through traffic on Auburn Ave
* Control spillover of on street commercial and institutional parking onto neighborhoods / streets
* Improve traffic conditions to increase safety on side streets.

**Land Use and Zoning**
* Allow residential zones permitting higher density than current use in certain areas
* Allow residential areas zoned for business use
* Allow residential and commercial areas consisting of several Zones.
* Potential rezoning to simplify boundaries, and to protect neighbourhood character

Source: Mt. Auburn Community Plan, June 1992
This chart reflects the costs involved in new development in the area of Mt. Auburn. First, the gray area shows an approximate amount of realtors and other developers feel the housing market can bear. Next, the red area shows the cost of construction for a new development. Finally, above this level, the clear box shows how much profit a conventional developer would hope to make on top of this from investing in a project. From this, it is determined that the cost to develop in Mt. Auburn is greater than the marketable rate, more simply labeled “the gap.” Clearly, projects in Mt. Auburn require additional sources of funding beyond housing sales in order to make development projects possible.

SOURCE: Based on numbers for the Inwood Village Project at Glencoe Place, provided by Pauline Van der Haar, Dorian Development, October 2006.

This chart identifies the annual incomes of several job markets in the Mt. Auburn area. It also shows the annual salary required in order to rent an apartment or own a home based on average costs in Cincinnati. From this chart, it is possible to identify the type of housing necessary to attract employees working in Mt. Auburn to new local housing developments. Homeownership is based on the Cincinnati average home price of $148,000. Rental rates are based on a 1 bedroom apartment at $497 per month and $652 per month for a 2 bedroom.


The above incentives are generalized descriptions based on several Cincinnati government websites including www.gcccs.com and www.cincinnati-oh.gov. It is understood that certain regulations and restrictions apply for the different incentives.

Job Creation Tax Credit allows companies creating at least 25 new full time jobs paying at least 150% of federal minimum wage or 10 new full time jobs with an average wage of at least 400% minimum wage to be eligible for state income or corporate franchise tax credits.

Department of Community Development Tax Abatement Program allows homeowners to make improvements to their property and the owner is only responsible for paying taxes based on the home's original value for ten years before taxes based on improvements go into effect.

Community Reinvestment Area Tax Exemption encourages rehabilitation and new construction by offering up 75% tax exemption for up to 15 years for new construction and 75% tax exemption for 10 years for renovation. The above incentives are generalized descriptions based on several Cincinnati government websites including www.gcccs.com and www.cincinnati-oh.gov. It is understood that certain regulations and restrictions apply for the different incentives.
The socio-economic geography of Cincinnati is similar to many American cities. However, what distinguishes Cincinnati is the racial and social segregation of its metropolitan area. Hamilton County, which is 43% African American is the only county in Greater Cincinnati with an African American population which exceeds 4%.

Mt Auburn continues to have high rates of poverty (26%) and female headed households (50%). Mt. Auburn is, however, one of the neighborhoods that has to a large degree reversed the pattern of decline in social indicators. Mt Auburn is one of the only five Cincinnati neighborhoods housing three socioeconomic areas with different socioeconomic status. The three SES areas have, nonetheless, struggled to integrate either economically or socially.

The socioeconomic inequities of Mt. Auburn encompass transportation, housing, employment and age. This inequality poses a serious dilemma to a community trying to promote development. This analysis brings the following questions to attention: Can Mt. Auburn justify developing additional hospital parking facilities and private garages when over 1/3 of the existing community has no access to a car? Is it practical to direct development towards young professionals and empty nesters while a stable class in Mt. Auburn remains scarce? Should the community seek increases in cost of living at a time when over 1/3 of its existing households spend more than 30% of their income on rent alone?

Source: Maloney, Michael and Christopher Auffrey. The Social Areas of Cincinnati: An Analysis of Social Needs, Patterns for Four Census Decades. 4th ed. School of Planning, University of Cincinnati; UC Institute for Community Partnerships (UCICP), 2004
Married couples have shown a higher household income than other types of families throughout. The reasoning for their greater increase, however, has been due to the women of the relationship generating a higher income over time. This has resulted in an increase of a 150% of total income since 1947. However, during this same period, the percentage of married families versus single person families has declined by 10%, slowing the growth of their income in comparison. This occurred after 1967, following a generous growth of married families of 75% from 1947. In addition, the overall family size has declined 12% since 1967.

*Homeownership, an essential part of the American dream, reached a new high for many areas in 2000. Regional differences in the percentage of residents owning their home still persist, particularly between the Midwest and Middle Atlantic regions and the rest of the country.*


Age distribution on population pyramids can help to suggest growth. Low birth rates and high death rates will often result in a larger portion on the top where high birth rates and low death rates will result in a bottom heavy pyramid. More "square" shaped pyramids suggest a stable growth.
Mt. Auburn: Top 5 Resident Profile

1 Bohemian Mix
A collection of young, mobile urbanites that represents the nation’s most liberal lifestyles.

2 City Roots
Found in urban neighborhoods, a segment of lower-income retirees, typically living in older homes and duplexes they’ve owned for years.

3 Multicultural Mosaic
An immigrant gateway community, the urban home for a mixed populace of younger Hispanic, Asian and African-American singles and families.

4 UrbanAchievers
These young singles and couples are typically college-educated and ethnically diverse: about a third are foreign-born, and even more speak a language other than English.

5 Urban Elders
These communities have high concentrations of Hispanics and African-Americans, and tend to be downscale, with singles living in older apartment rentals.

The general population of Cincinnati is declining at nearly the same rate the area population is increasing.

The household structure in Cincinnati is also declining while the area rate increases.

### Tri-State Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000 Census</td>
<td>1,886,650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 Census</td>
<td>1,744,048</td>
<td>8.17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000 Census</td>
<td>734,127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 Census</td>
<td>652,907</td>
<td>12.44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cincinnati Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000 Census</td>
<td>331,285</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 Census</td>
<td>363,974</td>
<td>-8.98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000 Census</td>
<td>148,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 Census</td>
<td>154,298</td>
<td>-4.22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Educational Attainment, 1990-2000

- Global at professional degree
- Bachelor’s degree
- Associate degree
- Some college (no degree)
- High school graduate [includes equivalency degrees]
- Some high school (no diploma)
- Less than 9th grade

### Household Composition, 1990-2000

- Married couple with children
- Married couple without children
- Female-headed household with children
- Female-headed household without children
- Male-headed household with children
- Male-headed household without children
- Non-family household, single person
- Non-family household, two or more persons

### 2000 Tenure of Occupied Housing Units: Tri-State

- 67% Owner Occupied
- 33% Renter Occupied

### 2000 Tenure of Occupied Housing Units: Cincinnati

- 39% Owner Occupied
- 61% Renter Occupied

Education is improving in the Tri-State Area, which probably contributes to the improving poverty rate.

In Cincinnati, over half of the population makes less than $35,000 a year. For the Tri-State Area, about 30% of the population falls into this category.
Goal:
Promote a safe, affordable community through sustainability that fosters economic, environmental, and social diversity.
**Vision**
To create an environment that integrates all types of urban form in a way that promotes a greater sense of community while maintaining each individual sense of identity.

**Strategies**
The people of Mt. Auburn are the main target, to keep them in the neighborhood for whatever need they may have. The people who do not live in the neighborhood are also a target to bring in outside money.

**Target Market**
To implement the plan in three stages. The first revitalizes the central business district. The second creates a gateway to the neighborhood, and the third connects the two and enhances the urban framework as well as the streetscape. This third stage also creates an important node for Inwood Park.
To revitalize Mt. Auburn by creating an identity through Inwood park to provide improved living environments for students and families of varying socioeconomic profiles.

**Target Market:**
Mixed Income groups

**Household Composite**
60% market rate, 20% moderate income, 20% low income

**Financing Opportunity**
American Dream Down payment Initiative (ADDI)
Down payment Assistance program, Tax Increment Financing, Impacted Cities program and Neighborhood Revitalization program.
**Inwood Commons**

No. of Built footprints: 48
Type: Single & Multi-family Row Housing
Mix: 50% Single family = 24 units
50% Multi-family = 24x2 =48 units
Parking:
Integrated (2 spaces per footprint) = 96
Public (on-street) = 47
Total = 96 + 47 = 143 spaces
Setbacks: Front: Paved setback - 6’ wide
Rear: Private yards

**Inwood Place**

No. of Built footprints: 62
Type: Single & Multi-family Row Housing
Mix: 50% Single family = 30 units
50% Multi-family = 32x2 =64 units
Parking:
Integrated (2 spaces per footprint) = 124
Public (on-street) = 107
Total = 124 + 107 = 231 spaces
Setbacks:
Front: None / Direct frontages
(transition spaces between 3’ to 7’)
Rear: Private yards

**Floor Plan Options**

- [View of floor plans]
Goals and Objectives:
Create contemporary urban community
Develop unique market-rate housing to provide an economic core to a traditionally poor neighborhood
Create a walkable neighborhood
Develop a new, non-traditional architectural vocabulary
Respect and utilize hillside conditions for architectural diversity

- Single-family housing: 156
- Multi-family housing: 033
- Parks/Greenspace: 003

Source: Cincinnati Hillside Development Guidelines
Proposed Sycamore St. Plan, Architectural Conditions

Hillside Parking Section Diagram
Vision:
A family based community distinct from the surrounding neighborhoods.

Existing Conditions
A juvenile center is located to the south of Southern Avenue, which will remain intact. Virtually no housing is located along Southern Avenue or Young Street. There is a very dramatic change in grade between the end of Southern Avenue and Highland Street beyond that provides opportunities for very good views.

Project Proposal
As a part of the overall scheme to create a family neighborhood between downtown and uptown, a park bounded by single family housing will replace the elementary school and community center. Additionally, the academy will be replaced by a YMCA and Community Learning Center. Multi-family housing will be added to both sides of Southern Avenue. A total of 74 units will be added to the site.

Much of the existing housing stock on the east side of Auburn Avenue are late nineteenth/early twentieth century shotgun houses that are very long and thin. Additions to the Mt. Auburn neighborhood will follow the example set forth by the Layer House designed by Ohtani. The different spaces that make up a neighborhood, streets, yards, parks, houses, backyards, sidewalks, etc., need to be defined for the space to be successful.
New Housing Units: Cluster Townhouses

LEGEND:
1. Duplexes (6 units)
2. Multi-family Housing (29 units)
3. Cluster Housing (20 units)
4. Single Family (19 units)
5. YMCA (40,000 s.f.)
6. Community Learning Center (12,300 s.f.)
7. Highland Park Stairs
8. Highland Park Lookout
9. Highland Park
Objective:
Development of three distinct districts to “attract and keep people in Mt. Auburn longer.”

Dorchester Strip:

The Dorchester Strip consists of a variety of single to multi-family loft style affordable apartments intermixed with a commercial/retail corridor. This strip is known as the “pedestrian friendly party district,” 6-3am time zone. We will preserve and renovate the existing buildings on the corner of Dorchester and Eleanor, these buildings will be bridged to create a visual focal point from the highway, an entrance into Jackson Hill Park.

Jackson Hill Park:

Jackson Hill Park is located in the “relaxation/interactive” district, together with Dorchester Square it is the climax of our new mixed use corridor and creates a center for residents to congregate. In the center of the park is a coffee shop/caffe that will be the focal point.

The Professional District:

The professional district is made up of a mix of professional/non-professional offices and daily needs. This district is viewed as the “working district”, 8-5pm time zone.

The Concept:

The continuous line or ‘ribbon’ spans from Auburn Street to Eleanor Street, its purpose is to enhance an individual’s experience by capturing and framing specific views of downtown Cincinnati, providing daily needs such as an affordable shelter, and amenities like mechanical services such as lighting and internet, as well as entertainment and nightlife. The width of the line transforms due to existing contours and/or upon function, houses all communication and mechanical services, provides apertures for an individual experience as well as wraps the existing buildings that we wish to preserve with a new modern edge.
Affordable Housing and The Service Wall Ribbon

The ribbon will create a horizon line of housing that will maintain the ‘grow home’ typology. This allows a homeowner to start with an allotted amount of space that can grow over time when financial needs are met. There will be approximately 15 new units within the 1000-2000 square foot ribbon.

Coffee Shop/ Café and Entertainment:

The commercial corridor will run the length of the ribbon, from Auburn to Eleanor underneath the newly proposed housing units. Elevators and stairs will be located at four pedestrian paths to allow access to housing units above as well as open up the corridor to the sky. This corridor will consist of non-professional and professional shops which we believe will stimulate activity and create a wider range of employment for Mt. Auburn residents.

Commercial Corridor and Job Security

The coffee shop/café is the termination of the ribbon into the grand view of downtown Cincinnati.

Perspective at Bridge, Street and Coffee Shop

Theoretical Elevation

Conceptual Section
Revitalizing Valencia Hollow

Existing Conditions

Nikhant Mischar

Site area:
Rear: 138075.00 sq. ft.
Proposed built up:
Residential: 80000.00 sq. ft.
Proposed residential units: 40
Area per unit: 2000 sq. ft.
is the main idea behind this site design. Seen with black dashes, the connections facilitate both pedestrian and vehicular movement throughout the site. These connections not only bring people into the site, but guide them as they move throughout as well as to other destinations. By facilitating non-vehicular connections to a major arterial like Vine, residents of Valencia Hollow are able to easily access bus stops within walking distance of home that can take them to work or entertainment destinations. Providing safe environments and appealing walking routes also encourages non-vehicular resident mobility to surrounding destinations.

The framing of Valencia Park with both natural features and built form formalizes the space and makes it the unique feature and focal point of Valencia Hollow. Streets and walkways in Valencia Hollow facilitate movement to the park to keep it an active social gathering place. The park amenities include a playground and swing set, natural climbing wall, covered pavilion, garden, chess tables, and a life size chess board and pieces.
Valencia Commons

Architectural decisions were often directly related to a desire to use the complex landscape in such a way that it becomes an asset for the area. Valencia Commons offers a wide variety of rental housing including single family residences and multi-family complexes. Through the creation of a “green” pedestrian street, residents have a sense of ownership of the shared space.

Park Residence

The residences located to the west of Valencia Park are designed to accommodate families in the affordable housing market. The owner-occupied stacked duplexes aims to be both economical and livable.
Goal:
To activate the intersection in a pedestrian urban context and to create a momentous gateway to the Auburn community, while creating density and commercial vitality.
Design Guidelines

Movement Networks
- All movement is layered vertically: pedestrian, bicyclists, trains, buses, and automobiles.
- A malleable grid.
- Movement emphasizes pedestrian on Dorchester.
- A street parkway along Dorchester.
- Green streets, medians, and stone and brick materials.

Landuse/Built Form
- Mixed-use buildings wherever pedestrian traffic is high.
- Open floor plans and evolving spaces and changes in programming.
- Urban form should be highly utilized with key green spaces.

Environmental Design
- Rain plazas and water management.
- Enhances views from the hill.
- Intensive green roofs.
- Passive Heating/Cooling.
- Porous Pavement/Pavers.

Public Realm and Parks
- The park and urban environment must meet in a democratic way.
- Push the park and public spaces out to the street.
- Ecology becomes a part of the public realm.
- Public gathering space is more urban.
- Environmentally sustainable does not necessarily mean ‘natural’ or ‘soft’.
- Connect plazas with movement corridors.

Design Principles

There are standard urban forms that are repeated throughout the area. These forms will be combined to form the design.

The building needs to be humble and appropriate to its context. The building shouldn't be too dominant. Pushing the top floor back matches the existing adjacent structure while allowing private spatial volumes to celebrate the city views.

The instances of private spatial volumes increase in quantity and quality vertically while public spatial volumes increase horizontally.

Semi-public spatial volumes are defined by the greater formal volumes, while maintaining a transitional buffer to the greater public space.

Private spatial volumes are defined by the adjacent formal volumes' uses. The level of privateness as a result helps to define the use of the semi-private space and the need of the transitional space to the public realm.
Goals and Objectives

- Movement with topography
- Pedestrian/vehicular connections creating an experience
- Creating destination pods/pockets
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 other crossing path is an amphitheater/terrace to enjoy.

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

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

**Ways**
Through the Mountain: Connecting downtown with Uptown and the rest of greater Cincinnati. Connects Mt. Auburn households with the City’s larger economic network.

**Zipper**
Around the Mountain: Linking forgotten city Hillside with the Cincinnati parks system and a variety of additional urban scenarios. Links Mt. Auburn households with the Mt. Auburn’s various housing clusters and the neighborhood’s two economic limbs.

**Lift**
Over the Mountain: Collecting the panoramic hilltop parks of Cincinnati within a larger, more integrated urban network. Provides Mt. Auburn households with a direct linkage of east and west, compensating for the topographical variances.

Creating a Potential for Critical Mass

Exploiting Existing Potentials

Addressing Forgotten Corners

**Mt Auburn Recreational Trail (The Zipper)**

**Auburn Avenue (The Gateway)**

**Cincinnati Parks Sky Transport (The Lift)**
a more inviting street for the historic housing stock

consolidating bus stops at the intersections of various programs

a park along the way

improving existing infrastructure
**Conceptual Diagrams**

**Community Meeting Space**

Communal gathering space is provided for surrounding residents for various types of recreational use and serves as a community focal point.

**Eyes on the Park**

Eyes on the park means a constant view of park activity and a serene residential setting.

**Continuity**

A continuous street facade enhances visual character and brings the street down to a more human scale.
End of quarter open house and presentation with partnering Anthropology students and Clifton Heights community leaders Lynne and Jack Martin.
Use type and mix of residential offerings has been an area of concern for redevelopment activities in Uptown. In Clifton Heights, where a five block area at the southern edge of the university campus is planned for new development, the University and the local community development corporation have advocated for a substantial residential component for students and middle income residents within retail and entertainment offerings for both the campus and community needs.

Community leaders sought to diversity the residential capacity of the new development and the neighborhood in general, to include more offerings for senior citizens. This was intended both as a way of diversifying the demographic mix, which is dominated by students, and of providing for more resident stability frequently undermined by a transient population. Concurrently, university faculty were studying the feasibility of creating a new type of residential community that addressed the demands of the growing bulge of ageing “baby boomers” who desired a stimulating urban environment that still provided all the amenities of a full service “continuum of care” senior’s community.

Accordingly, planning students of the Studio focused on simulating programming and urban design concepts for a “university linked retirement community” within the five block redevelopment area as well as the abutting University Plaza superblock, the north end of Inwood Park (part of the Uptown Parks Plan), and the adaptive reuse opportunities provided by the vacancies at Old St George Cathedral and the Friars Club residence and athletic complex. The intent of the proposals was to create mixed use developments that would provide market rate housing for alumni and for community residents to allow them to “age in place” while establishing programmatic connections to the university that would benefit both.

Students provided reconnaissance and analysis of existing conditions in the area and surveyed concepts of ageing and best practices in senior living. Urban design proposals were illustrated for a number of sites within the study area that included not only the senior housing function, but also neighborhood complementary civic and commercial services and university relevant program space.
Ageing involves several aspects of life, whether it is understood physically, emotionally, socially, mentally or culturally. Physically, ageing involves the changes one's body goes through as they progress through life. While ageing, the body has different needs at different periods of time. The same applies to the emotional, social, etc. aspects of life. At different periods of time, there are different wants and needs that we try to fulfill as people. A person may age emotionally by learning from past experiences, and understanding what was successful and unsuccessful with those experiences. Mentally, a person ages by learning, understanding, processing, and retaining information and experiences. This also applies to social and cultural experiences. All of this occurs with time. A person's beliefs, wants, needs and knowledge all stem from age and experience. We can better understand ageing by looking at the changing needs and wants of people as they grow older, and learning from their own experiences and knowledge gained while ageing, to better understand how they live and want to live.

“...
Senior citizens are now able to live very fulfilling lives more than ever before and they often look to live in thriving communities with a variety of age groups where they can participate in activities and socialize within the neighborhood. This is great for the older population but with this new phenomenon comes new challenges with creating housing criteria that meets their needs. Take a look at the changing demographics in the United States. We are becoming an older country because individuals are living longer and, as adults age, they face problems that are becoming more complex. This is a good portrayal of how seniors possibly living in a younger environment can learn and adapt to the younger generation. There would be more opportunities to learn if they were surrounded by a different group of people who have other outlooks or opinions. They could learn by simply experiencing urban lifestyles or even by taking classes of their interests at the college. The younger generation in turn would adapt to living in an age-integrated community rather than having solely college kids on the campus. Just by interacting with their surroundings, there are little bits of knowledge that get passed on.

Tetyana Pylypiv, a Purdue graduate student from Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine, shops at Westminster Village’s weekly flea market with residents Carolyn Risk (standing right), Edna McGinnis (standing left) and Kathryn Harmon (seated). Pylypiv, who will start her dual-title doctorate in the fall in gerontology and sociology after she completes her master’s degree, lives in the local retirement facility as part of Purdue’s Bridge Program.

The “Bridge Program” and it began in 2003 when two Purdue University students moved into Westminster Village, a retirement center north of their campus. The goal of this program for the students to spend a year living with and getting to know a retirement community so they could study what health and social issues many 70 and 80-year-olds face.

The context in which dwelling manifested either as a physical residential structure or an act of being, exists is a personal expression of culture, lifestyle, values, and interests. One’s choice to reside in the middle of a vibrant urban neighborhood or secluded in rural country strongly reflects these preferences and ideals. How important is a strong sense of community? How important is privacy? How important is family? Opinions on these issues, among countless others, dictate where and how we choose to live.

Just as values, cultural preferences, and technologies have changed over time, so have ideas about living. For instance, one may now choose to reside many miles away from his or her workplace; a luxury only available since the advent of the automobile. A different, but equally important cultural change, particularly in the Western world, is the shift in importance from public amenities to those of a private nature. This is clearly evident in the post-war suburbs throughout the United States. Private residential interiors are laden with every possible amenity, yet the public realm of the subdivision and/or the community as a whole is often devoid of life enriching places, spaces, or outlets for activity.

A dwelling offers respite and a comfortable place to relax and spend time with those close to us, away from work and other daily obligations. Yet it also provides a window through which we view the world with our own unique perspectives. We furnish, decorate, landscape, maintain, repair, arrange, rearrange, and repeat. Whether we put it on display for all to see, shared with only those we know well, or kept to ourselves, dwelling is a self-expression.

“I am drawn to this image because it is not a familiar household situation to me. The quarters are cramped, and the children are bathing in a common space. Despite some convenience amenities, I think it is easy to connect what is going on in this scene, both visually and audibly. I can practically hear the sounds of the scene; water splashing, children laughing, while the mother monitors from the sink. This photograph gives us a glimpse at a family using their dwelling, a concept which transcends structural typology.”
The traditional sense of the word learning often evokes thoughts of a teacher and a student, textbooks and memorization. Learning, however, can take a much simpler form and can become a part of the way we live. For me, the most fundamental way of learning is through observation.

An outdoor café jammed with people is often an image that one conjures up when thinking about Europe. Europe, of course is a model for planners all over the world. Therefore, when we ask ourselves, “Why are so many people attracted to this place?” We begin observing. Ironically, when one looks at this image, it is easy to see that every single chair is turned towards the street or plaza ahead and that about 95% of everyone in this image is looking towards the street or plaza; they are observing other people.

Especially in the planning field, observation is the most important tool we have for making great public spaces. In addition, the beauty of observation and the public realm is that we have the ability to learn on any given day if we let ourselves observe and then analyze as we go through daily life. Whenever we are in the public realm we have to think about how we feel when we experience that space. What attributes made that place a spectacular experience or why did the place not have an impact on us?

We can do ourselves a tremendous favor if we simply take out our headphones, put down the book and just watch. Where are people going; where are people sitting; how do we feel here? People in American society are too often on cruise control; they don’t stop and watch other people. If we allow ourselves to do this, we too can create those postcard images in our city.
Research and Reconnaissance

1853 North Elm Street (Clifton Ave.) was extended up the hill from Buckeye Ave. (East Clifton Ave)

1876 43 acres of Burnet Woods given to the University of Cincinnati, Hughes High School moves to the Heights

1882 Fairview incline opens

1895 The Fairview Heights Souvenir is published, a marketing booklet which presents 17 reasons why one should buy a home in Cincinnati's newest suburb. Cheap street railroad fare, proximity to the university and Burnet Woods are among the reasons listed

1895 Construction on Cincinnati's subway system begins

1903 Deaconess Hospital opens

1904 By the turn of the century, Cincinnati's rapid transit had reached the uptown area, servicing the large public and private institutions which were beginning to move north of the city.

1910 Cincinnati's population: 363,590

1915 Good Samaritan Hospital moves to their Clifton Avenue site.

1925 Cincinnati becomes the first major American City to adopt a Comprehensive city plan.

1948 Cincinnati releases its second Master Plan. The plan featured the development of expressway systems, the redevelopement of the Central Riverfront, parks and recreation expansion, and a new Airport.

1951 Streetcar operation ends

1961 The Cincinnati Planning Commissions releases its General Neighborhood Renewal Plan for the Avondale - Corryville neighborhoods. The plans objectives were to develop the assets of the area, restore confidence that this is an area with a good future, an to invite the attention of investors for opportunities for new investment as well as maintenance of existing neighborhood structures.

1963 U.C. releases the Campus Plan which calls for expansion into the surrounding Corryville neighborhood.

1964 1964 Comprehensive Plan released

1971 Model City Plan Published

1974 EPA building opens

1975 CUF begins community planning process

1981 Uptown Task Force Formed

1982 Clifton Heights NBD Urban Design Plan published

References:


The City of Cincinnati experienced a variety of ups and downs from 1990-2000. During this decade, growth occurred in median household income, and the number of vacant household units. Areas of decline were experienced in the number of housing units, occupied housing units, unemployed civilians, and employed civilians.

The Cincinnati MSA has encountered both significant and steady growth from 1990-2000. During this decade, growth occurred in the number of households, median household income, housing units occupied, housing units vacant, and the number of employed civilians. The only decline was in the number of unemployed citizens.

The City of Cincinnati is comprised of 51 neighborhoods.
1) Baby Boomers’ Attitudes Towards Retirement

**Self-Reliants:**

Highest income and educational levels. Have resources to save aggressively for retirement. Plan to work at least part-time because of “interest and enjoyment that work provides.”

**Anxious:**

Members try to save some money for retirement. Not optimistic about retirement. Expect that they won’t be able to stop working. Have anxieties about health care coverage during later years.

**Traditionalists**

Higher level of confidence and less uncertainty toward Social Security and Medicare. Believe both will be available. Plans to work and rely on Social Security and Medicare.

**Enthusiasts:**

Extremely optimistic about retirement. Do not plan to work at all during retirement; they plan to have both money and time to spend in recreational pursuits.

**Strugglers:**

Median household incomes is about $40,000. Saving almost nothing for retirement because they don’t have any money to save. Most in this group report little optimism about their later years.

Three Ways of Looking at Seniors (age 50+ according to the AARP)

1) Baby Boomers’ Attitudes Towards Retirement
2) Activity Level
3) Other Possible Age Groups
2) Activity Level

Active Adventurous:
This group enjoys activities such as world-wide traveling, hiking, climbing, biking, etc. Generally in good health and capable of such activities. Tend to be young at heart and enjoy lifelong learning.

Active Independent:
A bit more conservative in activities, such as golfing, shopping, attending the opera, attending local, classes, etc. Generally in good health and capable of living on their own without assistance.

Active Dependent
Still active and interested in activities, yet many factors limit them. May not need assistance on a daily basis, but not completely independent.

Non-Active Dependent:
Includes those who are completely dependent on others in their daily activities, such as meals, dressing, toileting, transportation, laundry, housekeeping, etc. Also includes those who may be physically capable to be active, yet may choose not to be due to fear or lack of interest.

3) Other Possible Age Groups

The Old-Old
Ages 85 and over
This group is the least healthy and least prosperous as well.

Middle Seniors
Ages 75 to 84
This group may be less prosperous and health begins to decline.

Young Seniors
Ages 65 to 74
This group tends to be the most healthy and affluent.
The Skyline at First Hill-Seattle, WA

- $100-million 26-story high-rise
- 199 apartments/ penthouses
  - Will offer one-, two-, and three-bedroom residences
  - High-quality residential living in a location that allows residents to enjoy downtown

www.skylineatfirsthill.org

Ridgewood Community-Upper Providence, PA

52 traditional, low-rise townhomes
- Units have 3 bedrooms and 2.5 baths
- Range in size from 1,956 to 2,400 square feet
- Priced from $330,000 to $360,000
- Convenient to historical sites and attractions, national and state parks, cultural events, entertainment, dining, shopping, and a multitude of services, business and conveniences

www.ridgewoodcommunity.com

Lake Ashton - Lake Wales, FL

Planned golf adult community
- Sits on 1,200 acres of land
- Single family homes and motor coach-garage homes
- Offer groups, clubs, programs and classes that emphasize learning
- Promotes an active lifestyle through golf clinics and fitness classes

www.lakeashton.com

The Village at Penn State - State College, PA

College-affiliated planned residential community
- Built on 80 acres Village-style setting for senior adults, ages 62 and over
- Maintenance-free living in an apartment or cottage
- 140 of the 200 residents at The Village are either alumni or retired faculty

www.villageatpsu.com

Architectural Forms

High-Rise -
High-rise condominiums appear in large cities, big retirement buildings with apartments for rent are being built downtown too. These buildings are typically expensive, with a rich package of services and help. But they offer an alternative for those who might otherwise live downtown in a traditional condo.

Medium-Rise -
Modest building heights are situated along major streets and employment areas. A large variety of housing options, such as stacked townhouses and medium-rise apartments, are offered. This style of housing can allow a more affordable option for seniors compared to others.

Low-Rise -
Rowhouses, single-family, multiplex, and flats are all examples of low-rise senior dwelling types. This housing ranges in its price from small, affordable units to large, upscale models.

Social and Activity Based

College-Affiliated -
Are Universities and some form of retirement homes that are linked together by financial ties and educational programs where both parties can benefit. Both seniors and students interact with each other and enjoy new experiences. These tend to be residences for life-long learners.

Golf -
Typically a large-scale development that runs through or borders a golf course. Residents living here generally have a great love for golf or simply enjoy the large lot sizes and maintained grounds. Gated communities are often associated with this type of retirement housing.

Interdependency -
Sustainable design for homes. It unites architecture, communities and landscapes to create new sustainable systems based on natural ecological models. Just as every element in an ecosystem depends on other elements, permaculture recognizes the interdependency of soil, plants, animals, buildings, people, and culture. Senior residents will work together to maintain this system.
**Functional Programmatic Types**

**CCRC -**
Continuing Care Retirement Communities allow seniors to "age in place," with flexible accommodations that are designed to meet their health and housing needs as these needs change over time. Residents entering Continuing Care Retirement Communities sign a long-term contract that provides for housing, services and nursing care, usually all in one location, enabling seniors to remain in a familiar setting as they grow older.

**Assisted Living -**
Also known as “Board & Care” and “Congregate Housing.” Numerous kinds of housing with services for people who do not have severe medical problems but who need help with personal care such as bathing, dressing, grooming or meal preparation.

**Independent Living -**
For healthy seniors who are self-sufficient and want the freedom and privacy of their own separate, easy-to-maintain apartment or house, along with the security, comfort and social activities of a senior community.

**Nursing Home Care -**
Facilities with 24-hour medical care available, including short-term rehabilitation (physical therapy) as well as long-term care for people with chronic ailments or disabilities that require daily attention of RN’s in addition to help with personal care such as bathing or dressing or getting around.

**Nursing-Care Home**
- A state-of-the-art 99-bed
- Long Term Care Facility
  - Completed: 1991

[Link to image: www.tsomides.com]

**Highland Ridge - Williamsburg, IA**

**Assisted Living Home**
- Offers one and two bedroom apartments
- Personal care is available, in the privacy of own apartment, from competent, on-site staff
- Emergency call assistance provided around the clock
- Reflecting pool, backyard patio and walking paths

[Link to image: www.highlandridge.org]
**Lifestyle**

**Changing Perceptions of seniors**

- Founding of America: leaders, affluent, wise, and experienced
- Industrial Revolution: slow, undesirable in the workforce
- Today: not active, illiterate, dependent
- Future: active, affluent, experienced, sophisticated

Notice that there is a change of perception from good to bad as a result from the Industrial Revolution. There is also an expected change from bad to good as a result of the more active baby boomer generation that will be entering the older stages of their lives soon.

**Life Expectancy**

For the first time in U.S. history, there will be more people over 65 than under 25. Currently 12% of the country's population are seniors. This percentage is projected to reach 20% by 2030. Why is this? Well, there are two conclusions; the baby boomers are starting to get older and people are living longer.

- 1900 life expectancy: 47 years
- 2000 life expectancy: 77 years

Life expectancy has improved a lot over the years, and will continue to do so. There will be more people living longer, healthier, and more active lives. Note that middle age has increased 15 years over a 100 year span. In 50 years middle age should be 46 years old!

**Money Spending Trends**

There has been some debate on whether or not the largest consumer group in the nation, baby boomers, will be a strain on the economy or will help it flourish as they grow older.

Conservative spenders like previous generations

Big spenders on things that contribute to their active lifestyles

The graphs to the left show how baby boomers aren't following the norm very precisely as of now. The following topics discuss some areas where spending is beginning to increase and is projected to increase more as the baby boomer generation grows older.

**Beauty**

The trend in aging is not to look old. This has caused many people to start using anti-aging products and techniques to keep themselves looking their best.

**Health**

The health industries have been recently growing because of baby boomers who would like to live actively until they are 100.

**Activity**

Living an active lifestyle is a very important aspect of boomer life. There are more boomers participating in court sports than ever before and more activity is projected for the future. Exercise is an important part of staying fit, healthy, and independent. Maybe as a result, disabilities in older Americans are declining.

**Boomers have more money and they are going to spend it on looking and feeling younger...**

Research and Reconnaissance

Retirement

There has been a noticeable trend in labor force participation rates. This is one indicator that retirement is becoming more and more common for earlier ages. This shows that more adults are putting off retirement for a later year.

| Age 25-54:  | 1950 = 96.5% | 2004 = 90.5% |
| Age 55-64:  | 1950 = 86.9% | 1995 = 66%    |
| Age 65+:    | 1950 = 45.8% | 1985 = 15.8% |
|            | 2004 = 19%   |            |

There are a few factors that influence retirement such as general economic conditions, Social Security benefits, health insurance and pension funds. Social Security has changed over the years and as of 2005 a person can qualify for full benefits at age 65 and 6 months, and this age is being increased to 67 over a period of time. A person can qualify for benefits at age 62, but those benefits will be permanently reduced by 25% (30% when the age becomes 67) of full benefits. Social Security used to penalize people for working past retirement age, but now it provides incentives for those who do. In fact, many employers are starting to enact phased retirement where a person can have a flexible work schedule or maybe work part time.

Marketing

Baby Boomers are the largest consumer group, holding 3/4 of the nation’s assets. This is why the marketing trend is changing. Some of the top industries have started to market specifically to the aging baby boomers.

Cosmetics industries have pushed makeup and anti-aging products to those who don’t want to look old. Food manufacturers are marketing to empty nesters, for example Pillsbury has “dinner for two” sized meals.

Sporting goods are increasing marketing to older adults because so many more are becoming active. Places like Fit after 50, Inc. are not only marketing to the 50+ crowd, but to the entire boomer generation.

Travel companies are marketing to the boomers because they are the age group that does the most traveling. Disney has a commercial that shows multiple generations having fun at their theme parks.

Car companies are marketing to an aging population because they are the people who have to most money. Audi, for example, has a commercial for its A6 Sedan and Quattro models that blends David Bowie’s classic “Rebel Rebel” with his newer hit “Never Get Old”. Audi says that it wants to connect to that certain age group who is now getting older and still wants to live a fun and exciting life.

Products

Transgenerational Product Design

One of the keys to success in the coming years is to create a product that all generations can use. There are two key points that Pirkl makes about transgenerational design.

Product Choice
- Help keep people active and independent
- Environment that supports changing needs
- Choices

Transgenerational Design
- Functional
- Aesthetically pleasing

Transgenerational design isn’t limited only to gizmos and gadgets, but to entire houses or living environments. Here are a few examples of what transgenerational design can look like.
Models and Approaches

Worldwide the proportion of elderly is reaching never before seen levels. In Europe, the elderly (over the age of 64) now consists of 16% of the population. Governments are investing millions on studies to improve the life of the elderly and to alleviate some of the monetary pressures their respective governments will be facing. Many countries have realized that taking self-help and self-independence initiatives are much more viable ways to deal with an ageing population. Governments are pushing for the elderly to remain living in their homes until it is absolutely necessary for them to have constant care. Moreover, in many countries, the elderly by tradition live with their children until their final days. Thus, entirely independent retirement communities are rarer world-wide than they are in the United States.

Urban Design

Throughout Europe, accessibility and pedestrian safety are widely practiced. Raised crosswalks, signage, and lighting are a few ways in which many cities are accommodating for its most vulnerable citizens. A safe and accessible public realm gives the elderly independence for a longer part of his/her third stage of life.

Diversifying Community

The Towers at Littlecombe, a 1905 structure will become a 45-bed nursing home in the heart of a new urban community. Littlecombe is a development under construction that has been carefully designed to bring the perfect balance of employment and services to the community. This mixed-use development will offer 600 homes, 30% of which are affordable housing, offices, and services for the community. In addition to the 45-bed nursing home there will be 19 assisted living units and care services for elderly in the community.
Japan is the world's most rapidly ageing society today. The Japanese government has therefore taken a 'self-help' or 'self-independence' approach to ageing. Governments all over the world are increasingly spending large amounts of money to fund research in the area of Ambient Intelligence and similar such technologies. In Germany, there is the Assisted Living Lab and throughout Europe there is SOPRANO (Service-Oriented Programmable Smart Environments for Older Europeans). The goal for many countries now is to keep the elderly in their own homes for as long as they can.

Plussenburgh, recently completed in southern Rotterdam, Netherlands is one attempt at accommodating for the tastes of the new senior generation. This housing model has 104 living units and is designed for those in denial of ageing, with a discretely placed elevator that connects the units to the existing nursing home.

This mid-rise senior housing model is located in Buenos Aires, Argentina. Its five stories make up 1100 square meters. As is the case with most senior housing in much of South America, this facility is for those in need of assistance through daily life. Traditionally, seniors live with their children as long as they can. The senior housing model contradicts the classical American model as it is located in the highly dense and bustling neighborhood of Belgrano, as opposed to the usually calm and quiet senior housing in the U.S.
Uptown Neighborhoods and Urban Analysis

The Uptown Study area is based around six strong existing neighborhoods which are the building blocks of this region. These neighborhoods are the home of major institutions and employment centers. Some are vibrant while others are struggling. The area lacks a strong identity for Uptown as a whole. It is divided into individual neighborhood identities. While each neighborhood should continue to have its own unique identity, all neighborhoods should also feel a larger affinity in the broader community of Uptown. Uptown is accessible by major Interstate and regional roadways and from the airport. Vine Street and Martin Luther King Boulevard are major routes crossing through the area and connecting to the surrounding region and the highway system. Additional major streets, such as Clifton Avenue, Burnet Avenue, and Reading Road, among others, also define the area's neighborhoods and institutions.

Building Fabric

There is an existing grid pattern in the area of Uptown east of the University Buildings, for the most part, follow this grid pattern which tends to run vertically north/south.

Uptown Parks

The majority of Uptown parks are located along the hillside ridge that borders along the southern and western edge of the study area. This greenbelt is mostly unusable land so it has been turned into public space. Burnet Woods, Uptown's central park, will be restored as a safe and accessible center of community activity and recreation.

Neighborhood Business District

There have been 7 Neighborhood districts located in Uptown:
- Avondale NBD (A) - 1,480,000 sq ft
- Avondale NBD (B) - 190,000 sq ft
- Avondale Rockdale - 585,000 sq ft
- Burnet NBD - 640,000 sq ft
- Calhoun Marketplace - 1,400,000 sq ft
- Ludlow NBD - 910,000 sq ft
- Short Vine Corridor - 1,870,000 sq ft

Hillside Definition

Hillsides are walls which limit views and thereby create definite places. Development which enhances both the character of these hillside walls and the character of the places they define extends the effect of hillsides.

Traffic Counts

This synthetic diagram uses the Average Annual Daily Traffic Count (AADT) to represent which neighborhood business district has the heaviest amount of car traffic through its main intersection. Calhoun's NBD was the highest where Clifton Ave. and McMillan St cross at 23,800 cars while the Burnet NBD was only seeing 7,305 cars at the intersection of Burnet Ave. and Forest Ave.

Uptown Area Analysis: Morphology

North to South

Flora St., Victor St., Stratford Ave., Chickasaw St., Rohs St., Wheeler St.

East to West


Square Blocks

Jefferson Ave., Vine St., Euclid Ave., Eden Ave., E. Daniels St., W. Charleston St., E. Charleston St., W. Corry St.

Triangle

W. McMillan St., E. Hollister St., W. Hollister St., Vine St.

Organic

W. Corry St., Jefferson Ave., William Howard Taft Rd., Euclid Ave
**Uptown Development History**

**Calhoun Street:** Once a residential strip with corner stores and churches, Calhoun Street saw rapid change while the university expansion was taking place. The area between Calhoun and McMillan was converted to commercial use, mainly food services to serve the university, hospital and high school. Currently, all fast-food establishments have been cleared out to make room for condominiums and student housing, which are aimed to attract “upscale” people to revitalize Clifton Heights. At the beginning of 1990, open space and the built fabric were balanced. Now in 2007, the area is far less dense than it once was. No major changes have occurred to the street configuration, except for smaller streets and alleys that are now demolished.

**Clifton Avenue:** The major change that took place on Clifton Avenue deals with the southward institutional expansion. Deaconess hospital took up some residential space with its northward expansion. Around 2005, houses were torn down to make room for the newly built “Stratford Heights” community. Clifton is a major hub for serving housing needs for university students. Institutional progression is very prominent on this road. A fairly good balance of the open space and built fabric was kept up until 2005, with the addition of “Stratford Heights”. This community seems isolated from its surroundings as it was just inserted into the neighborhood. By 2000, smaller alleys within the area disappeared, but “Stratford Heights” has since reconnected the area.

The university spread out sporadically, but the organic fashion in which it spread out was due to the topography of the site. The movement of the expansion went from the west of the site to the northeast, beginning from McMicken Hall, the first building in the campus. The pre-existing Burnet Woods was a strong influence on the form of the expansion. The university took advantage of the composition of the picturesque/windy paths within the site. The east side was influenced by the grid system of the Corryville residential area that was already in place. Upon expansion, large amounts of the Corryville residential areas were taken up. Jefferson Avenue was widened and streets disappeared in order to make a superblock.

Uptown: Current Figure Ground

Connectivity
Diagram illustrating various connections among the sectors of the Uptown area

Density
Diagram illustrating the different density patterns within the Uptown area

Urban Forms
Diagram illustrating the various urban forms or patterns within the Uptown area

Built Fabric
Diagram illustrating the many areas of built environment within the Uptown area

Texture
Diagram illustrating the various textures of built fabric and urban form within the Uptown area

Boundaries
Diagram illustrating the strong boundaries that are present within the Uptown area

Research and Reconnaissance

Spatial Network

Spatial Character and Morphology

W07
Jason Burns
Several unique building types are found throughout Cincinnati’s CUF neighborhood, greatly varying in size, form, function, and time period. These types are broken down into ten different categories which help to understand the existing urban fabric that makes up the neighborhood. Although various differences such as parking conditions, interior reconfigurations, and architectural style may occur within each type, the buildings share distinct characteristics and relationships to their contextual surroundings. The image at right locates the examples detailed.

i. Single Family House

Typically detached free-standing houses on either small or large lots. Many have been divided into multi-unit apartment houses for the student population. While many of the small-lot houses have no on-site space for parking, the larger lots often have driveways leading to garages located to the rear of the house.

Use: Residential
Approx. Sq ft: Sm. Lot: 1,400-2,000
Lg. Lot: 2,000-3,500
Height: 2-3 stories
Setback: 10-25’ typ.
Parking: Detached garage/Side or rear drive/On-street

ii. Townhouse

This attached single family dwelling is the least prevalent residential type in CUF. There is no front yard, but there is often a yard in the rear which is commonly used today for parking.

Use: Residential
Approx. Sq ft: 1,500-2,000
Height: 3-4 stories
Setback: 0-10’ typ.
Parking: Rear lot/On-street

iii. Duplex

These two-family houses are larger than the single family type and can be either free-standing or attached to neighboring structures. Unlike the many single-family houses that have been subdivided, this type was originally designed to consist of two separate units.

Use: Residential
Approx. Sq ft: 1,000-1,500
Height: 2-3 stories
Setback: 10-25’ typ.
Parking: Detached garage/Side or rear drive/On-street

iv. Converted Mixed-Use

A later front addition transforms these single family houses found in the business district into mixed-use buildings. The rear main structure, originally conceived for residential use, can be used as single-family residential, multifamily residential, or office space.

Use: Residential main structure, Commercial/Retail front addition
Approx. Sq ft: House: 1,500-2,000
Storefront: 400
Height: 2-3 stories
Setback: 0’ typ.
Parking: Detached garage/Side or rear drive/On-street

v. Multifamily

Lot situation and building configuration vary by year built. This larger type typically contains from 10 to 30 apartment units. Several multifamily buildings surround a courtyard.

Use: Residential
Approx. Sq ft: 600-1,000/apt.
Height: 3-4 stories
Setback: 5-30’typ.
Parking: Front, side, or rear lot/On-street
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>vi. Single-Story Commercial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>These structures are attached and consist of a single commercial space. The close relationship to the street creates visual harmony with adjacent buildings. As with all commercial spaces in the neighborhood, delivery access is generally through the front in the absence of a rear loading area or lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use:</strong> Commercial/Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approx. Sq ft:</strong> 13,000-1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Height:</strong> 1 story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setback:</strong> 0-5’ typ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking:</strong> On-street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>vii. Mixed-Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The most common type in the “Old Town” NBD along Calhoun/West McMillan corridor, these buildings are very flexible in providing space for various functions. The large-scale type mimics several older mixed-use types through variations in massing and facade articulation. It also achieves a creative parking solution with a garage situated in the tiered elevation of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use:</strong> Commercial/Retail ground floor, Residential/Office upper floors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approx. Sq ft:</strong> Varies Height: 3-6 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setback:</strong> 0-5’ typ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking:</strong> Small-scale: Side lot/ On-street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large-scale: Below-grade structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>viii. Residential Tower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This high-rise student dormitory-style housing is typically free-standing. The two 12-story towers along Calhoun Street stand perpendicular to each other with vehicular access located on the interior (campus) side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use:</strong> Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approx. Sq ft:</strong> 165/room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Height:</strong> 10+ stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setback:</strong> 20-25’ typ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking:</strong> Below-grade parking structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ix. Institutional/Civic Building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>These large structures were intended to provide a setting for learning, social activity, and religious ceremony in the neighborhood. While the schools and some of the churches still function as they were designed, the others are no longer in use by their congregations. This has presented unique opportunities for adaptive re-use. These structures are often considered landmarks due to their monumental scale, dignified siting, and/or architectural merit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use:</strong> Educational/Civic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approx. Sq ft:</strong> Varies Height: 3-5+ stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setback:</strong> 15-50’ typ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking:</strong> On-street/Side-lot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>x. University Buildings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>These buildings make up the fabric of the university adjacent to the CUF neighborhood and vary immensely in form and function. Their design and development are in accordance with the university master plan and there is little relationship between the campus and the surrounding urban context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use:</strong> Educational/Office/Athletic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approx. Sq ft:</strong> Varies Height: Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setback:</strong> n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking:</strong> On-street/Parking structures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: CAGIS, Googleearth
Development History

In the early 1800s, the land which is known today as Clifton Heights—University Heights—Fairview, or CUF, was located just north of the basin, which contained the city of Cincinnati. The land was situated on top of a steep hill and because of its hilly terrain, it was very thinly populated. It was not until 1849, when Fairview first started developing, Clifton Heights became a separate neighborhood due to the different years they were annexed to the city.

Fairview-1847

Fairview began to develop in the mid 1800s. People were anxious to get away from the busy and congested city life of Cincinnati. The first homes went up along the streetcar lines were built around Fairview.

Clifton Heights-1980

Clifton Heights was not annexed until 1870, although the land was subdivided for residential use in the 1850s. Most of this was due to lack of access to commercial uses. Clifton Heights remained without services for over 20 years and remained fairly unpopulated. Fairview on the other hand developed much quicker because it’s services were provided sooner, such as water and gas lines, sewers, and street improvements. Streetcar lines were not extended to Clifton Heights until the late 1900s. Clifton Heights was given its name to strike a positive attitude toward the community due to the already desirable suburbs of Clifton. However, Clifton Heights was designed for less affluent residents.

University Heights - early-mid 1800s

University Heights was also developing, but it arose along with the University of Cincinnati founded in 1819 and expanding in 1898.

Study Area

Historically, commercial activity was limited in Uptown with the exception of some truck farming and grape and wine production. The only access to the basin was from Vine Street until 1876 when the Bellevue Incline was constructed in what is now Bellevue Park. This was also the site of the Bellevue House, a resort, ballroom, and beer garden for residents’ entertainment.

Most of the homes were single-family structures and the street space was designed for public transportation and pedestrians. So the increase in automobile in the 1920s presented a parking problem as well as a traffic congestion problem on the narrow streets. It only grew worse as time went on and people owned at least one vehicle.

As the University of Cincinnati grew rapidly, it brought in new businesses with it along Calhoun and McMillan, which catered to the growing population of students. Families that lived in CUF, started to move out further into the suburbs around the 1960s and homes were converted into rental units. Students and lower-income residents moved in and made the area much denser than it once had been. The population has almost doubled. Because of the highly dense student and low-income population, in the 1980s and 1990s, the CUF neighborhood experienced a decline in the quality of the neighborhood. Housing was deteriorating and roads were in need of repair due to the heavy traffic. From 1998 to 2006, the CUF neighborhood has grown from 10,000 to 16,000.
Research and Reconnaissance

Key Institutions

- The University of Cincinnati - 1819
- Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion - 1875
- The Friar's Club - 1880
- University of Cincinnati School of Law - campus expansion 1883
- Deaconess Hospital - 1888
- Fairview German Bilingual School - 1888
- Engine Company No. 27 - 1890s. This was turned into a Masonic Lodge for political clubs, civic groups, and church meetings. It later became a photographic studio in 1945, and the converted to DuBois Bookstore in 1958 as the campus rapidly grew.
- Eight District Patrol Station - 1895
  Once the police boundaries were redrawn in 1927, the station became less effective and was transformed into a community center in 1957 and later the Fairview Arts Center in 1970, which later closed due to lack of funds.
- Hughes High School - 1911 (Clifton Avenue Location) Hughes in the early 1950s and 1960s was highly regarded and produced many graduates that continued on with their education. However, as the surrounding community changed, so did the school itself. There is a higher number of absentee and non-graduates. The school itself is also deteriorating, and there is talk about closing Hughes, however others in the community fight to renovate this architectural cornerstone.
- Good Samaritan Hospital - 1915
- St. Monica's Roman Catholic Church - 1927
- St. George's Cathedral

Race/Ethnicity in 2000

- White: 78%
- African-Americans: 12%
- Asian: 8%
- Hispanic: 4%

Community Attitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clifton Heights/University Heights</th>
<th>Fairview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>View as good place to live</td>
<td>45% Good</td>
<td>48% Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views on Crime</td>
<td>31% Serious</td>
<td>38% Somewhat Serious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30% Somewhat Serious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel Safe Walking Alone at Night</td>
<td>47% Safe</td>
<td>60% Safe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30% Somewhat Unsafe</td>
<td>20% Unsafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See Garbage and Glass in the Streets</td>
<td>36% Almost Always</td>
<td>33% Almost Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23% Almost Never</td>
<td>29% Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See Kids Without Supervision</td>
<td>44% Almost Never</td>
<td>40% Almost Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27% Almost Always</td>
<td>31% Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Common Crimes</td>
<td>Armed Robbery/Burglary</td>
<td>Armed Robbery/Burglary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust Neighbors</td>
<td>35% A Lot</td>
<td>66% Not at All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Change of African Americans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>15.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>22.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>23.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>37.90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mediocre family income of in 2000 was $32,000 and 30% of residents were below the poverty level.


Downtown Living on the Uptown Campus

Site Analysis

Constantly noted as a potential location for major redevelopment of the Short Vine and Uptown area, University Plaza features the conveniences of two neighborhood business districts, Short Vine and Calhoun/McMillan, as well as excellent adjacency to the University of Cincinnati. University Plaza also lies on a ridge that is the highest point of the area and has high visibility. Vine Street and Jefferson carry high amounts of traffic. Adjacent to the site are several parks and hillside areas, creating dramatic views to the south.

Goals and Objectives

Establish an Experiential Environment
- Create opportunities for life-long learning in an urban setting
- Encourage relationships between residents and the community
- Facilitate the active lifestyle that the 50+ aged generation appreciates
- Create a relationship with the University of Cincinnati that allows seniors to take part in events, classes and other activities related to the University

Create An Innovative Housing Community for Seniors
- Adequately house seniors
- Continuing Care Retirement Community
- Create senior residential destination within the Uptown area

Improve Circulation
- Increase safety of area
- Reduce traffic speed
- Extend Vine Street
- Create pedestrian pathway to Short Vine NBD and UC

Promote Neighborhood Improvement
- Re-establish/create new opportunities for businesses on Short Vine

Enhance Community Engagement
- Relationship with University of Cincinnati
- Community Center

Community Theme

Enjoy the convenience and proximity of downtown life in a retirement community where college is not just a place to achieve an education, but an opportunity to experience life. Experience downtown living, the excitement of a nearby university and active lifestyle.

Amenities associated with downtown living

Close proximity to UC and downtown Cincinnati

The diversity of a university environment

UC’s classes and activities

Opportunity for community engagement

Urban Design Concept

Extend Vine Street through site

New buildings reflect density of surrounding existing structures

Reinforce edges and gateways

Create building orientation focusing on open space
Building Design Concept

Buildings surround open space
Terraced building
Create dramatic entrance from Vine Street
Reduce dominance of building over the rest of the built environment

Examples

All buildings will have green roofs.

Each apartment has its own balcony to promote resident interaction and allow them to experience the outdoors.

Rooftop terraces are accessible to every resident through main north-south hallways

120 Bedroom apartments (1015 square feet)
58 Two Bedroom apartments (1300 square feet)
Retail space (48,000 square feet)

Section A-A

Section - Elevation B-B
Precedents

Stratford Heights

“Newly designed community exclusively for students attending UC”
Conveniently located directly next to UC
A very diverse student community that facilitates fraternities, sororities, religious organizations, academic departments, and educational focus groups
Resembles a Greek-style housing village
Many amenities provided for residents such as fully furnished living arrangements, numerous common spaces, all utilities, and on-site parking

Oak Hammock at the University of Florida - Gainesville, Florida

University-affiliated senior living setup just adjacent to U of Florida
Not formally apart of U of F; affiliated through a series of agreements
Bears the name of U of F, assuring vital interest in the success of this community
Targeted towards retired faculty, alumni and friends of U of F

1. Establish an experiential environment within a college setting

The vision behind “The Village at the University of Cincinnati” is to create opportunities for life-long learning within a Continuing Care Retirement Community (CCRC)

Encourage relationships between residents and the community
Facilitate and promote the active lifestyle of the 50+ aged generation
Create an environment within The Village that the resident can relate to when they were in college, similar to the new design of Stratford Heights
Create a relationship with the University of Cincinnati that allows seniors to take part in events, classes, and social activities related to the University

2. Create an innovative housing community that adequately houses seniors

3. Create an improved circulation network throughout the site area

Strategically connect McMillan Ave. to Hollister Ave. for better access

4. Increase the safety of the surrounding area

5. Enhance aesthetics and create pathways to Inwood Park

6. Promote surrounding neighborhood improvements

Strengthen existing commercial areas and promote homeownership

7. Enhance community engagement

Relationship with UC; target towards retired faculty, alumni, and friends of UC
Site Context

- Site Area: 6.3 acres (275,321 sf)
- Site Building to Common Space Ratio: 1:1.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Types</th>
<th>No. of Units</th>
<th>Beds</th>
<th>S.F.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Living</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>700-770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Cottages</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted Living</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Care</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alzheimer's Care</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL UNITS</td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Office Wing Parking Spaces: 16
- Underground Parking Spaces: 238
- TOTAL SPACES: 254

Floor No. | Private Space S.F. | Common Space S.F. | Ratio |
-----------|--------------------|-------------------|-------|
1          | 35,036             | 31,024            | 1:1.2 |
2          | 34,740             | 15,726            | 1:2.2 |
3          | 24,840             | 23,388            | 1:1.1 |
4          | 17,200             | 6,760             | 1:2.5 |
5          | 17,200             | 6,760             | 1:2.5 |

- Common Spaces include lobby, activities room, dining room, lounges, fitness center, chapel, computer lab, arts and crafts studio, and courtyards.
- Balcony Areas: 60 sf.
- Great Lawn Area: 31,668 sf.
- Underground Garage Area: 20,624 sf.

A central site element such as a clock similar to McMicken Hall

Create a main entry feature similar to those at UC

Example of steps and common space layout, from UC

Example of a large central courtyard, and an example of the desired style of architecture to be used, from Stratford Heights

Ornate system of pedestrian walkways similar to this commons area at UC

View looking directly into the site area from the corner of Vine and Hollister
At Inwood Park

**Location**

*education. Shopping. fitness. transit. health services*

Located on what is currently a portion of Inwood Park, this site is situated in a quiet pocket of the Uptown Neighborhood. Several promising mixed-use development sites, as well as existing residential neighborhoods are located adjacent to the site, providing residents at my facility with an interesting mix of urban activity, and a park-like atmosphere.

In addition to close proximity to the University of Cincinnati and its many resources, the Inwood site is a short walk or bus ride to several neighborhood business districts, shopping centers, and medical centers, providing senior residents with easy access to many urban amenities.

**Concept**

*urban. diverse. safe. affordable. supportive. home*

**Form**

*pedestrian. interaction. spaces. parkviews. neighborhood integration*
My Plan is based on the movement of people and activity though the center of my site and out into the Uptown Neighborhood. This circulation is provided to residents by an auto and pedestrian shared alley-way, which provides access from the residential areas south of Inwood park up to the new Uptown Gateway Plaza at McMillian and Taft Streets. From inside the residential complex, a network of formal and informal paths lead residents to this alley allowing for safe travel at a more level grade.

Shown here is a typical perspective view of the shared alley which runs though the center of my site North-South. All surfaces would be at level grade to provide Seniors with easy movement along the path as well as to calm traffic by integrating pedestrian and auto movement on a single hardscape.
Continuing Life Sustainably

Friar Hill is a Continuing Care Retirement Community that gives residents the opportunity to live a lifestyle that is fully sustainable environmentally, socially, and economically. From the layout of the community to the architectural elements of the housing, Friar Hill is a responsible and convenient alternative for both active seniors and those in need of care. These principles are symbolized by the central food-producing garden in the shape of a leaf. Just as the leaf of a plant collects a drop of water to sustain itself, rainwater and runoff are collected, retained, and reused on-site. This feature, among others, is central to the community in which residents can happily age in place while giving more to the neighborhood and taking less from the land.

Concepts

Conceptual Diagram

Porous Paving Surface Concept

Source: Tensar International
http://www.tensarinternational.com/

Cottage Concept

Source: McQuade Cuoto
http://www.cottagenovacite.com/

Proposal

Adaptable buildings (stacked-flat elevator townhouses)
0.25 acre central garden
Communal housing arrangement
Narrow shared streets (22’ROW)
Private rooftop courtyard
Connectivity with surrounding neighborhood
Re-use of older building
Maximal southern exposure
Preservation of slopes
Green walkways
Porous streets and alleys
Reduced parking spaces
Water runoff retention
Urban Design

Housing

Program
5.3 acres

Open Space
0.25 acre community garden
3,700 sq. ft. rooftop courtyard
0.7 acre natural wooded hillside

Services
Assisted living services
Nursing and other medical services
Limited meals
Housekeeping
Transportation (shuttle and car)
Emergency care
Social Activities

Common Space
(in Friar Building)
Business Center/Computer lab
Dining Room
Fitness Center
Arts & Crafts Studio
Lobby

The Friar Building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Type</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th>Sq. ft/unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouse</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouse Flat</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>350-470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing/Alzheimer's</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>400-500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where Healthy Living is Key to a Vibrant Future

The site is located on Calhoun Street across from the University of Cincinnati. The university is easy and accessible to residents who are taking part in classes or using the amenities.

**Amenities Included on Site**
- Spa
- Fitness Center
- Demo Kitchen
- Market Place
- Garden Rooftops and Greenspace

**Issues of crime and heavy traffic volume must be addressed. There will be sufficient lighting and surveillance on site and in the parking garage.**

**Sidewalks will be widened, but still maintain an urban feel.**

In order to create a vibrant community, social interaction must occur and this is a key location due to the university and proposed market place.
Program

Site: 2.1 Acres
Proposing attached dwelling units with greenspace and large windows. Traditional architectural style.

Total Units: 195
Independent Living: 78
Assisted Living: 27
Graduate Student Housing: 25
Nursing Care: 40 units located in the Care Center at Deaconess Hospital.

Type of Units
1-2 Bedroom
range from 600 SF - 1200 SF
(average SF is 900 on site)
Non-Residential: 30,000 SF
Open Space: 30,000 SF

Precedents

1. Garden Areas With Greenhouses for resident use on rooftops
2. Underground Parking Allows separate elevator access of residents and market place shoppers Provides 170 parking spaces
3. Greenspace/Park Areas with sitting areas and walking paths
4. Restaurant/Bar With outdoor seating facing open space
5. Yoga/Massage Therapy Room on roof
6. 3,000 SF Courtyard Creates scenic views for residents Open to residents and Public
7. Connecting Bridge Enclosed hallway connecting residential buildings Open on the first floor
8. Glass Hallways on top floors to provide extra lighting and accessible to rooftop gardens

I chose these precedents because of the open space they present. Green roofing is a good solution to the lack of open space in an urban environment.
Theme, Goals, and Objectives

The “Green House” of Clifton Heights is not just a place to live; it is a place to grow. A plant grows with a foundation that allows it to get the right amount of sunshine and water. The very foundation of the Green House will be built as a living organism cultivating in the hillside. The landscape will grow up and around the building. Taking it and embracing it.

Knowledge, health, and happiness can be nurtured in the right environment. Residents here will enjoy these aspects of life to their fullest because they will not be isolated and shut-off from the world. Participation and involvement with the surrounding neighborhood will be built into the daily life of a resident here. This development would not exist without the university and the community surrounding it.

Residents at the Green House of Uptown will be given the unique chance to “age in place.” Essentially someone moving in can live the rest of his or her life here without losing their social network and familiarity of the environment around them. Although age is not the primary factor to allowing a person to grow here, only retired individuals in a certain tax bracket will be accepted.

Independent units will be available to those who have an active lifestyle and are able to function by themselves and need no supervision. Assisted living is offered to the person who has trouble maneuvering or getting around at times. Nursing and Alzheimer’s units are located in the 7-story Friars building to those who have greater medical needs. The finest care will be given to the people from our highly trained and hand-picked staff from around the globe.

Design Diagram

The intent of this diagram is to symbolize the overall design concept through different urban and site issues. Gateways are shown in red, key viewpoints in radiating lines, circulation with curved arrows, and building forms are shown in green and brown.

Location and Context

The existing Friar’s Club site is located in a prime location because it is within a 5 to 10 minute walk of two major Hospitals, a Kroger grocery store, fine dining on Calhoun Street, unique cultural events, and a major university. Mass transit lines run on McMillan Street so use of an automobile is not required.
Site: 6.5 Acres

Proposed Buildings:
Adaptive re-use of Friar’s Club facility (Assisted Living)
Residential tower addition to Friar’s Club Facility (Nursing Care & Alzheimer’s)
2 large apartment/condo buildings (Independent Living)

Units
Independent Living: 62 units
Nursing Care: 48 units
Assisted Living: 31 units
Total: 141 units

Common Space
Gym
Cafeteria
Lobby
Day care Center
Floral Shop
Offices
Computer Labs

Services
Assisted Living Services
Nursing Care
Clinics
Personal Training
Housekeeping
Transportation
Emergency Help

Open Space
0.5 acre courtyard
0.5 rooftop gardens

Parking
66 parking-space garage
24 off-site parking on Ohio Ave and Lyon Street

The picture above is the Musée du Quai Branly in Paris designed by architect Jean Nouvel. It is described by Nouvel as a “sacred wood where material form seems to melt away, giving the impression of a sanctuary without walls.” My idea for the curved building was to form with the contours of the land and allow the building to become one with the hillside. The quote “a sanctuary without walls” sums up the experience I want a tenant to have while growing in this “living” building. The idea of making the whole structure green supports the idea of sustainable living and respecting nature.

Design Concept
A new web-based feedback on electric, gas and water usage developed by the Lucid Design Group will be featured in every unit of the Green House. The widget-like gadget will let the tenant know exactly how much energy they are using in terms of how many hot pockets they could heat up in the microwave.

Source: Wired Magazine (Mar 07 Issue)
Lofts For Lifestyles Of Health And Sustainability

**Theme**

Experience living at The Sophisticate: lofts for lifestyles of health and sustainability. The Sophisticate is a tranquil living experience with all the perks of an urban lifestyle. The development is for those who live a socially, mentally, and physically active lifestyle. The street level of the development includes a martini bar, wine cellar, micro-brewery, day-spa, restaurants, laundry mat, nursing station, main office, community building, and an abundant amount of public, semi-private, and private open space. These amenities will create space for people to gather and socialize. Because The Sophisticate is in such a great location, residents can walk to most of their everyday needs. The development is linked with The University of Cincinnati to allow residents to attend classes offered by the university as well as use their facilities, including the recreation center. There will be classes such as culinary, art, yoga, and ballroom dancing classes offered on site. The development is putting sustainable principles to work by incorporating grey water, garden roofs, and a large amount of greenspace into its design. The Sophisticate is an age diverse, mixed use, modern style development, with large open floor plans. Most lofts will have a private patio or garden.

**The Site Location and Surrounding Amenities**

1. University of Cincinnati
2. Deaconess Hospital
3. Hughes High School
4. St. Monica's Roman Catholic Church
5. Fairview German Bilingual School
6. Rohs Street Cafe
7. Kruek Community Center
8. Clifton Natural Foods
9. Clifton Heights Community Urban Renewal Corporations
10. St. George's Cathedral and Corryville Catholic School
11. University Plaza
12. Corryville Library
13. Corryville Post Office

**Site Connections**

**Character of Area**

**Design Concept**

**Modern Condos**

**Sustainable Design: Green Roof**
**Type:**
Continuing Care Retirement
Community and University
Affiliated Senior Housing

**Units on Site**

**Housing:** 148
1-2 Bedrooms, 600-2000 SQ FT
Under 50 yrs young: 18
Independent: 90
Assisted: 40
Owner Occupied: 75%
Renter Occupied: 25%

**Commercial:** 13
(1,440-5,000 SQ ft)

**Units Off Site**
Nursing: 30
Alzheimer: 10

**Parking (per floor):**
148 Spaces for Residents
18 Spaces for Visitors

**Goals and Objectives**

**Establish A Diverse Environment**
Introduce amenities attractive to the entire community, including students.

**Create An Eco-Friendly Development**
Incorporate grey water collection and greennroofs.

**Reduce Vehicular Conflict**
Slow high speed traffic and provide parking.

**Increase Connectivity**
Create passageways that connect the northern and southern sides of the site.

**Establish A Mentally, Physically, And Socially Stimulating Environment.**
Offer UC classes, the use of the Rec center, walkability of the area, and social gathering places.

**Promote A Sophisticated Way Of Living.**
Provide amenities that cater to the aging population's needs in a way that doesn't read "old".

**Urban Design Plan**

**Streetcape: University Park Apartments**

**Connectivity and Movement**

**Great Public Spaces:**
Piazza Del Campo, Sienna

**View From Northwest Corner**

**View Looking East**

**Elevation A**

**Elevation B**
Mixed/Senior Housing

High Volumes of traffic surround the site, yet Corry and Auburn are significantly less busy and much slower.

Synthetic Analysis

University Plaza breaks the pedestrian linkage between the two commercial hubs. High levels of pedestrian and auto-conflict at Jefferson and Calhoun prevent pedestrian linkages further.

Retail Attraction

University Plaza creates a gap between two relatively cohesive commercial hubs. Vine St. runs vertically and Calhoun street runs horizontally, but the anchor currently as a missing piece between the two.

Design Concept

While my intent was to solve a housing problem, through University Affiliated Senior Housing, I found that during site selection there was the opportunity to solve a major urban design problem as well. The site of University Plaza is placed at a pivotal location, bringing the commercial districts of Short Vine and Calhoun St. together. Unfortunately, with its massive parking lot and building location, University Plaza acts like more of a divider than a connector. A pedestrian linkage between Calhoun and Short Vine will be accomplished through a pedestrian alley. Two public open spaces will act as anchors to the two commercial hubs. Jefferson will be straightened for more 90 degree turns that will slow down traffic at the intersection of Jefferson and Calhoun. Retail will be located at ground level and housing will be located above.
A nursing care facility will be located across the bridge connecting to the housing community. It will contain 30 nursing units, a dining room, kitchen, a variety of common space, a hair salon, spas, a 24 hour nurses station, and rehabilitation rooms. Below the nursing care facility there will be a community center that shall be used by patrons of the housing community and their guests. This will gradually expand to include University - Senior Community functions. Retail will fill up remaining space.

**Housing**

- 165 Assisted/Independent Units
- 33 Assisted
- 132 Independent
- 25 Graduate
- 30 Nursing Units
- Parking: 224 below grade

**Community Center**

- Total: 27,000 sq. ft.

**Retail**

- Kroger: 70,000 sq. ft.
- Walgreens 15,500 sq. ft.
- Parking: 265 below grade
- 96 above grade
- Total: 145,000 sq. ft.
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End of quarter review with community partner JJ Gioducci and staff of the Corryville faith based Community Development Corporations
The availability of affordable workforce housing in the Uptown Neighborhoods has long been a concern of community leadership and institutional interests. Hospital and University institutional expansion throughout the last century has slowly eroded the availability of housing stock in the area. High demand for student housing around the university campus has inflated costs and because of its transient nature, has had a negative impact on the quality of the urban environment. Concurrently, the workforce of the uptown institutions continues to grow to the extent that today it rivals the volume of jobs and (with students) the daytime occupancy of Cincinnati’s downtown central business district. With almost ninety percent of employees of Uptown commuting from not only outside its neighborhood, but outside of the city, Uptown institutions have a pressing incentive to promote desirable housing options for its workers and especially for the substantial segment of its employee base that are at the lower end of the pay scale. Significant housing development efforts are planned or underway for market rate and student housing, many supported by university underwriting, but few of these are targeted for families with an annual income of less than $40,000.

Architecture students of the studio worked, in consultation with an affordable housing provider to create a site design and detailed housing plan for affordable workforce housing in Mt Auburn. Cluster housing programming included community space and retail service functions.
**Goal**

Keep as much of the existing fabric as well as the character of the site and neighborhood.

**Strategy**

Currently there are four structures on the site and of those four three are to be rehabilitated with as little alterations to the exterior as possible. The existing open space is a result of the removal of some of the buildings that were on the site before the project started. This open space left an undesired vacuum in the neighborhood, however this study takes advantage of it to create an open space for the members of the community.

**Context**

In this design only the continuous site in between Helen and McGregor is used. Some of the houses that currently exist on the site appear from the exterior to be sound, and they are consistent with the architecture of the surrounding neighborhood.

**Precedents**

Taking a cue from the houses in the neighborhood, each house has a porch for the inhabitants to sit out on and talk to their neighbors.

**Material**

The brick of the new houses is reflective of the stone modular units used on the exiting buildings while the horizontality of the siding is to be reflective of the brick coursing.

**Building Organization**

The existing buildings are to be two family housing units while the two new houses will be single family houses.

**Existing Houses**

The existing houses are to have minimal alterations to the exterior and completely new interiors. The first floor of the corner houses are single bedroom units with access to the basement from the exterior.

**New Houses**

The two new houses are three bedroom units and both face the new park space in the center of the site. The new houses feature gabled roofs, siding, and a brick faced foundation.
Public Space

The center park area is meant to be used by the whole neighborhood to provide a place for people to gather and to give children a place to play. It is composed of three areas; the trellised areas are to be more private while still giving a connection to the park. In between the trellised areas is a picnic area with a built-in grill that is the most public of the private areas in the park. The rest of the space is devoted to a play area with swings and a concrete slab for basketball and a field for running around or football. A walking path is drawn through the site making it one community.
Creating a Community for Those Who Serve the Community

Community Profile

The proposed site for redevelopment sits within the neighborhood of Corryville along Reading Road, just north of downtown Cincinnati. Reading Road is a major thoroughfare that transports Uptown residents into the downtown area. The proximity of the site to Reading Road, as well as its general position at the edge of the neighborhood, presents several opportunities and challenges to this particular project.

Many Corryville residents are employed at one of the five largest employers within the area, or what locals refer to as the "Fab Five": the University of Cincinnati; the Cincinnati Zoo; Children's Hospital; TriHealth Hospital; and Christ Hospital. The site serves as a gateway to these institutions from Reading Road. The goal of this project is to provide the residents of Corryville who are employed at the "Fab Five" with affordable workforce housing.

Site Development

This site will become a mixed-use development consisting of a day-care/community center, a community park, a retail building, and ten new single-family residences, all of which are connected via a series of paths. Each residence is a duplex unit, with each unit being a mirrored copy of the adjacent unit. Visitors will enter through the front door located off of a front porch. Once inside, a long brick barrel vault serves as the main circulation spine throughout the first floor, with the major living spaces (living room, dining room, and kitchen) located off of this spine. At the termination of this spine is the back porch, which can also be used by the residents who are coming from the covered parking along the alley. The staircase element protrudes from the regular footprint of the building, allowing for natural light to filter down the staircase and into the residences. It is clad in metal panels to add a contemporary language to the facade that complements the traditional language of the brick. Upstairs, the second door has two bedrooms, one that is accompanied by a balcony that looks onto the alley, plus a master suite that is also accompanied by a balcony that looks onto Reading Road.

Floor Plans
A set of four single-family houses lay clustered together on a site bordering Reading Road, between McGregor and Helen, in the Corryville area of Cincinnati, Ohio. These houses, very modern in design, aim to preserve the old-fashioned ideals of family togetherness while incorporating certain unique design concepts. The project combines a modern aesthetic with a Roman courtyard theme to give the building units their distinct character. The site plan shows how the four building units are arranged in a cluster; the spaces created between the buildings act as the main entrances to each building. There are no front doors or front porches on these units like the houses surrounding them. By deliberately keeping the entrances on the side, the idea is conveyed up-front that this is a modernist home with certain aesthetics that are unfamiliar to the people of Cincinnati. Design strategies are directed at bringing family together in a central space, the all-glass, Roman courtyard inspired living room, while discouraging isolation. Visually connecting the buildings are these brick "stitchings," arches that also serve as a visual gateway to the surrounding community. A large, residential swimming pool lies in the center of the complex in order to hierarchically reinforce the sense of community and place of gathering for residents. An all-glass pool house and community gazebo flank the pool, once again supporting the argument for a more interconnected complex. A fragmented glass roof connects the pool house to the gazebo and to the boundaries of the site and serves as a source of covered parking. A covered walkway, also made from pieces of fragmented glass, connects these designated parking areas to the units. Glass remains the choice material to express cohesion because of its thinness and transparency to facilitate social gatherings. The outdoor amenities of the site, therefore, are all constructed of glass, signifying to the residents that community unity is essential to the sustainability of the complex.

The front elevation illustrates some of the design strategies used to create a unified complex. The arches, combined with mullion-like horizontal members, effectively bring together the four separate units. The large glass triangle atop each building (the central living core) room indicates to the passerby that something special happens internally within the building. The front façade of each unit consists of a recessed void, once again referring to the central living room, and large vertical strip windows. The foremost goal of the design aims at using natural light as a magnet, attracting and guiding the family together. The strip windows offer enough light to the rooms within, but hopefully not enough to encourage an isolation. As it is the most important, the glass is treated as a canvas; pieces of glass with varying reflectivity are used to pick up color reflections from the surrounding neighborhood.

The floor plans highlight the central courtyard theme with the living room as the core, attempting to bring family to the center of importance. The thin slit windows often separate the furniture and interior millwork, exaggerating the effect the light plays in these darker, colder spaces. The last important design consideration of the house remains the open plan. This alludes to the modern architecture maxim, while at the same time providing programming flexibility that adapts to a specific family as it changes over time.
Affordable Workforce Housing

Background

Client Profile: The working residents need well designed, but affordable housing in the median home price range of around 100,000.

Workforce: 1 or 2 parents working outside the home with high school, vocational, or even college education.

Applicable professions can include: Electrician, $46,000 estimated annual income; Plumber, $45,000; Construction Worker, $35-50,000; Postal Service Worker, $50,000; Human Resources Employee, $43,000; Teacher, $50,000; Scientist / Researcher / Professor, $40-60,000

Site Development

Program: The site will retain the character of the neighborhood by keeping as many of the existing structures as possible and maintaining the streetscapes of both McGregor and Helen. The new buildings will draw from local forms to revitalize the area.

Residential: Provide homes for workforce families in restored, existing buildings of 2-3 families each and new buildings of 1-2 families each.

Commercial: Provide a building for a day care center and replace the existing convenience grocery with larger facility.

Circulation: Add an alley behind the buildings to provide access to the new garages. Allow off street loading for the grocery and additional parking along the western edge of the alley. Replace the sidewalk along Reading Road with a new sidewalk and 5 parking spots to provide a buffer between pedestrians and the street. Provide pathways between homes for access to the community amenities and other buildings.

Amenities: A new day care facility at the northern edge of the site. Grills and a picnic area between the two new buildings. A sitting area with a shade trellis between the new double unit building and the existing southern homes.

Exterior/Interior

Double Unit Elevation

Details

Window and porch details emphasize how joints connect the different elements of the building. European styling influences the kitchen layout and detailing with minimal upper cabinetry and drawers instead of shelves.

The double unit has a covered lower deck with a trellised upper deck to partially shade the exterior area. The building facade moves in with the window location to vertically articulate the brick wall, while large windows provide ample views and natural lighting.

Single Unit Elevation

The single unit has a convenience grocery on the lower level with both interior and exterior eating areas. A wider sidewalk and appropriate signage designate the commercial function of the lower floor. Woven metal panels serve as fencing around the decks while providing an additional raw material, like the wood and brick facade, that help to keep exterior maintenance to a minimum.
### Structure

**All Units**
The brick exterior walls serve as the load bearing structure. Wood posts and beams support the third floor while defining the dormer and dividing the interior spaces throughout the remaining levels of the building.

Metal fittings join the wood beams to the wood posts, but where they meet the brick wall they rest on bearing plates set into cutouts in the masonry.

### Entrance

**Double Unit**
East - west paths provide access from both Reading Road and the garages to the first floor through the side porches. The occupants of the upper levels enter the building from the west staircases, one per family. Then the occupants of the lower levels access the third floor through an interior stair along the kitchen and bathroom dividing wall.

**Single Unit**
Patrons access the convenience grocery from Reading Road, while the loading area is off the alley at the rear of the building. The occupants of the unit above come from their garage adjacent to the alley, up the northern staircase and into the unit. Then they access the third floor through an interior stair similar to the double units.

### Natural Light

**Double Unit**
Large windows provide ample natural lighting for the interior of the spaces. All four sides of the building have about the same amount of windows, but because of the unit size (50x20) the majority of the windows per unit are either on the north or south walls.

**Single Unit**
Large windows allow for multiple views of the site from all rooms. The majority of the windows in this unit face south because of the stair along the north side.

Trees on the exterior shade these windows for the majority of the summer cooling months but allow winter light into the spaces to heat the space.

### Services

**All Units**
Unfinished half basements below the units contain a washer and dryer for each family in addition to junior sinks and lockable storage facilities. Work areas in the detached garages provide space for tools, supplies, and lawn maintenance equipment.

**Single Unit**
A longer, wider parking space behind the building allows for loading into the grocery below the second and third floor unit without blocking access to the detached garages. The alley to the west of the site gives access to this spot, which keeps loading out of the traffic along Reading Road.

### Precedents

**Double Unit**
To prevent the building from looking too squat, the units are staggered relative to each other. Existing buildings inspire the shed roofs that also create play by opposing the standard gable with a simulated butterfly roof. The building typology dictates the general building size and the need for exterior porches.

**Single Unit**
A stand alone house with close proximity to neighbors retains privacy through interior layout. A side yard becomes the exterior focus with windows on this side of the house and generally a blank brick wall facing the adjacent building.

### Space Definition

**All Units**
Loft apartments inspire the open arrangement of the living units. Posts and beams define the common spaces such as the kitchen, dining, and living rooms. The entrance to the units occurs in the public areas that face Reading Road, while the more private areas face the backyard alley.

The more private areas, much as the bedrooms and bathrooms, also have standard stud wall construction with frosted glass panelled doors. The two level units have a floor designated as the children's area with two bedrooms and a shared bathroom, separate from the master suite on the main living floor.

### Circulation

**Double Unit**
On the first floor the tenants enter the unit from the side porch into the living area. Then the parents move back past the kitchen and children's room, the full bath, and into the master suite. In the common areas they move freely between the kitchen, living and dining rooms.

**Single Unit**
The residents of the single unit move up the north stair and across the unit to the interior stair which leads upstairs to the children's rooms. On the main living floor, the tenants move freely between the kitchen, living and dining rooms. The parents move back past the half bath into the master suite. This same layout applies to the upper floors of the double units.

### Sketches

**Site**
The majority of the existing homes on the site are in relatively good condition and will be restored. The house attached to the grocery represents a rapidly decaying structure and will be removed along with a garage and an addition on one of the other houses. The site also has two empty lots that have become overgrown.

**Retail**
The convenience grocery currently on the site remains closed due to unknown circumstances. This 500 square foot commercial building has become an eyesore over the years, but its concept remains important to the neighborhood fabric. A new facility of about 1000 square feet on the lower floor of the single unit will replace it.
Reading Road Detail and Dwelling

Site
This site is along a portion of Reading Road, between Mcgregor and Helen. It is on the edge of a residential neighborhood and is flanked by housing development. Several things are going on to ease this edge. A transition between building types, residential and retail, is made on Reading Road. The retail type acts as a buffer from the commercial density for the dwelling units. This transition of building type is reinforced with an axis that runs horizontally and vertically through the site. The axis is blurred and occupied by trees. The axis also connects the two portions of the site.

Elevation
The axis is then carried up into the elevation. A strong horizontal is carried across the entire façade which connects the three buildings. The horizontal is emphasized by the brick infill being set back from the edge of the horizontal slabs. The infill is reinforced by the column that breaks the field of brick. The brick infill has a texture applied to it by turning the brick on the horizontal axis within the field and its vertical axis at the top. This texture reduces the impact of the expanse of brick and makes it feel more pedestrian. The horizontal of the slab and the infill is only broken where there is vertical circulation. Here the slab is folded down and a strong edge is created. The vertical carries upward and breaks the plane of the roof and turns down to create a skylight.

Section
The skylight lights the entire middle of the dwelling while the storefront brightens the retail space. Again the horizontal is carried across the entire unit in section, only broken at the vertical penetrations. A larger community space is created in the front of the unit by opening the horizontal slab here as well. The horizontal extends out from the enclosure to provide a shading device for the strip windows that wrap the building, and a roof for the front and back porches. The porches have slightly different purposes. The front serves as a community area, while the back porch is more private.

Plan
The community/service parti is carried out within the plan. From front to back, the plan goes from a public, community space to a private, service oriented space. At the front of the plan we walk into an entry area where the floor is textured slightly different in order to separate the actual living space from being directly entered upon. As we move towards the back of the plan we go through the living and dining areas until we get back to kitchen and restrooms. As we move vertically in the plan the parti starts to break down as the private space starts to envelope the community spaces. The double height area at the front of the unit holds this community idea and is looked out on from a small meeting area. The rest of the plan is sleeping rooms, which are the most private of the program. The rules also start to break down as the service areas start to spread away from the rear of the unit and towards the middle; again this can occur because the overall community/service parti is altered as we move upward.
**Site Circulation**

Primary circulation is carried along Reading Road and secondary circulation is along Mcgregor and Helen. Access to retail parking is from Reading Road and residence parking from the secondary paths. Access to buildings is off of the secondary paths and from the resident parking. A linear flow parallel to Reading is carried out along paths from Helen to Mcgregor.

**Plan Circulation**

The plan can be accessed equally from any point on the plan. One point of entry at the retail level opens to an open plan where the user can wander clockwise or counterclockwise equally. Within the dwelling units entering from the front or back just differentiates the path taken. Main circulation occurs along the service corridor, which leads to the stair and around to all points of the plan.

**Entrance**

The retail plans are entered on Reading Road at one point, while the dwelling units are entered off the secondary paths of Mcgregor and Helen, and from the residence parking area. Entry on the retail level occurs at the space delegated to the vertical penetrations on the elevations.

**Spaces**

The major spaces are implied by joints in the floors, ceilings and walls. The community spaces are open in plan, while the private spaces are enclosed. Each space falls within a designated 'private' or 'community' space. The more open the plan is, the less formal of a boundary there is.

**Massing**

Strong horizontal elements create a simple profile on the elevation. The horizontal folds to make a vertical element the bounds the vertical circulation. That vertical element extends above the horizontal plane. Major areas are recessed behind the horizontals.

**Structure**

The horizontal structure is emphasized throughout the building, while the vertical elements recede. The horizontal slabs form the floors and ceilings of each floor. And the columns are actually 'T' shapes with the slim edge protruding through the enclosure of the brick infill. The horizontals also tend to seem to float between the verticals, above the clerestory windows, that extend across the entire building.

**Daylighting**

Light is brought into the spaces from clerestory windows that circle the plan. Light enters from all directions in the dwelling spaces, except along the parti wall. Light also comes from above from a skylight to light this space along this parti wall. Light only enters along the broad side of the retail space through full height storefront. The horizontal slabs extend out from the enclosure and form rudimentary sun shades, blocking the high summer sun, while allowing the low winter sun to penetrate.
The Uptown Corryville Neighborhood is a shrinking residential community, long encroached upon by its influential hospital and academic institutional neighbors. Not only have significant residential land areas of the community been lost to institutional use and its ancillary functions, like satellite medical offices, but both its housing district and its small commercial strip have been negatively impacted by patterns of student use.

As with other areas of Uptown, local development corporations, business leaders, and city agencies have put forth development plans for revitalized commercial areas and residential developments. These plans, with either the ambivalence or the active opposition of the community council, propose a development mix focused on the potential uses of students and outside users over the needs of permanent Corryville residents. Development projects include the complete redevelopment of the University Plaza superblock, infill and reprogramming of the Short Vine commercial district, and major high density housing developments along the edges of the community, of which several are completed.

Working among the various interest groups including the Community Council, Architecture, Planning, Anthropology, and Engineering students visioned alternative development scenarios for the benefit of dialogue. Students developed information on the community from surveys of residents, reconnaissance of existing conditions, and an analysis of neighborhood functions and assets.

In every case, student teams provided comprehensive community development scenarios that addressed all aspects of community life, including neighborhood commercial services, cultural programs, recreational options, environmental image, and green infrastructure with relevant economic development and implementation provisions. Fundamental to each plan is a comprehensive housing program designed to include the full spectrum of residential needs ranging from affordable to market rate types, permanent single family housing to transient student accommodations. Each team synthesized an “Urban Framework” that defined the planning, design, and programmatic components of their plans at the neighborhood scale. Finally students selected individual urban design areas for detailed study.

Community mentors included Housing developers Corryville Faith Based Community Development Corporation, Uptown Properties, and Community Leaders from the Corryville Community Council.
In Uptown, there are varying lot sizes, setbacks, and heights, usually according to the zoning at the time they were built. Each neighborhood is represented with an average home.

The lots sizes and housing placements are very different in each of the Uptown neighborhoods. What does this say about each neighborhood individually?

While each neighborhood's homes are varying sizes, the overall scale on average is similar in many of the average Uptown neighborhoods and similarly well within the human scale, making them very pedestrian friendly.
North of Martin Luther King Drive

Institutions such as Children's Hospital, University Hospital, and other buildings included in the University of Cincinnati's East Campus have dominated the northern half of Corryville.

Looking at the parcelization of land and the historical images, one can begin to notice that residential homes once flourished in the northern half of Corryville, which has now been lost except in the Northwest section.
Corryville has very similar sizes of homes, with varying lot sizes and building heights. Represented here are some average homes in Corryville.

Why is there no single-family zoning in all of Corryville?

Corryville hosts plenty of multi-family housing that sits close and are also close to their neighbors, often sharing lots. This is intended to encourage sharing with neighbors and keeping the homes connected to the street.
Research and Reconnaissance
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Source: City of Cincinnati Parks Department; Planning to Stay by Morrish&Brown
Location

Uptown's anchoring institutions are dispersed throughout the Uptown area. Several of the large scale research/health facility institutions include the superblock phenomenon, a condition where the institution covers several city blocks and access to the site is limited or discouraged both physically and visually.

Scale

As an employment center for the City of Cincinnati, Uptown's anchoring institutions are busiest Monday through Friday during the day. The University also causes major shifts in population during the summer due to the transient nature of the students.
Mix

Uptown has institutions of many uses ranging from recreation, health, and education to community development and religious use.

Left: Christ Hospital on Auburn Avenue
Right: Church of Our Savior on Auburn Avenue

Movement

Uptown’s anchoring institutions cause major traffic flow: over 300,000 vehicle trips into the area daily, with 53,000 trips made by those working in Uptown.

Legend
- Uptown Neighborhoods
- Supporting Institutional Street
- Major Artery
- Highway Connector
- Neighborhood Connector
- Institution Attracting Major Traffic

Clifton Avenue and Martin Luther King Boulevard Intersection at 5:00 PM on a Tuesday
Library entrance to University of Cincinnati on Martin Luther King Boulevard at 8:00 AM on a Monday

Time

Busiest Time of Year and Day for Major Institutions
As an employment center for the City of Cincinnati, Uptown’s anchoring institutions are busiest Monday through Friday during the day. The University is partially responsible for major shifts in population during the summer due to the transient nature of students.

Source: Planning to Stay by Morrish&Brown
Corryville's integrated community institutions are located in the southern half of the neighborhood below Martin Luther King Boulevard. The larger scale research and health institutions make up the northern half.

Corryville has institutions that function at a smaller integrated community scale, such as the Corryville Recreation Center, and others which function at a larger, isolated scale, like Children's Hospital.
Corryville's institutions offer a range of uses and integration with the neighborhood; from small community based organizations and facilities to nationally recognized education and health facilities.

**Left:** University Hospital at Eden Avenue and Goodman intersection

**Right:** Schiel Primary School for Arts Enrichment on (Short) Vine Street

Corryville is very accessible via vehicular access through major thoroughfares (Vine Street, Martin Luther King Boulevard, Taft Avenue) and numerous bus routes. The center of the community is pedestrian friendly, but there are dangerous areas for pedestrians upon leaving the neighborhood.

**Time Walking Diagram**

*Each ring represents 5 minutes*

Corryville is a small neighborhood with all institutions within reasonable walking or driving distance.

*Source: Planning to Stay by Morrish&Brown*
An Exploration of Uptown

Scale

Source: CAGIS
Creating a Typology Within Corryville

Scale

Movement

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

Corryville

Time
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hours of business: the neighborhood niche's influence over time
Conceptual Diagram: Walls, Color, and Exaggeration stress the feeling precipitated by the streetscape.

Significance of walls: Acceleration and Deceleration

Uptown Walkthrough: Change of Scale

Neighborhood scale can change drastically in one-thousand feet. This environment reflects heavily upon pedestrians. Feelings of disconnect and fatigue can accompany mismatched scale associated with short walks.
Corryville Analysis

Conceptual Diagram: Walls, Color, and Exaggeration stress the feeling precipitated by the streetscape.

1932

1975

2006

Significance of Walls: Acceleration and Deceleration

Consistent and predictable scale often gives a sense of security. Building heights and road widths that do not vary a great deal enclose space, making it more personable.

Source: Planning to Stay by Morrish&Brown
Identifying the Collective Common Ground

Anchoring Institutions and Neighborhood Niches

Source: Planning to Stay by Morrish&Brown
Vision Statement
To aid in the creation of a vibrant community, that offers a stable, diverse housing stock; access to quality spaces within the community and a rediscovery of connectivity within the Uptown Community.

A Highland Avenue Perspective (looking South from Donahue)

B Gerard Avenue Perspective (looking South from Fosdick)
Analyzing Relationships to Uptown

Our Vision

“Enhance Corryville by creating a more attractive and lively neighborhood that will improve the quality of life of the residents and the perception of the community.”

Vision Implementation

1. Re-design University Plaza to improve visitor’s first impression of Corryville and the grocery shopping experience for residents.

2. Re-connect Short Vine to Vine Street in order to provide access to the downtown area.

3. Identify potential sites for affordable workforce housing and greenspace.

4. Provide safer pedestrian thoroughfares connecting UC to Corryville.

5. Improve existing residential, commercial, and institutional structures to create a more pleasant living atmosphere and working experience.

6. Develop better streetscapes that address the safety of the residents and enhance the beauty of Short Vine and surrounding streets.

7. Offer alternative services, goods, and more pedestrian-friendly outdoor activities.
A Vision for the Future

Proposed Commercial / Mixed Use
Existing Commercial / Mixed Use
Proposed Residential
Existing Residential
Proposed Institutions
Existing Institutions
Proposed Public / Private Areas
Existing Public / Private Areas
Proposed Streets
Existing Streets
Proposed Parking Structures
Proposed Pedestrian Bridges

0 500 feet
Corryville and Uptown

Flow Chart Goals, Concepts, and Potential Outcomes

The team's approach to the project developed by way of goal and value assessments into conceptual design solutions which ultimately gave way to quality outcomes.

The varied topics addressed indicate a well-rounded approach which serves to fulfill the needs defined by the team's initial assessment of the neighborhood.

Green-Way Pervious Surface Analysis

A principal goal of the green-way was to re-examine the purpose and paving systems of streets. The thought that an alley could serve as a bicycle and running trail and a front yard, while still accommodating vehicular access could provide an innovative and ecologically sensitive solution to the absence of greenspace with the neighborhood. The proposed paving would greatly decrease the impervious surface ratio for the Corryville neighborhood.

Green-Way Neighborhood Trail

The proposed Green-Way Neighborhood Trail network would provide multi-modal transportation access to residents living throughout the neighborhood through a system of trails, the existing SORTA/METRO transit routes, and standard vehicular streets.

Vision Statement

To promote housing initiatives and green-space corridors that facilitate inhabitants' capacity to work locally, have a sense of ownership and investment in the community, and to keep their eyes on the street.

Green-Way Neighborhood Trail Analysis

The primary routes of the proposed trail system utilize the alleyways running along north/south routes through the neighborhood. When alleyway access is interrupted, the network employs a system of right-of-way trails to move users between alleyways, providing uninterrupted access between Mt. Auburn and the Cincinnati Zoo and Botanical Garden. Specific trails are indicated above through the use of distinctive colors.
**A Vision for the Future**

**Office of Arts and Culture**
The Art Commission
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
- Role of Public Art director and 
  approval oversight.
- All commissioned and 
  requested work must be 
  reviewed by the public artcouncil.
- The fusion of these two concepts 
  into the Schiel School Building 
  present an excellent chance 
  to bring two important 
  services to the 
  community.

**Permeable Pavers**
Part of our plan is to introduce permeable 
  pavers in all al eyways and on sections of 
  certain streets. These pavers provide much 
  needed green space in Corryville while 
  allowing all traffic to follow the same routine 
  it would on a traditional street.

**Workforce Housing**
This redevelopment of row houses outside downtown 
  Chicago was built as infill development on a vacant 
  lot. Its location is within walking distance of a 
  commuter rail line to get anywhere in the city. This 
  parallels the idea of creating workforce housing in 
  Corryville, with bus routes within walking distance of 
  the development.

**Adaptive Re-Use: grade School to Senior Center - “Grass Roots Campaign”**
The Scrabble School - Castleton Virginia
- Assisted in the design and rehab functions by the 
  University of Virginia.
- Adaptive re-use of a grade school to Senior Center for 
  a community to aid in the transition of the 
  neighborhood population.
- The senior Center will include:
  - Private Office Space and Outdoor Exercise Space 
  - Kitchens and Gardens 
  - Bathrooms and A/V Space 
  - Recreational Space 
  - Internet 
  - Multi-Use facility that also serves as an African 
    American Cultural Center

**Urban Grocery Store**
This Whole Fields Market in downtown 
  Austin, Texas, is an 80,000 square foot 
  corner grocery store. It proves that a big 
  box development can be incorporated 
  into an urban setting with a village style 
  interior layout to promote shopper 
  interaction.
Study Area Plan

Vision Statement

Create an active community with a high density of social exchange that develops and retains an economically and socially diverse population, while promoting economic and environmental sustainability.

To encourage a more diverse and affordable housing population in Corryville, a more livable environment must be created that encourages movement to the area and longevity of stay.

Highland and University Study Area

The Highland & University Study Area is an area that can encourage a smaller neighborhood commercial district. Building off of the current commercial and office structures, the proximity to several institutions and opportunities for infill housing development this area can be ideal for a smaller business district to cater more towards Corryville residents.

Concentrating Infill Development

Several areas in Corryville are available for infill housing development. These areas can be used to satisfy the area’s need for affordable workforce housing and affordable senior housing.

Short Vine Study Area

The Short Vine Study Area encompasses the current Short Vine Business District. The district has been in a state of decay over the years and has a perception as an unsafe area. The business district will be improved through a more continuous and dense street with mixed use buildings and consistent setbacks. Streetscape improvements, the addition of pocket public space and the reconnection of Short Vine with Vine Street will all work to invigorate the district and encourage consumers from not only the neighborhood but also the Uptown and greater Cincinnati Metropolitan area.

New and Improved Public Spaces

Public spaces will be added and improved upon in Corryville. Several pocket public spaces will be added up Short Vine to be utilized by pedestrians and neighboring businesses, as well as add to the aesthetic value of the street overall.
**NBD axon/cross sections**

**proposed modifications to NBD streetscape**

**Forms of Urban Intervention**

**Vine Street at Kinkos Plaza:**

- Parking proceeds entry
- Poor visual accessibility limited street presence
- Navigating parking zones discourages pedestrian traffic
- Building returns to sidewalk
- Parking pressed to secondary area
- Greatly improved visual accessibility
- Open storefronts inform passersby as to function and content
- Parking still accessible, yet removed from primary access

**Uncontrolled exterior zones**

- "Holes" in NBD density: low-slung buildings, awkward aesthetic
- Clutter along sidewalk, combined with spatial dominance of diagonal parking, poses frustrating pedestrian terrain
- Increased density and occupation
- Multiple layers/levels of street increase interaction; mix of affordable lofts and commerces/offices/retail
- Buildings brought to sidewalk
- Widened sidewalks are turned over to shops as ancillary eating/shopping spaces; additional "ownership" of sidewalks increases "eyes" on the street
- Parallel parking provides amenities
- Increased width of sidewalk promotes walking, provides additional space for bike lanes in street, possibility to bury utility lines, and also reduced speed of traffic

**Vine Street at Post Office:**

- Limited commerce
- Lacking public green space
- Opportunity for a set of shops serving local residents, as well as hospital traffic, at a small more privatized scale

**Highland at University:**

- Pocket commerce zone provides for immediate community
- Increased green space
- Public garden with adjacencies to both homes and eating venues
- Addition of workforce/senior housing
- Placement in quiet area, yet in proximity to area resources, venues, etc.
- Residents have both inward and outward facing zones (at grades and roof-gardens for user options)

**Legend:**

- Green/public outdoor seating and engagement areas
- Parking areas
- Commerce/retail/dining areas
A Walk Through Corryville

Corryville is a neighborhood with tremendous assets. The location of Corryville is perfect for those who choose to visit, shop, or work downtown, and is ideal for those who work in Uptown. The existing urban fabric of Corryville is historically significant and culturally vibrant. Existing homes and buildings have deep architectural roots and offer a myriad of different styles. However, a fundamental concern of Corryville is crime and a lack of affordable workforce housing.

Poor Use of Space

Streetlife

Entertainment

Indefensible Space

Workforce Housing

Affordable workforce housing is a critical issue for the neighborhood of Corryville, which desires to retain its diversity and identity as a working-class neighborhood while at the same time integrating populations from surrounding institutional employers, such as the university and hospitals. J.J. Johnson-JoDucci, Senior Partner of the Community Development/Community Reinvestment Consulting Group, states that around fifty percent of hospital employees in the area earn less than $35,000. In comparison, the average cost of new construction in Uptown is approximately $180,000. The base salary needed to purchase an $180,000 house is about $60,000. Furthermore, the median price of a home in Cincinnati is $140,000, which means that the needed salary to purchase this home is $46,935. These findings suggest that Corryville could use additional workforce housing units.

Greenspace

There is a lack of public green space in Corryville. Nearly all of Short Vine is composed of impervious surfaces and lacks any volumes of “green relief” outside of the occasional street tree. Though there are points at which University Avenue is lined with short sprouts of small street trees, there lacks the continuity in vegetation to suggest greater pedestrian safety and interconnect green space. The recreational field adjacent to the Corryville Rec Center provides the only green public gathering space. Yet, unfortunately, this space has at times adversely affected the neighborhood, attracting criminal behaviors. Thus, it is apparent that Corryville must promote green space that engenders values of environmental design, considering both public and semi-private uses.

Connectivity

The connection between Corryville and surrounding neighborhoods is imperative for the long-term sustainability of Corryville. Bus lines running through Corryville provide a means for Corryville residents to visit and work in other communities, as well as accommodating individuals from neighboring communities to visit Corryville. However, pedestrian accessibility within and about Corryville can be challenging. Only a few intersections provide safe crosswalks while Martin Luther King Drive and Jefferson Avenue are large traffic sewers which discourage and often impede pedestrian circulation. Finally, the addition of a streetcar line along Jefferson would serve to further expand the opportunities for residents in terms of employment and entertainment.
Vision Statement

Increased density of work-force housing, enhanced public green spaces and greater connection with surrounding communities to promote safety, economic opportunity, cultural awareness and an enhanced neighborhood identity.

Crime Prevention Though Environmental Design

- Creating a sense of ownership
- Infusion of legitimate populations
- Engaged watching
- Clear and clean visibility
- Designing to reduce fear of crime versus actual risk
- Awareness spaces
- Street as functioning unit

Corryville Civic Square

The new civic square concept enhances the existing urban framework on Vine Street between Daniels Street and East Rochelle Street. This mixed-income complex will foster a dynamic sense of place for those who wish to live and work in the new civic square, and will potentially invite individuals of different backgrounds to interact and gain a better understanding of different cultures.

Enhancing Urban Fabric

The streetscape enhancements of University Avenue will foster better pedestrian movement and will facilitate businesses to flourish, in a hope to return the street to its grandeur before the development of Martin Luther King Boulevard. Streetscape enhancements at this intersection as well as the new civic square development will serve as a “shared living space” for Corryville residents and University professors, faculty, and students.
**Urban Design**

**Vision Statement**
“Enhance Corryville by creating a more attractive and lively neighborhood that will improve the quality of life of the residents and the perception of the community.”

**Precedents**
- Row Houses
- Accessible Homes
- Single Family with Secondary Units
- University Plaza Scheme

**Urban Analysis**

- Area of Focus
- Need for Revitalization
- Need for Housing
- Pedestrian islands
- Runners

**Legend**
- Commercial
- Mixed Use
- Large Apartment
- Single Family
- Accessible Units
- Multi Family
- Row Homes
Urban Design

**Design Proposal**

Residential: 30 Private Access Parking Spaces
Commercial: 29 Parking Spaces
Total # of units: 24
Total Residential SF: 40,500 SF
Total Commercial/Retail SF: 10,000 SF
Target Occupant: Affordable Renter/Ownership

Parking: 45 Private Parking Spaces
Total # of units: 39
Total # of Commercial Units: 2
Total # of Single Family Units: 2
Total Building SF: 64,700 SF
Target Occupant: Affordable Rentals Market Commercial

- **A** 4 Four Bedroom Townhome Ownership 2,500 SF
- **B** (6) One Bedroom Garden Rentals 1,000 SF
- **C** (2) Three Bedroom Townhome Ownership 2,500 SF
- **D** (6) Three Bedroom Townhome Ownership 2,000 SF
- **D2** (6) One Bedroom Garden Rentals 1,250 SF
- **(8)** Commercial/Retail Spaces 1,250 SF

(8) Efficiency Apartment 600 SF per unit
(26) One Bedroom Apartment 750-900 SF per unit
(4) Two Bedroom Apartment 1,250-1,500 SF per unit
(1) Three Bedroom Apartment 1,800 SF per unit
(2) Commercial/Retail Spaces 3,600-4,500 SF per unit
(2) Single Family Townhomes 3,250 SF per unit
Analysis

Vision Statement
Create an active community with a high density of social exchange that develops and retains an economically and socially diverse population, while promoting economic and environmental sustainability, through stabilization of the neighborhood business district.

Legend
- Existing Commercial and Mixed Use
- Existing Residential
- Existing Institutional
- Phase II Development
- Proposed Residential
- Proposed Mixed Use
- Proposed Institutional and Office
- UC Shuttle Route
- METRO Bus Route
- UC Shuttle Stop
- METRO Bus Stop

Existing Street Wall
The existing commercial corridor has a discontinuous and confusing streetscape that hinders pedestrian movement and safety. The lack of visual accessibility of retail discourages customers and tarnishes the overall image of the community.

Urban Design Intervention
Several strategies serve to strengthen the corridor through diversification of uses, including the addition of and improved integration of residential, retail, and office uses.

Further strengthening the core is a network of public spaces supported by multiple functions that foster resident interaction and bolster social capital.

The development will encourage the ultimate goal of a diverse housing stock, a stable economic sector and development beyond the Short Vine corridor.

Furthermore, improved status of the corridor moves to attract new residents, visitors and businesses alike to Corryville.

Site and Housing Plans

Corry Street; Gateway Plaza; Live. Eat. Play

The northern side of Corry Street between Short Vine and Euclid is the location of a mixed use development with focus on affordable senior apartment housing and integrated public spaces for all users.

Site includes: Multi-modal transportation hub, exterior plazas, and signage.

Specifications:
- Land Uses: Commercial; Residential
- Land Use Square Footage:
  - Commercial, 5,760
  - Residential, 75,03
- # Units per Land Use:
  - Commercial 2 parcels
  - Residential 30 one-bedroom
  - 24 two-bedroom
- Parking Spaces: 26
The former Kinkos Plaza, is the location of a new mixed-use development; with private side courtyards for residential use, and a central space open to locals and visitors alike. In addition to restaurants, a book store, and space for vendors, there is a two-screen theater, and upper-level terraces.

**Land Uses:** Mixed-Use; Retail, Residential, Commercial

**Land Use Square Footage:**
- Commercial: 19,307 sq ft
- Residential: 38,160 sq ft
- # Units per Land Use: Residential: 16 units; from 650 sf studio lofts to ~2500 sf flats
- Commercial: 8 Retail
- Exterior Vendors: Max 5
- Parking Spaces: 69

**Schiel Schoolhouse / Post Office Restructuring**

Schiel Elementary School will be converted into apartment units. New construction will add a variety of unit types, a retail component at the corner of Daniels and Short Vine, as well as live/work lofts that line a semi-public courtyard. “Town home” units line Glendora to scale the addition and conceal the new parking garage.

**Specifications**

- **Land Uses:** Mixed Use
- **Land Use Square Footage:**
  - 15,000 sf retail, 60,000 sf renovated,
  - 40,500 sf new residential
- # **Units per Land Use:** 31 two bed, 16 one bed, 10 studio
- **Parking Spaces:** 64 space garage, 5 individual garages

The U.S. Post Office will be relocated across Short Vine and replaced by an apartment building targeting affordable workforce housing. New construction will be oriented towards the street to create a more continuous street wall. The residential building is connected to residential open space and a transit hub served by METRO and University of Cincinnati public transit.

**Specifications (East Parcel)**

- **Land Use:** Residential
- **Land Use Square Footage:**
  - 3 levels at 16,000 sf each / 48,000 sf total
- # **Units per Land Use:** 12 two bed, 12 efficiencies, 21 one bed / 45 total
- **Parking Spaces:** 59 space surface lot

**Specifications (West Parcel)**

- **Land Use:** Commercial/Institutional
- **Land Use Square Footage:**
  - 2 levels at 7,800 sf each / 15,600 sf
- **Total # Units per Land Use:** 4 Office units / 1 post office
- **Parking Spaces:** 38 space surface lot
Envisioning the Future of Corryville

**Neighborhood Hub**

**Residential:** Multi-Family

**Loss:** 8 Units

**Gain:** 14 Units, 800-1200 sq. ft.

**Parking Garage:**

- Integrated: 42 spaces (1 space/unit)
- Semi-public: 53 spaces
- TOTAL: 95 spaces

**Proposed Highland Under Plaza Garage**
Urban Design

Green Corridor

**Residential:** Single Family/Multi-Family
- **Loss:** 6 Units
- **Gain:** 28 Units
  - 8 Flats
  - 10 Single Townhomes
  - 5 Townhomes w/ granny flat
  - + 22 units

**Parking Garage:**
- 23 Single Garage Spaces
- 14 Open Lot Spaces
- **TOTAL:** 37 Spaces

Urban Garden

**Residential:** Single Family/Multi-Family
- **Loss:** 8 SF Units
- **Gain:** 32 Units
  - 6 Flats
  - 6 SF 1500 sq. ft.
  - 11 Townhomes w/ granny flat
  - + 24 units

**Parking Garage:**
- 6 Single Garage Spaces
- 2 Open Lot Spaces
- **TOTAL:** 8 Spaces
Site Conditions and Design Intention

By focusing government services and dense rental housing in one area, the transient population may be better integrated into the community.

While freeing up the single family homes by attracting renters to new higher density development, policy initiatives would be used to encourage individual investment in Corryville homes and provide affordable financing options.

By creating affordable housing designed for students at a higher density, the filtering process within Corryville's housing stock can be reversed.

ZONING FOR A MORE LIVABLE NEIGHBORHOOD

VISION
To increase density of workforce housing, enhance public green spaces and greater connection with surrounding communities to promote safety, economic opportunity, cultural awareness and an enhanced neighborhood identity.

Architectural Street Character

Sections
The sloping topography is used for creating underground parking for residential buildings. The four story height is maintained in order to improve the connections between the new buildings and neighborhood.
A public green space is proposed at the intersection at University Avenue and Vine Street. The enhancement of public amenities will serve to create a gathering space for the community at this point of civic engagement.
Existing Framework & “Green” Transportation Network

Vision Statement
To promote housing initiatives and green-space corridors that facilitate inhabitants' capacity to work locally, have a sense of ownership and investment in the community, and to keep their eyes on the street.

Vine Street Business District Revitalization

Goals
To provide affordable housing for both long and short term residents while reintroducing the traditional building typologies to the urban fabric, such as mixed use buildings on Vine Street.

Primary: Neighborhood Connector

Purpose:
To serve as the main route for inter-neighborhood automobile, bicycle, and pedestrian movement

Secondary: Urban Alleyway System

Purpose:
To connect the proposed alleyways to Kroger, the Vine Street business district, and the University Medical Campus
To serve as an alternate route for automobiles, bicycles, and pedestrians
To deliver residents and visitors onto the Mews and Garden Network
To showcase development and investment potential in Corryville
To create a space where new housing and businesses can tie into the existing Vine Street business district

Tertiary: Mews and Garden Network

Purpose:
To beautify underutilized areas and utilize greenspace in Corryville.
To enhance the primary and secondary network improvements.
To increase pride and interest in the neighborhood by existing residents.
To create a place to exercise and enjoy the outdoors for existing residents.
To create movement and human level presence deeper into Corryville.
Goals
Provide affordable workforce housing for those who work at nearby institutions and organizations, and create a denser residential base for the existing secondary business district at the intersection of University Avenue and Highland Avenue.

Site A Affordable Townhome and Flats
Total site area: 52,000 square feet
Average unit size: 1,167.5 square feet
48 rental occupied units (flats)
26 owner occupied units (townhouses)
Market rate & affordable units (1-3 bedrooms)
Privatization of public space
No commercial uses
Floor area ratio: 0.57
Parking: Onstreet and garage parking

Site A Affordable Townhome and Flats
Total site area: 33,296 square feet
Average unit size: 1,208 square feet
24 owner occupied units (townhouses & flats)
Market rate & affordable units (1-3 bedrooms)
Direct access to network
Floor area ratio: 0.58
Parking: Onstreet and garage parking
End of quarter events included a presentation and review with leadership of the Avondale Community Council and the Uptown Consortium as well as a panel discussion about community development with Kathy Wilson, Citybeat, Liz Blume, Xavier Community Building Institute, and Terry Grundy, United Way-Place Matters.
The Avondale Neighborhood in Uptown is perhaps the most disadvantaged and underserved of all communities in the area and the city. Severe disinvestment and blight characterize both its residential and commercial areas, despite the presence of the substantial and prosperous Cincinnati Children’s Hospital. As with the other Uptown neighborhoods, the Uptown Consortium Development Corporation in partnership with the hospital has developed a plan for the decimated Avondale Business District on Burnet Avenue. The plan calls for a mixed use scenario for residential and neighborhood serving commercial uses in conjunction with satellite medical offices and hospital parking. While conceived with the participation of the Avondale Community Council, the plan was viewed with ambivalence by neighborhood leadership. In addition, the Avondale community worked with the UC Institute for Community Partnerships to develop a market study for potential commercial uses in the business district. The work of the studio attempted to provide alternatives for the community to use in further discussions with its institutional partners.

In the research phase of the quarter, Architecture and Planning students studied broad urban interest areas relevant to the uptown area, ranging from history and development, residential loan patterns, cultural practices, and other aspects of cultural urbanism. (This can be found under separate cover). In the design phase of the quarter, students focused on the Burnet Avenue business district for a mixed use configuration of civic, residential, recreational, and commercial redevelopment visions often with special attention to the future relationship of the expanding hospital campus to the existing community area.
The Problem:

In an Afro-centric community, a kente cloth weaves together the patches of disconnect between the Avondale community, the zoo, and the institutions. The pattern hints at cultural roots, and creates a strategy in planning, general building formation and style. The assumption is for growth within the community, and therefore the kente cloth is most appropriate. Based upon the traditional technique, small squares are woven and later pieced together with string. So the community is rejuvenated a piece at a time, rather than expecting for sudden and complete redevelopment. The kente cloth allows for growth, as surely it will happen, rather than placing an artificial wall to stop it.

Disconnect
At present, there is an all too obvious disconnect between the community of Avondale, the zoo, and the institutions - a tear in the fabric. Once a robust neighborhood, it is now pushed aside to make room for an ever growing institutional complex at Children’s Hospital.

The Function
The various prominent uses are concentrated on their individual blocks. The physical situation of building functions also reveals a disconnect.
The Process

A megablock at the Burnet District to house all functions within its walls. Apply now the kente cloth, a traditional patterned cloth of the Ghana peoples. The result is a formally and spatially distinct means for design.

The Framework

The kente cloth pattern spreads across the Burnet District bringing with it integration of all parts.
**Design Process**

**Vision Statement**

To serve the needs of both the Avondale community, Children’s Hospital, and visitors by creating a vibrant entertainment, retail, and housing core. These efforts will help the revitalization of Burnet Avenue by creating services for both day/night and week/weekend, which will ultimately improve the living quality, safety, and perception of Avondale.

**Parti Diagram**

The site will consist of two corridors separated by a pedestrian buffer zone. The Commercial Corridor is oriented to the west to incorporate Children’s Hospital and the Medical office buildings. The Civic Corridor faces the east to create a connection to the residential neighborhood along Harvey.

**Patchwork Parti Diagram**

Layered on top of the west Commercial Corridor and east Civic Corridor lies a horizontal grid designating the activities for the three chosen blocks. The three activity blocks will attract residents, hospital workers, as well as visitors traveling along Burnet Avenue and Harvey.

**Connectivity**

The buffer zone between the west and east corridor will act as a pedestrian path pulling activity further north into the site. There will also be attractive retail placed halfway between the hospital and Pride Center in order to attract hospital workers who will then be more willing to travel further north along Burnet. Programmed green spaces will connect with the park nearby and baseball field.
Design Process

PROBLEM DIAGRAM

"We're proposing that fragmented voids, and leftover urban spaces be transformed to support hybrid and layered programs for flexible, affordable housing, civic and commercial uses, and public spaces. The goal has been to achieve maximum effect with minimal gestures, to take existing patterns of use as a point of departure, and to develop urban solutions with enough persuasive force to change obsolete planning policy and zoning regulations.”

- Teddy Cruz

PROBLEMS FACING BURNET AVE BUSINESS DISTRICT
- Imbalanced power structure
- Institutional expansion within community
- Deteriorating residential fabric
- Land banking and vacancies in business district
- Competition from other business districts: Avondale Town Center, Reading Road Corridor
- New development out of scale with existing neighborhood

A FRAMEWORK PLAN FOR BURNET AVE

1. The Strip Mall Transformed
2. Urban Community Allows Diversity
3. Reprogrammed Open Spaces
4. Reprogrammed Open Spaces
5. Urban Market
6. Addition to Existing Urban Fabric
7. Refurbished Strip Mall
8. Findlay Market

CATAclysmIC MONEY
GRADuAl MONEY
DEFENSIVE

DEVELOPMENT MODELS

STRATEGY FOR BURNET
DEFENSIVE ANCHORS
SCattered PlACeholders

Mary Fajans/Anna Kurkalova/ Amy Lynch
# Existing Conditions

**Gaps in Burnet Avenue:**

The diagram below depicts the pressure of existing entities in the Burnet Avenue area. Cincinnati Children’s Hospital is pushing more of its uses north along Burnet and making itself more out of balance with the Avondale community and the Pride Center.

**Gaps in Burnet Avenue:**

Burnet Avenue has many gaps in its streetscape. The streetscape diagram (pictured above) shows these gaps and what each looks like along Burnet. Some are open spaces in front of buildings and others are parking lots. Some spaces are even filled with debris and trash. So, as designers, how do we address these spaces? Do we fill them in with buildings, or embrace and frame these existing spaces?

# Architectural Precedents

**Background**

The architecture recedes or blends into the surroundings and acts as a backdrop to the activities and events that occur on the street.

**Piazza**

Paved open pedestrian space or square found in Italian cities. The piazza is typically located in front of significant buildings and bounded on three or four edges. These spaces host a variety of functions, including street vendors and festivals.

**Celebrated**

Architectural form that gestures and highlights unique moments and features that have significance or monumental importance.

**Canopy**

A canopy is an overhead roof structure or architectural projection that provides shelter, weather protection, identity or decoration. Large scale canopies are implemented to define the street edge, spaces of particular importance or significance, and public plazas.
Utilize the unique features and assets of Avondale and the Burnet district. Acknowledge the existing gaps along the Burnet corridor and use methods of repurposing and reprogramming as alternatives to traditional infill development. Respect and promote the cultural richness of the community of Avondale with architecture as a background to community activity.
Community Network

A main concept for the proposed urban design is based on the Avondale Community Network. The idea behind this network is to connect the four main entities, UC Medical Campus, Children’s Hospital, the Zoo, and programs of the Avondale Community, to one another. It is the connections between these entities that become the focus of community enhancement.

These desired paths can be literal or representational in defining the desired community connections. They are represented in the diagram with black lines. This process resulted in stitching existing and new programs into the site area and connecting them to existing programs around the site.

The existing community groups consist of: senior housing, Flieschman Gardens, the Zoo, Rockdale Academy, historic apartment buildings, baseball diamond, Ronald McDonald House, Avondale residents, and the medical district as a whole. Our proposal includes the following amenities: a plaza, community center and gardens, and duplicated programs such as the Ronald McDonald House, zoological research, and medical functions.
Zones of Influence

The premise of the Avondale Planning Strategy is to recognize emerging zones of influence within the distinct entities that occupy Avondale and to design within these geographic zones according to each entity’s unique needs. The Children's Hospital Campus is designed according to three criteria: to allow for necessary spatial growth that will keep the hospital in Uptown, to implement architecture in keeping with the rising prestige of the already highly-ranked hospital, and to openly provide a masterplan that will soften anxiety within the neighborhood over how much and in which manner they will expand.

The Avondale Community will be designed around the central anchor of a lively market that will encourage a safe, pedestrian, community-oriented commercial sector that will provide services geared towards longtime Avondale residents. Finally, a Civic Frontier Zone will fit between the two preceding zones. This frontier will clearly establish a ‘do-not-cross’ line with schools, a fire station, post office, park strip and the Pride Center. The Frontier Zone will also form a bridge, holding businesses that cater to both areas and new, middle-class housing.

The scheme proposes that Children’s Hospital consider taking a smart growth approach to their expansion plans. Rather than building without informing the surrounding entities, a master plan should be developed that will increase communication between the interest-conflict groups. Not only would this scheme benefit the community by capping hospital growth, but it would create a more pleasant atmosphere for the hospital by allowing the amenities that exist inside the building to extend outdoors into the community.

The new construction features a hotel, office space, retail, residential units, a roof garden, and park space. The plan includes signature architect - designed buildings to reflect Children's Hospital as the prestigious leader in its field that it is.
Urban Design

Breaking Down Burnet

As the city changes, the zoo must grapple with its constrained site and immediate environment. Additionally, it must deal with the problem of parking, as city dwellers consider more surface parking and garages undesirable, but the vast and growing majority of guests still arrive.

The current stig of the Children's Hospital is insufficient for its growth. Unlike Jewish, CCH has chosen to stay in Avondale, but it MUST expand in order to keep pace with its growth. The safety of the Avondale community is of prime concern.

Jewish Hospital Moves out of Avondale to Kenwood. There is a growing trend of the institutions on Hill moving to places like Liberty Township and Westchester. Without the insured patients from the suburbs, it becomes harder for hospitals to maintain their levels of compensated, uninsured care.

Applying the Precedents

A unique breed of market is envisioned for the northern terminus of Burnet Avenue. Taking advantage of the street-side retail that occurs on corridors, such as Avondale's Burnet Avenue and Corryville's Short Vine, we envision a structured market, similar to Over-the-Rhine's Findlay Market that fosters a common ground for visitors.

Taking advantage of the former Cincinnati Bell switch house on Harvey Avenue, and drawing inspiration from Koldinghus, a former Castle in Denmark where modern additions were made distinct from the original structure, we envision that construction of a hotel that could both serve the needs of the growing Cincinnati Children's Hospital, while breathing life into a neighborhood landmark.
This design for Burnet Avenue attempts to focus around an Afrocentric community plaza. Programming on Burnet follows a density gradient starting high to the south at Erkenbrecher and filters down toward Forest. The prime area of community activity will take place on Burnet between Northern and Rockdale. Here, a plaza will be developed extending out to the Cincinnati Zoo to the west and to existing recreational fields to the east. The inspiration for the plaza comes from the historic Congo Square in New Orleans which has been a place of cultural expression for centuries.

The Arts Consortium of Cincinnati will anchor the plaza and will be surrounded by Afrocentric retail space with new condos above. The Avondale Community Pride Center will be relocated to the corner of Burnet and Northern with ample office space attached for community organizations and initiatives that are currently scattered throughout the city.

The block between Rockdale and Forest will become a residential community consisting of 54 townhouses with garden apartments below. Amenities will be provided on the second and third floors of the existing mixed use building on the northwest corner of Rockdale and Burnet. Duplexes will be added along Harvey for the entire length of the project area.

The site of the old South Avondale School will become an extension of the plaza on Burnet consisting of an amphitheater, pavilion, concession stand and restroom facilities. Open greenspace will be preserved for multipurpose recreation and overflow event space for community functions.
Transforming Burnet Avenue

Vision Statement
The neighborhood of Avondale lacks a civic center. This redesign of Burnet Avenue seeks to create a public forum that represents the local community and strengthens the local economy. The Avondale Pride Center will be placed in the center of the civic center to act as the voice of the community.

Existing Problems on Burnet Avenue

Lack of Economy: There are only 2 existing businesses on Burnet Avenue between Forest and Erkenbrecher Avenues. Crime is the only other means of income generation on Burnet Avenue.

Tension between Uptown Consortium / Avondale Community: Uptown Consortium and Avondale Community Council have differing views on how to develop Burnet Ave.

Framework Diagram

Commercial Corridor:
Farmer’s Market, Business incubator, Family Owned Restaurants, Limited Service Restaurants, Supper Clubs, Personal Services, Retail, Social Services, Post Office

Civic Center:
Visibility of Pride Center within the public Square. Scale of buildings is kept small, Celebrating the differences between Avondale and Uptown Consortium’s stakeholders by creating a civic space that caters to both of their needs.
Connect Burnet, Protect The Neighborhood

Problem
The Uptown Consortium’s development on Burnet Avenue is poised to hemorrhage into Avondale’s porous residential zones abutting the corridor. Simultaneously, the form of Burnet Avenue creates a business cul-de-sac/appendix as opposed to a business oriented thoroughfare/artery. These issues will result in a languishing and poorly defined-business zone, should they continue unchecked.

Vision
Redirecting Burnet to Harvey and Reading avenue effectively cauterizes this hemorrhaging edge, while simultaneously creating a thoroughfare; this in turn defines the growth of the development while protecting and strengthening the more vulnerable residential tissues beyond.

Form Follows Function of Dynamic Corridor
To accentuate the function of the Burnet corridor there is a pairing of uses within the plan to build on the needs and desires of all constituents. With a ratio of 70:30 commercial to residential on the south side and a 70:30 residential to commercial on the north side, the boulevard is retained by a varying of scales and functions. The majority of the site retains a high percentage of square footage open to the public as the first floors serve as either retail or civic spaces. Also the footprint of these buildings creates a network of pedestrian paths meandering through civic squares, allowing residents and visitors the chance to traverse the corridor with ease and entertainment.
Community partners this quarter included community leaders from Clifton Heights, the Clifton Heights Urban Redevelopment Corporation, the Live Well Collaborative, Towne Properties, North American Development, Steed Hammond Paul Architects, and a dedicated focus group of ageing baby boomers and university alumni.
Uptown Boomer Community

As a follow-up to Studio work of the Winter quarter 2007, this studio quarter further developed the concept of “University Linked Senior’s Community”. Students worked again within the context of the redevelopment scenario for the Clifton Heights business district, which includes the almost complete remaking of a five block area on the south edge of the University campus for a new mixed use district.

In this quarter, the Studio had the benefit of working again with community residents and more closely with University staff but also with local professional architects and developers. Consultation with these interests limited the focus of the studio work to three sites in the redevelopment zone that allowed for three diverse program orientations.

Architecture students had the opportunity to collaborate with marketing students from the College of Business and with faculty from the School of Nursing as well as with members of the Live Well Collaborative, a research organization for issues relating to the 50 plus age group. Finally supporting research for the studio design work was provided through a funded project by a local Architecture firm.

Research of this studio quarter included a survey of consumer residential preferences with a “boomer” focus group, best practices in existing university linked seniors communities, and in senior communities of continuing care. Students surveyed existing conditions on the sites and relevant urban lifestyle, residential and urban design precedents. Finally student teams designed three mixed-use projects of varying density and theme for each of the three sites under consideration.
**Block 1: Possible Zoning Envelope**

- **Height**: 60'
- **Units**: 1,404 units
- **Parking**: 432 spaces
- **Retail**: 46,840 SQFT

**Block 2: Possible Zoning Envelope**

- **Height**: 65'
- **Units**: 1,500 units
- **Parking**: 432 spaces
- **Retail**: 54,970 SQFT

**Block 4,5: Possible Zoning Envelope**

- **Height**: 80'
- **Units**: 1,896 units
- **Parking**: 432 spaces
- **Retail**: 62,240 SQFT

**Density Study**

\[
5' + \left[ \frac{2 \left( \text{TOTAL HEIGHT} - 25' \right)}{10} \right] = \text{FOOTPRINT}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEIGHT</th>
<th>SETBACK</th>
<th>FOOTPRINT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25'</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td>76,682 SWFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45'</td>
<td>9'</td>
<td>71,747 SWFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65'</td>
<td>13'</td>
<td>66,943 SWFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85'</td>
<td>17'</td>
<td>202,565 SWFT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Zoning Codes**

- **CC-M**: Commercial Community-Mixed
- **RM**: Residential Multi-Family
- **Hillside District**

**Parking Requirements**

- **Retail**: 1 per 250 SWFT
- **Multi-Family**: 1 per unit
Friar's Club and Calhoun Sites

Land Use and Services

Strengths
- Neighborhood character
- Sidewalk community
- Good for walking
- Moderate scale
- Positive proximity to services

Weaknesses
- "Transient" student population
- Limited rental units; less prize"-some in built environment
- Lack of sidewalks, bike lanes + high traffic detours
- Local population underserved
- Green corridors not pedestrian oriented
- Miscommunication about plans

Opportunities
- Accessing Downtown/ Stadium/Rivers: Requires public or public transportation; not walkable
- "Nearest movie theatre is the Empire Independence" on Ludlow
- Entertainment locations geared toward student population

Threats
- In general services are isolated, requiring walking from one to the other; connectedness to another
- Rent Office on site
- Cross traffic affected by traffic
- Services primarily geared toward student population
- Diverse places of worship isolated outside of area
- No recycling deep storage

Land Use Category
- Residential
- Entertainment
- Services
- Food
- Retail
- Green Space

Proximity
- UC East Campus/Hospital/Zipper/Zoo/CovCau
- The population totals in Uptown are directly affected by the University of Cincinnati’s quarter enrollment.
Paris Arcades

Diagrams

Les Halles was built as an urban renewal project in 1853 and was designed by Victor Baltrad. This very active space, before its demolition was called the “belly of Paris” for the market activity. It organizes the activity of the space along the glass covered “streets”. Also, space is organized with underground tunnels, for storage and transportation of goods away from the crowds. The structure of the space is very rigid and formal, also, helping to keep the space feel organized.

Photos

[Images of Les Halles and associated architectural drawings]

Architectural Forum 1966 Jan.-Feb., v. 124, n. 1, p. [68]-[75]
Tinggården is located in Herfølge, Denmark and was designed by Vandkunsten. It is a co-housing community that uses flexible apartments, a central community room, and shared green space for all of the members. The apartment sizes vary according to the space needed, so when one family shrinks in size, another family can expand their home. The community is open to each other around a central courtyard, but they are private to the greater community. The buildings have varying window and material placement, emphasizing the flexibility of the spaces.
High end national and international brands give shoppers confidence and bring in people from other areas. Convenience of having so many stores in one place and all indoors. Shoppers have an amount of anonymity when shopping. Unlikely to see the same people each shopping trip.
Alleysways are dark and often gated. Painted and unpainted facades of varying heights and time periods add to the urban fabric.

Approximately 90% of the businesses on this stretch of Hamilton Ave are locally owned and operated. This gives a shopper a small town one-of-a-kind experience.

There are many instances of residential use above the retail storefront. Shoppers are remembered by owners and employees, “see and be seen”.

Tree-lined streets soften the urban setting.

Sidewalks for pedestrians. Pedestrian traffic runs parallel to automobile traffic and crosses it often.
New Urbanism: Celebration, FL

"The garage is one of the most anti-social devices in architectural history. You enter the garage directly from your home, you get in the car and if you even see a neighbor it may just be to wave as you both back down your driveways on the way to work."
-Wing Chao

Service Alley Concept

Image from Google Earth

Idealized Street Selection

Green spaces are considered essential and are located on both sides of the house, making both parking areas and front lawns more socially engaging spaces. This layout is evocative of those developments pre-World War II.

Overall Development Plan

The development integrates 4 unit types x 6 building styles to create a customizable environment based on resident's individual choices while maintaining an overall atmosphere. Lower, middle and upper incomes live in mixed districts, managing typical segregation based on financial security. Characteristics of courtyard (3), arcade (1), walkability, convenience and community of similar exterior (2) and unique interior are all words used to describe Celebration.
The Senior Gardens rely on a series of alternating gardens and housing structures to promote social exchange (8). Again, a market (8) is utilized to connect with the community. The arched forms of the housing allows for additional light and air to penetrate the linear spaces. The idea of alleys leading from main circulation (8) to private areas allows for a comfortable mixture for the seniors living in the development.

Living-room at the Border deals with the issue of a non-profit group managing and interacting (1) with the multi-family housing units located around a central church, organizing the community's growth. Circulatory space provides a way to experience the whole site by leading the user through (1). The units are arranged in such a way so that a community space (1) is created in the center of the site, along with gardens found in linear forms throughout the site. The market allows the community to interact with the residents. The units rely on shared kitchens (3) to promote higher densification.
**Regent’s Park Housing Typologies Then and Now**

**Typology Menu**

1. **circus**
   - A large, open space surrounded by buildings, typically in the center of a larger commercial or residential area.
   - Often used as a public space for festivals, parades, or market stalls.

2. **rowhouse**
   - A row of houses connected by common walls and forming a continuous group.

3. **mews**
   - A sequence of stables usually with living quarters built around a court (i.e., living quarters adopted from such stables or back streets).

4. **courtyard**
   - A court or enclosure adjacent to a building (as a house or palace).
   - Consists of a central area surrounded by buildings, often used for housing or other purposes.

5. **colonnade**
   - A series of columns set at regular intervals and usually supporting the base of a roof structure such as a porch, portico, arcade, or pergola.

**seen and be seen**

**Social Hierarchy**

**Sectional Relationship**

*Then*  

*Now*
1: a country house for summer residence
2: a covered structure in a garden or park designed to provide a shady resting place in summer
   : also garden pavilion
   : not a shed

Origins: Britain, Japan

The summerhouse becomes an outdoor: living room, playroom, office, bedroom
With two of our sites being long and narrow, it is necessary to begin to look at ways not to construct a long and skinny “building as wall”. One possible way to avoid this is to really spend some time designing an elevation that is captivating and active. House by Koen Van Velsen does just that.

**Warm Materials**

Designed by Artifact Design in Berkshire Mountains, Mass. Copper sheets, timber frame and cedar boards give this spa a warm feel. This could be incorporated into our design to give the building a relaxing, and vacation-inspired feel.

**Personal Amenities**

Everybody wants their own space, both inside and out. If people want to move to an urban environment, they should be able to experience it from all levels. Here at the Gosline House in Seattle designed by Bohlin Cywinski and Jackson, the user can enjoy both the exterior and interior of the structure and its surroundings.

**Interior Courtyard**

Although this is not a residential building, the Institute For Forestry and Nature Research in the Netherlands exemplifies a well-designed courtyard, a place for people to garden and have more than just a simple atrium as a centerpiece.

**Public I Private**

The Look Up office in Gelsenkirchen Germany designed by Anin Jeromin Fitilidis and Partners. The different levels of private zones are going to be very important when placing private programmed spaces between two busy roads.

**Urban Roof Deck**

Tado Ando’s Pulitzer Foundation for the Arts shows us what an urban roof can be like.
Enhancing the American Main Street

Main Street Revitalization Strategies

1. Design
   Promote an image of a constantly changing environment. Many small-scale improvements are more effective than one large-scale improvement.
   Streetscape improvements, historic facade preservation, and monuments celebrating the past. Many small changes are better than one large change.

2. Management and Marketing of Business "Business Improvement District" (BID) designation is a key strategy which provides additional funding, new life, and increased property values.
   BID area indicated in red. Adaptive reuse of buildings expands leasable space and promotes the economy.

3. Acknowledging Assets
   Downtown is more than shops and restaurants. Unique characteristics create identity and promote community.
   Originally functioned as a river trading town. Reunited business district with the waterfront through park space. Created a symbolic gateway into the town.

4. Plan with People in Mind
   The historic town center was originally designed for the human-scale. Design decisions should support the pedestrian.
   Sidewalk furniture, trees and awnings to provide shade for pedestrians and screen parking lots; modern paving materials were integrated with historic brick pavers.

5. Automobilies
   Cars are not going away anytime soon. Support 2-way, traffic-calming design strategies along main street commerce centers.
   Main Street in the BID designated as two-way traffic zone with traffic lights at every intersection. Parking lots located strategically near commerce and park zones.

Struggles of the Midwestern Town

Founded at a time when the pedestrian dominated the scale of urban design, the Midwestern town is nostalgically remembered as a place containing “hometown friendliness, bustling activity, celebration, and commerce.”

Automobile-oriented growth in the second half of the 20th century rendered the pedestrian-scaled downtown as useless and non-functional.

Areas outside of the city provided more space to accommodate parking and auto transportation. Disinvestment in the historic downtown yielded major infrastructure decay, inadequate funds for repair, and a loss of businesses.

Sources:
"an overlapping of disparate mediums and methods."

Bornhutte Hall, Wooster OH

ideal dormitory size: 25-30 students
El Monte Sagrado: A Living Resort and Spa

The luxurious El Monte Sagrado Living Resort and Spa, located in Taos, N.M., is a place as unique as the philosophy that guides it. Renowned for its commitments to ecological preservation and sustainability, the lush sanctuary of El Monte Sagrado is where you can nurture your mind, body and soul, naturally. With exquisite elegance, the resort offers 36 suites and casitas with décor that reflects an array of global influences inspired by Native American culture, foreign lands and local artists. El Monte Sagrado is a magnificent example of the philosophy behind the development of ecosystems as infrastructure. The ultimate goal is a 40 unit 4-acre resort set into the historic mountain valley of Taos that has virtually zero energy input. The water and organic matter generated on site is reclaimed, reused, and celebrated as a part of a complete living mechanism that has built-in redundancies, and is capable of learning from itself and evolving over time.
Friars Green-Promenade

Site Massing

The retail area is at the most north location, adjacent to the high street activity, and encourages the surrounding residents to participate in the space. The promenade street continues through the back of the site, connecting the urban and hillside fabric of the neighborhood. This space does not allow access to cars and will bring a walkable lifestyle to the community by providing for daily basic needs, as well as, innovative programmatic spaces that link the community to the university.

Perspective from West McMillan

The promenade is a space that promotes large amount of activity and movement, as well as, allows for the residents to sit back and enjoy the activity around them. The brick paver areas delineate a retail and sheltered zone, while the concrete pathway serves as an access to the more private side of the community. The balcony level increases activity and services and also allows residents to perch and watch the street activity. Featured in the space is an underground parking structure, residential units above, stores, eating venues, a green roof, and natural water and plant features.

Ground Plan

Tone Image

This image is taken from Quebec, Canada and was well received by our focus group. Participants responded to several desirable features:

- Courtyard
- ‘neighbohoody’ feel
- Brick Streets
- Sense of Community
- Medium Scale
Urban Design and Architecture

Friar's Green-Central Node

Typical Unit Plans

Residential

High-Rise
2BR/2 bath with den & balcony (1,400 SF)
1BR/1 bath with den & balcony (1,000 SF)

Urban Flats
1BR/1 bath with den (1,000 SF)

Amenities

One-Stop “Peace of Mind” Support Services
Dining Commons with outdoor seating
Multi-Purpose Space
University linked library with cafe
“Green” Lab & Lounge with access to public roof garden

Peace of Mind
An informational hub at the center of the scheme provides direct access to health care, technology education and support, along with community events

Green Lab and Lounge
Proposed program links horticulture, dining, and University-related resources promoting educational activities fostering a healthier lifestyle.
Friars Green-Garden Flats

Site Massing

Site Diagrams

With its location adjacent to the Hillside District, the Friar's site enjoys the unique position of being a green oasis. Serving as the 'backyard' of the site, the Garden Flats residences maintain the urban density of the community, but with a spacious, more suburban feel. The complex extends the walking street that runs through Friars Green but segues into a more private zone that begins to meld with the trees. Walking trails and a recreation center at the forest edge offer a direct connection to nature available in few other locations in Uptown.

Unit Plans

Generous with open area, the two bedroom flats offer both indoor and outdoor living opportunities, daylight, and views.

View From Hillside

stormwater rill main entry points access to hillside level recreation center below unit parking below
View from Hillside

Walking to the end of the site the path terraces down the hillside towards the treeline. Balconies overlook the greenspace, offering greening opportunities themselves through the use of large planting boxes.
Clustered Housing

Clustered housing offers residents the opportunity to have privacy and community with the larger Gateway complex. By giving each grouping of 5 to 6 residents their own vertical circulation and lobby space, the dreaded endless corridor is eliminated. One can choose to take the direct path from the parking garage to apartment, or engage in courtyard community life.

The lobby that is created by the clustering is also a potential social space for neighbors. The lightwell that connects all floors of the cluster is yet another connection while also creating increased natural light and aesthetics.

Raised Planter Boxes

Ergonomic planter boxes make the growing of vegetables, herbs, and flowers accessible and comfortable to all members of the community.

Residents ability to grow some of their own food contributes to the sustainable lifestyle promoted by this design. Local food production lessens our reliance on importing goods and fossil fuels.
Amenities Complex
The site is organized in such a way that all the shared amenities are fronting Vine Street, allowing the residents to be buffered from traffic, and therefore have a quieter living environment and courtyard space. The amenity complex is a very modern structure, built of storefront glazing. This is in direct juxtaposition to the more traditional reclaimed brick of the residential component.

Residents are able to enjoy several amenities in this portion of the site, a pool, a fitness center, restaurant, concierge service and a demonstration kitchen. This organization reinforces that concept of the choice a resident is given in regard to personal privacy.

Site Context

Walkability and Traffic

Highlighted Environmental Aspects
Site Selection,
Development Density and Community Connectivity,
Alternative Transportation: Public Transportation,
Alternative Transportation: Bicycle Storage,
Site Development: Maximize Open Space,
Heat Island Effect: Non-Roof, Heat Island Effect: Roof
Renewable Energy, Materials Re-Use,
Increased Ventilation, Rapid Renewable Materials
Low-Emitting Materials: Adhesives & Sealants,
Low-Emitting Materials: Paints & Coatings,
Low-Emitting Materials: Carpet Systems,
Daylight & Views: 90% of Spaces

Lowered Bar
Table height bar tops allow for accessible seating while a lowered back bar maintains the classic bartender/patron relationship
1) West End Market and Mingle

The west end market and mingle venue hosts various activities to bring people together with colorful local foods and farmers as well as worldly delicacies in the wine cellar and cheese shop.

Join friends on the piazza for an outdoor picnic, mingle with students or relax next to the fountain. The weekly farmer’s market brings in a variety of choices from food fare to house wares.

2) Center Shoppes

The core of snaking retail outlets and a plethora of dining options awaits the heart of this zone on the first level. Second level and above provide residential units with private balconies.

Gather with colleagues over a meal while basking in the sunshine and watching passersby.
3) Garden Terrace Tower

While perched upon the residents’ roof garden, enjoy vistas of the campus, city and river that are unique and breathtaking while jogging the track or reading a book beneath maple trees and bamboo plants.

Most units have a private balcony with planters and soil for your favorite garden plantings. Each unit incorporates day lighting and views capturing the vitality of the street below or the vista beyond.

Nestled between Calhoun and McMillan, directly south of UC, blocks 4 and 5 provide a necessary connection between a residential community and campus amenities. Unique views are offered at all angles, north overlooking campus and south overlooking downtown and the river. A long, narrow west-east oriented site, it demands a balance between public access for pedestrians and private space for residents.

With the feel of a collaged city, across the site are varied experiences, from the west end wine cellar and marketplace to a core of meandering shops and dining venues to the breathtaking campus and city views atop the tower’s roof garden in the east end.

Below the site is secure parking, both private for residents and public for retail and public-use linkages.
Appendix

Collateral Technical Service Projects

Scholarly Works
The work of the Winter 2008 Studio was incorporated into a Market Study for the Burnet Avenue Business District for the Avondale Community Council. The study was conducted by the University of Cincinnati Institute for Community Partnerships, the University of Cincinnati Economic’s Center for Education and Research, and the Local Initiative Support Corporation Inc (LISC).
Preliminary data from the study was used by students during the studio design process to define a desirable urban design program for Burnet Avenue. At the completion of the Market Study, at the request of the Avondale Community Council, a student design project, (modified by the Community Design Center to incorporate Uptown Consortium development projects already underway) was used as the basis for an urban design plan that reflected the neighborhood’s vision for a revitalized commercial and civic district.
The Spring Studio of 2008 on an “Uptown Boomer Community” benefitted from funding support and collaboration of Steed Hammond Paul Architects (now SHP Leading Design) as well as from other local developers and the University of Cincinnati Office of the University Architect and Community Development staff. Through the advocacy of the University Architect, UC President Zimpher agreed to fund a survey of university alumni to determine the interest and preferences related to such a University Linked Retirement Community in the vicinity of campus. An illustrative brochure was created to accompany the survey with design scenarios derived from student studio research and design work.
Survey on University-Linked Communities
Spring/Summer 2009

Project Report

Prepared by:
Kimberly Downing, Ph.D.
Charles Hulen, M.A.
Institute for Policy Research
University of Cincinnati

October 2009

The survey was administered to 3000 alumni by the University of Cincinnati Institute for Policy Research during the summer of 2009. Of the 391 respondents 71% indicated interest in residing in this type of a retirement community and stated preferences on issues ranging from health care options to most desirable urban amenities. Survey data will be used in future development planning for the available areas in the Clifton Heights district, south of Campus.
The University of Cincinnati Community Design Center facilitated technical outreach related to the 2006-08 Niehoff Studio theme of Housing and Community Development by working with Habitat for Humanity on affordable, accessible, and green housing in Avondale. The CDC, working with the University of Cincinnati Center for Community Engagement hosted a student charrette for design concepts with the winning entries eligible for implementation. In partnership with Habitat, the CDC developed construction documents for the selected design and provided construction observation for the house which was completed in 2009. A forensic report was conducted on the finished building to determine feasible best practices in green design for Habitat projects.
Avondale: Burnet Avenue Business District

Community Based Restaurant Proposal
3478 Burnet Ave

Summer 2009
Urban Design Development and Site Design Strategies

The University of Cincinnati Community Design Center followed up on Winter 2008 studio work on the Avondale Burnet Avenue Business District by providing a feasibility study for a community based restaurant on Burnet Avenue for the Uptown Consortium. This restaurant concept includes community development programming such as community gardening, job training, and a shared kitchen facility in addition to a commercial restaurant proposal.
A look at Corryville: Anthropologists mix it up with Architects and Planners

Martha Rees, editor
Department of Anthropology
University of Cincinnati

In collaboration with
Sarah Barth
Justin Bonar-Bridges
Amanda Huber
Melony Stambaugh
Maria Venegas
Elizabeth Wehri
Mark Sauer

Winter 2007
Introduction to a community interdisciplinary collaboration

Martha Rees

In 2006, I was invited by Michaele Pride, director of Architecture and Interior Design in the school of Design, Architecture, Art and Planning at the University of Cincinnati, to sit in on critiques in the Niehoff Studio, run by Frank Russell, Director of the Community Design Center and the Studio, and Assistant Professor in the School of Planning. Michaele and I were neighbors in the Emery Center in downtown Cincinnati, where the Niehoff Studio was then housed.

From the first visit, I was amazed by the different ways of knowing presented by the architects and planners in the Studio and impressed by their community interaction, especially in meetings with stakeholders in Mt. Auburn, that year's project. I brought Melony Stambaugh (See Chapter 3, p. 23) along for one of the critiques, and she commented that an anthropologist would be on the streets observing behaviors before planning any changes. Thus began the concept of how anthropologists, architects and planners could interact in a local project.

In January 2007, Frank Russell invited me to participate in the Studio, now settled in Uptown at 2728 Vine Street in Cincinnati. Anthropology and Planning piloted a meta-course called the Calhoun Corridor. The form this course took was that faculty from anthropology (Rees), planning (Russell) and architecture (Pride), as well as students in each other their classes, critiqued each other's presentations. Planning students were the interviewees for the pilot of a life history questionnaire; anthropology students attended and critiqued the initial planning presentations, and planning students attended and critiqued the presentation of the results of interview with stakeholders in the Clifton-University Heights-Fairview neighborhood (CUF). We find that community and neighborhood associations are active in planning and voicing their needs and opinions about the future of this neighborhood, which includes the joint neighborhood associations—CUF (Clifton/University/Fairview), the Corryville Community Council and the Avondale Community Council. These, and other neighborhoods, are referred to as Uptown (see Figure 1).

Students from planning and architecture in the Niehoff studio described and proposed plans for the neighborhood. Instead of just lecturing to students on economic anthropology, I combined theoretical lectures with a research project that exemplified in practice the theoretical basis of the course (the effect of global economics on people’s lives). Anthropology students designed and carried out life history interviews with residents of these neighborhoods, mainly community stakeholders and leaders. This combined the pedagogical exercise in life history interviews, as well as gathering information requested by planning students to carry out their work. They note people’s desire for community, as well as their antipathy to UC and to chain stores. People want to shop in the area where they live. One of the problems voiced by residents in one survey is the high turnover in residents, although they appreciate the diversity the neighborhood affords (Clifton Heights Survey). Residents appreciate the diversity, but dislike the construction, the turn-over and the ‘wall’—barrier between Uptown and Downtown. They like urban living, but desire a community (see Appendix 1).

http://www.uc.edu/edc/niehoff_studio/niehoff_studio.html
As a result of our desire to continue working together, I applied for and was awarded a Taft-Nichoff Community Scholar Fellowship for the 2007-2008 academic year. This fellowship made it possible for Michael Pride, Frank Russell and me to coordinate an urban anthropology course with the Nichoff Studio. One result is the preliminary list of readings and syllabus, compiled with the help of both Russell and Pride (Appendix 2).

The specific methodologies that I, like other anthropologists, bring to the Nichoff Studio centers around ethnographic methods: anthropologists talk to people. My methods combine qualitative research (life history interviews, genealogies, and observation) with quantitative data, including a random survey (see for example, Rees 2006a). While quantitative data gives general, often skeletal data, about a population, it

* [http://www.artsjournals.org/taf/awards/Nichoff.html](http://www.artsjournals.org/taf/awards/Nichoff.html)
A Look at Corryville: 7 is the only way to make generalizations. Qualitative data, while not generalizable, gives
voice to the people who live in the communities we study, telling us what their practices and lives mean to them. In my view, neither method alone is sufficient; only in combination can we approximate a representation of people and communities.

The benefits to me, of participating in the Niehoff Studio include, first, seeing things from a different perspective. I learned to appreciate visual forms of representation and learning as well as the critique method of team work. Second, the quality and visual presentation of the Niehoff Studio projects I have seen over the past two quarters is impressive. I can only gain by learning more about their process.

The outcomes for anthropology students include wanting to learn some of the techniques of the planners. Planning students have made excellent concrete comments and suggestions about our interviews and data. The dynamic of all meetings is interactive and creative. Another result was the inclusion of Margaret Kupferle of Environmental Engineering and her students in assessing environmental conditions in the neighborhoods. To this end, we worked on Seed Grant Proposal for Sustainable Urban Engineering that she was granted to help fund this next stage of our collaboration. Her students sampled and tested tap water for lead.

This project was truly interdisciplinary, in the sense that the product of each discipline contributed to the products of the others. We combined different perspectives in collaborating with community organizations to increase our knowledge of, and improve the design of, the urban community immediately surrounding the University of Cincinnati. Outcomes include not only the synergies from teaching across units, this report on the findings from Autumn of 2007, and continuing work in the Avondale neighborhood in Winter and Spring 2008. Community members and organizations participated in critiquing the report(s) at every stage.

(End of excerpt of full paper)
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A description of the relationship between the University of Cincinnati and its abutting neighborhoods can be told as two stories. The first is a narrative connected to the physical plant of the institution, its real estate development ventures and its impact on surrounding areas. This description revolves around institutional imperialism and self-preservation. The second story is about the nature of engagement that has occurred between the faculty and students of the institution and the surrounding communities.

This tale illustrates a history of neglect and irrelevance. This is the story of every big urban university. Yet, the value in its retelling is the shift in position and policy that has occurred at the University of Cincinnati over the last decade that has the potential to interwove these two separate and often estranged plot lines into an integrated and transformational university-community relationship.

The University and Community Development

The University of Cincinnati was established as a City University in 1819 and occupied several small footprints in the central urban basin of Cincinnati until it took its present site on the hilltop above. At that time the nascent campus, following the Beaux Arts model, was envisioned as a bucolic academy in a park, literally and figuratively, within what became public parkland. Throughout the first half of the twentieth century, municipal cessations of parkland permitted campus expansion to the north and east into an area that would soon occupy fully half of the previous park area and, with purchased land the campus would, eventually make up a super-block within an already dense residential part of the center city.

In the mid-20th century dramatic shifts in urban form and function were occurring in the center city of Cincinnati which heavily impacted the hilltop district around the University. This coincided with the same period when rational trends in the post-war growth of higher education stretched the capacity of programs and facilities on campus.

Historic Trends

Massive structural changes proposed for the central urban basin of Cincinnati were framed by the Metropolitan Master Plan of 1948. These included two initiatives that would impact housing patterns throughout the city and region. The first was a proposed limited access
regional and national highway system that was intended to link the city with the region, but required space within an already super-dense basin area. The second was a clearance program designed to rid the urban core of blight, to provide sanitary housing opportunities in public housing, as well as to provide space for already constrained light industrial-commercial uses. Together, these displaced more than 66,000 residents, or nearly 35 percent of the population of the city, and along with other historic pressures, contributed to a massive migration and turnover of households within the hilltop area surrounding the University. While the impact of these plans was anticipated and was accommodated in the 1948 and coordinated follow-up plans (1950-60 Cornville-Avondale Plan of the Model Cities Program) with specific policy measures for housing, failure in implementation caused the creation of the “Second Ghetto” in the neighborhoods to the east of the rapidly growing campus. (Casey-Leininger 1993)

Observe University campus planners, struggling to accommodate growth in enrollments and facilities demands, used this planning process to inject aggressive land-use and transportation proposals into the Avondale-Cornville Plan. These measures included merging with an adjacent hospital complex (now known as east campus), increasing the University footprint into abutting residential districts, and advocating for new traffic arterials to connect the expanding commuter campus, then isolated, within the dense residential fabric. This strategy, realized in the 1950’s, was essentially defensive in nature, and served to create a two super-block campus divided from the surrounding neighborhood by high speed roadways. At a time when pressure on inner-city housing supply was the greatest, through its expansion, the University and affiliated institutions removed nearly 500 residential buildings (Schaar-Russell 2000), further destabilizing the already fragile adjacent community of Cornville. And so the relationship between the University and the community settled into an uncomfortable divide supported by segregationist ideals of the 1948 Metropolitan Master Plan (p.10) and institutional isolationism.

Campus and Community Development in the 21st Century

The two campus super-blocks of the University are surrounded most closely by the communities of Cornville, Clifton Heights, University Heights-Fairview or OlU, and Avondale. During the cold-war period atmosphere that existed between the university and the community, after university expansion during the 1960’s, community leadership gained adequate strength to contain institutional activities to within the superblocks of campus. Without the option of spilling over its new boundaries and faced with continued demand for facilities expansion, available space on campus was quickly filled, and in 1990 the University embarked on a new master plan that would densify campus with new buildings consisting of three million square feet including structured parking to replace surface lots and a system of green space to hold the chaotic campus together.

At the same time, perhaps with attention to the reality of being politically landlocked by the abutting communities and fiscally landlocked by land costs, the University chose to radically alter its approach to community relations by attempting to forge a common agenda with community leadership. Both the University and the communities suffered from declining social and physical conditions in the areas around campus. For the university, which must compete for enrollments in a new cash-strapped business model and which seeks to shift from a commuter to a residential campus, attractive housing opportunities and liveability within the surrounding communities are essential for continued growth. Additional
Tensions in Community Building

Institutional support space is also desirable for the university, but this is sought through partnership opportunities rather than through campus expansion. So evolved a strategy to address the "second ring" development of the institution (McGin et al. 2003). In 1995 UC tested a collaborative relationship with the community through a land-swap involving recreational space that was traded by the community to UC in exchange for financing the construction of a recreation center elsewhere in the neighborhood. Following the success of this effort UC embarked on a global strategy of collaboration with area communities and institutions.

UC formed a non-profit development corporation called the Uptown Consortium (UpCo), with three hospitals and the Cincinnati Zoo, all residing within the university area, now known as "Uptown". In turn, the Uptown Consortium, working with select community members, framed a strategic development plan calling for a broad range of interventions including transportation, economic development, safety, services and housing (HRA 2004). The bricks and mortar of this plan translated into 2000-3000 new units of student housing, 1000 new/apartments units of non-student housing, and 400,000 s.f. of new/renovated retail and business space. With these goals and some funding from its new institutional partners, UC worked with community councils and business associations to establish and fund five new autonomous community development corporations that would have access to financing from a $75 million loan pool from the University endowment to spur $1.2 billion in specific project development. Six project areas were identified in three neighborhoods and urban design plans were outlined for each. Within these areas, six projects have been realized in this time which include a 710 bed student residence complex with structured parking (Stratford Heights), 40 apartments for medical residents and staff (Bellevue Garlands), 286 units of condominiums and apartment with

75,000 s.f. commercial space (Stetson Square), a 505 bed student residence with 40,000 s.f. of retail built on air-rights over a 1600 space parking garage (Callhoun Street Marketplace North), the redevelopment of a church into retail space (Urban Outfitters), and the redevelopment of a social club into retail and classroom space (Turner Center). (Romano et al. 2006)

Only an internal university fiscal crisis interrupted plans for continued development as proposed. UC was forced to pull back operating funding for the Community Development Corporations. At the same time, economic conditions developed to finance the most ambitious projects were found to be weak enough to hold would-be developers at bay. Today UC's efforts in collaboration are judged to be modestly successful. The availability of off-campus student beds, market rate apartments, and home ownership opportunities has been enhanced, and new or rehoused commercial space has been brought on-line. However, occupancy rates for the new living space are low and most commercial space remains unfilled with high rental rates to blame in both cases. (Romano et al. 2006) Some controversy exists over the urban design and architectural quality of the projects and few deny the self-serving nature of the new offerings. It is too early to judge the overall benefit to the community through environmental and economic enhancement, but this prospect seems likely in the long term.

The University in Community Engagement

Community engagement through University-Community Partnerships is a broad term that calls for clarification as applied to UC program activities. Themes include the role of the engagement activity in creating knowledge in pure or applied form and whether and how this knowledge is applied to solve community problems for mutual benefit (Romano et al. 2006). Based on our own literature review,
Mayhar Arefi describes four models of engagement activity: the Entrepreneurial University Model which organizes education and business goals; the Engaged University Model which connects teaching, research, and service activities but with an emphasis on education above community intervention; the Social Venture Partnership Model which seeks to address issues in a systematic and comprehensive way but in parity with its community partners; and the Civic Engagement Model which envisions university activity as directed toward not only understanding the issues in partnership with the community, but solving local problems while creating frameworks outside the institution to sustain those solutions. In his recent report by the University of Cincinnati School of Planning, Arefi further categorizes activities into four areas: generation of knowledge without application; collaborative studies with the community and with application of knowledge; community involvement by the university members provided as a service activity; and area redevelopment involving real estate (Romanos et al. 2006).

For the purposes of this paper, UC “program engagement” indicates a collaboration with the community that extends beyond observation, research, or the extraction of information to benefit the pedagogical activity or non-local research dissemination. Program community engagement considered here is not designed to benefit large scale business interests but may be of use to it. Program engagement does not involve real estate development which has been exclusively conceived and implemented by discreet UC administrative offices as described above.

Past efforts in community engagement

In regard to the program engagement that faculty and students of UC experience with the surrounding and nearby communities, historical documentation and quantification are difficult. By nature faculty, and students, operate independently and often do not accumulate and share information and outcomes of community engagement activities. Limiting this review of engagement activity to the College of Design, Architecture, Art, and Planning (DAAP) and allied units, no curriculum or pedagogical structure has historically existed to support community engagement, with the notable exceptions of the cooperative education program and individual strategic research partnerships with industry which are not considered here.

Faculty at the DAAP School of Architecture and Interior Design (SAID) are just beginning to form coordinated interest groups under its new Director who is committed to the concept and practice. Many DAAP faculty are oriented toward service and engagement activities through their research and teaching interests. Several outstanding examples of individual and program engagement activity have been accomplished in DAAP, especially from the School of Planning (SOP). In the 1980's faculty members, such as Harris Foruz, who began his career in the SAID and later taught in the SOP provided key community plans for several neighborhoods including Over-The-Rhine (OTR) in the city basin (Miller 1998). His work in OTR was funded through the federal Model Cities program. Later he formed a student-faculty partnership called Adventure Playgrounds aimed at improving the formative experiences of inner-city youth. The pattern of his work in engagement is typical of many faculty who organize engagement activities around their teaching assignments, volunteer student interests, or the availability of funding support.

Federal and state funding for technical outreach services by universities emerged in the mid- 80’s. In Ohio, the Urban University Program (UUP) funded a Community Design Center at DAAP organized by Foruz that exists today. In 1990, the Institute for Community Partnerships was created in the College of Education, also with UUP funding to
support faculty applied research in solving urban problems ranging from physical to social issues. A Center for Community Engagement was initiated by the University Vice President of Student Affairs to coordinate the individual student efforts across campus that served area non-profit human service and community development efforts. UC’s experience in community engagement, either through activism, curriculum, or research, has followed an ad-hoc pattern with little or no support from academic or administrative leadership. In DAP most documented engagement work occurred in communities further afield from campus rather than in abutting neighborhoods. On occasion faculty members or centers would be contracted by the city or a business association to conduct professional or service studies (Probst/Born/Miller-Corryville Plan, Gosling/Russell Clifton Plan). Perhaps, only one UC research center study has been conducted in association with the UC real estate development described above (Vredendal/Reinhaven - Calhoun Economic Impact Study). In short the university administration’s efforts in community development have been historically separated from the university’s academic efforts in community engagement.

Current work in Community Engagement

The arrival of University President Nancy Zimpher in 2003 brought a new focus in a sweeping academic plan that featured community engagement as a keystone for “defining a new urban research University.” Entitled UC 21, for 21st century, the plan identified five goals, among which “Forge Key Relationships and Partnerships” boldly pronounced UC’s future as an “engaged” university (UC 21: 2003).

In the previous five years, as the Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Zimpher had led the staff and faculty in an effort entitled “The Milwaukee Idea”, which galvanized an already engaged university for a role in service and collaboration meant to “transform” the university while supporting the “Urban renaissance of Milwaukee” (Percy 2008). Accordingly, once at UC, Zimpher set out to understand and coordinate existing university engagement efforts. Through the UC 21 budgeting process UC funded a “Center for the City” (CFC) which would function as the front door for engagement and service inquiries from the community at large to UC. Zimpher established a Vice President for Community Relations in her cabinet and a university-wide Community Engagement Council (CEC) was created. The CEC convened faculty and administrators involved with working in the community and the CFC documented existing efforts in a “Community Connections Database” and subsequently modestly funded new initiatives. Based on the current level of community engagement UC was recently included in the Carnegie Foundation’s Community Engagement Classification with 76 other US institutions. Of course, within this new framework, community engagement initiatives continued to be pursued by faculty and administrators, such as the faculty led Participatory Action Research Center (Brydon-Miller) and the administrative Center for Community Engagement’s new service learning curriculum effort with a new Director of Academic Community Partnerships (Meiner). Today we find documentation of hundreds of pre-existing and new efforts in community engagement and service at UC which are just beginning to be coordinated with each other.

Central administrative efforts, led by Zimpher, are clearly pushing UC toward a “Civic Engagement Model” for University-Community partnerships. She seeks coordination and comprehensiveness of academic/research activities that result in powerful and lasting impact. In her own words she lauds engagement work of both UW-M and UC but viewed “these myriad projects (as) ‘boutique’ in nature; many small projects do not always
scale up to solutions with holistic impact” (Parcy 2006). Consequently, certain central administrative efforts are now geared toward coordination, with possible future incentives for collaborative alignments between activities that can ultimately be rewarded by implementation with community partners for sustainable outcomes.

Other central administrative efforts are geared toward “transforming” the institution from the inside out through program and curriculum change as articulated in the sweeping UC 21 academic plan and its “Forge Key Relationships and Partnerships” goal (UC 21). Curriculum development is the purview of the academic departments, and it remains to be seen whether the “engagement” initiative will be institutionalized and made manifest in curriculum or the, even more arcane, faculty reappointment, promotion, and tenure criteria.

The presence of Presidential interest is beginning to have an impact on the hitherto separate worlds of UC community real estate redevelopment and UC program engagement in academic/research activities. This is occurring within the work of the Uptown Consortium through placement participation of UC faculty and staff among the various community-based subcommittees of the Consortium which address safety, community development, and neighborhood services. UC members have both direct and indirect impact on Consortium decision making and, at the minimum, expose UC members to the community development events that are unfolding around them. Additionally, the Consortium has begun to commission technical and research work by units of UC in criminal justice (Eck), real estate development (Vredveld) and the planning research (Russell).

Since her arrival Zimpher has consistently used her presidential clout as the head of the region’s largest employer, to place herself and other UC members in the center of the unfolding effort of Cincinnati to revitalize itself. She chairs the Uptown Consortium, but also presides on the Boards of the city’s most powerful leadership groups including the Cincinnati Center City Development Corporation. She has placed top administrators and faculty on a number of citywide improvement efforts and civic boards. While the city power elite have always embraced UC’s top administrator, it is doing so now with the urgency of a community in crisis. One understands why her experience with the “Milwaukee Idea” endorsed her to city leadership which recognized the value that UC represented to the community at large. CEOs for Cities well articulated the potential that Universities could have in leveraging urban economic revitalization in a number of areas including as a purchaser, employer, real estate developer, incubator, advisor, and workforce developer. (CCIC 2001). This view of the value of the academy to the city goes back as far as forty years and is captured in the book titles such as “The University and the Future of Our Cities” (Koltscha, 1968) or “The University and The Urban Crisis” (Mitchell 1974) to which UC’s own President Warren Bennis contributed his inaugural address of 1971, “Great Expectations”.

The DAAP Community Design Center and the Niehoff Urban Studio

While the nature of community-university engagement may have become more visible in recent years (Boyer Carnegie Report 1990, Kellogg Foundation Report 2000) the inclination to collaborate and provide technical services has consistently been popular within the design and planning disciplines. The concept of institutional assistance to local communities had been broached as early as 1862 when land-grant universities were mandated to provide technical services to the surrounding community as a condition of their establishment (Fisher 2004). A century later, universities were moved to engage with the community to address pressing issues related to a variety of national and international
problems including civil rights and were again provided incentives to do so through federal funding for programs. This was a fertile period in which campus activism fueled an interest in public issues and social change (Fisher 2004). And it was at this time that Whitney M. Young, Jr, President of the American Institute of Architects, called for the profession of architecture to engage with communities to address physical and social problems. At the one hundredth convention of the AIA, according to Rex Curry, the concept of university-based Community Design Centers was conceived (Curry 2004).

Community Design Centers were established as early as 1993 (Pratt - PICCED). Today more than 40 exist as university affiliated entities, with many more as stand-alone non-profit organizations (ACSA 2000). The UC Community Design Center was established in 1996 within the School of Planning through a State grant funding applied research at Ohio urban universities. Since that time the CDC has often been located off-campus within its partner communities, providing technical architectural, urban planning, graphic design, industrial design, community art, community organizing and research services in response to requests from the communities, the interests of participating faculty, and availability of funding sources. While the CDC has relied solely on the participation of paid and student volunteer workers, teaching activities were only a small part of center work and the mission and function of the CDC was unrelated to College or School curriculum.

Project selection for the CDC stemmed from needs identified by the community that required technical assistance and promised to provide a didactic experience for the participating students as well as an outcome that would innovate in the problem area. Between 1998 and 2002 community based projects were concentrated in one neighborhood and addressing a variety of social issues that included education (Schools as Centers for Community Learning), affordable housing (St Anthony Village), community development (the OTR Comprehensive Plan), community art and at-risk youth job training (Art in the Market), among others. Focusing work in one community allowed a strong relationship to develop between the university participants and the neighborhood and functioned to grow a knowledge base useful for enhancing the effectiveness of subsequent projects. Yet, while contributing on the local level, the CDC operated entirely outside any relationship with its own College's school curricula and therefore without any opportunity to institutionalize the community engagement lessons learned. In an effort to “reflect change from the bottom-up” a proposal was put forward to develop a community based environmental art course within the DAAP School of Art to complement the activities of the existing CDC Art in the Market youth job training program. This course was later formally integrated into the school curriculum and a new art education faculty member was hired who specialized in community based engagements, and who later adopted the Art in the Market program which continues to the present.

Following and in alignment with this, a community based Studio concept was modeled by the CDC in partnership with the School of Planning (SCP) and School of Architecture and Interior Design (SAID). This community engagement initiative emerged in 2001-02 just prior to Zimpher’s tenure and was named the "Niehoff Urban Studio" after the primary donor, who also served on the UC Board of Trustees. The Niehoff Urban Studio is a program of DAAP and is an off-campus studio primarily involving architecture and planning faculty and students and occasionally students of diverse disciplines such as anthropology, economics, engineering, and geography. The intention of the studio is to provide a place for university-led, but community-driven study and discussion of urban issues for the benefit of Cincinnati and
other urban centers. The studio is located off-campus where University and non-university participants can come to participate in educational classes, events, symposia, and exhibits that explore these urban issues. The work of the studio is intended to have a tangible impact on the urban problems under consideration and contribute to the body of knowledge of research in this area.

The studio is administered by the CDC and is conducted in partnership with the SAAD program and the SOP. The dean of the college has direct oversight under a university-wide provost committee composed of other deans and senior central administrators. Faculty of both schools teach the studio each quarter with the director of the CDC. Studio content is organized around biennial themes and community stakeholders collaborate to identify and set studio problems for each quarter. The studio is offered as an elective to both undergraduates and graduates, but is not yet integrated into any curriculum as a regular or required community-based learning experience.

The Community Design Center continues to provide technical design and planning services to the community but often provides service as a foundation to or extension of Nielson studio academic work. Over the course of 12 academic quarters, the Studio has involved more than 500 students and faculty with eighty community-based organizations and the CDC has completed ten related technical assistance projects.

The objectives of the studio are to conduct research on urban issues relevant to application to community problems; to apply this research through planning strategies and design interventions to address specific issues; to promote community development and student service-learning through engagement with community stakeholders for envisioning proposals and interventions that can have a timely and tangible impact; and to provide, through the work of the studio, as well as through public presentations, exhibits, and symposia, a forum for the discussion of urban planning, design, and quality of life issues for the urban center.

In the spring of 2007, through a central administrative directive, the CDC/Nielson Studio was relocated to the Uptown neighborhood of Cincinnati, which is a blighted area abutting campus. Its prior experience in engagement and visioning work in the basin neighborhood of Over-the-Rhine, contributed to the notion that all available and effective university technical and curricular resources should be focused on the challenged area immediately around the University campus. Quarter long interdisciplinary studios continue to explore concepts with community stakeholders within a two-year thematic focus on "Housing and Community Development." Technical work of the CDC is funded by and connected directly to the project priorities of the Uptown Consortium. The director of the CDC is integrated into the leadership structure of the Consortium as the Chair of its Community Development Committee.

At this moment the CDC/Nielson Studio is in a position to bring the two poles of UC engagement activity, hitherto separate: university program engagement activities (research, technical assistance) and its new related curriculum (service learning and studio pedagogy) can be linked to university community development through real estate activity, now primarily orchestrated by the Uptown Consortium. Until this time, UC top level central administration offices responsible for the expansive area real estate redevelopment efforts have kept UC's academic, research, and technical assistance resources at arms length. Today, through community engagement work, pedagogical activities within the academy finally have the capacity to influence real estate development activities without.
There is much to be written about the conflicts and opportunities created by this potential reenvisioning of community development policy and institutional pedagogy. Of course this position promises many opportunities for new and productive engagement, but not without peril. By design, this gives the CDC/Niehoff many masters, each with possibly diverse agendas. These are: the community itself as the basis of project activity, but not made up of a singular mind or body; the Uptown Consortium, while independent and composed of community advisors, is chaired and funded by UC and its partner Uptown institutions and is charged with real estate and community development; UC’s central administration, organized in part to pursue development interests for the benefit of the institution in the surrounding area and otherwise to manage and institutionalize the UC 21 academic plan; the Faculty of the College and other units who uphold the university’s pedagogical mission and their own relevant research interests; the funders of the program who expect certain outcomes as a product of their generosity; and finally, perhaps the most important participant, the students, who seek meaningful educational opportunities in alignment with their expectations. This begs the question of how this program can function among these potentially competing interests and meet the needs of its various constituencies.

As a Convener through place and structure

First and foremost the program can function to convene constituents. The studio occupies a “place” off-campus that can become the neutral turf, where the community and the university can convene and where administrators and faculty can come face to face. Current studio space is located in a building leased by UC, but owned and developed by the neighborhood Community Development Corporation. This space functions not only as a space for the Studio and Center, but also as an open meeting space for both university and community groups. And here, the importance of creating a known destination is critical to gaining credibility and effectiveness in community engagement. In its previous location, in the basin of the center city, adjacency to one of the great “third places” (Goldenburg 1999), a coffee shop across the hall, supported the “place identity” of the studio which made the studio an even more attractive destination at the same time that it exposed the work of the students. This is not a small matter in the process of embedding the studio into the community. In addition it is important for the program to remain outside of the control of one academic school. The current program is a part of the College, but not a part of any individual school, and this permits parity between academic interests within DAAP. And while the College of DAAP is the lead unit, having a space outside of the College allows the program to be more attractive to disciplines of other Colleges. Of course, space or subject is sometimes not enough to attract broad interdisciplinary involvement and accordingly the program funds a faculty research and graduate assistantship in partnership with the humanities center of UC, the Taft Research Center. This will fund two humanities faculty and two graduate assistants per year to collaborate with program engagement activities. Funding is only the first step in engineering this relationship between diverse disciplines which requires significant restructuring in didactic methods to form functional partnerships.

As an Organizer through resources and energy

Convening diverse university factions is not enough, because “…American Universities are remarkably specialized and fragmented, internally and externally, fiercely competitive, filled with conflict, and astonishingly unintegrated…” (Percy 2006). Diverse disciplines operate with diverse world views which sometimes prevent mutually beneficial interaction. However, within the
context of community engagement, the
disciplines have an obligation to adjust their
approach to accommodate a meaningful and
productive partnership, and most participating
faculty are already inclined to do so. Secondly,
within the universe of community engagement
activity, the program can identify themes to
permit the work of the collaborations to be
organized into a comprehensive body of work.
One component of this is the annual graphical
report of the program which can be
disseminated and utilized for action. At the
minimum, these coherent themes can stimulate
further faculty and student research,
scholarship, and community action which it has
modestly effective in doing.

If the program can be organized from the
outside in, it can also work the other way,
acting with the community, to organize
community functions. As an example the
CDC/Nehoff facilitated the Over-The-Rhine
Summit in the Fall of 2006 which brought
together for the first time more than forty non-
profits in the neighborhood to network and
share knowledge. The event also served as a
venue for a “state of the community” report
from city officials and generated enough critical
mass to warrant an address from the new
Cincinnati City Manager.

As an Observer: thorough expertise and
impartiality

As long as the program can maintain a
relationship of impartiality for all parties, the
program can observe and provide information
for the benefit of anyone. With the program
now positioned in the same geographical area
in which UC influences real estate
redevelopment for its own interest, sustaining
credibility may be challenging. The program
can and should provide information and must
do so in a completely transparent manner that
does not shelter opposing interests. As the
Director of DAAP SAID Michaela Price once put
it, “everyone is a potential target” including
entities that fund the program. Apropos of the
history of UC real estate redevelopment
described above, a recent report on
“Community Interactions and Collaborations”
(Kornacke et. al. 2006) commissioned by the
UC President’s office itself and conducted by
the UC SCP challenged the prospects of
development undertaken by UC through the
Uptown Consortium. This included data which
undermines absorption assumptions for
commercial space taken in the development
pro forma as well as proving that the
affordability index of new housing created is
well above that of our target population, which
includes UC and hospital employees.

The CDC/Nehoff program need not operate in
the capacity of “advocate” for one interest or
another to be effective. Rather the program
can provide transparent research as envisioned
in each partnership. This research and data is
often unavailable from other sources. An
example of this type of work, again in Over-
The-Rhine, is the creation and maintenance of
an ongoing database to track the proportion
of affordable to market rate housing in the
community. Affordable housing advocates and
gentrifiers have long been locked in a battle
over the proportion best suited for an
integrated neighborhood. A desirable
proportion was negotiated and agreed to in the
recent CTR Comprehensive Plan, but no means
of monitoring the changing number exists.
Since the city planning department has little
credibility for either group, the affordable
housing advocates in the community turned to
the university to provide the data. Forthcoming
results may be surprising, and disappointing
for the affordable housing advocates, but must
be as accurate as possible. In the same time
period the program provided property survey
information to the corporate controlled
Cincinnati Center City Development
Corporation (3CDC) for use in redevelopment
for market rate home ownership opportunities.
In effect the program is obliged to collaborate
with opposing groups in the community.

As an Arbitrator: through planning and design
Where conflict exists between community agendas, university programs have an excellent opportunity to facilitate the resolution of differences. Again this becomes somewhat more difficult for the areas immediately surrounding campus. In OTR, a housing design studio was conducted as a means of negotiation between the aforementioned OTR Community Housing affordable housing advocates and 3CDC, a non-profit market rate developer. Three student projects were created for the Washington Park Housing District to address three levels of density and preservation strategies. While none of these schemes was chosen as definitive, the process of interaction allowed these two groups to share priorities. Today they are partnering on a redevelopment scheme for a portion of the district.

In the Uptown context, our program now finds an opportunity to arbitrate between the outcome of the real estate activity of the university and the real estate needs of the community. The recent UC SOP study (Romano et al. 2008) uncovered an affordability gap in new housing created by UC and the Uptown Consortium. Long suspected and now proven, this gap is being addressed by local non-profits such as the Uptown Faith Based Community Development Group who have engaged with our program to research and vision affordable workforce housing. They use Studio work to solicit the Uptown Consortium for financial backing with some success.

As an Educator through mission and collaboration

Above all the program can function to educate all community collaborators as they, in turn, educate the university participants. This is the transformative exchange that Zimpher aims at. As Paulo Freire states:

“Authentic help means that all who are involved help each other, mutually growing together in common effort to understand the reality which they seek to transform. Only through such praxis – in which those who help and those who are being helped help each other simultaneously - can the act of helping becomes free from the distortion in which the helper dominates the helped” (Freire 1996, Curry 2004).

These moments do occur, but sometimes more by accident than design. One such event happen through a gaming exercise organized between students and community stakeholders in OTR. The scenario was constructed to mirror the process involved with developing the OTR comprehensive plan. In a grossly generalized way twelve “lifestyles” and “interest groups” were identified among the OTR stakeholders, e.g., young African American male, senior citizen, private developer, etc. Each student team adopted one of these profiles and used it as a “lens” through which to identify problems and opportunities in the community. A community member who closely resembled each profile volunteered to educate each student group. After recording their agenda, profile groups were combined according to which were the least compatible and asked to negotiate a shared agenda. Students used this agenda to develop design proposals for the community. The process was extremely effective for the students, who became completely empathetic with their profile subject. The community participants used the experience to relive and reconsider the actual negotiations that occurred during the OTR plan. These community members, some sworn enemies, stood together as they reviewed the mock student negotiations on their behalf. All parties came away with a new appreciation for diverse worldviews that will affect their future actions.

Scope and limitations

Because the university and this program cannot be all things and it is critical to be transparent about these limitations to minimize
false expectations about what institutions can do. Of all the roles that this program could play within community engagements, acting as a leader for community action is not one of them. Even though many community members and now perhaps the city of Cincinnati are grasping more than ever for an entity that can guide them forward, this is not this program’s best role, even though leadership is what communities expect from universities (Gilderbloom 2005). Among other things, leadership calls for consistency and continuity, both of which university programs lack because of the transient nature of students and to some degree, faculty. Leadership calls for absolute ownership of the issues, which university participants cannot claim unless they are of the community itself. The leadership within the community must be controlled by those who benefit the most. As an asset, leadership capacity exists within the community and is more effective when mined and exploited by the stakeholders themselves (Kretzmann and McKnight 1993).

Conclusion

UC enjoys a unique moment in time where forces and missions may align to better serve itself and its community partners. The University may start to make its roles as educator, developer, and citizen co-dependent and transformational. We will start to realize the benefit of this alignment when we start seeing internal and external signs such as the curriculum reflecting community engagement objectives or university real estate development work reacting to academic research and scholarship. Twenty years is a realistic time frame to realize the benefits of today’s efforts. And in this process the institution must be realistic and self-critical in its assessment of its situation to avoid the rhetoric of success without substance. Let us achieve what former UC President Warren Dennis did not when he overlooked the neighborhood clearance that his institution was engaging in during his tenure and wrote:

"I wonder how many of you sense the unique fortune UC enjoys in this city. So many universities now survive a situation of debilitating hostility with the communities that surround them. Our relationship with the community is one of affection and mutual respect and from that we both reap enormous benefits" (Mitchell 1974).
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I. Introduction

Current popular culture has put a lot of focus on social networks. This is seen in the game "The Seven Degrees of Kevin Bacon" and the more advanced version "The Six Degrees of Kevin Bacon". These games require the players to find a connection to the actor Kevin Bacon for any actor within six or seven steps. For example, Mel Gibson was in Braveheart with Sophie Marceau who was in The World is Not Enough with Pierce Brosnan who was in The Thomas Crown Affair with Rene Russo who was in Major League with Tom Berenger who was in Gettysburg with Sam Elliott who was in Tombstone with Bill Paxton who was in Apollo 13 with Kevin Bacon for 7 degrees. There is also a popular television program, Numbers, where a math genius uses complex mathematical equations to quantify networks in order to solve complex crimes for the FBI each week in only one hour.

It is not surprising that there are many studies that have looked at social networks in terms of how they are formed, what is their purpose, and how they operate to form centers of power. I first became interested in the social network of non-profit organizations while working as a research assistant at Northern Kentucky University.

The project I was involved with – The State of the Non-Profit, lead by Dr. Joan Ferrante, was a study on non-profit organizations in the Greater Cincinnati area. The focus of this study was to create a database that cataloged non-profit organizations and included their mission, purpose, assets, board members, and funding sources. The study also looked at the publicly available documents for the organizations such as tax returns for their completeness, accuracy, and clarity. In the process of this
study, I and my colleagues began to notice that there were many names of key people and addresses that were repeated for multiple organizations. This intrigued me especially in light of C. Wright Mills’ theory on the Power Elite. While Mills’ Power Elite theory focuses on the network of power as it is held by political, military, and economic institutions, I am applying that concept to the arena of non-profit institutions.

In looking at the relationship between non-profit organizations and the communities, it is necessary to also look at the links between the organizations in order to find the impact of the organizations on the community. These links help to provide services and jobs in communities creating an economic impact that cannot easily be measured. One measurement of this is the financial aspect. Each year we hear reports of the amount of money donated into the non-profit bucket of money. However, this bucket of money appears to have been counted more than once and may be a bit inflated when considering the sources of funding. For example, when looking at the tax returns of non-profit organizations, I have noticed that many organizations give money to other non-profit organizations. Each time this happens, the money is counted as revenue, but it is the same money being counted over and over again. So what appears to be a somewhat large bucket of money, may be only a small or medium size bucket. This is one of many webs of social connections found in the world of the non-profit organization. People and projects provide additional layers to this web which creates a web of kinship between the non-profit agencies and to the communities that they serve. This paper looks at the connections created by people and projects found in non-profit organizations located
in Cincinnati, Ohio. The key people in this case are board members, volunteers, and staff members.

II. Cincinnati Background

Cincinnati, Ohio was established in 1789 as the town of Losantiville. That same year, Fort Washington was built to protect the settlers. The population of the town and the fort was approximately 500 people. Hamilton County was established in 1790 with Losantiville as the county seat. Losantiville’s name was then changed to Cincinnati after “the Roman citizen soldier Cincinnatus”. Cincinnati covers a geographic area of 77.2 square miles and as of the 2000 Census, Cincinnati had a population of 331,285. In 2006, it was the third largest city in Ohio with a population estimate of 302,616.

Cincinnati is made up of fifty-two neighborhoods. These neighborhoods are represented by fifty-one organizations which include community, neighborhood, residents’, area, town and village councils, civic groups, and improvement organizations which are recognized by the City of Cincinnati Council. These organizations are a combination of registered and non-registered non-profit organizations. It is necessary for an organization to register their self in order to allow donors to claim their donations as a tax deduction. These organizations have IRS codes of 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4) and a variety of NTEE codes. The IRS code is used to identify the structure of an organization and regulates their activities. The NTEE code, or National Taxonomy of Exempt Entities, is used to classify organizations by the type of services they provide. These codes are broken into twenty-six categories with subcategories. These categories range from arts to
education, to health care and many others in between. The twenty-six categories of NTEE codes are further divided into ten subgroups. An organization may choose up to three codes. For example, the American Anthropological Association has an IRS code of 501c3 and an NTEE code of B03 which is Professional Societies & Associations.

The demographics for Cincinnati show that fifty-two percent of the population is female which is higher than the national and state of Ohio averages. The ethnic mix of Cincinnati has a higher percentage of African Americans with 44.3%; Ohio has 11.8% and the national average is 12.4%. The poverty, disability and the percent of the population over the age twenty-five with less than a high school education is also greater in Cincinnati.

On the other hand, one of the unique features of Cincinnati is the number of Fortune 500 companies headquartered there. There are six companies headquartered in Cincinnati on the Fortune 500 listing with one of those companies, Procter & Gamble, also on the Fortune 1000 Best Companies to Work For list. The six companies are:

- Procter & Gamble (25)
- Kroger (26)
- Federated Department Stores (76)
- Fifth Third Bancorp (299)
- Western & Southern Financial (460)
- Chiquita Brands International (488)
What makes this unique is the population size of Cincinnati as compared to the other cities that have at least six Fortune 500 companies. When the demographics are compared to other cities of the same general size, it is evident that the demographics in Cincinnati do not add up when compared to the relative wealth available.

III. Methods
In order to locate the non-profit organizations located in Cincinnati, OH, I used the website guidestar. Guidestar is a non-profit organization that tracks non-profit organization in the United States. The information that is available on Guidestar is a combination of data provided by the individual organizations, publicly available tax returns, and the IRS Masterfile. While not all organizations are required to file a tax return, many choose to do so voluntarily. After some trial and error, the search method that I used to gather the data on the non-profit organizations was to search by IRS code and NTEE code. I then followed up with a search by IRS code and the seventy-two zip codes located in Cincinnati.

Once the organizations were located, I then created a database of the key people listed on their tax returns and on their websites if available. I also completed interviews and a series of questionnaires with key people in the several of the organizations. Since there are a total of 5,677 non-profit organizations registered, I narrowed my focus to three case studies for analysis.

VI. Case Studies
I have completed three case studies of the non-profit organizations located in Cincinnati. The first looks at the community councils recognized by the Cincinnati
City Council. There are fifty-one councils located throughout the city of Cincinnati. While not all of the councils are registered non-profits, they are all included in my sample. The second case study is on the area known as Uptown. This geographic location includes seven communities. This case study was completed in part through my work as a Taft-Niehoff Community Scholar working for the Niehoff Community Design Studio. This studio is located in the community of Corryville. Architect and Urban Planning students from the University of Cincinnati College of Design, Architecture, Art, and Planning collaborate in the studio along with community leaders and Anthropology students to create designs in urban settings with a focus on the community. The Niehoff Studio is directed by Frank Russell whose focus for my work is on the civic organizations operating in Uptown. I completed in depth studies on eighteen civic organizations and thirty-seven social organizations. Also included in the sample for Mr. Russell are business associations which are not non-profit organizations. Although there are a total of 525 registered non-profit organizations located in Uptown, the connections in this diagram only maps the civic organizations from the Niehoff sample as an example of a power structure. The last case study focuses on youth organizations. This segment was chosen in order to achieve some understanding of the disparity of demographics found in Cincinnati as compared to the rest of Ohio, cities of similar population size, and to the United States as a whole. The three organizations that I am starting with are the Girls Scouts, the Boy Scouts, and Boys Hope Girls Hope. Each of these organizations focuses their attention on the youth of Cincinnati with an emphasis on education, growth, and leadership. With each of these case studies, I anticipate finding
separate webs of social connections and hope to find overlaps between case studies. With the community council group, I expect to find less direct connections between the community councils and more connections through additional layers of organizations in a circular pattern radiating out from the community councils to a secondary layer or organizations. The Uptown sample is where I expect to find some consolidation of power through many connections to few organizations. In the youth organization case, I anticipate finding less connections to other organizations that may account for the lack of progress in the demographic areas of education attainment, average wages, and individuals living below the poverty line.

**Uptown Case Study**

For today's purpose, I will go over some of the results from the Uptown case study. The area of Cincinnati known as Uptown consists of the communities of Corryville, Avondale, Mount Auburn, Clifton, Clifton Heights, University Heights, and Fairview. The 2000 population of these communities was 49,664 which accounts for fifteen percent of Cincinnati. The percent of females in Uptown is 50.3% which is below the percentage for Cincinnati, the state of Ohio, and the Nation as a whole. The percent of blacks and the individuals below the poverty line are higher in Uptown and the average wage for individuals are lower.

In order to understand the social power structure in Uptown, I looked at the social connections of the civic organizations. These connections were found by locating board and staff members currently and going back as far as 1997 according to their websites, the website GuideStar, and the organization tax returns. GuideStar is a website whose mission is to revolutionize philanthropy and nonprofit practice by
providing information that advances transparency, enables users to make better decisions, and encourages charitable giving. In addition to looking at the people in common between organizations, I also looked at projects in common. This diagram is a representation of the connections found between the Uptown Civic Organizations. Included in this diagram are the people who have more than one connection, or an affiliation to more than one organization or project. This criterion eliminated 129 people from the diagram, leaving fifty-nine people, five projects, and thirty-six organizations. As you can see from the diagram, the Uptown Consortium appears to be a hub at the center of the Uptown civic organizations. The Uptown Consortium receives its funding from five organizations who represent the five largest employers in Uptown. These organizations are also non-profit organizations. These five organizations are also affiliated with 198 additional non-profit organizations through funding or shared real estate. A search by address reveals many organizations sharing the addresses of these five organizations indicating a connection to each other.

In conclusion, it appears that a power elite is present in Uptown. The organization at the center of this network has the highest revenue and the largest number of connections through key people to other organizations. There are few project that they have in common with other organizations. According to one of my informants “they have all the money and are supposed to use it the help the community, but they don’t.”

For future work, I would like to do an analysis of the funding sources as well as a comparison of the non-profit activity of comparably sized cities.