

**2010 NEIGHBORHOOD SUMMIT  
GOAL COMMENT SHEETS  
HOUSING & NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT**

**Goal #1: The neighborhoods of Cincinnati are economically diverse, mixed-income neighborhoods.**

- Could be more (1)
- There is a natural tendency for individuals/families to move to like-minded neighborhoods that share similar values. This is hard to enforce or maintain. On a separate note, **NO SECTION 8 HOUSING IN EMERGING DISTRICTS LIKE THE BANKS!** (2)
- Would help to define what this means in real time (how it works, what it looks like) before voting
- 70% extremely important; mixed income should be throughout communities – not just in one place; market/educate the concept of mixed neighborhoods (12)
- Absolutely false – look at Evanston, no basic services like bank, police department, supermarket, commerce – just mom and pop (13)
- Goal is extremely important. This should be the overarching goal. All investments should be directed to or at least support this. Not concentrated. (15)
- Be clear that this means that each and every neighborhood is diverse – not the city collectively. Also, promote mixed use, mixed income development. (16)
- Not necessarily will they be (18)
- Somewhat (21)
- When neighborhoods are homogeneous they become single sighted and don't understand plight of others, which creates disconnectedness (22)
- Each historical character of neighborhoods must be properly analyzed and the most beneficial factors be utilized as a demonstration for planning enhancements (24)
- How do you assure “economically diverse neighborhoods?” (25)
- Gather data on current mix; Requirement for affordable and workforce housing for inclusion of lower and middle class (26)
- And accessible (27)
- Balance of single/multi family zoning – identify successfully executed (28)
- No “company towns” with boom-bust potential. Leveraging local assets to distinguish and create diversity also cuts down on cannibalistic attitude to gain at other's expense (34)
- It is important to allow people to gravitate to where they are most comfortable. Despite income or diversity (39)
- Goal should be to encourage prosperity for everyone (40)
- This will change the perception/division of the have and have not neighborhoods and focus more on making a health, and whole city. It will also change the concentration of crime and allow for lower-income residents to be exposed to higher economic opportunities and quality of life. (42)
- Social interaction is a desirable goal but the focus must be on the residents and not what the City wants (43)
- Honestly, quality of life in my mixed income neighborhood is decreasing, as neighbors don't share values of noise level, property maintenance and child rearing. I want to move to less mixed-income. (44)

- True, but every NBD should have its own unique niche, it doesn't have to be diverse individuals, but as a whole, the City's business districts should be diverse. (49)
- Yes! Mixed income is good, concentrations of poverty are bad (51)
- Should include racial diversity (53)
- Racially, age (54)
- Best way to ensure affordable housing is to use existing buildings (55)
- Neighborhoods have been transformed by relocation. Neighborhood identity needs to be re-defined. (56)
- Need mixed income (57)

**Goal #2: The housing stock of Cincinnati includes more units that are affordable to its residents.**

- Somewhat (1)
- Yes. All housing development not only those receiving federal funds (11)
- Developers receiving public funds should be required to include "x" amount of affordable housing and workforce housing (12)
- No – I've several units that I have to be renting below market in order to get occupancy (13)
- Somewhat important: only good if distributed well. Incentives/requirements needed (15)
- There may be close to enough units, but there is a concern that more of those units need to be of a higher quality. (16)
- Educate – teach people how to afford housing; Engineer – create affordable green housing (esp. single floor senior units); Intervention – City ombudsman for housing concerns – advocate for residents to banks, landlords (19)
- Supplement HUD grants with private funds administered by non-profits with experience in housing rehab and buildings. Available to low income only. (20)
- Somewhat (21)
- People should have the option to live anywhere in the City and not be confined to certain areas (22)
- Must be a strategically planned action step; area neighborhood demographics have been analyzed and structured as planning tools (24)
- And accessible (27)
- When developing areas/neighborhoods (e.g. OTR) ensure already existing residents are included, considered and not displaced (29)
- Note on the critical questions regarding incentive. If something is mandatory all developments do it, therefore incentive does not exist, it is just the standard rule. I favor very good incentives but not requirement for private developers to incorporate affordable housing pre mandate would be unworkable in purely private development. (31)
- The City will develop a subsidy/mandate program that will allow for the development of housing for persons of a range of incomes. (32)
- Less than 30% AMI (very low income) units must be developed – not just for the upper portion of low income range (33)
- Requires landlord and tenant responsibility/accountability with consequences for inactivity. Affordability not the issue; quality and responsibility are. Lots of low cost, low quality housing available. (34)

- This is good but it would be important to have a more accurate indicator of affordability than solely housing costs as a portion of income (35)
- Do not put mandates on housing! (incentives, restrictions, etc.) We have an over abundance of affordable housing in Cincinnati. Let the market dictate housing starts/types. (39)
- We should try to attract people who can afford housing vs. lowering standards (40)
- Affordable and market rate housing together can help overcome socio-economic stereotypes and prejudices (43)
- 1) Good goal: government incentives to get developers motivated 2) more private-public partnership 3) must create supply and demand (45)
- Of all these goals, this is the most important (48)
- I want a future that stops putting people after “profit” – more public/private partnerships not only affordable to buy/rent but affordable to maintain, energy efficient/green affordable homes (49)
- I favor publicly provided incentives for affordable housing in new private developments, but I do not support making this mandatory (50)
- Housing is already affordable. Quality of housing is the issue. Zoning should be revamped to allow greater mix of housing types. Use incentives not requirements. (51)
- Affordable housing + transit access = poverty – fighting strategy (55)
- Need quality to enforce vacant building license and code enforcement (57)

**Goal #3: The housing stock of Cincinnati includes a wide variety of housing types.**

- Good (1)
- Universal design factors should be mandated and the concept of visibility should be used in all housing designs, both private and public (8)
- If we aren’t offering variety, incentive drops to live, stay be here = housing is a part of marketing, but others are more important (12)
- Maybe but lack cohesiveness or distinct concentration (13)
- Somewhat important (15)
- ABSOLUTELY. (16)
- Yes (21)
- Yes, but unfortunately many areas have a predominance of one or two types – not complete range (24)
- Assess the existing housing stock, encourage what do other communities have; new development should fill gaps; and accessible (27)
- Of course, different SES and stage of life lend a family to a given housing type. There will be greater need for certain housing types over time. Reliable forecasts for what housing types are, and are becoming, are needed. (30)
- We need more accessible housing or housing with visitable features – one story (33)
- Located to take advantage of assets and benefits; single family for single families (not subdivided) and close to schools. Single-income no kids/double-income no kids near NBDs. (34)
- Why not? (40)
- New development would have to fit within a decided upon percentage (41)
- There is a diverse need to difference between what is needed downtown, Uptown, Hyde Park, etc. (43)

- FBC – More form-based code, and relax restriction on lot size; simplify deed in lieu of demolition to put vacant housing into hands of for- and non-profit developers (46)
- I'm particularly concerned about the lack of options for older adults (48)
- Not if that means having to destroy existing homes in order to provide diversity/variety (49)
- Yes. As households become more diverse, the housing market must respond to that. Zoning should be revised to allow greater mix of housing types. (51)
- Essential to be able to accommodate people of different walks of life. Density = green (55)
- Need quality (57)

**Goal #4: All aspects of neighborhoods are clean and well-maintained, including those that are publicly and privately owned.**

- Publicly better (1)
- Work with adults with disabilities. They want access to quality housing with access affordability and affordable transportation and or accessibility to stores and community centers. Access increase in cost and decrease in areas of public utilities has been a bigger barrier for individuals with disabilities making the more isolated and less involved. (10)
- Accountability! We need a department that can keep up with enforcement of maintenance in private properties (12)
- Have you been in Cincinnati? Foreclosed properties are rampant and almost totally neglected. (13)
- Size does not equal cost – incentive for developers (14)
- Somewhat important: 2<sup>nd</sup> tier goal (15)
- Don't disregard the appeal of "gritty artsy" neighborhood environments. (16)
- They should be but won't (18)
- Needs improving (21)
- This is paramount to having neighborhoods that are attractive to potential residents and to retention of current residents (22)
- Hard to achieve when the administration and City Council de-fund these departments and programs while adding funding to Human Services without accountability? (34)
- We talk about creating walkable communities – but only at the cost of individual homeowners – since sidewalks are at homeowner costs. But what about new walks where they do not exist? (37)
- Yes (40)
- There needs to be more pressure/laws enforced on landlords who do not keep up their lower-income properties because of location. There also needs to be education classes on what clean and maintained houses (exterior) are. People who are first time homeowners or low income families who are not familiar with upkeep of a house (exterior) can be educated. There are some cases of people who do not keep their home because they don't understand how keeping a clean home (exterior) can improve house value and neighborhood pride. (42)
- The City has to be careful not to trample private property rights but clean neighborhoods are attractive (43)
- [deleted "including those that are publicly and privately owned"]; If "all" then why state ownership, what other types of ownership besides public and private are there? (47)

- This is not unimportant, but resources should not be put here if other goals are neglected (48)
- Important, but just not the most important (49)
- Increase code enforcement for absentee landlords and owners (51)
- How do you include low income individual homeowners (54)
- Who could disagree with this goal? (55)
- Garbage can/green/automated like Columbus, Ohio (57)

**Goal #5: Neighborhoods of Cincinnati include a mix of uses, including residential, retail, office, and recreation uses.**

- Good (1)
- Not to include commercial, industrial uses, that could be unsafe near residential areas (7)
- No – not even close. Offices are only downtown and recreation centers are sparsely scattered. (13)
- Extremely important (15)
- There is NO way that each and every neighborhood can have every amenity. This balkanization of neighborhoods is a core problem with the current level of expectations today. Specific example: Not every neighborhood can support its own business district. It's okay for multiple neighborhoods to share a district. (16)
- Again, all neighborhoods don't relate to such mixes (18)
- Needs greatly improve (21)
- When neighborhoods have a breadth of mixed use property it increases walkability which effects connectedness (22)
- This is important to me in supporting the community I choose to reside in; it creates walkability (23)
- The variety and mix of uses are critical to developing a nucleus/core (24)
- Many neighborhoods already have mixed-use – how do you revitalize these areas? (25)
- Leveraging natural and invested assets (34)
- Identify key areas of the neighborhood where a combination of recreation, and mix use can occur. Specifically – Roselawn needs a recreation center (38)
- We need to regulate the number of cell phone/market stores in the City. (39)
- Of course. (40)
- I want to be able to service my needs with a relatively low opportunity cost relative to where I live (43)
- Housing density increase should not be required, just encouraged where appropriate around NBDs (49)
- Neighborhoods without a mix of uses are far more important than neighborhoods without mix of housing types and income groups (50)
- It's good to increase housing density near NBD's, but NOT through division of single-family homes into multiple units. This activity should be prohibited. (51)
- Dense, mixed-use neighborhoods are greener and more sustainable. (55)

### **Goal #6: Each neighborhood of Cincinnati is walkable.**

- Not always (1)
- We are a long way off from this; perhaps its our “mid-sized” city size (12)
- Yep – somewhat but not at nights in Avondale and Over-the-Rhine! (13)
- Extremely important: Top goal; All actors should support and not run contrary to this. Basic services should be within walking distance. (15)
- Not sure how one can change a century-old development pattern. (16)
- Not necessarily (18)
- No and needs to be for health and less gas circulating in communities (21)
- When neighbors are able to commute by foot they become more familiar with each other, taking more pride in the area and ownership of neighborhood issues (22)
- To the maximum the natural geographic structure/landscape/terrain will allow (24)
- What’s the metric for walkability? Closeness to mixed-use, transit options, existing sidewalk (25)
- And accessible (27)
- + accessible (29)
- Yes but this goes hand in hand with safety! When a neighborhood has businesses that attractive negative activity, unleashed dogs, pit bulls etc – walking is not safe! (33)
- To what extent? Riverside one end to the other? Queensgate – for what purpose? “Safe + clean = walkable” (34)
- Important for both person and environmental reasons. Fosters neighborhood integration and limits the burning of green house gases (35)
- We should have a mix – some walkable and some drivable (40)
- A healthy city means being able to walk more. A lot of the sidewalks need repair (42)
- Walkability is useless if people aren’t safe. Also, the stores within walking distance of my house are the most expensive. (43)
- Infrastructure improvements are not necessarily the way to achieve this – try safety! (49)
- There are some auto-oriented areas in Cincinnati...the emphasis should be on enhancing existing pedestrian-friendly neighborhoods before remaking auto-oriented neighborhoods (51)
- Improve walkability, create complete streets. (55)

### **Goal #7: City and federal housing dollars are invested in neighborhoods more strategically to have a greater impact.**

- Yes (1)
- Yes (18)
- Clearly, neighborhoods like OTR need a complete overhaul. Link OTR, the Banks, the new casino district, and fountain square goals to create the downtown neighborhood. (2)
- City should not invest heavily where the market is developing! But concentrate on those neighborhoods where there is disinvestment to jump start (3)
- 1. Fix empty houses by employing people in the neighborhood; 2. Start with empty City owned buildings (4)
- Greater influence for neighborhoods to be part of the decision making process possibly include voting for more renovation to reduce blight and the concentration of poverty (5)

- Identify what is the most critical need in the community and invest dollars till you finish the goals of that neighborhood (6)
- YES! Invest where its MOST needed first to prevent failing neighborhoods (12)
- Where is this? I certainly have not seen my federal dollar at work. Where is this impact? (13)
- Be clear – set expectations – that city \$ will not be spread like peanut butter over all development equally. But also be clear about how the strategic decision-making is done. (16)
- As long as it is in my neighborhood (17)
- It is very political (21)
- How do you do this fairly? (25)
- Using universal design principles (27)
- Good idea – should not displace existing residents (e.g. Metropole) (29)
- Strategic for city or strategic for greater community or strategic for neighborhood? I don't think we can satisfy each neighborhood, but also don't like barring some neighborhoods from development. (31)
- Very important – unfortunately the way dollars are distributed is very political and timelines re: use doesn't always lead to a good use of federal \$! (33)
- I don't agree with the premise that state/federal tax dollars should be expected/counted upon. The goal should be to limit this dependency through economic self-sufficiency/private sector financial transactions. (34)
- A clear explanation of the question was not available so the votes cannot be accurate (36)
- Yes, but not in the area of social programs and free housing/health care, which must be paid for by others (39)
- With the strategy to reduce subsidized housing (40)
- The City has to be smart with the money they receive and invest them where they are needed. (43)
- What does “more strategically” mean? Some neighborhoods are strategic? There should be more citywide investment criteria (47)
- Of course, why would anyone not agree? Why is this even a question? I suggest collaboration and information sharing! (49)
- Use funds on projects and in neighborhoods to have the greatest impact, rather than spreading it around to appease everybody and achieve nothing of significance (50)
- These dollars should not be used as a political slush fund to reward certain interests or constituent groups. (51)
- Confusing statement (53)
- Leverage with historic tax credits for income-producing multi-family and commercial projects. (55)
- More strategic --- Need impact (57)

### **General Comments:**

- Introduction very informative (1)
- The City needs to be more creative and innovative in developing its policy and strategies in dealing with its housing and economic development (3)
- Include project for artists live/work housing in plan (7)

- [additional comments on format, predictability of Summit] (9)
- Who are the stakeholders? Who determines who sits at the decision table? Are there any real serious efforts to bring diversity to Cincinnati (13)
- Do any development in Cincinnati, you must sign and adhere to a contract to develop low income housing – span whole economic spectrum (14)
- These goals/critical questions support Transit-Oriented Development and by inference the streetcar as a foregone conclusion (34)
- Poor choice and wording of questions. It seems the questions were too broad without sensible choices. What is the agenda behind the questions??? (39)
- This is by far the most slanted, pre-determined Neighborhood Summit I've been to. Ridiculous transparent agenda; reduce subsidized housing by stopping subsidies and demolish apartments; increase single family/owner occupied (40)
- Perhaps there was too much focus on requirements, penalties, and enforcement and people are adverse to that. I would recommend incentives and bonuses to accomplish these goals and requirements (43)
- "Neighborhood Development" needs to include non-physical things such as community building, strengthening neighborhood associations, door-to-door visiting, etc (48)
- I feel like this would be more beneficial if the questions were worded differently and some data regarding the goals would be helpful. These questions were worded in a way that I felt like you were almost forced to agree. (49)
- Re: affordable housing requirement, you can't have a requirement and an incentive at the same time. If the choice is "you must do this or you can't build here" that's not an incentive. (51)
- Need to address issues of safety in conjunction with above, e.g. walkable and safe (52)
- Many of our urban core neighborhoods already have "template" for revitalization in place on the model of 19<sup>th</sup> century streetcar suburb. Rebuild the transit system. (55)