



City of Cincinnati

801 Plum Street
Cincinnati, OH 45202

Agenda - Final

Equitable Growth & Housing

Chairperson, Reggie Harris
Vice Chairperson, Meeka Owens
Councilmember, Jeff Cramerding
Councilmember, Mark Jeffreys
Councilmember, Liz Keating
Vice Mayor, Jan-Michele Kearney
Councilmember, Victoria Parks
Councilmember, Scotty Johnson

Tuesday, March 29, 2022

1:00 PM

Council Chambers, Room 300

ROLL CALL

PRESENTATIONS

New Housing Unit Report

William Weber, Assistant City Manager

Housing Proforma Activity

Bobby Maly; CEO, Model Group

AGENDA

1. [202200548](#) **MOTION**, submitted by Councilmember Cramerding, We respectfully ask the City Manager to engage in mediation efforts between OTR Adopt, First Lutheran Church, and any relevant parties, to ensure the continued ministry of First Lutheran Church which has a historical presence in the neighborhood, and to preserve the bell tower. (STATEMENT ATTACHED)

Sponsors: Cramerding

Attachments: [Motion 202200548](#)

2. [202200627](#) **MOTION**, submitted by Councilmember Harris, **WE HEREBY MOVE** that on March 31, 2022, the City of Cincinnati raise a Transgender flag in recognition of, celebration of, and solidarity with our transgender residents - on the International Day of Visibility for transgender people. And, that in light of procedural time sensitivity, this motion be considered an emergency measure necessary for the preservation of the public peace, health, safety, and general welfare, making it effective immediately. (STATEMENT ATTACHED).

Sponsors: Harris

Attachments: [Motion](#)

3. [202200628](#) **REPORT**, dated 3/16/2022, submitted by John P. Curp, Interim City Manager, regarding the Five-Year Estimates of Housing Unit Production.

Sponsors: City Manager

Attachments: [Report](#)

ADJOURNMENT



202200548

Jeff Cramerding
Councilmember

March 1, 2022

Motion

First Lutheran Church Bell Tower

We respectfully ask the City Manager to engage in mediation efforts between OTR Adopt, First Lutheran Church, and any relevant parties, to ensure the continued ministry of First Lutheran Church which has a historical presence in the neighborhood, and to preserve the bell tower.

BACKGROUND

The First Lutheran Church is a tremendous asset to Over-the-Rhine and the City of Cincinnati in its ministry, its focus on social justice, and as an architectural landmark. It would be a tremendous victory for the neighborhood and city if the tower could be preserved without inhibiting First Lutheran's critical work in the existing church.

Jeff Cramerding

NOV 20 1978

W. H. H. H.



Reggie Harris
Councilmember

March 9, 2022

Transgender Day of Visibility & the Raising of the Transgender Flag ('22)

MOTION

We hereby move that on March 31, 2022, the City of Cincinnati raise a Transgender flag in recognition of, celebration of, and solidarity with our transgender residents — on the international day of visibility for transgender people.

- And, that in light of procedural time sensitivity, this motion be considered an emergency measure necessary for the preservation of the public peace, health, safety, and general welfare, making it effective immediately.

STATEMENT

History of Transgender Day of Visibility: In 2009 Rachel Crandall, a U.S.-based transgender activist, founded this day to raise awareness for the incredible burden of discrimination the community faces in every setting imaginable. The need to bring a day of 'visibility' for the transgender community is indicative of the oppression they face in many sectors of life. Crandall wanted to highlight the fact that the only transgender-centric day that is internationally recognized is Transgender Day of Remembrance, which is in mourning of members of the community who had lost their lives, and that there was no day to pay homage to living transgender people. By 2014, the day was observed by activists in Ireland and Scotland while, in 2015, many transgender people took part in the event by participating in social media campaigns. They successfully made the day go viral by posting selfies and personal stories.

Therefore, on Transgender Day of Visibility on March 31, annually, we recognize and revere their contributions, successes, and relentless resilience in standing tall and strong in the face of injustice. Through this Day of Visibility, we hope to induce moral responsibility and tolerance, and lift the restrictions on the rights of transgender people.

History of Transgender Flag: The trans pride flag was designed by Monica Helms, an openly transgender American woman, in August 1999. It was first shown at a Phoenix, Arizona LGBT pride celebration the following year. Helms describes the meaning of the transgender flag as follows: "The stripes at the top and bottom are light blue, the traditional color for baby boys. The stripes next to them are pink, the traditional color for baby girls. The stripe in the middle is white, for those who are intersex, transitioning or consider themselves having a neutral or undefined gender. The pattern is such that no matter which way you fly it, it is always correct, signifying us finding correctness in our lives."

Citations:

<https://nationaltoday.com/transgender-day-visibility/>

<https://www.pointofpride.org/blog/the-history-of-the-transgender-flag>

March 16, 2022

To: Mayor and Members of City Council
From: John P. Curp, Interim City Manager
Subject: Five-Year Estimates of Housing Unit Production

Reference Document #202200178

On February 2, 2022, City Council referred the following motion for a report:

MOTION, dated January 21, 2022, submitted by Councilmember Harris, **WE MOVE** that the Administration provide a report within thirty (30) days outlining the number, neighborhood geography and Adjusted Median Income (AMI) range for new housing units that have come online in the City of Cincinnati for at least the last five (5) years. The administration shall take into consideration a variety of data sources, considering but not limited to: Building & Inspections, CAGIS, Cincinnati Waterworks, and other feasible and accurate sources.

Summary of Findings

In response to the subject motion, the Administration conducted a survey of all available and pertinent data sources that track housing production. This analysis produced the findings discussed below and also identified several opportunities for improvement in how the City collects and tracks data on housing production and the loss of housing units. This is a summary of the findings:

- New construction in the City added a total of 4,177 new units over the last five years, an average of 835 units per year. This excludes additional units created through renovation of already existing buildings.
- The City lost at minimum 1,325 units to demolition in that same time period, producing an estimated net increase in housing units through new construction of 2,852 units or an average of 570 units per year.
- The City created or preserved 1,280 income-restricted affordable housing units over the last five years, an average of 256 units per year. This includes 983 new affordable units created through new construction or renovation and 297 units that were preserved through renovation and otherwise would have been lost. The location and income limits associated with these units are detailed below.

Available Data Sources and Analysis

In coordination with the Department of Buildings and Inspections (B&I), CAGIS, Greater Cincinnati Water Works (GCWW), and the Department of Planning and Engagement, the Office of Performance and Data Analytics (OPDA) conducted a comprehensive review of available data sources and alternative methodologies to determine the most accurate estimate of new housing units¹ created,

¹ This report defines a New Housing Unit as a place where permanent provisions are provided for living, sleeping, eating, cooking and sanitation within a single unit with a length of stay exceeding 30 days.

by neighborhood, from 2017 to 2021. OPDA concluded that the B&I permitting data provided the most reliable stand-alone data source. Efforts to pair permitting data with additional data sources did not yield more refined estimates. As discussed below, B&I permitting data was utilized for estimating new construction of units and demolition of units.

B&I permitting data for new construction does not capture the market price for the housing units produced nor does it capture if a particular project will create new income-restricted affordable housing units.² Therefore, to estimate the number of affordable units constructed, the Department of Community and Economic Development (DCED) conducted an analysis of City-subsidized affordable housing projects within the last five-years. Since most all affordable housing projects require some level of City support and subsidy, this data set produces a strong estimate of overall affordable housing units created within the City.

Overall, this analysis identified several opportunities to improve the City’s practices on recording and capturing data regarding housing creation and loss in order to improve future tracking and reporting.

New Housing Unit Construction: 2017-2021

Housing units are created through both new construction and the alteration or renovation of existing structures (i.e., conversion of an existing single-family unit into a duplex or rehabilitation of a long vacant building to permit occupancy). However, during this analysis OPDA and B&I determined that the method utilized for capturing data on new housing units created through alteration or renovation was not consistent or reliable. As a result, the scope of the reported data below is limited to new construction only and does not include units added through alterations. Based on this analysis and findings, B&I is taking the necessary steps to improve data collection on creation of new units through alterations to ensure future reporting can include these units.

CY2017 – CY2021 NEW CONSTRUCTION HOUSING UNITS BY NEIGHBORHOOD

NEIGHBORHOOD	NEW CONSTRUCTION 2017-2021	AVG PER YEAR	NEIGHBORHOOD	NEW CONSTRUCTION 2017-2021	AVG PER YEAR
CUF	736	147.2	PENDLETON	8	1.6
MADISONVILLE	599	119.8	UNASSIGNED	7	1.4
MT. AUBURN	420	84	CALIFORNIA	6	1.2
DOWNTOWN	402	80.4	PLEASANT RIDGE	6	1.2
OAKLEY	316	63.2	CLIFTON	3	0.6
CORRYVILLE	237	47.4	KENNEDY HEIGHTS	3	0.6
WALNUT HILLS	209	41.8	CAMP WASHINGTON	2	0.4
EVANSTON	159	31.8	HARTWELL	2	0.4
MT. ADAMS	139	27.8	LINWOOD	1	0.2
AVONDALE	131	26.2	NORTH AVONDALE - PADDOCK HILLS	1	0.2
COLLEGE HILL	88	17.6	CARTHAGE	0	0
HYDE PARK	84	16.8	EAST WESTWOOD	0	0
OVER-THE-RHINE	81	16.2	ENGLISH WOODS	0	0

² This report defines an “Affordable Housing Unit” as a housing unit created with required tenant income limits.

SOUTH CUMMINSVILLE	80	16	LOWER PRICE HILL	0	0
NORTHSIDE	78	15.6	MILLVALE	0	0
MT. LOOKOUT	72	14.4	MT. AIRY	0	0
WEST END	58	11.6	NORTH FAIRMOUNT	0	0
ROSELAWN	50	10	QUEENSGATE	0	0
BOND HILL	38	7.6	RIVERSIDE	0	0
EAST END	37	7.4	SEDAMSVILLE	0	0
COLUMBIA TUSCULUM	36	7.2	SOUTH FAIRMOUNT	0	0
SAYLER PARK	26	5.2	SPRING GROVE	0	0
			VILLAGE		
EAST WALNUT HILLS	25	5	VILLAGES AT ROLL	0	0
			HILL		
MT. WASHINGTON	15	3	WEST PRICE HILL	0	0
WESTWOOD	13	2.6	WINTON HILLS	0	0
EAST PRICE HILL	9	1.8	TOTAL	4177	835.4

For reference, according to data from the 2020 Decennial Census, the City has a total of 139,567 occupied housing units. The average per year new construction unit count of 835.4 new units represents approximately 0.6% of this total. Further, the City of Cincinnati added 12,374 persons between the 2010 Decennial Census and the 2020 Decennial Census, an average of 1,237 persons per year.

Reductions in Housing Units: Demolitions and Vacated Buildings

While new construction adds additional housing units, there are many additional factors (e.g., market dynamics or lack of maintenance or repair) that can reduce housing units through demolition or required vacation of buildings. However, to date, available data sources do not allow the City to track with accuracy the unit count reduction resulting from these actions. Though the City's demolition contractors report unit counts, the existing data is not consistent or reliable.³ In order to provide at least a demonstration of the volume and geographic dispersion of demolitions, a graph is included below demonstrating the number of residential demolition permits issued per neighborhood over the last five years. It can be safely assumed that each permit accounts for at minimum a reduction in one housing unit. The contractor-reported unit count is also stated; however, as discussed this unit count reporting data is not consistent and, therefore, should not be relied upon.

Going forward, B&I is taking necessary steps to improve the data collection on a per-unit-basis for demolitions and the City's Vacated Building Maintenance License (VBML) list to ensure future reporting can more accurately account for these factors.

³ For example, contractors may not be able to determine the number of existing units in a building prior to demolition and as a result, record 0 or 1 unit for what may have been a multifamily building. Despite these limitations, the data does represent an approximation of residential demolition activity during the past 5 years. The table contains cases where Indicated Units is less than Demolition Permits. This highlights situations where 0 units were entered on the permit.

CY2017 – CY2021 DEMOLITION PERMITS BY NEIGHBORHOOD

NEIGHBORHOOD	DEMOLITION PERMITS	INDICATED UNITS	NEIGHBORHOOD	DEMOLITION PERMITS	INDICATED UNITS
AVONDALE	164	387	LINWOOD	13	15
WALNUT HILLS	117	215	LOWER PRICE HILL	13	22
EAST PRICE HILL	106	143	SEDAMSVILLE	13	14
SOUTH FAIRMOUNT	80	77	SOUTH CUMMINSVILLE	13	14
EVANSTON	75	82	OVER-THE-RHINE	12	7
HYDE PARK	73	84	EAST WESTWOOD	10	10
OAKLEY	52	43	CAMP WASHINGTON	9	3
CUF	42	57	CLIFTON	9	9
MADISONVILLE	42	54	DOWNTOWN	9	250
NORTH FAIRMOUNT	42	42	EAST WALNUT HILLS	9	13
MT. AUBURN	39	57	MT. AIRY	9	6
WEST END	34	40	PLEASANT RIDGE	9	16
WEST PRICE HILL	34	44	UNASSIGNED	8	4
CORRYVILLE	29	104	MT. WASHINGTON	8	4
MILLVALE	29	98	MT. ADAMS	7	7
MT. LOOKOUT	27	33	QUEENSGATE	7	0
RIVERSIDE	25	27	CALIFORNIA	5	6
WESTWOOD	25	34	SAYLER PARK	5	3
NORTHSIDE	23	21	HARTWELL	4	3
BOND HILL	19	21	KENNEDY HEIGHTS	4	5
EAST END	19	35	WINTON HILLS	4	0
COLLEGE HILL	17	13	NORTH AVONDALE - PADDOCK HILLS	1	20
COLUMBIA			SPRING GROVE VILLAGE	1	1
TUSCULUM	16	19	VILLAGES AT ROLL HILL	1	1
CARTHAGE	13	10			
			TOTAL	1325	2173

Income-Restricted Affordable Housing Unit Production: 2017-2021

As discussed above, B&I's permitting data captures construction activity, but it does not capture the market price of new housing units constructed or other data that would allow the City to determine affordability of new units constructed. However, due to the inherent need for gap-financing and subsidy in affordable housing projects, DCED is involved to some degree in the majority of projects in the City that produce income-restricted affordable housing units. The graphs below detail income-restricted affordable units created or preserved through construction or renovation in the City over the last five years, categorized by the maximum Area Median Income (AMI) permitted for the units and neighborhood.

**CY2017 – CY2021 AFFORDABLE UNIT PRODUCTION
BY AMI**

MAXIMUM AMI	NUMBER OF UNITS	AVG PER YEAR	PERCENT
30% AMI	59	11.8	5%
50% AMI	89	17.8	7%
60% AMI	941	188.2	74%
80% AMI	184	36.8	14%
120% AMI	7	1.4	1%
TOTAL	1280	256	

**CY2017 – CY2021 AFFORDABLE UNIT PRODUCTION
BY NEIGHBORHOOD**

NEIGHBORHOOD	NUMBER OF UNITS	PERCENT
WALNUT HILLS	261	20%
AVONDALE	260	20%
WEST END	260	20%
OVER-THE-RHINE	183	14%
PENDLETON	85	7%
CBD/DOWNTOWN	69	5%
NORTHSIDE	64	5%
LOWER PRICE HILL	52	4%
COLLEGE HILL	26	2%
EAST PRICE HILL	13	1%
MT. AUBURN	7	1%
	1280	

This information includes 983 new units generated from both renovations and new construction and also 297 units that were previously income-restricted units but necessitated renovations to preserve those units as quality, habitable affordable housing units.

As discussed above, the B&I permitting data does not include renovations, so it is not possible to determine a precise percentage of the overall housing units created that are affordable; however, the data does make clear that proportionately the City has added significant new affordable units in the last five years when compared to the level of overall new housing units produced.

For reference, the average total development costs for each unit constructed in these affordable housing projects totaled approximately \$260,000. The average City-subsidy required per affordable unit was approximately \$25,000.

Housing Affordability – Income Levels and Real Estate Market Analysis

In addition to production of new affordable housing units, two critical components to understanding housing affordability in our City is to understand the real estate market dynamics of existing housing stock as well as the income levels of our residents.

The primary sources for income and housing data are the United States Census, including the Decennial Census and the American Community Survey, and U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). HUD publishes City/Metro Adjusted Median Income data annually, based on the American Community Survey data, and DCED anticipates this data will be available for the Cincinnati Metro area in April 2022. Release of the full 2020 Decennial Census results have been delayed due to COVID-19, but this information presents a unique and valuable data source for understanding the current state of the City's housing market. Once available the Department of City Planning and Engagement will complete a by-neighborhood analysis to include Occupied Housing Units, Age of Units, Housing Values, Renter Occupied Units, Rent Levels, and Income levels. This additional income and housing data analysis will be provided as a follow-up to this report.

cc: William Weber, Assistant City Manager
Eric Jamison, Director of the Office of Performance and Data Analytics
Markiea Carter, Director of the Department of Community and Economic Development