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Introduction

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN INITIATIVE

The City of Ithaca is preparing a new Comprehensive Plan. The objective is to articulate a vision for the future of Ithaca with clear goals and policies, and to create a blueprint that identifies the strategies and actions to be taken to achieve that future. Although there have been many plans prepared in Ithaca for different geographies and issue areas, there has not been a full community-wide General Plan put in place since 1971.

This current initiative to prepare the City of Ithaca Comprehensive Plan will have multiple points of focus: examining issues at the local level, the City’s relationship to the overall urban area and surrounding institutions of higher education, as well as a future growth strategy that is focused on environmental sustainability, equity, and universal design principles. The Comprehensive Plan will guide future planning and development in areas including, but not limited to, affordable housing, transportation systems, economic development, community building, and quality of life enhancement. The concepts and principles of sustainability will be integrated throughout the plan.

PHASE I OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN PROCESS

The City of Ithaca Planning and Development Board is responsible for the preparation and recommendation of a new Comprehensive Plan to the Common Council, which has the exclusive power to formally adopt the plan for the City. The Board has established a Comprehensive Plan Committee which includes representation from the Common Council, the Planning and Development Board, and the Town of Ithaca, along with representation from established City advisory boards and from other stakeholder groups intended to reflect a broad and diverse range of community and neighborhood interests. The Comprehensive Plan Committee is meeting regularly to review interim products, manage a public participation process, and provide guidance and direction on the preparation of the new Comprehensive Plan. Care was taken to assemble a committee representing diverse interests and to reflect a cross-section of opinions and perspectives.

This project is Phase I of a two-part effort. Phase I is to focus on an overall vision for the City, resulting in an “umbrella document.” Phase II, which will follow, will involve more detailed neighborhood plans and thematic plans. This Phase I plan will set the context for Phase II implementation actions.

Steps in the Process for Phase I

Task 1: Project Start-up
Task 2: Existing Conditions and Planning Analysis
Task 3: Evaluate Environmental/Sustainability Strategy Options
Task 4: Review and Affirm Values
Task 5: Develop Plan Framework
Task 6: Prepare Draft Plan with Implementation Strategies
Task 7: Phase 2 Groundwork
Task 8: Prepare Comprehensive Plan
Task 9: Environmental Review
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Introduction

The new Comprehensive Plan will include attention to sustainability issues to bring those to the forefront of the planning process, addressing the topics of Energy Conservation Measures; Sustainable Development Analysis; and Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction. Specifically, energy use and conservation strategies, along with strategies to achieve the City’s climate protection goals, will be incorporated into Tasks 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6.

ABOUT THE PLANNING INFLUENCES REPORT

PURPOSE

This Planning Influences Report is designed to serve as a documentation of existing and emerging community conditions that will influence policy decisions made during the planning process. This report has multiple objectives:

1. **Describe the History of Ithaca’s Land Development Patterns** - to help set the context for consideration of current conditions.
2. **Summarize Existing Plans and Studies** - to summarize all of the existing planning documents that influence current policy decisions made by the City of Ithaca and to describe the relevance of these documents to the Comprehensive Planning effort.
3. **Summarize Existing Community Conditions** - to provide a baseline of data and trends on existing conditions in the City, including land use and zoning, population and housing, employment, environmental features, historic resources, parks and recreational facilities, and community services and utilities.
4. **Summarize the Transportation System** - to summarize the City’s existing transportation system, including roads, transit, pedestrian and bicycle facilities.
5. **Review Projections and Estimate Land Capacity** - to review projections and estimates of growth scenarios for the City of Ithaca in the future, with consideration of new development and potential redevelopment of existing areas.

ORGANIZATION OF REPORT

This report is designed to be user friendly by providing information in a “snapshot” or quick reference format. The report is organized into five parts that align with the objectives of this report:

- Introduction (this section)
- Part 1: History of Growth Patterns
- Part 2: Summary of Existing Plans and Documents
- Part 3: Summary of Existing Conditions
- Part 4: Transportation System
- Part 5: Projections and Land Capacity
- Part 6: Summary

This report also includes an appendix which holds:

1. Maps referenced throughout the report
2. A full synopsis of existing plans and documents
3. Examples of typical street cross-sections
4. Assumptions for the land capacity analysis
In order to help set the context for consideration of facts and information in this Planning Influences Report, the following narrative has been assembled to highlight key events and conditions that have shaped the physical form of Ithaca today. Understanding why and how the existing City form and character have evolved as they have helps expand the understanding of current conditions and current influences that are at work now shaping the Ithaca of tomorrow.

This narrative starts with consideration of natural constraints and opportunities. Ithaca's terrain is marked by a valley, the "Flats," surrounded by steep hills on the west, south, and east, and by Cayuga Lake to the north. The City is cut by three major creeks that cascade down these hillsides and empty into Cayuga Lake. The original settlement of Ithaca occurred in the Flats.

In 1806 a street network was laid out, a series of north-south streets in a grid on the dry, flat land between Cascadilla and Six Mile Creeks. The City's early accessibility by overland turnpikes helped encourage linear development from east to west.

In 1821 Ithaca, with a population of about 1,000 residents, was incorporated as a Village. The recognized center of Ithaca in 1821 was the corner of Owego (now State) and Tioga Streets. All official notices were posted on that corner. By 1824 seven major turnpikes served Ithaca. All of these turnpikes came down East Hill and left Ithaca up the Inlet Valley. As Owego (State) Street became a main thoroughfare to the rapidly developing area at the inlet, linear development began along State Street.

The first 15 years after incorporation were particularly important because it was during this period that the core components of the street plan were put on the ground. During this time the Village population more than quadrupled from 860 to almost 4,000. Sidewalks were built and the Village boundaries were extended.

In 1831 a map for the Village was prepared that extended the north-south grid pattern to the area bounded by Brindley, Cascadilla, Factory, and Clinton Streets. (This map was the foundation for the present street system.) Much of the growth of the Village was in the form of peripheral expansion around the established core.

In 1835 the grid was extended up East Hill and the area west of Auburn Street was laid out at a diagonal to the village's original plat.

One of the key events in the history of Ithaca was the opening of a Morrill Land Grant College here in 1868. Cornell University received a charter in 1865 and was named after Ezra Cornell, who presented a gift of two hundred acres of farm land on East Hill. On October 7, 1868 Cornell University formally opened and admitted the first class of 412 students. It grew over the next four decades and became the nation's second largest university. University-related development immediately began on East Hill.

In 1870 an iron bridge was built over Six Mile Creek at Aurora Street, which eased access between South Hill and downtown Ithaca. By 1880, when the
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Ithaca Gun Company was founded, the City population reached 9,105. In 1888, Ithaca was incorporated as a city, and became the twenty-ninth city in the state of New York. Civic development continued with arrangements for streets, water, lighting, streetcars, traffic regulation, and social service programs.

Over the next two decades many changes occurred which transformed this small industrial village and college town. A strong local economy of maturing new large-scale industries emerged (e.g. Ithaca Gun and International Salt Co.). These new industries, combined with the steady growth of Cornell University in the 1890's led to a sustained building boom in Ithaca through the turn of the century. In 1892, W. Grant Egbert founded the Ithaca Conservatory of Music, which later became Ithaca College.

Most of the new building during this period took place on East Hill, where the demand for student and faculty housing had become acute. Around the turn of the century the City began to grow outside the bounds of the old village settlement along the Flats. By 1889 most of land in the Flats had been developed. In the 1890’s development began on the hills surrounding the Flats, first on East Hill adjacent to Cornell University, then on South Hill, and later on West Hill. This growth was accelerated with a major expansion program at Cornell University beginning in 1902, with the establishment of the New York State College of Agriculture.

By 1900 Ithaca's population stood at 13,136 people. In the 1920’s the automobile increased Ithaca’s accessibility and established the City as the central place for employment and retail services in the county. In 1923 a citizen’s committee was appointed to consider and formulate plans for a comprehensive program of permanent improvements for the City. In 1926 the first City Planning Commission was appointed. The City's population reached 20,000 people in 1930.

The end of World War II ushered in a new era of development. By 1950, the City's population was approaching 30,000 people. In 1956, the 42 existing suburban school districts merged with the Ithaca City School District. And from 1960 through 1965, Ithaca College constructed an entirely new campus in the South Hill area, in the Town of Ithaca. In 1968 the College's final academic department moved to the South Hill campus from downtown, making the move complete.

The year 1974 saw the opening of the Ithaca Commons pedestrian mall. Its boundaries are Green Street to the south, Cayuga Street to the west, Seneca Street to the north, and Aurora Street to the east. The Commons was created in part to counteract a new proposed mall in the Village of Lansing (Pyramid Mall). This was a time that many small towns in the United States were experimenting with creating pedestrian malls. The Ithaca Commons is one of the few such experiments that remains.

Much interest continues to be focused on the Commons and the area immediately around it as the heart of the community. One project completed was Seneca Place, a multistory mixed use building, incorporating retail, office space, and a Hilton Garden Inn hotel. The Cayuga Green project has brought the Commons area a new multi-level parking garage, new rental housing, and retail space on Green Street (along with new retail space on the first floor of the garage). Phase two of the project will bring a luxury apartment complex and a multiplex movie theater.
The Ithaca Farmers Market first opened for business in 1973 as a venue for local growers and craftspeople to sell their goods. The rapidly expanding market moved five times before settling in its current location. Now on the waterfront where steamboats from Cayuga Lake used to dock, the Ithaca Farmer’s Market has successfully anchored itself. The market has developed into a thriving community gathering place. Recently a dock was built to accommodate local fishermen, people arriving by boat, and those who want a picturesque picnic spot. The Market has continued to grow and prosper, often attracting well over 5,000 people a day. What was originally an innovative way to sell local produce, crafts, and baked goods is now an Ithaca tradition.

In 1988, Cornell opened its new Center for Theatre Arts in Collegetown, and the Ithaca/Tompkins County Convention & Visitors Bureau became operational. Collegetown development increased significantly during the 1980’s, shifting more retail activity and rental student housing nearer to the Cornell campus, and creating more density in this area of East Hill. This period saw significant growth both at Cornell and Ithaca College, both with new academic buildings and new campus residential halls. In 1990 the City population stood at 29,541 people. The next decade saw the construction of the state-of-the-art Ithaca College Science Building, a new U.S. Post Office, and a new $11 million terminal at Tompkins County Airport.

Development outside of the central core has included affordable housing and Eco Village on West Hill, retail development and suburban style housing to the east, and light industrial redevelopment on South Hill.

The land area of the City is currently almost fully developed.
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**INTRODUCTION**

Part 2: Summary of Existing Plans and Documents discusses existing planning documents and efforts that are important to include as part of the Comprehensive Planning process. The planning documents are divided into five categories:

- Comprehensive Plans
- Transportation Plans
- Neighborhood/District Plans and Regulations
- Park and Natural Resource Plans
- Other Related Studies, Reports, and Plans

This section provides the highlights from each of the planning documents and the relevance of each to the current Comprehensive Planning process. A full summary of these documents is included in the appendix of this report.

**LISTING AND DESCRIPTIONS OF PLANS AND DOCUMENTS**

**COMPREHENSIVE PLANS**

- Ithaca, NY: A General Plan
- Tompkins County Comprehensive Plan
- Tompkins County Five Year Progress report on Comprehensive Plan Implementation

**TRANSPORTATION PLANS**

- ITCTC: 2030 Long-Range Transportation Plan
- Ithaca Bicycle Plan

**NEIGHBORHOOD/DISTRICT PLANS AND REGULATIONS**

- Downtown Ithaca 2020 Strategic Plan
- Ithaca Commons Preliminary Design
- Collegetown Urban Plan and Conceptual Design Guidelines
- Northside: Turning the Corner
- Design Guidelines for the Southwest Area and Elmira Road-Meadow Street Corridor
- West End Urban Design Plan
- West Hill Master Plan

**PARK AND NATURAL RESOURCES PLANS**

- Stewart Park Rehabilitation Action Plan: Park Building and Landscape Improvement Projects
- NYS Local Waterfront Revitalization Program: Cayuga Lake Waterfront Plan
- Southwest Natural Area Master Plan

**OTHER RELATED STUDIES & PLANS**

- Ithaca Sustainable Design Assessment Team
- Compass II-2.0: Interim Report
- Report of the Joint City/Town Study Group on Shared Services and Consolidation
- City of Ithaca HUD Entitlement Program 2009-2013 Consolidated Plan
- Cornell Master Plan for the Ithaca Campus
- Affordable Housing Needs Assessment
- Route 96 Corridor Study
- t-GEIS Report - Cornell
- Tompkins County Housing Strategy

---


Adopted in 1971, this document is the last General Plan prepared for the City of Ithaca. The major parts of the plan include Land Use, Community Facilities, Community Activities, Special Community Projects, and Circulation. The initial chapters introduce the planning effort and development objectives, and contain helpful information about historical developments within the City and current conditions (as of 1971).

The development objectives of the Ithaca General Plan provide guidance for building a community in which each resident has an opportunity to exercise his or her full potential in seeking worthwhile economic, educational, cultural, and physical goals. The plan outlines eight specific development objectives, as documented in the full summary listed in the appendix. A copy of the 1971 plan’s projected land use map is also provided in the appendix.

**Relevance to this Planning Process**

The 2012 Comprehensive Planning process will provide a new Comprehensive Plan for Ithaca, replacing the 1971 plan. The new plan will include a vision that describes the ideal state of the community in 2035, accompanied by goals, policies, and strategies for achieving the vision. The development objectives from the 1971 plan may provide a solid foundation for the new vision, goals, and policies.
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Tompkins County Comprehensive Plan (2004)

The Tompkins County Comprehensive Plan provides the traditional planning elements to guide future development in the County: a community vision outlined through planning principles, documentation of existing community conditions, and identification of particular implementation mechanisms to achieve the planning principles. The plan’s ten planning principles are organized under four main topics (full list of principles are included in the appendix summary):

- Regional Cooperation
- Housing, Transportation, and Jobs
- The Environment
- Neighborhoods and Communities

The plan also includes alternative development scenarios and evaluations of these scenarios for their impact on the County’s fiscal health, land use patterns, and impacts on transportation, infrastructure, and natural resources.

Relevance to this Planning Process

The County’s Comprehensive Plan contains various planning principles that may provide a basis for updating the City’s vision, goals, and policies. In particular, the principles associated with the City’s development patterns should be reviewed, as should those related to coordination with the County and other regional entities. Additionally, the actions identified in the implementation chapter should be reviewed, especially those items that clearly involve the City of Ithaca.

Tompkins County Five Year Progress Report on Comprehensive Plan Implementation (2009)

This report provides an update on the status of the 61 actions identified in the 2004 Tompkins County Comprehensive Plan, as well as 17 actions added with the adoption of the Energy and Greenhouse Gas Emissions element in 2008. Many of the action items have been completed or are underway. The report also includes a list of proposed actions for the next five years.

Relevance to this Planning Process

It will be important to coordinate the City’s implementation priorities and action plan with the County’s 2009 Comprehensive Plan progress report. Many of the items identified in the list of proposed actions relate to and/or involve the City of Ithaca.

Transportation Plans

Transportation planning documents summarized in this section include:

- ITCTC: 2030 Long-Range Transportation Plan
- Ithaca Bicycle Plan

ITCTC: 2030 Long-Range Transportation Plan (2009)

Adopted by the Ithaca-Tompkins County Transportation Council (ITCTC), the 2030 Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) is the third update to the original LRTP that was developed in 1995. The LRTP covers a 20-year
Part 2: Summary of Existing Plans and Documents

planning horizon to 2030. The 2030 vision for the future of the Tompkins County transportation system embraces the concept of sustainable accessibility – the ability to get to a destination or complete a task in an efficient, convenient, and reliable way, while using technologies and services that minimize environmental impacts, promote economic vitality, and ensure equity in the provision of transportation to the community. The plan identifies mobility, proximity, connectivity, integration, and quality of life as the components of sustainable accessibility, and establishes a series of goals and objectives for each component. These goals are summarized in the appendix of this report.

Relevance to this Planning Process

The 2030 LRTP provides useful information about the regional transportation system, and is a good source for recent demographic data and trends. While broad, the plan’s goals can serve as a basis for many of the City’s comprehensive transportation goals and policies. The detailed maps and technical discussions in the LRTP will help inform the transportation and mobility elements of the City’s Comprehensive Plan.


The City of Ithaca Bicycle Plan was developed to determine bicycle facilities to be developed in the short-term to effectively spend $80,000 in ISTEA (Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act) funds, and to outline a long-term vision for the City of Ithaca to increase bicycle use while increasing safety for cyclists, pedestrians, and motorists.

Two main goals are incorporated in the plan: (1) double the percentage of total trips made by bicycles within the City of Ithaca, and (2) simultaneously reduce the number of bicycle-related deaths and injury accidents by ten percent. The plan outlines specific objectives towards achieving these goals. The plan also establishes two bikeway route network plans – a phase one bikeway route network, and a long-term bikeway route network.

Relevance to this Planning Process

Although not a recent effort, the Ithaca Bicycle Plan provides useful information about the vision for the long-term bicycle network in the City. Through the Comprehensive Planning effort, it will be helpful to revisit the goals for bicycling in the community, as well as the status and key priorities of the proposed bicycle networks.

Neighborhood/District Plans and Regulations

This section summarizes the following neighborhood and district plans and regulations:

- Downtown Ithaca 2020 Strategic Plan
- Ithaca Commons Preliminary Design
- Collegetown Urban Plan and Conceptual Design Guidelines
- Northside: Turning the Corner
- Design Guidelines for the Southwest Area and Elmira Road-Meadow Street Corridor
- West End Urban Design Plan
- West Hill Master Plan
Downtown Ithaca 2020 Strategic Plan (2010)

Prepared by the Ithaca Downtown Alliance, the Downtown Ithaca Strategic Plan identifies “the community big idea” as a three-pronged package to revitalize the urban core, reduce regional sprawl, reduce the community’s carbon footprint, bolster tourism, and strengthen the linkages between institutions of higher education and downtown. The three objectives of the “community big idea” are as follows:

- The creation of 1,500 new urban residential housing units in downtown and along the West State Street corridor.
- The rebuilding of the Ithaca Commons to enhance its commercial and community functions, and its recasting as a transit hub, but with a streetcar or other form of enhanced transit running through the middle of the pedestrian mall.
- The creation of a new enhanced transit program and route that connects the Commons with Cornell University and Collegetown, Ithaca College, and the West End/Waterfront. The enhanced transit could be a streetcar or trolley that would strengthen and encourage corridor development.

Relevance to this Process

Through the Comprehensive Planning process, it will be important to review, consider, and potentially incorporate goals and projects identified by the Ithaca Downtown Alliance in the Downtown Strategic Plan into the City of Ithaca’s Comprehensive Plan.

Ithaca Commons Preliminary Design (2010)

The Ithaca Commons Preliminary Design document summarizes the planning process and presents the preferred option for upgrading and investing in Ithaca Commons, the economic and social heart of Ithaca’s downtown. The preferred Preliminary Design calls for a traditional streetscape configuration along State/MLK Street, with a wide central corridor kept clear for pedestrian and service movement through the space, narrow bands of tree plantings lining either side, and a clear zone along the face of storefronts, providing space for window shopping and outdoor dining.

Relevance to this Process

Building on the Downtown Strategic Plan, the preliminary design for the upgrades to Ithaca Commons represents a new vision for significant reinvestment in Downtown Ithaca. Should this design concept continue to be pursued as the preferred option, the Comprehensive Plan could support this direction through the plan’s vision, policies, and implementation strategies.


The planning document consists of two parts: Part One, prepared by the City’s Planning and Development Board and endorsed by the Common Council, supersedes and replaces all portions of Part Two where the documents differ. Part Two is the 2008 version of the plan, prepared by Goody Clancy Associates. The planning process and development of both parts of the plan involved extensive public input and participation. The plan outlined several character areas that were designed to protect the surrounding residential neighborhoods by concentrating new development in central Collegetown. In addition, the plan outlined the components of a multi-
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layered sustainable transportation system that aims to address the issues of parking and congestion in Collegetown, while positively influencing the development economics in the area. Although this plan has not been formally adopted, it was endorsed by the Common Council in August, 2009.

Relevance to this Process

The Collegetown plan is a relatively recent effort that involved extensive public participation and feedback. For these reasons, it could serve as a very valuable source of information about community concerns and expectations for the Comprehensive Planning process. The plan also provides very detailed information about existing conditions in the Collegetown area, which will help inform the Planning Influences Report. Likewise, the plan’s vision, scenarios, guidelines, and implementation strategies establish a solid foundation for the Comprehensive Plan, both for the Collegetown area, and possibly for other similar parts of the community.

Northside: Turning the Corner (2003)

Prepared by the Northside Neighborhood Association, the purpose of the Northside: Turning the Corner plan is to ensure that the Northside neighborhood remains a healthy, viable community. The planning process focused on resident empowerment, a resident-driven effort, inclusion, outreach, diversity, representative participation, attention to neighborhood assets, and collaboration with City Hall and the greater community. Major findings and recommendations of the plan include physical and social projects to build on neighborhood assets.

Relevance to this Process

This plan serves as an excellent example of a successful neighborhood-led planning effort in Ithaca. Elements of the plan’s process can help inform the public participation strategies for the Comprehensive Plan. Moreover, the strategies identified to improve the neighborhood could be reviewed and possibly extended to other similar neighborhoods and areas of the City.

Design Guidelines for the Southwest Area and Elmira Road-Meadow Street Corridor (2000)

The Design Guidelines cover two different but related areas in the City of Ithaca: (1) the Southwest Area and (2) the Elmira Road-Meadow Street Corridor. The primary goals of the guidelines are to encourage development that contributes to Ithaca’s unique character and to supplement the existing site plan review criteria with more specific interpretations for each study area.

Relevance to this Process

The design guidelines will help provide a useful basis for the vision of future development and design in the southwestern and Elmira Road-Meadow Street areas, and may help inform the vision for other new development and redevelopment areas as well.

West End Urban Design Plan (1999)

The plan outlines the overall vision for the West End area, and identifies the basic design concepts and standards that will be implemented as new development occurs through the Site Development Plan Review process and
the adoption of a new zoning classification. The planning vision identifies the principal aims of the study, which include:

- Redevelopment that results in a visually appealing urban mixed-use district including retail,
- Office and residential uses,
- Protection of the traditional residential neighborhoods east of Meadow Street,
- Easing the impacts of the anticipated transition west of Meadow Street from single-family houses to denser mixed uses, which may include residential uses, without diminishing the overall potential for redevelopment, and
- Creation of an attractive and safe pedestrian environment coexisting with high volume traffic.

The design standards established in the plan address topics such as the street wall, building heights, separation between commercial and residential uses, waterfront development, and other elements.

Relevance to this Process

Many of the design standards identified in the West End Urban Design Plan are not incorporated into the City’s zoning regulations. The plan contains a helpful map depicting the area of the West End area. The Comprehensive Planning process offers the opportunity to revisit the vision for this area and to check in to see if the current zoning regulations are helping to implement this vision.

West Hill Master Plan (1992)

The West Hill Master Plan serves as a general guide for the development of West Hill. The plan identifies various planning issues and documents the existing conditions in the area. Planning issues and recommendations address a variety of topics including natural features, open space and recreation areas, environmental protection, public infrastructure, emergency vehicle access, neighborhood character, and land use and zoning.

Relevance to this Process

While relatively outdated, the West Hill Master Plan helps show the history of development of the West Hill area, one of the somewhat newer significant development areas within the community. Pockets within the West Hill area remain undeveloped. Some community members want to preserve these areas, while others may see these areas as possible opportunities for future residential growth and development. The Comprehensive Planning process offers an opportunity to revisit and confirm the vision and goals for these pockets, within the context of overall vision and goals for the broader neighborhood and overall community.

PARK AND NATURAL RESOURCE PLANS

The following park and natural resource plans are summarized in this section:

- Stewart Park Rehabilitation Action Plan: Park Building and Landscape Improvement Projects
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- NYS Local Waterfront Revitalization Program: Cayuga Lake Waterfront Plan
- Southwest Natural Area Master Plan

Stewart Park Rehabilitation Action Plan: Park Building and Landscape Improvement Projects (2011)

The Rehabilitation Action Plan effort involved study of various buildings and landscape projects at Stewart Park. Some of the preliminary priority projects identified include:

- Design and reconstruction of the small pavilion.
- Cascadilla Boathouse Stairway, with leadership by the Cascadilla Boat Club.
- Community build of new roof and renovations to Concession building to make space usable for special events.
- Renovation of the Memorial Flagpole Garden.
- Construction of an All-Children’s Playground.
- Seeking grant funding for the Performance Pier and Pavilion Plaza.

Relevance to this Process

The improvements and projects identified in the Stewart Park Rehabilitation Action Plan present many opportunities ranging from leisure and recreation, to economic development and community-building. The vision for the park and goals for the improvement projects provide ideas for the overall community vision and goals, especially related to the topics of parks and recreation facilities, economic development, visitor attraction, and community-building and events.


One of the implementation strategies identified in the 1997 Tompkins County Waterfront Plan was to prepare a Local Waterfront Revitalization Program (LWRP). The LWRP is administered by the NYS Department of State and provides participating communities more leverage in acquiring state and federal funds for implementing waterfront projects. Five key issues and opportunities emerged during the inventory phase and are listed in the appendix.

Additionally, an outline of 13 policy categories and 57 sub-policies, developed by the NYS Department of State, were considered in the development and implementation of the plan. Those policies applicable to Tompkins County are followed by a description of actions recommended in the plan to implement the policy. Various specific projects and initiatives are also proposed in the LWRP to address these policies, issues, and opportunities.

Relevance to this Process

While the Cayuga Lake Waterfront Plan covers an area broader than the City of Ithaca, it does contain detailed information regarding existing conditions in the City’s waterfront area. It also establishes specific goals, policies, projects, and initiatives for the waterfront area, many of which are extremely relevant to the City and will help guide the waterfront discussion in the Comprehensive Planning effort.
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Southwest Natural Area Master Plan (2000)

The Southwest Natural Area was assembled by the City of Ithaca primarily as substitute parkland for the designated Southwest Park, located adjacent to the natural area. The former Southwest Park was determined to have better uses as development parcels. The Master Plan was created in advance of any development on the adjacent commercially zoned site.

Relevance to this Process

It will be important to coordinate plans for the future commercial development of the former Southwest Park area with the Southwest Natural Area Master Plan, in order to ensure that development is compatible with the natural features that make the site unique and worth preserving. Additionally, the Southwest Natural Area Master Plan contains valuable information about circulation, drainage, and other topics which will be helpful to inform the Comprehensive Plan and future options for the development of the commercial site.

Other Related Studies, Reports, and Plans

The following other related plans and studies are summarized in this section:

- Ithaca Sustainable Design Assessment Team
- Compass II-2.0: Interim Report
- Report of the Joint City/Town Study Group on Shared Services and Consolidation
- City of Ithaca HUD Entitlement Program 2009-2013 Consolidated Plan
- Cornell Master Plan for the Ithaca Campus
- Affordable Housing Needs Assessment
- Downtown Housing Strategy (2011 Danter Study)
- Reconnaissance Level Survey of Historic Resources
- Route 96 Corridor Study
- I-GEIS Report – Cornell
- Tompkins County Housing Strategy

Ithaca Sustainable Design Assessment Team (2010)

The Sustainable Design Assessment Team (SDAT) program focuses on the importance of developing sustainable communities through design. In 2010, the SDAT Team worked closely with local officials to assist the City of Ithaca and its citizens in addressing issues facing downtown, regarding the need to connect more effectively to other commercial districts in the community.

Relevance to this Process

The SDAT document provides numerous examples and models of success from other communities, and identifies other resources that can be leveraged for information and support. Also, the key observations and recommendations contained in the document could serve as preliminary ideas for the vision and goals in the Comprehensive Plan.

Compass II-2.0: Interim Report (2009)

The United Way of Tompkins County (UWTC) and the Human Services Coalition of Tompkins County (HSC) conducted a county-wide community asset and needs assessment, COMPASS II, in 2003. At that time, UWTC made a commitment to conduct similar assessments on a regular basis. As a result, a second round of the needs and assets assessment, COMPASS II-
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2.0 was initiated, and this report provides an interim summary of information collected for those purposes. A major component of COMPASS II-2.0 is a survey of households in Tompkins County.

Relevance to this Process
The survey data provided in the COMPASS II-2.0 Report provides very helpful background information and trends that can inform the Comprehensive Plan process, especially as it relates to service needs of the community. While the survey covers the entire county, many of the findings directly relate to issues within and services provided by the City of Ithaca, including employment opportunities, transportation, environmental health, and others.

Report of the Joint City/Town Study Group on Shared Services and Consolidation (2009)
In May 2006, a resolution was passed to set up a “Joint Study Group” to investigate possible shared services and/or municipal consolidation opportunities between the City of Ithaca and Town of Ithaca. This report was produced by the Joint Study Group (JSG) and is intended to serve as a guide for informing the potential merging or sharing of services.

Relevance to this Process
One of the major outcomes of this report was the recommendation for the City and Town to develop a close relationship while updating their Comprehensive Plans. As the Comprehensive Planning process proceeds, it will be valuable to periodically check-in with the Town of Ithaca about the status of their planning effort, and to coordinate goals and implementation strategies (including the possible sharing of services and/or consolidation).

City of Ithaca HUD Entitlement Program 2009-2013 Consolidated Plan (2009)
The City of Ithaca’s five-year Consolidated Plan describes program goals for federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Investment Partnership Programs funds. This is the first update to the 2004-2009 Consolidated Plan. Since 2003, the City of Ithaca has been designated by HUD as an “Entitlement Community” and has an annual grant from HUD through the CDBG and HOME programs.

Relevance to this Process
The Consolidated Plan also identifies housing and community development needs of the Ithaca community; its community development and other goals may help provide the basis for goals and policies related to affordable housing and other topics in the Comprehensive Plan.

Cornell Master Plan for the Ithaca Campus (2008)
Prepared for Cornell University, the campus master plan is a living document that weaves together the functional relationships, environmental issues, landscaping, recreational space, vehicular and pedestrian traffic patterns, architectural character, and future possibilities into a whole, to realize the aspirations of the university. In its most simplified form, the heart of Cornell’s campus today springs from a formal quadrangle and an avenue running along a north-south axis situated within and connected to a dramatic and rugged natural setting. In the years to come, this pattern will be redirected
along Tower Road’s east-west axis and reinterpreted to guide growth and provide a framework for development. In time, a large central quadrangle uniting the two sides of today’s campus will be created on the Alumni Fields. This larger vision is captured in six words: open, green, compact, integrated, engaged, and connected.

**Relevance to this Process**

Cornell University plays a major role in the City of Ithaca, in terms of population, employment, housing, and many other factors. Because the master plan establishes a clear vision and framework for future development and change on the Ithaca campus, it will be essential to coordinate the Comprehensive Plan with Cornell’s plan for the future. In addition, the master plan provides valuable information regarding campus population/size projections, which will not only influence plans for university facilities, but also the greater Ithaca community.

---

**Affordable Housing Needs Assessment (2006)**

This affordable housing needs assessment examines the facts behind the housing availability and affordability problems for some population groups and household income categories in the county. The analysis is based on the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) guidelines. The most important finding of the assessment is that Tompkins County and its municipalities and non-profits will need to mobilize planning, development and community organization resources over the next ten years to stimulate and facilitate the siting and construction of 2,500+ units of housing that are affordable to households with incomes at 100% of the county household median income level and below.

**Relevance to this Process**

This assessment clearly identifies the need for additional housing units (both affordable and market-rate) in Tompkins County, including the City of Ithaca. This will be an important consideration in the housing element of the Comprehensive Plan, as well as plans for future land uses and permitted development intensities.

---

**Downtown Housing Study (Danter Study)**

This study was prepared by the Danter Company in 2011 for the Downtown Ithaca Alliance, and was designed to identify multifamily residential development opportunities and strategies in Ithaca. The study projected that over the next 5 years there is overall housing demand for up to 1,350 units in the Downtown Effective Market Area consisting of up to 350 for-sale housing units and up to 1,000 rental housing units.

**Relevance to this Process**

This study identifies significant demand for additional housing in downtown Ithaca. This information is an important consideration as policy options are considered in the Comprehensive Plan regarding density and locations for additional dwelling units in the City.

---

**City of Ithaca Reconnaissance Level Survey of Historic Resources**

The City of Ithaca Reconnaissance Level Survey of Historic Resources identifies areas of the community that have the potential to become recognized historic districts, and identifies areas where further survey work may be undertaken to understand the potential for future designation of...
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historic resources. Currently historic resource survey is underway for a potential Henry St. John historic district and individual historic resources in Collegetown.

Relevance to this Process

Awareness of existing and potential future historic districts and resources is an important consideration as the City faces pressures for new development and redevelopment.

Route 96 Corridor Study

The Route 96 Corridor Management Study evaluated traffic impacts associated with development along the corridor from the Village of Trumansburg to the junction of NYS Routes 96 and 13.

Relevance to this Process

The City of Ithaca Common Council adopted a resolution in 2010 to endorse the study’s goals for nodal development and protection of open space along the corridor, and to continue discussions as the City reviews its plans.

t-GEIS Report - Cornell

Cornell’s transportation-focused generic environmental impact statement evaluates the university’s transportation-related impacts and possible mitigations for potential growth over the next decade.

Relevance to this Process

Analysis of university-related commuting patterns, along with potential strategies to mitigate transportation impacts, should be considered in the development of strategies in the City’s new Comprehensive Plan.

Tompkins County Housing Strategy

The 2007 Tompkins County Housing Strategy follows on the County’s 2006 Affordable Housing Needs Assessment. The Strategy describes the need for new housing by location within the County, and suggests strategies for promoting affordable housing.

Relevance to this Process

The availability and cost of housing within the City of Ithaca is a key issue. Coordination with public and private partners is a critical component of potential strategies, and coordination with County efforts will be an important piece of the new Comprehensive Plan.

RECAP

Ithaca has a great wealth of past planning initiatives to build upon. What is clear is that the City needs a well-defined, overarching vision that incorporates, synthesizes, and reinforces the local area plans and connects them in an integrated framework. Updates and revisions to these plans should also be identified to ensure plan recommendations are still relevant. These existing plans can serve as the foundation for Phase II of the Comprehensive Plan process.
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OVERVIEW

In order to create the best plan for the future, it is important to understand what conditions and trends exist today. This section of the report provides a summary of the current conditions in the City of Ithaca, along with a discussion of key trends facing the community.

The summaries in this section address ten key topic areas:

- Land Use
- Ownership Patterns
- Current Zoning
- Population
- Housing
- Employment
- Environmental Features
- Historic Resources
- Parks, Recreation, Natural Areas, and Trails
- Community Services and Utilities
- Fiscal Health

In addition to the topic summaries, a series of inventory maps is provided in the report appendix.

PLANNING AREA

- Situated at the southern end of Cayuga Lake, and near the center of Tompkins County, New York, the incorporated City of Ithaca encompasses approximately 6 square miles.
- For purposes of the Comprehensive Plan, the planning area is the same as the City's corporate limits (see Map 1: Planning Area).
- Cornell University and Ithaca College are major influences in the planning area. A portion of the Cornell University campus is located within the City of Ithaca, while the remainder is located in the adjacent Town of Ithaca. The Ithaca College campus is located directly south of the City.

Key Facts

CITY/TOWN COORDINATION

- The City of Ithaca is surrounded by the Town of Ithaca, which encompasses approximately 30 square miles. While the City and Town operate as independent jurisdictions, the areas are closely related and impacted by each other's land-use patterns and decisions. The Town of Ithaca is also preparing an update to its Comprehensive Plan, so ongoing coordination between the City and Town Comprehensive Planning efforts will be important for the success of both plans.

SEE MAPS:
1: Planning Area
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LAND USE

This section contains information about existing land use patterns in the City. A map in the Appendix shows the distribution of existing land uses geographically, and Figure 1 and Table 1 below show a breakdown of land use by type of use (e.g., commercial, residential, etc.). Highlights include:

- As shown in Map 2: Existing Land Use, the most predominant land use in the City of Ithaca is residential (39% or 1,141 acres).
- Nearly 16% of the land in the community (461 acres) is currently used for park/recreation/natural area purposes, and nearly 13% of land is used for Cornell University or Ithaca College (368 acres).
- Approximately 251 acres are currently vacant or undeveloped.
- Public and quasi-public organizations (such as community groups, religious organizations, schools, etc.) occupy almost 205 acres.

Figure 1: Existing Land Use

Key Facts

MIX OF LAND USES

- The City of Ithaca features a wide variety of existing land uses, ranging from low-density residential neighborhoods to higher-density mixed-use areas such as Collegetown and Downtown. Preserving opportunities for a mix of land uses and intensities of development will help the City accommodate residents and businesses with various needs in the future.

ROADWAYS AND SURFACE PARKING

- The City of Ithaca is currently covered by nearly 92 miles of roadways and approximately 230 acres of parking. This is an important factor to consider as the community grows, and redevelopment pressure increases for areas currently used for surface parking. These areas are included in the general uses in Figure 1 to the right and Table 1 on the following page (e.g., a store’s parking lot would be included in the commercial land category).
- The City’s off-street parking requirements were written decades ago and should be re-examined. There is concern that parking requirements that are too high can encourage higher traffic in neighborhoods and prevent opportunities for increased density.

Sources:
City of Ithaca GIS data, 2012

See Maps:
2: Existing Land Use
Table 1: Existing Land Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1,141.3</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park/Recreation/Natural Area</td>
<td>460.7</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/University</td>
<td>368.1</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>345.7</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant/Undeveloped</td>
<td>251.0</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Quasi-Public</td>
<td>204.9</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad/Utility</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,908.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                        |             |            |
| Total Paved Surface Parking Lots | 231.4       | 7.9%       |
| Total Paved Street Surfaces      | 379.5       | 13.0%      |
| **TOTAL PAVED SURFACES**        | **610.9**   | **21.0%**  |

It is useful, in thinking about existing land use patterns, to consider how much land is taken up by paved areas for streets and surface parking lots. These areas of impervious surface are significant in designing strategies for water quality, stormwater management, and community character. In addition, paved surface parking lots can often represent opportunities for infill and redevelopment strategies, in considering the prospect of strategically replacing surface lots with more productive land uses. The extent of land used for surface parking lots is a factor that is also related to the issue of automobile use and promotion of alternative mobility options.

In 2008, ITCTC used GIS to measure the surface area of the City covered by parking and road surfaces. 231 acres of land (almost 8% of the total acreage of the City) are devoted to surface parking. 380 acres (13% of the total acreage of the City) are devoted to road surfaces. This is a combined total of 21% of the City paved for vehicle use and storage. In Table 1, these areas are included in the general uses shown in the top part of the table (e.g., a store’s parking lot would be included in the commercial land category). The last three rows of the table break out information for paved areas Citywide.

Map 2 in the Appendix shows the location and extent of these paved surfaces Citywide. The two maps following here show blow-ups of the two areas where the incidence of large paved parking surfaces is most prevalent within the City of Ithaca: in the Southwest Area and around the western end of State Street.
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ITHACA’S PAVED SURFACES

- Maps to the right are blow-ups of Map 2 in the Appendix (which shows existing land use patterns throughout the City). Shown with crosshatches on these maps are areas of the City used for surface parking. Most of these larger paved parking areas exist in the Southwest area (top map) and the western end of State Street (bottom map). The prevalence of very large surface parking lots is most common in the Southwest area.

Existing Land Use

- RESIDENTIAL
- COMMERCIAL
- MIXED-USE
- INDUSTRIAL
- PARK/RECREATION/NATURAL AREA
- PUBLIC/QUASI-PUBLIC
- UNIVERSITY
- RAILROAD/UTILITY
- RIGHT-OF-WAY
- VACANT
- PAVED PARKING AREA
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**OWNERSHIP PATTERNS**

- As shown in Map 3: Property Ownership, and summarized in Figure 2, below, most land within the planning area is privately owned (52.9%).
- The City of Ithaca owns about one-fifth of property in the planning area (19% or 553.7 acres). Of that City-owned land, approximately 447 acres is for parks and recreation uses.
- Other major property owners in the planning area include religious and community organizations, such as Cornell University (13.6%), churches, housing organizations, sororities, and fraternities (7%), the State of New York (2.9%), railroad and utility providers (2%), the City of Ithaca School District (1.7%), and Tompkins County (0.8%)
- Less than 1% of properties in the planning area are owned by Ithaca College, the federal government, the Ithaca Urban Renewal Agency (IURA), and the Town of Ithaca.

**Figure 2: Property Ownership**

**KEY FACTS**

**PUBLIC VS. PRIVATE OWNERSHIP**

- Approximately 53% of all land within the City of Ithaca is owned by private individuals or organizations. The remaining is owned by public and quasi-public organizations such as the City of Ithaca, religious and community organizations, educational institutions, and other governmental entities.

**PROPERTY TAX REVENUE**

- A significant amount of land in the City of Ithaca is exempt from paying property taxes (39% of the total planning area). As a result, about 64.2% of the total assessed value of properties in the City is exempt or partially exempt from paying property taxes. Properties owned by the City of Ithaca and Cornell University make up the largest amount these tax-exempt properties. The amount of property tax revenue collected directly correlates with the types of services and programs the City of Ithaca is able to fund.

**SOURCES:**

City of Ithaca GIS data, 2012, New York State Office of Real Property Tax Services, 2012

**SEE MAPS:**

3: Property Ownership
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Table 2: Property Ownership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Owner</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>1,544.4</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Ithaca</td>
<td>553.7</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>397.7</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious/Community Organization</td>
<td>193.7</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of New York</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Provider/Railroad</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Ithaca School District</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tompkins County</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithaca College</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Federal Government</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithaca Urban Renewal Agency (IURA)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Ithaca</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2,918.4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TAX ROLL STATUS

- In addition to showing ownership information, Map 3: Property Ownership identifies tax-exempt properties. Nearly 8% of the parcels in the City of Ithaca are exempt from paying property taxes. While these tax-exempt parcels comprise a relatively small portion of the total number of properties, they encompass more than a third of the planning area (39% or 1,018 acres).
- Taxable properties cover approximately 61% of the planning area and account for 92% of all parcels.
- According to the New York State Office of Real Property Tax Services, the total assessed value of all parcels in the City of Ithaca is $3.9 billion. The total assessed value of exempt properties in the City is $2.5 billion. In other words, approximately 64% of the total assessed value of properties in the City is wholly or partially exempt from property tax assessment.

Table 3: Tax Roll Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Roll Status</th>
<th>Total Parcels</th>
<th>% of Total Parcels</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taxable</td>
<td>5,072</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
<td>1,559</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>1,018</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5,509</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2,578</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CURRENT ZONING

- As illustrated on Map 4, the City of Ithaca has 18 zoning districts and 4 overlay zones.
- Nearly half (45.8%) of the community falls within residential zones (R-1, R-2, R-3, R-U, and MH-1).
- Approximately one-fifth of the City falls within the P-1 Park zone, which allows public recreation, and other public and semi-public facilities.
- University zoning covers approximately 12.6% of the City.
- Business and industrial zones cover 7.6% of the City (including B-1, B-2, B-4, B-5, CBD, and I-1).
- The remaining 13.7% of the community is covered by other specialty zoning districts, including C-SU, M-1, WEDZ, SW, and WF.

Table 4: Zoning Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone ID</th>
<th>Zone District Name</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>501.3</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>Two Family Residential</td>
<td>485.2</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>290.0</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-U</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1</td>
<td>Restricted Business</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>General Business</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-4</td>
<td>Service Business</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-5</td>
<td>Service Business</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>Central Business District</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-SU</td>
<td>Court House Special Use</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-1</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>104.1</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-1</td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>596.3</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-1</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>375.4</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH-1</td>
<td>Mobile Homes</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEDZ</td>
<td>West End Zone</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>302.5</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WF</td>
<td>Waterfront</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,966.1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Overlay Zoning Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overlay Zone District Name</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gorge Protection</td>
<td>75.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic District</td>
<td>265.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Uses</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegetown Parking</td>
<td>87.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>464.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY FACTS

ZONING

- The zoning map for the City of Ithaca identifies current permitted land uses and activities. While helpful in providing immediate direction for developers, it does not identify desired future patterns of development or land uses beyond what is permissible today. Many Comprehensive Plans contain a future land use map to illustrate the overall vision for City development and change, and to provide a foundation for future zoning districts and regulations.

ZONING SUB-DISTRICTS

- Nearly every zoning district in the City of Ithaca contains a series of sub-districts (e.g., R-1a, R-1b, etc.). The sub-district regulations provide detail for topics such as lot size, lot coverage, building height, and yard dimensions. In many ways, these sub-districts function as separate zone districts due to the complexity of regulations for each sub-district.

MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT

- Most of Ithaca’s business zoning districts allow residential dwelling units as permitted uses. This opens the door for creative use of properties and mixed-use development.

SOURCES:
City of Ithaca GIS data, 2012

SEE MAPS:
4: Current Zoning
Figure 3: Current Zoning

KEY FACTS

BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT

- The Downtown Ithaca Business Improvement District (DIBID) is a non-profit organization charged with the revitalization, development, promotion, and management of downtown Ithaca. The DIBID operates as the Downtown Ithaca Alliance (DIA). The DIBID is not a zoning district, but the DIA does support and guide downtown development, in accordance with its approved Downtown Ithaca 2020 Strategic Plan.
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**POPULATION**

**HISTORICAL POPULATION**
- Since the 1950s, the City of Ithaca’s population has remained relatively steady at 30,000 residents. In contrast, Tompkins County has grown considerably over the past 60 years, from just over 59,000 residents in 1950 to more than 101,564 residents in 2010.
- The Town of Ithaca and other areas account for much of the County’s growth. The City’s share of the County’s population has dropped from nearly 50% in 1950, to about 30% in 2010.

**Table 6: Historical Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>City of Ithaca Population</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Tompkins County Population</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>City Share of County Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>29,257</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59,122</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>28,799</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
<td>66,164</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>26,226</td>
<td>-8.9%</td>
<td>77,064</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>28,732</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>87,085</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>29,541</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>94,097</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>29,287</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
<td>96,501</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>30,014</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>101,564</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4: Historical Population**

**STUDENT POPULATION**
- According to the 2010 American Community Survey 5-year estimates, nearly 57% of the City of Ithaca’s population is enrolled in college or graduate school.

**KEY FACTS**

**POPULATION CHANGES**
- While the population of Tompkins County has grown considerably over the past 60+ years, the City of Ithaca’s population has remained relatively constant.

**COUNTING THE STUDENT POPULATION**
- 2010 American Community Survey 5-year estimates indicated that approximately 17,016 students were enrolled in college or graduate school in the City of Ithaca in 2010. Total 2010 undergraduate and graduate/professional enrollment at Cornell University’s Ithaca campus is estimated at 20,939. Census and American Community Survey data may not account for all college students in the community due to the low response rates associated with student populations.

**SOURCES:**
- US Census, 1950-2010
- 2010 American Community Survey 5-year Estimates

**SEE MAPS:**
- 5: Population Distribution
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Table 7: Student Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>City Population</th>
<th>College Student Population</th>
<th>Student Share of City Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>29,541</td>
<td>16,361</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>29,287</td>
<td>16,915</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>30,014</td>
<td>17,016</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Population Density

- In 2010, there were approximately 9,437 people per square mile in the City of Ithaca. As illustrated in Map 5: Population Distribution, the highest-density areas of the community are generally located near Cornell University.

Sex, Age, and Race

- According to the 2010 Census, the median age of residents in the City of Ithaca is 22.4 years. This is much lower than the median age of residents in Tompkins County (29.8 years), state of New York (38.0 years), and overall United States (37.2 years).
- A very substantial proportion of the City’s residents are age 29 or younger (70.6%). Many of these residents comprise the City’s large college student population (17,016 students).
- In contrast with its large student population, the City of Ithaca has a very small senior population (only 5.9% of residents are 65 years and older).
- The City of Ithaca’s population is evenly divided between males (50.4%) and females (49.6%).
- The most prevalent race of Ithaca residents is white (70.5%), followed by Asian (16.2%), and black/African American (6.6%). Nearly 7% of City of Ithaca residents are Hispanic or Latino.

Figure 5: Population by Sex and Age

KEY FACTS

STUDENT POPULATION
- The composition of the population in the City of Ithaca is quite different from national trends. The median age of residents is 22.4 years old, whereas the national median age is much older at 37.2 years. Nationally, approximately 29.2% of the population is age 62 and over, compared with only 13.2% of the population in Ithaca. It will be important for the City of Ithaca to continue to balance the needs of students with other segments of the population.

AGE IN OTHER UNIVERSITY COMMUNITIES
- The City of Ithaca’s age trends are consistent with other university communities in that the population is significantly younger than national averages, and seniors comprise a much smaller proportion of the population. For instance, the City of Boulder, Colorado (home to the University of Colorado), has a median age of 28.7 years, 52.2% of the population is age 29 or younger, and 8.9% of the population is 65 years and older. Another example is the City of Burlington, Vermont (home to the University of Vermont), which has a median age of 26.5 years, 56.2% of the population age 29 or younger, and 9.4% of the population age 65 and older.
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HOUSING

HOUSEHOLDS

- In 2010, there were 10,408 households in the City of Ithaca.
- Non-family households comprise 72.3% of households in the City of Ithaca, whereas family households comprise approximately 27.7% of households.
- Of all households in the City of Ithaca, only 12.9% have children under age 18.

Table 8: Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>City of Ithaca Total Households</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Average Household Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>9,617</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>10,287</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>10,408</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HOUSING UNITS

- In 2010, there were 10,950 total housing units in the City of Ithaca.
- According to the 2010 Census, approximately 95.1% of Ithaca’s housing units are occupied, meaning the housing vacancy rate is 4.9%. Other housing studies conducted in the City show even lower vacancy rates.
- According to the 2006-2010 American Community Survey 5-year Estimate, more than half of Ithaca’s housing units were built before 1940 (54.4%). A surge of housing unit construction occurred in the 1970s, and few housing units have been constructed since the 1990s.

Figure 6: Year Structure Built

KEY FACTS

AGING HOUSING STOCK

- More than half of housing units in the City of Ithaca were constructed before 1940. While many of these units are in good condition, some have not been adequately maintained or are not configured to satisfy current demands of smaller, non-family, and rental households. Many of the older housing units (approximately 600) are designated as historic resources that cannot be redeveloped. Reinvestment in existing homes and redevelopment in certain areas may be necessary in order to accommodate the housing needs of the City’s population. Adaptive reuse and restoration of historic properties may provide avenues to increase housing opportunities.

HOUSING OPTIONS AND VACANCY

- The City’s low vacancy rate (less than 5% in 2010) means that the market is tight and residents are limited in their options for finding housing.

STUDENT HOUSING SPILLOVER

- The City’s large student population puts significant pressure on housing markets in all areas of the community. Because the rental housing market is tight, students are looking beyond the campus and Collegetown areas for housing options. This has led to “spillover” student housing in some nearby neighborhoods as more properties convert to rentals and experience higher occupant turnover.

SOURCES:
City of Ithaca GIS data, 2012
US Census, 1990-2010
2006-2010 American Community Survey 5-year Estimates
### Part 3: Summary of Existing Conditions

#### HOUSING TENURE
- The majority of occupied housing units in the City are renter-occupied (73.6% or 7,656 units). Only 26.4% percent of housing units are owner-occupied (2,752 units).
- Housing tenure trends are very different in the City of Ithaca than in Tompkins County and the rest of the State of New York. In the City, the majority of occupied housing units are rentals, whereas in the County and State, the majority of occupied housing units are owner-occupied. In Tompkins County, renter-occupied housing units comprise 45% of occupied housing units, whereas in the State of New York, 46.7% of occupied housing units are renter-occupied.
- The average household size of renter-occupied units in the City of Ithaca is 2.09 people per household, whereas the average size of owner-occupied housing units is 2.29 per household.

#### Table 9: Housing Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Occupied Housing Units</th>
<th>% Renter-Occupied Housing Units</th>
<th>% Owner-Occupied Housing Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>9,617</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>10,278</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>10,408</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### HOUSING COSTS
- In 2010, the median value of owner-occupied housing units in the City of Ithaca was $171,400 (compared with $162,100 in Tompkins County).
- The median monthly owner cost for housing units with a mortgage was $1,529. The median gross rent paid in 2010 was $822 in the City of Ithaca. Nearly 56% of rental households paid 35% or more of their household income for rent.
EMPLOYMENT

EMPLOYMENT AND INCOME

- In the City of Ithaca, 56.1% of people are part of the labor force, while the remaining 43.9% of people are not part of the labor force.
- The unemployment rate in the City of Ithaca is 4.2%.
- The mean travel time to work in Ithaca is 15.4 minutes.
- The 2010 median household income in the City of Ithaca was $30,919. Nearly one-fifth of households (19.4%) had a total household income of less than $10,000. In 2010, per capita income was $17,346.
- Of all families in the City, 10.6% had income below the poverty level. 32.1% of families with a single, female head of household and related children under 18 years of age had income below the poverty level.

INDUSTRY

- Cornell University and Ithaca College play a major role in employment in the City of Ithaca, as the educational services, health care, and social assistance industries employ 55.9% of the City’s workers.
- Other significant industries in the City of Ithaca include arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation, and food services (10.2%), and retail trade (6.5%).
- Approximately 6.6% of workers in the City of Ithaca are self-employed.

Table 10: Employment by Industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>City Employment Estimate</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale trade</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and warehousing, and utilities</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and insurance, and real estate and rental and leasing</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, scientific, and management, and administrative and waste management services</td>
<td>1,107</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational services, and health care and social assistance</td>
<td>8,308</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, entertainment, and recreation, and accommodation and food services</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services, except public administration</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>14,863</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY FACTS

SUPPLEMENTAL ASSISTANCE

- In 2010, approximately 10% of the population in the City of Ithaca received food stamp/supplemental nutritional assistance program benefits. This is higher than the national average of roughly 9.3%.

HIGHER EDUCATION EMPLOYMENT

- In 2011, Cornell University employed 1,564 faculty members and 8,081 staff members (full- and part-time). Also in 2011, Ithaca College employed 701 faculty members and 1,074 staff members (full- and part-time). Together, these institutions employed more than 11,400 people in the greater Ithaca area. The City of Ithaca is poised to continue to capture much of this employment and employment in related industries due to its proximity to the two institutions.

SOURCES:

2006-2010 American Community Survey 5-year Estimates
New York State Department of Labor, Labor Statistics, 2011
Cornell University, 2012
Ithaca College, 2012
ENVIRONMENTAL FEATURES

HYDROGRAPHY
- The City of Ithaca is situated at the southernmost edge of Cayuga Lake, the longest of New York’s Finger Lakes.
- In 1969, the Army Corps of Engineers completed construction of the Cayuga Inlet. This flood control channel is designed to alleviate flood conditions.
- As illustrated on Map 6: Environmental Features, other significant hydrological features in the City of Ithaca include Six Mile Creek, Fall Creek, Beebe Lake, and Cascadilla Creek.

FLOOD HAZARD AREAS
- Boundaries of flood hazard areas are identified on Map 6: Environmental Features.
- The 100-year floodplain covers approximately 766 acres within the City of Ithaca in areas near Cayuga Lake and alongside the major streams and waterways, as well as the southwestern portion of the community. The 500-year floodplain encompasses another 576 acres, mostly within the central and southern portions of the community.
- The City of Ithaca has adopted policies and standards to regulate building and development activity within flood hazard areas.

WETLANDS
- Two wetland areas, covering approximately 27 acres, are located in the northern portion of the community.
- One of the wetlands areas is located within Fuertes Bird Sanctuary, and the other is located north of Newman Golf Course.
- Environmental review is required for development projects located near wetlands.

TOPOGRAPHY
- Central Ithaca is relatively flat, but surrounded by steep hills and dramatic gorges. The steepest slopes are found along Fall Creek, Cascadilla Creek, and Six Mile Creek.
- The Fall Creek and Cascadilla Creek gorges are protected by Gorge Protection (GP) overlay zoning regulations.
- Nearly 18% of the land within the City of Ithaca slopes by at least 15%. Approximately 2% of land slopes by more than 45%.
HISTORIC RESOURCES

- As illustrated on Map 7: Historic Resources, there are seven historic districts in the City of Ithaca. Combined, these historic districts cover 265.5 acres.
- Six of these are local historic districts, which means that the areas have unique local significance. The City’s Landmarks Preservation Ordinance serves to preserve and protect these important local historic resources.
- Additionally, four of the seven historic districts are listed on the National Register of Historic Places, which is the official list of the nation’s historic places worthy of preservation. There is some overlap between the locally and nationally designated historic districts in the community. The City of Ithaca does not have special historic-related review control of properties or districts listed only on the National Register.
- The City of Ithaca Reconnaissance Level Survey of Historic Resources identifies areas of the community that have the potential to become recognized historic districts, and identifies areas where further survey work may be undertaken to understand the potential for future designation of historic resources. Currently historic resource survey is underway for a potential Henry St. John historic district and individual historic resources in Collegetown. Awareness of existing and potential future historic districts and resources is an important consideration as the City faces pressures for new development and redevelopment.
- In addition to the historic districts, there are 23 individually designated historic landmarks in the City, which are not located within historic districts (see Map 7: Historic Resources). Nineteen of these are locally designated and four are listed only on the State and National Registers of Historic Places. Individual landmarks include historic structures at Cornell University, former industrial buildings, homes, a former school, a theater, and other structures.

Table 11: Historic Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic District</th>
<th>Size (Acres)</th>
<th>Designation Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cornell Heights</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>National, Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Hill</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>National, Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Hill</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell Arts Quad</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewitt</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>National, Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithaca Downtown</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton Block</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>265.5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY FACTS

INFILL COMPATIBILITY
- Because limited land is available in the City of Ithaca, most future development will likely occur as infill or redevelopment in established areas. As infill and redevelopment activities increase, it will be important for the City to balance the needs of new development with the continued protection of and emphasis on compatibility with existing historic resources and districts.

SOURCES:
City of Ithaca website, 2012
City of Ithaca GIS, 2012

SEE MAPS:
7: Historic Resources
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KEY FACTS

PARKS AND RECREATION RESOURCES

- The City of Ithaca has an abundance of parks, recreation, natural areas, and trail resources. As new development and redevelopment occur over time, it will be important to tie this development in with these existing assets, and to complete or preserve opportunities for future improvements and additions to the parks, natural areas, recreation, and trails systems.

SOURCES:
City of Ithaca GIS data, 2012

SEE MAPS:
8: Public Facilities

PARKS, RECREATION, NATURAL AREAS, AND TRAILS

PARKS AND RECREATION

- There are nearly 440 acres of parks within the City of Ithaca (see Map 8: Public Facilities).
- The City’s parks range in size from large, regional parks like Stewart Park and Cass Park, to small neighborhood parks such as Washington Park and Bryant Park.
- The existing park level of service (LOS) is approximately 14.5 acres of parkland per 1,000 people. This means the City of Ithaca has a tremendous supply of parkland available to meet the various needs of residents and visitors.
- The City of Ithaca features a wide variety of recreational offerings in its parks including athletic fields, trails, tennis courts, playgrounds, and picnic areas. Unique recreational offerings include the Newman Golf Course, Alex Haley Pool, Cass Park Pool, Cass Park Ice Rink, canoe launch, and the Stewart Park Carousel.

Table 12: Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Size (Acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allan Treman Marina (State Park)</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn Park</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker Park</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brindley Park</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryant Park</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass Park</td>
<td>103.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Street Park</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conley Park</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conway Park</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeWitt Park</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dryden Road Park</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillview Park</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maplewood Park</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDaniels Park</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negundo Woods</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart Park</td>
<td>177.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strawberry Fields</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson Park</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus Triangle</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Horn Park</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Park</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Street Park</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>437.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### NATURAL AREAS

- In addition to parks, the City features three designated natural areas that encompass almost 900 acres. Stewardship of the natural areas is supported by the Natural Areas Commission.

**Table 13: City Natural Areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Area Name</th>
<th>Size (Acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ithaca Falls Natural Area</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuertes Bird Sanctuary</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Mile Creek Natural Area*</td>
<td>762.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>862.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Much of this area is located outside of the City’s incorporated limits.*

### TRAILS

- The City of Ithaca has an extensive network of existing, planned, and proposed trails within and adjacent to the planning area.

**Table 14: City Trails**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trail Name</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Length (miles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multi-Use Trails</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cayuga Waterfront</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Diamond</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hill Recreation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACS Multi-Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian Trails</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Mile Creek System</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascadilla Gorge</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascadilla Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circle-the-City</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Fall Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Fall Creek</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuertes Bird Sanctuary</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Natural Area</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliff Street</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inlet Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thematic Walks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Sagan Planet Walk</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside African American History Walk</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.L.K. Jr. Freedom Walkway</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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COMMUNITY SERVICES AND UTILITIES

EDUCATION

Public and Private Schools

- The City of Ithaca is served by the Ithaca City School District. In 2012, the district reported a total enrollment of 5,275 students in public schools and 624 students in non-public schools. Public and private schools that serve the City are identified in the table below. The District also serves the towns of Ithaca, Danby, Enfield, and Caroline, as well as portions of Dryden, Cayuga Heights, and Lansing villages.

- The Cornell University Program on Applied Demographics prepared enrollment projections for New York’s school districts. The projections for the Ithaca City School District show overall enrollment will likely total between 5,063 and 5,416 students in 2019. This means that in the next decade overall enrollment is not likely to increase or decrease dramatically. However, as students age and shift through grade levels, over and under-capacity issues may arise at various school facilities, especially if enrollment increases or decreases suddenly or significantly.

Table 15: Schools Serving the City of Ithaca

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>2012 enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belle Sherman Elementary</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly J. Martin Elementary</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cayuga Heights Elementary</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Creek Elementary</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hill Elementary</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boynton Middle</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeWitt Middle</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithaca High</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>1,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehman Alternative</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Roots School</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascadilla School</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immaculate Conception School</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldorf School of the Finger Lakes</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home School</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Not all schools that serve the City are located within Ithaca’s City limits.

- In 2010, the Ithaca City School District maintained good standing for all subjects and graduation rates, pursuant to State of New York school district accountability standards.
- In 2010, the District reported 517 total teachers and an average class size of 18 students for grades 1-6. Approximately 26% of the district’s students are eligible for free lunch, and 6% are eligible for reduced-price lunch.
- Pre-kindergarten programs are available at numerous schools and other organizations throughout the community.
Cornell University

- Cornell University is the federal land-grant institution of New York State, a private endowed university, a member of the Ivy League/Ancient Eight, and a partner of the State University of New York.
- Cornell’s Ithaca campus features seven undergraduate units, and four graduate and professional units. The campus is partially located within the City of Ithaca as well as the Town of Ithaca.
- Total undergraduate and graduate/professional enrollment in 2010 in Ithaca was 20,939.
- In addition to the Ithaca campus, Cornell University has two campuses located in New York City (the Weill Cornell medical campus, and a technology campus under construction on Roosevelt Island), a campus in Qatar, and many other programs and facilities throughout the United States and world.

Ithaca College

- Ithaca College, founded in 1892, is a private, coeducational college offering undergraduate and graduate programs in business, communications, health sciences and human performance, humanities and sciences, music, and interdisciplinary studies.
- Ithaca College’s campus is located on South Hill in the Town of Ithaca.
- In 2011, total enrollment at Ithaca College was 6,760.

Library

- The Tompkins County Public Library is located at 101 East Green Street in Downtown Ithaca.
- The library’s collection exceeds 244,000 items. Other services provided by the library include free internet access, interlibrary loans, language learning materials, and continuing education opportunities.

POLICE SERVICE

- The Ithaca Police Department is a full-service agency that patrols the entire City of Ithaca. The department’s headquarters are located at 120 East Clinton Street.
- In 2012, the department employs 73 sworn officers, ranging from patrol, and investigations to specialty units (such as SWAT, bike patrol, traffic unit, warrants, and downtown Ithaca Commons patrol).
- Based on the 2010 population of 30,014, the level of service of the Ithaca Police Department is approximately 2.4 officers per 1,000 residents. The general level of service (LOS) standard nationwide is about 2.0 to 2.5 officers per 1,000 residents.
- City officers also frequently provide emergency responses to the Town of Ithaca and Cornell University through a mutual aid agreement.
- The Cornell University Police Department also provides safety services to the university campus. Duties include, but are not limited to patrolling the university, emergency response, crime prevention, investigation, and enforcement of state laws and campus regulations.
- The University Police staff consists of 70 members, 54 of who are sworn officers.
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**FIRE PROTECTION**
- The Ithaca Fire Department currently employs 67 career/uniformed staff members and 3 civilian employees.
- The Ithaca Fire Department has a minimum staffing level of 11 career emergency response personnel. Often there may be only 11 emergency response personnel on duty (8 fire fighters and 3 officers).
- The Ithaca Fire Department currently serves both the City and Town of Ithaca (excluding Cayuga Heights). Stations include the following:
  - Central Station – 301 W. Green Street
  - Station 5 (South Hill) – 965 Danby Rd.
  - Station 9 (East Hill) – 309 College Ave.
  - Station 6 (west Hill) – 1240 Trumansburg Rd.
- Services provided by the department include fire suppression and prevention, emergency medical services (EMS), rescue, critical incident response, and fire cause and origin determination.

**ELECTRIC AND GAS**
- Electric and gas service in the City of Ithaca is provided by NYSEG (New York State Electric and Gas), a subsidiary of Iberdrola USA.
- NYSEG offers a variety of energy efficiency programs and renewable energy options to residential and business customers.

**SOLID WASTE**
- The City of Ithaca provides curbside trash and yard waste collection for the residents of the City. Trash tags are required to pay for the collection of the trash and yard waste, and tags may be purchased at City Hall or local grocery stores.
- Recycling within the City is performed by the Tompkins County Solid Waste Management Division.

**WATER SYSTEM**
- The City of Ithaca Water Treatment Plant serves over 35,000 customers by treating 3.27 million gallons of water each day. Plans are currently underway to rebuild the treatment plant.
- The source of the City’s water is a reservoir on Six Mile Creek. Water drawn from the reservoir flows by gravity to the water treatment plant.
- After treatment, finished water is distributed to the public through a distribution network consisting of roughly 85 miles of ductile iron and cast iron water mains.
- The distribution system also includes three pumping stations and six water storage tanks.
- In 2011, the City of Ithaca Water & Sewer Division met and exceeded the requirements of the annual water quality test set forth by New York State Public Health Law standards.
**Wastewater System**

- There are approximately eighty miles of sanitary sewer mains located underground throughout the City of Ithaca.
- The City maintains separate sanitary and stormwater collection systems.
- Wastewater flows through the sanitary sewer mains by gravity or is pumped to the Ithaca Area Wastewater Treatment Facility (IAWWTF) for treatment. The IAWWTF discharges into Cayuga Lake through a half-mile 48-inch diameter line that reduces to 36 inches for the last 240 feet. The effluent is diffused into the lake through 6-inch riser pipes, located 10 feet apart along the last 240 feet of the line.
- The plant treats approximately 6.5 to 10 million gallons of raw sewage each day although there are noticeable seasonal variations tied to school schedules. The design capacity of the plant is 13.1 million gallons per day (MGD), as a monthly average. In addition, volumes increase at times of rainfall and snow melt and can approach a flow rate of 30 to 35 million gallons per day for short durations. This vast increase is due to the infiltration and inflow of other water into the sewer. The plant does have additional capacity available to serve future development in the City.
- The IAWWTF is a unique and successful example of inter-municipal cooperation between the City of Ithaca, and the Towns of Ithaca, and Dryden. IAWWTF has been serving the City of Ithaca and portions of the Towns of Ithaca and Dryden since 1987.
- The IAWWTF is fully licensed by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC). The laboratory at the plant is certified by the New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH) and the National Environmental Laboratory Approval Program (NELAP).
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FISCAL HEALTH

**City of Ithaca Budget**

- The City’s total 2012 budget is $61,531,923. The various funds that comprise the City’s budget, and their 2012 allocations are as follows:
  - The **General Fund** receives the majority of its revenue from property tax assessments and sales tax collections. The 2012 General Fund allocated budget is $50,651,711.
  - The **Water and Sewer Funds** rely upon water and sewage usage fees for revenue. The 2012 allocated budget for the Water Fund is $4,034,043, and the 2012 allocated budget for the Sewer Fund is $6,186,969.
  - The **Solid Waste Fund** receives revenue from the sales of trash tags and collection fees. The 2012 allocated budget for the Solid Waste Funs is $659,200.
  - **Capital expenditures** for 2012 are budgeted at $4,972,500.

**Financial Goals**

- The City of Ithaca has identified the following financial goals for 2012:
  - **Increase/maintain fund balance** – Currently the fund balance is 15% of revenues; the target fund balance is 10 to 20% of operating revenues/expenses to allow for greater flexibility.
  - **Reduce debt load** – Debt service is currently 14.2% of the City’s budget. The City aims to reduce reliance on debt (borrowing) for payment, paying by cash whenever possible.
  - **Reduce tax burden on City taxpayers** – The City aims to keep tax rate increases to a minimum, and stay within the State Property Tax Cap limits. The proposed 2012 tax rate is $12.91 per $1,000 in assessed value, with assessment increases shifting to new construction and commercial uses.
  - **Continue to move operating expenses from borrowed capital fund to general fund** – The City is reducing its reliance on borrowing for operating funds and every year aims to move streets and road construction costs to operating expenses, and move equipment acquisitions from capital funds to operating expenses.
  - **Purchase more efficiently and economically** – The City of Ithaca is focused on using more state contract, cooperative purchasing, and bidding opportunities.
  - **Maximize revenues and minimize costs** – The City is looking to lower costs and increase fees, where applicable.

**Taxes**

- The 2012 property tax rate is $12.91 per $1,000 assessed value. This represents a 2.22% increase in the tax rate from the 2011 tax rate of $12.63.
- Sales tax revenue collections are up from 2010; however, the City of Ithaca remains heavily reliant on sales tax revenue. The local and national economy remain fragile, which continues to have an uncertain impact on sales tax activity.
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Fiscal Considerations

- Cornell University and the City maintain a good relationship, with the university currently paying the City of Ithaca approximately $1.2 million each year for City services. Opportunities exist to better align the costs of these services with what the university pays.
- The City of Ithaca currently relies upon the State of New York for more than $2 million annually. Cuts in state aid to the City of Ithaca in the 1900s resulted in the City taking on a larger debt load. The City of Ithaca was on the path towards economic recovery until the national economic downturn also impacted the community.
- Due to the large number of tax-exempt properties in the community, combined with reductions in state aid, annual increases in pension and insurance needs, and other commitments the City of Ithaca remains fiscally constrained.

RECAP

Evaluation of existing conditions in the City of Ithaca highlights the following key considerations for the Comprehensive Planning effort:

- **Population Changes** – The population total for the City of Ithaca has remained virtually unchanged over the past few decades, while surrounding areas grew. That zero-population growth phenomenon however is not a predictor for what may take place in the City over the next 20 years. City policy decisions will have an influence on the rate of population and housing growth within the City. It is useful to look at past trends, but in this case those trends are not necessarily projections of things to come.
- **Development Opportunities** – Much of the City is developed and there are limited opportunities for new greenfield development. In some cases, development of remaining vacant lands is constrained by environmental features – flood hazard areas, wetlands, and steep topography. There are greater development opportunities presented by the potential that exists for redevelopment of underutilized areas. Development approaches identified in the plan may recommend a careful examination of redevelopment potential in the City, to revitalize existing areas, take advantage of existing infrastructure, and further support economic development efforts in established areas.
- **Development Controls** – Current development regulations provide considerable flexibility for a range of development opportunities in established zoning districts. The flexibility allows for consideration of infill and redevelopment options to satisfy growth needs, along with the importance of a focus on the quality and character of such development to assure compatibility with surrounding environments.
- **Community Demographics** – Due to the influence of area universities, the City’s population is very young. This affects the local real estate market in several ways: more properties are rented than owner-occupied and the vast majority of households are defined as “non-family households.”
- **Housing Needs** – Housing studies show a need for housing for all income levels in the City (including students, low-income residents and others). Residents also cite the need for more senior housing options. These studies, coupled with a relatively low vacancy rate, suggest that there is unmet housing demand in Ithaca. Of particular note is the recently completed Danter Company Housing Study for Downtown Ithaca that shows demand for 1,000 new rental units and 350 for-sale housing units over the next 5 years.
- **Employment Needs** – The City’s unemployment rate has been low over the last few years (4.2%), but the City has a significant rate of poverty and a
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lower median household income than surrounding areas. More higher-wage employment opportunities to meet the skills of the local workforce may be needed to serve the underemployed.

- **Fiscal Health** – The City of Ithaca has maintained a sound fiscal position, while providing a variety of needed services to the community. Maintenance of that fiscal health in the context of increasingly difficult economic conditions will be a key issue for discussion in the Comprehensive Plan, with a focus on levels of service and economic development opportunities.
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OVERVIEW

Ithaca’s transportation system is built on a grid network and is well established. Most streets have sidewalks on at least one side and many streets are sufficiently low volume and speed to be bike-friendly. The City is at the core of the TCAT service area which provides excellent coverage. Almost all of the City is within ¼ mile of a bus route, and the TCAT system operates at a frequency well above those in most other similar-sized cities.

There are a handful of vehicle choke points in the roadway network that have been issues for years and will continue to result in peak period congestion. There is concern regarding livability relating to locations with higher traffic volumes and speeding traffic, characteristics not conducive to Ithaca as a small, walkable city. There is an increasing push to make progress on the construction of the City’s bicycle and trail network and on transit to enhance residents’ travel options. Weather, traffic, and topography can limit the viability of travel by means other than car or bus, particularly in the winter.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

CURRENT TRAVEL PATTERNS

- According to the US Census, there is a strong reliance on non-auto transportation in the City, particularly when compared with the rest of the country, even other “college towns.” Census data show that this reliance has grown in the past ten years (see Figures 12 and 13).
- The Census Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) estimates that roughly one-sixth of those employed in the City reside in the City (see Figures 9 and 10). Therefore, for many commuters, car transportation and, in some cases, bus transportation will be the most feasible options for traveling to work. Beyond the Census, however, there is little additional data on the travel patterns of City residents, particularly for non-work and recreational trips.

Figure 9: Mode of Transportation to Work (one component of travel)

SOURCES:
ITCTC 2030 Long Range Transportation Plan Update
ITCTC 2011-2015 Transportation Improvement Program
Ithaca Bicycle Plan, 1997
Tompkins County/Cornell Employee Commuter Survey, Phase 2, 2006
US Census 2000, 2010 ACS, and LEHD

SEE MAPS:
9: Roads AADT
10: Sidewalks and Trails
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Figure 10: Job-Residence Relationship in the City
Figure 11: Residence Location of Jobs in the City

- 2,266 - 2,653 Jobs
- 1,918 - 2,285 Jobs
- 1,550 - 1,817 Jobs
- 1,182 - 1,549 Jobs
- 814 - 1,181 Jobs
- 446 - 813 Jobs
- 77 - 445 Jobs
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### Key Trends

**Vehicles Per Day**
- Vehicles per day (vpd) refers to the number of vehicles – cars, trucks and buses – traveling on a roadway on an average day. What volume is “reasonable” or “acceptable” is context-dependent and typically very subjective. Urban streets are typically classified as local, collector or arterial and the expectation of speed and acceptable volume changes with each. Local residential streets typically carry around 1,000-3,000 vpd, depending upon density and connectivity. Collector streets are typically in the range of 5,000 to 10,000 vpd but occasionally higher. It is not uncommon for two-lane arterial streets to carry 15,000 vpd and four-lane streets 30,000 vpd. These volumes correspond with the idea that higher road classifications have more focus on mobility (cross-town travel for example) over local access. In a planning context, the physical capacity of a local or residential street can often exceed acceptable volumes, above which the noise and safety issues associated with high volumes become an issue for residents.

**Grid Network**
- The City of Ithaca features an established street grid with relatively little congestion in most locations. The grid network has led to some concerns of cut-through traffic and speeding along what residents consider neighborhood streets. The City has a history of traffic calming, however, and has worked to slow speeds in places.

### Roadways

Traffic volumes, and congestion, vary substantially throughout the City. While many streets have volumes typical of neighborhood residential streets, others carry a number of cars more typically associated with larger urban areas.
Key roadways include:

- **Route 13/34** is the busiest road through the City with volumes reaching 44,000 vehicles per day (vpd) near the intersection with Routes 79, 89, and 96. North of Cascadilla Street it is a limited access highway and south of Clinton Street a five-lane arterial. The volume of traffic makes the road difficult to traverse by means other than a car. Particularly to the north, the cross-section creates a substantial barrier. During the peak periods the road can become congested.

- **Route 79** forms an important east-west route through the core of the City in the form of Green and Seneca Streets. Two-way volumes range from roughly 15,000 vpd to nearly 20,000 vpd in most parts of the City. West of the Inlet, Hector Street (Route 79) is one of two main routes to the west of the City and averages about 7,000 vpd.

- **Route 96** (Cliff Street) leaves the City and connects to destinations northwest, including Trumansburg and, more distantly, Rochester. Volumes are just over 13,000 vpd. South Aurora Street (Route 96B) is the primary route to South Hill, including Ithaca College, and points beyond. Volumes are typically around 14,000 vpd.

There are a number of secondary routes that form the spine of the vehicle circulation system including Mitchell Street/Ithaca Road (Route 366), Clinton Street, Cayuga Street, Buffalo Street, and Elmira Road (east of South Meadow Street). Volumes on these roads are typically between 6,000 and 10,000 vpd though volumes on portions of Clinton Street and Mitchell Street are around 13,000 vpd.

In addition, while the volumes are lower, the roads accessing Cornell University play an important part in the road system for many. These include College Avenue, Stewart Avenue, University Avenue, and Triphammer Road. Volumes on these roads are typically between 3,000 and 5,000 vpd.

Construction and maintenance of bridges is a major cost and responsibility, and is a significant issue in considering roadway networks.

---

**Livability**

- Essentially all of the minor arterials and collectors in the City are residential in nature. This can lead to livability concerns for residents because many of these roadways carry significant volumes of traffic.

- While the City has limited options available to reduce the traffic volumes (beyond promotion of non-auto modes), it has tried to respond to concerns about speeding. The City has pursued traffic calming in some locations to reduce speeds and deter cut-through traffic. Because many of the arterials are owned and controlled by NYSDOT, any changes are subject to their standards and review, which currently limits options related to reducing speeds and livability. The terrain and weather also limit the possibility of certain changes to reduce speeds.

- Since many of these roads are state highways or state numbered touring routes, they are designated truck routes. Truck traffic can be of concern to residents and can make the roads seem less user-friendly for other modes.

- While the street grid is generally seen as a boon for livability by allowing shorter walking and biking distances, and generally improving the quality and quantity of travel choices, it does introduce the possibility of cut-through traffic on non-arterial streets.
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Parking

- There are many ongoing discussions about parking issues in Ithaca. One topic is regulations. The City’s existing off-street parking requirements were written decades ago and need to be re-examined. There is concern that parking requirements that are too high can encourage high car traffic in neighborhoods and prevent opportunities for increased density. Another concern is degradation to residential neighborhoods caused by paving over back and side yards for parking lots. Another issue focuses on the extent of paved surface-level parking lots on otherwise developable land in the city’s commercial areas (especially in the Southwest and the West End).
- There is a substantial amount of on-street parking in the City, which is generally unmanaged. Most of the parking in Downtown and Collegetown is metered. The City is looking to replace parking meters with pay stations that would allow for demand-based pricing and provide flexibility hours of enforcement.
- Given the substantial disparity between development patterns in suburban areas within and adjacent to the City, Downtown and Collegetown, there has long been disagreement about whether there is enough parking in certain areas of the City. Particularly where residential areas abut commercial uses, there can be spillover and tension. There is disagreement about whether current supply is sufficient to support additional development in these areas – and remain competitive with suburban locations, or whether it is more an issue of effective management. Parking requirements and the role of non-auto travelers will be an important topic for the Comprehensive Plan.
- The City owns two parking garages in the Downtown near the Commons: at Seneca Street and Tioga Street; and on Green Street near City Hall. Monthly permits range between $74 at the Green Street garage to $85 per month at the Seneca Street garage. Rates are $1 per hour with a $7 daily max and all garages are free after 8pm weeknights and on weekends. There are also surface lots with meters and pay stations Downtown.
- There is a third garage on Cayuga Street, a public-private parking partnership that is privately managed.
- In the 2005 survey of Downtown employees, roughly 36% reported parking in one of the three City garages (roughly half park in private lots) and 80% reported that they had no out-of-pocket costs for their parking.
- In addition to the Downtown garages, the City owns and operates a garage on Dryden Road in the heart of Collegetown. Given the high demand for parking in this area, rates are much higher: $116.50 per month for daytime or nighttime access and twice that to park both days and nights.
- In response to resident concerns, there is a residential permit program in effect for much of East Hill.

Pedestrians

- The City has a well-connected and generally comprehensive sidewalk network. Much of the City has sidewalks on both sides of the street, particularly in the City center. At the edges, where densities are slightly lower, and topography steeper, the sidewalks can become patchy. There are few sidewalks on West Hill and sidewalks are intermittent on South Hill and portions of East Hill. See the map in the Appendix for sidewalk coverage.
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- The City has worked to install sidewalks on at least one side of many of the highways heading into the community. These include Cliff Street (Rt 96) and East State Street (Rt 79) as well as substantial portions of Hector Street (Rt 79), South Meadow Street/Elmira Road (Rt 13/34/96), and South Aurora Street (Rt 96B). Additionally, there are a combination of paved trails and sidewalks providing pedestrian access along portions of Dryden Rd (Rt 366) and Taughannock Boulevard (Rt 89). The City also is in the middle of a project with the State to install pedestrian crossings of Route 13 at 3rd Street and Day Street in order to improve access to the waterfront.

- While sidewalk coverage is good in many areas and typically the streets are pedestrian-friendly, there are some areas where it is unpleasant or difficult to walk. For example, sidewalks are missing along some arterials, and many arterials can be difficult to cross because crosswalks or signalized crossings are widely spaced. Additionally, while most all streets with sidewalks have a tree lawn, in some locations they are so narrow that pedestrians must walk very close to the roadway.

- Given the age of many of the sidewalks, many are in need of repair. The City has recently worked to streamline its sidewalk repair program, which makes adjacent property owners responsible for all maintenance. Some members of the community are concerned about the accompanying assessments for the work, while others would like to see the City take over responsibility for sidewalks. Beginning in 2010, a major debate began on how to maintain sidewalks within the City. The Board of Public Works is currently reviewing approaches to sidewalks and will consider Comprehensive Plan recommendations in its review. The recently reformed Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) will be active on this issue. The Disability Advisory Council has also been discussing sidewalk maintenance issues.

### Bicycles

- Bicycling in Ithaca is a nuanced topic. Census data shows that, overall, few commuting trips are made by bicycle. However, there are some strong proponents of bicycling in Ithaca and the City has worked for many years to improve bicycle facilities.

- Despite these improvements, the community faces some challenges in increasing bicycle use. The topography makes trips to the southern, eastern, and western parts of the City, and beyond, challenging for many, particularly in the winter.

- While some trails and paths are suitable for bikes, it has only been in recent years that the City has been able to complete on-street bike lanes, including the Thurston Avenue bridge and an uphill lane on State Street, from Green Street to Mitchell Street, an uphill bike lane along part of Hudson Street, and bike lanes along R 89 through Cass Park. With renewed interest from City staff and elected officials, this list will likely grow in the near term.

- A number of additional striped and signed bike lanes are planned, per the 1997 Ithaca Bicycle Plan (itself the culmination of more than 2 decades of planning). Nearly 15 miles were planned in Phase 1 alone, but the plan ran into resistance due to both a lack of implementation funding and neighborhood resistance to the loss of on-street parking.

- In recent years there has been increased discussion and interest in bicycle projects. In the past year, DPW has been exploring a bicycle boulevard network.
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- In an effort to enhance bicycle use in the community, TCAT has installed bicycle racks on all of their buses. This program has been quite successful and is particularly popular on routes heading uphill. TCAT has explored the possibility of procuring larger racks to satisfy the strong demand.

TRANSIT

- Tompkins Consolidated Area Transit (TCAT) is the transit provider for the region. While the majority of the service is in the City of Ithaca, routes traverse the neighboring towns and villages providing fixed-route service to most of the county. Additional transit corridors and service are actively being sought.
- There are two primary transfer stations located downtown on Green and Seneca Streets. Upgrades to these stations were competed in 2010.
- Transit service frequency varies substantially based on location: service to the exurban parts of the county typically consists of a few runs during the peak hours whereas service between Downtown and Cornell operates as often as every five minutes during the peak. In general, the City is very well covered with over 90% within ¼ mile of a bus route and all of it within ½ mile.
- The City is one of three financial partners in TCAT; the County and Cornell University being the other two. In recent years, as State and Federal assistance has declined, the TCAT budget has also decreased, since its partners have been unable to make up for the declining assistance. As a result, some service has been cut and in January, 2012 fares were increased for the first time in several years. While fares within Zone 1 (the urban core) remain $1.50, fares when boarding in rural areas rose to $2.50. (This $4 round trip is still less than the $6 it cost for a rural round trip in 2006 under the previous two-zone system.)
- In addition to the fixed route service offered by TCAT, there is an on-demand service, Gadabout, open to anyone age 60 or older or disabled. One-way fares are $1.50 for trips entirely within the City and $2 for all other trips.
- Other services available to support non-auto mobility include Ithaca Carshare (providing members with hourly, 24/7 access to cars parked conveniently near neighborhoods and work places), Tompkins Zimride (a matching service to help promote ride-sharing), and the Way2Go program (an initiative by Cornell Cooperative Extension of Tompkins County providing information about mobility options and promoting alternatives to use of automobiles). All three are in place and operating and proving services that, in combination with TCAT, are critical to facilitating alternatives to private car ownership and drive-alone commutes. One identified service need that needs consideration is a “guaranteed ride home” program. Continued collaboration among service providers will help move the City toward a comprehensive travel demand management system.
- Although TCAT service stretches deep into the rural and suburban portions of Tompkins County, it does not extend beyond the County. A number of other areas provide limited commuter-oriented transit service connecting adjacent counties with Ithaca.
- A separate multi-county mobility study is currently underway to identify ways to improve area residents’ mobility.

KEY TRENDS

TRANSIT SYSTEM

- TCAT currently provides a very high level of transit service to the City with the entire City within a short walk of a bus route. The bicycle racks on TCAT busses are very popular, especially on routes heading uphill.

---

1 This service is distinct from, the ADA paratransit service offered by TCAT. While this service is contracted to Gadabout, it has stricter eligibility requirements and only operates within ¾ mile of TCAT service.
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- Given the high ridership between Cornell and Downtown, the construction of fixed-guideway transit has been discussed by many in the community. This has included a trolley or modern streetcar, as well as bus rapid transit (BRT) and personal rapid transit (PRT). There is a long-term possibility of funding and feasibility so the Comprehensive Plan should address where such a transit system might go.

Other Modes

While nearly all local travel is by one of the above-mentioned modes, it is important to note other means of transportation for local and intercity travel.

- There are several intercity bus lines operating in the City with most using the bus depot at Seneca Street and Fulton Street. Additionally, Cornell operates a non-stop service to New York City that leaves from its Ithaca campus.

- There is a freight rail line running north-south through the City, generally parallel and west of Route 13. Though freight volume is relatively low, it and Route 13 create a physical and psychological barrier to the waterfront. Additionally, because of the proximity to Route 13 and lack of grade-separated crossings within the City, these trains can create substantial traffic backups. Moreover, they create a life-safety issue by impeding the connection to the Hospital (which is on West Hill) for much of the greater Ithaca area. A number of abandoned railroad rights-of-way in the City are part of several rails-to-trails initiatives.

- The waterfront and Cayuga Lake provide an important recreational opportunity for many boaters in the area. Additionally, Cayuga Lake is connected to the New York State canal system so there is the potential for barge traffic to provide shipments to and from Ithaca connecting to the Great Lakes and Hudson River.

Proposed Transportation Projects

Most transportation projects within the City focus on improvements to non-auto modes, such as bike lanes, sidewalks, and trails. Aside from spot roadway improvements, most road projects focus on maintenance and rehabilitation of the existing system.

Since funding has been limited, the City has worked hard to incorporate a “complete streets” approach to its maintenance projects, adding sidewalks and bike lanes wherever possible. The City also works hard to leverage state and federal dollars for so-called “enhancement” money, funding a number of recent and upcoming improvements such as multi-use trails and pedestrian facilities.

The current and anticipated City capital budgets call for few roadway or intersection improvements – most are focused on maintenance and reconstruction. A notable exception is the upcoming intersection improvement at the E State Street / MLK Street & Mitchell Street intersection.

More generally, several plans identify long-term transportation improvements for the City. While most include proposed timelines, many have yet to be completed because of funding constraints.

- The ITCTC 2030 Long Range Transportation Plan, identifies a number of programs and studies as well as the desire to generally improve pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities and operations within the area.
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covered by ITCTC. No specific enhancements or new infrastructure are recommended.

- The Ithaca Bicycle Plan calls for the development of a comprehensive system of on and off-road facilities to improve bicycle circulation in the City. Much of this network remains to be built or signed.
- Cornell University’s t-GEIS and TIMS identified a number of potential improvements to vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle circulation adjacent to the campus, including in the City. In some cases the reports identify existing deficiencies and others are anticipated. The university has committed to providing matching funds for many of these improvements.
- Many multi-use trails or paths in the City could be suitable for commuting in addition to recreation. A number of trails and multi-use paths have been identified for future construction or improvements.

TRANSPORTATION TRENDS AND OPPORTUNITIES

The transportation system in Ithaca is generally of high quality, but there are a few notable areas for potential improvement.

- The congestion along Fulton and Meadow streets can be severe at times, particularly for residents accustomed to little congestion elsewhere in the Ithaca region. This bottleneck leads to cut-through traffic through the City and, if it gets substantially worse, could be seen as a disincentive for area residents to travel to the Southwest commercial area or even Downtown. There are no simple fixes, however, comprehensive changes to land use and transportation could have some impact. The area has not been subjected to intensive study in some time so a more detailed examination may yield a non-traditional solution. As previously discussed, NYSDOT controls these roads and signals so any further discussion in the Comprehensive Plan will pivot primarily around how they can be made more amenable for all users.
- The center of Ithaca is very flat and thus relatively ideal for bicycle use. Yet there are few posted signs or marked lanes for bicyclists. This is a result of financial constraints and a lack of consensus in the community. Given the renewed interest in bicycling and that such improvements are typically very cost-effective, there may be motivation to increase the priority of these improvements.
- Funding is often the limiting factor in improving and enhancing the City’s transportation network. An increasing portion of the budget is spent on simply trying to maintain the existing infrastructure. While there are a number of improvements for all modes that have been identified, these projects outstrip the City’s budget for improvements. State and federal dollars are becoming increasingly competitive and have not kept pace with overall needs and demands.
- Part of the Comprehensive Plan discussion will focus on opportunities to create “complete streets” – streets with facilities to accommodate all modes of transportation. The appendix contains prototype cross-sections that can contribute to discussions about possible strategies for the City of Ithaca.
- Perhaps more than many other areas, Ithaca is acutely aware of the long-term uncertainties with respect to transportation. While immediate concerns center on changes in funding structure for transportation, many are also concerned about long-term predictions for the cost and availability of petroleum, shifts in fuel and energy sources, and implications for mobility and equity in the region.
**EXISTING TRANSPORTATION PLANS AND POLICIES**

As identified in Part 2, a number of plans guide transportation improvements in the City. These include the following.

- **ITCTC 2030 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and the 2011-2015 Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP)** - The ITCTC is the Ithaca-Tompkins County Transportation Council for the Ithaca region and these plans represent the long and short term plans, respectively. In general, these plans focus primarily on enhancements to the existing system and its maintenance.

- **Ithaca Bicycle Plan** - The plan was developed in 1997 and amended in 1998 and 2001 to address subsequent comments from residents and NYSDOT.

- **Downtown Ithaca 2020 Strategic Plan** - This plan was developed by the Downtown Ithaca Alliance and endorsed by the Ithaca Common Council. It provides a vision for the Downtown that includes increased density and increased reliance on a variety of transportation modes.

**RECAP**

Evaluation of existing transportation conditions in the City of Ithaca highlights key facts and issues for consideration as discussions continue in the Comprehensive Planning effort:

- **Streets** – Many streets in Ithaca have sidewalks and some streets have bicycle lanes. There is still more that can be done to provide “complete streets” in as many areas as possible. The City is pursuing traffic-calming techniques to address resident concerns about traffic impacts. The street grid provides for a good traffic pattern with relatively little congestion in most places, but peak period congestion reduction projects warrant additional consideration. The Comprehensive Plan should discuss strategies for completing the network and creating livable streets.

- **Pedestrians** – For much of the City there is a well-developed sidewalk network. A number of locations lack sidewalks, and completion of the City’s sidewalk network, including consideration of funding mechanisms, should be discussed in the Comprehensive Plan process. A critical component of this discussion will be ongoing repair of existing sidewalks.

- **Bicycles** – There is a strong need and growing support for a variety of facilities that would expand the City’s bicycle network. The Comprehensive Plan will include discussions of bike lanes, bicycle boulevards, and other facility types.

- **Transit** – TCAT provides a high level of transit service to the City. There are no areas of the City not within a short walk of a bus route. The City’s continuing support will be important for the ongoing success of TCAT. There are opportunities to improve multimodal connections at bus stops, and there is some interest in fixed-guideway transit systems.

- **Trails** – The City and the Ithaca area have a great potential to develop a regional off-road trail network, which can be used for recreation and tourism, but also for transportation. The Comprehensive Plan will discuss a trail network in the City and connections and partnerships with surrounding municipalities.

- **Parking** - Parking remains a concern in the community. Some of the key issues include effective management of existing parking; the cost of providing parking garages; parking capacity to accommodate new development Downtown; and spillover effects in Collegetown.
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- **System Management** – The City’s transportation infrastructure is extensive and aging. Historically, the City has relied heavily on state and federal funding for large projects and for system enhancements; the future of these funding sources is not clear. At the same time, the cost of construction materials has risen precipitously over the past decade. The Comprehensive Plan will discuss how the City can best approach management and maintenance of its transportation infrastructure in a future of uncertainty.

- **Partnerships** – As the City is at the center of the county and a regional destination, it is strongly influenced by travelers and agencies beyond its borders. Moreover, the City does not own all the streets within the City. Strong partnerships are important to build and maintain a high quality transportation system (both infrastructure and services). The Comprehensive Plan will explore how to expand and reinforce such partnerships with agencies and institutions, including the private sector.
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OVERVIEW

In addition to understanding existing conditions and trends shaping the community, it is beneficial to consider projections of population and housing growth, the types of development demand facing the community in the future, and the existing capacity of the City to accommodate such demand. This part of the report provides information regarding the developable land in the City of Ithaca, both in terms of new development and redevelopment potential.

The subtopics addressed in this part include:
- Base information
- Projected demand for employment
- Estimated capacity for growth
- Redevelopment opportunities

Projecting future population and housing growth for the City of Ithaca is a highly imprecise calculation. There is great uncertainty when considering future growth patterns in Ithaca. Many communities rely on historical data to predict the future, but that is very unreliable in this setting. The City has not experienced population growth for decades, but conditions are changing and few expect that non-growth scenario to continue. In addition to reacting to changing economic and demographic factors, the City’s growth rate can also be greatly affected by policy choices made over the next decade. The purpose of this Planning Influences Report is to offer information to be used in upcoming dialogues about the City’s future – not to predict an outcome.

The planning team (comprised of City staff and the consulting team) developed this portion of the report based on readily available data, observations from existing sources, as well as the application of various assumptions. There is great uncertainty about what lies ahead for the City of Ithaca and all communities – especially uncertainty about economic conditions and growth rates. There is also uncertainty because clear policy choices can be made that would affect future growth patterns. For these reasons, the information presented in the following sections is intended to draw a general picture of what might be expected in the future. It is provided to help illustrate what might be possible in the City of Ithaca in the future, in order to spur dialogue about trends and opportunities that will likely need to be addressed in the Comprehensive Plan.
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**BASE INFORMATION**

- **Property Status:** As illustrated on Map 11: Property Status, most of the land in the City of Ithaca is used for existing development and land uses. Approximately 8.6% of land within the City (251 acres) is currently undeveloped or vacant (not including undeveloped land committed for parks and natural areas purposes). This is the total amount of undeveloped/vacant land, but not all of these properties are developable due to conditions such as steep slopes, flood hazards, and other constraints.

- **Size of Undeveloped/Vacant Properties:** The City’s inventory of undeveloped/vacant properties ranges greatly in size. A few are greater than 20 acres in size, while some are less than one-tenth of an acre. The median size of an undeveloped/vacant property in the City is approximately 0.2 acres (10,000 square feet).

- **Infill Opportunities:** While some of the undeveloped/vacant properties in the City are adjacent to each other (thus presenting opportunities for consolidation), most are isolated and located in areas surrounded by existing development. This means that most future development on undeveloped/vacant property in the City will occur in the form of infill in existing areas.

- **Infill Challenges:** Infill development is often seen as more challenging than “greenfield” development (i.e., development in previously untouched areas) because of the nuances of and need for integration and compatibility with existing development and infrastructure.

- **Master Planning Opportunities:** Although many of the undeveloped/vacant properties in the City of Ithaca are relatively small, a few opportunities exist for larger-scale development on undeveloped properties that are adjacent to one another. The largest of these areas are located on West Hill (nearly 49 acres of contiguous undeveloped land) and in the Southwest Area (nearly 65 acres of contiguous undeveloped land). Again, these totals represent the total amount of undeveloped land – constraints such as topography and environmental conditions and the need for compatibility with nearby properties will likely limit the overall development potential of these larger areas.

**KEY TRENDS**

**DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES**

- The City of Ithaca has limited opportunities for large-scale new development on currently vacant “greenfield” sites. Most of the currently vacant areas with opportunities for new development are quite small and will require thoughtful planning and coordination in order to integrate new development in with the existing fabric and infrastructure. More extensive opportunity for development exists in the prospect of redevelopment and infill of underutilized tracts in strategic locations.

**SOURCES:**
City of Ithaca GIS data, 2012

**SEE MAPS:**
11: Property Status
PROJECTIONS

This section presents available information regarding projections, drawing on readily available data and intended to inform conversations during the Comprehensive Planning process.

County Population

- Cornell University's Program on Applied Demographics (PAD) prepares population projections for counties in the state of New York. The 2011 projections predict slow population growth in Tompkins County to 2020 (0.2%), then a decline in population to 2040 (see Table 16).
- The Tompkins County population projections align with PAD’s projections for the upstate region of New York and the State of New York.
- PAD’s projections for Tompkins County and the State of New York predict very slow population growth over the next two decades in. The overall rate of growth is expected to be much slower than experience by other regions of the country.
- After the next few decades, the projections show a slight decline in the Tompkins County population through 2040. This is consistent with projections for the entire region. Factors contributing to this population decline include decreasing average household and family size, which is especially prominent in the southern portion of the upstate region. Also, the trend of strong in-migration of people in age groups 25-34 is expected to continue, but will likely be offset by out-migration of people aged older than 34.

Table 16: Historical and Projected County Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tompkins County Population</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>59,122</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>66,164</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>77,064</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>87,085</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>94,097</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>96,501</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>101,564</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>101,732</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>100,893</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>98,606</td>
<td>-2.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 17: Historical City and County Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tompkins County Population</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>City Share of County Population</th>
<th>City Population</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>59,122</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>29,257</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>66,164</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>28,799</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>77,064</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>26,226</td>
<td>-8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>87,085</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>28,732</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>94,097</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>29,541</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>96,501</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>29,287</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>101,564</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>30,014</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Downtown Housing Needs

- The Downtown Housing Strategy, prepared for the Downtown Ithaca Alliance in 2011, projects that over the next 5 years there is overall housing demand for up to 1,350 units in the Downtown area (consisting of up to 350 for-sale units and up to 1,000 rental units). This equates to an annual demand of as many as 70 for-sale units and 200 rental units per year through 2017. It illustrates elevated demand for housing units now and in the near-term, possibly due to the extremely low vacancy rates in the City and/or need for affordable housing options in the Downtown and surrounding areas.

### Special Population Housing

- Students comprised approximately 56.7% of the City’s population in 2010. Many of the housing units where students live are aging or outdated, and may not be well suited to the needs and preferences of the student market. Interest in and pressure for reinvestment in or redevelopment of the existing housing stock is likely to continue in order to meet the demands of the large student population.
- Seniors comprise a small percentage of the overall population (5.9% are age 65 and older), yet many cite the need for more diverse housing
Part 5: Projections and Land Capacity

The availability of housing options for seniors could influence the number of seniors that choose to stay in Ithaca as they age.

### Housing Affordability

- The Affordable Housing Needs Assessment, prepared in 2006 for Tompkins County, identifies the need for 2,500 affordable housing units in the County over the next ten years (equating to 250 units per year). This is demand for units that are affordable to households with incomes at 100% of the County household median income level and below. This is in addition to an existing Countywide shortfall of nearly 1,350 units that are needed to meet demand for households at or above 100% of the County median household income. Note that these studies generally do not address the additional affordable housing needs of the student population.
- Like the County’s Affordable Housing Needs Assessment, the Downtown Housing Strategy identifies strong demand for tax-credit and affordable to moderate-level housing in the Downtown area – as many as 125 rental units per year.

### Housing Demand Summary

- Factors such as housing affordability, an aging housing stock, student housing needs and preferences, low vacancy rates, and redevelopment and investment Downtown and in other areas of the community also shape the housing needs of the Ithaca community.
- Looking toward the future, it will be important for the City of Ithaca to plan for ways to accommodate the housing needs of a growing population. It will also be important to address the current challenges in the housing market by encouraging and allowing redevelopment and investment in housing in targeted areas of the community.

### Regional Employment Projections

- The New York State Department of Labor projects that between 2008 and 2018, total employment in the Southern Tier Region\(^2\) will increase by 7,400 jobs (2.3%).
- Educational services employment in the Southern Tier is projected to increase by 4,520 jobs (7.2%) by 2018, and health care and social assistance employment is projected to increase by 6,640 jobs (17.6%) by 2018. While these are major industries in the City of Ithaca (approximately 55.9% of jobs), the projected increase in employment within these industries will likely spread across the entire Southern Tier Region; only a portion of these jobs will be located in the City of Ithaca.
- Other industries that are projected to grow significantly in the Southern Tier through 2018 include professional services, arts/entertainment/recreation/ accommodation/food services, other services, and public administration (see the following table).

---

\(^2\) Southern Tier Region includes Broome, Chemung, Chenango, Delaware, Schuyler, Steuben, Tioga, and Tompkins Counties.

### Key Trends

#### Employment Trends

- Projections for the City of Ithaca show continued strength in the educational, health care, and other services industries. Other recent national trends that influence employment include growth in self and at-home employment, the increasing role of technology and reliance upon communications infrastructure, and the role of Internet-based retail sales.

**Sources:**
- New York State Department of Labor, 2010
- 2006-2010 American Community Survey 5-year Estimates
- Tompkins County Area Development, 2012
- Tompkins County Workforce Strategy, 2010
- Tompkins County Labor Market Region Study, 2008
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Table 18: Historical and Projected Employment for the Southern Tier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>2008 Regional Employment Estimate</th>
<th>2018 Projected Regional Employment</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining</td>
<td>7,870</td>
<td>7,890</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>8,870</td>
<td>8,350</td>
<td>-5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>43,190</td>
<td>37,150</td>
<td>-14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale trade</td>
<td>7,860</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>32,040</td>
<td>30,920</td>
<td>-3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and warehousing, and utilities</td>
<td>6,730</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>-1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>4,230</td>
<td>3,760</td>
<td>-11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and insurance, and real estate and rental and leasing</td>
<td>10,740</td>
<td>10,070</td>
<td>-6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, scientific, and management, and administrative and waste management services</td>
<td>22,770</td>
<td>24,120</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational services, and health care and social assistance</td>
<td>99,200</td>
<td>110,360</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, entertainment, and recreation, and accommodation and food services</td>
<td>22,220</td>
<td>23,710</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services, except public administration</td>
<td>11,640</td>
<td>12,540</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration</td>
<td>29,980</td>
<td>30,370</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>324,230</strong></td>
<td><strong>331,630</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Southern Tier Region includes Broome, Chemung, Chenango, Delaware, Schuyler, Steuben, Tioga, and Tompkins Counties.

Tompkins County Employment

- In 2010, total employment in Tompkins County was 50,549. Employment in the City of Ithaca comprised nearly 30% of the County’s overall employment.
- According to the 2008 Tompkins County Labor Market Region Study, projected labor demand growth for Tompkins County is slightly higher than the regional average. The County is expected to outpace the region in the construction, manufacturing, retail, and professional and business services.
- Total annual number of new jobs in the County for the next ten years is estimated at 558.
### Table 19: 2010 City and County Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>2010 County Employment</th>
<th>2010 City Employment</th>
<th>% City Share of County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>2,234</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>3,161</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale trade</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>4,175</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and warehousing, and utilities</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and insurance, and real estate and rental and leasing</td>
<td>2,009</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, scientific, and management, and administrative and waste management services</td>
<td>4,237</td>
<td>1,107</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational services, and health care and social assistance (data are grouped together and not available disaggregated)</td>
<td>24,215</td>
<td>8,308</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, entertainment, and recreation, and accommodation and food services</td>
<td>4,113</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services, except public administration</td>
<td>1,475</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>50,549</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,863</strong></td>
<td><strong>29.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 20: Employment Forecast for Tompkins County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Short-Term Annual Growth Rate (next 5 years)</th>
<th>Long-Term Annual Growth Rate (next 10 years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and Food Services</td>
<td>0.76%</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>2.96%</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate (FIRE)</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>2.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Business Services (PBS)</td>
<td>2.73%</td>
<td>2.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale, Transportation, Warehousing, and Utility (WTWU)</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
<td>2.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.18%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.03%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Chmura Economics & Analytics*

### Table 21: Projected City of Ithaca Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>2010 Estimate</th>
<th>2020 Projection</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and Food Services</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>1,621</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Health Services*</td>
<td>8,308</td>
<td>9,330</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate (FIRE)</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Business Services (PBS)</td>
<td>1,107</td>
<td>1,419</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale, Transportation, Warehousing, and Utility (WTWU)</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>1,151</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,863</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,824</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.2%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: the Education and Health Services industries were combined into one category due to lack of 2010 American Community Survey data for each industry. The growth rate applied for this category was the calculated average of the long-term projected rates for both industries.*
Land Demand for Employment Activities

- As illustrated above, employment growth in the City of Ithaca is projected to be modest up to 2020, with the largest gains in the education and health services industries, and professional business services.
- Because the professional, educational, health care, social services arts, entertainment, accommodation, food services, and other services industries are expected to grow in the City, and because these industries are closely related with Cornell University and Ithaca College, the City of Ithaca should continue to coordinate with these educational institutions to ensure housing and services are available in the City to meet the needs of employees in these industries.
- The land use needs of future jobs can most likely be met on existing undeveloped/vacant properties in the City and through the intensification and/or redevelopment of some areas, including on the Cornell University campus, Downtown Ithaca, and underutilized commercial and industrial areas. Flexible zoning that allows a range of building types and land uses will be essential in capturing as much employment growth as possible.
- The Tompkins County Workforce Strategy notes that every year, between 2007 to 2016, approximately 9,000 workers are needed in Tompkins County to fill 600 net new jobs and replace 8,400 workers leaving jobs to make career or life changes. In addition, another 8,000 workers stay in the same occupation but change employers. These statistics highlight the fact that while the total number of new jobs may be modest, turnover and transformation of the employment market in Tompkins County and the City of Ithaca will continue, creating new opportunities and changes in demand for employment space.

CAPACITY FOR GROWTH

The majority of land within the current boundaries of the City of Ithaca is either already developed or committed for other uses such as parks, natural areas, or Cornell University. However, some opportunities for new development on undeveloped/vacant properties do exist in the City. The following sections detail the estimated capacity for both new residential growth and non-residential (commercial and employment) growth. The following subsection evaluates the opportunities for redevelopment/infill in the City.

METHODOLOGY

In order to estimate the range of potential growth in the City of Ithaca, the planning team relied upon GIS data and then calculated the growth capacity using a series of assumptions. The various steps and factors that comprised the capacity analysis are described below.

Vacant/Undeveloped Land

To begin the analysis, the planning team worked with City of Ithaca staff to identify vacant and undeveloped properties within the City limits. These generally include properties with no or very minor improvements or structures. Undeveloped properties with committed land uses including parks, natural areas, recreation, and Cornell University were removed from the vacant/undeveloped category. The vacant/undeveloped category does
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not include properties currently used as residential or commercial parking lots.

Uncommitted vacant and undeveloped properties serve as the basis for the growth capacity analysis. The analysis does not include properties that are developed but underutilized (prime for redevelopment). The following subsection of this report provides more discussion about growth through redevelopment.

Development Constraints

After the vacant/undeveloped properties were identified, the planning team examined various constraints that may limit or prohibit development on certain properties. Development constraints considered in the analysis included topography (steep slopes) and flood hazard areas. Other factors such as location in a historic district, environmental contamination, and other features could potentially place additional limits on future development potential, but were not included in this capacity analysis. Such additional considerations would have to be determined on an individual property basis.

Existing Zoning

Next, the planning team identified the existing zone district for each vacant/undeveloped property included in the analysis. Existing zoning regulations served as the basis for the growth capacity estimates. The analysis does not factor in any potential rezonings or modifications to zoning regulations.

Development Assumptions

In order to estimate the amount of potential development on each vacant/undeveloped property, a series of assumptions was applied. The assumptions accounted for reductions in overall developable area, based on the development constraints identified above, as well as estimations about the overall “efficiency” of development in various zones (e.g., how much developable property results after taking into account necessary utility easements, setbacks, public right-of-way dedication, and other factors that limit total development area).

Because the City of Ithaca’s zoning ordinance allows a wide range of types and densities of development in many of its zone districts, it is necessary to estimate a range of potential growth, rather than a single estimate. As a result, development assumptions generated for each zone district were established to capture the estimated range of the minimum to the maximum development possible in each zone. The development assumptions include factors such as minimum lot size, maximum lot coverage by buildings, and minimum and maximum building height. Growth capacity estimates for residential zone districts are presented as a low and high estimate of the number of dwelling units that could be accommodated. Growth capacity estimates for non-residential zone districts are presented as a low and high estimate of the overall building square footage. It is important to note that, in many non-residential districts, residential uses are permitted and therefore additional residential units could be accommodated within the overall estimated building square footages. Estimates for the maximum number of dwelling units likely to be accommodated in these non-residential districts are provided. Detailed assumptions used in this analysis are provided in the report appendix.
The flexibility of the zoning ordinance makes it nearly impossible to estimate the amount of potential development of each vacant/undeveloped property without undertaking an extensive review of each property. However, the application of these broad assumptions and the resulting estimated range of potential development are detailed enough to inform conversations about the City’s future development. They help illustrate how much and where development might occur based on existing regulations.

**Estimated Residential Growth Capacity**

Approximately 190 parcels (144 acres) are currently vacant/undeveloped and located within the City’s residential zone districts (R districts). Combined, these undeveloped/vacant parcels in residential zones could support the development of approximately 447 to 1,032 new dwelling units (see Table 22).

The largest opportunities for new residential growth are located in the R-1 and R-3 zone districts. Vacant/undeveloped land in the R-1 zones are predominantly surrounded by existing lower-density neighborhoods, and therefore compatibility and continuity with the existing patterns of development may limit their overall development potential. New residential development in the R-3 zones may face other challenges, due to the fact that despite the higher densities allowed in these zones, other issues such as parking needs, smaller lot sizes, topography, and compatibility with nearby buildings shape the overall development potential.
Table 22: Development Capacity in Residential Zone Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Zone District</th>
<th>Vacant/Undeveloped Parcels</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Residential Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1a</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1b</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2a</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2b</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2c</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3a</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3b</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-U</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>144.5</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Totals may not sum due to rounding.

Estimated Non-Residential Growth Capacity

Approximately 47 parcels (107 acres) are currently vacant/undeveloped and located within the City’s non-residential zone districts (B, CBD, I, P, SW, WEDZ, and WF districts). Together, these undeveloped/vacant parcels in non-residential zones could support the development of approximately 1.4 to 3.6 million building square feet (see Table ). Based on the projections for future employment growth set forth in the previous section (estimated at nearly 2,000 new jobs by 2020), there appears to be sufficient vacant/undeveloped land available to accommodate future employment activities and growth in non-residential zone districts in the City of Ithaca.

Perhaps the most notable opportunity for new non-residential development in the City of Ithaca is in the southwest area of the community, where large tracts of land are currently vacant/undeveloped.

Because residential uses are not required in the non-residential zones (and not permitted in several zones), it is difficult to estimate how many dwelling units could be built in these areas. While the low estimate of capacity residential-dwelling units in the City’s non-residential zone districts is zero (meaning that no residential units are required), it is estimated as many as 588 additional dwelling units could be accommodated on the vacant/undeveloped parcels located in non-residential zone districts, based on the application of assumptions about likely residential densities in the different zone districts. The number of units that could be accommodated in these districts is widely dependent upon unit types and sizes, among other factors.

Despite the difficulty in estimating how many residential units could be built on vacant/undeveloped parcels in non-residential zone districts, the analysis shows that residential development only in residential zones will not likely be enough to satisfy all future housing demand. Therefore, pressure for additional housing development in non-residential zone districts will continue to grow, and should be an important consideration of zoning regulations.
### Table 23: Development Capacity in Non-residential Zone Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-residential Zone District</th>
<th>Vacant/Undeveloped Parcels</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Building Square Footage (Low Estimate)</th>
<th>Building Square Footage (High Estimate)</th>
<th>Residential Units (High Estimate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-1a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>27,134</td>
<td>67,834</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD-120</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>34,452</td>
<td>229,677</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD-60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>4,231</td>
<td>14,104</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD-85</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>10,749</td>
<td>50,164</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>210,399</td>
<td>701,331</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>18,457</td>
<td>96,897</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW-1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>487,241</td>
<td>730,862</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>26,773</td>
<td>160,638</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEDZ-1a</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>86,380</td>
<td>259,141</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEDZ-1b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WF-1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>498,314</td>
<td>1,245,786</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WF-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>16,038</td>
<td>40,096</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>106.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,420,169</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,276,912</strong></td>
<td><strong>581</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Does not satisfy minimum lot size required for development.
** Residential development generally not permitted in this zone.

Note: Totals may not sum due to rounding. Low estimate of residential units not provided for non-residential zone districts, because residential uses are not required.
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REDEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

The previous section provided an estimate of the capacity of vacant or undeveloped properties within the City of Ithaca. While much of the City’s future development will likely occur on these undeveloped properties, reinvestment and redevelopment in already-developed areas will also be an important factor in the City’s overall future growth and development capacity.

To understand the opportunities surrounding redevelopment in the City of Ithaca, the planning team selected five potential redevelopment “focus areas” for review and analysis. These areas include: (1) Downtown area/West State Street corridor, (2) Waterfront/Inlet Island area, (3) West End area, (4) Collegetown area, and (5) Southwestern area. These areas were selected because they are generally large areas of the community where redevelopment has already started to occur or developer interest in redevelopment or intensification is high. Other areas for future redevelopment and reinvestment are located throughout the City of Ithaca. The planning team felt that the areas selected could be representative of the types of redevelopment and pressures that could face other parts of the community in the near future.

The purpose of examining these areas is to gain a better understanding of what factors are influencing redevelopment in the City and to start to understand where and how much redevelopment could occur in these areas, and beyond. It is important to note that the following discussion and analysis of redevelopment potential is quite general and only intended to help illustrate the myriad levels of new development and redevelopment that Ithaca will likely experience in the future. More detailed examination of and planning for specific neighborhoods and areas will occur during Phase II of the Comprehensive Planning effort.

METHODOLOGY

Like the previous section, which provided an estimate of future development capacity of undeveloped/vacant land within the City of Ithaca, the analysis in this section is based on GIS data and the application of various assumptions.

Value Ratio

To identify properties with possible redevelopment potential, the planning team started by calculating the “value ratio” of potential redevelopment focus areas. The value ratio is based on property data provided by the Tompkins County Department of Assessment. The value ratio is calculated by dividing the total assessed value of improvements for properties within a redevelopment focus area (e.g., total value of buildings and other structures) by the total assessed value of the land.

The resulting number shows how valuable the improvements are to the value of the land in the focus area. Areas with a value ratio greater than one indicate the total value of improvements to the property is more than the value of the land (meaning that significant investment has already been made in the property). Areas with a value ratio less than one indicate land values are either higher in this area or there is an opportunity to make investments to enhance the value of improvements (e.g., the value of the land is more than the total value of improvements). A value ratio equal to one indicates the total value of improvements equals the value of the land.
The average value ratio of all properties within the City of Ithaca is 5.95. This means that, on a citywide basis, the average value of improvements on properties is nearly six times the value of the land.

For purposes of this redevelopment analysis, properties with a value ratio equal to or less than one were selected because they are considered likely candidates for redevelopment due to the fact that the value of the land is as much, or nearly as much, as the value of any improvements to the property. A value ratio of equal to or less than one was selected because it yields a conservative estimate of possible candidates for redevelopment. If a higher ratio were selected, more properties would be included in the analysis, thus yielding a higher amount of potential redevelopment in each focus area.

From this point forward, properties with a value ratio equal to or less than one are referred to as “possible candidates for redevelopment.”

**Key Trends**

**USING VALUE RATIOS TO IDENTIFY REDEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES**

- Various factors affect whether or not a property is a possible candidate for redevelopment. They include real estate values, location, type and form of nearby development, quality and size of existing structures, and myriad other factors. It is nearly impossible to predict all properties that may have potential or opportunities for future redevelopment or intensification without detailed, site-specific analysis.

- One simple method for identifying possible candidates for redevelopment is by calculating value ratios (the value of improvements to the value of the land). This type of analysis is based upon GIS data provided by tax assessment records, and is a somewhat quick and simple method for identifying some of the possible redevelopment opportunities in an area.

- The value ratio method is not (nor is it intended to be) a comprehensive analysis of all redevelopment potential in an area. It is a high-level analysis that may be used to help inform the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan, in terms of what sorts of opportunities might existing in different focus areas of the community.

- More detailed review and analysis of redevelopment opportunities and potential may be explored during the Comprehensive Plan’s Phase II implementation stage.

**Redevelopment Constraints**

After the possible candidates for redevelopment were identified by calculating the value ratio, the planning team explored constraints that may limit or prohibit redevelopment on these properties. Redevelopment constraints considered in the analysis included topography (steep slopes) and flood hazard areas. Other constraints such as the historic nature of buildings and compatibility with nearby residential neighborhoods may further limit the redevelopment potential of some properties, but were not factored into the analysis due to the fact that these are site-specific conditions.

**Existing Zoning**

Next, the planning team identified the existing zone district for each property considered a possible candidate for redevelopment. Existing zoning regulations served as the basis for the potential redevelopment estimates. The analysis does not factor in any potential rezonings or modifications to zoning regulations.

**Redevelopment Assumptions**

As with the growth capacity analysis, a series of assumptions is applied in order to estimate the amount of potential redevelopment possible on each property considered a possible candidate for redevelopment. The assumptions accounted for reductions in overall developable area, based on the development constraints identified above, as well estimations about the overall “efficiency” of redevelopment in various zones (e.g., how much developable property results after taking into account necessary utility easements, setbacks, public right-of-way dedication, and other factors that limit total redevelopment area).

The City of Ithaca’s zoning ordinance allows a wide range of types and densities of development in its zone districts. Thus, the potential redevelopment estimates provided are intended to illustrate the maximum development possible in each zone. The redevelopment assumptions include maximum lot coverage by buildings and maximum building height. Detailed assumptions used in this analysis are provided in the report appendix.
Part 5: Projections and Land Capacity

Redevelopment Focus Areas

Ithaca will continue to grow, change, and evolve into the future. Population and economic growth are expected, as projected in this report. Revitalization of key strategic areas of the City is being planned for and encouraged. Nevertheless, the City is currently at or near “build-out,” which means that much of the growth that is likely to occur will take the form of infill and redevelopment of existing developed areas.

A key issue in the new Comprehensive Plan will be an emphasis on identifying areas where existing form and character need to be conserved, and identifying areas where infill and redevelopment might be important components of the City’s strategies to achieve a desired future. Accordingly, it is useful to look at some of these areas where infill and redevelopment might be desirable possibilities, and estimate the capacities of those areas to accommodate additional growth.

Five areas of the City have been identified in existing plans and initiatives as possible candidates for infill and redevelopment activity. Those are:

- The Collegetown Area
- Downtown and the West State Street Corridor
- The Waterfront/Inlet Island Area
- West End
- Southwest Area

No decisions have been made about redevelopment in these areas, but it is useful to analyze the existing characteristics of these areas and to project the capacities of these areas to accommodate additional development.

Collegetown

The Collegetown area is a major activity center for Ithaca. Given its proximity to the Cornell campus, student, faculty, and university-related activity is robust. Retail uses, dining and entertainment, and housing are all present, with growing demands for more. Community discussion continues about the desired future of the Collegetown area, with particular focus on conservation of residential neighborhoods abutting Collegetown. Following is an assessment of redevelopment potential in this area.

Existing Conditions

- The 206 properties examined in the Collegetown area encompass approximately 34.3 acres. As illustrated in the following table, the predominant existing land use in the Collegetown area is residential (67.3%), followed by mixed-use development (19.8%).
- Only 0.2 acres (0.5%) within the Collegetown area is currently vacant/undeveloped, meaning that any future growth in the Collegetown area will occur through intensification or redevelopment of existing areas.
### Table 24: Collegetown Existing Land Use and Average Value Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Number of Parcels</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>% of Total Acres</th>
<th>Average Value Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>5.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>5.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/University</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Quasi-Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>10.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant/Undeveloped</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>206</strong></td>
<td><strong>34.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.59</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The average value ratio of all properties in the Collegetown area is 5.59, which is relatively consistent with the citywide average, and means that significant investment has occurred on buildings and improvements in the Collegetown area.

### Redevelopment Potential

- Based on the calculated value ratios, approximately 1.5 acres (12 properties) in the Collegetown area can be considered possible candidates for redevelopment (meaning that the total value of improvements to the property is less than or equal to the property’s land value). This group of properties does not include land currently classified as undeveloped/vacant or used for parks or natural areas purposes, but does include properties currently used for commercial parking lots.

- Currently, the total square footage of existing buildings on these twelve properties is 11,526 square feet.

- If these 12 properties were redeveloped to the maximum extent allowed by current zoning regulations, they could support approximately 82,308 square feet of building space. In terms of dwelling units, it is estimated that as many as 22 dwelling units could be accommodated within this building space, if these properties developed at densities typical for the zone district that they are located within.

- Additional redevelopment beyond the properties identified through the value ratio analysis is likely in the Collegetown area. While it is difficult to estimate how much redevelopment may occur here, versus in other areas of the community, it is likely that redevelopment pressure will continue to be high due to the area’s proximity to Cornell University and demand for student housing. In addition to redevelopment of properties that have relatively low ratios of improvements to land values, redevelopment in the Collegetown area will most likely occur on properties with structures in disrepair, as well as on properties with relatively small building footprints, single-story buildings (where many more stories are permitted), and on blocks where there is potential to consolidate properties.
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Table 25: Collegetown Redevelopment Potential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone District</th>
<th>Properties Identified as Possible Candidates for Redevelopment*</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Building Square Footage</th>
<th>Residential Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-2b</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>82,308</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2b</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>82,308</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Properties identified as possible candidates for redevelopment have a total value of improvements to the property that is less than or equal to the property’s land value.

Downtown/West State Street Corridor

Downtown is the traditional heart of the Ithaca community, and community resources and attention have been focused here to maintain vitality and encourage growth. Part of the community dialogue about the future of Downtown includes the possibility of extending the nature and character of Downtown West along the State Street corridor, connecting to the waterfront area. Accordingly, the planning team examined redevelopment potential and opportunities in this area, as follows.

Existing Conditions

- The 314 properties examined in the Downtown/West State Street Corridor area encompass approximately 69 acres. As illustrated in the following table, the predominant existing land use in the area is commercial (45.0%), followed by public/quasi-public uses (23.2%).
- Approximately 1 acre (1.4%) within the Downtown/West State Street Corridor area is currently vacant/undeveloped. This low number of vacant/undeveloped property means that future growth in the Downtown/West State Street Corridor area will occur predominantly through intensification or redevelopment of existing areas.

Table 26: Downtown/West State Street Corridor Existing Land Use and Average Value Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Number of Parcels</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>% of Total Acres</th>
<th>Average Value Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Quasi-Public</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park/Recreation/Natural Area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant/Undeveloped</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad/Utility Provider</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- The average value ratio of all properties in the Downtown/West State Street Corridor area is 3.34. This is less than the average value ratio of properties in the Collegetown area, and the City as a whole. Interestingly, commercial properties in the Downtown/West State Street Corridor have a lower average value ratio than other types of uses in this area, which may indicate that land in this area is becoming nearly as valuable as the commercial buildings in this area.

Redevelopment Potential

- Based on the calculated value ratios, approximately 7 acres (47 properties) in the Downtown/West State Street Corridor area can be considered possible candidates for redevelopment (meaning that the total value of improvements to the property is less than or equal to the property’s land value). This group of properties does not include land currently classified as undeveloped/vacant or used for parks or natural areas purposes, but does include properties currently used for commercial parking lots.
- The total square footage of existing buildings on these 47 properties is 50,824 square feet.
- If these 47 properties were redeveloped to the maximum extent allowed by current zoning regulations, they could support approximately 905,001 square feet of building space. If the properties included residential units developed at densities typical for their corresponding zoning districts, it is estimated that this building space could accommodate 89 dwelling units. Based on the size of dwelling units desired, this estimated number of dwelling units accommodated through redevelopment could vary greatly in the Downtown/West State Street Corridor area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone District</th>
<th>Properties Identified as Possible Candidates for Redevelopment*</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Building Square Footage</th>
<th>Residential Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High Estimate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>12,725</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2c</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>157,409</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2d</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>97,594</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>31,213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD-100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>215,604</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD-85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>54,971</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD-60</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>335,485</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>905,001</strong></td>
<td><strong>89</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Properties identified as possible candidates for redevelopment have a total value of improvements to the property that is less than or equal to the property’s land value.
Waterfront/Inlet Island

Community discussions are active, concerning the future of Ithaca’s Waterfront Area, including Inlet Island. This area is currently home to low-intensity governmental and industrial uses, but holds the promise of a vibrant mixed-use center with housing, shops, and entertainment uses that take advantage of the waterfront amenity. Discussions for waterfront redevelopment do not extend to the public parks and open space uses at the northern edge of the waterfront, but are focused on the existing governmental and industrial use areas. Accordingly, the following sections describe the redevelopment potential in this area.

Existing Conditions

- The 105 properties examined in the Waterfront/Inlet Island area encompass approximately 145 acres. As illustrated in Table , the predominant existing land use in the area is commercial (32.8%), followed by public/quasi-public uses (29.5%).
- A significant amount of vacant/undeveloped property is located in the Waterfront/Inlet Island area (13.6 acres or 9.4%).
- Cornell University owns approximately 5.1 acres in the Waterfront/Inlet Island area, which may be used for future development/redevelopment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Number of Parcels</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>% of Total Acres</th>
<th>Average Value Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Quasi-Public</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad/Utility Provider</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant/Undeveloped</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>6.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park/Recreation/Natural Area</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>5.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>105</strong></td>
<td><strong>144.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.25</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The average value ratio of all properties in the Waterfront/Inlet Island area is 2.25. This is less than the average value ratio of properties in the Collegetown and Downtown/West State Street Corridor areas, and the City as a whole. Industrial uses have the highest average value ratio of properties in this area, which either means that significant investments have been made on improving these properties, or that land values are relatively inexpensive for industrial properties.

Redevelopment Potential

- Based on the calculated value ratios, approximately 51.8 acres (105 properties) in the Waterfront/Inlet Island area can be considered possible candidates for redevelopment (meaning that the total value of improvements to the property is less than or equal to the property’s land value).
value). This group of properties does not include land currently classified as undeveloped/vacant or used for parks or natural areas purposes, but does include properties currently used for commercial parking lots.

- The total square footage of existing buildings on these 105 properties is 7,789 square feet.
- If these 105 properties were redeveloped to the maximum extent allowed by current zoning regulations, they could support as much as 3,817,144 square feet of building space. If these buildings included residential units, developed at densities typical for their underlying zone districts, it is estimated that the building space could accommodate approximately 218 dwelling units. These estimates are based on current zoning, but actual totals may be lower due to various land use regulations in the Waterfront/Inlet Island Area that are intended to protect views and environmental quality.

### Table 29: Waterfront/Inlet Island Redevelopment Potential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone District</th>
<th>Properties Identified as Possible Candidates for Redevelopment*</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Building Square Footage High Estimate**</th>
<th>Residential Units High Estimate**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>111,603</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>655,290</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEDZ-1a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>62,079</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WF-1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>1,637,991</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WF-2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>1,238,579</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>3,817,144</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Properties identified as possible candidates for redevelopment have a total value of improvements to the property

** This estimate may be high due to factors in the Waterfront/Inlet Island area that may limit development, including stepback requirements, flood control channel and lookout point restrictions, and others factors that would be determined through the site plan review process.

### West End

The West End holds Ithaca’s main remaining inventory of developable, vacant land. The area is mainly residential in character with few retail and service uses, but holds the potential for significant levels of new residential growth (along with potential for related non-residential uses and services). Given the City’s need for additional housing of various types, development in the West End is likely to be an important part of the City’s growth pattern in the near and longer-term future. Following is an assessment of the capacity of this area to accommodate additional development.

### Existing Conditions

- The 146 properties examined in the West End area encompass approximately 39 acres. As illustrated in the following table the most predominant existing land use in the area is commercial (62.0%), followed by residential (14.8%).
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- Approximately 1 acre (2.5%) within the West End area is currently vacant/undeveloped, meaning that like other areas of the community, future growth will occur predominantly through intensification or redevelopment of existing areas.
- The average value ratio of all properties in the West End area is 2.90. This is slightly higher than the Waterfront/Inlet Island area, but less than the average value ratio of properties in the Collegetown and Downtown/West State Street Corridor area, and the City as a whole. Residential properties in the West End have a higher average value ratio than many other types of uses in this area.

Table 30: West End Existing Land Use and Average Value Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Number of Parcels</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>% of Total Acres</th>
<th>Average Value Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Quasi-Public</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad/Utility Provider</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant/Undeveloped</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Redevelopment Potential

- Based on the calculated value ratios, approximately 9.7 acres (30 properties) in the West End area can be considered possible candidates for redevelopment (meaning that the total value of improvements to the property is less than or equal to the property's land value). This group of properties does not include land currently classified as undeveloped/vacant or used for parks or natural areas purposes, but does include properties currently used for commercial parking lots.
- The total existing square footage of buildings on these 30 properties is 32,858 square feet.
- If these 30 properties were redeveloped to the maximum extent allowed by current zoning regulations, they could support as much as 1,372,334 square feet of building space. If these buildings included residential dwelling units, developed at densities typical for the underlying zone districts, it is estimated that they could accommodate approximately 111 dwelling units. Factors in the West End, such as the protection of significant views and compatibility with residential neighborhoods, may limit this redevelopment potential.
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Table 31: West End Redevelopment Potential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone District</th>
<th>Properties Identified as Possible Candidates for Redevelopment*</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Building Square Footage</th>
<th>Residential Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-2a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>109,343</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>37,254</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEDZ-1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1,187,415</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEDZ-2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>38,332</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>1,372,344</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Properties identified as possible candidates for redevelopment have a total value of improvements to the property that is less than or equal to the property’s land value.

** This estimate may be high due to factors in the West End area that may further limit development, such as protection of view corridors.

Southwest Area

The Southwest area is a major commercial and shopping destination in the community. It has developed in a more suburban nature than other parts of the community, with several large “big box” stores, surrounded by vast parking areas. This less intense pattern of development may present opportunities for future infill development, and even redevelopment in some areas. Following is an assessment of the infill and redevelopment potential in this area.

Existing Conditions

- The areas examined in the Southwest area occupy roughly 93 parcels and encompass approximately 266 acres. As illustrated in the following table, the predominant existing land use in the Southwest area is commercial (66.4%).
- Approximately 68.2 acres (0.5%) within the Southwest are currently vacant/undeveloped. The estimated build-out capacity for these vacant/undeveloped areas is included in the previous section, not within this analysis of infill and redevelopment potential.

Table 32: Southwest Area Existing Land Use and Average Value Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Number of Parcels</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>% of Total Acres</th>
<th>Average Value Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>176.7</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant/Undeveloped</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Quasi-Public</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- The average value ratio of all properties in the Southwest area is 2.45, which is much lower than the citywide average of 5.95, meaning that there is great potential for intensification and additional investment in this area.

Redevelopment Potential

- Based on the calculated value ratios, approximately 8.8 acres (14 properties) in the Southwest area can be considered possible candidates for redevelopment (meaning that the total value of improvements to the property is less than or equal to the property’s land value). This group of properties does not include land currently classified as undeveloped/vacant or used for parks or natural areas purposes.
- Currently, the total square footage of existing buildings on these fourteen properties is 8,506 square feet.
- If these 14 properties were redeveloped to the maximum extent allowed by current zoning regulations, they could support approximately 377,230 square feet of building space. In terms of dwelling units, it is estimated that as many as 104 dwelling units could be accommodated within this building space, if these properties developed at densities typical for the zone district that they are located within.

Table 33: Southwest Area Redevelopment Potential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone District</th>
<th>Properties Identified as Possible Candidates for Redevelopment*</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Building Square Footage High Estimate</th>
<th>Residential Units High Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SW-2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>335,887</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>41,343</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>377,230</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Properties identified as possible candidates for redevelopment have a total value of improvements to the property that is less than or equal to the property’s land value.

Infill Development Potential on Surface Parking Lots

- In addition to the redevelopment potential identified above, the Southwest area also has a significant amount of land currently utilized for surface parking that presents opportunities for intensification through infill development.
- The Southwest area currently contains approximately 77 acres of paved parking areas (these parking areas serve the underlying commercial and other land use activities).
- The following table identifies the potential infill development potential if one third (33%) of the land area currently utilized for surface parking in the Southwest area intensified through infill development at the maximum extent allowed by current zoning regulations. These parking areas could support approximately 1.2 million square feet of building space, and approximately 374 dwelling units.
### Table 34: Southwest Area Infill Potential on Surface Parking Lots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone District</th>
<th>Total Acreage of Surface Parking Lots</th>
<th>Building Square Footage</th>
<th>Residential Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High Estimate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW-1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>125,953</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW-2</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>1,004,065</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW-3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>89,133</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>1,219,151</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECAP**

This capacity analysis and discussion of redevelopment opportunities highlights a number of preliminary facts and issues:

- Projections estimate population and economic growth; however, community priorities and decisions made through the Comprehensive Plan and other planning processes can materially affect community’s rate of growth and development opportunities.
- There is limited available undeveloped land to accommodate expected growth, but significant opportunities are present to potentially accommodate infill and redevelopment.
- With respect to residential housing needs, there is a continuing need for affordable housing opportunities throughout the community and housing for the student population near campus and Downtown.
- Zoning and development regulations currently contain considerable flexibility in accommodating additional development/redevelopment, allowing a focus on economic activity and mixed-use development that may help address fiscal health issues.
- There are opportunities for infill and redevelopment, citywide, with significant potential for redevelopment activity in the Collegetown, Downtown/West State Street Corridor, Waterfront/Inlet Island, West End, and Southwest areas.

These are issues that will be addressed in the new Comprehensive Plan.
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PART 6: RECAP OF MAJOR INFLUENCES

This Planning Influences report has been prepared to help the City of Ithaca conduct informed discussions about a future vision for the City and possible policy directions to achieve that vision. The information can be summarized as follows.

POLICY CONTEXT

A rich array of plans and policies forms the context for this Comprehensive Plan. The plans are summarized in the body of this document, with more detail in the Appendix. There is a strong need for cooperation with nearby jurisdictions and institutions, and a regional focus needs to be an important part of the Comprehensive Plan. Plans prepared by Tompkins County and Cornell University are especially relevant in understanding the constraints and opportunities facing the City. The network of policies already in place helps inform the discussions about Ithaca’s future, and a key benefit of producing this new Comprehensive Plan is the opportunity to tie the threads together into a cohesive, understandable, and mutually supportive manner. Of particular note are existing policy directions calling for supporting downtown and waterfront mixed-use development and mixed-use strategies along the West State Street corridor, combined with emphasis on neighborhood preservation, and non-automobile mobility options.

DATA AND INFORMATION

As work proceeds on this Comprehensive Plan, the base of existing land use, infrastructure, and demographic information helps form the foundation for policy discussions. Highlights from this report:

- **Growth** – The City of Ithaca has experienced little change in population over the past few decades while surrounding areas grew.
- **Development Opportunities** – Much of the City is developed and there are limited opportunities for new development on vacant tracts. This means increased importance in examining infill and redevelopment opportunities and considerations.
- **Development Controls** – Current development regulations provide considerable flexibility for a range of development opportunities in established zoning districts, and also call for high standards.
- **Community Demographics** – Due to the influence of area universities, the City’s population is very young. This affects the local real estate market in several ways, including the fact that more properties are rented than owner-occupied.
- **Housing Needs** – Housing studies show a need for more affordable housing opportunities in the City.
- **Employment Needs** – The City’s unemployment rate has been low over the last few years, but the City has a significant rate of poverty and a lower median household income than surrounding areas.
- **Transportation** – Ithaca generally has a good transportation system with a strong grid network. With most areas built-out, there is little possibility for major new road systems, rather there is a need for improvements to existing roadways. There is strong support for additional bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and strong interest in adding more transit options.
FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

The issue of future population to be accommodated and the need for new housing in the City is a pivotal issue for the new Comprehensive Plan. Encouraging appropriate residential growth in the City is essential to a successful smart growth strategy for the City, the County and the region. With so much of the City already developed, with limited vacant land left, it is critically important to understand the capacities and opportunities for infill and redevelopment activity, viewed alongside projections for future population growth and housing demand.

New development in the West End is a clear possibility. For other parts of the City, redevelopment is more likely to be the focus to accommodate growth. The highest levels of redevelopment opportunities and growth appear to be in the Waterfront/Inlet Island areas, along the West State Street corridor. The Southwest area presents large opportunities for infill development, especially on large, surface parking lots.

NEXT STEPS

The City of Ithaca is currently engaging citizens and stakeholders in discussions about a desired future for Ithaca. Those opinions and aspirations will be summarized when the current phase of outreach is completed and can then be considered, along with the information in this Planning Influences report, to develop a vision and a set of realistic and achievable strategy options. The combination of facts, trends, vision, and strategies will then be pulled together in a draft Comprehensive Plan for community consideration.
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APPENDIX

1. Maps
2. Full Summary of Existing Plans
3. Example Road Cross Sections
4. Assumptions Used for Growth Capacity Analysis
1. MAPS

Map 1: Planning Area
Map 2: Existing Land Use
Map 3: Property Ownership
Map 4: Current Zoning
Map 5: Population Distribution
Map 6: Environmental Features
Map 7: Historic Resources
Map 8: Public Facilities
Map 9: Roads AADT
Map 10: Sidewalks and Trails
Map 11: Property Status
1. Planning Area
3. Property Ownership
4. Current Zoning
5. Population Distribution

The map shows the 2010 population distribution in Ithaca, New York, with population distribution categories ranging from 0-50, 51-200, 201-500, 501-1,000, and more than 1,000. The map includes City Boundary, City Designated Natural Area, Railroad, Road, Waterway, Ithaca Commons, and Schools. The map is prepared by Clarion Associates, May, 2012.
6. Environmental Features
7. Historic Resources

Data Source: City of Ithaca GIS Program, 2011
9. Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT)
10. Existing Sidewalks and Paved Trails

Note: Although not in the GIS, there is an extensive sidewalk network on the Cornell campus.
2. FULL SUMMARY OF EXISTING PLANS

COMPREHENSIVE PLANS

Comprehensive Planning documents summarized in this section include:

- Ithaca, NY: A General Plan
- Tompkins County Comprehensive Plan
- Tompkins County Five Year Progress Report on Comprehensive Plan Implementation

ITHACA, NY: A GENERAL PLAN

Date: 1971
Prepared For/By: City of Ithaca Common Council/City of Ithaca Planning Board
Location/Study Area: City of Ithaca (approximately 3,900 acres)

Overview

This is the most recent General Plan prepared for the City of Ithaca. The major parts of the plan include Land Use, Community Facilities, Community Activities, Special Community Projects, and Circulation. The initial chapters introduce the planning effort and development objectives, and contain helpful information about historical developments within the City and current conditions (as of 1971).

The Land Use chapter provides detailed information about existing and projected future land uses, summarized by planning units/neighborhoods. Maps in this section include existing land use and projected land use.

The Community Activities chapter summarizes the organization and operations of the City of Ithaca government, including City facilities, police, and fire departments. Also summarized are civil defense, libraries, schools, higher education, and social services organizations. The Community Facilities chapter provides background information about and projections for the City’s water supply, sewage, solid waste disposal, natural gas, electricity, street lighting, and parks and open space systems.

The Special Community Development Activities identified in this chapter include a proposed National Arts and Recreation Center (a multifaceted project that includes a marina, golf course, recreation complex, flood-control channel, and Center for the Arts), Urban Renewal, and housing (student, low-income, and market-rate opportunities).

The Circulation and Transportation chapter summarizes and offers recommendations (proposals) regarding the internal circulation system, external traffic patterns, parking, transit system, railroads, and air transportation. Maps include existing major streets and traffic generators, and projected major streets and traffic generators.

Development Objectives

The development objectives of the Ithaca General Plan provide the guidance for building a community in which each resident has an opportunity to
exercise his full or her potential in seeking worthwhile economic, educational, cultural, and physical goals. The development objectives are outlined below:

1. A City which builds for the different interests of its citizens.
2. A City which understands and does not abuse its irreplaceable physical resources.
3. A City which has a workable pattern for relating the industrial, commercial, and residential activities of men.
4. A City which moves its goods and people efficiently and safely.
5. A City which encourages the diversity of its industrial base and makes every effort to employ its labor force according to its skill and capacity.
6. A City which is responsive to its growing regional role as a cultural-recreational center and its local role as a commercial-service center.
7. A City which employs the renewal of resources, buildings, land, and circulation as a means to correct and bring new vigor to the community.
8. A City which recognizes that its future development will be based on the City’s role as a retail-service center, and the City’s attractive powers for service type industries; and a City which plans for these future developments.

Projected Land Use

The plan also contains land use projections to the year 1990. The projected land use map from the plan is provided in the following figure. Interestingly, the projected land use map looks quite similar to the existing land use map for the City of Ithaca today (see 2: Existing Land Use).

Figure 15: 1971 Ithaca General Plan, Projected Land Use Map
Appendix

Relevance to this Process

The 2012 Comprehensive Planning process will provide a new Comprehensive Plan for Ithaca, to replace the 1971 plan. Many of the remaining portions of the plan are outdated and will be significantly updated or revised. The new plan will include a vision that describes the ideal state of the community in 2035, accompanied by goals, policies, and strategies for achieving the vision. The development objectives from the 1971 plan may provide a solid foundation for the new vision, goals, and policies.

TOMPKINS COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Date: 2004
Prepared For/By: Tompkins County Legislature/Tompkins County Planning Department
Location/Study Area: Tompkins County

Overview

The County Comprehensive Plan begins with an introduction that describes the value of a Comprehensive Plan, a theme of regional cooperation, the importance of community input, coordination with other efforts, and the ten basic principles of the plan.

The Tompkins County Overview chapter summarizes the historic settlement, demographic profile, geology and natural surroundings, and anticipated future changes in the county. Next, the plan describes existing conditions, long-term policies, and short-term action items associated with various interlocking pieces including: (1) housing, transportation, and jobs, (2) the environment, and (3) neighborhoods and communities.

The implementation and Plan Analysis chapter identifies principal agencies responsible for taking the lead on implementation of the priority action items described throughout the plan. The Future Development Scenarios chapter provides two examples of what could happen in the county in terms of land use patterns, and impacts on transportation, infrastructure, and natural resources. The scenarios include the extension of past trends (continued suburban and rural development) and a planned pattern of development that shifts away from suburban/rural areas into the City, villages, and hamlets. The Fiscal Impact Analysis section shows the relative impacts of each of the scenarios on the fiscal health of the county and its communities.

County Planning Principles

REGIONAL COOPERATION

- Work proactively with towns, villages, the City of Ithaca, adjoining counties, state and federal agencies to cooperatively address regional issues.

HOUSING, TRANSPORTATION, AND JOBS

- Housing should be affordable and appealing to all residents, regardless of their income or whether they rent or own their homes.
- The efficiency of the highway system should be enhanced and use of public transit, walking, and bicycling should be increased.
- The local economy should be enhanced by building on important community assets, such as a highly educated workforce, an
entrepreneurial spirit, dynamic academic institutions, and a high quality of life.

- A diversified rural economy centered around the working rural landscapes of farms and forests, and the livelihoods of those who depend on them, should be preserved and enhanced.

THE ENVIRONMENT

- Water resources provide drinking water, recreational opportunities, and environmental benefits, and should be protected and used appropriately.
- Natural features that define our community, and form the foundation of our local and regional ecological systems, should be preserved and enhanced.

NEIGHBORHOODS AND COMMUNITIES

- Residents should be safe, healthy, and comfortable with the aesthetics of their communities, and have daily opportunities to interact with neighbors and community members to build strong, cohesive communities.
- The development patterns reflected in the existing villages, hamlets, and the City of Ithaca’s downtown area and neighborhoods should be promoted as key components of the built environment that greatly contribute to the vitality of the local economy and community life.
- The effectiveness of taxpayer dollars should be maximized by investing government funds in public infrastructure and facilities in the most efficient manner possible.

Relevance to this Process

The County’s Comprehensive Plan contains various planning principles that will help provide a basis for preparing the City’s new vision, goals, and policies. In particular, the principles associated with the City’s development patterns should be reviewed, as should those related to coordination with the County and other regional entities. Additionally, the actions identified in the implementation chapter should be reviewed, especially those items that clearly involve the City of Ithaca.
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- Development Focus Area Strategy (designates the City of Ithaca as an Urban Center)
- Conservation Strategy
- Housing Fund
- Stream Buffer Restoration
- Capital Reserve Fund for Natural, Scenic, and Recreational Resource Protection
- Purchase of Development Rights

Relevance to this Process

It will be important to coordinate the City’s implementation priorities and action plan with the County’s 2009 Comprehensive Plan progress report. Many of the items identified in the list of proposed actions relate to and/or involve the City of Ithaca.

TRANSPORTATION PLANS

Transportation planning documents summarized in this section include:

- ITCTC & 2030 Long-Range Transportation Plan
- Ithaca Bicycle Plan

ITCTC: 2030 LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Date: 2009
Prepared For/By: Ithaca-Tompkins County Transportation Council (ITCTC)

Overview

The 2030 Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) is the third update to the original LRTP that was developed in 1995. The LRTP covers a 20-year planning horizon to 2030. The 2030 vision for the future of the Tompkins County transportation system embraces the concept of sustainable accessibility – the ability to get to a destination or complete a task in an efficient, convenient, and reliable way, while using technologies and services that minimize environmental impacts, promote economic vitality, and ensure equity in the provision of transportation to the community. The plan identifies mobility, proximity, connectivity, integration, and quality of life as the components of sustainable accessibility, and establishes a series of goals and objectives for each component.

Beyond the goals and objectives (summarized below), major components of the plan include a demographic overview and a technical discussion of the transportation system. Topics addressed in the discussion of the transportation are connectivity, system integration, environmental impacts, safety, and financial resources.

Noteworthy maps contained in the plan include the 2004 County Highway Functional Classification System, Bridges and Ratings, Bus Routes, Bus Ridership, Intermodal Facilities, Bike Suitability, Sidewalk Inventory, Multi-Use Trails, City Parking Areas, Cayuga Lake Scenic Byway, Road Congestion, Freight Generators and Corridors, Natural Features and Areas, and Historic Bridges and Structures.
Goals

OVERARCHING GOALS
- Improve the safety of the transportation system.
- Enhance coordination between transportation providers to benefit and convenience of users.
- Minimize negative environmental impacts of transportation.
- Reduce vehicle miles of travel and vehicular emissions.
- Reduce fossil fuel energy dependency.

COMPONENT GOALS
- Integration: Develop an integrated transportation system for Tompkins County that is seamless, multimodal, and coordinated to achieve greater operational efficiencies and increase the safety and convenience of users.
- Mobility: Promote implementation of transportation services, programs, and projects that enhance mobility.
- Proximity: Achieve land development patterns that enable the efficient provision of multimodal transportation services.
- Connectivity: Maintain and improve transportation networks to enhance safety, multimodal and intermodal connectivity, and facilitate the movement of people and goods.
- Quality of Life: Develop a transportation system that sustains and enhances the quality of life for Tompkins County residents and visitors.
- Environment: Work progressively towards a transportation system that will have zero-net negative impact on the environment.

Relevance to This Process
The 2030 LRTP provides useful information about the regional transportation system, and may be a good source for recent demographic data and trends. While broad, the plan’s goals could serve as a basis for many of the City’s comprehensive transportation goals and policies. The detailed maps and technical discussions in the LRTP will help inform the transportation and mobility elements of the City’s Comprehensive Plan.

ITHACA BICYCLE PLAN
Date: 1997 (addendums in 1998 and 2001)
Prepared For/By: City of Ithaca, Department of Planning and Development/Trowbridge & Wolf Landscape Architects, IMC Consulting Group

Overview
The Ithaca Bicycle Plan was developed in order to determine bicycle facilities to be developed in the short-term to effectively spend $80,000 in ISTEA funds, and to outline a long-term vision for the City of Ithaca to increase bicycle use while increasing safety for cyclists, pedestrians, and motorists.

Two overarching goals are incorporated in the plan: (1) double the current percentage of total trips made by bicycles within the City of Ithaca, and (2) simultaneously reduce the number of bicycle-related deaths and injury accidents by ten percent. The plan also outlines specific objectives towards achieving these goals.
The plan establishes two bikeway route network plans – a phase one bikeway route network, and a long-term bikeway route network. Phase one addresses many of the critical needs of cyclists, is seen as more politically achievable and fiscally restrained and proposed “hybrid lanes” in various locations as an alternative to striped bicycle lanes. The long-term network is a Comprehensive Plan that builds on the successes of the first phase and incorporates more aggressive treatment of the proposed routes.

The plan also describes existing education, enforcement, and encouragement programs, and proposed additional programs such as a coordinated public service announcement, warning tickets, and a bicycle week. The plan calls for a strong City commitment to long-term commitment of City resources and incremental implementation of the plan, as funding allows.

The purpose of the 1998 addendum to the plan was to clarify that components of the plan needed further examination and/or clarification, especially related to implementation. These issues include the dollar costs of implementation, route selection, street level treatments, regional connections, New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDoT) comments, parking removal, and other streetscape changes. The 2001 addendum to the plan was issued in order to explicitly acknowledge comments raised by the NYSDoT.

Relevance to this Process

Although not a recent effort, the Ithaca Bicycle Plan provides useful information about the vision for the long-term bicycle network in the City. Through the Comprehensive Planning effort it may be helpful to revisit the goals for bicycling in the community, as well as the status and key priorities of the proposed bicycle networks.

NEIGHBORHOOD/DISTRICT PLANS AND REGULATIONS

This section summarizes the following neighborhood and district plans and regulations:

- Downtown Ithaca 2020 Strategic Plan
- Ithaca Commons Preliminary Design
- Collegetown Urban Plan and Conceptual Design Guidelines
- Northside: Turning the Corner
- Design Guidelines for the Southwest Area and Elmira Road-Meadow Street Corridor
- West Hill Master Plan

DOWNTOWN ITHACA 2020 STRATEGIC PLAN

Date: 2010
Prepared For/By: Downtown Ithaca Business Improvement District/The Downtown Ithaca Alliance

Overview

Prepared by the Ithaca Downtown Alliance, the Downtown Ithaca Strategic Plan identifies “the community big idea” as a three-pronged package to
revitalize the urban core, reduce regional sprawl, reduce the community’s carbon footprint, bolster tourism, and strengthen the linkages between institutions of higher education and downtown. The big idea includes:

- The creation of 1,500 new urban residential housing units in downtown and along the West State Street corridor.
- The rebuilding of the Ithaca Commons to enhance its commercial and community functions, and its recasting as a transit hub, with a streetcar or other form of enhanced transit running through the middle of the pedestrian mall.
- The creation of a new enhanced transit program and route that connects the Commons with Cornell University and Collegetown, Ithaca College, and the West End/Waterfront. The enhanced transit could be a streetcar or trolley that would strengthen and encourage corridor development.

The plan relies on the following fundamental and basic themes and concepts that permeate all of the recommendations and actions items:

- The necessity of mixed-use development
- The need for a dense urban core
- Reducing automobile usage in downtown
- Treating the Commons as a transit hub
- Utilizing the principles of infill development
- Clustering pedestrian traffic-generating destinations in downtown
- Recognizing transition zones at downtown’s edges
- Preserving and enhancing the retail streetscape
- Recognizing downtown as the community center
- Viewing downtown as a leader in green practices and sustainability

The plan identifies a series of quantitative goals for the period between 2010 to 2020. These goals include construction of new downtown retail and office space, target retail occupancy rate, attracting national retailers, increasing number of downtown employees, residents, and housing units, and various other new projects.

The plan also establishes goals, objectives, and recommendations for various segments of downtown, including the Ithaca Commons, retail, office, housing, entertainment, cultural arts, the downtown environment, other infrastructure, tourism and visitors, transportation system, serving youth, serving seniors, accessibility, higher education institutions, coordination with other commercial districts, historic preservation, role as a regional center, and marketing.

Relevance to This Process

Through the Comprehensive Planning process, it will be important to review, consider, and potentially incorporate goals and projects identified by the Ithaca Downtown Alliance in the Downtown Strategic Plan into the City of Ithaca’s Comprehensive Plan.

ITHACA COMMONS PRELIMINARY DESIGN

Date: 2010
Prepared For/By: City of Ithaca/Sasaki Associates and Clough Harbour & Associates
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Overview

The Ithaca Commons Preliminary Design document summarizes the planning process and presents the preferred option for upgrading and investing in Ithaca Commons, the economic and social heart of Ithaca’s downtown.

The preferred Preliminary Plan calls for a traditional streetscape configuration along State/MLK, Jr. Street, with a wide central corridor kept clear for pedestrian and service movement through the space, narrow bands of tree plantings lining either side, and a clear zone along the face of storefronts, providing space for window shopping and outdoor dining. The design reconstructs the Trolley Circle as the heart of the Commons, and shifts the main performance space to the northern end of Bank Alley, where a new pavilion serves as a stage and iconic new gateway.

The estimated timeline for construction of the project is about 12 months, including 8 months of actual construction work, with approximately 4 months lost due to winter weather conditions. The estimated construction budget is nearly $7.5 million.

Relevance to This Process

Building on the Downtown Strategic Plan, the preliminary design for the upgrades to Ithaca Commons represents a new vision for significant reinvestment in Downtown Ithaca. Should this design concept continue to be pursued as the preferred option, the Comprehensive Plan could support this direction through the plan’s vision, policies, and implementation strategies.

COLLEGETOWN URBAN PLAN AND CONCEPTUAL DESIGN GUIDELINES

Date: 2009
Prepared For/By: City of Ithaca Common Council/City of Ithaca and Goody Clancy.

Overview

The planning document consists of two parts: Part One supersedes and replaces all portions of Part Two, while Part Two is the 2008 version of the Collegetown Urban Plan and Design Guidelines. The planning process and development of both parts of the plan involved extensive public input and participation.

The planning document consists of two parts: Part One, prepared by the City’s Planning and Development Board and endorsed by the Common Council, supersedes and replaces all portions of Part Two where the documents differ. Part Two is the 2008 version of the plan, prepared by Goody Clancy Associates. The planning process and development of both parts of the plan involved extensive public input and participation. The plan outlined several character areas that were designed to protect the surrounding residential neighborhoods by concentrating new development in central Collegetown. In addition, the plan outlined the components of a multi-layered sustainable transportation system that aims to address the issues of parking and congestion in Collegetown, while positively influencing the development economics in the area.
**Vision Statement Themes**

- Strengthening and sustaining Collegetown’s residential and commercial diversity and activity.
- Identifying opportunities and appropriate locations for increased density while ensuring sensitive transitions from high- to low-density areas.
- Improving pedestrian amenities and connections.
- Rationalizing Collegetown’s parking options and opportunities.
- Focusing on new development options that can generate revenue.

The plan also sets out recommendations for a new “sustainable transportation system” (STS) for Collegetown. Components of the STS program include pursuing a “park once strategy,” creating a commercial parking-benefit district, providing universal transit passes, requiring “parking cash-out” charging for parking separately, implementing a “parking in lieu” payment system, establishing a car-sharing program, instituting additional transportation-demand management measures, establishing a residential parking benefit district, and investigating alternative infrastructure improvements. Note: Substantial revisions to this section (now called “Collegetown Transportation Plan”) are reflected in Part One of the plan.

The Urban Plan and Opportunity Scenarios section of the plan provides a foundation for the Collegetown Design Guidelines. It describes the organization of Collegetown into a series of unique character areas, and offers suggestions and scenarios for allowable building heights, typical street sections, block design, site layouts, and other design details for the various character areas.

The Design Guidelines component of the plan provide tools to understand, strengthen, and enhance the physical form and visual character of the Collegetown area. The design guidelines address goals, preferred uses, and desired site design, parking, height, setbacks, streets, transitions, urban form, materials, architectural and façade design, and streetscape for each character area. Lastly, the plan’s implementation chapter calls for a new Collegetown zoning ordinance.

**Relevance to This Process**

The Collegetown plan is a relatively recent effort that involved extensive public participation and feedback. For these reasons, it could serve as a very valuable source of information about community concerns and expectations for the Comprehensive Planning process. The plan also provides very detailed information about existing conditions in the Collegetown area, which will help inform the Planning Influences Report. Likewise, the plan’s vision, scenarios, guidelines, and implementation strategies establish a solid foundation for the Comprehensive Plan, both for the Collegetown area, and possibly other similar parts of the community.

---

**NORTHSIDE: TURNING THE CORNER**

Date: 2003
Prepared For/By: City of Ithaca/The Northside Neighborhood Association Steering Committee, City of Ithaca, Cornell University

**Overview**

The purpose of the Northside: Turning the Corner plan is to ensure that the Northside neighborhood remains a health, viable community. The planning
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effort focused on resident empowerment, a resident-driven process, inclusion, outreach, diversity, representative participation, attention to neighborhood assets, and collaboration with City Hall and the greater community.

The first part of the plan addresses neighborhood strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats. The section part of the plan contains goals and objectives that address the following subject areas: Community Building, Open Space, Housing, Youth Development, Infrastructure, Transportation, Neighborhood-Oriented Retail, Public Safety, and Sustainability.

Major findings and recommendations of the plan include physical and social projects to build on neighborhood assets, social activities and projects to increase cohesiveness of the neighborhood, increasing the quality of rental housing, improving the overall appearance of the neighborhood, programs to increase home ownership, improving the P&C store and lot, enhancing signage and streetscaping along Third Street, relocation of the Department of Public Works yard, and rebuilding a pedestrian bridge over Cascadilla Creek.

Relevance to This Process

This plan serves as a tremendous example of a successful neighborhood-led planning effort in Ithaca. Elements of the plan’s process can help inform the public participation strategies for the Comprehensive Plan. Moreover, the strategies identified to improve the neighborhood could be reviewed and possibly extended to other similar neighborhoods and areas of the City.

DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR THE SOUTHWEST AREA AND ELMIRA ROAD-MEADOW STREET CORRIDOR

Date: 2000
Prepared For/By: City of Ithaca/Trowbridge & Wolf Landscape Architects

Overview

The Design Guidelines cover two different but related areas in the City of Ithaca: (1) the Southwest Area, and (2) the Elmira Road-Meadow Street Corridor.

The Southwest Area relates to new development only, which includes site improvements such as streets, parking, lighting, bicycle systems, pedestrian systems, signage, vegetation, and architectural treatments for commercial, office, light industrial, and residential areas. The primary goals of the guidelines for the Southwest Area are to encourage development that contributes to Ithaca’s unique character and to supplement the existing site plan review criteria with more specific interpretation for the Southwest Area. The spirit of the design guidelines are intended to apply to redevelopment along Cherry Street and Taber Street, as applicable.

The Elmira Road-Meadow Street Corridor focuses on redeveloped areas related to existing rights-of-way, parking and service areas, lighting, bicycle and pedestrian systems, signage, vegetation, and architectural treatment for commercial and office development. The primary goals of the design guidelines for the Elmira Road-Meadow Street Corridor are to encourage development that contributes to Ithaca’s unique character and to supplement the existing site plan review criteria with more specific interpretation for the corridor.
**Relevance to This Process**

The design guidelines will help provide a useful basis for the vision for future development and design in the southwestern and Elmira Road/Meadow Street areas, and may help inform the vision for other new development and redevelopment areas as well.

---

**WEST END URBAN DESIGN PLAN**

Date: 1999  
Prepared For/By: City of Ithaca

**Overview**

The plan outlines the overall vision for the West End area, and identifies the basic design concepts and standards that will be implemented as new development occurs through the Site Development Plan Review process and the adoption of a new zoning classification. The planning vision identifies the principal aims of the study, which include:

- Redevelopment that results in a visually appealing urban mixed-use district including retail,
- Office and residential uses,
- Protection of the traditional residential neighborhoods east of Meadow Street,
- Easing the impacts of the anticipated transition west of Meadow Street from single-family houses to denser mixed uses, which may include residential uses, without diminishing the overall potential for redevelopment,
- Creation of an attractive and safe pedestrian environment coexisting with high volume traffic.

The design standards established in the plan address topics such as the street wall, building heights, separation between commercial and residential uses, waterfront development, and other elements.

**Relevance to This Process**

Many of the design standards identified in the West End Urban Design Plan are not incorporated into the City’s zoning regulations. The plan contains a helpful map depicting the area of the West End area. The Comprehensive Planning process offers the opportunity to revisit the vision for this area and to check in to see if the current zoning regulations are helping to implement this vision.

---

**WEST HILL MASTER PLAN**

Date: 1992  
Prepared For/By: City of Ithaca/Peter Trowbridge

**Overview**

Ithaca’s West Hill area is isolated from the rest of the City due to the vagaries of topography, waterways, and road access, and developed more slowly and in a less intensive fashion than the rest of the City. In 1998, the area became the focus of renewed interest for real estate investment, and a surge of residential development ensued. The response to the rapid and dramatic
change on West Hill was to reevaluate the City’s development regulations and land use plans for the area, and to update the existing master plan for West Hill.

The West Hill Master Plan serves as a general guide for the development of West Hill. The plan identifies various planning issues and documents the existing conditions in the area. Planning issues and recommendations address a variety of topics including natural features, open space and recreation areas, environmental protection, public infrastructure, emergency vehicle access, neighborhood character, and land use and zoning.

Relevance to This Process

While relatively outdated, the West Hill Master Plan helps show the history of development of the West Hill area, one of the somewhat newer significant development areas within the community. Some pockets within the West Hill area remain undeveloped, which some community members want to preserve, while others may see these areas as possible opportunities for future residential growth and development. The Comprehensive Planning process offers an opportunity to revisit and confirm the vision and goals for these pockets, within the context of overall vision and goals for the broader neighborhood and overall community.

PARK AND NATURAL RESOURCE PLANS

The following park and natural resource plans are summarized in this section:

- Stewart Park Rehabilitation Action Plan: Park Building and Landscape Improvement Projects
- NYS Local Waterfront Revitalization Program: Cayuga Lake Waterfront Plan
- Southwest Natural Area Master Plan

STEWART PARK REHABILITATION ACTION PLAN: PARK BUILDING AND LANDSCAPE IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

Date: 2011
Prepared For/By: City of Ithaca, Strategic Tourism Planning Board, and Tompkins County Chamber of Commerce Foundation/Claudia Brenner Design, Rick Manning Landscape Architect

Overview

The Rehabilitation Action Plan effort involved study of various buildings and landscape projects at Stewart Park. Some of the preliminary priority projects identified include:

- Design and reconstruction of the small pavilion.
- Cascadilla Boathouse Stairway, with leadership by the Cascadilla Boat Club.
- Community build of new roof and renovations to Concession building to make space usable for special events.
- Renovation of the Memorial Flagpole Garden.
- Construction of an All-Children’s Playground.
- Seeking grant funding for the Performance Pier and Pavilion Plaza.
Relevance to This Process

The improvements and projects identified in the Stewart Park Rehabilitation Action Plan present many opportunities ranging from leisure and recreation, to economic development and community-building. The vision for the park and goals for the improvement projects may provide ideas for the overall community vision and goals, especially related to the topics of parks and recreation facilities, economic development, visitor attraction, and community building and events.

NYS LOCAL WATERFRONT REVITALIZATION PROGRAM: CAYUGA LAKE WATERFRONT PLAN

Date: 2004
Prepared For/By: New York Department of State/Trowbridge & Wolf Landscape Architects, Planning & Environmental Research Consultants

Overview

One of the implementation strategies identified in the 1997 Tompkins County Waterfront Plan was to prepare a Local Waterfront Revitalization Program (LWRP). The LWRP is administered by the NYS Department of State and provides participating communities more leverage in acquiring state and federal funds for implementing waterfront projects.

The study area for the Waterfront Revitalization Area (WRA) is approximately 39 square miles and includes lands and waters in the Towns of Ithaca, Lansing, and Ulysses, the Villages of Cayuga Heights, and Lansing, and the City of Ithaca. The plan begins with a detailed inventory of the natural and cultural resources of the study area. Five key issues and opportunities emerged during the inventory phase, as follows:

- Increase public access to the waterfront through trail development and enhancing waterfront parks.
- Control noise from boats and enhance boater safety by strengthening and enforcing boating regulations.
- Dredge the navigable sections of the Cayuga Inlet to enhance boat access and maintain flood protection.
- Stimulate water-dependent and water-enhanced development in the City of Ithaca.
- Protect and improve the water quality of Cayuga Lake, which is critical and integral to the success of all other projects and initiatives.

Additionally, an outline of 13 policy categories and 57 sub-policies, developed by the NYS Department of State, were considered in the development and implementation of the plan. Those policies applicable to Tompkins County are followed by a description of actions recommended in the plan to implement the policy.

Various specific projects and initiatives are also proposed in the LWRP to address these policies, issues, and opportunities. Some of the short-term projects identified include improvements to Salt Point and Lansing Town Park, a Stewart Park Lake Edge Improvement Study, Cass Park Master Plan, Cass Park Landing, and the Cayuga Waterfront Trail.
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Relevance to This Process

While the Cayuga Lake Waterfront Plan covers an area broader than the City of Ithaca, it does contain detailed information regarding existing conditions in the City’s waterfront area. It also establishes specific goals, policies, projects, and initiatives for the waterfront area, many of which are extremely relevant to the City and may help guide the waterfront discussion in the Comprehensive Planning effort.

SOUTHWEST NATURAL AREA MASTER PLAN

Date: 2000
Prepared For/By: City of Ithaca/Trowbridge & Wolf Landscape Architects, TG Millers, PC Engineers and Surveyors, Robert Wesley and Nancy Ostman
Biology and Ecology

Overview

The Southwest Natural Area was assembled by the City of Ithaca primarily as substitute parkland for the designated Southwest Park, located adjacent to the natural area. The former Southwest Park was determined to have better uses as development parcels. Roughly sixty acres, referred to as the Southwest Natural area were selected as substitute parkland due to the presence of unique flora, significance of the Cayuga Inlet, proximity to the Black Diamond Trail and other regional trail extensions, and the importance of the site as a scenic and recreational resource for the community.

The Master Plan was created in advance of any development on the adjacent commercially zoned site. Development of the Master Plan included the following tasks:

- Site inventory and analysis
- Wetlands investigation
- Identification of existing plant communities and faunal habitat
- Research on the Cayuga Inlet
- Evaluation of existing drainage patterns and stormwater runoff
- Evaluation of site access points and circulation
- Description of existing uses of the site
- Identification of future activities to be allowed and encouraged

The inventory, analysis, and programming phases were synthesized into a Master Plan that addresses vegetation management, site access and circulation, programming, and stormwater management. The plan also includes vegetation management and site restoration guidelines, as well as an implementation plan that suggests phasing and provides an estimate of probable costs.

Relevance to This Process

It will be important to coordinate plans for the future commercial development of the former Southwest Park area with the Southwest Natural Area Master Plan, to ensure that development is compatible with the natural features that make the site unique and worth preserving. Additionally, the Southwest Natural Area Master Plan contains valuable information about circulation, drainage, and other topics which will be helpful to inform the Comprehensive Plan and future options for the development of the commercial site.
OTHER RELATED STUDIES, REPORTS, AND PLANS

ITHACA SUSTAINABLE DESIGN ASSESSMENT TEAM

Date: 2010
Prepared For/By: City of Ithaca/American Institute of Architects (AIA)

Overview
The Sustainable Design Assessment Team (SDAT) program focuses on the importance of developing sustainable communities through design. In 2010, the SDAT Team worked closely with local officials to assist the City of Ithaca and its citizens in addressing issues facing downtown regarding the need to connect more effectively to other commercial districts in the community. A series of key observations and recommendations resulted from the process including:

- Maintaining the Ithaca quality of life
- The centrality of downtown
- Making Ithaca’s connections work
- Connecting transportation and land use strategies
- The need for regionalism
- The governance connection

Relevance to This Process
The SDAT document provides numerous examples and models of success from other communities, and identifies other resources that can be leveraged for information and support. Also, the key observations and recommendations contained in the document could serve as preliminary ideas for the vision and goals in the Comprehensive Plan.

COMPASS II-2.0: INTERIM REPORT

Date: 2009
Prepared For/By: Human Services Coalition of Tompkins County/Lisa Horn

Overview
The United Way of Tompkins County (UWTC) and the Human Services Coalition of Tompkins County (HSC) conducted a county-wide community asset and needs assessment, COMPASS II, in 2003. At that time, UWTC made a commitment to conduct similar assessments on a regular basis. As a result, a second round of the needs and assets assessment, COMPASS II-2.0 was initiated, and this report provides an interim summary of information collected for those purposes.

A major component of COMPASS II-2.0 is a survey of households in Tompkins County. A total of 989 household surveys were completed, and an additional 105 key informants were surveyed.

Some of the key issues and findings of the survey include:

- Total employment in Tompkins County decreased by 1,485 jobs between 2003 and 2008.
- E. Coli and total coliform bacteria is consistently over EPA recommendations for swimming in all tested Tompkins County streams.
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- 17.8% of households surveyed indicated that at least one person in the household was uninsured.
- 17.9% of respondents do not have internet access in their home.
- 14.6% of employed respondents indicated a critical problem with a lack of adequate transportation for self or others in household.
- TCAT ridership increased by 24.0% between 2002 and 2008.
- Between 2000 and 2007 the largest increase in ways Tompkins County workers journey to work was by public transportation and bicycle, with decreases in driving alone and carpooling.

Relevance to This Process

The survey data provided in the COMPASS II-2.0 Report provides very helpful background information and trends that can inform the Comprehensive Plan process, especially as it relates to service needs of the community. While the survey covers the entire county, many of the findings directly relate to issues within and services provided by the City of Ithaca, including employment opportunities, transportation, environmental health, and others.

REPORT OF THE JOINT CITY/TOWN STUDY GROUP ON SHARED SERVICES AND CONSOLIDATION

Date: 2009
Prepared For/By: City and Town of Ithaca/Joint Study Group

Overview

In May 2006, a resolution was passed to set up a “Joint Study Group” to investigate possible shared services and/or municipal consolidation opportunities between the City of Ithaca and Town of Ithaca. This report was produced by the Joint Study Group (JSG), and is intended to serve as a guide for informing the potential merging or sharing of services.

The report identifies various possible future courses of action, including encouraging department cooperation and consolidation of efforts on a case-by-case basis, consolidation of additional services as directed by legislative bodies, and/or full consolidation of the City and Town of Ithaca. Individual services to consolidate could include fire protection, code enforcement, planning, public safety, public works, recreation, and records management. The report details commonly expressed arguments for and against full consolidation, and presents an analysis of the major perceived benefits and barriers to full consolidation. It also discusses other approaches to a more unified local government, such as the roles of County Government, the ITCTC, a regional transportation planning group, or others.

Recommended next steps include developing a close relationship between the parallel efforts in the Town and City to revise their Comprehensive Plans, and establishing a joint committee of legislators to adopt a broad policy position to be adopted by the municipalities to consolidate over time.

Relevance to This Process

One of the major outcomes of this report was the recommendation for the City and Town to develop a close relationship while updating their Comprehensive Plans. As the Comprehensive Planning process proceeds, it will be valuable to periodically check-in with the Town of Ithaca about the
status of their planning effort, and to coordinate goals and implementation strategies (including the possible sharing of services and/or consolidation), to the extent feasible.

CITY OF ITHACA HUD ENTITLEMENT PROGRAM 2009-2013
CONSOLIDATED PLAN
Date: 2009
Prepared For/By: United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)/City of Ithaca

Overview
The five-year Consolidated Plan describes program goals for federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Investment Partnership Program (HOME) funds. This is the first update to the 2004-2009 Consolidated Plan. Since 2003, the City of Ithaca has been designated by HUD as an “Entitlement Community” and has an annual grant from HUD through the CDBG and HOME programs. In 2004, funding peaked at nearly $1.6 million. In 2008, the total was approximately $1.3 million. In order to receive funding, HUD requires local jurisdictions to prepare and adopt a long-term consolidated plan to assess the community development needs and priorities and provide a strategy for addressing those needs.

The Ithaca Urban Renewal Agency (IURA) has been delegated primary responsibility for administering CDBG entitlement programs. The 2009-2013 plan carries forward the primary goals from the 2004-2009 plan, and adds three new Community Development Goals for 2009-2013. They include:

- Support programs and initiatives that incorporate the principles of smart growth and sustainability and enhance walkability to all areas of the community.
- Support programs that facilitate access to transit and the existing public transportation system and develop new programs that minimize the use and need for personal vehicles.
- Support programs which specialize in connecting people with existing programs and services and which enhance the ability of low-to-moderate income (LMI) people in accessing these services.

Relevance to This Process
The Consolidated Plan also identifies housing and community development needs of the Ithaca community, and its community development and other goals may help provide the basis for goals and policies related to affordable housing and other topics in the Comprehensive Plan.

CORNELL MASTER PLAN FOR THE ITHACA CAMPUS
Date: 2008

Overview
The campus master plan is a living document that weaves together the functional relationships, environmental issues, landscaping, recreational space, vehicular and pedestrian traffic patterns, architectural character, and future possibilities into a whole, to realize the aspirations of the university. In
its most simplified form, the heart of Cornell’s campus today springs from a formal quadrangle and an avenue running along a north-south axis situated within and connected to a dramatic and rugged natural setting. In the years to come, this pattern will be redirected along Tower Road’s east-west axis and reinterpreted to guide growth and provide a framework for development. In time, a large central quadrangle uniting the two sides of today’s campus will be created on the Alumni Fields. This larger vision is captured in six words: open, green, compact, integrated, engaged, and connected.

In order to ensure the best possible education for students, the university has made a commitment to keeping the size of the undergraduate student body constant (13,000 students), while slightly increasing the size of the faculty, graduate students and staff (additional 200 faculty, 1,000 graduate students, and 700 staff). The campus master plan allows for significant expansion due to the fact that a lot of the space additions in recent years address space issues that were present 30 years ago – the university is still catching up with these needs. The need for lab space is one of the primary drivers in the anticipated growth of the university, as are needs for recreational, athletic, performance, social and health services, and more on-campus housing.

The master plan acknowledges that the campus has and will continue to evolve to the east and south. Growth to the east will secure teaching and research space, and expansion to the south will accommodate administrative support, living arrangements, and athletic facilities. Collaboration with the community, including the City of Ithaca, Town of Ithaca, and adjoining neighbors will be essential in reshaping the campus and linking it with Collegetown and the Downtown Ithaca Commons.

The campus master plan comprises two documents: (1) the Overall Plan defines the principles, policies, guidelines, strategies, and initiatives that apply to the Ithaca campus as a whole, and (2) the Landscape Design Guidelines elaborate on the key elements of the campus open space network and key landscape initiatives described in the Overall Plan.

Relevance to This Process

Cornell University plays a major role in the City of Ithaca, in terms of population, employment, housing, and many other factors. Because the master plan establishes a clear vision and framework for future development and change on the Ithaca campus, it will be essential to coordinate the Comprehensive Plan with Cornell’s plan for the future. In addition, the master plan provides valuable information regarding campus population/size projections, which will not only influence plans for university facilities, but also the greater Ithaca community.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Date: 2006
Prepared For/By: Tompkins County Planning Department/Economic & Policy Resources, Inc.

Overview

This affordable housing need-assessment examines the facts behind the housing availability and affordability problems for some population groups and household income categories in the county. The analysis is based on the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) guidelines.
Owner occupied housing is considered affordable if no more than 30% of a household’s gross income is spent on a mortgage payment, utilities, taxes, and insurance. For renter units, the HUD standard is that no more than 30% of a renter household’s income should be spent on rent and utilities.

The most important finding of the assessment is that Tompkins County and its municipalities and non-profits will need to mobilize planning, development, and community organization resources over the next ten years to stimulate and facilitate the siting and construction of 2,500+ units of housing that are affordable to households with incomes at 100% of the county household median income level and below. That represents 250+ units annually, added on top of the existing shortfall of supply that needs to be made up and the nearly 1,350 units needed to meet demand for households at or above 100% of the county median household income.

Key recommendations of the assessment include the following:

- Undertake market surveys to help developers meet key components of future demand.
- Facilitate a housing-friendly environment for development.
- Investigate the pros and cons of establishing a community land trust in Tompkins County.
- Coordinate county housing organizations.
- Identify land suitable for new housing development.
- Establish growth areas to facilitate new housing development.
- Develop strategies to finance new housing development.

_Relevance to This Process_

This assessment clearly identifies the need for additional housing units (both affordable and market-rate) in Tompkins County, including the City of Ithaca. This will be an important consideration in the housing element of the Comprehensive Plan, as well as plans for future land uses and permitted development intensities.
3. TYPICAL STREET SECTIONS

As part of the development of a bicycle network, it is common to designate bicycle paths through an urban area. These are typically signed and often accompanied by printed maps to help with route planning, as route choice can be highly dependent upon experience and personal preference.

While there is no “one right” cross-section for incorporating bicycles into urban streets, there are a number of guidelines which have been developed based on best practices. In many cases, particularly when vehicle volumes and/or speeds are high (or where there is otherwise a substantial difference in vehicle and bicycle speeds, such as uphill), a striped and marked bicycle lane is typically preferable. Where streets are narrow, a shared lane (without stripe) for vehicles and bicycles is typically the preferred approach. (Not only is this often a practical consideration due to a lack of available roadway width, but this also recognizes that vehicle speeds are typically low on such streets.) This may include marking the street with “sharrows” (shared lane markings, see Figure 19). The presence (or absence) of parking, street and lane widths, and vehicle volumes all play a role in determining the appropriate cross-section.

The sections below describe additional details documenting current thinking about the installation of bicycle lanes and sharrows. It also includes sample cross-sections.

MARKED BICYCLE LANES

According to the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) Urban Bikeway Design Guide, based on AASHTO guidance, “The desirable bike lane width adjacent to a curbface is 6 feet. The desirable ridable surface adjacent to a street edge or longitudinal joint is 4 feet, with a minimum width of 3 feet. In cities where illegal parking in bike lanes is a concern, 5 foot wide bike lanes may be preferred.”
Figure 16: Bicycle Facility Guidelines from the NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide

- When placed adjacent to a parking lane, a solid white line marking of 4-inch width should be used between the parking lane and the bike lane to minimize encroachment of parked cars into the bike lane.
- The desirable width for a bike lane is 5 feet, with an optional buffer of 1 to 3 feet. Bike lanes can be designed with a flexible buffer to accommodate trees, shrubs, or other landscape features.
- Bicycle lane width and/or symbols and arrow markings (NACTO Figure 16-C.6) shall be used to define the bike lane and delineate that portion of the street for pedestrians. A minimum of 16.5 feet is recommended for pedestrian protection.
- Gutter seams, drainage inlets, and utility covers should be flush with the ground and oriented to prevent conflicts with bicycle traffic. (Not shown)
- Bike lanes may be positioned to the right of a right turn only lane or to the left of a left turn only lane (NACTO Figure 16-C.4).

Figure 17: Option 2 for 35’-36’ Roadway

- Design option for a 35’-36’ street with marked bike lanes and no on-street parking.
Figure 18: Option for 39’ One-Way Roadway

Design option for a 39’ one-way street with two travel lanes, a marked bike lane, and on-street parking.

**Marked Shared Lanes or “Sharrows”**

According to the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Guide for the Planning, Design, and Operation of Bicycle Facilities, there are six scenarios where sharrows are appropriate. Two of these scenarios are applicable to the design shown in Figure 19 for a 35’-36’ street width:

- In a shared lane with adjacent on-street parallel parking, to assist cyclists with lateral positioning that reduces the chance of a bicyclist impacting the open door of a parked vehicle.
- On wide outside lanes, to indicate safer positioning away from the curb or edge of roadway.
Figure 19: Option 1 for 35'-36' Roadway

Design option for a 35'-36' street with marked shared lanes and on-street parking.
4. ASSUMPTIONS USED FOR GROWTH CAPACITY ANALYSIS

This section of the appendix summarizes the assumptions used in calculating the growth capacity and redevelopment estimates. The results of this analysis are not intended to provide a 100% accurate estimate of development potential, but rather these calculations are intended to illustrate what levels of development might be possible in different areas of the community, given current zoning regulations and other factors.

The following assumptions were applied to generate the estimates used in the growth capacity analysis for all vacant/undeveloped land within the City, and were also applied to properties identified through the value ratio calculations as strong candidates for redevelopment.

DEVELOPMENT CONSTRAINTS

The planning team examined various constraints that may limit or prohibit development on certain properties. Development constraints considered in the analysis included topography (steep slopes) and flood hazard areas.

Slope

Using topographic GIS data, the planning team calculated the percent slope for all properties within the City of Ithaca. Various categories of slopes were identified, ranging from less than 5% to greater than 50%. It was assumed that, as the slope increases, less of the property is usable for development or redevelopment. The resulting total usable area served as the basis for all subsequent calculations.

Table 32: Slope Development Constraint Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slope Category</th>
<th>Estimated Usable Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 20%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 50%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Floodplain

GIS data also allowed the planning team to identify properties located within the City’s flood hazard areas. Flood hazard regulations can limit the amount and location of development on a parcel of land. For that reason, it was assumed that properties located in the 100-year floodplain would have a slight reduction in the overall usable (developable) area, whereas properties located within the 500-year floodplain would likely be able to utilize the full property for development or redevelopment. The resulting total usable area served as the basis for all subsequent calculations.
Table 33: Flood Hazard Development Constraint Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Hazard Area</th>
<th>Estimated Usable Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100-year</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-year</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Zoning Districts

Existing zoning regulations served as the basis for the growth capacity and redevelopment estimates. Because the City of Ithaca’s zoning ordinance allows a wide range of types and densities of development in many of its zone districts, it is necessary to estimate a range of potential growth, rather than a single estimate. As a result, development assumptions generated for each zone district were established to capture the estimated range of the minimum to the maximum development possible in each zone. Components of this analysis are discussed below. Detailed assumptions for each zone district are provided in the following table.

The flexibility of the zoning ordinance makes it nearly impossible to estimate the amount of potential development of each property without undertaking an extensive review of each property. However, the application of these broad assumptions and the resulting estimated range of potential development are detailed enough to inform conversations about the City’s future development. They help illustrate how much and where development might occur based on existing regulations.

Development Efficiency

In order to account for various factors that limit the total developable area of a property, including yard dimension requirements (setbacks), public right-of-way dedication, utility easements, and parking and loading areas, an estimated development efficiency factor was applied to the total area of each parcel (after accounting for the other development constraints identified on the previous page).

The resulting net usable area served as the basis for the application of all of the following assumptions. Residential Units Growth capacity estimates for residential zone districts are presented as a range (minimum to maximum) of the number of dwelling units that could be accommodated. For the redevelopment analysis, the values presented are intended to illustrate the maximum number of dwelling units possible through redevelopment.

To generate minimum and maximum numbers of dwelling units, the planning team generated low- and high-density estimates for each zone district. These density estimates are based on the minimum or typical lot sizes for various residential units. In general, the low estimate is intended to align with the typical lot size for a single-family detached dwelling unit or other use. The high estimate is intended to align with the highest-intensity residential use or smallest lot size allowed in the zone district. In some cases, parcels were determined ineligible for residential development because they did not satisfy minimum lot size requirements for their underlying zone district. Such parcels were excluded from further capacity analysis.
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To calculate the estimated number of residential units possible, the planning team multiplied the total net usable (developable) area of each property by the estimated residential density. To generate the low estimate of possible units, the planning team used the low estimate of residential units per acre. The high estimate of residential units per acre was used to generate the high estimate of possible units.

There is an inherent margin of error associated with these residential assumptions due to the fact that unit size and occupancy are unknown factors that will ultimately influence the total number of units that can be developed. While these assumptions cannot account for all of these factors, they do reasonably help illustrate how much development or redevelopment is possible for parcels in various zone districts.

Building Square Footage

Growth capacity estimates for non-residential zone districts are presented as a low and high estimate of the overall building square footage. For the redevelopment analysis, the values presented are intended to illustrate the maximum building square footage possible through redevelopment.

By reviewing the zoning regulations, the planning team generated low and high lot coverage estimates for each zone district. The high lot coverage estimates generally align with the maximum lot coverage permitted in each zone district, whereas the low estimates generally align with typical levels of development seen elsewhere in the community.

The planning team also generated low and high estimates for the total building height (in stories) for each zone district. In some zone districts, a minimum building height is specified – if not, the minimum was assumed to be one story. Also, the zone districts specify a maximum building height, which served as the basis for the high estimate. In some cases, the zoning regulations specify building height in terms of feet, instead of stories. In general, a story was assumed to be between 10 and 15 feet high.

To calculate the estimated building square footage, the planning team multiplied the total net usable (developable) area of each property by the lot coverage and then by the number of stories. To generate the low estimate, the low estimates for lot coverage and building stories were used; the high lot coverage and building story estimates were used to generate the high estimates of total building square footage. Like the residential calculations, some parcels were determined to be ineligible for development because they did not satisfy minimum lot size requirement and, as such, they were excluded from further analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone District</th>
<th>Development Efficiency</th>
<th>Residential Units per Acre</th>
<th>Lot Coverage</th>
<th>Building Stories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1a</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1b</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2a</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2b</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2c</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2d</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-4</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-5</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-SU</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD-100</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD-120</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD-60</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD-85</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-1</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH-1</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-1</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1a</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1b</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2a</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2b</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2c</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3a</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3aa</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3b</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-U</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW-1</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW-2</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW-3</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-1</td>
<td>** Need to determine on a case-by-case basis **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEDZ-1a</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEDZ-1b</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WF-1</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WF-2</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Residential uses are permissible but not required uses in this zone district, therefore the minimum number of units would be zero.

** Residential uses are not typically permitted uses in this zone district.