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Doug called the meeting to order and thanked everyone for coming.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES
The minutes from the April 25, 2017 CPC meeting were approved as submitted.

2. FEEDBACK AND DISCUSSION FROM PREVIOUS MEETING
Doug explained the reason for the 2045 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN and highlighted the contents.

Susan asked if there is anything citizens can do to help bring the bicycle projects noted in the plan to fruition.

Doug thinks it would be good to have some assistance in creating momentum in the jurisdiction for all new projects. He talked with West Lafayette about the Happy Hollow Trail and Sagamore Parkway Trail projects and it is always good for the mayors, county commissioners, city councils to know their constituents want the bicycle facilities and that they are needed.

Susan thinks that means citizens can help by talking with the decision makers. She added that she dropped someone off in the traffic mess at the Feast and noticed that there is a trail very close to providing full connection to the Fort. It would be very nice to be able to park as far out as the amphitheater and ride your bike to the Feast.
Doug explained that the previous County Engineer wanted to put a trail all along South River Road but it was difficult working with the property owners and that made it difficult to stay in budget. He added that soon there will be distance markers along the trail.

Margy drove to the Feast and took Newman Road. You could reach the site if you bike that route. She added that it would make it better if there was an organized parking area for bikes like they have had at the State Fair for many years. She thinks the Historical Association would be happy to portion off a parking area for bikes.

Curt said CIBA runs the Indy Bike Club and they have a template they might let us use.

Margy is interested to know what needs to be done to make it work because she knows you have to have portable bike racks.

Shannon she asked if there is anything to identify the property owners where the plan talks about connectivity trails.

Doug replied that each projects belongs to a jurisdiction.

Curt knows there is a question of who owns the Farm Heritage Trail. There is no lead municipality either.

Susan said a lot of title search work needs to be done for that project to move forward. She suggested we use Purdue interns in the spring to conduct the deed research.

Shannon asked if there is an immediate plan to work on the connectivity on the Harrison Bridge. She knows the county owns the bridge but West Lafayette has put in the bicycle lanes on their side but there is nothing on Lafayette’s side.

Margy said the Lafayette Development Office has contracted with BF&S to look at that and also the ramps. The preliminary findings, after measuring the road and looking at bike lanes, signage, and marketing, is that there is a problem with the Harrison Bridge and center railing where is goes over the railroad. West Lafayette was able to skinny-down the lanes but right now that is not an option on the Lafayette side. Now the bike lane only goes to 6th Street on Salem Street but the plans to repave Salem Street include a bike lane. Lafayette now has a bike guideline book and there is a sharrow design that makes it look like there is lane within a lane. It is not continuous but includes arrows showing bikes. She wonders if we can do something like that every 150’ or so. Lafayette is interested in not only delineating where bikes should and can be through signage but also doing something about the road that might slow traffic down. BF&S will revisit that issue but Lafayette is actively working to come up with something soon. Lafayette is very disappointed that the consultants could not come up with something that looks like West Lafayette’s.

Curt asked if the sharrows are being proposed as the final solution or will the repaving project open the door for other possibilities.

Margy said Salem Street, east of 6th Street, is being repaved so it will not directly connect with the bridge.

Susan said the bridge is not cohesive and the whole structure should be standardized and harmonized with regard to pedestrians and bicycles.

Margy agreed but said that would be possible if there was one consistent road design from 6th Street in Lafayette all the way to Littleton in West Lafayette. Right now there is a hodge-podge of railings, sidewalks, etc. The road is not even consistent.

Susan thinks that is not too much to ask for.

Margy replied that that a project like that would cost millions of dollars. She thinks the county did a great job on the bridge but the width of the roadway is not consistent on both sides. The road actually expands and contracts. Lafayette is just trying to come up for a solution where there is not enough room for a separate bike lane.

Shannon travels that route and right now it is safer to ride in the lanes because the gutters are full of rocks and dips. She feels the bike lanes took away her right to occupy the right hand lane and feel confident. She asked whose job it is to keep that area free of debris because the county owns the bridge.

Doug said he heard Lafayette was going to keep the bridge clean because they have a street sweeper.
Margy suggested getting an interlocal agreement laying out who will do it and how often the bridge is cleaned. That way someone will be held accountable.

Shannon said signage is an issue when traveling to Lafayette.

Margy said Lafayette is looking at more additional signage and one of the signs shows a ramp, a lane, a bike lane, and an arrow telling a motorist how to yield to the bike.

Jan said all the signage on the Harrison Bridge is too high from a pedestrian point of view and there are no visual markers for any people with sight disabilities. Many pedestrians will not go on those bridges. There should be white markers at the shoulders and on all the edges of the sidewalks where they abut the bridge road surface.

Curt said he attended the meetings about the Harrison Bridge a couple of years ago. Opal Kuhl, the previous County Engineer, said the long-range plan for the bridge is that the center median will be removed that when the decking is done and that will allow for an extra 3’ of decking to be used for bike/ped facilities.

3. PROGRAM

Draft Bike Walk Greater Lafayette Safety Plan

Margy said the two cities, the county and cyclist groups came together in 2015 after a cyclist was hit on the Harrison Bridge because there were concerns about the fact that the accident happened on the county bridge with city projects on either side of the bridge. The purpose was to see what can be done to make roads safe for all users and not just vehicles. Everyone knew the State Street project was coming and that would mean more bicycles on the Harrison Bridge to avoid State Street. The group had many good discussions and examples of safety awareness from other areas were looked at to see what could be done here. Opal then suggested the three jurisdictions contribute part of their Federal aid money toward a safety awareness education program. She took the ERC training and Lafayette’s Economic Development Department took the lead on the project. The goal for the first year was to come up with a 3-year plan looking at best practices throughout the nation and initiate programs over the next two years. The committee had to rely on partners like the hospitals and schools to make these things happen and at the same time had to look for additional funding sources and marketing and advertising programs. We know engineering is out there but right now the plan focuses on motorist education. BF&S is the lead consultant but other professionally groups contributed. The plan has lofty goals and all have been working diligently for almost a year to come up with the plan. The plan summarizes all the plans that have come before as well as the previous policies, maps, and crash data. A lot of time was spent reaching out to different organizations/agencies in the community that could help us partner with to understand who they are serving and what the needs are. The plan launch was at the 2017 Bike to Work Day in May. A website was developed and the goal for year two of the plan is to come up with a scope list to get a better understanding of what still needs to be done before the two cities and the county can take over, what the responsibilities will be, and what funding will be needed. She pointed out that the West Lafayette Police Department and Parks Department are very engaged and attend almost all the meeting. The Lafayette Police Department attends about half the meetings and the Lafayette Parks Department has never attended a meeting. She thinks there might be a bit of a disconnect with regard to who moves forward with the plan.

Curt pointed out that Margy works in the in the Lafayette Development Department and attended every meeting but the West Lafayette Development Department never attended a meeting.

Margy said a lot of different people from the cities attended and that was good to see. She added that West Lafayette has had a bike/ped advisory group for many years. Lafayette passed an ordinance establishing a Bik/Ped Citizen Advisory Committee in May and included identifying a staff person within the city to be the support for that advisory committee (Bike/Ped Coordinator).

Shannon asked if the staff person will be someone who already works for Lafayette or a new employee.

Margy said she is the coordinator and her new duties are in addition to what she is already doing.

Rose asked Margy how her day will work out related to activating the responsibilities to this compared to the other duties. She thinks the new position should be a full time job. She can’t help if she does not know what is going on.
Margy replied that every day is different at work but this is something she is very interested in. She will talk with the Mayor about getting the Advisory Committee established once the Plan is adopted. It was to start in September but the City Engineer submitted her resignation. We decided to sit down with the interim director, Cindy Murray, and the Mayor soon. Once the Committee is formed she will have a better idea of what it will look like for her going forward.

Curt asked Margy to document everything very well.

Susan asked how the West Lafayette bike/ped group interacts with the city with regard to planning.

Curt feels it is not a problem but the question is how much the city is willing to listen. Parks, Engineer’s Office and Development Office directors have all turned over in the last year or so and the problem lies with those who do not see it as a priority and trying to convince them to buy in. The better strategy is to have the mayor tell the directors that it is a priority.

Margy said the Complete Streets policy resolution as well as an ordinance establishing the advisory committee and a bike/ped coordinator was by City Council resolution and that means it is in the books.

Jan said USDOT is really pushing pedestrian/bike and that is a big deal because they are reversing the words. She is amazed how little attention is paid to pedestrians and pointed out Sagamore Parkway in West Lafayette as an example. She said it is impossible to walk from Yeager Road to River Road because there is no continuous sidewalk. USDOT is giving a lot more money and emphasis on the ped side of things because it affects everybody. The ped side of things is covered under ADA and this community is in serious violation of ADA all over the place. We need to be aware that this community has a big risk because we do not comply with USDOT regulations.

Stewart pointed out that pedestrian advocates are poorly organized.

Jan said everyone is a pedestrian.

Susan agreed but most pedestrians do not walk more than from their car to the front door of a store.

Margy said she went to the National Walk Summit in St. Paul with 600+ other attendees and it was eye-opening. Our consultants constantly warned us not to forget the peds during this planning process. The organization and planning behind the walking movement is completely different from bicycling and she did not anticipate that. Much of it comes from the public health side and they talked about inclusion and equity in planning and spending for low income areas as well as in affluent neighborhoods. She understands the value of having both a bike plan and a ped plan because having them together is problematic.

Lynn said dog walkers in her neighborhood are the crime watch and having good sidewalks is important to help them to get out and about in the community.

Kaitlin said she lives by Columbian Park and the school and she was surprised to see that there are no crossings for people to get across the street between the park and the school. That makes people jay-walk all the time on a busy street. All the intersections have weird angles and the walking signal is not on long enough to let a pedestrian cross the street.

Jan said at various meetings she invited city/county officials to take a walk with her on round feet. She said Dennis Carson took a walk with her and she recounted incidents involving pedestrians trying to navigate Main Street in Lafayette with the new streetscape. Two people in wheelchairs should be able to pass and that cannot be done on Main Street, even after all the money that was spent.

Susan asked what consultant did the plans for Main Street.

Margy replied that Hanna Waggle & Kline was the consulting firm the city used for the Main Street streetscape project.

Susan heard it said that the Main Street project was “built for cars”. She thinks it would be nice to see some kind of measures to see what has been accomplished.

Margy explained that a “base line” was established with the initial survey that went out and we plan to conduct a follow-up survey to gauge the progress.
Rose asked how many participated in the survey.

Shannon said there were 857 responders.

Susan asked how much it would cost to do a statistically significant sampling based on population.

Curt thinks the cost will be high because you would have to sample about 10,000.

Susan is not as concerned about the cyclists as she about the drivers.

Curt pointed out that the plan has very little on drivers and there is no recognized method to reach out to drivers.

Margy said it is easy to say “culture change” but hard to accomplish.

Curt agrees that is unattainable.

Kaitlin does not think it is impossible because she is from a city where it did happen and it was all about infrastructure and making people more comfortable getting on a bike or walking somewhere.

Curt agreed but said the funding for the plan excludes infrastructure.

Stewart thinks there is an opportunity for a “watch this space” in West Lafayette because he has perceived there are a lot more people walking from downtown West Lafayette to the Levee at all times of the day. It is a shame the sidewalks are very narrow. It is much easier to ride your bike up and down the hill than it used to be.

Curt reminded Stewart that a railing was put in to act as a psychological protector for pedestrians.

Katelin thinks the sidewalks on State Street were widened going down the hill.

Curt agreed that sidewalks on both sides are slightly wider.

Jan appreciates what has been done on State Street but she is waiting to see how snow removal goes.

Rose said she attended an Area Plan Commission meeting and it was apparent to her that the decision making process and how proposals for development are put forward do not include sidewalk considerations. When a subdivision was approved out by McCutcheon it was an afterthought to include a sidewalk going up to the school. She agrees that leadership is an issue. People working out on South Street by Lowe’s have to cross a ditch and stand out in the open to catch a bus. That is a shame.

Jan said another USDOT endeavor is to refer to pedestrian trails and sidewalks as bridges to opportunity.

Susan said she has attended three meeting in the last 24 hours and most of them have to do with sidewalks that would go across more major streets. They take out the handicap ramps that go across the streets and pedestrians would have to walk along the main street to a more distant crossing. That was done along Ferry Street and now they are doing that along Columbia and South Street. She was told it is because people with disabilities should not cross unless there is a controlled intersection. A person in a wheelchair might have to go several blocks to cross a street. She sees people in wheelchairs just cross the street anyway. The concept is delusional.

Jan said she has never heard of that. Her wheelchair goes 7mph and she can travel 30 miles at that speed. Manual wheelchairs are a different story and they will cross where they can. People using walkers will not go an extra loop around to cross a street. The best plan for any city or addition is a grid with straight streets. In the 1950’s and 1960’s we wanted meandering streets with cul-de-sacs but that is not the case now.

Steve said River Road and US 231 are good examples because they put signs in the middle of the sidewalk and actually look out sections of the sidewalk.

Susan said they tell you this is the standard but that is not the case.

Jan said she would love to know where they got those standards because she has not read anything like that.

Margy is skeptical about those standards too.
Lynn said it is difficult to walk around with a push wheel chair, wheel walker, or on crutches.

Kaitlin asked if having people get around in a push wheel chair, wheel walker, or on crutches could be a training exercise.

Shannon said Health by Design does audits.

Margy said a walk audit is one of the first activities in the plan.

Curt pointed out that most of the developments done on a grid in the 40's and 50's have lousy sidewalks and are not well-maintained because they have not been updated in years. All the developments in the 60's, 70's, and 80's do not have sidewalks because of the meandering roads and cui-de-sacs. Many cities have ignored the poor neighborhoods and focused on putting the sidewalks along the main roads.

Lynn said South 24th Street is a major route kids walk on to get to school and there is not continuous sidewalk on either side. Kids literally walk down the middle of the street. She does not think Safe Routes to School is much better.

Doug said the Technical Transportation Committee will review the Plan and make a recommendation to the Policy Board for approval. If approved, the Plan will go to APC to be included as part of the 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan. All six member jurisdictions will need to adopt the Plan so it can be part of the County's Comprehensive Plan for Tippecanoe County.

Steve believes some graphs are missing in the Plan.

Stewart thinks the book "How" is an excellent book and thinks it should be discussed at a future meeting. There is a lot in there that would be very helpful.

Doug asked if the next meeting should be November 28th but that is the Tuesday after Thanksgiving. He said This Committee can meet that day or on December 5th.

The Committee chose to meet on November 28th.

4. QUESTIONS, COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS:

None

5. ADJOURNMENT:

Doug thanked everyone for coming.

The meeting adjourned at 8:30pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Underwood
Recording Secretary

Reviewed by,

Doug Poad
Senior Transportation Planner
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INTRODUCTION

This update continues to build our storehouse of data by augmenting the previous four reports with the latest information. As with the previous reports, our objective is to identify emerging trends in the state of our community’s student housing market to better inform elected and appointed officials as they make decisions on future developments both near campus and countywide.

This report contains four parts:

1. An analysis of existing data and other relevant public information;
2. An analysis of vacancy data;
3. Conclusions and recommendations; and
4. An appendix.

The first part involves a review of a variety of data sources containing historical and current information regarding population and housing. The second part involves an analysis of vacancy data from HUD/USPS concerning residential vacancies by census tract. The third part draws conclusions from the data sets and survey results and identifies any patterns or trends that the data from all four years may reveal.

The landlord survey, which had been part of the previous four reports, was not conducted for the 2016-2017 school year. Due to past year-to-year findings drawing similar conclusions staff has elected to conduct the survey every two years to make better use of staff time and resources. As the procurement and analysis of the HUD/USPS data requires less staff time and resources, we are relying on this data set only relative to the residential vacancy analysis.
PART 1: DATA & INVENTORY

Multiple sources were used to capture as much relevant public information as possible pertaining to the status of student-oriented housing. The entities that provided data included:

1. US Bureau of the Census
2. US Department of Housing and Urban Development & US Postal Service
3. Purdue University
4. Tippecanoe County Assessor
5. City of West Lafayette Rental Inspection Program

The 2010 Census and Census Estimates

According to the Census, the total population of Tippecanoe County in 2010 was 172,780 persons. Population growth county-wide is projected to remain steady in future years as reflected in the Census estimates for 2011 (173,186), 2012 (175,204), 2013 (180,174), 2014 (183,074), 2015 (185,826) and 2016 (188,059). This estimated growth represents an approximate 8.1% increase between 2010 and 2016 and a 1.1% decrease in the population’s projected growth rate reported in last year’s report.

Figure 1 – Tippecanoe County Population 1950-2016

Source: US Bureau of the Census (* indicates estimate only)
Purdue University Student Population

At the start of the fall 2016 semester, the total student population (both undergraduate and graduate students) of the West Lafayette campus of Purdue University was 40,451 students. Compared to the previous year (39,409 students), this represents an approximate 2.64% increase in population. As shown in Figure 2 below, the fall 2016 population figure is the highest recorded not only within the last ten years but the highest recorded in the university’s history.

Figure 2 – Purdue Student Population 2006 – 2016

Purdue University Housing

In the fall of 2016, Purdue University Housing’s housing stock totaled 13,237 bedspaces (an increase of 947 bedspaces from the previous year owing to the leasing of private, off-campus student apartments for Purdue University Housing’s purposes). Of the 40,451 students enrolled at the West Lafayette campus beginning in the fall of 2016 there were 13,043 students living in university housing units (an increase of 633 from the previous year), 194 vacant bedspaces and 27,408 students living in non-university housing situations (an increase of 409 students from the previous year).
Purdue University Fraternities, Sororities and Cooperatives

Of the 27,408 students living off-campus during the fall 2016 semester, 3,189 lived in a fraternity, sorority or cooperative (a decrease of 92 students from the previous year). The total capacity among the 62 houses was 4,098 (a capacity increase of 42 persons from the previous year).

Purdue University Parking

The “C” parking permit is required for all commuter students who seek to park their vehicle on campus and reside outside the University-imposed, near-campus boundary. Those students living within the boundary but not on-campus are generally not eligible for a parking permit. As illustrated in Figure 3, the boundary (recently updated in 2017 to include portions of downtown Lafayette and stretching to US 231) surrounds the campus and is roughly rectangular.

Figure 3 – Parking Permit C Boundary

Source: Purdue University Parking & Transportation Services
For the fall of 2016, Purdue University’s Parking and Transportation Services Office issued 4,810 “C” permits for those commuter students who resided beyond this boundary surrounding campus (an increase of 106 permits over the previous year).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purdue Commuter Student Parking Facility</th>
<th>Number of C-permits issued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C Parking Lots</td>
<td>3,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern Garage</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Street Garage</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Street Garage</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison Street Garage</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,810</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the purposes of this report, it is assumed that the vast majority of the 24,219 remaining off-campus students who have not applied for “C” permits and don’t live on-campus or in a fraternity, sorority or co-op likely lived within the C-permit boundary. These 24,219 students, generally assumed to be within the C-permit boundary, represent a slight increase over last year’s 23,718 students.

**Tippecanoe County Assessor and City of West Lafayette Data**

The Tippecanoe County Assessor and the City of West Lafayette both maintain data sets of residential rental units. In addition, the City of West Lafayette through its rental inspection program, keeps data on the number of bedrooms per dwelling unit. By utilizing both data sets and excluding Purdue’s 13,237 bedspaces, the following inventory has been created:

According to the Tippecanoe County Assessor, as of March 1, 2017 there were in Tippecanoe County:

- 37,845 owner-occupied units, an increase of 2,164 from last year’s report.
- 37,007 rental units, an increase of 1,597 from last year’s report.

The rental units comprise all housing types including, single, two, and multi-family units, manufactured homes and mobile home trailers. As with prior reports, the geographic distribution of the rental units is more concentrated near the densely urbanized areas in Lafayette (west of Sagamore Parkway and north of Brady Lane) and West Lafayette (east of Northwestern Avenue, south of Sagamore Parkway West and south of State Street).
City of West Lafayette Rental Inspection Program Data

Relative to the City of West Lafayette's Rental Inspection Program data for 2016, out of the 37,007 rental units in Tippecanoe County approximately 24% or 8,913 units containing 19,184 bedrooms were within the city limits of West Lafayette and subject to the rental inspection program. These figures represent an approximate 1.27% decrease in units, but a 0.34% increase in bedrooms from last year's report. Of these West Lafayette rental units, there were:

- 796 single-family units containing 2,643 bedrooms
- 242 two-family units containing 588 bedrooms
- 177 three-family units containing 366 bedrooms
- 7,698 multi-family units containing 15,587 bedrooms

PART 2: VACANCY DATA RESULTS

US Department of Housing and Urban Development and US Postal Service Data

Since 2005 the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the US Postal Service (USPS) jointly has produced quarterly reports of mailing address vacancies by Census Tract for residential and non-residential properties. This data is made available to local governments by request and does not discriminate between owner-occupied and rental. The USPS mail carriers that collected the data, while not capturing vacancy data for all units in a tract, have collected a large enough sample of units in each tract that the results can reasonably be relied upon to identify trends or patterns for the entire tract.

For the following analysis we have only made use of the residential unit vacancy data for the years 2013 through the second quarter of 2017. As shown in Figure 4, the “West Lafayette Area” includes the following Census Tracts: 51.01, 51.02, 52, 53, 54, 55, 102.03, 102.04, 103, 104, 105 and 106. The “Lafayette Area” includes these Census Tracts: 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15.01, 15.02, 16, 17, 18, 19, 108 and 111.

Again, the vacancy data does not discriminate between a rental unit and an owner-occupied unit. Through our agreement with HUD, we can present the following findings (Figure 5) on residential vacancies in these tracts:
Figure 4 – Greater Lafayette Urban Area Census Tracts

Source: US Bureau of the Census
**Figure 5 – West Lafayette Area Residential Vacancy Rates**

![West Lafayette Area Year Average](image)

**Figure 6 – Lafayette Area Residential Vacancy Rates**

![Lafayette Area Year Average](image)

*Sources for Figures 5 & 6: US Department of Housing & Urban Development*

*Represents the first and second quarter of 2017 only*
As shown in Figure 5, over the last four-and-a-half years the West Lafayette Area has experienced on average an approximate 1.93% residential vacancy rate while in Figure 6 the Lafayette Area experienced on average a 4.39% residential vacancy rate (up from 1.83% for West Lafayette and down from 4.64% for Lafayette relative to last year’s report). As with our past reports, these figures were calculated by averaging the quarterly data into single years and averaging the years (including the first two quarters of 2017).

Generally, there were no dramatic fluctuations in each area’s vacancy rates over a 4½ year period. The main difference between the two areas remains the relationship each area’s core has with its periphery.

The urban periphery of the West Lafayette Area (which includes tracts 51.02, 52, 102.03, 102.04 and 106) averaged 2.61% in residential vacancy (up from 2.3% last year) while the area’s core tracts (53, 54, 55, 103, 104 and 105) had, on average, a 1.26% vacancy rate (down from 1.36% last year). Meanwhile in the Lafayette Area, the tracts in and near the urban core (1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12 and 111) have the highest average vacancy rate at 6.53% (down from 6.9% last year), while the urban periphery of the Lafayette Area (tracts 13, 14, 15.01, 15.02, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 108) averaged 2.57% in residential vacancy (down from 2.8% last year).

So, the inverse relationship between the two cities, as it relates to residential vacancies, remains as was reported in our past analyses: Residential vacancies remain highest near Lafayette’s urban core and lowest in its urban periphery while vacancies remain lowest in West Lafayette’s urban core and highest in its urban periphery.

**PART 3: CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Population Growth**

US Census estimates continue to show steady increases in the overall population of Tippecanoe County. The estimated 8.1% increase from 2010 to 2016 continues to highlight the stability and economic vitality of the community and its ability to attract newcomers. Purdue University’s student population decreases after 2012 have long since reversed with the 2.64% jump in population experienced during the 2016-2017 school year compared with the previous school year. And this growth appears to be continuing: The 2017 fall student population jumped to a new record of 41,573 students (a 2.7% increase from the fall of 2016).
Residential Vacancies Overview

As with previous reports' conclusions from past years, no great fluctuations have occurred relative to the analysis of the USPS/HUD data. Residential unit vacancies generally remain higher near Lafayette’s core and in the areas surrounding the C-permit boundary in West Lafayette. Conversely, the lowest residential unit vacancies in the community are found within the C-permit boundary in West Lafayette and around the outer parts of Lafayette.

Residential Vacancies in the West Lafayette Area

From the West Lafayette Area’s HUD/USPS data set, we reported a four-and-a-half-year average 1.93% residential vacancy rate (1.83% was reported last year). Along the urban periphery of the West Lafayette Area the residential vacancy rate climbed to 2.61% (up from 2.3% a year ago). Meanwhile, within the urban core of the West Lafayette Area, the residential vacancy rate dropped to 1.26% (down from 1.36% a year ago).

The conclusion to draw from the analysis for the West Lafayette Area remains similar to our past reports: With lower vacancies in the core areas as compared with the periphery areas, continue to support the responsible urban densification of the near-campus area while discouraging dramatic increases in large, undergraduate-student-oriented, multi-family housing developments in the outlying areas of West Lafayette. The exception to multi-family expansion in the periphery remains units that cater to a mix of student and especially non-student groups which are adjacent and walkable to major commercial activity centers and public transit.

Comprehensive Plan support for this conclusion continues to be found, in part, in some of the implementation strategies within the New Chauncey Neighborhood Plan:

- “Goal 2 – Neighborhood Redevelopment – Objective 1, Strategy 2 – Focus all residential density along the Northwestern and Fowler corridors per the future land use map.”
- “Goal 2 – Neighborhood Redevelopment – Objective 3, Strategy 1 - Develop neighborhood plans for Chauncey Village, Hills & Dales and the neighborhood south of State Street.”
- “Goal 2 – Neighborhood Redevelopment – Objective 3, Strategy 2 – Direct urban density residential projects to primarily rental neighborhoods like Chauncey Village and the neighborhood south of State Street through land use planning, reduced parking ratios, on-street permit parking for residents, and the construction of public parking facilities.”
• “Goal 2 – Neighborhood Redevelopment – Objective 3, Strategy 3 - Analyze existing zoning districts and develop an Overlay Plan that respects the Land Use Plan and provides specific direction for development to the appropriate areas within the New Chauncey Neighborhood.”

Residential Vacancies in the Lafayette Area

As with our previous reports, the HUD/USPS data continues to report residential vacancies in Lafayette being highest in and around the downtown core. The four-and-half year average residential vacancy rate fell to 6.53% (down from 6.9% reported last year). Beyond this core area, the city’s outlying tracts reported a four-and-half year vacancy rate average of 2.57% (down from 2.8% reported last year).

As with our previous reports’ conclusions, the Lafayette rental market continues to cater to a more diverse collection of tenant groups than West Lafayette and it is that defining quality which sets it apart from the West Lafayette Area. This difference should continue to be promoted in housing policy for the city; policy which the Historic Centennial Neighborhood Plan already supports in such strategies as Task 1 of Implementation Strategy 1 which calls for the promotion of “urban living” to non-student groups in core neighborhoods like Centennial.

Looking to the Future

Dramatic changes in the student housing marking have begun to occur in the near-campus neighborhoods since our first report four years ago. The well-established pattern of urban densification of the near-campus neighborhoods (begun in earnest over 17 years ago with the first large mixed-use planned developments like Wabash Landing and River Market) has given way to even larger projects centered on West Lafayette's traditional central business district of Chauncey Village.

Looking ahead, it is important to note the following as new student-oriented rental and other multi-family projects are considered:

1. Purdue’s student population: After modest declines in student enrollment since 2009, Purdue’s student population growth rebounded in the fall of 2015 with a 1.65% increase followed by a 2.64% increase in the fall of 2016. With a student population at now record levels, the demand for new residential units will naturally follow in the years ahead.

2. Purdue’s On-Campus Housing: The on-campus housing totals increased during the 2016-2017 school year from the previous year (947 bedspaces) largely due to Purdue leasing private off-campus student apartments. At present there are no new on-campus housing projects in the construction pipeline.
3. New multi-family projects in the near-campus area that are either under construction or approved to submit construction plans include:

In West Lafayette:

- 302 Vine Street Planned Development (under construction): 73 units, 117 bedrooms
- The Hub at West Lafayette Planned Development (under construction): 270-300 units, 599 bedrooms
- Rise at Chauncey Planned Development (under construction): 300 units, 675 bedrooms
- The Hub Plus on State Street Planned Development (under construction): 200-260 units, 630 bedrooms
- Wabash Landing Apartments II Planned Development (approved): 115 units/bedrooms
- 202 S. Chauncey Avenue Planned Development (approved): 56 units, 104 bedrooms
- Innovation Place Apartments Planned Development (approved): 375 units, 835 bedrooms

In Lafayette:

- The Marq Lafayette (under construction): 99 units, 122 bedrooms
- Uptown Flats (under construction): 20 units, 26 bedrooms
- J&C Building Apartments (under construction): 24 units/bedrooms
- Painters & Decorators Building Apartments (under construction): 32 units/bedrooms
- Glen Vick Apartments (under construction): 6 units, 9 bedrooms

Guiding Policies & Recommendations

To best manage future growth and ensure that sound planning principles work in concert with market forces, applicable policies from the 2011 Housing Element of the Tippecanoe County Comprehensive Plan, found in Appendix A-1 of this report, should be respected along with the following recommendations:

1. Support the land use recommendations in the New Chauncey Neighborhood Plan and create land use plans for West Lafayette’s downtown (Chauncey Village and the Levee) and the neighborhood south of State Street.
2. Continue to support redevelopment efforts centered on West Lafayette’s downtown (Chauncey Village and the Levee), along Northwestern Avenue (from State Street to Meridian Street), and the neighborhood south of State Street.

3. Require compelling data from developers that supports significant increases in student-oriented residential density, particularly along the fringe areas of the campus and West Lafayette city limits.

4. Prepare for the adaptive re-use of multi-family rental units built for students beyond the near-campus area.

5. Discourage the development of student-oriented, multi-family, residential developments on the urban fringe that are not along a transit route and not adjacent and walkable to a major commercial activity center.

6. Explore the creation of near-campus, municipal public parking facilities and investigate creating a residential parking permit program for the neighborhood south of State Street to increase parking efficiency and availability for residents while discouraging commuter students, faculty and staff from parking there.

7. Continually monitor Purdue’s on-campus housing planning and construction efforts to ensure proposed off-campus residential development is in fact needed.

**Conclusion**

Purdue’s record population growth combined with no new dormitory construction in the pipeline continues to be the most significant factor affecting the student housing market. The private market is responding with numerous projects, including three high-rises near campus, already under construction. By 2019, the bulk of these new student-oriented projects will be completed and leasing. As the full effect of this record influx of new units near campus has year to be determined, it is incumbent upon APC and West Lafayette to guard against over-saturation by prudently weighing the timing of any new influx of units in the short term even if current land use policy, the data in this report, and market forces might direct otherwise. Ultimately, if the current influx of units produces no negative impacts in city-wide vacancy rates, then APC and West Lafayette can reasonably respond by encouraging the continued densification of the urban core so long as the fundamentals impacting it (Purdue’s growth, housing policies, etc.) remain favorable.

As the urban densification in both cities unfolds, the continued reliance on sound land use polices, informed by the most reliable data, will continue to be the guiding force that ultimately shapes these development pressures into projects of lasting value and identity for the greater Lafayette community.
PART 4: APPENDIX

Appendix A-1: Policies of the Comprehensive Plan’s Housing Element

- **Policy 5** - In relation to established needs multi-family development should be encouraged on lands located near major activity centers.
- **Policy 14** - Create land use plans that emphasize vibrant neighborhoods and support growth in Downtown Lafayette, the Levee area, and West Lafayette Village areas.
- **Policy 23** - Significant new residential construction, regardless of density and configuration, is to be constructed only in the presence of, or in conjunction with, sufficient levels of public services, facilities, and all modes of transportation.
- **Policy 24** - Housing specifically intended to serve low and moderate income and student populations is to be built within reasonable proximity to major shopping facilities and established public transportation routes.
- **Policy 27** - Zoning and land use decisions regarding housing development and redevelopment shall be guided, in part, by adopted neighborhood plans. A neighborhood plan found to be outdated relative to the neighborhood’s current situation shall be updated as APC staff resources allow. In developing neighborhood plans, staff shall encourage the active participation of neighborhood associations with all other property owners and residents. Continued development of neighborhood associations and property owner associations is strongly encouraged.
- **Policy 28** - Zoning and land use decisions impacting neighborhoods rich in diversity, including those near Purdue University, shall consider all competing interests and promote an improved quality of life for all neighborhood residents.
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Chapter 1: Introduction
Introduction

Purpose
With the completion of the “new” US 231 by the Indiana Department of Transportation in 2013 and annexation of the land surrounding it by the City of West Lafayette in 2014, new opportunities for development and urban expansion have arisen. Seeing these opportunities, the city council adopted on May 2, 2016, Resolution 10-16 requesting the Area Plan Commission of Tippecanoe County to study the US 231 Corridor and create a corridor land use plan as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan for Tippecanoe County.

Within this document are goals, policies, and implementation strategies that provide recommendations for future improvement within the corridor. Following adoption, this plan will serve as a decision-making tool for the Area Plan Commission, the City Council, the City staff, and the local development community among others. In embracing this plan, the ongoing partnership between these and other partners will result in a steady realization of the established goals and objectives found within the plan.

Location and Study Area Boundary
As depicted the map, the US 231 Corridor study area (as approved by the West Lafayette City Council) stretches from the River Road intersection in the south to the Sagamore Parkway intersection in the north and contains approximately 28,074 acres or nearly 44 square miles.
History

West Lafayette was originally settled in the early 1820’s in the area now known as Chauncey Village. With the founding of Purdue University in 1869 land near the corridor began to develop beyond the established agricultural pattern. The first major development in the corridor began with the establishment of the Purdue University Airport in 1930 on land donated by David Ross.

Located in the southernmost portion of the corridor, the airport was expanded in the 1960’s and today still remains the second busiest in the state, in terms of number of flights per year, behind Indianapolis International Airport.

Purdue’s continued expansion in the corridor also introduced an element of conservation. In 1967 the 24-acre Purdue Horticulture Park opened to the public and still contains large areas of natural woodlands along with a variety of plant species first introduced in the 1940’s by C.W. Beese, a Purdue professor of engineering and plant enthusiast.

More recently, with the relocation of the Purdue Grand Prix in 2009 and expansion of university athletic facilities off Cherry Lane, the growing commercial development on the north end of the corridor, and the emerging Purdue Research Park Aerospace District near the airport, it is clear the US 231 corridor is only just beginning to realize its potential.

Process of Public Engagement

This planning process employed specific public outreach efforts to gather information from pertinent stakeholders to provide an avenue to share their concerns and hopes for the future. The following is a brief summary of the public engagement process.
Project Steering Committee
In early of 2017 a Steering Committee was formed from stakeholders. The body consisted of:

- Purdue Research Foundation – Jeff Kanable
- West Lafayette City Council – Wang, Deboer
- West Lafayette City Staff – Erik Carlson
- Developer of Single Family Homes – Derrin Sorenson
- Developer of Apartments – Keith Long
- Developer of Commercial Properties – Alan White
- Single Family Homeowner – let district reps pick
- Non-Student Apartment Renter – let district reps pick
- Student Apartment Renter – let district reps pick
Chapter 2: Profiles
Profiles

Land Use

Existing Land Use

In early 2017 APC staff surveyed the corridor to create a land use inventory. With vacant land or land in agricultural production dominating approximately 47% of study area, the land use development pattern can best be described as “emerging” north of the Purdue Airport vicinity.

At the State Street and US 231 intersection, emerging high-technology industries connected with Purdue and its airport (typified by the new Rolls Royce facility at the southwest corner of the intersection) can be found. North of this, the Horticultural Park and Purdue athletic facilities can be found. Moving farther north to the Lindberg Road intersection, the emerging development pattern is solidly residential with a mix of residential densities already in place.

At the Cumberland Road intersection and north to the Sagamore Parkway intersection, the combination of an established commercial zoning pattern and already commercially developed sites has solidified these two intersections as important regional commercial nodes.
**Building Conditions**

In early 2017, using a standard scoring system previously employed in past survey efforts, APC staff surveyed and noted the physical condition of all existing structures in the corridor. The grading categories, from the *Comprehensive Plan of Tippecanoe County*, are:

A – GOOD = Structures in the good designation should be of high quality and of sound condition. New structures or older units that have been extensively rehabbed or perpetually maintained are included. The structure must be free of a visible need of repair. The property must also be well maintained.

B – MAINTENANCE = Buildings with maintenance ratings are in good structural condition and are in need of minor repairs. As a structure ages, it naturally requires maintenance. Fix-up work could include new paint, minor screen or window repair, a loose piece of the exterior material, or replacement of a few strips of siding.

C – REPAIR = A building in the repair category is in need of major repairs. If a major repair such as a new roof, additional structural support, or complete exterior rehab is needed, the building falls into this category. If a structure is neglected as it ages, small repairs mount into larger problems. Therefore, an aggregate of smaller repairs also constitutes a building needing major repair. A conglomeration of exterior problems might be an indication of additional serious issues inside the structure.

D – DILAPIDATED = Buildings that are unfit for human habitation, structurally unsound, and unsafe can be classified as candidates for dilapidated. These buildings have serious conditions requiring substantial investment. Serious problems might include but are not limited to major structural faults, advanced weathering of materials, and a foundation or footing that is not level or solid.
Given that so much of the study area is undeveloped, it is no surprise the results of the survey showed approximately 85% of the 442 lots as having “No Structure”. The remainder of the lots with buildings on them (excluding Purdue Airport buildings which were not surveyed) fell into the remaining categories accordingly: approximately 9% received the “A” rating, approximately 2% received the “B” rating, approximately 1% received the “C” rating, and approximately 0.5% received the “D” rating.
Future Transportation Improvements

In anticipation of future growth the US 231 Corridor’s transportation infrastructure has several improvements planned. The following improvements are contained within the 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan and the 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program:

**Purdue Airport**
Improvements include an environmental assessment, the rehabilitation of runways and taxiways and expanded facilities for rescue/fire vehicles.

**New Sidewalks & Trails**
A host of new 5’ sidewalks and 10’ trails are proposed throughout the corridor as shown on the map.

**New Roads**
Two new roads are proposed including an extension of Cherry Lane to intersect with US 231 and an extension of US 231 north of the Sagamore Parkway intersection.

**Road Improvements**
Improvements to existing roadways include the widening of State Street and the reconstruction of Cherry Lane in anticipation of its extension to US 231.
Parks, Paths and Trails

The US 231 Corridor already has a strong foundation of parks, paths and trails upon which to build as the corridor develops. The following sites and facilities make up portions of West Lafayette’s open space network along the corridor:

Purdue Horticulture Park
This large and well established park along State Street near US 231 contains an extensive internal trail system through a variety of forested and landscaped environments.

US 231 Trail
With the construction of US 231 came its trail system with runs nearly the full length of corridor on both sides of the roadway. This important bike and pedestrian facility will be the spine from which all future facilities should connect to.

Cumberland Avenue Trail
When Cumberland Avenue was extended to intersect with US 231 and sidewalk and trail system was incorporated along the roadway.

Proposed Park
A future park containing the relocated historic Morris School building is proposed along Cumberland Avenue east of the US 231 intersection.
**Sewer Infrastructure**

Adequate public infrastructure is needed for development. The existing sewer infrastructure in the US 231 Corridor is a critical piece of the development puzzle. Maintenance by both the city, county and property owners is the key to ensuring its ability to expand and serve this high-growth area.

**Sanitary and Storm Sewer**

Wastewater in the corridor is collected through a network of sanitary sewer, stormwater sewer pipes that convey the waste to the City of West Lafayette’s wastewater treatment plant located along the Wabash River at the southeastern corner of the city limits.

The US 231 Corridor is served primarily by a long sanitary sewer main stretching from just east of the US 231 and Cumberland Avenue intersection, roughly parallel with US 231, to nearly the southern limit of the corridor near Purdue University airport.

County storm sewer facilities were constructed with the Cumberland Avenue extension and are largely limited to that road’s corridor.
Wetlands
While there is no Floodplain zoning found within the corridor boundary. The following map (with areas shown in red) inventories wetland areas identified by the US Fish and Wildlife Service’s National Wetlands Inventory map.
US 231 Corridor Vision

“A vibrant, mixed-use corridor, where attaining the highest quality of life is achieved through preserving the natural environment, promoting a unique and attractive aesthetic appearance, and encouraging a diverse mix of commercial, residential, and university-related uses which provide for the long-term vitality of the city and the region.”

Corridor Goals and Objectives

The Steering Committee members, selected for the US 231 Corridor Plan and representing the principle stakeholders in the corridor, endorse the following goals and objectives which, when realized, will achieve the Vision of the US 231 Corridor. The following goals and objectives are based on public input and the guidance of the Steering Committee.

To accomplish the Vision of the US 231 Corridor, the following goals and objectives are established to promote and support:

1. Diverse Residential Development
2. Regional Commercial Node Development
3. Environmental Preservation and Quality of Life
4. University Research and Innovation Development
1) GOAL 1: DIVERSE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
   a) **Objective:** Provide for the future residential needs of a growing and increasingly diverse population based on a future land use plan and support its adoption as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.
   b) **Objective:** Ensure that there is proper code enforcement and property maintenance.
   c) **Objective:** Promote neighborhood identity and a sense of place.
   d) **Objective:** Expand city and community resources that benefit the residents and businesses in the corridor.

2) GOAL 2: REGIONAL COMMERCIAL NODE DEVELOPMENT
   a) **Objective:** Provide for local and regional commercial/business needs based on a corridor future land use plan employing a nodal development philosophy and support its adoption as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.
   b) **Objective:** Ensure commercial development is appropriate in scale and character with existing and emerging neighborhoods both within the corridor and immediately adjacent to it.

3) GOAL 3: ENVIRONMENTAL PRESERVATION AND QUALITY OF LIFE
   a) **Objective:** Protect existing park natural open spaces and support their expansions based on a future land use plan and support its adoption as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.
   b) **Objective:** Ensure there is adequate passive and recreational open space opportunities throughout the corridor that serve both a local and regional need.
   c) **Objective:** Support the expansion of transit and alternative forms of transportation and ensure public infrastructure is sufficient to meet future needs.
   d) **Objective:** Encourage public art at important locations and intersections throughout the corridor, particularly near Purdue University.

4) GOAL 4: UNIVERSITY RESEARCH AND INNOVATION DEVELOPMENT
   a) **Objective:** Support the expansion of Purdue University’s research and development uses (including supportive residential and commercial uses) based on a future land use plan and support its adoption as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.
   b) **Objective:** Ensure university-related development is appropriate in scale and character with existing and emerging developments both within the corridor and immediately adjacent to it.
Chapter 4: Implementation
### Implementation Tables

Consistent with the corridor’s vision, goals and objectives, the following implementation strategies matrix offers action steps and suggests roles that a variety of stakeholders will play to realize the vision of the corridor. The strategies are placed in categories based on the goals and objectives found in Chapter 3. The following strategies have been assigned approximate time frames but are subject to budgets, the market and many other factors:

- **Short-Term Opportunities**  Immediate to 18 months following the Plan’s adoption.
- **Mid-Term Opportunities**  2 - 5 years.
- **Long-Term Opportunities**  6 - 15 years.

Priority levels are generalized in terms of low, medium and high. These levels represent a general order of importance relative to fulfilling the vision of the corridor and accomplishing the goals and objectives. Some of the individuals or organizations taking responsibility for the following tasks include:

- **City**  = City of West Lafayette staff
- **APC**  = Area Plan Commission of Tippecanoe County staff
- **PRF**  = Purdue Research Foundation
- **PU**  = Purdue University
- **BUS**  = Greater Lafayette Public Transportation Corporation
- **ART**  = City of West Lafayette Public Art Advisory Group
- **BSO**  = Business Owners
GOAL 1: DIVERSE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

OBJECTIVE A: Provide for the future residential needs of a growing and increasingly diverse population based on a future land use plan and support its adoption as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Strategy Description</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Develop a future land use plan that promotes a diverse range of residential options in the corridor and ensure that it is adopted as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>APC, City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Make changes in the corridor’s existing zoning districts to ensure the policies of the future land use plan are realized</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>APC, City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Periodically review and update the future land use plan to ensure it continues to meet the residential needs of the city.</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>APC, City, PRF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**OBJECTIVE B: Ensure that there is proper code enforcement and property maintenance.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Strategy Description</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Improve property maintenance through preventive measures such as education and communication.</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Periodically review property maintenance, zoning and building codes to ensure the highest standards are maintained.</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>City, APC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Support and expand the efforts of the City’s rental inspection program with an emphasis on curbing over-occupancy and increasing property maintenance. Consider providing incentives to landlords who maintain their property above and beyond the minimum code requirements.</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Improve animal control operations and ensure there is a no-kill policy for adoptable animals.</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Progressively increase fines for repeat violations.</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### OBJECTIVE C: Promote neighborhood identity and a sense of place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Strategy Description</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Improve a system of wayfinding signage directing the public to parks, trails and other amenities in the corridor.</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>City, PRF, PU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Discourage the placement of billboards along the US 231 corridor</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Promote the inclusion of public art at important intersections and community spaces</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>City, ART</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OBJECTIVE 4: Expand city and community resources that benefit the residents and businesses in the corridor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Strategy Description</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ensure that community recreation resources keep pace with residential growth.</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Promote the expansion of public library branches into the corridor’s neighborhoods as they grow</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>City, BSO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GOAL 2: REGIONAL COMMERCIAL NODE DEVELOPMENT

OBJECTIVE A: Provide for local and regional commercial/business needs based on a corridor future land use plan employing a nodal development philosophy and support its adoption as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Strategy Description</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Develop a future land use plan that promotes a diverse range of commercial development options in the corridor and ensure that it is adopted as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>APC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Make changes in the corridor’s existing zoning districts to ensure the policies of the future land use plan are realized</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>APC, City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Periodically review and update the future land use plan to ensure it continues to meet the commercial and business needs of the city.</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>APC, City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OBJECTIVE B: Ensure commercial development is appropriate in scale and character with existing and emerging neighborhoods both within the corridor and immediately adjacent to it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Strategy Description</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Support the future land use plan’s policy for commercial development along the corridor discourage commercial rezone petitions that would deviate from it.</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>City, APC, BSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Discourage commercial strip development and support commercial development that is designed with pedestrians and transit users in mind.</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>APC, City, BSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Investigate the creation of an Architectural Review Board.</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>APC, City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GOAL 3: ENVIRONMENTAL PRESERVATION & QUALITY OF LIFE

OBJECTIVE A: Protect existing park natural open spaces and support their expansions based on a future land use plan and support its adoption as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Strategy Description</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Create a corridor-wide parks and open spaces plan based on the future land use plan and periodically update it to meet the community's needs.</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>City, PRF, PU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provide development incentives to both commercial and residential developers who provide active and passive open spaces in their developments.</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>APC, City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OBJECTIVE B: Ensure there is adequate passive and recreational open space opportunities throughout the corridor that serve both a local and regional need.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Strategy Description</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Investigate the use of impact fees to assist in the funding of future public passive and active recreational open spaces.</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>APC, City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Update zoning and subdivision ordinances to require the inclusion of public active and recreational open spaces.</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>APC, City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Investigate allowing cluster subdivisions in the subdivision ordinance.</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>APC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**OBJECTIVE C:** Support the expansion of transit and alternative forms of transportation and ensure public infrastructure is sufficient to meet future needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Strategy Description</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Update zoning and subdivision ordinances to require commercial and higher-density residential developments provide bus stop facilities.</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>APC, City, BUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Promote the use of transit as it becomes available throughout the corridor with HOA’a, business associations and the university</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>City, BUS, PRF, PU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OBJECTIVE D:** Encourage public art at important locations and intersections throughout the corridor, particularly near Purdue University.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Strategy Description</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Create a public art plan for the corridor.</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>City, ART, PRF, PU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Create literature for a public art walking/driving tour along the corridor.</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>ART</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GOAL 4: UNIVERSITY RESEARCH AND INNOVATION DEVELOPMENT

OBJECTIVE A: Support the expansion of Purdue University’s research and development uses (including supportive residential and commercial uses) based on a future land use plan and support its adoption as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Strategy Description</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adopt and periodically update a future land use plan for the corridor that provides for all university-related development.</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>APC, City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Update all zoning and subdivision ordinances to better accommodate the needs of university-oriented development</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>APC, City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OBJECTIVE B: Ensure university-related development is appropriate in scale and character with existing and emerging developments both within the corridor and immediately adjacent to it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Strategy Description</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Investigate the creation of a university overlay district to better realize the mixed-use potential of the areas along and adjacent to State Street.</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>APC, City, PRF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Investigate the creation of an Architectural Review Board to ensure a harmonious development pattern, particularly along State Street.</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>APC, City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5: Future Land Uses
The Future Land Use Plan

The Future Land Use Plan, consisting of land use classifications and the Future Land Use Map is intended to set policy and act as a guide for development of the corridor. The Plan does not affect the existing uses of property, but influences future development proposals, requests to rezone property and requests for variances and special exceptions from the ABZA.

**Low Density Residential**
This classification allows for single-family detached homes. Certain lower impact uses such as churches and parks may be encouraged within this category. Development standards should be consistent with the R1, R1A and R1B zones unless Planned Development zoning is utilized.

**Medium Density Residential**
This classification allows for a variety of single, two-family and multi-family residential buildings. Development standards should be consistent with R1B, R1Z, R2 and R3 zones, unless Planned Development zoning is utilized.

**Regional Commercial**
This classification allows for a variety of commercial retail and service uses that serve both a neighborhood and regional need. Unless Planned Development zoning is utilized, development standards shall be consistent with GB and NB zones.

**Aerospace District**
This classification allows for a mix of university-oriented aerospace research, development and manufacturing uses. Unless Planned Development zoning is utilized, development standards shall be consistent with OR and I1 zones.

**Innovation Mixed-Use**
This classification allows for a diverse mix of university-oriented uses that may contain residential, commercial, office and light industrial and manufacturing uses. Multiple uses within a single building or on a single development site are encouraged. Development standards shall be urban in character and should typically utilize Planned Development zoning.

**Recreational**
The category contains a variety of active, passive, public and private open spaces including university athletic properties.

**Airport**
This classification encapsulates all the primary and accessory uses contained with the Purdue Airport property.

**State of Indiana**
This classification identifies properties currently owned by the State of Indiana and managed by the Indiana Department of Transportation.
Low Density Residential

**LAND USE DESCRIPTION**

- Single-family detached homes of varying lot sizes.
- Certain lower impact community oriented uses such as churches, parks, or schools may be encouraged within this category.
- Unless a Planned Development, residential density and development standards consistent with the R1, R1A, and R1B zones.
Medium Density Residential

**LAND USE DESCRIPTION**

- A denser mix of single, two-family and multi-family residential structures utilizing, unless a Planned Development, design standards consistent with the R1B, R1Z, R2, and R3 zones.
- Designed to serve primarily as a transition between lower density residential environments and commercial areas.
- Certain lower impact community oriented uses such as churches, parks, or schools may be encouraged within this category.
Regional Commercial

LAND USE DESCRIPTION

- An exclusively non-residential area containing a host of commercial, retail and service uses serving both surrounding neighborhoods and the larger metropolitan area.
- Larger developments should incorporate community gathering spaces to serve the needs of businesses and customers.
- Unless a Planned Development, standards shall be consistent with GB and NB zones.
Aerospace District

LAND USE DESCRIPTION

- Areas devoted to aerospace research, development and manufacturing connected with Purdue University.
- Light-industrial uses may be supported by this category.
- Unless a Planned Development, standards shall be consistent with the OR, I1 and I2 zones.
Innovation Mixed-Use

**LAND USE DESCRIPTION**

- An urban, university-oriented area of moderate density designed to provide a mix of residential, commercial, office, and university-related research and manufacturing uses.
- Commercial examples include professional/personal services, shop front retail with restaurants, cafes and gift shops.
- For mixed-use buildings, integration of uses occurs typically within structures with commercial uses on the ground floor level and residential and/or non-residential uses on upper levels.
- Typically constructed under the Planned Development regulations with building heights generally not exceeding six stories.
Future Land Use Map
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