

# **SOUTH EUCLID COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

Recommended by the Planning Commission  
November 11, 1999

Adopted by City Council- Resolution 58-99  
Passed April 10, 2000

Revised March/April 2011

Recommended by the Planning Commission  
April 14, 2011

Adopted by City Council- Resolution ??-2011  
Passed May ??, 2011

## Table of Contents

		<u>Page No.</u>
<b>Council Resolution 58-99</b>		
<b><u>Council Resolution ??-2011- revise TOC as necessary following completion of revisions</u></b>		
I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PATTERN .....	5
III.	OBSERVATIONS AND ASSESSMENTS .....	12
IV.	BASIC DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS .....	17
V.	OVERALL COMMUNITY OBJECTIVES .....	19
VI.	RESIDENTIAL AREA ASSESSMENT .....	21
VII.	DEVELOPMENT POLICIES .....	24
	A. Overall Development Policies .....	24
	B. Application of Development Policies .....	25
	C. City-Wide Remedial Efforts .....	33
VIII.	IMPLEMENTATION .....	35
	A. Zoning Text Amendments .....	35
	B. Financial/Administrative Assistance .....	39
IX.	APPENDIX .....	41
	A. Background Data – Demographic and Tax Values.....	A-1
	B. Residential Assessment - Criteria for Sub-Area Value Assignment.....	B-1
	C. Prior City Improvement Programs .....	C-1
	D. Summary Of Steps Conducted In The Preparation Of This Plan .....	D-1

**Table of Contents**  
*(continued)*

		<u>Page No.</u>
<b>LIST OF MAPS</b>		
Map 1	Regional Map.....	6
Map 2	Existing Conditions.....	7
Map 3	Density Comparison.....	9
Map 4	Target Areas for Planning Development Policies.....	23
Map 5	Application of Development Policies.....	28
Map 6	Policy for Mixed Use Core Area.....	30
 <b>LIST OF TABLES</b>		
Table 1	Summary of Single-Family Zoning Districts.....	8
Table 2	1990 Percentage of Population 65 Years and Older.....	10
Table 3	Effective Residential Property Tax Rates (1997 Tax Year).....	11
Table 4	Percentage of Real Estate Tax Base Derived from Residential Property (1997 Tax Year).....	11
Table 5	Comparison of South Euclid Development with Typical New Suburban Development.....	15
 <b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>		
Figure 1	Senior Citizen Housing Option A.....	26
Figure 2	Senior Citizen Housing Option B.....	27
Figure 3	Expansion of Commercial Use into Residential District as a Conditional Use.....	37
Figure 4	Suggested Modifications to Existing Homes to Enhance Marketability.....	38

## I. INTRODUCTION

A comprehensive plan is a broad guide that can provide direction and purpose and aid a community in making land-use and development decisions. **It is designed to provide a flexible roadmap for future development, and to ensure that new growth is consistent with the City's goals.** The adoption of a comprehensive plan changes no laws. It does however, provide a framework for legislation and administrative action.

**A comprehensive plan is long range in that it examines past trends and makes projections for the next 20 years. This allows the City to plan ahead and anticipate future needs. It should be noted, however, that projections are most accurate in the short term (five years), and that many factors that will shape the future cannot be anticipated. For this reason, an annual, joint meeting between the City Council and Planning Commission should be held to review the Plan and any amendments that may have become necessary. In addition, a full-scale Plan update should be undertaken at least every five years.**

Choice is a major factor in the creation of a community's plan as several implementation "tools" are possible. From these, the City must assess varying levels of difficulty and choose which elements to implement in the short and long range horizon.

### A. SOUTH EUCLID: WHY DEVELOP A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN?

South Euclid is a well-maintained community. There are many tree lined streets, housing costs are reasonable, the taxes are not too high, it is close to numerous shopping areas, there are a variety of recreation opportunities, and the school system has been well maintained. For many, there is a sense of community where people know their neighbors and interact with one another on a friendly basis.

The City is a member of ~~the First Ring Suburbs~~ **First Suburbs Development Council (FSDC)**. This is a consortium of ~~older~~ **inner ring** suburbs abutting the City of Cleveland that are collectively addressing the issue of how to remain competitive. **The FSDC is a not-for-profit organization that strives to achieve economic stability and viability to its member cities. The FSDC was formed as a result of a task force comprised of economic development officials of the member cities and representatives from the Cuyahoga County's Department of Development and Planning Commission to design a program to address development issues and augment each of the member cities' re-development efforts. The committee engaged to develop a framework for the program, solicited input from development practitioners, regional economic development agencies and foundations. The result was the creation of the First Suburbs Development Council. The FSDC a not-for-profit, 501(c)(3) organization, and is incorporated in the State of Ohio. The mission of the FSDC is "fostering economic and community development within the**

**member cities of the First Suburbs". The FSDC accomplishes this by providing technical assistance, expertise, and resources to member cities to strengthen the capacity of cities advancing development and re-development projects, to market member communities and to enhance the cities' quality of life.**

~~in an outwardly expanding geographic region that continues to support a market which has remained approximately the same size for several decades. In all of these "first ring" suburbs, there is little vacant land available for new development. This makes it very difficult for these communities to compete with outlying suburbs where vacant land is more plentiful. This is especially important to note, since the number of new housing units in the Greater Cleveland area has increased over the last 20 or 30 years, but the population has not. People have simply moved from one location to another.~~

In some neighborhoods there is a concern that more single-family homes are being occupied as rental units. **The financial (tax revenue generation) and aesthetic impacts associated with vacant and foreclosed homes are also a concern.** Vacancy rates for the Mayfield Road retail corridor and at Cedar Center have increased. Therefore, more creative methods are required to maintain "market share" and encourage development **where it is determined to be appropriate and reasonable from a sound land use planning perspective. New development, and in most cases redevelopment, should take place in a manner that is considered to be generally in-line with the City's development plans and objectives; will not be detrimental to adjacent property owners, structures and uses; and will maintain the health, safety, and welfare of the community.** ~~or in South Euclid's case, redevelopment.~~

## **B. PURPOSE OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

In the preparation of this Comprehensive Plan it is recognized that every community has choices in its approach to development and redevelopment that range from laissez-faire to a much more hands-on approach seeking to guide, enable, and encourage. Therefore, there is no one right answer. In an older, built community like South Euclid, with limited financial resources, the key issue is to determine what policies and actions are warranted for South Euclid to remain competitive – from the perspectives of housing, economic development, convenience and quality of life – in a region that continues to build in the outlying areas but whose overall market size remains constant. This Plan is intended to encourage South Euclid to respond positively to challenges in ways that go beyond the standard and typical response. The Plan contains a mix of policies: some are long-range policies that may be difficult to achieve, while others involve relatively small changes to the planning and zoning code that can be implemented in the next few months.

The adoption of this Plan changes no laws but instead identifies regulations that need to be changed and administrative actions that can be taken. The City must determine to what extent

the Plan's recommendations are enabling versus prescriptive. For example, some recommended zoning amendments are enabling. They simply make it possible for, or enable, certain desired forms of development to occur, but do not go so far as to mandate a particular activity. Other recommendations actually prescribe a specific action on the part of the City that will result in some form of mandatory compliance.

The Plan's policies are primarily influenced by the City's current development patterns and its context within the regional market. As a result of these influences, the Plan addresses the following:

1. Economic Development – Ways in which the City can ~~maintain~~ **move towards** a **more** balanced tax base in light of:
  - **Geographic location** ~~at disadvantages~~ related to major highway access and the amount of non-residential uses in surrounding communities.
  - Limited **and fixed** amount of undeveloped land.
2. Remedial or ongoing techniques to assure sustained marketability of the City's existing land uses (both residential and non-residential) with respect to:
  - Property maintenance.
  - Avoiding or eliminating obsolescence.
  - Suitable infrastructure.
  - Community facilities.
  - City Services.
  - Private support services – retail, churches, recreation, etc.
3. The range of housing options offered in order to be responsive to demographic patterns and owner preferences with respect to:
  - Alternative types of housing (cluster, senior, etc.).
  - Marketability of existing or new housing stock.
  - Quality and value.
4. Ways in which the City can increase its financial capability to realistically carry out and enable the development/redevelopment objectives.

### **C. SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS STUDIES**

This Plan is a broader continuation of previous studies. In 1983, the Community Development Corporation prepared a Business Area Improvement Program. The program included plans for

improved off-street parking, sidewalk repaving, landscape planting, and storefront upgrading. These efforts were seen as the primary means of encouraging “the return of shoppers, increased retail sales and the creation of an atmosphere of vitality and confidence.” Unfortunately, the program’s efforts did not adequately achieve the objectives.

In 1995, the City received a special purpose grant of \$750,000 in Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds to conduct detailed studies related to the Monticello Boulevard/Green Road industrial area at the north end of town and the Mayfield Road Business Area (an area that included the commercial parcels on the north side of Mayfield Road between Victory Drive and Green Road). At that time, Mayor Kocevar wrote about the “urgent need to address the City’s primary economic development areas” which were experiencing a degree of functional and locational obsolescence. The purposes of the grant were to foster redevelopment and reestablish these two areas as viable, marketable industrial and retail sites. Public money from the grant was utilized to prepare the sites for sale to private developers, which would ultimately lead to a higher level of investment by the private sector. By 1998, the entire grant had been utilized with visible results: the northwest corner of Mayfield Road and Green Road was redeveloped with a new strip retail center and a small green area and the northeast corner of Green Road and Monticello Boulevard was redeveloped with a new drug store.

While these studies focused on key locations in the City, there was not a comprehensive evaluation of the City’s overall needs. This Plan takes the next step and looks at the city as a whole.

By committing to prepare a comprehensive plan, the City is not content to let development occur according to the existing land use patterns.

The Planning Commission was designated as the "entity" to prepare the comprehensive plan. D.B. Hartt, Inc., Planning and Development Consultants, was selected to provide technical expertise in support of the Planning Commission’s work. At the outset, D.B. Hartt interviewed the Mayor, representatives of the City administration, City Council, the Planning Commission, and the City’s real estate consultant to determine the range of issues to be addressed and to assess the overall direction for development and redevelopment policies. Meetings with the Planning Commission, City Council, and the Mayor’s Task Force were held throughout the summer and fall of 1998 to review the observations and alternative development choices and reach consensus on the policies herein. A summary of the meetings is included in Appendix D.

**Since 1999, the Planning Commission has made periodic updates to the Plan- in 2005 and 2010. The 2005 updates consisted of updating various demographic information and revisiting the 1999 Plan’s goals and objectives.**

The 2010 Plan Update was first discussed by the Planning Commission in January 2009 and formally recommended to Council on March 11, 2010. The 2010 Plan Update consisted of an evaluation of City's progress relative to previous Plan elements with particular attention paid to the validity and implementation status of the Plan's Overall Community Objectives, Development Policies, and Implementation Measures. Significant 2010 Plan revisions included the addition of objectives, development policies, and implementation measures addressing preservation, linkage, and creation/acquisition of open/green space. It should be noted that the 2010 Plan Update was never formally adopted by City Council.

Understanding the flexible, dynamic nature of long-range planning, and in response to the sudden and unexpected private sale of Oakwood Country Club in late 2010 and the property constituting a large parcel of undeveloped land, the Planning Commission undertook a small-scale Plan revision in March 2011. The 2011 Plan Update focused on the Oakwood site and surrounding areas to the south and east, and included City-wide land use planning-related concepts for the Planning Commission to consider moving forward.

The 2011 Plan Update was precipitated by a request to rezone a 41-acre portion of the Oakwood Site from residential to commercial use and was completed following a recommendation to revisit the Plan. The recommendation to revisit the Plan was contained in a rezoning review, completed by McKenna Associates (planning and zoning consultants retained by the City), that evaluated the merits of the rezoning request on the basis of, amongst other things: the potential detrimental impacts of the proposed rezoning on adjacent property owners, buildings and uses per current Zoning Ordinance regulations; the City's existing infrastructure (road, water, sewer); the impact on health, safety and general welfare of residents of the City; the proximity to and natural extension of nonresidential uses; and various economic, environmental, and social benefits to the City as a whole.

The 2011 Plan Update was undertaken to ensure that the Plan reflects the City's current development plans and objectives, realizing that conditions in the City have changed and the scale and size of the Oakwood site alone was significant enough to warrant a revision to the City's Comprehensive Plan, particularly for the southwest area of the City. The scope of the 2011 Plan Update focuses primarily on areas west of Warrensville Center Road from Cedar Center (Cedar Road) north to the northern boundary of the Oakwood site. Also included indirectly in map revisions are adjacent neighborhoods on the east side of Warrensville Center Road.

**The City should consider a full-scale revision to the Plan to address City-wide changes in development patterns since completion of the 1999 Plan.**

DRAFT

## II. GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PATTERN

South Euclid is located in the northeast quadrant of Cuyahoga County, approximately 8 miles from downtown Cleveland. As noted earlier, it is an inner suburb located within the I-271 ring (see Map 1). The nearest access points to I-90 to the north and I-271 to the east are a few miles outside the city limits. Numerous shopping centers are located within and just beyond a three-mile radius from the Mayfield Road/Green Road intersection. Major employment centers (industrial and office parks) are located along both the I-90 and I-271 corridors, where regional access is available. Streets such as Mayfield Road and Cedar Road (east-west arterials) and Warrensville Center Road and Green Road (north-south arterials) provide connections to surrounding suburbs as well as to Cleveland. A plethora of employment, retail, entertainment, and cultural choices are available to South Euclid residents within a 30 minute drive.

**Residents have the opportunity to live close to their work as well as the major cultural attractions our region offers, such as University Circle and downtown Cleveland. Inner ring suburbs have historically served the city center of Cleveland, while providing affordable and attractive housing and neighborhood options in close proximity thereto.** However, due to the City's distance from highway interchanges and the many established centers beyond its boundaries, South Euclid is at a locational disadvantage when competing for new development.

### A. Local Land Use Pattern

South Euclid is a nearly built-up community that has been primarily developed as a traditional, residential suburb. According to the 1990 U.S. Census, the majority (86%) of the 9,565 dwelling units in the City are single-family detached homes, many (66%) of which were built during the post-war era<sup>1</sup>. During this time, neighborhood blocks were platted in a very orderly, efficient rectangular manner, with perpendicular cross streets. Most of the lots in these areas have a width of between 40 and 60 feet and a depth of between 120 and 150 feet, with an average lot size of 5,000 to 6,000 square feet. The predominant street pattern and lot characteristics are depicted on Map 2, Existing Conditions. The houses built on these small lots were typically small, three bedroom, two-story homes. Because of the time period when most of the houses were built, many have only a one-car garage that is detached from the house.

In 1997, the median sales price of a single family home in South Euclid was \$90,000, which is below the median for the entire County (\$95,000)<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> This includes units constructed between 1940 and 1959.

<sup>2</sup> Source: "Residential Sales Price Summary" 1997 Prepared by NODIS

Most of the land in the city is zoned residential. There are currently four single-family residential zoning classifications, though the majority of the City's residential areas are zoned either R-40 or R-50 (see Map 2 for the existing zoning districts). Table 1 indicates the minimum lot requirements for each district. Based on the minimum lot size and given an

DRAFT

Map 1 – Regional Map

DRAFT

Map 2

DRAFT

allowance for the area devoted to streets (based on the minimum lot width), the permitted density (the number of dwelling units per acre of land) for each of the zoning districts was calculated. Table 1 also compares the permitted density to the actual density. The actual density was determined by choosing a typical area within each of the four zoning

Table 1 Summary of Single-Family Zoning Districts (see also Map 3)				
Zoning District	Minimum Lot Area Required	Min. Lot Width	Permitted Density	Actual Density from Sampling
R-40	4,800 sq. ft.	40	7.2	6.0
R-50	6,000 sq. ft.	50	5.8	5.8
R-60	8,000 sq. ft.	60	4.4	4.0
R-75	12,000 sq. ft.	75	3.0	2.0

classifications. The total acres for each area were calculated, the lots were counted, and the actual density was determined by dividing the total acres by the number of lots. Map 3 indicates the representative sample area for each zoning

district. As indicated on Table 1, the R-50 and R-60 areas are developed in a very efficient manner, meaning nearly all the lots have only the minimum area required.

Besides single family homes, the only other type of housing found in South Euclid is multi-family units in larger, garden apartment style buildings. **South Euclid offers several housing choices in addition to single family homes. There is a small concentration of duplex housing as well as newly constructed attached and detached townhomes. Additionally, several multifamily units are also available.** Such garden apartments are concentrated in a few areas along Warrensville Center Road and Cedar Road near Cedar Center, along Green Road north and south of Monticello Boulevard, and along Mayfield Road.

**Planned unit residential developments (PURDs) are intended to specifically promote a diversity of dwelling unit types. A number of PURDs have been developed throughout the City including: Novicky Court, Crestview Court, Monticello Place, and Cutters Creek.**

**A number of condominium (attached single family dwellings) developments are also present in the City including: Ramblewood Condominiums, The Lofts, and Mayflower Condominiums (on Cedar Road, just west of Cedar Center).**

**It is important to note that City is currently implementing what it has termed a Green Neighborhoods Initiative in the West 5 neighborhood. The program is intended to capitalize on the City's existing housing stock by retrofitting existing bungalows to accommodate the needs of young professionals and senior citizens alike. Smaller, right-sized single family homes represent a sensible housing choice for the majority of buyers. One of the primary goals of the Green Neighborhoods Initiative is to call attention to the**

**attributes that make sense in today's residential market. Infill development, beginning in the West 5 area and spreading out to other areas of the City, is intended to encourage sustainable homeownership and prevent another wave of foreclosures.**

After residential, the second major type of land use in the City is retail. The two primary locations include the Mayfield Road retail corridor and Cedar Center. **The sale of the former Oakwood Country Club site in late 2010 to a private developer presents additional vacant land available for nonresidential development** at the City's southwestern border.

South Euclid shares a large portion of the Mayfield Road corridor with Cleveland Heights, Lyndhurst, and Mayfield Heights. As is common for many major streets in the County, the majority of the Mayfield Road frontage is zoned for and developed with retail establishments. Given that much of the area was platted and developed in the 1950s, the lots along Mayfield are narrow and shallow. Except for two larger, deeper parcels near the Green Road intersection, the average lot depth is about 150 feet. As a result, many of the older retail buildings do not meet contemporary retail standards for store size, location of parking spaces or number of parking spaces. Residential streets intersect Mayfield Road at short intervals, contributing to the difficulty in aggregating larger parcels for more contemporary retail development. In addition, the buildings in the corridor lack a common architectural style that would provide a cohesive character to the area.

**The Oakwood Site is unique in that it represents a large parcel of undeveloped land in the City. South Euclid is otherwise for the most part and for all intent and purpose already built-out with very little undeveloped land available. Unlike the existing commercial properties along the Mayfield Road corridor, the Oakwood site is of a scale and dimension that would enable the City to compete for and attract contemporary retail/nonresidential development.**

Cedar Center **formerly contained a** strip shopping center **with retail.** **Cedar Center is currently proposed to be redeveloped with a mix of various nonresidential uses.** associated with a similar retail center located across the street in University Heights. It currently has two rows of parking in front of the buildings, with a larger area of parking behind. This presents problems for the stores by requiring rear entrances and signs indicating where additional parking is located.

Map 3

DRAFT

These retail development patterns within the City – small freestanding buildings with limited parking, and strip shopping centers with most of the parking behind - are in stark contrast to the typical pattern of contemporary retail development which is characterized by larger centers of coordinated management. **Commercial development of the former Oakwood County Club site would accommodate such contemporary retail development, a retail asset that the City cannot otherwise offer its residents given the existing parcel configurations (shallow depth) and development patterns outlined previously. Encouraging redevelopment of existing retail spaces through programs like the Store Front Renovation Matching Grant Program and other similarly designed incentives will encourage updates to the existing retail spaces.**

The only industrial area is in the Green Road/Monticello Boulevard area. It is relatively small in size, isolated from other larger concentrations of industrial uses and not easily accessible to the regional expressway system. This area was one of the two focus areas for the 1995 CDBG.

Other notable land uses include Suburban University Hospital and Notre Dame College, both located along Green Road south of Mayfield and surrounded by residential neighborhoods.

Table 2: 1990 Percentage of Population 65 years and older <b>(to be updated following release of the full 2010 U.S. Census figures)</b>		
	Population	% over 65
South Euclid	23,866	22.6%
Portage County	142,585	11.2%
Medina County	122,354	11.8%
Geauga County	81,129	12.7%
Lorain County	271,126	13.9%
Lake County	215,499	14.3%
Summit County	514,990	16.8%
Cuyahoga County	1,412,140	19.0%
Statewide		15.9%
Urban Area		16.6%
Rural Area		13.7%

The Euclid Creek Metropark extends into the City from the north for about ¾ of a mile. Euclid Creek Parkway, which is parallel to the creek, provides a scenic drive that is utilized by residents as a route to the I-90 freeway. The City’s parks - Bexley, Victory, and North and South Quarry - are noted on Map 2. Oakwood Country Club is a 146 acre facility of which approximately 60 acres (40%) are in South Euclid and the remainder are in Cleveland Heights. In 1993 the golf course owner publicly discussed moving

the golf course further out. This led to preliminary plans that explored alternative uses to this site, including multi-family and large-scale retail shopping area.

**Oakwood County Club was sold in late 2010 and is being proposed for commercial development. As part of the development, the purchaser has offered to deed 21-acres to the City for use as a City-owned passive park.**

**The above noted redevelopment of Cedar Center, coupled with the sale of the Oakwood County Club, represents a significant change in land use patterns, particularly in the southwest portion of the City.**

**B. Population Characteristics (Section to be updated following release of the full 2010 U.S. Census figures)**

Table 3 Effective Residential Property Tax Rates (1997 Tax Year)	
Euclid	54.19
Lyndhurst	59.22
South Euclid (South Euclid, Lyndhurst School District)	61.55
East Cleveland	75.06
University Heights	81.18
Cleveland Heights	82.78
Median Rate for County	54.70

Based on the 1990 U.S. Census, approximately 23% of South Euclid residents are 65 years of age or older. This is due to the fact that many homeowners have lived at their place of residence for twenty or more years, and are probably the original owners of their homes. In comparison, in Cuyahoga County and adjacent counties the percentage of persons over 65 ranges from only 11% to 19% (See Table 2).

**C. Tax Implications (Section to be updated as part of a future full-scale Plan Update)**

In 1997, the effective tax rate for residential property in South Euclid was 61.55 mills. This is higher than the median residential tax rate for Cuyahoga County. But, as indicated on Table 3, South Euclid's residential tax rate is in the mid-range when compared to the surrounding communities.<sup>3</sup>

Table 4 Percentage of Real Estate Tax Base Derived from Residential Property (1997 Tax Year)	
East Cleveland	57%
Euclid	58%
Cleveland Heights	79%
Lyndhurst	79%
South Euclid	81%
University Heights	84%
County, exclusive of Cleveland	65%

As stated earlier, South Euclid is primarily a bedroom community. It is not surprising therefore, that 81% of the tax valuation in the City is attributable to residential property. This percentage is substantially higher than the proportion of residential tax

<sup>3</sup> See Appendix Table A-1 for a list of residential and commercial tax rates for South Euclid and 14 other eastern Cuyahoga County communities

valuation for suburban Cuyahoga County (which excludes the City of Cleveland). Compared to the five surrounding communities, South Euclid has the second highest percentage of its real estate tax derived from residential property (see Table 4).<sup>4</sup>

A high percentage of residential valuation indicates that a high level of the community's tax burden is borne by its residents, as opposed to being more equally shared with business, office, and industrial establishments.

DRAFT

---

<sup>4</sup> See Appendix Table A-2 for a comparison of assessed tax valuation for the able data for South Euclid and 14 other eastern Cuyahoga County communities.

### **III. OBSERVATIONS AND ASSESSMENTS**

The Greater Cleveland metropolitan area continues to build new homes and shopping centers that expand market choices in a region whose population is not materially increasing. In effect, more homes are being built to serve the same population base. While smaller household sizes have resulted in some increased demand for more dwellings, this demand is limited when the regional population base remains constant.

When new development continues in a region with a stable population, older properties may not compete equally in the market if they do not have the functional or locational characteristics expected by today's consumer. Both homebuyers and commercial shoppers will consider and often choose new development that features conveniences and amenities compatible with current lifestyles.

Property in South Euclid is generally well-maintained. Continued high maintenance of both residential and non-residential property is extremely important for South Euclid as well as other "first-ring" **inner ring** communities. Although property maintenance is critical, it alone is insufficient to address or change the underlying problems associated with functional obsolescence. In order for South Euclid properties to compete in the regional market, maintenance must be combined with alternatives that overcome functional obsolescence for both residential and non-residential uses.

This does not mean that all older retail centers are obsolete. Many communities have a mixed-use development core that retains or establishes an old-style, "downtown" layout (buildings side by side, located near the street with rear parking) despite not meeting contemporary retail standards. A successful old-style downtown contains one or more of the following characteristics:

1. Unique and historic architectural fabric;
2. A large, consolidated mass of high-density housing (8 units per acre or greater) in the immediate surrounding area;
3. A daytime population in existing or new office buildings in the immediate vicinity that produces a high volume of pedestrian traffic; and/or
4. Facilities or uses that attract tourists or visitors from outside the "local" market area.

The most logical location for the development of a mixed-use downtown core would be the Mayfield Road and Green Road intersection. Unfortunately, this area presently does not possess any of the essential characteristics listed above.

There are just over 52,600 dwellings within three miles of the Mayfield and Green intersection that will support a substantial amount of retail floor area. However, significant retail facilities already exist to serve this market both within and outside South Euclid. With new retail development continuing to occur throughout the region, the degree to which highly-intensive retail development could be successfully sustained in South Euclid is questionable. The development and/or redevelopment of a mixed-use district is more likely to be successful when consideration is given to what can be realistically accomplished given the existing urban fabric and regional market conditions.

**Given the opportunity presented by the availability of the Oakwood site, and coupled with the desire to understand the current regional market conditions, a general retail market analysis was undertaken as part of the 2011 Plan Update. According to Esri Business Analyst, and as outlined in Appendix E, a significant amount of retail leakage, i.e. money is leaving the City, when taking into consideration 1, 3, and 5 mile trade areas from the Oakwood site.**

**The planned redevelopment of Cedar Center, together with the proposed development of the former Oakwood Country Club site for commercial use have the potential to create a cohesive, successful mixed-use district. Redevelopment of Cedar Center and development of the Oakwood site could provide investment and associated positive impacts on property values vital to attracting new residents to the West 5 neighborhood. A neighborhood that has been severely impacted by the mortgage crisis.**

#### **A. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATIONS**

South Euclid has a higher percentage of its real estate tax revenue being derived from residential property than most other surrounding communities and the regional average. This is significant since, generally, single-family residential property generates less in local real estate taxes than the related cost of services. Conversely, non-residential development generates more tax revenue than the cost of services associated with its development. When the proportion of moderately valued housing in a community is high, the resultant negative impact to the tax base can be considerable.

The percentage of Cuyahoga County's tax valuation (exclusive of the City of Cleveland) derived from residential property is 65%, compared to South Euclid's 81%. In order to achieve a 10% shift in tax burden from residential to non-residential, and move closer to the suburban county percentage, approximately 175 to 250 acres of non-residential development would be needed. ~~Once again, South Euclid is at a distinct disadvantage when compared with outlying suburban communities (such as Solon, Strongsville, and Hudson) since there is virtually no vacant land available for this amount of non-residential development.~~ To accomplish a shift in the tax base with little or no vacant land available, South Euclid is limited to two basic options:

- Replace the residential areas with non-residential development and/or

- Increase the intensity of non-residential development to a significantly higher level than what currently exists.

The City's current economic development initiatives (e.g. industrial/commercial redevelopment at Green and Monticello and the retail redevelopment at Mayfield and Green) are being focused within the confines of the existing non-residential areas. These initiatives are important because they help to maintain property values, reduce functional obsolescence, and create a sense of "newness" and improved image. However, the result is replacement of the existing building area for an approximately equal amount of new building area. While the new development will likely have more value per square foot than the old development, confining these efforts to the existing non-residential areas will not result in a significant increase to the City's non-residential tax base or a shift of the tax burden from residential to non-residential.

To compound this issue, some of the obsolete commercial areas (i.e. along portions of Mayfield Road) may not be, in the long run, easily sustained or redeveloped for commercial purposes because of the small sites and shallow depth. Retail sites should have a minimum depth of 180 to 200 feet to be competitive. Several existing areas have a depth of approximately 150 feet or less (See Map 3). ~~Yet, if some of these areas are ultimately phased back to residential, the community's non-residential areas will actually decrease. This is not concluding that there is no market for small, free standing office, retail, or special use building, but that long term marketability is difficult to measure.~~

The City's tax base can be increased in the following ways (moving from item "1" to item "4" requires an increasing amount of public revenue but may also have greater community benefit):

1. By maintaining property and thus preserving property values;
2. By enabling and encouraging expansion of existing homes and businesses;
3. By promoting infill development ~~on small, vacant parcels~~ – both residential and non-residential;
4. By promoting redevelopment that either expands the non-residential tax base or creates higher-value residential homes. This can be achieved by either:
  - expanding non-residential uses into existing residential areas; and/or
  - increasing the density or intensity at the time of redevelopment – whether residential or commercial.

**B. HOUSING/DEMOGRAPHIC CONSIDERATIONS-**

~~Recognizing that significant increases in the City's non-residential development may be difficult to achieve due to the large amount of non-residential uses existing in the region, housing may be South Euclid's most important "industry." Therefore, a~~

Assuring competitive housing is necessary to ensuring the long term viability of the City. ~~may be the most realistic and effective course of action to balance the tax base.~~ For instance, providing alternative housing options that attract households without school-aged children could positively contribute to the tax base while not placing an undue burden on the City for public services.

Because South Euclid's housing stock consists predominantly of traditional, single-family detached dwelling units, there is a potential risk for the City to lose residents from both ends of the population spectrum. Both young adults and seniors will be more likely to relocate to communities where alternatives to the traditional single-family arrangement exist that better suit their needs and preferences.

**The Green Neighborhoods' Initiative, developed by the City's Housing Department, focuses on rehabilitation of the current housing stock to create diversity in what the city has to offer. The comprehensive rehabilitation of existing bungalows is designed to provide bedroom, bath and laundry facilities on the first floor, thereby creating a space that can be utilized by residents of all ages and ability levels. The initiative also places an emphasis on infill green building techniques.**

**The City should seize the opportunity to build on current market interest and, therefore, support by whatever means possible those interested in purchasing and renovating single-family bungalows. Such support could include: marketing, financial assistance, and/or design assistance to illustrate how these homes can be efficiently modified to meet current market needs.**

**In 2008 the City took steps to incentivize home purchase and renovation through establishment of a Community Reinvestment Area and creation of a community reinvestment housing council and tax incentive review council. The City should consider amending the CRA to provide 100% abatement for residential remodeling projects and new residential and nonresidential green infill projects.**

As stated in Chapter II, South Euclid has a larger population of senior citizens than is typical for many other communities. Currently, South Euclid has no housing specifically designed or intended for senior citizens, whether independent, congregate, or assisted living facilities. ~~Older residents are seriously limited if they decide to stay in South Euclid when they are ready to sell their single family homes. Therefore, there is little choice but to relocate to another community, especially where segments of the housing market have been specifically developed and marketed to meet the needs of seniors.~~ Other segments of the population that would benefit from alternatives to the traditional, single-family arrangement would be young adults and couples with no children. Housing alternatives for these groups usually focus on providing amenities and low-maintenance ownership arrangements.

**As noted previously, the Green Neighborhoods Initiative is intended to increase housing choice and provide housing stock that is attractive to young professionals and senior citizens. The creation of community gardens and incorporation of sustainable building practices are important aspects of the initiative. Community gardens, walkable neighborhoods, and sustainability concepts are important quality-of-life amenities. In addition, the goal of the Green Neighborhoods Initiative bungalow retrofit program is to provide a tangible model to show the versatility of the bungalow and how it can practically accommodate many life phases. Creation of smaller, right-sized houses placed in a conveniently located, transit friendly community like South Euclid represent a sensible housing choice for the majority of today's residential buyers.**

**The Green Neighborhoods Initiative is an important step toward rebranding and repositioning the City's existing housing stock for today's buyer. Also important is the Initiative's and City-wide focus on sustainability. Utilization of green building protocols facilitates affordable homeownership. In addition to the City being a walkable, transit-friendly community, retrofitting the houses to make them green and affordable will help residents sustain homeownership.**

Many of the homes in South Euclid were built in the 1950s. The older residential areas in South Euclid, particularly the areas with moderately-priced housing, do not have unique historic or architectural characteristics with respect to the dwelling units or the layout of the street pattern to enhance their marketability. The lots as well as the homes tend to be small, and often do not meet the expectations of today's "typical" homebuyer. Specifically, the "typical" homebuyer expects the following minimum features:

1. A larger home – The typical minimum size being built today is between 1,200 and 1,400 square feet, compared to many South Euclid homes which are approximately 1,000 to 1,200 square feet.
2. A larger lot – The average lot sizes for standard single-family homes in the R-40, R-50 and R-60 districts range from 4,800 to 8,000 square feet. This is less than the typical minimum lot size of 11,000 and 12,000 square feet being built in today's market. (See Map 3 and Table 5.)
3. A two-car, attached garage.
4. "Contemporary" kitchens and bathrooms as well as a greater number of bathrooms (including combination bathroom and master bedroom).

Table 5 Comparison of South Euclid Development with Typical New Suburban Development			
South Euclid Existing Development (based on sample identified on Map 3)		Typical New Development in Outlying Suburbs	
Zoning District	Actual Density	Dwelling Type	Density
R-40	6.0 units per acre	Attached Clusters/ Townhouses	5.5 – 6.0 units per acre
R-50	5.8 units per acre		
R-60	4.0 units per acre	Detached Clusters	4.0 – 4.5 units per acre
R-75	2.0 units per acre	“Standard Suburban” Single-family	2.0 – 2.5 units per acre

Many of the older residents have been living in their houses for decades – often, since their house was built. When their homes are offered for sale the typical buyers are younger adults who view their purchases as “starter” or “transitional” homes. These buyers will usually only remain in these houses until they can afford to purchase larger homes which better meet their needs.

**C. COMMUNITY FACILITIES**

The number and size of the existing schools and school sites are generally adequate. The continuing need is for additional athletic fields and additional parking at Brush High School. This need can be accommodated by the Board of Education, without City intervention, either on land currently owned by the Board or adjacent land that the Board will acquire for these purposes.

The City of South Euclid has 36 acres of parkland, which is 1.5 acres/1,000 people. National “standards” or “averages” suggest that cities should have between 6.25 – 10 acres/1,000 people. Meeting this standard would require an additional 114 to 204 acres of parkland. These standards are generally viewed as local public park requirements and are in addition to school sites and regional parks or open space. Nevertheless, based on the interviews with the City administration, Council, and Planning Commission, expanding the amount of the City’s public open space does not appear to be a high priority.

**D. PUBLIC FINANCING** **(Section to be updated as part of a future full-scale Plan Update)**

The City has a continuing financial obligation to maintain its basic infrastructure – flood control, roads, utilities, etc. -- while simultaneously pursuing implementation of the policies in this Plan, which, in part, requires financial commitments in order to attract the investments advocated.

To meet basic infrastructure needs, the City Engineer has prepared a five-year Capital Improvement Program (CIP). Approximately \$10.5 million is needed to fund this five-year program, though only \$8.3 million is funded or anticipated to be funded. It should also be noted that implementation of the CIP does not fully correct all of the City's current infrastructure deficiencies!

The City's other funding options are limited as well. First, the one-time special block grant awarded to the City has been spent in the successful Monticello/Green and the Mayfield/Green redevelopment projects. Second, the City has no surplus operating funds to invest heavily in the Plan's implementation. Third, the City **cannot** and should not expect to generate additional property tax revenue specifically for the implementation of this Plan because the tax revenues should be reserved to meet current needs and the tax burden on residential property owners is already greater than desired.

Nevertheless, since many of the Plan's recommendations are important to the long-range welfare of the City, South Euclid must aggressively pursue outside funding to provide seed money to achieve its long-range objectives.

## **IV. BASIC DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS**

South Euclid's position as an **inner ring** suburb presents several constraints regarding development. After reviewing the City's general development pattern and addressing issues of competitiveness, it is clear that many of South Euclid's options are defined and fixed by regional forces over which the City has limited control. However, the purpose of this Plan is to identify those areas where the City can realistically affect change. In considering the various development options presented, the City needs to take into account the relative difficulty of an option and the ability of an option to be supported by the market alone, or whether financial and administrative assistance will be required. It must also be acknowledged that in order for the City to effectively address the underlying fundamental issues that are associated with development, options must extend beyond traditional, "status quo" approaches.

### **A. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

In regard to economic development, the City **should undertake the following actions** has the following choices:

1. Continue to foster redevelopment of the existing commercial/industrial areas in the manner in which it has been done over the last several years, recognizing that while this approach eliminates functional obsolescence it only marginally increases the City's non-residential tax base.

**OR**

2. Substantially increase the City’s non-residential tax base by:
  - a. Enabling and facilitating the expansion of non-residential uses, even if it means the redevelopment of selected residential areas.
  - b. Enabling higher intensity **development**/redevelopment in selected non-residential areas when supported by the market.
  - c. Taking steps to enable and provide incentives for the development of a wider range of housing choices (elderly, “empty nester,” starter clusters/condos ~~—which are not now available in South Euclid~~) that will attract households without children in order to increase tax revenues and reduce the cost of educational services.

**B. HOUSING**

In regard to housing, the City **should undertake the following actions** ~~has the following choices:~~

1. ~~Rely on~~ **Continue** property maintenance, infrastructure improvements, and continued excellent public services (including schools) to maintain the community’s tax base and marketability of its housing stock.

**OR**

2. ~~The City can~~ **Take** steps to ensure that additional housing options are available for potential homebuyers. Steps include:
  - a. Adjusting the current regulations and possibly providing financial incentives to enable existing homes to:
    - be expanded with additional floor area and two-car attached garages. Adding onto a house makes it more competitive in the current market and increases its residential tax value;
    - be expanded/modified as empty-nester/senior housing.
  - b. Identifying suitable locations and providing enabling regulations and financial incentives to promote redevelopment of existing single-family areas for:

- Cluster housing targeted to first-time home buyers or empty-nesters;
- Senior housing facilities – either independent dwelling units and/or assisted living facilities that provide congregate dining and social areas.

In order to choose the appropriate plan of action, the City needs to first analyze the fundamental direction for the community. The goals and objectives outlined in the next chapter do just that.

DRAFT

## V. OVERALL COMMUNITY OBJECTIVES

The following goals and objectives have been formulated to provide a general framework on which development policies (Chapter VII) and implementation measures (Chapter VIII) have been developed. There are three fundamental objectives.

**OBJECTIVE A: South Euclid will take the necessary steps to remain competitive in the regional market. This will be achieved by:**

1. Providing housing choices that meet the needs of today's homebuyer with respect to:
  - a) The size and features of single-family homes available.
  - b) The availability of alternative housing choices (i.e. clustering, retirement, new apartments, green bungalows) to meet the needs of residents in all phases of their "life cycle".
2. Enabling/encouraging non-residential development within the City of South Euclid which meets the current needs of the developer, tenant, employee, and/or consumer.
3. Assuring that development provides adequate tax revenue for the City to maintain expected public services.

~~This policy of striving to regain overall competitiveness recognizes that:~~

- ~~• Housing decisions always require a balance of lifestyle choices vs. ability to pay — the market is not doing its job when choice is overwhelmingly influenced or dictated by financial limitations. In such case, the housing is not fulfilling lifestyle desires but rather is temporarily selected out of necessity and will only be retained as long as the economies dictate.~~
- ~~• Many retail stores meeting the needs of South Euclid residents are and will continue to be outside the City's boundaries.~~
- ~~• Industrial areas in the City do not, by today's standards, represent preferred industrial locations or size.~~
- ~~• Major office developments are and will continue to concentrate in a few selected locations outside the City.~~

**OBJECTIVE B:** The City’s policies will focus on enabling (from a regulatory perspective) and encouraging (from an administrative and financial perspective) non-residential uses to expand or redevelop in selected locations in a manner which:

1. Meets market needs and provides continuing services to South Euclid and the region.
2. Increases tax revenue to the City.
3. Overcomes any existing functional and locational obsolescence **(i.e. minimal commercial lot depth)**.
4. Represents “logical extensions” of existing non-residential areas and minimizes (but does not eliminate) arbitrary intrusions into residential areas.
5. Maintains and improves the compatibility and buffering between residential and non-residential uses.

**OBJECTIVE C:** ~~Promote (with enabling legislation and administrative and financial support) housing as the City’s primary “industry” or resource.~~ **Encourage redevelopment and investment in the City’s housing stock.** To this end, the City will:

1. Continue to utilize existing programs and further seek and promote the use of new tools to assure the current high level of housing maintenance.
2. Encourage infill housing development on available vacant lands with densities at least equal to the density of the surrounding residential areas.
3. Enable and promote revitalization or redevelopment of the City’s housing stock in selected locations:
  - a) to be more responsive to current market needs.
  - b) to increase the City’s tax base.
4. Develop a systematic capital improvement program to make improvements to those existing streets which do not meet current subdivision improvement standards (i.e., lacking curbs, sidewalks, enclosed storm sewers, street trees, etc.).
5. **Encourage diverse housing options through rehabilitation of existing stock and new construction where appropriate.**

**OBJECTIVE D: Open/Green Space Preservation. To preserve and enhance the overall quality of life within the City of South Euclid by managing redevelopment in a manner that provides and maintains a system of parks and recreation facilities to meet the needs of the community. To advance and employ measures that will make land use decision-making, coordinate conservation and growth thereby insuring that each area preserves its unique character and sense of place by providing for growth and prudent use of natural resources. To promote and implement measures that will make the City of South Euclid a cleaner, healthier, and more environmentally friendly community.**

DRAFT

## **VI. RESIDENTIAL AREA ASSESSMENT**

The previous objectives indicate that specific geographic areas of the City need to be identified where the various development, redevelopment, and preservation policies will be implemented. In order to do so, it became apparent that a detailed assessment of South Euclid’s single-family residential areas should be conducted.

The residential area assessment involved a two step process. First, the single-family residential areas were objectively evaluated according to specific criteria related to quantifiable physical features related to lots.<sup>5</sup> Second, the market and development implications of locational characteristics such as proximity to major thoroughfares, commercial districts, and neighboring communities and related market influences were considered. Studies previously undertaken by and for the City were also considered. This combined evaluation of objective criteria and locational characteristics provides a more complete basis for policy development.

### **Step 1**

To undertake the initial objective assessment of residential areas, the City was divided into small evaluation areas that had similar physical characteristics. These similarities were determined by establishing area boundaries based on the following:

1. Existing zoning boundaries;
2. The existing street pattern (grid, curvilinear, cul-de-sac) and street hierarchy (arterial, collector, local);
3. Physical/visual separation created by public or semi-public facilities such as municipal centers, parks, schools, hospitals, or churches;
4. Physical/visual separation created by land use changes: commercial, industrial, non-single-family residential;
5. Degree of “isolation” from other residential areas;
6. Relationship to natural feature(s): i.e., woodland, stream, and ravine.

As a result of these considerations, the City was divided into 49 sub-areas. Objective criteria from the public records of the Cuyahoga County Auditor’s office were then collected and recorded (by address) for properties with single-family detached dwelling units. The initial sample represented approximately 1.5% of the total number of single-family dwelling units in South Euclid. An evaluation of the selected samples revealed that certain sub-areas were

---

<sup>5</sup> The detailed evaluation form and an explanation of the criteria are included in Appendix B.

underrepresented. Therefore, the initial sample was supplemented to include 254 properties, which resulted in approximately a 3% sample representation for each individual sub-area. The sampling was verified where possible through aerial photography and field verification.

Three basic categories were used in the assessment: lot size, dwelling unit living area, and garage type (whether attached or detached). A numeric scoring system was used in the assessment and applied to each sub-area. Based on assigned values, totals were calculated for each of the 49 sub-areas.<sup>6</sup>

## **Step 2**

In the second step, the findings of the residential assessment were adjusted to reflect locational characteristics -- such as proximity to major thoroughfares and/or commercial uses and the spatial relationship between residential areas and related commercial frontage -- which have an important bearing on the selected locations for various strategies. As part of this step, the Improvement Target Areas (ITAs) initially designated by the Cuyahoga County Community Development Department (1991) and adopted by resolution of City Council (1992) were considered. ITAs are those areas of the City (both residential and nonresidential) which, based on several factors, have a higher concentration of deferred maintenance and functional obsolescence than elsewhere in the City<sup>7</sup>.

Adjustments to the residential assessment were made to accommodate these fundamental factors of locational characteristics and to expand the evaluation to the nonresidential areas of the City. As a result of this composite assessment, three categories were devised for the purpose of formulating long-range strategies. Following is a brief explanation of each category. Areas within the City were then placed in one of the three categories. These areas are identified on Map 4 and the fundamental policies for each of the areas are discussed in Chapter VII.

Areas labeled **1** were determined to be the least competitive from a regional standpoint, and therefore, these areas are prime locations for revitalization and redevelopment.

Areas labeled **2** were found to have only some of the competitive characteristics that are needed to maintain the viability of the area.

Areas labeled **3** had the highest composite scores from the residential assessment, meaning that the existing housing stock has maintained its regional competitiveness. Therefore, the characteristics of these areas should be preserved.

---

<sup>6</sup> Map B-1 indicating each of the 49 sub-areas is included in Appendix B.

<sup>7</sup> Prior City improvement programs are discussed in Appendix C, which includes copies of Resolution No 39-92 and Resolution No 76-92 adopting the public improvement plan for Cedar Road and Mayfield Road, respectively.

Map 4

DRAFT

## **VII. DEVELOPMENT POLICIES**

To achieve the overall community objectives discussed in Chapter V, the City has been divided into three segments. These segments depict where various preservation, development, redevelopment, and revitalization efforts, including nonresidential economic development policies that would be least disruptive to the residential fabric of the City, should be focused (See Map 4 in Chapter VI). These areas were established based on an evaluation of several factors: the residential area assessment study, aerial photography and field verification of physical elements, the integration of locational criteria such as the relationship between various uses within the City, and the impact of general land uses in adjoining communities.

### **A. OVERALL DEVELOPMENT POLICIES-**

The boundaries of Areas 1, 2, and 3 are identified on Map 4.

1. Locations in **AREA 1** are designated for mixed-use and higher intensity development, revitalization, or redevelopment. These are primarily the City's non-residential areas and adjacent residential areas. ~~Combined, these areas fall below competitive standards for both residential and non-residential markets.~~ These include locations where the expansion and redevelopment of non-residential and mixed-uses could play a central role in the competitive revitalization of the City. Revitalization and redevelopment of these areas will require highly proactive policies that:
  - a) Enable higher intensity non-residential, mixed-use development and redevelopment in existing **and proposed** non-residential areas if supported by the market. **Such mixed use development will help establish neighborhood character, create a sense of place, and encourage walking, bicycling and connectivity between mixed use areas and surrounding neighborhoods. Mixed use districts should provide services and goods that are accessible to pedestrians from nearby neighborhoods and create the ability for residents to work, shop, and socialize in close proximity to thier homes.**
  - b) Promote and enable the expansion and concentration of retail, office and residential development/redevelopment into mixed-use centers which may be logically expanded into adjacent residential areas. **Existing nonresidential zoning adjacent to the south and along portions of both sides of Warrensville Center Road, expansion of mixed use development on the former Oakwood County Club site would**

**constitute a logical expansion of mixed use development. New development on the site would serve the needs of the West 5 neighborhood as well as those neighborhoods east of Warrensville Center Road. Combined with redevelopment of Cedar Center, the surrounding single and multi-family residential density, and development of a neighborhood park west of the Oakwood site, the area would include have many of the attributes of a successful mixed-use district.**

2. In **AREA 2**, residential development/redevelopment is encouraged at approximately existing densities for both senior or non-senior housing. These areas fall into a moderate range in terms of meeting housing market needs. Development and/or redevelopment should be permitted and enabled when specific criteria are met. Policies for locations in Area 2 include:
  - a) Encourage infill development according to the prevailing density, or at increased densities when expanding housing options to respond to current and emerging market needs.
  - b) Permit redevelopment for new cluster housing.
  - c) Permit/encourage senior citizen housing, assisted living, nursing and continuing care retirement facilities in existing residential areas through new development/revitalization. See Figures 1 and 2 for illustrations of Senior Citizen Housing options.
  
3. In **AREA 3**, the existing residential characteristics is to be preserved. **With the exception of the neighborhood park west of the former Oakwood County Club, which should be preserved as a park in perpetuity,** infill development on vacant land is encouraged, but no redevelopment is advocated. These areas best meet current housing market needs in terms of lot size, dwelling unit living area and garage type (attached/detached). Therefore, policies in these areas should be confined to the following:
  - a) Permit new infill development at densities allowed by the zoning code to strengthen existing market conditions. Wherever possible, Planned Residential Development (PRD) should be utilized.

- b) Discourage redevelopment unless an exceptional opportunity for economic development is presented that is strongly related to and is a logical extension of a priority redevelopment area.

**B. APPLICATION OF DEVELOPMENT POLICIES-**

These policies are graphically depicted on Map 5.

- 1. ~~In AREA 1, p~~Priority locations for mixed-use and higher intensity development include the Mayfield Road corridor, two locations along Green Road - south of Mayfield Road and north of Monticello, **the former Oakwood County Club site**, and the Cedar Road corridor.

Policies 1.a) through 1.c) pertain to the Mayfield Road Corridor.

- a) Promote Retail/Office Mixed-Use Core around the intersection of Mayfield and Green Roads. Policies for this core area include:
  - Permit high-intensity mix of retail and offices, which would entail substantial redevelopment of the existing parcels.

Figure 1

DRAFT

Figure 2

DRAFT

Map 5

DRAFT

- Encourage development of multi-story structures. Taller buildings (up to 100 feet) are encouraged at or near the Mayfield/Green intersection. Buildings that exceed the existing height limit of 40 feet must provide deck parking to accommodate the parking spaces needed for the added stories.
- Continue to allow apartments within the core area, but only when located in a building that has retail stores on the first floor.
- Establish strong design review criteria to control relationship between uses, street character, etc. Parking areas should not be visible from the street; instead, they should either be behind or inside a building or screened by an architecturally pleasing wall that is appropriately landscaped.

It is recognized that this policy endorses actions that require existing buildings to be torn down to allow for complete redevelopment of this area. See Map 6 for an illustration of the policies for the mixed-use core area.

- b) Encourage redevelopment in areas that are immediately adjacent to the Mixed-Use Core Area:
- Permit only multi-story office buildings (exclusive of retail) on the east and west side of Green Road, north of Mayfield Road. Develop as a logical, contiguous progression from the retail/office core at Mayfield and Green Roads.

Map 6

DRAFT

- Permit independent higher density residential development north of Mayfield Road, flanking the east and west boundaries of office uses to the east of City Hall and west to Belvoir Boulevard. Develop as a logical, contiguous progression from the retail/office mixed-use core at Mayfield and Green Roads. This type of development could include senior housing facilities with congregate living and dining services. See Figures 1 and 2 (on pages 26 and 27) for illustrations of Senior Citizen Housing options.
- Permit retail/office expansion and redevelopment of the existing commercial along Mayfield Road, west of the mixed-use core to South Belvoir Boulevard. These uses may be extended into residential areas to the north of Mayfield Road when overcoming obsolescence or as a contiguous and logical progression from the mixed-use core at Mayfield and Green Roads.

In all cases, the above uses are to be encouraged only after the core area is developed in order to ensure that the primary focus remains at the Mayfield/Green intersection.

- c) Permit multi-family, retail and offices along Mayfield Road west of Belvoir Boulevard and southeast of the intersection of Mayfield Road and Warrensville Center Road.
- Development may be expanded into existing residential areas when overcoming obsolescence related to shallow site depth.
  - Whenever possible, commercial development should be redirected into the expanded central core emanating from Mayfield and Green Roads. Therefore, the conversion of commercial uses to residential at increased densities should be permitted. Since most of the affected retail stores are small, independent sites that lack any type of cohesion, scattered multi-family development in this area is acceptable.

Policies 1.d) through 1.f) pertain to the Green Road corridor

- d) Permit multi-story offices only (exclusive of retail) on the east and west sides of Green Road, south of Mayfield Road between St. Gregory's Church and University Suburban Health Center.
- e) Permit higher density residential development east of Green Road between University Suburban Health Center and Greenview Upper Elementary School.
- f) Permit development/redevelopment or expansion of the industrial area at Green/Monticello adjacent to Euclid Creek Metropark. This area is suitable for and may be appealing to incubator-type uses that do not necessarily require the prime industrial locations.

Since this area is adjacent to and overlooks the Euclid Creek Metropark, redevelopment for higher density housing would be acceptable and should not be precluded. However, in order for multi-family development to be acceptable, a proposed project has to be large enough and in the right location so as not to be an intrusion in the middle of an otherwise non-residential area.

Policies 1.g) through 1.i) pertain to the Cedar Road corridor **and former Oakwood County Club site.**

- g) ~~Permit expansion of~~ **Promote mixed use (residential, office, neighborhood commercial uses)** retail on the north side of Cedar Road from Cedar Center to Miramar Road **and mixed use development (residential, office, and/or commercial uses) on the former Oakwood County Club site.**
- h) **Maintain and** permit **logical** expansion of existing multi-family **uses** to the north of Cedar Road along both sides of Warrensville Center Road and to the west of Cedar Center. **Expansion of multi-family uses should be done in a manner that limits impacts on adjacent single-family residential uses. Zoning regulations may need to be drafted to limit impacts. The West 5 neighborhood and surrounding neighborhoods on the east side of Warrensville Center Road (as indicated on Map 5) are considered high priority areas for targeted**

**residential redevelopment.** Commercial expansion along the Warrensville Center Road corridor should be discouraged.

- i) Permit limited expansion of office/retail development as a small node at the intersection of Cedar and Green Roads.
2. ~~In AREA 2,~~ **Priority locations for residential development/redevelopment including clustering, attached housing and senior facilities are:**
    - a) The area west of Warrensville Center Road and north of Cedar Center.
    - b) The area between Warrensville Center Road and Wrenford Road, from north of Cedar to Harwood Road.
    - c) The area west of Princeton Boulevard in the upper northwest section of the City.
  3. ~~In AREA 3,~~ **priority locations for infill housing at the density permitted by the zoning code are Redevelopment or residential infill sites should be at the density permitted by the Zoning Ordinance and prioritized as follows:**

~~The Oakwood Country Club site if the Club moves. It is important to note that this policy reflects the position that this site should not be developed for retail uses. Instead, the City desires to focus all non-residential development/redevelopment in the priority locations addressed in Area 1.~~

~~On assembled backland at the northeast section of the City (Ammon/Trebisky area).~~

~~On other small existing vacant sites which may be available.~~

- a) **On any vacant infill residential lot first (sites of previous residential demolitions), before building on previously undeveloped vacant residential lots; and**
- b) **Areas where defunct developments now stand (ie. Liberty Court).**

~~The development expected is similar to the townhouses at the Mayfield/Dorsch intersection.~~

**C. CITY-WIDE REMEDIAL EFFORTS**

The following policies apply generally to all areas of the city.

1. Continue to utilize existing programs and further seek and promote the use of new tools to assure the current high level of housing maintenance.
2. Develop a systematic capital improvement program to make improvements to those existing streets which do not meet current subdivision improvement standards (i.e., lacking curbs, sidewalks, enclosed storm sewers, street trees, etc.)

When these development policies are implemented as suggested in Chapter VIII, or by other measures developed by the City, the following benefits will be realized:

- A higher percentage of the City's tax base will be shifted to commercial property and away from the single-family homeowners.
- Local income tax revenue will increase.
- A wider variety of housing choices will be available.
- With more housing choices, South Euclid will better maintain its "proportionate share" of the housing market, thereby maintaining and/or increasing residential property values.
- The City's commercial areas will be improved through the elimination of existing obsolescence and the image of the City's "front door" entry ways will be strengthened. The appearance and economic health of major commercial corridors significantly influences the resale marketability of adjacent residential areas.

**D. DEVELOPMENT OPEN/GREEN SPACE POLICIES**

**1. OPEN/GREEN SPACE CHARACTER**

**It shall be the policy of the City to encourage the creation and preservation of open and green space as an important element in shaping The City of South Euclid's development pattern and in preserving its aesthetic and environmental quality. The City's open space system has two components:**

- **Definite Elements of Open Space - public lands permanently protected from development such as dedicated parkland, nature preserves, cemeteries, etc.**

- **Areas of Open Space Character - parcels not permanently protected from development (e.g. golf courses, campuses, or private/public schools), which contribute to the open space character of an area.**

**The city will give high priority to maintaining open space elements that:**

- a) **Provide space for active and passive recreation and encourage site development that is sensitive to the area's natural characteristics.**
  - b) **Preserve areas that shape community design and character, i.e. plazas, buffer strips, landscaped yards, street trees and areas visible from roads, sidewalks, and community gateways.**
  - c) **Provide incentives including clustering, density bonuses, and creative design meaningful to open space within private development.**
2. **LINKAGES**

**It shall be the policy of the City to provide open space linkages that form a connected system of parklands within the City, and as may be feasible with adjacent communities.**

- a) **Properties, which create or enhance linkages or linear parks or serve as open space routes connecting to state and municipal parks for pedestrians, bicyclists, or similar uses within the city and adjacent communities.**
- b) **Assemble open corridors or greenbelts as opposed to scattered parcels. May be linkages to existing open space or connecting nodes of development, trails, wildlife corridors or riparian buffers.**

3. **ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES**

**It shall be the policy of the City to facilitate the protection and preservation of properties that have been identified as having special natural, scenic, or environmental significance.**

- a) **Properties, which protect water quality including groundwater supplies wetlands, floodplains and streamside Riparian zones.**
- b) **Properties, which provide exceptional habitats for plants fish and wildlife species, provide critical habitat linkages or which can be reclaimed to provide for biodiversity or other environmental needs.**
- c) **Properties, which protect unique and significant natural features including wetlands, floodplains, and natural drainage ways (Euclid Creek and Nine Mile Creek).**

## **VIII. IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES**

There are several steps the City can and should take to facilitate implementation of the Plan. Some steps can be completed immediately; others will take longer. These efforts include:

- **Amending the City's zoning regulations** to enable investment to occur in a manner consistent with the Plan and to prevent development that is contrary to the Plan's policies.
- **Providing adequate administrative capacity** to communicate to the community (both residential and commercial property owners and potential investors) the Plan's policies and rationale and to assist residents or investors in understanding the process required for a project to be approved.
- **Securing financial resources to facilitate private investment.** Since virtually no vacant land is available in South Euclid, most real estate investment will require acquisition of developed land, which is typically more expensive than vacant "greenfield" sites in outlying communities. In order to maintain its competitive position, South Euclid must take steps to financially eliminate these cost differentials so that investors are as likely to be attracted to South Euclid as elsewhere. Removing these cost differentials and creating a "level investment playing field" should be viewed as a community "infrastructure need" in the same sphere of importance as utilities and other more traditional community needs.

Within this framework, the following implementation measures should be undertaken.

### **A. ZONING TEXT AMENDMENTS**

The zoning regulations are the fundamental regulatory tool used to implement many of the land use policies stated in this Plan. The following text amendments should be made to the South Euclid Planning and Zoning Code.

1. Create a new C-3 Downtown Business District to be applied at the Mayfield/Green intersection as generally depicted on Maps 5 and 6. In contrast to the existing C-1 and C-2 Districts, this new classification would:
  - a) Permit a building height up to 100 feet (about 8 stories) in locations most removed from existing single family areas.
  - b) Require deck parking when a building exceeds four (4) floors.
  - c) Require either buildings or decorative walls along the existing street frontage to create a "downtown" environment and avoid vast areas of open parking.

- d) Continue to prohibit residential dwelling units on the ground floor but encourage residential uses on upper floors of existing or new buildings.
2. Allow retail development or multi-family development in residential districts as a conditional use when:
- a) The proposed development is contiguous to and coordinated with development on the main commercial street.
  - b) No access is provided on the side street within the residential zone.
  - c) Proper buffering is provided between the commercial or multi-family use and the single-family homes.

This modifies the existing zoning provision that limits such expansion to parking only. While the existing provision may continue to be applicable, it does not as easily permit the more conventional retail arrangement with parking in front of the building. Figure 3 indicates how the existing and proposed provisions apply to commercial development and adjacent residential areas.

3. Conditionally permit independent multi-family buildings in the C-1 and C-2 Districts to increase development alternatives. Currently in the C-1 and C-2 Districts, apartments are permitted only on the upper floors in commercial buildings.
4. Conditionally permit taller buildings in the C-2 District when the buildings are sufficiently set back from existing residences (i.e., increasing the height limitation from 40 feet to 60 or 70 feet).
5. Create a residential overlay zone that would reduce the residential setback regulations (both front and side) to enable existing homes to:
- a) Be expanded with two-car attached garages to be more competitive in the current market and increase residential tax values. Figure 4 illustrates how this provision could be applied.
  - b) Be expanded/modified as empty-nester/senior housing.

The front setback should be reduced to 25 or 30 feet from the existing 40 feet. Also, the side setback should be eliminated so that zero lot line development is possible either for detached homes or for attached units with a party wall along the common property line. This overlay concept should be initially applied along the Warrensville Center Road corridor north of Cedar or in the Improvement Target Area north of Mayfield Road.

6. Consider development of a multi-use zoning district to encompass the southwest portion of the City including Cedar Center, the West 5 neighborhood, and the former Oakwood Country Club site. Said district should facilitate cohesive, pedestrian friendly, sustainable and low impact development concepts throughout.

DRAFT

Figure 3

DRAFT

Figure 4

DRAFT

7. Amend the current Planned Unit Residential Development regulations to:
  - a) Reduce the minimum required project area from 5 acres to 2 acres.
  - b) Permit greater flexibility in the arrangement of units and minimum lot sizes while maintaining the provision that the gross density shall not be greater than otherwise permitted in the zoning district.
8. Grant greater authority to the Planning Commission to relax the parking standards for the following situations:
  - a) For older buildings (recognizing that older buildings generally are not as efficiently designed to justify more conventional parking requirements);
  - b) Along public transit lines; and
  - c) When “nearby” parking lots may be available and the adjacent uses do not utilize the required parking at the same peak periods.

**B. Financial/Administrative Assistance**

The following administrative measures and financial assistance when implemented will facilitate the accomplishment of the development policies set forth in the Plan.

1. The City should ensure that there is a staff person at City Hall who can provide support and assistance related to community development issues. This person would have the following responsibilities:
  - a) Promoting the Plan's policies within the City and to potential investors.
  - b) Assisting potential investors in understanding the types of projects that are promoted by the Plan and which would be acceptable to the City.
  - c) Helping applicants/investors to understand, facilitate and expedite the review process.
  - d) Seeking both outside funding (i.e., state, federal, foundation or other sources) and creative ways of financing new development (i.e., tax increment financing, etc.) which provides incentives for making investments in South Euclid.

2. The City should prepare and submit applications for "demonstration grants" on the premise that the investment needs of South Euclid are not unique. Many communities in Northeast Ohio are very similar to South Euclid in that they were built after World War II. Historically, assistance programs have been primarily directed at either central cities or older (pre-WWII) communities. However, the needs of postwar communities are emerging as equally important.
3. The City should undertake a comprehensive review of existing regulations and administrative procedures to determine if additional programs are warranted in order to achieve the highest possible level of maintenance in the City in the most effective manner. The City should continue to pursue the adoption of the Point of Sale Inspection Program

**C. STRATEGIES FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF OPEN/GREEN SPACE:**

**The following measures when implemented will facilitate the accomplishment of the open/green space policies set for the Plan.**

- a) **Education ensuring the community gains understanding of the objectives of the open space policy.**
- b) **Direct purchase or first option to purchase.**
- c) **Easements or rights of way can be used to ensure pedestrian or vehicular access across private land.**
- d) **Facilitating the protection/preservation action(s) to be taken by the State, by the City of South Euclid and by private organizations such as land trusts or foundations**
- e) **Transfer of development rights [TDR] allow landowners to sever development rights from properties in designated areas, and sell them to purchasers who want to increase the density of development in areas that have been selected as higher density areas."**

**IX. APPENDIX**

**(to be updated as part of a future full-scale Plan Update)**

DRAFT

**Appendix A**  
**TABLE 1**

**(to be updated as part of a future full-scale Plan Update)**

**COMPARISON OF 1997 RATES OF TAXATION**

**City of South Euclid and Surrounding Jurisdictions**

**(Ranked by effective residential tax rate)**

<b>COMMUNITY</b>	<b>Voted Tax Rate</b>	<b>Effective Residential Tax Rate</b>	<b>Effective Commercial and Industrial Tax Rate</b>
Highland Heights	80.90	41.46	49.40
Mayfield Village	84.20	41.80	50.48
Beachwood	89.50	43.71	55.79
Mayfield Heights	86.90	47.46	55.40
Pepper Pike	95.70	49.86	62.48
Euclid	97.80	54.19	69.94
Lyndhurst	104.70	59.22	69.70
Cleveland	93.30	60.62	76.07
Richmond Heights	104.40	61.02	68.75
South Euclid	108.40	61.55	71.99
Highland Hills	106.10	70.62	84.47
East Cleveland	127.60	75.06	101.48
University Heights	144.80	81.18	98.42
Cleveland Heights	146.40	82.78	100.02
Shaker Heights	170.10	86.60	106.00

SOURCE: Cuyahoga County Auditors

**Appendix A**  
**TABLE 2 (to be updated as part of a future full-scale Plan Update)**  
**COMPARISON OF ASSESSED TAX VALUATIONS: TAX YEAR 1997**  
**City of South Euclid and Surrounding Jurisdictions**

COMMUNITY	TOTAL VALUATION (in \$)	REAL PROPERTY <sup>(a)</sup>		TANGIBLE PERSONAL PROPERTY <sup>(a)</sup>
		Agricultural/ Residential	Commercial/ Industrial/ P U	
Beachwood	580,801,639	259,128,280 45%	267,846,290 46%	53,827,069 9%
Cleveland	5,375,222,416	2,020,084,690 38%	2,469,912,820 46%	885,244,906 16%
Cleveland Heights	670,565,771	532,699,630 79%	117,860,140 18%	20,006,001 3%
East Cleveland	183,177,496	104,375,660 57%	65,667,830 36%	13,134,006 7%
Euclid	793,607,480	459,728,870 58%	222,393,300 28%	111,485,310 14%
Highland Heights	270,934,292	184,705,270 68%	50,967,510 19%	35,261,512 13%
Highland Hills	12,388,128	3,332,400 27%	8,940,950 72%	114,778 1%
Lyndhurst	349,725,426	274,574,910 79%	68,046,030 19%	7,104,486 2%
Mayfield Heights	425,387,266	215,674,790 51%	179,889,920 42%	29,822,556 7%
Mayfield Village	151,538,666	79,910,040 53%	54,509,980 36%	17,118,646 11%
Pepper Pike	303,714,524	267,693,230 88%	32,910,340 11%	3,110,954 1%
Richmond Heights	219,650,598	141,183,330 64%	64,229,820 29%	14,237,448 6%
Shaker Heights	654,440,465	556,977,040 85%	85,937,600 13%	11,525,825 2%
South Euclid	356,749,991	288,910,160 81%	54,425,400 15%	13,414,431 4%
University Heights	202,556,321	169,391,080 84%	28,718,810 14%	4,446,431 2%
<b>COUNTY SUMMARY</b>				
Cuyahoga County	24,953,150,094	14,686,989,910 59%	7,474,825,530 30%	2,791,334,654 11%
Excluding Cleveland	19,577,927,678	12,666,905,220 65%	5,004,912,710 26%	1,906,089,748 10%

(a) Shown as dollars and percent of total valuation; percentages may not total 100% exactly due to rounding.  
SOURCE: Cuyahoga County Auditors.

**Appendix A**  
**TABLE 3**

**(to be updated as part of a future full-scale Plan Update)**

**COMPARISON OF 1997 VALUATION Per DWELLING UNIT<sup>(a)</sup>**  
**City of South Euclid and Surrounding Jurisdictions**

<b>COMMUNITY</b>	<b>Total Property Value/Unit</b>
East Cleveland	\$12,077
Cleveland	\$23,963
Euclid	\$29,851
Cleveland Heights	\$30,673
South Euclid	\$37,297
University Heights	\$38,319
Mayfield Heights	\$41,300
Richmond Heights	\$48,779
Shaker Heights	\$48,934
Lyndhurst	\$51,973
Mayfield Village	\$107,019
Beachwood	\$122,739
Highland Heights	\$124,510
Pepper Pike	\$139,961
<b>COUNTY SUMMARY</b>	
Cuyahoga County	\$41,276
Cuyahoga County excluding Cleveland	\$51,490

<sup>(a)</sup> Derived by dividing the total real property valuation (residential, commercial and industrial) for the community by the 1990 dwelling units from the U.S. Census.

SOURCE: Prepared by D.B. Hartt, Inc.

**Appendix B**  
**RESIDENTIAL ASSESSMENT**  
**CRITERIA FOR SUB-AREA VALUE ASSIGNMENTS**

This residential assessment was developed to provide an objective evaluation of the residential areas of South Euclid in order to determine how well the existing residential areas in South Euclid compare to communities where new homes are being constructed.

The following characteristics are representative of the features homebuyers are looking for when buying a home.

- Larger lots - for this survey, larger means a lot size greater than 8,000 square feet.
- Larger homes - for this survey, larger means a floor area greater than 1,400 square feet.
- Attached garage.

The assessment ranks areas according to these physical characteristics. Areas were evaluated based on a statistical sampling of property records at the County Auditors Office and verified by a review of aerial photography and/or “windshield” survey. The higher the number given, the more “competitive” the area.

**Summary of Assigned Values**

<b><u>CRITERIA</u></b>	<b><u>Point value assigned</u></b>
<b>Lot Size:</b>	
• Majority of the lots were less than 6,000 sq. ft.:	1
• Majority of the lots ranged from 6,000 to 8,000 sq. ft.; <b>OR</b> a mixture of lot sizes was reported and, therefore, the average lot size was in this 6,000 to 8,000 sq. ft. range.	2
• Majority of the lots were greater than 8,000 sq. ft.:	3
<b>Dwelling Unit Living Area:</b>	
• Majority of the dwelling units were less than 1,200 sq. ft.	1
• Majority of the dwelling units ranged from 1,200 to 1,400 sq. ft.; <b>OR</b> a mixture of dwelling unit sizes was reported and therefore, the average dwelling unit size was in this 1,200 to 1,400 sq. ft. range.	2
• Majority of the dwelling units were greater than 1,400 sq. ft.	3

**Summary of Assigned Values, *continued***

<b><u>CRITERIA</u></b>	<b><u>Point value assigned</u></b>
<b>Attached and Detached Garages:</b>	
• Majority of the parcels had a detached garage.	1
• Mixture of attached and detached garages was reported.	2
• Majority of the parcels had an attached garage.	3

Table B-1 on the next page indicates the scores for each of the 49 sub-areas. Each sub-area was assigned a location number that corresponds to the numbered areas on Map B-1.

After totaling the scores for all three categories, average composite scores were determined. Using the average composite scores, Map B-2 was prepared to consolidate areas that received similar ratings. The Investment Target Areas are also shown on this map.

**Table B-1**  
**South Euclid Residential Area Assessment**

Sub Area	Lot Size	Living Area	Garage Att/Det	Total	Average		Sub Area	Lot Size	Living Area	Garage Att/Det	Total	Average
1	1	2	1	4	1.3		26	2	3	3	8	2.7
2	3	2	3	8	2.7		27	3	3	1	7	2.3
3	2	2	2	6	2		28	1	2	1	4	1.3
4	2	2	1	5	1.7		29	1	2	1	4	1.3
5	3	3	3	9	3		30	2	2	2	6	2
6	3	2	2	7	2.3		31	2	2	1	5	1.7
7	3	3	3	9	3		32	1	2	1	4	1.3
8	3	3	3	9	3		33	1	2	1	4	1.3
9	3	2	2	7	2.3		34	2	2	2	6	2
10	2	2	1	5	1.7		35	3	3	3	9	3
11	2	2	1	5	1.7		36	3	2	2	7	2.3
12	2	3	2	7	2.3		37	2	3	1	6	2
13	2	2	2	6	2		38	3	2	3	8	2.7
14	3	2	1	6	2		39	3	3	2	8	2.7
15	2	2	2	6	2		40	3	3	2	8	2.7
16	2	2	1	5	1.7		41	3	3	3	9	3
17	2	2	2	6	2		42	2	3	1	6	2
18	2	2	1	5	1.7		43	3	3	1	7	2.3
19	1	2	3	6	2		44	2	1	1	4	1.3
20	2	2	1	5	1.7		45	3	3	1	7	2.3
21	3	3	2	8	2.7		46	2	3	1	6	2
22	3	3	3	9	3		47	2	2	2	6	2
23	3	2	1	6	2		48	3	3	3	9	3
24	2	3	1	6	2		49	2	3	2	7	2.3
25	1	2	1	4	1.3							

Legend: (See previous page for a more detailed discussion of the score assigned to each criteria)

**Lot size:**

< 6,000 sq. ft. = 1 pt.  
6,000 - 8,000 sq. ft. = 2 pt.  
> 8,000 sq. ft. = 3 pt.

**Living area:**

< 1,200 sq. ft. = 1 pt.  
1,200 - 1,400 sq. ft. = 2 pt.  
> 1,400 sq. ft. = 3 pt.

**Garage:**

Detached = 1 pt.  
Mixture in area = 2 pt.  
Attached = 3 pt.

Map B-2

DRAFT

**Appendix C**  
**PRIOR CITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

DRAFT

Signature page

DRAFT

Public Improvement Plan

DRAFT

Appendix Map C

DRAFT

Page 1 of resolution

DRAFT

Page Public Improvement plan

DRAFT

**Appendix D**  
**SUMMARY OF STEPS CONDUCTED IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS PLAN**

June/July 1998 Initial background/research conducted by D.B. Hartt, Inc:

1. Reviewed pertinent background information: housing/ demographic data and trends; past studies; zoning regulations; material compiled by and for the First Suburbs Consortium.
2. Toured the City to understand existing land uses and characteristics.
3. Conducted conversational interviews with representatives of the administration, Council, Planning Commission and consultants.
4. Compiled the following “issues and options paper” for initial discussion with the Planning Commission and Council.

July 23, 1998 Meeting with Planning Commission to:

1. Summarize key data and factors that may influence the Comprehensive Plan.
2. Review current City policies as compiled from existing reports/studies or the interviews.
3. Present initial observations, range of options to consider, and “first cut” policies and strategies which have emerged to date.
4. Initiate discussion to:
  - Identify key issues and issue areas
  - Formulate objectives
  - Identify policies to address issues
5. Identify additional information needed to aid further discussions.

Aug. 27, 1998 Joint meeting with Planning Commission and City Council to:

1. Present supplemental information/findings based on July 23<sup>rd</sup> discussion with Planning Commission.
2. Review observations and the range of options presented on July 23<sup>rd</sup> and supplemented since.

3. Facilitate discussion to:

- Reach *preliminary* consensus on issues, objective and options to be presented and reviewed by the Mayor's Task Force and the public.
- Identify additional information needed to support directions being considered.
- Identify unresolved issues for which no clear direction has been reached and further discussion is needed.

Sept. 3, 1998 Follow-up meeting with Planning Commission and Council to continue discussion from the first meeting and reach general consensus on preferred policies to address issues.

Sept. 17, 1998 First meeting with the Mayor's Task Force to:

1. Present background information similar to that presented to the Planning Commission.
2. Review preliminary statement of issues, objectives and alternative policies.
3. Initiate discussion for reaction to:
  - Overall objectives
  - Optional policies to address issues

Oct. 1, 1998 Follow-up meeting with the Mayor's Task Force to continue discussion from the first meeting and reach general consensus on preferred policies to address issues.

Nov. 18, 1998 Meeting with the Planning Commission to review the draft Plan.

Dec. 8, 1998 Meeting with Council at a work session to present the draft Plan.

Dec. 8, 1998 Meeting with the Mayor's Task Force to present the draft Plan.

Dec. 17, 1998 Meeting with the Planning Commission to review the refined draft Plan and agree

**Appendix E**  
**RETAIL GAP ANALYSIS FOR OAKWOOD SITE**  
**(1516 WARRENSVILLE CENTER ROAD)**

**Below is a summary of general concepts and terms associated with market and gap analyses. These terms are intended to assist in evaluation and understanding of the Esri Retail Gap Analysis (dated April 1, 2011) provided for the Oakwood Site and contained in its entirety following the below terminology and summary information.**

**Market Potential:**

**Total market potential is determined by conducting a Gap Analysis. Gap Analysis is a market analysis technique that compares demand for retail goods and services against available supply for a particular trade area. The demand is determined by taking the aggregate disposable household income for all households that reside in a trade area and then estimating how much money households will spend on retail goods and services based on consumer expenditure surveys. Esri conducts consumer expenditure surveys that form the basis for demand calculations.**

**Market Supply:**

**Supply is calculated by determining the amount of sales that businesses of various kinds are making on an annual basis. This information is calculated using sales tax or other tax information, and North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code for each business.**

**Market Gap:**

**A gap is determined by subtracting the annual sales figure from the annual demand figure for each kind of good or service. A positive number indicates that there is more demand than supply for a particular good or service. In this case, a gap exists and residents of the trade area are likely traveling outside of the trade area to acquire goods and services. A negative number indicates that a surplus of supply exists, and businesses in the trade area are attracting sales from customers who reside outside of the trade area. The size of the gap is also important, as there may be room for new businesses in the trade area even if there is a small surplus of supply.**

**The following page contains a summary of the retail gap present within 1, 3, and 5 miles of the Oakwood Site:**

---

**The retail gap within a 1-mile radius of the Oakwood site (1516 Warrensville Center Road) is as follows:**

- **Total Retail Trade = \$76,778,775;**
- **Total Food and Drink = \$14,469,672; and**
- **Total Retail Trade and Food & Drink = \$91,248,447**

---

**The retail gap within a 3-mile radius of the Oakwood site (1516 Warrensville Center Road) is as follows:**

- **Total Retail Trade = \$401,244,985;**
- **Total Food and Drink = \$41,503,746; and**
- **Total Retail Trade and Food & Drink = \$442,748,731**

---

**The retail gap within a 5-mile radius of the Oakwood site (1516 Warrensville Center Road) is as follows:**

- **Total Retail Trade = \$485,005,932;**
- **Total Food and Drink = \$53,927,260; and**
- **Total Retail Trade and Food & Drink = \$538,933,192**

---

**In general, as the trade area increases, the Total Retail Trade and Food & Drink retail gap increases, indicating largely that the supply of retail goods does not meet the demand for such goods.**

---

**The following page contains a Retail Gap Analysis for locations within 1, 3, and 5 miles of the Oakwood site.**