

*Draft*

MASTER PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE  
April 19, 2016  
MEETING MINUTES

The Master Plan Review Committee meeting was called to order by Chairman Dan Fritz at 7:03 pm.

PRESENT AT ROLL CALL: Mrs. Jenny Burke, Mr. David Cooper, Mrs. Robin Cooper, Councilman Dan Fritz, Mrs. Sibyl McBride, Mrs. Sarah Richards, Mr. Sam Steinhouse  
ABSENT: Mr. David Haines

Also Present: Mayor Susan Renda, Sherri Arrietta, Clerk of Council, Aimee Lane, Law Director, Paul Lippens, McKenna Associates

Mr. Steinhouse made a motion seconded by Mrs. Cooper to approve the minutes from the Master Plan Review Committee Meeting of February 16, 2016

ROLL CALL:

AYES: Ms. Burke, Mr. Cooper, Mrs. Cooper, Mrs. McBride, Mrs. Richards, Mr. Steinhouse

ABSTENTIONS: Mr. Fritz

NAYS: NONE

MOTION CARRIED

**Review the Master Plan draft**

Mr. Fritz gave background on this process. He stated that the draft was received from McKenna Associates, and he and Mayor Renda have been in conversations with them both face to face and via email. They have been gracious in working with us to get changes made so that tonight we can discuss issues of substance rather than semantics of changes. Mr. Fritz stated that he believes that the draft copy submitted to this committee is one that is cleaned up pretty well and only has some minor changes needing to be made to it. He stated that he would like to open the discussion from the committee regarding the current draft of the plan. Mr. Fritz asked each member to give a brief statement/comment on the readability of the plan and whether it captured our sentiment. The goal this evening is to approve the Comprehensive Lane Use Plan, either with or without changes.

Mr. Fritz began and stated that when he read it, he thought of all the work that has gone into this process (open house, focus groups, survey, and phone interviews) and how that has all been brought together into this plan. We have also received a lot of information and input from our Village Engineer, Law Director, as well as Master Plan Committee members. It was not an easy thing to put this all together, and so he believes the readability of the plan is good and that it is a pretty accurate depiction of all the hard work that was put into it.

Mayor Renda stated that she is perfectly comfortable with the content and readability at this point. She stated that she spoke with Mrs. Lane today regarding recommendation #3, because it was not something that this committee thoroughly discussed, so Mrs. Lane will talk about it a little later this evening.

Mrs. McBride stated that she agrees and believes that it is very readable and she does not see any changes that need to be made.

Mrs. Richards stated that she believes that it is very accurate and descriptive.

Mrs. Cooper stated that it is orderly and incorporates all parts of the input that was gathered as well as including the history of the Village. She stated that it is a good document and it will serve us well in the future. Mrs. Cooper stated that she does have a few minor comments/corrections.

Mr. Cooper stated that he likes it as is and does not think it needs any changes.

Mrs. Burke stated that she feels that it has come a long way and she feels good about this document and that it does reflect the committee's work. She stated that she has some relatively minor suggestions to make, but over all is happy about the process and the fact that they are circling back to the goals and objectives, because she believes they need tweaking, as does the vision statement. She stated that she likes the way that process has unfolded.

Mr. Steinhouse stated that he is good with the plan and feels that it is reflective of this committee's work.

Mr. Fritz stated that he wanted to give the members an update on where the Village stands with the recommendations that are in this document in terms of procedural issues, before we review it chapter by chapter. This committee recommended to the Planning Commission that they adopt the recommendations that are reflected in this plan, specifically the potentiality of PDA #1 for a PUD. That recommendation from the Planning Commission was handed over to Council where they put it on first reading and recommended it back to the Planning Commission for it to be looked at and analyzed. A zoning expert was hired to come up with draft language for that particular area, which is still in the early stages. The Planning Commission will have a Public Hearing where they will potentially recommend it to Council, and Council will also have to have a public hearing thirty days later. There is still a lot of room for public input in this process. These meetings are running parallel because it needs to go to the electors, and there is a deadline to submit to the Board of Elections.

Mr. Steinhouse stated that given the sense of this group, he does not feel that they need to go through the plan chapter by chapter. Mr. Fritz stated that he asked the members for their opinions on the readability of the document and under that pretense he assumed some members would have some changes that they wanted to have made. He stated that he does not feel that they need to get into deep discussions on the things we all agree with, but perhaps it is a good opportunity to bring up any minor tweaks or changes to a specific chapter that anyone may have.

### **Chapter 1- Community Goals and Visions**

Mr. Fritz stated that this chapter reads well; the vision statement that will be included in this chapter will be chosen later in this meeting. Mrs. Richards noted a spelling error in the table of contents (#10 under "Tables" on page ii) "communities" was spelled incorrectly. Mayor Renda stated that she has a dozen grammar corrections that she has highlighted throughout the plan, which she is going to give directly to Mrs. Arrietta and suggested that the members do the same with any minor corrections they may have. Mr. Fritz stated that was a good way to go about it; he will highlight any other suggestions made here tonight and also give them to Mrs. Arrietta.

## **Chapter 2 – Growth and Development**

Mr. Fritz stated that this chapter lays out our efforts that we have taken to strengthen and encourage our semi-rural neighborhoods. He stated that he has a few changes; it should be Cleveland “Metroparks” not “Metropolitan,” as well as a few others that he will highlight for Mrs. Arrietta. Mr. Fritz informed the members that there was some debate regarding the “ESRI” numbers but ultimately Mr. Lippens made a convincing argument that the ESRI numbers should not be something we look at it as a true reflection of every household being at 100%; it is more of a broad look using a number of indicators. As it relates to the ESRI numbers, the important aspect to look at is that they pertain to our desire to interpret our input from residents and the need for downsized luxury units, which is supported by some of that data. He stated that because of what he assumed as the misleading aspects of ESRI, he approached Mr. Lippens who explained it in better detail. Mr. Lippens also included a paragraph that explains how the ESRI is calculated. Mr. Fritz stated that after having that discussion and seeing that paragraph in the plan, he is much more comfortable with the ESRI numbers. Mr. Lippens stated that he believes that the time spent ironing out that section was well spent, and he feels that this data is value added and is supportive of the Village’s goals.

Mrs. Richards asked about the definition of “family households” (on page 14 chart). She stated that sometimes it refers to just “households” and other times “family households.” Mr. Fritz stated that he also had a note to define what “family households” means. Mr. Lippens explained that they are just describing different data sets, but that he can make it clear in the plan.

Mr. Steinhouse pointed out the source at the bottom of Table 3 on page 14; it shows “20009” instead of “2009.”

## **Chapter 3 – Community Character**

Mr. Fritz stated that a lot of work for this chapter was done by Mr. Filarski in making sure the correct maps were incorporated because there were some revisions that needed to be made to the maps.

Mrs. Cooper asked if it was supposed to be “Willey” Creek or “Wiley Creek.” Mayor Renda stated that it is “Willey Creek,” however it was listed as “Wiley” in the last Comprehensive Land Use Plan because we were only corrected in the last few years by a resident of the actual name.

Mrs. Cooper stated that in the 2003 plan, all the maps were landscape in orientation and were larger. She asked if they could be changed in this plan to the landscape orientation so that they are easier to read. Mr. Lippens stated that he received a comment to keep the header and sourcing in the same format as the rest of the document and in terms of the feel and the pagination, it is easier for it to fit that way, but the maps were made by Mr. Filarski. He stated that if Mr. Filarski were to renumber them with the correct figure number and sources, he does not see why they cannot be subbed in.

Mayor Renda asked about the white spaces on Figure 9 (page 25) and what they represent because they are not listed in the legend. Mr. Lippens stated that they are vacant but since they are residential, it could be shown as “vacant residential.” Mayor Renda stated that she will discuss it further with Mr. Filarski. Mr. Fritz stated that it looks like land that has been developed below two-acre density and could potentially be split, thus it represents potential additional development and potential for more density.

#### **Chapter 4 – Public Outreach**

Mrs. Burke stated that she finds the first sentence to be awkward and also feels that it may not be necessary. She stated that the second sentence really captures what we were trying to do, so she thinks if the first sentence were eliminated, and lead with the second sentence; it would make it clearer. Mrs. Burke stated that she would prefer the term public “engagement process” to public “outreach process” in the second sentence.

#### **Chapter 5- Land Use Plan**

Mr. Fritz stated that this chapter discusses the recommendations that this committee made. It describes PDA #1, which we recommended the possibility of rezoning to U5 Chagrin Northwest Residential and Planned Development Conservation District. He stated that this committee felt that it was important to define PDA #1 as it relates to its proximity to and being surrounded by other non-2 acre areas. Mr. Fritz stated that he believes that it is really important that we have consensus on the description and that we are all in agreement that it is defined to our satisfaction. He stated that he believes they mentioned the three borders with Pepper Pike, the proximity to Heathermore (with a density of 9 units per acre), proximity to Moreland Mews (with a density of 3 units per acre), proximity to the commercial zoning at Moreland Town Center, and being adjacent to and across from institutional uses. The wording really captured the details that surround PDA #1 and so he feels it was done well. The other PDA’s were described in great detail as were the residential and commercial PDA’s.

Mrs. Lane took this time to explain the third recommendation of this committee. On page 54, there is a recommendation for a Public Open Space Classification in the zoning code. This would essentially encompass the South Chagrin River Reservation, Forest Ridge, Veterans Park, Garfield Birth Site, and any public open space acquired in the future. This was not really discussed during the committee’s process but she would like to make a few points about it. She stated that other communities do this as well because it provides an additional layer to protect what is currently being used as park land. Some of these park uses are technically zoned for residential use; Veteran’s Park is actually zoned for retail business. Mrs. Lane stated that by doing this, it would provide an additional layer of protection to that use and stated that she does not see any cons to doing so.

The way our charter reads for zoning classification changes is that this would be a ballot issue because we are providing for something other than traditional single family zoning. Given the current time schedule that we are on for the PUD development, we are too far along in that process to bring this change in. This document is a guiding tool to be used in the community over a period of years, so this is something that can come to fruition in the future.

Mr. Fritz asked Mrs. Lane if he is correct in thinking that changing this zoning classification could prevent any future administrations from selling these properties for what they are actually zoned for. Mrs. Lane stated that it is correct and once it is called out as Public Open Space Classification, it creates a bit of an obstacle (going back to voters) to change it back should someone want to sell it for a different use other than park land, which is why a lot of communities do this. Mr. Fritz stated that he likes the preservation aspect of that. He asked if the consensus of the group was to keep that in the document.

Mrs. Cooper asked if we put that in the document, would it also be included in the preferred land use plan; right now for PDA #1 it is shown as “Single-Family/Cluster/ Attached Residential/PUD” on Figure 19. She asked if this is the time to change that. Mayor Renda stated that we can say make that a

recommendation but it is not necessary to change the map now. The consensus of the committee was to keep the third recommendation in the plan.

### **Chapter 6 – Appendix**

The appendix contains essentially all the hard work that was undertaken by the members of this committee and of course, McKenna Associates. It includes phone interviews, surveys (187 responses), focus groups, and results of the open house with all the table exercises. All the public input we sought is laid out in the appendix.

Mr. Fritz stated that while no substantive changes can be made, he asked if anyone had any typos or other minor changes to the appendix. No changes were requested.

Mr. Lippens asked for a consensus on the preference of the orientation of the maps. There was a consensus among the committee that they would like the maps to be landscape in orientation. Mrs. Richards stated that the keys should be accurate on the maps as well. She explained on Figure 20 that the square showing Potential Residential Development Areas and the pentagon showing Potential Commercial Development Areas both only show the number 1 inside them. Mr. Lippens explained that each shape signifies the different areas and the number 1 inside signifies that each area is indicated by a number. He stated that just having the number 1, could be misleading however. Mr. Lippens stated that since there are not that many, they could all be individually listed in the key. Mr. Fritz suggested indicating 1-9 inside the square (to represent Residential) and 1-3 inside the pentagon (to represent Commercial). The committee agreed to make the change suggested by Mr. Fritz.

### **Revisit Goals of the Master Plan**

Mr. Fritz stated that he asked the committee members to look at these goals, which were ones that this committee first discussed. He stated that he wanted them to determine if the document reflects those goals.

Mrs. Burke suggested changing the order of the goals; she feels Goal #3 “Preserve historic and cultural resources” should be last. She stated that she does not feel that there are any recommendations that link to that and that it is more of a continuation of what has already been taking place. Mrs. Burke stated that she also questions Goal #5 “Promote efficient and safe transportation and recognize other means of transportation” and whether it lines up with our recommendations. Mr. Steinhouse agrees with Mrs. Burke about Goal #5 and stated that he was not sure where that one came from. Mr. Fritz stated that some of it is supported by the public input. Mr. Lippens further explained that Goal #5 was changed slightly from our initial sessions and has been rephrased to be more positive. He stated that the advantage to having a transportation related goal is that it does relate to the Village’s land use goals. The desire to encourage limited residential development, and to maintain 2 acre zoning is supported by the desire to promote efficient and safe transportation and not overburden the capacity of the Village’s transportation network with development. Mr. Fritz stated that we do make reference to PDA #1 in terms of the deep lots and multiple access to Chagrin Blvd. in one of the busiest areas. There were some concerns with commercial in terms of safety. He stated that he would counterpoint that perhaps it does fall into some of the recommendations. Mayor Renda stated that it certainly captures the goals of our residents whose number one objective is to maintain roads and number two objective is to increase bike paths and walkability. She stated that it is important that we acknowledge their input in our goals. Mrs.

Burke agreed with Mayor Renda. She stated that she does recall now, that maintaining the roads was a huge priority for the residents.

Mrs. Burke asked if biking would be considered "other means of transportation," because she knows that bike trails were very important to the residents as well. Mr. Lippens suggested changing that phrase to "alternative non-motorized means of transportation." Mayor Renda also suggested removing the word "recognize," so that Goal #5 would be "Promote efficient, safe, and non-motorized means of transportation." The committee agreed to that change.

Mrs. Cooper suggested changing the title of Goal #1 "Preserve and protect the value of residential properties" to either add or replace some of it with "quality of life." She stated that if "property values" was removed and replaced with "preserve and promote quality of life," then "protecting property values" could be added as one of the objectives underneath it. Mr. Fritz stated that he is okay with it being reordered as long as "property values" is in there because enforcing the exterior property maintenance ordinance has been a big goal for the Village in order to have properties kept up, as well as getting the corner of Chagrin and SOM cleaned up. He stated that he thinks that should still remain a focus. Mr. Lippens agreed with Mr. Fritz based on the feedback received from the residents but stated that they can add "and neighborhood quality of life."

Mrs. Burke stated that she sees "quality of life" being more in the vision statement rather than a goal and pointed out that one of the vision statements has that term included in it, which happens to be her favorite. Mrs. Cooper agreed with Mrs. Burke.

Mayor Renda stated that she thinks that the last objective under Goal #2, "discourage addition or expansion of wastewater treatment areas not in compliance with regional water quality plans," should be deleted because that is outdated. The committee agreed.

Mrs. Burke wanted to mention that this plan does a good job listing what the Village has done since the 2003 plan. She wanted to express her appreciation that the list of items that have been done was included in there because when you have a plan that is updated periodically; people will want to know what happened from one to the other.

### **Vision Statement**

Mr. Fritz thanked Mrs. Cooper for finding some good examples of vision statements.

Mr. Steinhouse stated that he liked example #2.

Mayor Renda stated that she likes example #1 but wants "historic resources" incorporated into it because we are one of the few communities that has a President's birth site.

Mrs. Burke stated that she likes the idea of a vision statement that is broad and will persist for decades, which is why she likes example #1. She stated that she feels that it captures what we would potentially still want the vision to be 50 years from now.

Mr. Fritz agreed with Mrs. Burke because essentially the things in example #2 are already laid out in the document. He stated that one of our goals was to look at 2025, therefore in terms of the vision statement

sustaining itself and working for an extended period of time, he stated that he likes example #1.

Mrs. McBride stated that example #2 seems restrictive in that it looks as though we are only interested in downsizing for older residents when we were trying to open it to all ages and stages of life.

All members agreed to use Vision Statement example #1 with the Mayor's added "historic resources" reference

### **Executive Summary**

Mayor Renda stated that she asked for an executive summary, which Mrs. Burke wrote, because she believes that it helps the reader focus on what is important in the document. She stated that she thinks Mrs. Burke did a nice job of bringing those things together. Mr. Fritz stated that he thinks it captures what our plans were and what we did as a committee. He stated that he had one minor correction; the line "some of whom were also developers" should be corrected because only one member, David Cooper, is a developer. Mayor Renda stated that Mr. Fritz is the only Council member on this committee, and while he is also a Planning Commission member, she and Mr. Fritz agree that Mrs. Cooper should represent the Planning Commission and Mr. Fritz should represent Council. She stated that she would like it to read correctly that there is one Council member and one Planning Commission member the acknowledgements section. Mayor Renda stated that she thinks that is important because she and Mr. Fritz were very thoughtful about whom they wanted on this committee; they wanted a wide range of ages, where they lived in the Village, occupations, etc. She stated that she wanted to thank all the committee members for their hard work because it has not been easy.

Mr. Steinhouse suggested changing the order of acknowledgments listed because he feels that the Master Plan Review Committee should be listed higher since this committee did a lot of the work. Mrs. Cooper stated that Mrs. Burke also suggested adding Mrs. Arrietta to the acknowledgments also. The committee was in agreement with those suggestions.

Mayor Renda stated that she feels that the executive summary is a separate part of the document so she questioned whether the page should be numbered or not so that it does not interfere with the rest of the page numbers. Mr. Lippens stated that we could put it in the following order: acknowledgements, executive summary, then table of contents. He stated that it could follow the two table of contents pages (i and ii) and number it iii. It could also be a 2-3 page separate document that the Village could hand out. Mayor Renda stated that she would like to be able to do that. Mr. Lippens stated that he will work out those details.

Mayor Renda stated that she would also like to be able to print the plan without the appendix, so that we do not always have to print so many pages. Mr. Lippens stated that sometimes the appendices are not paginated, however, it has already been set up that way in this case. He stated that the easiest way is to have two different PDF's of the plan; one with the appendix and one without. Mayor Renda agreed with that option.

### **Comments from Mr. Lippens, McKenna Associates**

Mr. Lippens stated that while the ESRI data was already discussed, he wanted to mention that he believes that that section was value added. He stated that he really does think that with committee's guidance, they did a really good job understanding the meaning behind the public engagement and

translating that to some of the development decisions that were facing the Village. Mr. Lippens stated that by including the data from the public engagements, there is information in this plan that can be consulted for future decisions and he stated that he believes there is value added in that as well. He stated that he likes that the data can be looked at and one can see how that process was documented.

Mr. Lippens stated that the fact that he did not have to walk everyone through the document is a testament to the process of working with this committee. He stated that it was clear that this committee was engaged and prepared and he was able to come here tonight with issues addressed ahead of time.

### **Questions & Answers**

Mrs. Richards asked how the committee members were received by the Planning Commission when they presented to them. Mr. Steinhouse stated that they adopted the recommendation so he feels he was well received. Mr. Fritz stated that Mr. Steinhouse did a wonderful job explaining to the Planning Commission what the recommendations from this committee were. It was unanimously adopted by the Planning Commission and recommended to Council. A zoning expert has been hired to draft the language for PDA #1, which is still in its infancy. Council has sent it back to Planning where it will be discussed and approved either as is or with additions/corrections. Mr. Steinhouse stated that is not even a midway point to the work that has to be done to analyze it and make sense out of it. They really have to do a deep study of it and not just throw it to the voters. The Planning Commission also needs to have a public hearing as does Council which gives the residents several opportunities to give their input.

Mayor Renda wanted to point out that Mrs. Burke also did a fabulous job presenting to the Planning Commission. When she first presented, they needed more time to think about it and since she was busy two weeks later, Mr. Steinhouse presented the second time.

Mayor Renda stated that we need to formally adopt this plan tonight and then formally (sooner rather than later) present it to the Planning Commission and then again to Council. She stated that if any other members were interested in presenting to Planning and/or Council if Mr. Steinhouse or Mrs. Burke are not available, they can let us know. Mayor Renda stated that the committee member(s) will just need to summarize the plan to reemphasize the process this committee went through and discuss the three recommendations that we came up with.

Mayor Renda asked if the Planning Commission should have this draft before their meeting on Monday, or if the members feel it needs to be perfect first. She stated that we got out of order because we asked them to accept our recommendations without reading our whole plan and they are already moving forward with the re-write of the zoning chapter for the PUD. Mayor Renda stated that she feels that it will be helpful for them to have some background, so she feels if they could have it in advance in order to have time to review it, it would be beneficial, and we can just inform the Planning Commission that a few minor changes will still need to be made to it.

Mrs. Burke stated that she is not sure about that because when she first presented to the Planning Commission, they wanted to see more information before they made a decision so she is concerned that it will be a repeat of that. Mr. Cooper stated that if there is a need to get on that agenda, he feels the draft would be fine to give. Mr. Steinhouse stated that the things that were driving the recommendations that we were asking them to consider, have not materially changed. What we are doing now is pulling

everything together and having it make sense over the long term. The Planning Commission brought up specific issues about the Chagrin Blvd. area and the WEB area, but stated that he was able to clear those issues up with them. He stated that he does not believe that any revisions we have made to the plan will make a difference.

Mayor Renda stated that she just wants to make sure the Planning Commission has it before their Public Hearing on May 11, so if they get it on Monday, they would have it for a while. Mr. Cooper asked Mr. Lippens how long it will take for the changes discussed tonight to be made. Mr. Lippens stated that the only thing he does not want to make promises on are the map changes because that needs to be coordinated with Mr. Filarski, however, the other changes will not take more than an hour or hour and a half. Mr. Cooper stated that worst case scenario would be to give the Planning Commission the revised document tomorrow and tell them that the map orientation will be changed. The committee agreed to give the Planning Commission a copy of the plan before their Monday meeting.

Mrs. Burke made a motion seconded by Mr. Steinhouse to accept the current draft of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan, subject to the changes as defined and documented by both Mrs. Arrietta and Mr. Lippens.

ROLL CALL:

AYES: Ms. Burke, Mr. Cooper, Mrs. Cooper, Mr. Fritz, Mrs. McBride, Mrs. Richards, Mr. Steinhouse

NAYS: NONE

MOTION CARRIED

Mr. Fritz stated that this is our last meeting but we will keep the members in loop of the various stages of the process and he suggested that they may want to attend the public hearings for both Planning Commission and Council and thinks it would be interesting for them to hear the residents input on the work they have done.

Mr. Cooper asked if the residents will have access to the plan before the public hearings. Mayor Renda stated they will because the draft will be put on the website as soon as possible. She stated that the 2003 Comprehensive Land Use plan is currently on the website so the draft will be put in the same general area so people can compare the two.

Mr. Fritz showed his appreciation to all the members for putting in the time to attend the meetings, read the materials, attend the open house, encourage residents to take the survey, etc. He stated that everything they have done has made a difference. This document is only as good as all our efforts combined. He gave his thanks for their time and effort and stated that he is proud to have them as neighbors.

Mrs. McBride made a motion seconded by Mr. Cooper to adjourn the meeting.

ROLL CALL:

AYES: Ms. Burke, Mr. Cooper, Mrs. Cooper, Mr. Fritz, Mrs. McBride, Mrs. Richards, Mr. Steinhouse

NAYS: NONE

**MOTION CARRIED**

The Master Plan Review Committee Meeting was adjourned at 8:22pm.

Respectfully submitted by:

---

Sherri Arrietta, Clerk of Council

\*This was the last meeting of this committee; therefore the minutes have never been officially approved.