

Process

Goal: Create a shared vision of Ohio City (and the necessary regulations and policy) to guide development in the neighborhood.

This is not a typical planning process because of the inclusion of the design guidelines submitted to the City Planning Department for approval as a new “governing” document. This process will culminate in a document that will update many of the outdated, out-moded guidelines currently held by the City.

Goal: Review and revise historical technical documents to match current code. Create shared definitions and a shared language to allow for consistency in neighborhood development.

Role of Steering Committee: To direct & inform the process; to serve as a liaison to your neighbors—keeping them informed and encouraging their participation in the public process.

Timeline: This process needs to move with intentionality, but can be fluid and agile, and take more time, in response to community input. The Steering Committee will meet in advance of each public meeting to help guide and shape what that meeting will look like. Committee members will be paired with each public meeting to help share information and shepherd their neighbors through the dialogue.

November 28: First Steering Committee meeting

December 6: First public meeting

January 31: Second public meeting

March 6: Third & final public meeting

There is concern that this is an accelerated timeline and that there should be more time allowed for this process. There needs to be a period of time where all stakeholder concerns can be considered. The Steering Committee would like more detail and clarity about the process. The Councilman assured the Committee that the main motivation is for the community to lead the conversation and drive the outcome.

Outreach Strategy: Outreach will consist of 3 main phases, some happening simultaneously to others. A core Steering Committee; public meetings; as well as several small-group conversations with key neighborhood stakeholders and experts.

The initial list includes: CMHA, St. Ignatius, Lutheran Hospital, commercial property owners, business owners, and the development community. Who is missing from this list?

- Small business owners—specifically restaurant owners since they represent such a large portion of small businesses
- Renters—they are such a large portion of the neighborhood, but are typically underrepresented in community dialogue
- Social Service Agencies—also a large part of the neighborhood and service a variety of underrepresented constituencies
- AIA/Cleveland Restoration Society

-Landmarks Commission and the local Design Review Board

**It was noted that there was a lack of diversity in the room—socioeconomic, racial, homeowner v renter, etc.

What is Ohio City Becoming?

The corridors are coming along, but there is no plan for the interior of the neighborhood

The architecture is changing

Mish-mosh of development

We are in a period of “growing pains”

OHC has a choice—want to be more prosperous, work against poverty

Need to be inclusive—true to self

Density

- Overall, the new construction has been a significant improvement
- Some of the development does not belong in the areas where it is being located
- The focus on density is good, but not always done in the correct places
- Spend too much time on single family homes
- Ensure the preservation of green space—huge plus about the neighborhood
- Want density to support people (and subsequent retail), but within reason—don't compare to historical numbers

Transportation

- More walkable and pedestrian-friendly
- The City's (and resident's) attitude toward cars and how that affects the neighborhood is a challenge
- +Public transportation
- Parking—non-drivers are subsidizing car owners
- +on-street parking (there is plenty) and can live in the neighborhood “car-lite”

Housing

- SOLO-would like single-family homes that don't all look alike
- Moving towards less blight, but there are still some opportunities (in reference to SOLO)
- SOLO-not part of the super-super watched areas, which has its own challenges
- There is some creative thinking w/St. Ignatius
- Concerns about “Aging in Place”—new floor plans not suitable (single floor options)

Affordability

- The neighborhood has become less affordable
- Are CMHA residents being pushed out?
- We have lost the organizations that were advocating for low-income residents
- Gentrification +++
- Low-income residents are being pushed out

- The on-going use of tax-abatement is leading to a lack of affordability
- Preserve old houses/affordability because new construction is **expensive**
- Need to keep a diversity of incomes in the neighborhood—low- & mod-income
- More needs to happen for low-income residents—changed because of gentrification (not all investment is bad)
- Tax value increases for those that have lived here for a long time are a struggle
- Would like developers to consider who they are bringing to the neighborhood—they will make \$ eventually

Culture

- There are a lot of new people moving into the neighborhood who don't know the history—the “tenor” of the neighborhood is changing
- The dynamic of renters that “don't get” our neighborhood is disturbing
- Lack of awareness of neighborhood history and a lack of involvement
- Great opportunities to build relationships with neighbors
- Would like more diversity
- Love the greenspace
- Love that there is a library in the center of the neighborhood

Retail

- Lack of diversity in commercial activity/business (businesses or business owners?)
- Would like to see more social enterprise
- Keep good, small businesses—no chains
- Keeping more retail options like Family Dollar