

Centers, Corridors, and Wedges – Advisory Group Meeting # 4 January 27, 2009

Summary Minutes

I. Welcome and Introductions

II. Presentation/ Advisory Group Discussion

A. Process Update:

Staff provided an update on the Advisory Group process anticipating the addition of a 6th meeting, with an end goal of wrapping up the meetings by March.

Staff also provided a status on work that has taken place as a result of the comments received by the Advisory Group:

- Re-establish web survey – *underway*
- At end of Advisory Process, determine additional input needed -
- Develop glossary of terms for document - *underway*
- Revise wording for vision –
- Advisory Group to provide suggested language for Vision - *complete*
- Revise wording for Guiding Principles and provide explanatory text for each Principle - *underway*

Question: When will we do the email blast?

Answer: *In the next couple of days.*

B. Discussion on Centers:

Staff explained the difference between the types of centers as defined in the GDP's vs. "Centers" as described in Centers, Corridors and Wedges (CC&W). It was noted that all of these centers (in GDP's) are predominantly retail oriented but could at times contain some additional uses such as office.

- Convenience Center – up to 70,000 square feet
- Neighborhood Center – up to 130,000 square feet
- Community Center – up to 300,000 square feet
- Regional Center – up to 750,000 square feet
- Super-Regional Center – over 750,000 square feet

Staff explained that the Super-Regional Centers as described in the GDP's would most likely be located in a Mixed-Use Center as described in CC&W.

Question: When determining Centers, do we consider existing or planned development?

Answer: *Both*

Question: Aren't there other area that have the potential for being Centers?

Answer: *Yes, but they would be determined through the area planning process.*

Question: What about the University City area being a Mixed Use Center?

Answer: *It may not have met all of the special characteristics that define a Center, but has the potential of becoming a pedestrian friendly center.*

Question: Wasn't there the potential for a Center in Rocky River?

Answer: *Not of the size laid out for this framework. It would be more of a neighborhood or convenience shopping center as defined in the GDP's not in CCW.*

Question: Why is Cotswold considered a Center?

Answer: *The Cotswold Center includes the retail and the surrounding office.*

Question: Why Cotswold since it is so auto oriented and the characterization of a Mixed Use Center outlined in the document is for it to be more pedestrian friendly?

Answer: *It is an existing Center today and because of the total square footage. Even though it is auto-oriented now, in the future we would want it to be eventually more pedestrian friendly.*

Question: At what point do the citizens stop having the opportunity to comment on this process?

Answer: Citizens can comment throughout the process and have the opportunity to address concerns at a series of future public hearings and meetings with the Planning Commission, and ultimately City Council.

C. Discussion on Corridors:

Staff identified some major issues regarding Corridors. Those issues identified are as follows:

- Have a negative image
- Described as if anything goes
- Described as places to go through as opposed to go to
- Difference between centers and corridors is not clear
- Established neighborhoods in corridors are not protected

Question: What happens if we are labeled a Corridor (Elizabeth Neighborhood)?

Answer: We will develop parcel specific recommendations during the Elizabeth Area Plan process.

Question: Since this is such a general document, how do we plan to test the merits of the document? Are we looking at the pitfalls? What are the negatives?

Answer: It is difficult to test a broad concept. CCW is an "idea" to begin to discuss other policies.

Question: How did staff come up with the figures for intensity and use for Corridors on page 17?

Answer: Through analysis of existing conditions and future plans

Question: There is some confusion as to what trumps what. What is the priority? Can we list the priorities?

Answer: CCW is a starting point for Area Plans. Area Plans will be used to assess proposed re-zonings.

Comment: There are not enough protections for established neighborhoods within Corridors.

Response: We will provide language back to you in advance of the next meeting that addresses preservation of established neighborhoods.

Question: What do we mean by "in most cases" on Page 18 "Established low-density residential neighborhoods are, in most cases, appropriate for preservation?"

Answer: CCW anticipates preservation, but the area plan defines it.

Question: Would staff look at supporting TOD in areas planned for rapid transit but do not currently have funding yet for construction?

Answer: Currently, the TOD ordinance does not allow for it.

D. Staff Recommendations:

Staff requested feedback on a number of recommendations that were developed in response to the advisory group comments regarding Centers and Corridors.

- Agreement was reached for staff to revise text regarding Centers in both the General Development Policies (GDP) and Centers, Corridors, and Wedges (CCW) documents to eliminate confusion. However, there was no decision on the specific changes required. More staff work is needed for this item.
- Agreement was reached for staff to revise the CCW document to address smaller centers, centers within Corridors and historic centers in the following manner:
 1. Station areas (in Corridors) have same general characteristics as Mixed Use Centers and function as Centers designed around a rapid transit station
 2. Some areas within Corridors can also have areas with the character and function of Mixed Use Centers
 3. Smaller centers may be located in Wedges and Corridors
 4. Areas with unique or historic qualities will be addressed in site design section of CCW
- Agreement was reached that the concept of mixed use needs to be clarified in the following ways:
 1. Define "mixed-use" and "multi-use" in the glossary (draft definitions were approved by group)
 2. Revise document to say they are defined the same in either Centers, Corridors or Wedges
 3. Revise document to say that these uses are the desired character in Center City and Centers
 4. Strengthen document to indicate that Center City is the heart of the City and Region

Comment: Would like to see different names for different types of centers so they can be better differentiated.

Comment: Document should add language to Mixed Use Centers that indicates they may have regional and corporate headquarters as well as local serving office.

Comment: Add FAR to the glossary.

- Agreement was reached for staff to develop summary of framework areas that highlights major common elements and differences between Centers, Corridors and Wedges.

Comment: Use of the word linear is negative as it relates to Corridors. The suggestion was made to characterizing Corridors as connectors to nodes rather than as lines with nodes on it.

- Agreement was reached that staff revise the document to include a fourth subarea for Corridors for established neighborhoods.

- Staff asked the group for comments regarding an executive summary for the general public.

Comment: Dangerous thing to do because we could end up having to go back to the beginning.

Comment: Disagrees with the comment above, thinks it will lead to the reading of the entire document.

Comment: Believes the executive summary would be better served at the beginning of the document rather than as a standalone item.

Comment: Would like to see the document show the relationships by general geographically rather than by parcel. "Bubble Diagram"

Comment: Like the level of specificity.

III. Break-Out Group Discussion (for Corridors) and Report-Back

Since the group as a whole spent significant time discussing Corridors, the group voted to postpone the breakout group discussions and instead wait until the next meeting to review staff's proposed revisions to the Centers & Corridors text.

Question: When will we provide new concepts?

Answer: *We will provide concepts for the redefinition of the corridors in a positive light by the Friday before the next meeting.*

IV. Discuss Assignment for Next Meeting

- Staff raised the possibility of adding a 7th meeting to the process.
- Notify everyone that the next meeting is on the 8th floor and also let the control room know in advance of the meeting.
- Staff suggested everyone look at the Transit Station Area Plans along the South Growth Corridor and see how those plans work to define the parcel specific land use recommendations within the confines of the Corridor.

Comment: Add Station Area Plan (SAP) to the glossary.

V. Adjourn