



SHAKER HEIGHTS

City Council Agenda

Via Zoom pursuant to Chapters 113 and 115 of the Codified Ordinances
(as amended in Ordinance No. 22-28) and Resolution No. 22-29, enacted

March 22, 2022

Tuesday, February 21, 2023, at 12:00 pm

Join the Zoom meeting online as a viewer or listener from a PC, Mac, iPad, iPhone or Android device at [https://us06web.zoom.us/j/87531028403?](https://us06web.zoom.us/j/87531028403?pwd=cEttTWF6eGtsTFpZNVgwUIUzTjRldz09)

[pwd=cEttTWF6eGtsTFpZNVgwUIUzTjRldz09](https://us06web.zoom.us/j/87531028403?pwd=cEttTWF6eGtsTFpZNVgwUIUzTjRldz09) Password: 33553400: Description: Council Meeting; or join by phone at 833-548-0282 (toll free); Webinar ID: 875 3102 8403, Password: 33553400. International numbers available at <https://zoom.us/u/ahwKbeuA>. The video of the meeting will be available the following day on the City's [website](#).

WORK SESSION

1. Recommendation of Scope of Work for Recreation Plan

-Mayor David E. Weiss

-Planning Director Joyce Braverman

-Recreation Director Alexandria Nichols

Documents:

[2023 0216 MEMO TO COUNCIL RECREATION STUDY.PDF](#)
[SH_BUILDING THE VISION ENGAGEMENT ROUND ONE_SUMMARY](#)
[MEMO_211117.PDF](#)

To request an accommodation for a person with a disability, call the City's ADA Coordinator at 216-491-1440, or Ohio Relay Service at 711 for TTY users.



SHAKER HEIGHTS

Memorandum

To: Members of City Council

From: Joyce Braverman, Director Planning
Alexandria Nichols, Director, Recreation

cc: David E. Weiss, Mayor
Jeri E. Chaikin, Chief Administrative Officer
John Potts, Director, Finance

Date: February 16, 2023

Re: Recreation Plan

Why A Recreation Plan Now?

Support citywide goals and values. An analysis of recreation services was included in the goals set at the 2021 Council retreat. The proposed plan supports several citywide goals:

Goal 4 - Recreation: Determine the level and type of recreation services and programming based on demand and available resources; deliver quality, accessible programming.

Goal 3 - Green Space and Public Spaces:

Maintain the quality of Shaker's beautiful green spaces and public space.

Goal 8 – Economic Development:

Develop and maintain vibrant commercial districts through public/private partnership and other innovative approaches.

Value 1 – Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI): We are stronger and more effective because DEI is central to every aspect of operations, from service delivery to opportunities for involvement and decision-making, we believe Shaker can and should be a leader in creating a diverse, equitable and inclusive community.

Support resident attraction and retention and economic development. Recreation is an amenity that strengthens neighborhoods by building community and provides services to current and future residents and can draw businesses and employers. It is important to plan for future recreation needs now to support other planning efforts, promote economic development, support neighborhoods, and attract and retain a diverse resident population.

The recreation plan will support economic development efforts on Lee Road as recommended in the [Lee Road Action Plan](#). The plan proposes relocation of the Shaker Schools' bus depot to create a core Neighborhood Center, a critical hub of the future, more vibrant Lee Road. The Neighborhood Center includes new development parcels flanking the central gathering area created by expanding Chelton Park through to Lee Road. It provides a proposed plaza, outdoor dining, and expanded passive and active recreation space, while creating connections to both the Moreland and Lomond neighborhoods. Additional recreational uses may also be possible near the STJ Community Building at the corner of Lee and Van Aken. New recreation uses in the Lee Road corridor will

provide accessible and equitable facilities. Further exploration with the community of the types of parks and recreational uses desired in a new Neighborhood Center and at the Community Building is necessary.

A relocation of some or all of the Thornton Park facilities may result in developable land, creating an opportunity to further increase vibrancy in the greater Van Aken District. This prospective opportunity could help advance City goals to attract and retain residents, invest in the growth of additional attractive housing types, and promote economic development.

Support recreation services, programming and provide quality recreation facilities. The recreation plan will study recreation facility and programming needs and build upon the innovative and high quality programming already offered. It will further explore joint programming and facility usage with the Shaker Schools. The plan will further the development of quality green and open spaces and facilities. These type of recreation services and facilities serve as an amenity for residents and supports a diverse, equitable and inclusive community.

Build on joint facility planning. A recreation plan will build upon Forward Together: A Vision for Community Facilities (Vision Plan, October 2019). The Vision Plan was followed up in 2022 by work on a Joint Facility Plan and included two (2) rounds of robust community engagement and documented the desire for neighborhood recreation facilities. It is important to coordinate with the Shaker Schools' plans to update educational buildings and the potential opportunity to redevelop the middle school site for recreation.

It is important to develop a conceptual recreation plan, answer questions, and engage the public to provide direction.

Background

In 2005, the city completed a [Recreation and Leisure Study](#). The study included two rounds of public engagement and recommendations for short-term and medium-term actions. It covered all recreation facilities as well as leisure activities and resulted in the:

- Rehabilitation of Thornton Park recreation area and pool which included the addition of basketball and skateboard parks.
- Rehabilitation of Horseshoe Lake Park.
- Addition of a soccer field in the Shaker Median.
- Construction of the Shaker Median multipurpose path.

In 2019, the City, Schools and Library completed the Forward Together: A Vision for Community Facilities, which set a high-level vision for shared community facilities and created a key initiative list that was developed with the community. The Vision Plan identified 15 key initiatives including a Joint Facilities Plan, which was identified as a top priority. The full list of key initiatives is contained in the [Vision Plan](#).

In 2021, the City, Schools, and Library began a Joint Facilities Plan. Two rounds of public engagement were completed and general concepts and later, specific facility options, were proposed for the school buildings. Round 1 engagement included feedback about recreation facilities. Participation included representation from all 9 neighborhoods – 719 persons participated, including

Asian-1%; Black/African American-20%; White/Caucasian-74%; Latinx/Hispanic-1%; two or more-4%; other-1%. Community responses to a question about desired neighborhood facilities included the following recreation facilities:

- Community or Recreation Center (32%)
- Playgrounds (24%)
- Athletic fields and/or Green Spaces (20%)
- Dog Park (15%)

The Round 1 engagement summary is attached.

Scope of the Recreation Plan

The plan will create a framework for defining short, medium, and long-term efforts that focus on recreational amenities. We recommend the plan be completed in two phases. The draft scope of work includes these elements:

PHASE 1

1. Community Engagement – a robust engagement plan to define the recreation desires of the community.
2. Needs and Desires Analysis – identify potential uses for each prospective site. Define the desires by neighborhood, the sites to be analyzed, and the best use for each site, including indoor and outdoor uses. Shared facilities with the schools will be discussed during this analysis.
3. Facilities Analysis and Plans – This work will include an analysis of site sizes and site plans for facilities that could be located at each location based on community input and site analysis, develop a program for each site to include type of recreation improvements and square footage calculations:
 - Middle School* – to respond to Shaker Heights School District facility plans and the likelihood that the site will be developed for recreation by the City in a future year.
 - Thornton Park* – is connected to the Middle School site because some Thornton facilities could be relocated to the Middle School site. The plan needs to respond to the projected useful life of the ice rink ending in 2028, and the opportunity to increase density allowing for increased success and opportunities in the Van Aken District.
 - Lee Road Sites – Chelton Park and Stephanie Tubbs-Jones Community Building Area* – to respond to Lee Road Action Plan recommendations including: Lee Road reconfiguration in 2027, the future expansion of Chelton Park, and new recreation opportunities in the Community Building area.
4. Cost Estimate – a preliminary estimate of probable cost will be developed for each site.

PHASE 2

5. Phasing Plan - a phasing plan will be developed to respond to timing issues, needs, and site availability. Short-term, medium-term and long-term actions will be defined.

6. Financing Plan – options for financing the improvements, including timing, will be developed. This will include investigation of fundraising, grants, and voted or unvoted debt. Best practice research will be completed on finance and management.
7. Operations Plan – to include programming, staffing, management, shared facility and management agreements and leases, scheduling, budget, cost sharing, fees, ownership, and maintenance plans.

Timing

Timing and phasing issues need to be taken into account in the plan. Some timing is known and some is still being developed. The bus depot relocation makes way for the expansion of Chelton Park and economic development projects. The Thornton ice rink requires a decision in response to the estimated 5 years of useful life remaining for the rink. The availability of the Middle School site depends on the Schools' segmenting and sequencing plan. The Schools' current proposed timing calls for a draft master plan to the OFCC in April 2023, a May 2023 Board of Education resolution, and a November 2023 ballot issue. In general, recreation facilities are a local cost (i.e. locally funded initiative or LFI) and likely will not be contributed to by the State. However, as the Schools begin to site any new buildings or renovated buildings and design the site layout, it is important that recreation facilities sharing these sites be identified. All these factors will be taken into account in the Recreation Master Plan as part of the phasing plan and long-term, medium-term, and short-term actions.

Next Steps

If Council agrees to move forward, the next steps include:

- Undertake Phase 1.
- Drafting an RFP and detailed scope.
- Releasing RFP, receiving proposals, and hiring a consultant.
- Begin development of the plan and robust public engagement.
- Coordination with Schools district plans.
- Bus Depot Relocation Feasibility Study.

Recommendation

It is recommended to proceed with the plan as soon as possible in 2023. It is important to move forward with a recreation plan now to take advantage of opportunities for shared facilities/shared use with the Schools to build upon joint facilities planning and to support City-wide initiatives, including resident attraction and retention and economic development. A plan will set the stage for future recreation investments to provide modern recreation amenities to our residents and ensure our aging facilities avoid unexpected closures due to end of useful life.

Memo for Round 1 Engagement: Building the Vision

November 17, 2021

This document summarizes several inputs as part of the engagement process for Forward Together, which was conducted between October 6 and October 31. The first round of engagement sought to engage the public on their thoughts regarding facility locations, equity, education, and alternative uses for city facilities. The feedback process was open to all, however participants in the process were self-selected and the results are not a statistically valid sample.

The memo includes the following:

1. Purpose
2. Outreach and Publicity
3. Engagement Overview
4. Results

1. Purpose

The first round of public engagement sought to re-energize the community to the Forward Together process and build excitement for public participation. It was an opportunity to provide background information on the master plan process and how it will move forward to make the vision, established as part of the first phase, a reality. Most importantly, this public engagement opportunity was a chance to ask big picture questions and hear future facility ideas and opportunities desired by the community. The input will help the planning team understand important and relevant issues that should be addressed in the facilities master plan and to develop concepts based upon that input.

2. Outreach and Publicity

Extensive outreach was conducted to spread the word about the opportunity to participate in the Forward Together process. The process capitalized on existing networks through each of the three entities (City, Schools, Library).

- 2,500 printed rack cards distributed throughout the community
- Email notifications sent by the City, Schools, Library
- Social media posts by the City, Schools, Library
- Featured on front page of City website, starting 9/20/21
- Article in Shaker Life Magazine
- Weekly Neighborhood Notes flyer
- Rack cards distributed to 27 local businesses, 10/9/21 Moreland Fall concert, local events
- Flyers distributed in Recreation's senior programming mailer
- Flyer in backpacks of all K-6 students in Shaker schools
- Included in City Enews from August 30 to October 28
- Direct email to neighborhood association leaders
- Online articles in Cleveland.com and Patch.com

3. Engagement Overview

Round 1: Building the Vision included many ways to get involved, both in-person and online. All engagement formats included the same information and critical questions for participants to learn about the process and provide their input. Formats included: an online survey available on ForwardTogetherShaker.com from October 6 to October 31; virtual workshops held on October 7 at two times, noon and 6pm; in-person workshops held on October 13 at the Middle School, October 14 at the STJ Community Building, and October 14 at Chelton Park; and two “meeting-in-a-box” sessions which allowed for facilitation in small groups of key demographics whose voices had not been heard through the other engagement formats.

4. Results

This section summarizes the input collected. It draws from what was learned from each engagement activity. Over 7,000 pieces of public input were collected during this phase of engagement.

Building the Vision Workshops

Below is the summary of the key themes and ideas that were shared as part of the public workshops, virtual workshops, online survey, and meeting-in-a-box sessions. This section is organized into two main sections: Participation and Station Results. Station Results are further broken down by station.

Participation

719 people participated in the workshops, filled out the online survey or attended a meeting-in-a-box session. Participants filled out an exit questionnaire which included questions on age, race/ethnicity, and neighborhood. The following insight is based on the responses collected.

- Participants were diverse, but not as diverse as the community. 20% of participants identified as African American, compared to 47% of the Shaker Heights School District.
- There was participation from a wide range of ages; however, people aged 18-34 year were underrepresented at 9% compared to 18% in the whole community.
- Residents from all neighborhoods were represented in the engagement process. Ludlow and Moreland had the lowest levels of representation with 2% and 7% of respondents respectively.

Age:

Under 18:	9% (Census = 26%)
18-24:	1% (Census = 6%)
25-34:	8% (Census = 12%)
35-44:	26% (Census = 13%)
45-54:	27% (Census = 12%)
55-64:	17% (Census = 14%)
65+:	12% (Census = 18%)

Race:

Asian:	1% (SHSD = 3%)
Black/African American:	20% (SHSD = 47%)
White/Caucasian:	74% (SHSD = 40%)
Latinx/Hispanic:	1% (SHSD = 3%)
Two or more:	4% (SHSD = 7%)
Other:	1% (SHSD NA)

SHSD = Shaker Heights School District Demographics

Neighborhoods

Boulevard	11%
Fernway	13%
Lomond	19%
Ludlow	2%
Malvern	9%
Mercer	13%
Moreland	7%
Onaway	20%
Sussex	8%
I am not sure	1%
I live outside the city	5%

Station Results (by station)

The following summarizes the feedback from the engagement by station. Qualitative feedback was analyzed for key themes and listed in order of magnitude.

Station 1: Guiding Principles

Do you agree with these guiding principles?

- Yes: 94%
- No: 6%

Please provide any comments you have on the guiding principles. If you think there are guiding principles missing, please write them below.

- **Sustainability:** Sustainability and a response to climate change should be included in the principles.
- **Accessibility:** Facilities should be accessible, safe, and should provide inclusive programming, especially for seniors, teens, and all income levels.
- **Too many principles/not meaningful:** The principles are poorly defined, vague, and/or there are too many to be meaningful.
- **Cost and taxes:** Principles should consider costs, taxes, and fiscal sustainability.
- **Diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) :** Important to include diversity, equity, and inclusion. DEI efforts should be acted on and better defined.
- **21st Century Learning:** 21st Century Learning should be better defined. Listen to the needs of students and teachers. High-quality education is important but changing facilities and curriculum risks changing what works well now.
- **Hesitancy regarding efficiency and collaboration:** Principles regarding collaboration, efficiency, and transformation should be better defined. Transformation, collaboration, and efficiency may result in inequities and in the mission of the different facilities being ignored in favor of other uses.

Station 2: Where our facilities are located

Please reference the location numbers as shown on the graphic. Thinking city-wide, how important are the current facility locations to you? Which locations are most important and why?

- **Current locations important (75%):** Majority of respondents indicated that some or all of the current locations are important to them or their community.
- **Libraries (25%):** Libraries, both Main Library and Bertram Woods, are important locations.
- **Neighborhood elementary schools (19%):** Residents in favor of having neighborhood elementary schools because they are walkable and build sense of community.
- **Tri-school area (19%):** The location of the High School, Woodbury, and Onaway is important to residents.
- **Thornton Park (19%):** Residents value a recreation space in the community.
- **Walkability and transit access (10%):** Respondents want walkable facilities, want improved sidewalks and safe access to facilities, and value facilities that are accessible by transit.

Thinking about where you live in your neighborhood, what types of facilities or spaces (schools, library, city facilities, playgrounds etc.) do you want?

- **Community or recreation center (32%):** A facility that provides meeting spaces, recreation space, exercise equipment, and programming for all ages (particular focus on teens and seniors).
- **Playgrounds (24%):** Playgrounds in neighborhoods – both stand-alone and located on school grounds.
- **Athletic and green spaces (24%):** Green and open spaces, basketball courts, tennis courts.
- **Neighborhood elementary schools (20%):** Preference for neighborhood elementary schools in safe walking distance.
- **Library (19%):** Respondents value access to existing libraries.
- **Dog park (15%):** Neighborhood dog parks

Thinking generally about facilities (schools, library or city) would you rather have decentralized facilities (facilities in each neighborhood) or centralized facilities (one larger facility that draws entire community together)?

- Centralized: 35%
- Decentralized: 41%
- Other: 24%

Additional comments on centralized and decentralized facilities:

- Majority of “Other” options preferred a mixture of centralized and decentralized facilities.
 - Many respondents prefer decentralized neighborhood elementary schools and centralized middle and high schools.
 - Many respondents prefer decentralized playgrounds and smaller recreation and athletic facilities (e.g., basketball courts).
 - Respondents generally favor a centralized recreation and/or community building.

- Respondents generally prefer one central library with decentralized branch locations or libraries co-located in neighborhood facilities.

Station 3: How our facilities can be improved

If the following facility is to remain, how should it be improved?

	Renovate Existing	Build New
Shaker High School:	82%	18%
Shaker Middle School:	36%	64%
Shaker Elementary Schools:	91%	9%
STJ Community Building:	73%	27%
Thornton Park:	54%	46%
Bertram Woods Branch:	77%	23%

If the following facilities are not used for their current use, what alternative uses do you imagine for the building location?

Shaker High School:

- Other school (e.g., middle school, vocational school, continuing education) (23%)
- Community or recreation center (22%)
- Keep as the high school (17%)
- Housing (7%)

Shaker Middle School:

- Community center, recreation center, or athletic complex that utilizes existing pool/facilities (39%)
- Other school (15%)
- Green space/athletic fields (8%)

Shaker Elementary Schools:

- Combine schools or use for other schools (20%)
- Community or recreation center (19%)
 - Many mentioned smaller recreation/community spaces and use of facilities for community gathering after school hours
- Keep all buildings as elementary schools (15%)
- Housing (10%)
- Use as preschool/pre-k/daycare (10%)

STJ Community Building:

- Expand offerings and utilize as a full community center (26%)
- Expand Innovative Center or use as other alternative education space (8%)
- Youth center (8%)

- Senior center (7%)
- Event or meeting space (7%)
- Private business (7%)

Thornton Park:

- Majority of respondents want Thornton Park to remain – either renovated, built new, or the same (63%)
- Main alternative uses:
 - Green space (9%)
 - Housing (8%)

Bertram Woods Branch:

- Keep as the Bertram Woods Branch Library (22%)
- Community or recreation center (18%)
- Combine with existing middle school building (either as middle school or as a different building) to form a centralized campus (17%)
- Alternative learning space like Innovative Center, tutoring center, or school (12%)

Station 4: How our facilities can be more equitable and inclusive

What inequities do you see in the current locations of Shaker facilities (schools, library or city)?





- **Locations of facilities are inequitable (36%):**
 - Not all neighborhoods have elementary schools
 - Not all neighborhoods have access to a library or recreation facilities
 - High school and middle school are not accessible to all neighborhoods
- **Walking and transit access (25%):**
 - Not all city facilities are in walkable areas, particularly elementary schools
 - Many facilities are not located near public transit
 - High schoolers do not have option to bus to school
 - Sidewalks and street crossings are not always safe to use
- **Inequities in predominantly black and lower income neighborhoods (24%):**
 - Neighborhood schools closed
 - Far from other city facilities
- **Disproportionate levels of bussing (20%):**
 - Students who are bussed are predominantly black
 - Black students do not have access to neighborhood schools
- **Inequitable programming and services (11%):**
 - Some facilities have better programming than others
 - Programming is not financially accessible to all
 - Neighborhoods without elementaries have access to extracurriculars/difficult for parents to get involved in schools and school community





How can our community facilities be more equitable?

- **Improve transportation (25%):**
 - Free transportation for high school
 - Improve public transit
 - Build facilities on transit lines or offer new transit options
 - Increase walkability and bike access
- **Reopen neighborhood schools or redistrict (16%):**
 - Redistrict or reopen schools in neighborhoods without neighborhood elementary.
- **New or renovated facilities future investment (10%):**
 - Investment, renovation and new facilities should be focused in neighborhoods that currently lack facilities.
- **Welcome all voices (9%):**
 - Make facilities more welcoming
 - Seek diverse perspectives in planning
- **Centralize school facilities (8%):**
 - Centralize school and other facilities
- **Broaden programming (7%):**
 - Include programming for more groups (e.g., teens, seniors, different income levels)
 - Focus programming on issues impacting equity/equitable access (e.g., childcare options)
 - Broaden programming options (e.g., art, music, dance, etc.)

Station 5: How our schools can embrace 21st Century Learning

The images below represent different ways school spaces can be organized or designed. Which of these images resonate with you?

<p style="text-align: center;">Example 1</p>  <p style="text-align: right; font-size: small;">Example 1</p>	55%	<p style="text-align: center;">Example 5</p>  <p style="text-align: right; font-size: small;">Example 5</p>	45%
<p style="text-align: center;">Example 2</p>  <p style="text-align: right; font-size: small;">Example 2</p>	47%	<p style="text-align: center;">Example 6</p>  <p style="text-align: right; font-size: small;">Example 6</p>	35%

<p>Example 3</p>  <p>Example 3</p>	<p>44%</p>	<p>Example 7</p>  <p>Example 7</p>	<p>11%</p>
<p>Example 4</p>  <p>Example 4</p>	<p>60%</p>	<p>Example 8</p>  <p>Example 8</p>	<p>13%</p>

Please explain why you chose the photos. What was it about them that resonated with you?

- **Physical environment:** Respondents liked examples 1-6 because they are bright, open, comfortable, colorful, support creativity, and have supportive furniture (34%).
- **Flexibility:** Respondents selected classroom styles that are flexible, functional, and offer a variety of learning spaces to support different learning styles. They favored options that allowed for some segmentation of the learning space over completely open spaces (34%).
- **Collaboration:** Respondents selected examples that allow for more collaboration, cooperative learning, and interaction (30%).
- **Open spaces are challenging:** Open spaces, particularly 2 and 6, can be challenging, loud, and distracting. Spaces that are too open are not conducive to individual learning (14%).
- **Hands-on learning:** Example 5 is supportive of hands-on learning and supports vocational and artistic learning and maker spaces (13%).

How do you envision our schools in the future?

- **Supportive of different learning styles and paths:** Support different paths through school (e.g., college prep, vocational, etc.) and different learning styles (e.g., online education, individual learning, experiential learning).
- **Updated buildings and modern classrooms:** Modernize classrooms with new technology, updated buildings, air conditioning, supportive furniture.
- **Flexible and inclusive spaces:** Learning spaces should support a variety of learning styles and be inclusive for all students.
- **Community and collaboration:** More ways for students to engage with community, for community to be involved in the schools, and for students and teachers to collaborate with one another.
- **Support teachers and evidence-based curriculum:** Quality education starts with quality teachers, continuing education for teachers, and an evidence-based curriculum.

Station 6: How our schools are organized

Do you have a preference on the re-organization of the grades?

Example A [PK / K-5 / 6-8 / 9-12]	65%
Example B [PK-2 / 3-5/ 6-8 / 9-12]	35%

If you do not have a preference to Example A or B, please suggest or comment on a grade organization you think is appropriate.

- Majority of respondents preferred grade banding that kept K-5 or K-6 together.
- Many respondents prefer models that result in fewer transitions.
- K-5 or K-6 allows for fewer transitions, is better for families with multiple children in elementary school, and allows for mentorship and leadership between grades.
- Many respondents indicated a preference for Pre-K alone, grouping early childhood ages together (K-2 or 3), and keeping grades 6-8 or 7-8 together as these grades are developmentally similar.