1. PEOPLE
Planning team, volunteers, stakeholders, and participants. PAGE 02

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cleveland Neighborhood Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michaila Crislip</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizing Ohio Collaborative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charles Bromley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Western Reserve Land Conservancy, Thriving Communities Institute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jay Westbrook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buckeye Shaker Sq Development Corp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vaughn Johnson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shaker Square Area Development Corp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greg Staursky</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burten Bell Carr Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erick Rodriguez</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E130 Advisory Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vaughn Johnson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E130 Working Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Meeting Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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For more than two years, an ad hoc group of local stakeholders concerned with the state of a small stretch of East 130th Street has been meeting, organizing, and acting. Of late, former Cleveland City Councilman Jay Westbrook, now with the Western Reserve Land Conservancy’s Thriving Communities Institute, has been convening the group and has been assisted by Harriet Wadsworth, a Cleveland organizer for the Organizing Ohio Collaborative.

The Saint Luke’s Foundation, a local funder dedicated to the advancement of the former Saint Luke’s hospital service footprint (specifically the Buckeye and Mount Pleasant neighborhoods), has supported this critical administrative support and this study as well.

CLEVELAND NEIGHBORHOOD PROGRESS
Sensing the need for professional insight into planning and redevelopment strategy, Westbrook engaged Cleveland Neighborhood Progress (CNP) in the working group dialogue and eventually contracted us to perform a scope of professional services to achieve a consensus stabilization strategy and direction for the area. CNP is a local Community Development Finance Intermediary (CDFI) that works on capacity building and neighborhood advancement across Cleveland. The agency has two subsidiary organizations—a real-estate developer and construction lender—who have expertise in the areas of planning, neighborhood stabilization, financing, and development strategy, among others. When staff are not occupied with the development work of the subsidiaries or the provision of in-kind technical assistance to the neighborhoods, they are lent to intensive community interventions like these, at a subsidized cost.

The Buckeye and Shaker neighborhoods have been a key area of focus for the organization, since its founding in 1988 and is the site of the largest redevelopment project ever attempted by the group: the six-year, $63Mn redevelopment of Saint Luke’s Hospital at 113th Street and Shaker Blvd. CNP is committed to the past, present, and future of Buckeye, on a number of levels.

PLANNING TEAM
Cleveland Neighborhood Progress teamed with the Thriving Communities Institute and Ohio Organizing Collaborative, as well as with two local CDCs (Buckeye Shaker Square Development Corporation and Shaker Square Development Corporation) to complete the work in an impactful way. The Saint Luke’s Foundation, who is committed to the neighborhood by their charter and is a preeminent community development funder in their own right, agreed with the need for this level of consideration and funded the study. Our thanks extends to all team members and foundation staff for recognizing the need and facilitating an effective community conversation.

PROJECT STATEMENT
In order to appropriately frame the conversation, the planning team developed the following project statement, which was vetted and approved by participants:

“Built in another era as a dense, multifamily residential corridor, East 130th Street has suffered from deferred maintenance and a decades-long shift in market demand. ‘Evolution: East 130’ will combine existing stakeholders with new partners, investors, and development professionals to define a consensus stabilization and redevelopment strategy.

“We will do everything we can to facilitate the evolution of East 130th Street.”

PROJECT SCHEDULE
March 2016
03: Initial Conversation

July 2016
25: Advisory Committee Meeting 1

August 2016
15: Advisory Committee Meeting 2
26: Stakeholder Charrette 1

September 2016
27: CDC Staff Focus Group

October 2016
14: Stakeholder Charrette 2
25: Developers Focus Group

November 2016
18: Working Group Meeting 1

December 2016
06: Advisory Committee Meeting 3
09: Stakeholder Charrette 3

February 2017
03: Working Group Meeting 2

March 2017
07: Advisory Committee Meeting 4
21: Advisory Committee Meeting 5
24: Working Group Meeting 3
5-1. Breakout Group Assesses Priority Buildings During October Charrette

5-2. Stakeholders Listen to Presentation

5-3. Charrette Table

5-4. Holy Grove Parishioners Present their Ideas at August Charrette

**E130 WORKING GROUP**

- **Lynne Alfred**, Resident/Business Owner
- **Charles Bromley**
- **Harriet Wadsworth**
  Organizing Ohio Collaborative
- **Mike Bilovecky**
- **R.L. Render**
  E128 Street Block Group
- **Mary Boyle**, Resident
- **Jack Boyle**, Resident
- **Rev. Ian Cox**, Pastor
  Holy Grove Missionary Baptist Church
- **Remmie Crawford**
  Office of Councilwoman Mamie Mitchell
- **Dianne DePasquale-Hagerty**, CEO
  Medina Creative Housing, Inc.
- **Julie Donaldson**
- **Mary Ann Kovach**
- **Susan Rotatori**
  Ludlow Community Association
- **Marka Fields**, District Planner
  City of Cleveland
- **Rick Fisher**
  Crandall Apartments
- **Candy Foust**
  Securitas
- **Peg Gallagher**, Resident
- **Michael Laskey**, Owner
  Salus Development
- **Vaughn Johnson**, Deputy Director
  Buckeye Shaker Square Dvpm Corp
- **Brandon Kutz**, Commander
  Ray O’Conner, Sergeant
  John Sotomayor, Captain
  Cleveland Police Dept, Fourth Precinct
- **Wayne Mortensen**, Director of Design
  Cleveland Neighborhood Progress
- **George Palda**, Board Member
  Greg Staursky, Acting Director
  Shaker Square Dvpm Corp (SHAD)
- **Mary Powell**, Resident
- **Diane Pride-Mays**, Editor
  Residents Voices
- **Peter Rubin**, Owner
  The Coral Company
- **Charles Slife**, Special Assistant
  City of Cleveland
- **Jay Westbrook**
  Thriving Communities Institute
- **Fouad Yared**
  Cleveland Tenants Organization

* No longer in position at time of report

^ E130 Advisory Committee
not just a consensus vision, but also the empowerment of neighborhood champions to implement.

Time will tell as to whether this plan has accomplished those goals, but it is likely to avoid the fate of becoming a “bookshelf plan” (a plan that is put on a shelf and never looked at again) since there is a group of volunteers at the ready, willing to act in whatever manner they can to advance the collectively-defined strategies contained in this report.

OUTREACH
Because the plan dealt with such a finite geography and focused conversation, a typically public planning process was not followed (the nomadic profile of the typical corridor resident also made such an approach highly difficult). Instead, the planning team worked with a broadly engaged group of stakeholders, the existing E130 Working Group, and was led by a smaller subset of that group, the E130 Advisory Committee.

As opposed to recruiting the general public to a series of planning charrettes that would quickly get into the weeds of local development dynamics, stakeholder charrettes were populated with local business and land owners, resident representatives, church parishioners, and elected leaders. This approach was not perfect and the outreach must improve, going forward (see procedural recommendations in next section), but we were able to host more than 70 individuals concerned about the future of the corridor who candidly expressed their frustrations and ideas while providing feedback on various paths forward.

In total, the insights solicited from the outreach were meaningful and, as such, the correlating recommendations have the ability to achieve the stated objectives of a stronger corridor for everyone.

What follows is an approach to a small geography that combines both small and large interventions performed by untrained volunteers and professionals alike to stabilize and redevelop a tumultuous piece of the Buckeye/Shaker Square neighborhood fabric and, through it, strengthen the broader community.
### S - STRENGTHS
Location, convenient regional access | Local post office is convenient destination | Access to train and bus transportation | Access to Dave’s Supermarket | Shaker Square shopping, entertainment, restaurants | Access to Gas station convenience | Coral Company Investment | Edwin’s Mission | “Roll-able” community for all ages | Freedom from cars: sustainable and affordable living | Access to jobs in University Circle and CBD | Access to healthcare | Diversity (age, race, education level, wealth) | Urban scale and physical proportion of E130 | Foot/car traffic to Buckeye, Moreland corridors | Shaker Square Historic District, notoriety | Stable adjacent corridors: E128 & Moreland | Valued, respected church with supportive members. | Ownership diversity (not consolidated) | Growing partnership with CPD

### W - WEAKNESSES
Gas station attracts loitering | Inadequate police presence | Crime (drugs, gangs, domestic violence, vandalism, littering, loud music) | Property values declining | Residents are not engaged, majority renters | Cost of demolition/redevelopment (i.e. lead, asbestos) | Lack of housing inspection | Shaker Square turns back on neighborhood | Size/value of buildings increases redevelopment cost | Isolated from community, unfamiliar | Lack of awareness of University Circle activities | Lack of Streetscape | Divergent building aesthetics, massing | Decline of USPS property | Transient population | Frequent property transfers, no local affinity by owners | Infrastructure deterioration (road, walks, lamps, etc) | Negative reputation | No activities for children | Poorly Lit | Lack of opportunity, resulting in unemployment | Inconsistent lot maintenance (dumping, mowing, etc) | Lack of Street maintenance and cleaning/sweeping | Smaller church congregation | Ownership diversity (not easily assembled)

### O - OPPORTUNITIES
Community policing and block watch | Vacant, available lots (some already cleared) | Housing affordability | Renovation of existing apartments (with city support) | Diversity of residents | USPS site | Housing court as community accountability partner (potential community control arrangement) | Coral Company as principal stakeholder | Lighting for buildings in compliance | Church to attract neighborhood people | Interested developers | Southern gateway to Shaker Square | Efforts to connect with business/property owners | Chance to rethink land use, scale | Attractive, secure, access point to Shaker Square | Rethink streetscape with “guerilla tactics” | Leverage Moreland, Drexmore, E128 | Market response to new development | Institutional leaders are engaged/could be | Broaden age diversity | Re-brand the little-known corridor | Strengthen code enforcement | Quick wins: Dave’s access, gateway, light timing | Holy Grove announcement board | Sunoco liquor license renewal contingent on community | Drexmore as branding opportunity (South Gateway) | New Family Dollar = investment, convenience, activity | New development will redefine corridor

### T - THREATS
Insufficient code enforcement, City oversight | “Slumlords” and developers not committed to area | Crime seems to be getting worse | Many buildings experiencing decline, deferred maintenance | Unsavory activity: drug dealing, gambling, assault | Inconsistent ground level accessibility | Lack of parking/convenient access to | Loss of economic diversity | Struggling adjacent neighborhoods to South, West | Sales of vice merchandise at gas station | Regional economy, lack of opportunity | Limited CDBG, and subsidy funding for redevelopment | No obvious source for property improvement/acquisition | Resource(s)/capacity of CDCs limited | Vacancy rates at Shaker Square indicate weak market | Unstable Buckeye corridor could threaten progress

### S-W-O-T ANALYSIS
Learning from those that inhabit the corridor everyday is a pretty standard tactic for any planning exercise, as is a “SWOT” analysis. This is how a community helps teach outsiders about what is happening in the area, on a daily basis and at a number of different levels (macro, micro) of community function simultaneously. These issues were developed by the community and represent the consensus dynamics affecting the area’s social, economic, and environmental context.

#### Strengths
What is CURRENTLY right about the site? What is going well? What does the site have going for it?

#### Weaknesses
What is CURRENTLY problematic? What is NOT going well? What are the challenges the corridor faces?

#### Opportunities
What are the FUTURE possibilities of the site? Where is the potential? What should be leveraged, going forward?

#### Threats
What FUTURE challenges are possible? Where are the roadblocks to success? What should the plans take into account?
Process

CURRENT SITE
The planning graphic to the right presents the corridor, as of the time of this publication of this report. The study area included all four corners of the intersection of E130 and Buckeye Road to the South (left) and terminates into the “rear” of Shaker Square to the North (right). Although the buildings along the corridor have collectively retained a somewhat surprising amount of value, the instability of corridor and overall decline of properties has negatively effected individual property values in all but three cases.

The graphic lists the property address, current owner, permanent parcel number (PPN), valuation (change since 2010), and a nickname that the community identifies the property as. Although shown as existing, the “Family Dollar” building is currently under construction and not expected to come online until late summer of 2017. Also, the aerial background shows three “ghosted” buildings at the northern end of the block—all of which have been recently razed by the City of Cleveland, in collaboration with the working group.

The outreach committee specifically has made a concerted effort to engage all property owners along the corridor, with varying levels of success. Some owners/property managers chose to engage in this process while others did not. The level of engagement did not influence the study’s recommendations.
11-1. Erick Rodriguez Leads his Breakout Group on Survey of E130 Street During October Charrette
3. PLANS
3. PLANS

These recommendations were developed collaboratively through charrette feedback and discussions with corridor stakeholders. The basis for inclusion in this report was consensus, not unanimous agreement, and some recommendations come directly from the planning team and advisory committee.

A. CONNECTION TO SHAKER SQUARE

The Square is the beating heart of Cleveland’s East side neighborhoods and inner ring suburbs. As a mixed-use center for convenience retail, dining, and public transit, it is a well-known regional asset. Ensuring convenient access to the Square will help both the corridor and the Square.

1. Branding Extension: Wayfinding signage used throughout the square indicating location of Square amenities and parking should be extended down E130th Street to include at least its intersections with Drexmore and Buckeye Roads.
   A. Strategy: Work with the Coral Company and Studio Graphique to select appropriate signage.
   B. Cost: $2,500 - $15,000
   C. Source(s): The Coral Company
   D. First Step(s):
      1. Meet with both parties id’d above to select signage that would be of mutual benefit to square, street.
      2. Confirm funding/installation timeline.

2. Crosswalks: Pedestrian safety should be the top priority for any neighborhood, but on E 130th Street there are no crosswalks to protect pedestrians across Buckeye, Drexmore, or 130th Street, itself. This should be remedied as quickly as possible.
   A. Strategy: Seek permission from City officials to do creative crosswalks (preferred) or get standard crosswalks put into the capital budget, with the assistance of the councilperson.
   B. Cost: $2,000 - $10,000
   C. Source(s): Neighborhood Connections, City of Cleveland, Councilperson
   D. First Step(s):
      1. Advocate for creative crosswalks as they are becoming increasingly standard across the globe, with many cities joining the movement, including Portland, Minneapolis, Rochester, Santa Barbara, Seattle, San Francisco, Austin, and Atlanta, to name a few, as they stimulate far greater brand recognition and place affinity.
      2. Meet with Cleveland Public Works officials Robert Mavec (Commissioner of Traffic Engineering) and Andy Cross (traffic engineer) to discuss aspirations.
      3. Work with Councilpersons to get crosswalk approach in Cleveland capital improvement budget, along with resurfacing of E130 Street.

3. Protected Walkway: A protected pedestrian link should be planned and implemented from the heart of Shaker Square to the terminus of E130 Street. The walkway should consist of crosswalk markings, signage, curbs, lighting, repaired sidewalks and landscaping (see plan).
   A. Strategy: In collaboration with The Coral Company, the E130 Advisory group should design and implement walkway as an extension of E130. The walkway should take over six parking spaces and provide for safe and pleasant passage from E130 to the Square.
   B. Cost: $5,000 - $25,000
   C. Source(s): Saint Luke’s Foundation, Coral, Dave’s, City of Cleveland

3. PLANS
2. **Portland Street Trees**

The right-of-way can be reconfigured to include a tree lawn adjacent to the street on both sides of the corridor. This adds dignity and prestige to the corridor while protecting pedestrians from motorists.

**A.** Strategy: Work with the City to determine ability to slate project during scheduled resurfacing of 130 street.

**B.** Cost: $60,000 - $200,000

**C.** Source(s): Trees donated by WRLC and planted by volunteers, maintained by owners

**D.** First Step(s):
1. Confirm interest and care commitment with WRLC arborists.
2. Draft MOU for property owners willing to accept a tree donation and gratis pruning in exchange for basic care in first two years.

3. **Assess interest of property owners.**

4. **Mural:** The rear façade of the Shaker Square Cinema is an unadorned brick canvas that should be activated by a local muralist and lit, with feedback from the theater owner, Coral Company, and neighborhood stakeholders.

**A.** Strategy: Work with MOOS to prototype and test furniture and implement.

**B.** Cost: $400/ea

**C.** Source(s): LAND Studio, Gund Foundation

**D.** First Step(s):
1. Meet with MOOS leadership to discuss interest, budget.

B. **IMPROVED WALKABILITY**

Great urban streets are almost universally pedestrian-friendly places. The keys to walkability are scale, distance, destination, and visual interest.

1. **Tree Plantings:** Trees improve property values, community aesthetics, air quality, and urban walkability while decreasing heat island effect.

**A.** Strategy: Work with property owners and City arborist to approve locations, species, and planting and care requirements.

**B.** Cost: $500

**C.** Source(s): Trees donated by WRLC and planted by volunteers, maintained by owners

**D.** First Step(s):
1. Confirm interest and care commitment with WRLC arborists.
2. Draft MOU for property owners willing to accept a tree donation and gratis pruning in exchange for basic care in first two years.

2. **Planters:** Annual and perennial flowers add visual intrigue to an urban street and increase the sense of investment and pride.

**A.** Strategy: Develop prototypes in collaboration with MOOS program for sidewalk planter benches and hanging planters that attach to light poles.

**B.** Cost: $200/ea

**C.** Source(s): Neighborhood Connections, Saint Luke’s Foundation, LAND Studio

**D.** First Step(s):
1. Meet with MOOS leadership to discuss interest, budget.

3. **Street Furniture:** A few benches and waste receptacles along the street would go a long way toward unifying and branding the area. Innovative furniture that combines resting with plantings or recreation may also be welcomed.

**A.** Strategy: Work with MOOS to prototype and test furniture and implement.

**B.** Cost: $400/ea

**C.** Source(s): Councilperson, Saint Luke’s Foundation, LAND Studio

**D.** First Step(s):
1. Meet with MOOS leadership to discuss interest, budget.

4. **Mural:**

The rear façade of the Shaker Square Cinema is an unadorned brick canvas that should be activated by a local muralist and lit, with feedback from the theater owner, Coral Company, and neighborhood stakeholders.

**A.** Strategy: Work with MOOS to prototype and test furniture and implement.

**B.** Cost: $400/ea

**C.** Source(s): Councilperson, Saint Luke’s Foundation, LAND Studio

**D.** First Step(s):
1. Meet with MOOS leadership to discuss interest, budget.
Plans

C. Source(s): City, NOACA, Councilperson
D. First Step(s):
   1. Confirm resurfacing schedule.
   2. Apply for TLCI planning grant.

5. Pedestrian Lighting: Lower lights, focused on the sidewalks and common areas (with better lighting quality) could be added to the existing wooden light poles.
   A. Strategy: Work with the City, CPP, and GE to select light fixtures and implement.
   B. Cost: $800 - 1,200/ea
   C. Source(s): Councilperson, GE/Vendor, Saint Luke’s Foundation, Cleveland Public Power, CNP
D. First Step(s):
   1. Meet with Little Italy Redevelopment Corporation and GE to discuss possible partnership.
   2. Meet with Cleveland Public Power to discuss feasibility.

C. BRANDING
An elaborate sub-district brand is not necessary for East 130—not when Shaker Square is so proximate. The proposal here is to reinforce neighborhood unity while promoting the corridor as an attractive urban street at the doorstep of Shaker Square.

1. Waste Bin Branding: Litter, branding, and unity can all be accomplished by a simple decoration of concrete trash cans or purchasing of new ones that match those employed at Shaker Square.
   A. Strategy: Community stakeholders should decide which route they would like to take and work with the respective entities to procure bins and decorate (if necessary). This could include Coral Company, City Public Works Staff, Passport Project, City Repair, and Council Person.
   B. Cost: $50 to $800/ea
   C. Source(s): See above.
D. First Step(s):
   1. Contact Passport Project and/or City Repair to gauge interest.
   2. Request additional receptacles (and service schedule) from Cleveland Public Works.

2. Public Art: Stakeholders should work with local arts organizations to exploit opportunities for art installation along the corridor, including sculpture, waste bin decoration, and wall murals.
   A. Strategy: Work with Passport Project, City Repair, LAND Studio to make plan.
   B. Cost: Unknown
   C. Source(s): Gund Foundation, LAND Studio, Councilperson
D. First Step(s):
   1. Discuss effort with LAND Studio.
   2. Discuss interest with Gund Foundation, Councilpersons.

3. Corridor Clean-Up: Monthly, warm-weather clean-ups are critical to ensuring that the corridor looks well-tended and overseen, which aids in crime prevention.
   A. Strategy: Solicit different groups to volunteer for 1-2 volunteer days from those active in the community (youth groups, Holy Grove Church, corporate partners, etc.). Provide bags and gloves to volunteers and notify Councilman Johnson to have clean-up crew pick up trash bags in central location. CNP’s “Clean and Green” Trailer can also be reserved ahead of time (recommend a few months) for more intensive events.
   B. Cost: $25
   C. Source(s): SHAD, BSSDC
D. First Step(s):
   1. Establish monthly volunteer schedule and reserve C&G trailer.
   2. Contact interested groups.
   3. Shaker Square Branding (See branding extension in category 1)
   4. Work with crime prevention task group and precinct to leverage.
D. REDEVELOPMENT
These quick wins of varying commitment levels will have to be met with an aggressive real estate advocacy effort that can span from simple advocacy and community organizing to activist intervention, depending upon the appetite of the community stakeholders.

1. Support Current Redevelopment Proposals (Salus and Medina Creative Housing): In light of available development subsidy and market dynamics, it would be wise for the community to put their full support behind these two, potentially transformative, projects.
   A. Strategy: Tax credits are incredibly competitive across the nation and especially in Ohio, meaning the likelihood of both projects going forward immediate is remote. However, both have proposed projects that would be of benefit to the corridor and investment at this level should not be dismissed.
   B. Cost: None
   C. Source(s): N/A
   D. First Step(s):
      1. Letters of support for state funding applications.
      2. Publish report.

2. USPS Relocation into Nearby Storefront: The current post office is run down, inefficient, and non-supportive of the residential fabric of the corridor.
   A. Strategy: Today’s post office is far more transactional and foot traffic helps. The retail functions of the post office should be relocated into a storefront on Shaker Square that provides convenient pedestrian access in the front and drop-off motorist access in the rear.
   B. Cost: TBD (Contingent on transfer of USPS building, tenant improvements.)
   C. Source(s): TBD
   D. First Step(s):
      1. Draft letter of intent (LOI) for church to own site.
      2. Develop options for Church leadership.

3. Holy Grove Campus Expansion: The "Blace" building is nearing the end of its useful life. Should the facility be razed in the near future, we are convinced that the most beneficial owner would be the neighboring church (Holy Grove). It is our recommendation, however, that the site not be fully converted into parking as that would be a large detractor from the corridor. Instead, a combination of parking with a garden, playground or event hall along the property’s frontage would be far more acceptable.
   A. Strategy: Track stability of parcel ownership and set a budget with the Church to determine maximum purchase price.
   B. Cost: Unknown
   C. Source(s): Parish
   D. First Step(s):
      1. Consult local [commercial] property owners to gauge interest in USPS tenant.
      2. Engage the US General Services Administration to discuss neighborhood goals, lease.
      3. Develop building ownership transition strategy.

4. Promote Housing Diversity: All new residential development should be done with an eye toward accommodating the housing needs of a low-income neighborhood, but also creating amenities such that market-rate residents will choose to live on the corridor, as well.
   A. Strategy: Advocacy or proactive assembly of land to recruit market-rate developer(s)
   B. Cost: TBD
   C. Source(s): TBD
   D. First Step(s):
      1. Consult local [commercial] property owners to gauge interest in USPS tenant.

5. Eastern Parcel Consolidation: The
east side of the street, being populated primarily by large-parcel land uses, is an ideal candidate for land acquisition and redevelopment at scale. It is our belief that the gas station can discontinue operations and the post office relocated to Shaker Square without negative impact to the immediate community. Additionally, Shaker Tower Apartments are in bad disrepair and are outmoded residential buildings.

A. Strategy: Consult the planning graphic for an ideal redevelopment scenario. The planning team believes that the Medina Creative Housing proposal fully respects the corner site it is proposed for and is a worthy addition to the street. Should it not proceed, however, an alternate vision is provided.

B. Cost: $100,000 to $350,000

C. Source(s): City Economic Development, Councilperson, Village Capital Corp

D. First Step(s):
   1. Due diligence research on parcels.

NOTE: Western parcel consolidation was originally considered a prudent strategy to consolidate the multi-family structures along the western side of the street and transfer ownership to a responsible property manager in exchange for property improvements and community security provision. However, given the current value of those properties (and the general lack of legal leverage), this idea has been withdrawn. Organizing the owners of the multi-family buildings may be the quickest (and only) path to community change, with regard to these inconsistently managed properties.

### E. PROCEDURAL RECOMMENDATIONS

#### 1. Working Group Representation

**First Step(s):**

- **Source(s):** TBD
- **Cost:** Staff Time

**Strategy:** Recruit additional members for specific working groups or sunset the working group.

**Notes:**

- Thoughtful and cogent proposals, informed by this process, to a wide array of funders are imperative.

---

**Strategy:** Hire grant writer/initiative manager to orchestrate implementation agenda and fund raising effort.

**Notes:**

- Complete quick wins.

**4. Transparency:** All development activity should meet the threshold of accountability, but may not be able to achieve complete transparency due to the logistics and dynamics surrounding real estate development.

**Strategy:** All decisions should be in keeping with the stated goals of this process and in the best interests of the community (both current and future residents and stakeholders).

**B. Cost:** None

**C. Source(s):** N/A

**D. First Step(s):**

1. Publish report, disseminate.
2. Establish transparency goals/requirements.
3. Make requisite documentation publicly accessible.

---

### RETENTION PRIORITY

The graphic at the right shows the consensus priority of the community, relative to saving remaining structures along the corridor. This assessment was based on the current condition of the property and its contributing character to the street. The properties were assigned ratings, on a scale of 1 (must save) to 4 (indifference):

#### MAPPING RETENTION PRIORITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2844 E130</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 2836 E130</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 2812 E130</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 2804 S. Moreland</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 13018 Buckeye</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 12915 Buckeye</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 12910 Buckeye</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 2860 E130</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - 2815 E130</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 2855 Shaker Heights Post Office</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PLANNING SCENARIOS

The following scenarios depend on many factors, including effectively staffing the initiative, securing funding, and arranging the political capital necessary to execute the consensus vision. Each of the scenarios are described below. You will see that they represent a range of options for East 130th street and different levels of redevelopment aggression.

A. A Stronger Street
Vacant lot reuse, property enhancement through improved/engaged management in multi-family structures, informal streetscape improvements, and simple access to Shaker Square, with community-led branding and gateway highlights.

B. A More Vibrant Street
Build out of vacant parcels along the street, including renovation of the USPS building and adjacent parking. Informal streetscape and ground-level building improvements and community-led branding that connects to a Shaker Square pedestrian connection.

C. A Re-imagined Street
Proactive site assembly and redevelopment of insignificant structures, including the relocation of the USPS branch and closing of the Sunoco station. Formal streetscape improvements, professional branding, and a landscaped Shaker Square pedestrian connection with public art adorning blank facades.
The plan at the right represents the consensus ideal for the redevelopment of the corridor. Because plans are often imprecise forecasts that are unable to account for all scenarios and roadblocks, this graphic should be treated as an illustration that conveys the general approach preferred by project participants and not the only acceptable result. The horizon of this effort will easily eclipse a decade and many things (real estate market, adjacent assets, stabilizing neighborhood) will fluctuate between now and successful implementation.

LEGEND
1. Mixed-Use New Construction - Workforce housing with ground floor training facilities (possibly owned and operated by Edwins’ Leadership and Culinary Institute).
2. Mixed-Use anchor building with community-supportive retail and social services on the ground floor and mixed-income residential units above.
3. Visitor/Resident Parking
4. Conventional, market rate townhouses with rear yards and garage parking.
5. Proposed assisted living residential facility (Developer/Operator: Medina Creative Housing).
6. Shared community room.
7. Protected pedestrian connection to Shaker Square.
8. Shaker Square parking lot, serving Dave’s Supermarket and the theater.
10. Townhouses accessible off of common court, that runs perpendicular to E130.
11. Family Dollar (opening Summer 2017)

Existing structures shown in grey.
...ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES
**PROTECTED PEDESTRIAN CONNECTION**

The greatest geographic strength of the study area is its proximity to Shaker Square. A pedestrian walkway that provides pedestrians safe passage from the E128/ E130/Moreland residential streets into the heart of Shaker Square would reverse years of apathy—in both design and in operation.

The proposal shown here (See A.3) suggests the dedication of six parking spaces to a permanent walkway with pedestrian lighting, vegetation, and areas of refuge and other crosswalk safety signage/lighting. This approach would require puncturing the periphery fence, but would disallow many from trying to access the square from the same busy drive that motorists and truck drivers are using to get in and out of the square’s largest parking area.

A dynamic mural (A.4) adorning the blank facade of the theater formalizes the gesture of the square addressing this access point as a “front door” as opposed to a rear entry or service access point.
Planned

ALTERRANE DREXMORE DEVELOPMENT
It is the recommendation of this study that both the Salus and Medina Creative Housing proposals be warmly supported by the community (D.1). Although not typical market-rate developments, they represent the first new construction proposals to be built in the broader Buckeye neighborhood since the opening of “Buckeye Square” (corner of Buckeye Road and MLK, Jr. Drive) in 2014.

NEW CONSTRUCTION PROPOSALS:
The proposed building projects are represented here, with the Salus project on the left (West) and the Medina Creative Housing site on the right (East). The Medina project specifically creates a community meeting facility that will be used jointly by both projects, as well as being available to the community.

NORTH END ALTERNATE:
Both projects rely on highly competitive government subsidy to be realized, so it is a good idea to have a back-up plan in case those resources are never secured or other complications force the developers to abandon their plans. The Salus footprint is largely maintained, but without the courtyard housing shown in scenario C (assumes retention of existing apartment building, instead). On the East side of the street, the Medina project is replaced with additional townhouses that wrap the corner at Drexmore.
HOLY GROVE SITE:
One of the parcels in the best shape along the corridor is the Holy Grove Baptist Church. The building and grounds are well-tended by a congregation that is increasingly interested in playing a significant role in community stabilization and redevelopment efforts. The “Blace” building next door to the church is largely an outmoded structure that is likely in the homestretch of its useful life. In the event that the property becomes available, one possibility is the construction of market-rate courtyard townhouses on the property in a manner similar to those on Larchmere that have surprised everyone with their popularity and value. The townhouses could be a joint venture between a developer and the church, as an access easement would be necessary.

HOLY GROVE CAMPUS ALTERNATE:
Should the congregation formalize its plans to expand, it can do so on the footprint of its neighboring parcel. In fact, Holy Grove could augment its physical footprint with 3,500 square feet (massing shown here) of new construction (community center/events hall, expanded worship space, administrative offices, etc.) and still accommodate parking for forty cars on-site, which was a concern expressed by church leadership during the planning process.
key institutional players attract greater age diversity, sense of community, security, attractive streetscape, green spaces, effective code enforcement, sidewalk conditions.
INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE

TO: E130 Street Stakeholders

FROM: Wayne Mortensen, Director of Design and Development

DATE: 15 AUG 2016

Cleveland Neighborhood Progress is pleased to announce the kick-off of “Evolution East 130”, a planning process that will convene property owners, residents, and local leaders with business and organizational stakeholders to envision a better future for the struggling corridor. The process begins NEXT FRIDAY (August 26) and will extend through December.

As you are well aware, E130 Street plays a significant role in the stability of its Buckeye Shaker Square neighborhood and to the stability of both Shaker Square and the Buckeye Corridor, by extension. With recent demolition activity and new development being planned for the corridor, now is a great time to develop a consensus plan for the future of the corridor and, more importantly, devise a plan to get us there!

Stakeholder Charrette #1: SWOT Analysis
Friday, Aug 26, 3-5pm
Holy Grove Baptist Church, 2844 E 130th St.

Stakeholder Charrette #2: Development Scenarios
Friday, Oct 14, 3-5pm
Location TBD

Stakeholder Charrette #3: Development Strategy
Friday, Dec 2, 3-5pm

These meetings are sequenced and the conversation builds throughout the process, so your attendance at all three is our best case scenario. If you can’t make it to one, however, we will be happy to get you caught up and ready for the next great discussion. Please contact me if you have any questions or would like to discuss the project in more detail.

Thank you for your participation in this important effort.

Wayne A. Mortensen, AIA
216.453.1443
WMortensen@ClevelandNP.org

11327 Shaker Blvd. Suite 500W, Cleveland, Ohio 44104 • 216.830.2770 • ClevelandNP.org

investing for vibrancy

SUMMARY

The meeting began shortly after three o’clock when Harriet Wadsworth welcomed everyone and asked them to be seated. Nearly forty stakeholders of the corridor were in attendance. Wadsworth provided a brief welcome in absentia from Jay Westbrook and Vaughn Johnson invited Wayne Mortensen to begin the charrette, who began by introducing the purpose of the meeting through a draft project statement, which reads as follows.

“We will do everything we can to facilitate the evolution of East 130th Street.”

He then went on to present the study area being analyzed and the project team that would be helping facilitate the planning process, including Cleveland Neighborhood Progress, the Western Reserve Land Conservancy, Ohio Organizing Collaborative, Saint Luke’s Foundation (funder), and the two local community development corporations, the Buckeye Shaker Square Development Corporation and Shaker Square Area Development Corporation. Before introducing the group work, Mortensen reiterated a few times that the meeting today was all about borrowing the insight of those in attendance so that the planning team could develop a better understanding of the dynamics of the study area.

Small group discussion was divided into four areas of topical interest: neighborhood safety, community outreach, code compliance, and redevelopment. Each small group was facilitated by a member of the working group, but featured open discussion about four points of inquiry for the corridor: Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT). Mortensen was emphatic that the planning team was there to learn from those in attendance, so everyone should make sure that their feedback is heard and incorporated into the charrette feedback boards. Attendees were asked to split into groups to follow the SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats) model to assess the community. The feedback follows.

STRENGTHS (S)

- Location, convenient regional access
- Local post office is convenient destination
- Access to train and bus transportation
- Access to Dave’s Supermarket
- Shaker Square shopping, entertainment, restaurants
- Access to gas station convenience
- Coral Properties Investment
- Edwin’s Mission
- Reliable community for all ages
- Freedom from cars: sustainable and affordable living
- Access to jobs in Univ. Circle and CBD
- Access to healthcare
- Diversity (age, race, education level, wealth)
- Urban scale and physical proportion of E130
- Foot traffic to Buckeye, Moreland corridors
- Shaker Square Historic District, Noteworthy
- Stable Adjacent Corridors: E128 & Moreland
- Valued, respected church with supportive members.
- Own business diversity (not consolidated)
- Growing partnership with CPD

WEAKNESSES (W)

- Gas station attracts loitering
- Inadequate police presence
□ Crime (Drugs, gangs, domestic violence, vandalism, littering, loud music)
□ Property values declining
□ Residents are not engaged, majority renters
□ Cost of demolition/redevelopment (i.e. lead, asbestos)
□ Lack of housing inspection
□ Shaker Square turns back on neighborhood
□ Size/value of buildings increases redevelopment cost
□ Isolated from community, unfamiliar
□ Lack of awareness of University Circle activities
□ Decline of USPS property
□ Transient population
□ Frequent property transfers, no local affinity by owners
□ Infrastructure deterioration (road, walks, lamps, etc)
□ Negative reputation
□ No activities for children
□ Poorly Lit
□ Lack of opportunity, resulting in unemployment
□ Inconsistent lot maintenance (dumping, mowing, etc.)
□ Lack of Street maintenance and cleaning/sweeping
□ Smaller church congregation due to safety concerns
□ Ownership diversity (not easily assembled)

OPPORTUNITIES (O)
□ Community policing and block watch
□ Vacant, available lots (some already cleared)
□ Housing affordability
□ Renovation of existing apartments (with city support)
□ Diversity of residents
□ USPS site
□ Housing court as community accountability partner
□ Coral Properties as principal stakeholder
□ Lighting for buildings in compliance
□ Church to attract neighborhood people
□ Interested developers

□ Southern gateway to Shaker Square
□ Efforts to connect with business/property owners
□ Chance to rethink land use, scale
□ Attractive, secure, access point to Shaker Square
□ Rethink streetscape with “guerilla tactics”
□ Leverage Moreland, Drexmore, E128
□ Market response to new development
□ Key institutional players
□ Broaden age diversity
□ Re-brand the little known corridor
□ Strengthen code enforcement
□ Quick wins: Dave’s Access, Gateway, Light Timing
□ Holy Grove announcement board
□ Sunoco liquor license renewal contingent on community
□ Drexmore as branding opportunity (South Gateway)
□ New Family Dollar = investment, convenience, activity
□ New development will redefine corridor

THREATS (T)
□ Insufficient code enforcement, City oversight
□ “Slumlords” and developers not committed to area
□ Crime seems to be getting worse
□ Many buildings experiencing decline, deferred maint.
□ Unseayvory activity; drug dealing, gambling, assault
□ Inconsistent ground level accessibility
□ Lack of parking/convenient access to
□ Loss of economic diversity
□ Struggling adjacent neighborhoods to South, West
□ Nearby halfway house
□ Sales of vice merchandise at gas station
□ Regional economy, lack of opportunity
□ Limited CDBG, and subsidy funding for redevelopment
□ No obvious source for property improvement/acquisition
□ Resources/capacity of CDCs limited
□ Vacancy rates at Shaker Square indicate weak market
□ Unstable Buckeye corridor could threaten progress

At 4:15, each of the groups provided a verbal report of their discussion, during which Mortensen asked questions and the group indicated areas of agreement. The meeting was adjourned at 4:45.

NEXT MEETING 14 Oct 2016, 3-5 pm
Holy Grove Baptist Church, 2844 E 130th Street
Papers

Evolution: East 130
Stakeholder Charrette #2
14 Oct 2016, 3:00 PM
Holy Grove Baptist Church
(3) Boards, Attendee Roster, Images

TO E130 Working Group
FROM Victoria Duncan, Cleveland Neighborhood Progress
Wayne Mortensen, Cleveland Neighborhood Progress
PARTICIPANTS See Roster
TEAM Vaughn Johnson, Wayne Mortensen, Greg Staursky
SUMMARY

Vaughn Johnson began the meeting shortly after 3:15 pm, when he welcomed everyone and asked them to be seated. Nearly thirty stakeholders of the corridor attended the second charrette. Johnson welcomed everyone on behalf of Jay Westbrook and invited Pastor Cox to do the same. After a short welcome, Johnson turned the proceedings over to Wayne Mortensen, who reviewed the findings of the previous charrette with those in attendance. Mortensen reviewed the project statement and each of the findings from the SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats) analysis completed in the first charrette, asking participants to “check” statements they felt were inaccurate or poorly worded (those papers were collected and reviewed, with no significant changes felt necessary).

Mortensen again reiterated the importance of the community’s feedback. In order to see the corridor through the eyes of those that are most concerned about it—and knowledgeable of it—he explained that the group would be splitting into four teams and heading out to the street to have focused conversations about one of four topics: public realm, sites of interest, gateways, and preservation.

The groups spent about 45 minutes on the street and provided report-outs to those in attendance; the unedited feedback follows.

Gateways (facilitated by Jeff Kopp)

Southern Gateway: Potential new development linked to Shaker Square… Drexmore looks disconnected… Need age, etc. Diversity… Street is cut through to Post Office, high traffic… Importance of new development stability starts from Shaker Square… Connect with Shaker Square sidewalk on N. Side of Drexmore… Shaker Square arch crosses Drexmore… Parking
Northern Gateway: Traffic in both ways... CDC must stay on top of four-dollar design… Shaker Square design/approach wraps… Moreland to Buckeye… Walkable short block… Gateway anchor design improvements can carry through fill street

Public Realm (facilitated by Erick Rodriguez)

Wheel chair accessibility is inconsistent… Manicured greenspace… CPP – Illuminate… Protection of light poles… Accountability for maintenance… Introduce Trees… Street edge… Trash cans as uniting element… Cleaning up vicinity… Coral… Pavers heaved… Stamped Concretes… Delayed street light and congested traffic pattern… Fast moving traffic… Prefer one-way reverted… recent post office drop box… no buffer for pedestrian… preferred old one—people—colorful… explanation of the symbols… trash containers on 130th at each side of the street… too much garbage… trashcan basketball… painting fire hydrants

Key Sites (facilitated by Vaughn Johnson)

Sunoco Gas Station - The appeal of the gas station’s retail sales are snacks, tobacco and related products, liquor and lottery. The group believes those items can be purchased in other retail outlets or not sold at all at the station (Chip has comments on this). The group did not believe that the gas station is “critical” to the neighborhood as there are other stations in the area that can service the needs of the community (the group was a bit split on this as a couple of group members felt the station could be viable by only selling gas, coffee, and snacks). The best case scenario, if the station remains, would be a more contemporary gas station that does not sell liquor, tobacco products, or lottery tickets. We also discussed limiting Buckeye Rd. access, increased security and a far more appealing exterior design and landscaping. We reached consensus agreement that redevelopment of the site was desired, as part of a larger plan that would include adjacent property/land and redevelopment of that side of the corridor (east) into a mixed-use, market-rate development (Tania had other comments on this). If it’s not part of the larger redevelopment, then as part of the gateway we discussed public art, a pocket park, or a gathering place would still be a better use.

Shaker Heights Post Office Branch

The facility no longer performs the duties it was originally designed for and, as such, is much larger than it needs to be. Also, capital improvement monies for post office branches are highly limited—especially at low-performing locations. The team did not believe the post office would be a major loss for the community (we discussed the Stephanie Tubbs-Jones location and the new services the postal system offers such as free pick-up for packages and on-line purchase of stamps). We felt that a smaller, more technology-based operation would be of great benefit to the community. A high-tech high-touch location could serve the community well in a very central location with multi access points for convenience as would be available at Shaker Square or elsewhere. The teams discussed that if the branch remains there has to be a major upgrade in beautification; exterior façade and landscaping, customer service, and community engagement. The team felt that a mixed-use development would be the best case scenario if it could tie into the redevelopment of the two apartment buildings and the gas station site.

Coral Company Parking Lot

If fully occupied, the street is far below expected parking ratios. The group believed that the parking lot should be better maintained if it remains in its current state and if the corridor is not redeveloped. We observed the lot was empty at the time and needed maintenance. The team discussed the central lot behind Dave’s if more parking is needed for the corridor. The corner location of the existing lot may be appealing to a developer and the group agreed that this could be part of the larger vision of the entire east side of the corridor

Preservation (facilitated by Wayne Mortensen)

Rating: 1Asset, 5recoverable eyesore)
13018 Buckeye (2) Corner Storefront
Could be attractive element, if renovated
12910 Buckeye (4) Popeye’s Restaurant
Franchise Restaurant with no real commitment to neighborhood or aesthetics
13009 Buckeye (3) Sunoco Station
Decent building…well maintained building/list…signage is new… parking lot behind has never been formalized
12915 Buckeye (3) Family Dollar
In construction…no commitment to neighborhood expected
2860 (4) Bank
Past its useful life… outdated… deferred maintenance… office building without usefulness
2855 (4) Shaker Heights Post Office
Outdated… had some initial character but has become eyesore… expensive to renovate… could be moved

1 of 3
into smaller facility in neighborhood...outdated...no longer used as distribution facility (two parking lots unnecessary)

2844 (1) Holy Grove Baptist Church
Best property on the street...well maintained...manicured lawn...well landscaped...an asset to the neighborhood

2836 (2) Crandall Apartments
Good character...nicely scaled...maintenance issues...new windows...no central a/c...truck parking necessary.

2834 (2) Buckwood/Woodbuck
New windows...concrete maintenance needed...deferred maintenance...cleaning necessary...no central a/c...good art deco character.

2815 (4) Shaker Square Towers
Not well maintained...ugly...too much concrete.

2812 (3) Shakerwood Apartments
Bland...newer building...no central a/c...no character.

Mortensen thanked everyone for their great work and adjourned the meeting at 4:50 pm.

NEXT MEETING
9 Dec 2016, 3-5 pm
Holy Grove Baptist Church, 2844 E 130th Street
City of Cleveland, Ohio

GROUP: GATEWAY

CHARRETTE 02: STRATEGIC CONSIDERATIONS
OCTOBER 2016

EVOLUTION: EAST 30

GROUP:

CHARRETTE 02: STRATEGIC CONSIDERATIONS
OCTOBER 2016
Jay Westbrook began the meeting at 3:10 pm by welcoming everyone and thanking them for taking time out of their week to help strategize the future of East 130th Street. He yielded the floor to Pastor Cox, the meeting host, who welcomed everyone to Holy Grove for the third and final time of the process and reiterated his parish’s commitment to the street. Westbrook then introduced Wayne Mortensen, who chaired the remainder of the meeting. He began with a brief review of where the process had been, including a brief summary of the first and second charrettes, printed summaries of which were available to all attendees. Mortensen identified the primary themes of the feedback and the main ideas that had emerged prior to outlining next steps. The feedback to that point, Mortensen explained, was used to create three strategic options that the planning team was seeking public feedback on. He specifically identified three development project in various stages of implementation.

The site work for Family Dollar on the northwest corner of Buckeye and East 130 is well underway, with construction expected in the Spring. Buckeye Shaker Square Development Corporation executive John Hopkins and city planner Marka Fields have worked with the developer to achieve the most urban version of the franchise footprint possible. An easement was being worked out and the project was expected to proceed as scheduled. At the other end of the block, two proposals have been put forward: an income-restricted residential facility for residents fifty-five years of age and older being proposed by Salus Development on one corner and an independent living complex for adults with development disabilities being offered by Medina Creative Housing Solutions on the other. Mortensen described that both developers had provided enviable proposals and had worked closely with the planning team to accommodate necessary changes to fully leverage the sites. It was the planning team’s recommendation that the community support both projects, but that decision would ultimately be the decision of the community. For the sake of consistency, he explained, all three projects were included in each of the scenarios. He then yielded the floor to representatives from both development teams to present their respective projects to those in attendance.

Michael Laskey and Dianne DePasquale-Hagerty presented the Salus and Medina projects, respectively. They both outlined their clientele and its respective needs, the designs of their projects, and the process by which they would be realized. Specifically, both developers were drawn to the vacant sites at the North end of the corridor because of the strengths the community had identified in the first charrette: the possibility of urban living with easy access to Shaker Square and public transit. Both reiterated the importance of community support since public funding was necessary and neither wanted to be in a community that did not want them. They each ensured attendees that they were committed to the long-term stability of the street. The meeting finished with a charrette exercise where small groups provided feedback on each of three redevelopment scenarios:

- **A Stronger Street** – Vacant lot reuse, property enhancement through improved/engaged management in multi-family structures, informal streetscape improvements, and simple access to Shaker Square, with community-led branding and gateway highlights.

- **A More Vibrant Street** – Build out of vacant parcels along the street, including renovation of the USPS building and adjacent parking, informal streetscape and ground-level building improvements and community-led branding that connects to a Shaker Square pedestrian connection.

- **A Reimagined Street** – Proactive site assembly and redevelopment of insignificant structures, including the relocation of the USPS branch and closing of the Sunoco station. Formal streetscape improvements, professional branding, and a landscaped Shaker Square pedestrian connection with public art adorning blank facades.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General notes:</th>
<th>USPS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Don't hurt businesses/groups already here</td>
<td>• Green roof (arrangement with Edwin's?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pedestrian connection to square is critical</td>
<td>• Host police substation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mixed-income housing along corridor</td>
<td>• Site will not support commercial space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Address safety concerns</td>
<td>• Could be residential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Who will move here? Should street be renamed?</td>
<td>• USPS could be moved to Square.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What developers have been approached?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Security cameras should be included</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need for recreation, outdoor/grilling areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community development must drive this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Start on quick wins ASAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blaze:</th>
<th>Family Dollar:</th>
<th>Option A:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Police substation</td>
<td>• Parking congestion/activity concerns</td>
<td>• Possible consolidation of multifamily buildings for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demolition: ½ green, ½ parking</td>
<td></td>
<td>transfer to one owner who will upgrade structures and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Future ownership by Holy Grove Church</td>
<td></td>
<td>manage professionally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Welcoming gateway elements on south side of street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Grove:</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase parking availability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hopes to expand parish, influence</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Incorporate pedestrian link, tree lawn from opt C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Favor using the site to the south for a garden or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaker Towers:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Option B:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Some opposition to removal</td>
<td>• Parking v. housing ongoing convo with church</td>
<td>• Incorporate pedestrian link, tree lawn from opt C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mixed feedback on façade and landscape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strong market rate potential in redevelopment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunoco:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Option C:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Another, more accessible station around corner</td>
<td>• Nice vision but probably not feasible (cost of relocating</td>
<td>• Nice vision but probably not feasible (cost of relocating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Investigate liquor/lease laws because of proximity to</td>
<td>residents, acquisition).</td>
<td>residents, acquisition).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Consider market rate units off alley instead of ctyd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salus &amp; Medina:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quick Wins:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Some desire for alternate location for Medina.</td>
<td>• Safety: crosswalks, lighting, security cameras</td>
<td>• Safety: crosswalks, lighting, security cameras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider extending townhomes to Drexmore.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Trash clean up, can painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Landscape enhancements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Flower baskets &amp; barrels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• UV bike station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Work with CMSD program that teaches trades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(carpentry, etc.) to build benches/furniture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Press current property owners for improvements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mortensen again thanked everyone for their time and informed them that all attendees would be provided a digital version of the final report. The charrette was adjourned at 5:05 pm.

70 different people have attended the three charrettes, which boasted total attendance of 102 individuals.
Mortensen began the meeting at 3:10 PM and clarified the anonymous nature of the meeting with those in attendance, in order to achieve the primary purpose of the meeting: to solicit candid feedback about the development dynamics of the Buckeye/Shaker neighborhood (and beyond). Mortensen then provided an update about Cleveland Neighborhood Progress’ strategic plan and revised organizational structure. He then went on to provide an overview of activity in the area, including the recently-completed Saint Luke’s Hospital, planned Legacy Pointe housing development and East 116th RTA station redevelopment, Buckeye Road public art installations, area stormwater projects being implemented by the NEORSD, and a brief overview of the East 130th Street project. Mortensen then opened up the meeting to comments and conversation. What follows are key discussion points most relevant to Evolution: E130.

Neighborhood, broadly

- The area has many sub-neighborhoods and districts with their own issues and idiosyncrasies.
- Gritty urban redevelopment issues (that go well beyond individual real estate and development projects) persist in Buckeye.
- Buckeye remains a troubled local economy and is desperate for investment of any kind.
- Crime in the area (specifically gun crime) means that many MFH projects (and operators) have to spend inordinate amount of operating budget on security, instead of property improvements and amenities. This deters new development.
- Property managers should work with the CPD Precinct Commander to identify crime hotspots and develop approaches—the relationship is not currently strong.

Local Organizations

- The limited capacity of local CDCs (BSSDC, SHAD) prevents robust shared services (supplemental security, community clean-up efforts, etc.) from being developed and further ‘disincent’ investment.
- The introduction of Burton, Bell, Can into the neighborhood as a development partner should begin to melt into these concerns, but their involvement will not be immediately beneficial at the level of property operations.
- It is often difficult for developers to deal with/overcome/soothe the different neighborhood constituencies and the public. The CDCs should be of assistance here.
- The Cleveland Corporate and Philanthropic communities are eager to help and their collective interest could be channeled into a single neighborhood where resources could be layered and solutions to systemic issues (economic vulnerability, public health, crime and security, etc.) tested via public-private partnerships. Perhaps Buckeye is that community.

Shaker Square

- Increasing the vitality of Shaker Square is yeoman’s work and remains fragile on several fronts.
- The Square must be better leveraged by adjacent neighborhoods and streets like E130, whose decline threatens the square in many ways.
- Early conversations about bringing “Cleveland Hustles” (or a similar program) to Shaker Square have been had.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT MEETING</th>
<th>LOCATION ATTACHED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evolution: East 130</td>
<td>Cleveland Neighborhood Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>PARTICIPANTS</th>
<th>TEAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E130 Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Wayne Mortensen, Cleveland Neighborhood Progress</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Wayne Mortensen, Victoria Duncan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E130 Dynamics**

- There are many isolated sites in the immediate area with vision and commitment from investors/developers, but too few “boots on the ground” to change community behavior patterns. A major property owner could also have this effect.
- Individual property owners often cannot develop the necessary momentum to address systemic issues, the solutions to which are in everyone’s self-interest.
- Widespread loitering along the street reduces property value and makes potential residents/investors uncomfortable.
- The East side of the street is currently overbuilt and needs to be ‘down-scaled’ to comply with current market realities.
- The West side of the street could be consolidated and transferred to a single management company willing to significantly invest in building rehabilitation and implement corridor reforms (read: transfer cost cannot be significant).
- The strength of E128 (consistent, core group of invested owners) and its block club provides hope for E130.

**E130 Approach**

- A mixed-income residential approach should be successful along E130.
- Exemplary developments will be necessary to reverse decline and those projects will require subsidy (or interest-free capital).
- Exemplary project managers need to be celebrated.
- Any large-scale neighborhood recovery effort needs a quarterback (calling plays), linemen (executing), and skill players (champions making waves).
- Modest investments in property improvements, in many cases on this corridor, would be putting ‘lipstick on a pig’ (several structures need significant renovations or need to be demolished).
- The gas station should be targeted for redevelopment.
- The post office should be relocated, which should be achievable with enough political pressure.
- CRA money might provide a helpful angle for banks to lend to developers on the street (one home along the street each year, for example).
- After enough control is wrested away from absentee property owners a tipping point will be achieved where relatively small investors could redevelop most of the corridor (see also: East Liberty, Pittsburgh).

**E130 Development Proposals**

- Good to have investment, but could send signal to other developers/investors.
- Market rate development is not currently possible in the economic environment of this neighborhood.
- Low income housing could further jeopardize the corridor, but subsidized projects are great to locate next to as they are required to be well-kept and maintained, with all tenants screened. (This is even true of special needs housing, which also carries certain unearned stigmas.)
- Corridor security is a concern for all residents (especially older and special needs residents). Good management at these projects, however, could improve the corridor for everyone.
- These sites could be retained (“preserve the gold”) for the future, but that is an uncertain proposition.
- Every development in the neighborhood requires some kind of subsidy—deals cannot get developed or financed without.
- Overall, these investments would be a net positive for the corridor and its future.

The forum concluded at 4:40 pm.

**NEXT MEETING**

No Meeting Scheduled
4.2 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENTS

Proposed Low Income Housing Development (Salus)
Approved Family Dollar Development
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20-4. Courtesy Avery Hall Investments
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20-8. Courtesy Detroit Shoreway Community Development Organization
21-1. Courtesy Salus Development
21-2,3. Courtesy Dangermond Keane Architecture
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Twitter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Neighborhood Progress</td>
<td>11327 Shaker Boulevard Suite 500W</td>
<td>216.830.2770</td>
<td><a href="http://clevelandnp.org/">http://clevelandnp.org/</a></td>
<td>@CLEprogress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Reserve Land Conservancy</td>
<td>3850 Chagrin River Road Moreland Hills, Ohio 44022</td>
<td>440.528.4150</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wrlandconservancy.org">http://www.wrlandconservancy.org</a></td>
<td>@WRLconservancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thriving Communities Institute</td>
<td>3101 West 25th Street Second Floor Moreland Hills, Ohio 44022</td>
<td>330.743.1196</td>
<td><a href="http://ohorganizing.org/">http://ohorganizing.org/</a></td>
<td>@OHorganizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Organizing Collaborative</td>
<td>11811 Shaker Boulevard Suite 106</td>
<td>216.421.2100</td>
<td><a href="http://www.shad.org/">http://www.shad.org/</a></td>
<td>@BuckeyeCDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckeye Shaker Square Development Corporation</td>
<td>11802 Buckeye Road Cleveland, Ohio 44120</td>
<td>(216) 491-8450</td>
<td>buckeyeshaker.org</td>
<td>@BuckeyeCDC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This effort was possible only through financial assistance provided by the Saint Luke's Foundation.