

Village of Gates Mills  
Ad Hoc Master Planning Selection Committee  
August 13, 2019 8am  
Meeting Minutes

- Chip AuWerter, Karen Schneider, Nancy Sogg, David Atton, Sandra Turner and Craig Steinbrink in attendance. Nat Smith and Jocelyn Linsalata excused
- Meeting called to order at 8:05 am by Chair, Chip AuWerter. Meeting minutes from July 23<sup>rd</sup> reviewed and approved with minor grammatical corrections.
- Chip handed out a Q&A version of his phone conversation with Kim Lieber (North Olmsted)
- Some general comments:
  - Chip commented that “What do we need” is more important question than “What do we want”
  - Karen commented that breadth/depth of questionnaire is important to getting relevant data and input from community
  - Sandra commented that North Olmsted only got 75-100 responses in some instances, with a population of 30,000+; is that a relevant sample? What should we expect?
- A summary of items discussed during a conference call with Kim Lieber and the committee follows:
  - Kim discussed the importance of educating the community on issues facing the village (e.g. fiscal, demographic, etc.), so residents understand the rationale for change.
  - Might want to consider more specialized housing and economic development market analysis or specific zoning/land use as part of master plan data collection process so that data is more relevant
    - ✓ Sets the stage for potential zoning and/or land use controls
  - Broad representation from village on master plan committee is important
  - Kim also mentioned that it would be helpful in the data collection process to have comparisons to neighboring communities
  - Most important part of master plan process is action/execution once plan is completed
    - ✓ As an example, Kim cited the fact that North Olmsted finance director, council, etc. use their master plan as foundational document. If something is being contemplated but isn't addressed in the plan, why are we bothering to do it?
- A group discussion occurred with Moreland Hill Mayor Susan Renda:
  - Question from Sandra on why the plan is called a “Land Use Plan” and not “Master Plan”, and is there a difference? Susan said the land use plan was an update from a previous master plan that had been done, but they are generally the same thing
  - Susan then briefly reviewed the history of master plan process in Moreland Hills going back to 1970's
  - Questions from Chip and Karen around cost of plan. Susan couldn't remember the exact number and would get back to Karen on this. However, Susan mentioned that a lot of work was done internally by the village to save on costs (e.g. engineer did the maps) and that this is something we should investigate in order to keep costs down
  - David mentioned that McKenna did the plan and he thought it was well done. Susan agreed and commented that it was helpful having an outside perspective (e.g. different thoughts, recommendations) from a firm outside the Cleveland area. Susan further commented that McKenna did a great job engaging residents with surveys, etc.

- Question from Craig if Susan thought results from master plan helped forge consensus in village, and also if data collected gave them any new insights. Susan responded that goal of master plan isn't to create consensus, but end up with an objective analysis of the facts impacting the community.
  - ✓ Some issues are 50/50 split and she cited the PUD going in across from Orange HS as an example. Nancy agreed with Susan and commented that village leadership is important part of master plan process.
  - ✓ It was Susan's opinion that residents should have a vote for large zoning/ordinance changes
- Susan commented that it's not possible to overcommunicate. She spent a considerable amount of time talking to residents, writing newsletters, etc. to explain what was being done and why. Communication during the entire process is vital.
  - ✓ Development can be "done with our help and input, or against our wishes". Important for master plan to address land use and zoning for not just what is there currently, but consider what could change in the future.
- The committee discussed potential timelines. Nancy commented that she would like to see something in front of Council in October. Chip commented that was a reasonable timeline. Would look to bring potential firms in for interviews during early September; that would leave enough time for committee to evaluate and make a recommendation. Committee agreed that firms should be: CT Consultants, McKenna and planningNEXT. Committee will meet individually with each firm during an interview process and expect a formal proposal as a follow up.
- Next meeting scheduled for 8/23 @ 8am. Committee members are to email Chip 3-5 interview questions for the finalists. Goal at next meeting is to condense those questions/areas of discussion into a list of 10-12 that would then be used during interviews
- Meeting adjourned at 10:10am