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Mayfield Village's 2017 Survey was conducted to understand the community's attitudes on a variety of important issues and topics. The survey results are intended to be used to inform and guide Village policies and planning documents. In coordination with Village officials, County Planning staff designed, distributed, collected, and analyzed the survey and its results.

WHAT'S IN THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY?

The Executive Summary provides a snapshot of the most important and compelling survey results. This overall summary is organized by topic area and mirrors the organization of the Results Report as a whole. It includes an overview and analysis of the most important information from the survey, as well as associated graphics.

HOW DO I USE IT?

The Executive Summary is a quick glimpse of the results and can give an overview of residents' most pressing issues. Use this summary as an overview and refer to the detailed findings section of the Results Report for additional analysis and context.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RESPONSE RATE
The Mayfield Village Survey was completed by 544 households representing 36.1% of those surveyed. The response rate had a margin of error of +/- 3.4%. The results displayed below are the highlights from each topic area covered.

RESIDING IN MAYFIELD VILLAGE
Respondents were first asked to select the reasons they reside in Mayfield Village. The top reasons respondents choose to live in the Village were that residents feel safe in their neighborhood, the quality of the services provided by the Village, and the quality of the local school system.

When asked why one might consider moving out of the Village, 38.4% of respondents said that they would not consider moving out. Lower taxes, a smaller house, and a different climate were the top three reasons for considering to move out.

PARKS, RECREATION & CULTURE
The next survey topic covered the recreational and cultural services and amenities provided by the Village. Respondents felt that overall, access to parks was very good with 77.9% stating it was “Excellent”. The quality of the parks and recreation facilities was similarly rated with 67.2% rating it as “Excellent”. Another 30.4% of respondents rated it as “Good”.

The highest rated Parks and Recreation facilities were The Community Room, Parkview Pool, the Bruce G. Rinker Greenway, and the baseball/softball fields all received an over 95% response rate as either Excellent” or “Good”. No facility had a response rate below 85%.

Residents were also asked about the improvements they would like to see along the Bruce G. Rinker Greenway. Rest stops (22%) were the most popular improvement, followed by exercise stations, cultural/historical markers, better connections, and trailhead parking all with a response rate between 15.1% - 14%.

Finally, respondents were asked about which types of events they would like to see at The Grove and Reserve Hall. Residents wanted more music (31.2%) and community events (23.7%) at the Grove. While they wanted more live theatre (31.9%) and music (23.6) at Reserve Hall.

VILLAGE IMAGE & COMMUNICATION
Residents were asked the method of communication from the Village the most preferred. Respondents overwhelmingly
RESIDING IN MAYFIELD VILLAGE

Top 3 Reasons for Residing in Mayfield Village:
1. I feel safe in the Village/my neighborhood (50.4%)
2. The high quality of municipal services (44.5%)
3. The quality of the school system (36.2%)

Top 3 Considerations for Moving from Mayfield Village:
* I would not consider moving out of Mayfield Village (384%)
1. For lower taxes (21.5%)
2. For a smaller house (16.9%)
3. For a different climate (16.4%)

PARKS, RECREATION & CULTURE

of respondents rated the overall quality of the Village’s parks and recreation facilities as good or excellent

97.6%

Top Recreation Facilities*:
1. The Community Room (99%)
2. Parkview Pool (96%)
3. The Bruce G. Rinker Greenway (95.4%)
4. Baseball/Softball Fields (95%)

*Based on the combined response of “Excellent” and “Good” for each facility.

Desired programming at:
The Grove Amphitheatre
1. Music (31.2%)
2. Community Festivals/Events (23.7%)

Reserve Hall
1. Live Theater (31.9%)
2. Music (23.6%)

VILLAGE IMAGE & COMMUNICATION

Respondent preferred method of communication from the Village:
1. Voice of the Village (52.9%)
2. Direct Mailing (47.2%)
3. Village Website (20.2%)

of respondents said they feel well informed about community programs and events.

89.5%
preferred the Voice of the Village (52.9%) and direct Mailing (47.2%). Phone Calls was the least preferred method (12.5%).

Overall, residents felt the Village did a good job of making information accessible to residents and residents said they felt well informed about community programs. Over 89% of residents said they either “Strongly Agreed” or “Agreed” with these assertions.

Resident also supported decorative streetscape elements and preserving the cultural and historical heritage of the Village. They only slightly favored the creation of a unique identity or brand for the Village.

**HOUSING & DEVELOPMENT**

This section asked respondents about various issues regarding housing and development in Mayfield Village. The first question asked about the priority for different types of housing. Over 92% of respondents highly prioritize the maintenance of existing housing. This was followed by a desire to preserve underutilized land as greenspace. Over 56% wanted to see more housing options for seniors. Respondents did not support adding apartments.

Respondents were also asked about future development priorities. Most agreed on the encouragement of sustainable development, followed again by the preservation of greenspace. They also supported new homes matching the scale and design of existing homes.

The most agreed upon economic development statements were that the Village should support local businesses, that residents can meet the majority of their shopping needs by local retail, and the Village should focus on the redevelopment of Beta Drive.

**LAND USE**

The next survey topic covered land use issues. Respondents were first asked how successful they felt the Village had been on accomplishing several stated goals. Residents felt the Village was most successful in upgrading Village facilities, preserving the SOM Center Road Corridor, and the improvements to the Grove Amphitheatre. All goals received at least 60% response as either “Excellent” or “Good”.

Residents were then asked which types of uses they wanted to see along 4 major corridors in the Village. Respondents most wanted to see Parks or Retail along SOM Center Road. They desired Office and Industrial along Beta Drive. They preferred Retail and Office along Wilson Mills Road. And finally, they desired Parks and Office along North Commons Boulevard.

**TRANSPORTATION**

Respondents next answered questions regarding the focus of transportation improvements in the Village. Residents were asked about the priority for improvements along seven corridors. Respondents prioritized making streets safer for bikers and pedestrians for Wilson Mills, SOM Center, Highland, and White Roads, and North commons Boulevard.

They favored moving cars more quickly and more attractive streets for Beta Drive. and Moving cars more quickly and pedestrian safety around the I-271 interchange.

Overall, respondents favored pedestrian improvements, followed by auto, and then bike improvements. Public Transit was not a significant priority for most respondents.
**Executive Summary**

**TRANSPORTATION**

Respondents prioritized transportation improvements as follows:

- **Highest priority**
  - Walking (72.1%)
  - Biking (56.2%)

- **Lowest priority**
  - Public Transit (24.4%)
  - Driving (59%)

**HOUSING & DEVELOPMENT**

The following are the top four highest priority housing policies for residents:

- Maintain existing housing (92.2%)
- Leave lands as Greenspace (78.7%)
- More options for Seniors (56.1%)
- More energy-efficient housing (42.3%)

Priorities for Land Development:

- Sustainable Development (77.5%)
- Preserve land as Greenspace (74.6%)

Economic Development Focus:

- Support local Businesses (77.5%)
- Redevelop Beta Drive (74.6%)

**LAND USE**

Desired Land Uses Along Major Corridors:

- **SOM Center Road**
  - Parks 30.1%
  - Retail 26.9%

- **Beta Drive**
  - Office 34.9%
  - Industrial 26%
  - Retail 30.6%

- **Wilson Mills Road**
  - Office 23.5%

- **North Commons Boulevard**
  - Parks 32.7%
  - Office 27.4%
COMMUNITY AMENITIES

Respondents were positive about non-Village provided amenities. The North Chagrin Reservation was the most well rated amenity with over 97% saying it was either “Excellent” or “Good”. It was followed by the Mayfield Branch of the Cuyahoga County Library and the Mayfield Public School System. Every amenity received a response rate of 85% as either “Excellent” or “Good”.

Hillcrest Hospital was identified as the most important of these amenities based on the combined response of “Very Important” and “Important”. It was followed closely by the North Chagrin Reservation, the Library, and Mayfield Public Schools. Over 76% of respondents identified the school system as “Very Important”, the highest for that response category.

VILLAGE SERVICES

Respondents were asked a series of questions on the Village's current services. Respondents were asked to rate the quality of 26 services while a following question asked them to rate the importance of these same services. A majority of the respondents rated all of the services as being high quality (combined “Excellent” and “Good” response). All but two services were identified as being high in importance (combined “Very Important” and “Important” response).

The results of these two questions were cross-referenced to understand how well the City was delivering on services for respondents in relation to how important those services were. This matrix of importance and quality can help the Village to prioritize actions.

Four services were rated as being above average in importance (relative to all services) while the current quality of these services was rated as below average (relative to all services). These services—commercial maintenance enforcement, Mayfield Village website, street maintenance/repair and water back-up/sewer inspection—should be priorities for improvement.

Respondents also identified how often the used services. Curbside recycling and bulk/yard waste pick-up were the most often used programs. The sidewalk repair program and PIPE (Public Involvement/Public Education Euclid Creek) were the least used services.

The majority of respondents support sharing dispatch and other services with neighboring communities, with 55.6% saying they support it. It is a small margin, but shows the community is open to it.

Finally they were asked about the overall quality of service in Mayfield Village, with 72.8% of respondents saying it is “Excellent” and another 26.8% saying it is “Good”.

QUALITY OF LIFE

Results show that over 99% of respondents say that overall the quality of life in the Village is either “Good” or “Excellent”.

Residents want to keep the Village small, with 91.5% saying they did not want the population to grow to become a city.

Finally, just over 70% of respondents said they felt engaged in the community. The most common method was through recreation/athletic organizations followed by neighborhood or homeowner’s associations and the schools.
COMMUNITY AMENITIES

Top 3 Non-Village provided amenities:

1. North Chagrin Reservation (97.4%)
2. Mayfield Branch of the Cuyahoga County Library (95.6%)
3. Mayfield Public School System (89.8%)

CITY SERVICES

Building Maintenance, road maintenance, and sewer inspection and repair are services that could be improved to match the high quality of other Village services.

Over 99% of respondents rated the overall quality of Village services as good or excellent.

QUALITY OF LIFE

72.8% of respondents rated the overall Quality of Life in Mayfield Village as “Excellent”.

70.5% of respondents said they felt engaged in the community.

91.5% of respondents did not want the Village to grow its population and become a city.

Respondents were most likely to be engaged through:

1. Recreation/Athletic Organization (24.8%)
2. Neighborhood/Homeowner's Association (23.5%)
The 2017 Mayfield Village Community Survey was an opportunity for public officials to gather the thoughts and opinions of residents. The outcomes of the survey can assist in future planning projects and policy formation.

WHAT'S IN THIS SECTION?

The Introduction Section includes an overview of the findings, a description of the topics surveyed, the methodology used for the survey, and a description of the data tabulation and analysis process.

HOW DO I USE IT?

The Introduction describes what is in the document and how to read and interpret the data. This information should be used to give context to the detailed results provided within later sections of the Results Report.
USING THE FINDINGS

The survey responses should be used to inform Mayfield Village's public policy, regulations, actions, and planning documents. To accurately understand the results, it is important to note the topics that are covered, how they are arranged, and the statistical validity of the findings.

NUMBER OF RESPONSES

The number of responses to each survey question varied, as not all respondents completed the entire form. For some questions, respondents were asked to provide their knowledge of a particular service or facility. Respondents who were not familiar with the item in question had the option to check “No Opinion” or “Not Applicable,” yet in many cases respondents left the question blank. In all cases, charts only depict responses that provided opinions.

TOPIC AREAS

As in the survey form, the Survey Results document is organized by topic area. A brief description of the topics as well as the page number for that topic in this document is provided on the next page.
SURVEY TOPICS

The topics covered in the 2017 Mayfield Village Community Survey are as follows:

- **Residing in Mayfield Village**: Overall understanding why residents choose to live within the Village and why they might choose to leave, beginning on page 22.

- **Parks, Recreation & Culture**: Ratings and ideas for parks, public spaces, and community events, beginning on page 28.

- **Village Image and Communication**: Evaluation of the Village's communication methods and effectiveness in reaching residents, beginning on page 34.

- **Housing**: Priorities for types of new housing developments, beginning on page 38.

- **Economic Development**: Evaluation on what types of businesses the Village should attract and what these developments should look like, beginning on page 38.

- **Land Use**: Review of development possibilities such as new housing or retail and where these developments should be focused, beginning on page 46.

- **Transportation**: Evaluation of the ease and safety of getting around the Village by different transportation methods, beginning on page 50.

- **Community Amenities**: Ratings of quality and importance of amenities found within Mayfield Village, beginning on page 56.

- **Village Services**: Ratings and evaluation of Village services such as police, fire, and trash removal, beginning on page 60.

- **Quality of Life**: Ratings and understanding of resident participation within community activities, events, or groups, beginning on page 68.
METHODOLOGY

County Planning staff worked with Village administration to conduct the 2017 Mayfield Village Community Survey. The goal for the survey was to produce statistically valid responses that could be used to inform Village actions, policies, and future planning activities.

SURVEY TIMELINE

The 2017 Mayfield Village Community Survey began with the collaboration of Mayfield Village and County Planning staff to review possible questions, refine them, and add additional questions. The questions were refined and pre-tested on volunteers to ensure questions and response options were clear. The final survey forms were approved by Mayfield Village and were mailed to residents.

A master list of all residential addresses in Mayfield Village was compiled by County Planning staff and all 1,507 residential addresses were mailed a survey with a self-addressed return envelope. Addresses were cross-checked with known vacant houses to ensure surveys were sent to occupied homes.

On August 21, 2017, County Planning staff mailed the 12-page survey to all 1,507 Mayfield Village households. Each packet included an introductory letter from Mayfield Village Mayor Brenda Bodnar explaining the importance of this process as well as a postage-paid return envelope.

A reminder postcard was sent September 5, 2017 to encourage residents to complete the survey by the September 22, 2017 deadline.

SURVEY DESIGN

The 2017 Mayfield Village Community Survey was comprised of 40 questions arranged by topic with a comment section on the last page of the survey.

A short summary of the write-in responses is included in the report, while a complete compilation is available in Appendix B.

RESPONSE RATE

The goal of the survey was to obtain statistically valid responses that represented the opinions of the entire Village. In order to do so, County Planning staff compared
response rates for similar cities and determined the number of surveys needed for statistical validity. The final surveys were mailed to all 1,507 residential households that included both owner-occupied and renter-occupied homes.

Of the 1,507 surveys mailed, 544 were returned and included in the analysis for a response rate of 36.10%. This equates to a 95% confidence level and a +/- 3.4% statistical error rate. That is the actual response rate of the total population could be within a range of 3.4% higher or lower.

When reading and interpreting the results of the survey, the statistical error rate should be taken into account. Additionally, because not every respondent answered every question, error rates for individual questions may vary. Similarly, error rates for cross-tabulations can be significantly higher due to the smaller number of responses within each cross-tabulated group.

**DATA TABULATION**

The returned surveys were scanned and read by a survey review software program. The results of this scanning program highlighted potential scanning errors, which were manually reviewed by County Planning staff and updated to ensure they accurately reflect the intention of the respondent. Random spot checks were completed to ensure the software program appropriately counted marked answers.

All data in its raw form is available in Appendix A.

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017 Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Universe</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mailed Surveys</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Returned Surveys</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response Rate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confidence Level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Margin of Error</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of the survey can be used to determine overall opinions on important issues and topics within the Village.

**WHAT'S IN THIS SECTION?**

This section contains answers to individual questions that are arranged by topic and are described, displayed graphically, and analyzed.

In addition to analyzing each question individually, several questions were also cross-referenced with certain demographic questions, or other survey questions, to gain a better understanding of how characteristics such as age or tenure may have influenced the responses.

**HOW DO I USE IT?**

Questions in this section are arranged as they were within the survey sent to households. Each question is numbered and includes a description of the question, a chart or graph of the results, and some analysis of respondent's answers.

The analysis should be understood within the context of the demographic profile of respondents and how it relates to the Village as a whole. This information is available in the Demographics Section on page 73.
RESIDING IN MAYFIELD VILLAGE

The first series of questions was designed to understand the reasons residents choose to live in the Village and what reasons or circumstances would cause them to move from Mayfield Village. The questions provided a list of possible answers such as being close to work, proximity to family, or the quality of services and amenities. By understanding the qualities that residents deem most important, public officials can work to protect or enhance those areas. Similarly, knowing the issues that may cause residents to leave, allows officials to work to reduce their negative impact.

Figure 1
Reasons for Residing in Mayfield Village

- I feel safe in the Village/my neighborhood: 50.4%
- The high quality of municipal services: 44.5%
- The quality of the school system: 36.2%
- I have access to highways: 35.3%
- I enjoy the suburban environment: 35.3%
- I am close to my family and/or friends: 31.8%
- I am close to the North Chagrin Reservation: 26.1%
- I am close to shopping: 25.7%
- It offers the type of housing I want: 24.8%
- My neighborhood is well-maintained: 23.0%
- My property is a good investment: 22.6%
- I am close to my work: 17.3%
- My housing costs fit my budget: 10.8%
- I have easy access to Downtown Cleveland: 10.3%
- I have easy access to the Village's parks: 8.6%
REASONS FOR LIVING IN MAYFIELD VILLAGE

Question 1 asked respondents why they choose to live in Mayfield Village by providing a list of 15 options and instructing them to select up to four of those options. Out of the 544 returned surveys, all of the respondents selected at least one reason for residing in the community. With a total of 2191 responses, an average of 4 responses were selected per respondent.

As shown in Figure 1, just over 50% of respondents chose "I feel safe in the Village/my neighborhood" as a reason for residing in Mayfield Village. "The high quality of municipal services," "The quality of the school system," "I have access to highways," and "I enjoy the suburban environment" were the top overall reasons for choosing to reside within in Mayfield Village.

Over 25% of respondents said "I am close to shopping," "I am close to family and/or friends," and "I am close to the North Chagrin Reservation." I am close to the North Chagrin Reservation," and, "I am close to my family and/or friends" were reasons they lived in Mayfield Village.

Figure 2
Top Three Considerations for Living in Mayfield Village by Age

18 to 34 Year Olds
1. I have access to highways (51.72%)
2. I am close to my work (41.38%) OR I am close to my family and/or friends (41.38%)
3. I enjoy the suburban environment (37.93%)

35 to 44 Year Olds
1. I feel safe in the Village/my neighborhood (58.33%)
2. The quality of the school system (56.25%)
3. I am close to my family and/or friends (37.50%)

45 to 54 Year Olds
1. The quality of the school system (56.72%)
2. I feel safe in the Village/my neighborhood (55.22%)
3. I am close to my family and/or friends (30.30%)

55 to 64 Year Olds
1. I feel safe in the Village/my neighborhood (50.41%)
2. I have access to highways (41.46%)
3. The high quality of municipal services (40.65%)

65 to 74 Year Olds
1. The high quality of municipal services (48.48%)
2. I feel safe in the Village/my neighborhood (46.97%)
3. I have access to highways (45.45%)

75+ Year Olds
1. The high quality of municipal services (59.09%)
2. I feel safe in the Village/my neighborhood (53.79%)
3. I enjoy the suburban environment (48.48%)

*Based upon percentage of respondent selections vs. total number of respondents within each age group.
Less than 20% of respondents chose, “I am close to my work,” “My housing costs fit my budget,” “I have easy access to Downtown Cleveland,” and “I have easy access to the Village’s parks,” indicating these issues are less important to the majority of residents.

**REASONS FOR LIVING IN MAYFIELD VILLAGE BY AGE**

Figure 2 breaks responses down by age group, providing the top three selected reasons for six age groups.

Young adults aged 18 to 34 selected “I have access to highways” and “I am close to my work” at a much higher rate than the general population. “The quality of the school system” is very important for Middle-Aged respondents, likely due to the presence of school aged children typical in these age groups. Senior respondents are drawn much more for “The high quality of municipal services.”

**REASONS FOR MOVING OUT OF MAYFIELD VILLAGE**

**Question 2** asked respondents about reasons they might consider moving out of Mayfield Village. Respondents were provided 25 options and allowed to select up to 4 responses. As shown in Figure 3, they were also given the opportunity to select “I would not consider moving out.” If this was selected the respondent was asked to not select any additional options for this particular question since they would not actually be considering moving out of Mayfield Village.

Out of the 544 respondents, almost 40% selected, “I would not consider moving out.” The most significant consideration for moving out of the Village, with 21.5% of respondents, was “For lower taxes.” There were 16.9% of respondents that would consider moving, “For a smaller house,” 16.4% “For a different climate,” and 11.6% “For a single story/ranch style home”. Similarly, the senior housing related considerations “For attached condos/clustered homes” and “For a retirement friendly community” both received almost 11% of responses.

No other option received more than a 10% response rate. Four options were selected by less than 1% of respondents: “For better community facilities (0.7%),” “For a higher quality of municipal services (0.4%),” “For better access to shopping (0.2%),” and “To have better access to highways (0.0%).”

**REASONS FOR MOVING OUT OF MAYFIELD VILLAGE BY AGE**

The response to Question 2 was also cross-tabulated by age group. Figure 4 shows the top three responses by age group.

Age groups 35 to 44, 65 to 74, and 75+ were most likely to say they would not consider moving from the Village. The quality of the local school system was very important to 35 to 44 so it is likely many in this group have children in the schools and would not want to move them out.

Those age 65 and over love the Village services, but some would move to seek a smaller house. A common issue for seniors looking to age in place.

“For Lower taxes” appears in each groups top three, however it is the mostly likely reason to move out of the Village for age groups 18 to 34 and 55 to 64. Those early and late in their careers. Those who have yet to reach their earning potential and those getting close to retirement.
Figure 3
Considerations for Moving from Mayfield Village

- I would not consider moving out: 38.4%
- For lower taxes: 21.5%
- For a smaller house: 16.9%
- For a different climate: 16.4%
- For a single story/ranch style home: 11.6%
- For attached condos/clustered homes: 10.8%
- For a retirement friendly community: 10.7%
- To be closer to family and/or friends: 9.0%
- For a newer house: 8.3%
- To be able to walk places: 7.5%
- For less traffic congestion: 7.4%
- For more property: 7.2%
- For a larger house: 6.6%
- For more home for my money: 6.6%
- For a more rural environment: 4.6%
- For a rental unit: 3.5%
- For a safer community: 3.5%
- For a better school district: 3.5%
- To be closer to work/job related (including job transfer): 3.1%
- For a more diverse community setting: 2.6%
- For a more urban environment: 2.6%
- For better community facilities: 0.7%
- For a higher quality of municipal services: 0.4%
- For better access to shopping: 0.2%
- To have better access to highways: 0.0%
### Figure 4

Top Three Considerations for Moving from Mayfield Village by Age

#### 18 to 34 Year Olds
1. For lower taxes (48.28%)
2. For a larger house (37.93%)
3. For more property (31.03%)

#### 35 to 44 Year Olds
1. I would not consider moving out (22.92%)
   OR For a larger house (22.92%)
2. For a different climate (20.83%)
3. For a newer house (18.75%)

#### 45 to 54 Year Olds
1. I would not consider moving out (31.34%)
2. For lower taxes (25.37%)
3. For a different climate (23.88%)

#### 55 to 64 Year Olds
1. For lower taxes (26.02%)
2. For a smaller house (25.20%)
   OR For a different climate (25.20%)
3. I would not consider moving out (24.39%)

#### 65 to 74 Year Olds
1. I would not consider moving out (43.94%)
2. For lower taxes (18.18%)
3. For a smaller house (15.91%)

#### 75+ Year Olds
1. I would not consider moving out (61.36%)
2. For a smaller house (15.91%)
3. For lower taxes (12.88%)

*Based upon percentage of respondent selections vs. total number of respondents within each age group.

### Major Themes
- Residents live in the Village for its high quality services, quality schools, and safe neighborhoods.
- Many residents would not seek to move out of Mayfield Village, however, those that would are looking for lower taxes.
- Younger respondents want larger houses while seniors are seeking to downsize.
This page intentionally left blank.
PARKS, RECREATION & CULTURE

Parks and recreation facilities are highly desirable components of a complete community. They provide space for active living, community interaction, and physical activity. The survey asked respondents about accessibility to parks and recreation facilities, the quality of facilities, and general quality of Parks and Recreation in the Village.

ACCESS TO COMMUNITY PARKS

Question 3 asked respondents to rate the ease of public access to parks within the community on a scale from “Excellent” to “Very Poor”. Respondents overwhelmingly rate park access as “Excellent” with almost 78% of the respondents making this selection (Figure 5). The remaining respondents rated park access as “Good (19.7%),” and “Average (2.4%)” with no respondent selecting “Poor” or “Very Poor”. With almost 98% of respondents rating ease of public access to parks as “Good” or “Excellent,” this signifies that residents have little to no issue with accessing Village parks and facilities.

TARGET DEMOGRAPHIC OF VILLAGE EVENTS

On Question 4, respondents were asked which age group they would like to see more Village events targeted. Respondents could select more than one group if desired. The highest response at 35.5% of respondents desired more events for “Seniors 55+.” “Families with Children” and “Young Adults/Professionals” both received just over 25% response rate at 25.7% and 25.3%, respectively. Responses “Teens “
and “Children” both received less than 10%. This signifies the least demand for community events targeted towards Teens and Children in the Village.

**QUALITY OF VILLAGE PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES**

**Question 5** asked respondents to rate the quality of ten Village parks and recreation facilities on a scale from “Excellent” to “Very Poor” with an option to select “Have not Used.” The results are shown in Figure 6. The Community Room was the highest rated facility with 99% of respondents rating it as either “Good” or “Excellent.” Three other facilities had over 95 percent of respondents identify it as either “Excellent” or “Good”: Parkview Pool (96%), Bruce G. Rinker Greenway (95.4%), and the Baseball & Softball fields (95%). Three other facilities received over 90% response as “Good” or “Excellent” quality: The Grove Amphitheatre (94.4%), Wetland Preserve Trail (92.2%), and Soccer fields (91.8%).

Respondents were also able to answer that the “Have Not Used” a facility. Three facilities received almost 50% response of “Have not used.” Reserve Hall Theatre (49.6%), Soccer fields (47.7%) and Baseball/softball fields (47.6%). One-third of respondents had not used the Bruce G. Rinker Greenway or Wiley Park. This may indicate an opportunity to expand usership with new programming or expanded outreach.

**Figure 6**
Quality of Village Park and Recreation Facilities

---

![Quality of Village Park and Recreation Facilities](image-url)
IMPROVEMENTS TO THE BRUCE G. RINKER GREENWAY

Question 6 asked respondents what types of improvements/features they would like to see along the Bruce G. Rinker Greenway. Respondents chose rest stops as the most popular improvement option with 22.3% of the response. Following rest stops in respondent ranking are Exercise Stations (15.1%), Cultural/Historical Markers (14.6%), Better Connections (14.2%), and Trailhead Parking (14%). The final two improvements/features are public art (11.2%) and bike parking (8.7%).

While rest stops were chosen the most by respondents overall, the rest of the results are somewhat evenly distributed without a general consensus.

Looking at the response by age group, Figure 8 shows young adults age 18 to 44 were much more likely to desire improvements that support active use and beautification such as Exercise Stations (28.6%), Better Connections (23.4%), and Public Art (18.2%). Seniors 65 and older were significantly in favor of Rest Stops (25.8%) but were low on most other improvements. Middle aged adults were split relatively evenly.

Together, this suggests that any improvements to increase access and usability would be beneficial and that cost and funding may be more critical in determining what can be implemented.

EVENTS AT THE GROVE AMPHITHEATRE & RESERVE HALL

With two new event facilities, the Village desired input into what type of programming and events residents would like.

Question 7 asked respondents what types of events they would like to see hosted at the Grove Amphitheatre. Respondents could select from the five categories of music, live theater, outdoor movies, community festivals/events, and comedy
Figure 8
Desired Greenway Improvements By Age

events. Figure 9 on page 32 shows the most chosen type of event was music with 31.2% followed by community festivals/events (23.7%) outdoor movies (17.1%), live theater (16.1%), and comedy events (11.9%).

Question 8 asked respondents what types of events they would like to see at the Reserve Hall Theatre. Figure 10 on page 32 shows almost 32% of respondents selected live theater, followed by music (23.6%), movies (17.9%), community festivals/events (13.6%), and comedy events (13.2%).
Major Themes

- Overall, respondents are highly satisfied with the Village’s parks and recreation facilities.

- There is a desire for more events in the community, especially targeted to young adults and seniors.

- Programming and facilities need to cater to residents at all stages of life. Parks and facilities that have active and passive programming or elements for all levels.

- High levels of access need to be maintained.
OVERALL CONDITION OF PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES

Question 9 asked respondents to rate the overall condition of the Village’s parks and recreation facilities on a scale from “Excellent” to “Very Poor.” The Results are shown in Figure 11. Of the 516 respondents, 67.2% rated the Village’s parks and recreation facilities as “Excellent,” and 30.4% rated parks and recreation facilities as “Good.” With 97.6% of the question respondents rated the parks and recreation facilities above average, this indicates extremely positive views among the residents. Only 2.1% of respondents chose “Average,” and only 0.2% chose “Poor.” Overall, respondents are satisfied with the Village’s parks and recreation facilities.
Communicating Village news and initiatives with residents is as important as the events and programs themselves. If residents are unaware of events, services, and news they will not be able to actively engage in the community. The next series of questions were aimed at understanding how residents best connect to information from the Village and identify areas where the Village can improve.

VILLAGE COMMUNICATION

Question 10 asked respondents which form of media they prefer to receive information from the Village. The options were the Village website, social media, phone calls, Voice of the Village newsletter, and direct mailing. With 544 respondents to the question, there were 797 responses since they could select more than one response. Figure 12 shows the results. The two most popular responses were Voice of the Village, selected by 52.9% of respondents, and direct mailing, selected by 47.2% of respondents. The least preferred methods of communication are social media, at 13.6%, and phone calls, selected by only 12.5% of respondents.

Figure 13 shows that younger residents were more likely to prefer the Village website or social media as a method of communication. Older residents overwhelmingly preferred the Voice of the Village and Direct Mailings. A proportionally higher response rate by older residents may skew this result slightly. Though Direct Mailing and Voice of the Village were among the top three of all age groups.

Question 11 (Figure 14 on page 36) asked respondents whether they agreed or disagreed with seven statements about the Village’s image and communication. More than half of the respondents “Strongly
Agree” or “Agree” with every statement except for one.

Over 90% of respondents “Strongly Agree” or “Agree” that “the Village does a good job of making information accessible to all residents.” The statement, “I feel well informed about community programs and events,” received 89.5% of respondents saying they “Strongly Agree” or “Agree.” The next most agreed upon statements are “The Village should focus on preserving its cultural heritage and history (73.8%),” “Neighborhood streets should have decorative elements (e.g. signs, lamp posts, sidewalks) (69.7%),” “The Village’s website is easy to use and to access information (60.7%),” and “The Village should focus on creating a unique identity and brand (59.7%).”
Mayfield Village Survey Results

**Figure 14**
Community Image & Outreach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Village does a good job of making information accessible to all residents</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel well informed about community programs and events</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood streets should have decorative elements (e.g., signs, lamp posts, sidewalks)</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Village should focus on preserving its cultural heritage and history</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Village should focus on creating a unique identity and brand</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Village's website is easy to use and to access information</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Village has an active and informative presence on social media</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents did not agree with the statement, “The Village has an active and informative presence on social media,”. Only 46.5% of respondents agreed while 47.4% neither agreed or disagreed.

The results show that the community is well informed of community efforts. It also shows support to cultivate and ensure a unique community image. While creating a unique brand is supported, it is more important to focus on attractive streetscapes and preserving the community’s culture and heritage. Doing this should allow the inherent image and identity of the Village to shine through.

**Major Themes**

- The Village does a good job of communicating and making information accessible.

- *Voice of the Village* is popular. Younger residents are more likely to use social media.

- Community image is best attained through attractive streetscapes and preserving the cultural and historic heritage of the Village.
Development continually changes and shapes communities. General development practices and land use affect environmental health and sustainability, population growth, community aesthetics, and overall quality of life.

Housing is a critical component to strong neighborhoods and strong neighborhoods are important for strong communities. Housing that fits resident and potential resident needs is important to developing communities that serve all ages and preferences.

Economic development is an important indicator of the overall health for a community. It is significant in attracting residents and paying for Village services.

The following questions are designed to gauge feelings and priorities for housing and development in the Village.

HOUSING PRIORITIES

Question 12 provided a list of 11 housing development types and asked respondents to indicate their priority for development for each type in Mayfield Village.

As shown in Figure 15, respondents overwhelmingly support maintaining existing housing and neighborhoods. Over 92% of respondents rate this statement as a “Very High” or “High” priority.

The next two highest priority housing statements are “Underutilized land should remain greenspace” with 78.7% of respondents choosing “Very High” or “High” and “More housing options for seniors looking to remain within the Village” with 56.2% of respondents choosing “Very High” or “High.”

There is strong support for sustainable and energy efficiency in the housing stock with 42.3% rating it as “High” or “Very High”. “More single-family, detached homes,” “More code enforcement” and “More housing types for young professionals,” had very similar priority levels with each receiving between 39%-41% support.

Multi-Family housing is the lowest priority in Mayfield Village. Over half of respondents (55.5%) said apartments in appropriate locations was “Very Low” priority. Affordable Housing and townhouses or condos also each had over 42% say it was a “Low” or “Very Low” priority.
Overall, maintaining existing housing and neighborhoods is overwhelmingly of highest priority for respondents. There is little support for extreme changes in housing development pattern, especially for adding apartments.

HOUSING PRIORITIES BY AGE

Opinions on housing priorities were also cross-referenced with the age of respondent. Those respondents answering “Very High” or “High” priority to an issue were grouped and charted by age as shown in Figure 16 on page 40.

When comparing housing priorities to age, five statements had a difference of opinion of more than 10%, as described below.

More Housing Options for Seniors

More than any other option, options for seniors had the widest range of opinions, with only 19.5% of respondents age 18 to 44 saying this was a high priority and 68.1% of those 65 and older saying this was a high priority.

More Walkable Options

When cross-referencing the desire to be within walking distance of amenities to age, older respondents were more likely to desire housing options that were within close proximity. Among those age 65 and older, 37.4% desired more housing options within walking distance to amenities while only 25.6% of respondents age 18 to 44 did.
More Townhouses/Condos

Older respondents were significantly more likely to be interested in townhouses or condos than younger residents. Among those age 65 and older, 38.4% of respondents said townhouses or condos were a high priority while only 16.3% of 18 to 44 year olds did.

More Apartments/Mixed-Use

In addition, older respondents were more likely to support apartments or mixed-use development than younger respondents with 17.3% of those age 65 and over supporting this housing option compared to only 6.5% of those age 18 to 44.

Maintain Single-Family Detached

Consistent with previous statements showing lower support among younger respondents for townhouses, condos, mixed-use developments, or apartments; support for single-family detached homes was remarkably high among younger respondents. Among those age 18 to 44, 50.0% rated more single-family homes as a high priority compared to only 38.0% of those age 65 and over.

The results by age indicate a desire among younger respondents for a traditional, single-family suburban community while older respondents are more likely to support and desire a wider range of housing options.

This dovetails well with the responses on why residents choose to live in the Village versus why they would move in Questions 1 and 2. Housing development policy must balance the desire to retain strong single family neighborhoods while strategically adding housing stock that caters to an aging population.

Figure 16
Top Five Priorities for Housing Policy by Age*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18 to 44 Year Olds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Maintaining existing housing and neighborhoods (84.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Underutilized land should remain green-space (78.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. More single-family, detached homes (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. More housing types for young professionals (45.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. More sustainable and energy-efficient housing (45.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>45 to 64 Year Olds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Maintaining existing housing and neighborhoods (94.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Underutilized land should remain green-space (77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. More housing options for seniors looking to remain within the Village (55.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. More housing types for young professionals (43.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. More sustainable and energy-efficient housing (39.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>65 and Older</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Maintaining existing housing and neighborhoods (92.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Underutilized land should remain green-space (79%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. More housing options for seniors looking to remain within the Village (68.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. More code enforcement (46.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. More sustainable and energy-efficient housing (42.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percent of residents identifying as a Very High or High priority
Figure 17
Agreement on Future Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Village should encourage environmentally sustainable development</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underutilized properties should be preserved as greenspace (e.g., parks, community gardens)</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New homes should match the scale and design of existing homes</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Village should focus on walkable mixed-use development (retail, office, residential)</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underdeveloped properties should be used to build new housing options</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underdeveloped properties should be developed for commercial use (e.g., retail, offices, industrial)</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OPINIONS ON FUTURE DEVELOPMENT**

**Question 13** asked whether respondents agreed or disagreed with statements about the future development of Mayfield Village. Respondents chose responses on a scale from “Strongly Agree” to “Strongly Disagree.” Figure 17 organizes the responses based on how many respondents either “Highly Agreed” or “Agreed” with each statement.

Nearly 78% of respondents agreed “The Village should encourage environmentally sustainable development.” In a similar vein 74.5% of respondents agreed that underutilized land should be left as greenspace. Supporting the results of the previous questions on housing, 68.6% of respondents agreed that new homes should match design and scale of existing houses.

Walkable, mixed-use development received a majority of support with 51% stating that they agreed with the statement.

Using underdeveloped land for housing had a relatively equal portion of respondent agreeing and disagreeing. Utilizing underdeveloped property as commercial use had almost 60% disagree.
### Figure 18
**Future Development in Mayfield Village**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Village should support the establishment of local businesses</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The majority of my necessary shopping needs can be met by local retailers</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Village should focus on the redevelopment of Beta Drive</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Village needs to maintain and attract different types of retail/service stores</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Village should support more redevelopment and reuse near I-271</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Village needs to focus on developing more arts and cultural attractions</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Village should promote workforce training programs in Mayfield</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Village should provide financial incentives that attract office jobs</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Village should support the establishment of amusement businesses (Go Karts, theaters, etc.)</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Village should focus development on manufacturing and industrial jobs</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OPINIONS ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

**Question 14** asked specifically about economic development in the Village. Again respondents were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with the statement. The results are shown in Figure 18.

The top three most agreed upon statements (“Strongly Agree” or “Agree” responses) were, “The Village should support the establishment of local businesses” (79.7%), “The majority of my necessary shopping needs can be met by local retailers” (75.9%), and “The Village should focus on the redevelopment of Beta Drive” (58.5%).

Conversely, the three most disagreed with statements (combined “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree” responses) were, “The Village should support the establishment of amusement businesses (Go Karts, theaters, etc.)” (59.2%), “The Village should focus development on manufacturing and industrial jobs” (46.3%), and “The Village should support more redevelopment and reuse near I-271” (27.5%).

Mayfield Village residents want to focus on supporting existing commercial areas and local business. Maintaining and maximizing the use of existing commercial and industrial land is preferred to significant new development.
Figure 19
Most and Least Agreement with Economic Development Statements by Age

18 to 44

- The Village needs to focus on developing more arts and cultural attractions: 89%
- The majority of my necessary shopping needs can be met by local retailers: 80%
- The Village should support the establishment of local businesses: 58%
- The Village should focus on the redevelopment of Beta Drive: 63%
- The Village needs to focus on developing more arts and cultural attractions: 89%
- The Village should support the establishment of amusement businesses (Go Karts, theaters, etc.): 12%
- The Village should focus on the redevelopment of Beta Drive: 19%
- The Village should support more redevelopment and reuse near I-271: 41%

45 to 64

- The Village should support the establishment of local businesses: 82%
- The majority of my necessary shopping needs can be met by local retailers: 72%
- The Village should focus on the redevelopment of Beta Drive: 63%
- The Village should promote workforce training programs in Mayfield: 26%
- The Village should focus development on manufacturing and industrial jobs: 46%
- The Village should promote workforce training programs in Mayfield: 26%
- The Village should support the establishment of amusement businesses (Go Karts, theaters, etc.): 63%

65+

- The majority of my necessary shopping needs can be met by local retailers: 78%
- The Village should support the establishment of local businesses: 76%
- The Village should focus on the redevelopment of Beta Drive: 56%
- The Village should provide financial incentives that attract office jobs: 25%
- The Village should focus development on manufacturing and industrial jobs: 48%
- The Village should support the establishment of amusement businesses (Go Karts, theaters, etc.): 63%
OPINIONS ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT BY AGE

When looking at economic development opinions by age group, there are some distinctions. The top and bottom three responses for age groups are shown in Figure 19 on page 43.

Young adults age 18 to 44 were very interested in the development and support of arts and cultural attractions. Possibly indicating a desire for arts, entertainment, and dining spots in the Village for nights out.

They also did not want to see development around I-271, possibly indicating that this is a popular route for work or recreation and traffic and the disruption of development would be unwanted.

Those age 45 and over were in general agreement with the response rate overall. They want to support local business and are against entertainment uses in Beta Drive.

Major Themes

- Overwhelmingly, respondents want to maintain existing housing and neighborhoods.
- Undeveloped land should be preserved as greenspace.
- The Village’s seniors would like more housing options—and want a range of townhouses, mixed-use buildings, single-family homes, and walkable neighborhoods.
- New development or redevelopment needs to fit the context of the Village.
This page intentionally left blank.
LAND USE

Land use and zoning are two closely related topics, but are defined differently. Land Use is a general term used to describe how land is currently being used and potential future uses. Zoning is the specific regulations that designate restrictions and allowable uses for districts and sometimes specific areas throughout a community. These regulations can vary in definition and restrictiveness from community to community, but they all serve to protect property values and to ensure that communities are planned and function in a safe, predictable, and suitable manner for that specific municipality.

The Land Use Section of the survey asked residents their opinions on a variety of possible land use scenarios to gauge community feeling on each.

OPINIONS ON LAND USE STATEMENTS

Question 15 asked respondents to rate Mayfield Village on its accomplishment of eight specific goals during the past 10 years on a scale from “Excellent” to “Very Poor.” The results are shown in Figure 20.

Responses were very positive for all of their efforts. Each goal received over 60% of responses as either “Excellent” or “Good”. Residents were very supportive of the recent upgrading of Village facilities with 94.3% saying it was “Excellent” or Good”. Preserving the SOM Center corridor also received 92% approval as “Excellent” or “Good”.

Rounding out the top three was the “Improvements at the Grove Amphitheatre, which received 91.6% saying it was “Excellent” or “Good”.

However, 37.3% of residents felt they did average or worse in expanding uses in the office/industrial areas. It is not a significant disappointment, but it is an area that can be improved.

Overall, respondents seem to be overwhelmingly satisfied with the accomplishment of the eight listed goals within the past 10 years.

Question 16 asked respondents to indicate which types of uses they would like to see in the four following areas: Beta Drive, SOM Center Road, North Commons Blvd, & Wilson Mills Rd. Responses for all four areas are graphed in Figure 21.
Responses for Beta Drive indicate 34.9% of respondents would want “Office,” 26% selected “Industrial,” 19.4% selected “Retail,” 12% selected “Entertainment,” 3.9% selected “Housing,” and 3.9% selected “Parks.”

According to these results, respondents would generally like to see Office, Industrial, and some Retail on Beta Drive, with little desire for Entertainment, Housing, and Parks in the area.

For SOM Center Rd, 30.1% of respondents selected “Parks,” 26.9% selected “Retail,” 19.4% selected “Housing,” 13.3% selected “Office,” 8.5% selected “Entertainment,” and 1.9% selected “Industrial.”

Respondents would generally like to see Parks and Retail with the possibility of Housing, Office, and Entertainment on SOM Center Rd. There is little desire for Industrial.

For North Commons Blvd, 32.7% of respondents selected “Parks,” 27.4% selected “Office,” 12.2% selected “Entertainment,” 11.8% selected “Housing,” 8.6% selected “Retail,” and 7.4% selected “Industrial.”

Parks and Office are more generally desired for North Commons Boulevard than Housing, Retail, and Industrial uses.

On Wilson Mills Rd, 30.6% of respondents selected “Retail,” 23.5% selected “Office,” 19.4% selected “Housing,” 14.9% selected “Parks,” 9.1% selected “Entertainment,” and 2.7% selected “Industrial.”

Respondents would generally like to see Retail and Office with some Housing on Wilson Mills Rd, with little desire for Parks, Entertainment, & Industrial.
Figure 21
Types of Uses Desired Per Area

Major Themes

- Respondents are very satisfied at the rate in which the Village has been accomplishing goals.
- Residents would like to see more Parks along SOM Center Road and North Commons Boulevard.
- They would also support more Retail options along SOM Center Road and Wilson Mills Road.
- Respondents are satisfied with Industrial and Office uses along Beta Drive.
TRANSPORTATION

Transportation is an important component to the ability to easily move throughout any municipality. The construction and maintenance of roads, bridges, sidewalks, and rails are essential parts of economic development, community health, and quality of life for residents.

Mayfield Village sought to gather resident input on transportation through the survey. By understanding residents’ feelings about the ease of existing transportation methods as well as community priorities for future investments, Village administration can prioritize transportation initiatives and seek funding.

TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS

Question 17 asked respondents which types of improvements they would like to see on the seven major streets in Mayfield Village. The 544 respondents were able to select more than one improvement for each area. The five listed improvements were “safer for bikes,” “safer for walking,” “easier to access transit,” “more attractive streets,” and “moving cars more quickly.” Figure 22 through Figure 26 show the response rate regarding each mode of transportation along each corridor.

On Wilson Mills Road, “safer walking” was the most popular improvement, with 48.6% of respondents selecting this response. Following “safer walking” was “safer for bikes” (40.8%), “moving cars more quickly” (37.2%), “more attractive streets” (28.2%), and “easier access to transit” (11.9%). Respondents feel it is most important to improve pedestrian and bike safety along Wilson Mills Rd, closely followed in importance by a need to continue traffic in the area.

On Beta Drive, “moving cars more quickly” was the most popular improvement, with 35.9% of respondents selecting this option. Following “moving cars more quickly” was “more attractive streets” (32.8%), “safer for bikes” (23.8%), “safer for walking” (23.1%), and “easier access to transit” (21.9%). It is most important to residents to improve the flow of traffic and street beautification along Beta Drive. Public transit alternative transportation infrastructure also received significant support.

On SOM Center Road, “safer for bikes” was the most popular improvement, with 39.2% of respondents selecting this option. Following “safer for bikes” was “safer
Figure 22
Priority of Transportation Improvements for Wilson Mills Road

- Moving Cars More Quickly: 37.2%
- More Attractive Streets: 28.2%
- Easier Access to Transit: 11.9%
- Safer for Walking: 48.6%
- Safer for Bikes: 40.8%

Figure 23
Priority of Transportation Improvements for Beta Drive

- Moving Cars More Quickly: 35.9%
- More Attractive Streets: 32.8%
- Easier Access to Transit: 21.9%
- Safer for Walking: 23.1%
- Safer for Bikes: 23.8%

Figure 24
Priority of Transportation Improvements for SOM Center Road

- Moving Cars More Quickly: 32.6%
- More Attractive Streets: 29.7%
- Easier Access to Transit: 16.3%
- Safer for Walking: 36.9%
- Safer for Bikes: 39.2%
Figure 25
Priority of Transportation Improvements for Highland Road

- Moving Cars More Quickly: 11.7%
- More Attractive Streets: 32.9%
- Easier Access to Transit: 10.0%
- Safer for Walking: 49.7%
- Safer for Bikes: 49.1%

Figure 26
Priority of Transportation Improvements for White Road

- Moving Cars More Quickly: 11.8%
- More Attractive Streets: 42.4%
- Easier Access to Transit: 10.2%
- Safer for Walking: 62.9%
- Safer for Bikes: 58.8%

Figure 27
Priority of Transportation Improvements for North Commons Boulevard

- Moving Cars More Quickly: 13.6%
- More Attractive Streets: 26.7%
- Easier Access to Transit: 19.5%
- Safer for Walking: 39.0%
- Safer for Bikes: 35.2%
for walking” (36.9%), “moving cars more quickly” (32.6%), “more attractive streets” (29.7%), and “easier access to transit” (16.3%). Improving pedestrian and bike safety on SOM Center Rd is most important to residents.

On Highland Road, “safer for walking” was the most popular improvement, with 49.7% of respondents selecting this option. Following “safer for walking” was “safer for bikes” (49.1%), “more attractive streets” (32.9%), “moving cars more quickly” (11.7%), and “easier access to transit” (10.0%). Again, improving bike and pedestrian access and safety is most important along Highland Road. Streetscape improvement is also important.

On White Road, “safer for walking” was the most popular improvement, with 62.9% of respondents selecting this option. Following “safer walking” was “safer for bikes” (58.8%), “more attractive streets” (42.4%), “moving cars more quickly” (11.8%), and “easier access to transit” (10.2%). Similar to Highland road, bike and pedestrian safety improvements are most important followed by an attractive streetscape.

Along North Commons Blvd, “safer for walking” was the most popular improvement, with 39.0% of respondents selecting this response. Following “safer for walking” was “safer for bikes” (35.2%), “more attractive streets” (26.7%), “easier access to transit” (19.5%), and “moving cars more” (13.6%). Again bike and pedestrian safety improvements followed by an attractive streetscape is most important.

Finally, on the I-271 Interchange, “moving cars more quickly” was overwhelmingly the most popular improvement, with 61.2% of respondents selecting this option. Following this was safer for walking” (29.4%), “safer for bikes” (23.1%), “more attractive streets” (22.3%), and “easier access to transit” (11.5%). Traffic management is predictably most important at the I-271 interchange. However there is also a desire for bike and pedestrian safety improvements.

Overall there is significant support for bike and pedestrian safety improvements along the major corridors in Mayfield Village. There is also a desire for quality, attractive streetscapes. Traffic management is a concern on several major thoroughfares. Public Transit receives some support on certain roads but does not appear to be a priority.
Figure 29
Very High or High Level for Improvement by Age

18 to 34
- Car: 40.7%
- Public Transit: 18.5%
- Bike: 59.3%
- Walk: 81.5%

35 to 44
- Car: 53.2%
- Public Transit: 19.1%
- Bike: 70.8%
- Walk: 72.9%

45 to 54
- Car: 47.6%
- Public Transit: 15.6%
- Bike: 68.8%
- Walk: 71.9%

55 to 64
- Car: 53.9%
- Public Transit: 17.9%
- Bike: 58.3%
- Walk: 76.7%

65 to 74
- Car: 64.3%
- Public Transit: 29.4%
- Bike: 52.8%
- Walk: 72.4%

75+
- Car: 70.5%
- Public Transit: 34.0%
- Bike: 41.4%
- Walk: 63.0%
**Priority of Transportation Improvements**

**Question 18** asked respondents to indicate their priority for improving the ease and safety of getting around by using four different modes of transportation on a scale from “Very high” to “Very low.” Improving the ease and safety of getting around by walking received the greatest response of “High” or “Very High” priority with 72.0%. Next in priority was “improving the ease and safety of getting around by car,” with 59% of respondents choosing “High” or “Very High,” and “improving the ease and safety of getting around by bike,” with 56.2%. Respondents selected “improving the ease and safety of getting around by public transit” as the lowest priority. Only 24.4% of respondents selected “High” or “Very High” and 46.9% chose “Low” or “Very low.”

When breaking it down by age, response rates are generally the same. Bike improvements are more likely to be favored by middle-age groups and public transit is more important to those age 65 and older. Pedestrian safety is significantly supported across age groups but is slightly less likely to be a response to those age 75 and over. Likely related to the increase in desire for public transit. Figure 31

The significant response for auto improvements among those age 65 and over may indicate a need for improvements related to visibility and other issues.

These results show that respondents overwhelmingly prioritize and place importance on improving the walkability of Mayfield Village. Following walkability in importance is car and bike safety. Public transit received little priority from respondents, signifying that it is by far the least desired and used form of transit in Mayfield Village.

**Figure 30**
Priority for Improvements by Transportation Modes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Very High</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving the ease and safety of getting</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>around by walking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the ease and safety of getting</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>around by car</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the ease and safety of getting</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>around by bike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the ease and safety of getting</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>around by public transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Themes**

- Residents are very supportive of bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure along major corridors.
- There is support for streetscape beautification along major corridors.
- Public Transit is not a priority to Mayfield Village residents.
COMMUNITY AMENITIES

The Community Events Section of the survey asked residents to rate the quality of the Village’s events as well as whether residents would like to see additional community events. This information is important to understanding whether current programming is sufficient and whether existing events are popular. A “No Opinion” response about events can also assist in understanding how well-attended events are.

COMMUNITY AMENITY QUALITY

Question 19 asked respondents to rate the following seven community amenities:
- University Hospitals Health Center
- Mayfield Public Schools
- Private or Parochial Schools
- Mayfield Branch of Cuyahoga County Library
- North Chagrin Reservation
- Hillcrest Hospital
- Wildcat Sports & Fitness Center

Respondents were asked to rate the quality of the amenities on a scale from “Excellent” to “Very Poor” with an option to select “Have Not Used.” Results are shown in Figure 31.

Each of the seven listed amenities received a response of “Good” or “Excellent” by more than 85% of respondents.

North Chagrin Reservation received the greatest quality rating with 97.4% of respondents selecting “Good” or “Excellent,” closely followed by Mayfield Branch of the Cuyahoga County Libraries with 95.6% of respondents selecting “Good” or “Excellent.”

The remaining amenities, Wildcat Sports & Fitness Center (85.0%), University Hospitals Health Center (87.0%), Mayfield Public Schools (89.8%), Private or Parochial Schools (89.3%), and Hillcrest Hospital (88.6%) all received high percentages of “Good” or “Excellent” ratings by respondents.

In general, the respondents ranked each of the community amenities very highly. Figure 32 on page 58 provides a further summary of the responses rates for each amenity.

While not provided by the Village, these amenities support the high quality services and facilities respondents have indicated are a reason they live in the Village.
Figure 31
Quality of Community Amenities

- North Chagrin Reservation: 69.5% Excellent, 27.9% Good
- Mayfield Branch of Cuyahoga County Library: 66.6% Excellent, 29.0% Good
- Mayfield Public Schools: 45.3% Excellent, 44.5% Good, 8.8% Average
- Private or Parochial Schools: 41.0% Excellent, 48.3% Good, 9.2% Average
- Hillcrest Hospital: 49.3% Excellent, 39.3% Good, 9.3% Average
- University Hospitals Health Center: 42.8% Excellent, 44.2% Good, 11.0% Average
- Wildcat Sports & Fitness Center: 42.5% Excellent, 42.5% Good, 14.4% Average
**Figure 32**
Quality of Community Amenities Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North Chagrin Reservation</th>
<th>Mayfield Branch of CC Library</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Nearly all respondents rated as “Excellent”</td>
<td>1. Nearly all respondents rated as “Excellent”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Only 2.8% “Have Not Used”</td>
<td>2. Only 5.6% “Have Not Used”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Highest rated amongst ages 55 to 74</td>
<td>3. Lowest ratings amongst ages 65 to 74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hillcrest Hospital</th>
<th>Mayfield Public Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Majority are “Good” to “Excellent”</td>
<td>1. 47.5% “Have Not Used”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Highest rated amongst ages 75+</td>
<td>2. Lowest rating amongst ages 55 to 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Only 3.9% “Have Not Used”</td>
<td>3. Majority are “Good” to “Excellent”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Hospitals HC</th>
<th>Wildcat S &amp; F Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Highest rated amongst ages 75+</td>
<td>1. Majority of respondents “Have Not Used”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Most “Have Not Used” from ages 55 to 64</td>
<td>2. Most rated as “Good” or “Excellent”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Majority are “Good” to “Excellent”</td>
<td>3. Lowest rating amongst ages 45 to 64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private or Parochial Schools</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Majority of respondents “Have Not Used”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Most rated as “Good”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ages 18 to 34, 82.1% “Have Not Used”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Themes**

- The highest rated amenities in terms of quality are the North Chagrin Reservation, the Mayfield Branch of the Cuyahoga County Library, and Hillcrest Hospital. These are also the highest in terms of importance.

- The lowest rated amenities in terms of quality are the University Hospitals Health Center, the Wildcat Sports & Fitness Center, and the private and parochial schools. This also largely due to a high number of respondents having never used these amenities prior to completing this survey.
COMMUNITY AMENITY IMPORTANCE

Question 20 asked respondents to rate the importance of the same seven community amenities on a scale from “Very Important” to “Not Important.” Each amenity received a response of “Good” or “Excellent” by more than 67% of respondents.

As shown in Figure 34, Hillcrest Hospital received the greatest importance rating with 96.8% of respondents selecting “Important” or “Very Important.” Closely following this with high ratings of “Important” or “Very Important” were the North Chagrin Reservation (95.3%), the Mayfield Branch of Cuyahoga County Library (94.7%), and Mayfield Public Schools (92.7%).

The remaining amenities, University Hospitals Health Center (75.2%), Wildcat Sports & Fitness Center (71.7%) and Private or Parochial Schools (67.1%), received similar ratings of importance.

Figure 33
Importance of Community Amenities by Age

18 to 54 & 65 to 74
1. Very Important: Mayfield Public Schools
2. Not Important: Private or Parochial Schools

55 to 64
1. Very Important: North Chagrin Reservation
2. Not Important: Private or Parochial Schools

75+
1. Very Important: Hillcrest Hospital
2. Not Important: Wildcat Sports & Fitness Center

Figure 34
Importance of Community Amenities
VILLAGE SERVICES

The provision of basic services to residents is an essential component of any municipality, and the quality provision of these services is an important component to economic development and quality of life in the community.

Mayfield Village provides vital services to residents such as Police and Fire protection. Additionally, the Village provides other beneficial services such as leaf and mulch collection, refuse and recycling collection, tool lending, and snow removal among many.

To understand more about the quality of service provision in the Village, the survey asked residents about the quality and importance of individual services, the use of services, and the overall quality.

REGIONAL SERVICES

**Question 21** asked respondents to select “Yes” or “No” if they thought the Village should explore shared dispatch or other regional services with neighboring communities. Sharing services can often provide cost savings to the community while securing basic, and sometimes even expanded services. Switching to shared services often requires broad community support as, depending on the service, it can be an intensive process.

Figure 35 shows a majority of respondents (55.6%) support exploring service sharing. There is enough opposition that the Village could expect resistance to any efforts. Overall support, and success, would depend on the service being shared and a process of consolidation that engages those against it.

**Figure 35**
Desire to Share Dispatch or Other Regional Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 36
Usage of Village Services

VILLAGE SERVICES USAGE

Question 22 asked respondents how often they use eight services offered by the Village. Options were “Once a week,” “Once a month,” “Several times a year,” “Rarely,” or “Never,” with results shown in Figure 36.

Overwhelmingly the most used service was the curbside recycling program, with 63.6% of residents using this once a week. Bulk/yard waste pickup was used at least once a week by 22.2% of respondents. The least used services are the sidewalk repair program and PIPE (Public Involvement/Public Education, Euclid Creek) both with over 70% of respondents who have never used them.

When using this data it is important to understand the purpose of the program and that certain programs are not intended to be used as frequently as others.

Recycling and waste are generated more quickly and thus disposal services are more likely to be used more frequently. Hazardous waste and sidewalk repair are not needed on a household frequency as often.

Table and chair rental has a 49.2% total response for those that use it “Several times a year” or “Rarely” which would make sense with the idea that most households would only host events that would require extra tables and chairs several times a year at most.

With this in mind, there does not appear to be any service that is being used more frequently than would be expected by households.

The four programs that have over 50% response of having “Never” been used may
need to be evaluated for effectiveness, efficiency, or overall community awareness.

**QUALITY OF INDIVIDUAL SERVICES**

**Question 23** asked respondents to rate the quality of 26 services in the Village. In general, the respondents rated the services positively, with more than 60% marking services as either “Excellent” or “Good.” As shown in Figure 37, emergency services were the highest rated services in the Village, with Fire protection/EMS having an 80.3% response rate of “Excellent”. Police protection was close behind with an “Excellent” response rate of 78.1%.

Thirteen of the services received a combined response rate of “Excellent” or “Good” of 90% or greater. Another five received a response rate between 80% and 90%. Every service had a combined “Excellent” or “Good” rating over 50%.

Housing maintenance enforcement, commercial maintenance enforcement, sidewalk repair program, and water back up/sewer inspection received the greatest percentage of “Very Poor” or “Poor” ratings. Housing maintenance enforcement had 13% say it was “Poor” or “Very Poor”. Another 30.6% called it “Average”. The other three had just between 8% and 10% “Poor” or “Very Poor”. They also had a 25% or greater response as “Average”.

When dealing with a response rate showing services are overwhelmingly high quality, identifying services that need to be improved often means making “Good” services “Excellent” or “Average” services “Good”.

Overall services offered by the Village are of the highest quality. This signifies the opportunity to make some services even better, or introduce new services. This is a very advantageous position for the Village.

**IMPORTANCE OF INDIVIDUAL SERVICES**

In addition to understanding the quality of existing services, **Question 24** asked respondents to rate the importance of the same 26 services in the Village. The results are displayed in Figure 38 on page 64.

Respondents indicated that emergency services such as fire protection/EMS and police protection are the most important provided by the Village. However, twenty-one of the services received over 75% as being either “Very Important” or “Important”. Two services, with over 50% of respondents designating them as “Somewhat Important” or “Not Important” are the tool lending program and PIPE (Public Involvement/Public Education, Euclid Creek).

Three services had over 18% response that they were “Not Important”; Table and chair rental, tool lending, and PIPE.

Based on responses to previous questions, it is evident that Village services are integral to the quality of life in Mayfield Village and are significant in residents decision to live or stay in the Village. Response to this question enforces that.

It is to the Village’s credit that there are very few services offered that the majority of residents feel are not important. The few that are deemed not important are still beneficial to many. Being able to provide and fund services that are not critically important is a great benefit the Village can offer to residents.
Figure 37
Quality of Village Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection/EMS</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police protection</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash collection</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park maintenance</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency notification system</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curbside refuse &amp; recycling program</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior services</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow &amp; ice removal</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaf &amp; mulch program</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table and chair rental</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic enforcement</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational programs</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partnership on Aging</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior snow plowing</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of Village owned properties</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulk/yard waste pickup</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool lending</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous waste/computer round up</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street maintenance/repair</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Department permitting process</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayfield Village website</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk repair program</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water back up/sewer inspection</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial maintenance enforcement</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIPE (Public Involvement/Public Education,…)</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing maintenance enforcement</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Figure 38
Importance of Village Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection/EMS</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police protection</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow &amp; ice removal</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash collection</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street maintenance/repair</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency notification system</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park maintenance</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic enforcement</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of Village owned properties</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water back up/sewer inspection</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curbside refuse &amp; recycling program</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational programs</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulk/yard waste pickup</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior snow plowing</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial maintenance enforcement</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior services</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing maintenance enforcement</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaf &amp; mulch program</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Department permitting process</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk repair program</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partnership on Aging</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous waste/computer round up</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayfield Village website</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table and chair rental</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool lending</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIPE (Public Involvement/Public Education, Euclid Creek)</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUALITY-IMPORTANCE MATRIX OF SERVICES

In order to better understand the relationship between quality of services and importance of services, the 26 services were plotted on a matrix with one axis displaying the rating of quality (“Excellent” and “Good” response rate) and the other displaying its importance rating (“Very Important” and “Important” response rate).

Plotting services in this matrix will provide a comparison to the overall average quality and importance for services and will aid in identifying which services can be improved and which need to be maintained. The matrix displayed in Figure 39 shows four quadrants divided by the overall average rating of importance and quality (red lines).

The quadrants indicate the following:

- The **bottom right quadrant (Yellow)** displays services of higher than average quality but lower than average importance. These are services that could be diminished.
- The **bottom left quadrant (red)** displays issues of lower than average quality and importance. These are services that could be improved if the resources and time are available.
- The **top right quadrant (Purple)** displays services of higher than average quality and importance. These are services that should be maintained.
- The **top left quadrant (blue)** displays issues of lower than average quality but higher than average importance. These are services that should be improved.

**Figure 39**
Quality-Importance Matrix of Village Services
Five services in the Village fall below the average rating for high quality and importance. They are housing maintenance enforcement, sidewalk repair program, building department permitting process, hazardous waste/computer round up, and PIPE. Only PIPE is nowhere near either of the averages. The other three services are all within 3% of the average for importance.

Four services are above the average for importance but below the average for quality. They are Mayfield Village website, street maintenance/repair, water backup/sewer inspection, and commercial maintenance enforcement.

Infrastructure issues and code enforcement for residential and commercial properties show areas where improvement can be targeted. They are all relatively high in importance but are below the standard for quality set by the other services in the Village. Granted some of these are still highly rated for quality. This just identifies those as services that could be made even better.

The Village website could also be improved, which would benefit communications with residents and access to Village information.

OVERALL QUALITY OF SERVICES

Question 25 asked respondents to rate the overall quality of services offered by Mayfield Village. As the response to individual services indicates, residents view Village services highly. Almost three-quarters of respondents, 72.8%, rated the overall quality of services as “Excellent” and 26.8% rated the overall quality as “Good.” Together 99.6% of respondents said the overall quality of services were “Excellent” or “Good.” There were no responses for either “Poor” or “Very Poor”. The results indicate a high level of satisfaction with services currently offered by the Village. Results are shown in Figure 39.

Figure 40
Overall Quality of Services

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.8%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Themes

- The overall quality of services is extremely high. Residents are pleased with the Services offered by the Village.

- Emergency services were rated the highest quality services offered by the Village.

- Infrastructure maintenance and housing and commercial code enforcement services are possible areas for future improvement.
QUALITY OF LIFE

Quality of life can be described as the general well-being of an individual or community. Many of the surveyed topics contribute to the community’s overall quality of life.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT & INVOLVEMENT

Question 26 asked respondents if they feel engaged in their neighborhood/community. Figure 42 shows that out of 508 respondents, 70.5 percent of respondents selected “Yes” to this question while 29.5% selected “No.” This indicates that a majority of respondents do feel engaged in their neighborhood/community in Mayfield Village. However, nearly 30% do not, indicating this is an area where the Village can work to reach out to increase involvement in the community.

This result holds across all age groups where approximately 70% feel engaged while 30% do not.

Question 27 asked respondents how they are involved in their neighborhood/community. Figure 42 shows that 24.8% of respondents are involved in athletic organizations, 23.5% in Neighborhood or Home Owner’s Association, 19.3 in the neighborhood schools, 18.8% in a place of worship or faith community, 9.2% on Village Boards, commissions or committees, and only 4.4% in Community service groups (e.g., Kiwanis Club).

The Village could work with some of these groups to increase outreach and participation.
Figure 42
Areas of Involvement in the Village

- Recreation/athletic organizations: 24.3%
- Neighborhood or Home Owner's Association: 23.5%
- Schools: 19.3%
- Place of worship or faith community: 18.8%
- Village Boards, Commissions or Committees: 9.2%
- Community service groups (e.g., Kiwanis Club): 4.4%

Figure 43
Community Engagement Method by Age

- Homeowner's Association:
  - 18 to 44: 18%
  - 45 to 64: 28%
  - 65+: 27%

- Place of Worship/Faith Community:
  - 18 to 44: 19%
  - 45 to 64: 22%
  - 65+: 21%

- Community Service Groups:
  - 18 to 44: 1%
  - 45 to 64: 3%
  - 65+: 8%

- Village boards, Commissions, or Committees:
  - 18 to 44: 10%
  - 45 to 64: 12%
  - 65+: 9%

- Recreation/Athletic Organization:
  - 18 to 44: 45%
  - 45 to 64: 32%
  - 65+: 19%

- Schools:
  - 18 to 44: 36%
  - 45 to 64: 32%
  - 65+: 19%
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT BY AGE

When looking at groups or methods by which residents are involved in the community by age, there are some distinct differences.

Young and middle-aged adults are much more likely to be involved through the schools, which is likely due to the presence of children in the school system. The same 18 to 44 and 45 to 64 age groups are also more likely to be involved in recreational or athletic organizations.

Seniors and middle-aged residents are more likely to be involved in homeowner’s associations.

Seniors are much more likely to be involved through community service organizations, however, there does not appear to be a major engagement of community groups in the Village. Results shown in Figure 42.

POPULATION GROWTH OPINION

Question 28 asked if respondents would like to see the Village’s population grow above its current population of approximately 3,400. This question is significant because at 5,000 residents, the Village’s status would change to a City. This would have impact on certain structures and processes in the Village’s operations, but would probably have very little impact on residents daily lives. The response is informative as it indicates the desire of residents regarding growth and increased development.

As shown in Figure 42, an overwhelming 91.5% of the 516 respondents do not want the Village’s population to grow. Only 8.5% of respondents want to see the Village’s population grow. This aligns with the motto of Mayfield Village, to “Think Big” but “Stay Small.”

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

Question 29 asked respondents about their participation in the Mayfield Village events of Cruise Night, the Pancake Breakfast, and the 4th of July Celebration/Fireworks. Results are shown in Figure 46. The most attended event in the Village is the 4th of July Celebration, with 79.6% of respondents who participate, 16% who do not participate, and only 4.4% who have never participated. Next in popularity is the Cruise Night, with 71.9% of respondents who participate, 20.2% who do not participate, and 7.9% who have never participated. The Pancake Breakfast is the event with the smallest amount of participation, with only 31.5% of respondents who participate, 50.9% who do not participate, and 17.6% who have never participated.
**QUALITY OF LIFE**

**Question 30** asked respondents to rate the overall quality of life in Mayfield Village on a scale from “Excellent” to “Very Poor.” Overwhelmingly, respondents are very happy with the quality of life in Mayfield Village. Almost everyone, 99.6%, said it was either “Excellent” or “Good”. Only 0.4% selecting “Average”. Zero respondents said it was either “Poor” or “Very Poor.” This shows that respondents overwhelmingly value the quality of life in Mayfield Village. Results are shown in Figure 42.

**Figure 46**
Participation in Certain Community Events

**Figure 45**
Overall Quality of Life

**Major Themes**

- Residents overwhelmingly agree that the Quality of Life in Mayfield Village is very good.
- Most residents feel engaged in the community. Mainly through recreation organizations, homeowner’s associations, the schools, or faith communities.
- Residents DO NOT want the Village’s population to grow.
The Mayfield Village Community Survey was sent out to the entire community as a whole. The Demographics Section summarizes the population that responded to the survey.

WHAT’S IN THIS SECTION?

This section includes the results of the ten, general demographic questions. The results can be helpful in comparing the survey respondent population to the population as a whole.

HOW DO I USE IT?

Questions in this section of the Results Report are arranged as they were within the survey sent to each household. Each question is numbered and includes a description of the question, a chart or graph of the results, and some analysis of respondent answers.

These responses should be used to give context to the detailed findings of the residential report. Over representation or underrepresentation of specific groups can alter overall opinions and should be considered.
RESPONDENT INFORMATION

AGE OF RESPONDENTS

Question 31 asked respondents their age, and for households that completed the survey collaboratively, the respondent who most recently had a birthday was instructed to list his or her age. As shown in Figure 42, the age of the respondent was compared to 2015 Census data in Mayfield Village from the American Community Survey for age of householder to determine the extent to which survey respondents age aligned with Mayfield Village data in general. In all age groups 55 or older, survey respondents were over represented.

Figure 47
Age of Respondent, 2017 Survey and 2015 ACS Data
while respondents 54 or younger were underrepresented.

There was the most overrepresentation in respondents age 65 to 74, with 24.9% of respondents in this age group and only 13.2% in this age group in Mayfield Village. The most underrepresentation in response was age group 18 to 34, with this age group making up only 5.5% of survey respondents, but 22% of the Mayfield Village population.

LENGTH OF RESIDENCY & TENURE

Question 32 asked respondents how many years they have resided in Mayfield Village. The greatest response, as shown in Figure 48, was “More than 30 years,” with 32.5% of respondents selecting this option. Only 6% of respondents had lived in Mayfield Village for under two years.

Question 33 asked respondents how much longer they plan on living in Mayfield Village. The response, shown in Figure 49 on page 76 shows an overwhelming 63.9% of respondents stated that they do not intend to move out of Mayfield Village. The second most popular response was 6-10 years, with 11.5% of the vote. This signifies that residents are content and have little desire to move out of Mayfield Village since a majority responded by saying that they do not intend to move.

Question 34 asked respondents whether they were a homeowner or a renter. Of the 544 question respondents, 94.1% owned their home while only 5.9% were renters.

Question 35 asked respondents whether they planned to own or rent their home in five years. Of the 544 question respondents, 93.4% said they would own their home in five years while the remaining 6.6% said they would rent their home. This is a very slight increase in the total number of respondents who believe they will rent their home in five years compared to the present day.

Responses to questions 34 and 35 are shown in Figure 50 and Figure 51 on page 76.

Question 36 asked respondents how many people are in their household per age group. This data was requested for possible cross-tabulation with other questions.

Question 37 provided space for survey respondents to write-in a comment stating

**Figure 48**

Length of Residency in Mayfield Village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Residency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 2 years</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 years</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 30 years</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 49
Planned Length of Residency in Mayfield Village

- Under 2 years: 2.3%
- 2-5 years: 10.1%
- 6-10 years: 11.5%
- 11-20 years: 8.6%
- 21-30 years: 1.9%
- More than 30 years: 1.7%
- I do not intend to move out: 63.9%

Figure 50
Current Tenure
- Homeowner: 94.1%
- Renter: 5.9%

Figure 51
Rent or Own in the Future
- Homeowner: 93.4%
- Renter: 6.6%
what they think is the greatest strength of Mayfield Village. Of the 456 question responses, the most prominent response was the village's amenities & services. Other common responses were the small size of the village, the overall feeling of safety, the parks & recreation, the school system, and the proximity to the highway and downtown Cleveland.

**Question 38** asked respondents which street they live on in the event it would be beneficial to cross reference against other question responses.

**Question 39** asked respondents to list the one thing they would most like to change, enhance, or improve about Mayfield Village. There were many shared goals within the responses to this question and there were also a few opposing viewpoints. The improvement that appeared the most among the responses was the addition of sidewalks and streetlights to create a more walkable and bikeable community.

There were varying suggestions regarding addition of business and retail to the village. Specifically, residents stated their desire to see a change, enhancement, or improvement to Beta Drive. This includes adding boutique shops, restaurants, and smaller businesses to create a mixed-use area and restoring and utilizing older buildings for new uses. There were also responses opposing this suggestion, stating that they would prefer no more retail and business additions in order to grow and improve the residential aspect of the village. There were also numerous responses suggesting the improvement of the village center by adding retail to the SOM Center Rd & Wilson Mills Rd intersection and completing streetscape beautification.

Regarding the residential areas of the neighborhood, there were also varying opinions on what should be changed. It was stated many times in the responses that there are houses and yards that are not maintained and due to this, there should be a stricter code enforcement. The addition of a home improvement program to assist residents with their own home maintenance was also suggested. Many residents stated a desire to not have rental properties in the village with the concern of housing value decreasing. Some of the senior respondents expressed a need for a retirement facility of smaller apartments for older residents when they become unable to inhabit their homes.

Many responses provided suggestions for enhancements to the community services and amenities of the village. Some residents desired a longer pool season that extends into August and September and pool access fees. The responses also indicated that there is a high demand for more community events that focus on children, teens, and young families, instead of only the senior residents in the village. Many respondents stated that they would like to have a practical recycling program implemented in the village. Another shared response was for the property taxes to either decrease or stay the same.

There are also recommendations to improve the storm drainage and sewer system. Finally, a common response was to not change anything about the neighborhood.

**Question 40** gave respondents the opportunity to write in any comments they have regarding Mayfield Village, its future development, quality of life, services, or other areas or issues they had.

Written responses are included as an Appendix to this document.