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The City of University Heights 2016 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 City policies and planning documents.

In coordination with City officials, County Planning designed, distributed, collected, and analyzed the survey.

WHAT'S IN THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY?

This Executive Summary provides a snapshot of the most important and compelling survey results. The 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 snapshot 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.

City of University Heights
2300 Warrensville Center Road
University Heights, OH 44118
216.932.7800
www.universityheights.com
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The University Heights Survey was completed by 899 households representing 18.2% of those surveyed. All 4,872 occupied households received the survey. The results displayed below highlight each topic area covered.

CITY QUALITIES

Respondents were first asked to select the reasons they reside in University Heights. The top reasons respondents choose to live in the City were its proximity to family and friends, it offers the type of housing desired, respondents feel safe in their community, and that the housing fits their budget. More than 30% of all respondents selected these options.

When asked why one might consider moving out of the City, only 9.9% of respondents said they would not consider moving out of University Heights. The overwhelmingly most common reason for considering moving from the City was for lower taxes (66.7%). Respondents would also consider moving for better schools, a different climate, a larger house, and a retirement friendly community.

LAND USE

The next survey topic covered land use issues. Given a list of statements, respondents were asked if they agreed or disagreed with each. Results showed that more than three-quarters of respondents felt that environmentally friendly redevelopment was important.

A majority of respondents also agreed that the city should focus on attracting different types of commercial businesses and that the majority of their shopping needs can be met by local retailers. They also agreed that the City should focus on mixed-use and walkable redevelopment, promoting more greenspace, and focusing on economic development to attract employment. Finally, a slight majority (51.9%) felt the city had a unique “sense of place”.

A majority of respondents disagreed with the statement that the City should allow more multi-family residential development.

PARKS AND RECREATION

Respondents were asked to rate the quality of the City’s parks and
CITY QUALITIES

Top 3 Reasons for Residing in University Heights:
1. I am close to my family and/or friends (31.8%)
2. It offers the type of housing I want (30.5%)
3. I feel safe in the City/my neighborhood (30.4%)

Top 3 Considerations for Moving from University Heights:
1. For lower taxes (66.7%)
2. For a better school district (35.5%)
3. For a different climate (14.9%)
* I would not consider moving out of the City of University Heights (9.9%)

LAND USE

A majority of respondents agreed with following land use statements:
1. Environmentally friendly development is important (76.6%)
2. The City needs to focus on maintaining/attracting different types of commercial business (73.5%)
3. The majority of my necessary shopping needs can be met by a local retailer (71.1%)

PARKS AND RECREATION

45.6% of respondents rated the overall quality of the City's parks and recreation facilities as good or excellent

44.1% of respondents rated the overall quality of the City's parks and recreation facilities as average
recreation facilities. All three City facilities were rated by a majority of respondents as high quality. The City Pool and Community Park were both rated as highly by over 60% of respondents. However, a significant portion of respondents (44.1%) felt overall park facilities were only “Average”.

When asked about the City adding new parks or open space, a majority of respondents (53.4%) were undecided. Although a majority of those responding “Yes” or “No” responded “Yes”.

TRANSPORTATION

The first transportation question asked about the ease of getting around via different modes of transportation. Over 95% of respondents agreed that it is easy to get around University Heights by car, followed by 85.1% of respondents saying it is easy to get around on foot. A smaller majority, 69.8% said it is easy to get around by bike. Conversely, respondents noted that public transit was poor, with only 27.5% of respondents saying it was easy to get around.

When asked to rate the priority for improvements to these same transportation methods, the highest priority for improvements was walking with 57% of respondents indicating it was a high priority.

Though rated the worst for ease of getting around, public transit only was the lowest rated priority for improvement.

The survey also asked about the priority of transportation improvements that were recommended by the 2015 Warrensville Center Road and Cedar Road Multi-Modal Transportation Study. Respondents prioritized intersection and street improvements and safety enhancements along commercial corridors and intersections on Cedar Road and Warrensville Center Road.

CITY SERVICES

Respondents were asked a series of questions on the City’s current services. The first question asked respondents to rate the quality of 15 services while the second question asked respondents to rate the importance of these same services. A majority of respondents rated 10 of the 15 services as being high quality and all but two services as being high in importance.

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 City to prioritize actions.

Four services were rated as being above 50% in importance while the current quality of these services was rated as below 50%. These services—street maintenance/repair, property maintenance enforcement, the building department, and recreational programs—should be priorities for improvement.

Respondents were also asked to rate the overall quality of services in University Heights. Approximately 71.3% of respondents rated the overall quality of services either good
TRANSPORTATION

Respondents prioritized transportation improvements as follows:

- **Highest priority**
  - Walking (57.0%)
  - Biking (48.9%)
  - Driving (35.7%)
  - Transit (34.1%)

CITY SERVICES

Street maintenance/repair, property maintenance enforcement, the building department, and recreational programs are key services respondents would like to see improved.

More than 71% of respondents rated the overall quality of City services as good or excellent.

HOUSING

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

- Maintain existing housing (90.6%)
- Infill or obsolete & vacant housing (82.3%)
- More options for seniors (54.4%)
- More walkable options (52.4%)
or excellent. Only 5% of respondents rated the quality as either poor or very poor, indicating that respondents are generally pleased with the quality of the City’s services, although there remains areas for improvement.

HOUSING

This section asked about various issues regarding housing in University Heights. The first question asked about the priority for different types of housing. Nearly 90.6% of respondents highly prioritize the maintenance of existing housing and neighborhoods. Infill or redevelopment of obsolete or vacant housing was also indicated as a high priority by over 82% of respondents. Increased housing types for seniors, within walking distance to amenities, and for young families were also high priorities.

Demolition of vacant or blighted housing and stronger enforcement of the rental housing registration requirements were the two highest rated priorities for housing services at over 70% each.

IMPORTANT ISSUES

The survey also asked University Heights respondents about the importance of a series of issues as well as the City’s current effectiveness in addressing those same issues. The results of these two questions were again cross-referenced to better understand how importance and current effectiveness were related.

Respondents rated 4 of the 14 issues as being above average in importance and above average in current effectiveness. They rated three issues as being below average in current effectiveness but above average in importance. These three issues—improving sidewalks, attracting new retail/commercial, and attracting jobs—are areas where the City should focus its attention.

MASTER PLAN PRIORITIES

Respondents were also asked to rank their priority for issues that were identified during the initial phases of the master planning process being undertaken concurrently with this survey.

The highest priority indicated by respondents was planning for the future use and redevelopment of the Wiley School Property at 80.3%. Also of high importance were mixed-use redevelopment of commercial areas, improving City image, and creating commercial development districts with design guidelines.

Cedar-Warrensville and Cedar-Taylor commercial areas were identified as two of the highest priority areas for mixed-use redevelopment. Major corridors were less of a priority.

QUALITY OF LIFE

The survey also asked respondents about the overall quality of life in University Heights. Over 78% of respondents say that their quality of life is either good or excellent.
IMPORTANT ISSUES

The following issues are of high importance to respondents, however the City’s current effectiveness is below 50% approval:

- Improving sidewalks
- Attracting new retail/commercial
- Attracting jobs

MASTER PLAN PRIORITIES

The following four issues were identified as the highest priority for the 2015 University Heights Master Plan:

- Planning for the future use of the Wiley School Property
- Mixed-use redevelopment of commercial areas
- Improving the city image/sense of place
- Creating commercial development districts with design guidelines

QUALITY OF LIFE

78.6% of respondents rated the overall quality of life in University Heights as good or excellent.
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SECTION 1

INTRODUCTION

The 2016 University Heights Survey was an opportunity for public officials to gather the thoughts and opinions of residents. The outcomes of the survey can assist in 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 in later sections of the Results Report.
USING THE FINDINGS

The survey responses will be used to inform public policy, regulations, actions, and implementation goals of the 2015 University Heights Master Plan and future government policy, action, and planning decisions. 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.

The document includes a detailed summary of each topic as well as a description of the individual questions. Some questions have also been cross-tabulated with demographic data to provide a fuller picture of community attitudes. Data is presented in graphic form with additional tabular representations included in Appendix A.

The question numbers are provided for reference throughout the document.
SURVEY TOPICS

The topics covered in the University Heights Survey are as follows:

- **City Qualities**: Reasons for living in or considering to move from University Heights along with an overall assessment of the quality of life in the City, beginning on page 22.

- **Land Use**: Review of development possibilities such as new housing or retail, beginning on page 28.

- **Parks and Recreation**: Ratings and ideas for parks, public spaces, programs, beginning on page 32.

- **Transportation**: Evaluation of the ease and safety of getting around the City by different transportation methods, beginning on page 36.

- **City Services**: Evaluation of City services such as police, fire, and trash removal, beginning on page 42.

- **Housing**: Priorities for types of new housing and housing services, beginning on page 48.

- **Important Issues**: Ratings of issues such as senior services or environmentally friendly development, beginning on page 52.

- **Master Plan Priorities**: Assessment of the priority of issues that have been previously identified in the Master Planning Process, beginning on page 58.
METHODOLOGY

County Planning worked with the City of University Heights to conduct the 2016 University Heights Survey. The goal for the survey was to produce responses that could be used to inform future City actions and policies. Especially in refining the recommendations of the 2015 Master Plan which was in the planning process during the administration of this survey.

SURVEY TIMELINE

The 2016 University Heights Survey began with the collaboration of University Heights and County Planning during the planning process for the 2015 Master Plan update. County Planning worked with University Heights Administration and the Master Plan Project Team to review possible questions, refine them, and add additional questions. The questions were refined and pre-tested to ensure questions and response options were clear. Upon revisions, County Planning reviewed and received approval of the final survey forms that were then mailed to University Heights residents.

A master list of all occupied addresses in University Heights was compiled by County Planning. Addresses were cross-checked with known vacant houses to ensure surveys were not sent to occupied homes. A total of 4,872 households were identified. In order to allow all households the opportunity to respond to the survey, the survey was to be delivered to every address.

To facilitate survey response, University Heights decided to provide return postage on a randomly selected sample of 1,192 addresses. This number was selected to fit within the total budget available for the project.

Other respondents had the option of providing their own postage or dropping completed surveys at University Heights City Hall or the University Heights Public Library. Surveys remained anonymous regardless of the return method.

On March 14, 2016, County Planning mailed the 12-page survey to all 4,872 households. Each packet included an introductory letter from University Heights Mayor Susan Infeld.
The deadline to return surveys via either return mail or at drop off locations was April 15, 2016.

**SURVEY DESIGN**

The University Heights Survey was comprised of 32 questions arranged by topic with a comment section on the last page of the survey.

**RESPONSE RATE**

A major goal of the survey process was to allow all City residents the opportunity to provide their response.

Of the universe of 4,872 surveys mailed, 899 were returned and included in the analysis for a response rate of 18.2%. This equates to a 95% confidence level and a +/- 2.95 statistical error rate.

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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Response Rate and Statistical Error Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2015 Survey</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universe</td>
<td>4,872 Households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailed Surveys</td>
<td>4,872 Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned Surveys</td>
<td>899 Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Rate</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence Level</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margin of Error</td>
<td>+/- 2.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of the survey can be used to determine overall opinions on important issues and topics within the City.

**WHAT’S IN THIS SECTION?**

Answers to individual questions are arranged by topic and are described, displayed graphically, and analyzed in this section.

In addition to analyzing each question individually, questions were also cross-referenced with certain demographic questions to gain a better understanding of how characteristics such as age changed the results.

**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 answers.

The analysis should be understood within the context of the demographic profile of respondents and how it relates to the City as a whole. This information is available in the Demographics Section on page 63.
University Heights is a first ring suburb of Cleveland that is locked between other first ring suburbs. Made up significantly of single-family residential neighborhoods, it also contains significant centers of commercial retail and institutional uses typical of urban areas. This creates a small, but diverse community.

The first questions of the survey asked residents to select their top reasons for residing in the community and any reasons which they would consider moving. The questions provided a list of possible answers including geographic, economic, and social factors.

By understanding those qualities that residents most desire, public officials can work to enhance them.

REASONS FOR RESIDING IN UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS

Question 1 asked respondents why they choose to live in University Heights. The survey provided a list of 16 possible responses and instructed respondents to limit the number of responses to four. Out of the 899 surveys returned, 887 people checked at least one response. Respondents selected a total of 3,155 reasons or approximately 3.5 reasons per respondent.

As shown in Figure 1, the most common reason for living in University Heights was “I am close to my Family and/or Friends,” which was closely followed by “It offers the type of housing I want”. “I feel safe in the City/my neighborhood” and “My housing costs fit my budget” also ranked high and all four received at least a 30% response rate.

With fewer than 10% of respondents, “Quality of the school system”, “My property is a good investment” and “I am close to John Carroll University” were the least common selections.

Generally, there was an evenly distributed response rate for most of the options. Eleven of the sixteen options had response rates over 20% with none higher than 31.8%. This suggests that there is no single factor drawing residents to University Heights. High
response rates for proximity to family and friends as well as places of work and downtown Cleveland, combined with high response for housing and neighborhood safety suggest that University Heights provides a balance of quality, proximity, and affordability that residents desire.

CONSIDERATIONS FOR MOVING FROM UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS

Question 2 asked respondents why they might consider moving out of University Heights as a way to determine potential negative opinions without directly asking. The survey provided a list of 21 reasons residents might consider moving from the City as well as the option “I would not consider moving out of University Heights.”

Figure 1
Reasons for Residing in University Heights
Out of the 899 surveys returned, 899 respondents answered Question 2, with 9.9% selecting “I would not consider moving out of the City of University Heights.” While instructions in the survey asked respondents to not select any additional reasons if they selected that they would not consider moving out of the City, some respondents did select both options. All responses were included in the results.

In total, the 899 question respondents selected 2,502 answers to this question. Of the total, 89 were “I would not consider moving out of the City of University Heights,” leaving 2,413 responses for people who might choose to move out of the City. This is compared to 3,155 reasons respondents selected for why they choose to live in the City in Question 1. This indicates a significantly higher number of reasons residents choose to live in University Heights as compared to reasons for moving.

The results of Question 2, are shown in Figure 2.

The most commonly selected option was “For lower taxes,” which was selected by 66.7%, or two-thirds of all respondents. The large proportion of respondents who selected this reason indicates that taxes are an enormous issue.

Another significant response rate was “For a better school district” at 35.5%. This highlights a continuing contentious issue of school performance, negative perception, and community relations with the Cleveland Heights-University Heights School district. This is a complicated issue as the school district is separate for the City and also is shared with Cleveland Heights. However, as demonstrated with the response, school performance is a major contributing factor for where people choose to live. The City must be willing to cooperate to help increase the performance and positive perception of the school.

Eight other responses were selected by more than 10% of respondents. Following lower taxes, “For a different climate” was the most common reason for considering to move. Importantly, this trait is beyond the ability of the community to control.

Among the remaining reasons, four related specifically to housing or neighborhood characteristics: for a larger house, retirement friendly neighborhood, a newer house, and for a smaller house, respectively. This indicates a desire among respondents for a variety of other housing types to keep them within the community.

Two of the eight responses dealt specifically with the community. “For a safer community,” and “For better community facilities” received over 10%. Both deal with the services and amenities provided for by the City and which the City has responsibility.

“To be closer to family and friends” received an 11.1% response rate. Supporting its importance as a factor for why people choose to live where they do. Unfortunately University
Figure 2
Considerations for Moving from University Heights

- I would not consider moving out of... 9.9%
- For lower taxes 66.7%
- For a better school district 35.5%
- For a different climate 14.9%
- For a larger house 14.3%
- For a retirement friendly community 14.2%
- For a safer community 12.5%
- For a newer house 12.3%
- For a smaller house 11.7%
- To be closer to family/friends 11.1%
- For better community facilities 10.1%
- For more home for my money 9.5%
- For attached condos/clustered homes 8.6%
- For higher quality of municipal services 8.6%
- To be closer to work/job related 8.5%
- For a more rural environment 7.2%
- To be able to walk places 5.6%
- For a rental unit 5.5%
- To have better access to highways 5.5%
- For less traffic congestion 4.4%
- To be closer to Downtown Cleveland 1.3%
- For better access to shopping 0.4%
Heights cannot directly influence this criteria.

REASONS FOR LIVING IN UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS BY AGE

When cross referencing the reasons for living in University Heights by age group, similarities and variations became apparent.

Among those age 18 to 44 years old, reasons for living in University Heights tend to focus on proximity to significant places (work, downtown Cleveland) and housing opportunities and costs. Compared to other age groups there is also more consensus in this group as the top three reasons all had 70% or greater response rates.

Among 45 to 64 year olds, proximity to work and downtown Cleveland were also important, but were not as universal as with 18 to 44 year olds. Feeling safe in their neighborhood becomes much more important to this age group.

For those 65 years and over, proximity to work and other major job centers is much less important and access to safe and pleasing neighborhoods and proximity to family and friends are most important. This information is displayed in Figure 3.

Figure 3
Top Five Reasons for Living in University heights by Age

18 to 44 Year Olds
1. Close to work (90.4%)
2. Housing costs fit my budget (80.2%)
3. Close to family and/or friends (70.2%)
4. Offers the type of housing I want (68.7%)
5. Access to downtown Cleveland (57.6%)

45 to 64 Year Olds
1. Access to downtown Cleveland (62.6%)
2. Feel safe in my City/neighborhood (61.6%)
3. Close to work (60.6%)
4. Housing costs fit my budget (58.2%)
5. Close to family and/or friends (57%)

65+ Years Old
1. Close to shopping (78.7%)
2. Close to family and/or friends (67.1%)
3. Offers the type of housing I want (66.2%)
4. Feel safe in my City/neighborhood (61.5%)
5. Neighborhood is well maintained (60.9%)
**QUALITY OF LIFE**

Respondents were asked to rate the overall quality of life in University Heights. Of the 890 responses to this question, 78.6% responded that their quality of life was either “Excellent” or “Good”. Only 2.2% responded that the quality of life was “Poor” or “Very Poor.”

A significant population of respondents (19.2%) indicated that the quality of life was only “Average.” So while the significant majority of the population find the quality of life in the City to be good, there remains room for the City to seek overall improvement to increase the quality of life for all residents. Increasing the overall quality of life for more residents will help retain existing residents, attract new residents, and maintain strong and thriving communities and neighborhoods.

---

**Major Themes**

- There is a diverse, relatively equal set of reasons attracting people to University Heights with proximity to work and the availability of affordable housing choices as the main drivers.

- The prime reason residents would consider moving is for lower taxes.

- As residents age, the provision of services and safe, quality neighborhoods become more important.
LAND USE

Land use describes the way developers or land owners use their property—for instance, using property for a retail store is a commercial land use while constructing a new home is a residential land use. Zoning codes can be updated to address changing land use needs or new preferences for development.

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

OPINIONS ON LAND USE STATEMENTS

Question 4 asked respondents to agree or disagree with a variety of statements regarding possible future land uses, as illustrated in Figure 5. Seven statements attracted agreement from more than half of respondents.

The land use statement that respondents agreed with the most was “Environmentally friendly development is important,” with 76.6% of question respondents saying they “Strongly Agree” or “Agree” with the statement. This two-thirds agreement indicates a strong and consistent community desire to focus on environmentally friendly redevelopment.

The next most agreed upon statement is “The city should focus on attracting different types of commercial business” at 73.5%. This is supported by the 71.1% agreement on the statements that “The majority of my necessary shopping needs can be met by local retailers.” The response for these statements indicates the importance of maintaining and enhancing local commercial development to serve residents.

Two other statements that have a majority of agreement also support local development or redevelopment. The statements “The city should focus on mixed-use development within walking distance to amenities” and “The City should promote economic development to attract employment” were agreed upon at rates of 68.7% and 64% respectively.

Together, this indicates the desire to promote redevelopment in University Heights.
Heights that employment opportunities and amenities to serve the community.

Respondents also agreed that “That City should promote more greenspace” at 65.6%. This suggest the City is appropriate to pursue projects like its new Community Park.

Finally, “The City has a sense of place that distinguishes it from other cities” received 51.9% agreement. This might be surprising given a common perception of a homogeneous nature of east-side first ring suburbs. This should encourage for the City to investigate the culture and amenities that residents find unique.

In addition, more respondents agreed than disagreed with three statements:

- 45.4% of respondents agreed “The City should allow more townhouses/condos in appropriate locations”
- 43.3% of respondents agreed “Major streets should have decorative elements”
- 41.4% of respondents agreed that “The City should explore expanding alternative transportation options”

**OPINIONS ON LAND USE STATEMENTS BY AGE**

Opinions on land use statements were cross-referenced with the age of respondent. Those respondents answering “Strongly Agree” or “Agree” to a land use statement were grouped and charted by age in Figure 6.

When comparing land use statements by age group, Five statements had a difference between age groups of more than 10%. Of those, only one statement
had one age group in which a majority of respondents agreed with the statement and at least one other age group in which a majority of respondents did not agree. One other question had a response where one or more age groups had a majority of agreement while another age group had less than a majority of agreement. Those two statements are described in further detail below.

*The City should allow more townhouses/condos in appropriate places*

The statement regarding townhomes and condos was more popular with those age 45-64, with 51.3% of respondents agreeing with the statement. Those 65 and older agreed at 49.8%, almost reaching a majority. Those aged 18 to 44 were much less in support of townhomes and condos at just 35.3%. This may signal the preferences for young adults and young families for single-family detached homes while aging families and retirees have preferences for smaller homes and less homeowner responsibilities as they age, children leave the house, and they move into retirement.

*The City has a sense of place that distinguishes it from other cities.*

Response to this question was close in all three age categories with only 7% difference between the highest agreement rate and lowest. It also just barely had a majority of overall agreement with 51.9%.

Those in the 18 to 44 age group and those 65 and over both had a majority of agreement at 55.2 and 53.4 percent respectively. Those aged 45 to 64 only had a 48.2% agreement, just under a majority.

As noted earlier, this result is intriguing as there is often a common perception that many east side communities have little differentiation between them. This might suggest that more differentiation exists among the neighboring communities, or there are potential amenities or areas that can be developed to highlight the community to attract new residents or visitors.

**Major Themes**

- Maintaining, attracting, and developing retail and office uses and employment is important for the future of University Heights
- Environmentally friendly development or redevelopment is important.
- Mixed-use development is an appropriate focus for redevelopment
- Seniors are more interested in expanding multi-family and townhome options while younger residents desire only single-family detached housing
**Figure 6**  
Strongly Agree or Agree with Land Use Statements by Age of Respondent

- Environmentally friendly development is important  
  - 18 to 44 Years Old: 71.7%  
  - 45 to 64 Years Old: 76.7%  
  - 65 Years or Older: 81.8%

- The City should focus on maintaining and attracting different types of commercial businesses  
  - 18 to 44 Years Old: 74.2%  
  - 45 to 64 Years Old: 72.8%  
  - 65 Years or Older: 73.3%

- The City has a sense of place that distinguishes it from other cities  
  - 18 to 44 Years Old: 69.9%  
  - 45 to 64 Years Old: 71.7%  
  - 65 Years or Older: 71.4%

- The City needs to focus on mixed-use development within walking distance to amenities  
  - 18 to 44 Years Old: 64.6%  
  - 45 to 64 Years Old: 71.2%  
  - 65 Years or Older: 69.5%

- City should promote more greenspace  
  - 18 to 44 Years Old: 71.6%  
  - 45 to 64 Years Old: 63.7%  
  - 65 Years or Older: 60.9%

- City should promote economic development that attracts office jobs  
  - 18 to 44 Years Old: 61.2%  
  - 45 to 64 Years Old: 65.9%  
  - 65 Years or Older: 64.0%

- Majority of my necessary shopping needs can be met by local retailers  
  - 18 to 44 Years Old: 55.2%  
  - 45 to 64 Years Old: 48.2%  
  - 65 Years or Older: 53.4%

- Major streets should have decorative elements  
  - 18 to 44 Years Old: 46.7%  
  - 45 to 64 Years Old: 47.2%  
  - 65 Years or Older: 35.2%

- The City should explore expanding alternative transportation options  
  - 18 to 44 Years Old: 37.8%  
  - 45 to 64 Years Old: 42.1%  
  - 65 Years or Older: 43.5%
PARKS AND RECREATION

Parks and recreation centers are important components of a community. They provide space for active living, community interaction, and physical activity. The survey asked respondents about the quality of existing University Heights facilities, and community events.

FACILITY QUALITY

**Question 5** asked respondents to rate the quality of the City’s parks and recreation facilities. Respondents were also given the option to select “No Opinion.” The results, shown in Figure 7, display responses excluding “No Opinion.”

In general, respondents rated most facilities to be of good quality. All three facilities rated over 50% as either “Good” or “Excellent” combined. The City Pool and the new Community Park both had 61.7% as “Good” or “Excellent”. The Community park has not even been completed yet, so it figures that its rating should go up as the park is finished.

A significant portion of respondents also indicated that they deemed the recreational facilities to be “Average”. This is specially true of Purvis Park which had 37.3% respond that it was of “Average” quality, just more than 5% than the respondents rating it as “Good”.

OVERALL QUALITY

**Question 8** asked respondents about their overall rating of parks and recreational facilities. These results, shown in Figure 8, support the respondents feelings in Question 5 that facilities are average in overall quality. Just 2.8% of respondents feel that they are “Excellent” while 42.8% Rate them as “Good”. “Average” was the most common response with 44.1%. Encouragingly, only 8.9% rated them as “Poor” and just 1.4% said they were “Very Poor”.

The responses overall are not surprising based on the initial feedback and discussions during the Master Plan process. The issue regarding facilities may not necessarily be their quality, though the responses show there is
room for improvement. The major issue is the number of facilities available. Unfortunately, there is little to no land available to provide new parks or modern recreational facilities.

When asked about access to recreational programs and cultural offerings, the ratings improve from those of the Facility Quality. Figure 9 shows that overall ease of access to programs is rated as “Good” or “Excellent” by 55.8% of respondents. This most likely reflects efforts to cooperate with neighboring communities and institutions or programming that works to maximize the use of current facilities.
NEW PARKS AND EVENTS

Questions 7 and 9 asked respondents about their desire to see new parks or events added to University Heights. The responses to these questions are shown in Figure 10 and Figure 11.

A significant portion of respondents indicated that they were “Not Sure” if they wanted new parks or greenspace in the City. With 882 total responses, 471, or 53.4%, indicated “Not Sure”.

Of those that answered “Yes” or “No”, 59.4% (just 27.7% overall) said replied “Yes” that they would like to see new parks and greenspace constructed in the City. With the significant number of “Not Sure” responses, it seems any new proposals would need to be vetted through a public process, as overall desire for a project would depend on project design or alternative site development options.

The response to whether residents would want to see new community events in the City a significant portion of respondents replied “Yes”. 44% want to see additional community events where 18.1% were opposed to new events. When “Not Sure” responses are removed, those rates increase to 70.9% and 29.1% respectively. New events should be considered, but should be approached thoroughly and thoughtfully as there remains a significant group who are “Not Sure” if they want new events. Planning and execution of new events would be critical.

### Figure 10
Would like to see new parks or open space constructed

### Figure 11
Would like to see new community events added

Major Themes

- The City’s parks are rated as Average
- There is potential to improve facilities and expand community events
This page intentionally left blank.
TRANSPORTATION

Transportation is a critical component of City governance. The construction and maintenance of roads, bridges, trails, and bike infrastructure are essential for economic development and resident quality of life.

University Heights sought to gather specific input on transportation in the City as well as specific transportation improvements identified in the Warrensville Center Road and Ceder Road Multi-modal Transportation Study completed in 2014. Understanding residents’ feelings about the ease of existing transportation methods as well as community priorities for future investment, the City administration can prioritize actions and funding.

EASE OF TRANSPORTATION

Question 10 asked respondents to indicate whether they agreed or disagreed with statements about the ease of getting around their community by car, public transit, biking, or walking. Respondents were also given the option to select “Not Applicable.”

Respondents overwhelmingly said getting around by car is not an issue, with 95.9% of respondents saying they “Strongly Agree” or “Agree” that getting around by car is easy. All other modes of transportation were lower, with 85.1% of respondents saying getting around by walking is easy and 69.8% of respondents saying getting around by bicycle is easy. Results are shown in Figure 12.

Public transportation had significantly lower response, with only 27.5% of applicable respondents saying getting around by public transit was easy. Significantly, 35.1% of respondents indicated that it was not easy to get around by public transit.

IMPROVING THE EASE AND SAFETY OF TRANSPORTATION

Question 11 asked respondents their priority level for improving the ease and safety of getting around their community by the same transportation methods.

Walking was indicated as the highest priority with 57% of respondents indicating it as either a “High” or “Very High” priority.

Getting around by bike was the second highest priority with 48.9% indicating
that it was either a “High” or “Very High priority.

Consistent with the previous question indicating that it was easiest to get around by car, there were few respondents stating that increasing the ease of getting around by car was a “High” or “Very high” priority; only 35.7%.

However, public transit was given the lowest priority for improvement despite being the least easy to get around with. Only 34.1% of respondents stated it was a high priority. It also received 29.9% of respondents saying it was a low priority. Complete results are shown in Figure 13

PRIORITIES FOR IMPROVEMENTS BY AGE

Priorities for improvements were cross-referenced with the age of the respondent to see how varying age groups viewed transportation priorities differently. The charts in Figure 14 display the percent of each age group that marked improvement priorities by mode as “Very High” or “High.”

The highest priority for improvement was walking among all age groups. Biking was the next highest priority in all age groups except those 18 to 34 and those 75 and over. Car was the second most important priority for both of those age groups.

Figure 12
Opinions on Ease of Getting Around by Transportation Modes

Figure 13
Priority Level for Improvement by Transportation Modes
Figure 14
Very High or High Priority Level for Improvement by Age of Respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Car</th>
<th>Public Transit</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>Walking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 to 34 Years Old</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44 Years Old</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54 Years Old</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 64 Years Old</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 74 Years Old</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 Years and Older</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public transit was the least important priority for age groups 18-34, 45-54, and 65-74. Improving getting around by car was the lowest priority for those in the 35-44 and 55 to 64 age groups. Bike was the least important for those 75 and over.

Those aged 55-64 responded that alternate modes of transportation were of significant importance to them. Walking, biking, and public transit were all identified by greater than 50% of respondents as either “High” or “Very High” in importance to that age group. They were the only group that a majority of respondents indicated public transit as a high priority.

Active transportation such as walking and biking is a significant priority for all residents. Interestingly, public transit seems to gain importance as residents age, although only those 55 to 64 as a majority find it important.

**SIDEWALKS**

**Question 12** asked respondents to rate the current condition of the City's sidewalks. The results, illustrated in Figure 15, show that only 2.9% of the 884 question respondents said the City's sidewalks were in “Excellent” condition. An additional 35.5% said the City's sidewalks were in “Good” condition.

Slightly more than 17% of respondents said the City's sidewalks were in “Poor” or “Very Poor” condition, indicating a need to improve the City's pedestrian infrastructure. This is reinforced by the ranking of improvements to the walking environment as being the highest priority transportation improvement.

**TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS**

In 2015, the City completed a transportation study of its two main corridors along Warrensville Center Road and Cedar Road. It was a multi-modal study aimed at increasing the capacity and safety of all forms of transportation (bike, pedestrian, transit, auto). The study produced specific recommendations regarding intersection improvements, bike lanes and markings, streetscape improvements, and other traffic and safety enhancements. As part of the survey we asked respondents to indicate their priority for the different types and locations of transportation improvements recommended in the study.

Four of the six transportation improvement recommendations identified more than 50% as either a "High" or “Very High” priority.
Multi-modal street intersection improvements along Cedar and Warrensville Center Roads were ranked the highest priority at 58% and 55.4%, respectively.

The addition of marked bike lanes just missed a majority of support with 49.9% of respondents marking it as either “High” or “Very High”.

Complete results are shown in Figure 16.

**Figure 16**
Priority For Transportation Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very High</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-modal street intersection improvements on Cedar Road</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-modal street intersection improvements on Warrensville Center Road</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic and Safety enhancements at Commercial Development entrances and exits along Cedar and Warrensville Center</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape improvements along major corridors</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional marked bike routes throughout the city</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike lanes along Cedar and Warrensville Center Roads</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Themes**

- Respondents are easily able to get around by car
- Respondents would like to see improvements to active transportation modes, specifically walking and biking
- Public transportation is the most difficult means of getting around, but is the lowest priority for improvement.
CITY SERVICES

The City of University Heights provides vital services to residents such as Police and Fire protection. Additionally, the City provides other services ranging from snow and trash removal to running the City website that are necessary to the functioning of the community.

The provision of basic services to residents is an essential component of City governance, and the quality provision of these services is important to economic development and quality of life. To understand how well the City is providing services, the survey asked residents to rate the quality of individual services, the importance of individual services, and the overall quality.

QUALITY OF INDIVIDUAL SERVICES

Question 14 asked respondents to rate the quality of 15 services in the City. More than half of respondents rated 10 of the 15 services positively, with more than 50% of respondents marking these services as "Excellent" or "Good." Emergency services such as Fire protection/EMS and Police protection were the highest rated, with more than 90% of respondents marking these services positively.

The services with the lowest rankings were the city Website and Property Maintenance Enforcement with 41.9% and 41.2% rating this service positively. Street Maintenance/Repair was the lowest with a 39.9% positive rating. Additionally, less than half of respondents rated the Building Department and Recreational Program positively.

In general, emergency and protective services (fire protection/EMS, police protection) and collection services (trash removal and leaf collection) were the highest ranked services.

Transportation related services were mixed with Traffic Enforcement and snow removal, rating positively but street maintenance/repair ranked as the worst.

This information is shown in Figure 17.
**IMPORTANCE OF INDIVIDUAL SERVICES**

In addition to understanding the quality of existing services, **Question 15** asked respondents to rate the importance of the 15 services in the City, and the results are illustrated in Figure 18.

Respondents indicated that emergency services such as Fire Protection/EMS and Police Protection are the most important provided by the City. Overall, five services were ranked by more than 95% of respondents as being “Very Important” or “Important.” An additional five services were rated between 75% and 90% in importance by respondents. Only two services—the City website and City email notifications/Reverse 911—was ranked by less than half of respondents as being “Very Important” or “Important.”

**Figure 17**
**Opinions on the Quality of City 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>51.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police protection</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash removal and recycling</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaf collection</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic enforcements</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park maintenance</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree lawn planting program</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street snow removal</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk snow removal</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City email notifications/Reverse 911</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building department</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Programs</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of University Heights website</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property maintenance enforcement</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street maintenance/repair</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Quality of City Services Chart](chart.png)
In order to better understand the relationship between quality of services and importance of services, the 15 services were plotted on a matrix with one axis displaying the range of quality and the other displaying the range of importance to respondents. The matrix, displayed in Figure 19, shows four quadrants. The dividing lines displaying the location of the 50% rating of importance and quality. The quadrants are described below:

- The **bottom right quadrant (purple)** displays issues of higher than 50% in quality but lower than 50% in importance. These are services that could be improved if the resources and time are available.

- The **bottom left quadrant (red)** displays issues of lower than 50% in quality and importance. These services...
are also services that could be improved only if the resources and time are available.

- The **top right quadrant (blue)** displays services of higher than 50% in quality and importance. These are services that should be maintained.

- The **top left quadrant (light blue)** displays services of higher than 50% in importance but lower than 50% in quality. These are services that could be improved.

For University Heights, street maintenance/repair, property maintenance enforcement, the building department, and recreational programs are critical areas for residents in which services are considered low quality while importance is high.

City email notification/Reverse 911 is just below the 50% mark for importance and just over the 50% mark for quality. It is the only service that was indicated in the high quality, low importance quadrant.

Only the City website was listed as being below average in enforcement and above average in quality.

---

**Figure 19**

Quality-Importance Matrix of City Services
QUALITY-IMPORTANCE MATRIX OF SERVICES BY AGE

Quality and importance responses were also evaluated by age groups. Figure 20 shows priority issues by age group. These are services that have higher than average importance rankings but lower than average quality rankings, indicating that these should be a priority for improvement.

Street maintenance and repair was high across all age groups. Those aged 45-64 and 65 and over were more concerned with property maintenance than were 18 to 44 year olds. Park maintenance was also more important to the 18 to 44 year old age group, possibly due to the more likely presence of young children.

Those issues of secondary priority—areas where the quality of service was lower than 50% and the importance of the service was lower than average—are listed in the boxes in Figure 21. The biggest takeaway from the responses is that younger respondents, those 18 to 44, were more likely to be less satisfied with the quality of service—satisfaction increasing with age. However, older respondents tended to rank the issues as a whole as more important than the 18 to 44 age group.

Figure 20
Higher than Average Importance-Lower than 50% Quality by Age Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18 to 44 Year Olds</th>
<th>45 to 64 Year Olds</th>
<th>65+ Years Old</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Park Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Building department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sidewalk Snow removal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 21
Lower than Average Importance-Lower than 50% Quality by Age Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18 to 44 Year Olds</th>
<th>45 to 64 Year Olds</th>
<th>65+ Years Old</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Property Maintenance Enforcement</td>
<td>1. Building Department</td>
<td>1. Recreational programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Building Department</td>
<td>2. Park Maintenance</td>
<td>2. City email notifications/Reverse 911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Recreational programs</td>
<td>3. Tree Lawn Planting</td>
<td>3. City website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Tree Lawn Planting</td>
<td>4. City email notifications/Reverse 911</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. City email notifications/Reverse 911</td>
<td>5. City website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. City website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OVERALL SERVICES

**Question 18** asked respondents to rate the overall quality of services offered in the City of University Heights.

Generally, respondents rated the overall quality of services as good. Of the 882 question respondents, 12.8% rated the overall quality of services as “Excellent” and 58.5% rated the overall quality as “Good.” This combines to 71.3% of respondents saying the overall quality of services were “Excellent” or “Good.” Only 5% of respondents rated the overall quality of services as “Poor” or “Very Poor,” indicating a significant level of satisfaction with services in the City. This information is displayed in Figure 22.

**Question 19** asked respondents how they felt the overall quality of services has changed in the last five years. The majority of question respondents (55.7%) said the overall quality of services has stayed the same, 26.1% said quality had somewhat improved, and 3.4% said quality had greatly improved.

A 14.9% of respondents said services have declined either “Somewhat” or “greatly. However, a far greater percentage (29.5%) said services have improved. See Figure 23.

---

**Major Themes**

- Improvements to street maintenance, property maintenance enforcement and recreation programs are key areas of importance.
- Overall, respondents rate the City’s services as good, but there is room for improvement in several areas.
HOUSING

Housing is a critical component to a community health. Strong, healthy housing with options to meet a variety of housing needs is important for attracting and retaining residents.

HOUSING PRIORITIES

**Question 20** asked respondents to prioritize nine housing options from “Very High” to “Very Low.” Housing options were selected to describe existing housing types in University Heights and housing that may become more popular in the City. Understanding the housing priorities for existing residents allows the City to use zoning and policy to protect existing neighborhoods or encourage redevelopment where appropriate. The results are displayed in Figure 24.

The housing option receiving the highest priority was “Maintaining existing housing and neighborhoods” with 90.6% of respondents rating this “Very High” or “High” in priority. “Infill or redevelopment of old or obsolete housing or vacant land” was also rated as a very high priority at 82.3% combined.

Four other selections received a majority of respondents marking it as a “Very High” or “High” priority. Those selections were “Increased housing options for seniors looking to remain in the City,” “Increased housing options within walking distance to amenities,” “Increased housing types for young families,” and “More well-designed single-family, detached homes,” with 54.4%, 52.4%, 51.9, and 50.4% of respondents marking these as above average priorities, respectively.

Two options received more responses of “Low” or “Very Low” priority than that of “High” or “Very High.” They were “New well-designed apartments/mixed-use development,” and “More campus oriented housing,” with 42.2% and 54.6% respectively.

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 25.
Detailed Findings

When comparing housing priorities to age, four statements had a difference of opinion of more than 10% as well as at least one group having a majority indicate that it was a high priority. They are described below.

More Housing Options for Seniors

More than any other option, options for seniors had the widest range of opinions. Only 37.4% of respondents age 18 to 44 said this was a high priority. Not surprisingly, 78.9% of those 65 and older said this was a high priority. Those 45-64 also felt strong about this issue with 59.2% saying it was a high priority.

Walkable Housing Options

Older populations also identified housing developments walkable to amenities as a high priority. Those 65 and older desired this the most at 61.3% while those aged 18 to 44 had only a 41% ranking highly important.

More Well Designed Single-Family

On the reverse side, younger residents were more likely to indicate that single-family residential development was a high priority. A majority, 62.9% of 18 to 44 year olds ranked this as a high priority. Just 45.9% and 43.1% of those 45 to 64 and 65 and older ranked it as a high priority, respectively.

Increased Housing Types for Young Families

Younger residents were also more likely to indicate housing for young families as a high priority with 62.2% of those 18 to 44 agreeing it is a high priority.

“Maintaining existing housing and neighborhoods” and “Infill or redevelopment of old or obsolete housing” was highly ranked by all age groups, consistent with overall response.
University Heights Survey Results

Figure 25
Very High or High Priority Level for Housing Policy Options by Age of Respondent

- Increased housing options for seniors looking to remain in the City:
  - 18 to 44 Years Old: 37.4%
  - 45 to 64 Years Old: 59.2%
  - 65 Years or Older: 78.9%

- Increased housing options within walking distance to amenities:
  - 18 to 44 Years Old: 41.0%
  - 45 to 64 Years Old: 54.6%
  - 65 Years or Older: 61.3%

- New well-designed townhouses/condos:
  - 18 to 44 Years Old: 27.2%
  - 45 to 64 Years Old: 43.6%
  - 65 Years or Older: 46.6%

- New well-designed apartments/mixed-use development:
  - 18 to 44 Years Old: 21.8%
  - 45 to 64 Years Old: 28.2%
  - 65 Years or Older: 32.2%

- More well-designed single-family, detached homes:
  - 18 to 44 Years Old: 62.9%
  - 45 to 64 Years Old: 45.9%
  - 65 Years or Older: 43.1%

- Increased housing types for young families:
  - 18 to 44 Years Old: 62.2%
  - 45 to 64 Years Old: 47.7%
  - 65 Years or Older: 46.8%

- Maintaining existing housing and neighborhoods:
  - 18 to 44 Years Old: 91.2%
  - 45 to 64 Years Old: 88.4%
  - 65 Years or Older: 92.1%

- Infill or redevelopment of old or obsolete housing or vacant land:
  - 18 to 44 Years Old: 85.8%
  - 45 to 64 Years Old: 83.1%
  - 65 Years or Older: 77.5%

- More campus oriented housing:
  - 18 to 44 Years Old: 12.7%
  - 45 to 64 Years Old: 17.5%
  - 65 Years or Older: 18.9%
Alternate housing types like townhomes and apartments were more likely to be supported by older populations, though neither reached a majority of support.

**HOUSING SERVICES**

**Question 21** asked respondents about their priority for specific housing services. These would be programs to support housing, homeownership, and rental responsibility. This information is displayed in Figure 26.

The overwhelming majority of respondents indicated that “Demolition of vacant/blighted housing” was important with 85.6% saying it priority was either “High” or “Very High”. “Enforcement of rental housing registration” was also important receiving 72.9 Percent response as “High” or “Very High”.

The two options relating to Rental Property Management Education and First-time Homeowner education were both ranked as high priorities with 65.3% and 58.1% respectively.

Only Stronger or more frequent code enforcement received less than a majority support as a high priority. However it still had a 49.6% ranking as a high priority.

**Figure 26**

**Priority of Housing Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Very High</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition of vacant/blighted housing</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement of rental housing registration</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental property management education</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-time homeowner education</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stronger or more frequent code enforcement</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Themes**

- Respondents are in agreement that maintaining existing housing and neighborhoods is the highest priority.
- The City’s seniors would like more housing options—specifically those that are walkable to city amenities.
In order to assist in prioritizing City actions, the survey asked residents to describe how important a variety of issues were to them. These issues ranged from attracting jobs to ensuring public safety.

**IMPORTANT ISSUES OVERALL**

*Question 22* asked respondents to rank 14 issues on a scale from “Very Important” to “Not Important,” as displayed in Figure 27. Of the 14 issues, “Ensuring public safety” was overwhelmingly the most important among respondents, with 98.3% rating it as “Very Important” or “Important.”

“Improving roads” was almost just as important to respondents as 91.2% selecting this option as important. “Being able to safely bike/walk to amenities,” “Improving sidewalks,” and “Protecting the environment” were also deemed important with 84%, 82.8%, and 80.5 percent, respectively, responding as either “Very Important” or “Important.”

The next two highest rated issues were related to commercial and economic development. “Attracting new retail/commercial” and “Attracting job to University Heights” both had an over 75% response rate as either “Very Important” or “Important.”

All 14 issues received at least a majority of responses as either “Very Important” or “Important.” The least important issues to respondents were “Providing recreational programs,” and “Having a diverse community,” which received combined ratings of “Very Important” or “Important” at 58.7% and 59.9%, respectively.

**CURRENT EFFECTIVENESS OVERALL**

*Question 23* asked respondents to rank the 14 issues on how well University Heights is accomplishing those goals. Only two issues received a majority or respondents who rated the City as doing either an “Excellent” or “Good” job. Those two were “Ensuring public safety” with 76% and “Having a diverse community” with 50.8%.
Conversely, for three issues the number of respondents saying the City was doing a “Poor” or “Very Poor” were greater than those saying the City was doing an “Excellent” or “Good” job. Those were “Attracting new retail/commercial,” “Attracting jobs to University Heights,” and “Providing housing/services for seniors,” with 37.1%, 31.4%, and 25.8%, respectively, saying the City was doing a “Poor” or “Very Poor” job.

The majority issues had the greatest response being that the City was doing an “Average” job.

This information is displayed in Figure 28.
**Figure 28**
**Important Issues by Current City Effectiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring public safety</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a diverse community</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being able to safely bike/walk to amenities</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserving open space/green space</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing home maintenance ordinances</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting the environment</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing the sense of community</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving roads</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing recreational programs</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving sidewalks</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving traffic flow</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attracting new retail/commercial</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attracting jobs to University Heights</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing housing/services for seniors</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPORTANCE-EFFECTIVENESS MATRIX OF ISSUES**

In order to better understand the relationship between the importance of issues and the current effectiveness of the City’s efforts in addressing them, the 16 issues were plotted on a matrix with one axis displaying the range of importance and the other displaying the range of current effectiveness. The matrix, displayed in Figure 29, shows four quadrants divided by lines displaying the average rating of importance and effectiveness for all issues. The quadrants are described below:

- **The bottom right quadrant (purple)** displays issues of higher than average effectiveness but lower than average importance.
- **The bottom left quadrant (red)** displays issues of lower than average importance and effectiveness. These are issues that could be addressed if the resources and time are available.
The top right quadrant (blue) displays issues of higher than average effectiveness and importance. These are issues that are currently being addressed well.

The top left quadrant (light blue) displays issues of lower than average effectiveness but higher than average importance. These are issues that should be addressed.

For University Heights, Improving Roads, improving sidewalks, attracting new retail/commercial, and attracting jobs are areas of critical importance for respondents but that are seen as not currently being effectively carried out by the City.

Additionally, providing housing/services for seniors, improving traffic flow, enhancing the sense of community, and providing recreational services are secondary issues that the City could improve upon, but are not rated as important as the three previously mentioned issues.

Only ensuring public safety received at least 75% importance and above 75% in effectiveness. There is ample room for improvement in most issues and the City will need to pay close attention to the ranking of importance of the issue in approaching these issues.

Figure 29
Important Issues by Importance-Effectiveness Matrix
**IMPORTANT ISSUES BY AGE**

Looking at the intersections of performance and effectiveness by age groups some slight differences the issues The boxes in Figure 30 show those issues that have higher than average importance rankings but lower than average effectiveness rankings—indicating that these should be a priority for improvement.

Results are consistent with the overall response Attracting retail and improving sidewalks and roads important to all age groups, but also perceived as lacking effectiveness. The two younger age groups are most concerned about attracting jobs and where effectiveness is most below the average.

Those issues of secondary priority—issues in which the City's effectiveness was lower than average but the importance of the service was also lower than average—included a variety of issues and is displayed in Figure 31. “Providing housing/services to seniors” was much more important to those aged 65 and over. In fact, it just barely missed meeting exceeding the average measure of importance for all issues and was very high at 79.2%. Attracting jobs was also less important to those age 65 and over. Providing housing for services/seniors was the least priority for the two younger age groups.

![Figure 30](image)

**Figure 30**
Higher than Average Importance-Lower than Average Effectiveness by Age Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18 to 44 Year Olds</th>
<th>45 to 64 Year Olds</th>
<th>65+ Years Old</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Attracting jobs</td>
<td>1. Attracting jobs</td>
<td>1. Attracting retail/commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Attracting retail/commercial</td>
<td>2. Attracting retail/commercial</td>
<td>2. Improving sidewalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improving sidewalks</td>
<td>3. Improving sidewalks</td>
<td>3. Improving Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Protecting the environment</td>
<td>4. Improving Roads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Improving Roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Figure 31](image)

**Figure 31**
Lower than Average Importance-Lower than Average Effectiveness by Age Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18 to 44 Year Olds</th>
<th>45 to 64 Year Olds</th>
<th>65+ Years Old</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Enhancing sense of community</td>
<td>1. Enhancing sense of community</td>
<td>1. Providing housing/services for seniors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Providing recreational programs</td>
<td>2. Providing recreational programs</td>
<td>2. Attracting jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improving traffic flow</td>
<td>3. Enhancing sense of community</td>
<td>3. Improving traffic flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Providing housing/services for seniors</td>
<td>4. Improving traffic flow</td>
<td>4. Providing housing/services for seniors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Providing recreational programs</td>
<td>5. Providing recreational programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Major Themes

- Economic development issues such as attracting jobs and new retail or commercial services is important, but is not perceived as being done effectively by the City.

- Improving infrastructure such as sidewalks and roads is important to all age groups

- University Heights is being successful at ensuring public safety and having a diverse community.
In 2015-2016, University Heights undertook a Master Planning process to update their previous Master Plan which had been completed in 2003. As this survey was being completed during this planning process, the final survey questions were addressed to the priority of issues that had already been identified during the initial process.

Response to these questions, along with the findings from the rest of the survey, will help to further guide and refine policy and action priority.

QUALITY OF LIFE RATING

Question 24 asked respondents to identify the priority of key issues that had been identified through the initial phases of master planning. Twelve issues were identified with a response range from “Very High” priority to “Very Low”. Complete response rates are shown in Figure 32.

Planning for the future of the Wiley School property received the most support as a high priority with 80.3% responding that it was either a “Very High” or “High” priority. It is important to know that the Wiley Property is proposed to be in use over at least the next 10 years as flex space as other schools are being renovated. However, this support shows that it is important for the City to stay on top of this issue and work closely with the CH-UH School Board and the community to plan and build consensus for when it is no longer in use.

Four other issues received over 70% response as either a “Very High” or “High” priority. “Redevelopment of commercial areas as mixed-use,” “Improving City image/sense of place,” “Creating commercial development districts with design guidelines,” and “Improvement of major intersections” received a response rate of 75.2%, 72.7%, 71.6%, and 70% respectively.

Consolidation of services with neighboring cities received significant support with 29.7% of respondents citing it as a “Very High” priority. That is the second highest response rate behind only planning for the Wiley School property. This is encouraging for the growing trend in service consolidation
and regional collaboration going on in Northeast Ohio and nationally.

Only “Increasing City Hall’s on-line presence and accessibility” received less than a majority response as a “Very High” or “High” priority.

**Question 25** asked about the priority of redeveloping certain commercial areas or corridors as mixed-use development (a mix of retail, office, and residential uses in the same development). Respondents were given a range or response from “Very High” to “Low” but were also given the option of responding that “Mixed Use Not Appropriate” if they felt this type of development was not appropriate or desired for that area.
As shown in Figure 33, the Cedar-Warrensville and Cedar-Taylor commercial areas were indicated as either a “Very High” or “High” by 68.6% and 60.9% respectively. 41.5% of respondents indicated that The Cedar-Warrensville area was a “Very High” priority.

The Green Road was a very low priority for mixed-use redevelopment as it received only 38.2% support as either a “Very high” or “High” priority. More importantly, 16.9% ranked it as “Low” priority and 9.6% said mixed use was “Not Appropriate”.

**Major Themes**

- Redevelopment of the Wiley School property is an important issue for the City of University Heights and planning for its future use is a high priority
- Commercial and Economic Development in general are a high priority with mixed-use desired at major commercial areas
- Consolidation of services is supported by a majority of respondents
SECTION 3

DEMOGRAPHICS

The University Heights survey was sent to all 4,872 households in the City in order to allow all residents an opportunity to respond. The Demographics Section summarizes the population that responded to the survey.

WHAT’S IN THIS SECTION?

This section includes the results of the seven demographic questions asked in the Survey. 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 households. 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 report. Over representation or underrepresentation of specific groups can alter overall opinions and should be considered.
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RESPONDENT INFORMATION

AGE OF RESPONDENT

The University Heights Survey asked the heads of households to complete the survey collaboratively. Question 26 asked respondents their age, and for those households that completed the survey collaboratively, the question stated that the respondent who most recently had a birthday should list his or her age. The age of the respondent was compared to 2014 Census data from the American Community Survey for age of householder to determine the extent to which survey respondents aligned with citywide data.

For this question, 887 respondents selected one of the six age groups provided. In all age groups 55 years old and above, respondents were overrepresented as compared to their citywide population while all age groups under

Figure 34
Age of Respondent, 2015 Survey and 2014 ACS Data
55 were underrepresented among survey respondents.

Respondents age 65 to 74 were particularly overrepresented in the survey results, with 19.4% of survey respondents in this age group compared to being only 11.6% of the overall population.

This information is illustrated in Figure 34 and should be taken into account when reviewing the survey results.

**COLLEGE STUDENTS**

With the presence of John Carroll University in the City and the Proximity to Case Western Reserve University and Notre Dame College a question was asked to determine if there was a significant amount of college students represented in the survey response. **Question 29** asked respondents if they were college students.

Only 3.6% of respondents indicated that they were college students. That was a total of 32 out of 889 total responses.

**LENGTH OF RESIDENCY**

**Question 27** asked respondents how many years they had lived in University Heights. In general, survey respondents were more likely to have lived in the City for longer periods of time. Almost 65% of residents indicated they had lived in University Heights for 11 years or more. Only 23.2% had lived in University Heights for five years or fewer, while 27.6% had lived there for more than 30 years, as shown in Figure 35.

**Question 28** asked respondents how much longer they planned to live in University Heights. Of 597 respondents, the largest group marked that they did not intend to move out of the City, with 50.6% of respondents selecting this option. 15.6% intended to move out of the City in the next two years while 21.6% planned to live in the City more than 10 more years. This information is illustrated in Figure 36.
TENURE

Question 30 asked respondents whether they were a homeowner or a renter. Of the 889 question respondents, 90.8% owned their home while the remaining 9.2% rented their home, as shown in Figure 37.

Question 31 asked respondents whether they planned to own or rent their home in five years. Of the 864 question respondents, 90.5% said they would own their home in five years. The remaining 9.5% said they would rent their home. This is an identical response rate as compared to the current ratio of homeowners to renters indicated in Question 30.

When cross-referenced with current tenure, 94.8% of current homeowners see themselves as owning their home five years from now while 5.2% saw themselves as renting. Conversely, 50% of renters saw themselves as switching...
to homeownership in five years while the other half of renters saw themselves remaining renters.

**AGE OF HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS**

**Question 32** asked respondents to indicate the number of people in their household within specific age groups. To determine to what extent the population characteristics of respondent households compared to the City as a whole, this information was also compared to the 2014 Census data from the American Community Survey.

University Heights is predominantly a community of families with children and young adults. The percent of residents under age 18 is nearly a quarter of the City’s total population at 23.1%. The City also has a significant portion of residents aged 18 to 24 (19.3%) and 25 to 34 (14.7%), a possible affect of having JCU within its borders. Middle-aged adults—those aged 35 to 64—make up 31.8% of the population.

The City has lower a percentage of seniors—those aged 65 and older—who make up just 11.3% of the population.

Survey respondents were consistent with the population of the City in regards to children and adults from the age of 25 to 54. Young adults aged 18 to 24 were significantly underreported in households while those aged 55 and older were much more likely to be present than the population as a whole would suggest. This information is displayed in Figure 39.

**Figure 39**  
*Age of Household Members, 2015 Survey and 2014 ACS Data*