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1.0 Executive Summary

The City of Brecksville conducted the 2018 Resident Survey to better understand the community’s position on a variety of important issues and topics. The survey results are intended to be used to inform and guide City policies in conjunction with planning documents.

In coordination with City officials, County Planning designed, distributed, collected, and analyzed the survey results to produce this report.

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 document 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 brief overview of the results and can give a concise summary of the community’s most pressing issues. Use this summary as an overview and refer to the detailed findings section of the results document for additional analysis and context.
Respondents were asked to select the reasons why they choose to reside in Brecksville and for what reasons might they consider moving. The top three reasons respondents choose to live in the City of Brecksville were “I feel safe in the City/my neighborhood,” the “quality of the school system,” and “I have access to highways.” When asked what they might look for in another community if they would ever consider moving from the City of Brecksville, nearly 60.0% of respondents said, “lower taxes,” followed by “a different climate” or “a smaller house.” Younger respondents said they would look for more walkability, better access to shopping, and more property, while older respondents said they would look for smaller homes, single story homes, or retirement friendly communities.

### Top 5 reasons residents choose to live in the City of Brecksville:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe in the City/my neighborhood</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of the school system</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have access to highways</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am close to the Cuyahoga Valley Nat’l Park</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy the suburban environment</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Top 5 community characteristics residents would look for if moving from the City of Brecksville:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For lower taxes</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For a different climate</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For a smaller house</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be able to walk more places</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For a single story/ranch style home</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents were asked their preferred method of receiving information about City meetings, events, projects, and issues as well as the general ease of accessing information. Nearly three-quarters of respondents prefer to receive information from the City through the “Brecksville Bulletin.”

Younger respondents tended to also prefer the “City’s website, social media, and emails,” while older respondents tended to prefer direct “phone calls” in addition to the “Brecksville Bulletin.”

Overall, respondents feel information is made accessible to all residents and they also feel well informed about community programs and events.

**Top 3 preferred methods of receiving information from the City of Brecksville:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Form of Media</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRECKSVILLE BULLETIN</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY WEBSITE</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHONE CALLS</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents were asked to select how often they utilize various park and recreation amenities in and around the City as well as about trail and sidewalk usage. The top three most frequented facilities were the “Brecksville Community Center,” the “Brecksville Reservation,” and the “Cuyahoga Valley National Park.”

Respondents were also asked about how often they ride a bike or walk within the City. More residents said that they tended to walk more than bike, but those that do bike tend to do so for exercise or enjoyment. Additionally, nearly 70.0% of all respondents say that they would walk or bike more throughout the community if the City added more sidewalks and trails.

**Top 3 most frequently used facilities:**

- Brecksville Community Center: 40.1% Use Weekly
- Brecksville Reservation: 36.2% Use Weekly
- Cuyahoga Valley Nat’l Park: 30.3% Use Weekly

**Bottom 3 facilities least frequently used:**

- Ball Fields/ Sports Fields (City Hall): 63.0% Never Used
- Blossom Hill: 53.8% Never Used
- Seneca Golf Course: 50.1% Never Used

**Age group most frequently using each park and recreation facility:**

- **18 to 44 year olds**
  - Brecksville Community Center
  - Blossom Hill
  - Ball Fields/ Sports Fields (City Hall)
  - Sleepy Hollow Golf Course

- **45 to 64 year olds**
  - Brecksville Reservation
  - Cuyahoga Valley Nat'l Park
  - Cuyahoga Valley Scenic Railroad

- **65+ year olds**
  - Seneca Golf Course
Respondents were asked a number of questions about the City's identity and whether or not they agree or disagree with statements about the sense of place, cultural heritage, decorative elements on streetscapes, and City gateways. Over 76.0% of all respondents agree that the City of Brecksville has a “unique and strong sense of place.” Additionally, over 60.0% of respondents also feel that the City should both “preserve its cultural heritage and history” and encourage “decorative elements” on neighborhood streets. Just under half (46.8%) of respondents would like to see “gateways into the City” improved.

Highest agreement on the City of Brecksville’s identity:

- **Brecksville has a unique and strong sense of place**: 76.5%
- **The City should focus on preserving its cultural heritage and history**: 68.2%
- **Neighborhood streets should have decorative elements**: 61.3%
- **Gateways into the City should be improved**: 46.8%
Respondents were asked about a number of transportation and infrastructure questions, rating of general priority levels for transportation enhancements, and the types of improvements they would like to see completed on major streets. The majority of respondents feel that they can “easily find their way around the City with existing signage” and most are in favor of connecting both residential areas and main streets with more sidewalks. Improving the ease and safety of getting around by walking was the most selected transportation enhancement respondents would like to see the City pursue.

Most respondents would like to keep traffic moving along Brecksville Road and Royalton Road, enhanced bicycle safety on Snowville Road, and enhanced pedestrian safety along both Miller Road and Barr Road.

### Highest agreement on transportation and infrastructure issues:

- **I can easily find my way around the City with existing signage**
  - 79.1%
  - Strongly Agree/Agree

- **Connect more residential areas with sidewalks**
  - 67.5%
  - Strongly Agree/Agree

- **Connect more main streets with sidewalks**
  - 67.1%
  - Strongly Agree/Agree

### Highest priority level for transportation enhancements:

- **Spend City resources to improve the ease and safety of getting around by walking**
  - 53.3%
  - Very High/High Priority

- **Spend City resources to improve the ease and safety of getting around by bike**
  - 36.4%
  - Very High/High Priority

- **Spend City resources to improve the ease and safety of getting around by car**
  - 28.1%
  - Very High/High Priority
Respondents were asked their opinions on a number of land use statements for how the City should focus its future development. Over 80.0% of respondents either strongly agree or agree that “environmentally friendly development is important.” Additionally, over 70.0% of all respondents also strongly agree or agree that the City should both focus on “different types of retail/services stores” and “mixed-use development.”

Conversely, only 16.5% of respondents would like to see the City focus on “growing its population.”

Overall, respondents would like to see environmentally friendly development and diversified retail options, mixed with residential housing.

Highest agreement on land use within the City of Brecksville:

- Environmentally friendly development is important: 80.3%
- The City needs to focus on maintaining and attracting different types of retail/service stores: 70.5%
- The City should focus on mixed-use development within walking distance to amenities: 70.0%
- The City should focus on growing its population: 16.5%
Respondents were asked to rate their priority level for various economic development strategies. The highest rated strategy that respondents would like to see the City pursue is “focus on filling vacant storefronts,” which was rated by 83.0% of respondents as a very high or high priority level. The lowest priority as selected by respondents was “attract large national retailers,” which was selected by 67.6% of respondents as a low or very low priority for the City.

Overall, respondents would like to see the City fill existing structures and they would also like to see more diverse, local retail options for shopping. Additionally, any new development should be done so in an environmentally sustainable manner.

### Top 3 economic development strategies with the highest priority for spending City resources:

- Spend City resources to focus on filling vacant commercial storefronts
  - 83.0% Very High/High Priority
- Spend City resources to support the establishment of local businesses
  - 75.2% Very High/High Priority
- Spend City resources to encourage environmentally sustainable development
  - 62.8% Very High/High Priority

### Bottom 3 economic development strategies with the lowest priority for spending City resources:

- Spend City resources to attract large national retailers
  - 13.6% Very High/High Priority
- Spend City resources to promote workforce training programs
  - 19.2% Very High/High Priority
- Spend City resources to focus development on manufacturing/industrial jobs
  - 19.5% Very High/High Priority
Respondents were asked a series of questions about accessing and parking within the Town Center. Overall, respondents feel that parking in the Brecksville Town Center is convenient and easy, but roughly 40.0% of all respondents also feel that “more off-street parking is needed” and that existing parking areas “should be reorganized.”

Respondents also felt that parking areas are safe and that they do not avoid the Town Center due to a lack of parking. Additionally, about 23.0% of all respondents would rather “walk, bike, or take transit” to the Brecksville Town Center.

**Highest agreement on parking within the Brecksville Town Center:**

- **Parking is convenient and easy**: 55.6%
- **More off-street parking is needed**: 40.7%
- **Off-street parking should be reorganized**: 38.3%
- **On-street parking should be improved**: 29.6%
Respondents were asked about various types of housing options and their opinions on priority level and need within the City. Nearly 85.0% of all respondents would like to “maintain existing homes and neighborhoods;” which was the highest rated priority for respondents. The lowest rated priority was for “more apartments in appropriate locations” and was rated as a low or very low priority by 62.7% of all respondents.

Additionally, younger respondents tended to rate “more housing for young professionals” and “more single-family, detached homes” higher than other age groups, while older respondents tended to rate “more housing options for seniors” and “more affordable housing” higher than other age groups.

Top 3 most selected housing types with the highest priority within the City of Brecksville:

1. The City should continue maintaining existing neighborhoods 84.9% Very High/High Priority
2. The City should match the scale and design of existing homes 53.6% Very High/High Priority
3. The City should have more options within walking distance to amenities 49.2% Very High/High Priority

Bottom 3 most selected housing types with the lowest priority within the City of Brecksville:

1. The City should have more apartments in appropriate locations 14.6% Very High/High Priority
2. The City should have more affordable housing 31.1% Very High/High Priority
3. The City should have more single-family detached homes 33.9% Very High/High Priority
COMMUNITY AMENITIES

Respondents were asked to rate the quality and importance of community amenities. The top two highest rated community amenities in terms of both quality and importance were the “Brecksville Reservation” and the “Cuyahoga Valley National Park.” Over 94.0% of all respondents agree that these amenities are of either excellent or good quality and over 97.0% of all respondents also agree that these amenities are either very important or important.

Additionally, respondents also selected the “Seneca Golf Course” as the lowest both in terms of quality and importance. However, while rated the lowest, over 61.0% of respondents still feel that this amenity is of excellent or good quality and nearly half feel it is very important or important to the community.

CITY SERVICES

Respondents were also asked to rate the quality and importance of City services. Respondents agree that “fire protection/EMS” and “police protection” are the highest quality services provided by the City and among the highest in terms of overall importance.

Additionally, respondents selected “commercial maintenance enforcement,” water back up/sewer inspection,” and “housing maintenance enforcement” as the lowest City services in terms of quality, but selected the “City of Brecksville website,” building department permitting process,” and “housing maintenance enforcement” as the lowest City services in terms of importance. Lower rating could largely be due to low usership of specific City services.
Respondents were asked a series of questions about their engagement within the community, overall quality of life, and opinions on funding future projects. Nearly 70.0% of respondents feel engaged within their neighborhood or community and most are involved through a “place of worship or faith community” or through “neighborhood or home owner’s association.” Additionally over 96.0% of all respondents feel that the overall quality of life within the City of Brecksville is excellent or good and that they would recommend others live in the City as well.

In terms of funding future projects, nearly half (48.4%) of all respondents said that they would be likely or somewhat likely to support a tax increase or property assessment and only 38.3% said that they would not. Additionally, 13.2% are undecided and could either support or not support a tax increase or property assessment.
2.0 Introduction

The 2018 Brecksville Resident Survey was an opportunity for public officials to gather the thoughts and opinions of residents. The outcomes of the survey are intended to assist in the Master Plan process and policy formation.

WHAT'S INSIDE

The Introduction Section includes 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, how to read and interpret the data, and how various tabulations were formulated. This information should be used to give context to the detailed results provided in later sections of this report.
2.1 PROCESS & METHODOLOGY

County Planning worked with the City of Brecksville to conduct its 2018 Resident Survey. The goal for the survey was to produce statistically valid responses that could be used to inform City actions, policies, and future planning activities.

SURVEY TIMELINE

The City of Brecksville and County Planning began by drafting possible questions, refining them, and adding follow up questions. These were tested on volunteers to ensure question and response options were clear. Upon revision, County Planning with guidance from the City finalized the questions and received approval to mail surveys to random households.

County Planning compiled a master list of all Brecksville residential addresses and produced a random sample of 1,400 households. Addresses were cross-checked against known vacant houses to ensure the surveys were sent to only occupied homes.

On April 26, 2018, County Planning mailed the 12-page survey to 1,400 households. Each packet also included an introductory letter from Mayor Jerry N. Hruby and a stamped return envelope. A reminder postcard was sent on May 11, 2018, to encourage residents to complete the survey by the May 25, 2018, deadline.

SURVEY DESIGN

The Brecksville Community Survey was comprised of 27 multiple choice questions arranged by topic, four (4) multiple choice and one (1) fill in the blank demographic questions, and seven (7) additional open-ended questions throughout the survey. A short summary of the write-in responses is included within this report, while a complete compilation is available in Appendix A. Additionally, data tables containing the raw survey results numbers as well as calculated percentages for each question in the survey is available in Appendix B. Lastly, Appendix C contains a copy of the final survey form as it was sent to residents.

DATA TABULATION

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

RESPONSE RATE

Of the surveys mailed, 657 were returned and included in the analysis for a 46.93% response rate. With 5,332 households according to the 2016 American Community Survey data, this equates to a 95% confidence level and a +/- 3.58 margin of error.

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 fewer responses within crosstabulated groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Response Rate &amp; Statistical Error Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2018 Survey</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universe</td>
<td>5,332 Households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailed Surveys</td>
<td>1,400 Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned Surveys</td>
<td>657 returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Rate</td>
<td>46.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence Level</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margin of Error</td>
<td>+/- 3.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 SURVEY TOPICS

The survey responses should be used to inform Brecksville’s public policy, regulations, actions, and planning documents.

TOPIC AREAS

As in the survey form, the survey results document is organized by topic area. The document includes a detailed summary of each topic as well as a description of the individual questions. Some questions have also been crosstabulated with demographic data to provide a more complete picture of community opinions.

SURVEY TOPICS

The topics covered in the Brecksville Survey are as follows:

- **Residing in the City of Brecksville**: Overall likes and dislikes about living in the City of Brecksville, beginning on page 26
- **Communication**: Review of preferred ways by which residents receive communication, beginning on page 32
- **Parks and Recreation**: Ratings and ideas for parks, public spaces, and use of sidewalks and trails, beginning on page 34
- **Community Identity**: Ratings of the City’s identity, beginning on page 38
- **Transportation & Infrastructure**: Evaluation of the ease and safety of getting around the City of Brecksville by different transportation methods and ratings of improvements to streets, beginning on page 40
- **Land Use**: Desired types of uses within specific areas and corridors, and ratings on various land use statements, beginning on page 44
- **Economic Development**: Desired economic development strategies and priority areas for focusing economic development efforts, beginning on page 48
- **Brecksville Town Center**: Ratings about getting around the Town Center and ease and convenience of parking, beginning on page 50
- **Housing**: Priorities for new types of housing developments, beginning on page 52
- **Community Amenities**: Ratings about the quality and importance of various community amenities, beginning on page 54
- **City Services**: Ratings about the quality and importance of various City services, beginning on page 60
- **Quality of Life**: Ratings about the quality of life within the City, if residents feel engaged within the community, and if they are likely or unlikely to support a tax increase to fund future projects, beginning on page 66
3.0 Detailed Findings

The results of the survey can be used to determine respondents’ overall opinions on important issues and topics.

WHAT’S IN THIS SECTION

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

In addition to analyzing each question individually, some questions were also crosstabulated with certain demographic questions. This was done to gain a better understanding of how characteristics such as age of the respondent changed various results and corresponding trends.

HOW DO I USE IT?

The information presented in this report may be used by members of the community and community leaders to assess common themes, policies, and opinions important to the respondents as they relate to the City of Brecksville.

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 described in detail in the Demographics Section on page 69.
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3.1 RESIDING IN THE CITY OF BRECKSVILLE

COMMON THEMES

- The main reasons people choose to live in Brecksville were community and lifestyle related and includes safety in neighborhoods, quality schools, and easy access to highways
- Proximity to recreation amenities such as the Cuyahoga Valley National Park and the Cleveland Metroparks was also rated highly as a reason for choosing to live in Brecksville
- The main reasons people would consider moving from Brecksville were tax and retirement related and include lower taxes, a different climate, and a smaller house for potential downsizing
- Nearly 30.0% of respondents would also consider moving to be able to walk more places
- Proximity to shopping was not a main reason people chose to live in Brecksville, however proximity to shopping was more than doubled as a reason to consider moving from the City

The first series of questions asked residents about their reasons for both choosing to reside in the City of Brecksville and for what reasons they would consider moving out of the community. By understanding those qualities that residents enjoy most, public officials can work to enhance them. Similarly, by understanding the various reasons residents would consider moving out of the community, officials can seek to reduce these negative impacts where possible.

REASONS FOR RESIDING IN BRECKSVILLE

The first question asked residents why they choose to live within the City of Brecksville and provided respondents 18 different answers to choose from; respondents were permitted up to four (4) selections total. Out of the 657 returned surveys, 655 respondents selected at least one answer. Respondents selected a total of 2,524 responses for approximately four (4) selections per respondent.

As shown in Figure 1, the most selected reason for choosing to live in the City of Brecksville was, “I feel safe in the City/my neighborhood” (47.9%). This was followed by, “the quality school system” (45.6%), and “I have access to highways” (44.1%). All three of these options were selected by at least 44.0% of all respondents.

The next set of most selected reasons for residing in Brecksville were focused around the community’s natural beauty and proximity to outdoor recreation amenities. With more than 33.0% of respondents, “I am close to the Cuyahoga Valley Nat’l Park” (33.9%) was rated very highly. This was followed by, “I enjoy the suburban environment” (27.8%), “I enjoy the City’s natural environment” (26.9%), and “I am close to the Brecksville Reservation” (24.3%). All of these options were selected by at least 24.0% of all respondents.

With fewer than 10.0% of selections made by respondents, the least likely reasons residents choose to live in the City of Brecksville include, “I am close to shopping” (6.6%), “I enjoy the Brecksville Town Center” (4.4%), “My housing costs fit my budget” (3.7%), and “I inherited my home/property” (3.4%). This data was cross-tabulated by the age of respondents, but no significant findings were identified.

Table 2
Top Five Overall Reasons for Residing in Brecksville

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe in the City/my neighborhood</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of the school system</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have access to highways</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am close to the Cuyahoga Valley Nat’l Park</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy the suburban environment</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Figure 1
Reasons for Residing in Brecksville

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe in the City/my neighborhood</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of the school system</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have access to highways</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am close to the Cuyahoga Valley Nat'l Park</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy the suburban environment</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy the City's natural environment</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am close to the Brecksville Reservation</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am close to my family and/or friends</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My property is a good investment</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The high quality of municipal services</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It offers the type of housing I want</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have easy access to Downtown Cleveland</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My neighborhood is well-maintained</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am close to my work</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am close to shopping</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy Brecksville Town Center</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My housing costs fit my budget</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I inherited my home/property</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONSIDERATIONS FOR MOVING FROM BRECKSVILLE

The second question asked residents what they might look for in another community if they considered leaving the City of Brecksville and provided respondents 23 different answers to choose from; respondents were permitted up to four (4) selections total. Out of the 657 returned surveys, 641 respondents selected at least one answer. Respondents selected a total of 1,958 responses for approximately three (3) selections per respondent.

As shown in Figure 2, the most selected feature residents might look for in another community if they would consider moving was, “for Lower Taxes,” at 59.0%. This was followed by, “for a different climate” (32.6%), “for a smaller house” (30.1%), “To be able to walk more places” (28.2%), and “for a single story/ranch style home” (25.0%). All of these selections were chosen by at least 25.0% of all respondents.

The next set of the most selected features residents might look for in another community if they would consider moving were generally focused around the City’s housing environment and available shopping. With the same number of respondents, both “for better access to shopping” and “for a retirement friendly community,” were selected by 13.9% of all respondents. This was followed by, “for more property” (13.3%), “to be closer to family and/or friends” (12.6%), “for a more rural environment” (11.7%), and “for attached condos/cluster homes” (11.2%). All of these options were selected by at least 11.0% of respondents.

With fewer than 2.0% of selections made by respondents, the least likely reasons residents would consider moving out of Brecksville include, “for a larger house” (1.9%), “for a safer community” (1.4%), and “to have better access to highways” (0.6%).

Table 3
Top Five Overall Moving Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moving Considerations</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For lower taxes</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For a different climate</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For a smaller house</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be able to walk more places</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For a single story/ranch style home</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2
Considerations for Moving from Brecksville

- For lower taxes: 59.0%
- For a different climate: 32.6%
- For a smaller house: 30.1%
- To be able to walk to more places: 28.2%
- For a single story/ranch style home: 25.0%
- For better access to shopping: 13.9%
- For a retirement friendly community: 13.9%
- For more property: 13.3%
- To be closer to family and/or friends: 12.6%
- For a more rural environment: 11.7%
- For attached condos/clustered homes: 11.2%
- For a newer house: 9.8%
- For a more diverse community: 7.6%
- To be closer to work/job related: 7.0%
- For better community facilities: 6.1%
- For less traffic congestion: 5.0%
- For a rental unit: 4.2%
- For a more urban environment: 4.1%
- For a higher quality of municipal services: 3.9%
- For a better school district: 2.3%
- For a larger house: 1.9%
- For a safer community: 1.4%
- To have better access to highways: 0.6%
CONSIDERATIONS FOR MOVING FROM BRECKSVILLE BY AGE OF RESPONDENT

When crosstabulated with the age of respondents, Figure 3 shows the number one attribute that residents would look for in another community if they would consider moving out of the City of Brecksville was, “lower taxes.” This was the most selected option amongst all respondents and age groups.

Respondents ages 18 to 44 could be considered the most active age group within the community. These respondents would like, “to be able to walk more places” and have “better access to shopping.” Additionally they would also consider moving for “more property” or a “different climate,” which isn’t something the City can necessarily control. Overall, this age group would like a walkable community with interactive retail spaces.

Respondents ages 45 to 64 are predominantly working age adults and are approaching retirement. This age group commonly has grown children and are looking towards the near future with a focus on lifestyle; which will play a large role in where they decide to live. Over 35.0% of respondents ages 45 to 64 would consider moving “for a different climate” (35.7%). Additionally, this age group would also consider moving “for a smaller house,” “to be able to walk more places,” or “for a single story/ranch style home.” As this group is approaching retirement, these respondents likely want to limit their monthly costs by downsizing and doing so within a single story home to accommodate smaller households and aging family members.

Respondents ages 65+ are at retirement age or in their senior years. Similar to the 45 to 64 age group, the 65+ age group would consider moving out of the City of Brecksville “for a smaller house,” “for a different climate,” or “for a single story/ranch style home.” Additionally, over 25.0% of respondents ages 65+ would consider moving out of the City of Brecksville for a more “retirement friendly community” (25.4%).

### Table 4
Top Five Moving Considerations, 18 to 44

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moving Considerations</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For lower taxes</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be able to walk more places</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For better access to shopping</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For more property</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For a different climate</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5
Top Five Moving Considerations, 45 to 64

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moving Considerations</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For lower taxes</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For a different climate</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For a smaller house</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be able to walk more places</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For a single story/ranch style home</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6
Top Five Moving Considerations, 65+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moving Considerations</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For lower taxes</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For a smaller house</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For a different climate</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For a single story/ranch style home</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For a retirement friendly community</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3
Considerations for Moving from Brecksville by Age of Respondent
3.2 COMMUNICATION

COMMON THEMES

- The main form of media from which residents prefer to receive information is the “Brecksville Bulletin”
- The majority of respondents feel that information from the City is easily accessible to all residents
- Less than half of residents agree that the City’s website is easy to use, despite being the second highest form of media from which residents prefer to receive information from the City

The second series of questions asked residents about the City’s communication efforts as well as the methods by which they prefer to receive their information. By understanding how people prefer to receive information, efforts can be made to enhance those methods which prove to be most successful and improve upon other areas that may be falling short of reaching the intended audience.

PREFERRED METHOD OF RECEIVING INFORMATION

The third question asked residents which form of media they prefer to receive information from the City. As shown in Figure 4, the vast majority of respondents prefer to receive information from the City through the “Brecksville Bulletin” (72.3%). This was followed by the “City website” (18.3%), “phone calls” (10.9%), and “social media” (9.0%). Additionally, 8.9% of total respondents selected, “other,” which predominantly included email and word of mouth as written-in responses for the fourth question.

Conversely, older respondents tended to be more inclined towards mailings such as the “Brecksville Bulletin” (82.8%) and direct “phone calls” (16.8%).

OPINIONS ON THE CITY’S COMMUNICATION

The fifth question asked residents whether they agree or disagree with various statements about the City’s communication. As shown in Figure 6, nearly 80.0% of all respondents either strongly agree or agree that, “information is accessible to all residents” (79.1%). This was followed closely by, “I feel well informed about community programs and events,” at 75.3% of respondents. Additionally, less than half of all respondents either strongly agree or agree that the City’s website is “easy to use for accessing information” (49.2%), and this selection also had the highest percentages of respondents that either disagree (12.5%) or strongly disagree (2.3%) with the same statement.

WRITTEN COMMENTS | FOURTH QUESTION

The fourth question asked respondents to indicate their preferred form of media for receiving information from the City if it was anything other than the city website, social media, phone calls, or the Brecksville Bulletin. While only 7% of total survey respondents provided comments, nearly 59% of them indicated e-mail as their preferred form of media, and another 13% indicated the local newspaper as their preferred form. The remainder noted mailings or flyers, text messages, friends, and the Sun Press as their preferred form of media for receiving information.
Figure 4
Preferred Method of Receiving Information

- "Brecksville Bulletin" 72.3%
- City Website 18.3%
- Phone Calls 10.9%
- Social Media 9.0%
- Other 8.9%

Figure 5
Preferred Method of Receiving Information by Age of Respondent

- Other
  - 18 to 44: 8.6%
  - 45 to 64: 15.9%
  - 65+: 20.4%
- Social Media
  - 18 to 44: 8.2%
  - 45 to 64: 24.8%
  - 65+: 3.5%
- Phone Calls
  - 18 to 44: 8.2%
  - 45 to 64: 16.8%
  - 65+: 3.5%
- City Website
  - 18 to 44: 20.4%
  - 45 to 64: 22.1%
  - 65+: 12.9%
- "Brecksville Bulletin"
  - 18 to 44: 68.2%
  - 45 to 64: 58.4%
  - 65+: 82.8%

Figure 6
Opinions on City Communication

- The City makes information accessible to all residents
  - Strongly Agree 24.7%
  - Agree 54.4%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree 12.8%
  - Disagree 7.1%
- I feel well informed about community programs and events
  - Strongly Agree 23.1%
  - Agree 52.2%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree 16.6%
  - Disagree 7.2%
- The City’s website is easy to use for accessing information
  - Strongly Agree 10.3%
  - Agree 38.9%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree 36.1%
  - Disagree 12.5%
- The City has an active and informative presence on social media
  - Strongly Agree 7.1%
  - Agree 20.1%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree 60.0%
  - Disagree 11.8%
3.3 PARKS & RECREATION

COMMON THEMES
- The Brecksville Community Center and the nearby Brecksville Reservation and Cuyahoga Valley National Park are the most frequented amenities amongst respondents
- The sports fields located behind City Hall are the least used recreation space among respondents; this is followed closely by Blossom Hill and the Cleveland Metroparks golf courses
- More residents tend to walk than bike within the community, but respondents would walk and/or bike more if additional sidewalks and trails were installed

The third series of questions asked residents about City owned and neighboring park systems and recreation areas. By better understanding how and why residents use specific recreation areas, funds, partnerships, and various enhancement efforts can be better planned and executed.

USAGE FREQUENCY OF PARK AND RECREATION FACILITIES

The sixth question asked residents how often they use various parks and recreation facilities available to the community. As shown in Figure 7, the most frequently used park and recreation facility was the Brecksville Community Center, with 40.1% of respondents using this facility on a weekly basis. This was followed by two of the regional park systems in the area: the Brecksville Reservation, where 36.2% of respondents use this park on a weekly basis; and the Cuyahoga Valley National Park, where 30.3% of respondents use this park on a weekly basis.

There is an immediate drop off in the number of respondents that use the remaining facilities on a weekly basis. Over 60.0% of all respondents have never used the, “Ball Fields/Sports Fields (Behind City Hall, 63.0%)” and 53.8% have not used the various facilities at, “Blossom Hill.” Additionally, while the Brecksville Reservation ranked very high in weekly and monthly use, 46.8% of respondents have never used the Sleepy Hollow Golf Course and 50.1% have never used the Seneca Golf Course, which are both part of the larger Cleveland Metroparks system.

USAGE FREQUENCY OF PARK AND RECREATION FACILITIES BY AGE OF RESPONDENT

When crosstabulated with the age of respondents, Figure 8 shows that the Brecksville Community Center, the Brecksville Reservation, and the Cuyahoga Valley National Park were the top three (3) most frequented park and recreation facilities by respondents regardless of age.

Younger respondents ages 18 to 44 tended to use Blossom Hill, the ball fields behind City Hall, and the Sleepy Hollow Golf Course more frequently than other age groups.

Respondents ages 45 to 64 tended to also use Blossom Hill, the ball fields behind City Hall, and the Sleepy Hollow Golf Course more frequently than those aged 65+, but they also used the Seneca Golf Course and the Cuyahoga Valley Scenic Railroad more frequently than other age groups as well.

Conversely, respondents ages 65 years and older tended to use the Sleepy Hollow Golf Course at a similar rate when compared to other age groups, but this age group also had the most frequent userhip at the Seneca Golf Course.

While each individual age group had the highest usership in at least one of the listed park and recreation facilities, the overall highest usership amongst all respondents remains the Brecksville Community Center, the Brecksville Reservation, and the Cuyahoga Valley National Park.
**Figure 7**
Usage Frequency of Park & Recreation Facilities

**Figure 8**
Use of Park & Recreation Facilities at Least Once a Week by Age of Respondent
USAGE FREQUENCY AND REASONS FOR BIKING OR WALKING THROUGHOUT THE COMMUNITY

The seventh question asked residents how frequently they walk or bike throughout the community. Over 50.0% of all respondents say that they walk at least weekly within the community (52.6%). However, only 19.5% of respondents say that they bike at least weekly within the community.

The eighth question then asked residents if they do ride a bike in the City, for what purpose do they typically do so within the community. Nearly 70.0% of respondents say that they do so for, “Recreation/Exercise (68.9%).” This was followed by, “Enjoyment/Pleasure,” at 58.9%. Less than 5.0% of all respondents say that they ride a bike within the community for means other than recreation. With enhanced and improved connectivity, additional residents could feel more comfortable riding bikes for daily tasks; such as commuting to work or small shopping trips.

The ninth question asked residents if the City added additional sidewalks and trails, would they walk or bike more within the community. Nearly 70.0% of all respondents said that if the City installed more sidewalks and trails, that they would walk or bike more within the community (68.4%). With improved connectivity residents and visitors alike could enjoy and explore the community on comfortable and safe routes at their own pace.

Conversely, fewer respondents say that they ride a bike at least once a week within the community. The highest percentage of those that ride a bike at least once a week were those age 45 to 64 (26.9%). This was followed closely by 18 to 44 year olds at 24.3%. There was a large drop in weekly bike ridership among those aged 65 years or older; only 9.3% say that they ride a bike weekly.

Additionally, Figure 13 shows that the majority of respondents would ride a bike or walk more within the community if more sidewalks or trails were installed throughout the City regardless of age. Over 80.0% of respondents aged 18 to 44 (83.0%) say that they would bike or walk more within the community, followed by 75.1% of those aged 45 to 64, and 53.9% of those aged 65 years or older.

USAGE FREQUENCY AND REASONS FOR BIKING OR WALKING THROUGHOUT THE COMMUNITY BY AGE OF RESPONDENT

When crosstabulated with the age of respondents, Figure 12 shows that residents tend to walk more within the community than bike. Nearly 50.0% of all age groups say that they walk at least once a week within the community. Those aged 45 to 64 (54.9%) tend to walk the most throughout the City, followed by 18 to 44 year olds (50.4%), and those aged 65 years or older (49.6%).

Additional, Figure 13 shows that the majority of respondents would ride a bike or walk more within the community if more sidewalks or trails were installed throughout the City regardless of age. Over 80.0% of respondents aged 18 to 44 (83.0%) say that they would bike or walk more within the community, followed by 75.1% of those aged 45 to 64, and 53.9% of those aged 65 years or older.

USAGE FREQUENCY AND REASONS FOR BIKING OR WALKING THROUGHOUT THE COMMUNITY BY LENGTH OF RESIDENCY

When crosstabulated with the length of residency of respondents, Figure 14 shows a similar trend when compared to the age of respondents. Overall, the majority of respondents, regardless of how long they have lived within the City, would bike or walk more within the community if additional sidewalks or trails were installed throughout the City. Respondents that have lived within the City under 10 years (82.2%) are more likely to bike or walk more in the community, followed by those that have lived in the community for 11 to 30 years (69.8%), and those that have lived in the community for over 30 years (54.4%). This indicates that not only younger residents, but also newer residents are looking for more biking and walking options within the community.
### Figure 9
Frequency of Walking & Biking in the City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>A Few Times a Week</th>
<th>Once a Week</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walk in the City</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ride a Bike in the City</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 10
Reasons for Riding a Bike within the City of Brecksville

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreation/Exercise</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment/Pleasure</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute to Work</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 11
Would Walk or Bike More if the City Added Additional Sidewalks and Trails

- No: 31.6%
- Yes: 68.4%

### Figure 12
Ride a Bike or Walk at Least Once a Week Within the Community by Age of Respondent

**BIKE**

- 18 to 44: 24.3%
- 45 to 64: 26.9%
- 65+: 9.3%

**WALK**

- 18 to 44: 50.4%
- 45 to 64: 54.9%
- 65+: 49.6%

### Figure 13
Would Walk or Bike More if the City Added Additional Sidewalks and Trails by Age of Respondent

- 18 to 44: 83.0%
- 45 to 64: 75.1%
- 65+: 53.9%

### Figure 14
Would Walk or Bike More if the City Added Additional Sidewalks and Trails by Length of Residency

- Under 10 Years: 82.2%
- 11-30 Years: 69.8%
- 30+ Years: 54.4%
3.4 COMMUNITY IDENTITY

COMMON THEMES
- Respondents overwhelmingly agree that the City of Brecksville has a strong sense of place.
- Respondents would like to see a greater focus on preserving its cultural heritage.
- Gateway enhancements into the City were considered a lower priority for respondents.

The fourth series of questions asked residents about the City's identity and physical character. By better understanding how residents feel about the overall essence of the community, efforts can be made to both enhance the City's aesthetic appeal and preserve its cultural heritage.

OPINIONS ON THE CITY'S IDENTITY

The tenth question asked residents their opinions on various statements about the City of Brecksville's community identity. As seen in Figure 15, 76.5% of respondents either strongly agree or agree that the City has “a strong sense of place.” Additionally, 68.2% of respondents also feel that the City should “focus on preserving its cultural heritage and history” and 61.3% of respondents feel that “neighborhood streets should have decorative elements.”

Conversely, just under half of respondents either strongly agree or agree that “gateways into the City should be improved” (46.8%). This statement also had the highest percentage of respondents neither agreeing or disagreeing, disagreeing, or strongly disagreeing. This could indicate that gateway enhancements and improvements may not be a main priority that residents are presently concerned about.

Knowing that residents admire the look and feel of the community and that they also want to see more efforts made in preserving its cultural heritage, the City should continue to not only maintain a strong sense of place, but also incorporate its cultural story whenever possible.
**Figure 15**
Opinions on the City’s Identity

- **Brecksville has a unique and strong sense of place**
  - Strongly Agree: 32.9%
  - Agree: 43.6%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 17.9%
  - Disagree: 11.0%
  - Strongly Disagree: 6.4%

- **Focus on preserving its cultural heritage and history**
  - Strongly Agree: 29.0%
  - Agree: 39.2%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 24.3%
  - Disagree: 6.4%

- **Neighborhood streets should have decorative elements**
  - Strongly Agree: 24.6%
  - Agree: 36.7%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 26.1%
  - Disagree: 11.0%

- **Gateways into the City should be improved**
  - Strongly Agree: 15.4%
  - Agree: 31.4%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 36.0%
  - Disagree: 14.8%
3.5 TRANSPORTATION & INFRASTRUCTURE

COMMON THEMES

- Majority of respondents agree that existing wayfinding signage is easy to use
- More than half of respondents would like better sidewalk connections into neighborhoods and to main streets within the City
- Less than half of respondents consider biking enhancements as a high priority
- Most respondents would like to keep traffic moving on Royalton and Brecksville Roads, improve bicycle safety on Snowville Road, and improve pedestrian safety along Miller and Barr Roads

The fifth series of questions asked residents about the City’s transportation and infrastructure networks. By better understanding how residents feel about connectivity, accessibility, and transportation needs, efforts can then be made to prioritize future projects and allocate funds appropriately.

OPINIONS ON CITY TRANSPORTATION & INFRASTRUCTURE

The eleventh question asked residents their opinions on various statements regarding the City’s transportation and infrastructure networks. As shown in Figure 16, nearly 80.0% of respondents either strongly agree or agree that they “can easily find their way around the City with existing signage” (79.1%). This was followed closely by “connect more residential areas with sidewalks” (67.5%) and “connect more main streets with sidewalks” (67.1). Additionally, connecting more residential areas and main streets with sidewalks both had the highest overall ratings of respondents that Strongly Agree with those statements as well.

Conversely, 59.4% of respondents either disagree or strongly disagree that they, “would be willing to pay an assessment for sidewalk installation.” This was followed by, “I have experienced flooding in my home and/or yard,” with 57.4% of respondents saying that they Disagree or Strongly Disagree with this statement as well. However, 35.4% of respondents strongly agree or agree that they have experienced flooding in their home and/or yard.

PRIORITY FOR TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENTS

The twelfth question asked residents to rank their priorities for transportation enhancements involving three modes of transportation: cars, bikes, and walking. As shown in Figure 17, 53.3% of respondents ranked “improving the ease and safety of getting around by walking,” as very high or high. This was followed by “improving the ease and safety of getting around by bike,” which 36.4% of respondents ranked this as very high or high. However, 37.0% of respondents also ranked this as low or very low. This indicates a relatively even split among the community for support of bicycle enhancements throughout the City. The lowest priority as ranked by respondents was “improving the ease and safety of getting around by car,” with only 28.1% of respondents saying this should be a very high or high priority for the City.

PRIORITY FOR TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENTS BY AGE OF RESPONDENT

When crosstabulated with the age of respondents, Figure 18 shows that most respondents feel that “walking” enhancements should be the highest priority for the City. About 40.0% of respondents ages 18 to 44 would like to see “car” (38.9%) and “bike” (40.7%) enhancements. However, 44.1% of respondents ages 45 to 64 would like to see “bike” enhancements, but only 24.4% would like to see “car” enhancements. Respondents ages 65 years and older were the only age group that would prefer “car” (27.6%) enhancements over “bike” (24.9%) enhancements.
Figure 16
Opinions on City Transportation & Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I can easily find my way around the City with existing signage</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect more residential areas with sidewalks</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect more main streets with sidewalks</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City has a good program for street maintenance</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing infrastructure cannot control roadway runoff</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have experienced flooding in my home and/or yard</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails and bikeways can get me where I need to go</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be willing to pay an assessment for sidewalk installation</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 17
Priority Level for Transportation Enhancements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enhancement</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 around by walking</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the ease and safety of getting around by bike</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the ease and safety of getting around by car</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 18
Very High or High Priority Level for Transportation Enhancements by Age of Respondent
PREFERRED TYPE OF TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT BY STREET

The thirteenth question asked residents to select the types of improvements that they would like to see on a number of roadways throughout the community. As shown in Figure 19, respondents were asked to select from five (5) transportation enhancements for Royalton Road, Brecksville Road, Snowville Road, Miller Road, and Barr Road. These enhancements included safer for bikes, safer for walking, easier access to transit, more attractive streets, and keeping traffic moving.

Nearly 40.0% of all respondents would like to “keep traffic moving” (39.4%) along Royalton Road. This was ranked as the highest percentage among all other roadways and transportation improvement options. Brecksville Road had the second highest percentage of respondents wanting to “keep traffic moving” 27.7%. However, “safer for walking” and safer for bikes” was selected by at least 20.0% of respondents for both of these roadways as well.

With safety improvements for bikes and walking ranking as the top two options, Snowville Road, Miller Road, and Barr Road all shared similar trends amongst each other. The most selected option for Miller Road (30.7%) and Barr Road (39.3%) was “safer for walking,” with “safer for bikes” following closely behind. Snowville Road had a slightly higher percentage of respondents selecting “safer for bikes” (36.5%) over “safer for walking (32.5%), but both were rated very high when compared to other enhancement options.

Additionally, all roadway options followed the same trend for “easier access to transit” and “more attractive streets.” Both of these categories were selected by respondents the least, with “easier access to transit” being the lowest. “Easier access to transit” was selected the most by respondents for Miller Road (6.4%) and “more attractive streets” was selected by the most respondents for Brecksville Road (15.7%), but was followed closely by Miller Road (14.1%) and Royalton Road (13.0%).

While not a specified roadway option within the survey, there were also a number of written responses that would like to see both bicycle and pedestrian safety improvements along Fitzwater Road.
Figure 19
Preferred Type of Transportation Improvement by Street

ROYALTON ROAD

Safer for Bikes: 20.0%
Safer for Walking: 23.4%
Easier Access to Transit: 4.2%
More Attractive Streets: 13.0%
Keeping Traffic Moving: 39.4%

BRECKSVILLE ROAD

Safer for Bikes: 25.3%
Safer for Walking: 27.5%
Easier Access to Transit: 3.8%
More Attractive Streets: 15.7%
Keeping Traffic Moving: 27.7%

SNOWVILLE ROAD

Safer for Bikes: 36.5%
Safer for Walking: 32.5%
Easier Access to Transit: 4.0%
More Attractive Streets: 10.2%
Keeping Traffic Moving: 16.8%

MILLER ROAD

Safer for Bikes: 25.8%
Safer for Walking: 30.7%
Easier Access to Transit: 6.4%
More Attractive Streets: 14.1%
Keeping Traffic Moving: 23.0%

BARR ROAD

Safer for Bikes: 30.8%
Safer for Walking: 39.3%
Easier Access to Transit: 3.0%
More Attractive Streets: 8.6%
Keeping Traffic Moving: 18.2%
3.6 LAND USE

COMMON THEMES

- There is a high desire for mixed-use along main corridors and developable land along Miller Road
- Respondents want to see parks, open space, or general greenery as part of development
- Majority of respondents say environmentally friendly development is important
- Respondents say that the main type of development the City should focus on is a diversity of retail and mixed-use development
- Over 40.0% of all respondents would like to see retail concentrated within the Brecksville Town Center
- Most respondents do not want the City to focus on growing its population

The sixth series of questions asked residents about the use of land within the City. By better understanding what residents would like to see in specific areas of the community, efforts and plans can be made to attract specific types of businesses, modify code and ordinance language, or initiate new zoning designations.

PREFERRED TYPES OF LAND USES BY AREA

The fourteenth question asked residents to select the types of land uses that they would like to see at seven (7) different locations within the City of Brecksville. These land use options included mixed-use, retail, office, housing, industrial, and parks.

As shown in Figure 20, “Mixed-Use” was the most selected type of use for Brecksville Road North of Royalton Road (30.1%), the Veterans Affairs Site (29.9%), Brecksville Road South of Royalton Road (29.6%), and Miller Road (24.5%). Also, these locations tend to be more commercially focused, but respondents also would like to see residential uses in these areas as well, the desire for walkability and the “Live. Work. Play” concept is very high; especially along Miller Road. Additionally, “Parks” and generally open space was selected by at least 9.0% of all respondents for each of the seven (7) total locations. Overall respondents would like to see “Parks” be integrated into all areas of the community.

Conversely, there were two locations where, “Housing” was selected as the predominant use for particular areas; Snowville Road (37.0%) and Barr Road (58.0%). Additionally, these two locations also had the highest selections made for, “Parks.” As respondents highly value the residential nature and greenery in these areas, efforts should be made to ensure these locations are protected and that any negative effects of development are reduced as much as possible.

However, while the most selected type of use on Snowville Road was, “Housing,” it also tied for the highest percentage of respondents selecting, “Industrial” as the type of use that they would like to see in this area. Both Snowville Road and Miller Road received 11.2% of respondents selecting this type of use for these locations. Careful planning and considerations would need to be made to ensure these two types of uses do not negatively impact each other.
Figure 20
Preferred Types of Land Uses by Area

BRECKSVILLE TOWN CENTER

BRECKSVILLE ROAD NORTH OF ROYALTON ROAD
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3.6

OPINIONS ON LAND USE STATEMENTS

The fifteenth question asked residents their opinions on various land use statements and what the City should focus on in terms of future growth. As shown in Figure 21 over 80.0% of respondents strongly agree or agree that “environmentally friendly development is important” (80.3%). This was followed closely by “focus on different types of retail/service stores” (70.5%) and “focus on mixed-use development” (70.0%), indicating that vibrant retail areas are important to residents.

Conversely, over half of all respondents either disagree or strongly disagree that the City should “focus on growing its population” (51.7%).

STRONGLY AGREE OR AGREE ON LAND USE STATEMENTS BY AGE OF RESPONDENT

When crosstabulated with the age of respondents, Figure 22 shows overwhelmingly that residents do not want the City to “focus on growing its population.” This rated as the lowest selection across all age groups when compared to other options, but was rated highest amongst 18 to 44 year olds (23.9%).

Overall, the highest selected option was “environmentally friendly development is important,” which was selected by at least 78.0% of each age group. This is important to note because the City faces significant development constraints due to topographical issues that could cause hillside failures, flooding, or erosion of soils.
Figure 21
Opinions on Land Use Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmentally friendly development is important</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on different types of retail/service stores</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on mixed-use development</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on growing the City's population</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 22
Strongly Agree or Agree on Land Use Statements by Age of Respondent
3.7 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

COMMON THEMES
- Majority of respondents would like the City to focus on filling currently vacant commercial storefronts and supporting local businesses
- Would like to see both development and redevelopment occur in an environmentally sustainable manner
- Large number of respondents would like the City to diversify its retail presence
- Most respondents place attracting large national retailers as a low or very low priority for the City

The seventh series of questions asked residents about the City’s economic development strategies. By better understanding how residents perceive economic development, the City can prioritize future development projects and work to enhance current programs, add new outreach efforts, or attract new types of businesses to the community.

PRIORITY LEVEL FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES

The sixteenth question asked residents to rank their priority levels for various economic development strategies the City might undertake. As shown in Figure 23, the highest ranking strategy was for the City to “focus on filling vacant commercial storefronts,” which 83.0% of respondents ranked as very high or high. This was followed closely by “support the establishment of local businesses” (75.2%), “encourage environmentally sustainable development” (62.8%), and “maintain and attract diverse types or retail/service stores” (61.7%). Three of these top four strategies revolve around local retail businesses, indicating a desire by residents for a strong and authentic retail focused core.

Conversely, “attract large national retailers” (67.6%) had the highest percentage of respondents ranking this economic development strategy as low or very low. Knowing that respondents place an emphasis on utilizing existing development in a sustainable manner, efforts could be made to ensure any future development is not only environmentally friendly, but also that commercial spaces have the flexibility to be easily converted by future tenants.

VERY HIGH OR HIGH PRIORITY LEVEL FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES BY AGE OF RESPONDENT

When crosstabulated with the age of respondents, Figure 24 shows that the number one priority as selected by residents for the City’s future economic development strategies is to “focus on filling vacant commercial storefronts.” This was selected by at least 82.0% of respondents from each age group. Overall, all three age groups followed similar trends, but 18 to 44 year olds also placed a slightly higher emphasis on “maintaining and attracting diverse types of retail/service stores” (77.9%) and “attracting large national retailers” (23.2%). Additionally, those aged 65 years or older placed a slightly higher emphasis on “promoting workforce training programs” (22.8%) than other age groups.

Over 40.0% of respondents felt that “encourage new development in the Brecksville Town Center” (48.4%) and “provide financial incentives that attract office jobs” (40.0%) were a very high or high priority. Additionally, less than a quarter of respondents felt that “focus on developing more arts and cultural attractions” (24.7), “focus development on manufacturing and industrial jobs” (19.5%), and “promote workforce training programs” (19.2%) were rated as a very high or high priority.
Attract large national retailers

Promote workforce training programs

Focus development on manufacturing and industrial jobs

Focus on developing more arts and cultural attractions

Figure 23
Priority Level for Economic Development Strategies

Figure 24
Very High or High Priority Level for Economic Development Strategies by Age of Respondent
3.8 BRECKSVILLE TOWN CENTER

COMMON THEMES

- Majority of respondents feel that parking in the Brecksville Town Center is easy and convenient, but they also feel the parking needs to be reorganized and more spaces provided
- Nearly a quarter of respondents would like to see enhancements made to accommodate pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users

The eighth series of questions asked residents about parking and accessing the Brecksville Town Center. By better understanding how, why, and by what means residents access this area, efforts can be made to enhance the user experience and ensure residents and visitors have a positive experience every time they use the amenities at this location.

OPINIONS ON PARKING IN THE BRECKSVILLE TOWN CENTER

The seventeenth question asked residents their opinions on parking within the Brecksville Town Center. As shown in Figure 25, the majority of respondents strongly agree or agree that “parking is convenient and easy” (55.6%) in the Brecksville Town Center. Additionally, over 70.0% of all respondents either disagree or strongly disagree that they “feel unsafe walking through the off-street parking areas” (72.1%) in the Brecksville Town Center. This could be due to the perception of respondents reacting to low crime rates and police presence, but not reacting to safety due to speeding vehicles, distracted drivers, or other safety issues that could arise in a large surface parking lot.

However, while the majority of respondents feel that parking is convenient and they feel safe walking through the available surface lots, 38.3% of respondents either strongly agree or agree that, “off-street parking should be reorganized.” In addition to parking lot reorganization, 40.7% of respondents also strongly agree or agree that “more off-street parking in needed,” in general.

While a large number of respondents would like to see enhancements that cater to personal vehicles, nearly a quarter or respondents either strongly agree or agree that they would “rather walk, bike, or take transit” (22.8%) to the Brecksville Town Center.

STRONGLY AGREE OR AGREE ON PARKING IN THE BRECKSVILLE TOWN CENTER BY AGE OF RESPONDENT

When crosstabulated by the age of respondents, Figure 26 shows that over 42.0% of each age group either strongly agrees or agrees that “parking is convenient and easy” in the Brecksville Town Center. However, over 35.0% of each age group also felt that “more off-street parking is needed” and “off-street parking should be reorganized.” This could indicate that parking is easily accessible, but may fill up quickly during peak hours. Additionally, all age groups had similar agreement for “on-street parking should be improved” with at least 27.0% of each age group either strongly agreeing or agreeing with this statement.

Younger respondents ages 18 to 44 had the strongest agreement for “more off street parking is needed” (49.1%) and “I would rather walk, bike, or take transit” (33.9%) to the Brecksville Town Center.

Older respondents ages 65 and older said that they “avoid the Brecksville Town Center because of a lack of parking” (13.6%) more so than other age groups. This could potentially indicate a need for more accessible spaces closer to store entrances to ensure an inclusive environment for shoppers of all ages and physical capabilities.
Figure 25
Opinions on Parking in the Brecksville Town Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking is convenient and easy</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More off-street parking is needed</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-street parking should be reorganized</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-street parking should be improved</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would rather walk, bike, or take transit</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel unsafe walking through the off-street parking areas</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I avoid Brecksville Town Center because of a lack of parking</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 26
Strongly Agree or Agree on Parking in the Brecksville Town Center by Age of Respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>18 to 44</th>
<th>45 to 64</th>
<th>65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel unsafe walking through the off-street parking areas</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I avoid Brecksville Town Center because of a lack of parking</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would rather walk, bike, or take transit</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-street parking should be improved</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-street parking should be reorganized</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More off-street parking is needed</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parking is convenient and easy
3.9 HOUSING

COMMON THEMES

- Overwhelmingly, the highest priority for respondents regarding the City’s housing stock is maintaining existing homes and residential neighborhoods
- A large number of respondents are in support of more affordability and diversified housing stock
- Most respondents are not in favor of apartment style housing types within the City

The ninth series of questions asked residents about types of housing in the City of Brecksville. By better understanding what residents are looking for in terms of future housing, efforts can be made to focus residential development in a desirable manner for the community. This will not only encourage current residents to stay within the community, but attract new families to the area.

PRIORITY FOR TYPES OF HOUSING

The eighteenth question asked residents their priority level for various types of housing needed within the City of Brecksville. As shown in Figure 27, nearly 85.0% of all respondents rank, “maintaining existing housing and neighborhoods” (84.9%) as a very high or high priority. This was followed by “matching the scale and design of existing homes” (53.6%) and “more options within walking distance to amenities” (49.2%), which were both ranked as a very high or high priority by respondents. Additionally, there were similar trends among specific housing types for seniors and young professionals. Over 40.0% of all respondents rated both “more housing types for seniors” (43.9%) and “more housing types for young professionals” (40.8%) as a very high or high priority. Knowing that respondents strongly desire to maintain existing homes and residential neighborhoods, the City should continue to encourage property maintenance, home renovation incentives or programs, and match the general style and design of existing structures.

Conversely, the majority of respondents ranked, “more apartments in appropriate locations” (62.7%) as a low or very low priority. However, nearly 40.0% of respondents ranked, “more townhomes/condos in appropriate locations” (36.3%) as a very high or high priority. This indicates that residents would rather see condos and townhomes over apartment units built within the City of Brecksville.

PRIORITY FOR TYPES OF HOUSING BY AGE OF RespondENT

When crosstabulated by the age of respondents, Figure 28 shows that at least 80.0% of each age groups said that “maintaining existing housing and neighborhoods” was the highest priority for the City. Additionally, “matching the scale and design of existing homes in new construction” was also a very high priority amongst respondents regardless of age. However, this was rated highest amongst those aged 65 years or older (57.0%).

Younger respondents, ages 18 to 44 focused more on “housing for young professionals” (55.9%) and “more single family homes” (40.6%). This could largely be due to a desire for young professionals wanting a living space that allows them to socialize and offers a wide range of amenities or young families looking for a first home.

Conversely, those aged 65 years or older focused more on “more housing options within walking distance to amenities” (52.2%), “more townhomes/condos” (37.0%), “more apartments” (16.7%), and “more affordable housing” (41.1%). Additionally, nearly 70.0% of those respondents ages years or older also would like “more housing options for seniors” (66.5%).
**Figure 27**
Priority Level for Types of Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Housing</th>
<th>Very High</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining existing housing and neighborhoods</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matching the scale and design of existing homes</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More options within walking distance to amenities</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More housing options for seniors</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More housing types for young professionals</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More townhouses/condos in appropriate locations*</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More single-family, detached homes</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More affordable housing</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More apartments in appropriate locations*</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Appropriate locations may include major corridors, areas near the Brecksville Town Center, or as part of mixed-use development

**Figure 28**
High or Very High Priority Level for Types of Housing by Age of Respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Housing</th>
<th>18 to 44</th>
<th>45 to 64</th>
<th>65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More housing options for seniors looking to remain within the City</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More housing options within walking distance to amenities (restaurants, shops, parks)</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More townhouses/condos in appropriate locations*</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More apartments in appropriate locations*</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining existing housing and neighborhoods</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matching the scale and design of existing homes in new construction</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More single-family, detached homes</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More affordable housing</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.10 COMMUNITY AMENITIES

COMMON THEMES

- The vast majority of respondents rated both the Brecksville Reservation and the Cuyahoga Valley National Park as the highest in terms of quality and importance for the community.
- The Seneca Golf Course was rated the lowest in terms of both quality and importance amongst respondents.
- Most respondents also rated the Brecksville-Broadview Heights City School District and the Brecksville Branch of the Cuyahoga County Library very highly in both quality and importance for the City.

QUALITY OF COMMUNITY AMENITIES

The tenth series of questions asked residents about the quality and importance of various community amenities offered both within the City and nearby recreation areas. By better understanding how residents perceive the quality and importance of amenities, efforts can be made to maintain and enhance those that are rated highly and improve upon those that may fall short.

The nineteenth question asked residents to rate the quality of fifteen (15) amenities available to the community’s residents. As shown in Figure 29, at least 31.0% of respondents said that all of the listed community amenities were of either excellent or good quality. An overwhelming number of respondents rate the nearby regional parks systems very highly. Over 97.0% of all respondents rated the “Brecksville Reservation” (97.7%) and the “Cuyahoga Valley National Park” (97.1%) as excellent or good in quality. As part of the Cuyahoga Valley National Park system, both the “Towpath Trail” (94.9%) and “Cuyahoga Valley Scenic Railroad” (90.6%) were also rated very highly; within the top five amenities in terms of quality. Additionally, the “Brecksville-Broadview Heights City School District” (86.7%) and the “Brecksville Branch of the Cuyahoga County Library” (86.4%) were rated as excellent or good by at least 86.0% of respondents.

Conversely, respondents rated “private or parochial schools” the lowest in terms of quality. However, this amenity was still rated as excellent or good by 31.8% of respondents. This lower rating for quality could be due to respondents not using this amenity as much as others. Over 55.0% of all respondents said that they have never used this community amenity.
Figure 29  
Opinions on the Quality of Community Amenities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Have Not Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brecksville Reservation</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga Valley National Park</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towpath Trail</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brecksville Branch of Cuyahoga County Library</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga Valley Scenic Railroad</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brecksville-Broadview Heights City School District</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brecksville Community Center</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brecksville Town Square (Gazebo)</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga Valley Career Center</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleepy Hollow Golf Course</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brecksville Theatre</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blossom Hill</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball Fields/Sports Fields (Behind City Hall)</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca Golf Course</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private or Parochial Schools</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPORTANCE OF COMMUNITY AMENITIES

The twentieth question asked residents to rate the importance of the same fifteen (15) amenities available to the community’s residents. As shown in Figure 30, nearly 50.0% of respondents said that all of the listed community amenities were either very important or important to residents. An overwhelming number of respondents said that the, “Brecksville Reservation” was the most important amenity that is available to the City and its residents; 96.1% of respondents say that this amenity is either very important or important to the community. This was followed closely by the, “Cuyahoga Valley National Park” (94.1%), “Brecksville-Broadview Heights City School District” (93.4%), the “Brecksville Branch of the Cuyahoga County Library” (91.4%), and the “Brecksville Community Center” (91.4%); all of which were selected as either very important or important by at least 90.0% of all respondents.

Conversely, the “Seneca Golf Course” had the lowest rating for overall importance rating within the community. However, this amenity was still rated as very important or important by 47.8% of all respondents. Additionally, the “Sleepy Hollow Golf Course” was the fourth lowest in terms of overall importance within the community. Similar to the “Seneca Golf Course,” the “Sleepy Hollow Golf Course” was still rated as very important or important by 57.9% of respondents. Both of these amenities are located within Cleveland Metroparks system and while the, “Brecksville Reservation” ranked as the highest in terms of both quality and importance, the golf courses appear to fall short in both categories. However, this could indicate a good opportunity for park enhancements, new programs, community outreach, or partnerships.

QUALITY-IMPORTANCE MATRIX OF COMMUNITY AMENITIES

In order to better understand the relationship between the quality of community amenities and the importance of community amenities, the fifteen (15) community amenities were plotted on a matrix with one axis displaying the range of quality and the other displaying the range of importance to respondents. As seen in Figure 31 on page 58 the matrix shows four quadrants divided by lines displaying the average rating of importance and quality. The quadrants are described below:

- The top right quadrant displays community amenities that are considered the highest quality and importance as selected by respondents.
- The bottom right quadrant displays community amenities that are among the highest in terms of quality, but slightly less importance as selected by respondents.
- The bottom left quadrant displays community amenities that are slightly less quality and slightly less importance as selected by respondents.
- The top left quadrant displays community amenities that are among the highest in terms of importance, but slightly less in quality as selected by respondents.
### Figure 30
Opinions on the Importance of Community Amenities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brecksville Reservation</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga Valley National Park</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brecksville-Broadview Heights City School District</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brecksville Branch of Cuyahoga County Library</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brecksville Community Center</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towpath Trail</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga Valley Career Center</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball Fields/Sports Fields (Behind City Hall)</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga Valley Scenic Railroad</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brecksville Town Square (Gazebo)</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blossom Hill</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleepy Hollow Golf Course</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brecksville Theatre</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private or Parochial Schools</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca Golf Course</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 31
Quality-Importance Matrix of Community Amenities

- Increasing Quality
- Increasing Importance

Quality Average: 80.9%
Importance Average: 73.1%

Amenities:
- Seneca Golf Course
- Private or Parochial Schools
- Blossom Hill
- Towpath Trail
- Town Square
- Brecksville Theatre
- Ball Fields/Sports Fields
- Cuyahoga Valley Scenic Railroad
- Sleepy Hollow Golf Course
- Cuyahoga Valley National Park
- School District
- Brecksville Library
- Cuyahoga Valley Career Center
3.11 CITY SERVICES

COMMON THEMES

- Overwhelmingly, respondents are satisfied with the level of services that the City provides to the community.
- Police protection, Fire protection/EMS, and park maintenance were the top three highest rated amenities in terms of quality.
- Street maintenance/repair, snow and ice removal, and Fire protection/EMS were the top three highest rated amenities in terms of importance.
- A number of services provided by the City were selected by respondents as “have not used” in terms of quality, but still rated by most respondents as either very important or important.

The eleventh series of questions asked residents about the quality and importance of various City services. By better understanding how residents perceive the quality and importance of City services, efforts can be made to maintain and enhance those that are rated highly and improve on those that may fall short.

QUALITY OF CITY SERVICES

The twenty-first question asked residents to rate the quality of seventeen (17) City services available to the community. As seen in Figure 32, both, “Police protection” (94.1%) and “Fire protection/EMS” (92.6%) were rated very highly in terms of quality with at least 92.0% of respondents saying these services were excellent or good. This was followed closely by “park maintenance” (90.8%), “snow & ice removal” (88.0%), and “trash collection” (83.8%).

Conversely, respondents rated, “commercial maintenance enforcement” as the lowest in terms of quality; however, 45.3% of respondents also have never used this service offered to residents within the community. Additionally, “water back up/sewer inspection,” “housing maintenance enforcement,” “Building Department permitting process,” and “Planning & Zoning Code enforcement” all followed a similar trend and were rated the lowest in terms of quality, but at least 34.0% of respondents have never used these available City services.
Figure 32
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>
<th>Have Not Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police protection</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection/EMS</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park maintenance</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow &amp; ice removal</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash collection</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic enforcement</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.6% 5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curbside refuse &amp; recycling program</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational programs</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.3% 9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulk/yard waste pickup</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.0% 8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior services</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street maintenance/repair</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Brecksville website</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning Code enforcement</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Department permitting process</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing maintenance enforcement</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water back up/sewer inspection</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial maintenance enforcement</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.11

IMPORTANCE OF CITY SERVICES

The twenty-second question asked residents to rate the importance of the same seventeen (17) City services available to the community’s residents. As seen in Figure 34, nearly 60.0% of all respondents said that the each of the listed City services were either very important or important. The most important services as selected by respondents were, “street maintenance/repair,” “snow & ice removal,” “Fire protection/EMS,” “Police protection,” and “trash collection;” all of which had at least 98.0% of respondents saying that these services were either very important or important. Additionally, “street maintenance/repair” was the highest rated service in terms of importance among respondents; 99.5% rated this as either very important or important. However, this service was rated eleventh in terms of quality. This could indicate an opportunity for improvement with this service moving forward and with future projects or programs.

Conversely, while 56.5% respondents said that the, “City of Brecksville website” is either very important or important, this City service also had the highest number of respondents selecting this as either somewhat important (34.1%) or not important (9.4%). Although, the City’s website may not be viewed as a priority, it is still considered an important component of what the community offers to its residents.

OVERALL QUALITY OF CITY SERVICES

The twenty-third question asked residents to rate the overall quality of the services offered within the City of Brecksville. As seen in Figure 33, 94.4% of respondents agree that the services provided by the City are either excellent or good. Additionally, only 5.2% of respondents say that the City’s services are average and 0.3% say they are poor in terms of quality. However, no respondents said that the services provided by the City were considered very poor.

Figure 33
Overall Quality of City Services

QUALITY-IMPORTANCE MATRIX OF CITY SERVICES

In order to better understand the relationship between the quality of City services and the importance of City services, the seventeen (17) City services were plotted on a matrix with one axis displaying the range of quality and the other displaying the range of importance to respondents. As seen in Figure 35 on page 64, the matrix shows four quadrants divided by lines displaying the average rating of importance and quality. The quadrants are described below:

- The top right quadrant displays City services that are considered the highest quality and importance as selected by respondents.
- The bottom right quadrant displays City Services that are among the highest in terms of quality, but slightly less importance as selected by respondents.
- The bottom left quadrant displays City services that are slightly less quality and slightly less importance as selected by respondents.
- The top left quadrant displays City Services that are among the highest in terms of importance, but slightly less in quality as selected by respondents.
### Figure 34
Opinions on the Importance of City 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>Street maintenance/repair</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow &amp; ice removal</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection/EMS</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police protection</td>
<td>91.4%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash collection</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curbside refuse &amp; recycling program</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park maintenance</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water back up/sewer inspection</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulk/yard waste pickup</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational programs</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic enforcement</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior services</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial maintenance enforcement</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning Code enforcement</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing maintenance enforcement</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Department permitting process</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Brecksville website</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 35
Quality-Importance Matrix of City Services

Importance Average: 87.2%
Quality Average: 74.2%
3.12 QUALITY OF LIFE

COMMON THEMES

- Overall, respondents are very satisfied with the quality of life within the City of Brecksville.
- Nearly 70.0% of all respondents feel that they are engaged within their neighborhoods or the community as a whole.
- Most respondents that feel they are engaged within the community are involved through a “place of worship or faith community” or a “neighborhood or home owner's association”.
- Over 95.0% of respondents would recommend Brecksville to others as a place to live.
- Younger residents, households with children, and residents that have lived within the City for less than ten years are more likely to support a tax increase or property assessment over older residents, households with young adults or seniors, or residents that have lived within the community for over ten years.

The twelfth series of questions asked residents about the quality of life within the City of Brecksville. By better understanding how residents feel, interact, and participate within the community, efforts can be made to provide more opportunities for engagement, enhance the Brecksville experience, and create a desirable community to call home.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

The twenty-fourth question asked residents whether or not they feel engaged within their neighborhood and/or community. As seen in Figure 36, the majority of respondents (68.3%) said that they do feel engaged within the community. However, another 31.7% of respondents said that they “do not feel engaged” within the community. This could be an opportunity to improve community outreach, programs, and partnerships to enhance how residents interact within the City.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT BY AGE OF RESPONDENT

Additionally, those respondents that said they do feel engaged within the community are involved in a number of ways. As seen in Figure 38, the twenty-fifth question asked residents how they are involved within the community. Most respondents are involved within the community through a “place of worship or faith community” (51.4%). This was followed closely by “neighborhood or Home Owner’s Association” (50.7%), “recreation/athletic organizations” (42.2%), and “schools” (38.6%).

The lowest level of community involvement as selected by respondents were “community service groups” (11.9%) and “City Boards, Commissions, or Committees” (5.2%). This could largely be due to some of these entities requiring specific background or knowledge and possibly needing more of a commitment than less structured groups within the community.
Figure 36
Do you feel engaged in your neighborhood/community

- Yes: 68.3%
- No: 31.7%

Figure 37
Do you feel engaged in your neighborhood/community by age of respondent

- Yes: 67.0%, 69.2%, 67.6%
- No: 33.0%, 30.8%, 32.4%

Figure 38
Neighborhood & Community Involvement

- Place of worship or faith community: 51.4%
- Neighborhood or Home Owner’s Association: 50.7%
- Recreation/athletic organizations: 42.4%
- Schools: 38.6%
- Community service groups (e.g., Kiwanis Club): 11.9%
- City Boards, Commissions, or Committees: 5.2%
QUALITY OF LIFE

The twenty-sixth question asked residents their opinions on the overall quality of life within the City of Brecksville. As seen in Figure 39, over 95.0% of all respondents say that the quality of life in Brecksville is either excellent or good (95.3%). Additionally, no respondents said that the quality of life was very poor. This indicates an exemplary high quality of life among residents.

QUALITY OF LIFE BY AGE OF RESPONDENT

When crosstabulated with the age of respondents, Figure 40 shows that the quality of life is very high among all age groups. The highest quality of life was reported by residents age 65 years or older, with 98.0% of this age group saying that the quality of life was either excellent or good.

QUALITY OF LIFE BY PRESENCE OF CHILDREN, YOUNG ADULTS, OR SENIORS

When crosstabulated with the presence of children, young adults, and seniors, Figure 41 shows that the quality of life is again very high regardless of the presence of children, young adults, or seniors in the home. The highest quality of life was reported by residents that live with seniors in their homes. Nearly 99.0% of residents living with seniors report the quality of life within the City of Brecksville as being excellent or good.

RECOMMENDING THE CITY OF BRECKSVILLE

The twenty-seventh question asked residents whether or not they would recommend others live in the City of Brecksville. As seen in Figure 42, over 95.0% of total respondents say that they “would recommend others live in the City of Brecksville” (95.6%). Conversely, only 4.4% of respondents say that they “would not recommend others live in the City of Brecksville.”
**Figure 39**
Overall Quality of Life

![Pie chart showing excellent, good, average, poor, very poor categories with percentages.]

- Excellent: 55.9%
- Good: 39.4%
- Average: 3.0%
- Poor: 0.3%
- Very Poor*: 0.0%


*May not be visible due to very small value

**Figure 40**
Excellent or Good Overall Quality of Life by Age of Respondent

- 18 to 44: 94.6%
- 45 to 64: 96.4%
- 65+: 98.0%

**Figure 41**
Excellent or Good Overall Quality of Life by Presence of Children, Young Adults, or Seniors

- Children: 95.9%
- Young Adults: 97.1%
- Seniors: 98.3%

**Figure 42**
Would you recommend others live in the City of Brecksville

- Yes: 95.6%
- No: 4.4%
3.12

PROJECT FUNDING

The twenty-eighth question asked residents whether or not they would support an income tax increase, property tax increase, or a special property owner assessment to fund future projects. As seen in Figure 43, there is a close split amongst respondents that would support and would not support a potential tax increase or property assessment. Nearly half of all respondents said that they are somewhat likely or likely to support a tax increase or property assessment (48.4%). Conversely, 38.3% of respondents said that they are not likely to support a tax increase or property assessment. The remaining 13.2% of respondents are undecided and need more information before making a final decision on any funding requests.

PROJECT FUNDING BY AGE OF RESPONDENT

When crosstabulated with the age of respondents, Figure 44 shows that residents ages 18 to 44 are the most likely (61.3%) to support a tax increase or property assessment. Residents ages 45 to 65 years and older were less inclined to support a tax increase or property assessment. In general, younger residents are more likely to support a tax increase or property assessment over older residents.

PROJECT FUNDING BY PRESENCE OF CHILDREN, YOUNG ADULTS, OR SENIORS

When crosstabulated with the presence of children, young adults, and seniors, Figure 45 shows that households that have children are the most likely (58.5%) to support a tax increase or property assessment. Households with the presence of young adults or seniors were less inclined to support a tax increase or property assessment. In general, households with children are more likely to support a tax increase or property assessment over households with young adults or seniors.

PROJECT FUNDING BY LENGTH OF RESIDENCY

When crosstabulated with the respondent’s length of residency, Figure 46 shows that residents who have lived within the City of Brecksville under 10 years (57.8%) are the most likely to support a tax increase or property assessment. Residents that have lived within the City greater than ten years were less inclined to support a tax increase or property assessment. In general, residents that have lived within the City less than ten years are more likely to support a tax increase or property assessment over residents that have lived within the community longer than ten years.

WRITTEN COMMENTS | TWENTY-NINTH QUESTION

The majority of respondents were either not likely or somewhat likely to support a tax increase, at 73.0% and 41.3%, respectively. Nearly 23.0% of respondents that were not likely to support a tax increase felt that taxes are already too high. Another 10% felt that the City should better prioritize and reallocate current tax revenue, and nearly 9.0% indicated retirement or fixed income as their reasoning for not supporting an increase. Other responses included that the City should increase the tax base with new businesses, that the City doesn’t have residents’ needs in mind, that the City should focus on infrastructure maintenance, and that there have been too many recent tax increases.

Over 20.0% of respondents that were somewhat likely to support a tax increase indicated that their support would depend on the project being proposed. Nearly 6.0% would support a tax increase for more sidewalks, and nearly 3.0% indicated that their support would depend on the cost. Other responses included that residents would support a tax increase for more bike lanes, for schools, for new retail and business downtown, for improved recreation facilities, if the use served all citizens, for better storm drainage, and for more recycling. Nearly 10.0% of respondents indicated that they were likely to support a tax increase because taxes are important to maintain city services and quality of life. Of the respondents that were not sure or need more information, over 5.0% indicated that the government needs to be more transparent, provide more information, and allow citizens the ability to offer input in the tax revenue decision-making process.
Figure 43
Support of a Tax Increase or Property Assessment to Fund Future Projects

Figure 44
Support of a Tax Increase or Property Assessment to Fund Future Projects by Age of Respondent

Figure 45
Support of a Tax Increase or Property Assessment to Fund Future Projects by Presence of Children, Young Adults, or Seniors

Figure 46
Support of a Tax Increase or Property Assessment to Fund Future Projects by Length of Residency
The City of Brecksville 2018 Resident Survey was sent to 1,400 random households in order to solicit opinions that encompass the broad range of opinions held by the City’s population. The Demographics Section summarizes the population that responded to the survey.

WHAT’S IN THIS SECTION?

This section includes the results of the five (5) demographic questions asked in the Resident Survey. Each question includes a description, a chart or graph of the results, and analysis of respondent answers.

HOW DO I USE IT?

These responses should be used to give context to the detailed findings of the results document. The demographic questions can be helpful in comparing the survey respondent population to the City population as a whole. Over representation or underrepresentation of specific groups can alter overall opinions and should be taken into consideration.
COMMON THEMES

- Survey respondents were very close to the actual 2016 ACS data for heads of households
- Nearly three-quarters of respondents have lived within the City for at least ten years
- Majority of respondents own their homes and say that they see themselves still owning a home in five years time

The thirteenth series of questions asked residents general demographic questions about each respondent taking their respective survey. By knowing general demographic information, a more thorough and accurate survey analysis can be undertaken and cross-tabulation of various data points can also be calculated.

AGE OF RESPONDENTS

The thirtieth question asked residents the age of the respondent completing each survey. If more than one adult completed the survey, the age of the one who most recently had a birthday was requested. As seen in Figure 47, the number of respondents represented within each age group was relatively close to the actual number of “heads of households” within the community. There was a slight under-representation of those aged 18 to 34 and 45 to 54. Additionally, there was a slight over-representation of respondents aged 65 to 74.

Overall, the survey sampling yielded a diverse span of resident ages, had a very slight over-representation of post-retirement residents and a very slight under-representation of pre-retirement or working age residents.

LENGTH OF RESIDENCY

The thirty-first question asked residents the length in which they have lived within the City of Brecksville. As seen in Figure 48, 73.7% of respondents have lived in the City for at least ten years and over 30.0% of all respondents have lived in the City for more than 30 years (31.4%). Only 26.3% of all respondents have lived in the City for less than 10 years and only 6.5% have lived in the City for under 2 years.
Figure 47
What is your age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Survey Respondents</th>
<th>2016 ACS Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 to 34 years</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44 years</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54 years</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 64 years</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 74 years</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+ years</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 48
Length of Residency within the City of Brecksville

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Residency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than 30 years</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30 years</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20 years</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10 years</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5 years</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 2 years</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TENURE OF RESPONDENTS

The thirty-second question asked residents if they currently own or rent their homes. As seen in Figure 49, nearly 96.0% of respondents say that they currently own their homes (95.4%) and less than 5.0% of respondents say that they currently rent their homes (4.6%).

However, in the thirty-third question residents were asked if they see themselves owning or renting their homes in five (5) years time. Again, the vast majority of respondents say that they plan on owning their homes (93.5%), but this number did slightly decrease from those respondents that currently own their homes.

Conversely, as seen in Figure 50, the number of respondents saying that they see themselves “renting” a home in five (5) years time increased from those that are currently renting their homes; an increase from 4.6% to 6.5%. This small increase could equate to a slightly higher demand for rental units over conventional home purchasing in the future.

NUMBER OF PEOPLE IN RESPONDENT HOUSEHOLDS

The thirty-fourth question asked residents to provide the number of people within each age group that currently live in their home. As seen in Figure 51, 349 respondents have at least one (1) child under the age of 18 living in their home. There is also an increase from young adults ages 18-34 to middle-age, working adults ages 35-64. This indicates that the majority of respondents have either and/or both middle-aged working adults and children living in the same household.

Conversely, fewer households tended to have residents 75 years and older or young adults ages 18-34. The fewest number of respondents said that they had young adults ages 25-34 living in the same household (110).
Figure 49
Do you rent or own your home currently

Figure 50
Do you see yourself renting or owning in five (5) years from now

Figure 51
Number of People in Respondent Households
The 2018 Resident Survey not only included multiple choice questions, but also open ended questions for respondents to write in their own answers. The Open Ended Questions section summarizes common themes identified from respondent answers. A complete list of written comments and answers can be found in Appendix A.

WHAT'S IN THIS SECTION?

This section includes the results of the four (4) open ended questions asked at the end of the Resident Survey. Each question includes a description, a chart or graph of the results, and analysis of respondent answers. To ensure personal information remains anonymous, Question 35, which asked respondents to list what street they live on, has been excluded from the final results and appendices.

HOW DO I USE IT?

These written responses can be helpful in providing a more complete picture of how residents feel about specific issues that may not have been addressed in the survey form.
COMMON THEMES

- Residents feel that parks and greenspace, municipal services, and safety and security are the top three strengths for the City of Brecksville.
- The main elements that residents would like to change, enhance, or improve in the City of Brecksville included economic development, transportation infrastructure (including sidewalk connectivity and current road conditions), and a high tax rate.
- Residents feel that the vision for the City’s future is one where Brecksville retains its small-town feel, welcomes diversity, and maintains its high standards, reputation, and quality of life.

The fourteenth and final series of questions were open ended and provide space for respondents to write in their own answers. These questions generally asked about what respondents felt were the City’s greatest strengths, areas for improvement, and vision for the future.

CITY’S GREATEST STRENGTH

The thirty-sixth question asked residents to list what they felt was the City’s greatest strength. As seen in Table 7, nearly 22.0% of respondents feel that the presence of parks and greenspace is Brecksville’s greatest strength.

The second most written comments were related to the municipal services that the City of Brecksville provides. Over 17.0% of respondents said services (17.3%), which broadly included police and fire, the Brecksville Community Center, cleanliness, senior services, recreation, and snow and waste removal; are the City’s greatest strength. A sense of safety and security was the third greatest strength, which was written by over 15.0% of respondents (15.4%).

Following the top three most written strengths were location (12.0%), schools (11.6%), appearance and values (10.9%), and City leadership (10.7%), all of which were written by over 10.0% of respondents. Location included proximity to Cleveland and Akron, as well as access to highways. Appearance and values included the physical appearance of the City, its reputation, its quiet suburban atmosphere, and the quality of life.

City leadership included city personnel, financial stability, and loyalty to residents.

With under 10.0% of respondents, development character (8.4%), sense of community (7.3%), small town feel (5.7%), and housing (2.7%) were all written in the fewest times when compared to other comments. Development character encompassed physical development patterns, the lack of large retail, the downtown core, low traffic, and historic preservation and sense of community generally included the quality of people and citizen pride.
Table 7
Top Written Comments for the City’s Greatest Strength as Described by Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greatest Strengths Include:</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Greenspace</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Services</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Security</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance &amp; Values</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Leadership</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Character</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Community</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Town Feel</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.0

ELEMENTS OF THE CITY TO CHANGE

The thirty-seventh question asked residents to list any element of the City that they would like to see changed in the future. As seen in Table 8, the top item residents would like to change was related to commercial development (35.4%) within the City. Of those respondents that would like to see this changed, most noted interest in retail development throughout the City, which included more restaurants, shopping, bars, and social options. Additionally, respondents would also like downtown Brecksville improved aesthetically, through increased shopping, and enhanced walkability.

The second most written element that residents would like to see changed was related to transportation infrastructure (26.5%), especially regarding sidewalk connectivity and road conditions. Of those respondents that would like to see this changed, most respondents indicated sidewalk improvement and connectivity as the top item and others noted a desire to improve street conditions and maintenance programs. Additionally, respondents also prioritized bicycle infrastructure improvements, reducing traffic congestion, enhancing public transportation, and providing parking improvements. The third item residents would most like to change was related to taxes. Most respondents would like lower taxes, while improving and diversifying the tax base through commercial development.

Other answers included changes to government operations, personnel, transparency, and communication; improvements to city services including storm water management, infrastructure maintenance, recycling, and waste removal; improvements to recreation facilities and programming; enhancing the diversity of the City’s residents; improved code enforcement for property maintenance; improvements to Brecksville schools; and enhanced programming for seniors and youth.

VISIONS FOR THE FUTURE

The thirty-eighth question asked residents to list their visions for the City Brecksville as they would like to see it in the future. As seen in Table 9, nearly 52.0% of respondents indicated a vision related to the character and values of the community (51.9%), with most noting that they would like to maintain the small-town feel, welcome diversity, the City’s high standards, reputation of excellence, and quality of life. Other responses related to the character and values of the community were a vision of Brecksville that stays the same and maintains tradition, is forward-thinking, that grows, that stays small, is modern, and is family-friendly.

The second most popular topics, noted by just over 19.0% of respondents, were related to economic development (19.2%) and included a vision of a City that attracts more retail and new business, that retains and supports small business, that does not over-commercialize, that grows retail in the Town Center, and that develops the Veterans Affairs site.

Other popular topics included a vision of a Brecksville that attracts young families, young professionals, and visitors; a Brecksville that embraces and preserves the natural environment; a Brecksville that remains safe and maintains City services and infrastructure; a Brecksville that is walkable and bike-friendly; and a Brecksville that caters to seniors and maintains the quality of its schools.
| Table 8 |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| **Top Written Comments for the Elements of the City that Respondents would Like to See Changed** |
| **Would like to Change:** | **% of Respondents** |
| Economic Development | 35.4% |
| Transportation Infrastructure | 26.5% |
| Taxes | 8.6% |
| Government | 8.6% |
| City Services | 7.8% |
| Recreation | 6.7% |
| Values | 5.3% |
| Housing | 6.3% |
| Senior Services & Programs | 3.2% |
| Youth Services & Programs | 2.7% |

| Table 9 |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| **Top Written Comments as Visions for the Future of the City as Described by Respondents** |
| **Visions for the Future Include:** | **% of Respondents** |
| Values & Community Character | 51.9% |
| Economic Development | 19.2% |
| Attraction & Retention of New Residents | 11.4% |
| Appearance & Environment | 10.3% |
| City Services | 9.4% |
| Transportation | 8.9% |
| Youth & Seniors | 8.9% |
| Government | 8.2% |
| Economy | 4.1% |
| Recreation | 2.7% |
| Housing | 2.3% |
ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

The final question provided space for respondents to discuss any issues, concerns, general questions, or comments related to the City of Brecksville that may not have been addressed in the survey form. As seen in Table 10, nearly half of respondents wrote comments related to economic development (48.9%) in the City. Of those respondents that wrote comments related to economic development indicated a desire for more retail and restaurants and prioritized redevelopment of the Veterans Affairs site. Alternatively, some respondents also noted opposition to more retail development within the City. Other responses included desires to keep out big box retail, model a downtown similar to that of Hudson or Chagrin Falls, fill commercial vacancies, attract less finance and real estate offices, remove fewer trees for development, attract business to increase the tax base, bring in a Trader Joe’s, redevelop the old McDonald’s on Brecksville Road, attract more local business or offices, and provide downtown residential options.

Just over a quarter of respondents wrote comments related to transportation infrastructure (25.1%), especially regarding road conditions and sidewalk connectivity. Of those respondents that wrote comments related to transportation infrastructure indicated issues with road maintenance, a desire for better sidewalk connectivity, more bike lanes, and improved parking downtown. Others noted a desire to ban overnight parking on residential streets, concerns for the safety of children near schools because of heavy traffic, and some opposition to bikers and runners on roads.

Just under a quarter of respondents wrote comments related to City services (23.8%), particularly regarding storm water management and recycling. Of those respondents that wrote comments related to City services indicated a need for a better storm water management and for improved recycling services. Others indicated a desire to provide better access to brush pick-up and wood chipping services, the installation of sound barriers along the highway, better training and response time for fire and EMS, and a Citywide fiber optic internet.

Other answers included comments regarding government structure and management. This generally included a desire for term limits on elected officials to encourage fresh ideas, questions with the decision to combine schools into a single campus, more transparency in government decision-making, and better communication and website design; community values, including a desire to attract families and young professionals, staying true to Brecksville’s character, and creating more community events and social options; concerns with housing in the City, particularly the enforcement of home and yard maintenance and a desire to build less senior housing; and concerns with recreation, including a desire to improve the Rec Center, the construction of a new pool, and the high membership costs for the Rec Center.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Overall Comments Include:</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Infrastructure</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Services</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.0 Final Thoughts

The 2018 Resident Survey has been completed and the results tabulated. The data gathered from respondents will be utilized to help shape future policies, planning initiatives, and provide insight to desired future development. The following section provides a brief overview of the top five (5) overall issues that provides readers a snapshot of the community as described by survey respondents.

Those interested in more detailed results are encouraged to review the complete report and attached appendices for a better understanding of community topics and issues.

1. Overwhelmingly, respondents are satisfied with the quality of life within the City, services provided, and amenities offered.

2. Nearby, world class park systems are enjoyed daily by Brecksville residents and are not only a regional draw for visitors, but a national one as well.

3. Stronger and safer connectivity throughout the community for both pedestrians and bicyclists was a high priority for respondents.

4. The City’s natural features are highly valued by respondents and environmentally friendly or sustainable future development is desired.

5. The City offers high quality housing options to its residents. However, housing types are limited and respondents would like to see an increase in smaller, single-story homes, preferably within walking distance to amenities.
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