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INTRODUCTION

"To accomplish great things, we must not only act, but also dream; not only plan, but also believe."

~Anatole France
This page intentionally left blank.
INTRODUCTION

For most communities, a master plan is the physical manifestation of putting down on paper the hopes, dreams and goals a community holds. Local planning is one of the most direct and efficient ways to involve the members of the general public in describing the community they want. A community with a balance of land uses has long-term economic stability. Yet it takes vision, foresight and determination to achieve such a balance.

The City of Brooklyn embarked on the preparation of a comprehensive Master Plan in August, 2004, taking a proactive role in maintaining and enhancing the quality of life of its residents, businesses, and many other stakeholders. Brooklyn’s proximity to downtown Cleveland, quality of city services, housing variety, availability of commercial and industrial opportunities, quality schools, and both natural and man-made attributes help to define the City as a strong and vibrant community. At the same time, the City of Brooklyn has recognized the need to plan for its future so as to remain competitive within the region.

The purpose of developing a Master Plan for the City of Brooklyn is three fold. First, to document the numerous and complex changes occurring within the City and the region. Second, to devise an overall strategy that will recommend the best approaches for the City to take in addressing any problems, issues and opportunities it is likely to face within the coming decade and beyond.

Third, a Plan provides predictability to the private property owner because planning results in a statement of how the local government intends to act over time with respect to its physical development and redevelopment, public investment strategies and land development controls. The private land owner can use this information to guide and shape his/her development decisions, which then results in complimentary private investments.

The master planning process was undertaken to ensure that as new development and redevelopment continues throughout the region, Brooklyn will continue to be a resilient residential community with strong commercial, industrial, recreational, and institutional offerings. The Master Plan serves as a practical guide to base future decisions involving the City’s zoning map, its zoning district regulations and the City’s development review procedures, as well as a guide for capital improvements, recreational programming, and natural resource management.

Adoption of the Master Plan by action of Brooklyn City Council is a critical objective to be achieved once the Plan is finalized. Adoption institutionalizes the Master Plan, so that future elected officials, City staff, board members, residents, and other stakeholders will have a guide to direct their decisions. Their decisions will be in response to thoughtful consideration of issues related to the development and redevelopment of the community in order to achieve the shared “vision” of the City’s future.

The ultimate success of the Plan, however, will be measured by the community’s implementation of the recommended strategies outlined in the final chapter of this report. Numerous strategies, and appropriate action steps are identified, including a mechanism to increase public awareness of the Plan’s goals, recommendations, and other findings.
Some of the policies in the Plan involve changes to the zoning code that can be undertaken in a relatively short time. Others are long-range policies, some of which will take considerably more effort and funding to achieve. And yet other policies, especially those dealing with redevelopment, are very far reaching and will need to occur in incremental steps.

The adoption of this plan establishes guidelines to aid the City in making future land use decisions. No laws or ordinances are changed by this Plan. The Brooklyn Planning and Zoning Code is a very important tool the City has to carry out the policies of this Plan, and this Plan includes specific recommendations for updating and modifying the existing zoning regulations. However, in order to actually adopt the recommended changes, a formal zoning amendment process will need to be undertaken as a separate and distinct action.

**METHODOLOGY**

The City of Brooklyn commissioned the Cuyahoga County Planning Commission (CPC) to undertake a comprehensive Master Plan, to be completed during a 15-month period. At the outset, the City and the CPC agreed that in order for the Plan to be the guide it is intended to be, it must be tailored to the unique characteristics, needs and desires of the community, and ultimately, must reflect the goals of the community and its residents. This belief underscored the need to include a strong public participation component comprised of an advisory committee (a small, structured working committee) along with periodic community-wide public meetings.

The Master Plan Advisory Committee (MPAC) was constituted at the start of the plan preparation process. It was comprised of 15 members who were appointed by the City Administration to serve in an advisory capacity to the Mayor, City Council and the City Planning Commission.

Committee members met on a regular once-a-month schedule with the County Planning Commission and were joined by various Council Members and Administration staff throughout the planning process. Analyses of physical and social conditions were shared with the MPAC members at each meeting which lead to the identification of focus areas. This project included three additional levels of public participation.

**Individual Interviews.** "Conversational" interviews were conducted with nearly all of the MPAC members, City Council, Mayor and other administrative department heads. The purpose of these interviews was to gather general opinions and observations of the development issues confronting the City of Brooklyn from the perspective of the interviewee. These interviews helped the County Planning Commission staff gain a full understanding of the range of issues that should be addressed in the Master Plan.

**Community Survey.** A community survey of a random sample of 20% of households in the City was conducted in the Fall of 2004. The 13 page survey included 45 questions that covered a wide range of issues, including questions on residents’ opinions on the strengths and weaknesses of the City. A copy of the Community Survey and its findings are included as Appendix A.

**Community-Wide Public Meetings.** In order to communicate and create a dialogue with the community as a whole and to test the directions being considered, general public meetings were held at two strategic points in the process.
The first two public meetings were held at the time the basic development objectives were formulated and alternative policy directions being considered. These meetings were conducted on June 7 and July 21, 2005. Recorded information was presented on display maps suitable for public review. The purpose of these reviews was for the public to comment on the observations made, the conclusions reached, and the alternative directions being considered and help identify any areas for further detailed analysis.

Once a Draft Plan was completed, it was presented at a second community-wide public meeting on January 19, 2006. Feedback from the general public was considered by the MPAC at follow-up meetings.

It is intended that the Plan will serve as a strong and powerful guide for the City. However, it is also understood that the recommendations put forth are largely based on current conditions and assumptions of future trends. The City should continually refer to and periodically reevaluate the Master Plan to reflect changing conditions and ensure that it remains a useful document for guiding key decisions.

GOALS OF THIS PLAN
The fundamental goal of preparing this Master Plan for Brooklyn is to address the constant change and evolution of the City. In doing so, this plan document meets six basic requirements of planning:

1. It is comprehensive.
2. It is long-range – some goals will take years to accomplish.
3. It is general.
4. It focuses on physical development.
5. It relates physical design to community goals and social and economic policies.
6. It is a policy guide first, and a technical instrument only second.
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PART 1  EXISTING CONDITIONS AND ASSESSMENTS

1.1. REGIONAL CONTEXT
1.2. DEMOGRAPHICS
1.3. LAND USE PATTERNS, ZONING AND NATURAL FEATURES
1.4. MARKET ANALYSIS
1.5. PUBLIC AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES
1.6. PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE
1.7. FINANCIAL ASSESSMENT
1.8. KEY ISSUES

"Long range planning does not deal with future decisions, but with the future of present decisions."

~ Peter F. Drucker
CHAPTER 1.1
REGIONAL CONTEXT

Brooklyn is a first-ring suburb of the City of Cleveland in Northeast Ohio and is one of 59 communities in Cuyahoga County, which is quickly becoming Ohio’s first fully developed county. Cleveland surrounds Brooklyn on three of its municipal borders, while the Village of Linndale is located to the northeast and the City of Parma is located directly to the south. Each of these communities exerts its own influence on Brooklyn from both a physical and economic standpoint. In addition, the City’s location in the county, roughly six miles southwest of downtown Cleveland and five miles from the Hopkins International Airport, and the larger Northeast Ohio region also influences development decisions the City faces. Because of these factors, a plan for the future of Brooklyn should consider the city within its greater regional context.

Two interstate highways, I-71 and I-480, bisect the City in an east-west direction. There are two access ramps to Interstate 480 in Brooklyn, while travelers can access Interstate 71 in nearby Cleveland. These highway systems link Brooklyn to numerous communities throughout Cuyahoga County as well as to such regional amenities as Downtown Cleveland, Lake Erie, Hopkins International Airport, and the rest of the Greater Cleveland area.

Figure 1 Regional Context
Brooklyn is also a part of the extensive network of the Cleveland Metroparks, Ohio’s oldest and largest metropolitan park district. Two of the Metroparks Reservations are in or abut Brooklyn. Brookside Reservation, in the City of Cleveland, abuts Brooklyn to the east, just south of I-71 and provides over 135 acres of recreational amenities including the Zoo. A portion of the Big Creek Reservation, a 37-acre picnic area, is located in Brooklyn while the Big Creek Parkway and majority of the Reservation continue southward, extending across seven communities: Brooklyn, Parma, Parma Heights, Middleburg Heights, and Strongsville. These two Reservations are part of the 14 reservations that circle the City of Cleveland and make up Metroparks’ Emerald Necklace.

The City offers numerous retail opportunities and attracts shoppers from within as well as outside of its municipal boundaries. Restaurants and retail businesses are concentrated at Ridge Park Square, Cascade Crossings, Biddulph Plaza, and along the Brookpark Road corridor. In addition, with the extensive highway system, numerous other employment centers and shopping centers are easily accessible for Brooklyn residents.

Brooklyn is strategically located between Downtown Cleveland and the airport, with easy access to the interstate highway system. Its location is an asset to residents, employers and retailers.
CHAPTER 1.2
DEMOGRAPHICS

A demographic analysis of Brooklyn is important and necessary for several reasons. An analysis provides insight into existing community needs in terms of facilities and programming and is most useful when forecasting future community needs. As such, an in-depth look at key demographic trends can assist in the formation of city-wide goals and recommendations.

The majority of the data presented is derived from the decennial Census of Population and Housing of the U.S. Census Bureau. Year 2000 census data was primarily used, but previous census years were also included in order to assess trends in the community. Additional information was provided by Cleveland State University's Northern Ohio Data & Information Service (NODIS) and the Cuyahoga County Auditor's Office.

Eight communities were selected in which to compare against Brooklyn: Bedford, Brook Park, Brooklyn Heights, Fairview Park, Maple Heights, Parma Heights, Seven Hills, and South Euclid. These communities were selected because of factors such as population similarities, total number of housing units, year housing built, median income, and their similar proximity to the City of Cleveland. In reviewing comparison data, the more noteworthy statistics are highlighted below while the complete set of data in tabular format is included in Appendix B.

Figure 1: Brooklyn and Comparison Communities
Because Brooklyn does not operate in a vacuum, the City is subject to demographic trends that are occurring locally, regionally and nationally. In general, older, central cities have experienced population declines while outlying rural areas are being developed. In Greater Cleveland, there has been an out-migration of residents from Cleveland and its inner-ring suburbs, and a net gain in population in Cuyahoga County’s outer suburbs and beyond. In contrast, many communities have maintained or increased their number of households - due to smaller household size. Nationally, household size has fallen from 3.33 in 1960 to 2.57 in 2003. Another trend is that our society is aging. Because of advances in healthcare, healthier lifestyles, and declining birth rates, older adults are becoming an increasing proportion of our population. This Chapter looks at how these and other trends are occurring in Brooklyn.

**POPULATION**

Brooklyn’s official population count in 2000 was 11,586 according to the U.S. Census Bureau. Like many other communities in Cuyahoga County, Brooklyn’s population peaked in 1970, when approximately 13,142 persons resided in the City. Since then, Brooklyn’s population has declined each subsequent census. According to the latest population estimates published by the U.S. Census Bureau, Brooklyn’s population was estimated at 11,051 as of July 1, 2004.

While Brooklyn lost population over the past four decades, the number of households has experienced steady growth. Since 1960, the number of households has increased, up from 3,048 in 1960 to 5,348 in 2000 according to the U.S. Census Bureau. The total number of households in Brooklyn has increased more than 75% since 1960 which is similar to other communities in the region that experienced population declines but an increase in total households.

![Figure 2: Population and Household Change: 1960-2000](image)

Brooklyn’s household size was considerably larger four decades ago with more than 3.5 persons per household as compared to 2.17 persons per household in 2000.

While Brooklyn’s population loss has been trending downward for the past 40 years, the decline has slowed in the last decade. Between 1990 and 2000, Brooklyn experienced a 1% loss of
residents. A decade earlier, Brooklyn experienced a population loss of 5.4%, similar to Cuyahoga County which had a 5.2% decline from 1980 to 1990.

Compared to the eight comparison communities, Brooklyn's population change is modest. Brook Park, Bedford and Maple Heights experienced population declines of 7.2%, 4.1% and 3.4% respectively between 1990 and 2000. On the other hand, only two of the comparison communities experienced a gain in total population since 1990: Brooklyn Heights (7.4%) and Parma Heights (1%). Many of the older inner-ring communities and Cuyahoga County in general are losing population to outlying suburban communities and places outside of the County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>-120</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>Maple Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>-608</td>
<td>-4.1%</td>
<td>Parma Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook Park</td>
<td>-1,647</td>
<td>-7.2%</td>
<td>Seven Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn Heights</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>South Euclid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview Park</td>
<td>-456</td>
<td>-2.5%</td>
<td>Cuyahoga County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Population Projections**

Population projections can be especially useful to estimate future public facility needs such as schools, police and fire protection, and recreation. The U.S. Census Bureau however, does not conduct projections for communities less than 50,000 persons. Assuming that past population trends such as lower birth rates and smaller average family sizes will continue into the future (though likely at a slower rate of decline), it is projected that the population of Brooklyn will continue to decline and range from 9,583 to 11,232 by the year 2020. This trend in population decline is not expected to reverse unless Brooklyn identifies additional undeveloped land for new residential development, or redevelops existing nonresidential land for new residential uses.

**Table 2: Population Forecast, Brooklyn, 2000-2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Methodology</th>
<th>Year 2000</th>
<th>Year 2010</th>
<th>Year 2015</th>
<th>Year 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. High (1980-2000)</td>
<td>11,586</td>
<td>10,876</td>
<td>10,209</td>
<td>9,583</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Denotes that this number is the official census count for the City of Brooklyn.

The above population projections are based upon linear extrapolations. **Methodology A** assumes that the average population change (loss) that occurred within Brooklyn from 1980-2000 will continue through to the year 2020. **Methodology B** assumes that the average population change that occurred from 2000-2004 will continue to the year 2020. **Methodology C** assumes that the average population change that occurred from 1990-2000 will continue to the year 2020. All three population projections further assume that the City's present geographical boundaries will not change, and that the amount of residentially-zoned land will not change significantly.
AGE

When broken out by typical marketing segments, Brooklyn's age composition is similar to many of the comparison communities and Cuyahoga County in general. Brooklyn's largest age group is that of middle-age adults, persons 35 to 54 years old (See Figure 3). Approximately 28% of Brooklyn residents are between 35 and 54 years old, according to the 2000 U.S. Census. The next highest percentage of persons in Brooklyn is 55 to 74 years old. Approximately 21% of Brooklyn residents are between 55 and 74 years old, as compared to the communities of Seven Hills, Brooklyn Heights, and Brook Park which have higher percentages of persons between 55 and 74 years old, ranging from 22.5% to 26.9%.

About one-third of Brooklyn's total population is at least 55 years old or older. Among the comparison communities, Brooklyn has the fourth highest percentage of residents over the age of 55. The communities of Seven Hills, Brooklyn Heights, and Parma Heights have larger percentages of residents age 55 or over, 39.1%, 35.0%, and 33.5% respectively. For persons 75 years and older, Brooklyn has the third highest percentage among the comparison communities and the 12th highest percent county-wide.

In Brooklyn, the smallest percentage of persons by age group is 19 to 24 years old, but this age range includes the fewest number of years of all the age groups. Roughly 7% of Brooklyn residents are in this age group. While small, this age group translates into 811 young adults.

Figure 3: Age Composition, Brooklyn, 2000

Just less than 10% of Brooklyn residents are between the age of 10 and 18 years old, and another 10% are nine years old or younger. Combined, persons below the age of 18 years old total roughly 2,300 persons and comprise almost one-fifth of Brooklyn's total population.

In terms of age composition, Brooklyn most closely resembles the City of Parma Heights. The two cities have approximately the same percentages of persons within each age category.
Figure 4: Change in Age Composition, 1990-2000

As Figure 4 shows, Brooklyn has experienced significant gains in the number of total persons 35-54 years old and persons over 75 years old when compared to 1990, 17% and 37% respectively. Factors such as advances in healthcare, healthier lifestyles, and declining birth rates have contributed to a growing proportion of older adults.

During the same time, Brooklyn also experienced noticeable declines in certain age groups. Persons between the ages of 25 to 34 years and 55 to 74 years old lost population, 20% and 29% respectively. The rise of Baby Boomers, those born between 1946 and 1964, and their offspring help to explain the large increases in population and subsequent drops in certain age groups as these age groups move into the next age bracket. In general, Brooklyn's population is growing older.

INCOME

The City of Cleveland has the highest poverty rate in metropolitan areas around the Country. While this does not impact Brooklyn directly, it has some indirect consequences because Brooklyn is surrounded on three sides by Cleveland. Poverty affects property maintenance, housing values, and shopping thefts.

According to the 2000 Census of Population & Housing, Brooklyn’s median household income was $36,046. Median refers to the middle value in a distribution, suggesting there are equal values above and below it. In terms of the comparison communities, Brooklyn ranks lowest and has the eighth lowest overall median household income of the 59 Cuyahoga County communities. However, Brooklyn experienced a significant percentage change increase over 1990 median household income (not adjusted for inflation). Between 1990 and 2000, Brooklyn’s median household income increased more than 34%, the fourth highest increase of the comparison communities. Still, Brooklyn’s 1990 median household income also ranked as one of the lowest countywide at $26,818.

Per capita income is the result of total aggregated income divided by population. Brooklyn’s per capita income was $21,127 in 2000, and ranked fifth among the comparison communities. Cuyahoga County as a whole compares at $22,272. In terms of percentage change from 1990 to 2000, Brooklyn’s per capita income rose more than 53% since 1990, the second highest percentage increase among the comparison communities.
Table 3: Median Household and Per Capita Income, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>2000 Income</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>2000 Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Median HH</td>
<td>Per Capita</td>
<td>Median HH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>$36,046</td>
<td>$21,127</td>
<td>Maple Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>$36,943</td>
<td>$20,076</td>
<td>Parma Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook Park</td>
<td>$46,333</td>
<td>$20,411</td>
<td>Seven Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn Heights</td>
<td>$47,847</td>
<td>$27,012</td>
<td>South Euclid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview Park</td>
<td>$50,487</td>
<td>$27,682</td>
<td>Cuyahoga County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Figure 5: Median Household Income by Age, Brooklyn, 2000

In general, a person’s median household income decreases as a person reaches retirement age. This is true in Brooklyn where the highest median household income is $51,250 for persons between 45-54 years old, but declines to $28,864 for persons between 65-74 years old. It drops still lower at $21,708 for persons age 75 years and older, which is almost half the peak median household income by age (See Figure 5).

EDUCATION

Table 4 shows educational attainment for Brooklyn and each of the comparison communities according to the 2000 U.S. Census. Of persons age 25 years and older, roughly 80% of Brooklyn’s residents had at least a high school diploma or equivalent, the lowest of the eight comparison communities, and slightly lower than Cuyahoga County in general. Of the comparison communities, Fairview Park and South Euclid have the highest percentages of persons with a high school degree or more, where 90% or more have a high school diploma.

In terms of post-high school education, 13% of Brooklyn residents who are 25 years and older had a college degree or higher compared to 25% of all Cuyahoga County. The comparison communities of Fairview Park and South Euclid both have over 36% with a college degree or above. In general, the higher the educational attainment is, the higher the household income.
### Table 4: Educational Attainment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Persons 25 yrs &amp; older</th>
<th>High School Diploma &amp; Above</th>
<th>College Degree &amp; Above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>8,476</td>
<td>6,791</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>10,365</td>
<td>8,631</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook Park</td>
<td>14,883</td>
<td>12,019</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn Heights</td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview Park</td>
<td>12,719</td>
<td>11,644</td>
<td>91.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Heights</td>
<td>17,705</td>
<td>14,558</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma Heights</td>
<td>15,990</td>
<td>13,222</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Hills</td>
<td>9,187</td>
<td>7,811</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Euclid</td>
<td>16,056</td>
<td>14,454</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga County</td>
<td>936,148</td>
<td>763,897</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Table 5: Place of Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Persons 16 yrs &amp; older employed in labor force</th>
<th>Worked within place of Residence</th>
<th>Worked outside place of Residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>5,245</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>6,878</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook Park</td>
<td>10,183</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn Heights</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview Park</td>
<td>8,833</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Heights</td>
<td>12,084</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma Heights</td>
<td>9,644</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Hills</td>
<td>5,629</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Euclid</td>
<td>12,137</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga County</td>
<td>617,590</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### LABOR FORCE

Brooklyn has approximately 5,600 persons in the civilian labor force. Of that total, roughly 5,345 are employed and working, according to the 2000 U.S. Census. Similar to each of the comparison communities, more than three-quarters of these residents (age 16 years and older employed in the civilian labor force) work outside of the city in which they reside (See Table 5). Brooklyn has a higher percentage of persons working within its boundaries, at 16.3%, second only to Brooklyn Heights. Of the 59 communities county-wide, Brooklyn ranks 23rd in terms of the percentage of persons who work within their place of residence.
Brooklyn residents work in a variety of industry occupational sectors. According to the 2000 U.S. Census, the majority of Brooklyn residents age 16 years and over who are employed in the civilian labor force work in the Manufacturing sector. Approximately 23% of Brooklyn residents (more than 1,230 persons) work in manufacturing. Brooklyn’s next highest percentage of industry occupations is in the Educational, Health, and Social Science at approximately 16%. This percentage is low when compared to the comparison communities where all but Brooklyn Heights have more employed in Educational, Health, and Social Science industry occupations. More than 10% of all employed Brooklyn residents age 16 years and older were employed in the Retail trade sector, the third highest percentage of occupational industries. See Figure 6.

For a detailed discussion of employees and earnings in Brooklyn, see Chapter 1.4 Market Analysis.

**HOUSING**

As Table 6 shows, Brooklyn has experienced an increase of housing units over the past twenty years. Between 1980 and 1990, Brooklyn’s number of housing units rose from 5,175 to 5,239 units. Compared to communities such as Brooklyn Heights and Maple Heights, which showed losses in total housing units between 1980 and 1990, Brooklyn experienced a modest increase of 1.2%. The community that experienced the largest gain in total housing units was the City of Bedford, with approximately 19% during that same period.

Within the last decade, Brooklyn saw an additional increase in housing units, up to 5,521 total units in 2000. Brooklyn’s recent gain of 5.4% between 1990 and 2000 is most similar to Cuyahoga County as a whole at 5.5%. The comparison communities that experienced the largest gains in housing since 1990 were Brooklyn Heights, Parma Heights, and Seven Hills, while Bedford’s previous gains actually showed a decline from 1990 to 2000.
In terms of housing tenure, Brooklyn's total number of occupied housing units increased from 5,018 in 1980 to 5,348 in 2000. Of that total, owner-occupied housing has remained relatively stable. On the other hand, renter-occupied housing units have accounted for an increasing portion of that total, up from 32.5% in 1980 to 36.7% in 2000. Owner-occupied housing units continue to comprise the majority, about two-thirds of all occupied housing in the City. Vacant housing units have fluctuated over recent decades, down between 1980 and 1990 and returning to about 3% in 2000, according to the U.S. Census.
As Figure 8 shows, the decade that experienced the largest increase in housing construction in Brooklyn was the 1950's. Combined, the amount of construction during the 1950's and 1960's account for more than half of all the housing units in the City. Just over one quarter of Brooklyn's housing was built before 1950 and the remaining 18% was built after 1970. Brooklyn has had some activity in recent years, accounting for 6% of housing construction since 1990.

Figure 9 compares the median year in which housing units were built in Brooklyn and in each of the comparison communities. The median year that Brooklyn's housing was built is 1958. This is later than the median year in communities like Maple Heights, Parma Heights, South Euclid and Cuyahoga County in general, but earlier than communities like Brook Park and Seven Hills. The County as a whole compares with a much earlier median year of 1940.
Almost two-thirds of Brooklyn’s housing units are single-family detached units (See Figure 10). Similar to other communities, single-family detached units are the predominant type of housing in the region. The next highest percentage of housing type in Brooklyn is apartment buildings with 5 to 19 units, followed by larger apartment complexes with 20 or more units per building. Only Parma Heights and Brook Park have a higher percentage of apartment units (5 or more) than Brooklyn. One-unit attached dwellings (townhouses) and apartment buildings with 2 to 4 units each comprise about 4% of the total housing in Brooklyn.

Table 7 compares the median sale price of single-family homes for Brooklyn and each of the comparison communities. Housing in Brooklyn is one of the most affordable in the County. Over the five-year period of 2000 to 2004, Brooklyn’s median single-family home sale price increased roughly 11%. In 2004, the median price of a single-family home sold in Brooklyn was $120,000. Of the comparison communities, Brooklyn had the third lowest median sale price in 2004. In terms of all Cuyahoga County municipalities, Brooklyn has the 10th lowest median sale price in 2004, indicating that much of the City’s housing stock is affordable. To some extent, this is due to the average size and type of house in Brooklyn, which is a 50-year-old, 1,200 square foot bungalow.

Comparison communities with the highest percent increase in housing sale prices over the past five years include Bedford and Brooklyn Heights. Overall, nearby Brooklyn Heights had the highest percent change in sale price and the highest median sale price of the comparison communities.

Some publications in the Northeast Ohio region rank communities in terms of housing, safety, education and services, as a service to their readers. However, these studies tend to disfavor older, inner-ring suburbs because they do not take into consideration the positive characteristics that are typical of cities like Brooklyn. For instance, community factors such as availability of affordable housing and a range of housing types are positive features that should be noted, but are not.
Table 7: Median Single-Family Home Sale Price, 2000-2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>% Change 2000-2004*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>$108,000</td>
<td>$113,000</td>
<td>$113,000</td>
<td>$119,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>$88,000</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>$102,500</td>
<td>$107,900</td>
<td>$109,000</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook Park</td>
<td>$118,400</td>
<td>$119,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$125,050</td>
<td>$127,000</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn Heights</td>
<td>$128,500</td>
<td>$122,000</td>
<td>$138,500</td>
<td>$165,500</td>
<td>$165,650</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview Park</td>
<td>$131,500</td>
<td>$135,600</td>
<td>$136,000</td>
<td>$143,000</td>
<td>$146,000</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Heights</td>
<td>$83,250</td>
<td>$87,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$92,000</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma Heights</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>$119,000</td>
<td>$122,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$129,900</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Hills</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$165,000</td>
<td>$164,500</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Euclid</td>
<td>$107,000</td>
<td>$109,900</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>$119,000</td>
<td>$123,000</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga County</td>
<td>$107,500</td>
<td>$111,000</td>
<td>$116,000</td>
<td>$122,000</td>
<td>$122,000</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga County, excl City of Cleveland</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$129,000</td>
<td>$134,900</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$141,000</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not adjusted for inflation

Source: Cleveland State University Housing Policy Research Program and NODIS from the Cuyahoga County Auditor’s Office Deed Transfer file.

Figure 11: Comparison of Median Single-Family Home Sale Price

As Figure 11 demonstrates, when compared to Cuyahoga County as a whole, Brooklyn’s median home sale price rose higher in 2000 and 2001 than the County. In the last three years however, housing sale prices in Brooklyn have been just below the County’s median single-family home sale price.

Table 8 shows the number of housing sales from existing single-family homes and new construction. Over the past five years, Brooklyn has experienced a relatively steady number of single-family home sales, a combined total of 702 single-family house sales. In terms of new home construction, 16 houses were sold between 2000 and 2004 in Brooklyn.

Part 1 Existing Conditions and Assessment
Chapter 1.2 Demographics
Brooklyn had between 127 and 168 single-family housing sale transactions annually between 2000 and 2004. South Euclid experienced the highest activity during the same period and its single-family housing sales averaged 27% between 2000 and 2004, the highest of all the comparison communities. Brooklyn compares with a single-family housing sales average of 12.7% during the same time period, the second lowest recent turn-over rate of all comparison communities. According to the survey results, Brooklyn residents tend to be long time residents of the City, which accounts for the low number of annual home sales.

Table 8: Number of Housing Sales: Existing Single-Family & New Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook Park</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn Heights</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview Park</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Heights</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma Heights</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Hills</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Euclid</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga County</td>
<td>16,772</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>16,805</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>17,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga County, excl City of Cleveland</td>
<td>12,067</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>12,116</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>12,978</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Cleveland State University Housing Policy Research Program and NODIS from the Cuyahoga County Auditor's Office Deed Transfer file.

CONCLUSIONS

Brooklyn is a strong, small-town community that has an interesting demographic profile. While demographic composition certainly changes over time, the City is not immune to factors occurring in nearby communities and the County in general. Such factors include urbanization and urban sprawl, an aging population, maturing housing stock, and changes in the composition of residents. Some key conclusions of this chapter include:

- The residential population in Brooklyn is declining. Smaller family and household size have contributed to population decline, and some residents have all together moved out of the City. While the City's population decline has been modest, the loss translates into fewer users of certain municipal services, but may result in the need for additional municipal services because of potentially abandoned or vacant properties.
• Brooklyn’s population is aging. There is a growing population of persons over the age of 55 years old. This age group, while more mobile and independent than ever, has significant needs in terms of programming, housing and financial assistance.

• As the population ages, the need for empty-nester and elder-friendly housing and neighborhoods increases.

• There is a disparity of income as one ages. The median household income for persons over the age of 75 is a fraction of the peak household income of all households. While many Brooklyn seniors are on fixed incomes, they have increased needs.

• Heads of households between 35 and 64 years old have the highest household income. It is necessary to maintain a higher percentage of this age category to help offset the lowered income tax revenues from, yet increased needs of, older residents.

• Educational attainment is generally a predictor of income. Among the 59 Cuyahoga County communities, Brooklyn has one of the lowest percentages of residents with at least a high school degree. Emphasis on completing high school, pursuing a college education, as well as attracting and retaining residents with higher income levels should be promoted.

• Residents are largely employed in manufacturing occupations, which in recent years, has experienced declines in total employment. This could have severe consequences on income tax revenue and could increase the need for city services if manufacturing jobs continue to leave the region.

• Brooklyn has experienced an increase in the percentage of rental units. The number of renters has increased in recent decades and continues to grow. Maintaining housing and property values is of concern given the number of renters and absentee landlords.

• Housing values in Brooklyn have not outpaced other communities within Cuyahoga County. While residential market values are largely a measure of housing square footage and lot size, Brooklyn is limited with its stock of 1,200 square feet average house size and 0.12-acre lots. Creative approaches to enhancing housing opportunities in the City can help Brooklyn remain competitive in attracting homebuyers.
CHAPTER 1.3
LAND USE PATTERNS, ZONING AND NATURAL FEATURES

Brooklyn is a west side community located approximately six miles southwest of downtown Cleveland. Brooklyn, comprised of 4.25 square miles, is surrounded by Cleveland on its east, north, and west borders, and bounded by the City of Parma to the south. It is primarily a residential suburb, but has a unique mix of other land uses including a number of churches, retail and other commercial uses, industry, utilities, and parks.

The existing land use patterns in Brooklyn have evolved over many years in response to early settlement patterns and environmental challenges, among other influences. Understanding land development patterns and their relationship to established regulations (such as the zoning and subdivision regulations) is critical in determining how to formulate future development and redevelopment policies.

This chapter presents the findings of a detailed land use inventory conducted by the Cuyahoga County Planning Commission during the Fall of 2004. It also provides an overview of forces that have shaped Brooklyn’s current development pattern, a summary of the existing zoning regulations, and an overview of natural features and environmental constraints. Combined, these considerations will impact the evolution of future individual land uses and the overall development pattern of the City.

DEVELOPMENT HISTORY
Brooklyn Township was organized in June 1818 as a part of Cleveland’s early west side territory. Throughout the 19th and early 20th centuries, the City of Cleveland annexed land from the township while a number of individual communities in the township incorporated. In 1927, with only a small area in the southwest corner of the original Brooklyn Township remaining, residents of the township incorporated as a village. Under the leadership of Mayor John M. Coyne, Brooklyn became a home-rule city with a charter in 1950.

After WWII, a housing boom was underway. Over 840 homes were built in the 1940s compared to only 67 the decade before. Then, between 1950 and 1960 nearly 1,500 more homes were constructed. By this time, the City’s street network and neighborhood patterns were in place with Ridge Road as the primary north-south street and Memphis Avenue and Biddulph Road as major east-west streets; single-family homes, mostly bungalows were built in fairly compact neighborhoods; and industry was located at the outer edges of the City, along Clinton Road and Tiedeman Road, between Big Creek and the rail lines. Small-scale retail stores were located along Memphis Avenue and Ridge Road.

In the mid-1950s, during the housing boom, City Hall was constructed in a central location on the south side of Memphis Avenue between Ridge Road and Roadoan Road. With great foresight, the City acquired a sizeable amount of land on which it built City Hall and established Veterans Memorial Park. Over the next 30 years, the City continued to expand upon its civic center site with the construction of the Brooklyn Recreation Center in 1975 and the Senior/Community Center in 1983. Further south of the civic center campus, the Brooklyn City School District erected its two
elementary buildings in the late 40s and early 50s. This comprehensive array of public buildings was supplemented by numerous churches, associated parochial schools and cemeteries.

By the late 1950s, concentrated commercial development was occurring along Brookpark Road at the City’s southern boundary, as Parma too was experiencing record housing construction. Biddulph Plaza was constructed at the corner of Biddulph and Ridge Roads to serve the growing population.

While much of the physical development of Brooklyn was shaped by the location of the Big Creek, the construction of two major highways through the City established two very real barriers that separated the center of the City from its northern and southern edges. When the Ohio Department of Transportation constructed Interstate 71 in 1965, the highway cut through the northern portion of Brooklyn, though Big Creek had already served as a significant buffer between industrial uses to the north and residential uses to the south. However, ODOT’s construction of Interstate 480 between Biddulph Road and Brookpark Road caused a bigger disruption to the City’s neighborhoods. This highway project, constructed in 1986 and 1987, severed the Southwood Subdivision, a relatively new subdivision (platted in 1964 and nearly entirely constructed by 1970) from the rest of the neighborhoods and also physically separated most Brooklyn residents from the Brookpark retail corridor.

**EXISTING LAND USE**

The combination, concentration, and diversification of land uses in a community contribute to its visual form. In addition, a community is made up of various elements that further define and shape its physical form such as topographic features, streets, edges, nodes, neighborhoods, and landmarks.

Now, approximately 88% of the land in the City is developed. Table 1 indicates that 1/3 of the City (34.4%) is devoted to business (including retail and office) and industrial uses, while residential uses occupy 29% of the City. The Current Land Use Map indicates the concentration of the various land uses, the street network and the location of Big Creek.

Existing land uses were initially determined from the Cuyahoga County Auditor records, and then verified using aerial photographs and comprehensive field investigations.

![Table 1: Land Use in Acres, 2004](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developed Land (including open space restricted from development)</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>% of Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>675.9</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family</td>
<td>569.6</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Family</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Industrial</td>
<td>802.3</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>277.1</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Vacant</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail/Mixed</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>438.1</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>431.7</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserved Open Space</td>
<td>129.6</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>209.9</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>138.7</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developed Land</td>
<td>2,048.6</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underdeveloped/Vacant</td>
<td>262.3</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,330.9</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 1 Existing Conditions and Assessment
Chapter 1.3 Land Use Patterns, Zoning and Natural Features
The Current Land Use Map identifies the locations of the remaining vacant land within Brooklyn. While approximately 12% of the land area is noted as vacant, much of that land has significant constraints to development. A sizeable amount is located in the Big Creek floodplain. Other areas are landlocked and will require additional street access to facilitate development.

**Residential**

Residential land uses occupy 29% of the land area in the City, primarily single-family homes (84% of the total land area devoted to residential uses). The majority of single-family homes are located in subdivisions with typical lot sizes ranging from 4,000 square feet to under 9,000 square feet and constructed between 1940 and 1970. The short period in which each subdivision was constructed has lead to a homogeneous appearance of the homes.

As stated above, the path of Big Creek through parts of Brooklyn has provided an edge to the compact residential areas in the City. On the west side of Big Creek, the relatively small amount of residential development that does exists was constructed over a long period, with one structure dating back to 1875 and others constructed in the late 1970's and early 1980s. The lots sizes in this area are the largest in the City with some lots extending over 1,000 feet to Big Creek. This range in the years the homes were built and the larger variety in lot sizes has created an eclectic residential area.

Approximately 4% of developed land area in the City is occupied by apartment buildings; in contrast, 28% of the total dwelling units in the City are apartment units that are located on this small amount of land. The apartment complexes are located in concentrated areas on the major streets – Memphis, Ridge and Biddulph.

A small percentage (less than 1%) of the developed land area in the City is occupied by two-family houses, mostly along Roadan and Memphis Streets, with new construction on Westbrook Drive.

**Nonresidential**

The next largest land use category is industrial, which occupies nearly 21% (439 acres) of the developed land in the City. All of the industrial land is located on the edges of the community, primarily to the north in the Clinton Road/Ridge Road industrial area and to the west along Tiedeman Road and the western end of Memphis Avenue.

Retail and retail/office uses occupy the third largest category with 363 acres. The large majority of retail stores are concentrated in one of three distinct locations: along Brookpark Road, at either the Biddulph Plaza or Ridge Park Square shopping centers. Newer restaurants have opened along Tiedeman, just south of the I-480 ramps.

Together, the nonresidential land uses occupy the largest percentage of land area in the City.

**Community Facilities and Infrastructure**

Institutional uses including governmental buildings, libraries, churches, and schools comprise over 10% (210 acres) of the developed land in the City. Parks occupy another 92 acres, most notably Veterans Memorial Park, the City’s largest community park, and the portion of the
Cleveland Metroparks Big Creek Reservation that is located in the City. There are approximately 130 acres of open space that are noted as unavailable for development. Finally, nearly 140 acres are devoted to either utility or railroad rights-of-way.

**OTHER FACTORS INFLUENCING DEVELOPMENT**

The major streets within a community generally set the tone for the feel and character of that community. The major streets in Brooklyn – Brookpark, Biddulph, Memphis, Ridge and Tiedeman - were built or expanded to maximize automobile circulation, which then minimizes the importance, or even presence, of the pedestrian.

*Edges* of a community are linear elements that often prohibit or separate one area from another in either a physical or visual way. Ideally, these edges exist at the perimeter of the City; however, when these edges exist within the community, they act as barriers and divisions between parts of the community. Edges include railroads, interstate highways, power transmission right-of-ways, and natural topographic features, such as the Big Creek. The railroad tracks that form the City’s northwestern boundary serve as a major edge separating Brooklyn from Cleveland, while the Big Creek, the CEI easement, I-71, and I-480 all serve as major edges within Brooklyn.

A *node* is an area with a concentration of particular uses or a group of similar uses. Often a node can be referred to as a core. There are three primary nodes within the City, two acting as the commercial/retail centers of the City and the other characterized by governmental/community facilities. These nodes, respectively, are the Ridge Park Square/Biddulph Plaza retail concentration along Ridge Road between Biddulph and the I-480 ramps, the Key Commons/Cascade Crossing on Tiedeman south of the I-480 ramps, and Memphis/Ridge area where City Hall, the Senior/Community Center, Veterans Memorial Park and the City’s Recreation Center anchor a concentration of civic uses, churches and small retail stores.

A *neighborhood* is an area, larger than a node that has common identifying characteristics such as lot size, building style, age, types of street layout, or unique natural features. As part of the Community Survey conducted in the Fall of 2004, nine neighborhoods were identified in the City based primarily on the year of construction, the configuration of the streets, and proximity to natural or manmade barriers. Figure 2 indicates the neighborhood boundaries and assigns names to identify the different neighborhoods for the purposes of this Plan.

A *landmark* is an icon in the City to which people refer and relate; a place that is widely used when describing geographic location within a community. For example, a resident may refer to a street off Ridge Road as being located across the street from the Ridge Park Square. Whenever it is widely known to residents where the road or other feature is generally located, and is used as a means of giving directions it becomes a landmark. Examples of other major landmarks include Veterans Memorial Park, Big Creek Reservation, the Big Creek, and City Hall/Senior/Community Center/Veterans Memorial Park area. Additional landmarks could include places of worship, schools, and businesses with visibility to main roads.

*Access routes* include Interstate I-71 (north-south) and I-480 (east-west). *Shopping locations* include Ridge Park Square and Biddulph Plaza with several strip retail centers in the vicinity.
Figure 2: Brooklyn Neighborhood Delineations used in the Community Survey.
Parmatown Mall, a large shopping complex is located just three miles south at Ridge Road and Ridgewood Drive (in Parma, Ohio).

**ZONING IN BROOKLYN**

Zoning is the exercise of the City's "police power" to protect the public health, safety and welfare by placing use, bulk, and height controls upon land and buildings. These controls prevent overcrowding of land, congestion on the streets and sidewalks, undue concentration of population and the mixing of incompatible land uses. Ultimately, zoning is one of the primary controls over the pattern of future development.

Zoning delineates where and how residences, businesses, industry and institutions can be located within a community. These land use regulations are adopted as law in the "Zoning Code". Every zoning code has two essential elements: the zoning code text, which contains written regulations typically prescribing minimum standards of development, and the zoning map, which delineates the boundaries of the various zoning districts so each property owner knows which set of regulations apply to his or her property.

In 1992, the City adopted a comprehensive update of the Brooklyn Zoning Code (Ord. 1991-88. Passed 11-4-92.) The Brooklyn Zoning Code includes eight zoning districts: four residential districts, two business districts and two industrial districts. The existing zoning district boundaries are shown on Figure 3. A summary of each district follows, while a more detailed summary of the permitted uses and development standards for each zoning district is included in Appendix C. A comparison of the number of acres zoned for each district, compared to the actual use of the property is shown on Table 2.

Almost half of the City (46%) is zoned SF-DH, Single-Family Dwelling House District. Of this, 52% is actually used for residential purposes; the remaining area is devoted to institutional uses, parks, open space and land for utilities. This district lists single-family homes as the only type of residential use permitted yet also conditionally permits a range of public uses. The district requires a minimum single-family lot size of 10,000 square feet and a minimum lot width of 75 feet. These standards render a large portion of the existing house lots as nonconforming since many were platted at less than these minimums.

Only a small portion of the City (6 acres, which is 0.26%) is zoned D-H Dwelling House, which permits both single-family and two-family houses. The minimum residential lot size in this district is 6,000 square feet and the minimum lot width is 65 feet for both single-family homes and two family homes. That means that any single-family house in this district that complies with these minimum zoning requirements can be converted to a two-family home or duplex.

Both the A-H, Apartment House District and the MF-PD, Multi-Family Planned Development District permit the construction of apartment buildings. There are roughly the same amounts of land area zoned for both of these districts, 54.5 acres and 57 acres respectively. In addition, the A-H Apartment House District permits single-family homes and two-family homes, and all residential types must be on a minimum lot size of 6,000 square feet dwellings. In contrast, the MF-PD, Multi-Family Planned Development District requires a minimum development site of five acres, with a minimum lot width of 100 feet and a maximum density of eight dwelling units per acre.
Figure 3: Current Zoning Map
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Table 2: Land Area by Zoning District and Land Use, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Zoning District (in acres)</th>
<th>Total by Land Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SF-DH</td>
<td>D-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family</td>
<td>553.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-family</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail vacant</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Mixed</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>188.9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- zoned residential = 106.4
- zoned business = 21.7
- zoned industrial = 154.2

When reviewing the amount and location of vacant land it is important to consider the current zoning. As noted earlier in this chapter, only 12% (282 acres) of the land area in the City remains vacant, and approximately 106 acres are zoned for residential.

Nearly 300 acres in the City are zoned either R-B, Retail Business District or G-B, General Business District. The two business districts have the same development standards: a minimum lot size of 20,000 square feet, minimum lot width and frontage of 100 feet and maximum lot coverage by the principal building of 25% of the total lot area. The differences between the two districts are the type of uses permitted in each and their application in the City. The R-B Retail Business District is more restrictive and is intended to create a concentrated shopping environment that encourages shoppers to visit more than one store on a single trip.
In contrast, the G-B General Business District is intended to accommodate a wide range of commercial activities, along with outdoor storage and display, in a manner that does not disrupt concentrated shopping areas and intrude upon residential areas. Larger scale uses such as hospitals and motels, and drive-through facilities are permitted by right in the G-B District, but are only conditionally permitted in the R-B District.

Of the three categories of zoning, the business district zoning is applied to the smallest area of the City, and has the fewest number of acres (21.7) that remain vacant, see Figure 4.

Industrially-zoned land comprises 847 acres in the City, of which 693 acres are developed. The two industrial districts include L-I, Limited Industrial District, and G-I, General Industrial District. In the L-I District, all principal uses must be conducted entirely within the building while the G-I District permits a wide range of industrial uses, including uses that rely heavily on truck traffic and outdoor storage.

As with the business districts, the industrial districts differ only in the use regulations: the development standards are the same for both, with a minimum lot size requirement of 1 acre, minimum lot width and frontage requirement of 125 feet and maximum lot coverage by the principal building of 25% of the total lot area. There are approximately 154 acres of vacant industrially-zoned land, mostly located along Tiedeman Road.
NATURAL FEATURES

A discussion of selected environmental characteristics or “constraints” to development/renovation identified in Brooklyn follows. While City-wide patterns are discussed here in general terms, Part 2: Focus Areas offers detailed discussions of such challenges to developers that exist for particular properties.

Brooklyn’s proximity to Lake Erie provides access to unique natural features of the region. Within its borders, Brooklyn has a distinctive mix of natural features and amenities that help make the City a special place to visit, work, and live. Topography changes, the Big Creek water body and venues such as Big Creek Reservation of the Cleveland Metroparks all contribute to a varied and interesting landscape. These natural features not only affect the quality of life of residents, but can affect development decisions on and around these natural areas.

NOTE: For those properties demonstrating the presence of potentially limiting physical constraints, there is no substitute for on-site investigations before development in order to accurately determine the presence, extent and severity of the limitations discussed here and the costs associated with overcoming them if development is pursued. Further investigations are particularly important when considering the potential for nature’s and man’s actions to alter conditions with the passage of time.

Big Creek and Its Tributaries

The Big Creek is a tributary of the Cuyahoga River. The City of Brooklyn lies within the Big Creek watershed, which drains surface water from the City eastward to the Cuyahoga River and which encompasses approximately 40 square miles. The watershed includes southwest Cleveland, Brooklyn and Linndale, and portions of Parma, Parma Heights, Brook Park and North Royalton.

Waterways, such as the Big Creek and its tributaries play important roles by creating positive visual images, providing no-cost storm water management services, supporting leisure and recreational activities, and maintaining sensitive natural habitats for plant and animal life. Disruption of drainage patterns can result in erosion, siltation, and damage to buildings and grounds, whereas land mismanagement and human carelessness can pollute or destroy our complex, interconnected surface and ground water systems.

The natural characteristics of Big Creek and its tributaries include the adjoining floodplain and the steep slopes lining the river valley. Figure 5 highlights these features and indicates their overall impact on the City and the remaining vacant land.

In 2005, a group of interested residents organized a non-profit entity titled “Friends of Big Creek”. The mission of the organization is to improve conditions of the waterway, improve accessibility to this natural feature, increase public awareness of the nature and condition of the watershed, and harness the economic potential of Creek. The organization includes residents of Cleveland (Old Brooklyn neighborhood) and of Brooklyn. During the Summer of 2005, the group organized walks along the Big Creek to familiarize/remind residents of the current characteristics and future potential of the Creek. See Appendix D for more details about the “Friends of Big Creek” group.
Figure 5: Water Features and Slope, Brooklyn
Steep Slopes
Steep slopes present special challenges for land developers. Slopes in excess of 20% (drop of 20 feet in 100 feet of horizontal surface) are generally prohibitive for new building construction without added investments in site design and building construction. Slopes from 15% to 20% are considered marginal depending on the type of new development. Most properties in the City are flat with slopes less than 5%.

Terrain with slopes in excess of 15% is found primarily within the Big Creek valley and its tributaries. Most of these areas are located in the back yards of the larger residential lots along Tiedeman Road, or on residentially-zoned properties which are currently vacant. A portion of the land impacted by steep slopes is either owned by the City (north of Thomas More Church) or by the Cleveland Metroparks.

Floodplains
Floodplains (flat, low-lying areas along rivers and other drainage courses where rainwater accumulates) are integral elements of the storm water management system because they hold water that may otherwise flood nearby developed areas during storm events. Altering the configuration of a floodplain, even to a seemingly insignificant degree, can drastically impact storm water flow and prompt new flooding damage up- or down-stream. Compounding the frequency and magnitude of flooding is the increased runoff prompted by the development of additional hard surfaces (e.g., roads, parking lots and building roofs) which slow or prohibit the infiltration of rainwater. The Big Creek has a large flat area prone to flooding in the southern portion of the City near Biddulph Road.

Wetlands
Pockets of wetlands are located in the western portion of the City, with a large concentration of them at the City’s western terminus of Biddulph Road on and north of the Plain Dealer’s property. In total, Brooklyn has roughly 24.2 acres of land considered wetlands. Wetlands perform a valuable function in the environment: They not only provide habitat to plants and animals within the watershed, but when rivers overflow, wetlands help absorb and slow floodwaters. This ability to control floods can alleviate property damage and loss.

Cuyahoga County Greenspace Plan and Greenprint
The Cuyahoga County Planning Commission, assisted by the Greenspace Working Group, has been developing a plan aimed at preserving the county’s greenspace as well as enhancing and increasing what exists. The intent of the Greenspace Plan is to promote a broad, comprehensive vision for greenspace protection and restoration within the County. The Plan is also intended to promote complementary development and establish a common agenda and direction for the varied efforts of the many necessary participants. See Figure 6 for the Countywide Greenprint Map, which documents the open space resources throughout Cuyahoga County.

Basic elements of the plan include the creation of a system of natural corridors, a countywide trail system, the preservation of scenic views, and the protection and restoration of critical natural areas. The Greenprint Trail Map indicates opportunities for open space protection and trail connections based on natural features and is intended to be used as a framework for more detailed planning. The potential trail locations in and near Brooklyn are shown on Figure 7.
Cleveland Metroparks

Brooklyn residents are fortunate to be in proximity to two of the Cleveland Metroparks Reservations: Brookside Reservation in Cleveland (east of the City, just south of I-71) and Big Creek Reservation, a portion of which is in Brooklyn, and with the Big Creek Parkway and remainder of the Reservation located immediately south of the City east of Tiedeman Road.

One of the goals of the Cleveland Metroparks is to enlarge its Emerald Necklace. The Metroparks recognizes that opportunities exist for strengthening the linkage between its park reservations and facilities. The City of Brooklyn has the potential to link up its Memphis Avenue Picnic Area with the Fern Hill Picnic Area site as part of the Big Creek Reservation and with Brookside Reservation. As part of its long-term planning, the Metroparks has identified potential sites for linkages, which are shown on Figure 7.
Figure 7: Existing and Planned Pedestrian and Bike Trails, Brooklyn
Environmental Hazards

Environmental hazards prompted by man’s past or current practices on some properties can interfere with the development and redevelopment of land because of costs associated with hazard clean-up, removal or management. Such hazards, discussed below, have the potential to pollute surface and ground water or soil. They may also pose life-threatening dangers to nearby residents, workplace employees, and the safety forces who must respond to incidents. There are also potential current and future costs to owners of such properties due to associated legal liabilities.

It is not unusual for a community to have commercial and industrial properties characterized by operations that were or are potentially hazardous. Such properties can be a source of future concern if the operation is abandoned, old waste burials are present, old spills or leaks are present, new leaks or spills occur and are not properly managed, or materials are not properly managed in the course of conducting manufacturing or other activities. These properties possess documented site features that have the capacity to present current or future potential hurdles to development/redevelopment.

Storage tanks (many underground with some documented as leaking) and facilities that manufacture, treat, store, release into the environment, or dispose of hazardous materials and wastes are scattered throughout Brooklyn. The majority of the roughly three dozen sites demonstrating these hazards are found in clusters within the along Brookpark Road, Clinton Road and Memphis Avenue. The largest concentration of potential hazards is situated on properties along Brookpark Road. Mapped and classified locations identified by state and federal regulators and other sources can be viewed by going to the “Brownfields GIS” maps and related information presented on the Cuyahoga County Planning Commission’s website (http://planning.co.cuyahoga.oh.us/).

Conclusions

- There is very little vacant land remaining in the City and environmental constraints impact the development potential on a sizeable portion of that which does remain.

- Brooklyn was developed with a well-balanced array of land uses relatively well laid out, with industrial uses buffered from residential areas, shopping areas located along major corridors and institutional uses generally centralized in the community.

- Residential land uses comprise about one-third of all land uses in terms of acres, the majority of which is single-family housing.

- Parks, recreation and institutional uses are well accounted for in the City and should be maintained. The City’s concentration of civic uses on Memphis is a great example of planning foresight.

- Natural features and environmental considerations such as steep slopes and floodplains should be accommodated for, be recognized, and protected.

- There has been considerable discussion about the preservation of open space and trail connections at the county level as a way of enhancing the quality of life for residents.
CHAPTER 1.4
MARKET ANALYSIS

A strong commercial and industrial base is important to the long-term health of a community. Commercial establishments not only provide goods and services which meet the daily needs of residents, but also provide jobs and tax revenue for a community. Business growth should also meet the future needs of residents and the City. Business growth must be carefully balanced to ensure that quality local businesses have an opportunity to thrive alongside larger, national chains. Brooklyn is a place where the local businesses and companies contribute to the uniqueness of the City.

A sufficient range of convenient and competitive shopping opportunities is, historically, one of the strengths of urban neighborhoods. National retail stores such as Wal-Mart, Best Buy, and Lowe’s commingle with small, locally-owned restaurants, clothing and resale stores, and convenience services.

This chapter covers a broad range of issues related to the City’s economic capacity. A detailed inventory of all commercial (retail and office) and industrial establishments was conducted in November, 2004 and updated in August, 2005 to gain an understanding of the kinds of businesses operating within Brooklyn’s borders. Because businesses constantly change, it is difficult to continuously update the listing. The inventory therefore provides a “snapshot” of the business establishments located in the City at a specific point in time. This inventory is contained in its entirety in Appendix E.

The findings from the Community Survey that dealt with the shopping experiences of local residents and the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce’s Business Retention and Expansion report were also considered. These components shed some light on the City’s potential for attracting future additional retail, office and industrial development and opportunities for enhancing existing businesses.

RETAIL & OFFICE INVENTORY

A comprehensive inventory of commercial (retail and office) floor space within Brooklyn was undertaken in the Fall of 2004 and updated in August, 2005 to reflect changes since the original inventory was compiled. A number of sources were used to compile the detailed inventory including Cuyahoga County Auditors records, Harris Industrial Survey, the Northeast Ohio Regional Retail Analysis, and Power Finder USA – a national phonebook listing. The City of Brooklyn Building Department and major shopping center leasing companies also provided tenant square footage. Field investigations allowed for identification of recent new construction, tenant changes, and floor area measurements, where needed.

Commercial businesses were classified according to one of seven categories ranging from Convenience Goods and Services to Office space. In total, the commercial sector occupies more than 3 million square feet and approximately 174 retail and office establishments operate in the City. The findings of Brooklyn’s detailed commercial inventory are presented in Figure 1 and Table 1.
The **Shopping Goods and Services** category accounts for the largest percentage of commercial floor space. Comprised of 524,010 square feet (40.3%), this category includes general merchandise stores such as Wal-Mart, Sam’s Club, Home Depot, and Lowe’s, as well as thrift stores and resale shops. Approximately 29 shopping goods and service business establishments are located in the City. While many of these shopping goods and services businesses are found throughout the community, many of the larger, national retail chains are concentrated on Brookpark Road and within the Ridge Park Square Shopping Center.

**Offices** make up approximately 27% of the inventory, the next largest percentage of floor space in Brooklyn. Regional and national offices such as Key Bank’s Operations Center, Progressive Insurance, and Ohio Savings Bank Operations Center are some of the larger exclusively-office buildings within the City. Brooklyn’s percentage of office space, almost one-quarter of all its commercial square footage, is significant especially compared to other communities nearby – the City of Parma has 12.7% of its overall commercial floor area in local and regional offices. This category does not include American Greetings. While offices are a component of the American Greetings plant, its predominant land use is printing and manufacturing of greeting cards. Therefore, based on its standard industrial code, it was included in the industrial inventory.

**Figure 1: Commercial (Retail & Office) Floor Area, 2005**

The third largest category of commercial businesses is **Convenience Goods and Services**. This category accounts for 16.4% of the overall commercial inventory and is comprised of 82 firms, the largest number of different business establishments. This category includes a variety of convenience businesses such as gift shops, delicatessens, dry cleaners, beauty salons, and drug stores. The largest of these businesses includes the many supermarkets and restaurants located in Brooklyn. Cascade Crossings is one of the newer and larger concentrations of food service businesses, which caters to the employees of nearby offices and industries as well as to residents and families.

**Automobile Sales, Parts and Services** comprise the next largest commercial category. New and used automobile sales comprise the highest square footage in this category, almost 70% of the category’s combined 144,983 square feet. Approximately 14 different firms, made up of gas stations, auto repair shops, auto parts sales, and new and used cars, account for the fourth largest commercial category

**Other Retail and Commercial Amusements** comprise 4.0% and 3.6% respectively of the commercial inventory. Hotels, business services such as photocopying and tax services, and training schools are categorized as Other Retail and cover a total of about 127,270 square feet in

---
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Brooklyn. Commercial Amusements include movie theaters, social halls, and outdoor amusements such as Memphis Kiddie Park and the Memphis Drive-In Theater. Approximately 114,280 square feet of commercial amusements are located within Brooklyn.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Type of Establishment</th>
<th>Floor Area (S.F.)</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th># of Firms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>CONVENIENCE GOODS AND SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Supermarkets</td>
<td>187,565</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Other Food</td>
<td>14,795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Food Service</td>
<td>230,755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Other Convenience Goods</td>
<td>42,830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>Convenience Services</td>
<td>48,105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal for A</td>
<td>524,010</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>SHOPPING GOODS AND SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Department Stores,</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Other General Merchandise</td>
<td>959,950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Clothing and Shoes</td>
<td>57,020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Other Shopping Goods</td>
<td>141,147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>Furniture/Home Furnishings</td>
<td>128,005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal for B</td>
<td>1,286,122</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>AUTOMOBILE SALES, PARTS AND SERVICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1/C2</td>
<td>New /Used Auto Sales</td>
<td>100,385</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Auto Parts Sales</td>
<td>14,850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Auto Repair</td>
<td>22,863</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>Gas Stations</td>
<td>6,670</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>Transportation Service</td>
<td>295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal for C</td>
<td>144,983</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>COMMERCIAL AMUSEMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Enclosed Amusements</td>
<td>32,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Banquet/Social Halls</td>
<td>71,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Outdoor Amusements</td>
<td>10,180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal for D</td>
<td>114,280</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>OTHER RETAIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>97,160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>Funeral Homes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>Animal Hospitals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>Training Schools</td>
<td>21,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5</td>
<td>Business Services</td>
<td>9,010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal for E</td>
<td>127,270</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Existing Vacant</td>
<td>137,205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal for F</td>
<td>137,205</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>OFFICE SPACE*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Local Offices/Banks/Medical Offices</td>
<td>171,055</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Regional and National Offices</td>
<td>684,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal for G</td>
<td>855,555</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3,189,425</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This inventory does not include American Greetings; AG is listed in the industrial inventory.
Brooklyn’s commercial *Vacancy* rate is relatively favorable at 4.3%. Compared to other communities with retail establishments, Brooklyn’s vacancy rate is low: Parma has a 7.4% vacancy rate, while Warrensville Heights and Parma Heights have double digit rates of 12.7% and 18.9%, respectively.

**Retail Opportunities and Recent Development**

Table 1 also highlights those business types that are currently underrepresented in Brooklyn. As of August 2005, businesses such as drug stores, department stores, funeral homes, and animal hospitals were not located in the City. While it is not imperative to have each business type represented in the community, it highlights where there are business opportunities. Brooklyn residents are currently traveling outside the City’s borders in order to meet these commercial goods and service needs. Nearby communities provide a number of these needs: a funeral home and animal hospital are located in nearby Cleveland, and Brooklyn residents can get their prescriptions filled at certain grocery stores or travel to free-standing drug stores in neighboring communities.

Some additional opportunities exist in the commercial sector. Child care services were underrepresented in the inventory and cited in the community survey as a needed and desirable use. As more women are projected to enter the work force, demand for child care is expected to grow. As our population ages, and experiences longer life spans, there is projected to be an increased demand for healthcare and social assistance. Community care facilities, rehabilitation services, and ambulatory health care services are projected by the Bureau of Labor Statistics to be fast growing industries through 2012.

Within the last three years, several food-oriented businesses and restaurants have opened at Key Commons which complement the newer restaurants and hotels at Cascade Crossing across the street and next to I-480. Several additional businesses have been proposed at Key Commons and are expected to be developed on a portion of Key Bank’s office campus and 20 acres of vacant land.

Other new commercial development in Brooklyn includes Circuit City which is one of the newest developments at the Ridge Park Square Shopping Center. Circuit City opened in the Fall, 2004 and added 34,100 square feet of retail space to the market. Office flex-space located off Northcliff Avenue was constructed beginning in 2002 through 2004. Several new restaurants have also been constructed in recent years including IHOP and Golden Corral in 2004.

**Retail Trends**

The growth of retail has been significant in Brooklyn and nationwide over the past three decades. According to a 1970 study done by the Regional Planning Commission (prior to becoming the Cuyahoga County Planning Commission), Brooklyn has experienced an increase in all commercial retail sectors (See Table 2). Overall, square footage increased more than 701%, up from 398,000 square feet to more than 3 million square feet in 2005. Office square footage increased the most over the past 35 years, and commercial amusements had the second highest percentage increase. The addition of numerous office buildings, two hotels and two party centers have contributed to the greatest increase in commercial floor area in Brooklyn since 1970.
Table 2: Comparison of Commercial Floor Area, 1970 and 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commercial Type</th>
<th>1970 Square footage</th>
<th>2005 Square Footage</th>
<th>% Change 1970-2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convenience Goods &amp; Services</td>
<td>122,000</td>
<td>524,010</td>
<td>329.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Goods &amp; Services</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>1,286,122</td>
<td>635.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobiles</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>144,983</td>
<td>479.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amusements</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>114,280</td>
<td>1,042.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>127,270</td>
<td>879.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Retail</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>137,205</td>
<td>6760.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>51,000</td>
<td>855,555</td>
<td>1,577.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>398,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,189,425</strong></td>
<td><strong>701.36%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the quantity of commercial space has increased over recent decades, the character and quality have also changed. Many of the older retail corridors have buildings that were designed to accommodate small, local establishments. Buildings were situated close to the street, parking was typically located to the rear if at all, and overall tenant space was small. Today, retail businesses cater to the automobile and are much larger in size. The proliferation of “big box” stores tends to create large stores located further from the street with large expansive parking lots separating building entrances from sidewalks along the street. Whereas the older storefronts were more articulated and provided uniqueness and character to retail districts, these larger stores are occupied by national chains that are required to maintain the corporations’ national identities and therefore lack any sense of place. In addition, internet shopping has become more popular and is expected to increasingly compete for consumer expenditures from more traditional “bricks & mortar” establishments.

Newer retailers tend to require larger stores on sizeable tracts of land for both store structures and parking. This tends to make the older storefronts less marketable, resulting in lower rents, marginal uses and increased vacancies. However, many factors and retail trends will continue to affect the competitiveness of Brooklyn’s commercial businesses. In general, there has been a significant and growing increase in retail floor area, even as the population in Cuyahoga County continues to decline. This phenomenon has had a profound effect on older retail stores and shopping centers as they compete for shoppers and revenue. The older retail venues must continue to reinvent themselves and provide well-designed retail spaces in order to attract quality tenants.

**Industrial Inventory**

Brooklyn has a relatively strong industrial and manufacturing base, with over 4.3 million square feet of floor space. Approximately 96 different industrial businesses were operating in Brooklyn as of August, 2005. While there has been globalization and outsourcing of many businesses nationwide, Brooklyn’s manufacturing base remains an important component of the regional economy.

There are six major categories within the industrial inventory, including industrial vacancies. Businesses were classified according to a five-digit North American Industry Classification
System (NAICS) Code which was developed jointly by the U.S., Canada, and Mexico to provide new comparability in statistics about business activity across North America.

**Figure 2: Industrial Inventory**

Figure 2 highlights the findings of Brooklyn’s industrial inventory. The category that occupies the largest square footage is the **Light Industry** category with more than 2.95 million square feet, accounting for 48.6%, almost one-half of Brooklyn’s industrial businesses. There are approximately 22 different firms in this category including The Plain Dealer, Mail-Well Envelope, American Greetings, and Eaton Corporation.

**Warehouse/Distribution/Wholesale**

This category comprises about 18.6% of the total industrial floor area and includes businesses such as Knall Beverage and Hugo Boss. In total, 20 businesses operate as warehouse/distribution/wholesale establishments.

**Heavy Industry** comprises almost 16.7% of the total industrial floor area. Approximately 23 firms are considered heavy industry and include businesses such as sheet metal manufacturers, industrial coatings, and lubricant manufacturers.

The number of **trucking** businesses in Brooklyn is significant and this group of uses was broken out into a separate industrial category. Trucking companies occupy close to 167,000 square feet, approximately 2.7% of the total industrial inventory. Businesses like USF Holland, Bridge Terminal Transport, Ryder Truck Rental, and A & H Trucking are located in Brooklyn, many of which are concentrated at the City’s western edge on Memphis Avenue. These uses tend to have a smaller percentage of the lot occupied by buildings, while a larger portion of the site is paved and used for truck parking/storage.

**Industrial Services/Contractors** account for roughly 2.4% of the total industrial inventory. Moving companies, waterproofing and concrete companies, and electrical contractors are included in this industrial category, and are represented by 19 different businesses.

**Industrial Vacancies** account for 11.1% of the total industrial inventory. Brooklyn has approximately 673,410 square feet of available industrial floor area with 272,000 square feet at one location. Several of the City’s industrial vacancies are located on Clinton Avenue, the City’s older industrial corridor.
Table 3: Industrial Floor Space and Firms, Updated August, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type Code</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Floor Area (S.F.)</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th># of Firms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(I) Industrial</td>
<td>I1</td>
<td>Heavy Industry</td>
<td>1,017,200</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I2</td>
<td>Light Industry</td>
<td>2,951,627</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I3</td>
<td>Warehouse/Distribution/Wholesale</td>
<td>1,125,258</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I4</td>
<td>Trucking</td>
<td>166,620</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I5</td>
<td>Industrial Services/Contractors</td>
<td>144,460</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(V) Vacant</td>
<td>V1</td>
<td>Industrial Vacant</td>
<td>673,410</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,078,765</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INDUSTRIAL OPPORTUNITIES AND RECENT DEVELOPMENT

Overall, growth in several industrial occupational sectors is projected by the Bureau of Labor Statistics: transportation industries, warehousing and certain utilities such as water, sewage and other systems. Nationally, transportation and warehousing are expected to increase by 21.7% through 2012. As manufacturers concentrate on their core competencies, demand for truck transportation and warehousing services is projected to increase. Utility jobs in water, sewage, and other systems are expected to increase significantly by 2012, up to 46.4%. While employment in other utilities is not projected to rise because of improved technology, jobs in water and sewage are “not easily eliminated by technological gains because [water treatment and waste disposal] are very labor intensive”.

In recent years, Brooklyn has experienced some newer industrial investments. In 1994, the Plain Dealer opened a $200 million printing and distribution facility on Tiedeman Rd. adjacent to I-480 on Brooklyn's south side. Other industrial businesses in Brooklyn have expanded their facilities and improved their properties including Bridge Terminal Transport and Dylon Industries, which is a manufacturer and wholesaler of lubricants.

INDUSTRIAL TRENDS

The industrial sector has also experienced significant changes in recent decades. In general, there has been a shift from manufacturing to service industries. While the manufacturing base remains an important component of the regional economy, traditional manufacturing has struggled to remain competitive in an environment of globalization and outsourcing. Production occupations are projected to have the slowest job growth of all major occupational groups, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

---

Nationwide and locally, the use of trucking as a means of transporting goods and materials has increased. Businesses today have much less reliance on railroads for transporting raw materials and finished products, even though there is an existing network of railroad lines and tracks throughout the country. Locally, businesses on the north side of Brooklyn’s Clinton Road industrial corridor and businesses on the north side of Brookpark Road have access to the railroad lines, but few companies use the tracks.

EMPLOYMENT AND INDUSTRY EARNINGS

Brooklyn is home to many local, regional, and national businesses. Among the City’s largest municipal income tax withholdings are American Greetings, Keybank, the Plain Dealer, Arrow International, Wal-Mart, USF Holland, Eaton Corporation, Hugo Boss, and McDonald Investments. Combined with the City of Brooklyn, these top ten largest contributors of municipal income tax withholdings employed 9,475 people and contributed more than $6 million in income taxes in 2004.

Table 4 shows annual average earnings by industry for Ohio workers in 2004. According to the Bureau of Labor Market Information, the highest annual average earning occupations were manufacturing of Durable Goods and Nonresidential Building Construction, $43,998 and $43,072 respectively. The lowest annual average earning occupation was in the Retail Trade with $16,700, excluding tips.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>2004 Average Annual Earnings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goods-Producing Industries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$41,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidential Building construction</td>
<td>$43,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>$40,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durable Goods</td>
<td>$43,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondurable Goods</td>
<td>$30,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service-Producing Industries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>$30,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade*</td>
<td>$16,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, Transportation, and Utilities</td>
<td>$29,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Activities</td>
<td>$29,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care &amp; Social Assistance</td>
<td>$24,947</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Does not include tips.

Among the 20 fastest growing occupations, on-the-job training is the most significant source of education for 17 of the 20 occupations. A bachelor’s or associate degree is also a significant source of education or training for half of them.

IMPACTS OF COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Retail, office and industrial land uses have significant impacts on the environment. Airborne pollutants from vehicular trips for shopping purposes and truck traffic, storm water runoff quality and quantity, noise and light pollution are all factors that should be addressed. Excess parking capacity and lack of landscaping in parking lots increase the amount of storm water that washes directly into urban streams. This runoff carries with it significant amounts of petroleum,
nitrogen, heavy metals, and sediment which contribute to the degradation of streams, rivers, and lakes.

Large retail establishments are significant generators of traffic. Traffic from retail can account for as much as four times the volume created by office uses, eight times the volume of light industrial uses, and 24 times the volume of residential uses. Retail development generates heavy traffic volumes and large numbers of turning movements, which leads to a higher number of accidents.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INCENTIVES

The City of Brooklyn has numerous programs available to it to assist businesses in the community and help spur economic development. Brooklyn currently participates in many of the Cuyahoga County Department of Development programs. Other entities provide loans and grant monies to municipalities and businesses in order to attract and/or retain employees and jobs. See Appendix F for a list of the incentive programs identified.

Brooklyn was recognized and designated a “Business Friendly Community” by the Business Friendly Community (BFC) Partnership, an organization that represents economic development agencies in seven Northeast Ohio counties. The City strives to retain and attract businesses and recently created the position of Economic Development Administrator to assist businesses looking to locate within the City, and to guide them through permit and development process.

BUSINESS RETENTION AND EXPANSION STUDY

The City of Brooklyn and the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce undertook a Business Retention and Expansion study in order to assess the needs of Brooklyn’s businesses and the City’s overall business environment. The study was published in November, 2003 and surveyed local Brooklyn merchants about their perceptions of doing business in Brooklyn and their future plans. Of the 340 Brooklyn businesses surveyed, approximately 21% responded. Most of these businesses serve the local or northeast Ohio market and are privately- or family-owned. Among the key findings, local businesses viewed Brooklyn as a favorable place to operate a business. Proximity to freeways and access to customers were top cited reasons by respondents.

CONCLUSIONS

- Brooklyn has a robust mix of commercial and industrial opportunities in the City, which attracts shoppers and workers from outside its borders. The existing combination of businesses meet many of the needs of Brooklyn residents, however there are opportunities for additional goods and services which residents currently travel outside of the City. While retail growth is desired and continues, the total population in Brooklyn and Cuyahoga County is not increasing. The overbuilding of retail typically leads to increased competition among businesses, which results in lower rents, more marginal businesses, more vacancies in older retail areas, and reduced property revenues for school districts and communities. Complications from traffic, parking and environmental impacts must also be weighed against new development.
• Retail is changing in dramatic ways – Shift to more national retailers, rise of internet shopping, presence of urban entertainment centers, and the homogenization of retail – shopping centers that feature the same stores and tenant mix. While many consumers frequent freestanding “big box” stores surrounded by acres of parking, there has been renewed interest in the “Main Street” retail form characterized by pedestrian amenities, human scale architecture, and a “sense of place”.

• Brooklyn’s industrial areas are scattered in pockets throughout the City. With the exception of Tiedeman Road, these industrial areas are buffered from residential areas. While there has been some new industrial development in recent years, many of the City’s industrial buildings were built in the 1950’s and geared towards traditional manufacturing.

• While Brooklyn has excellent interstate highway access which has attracted retailers and businesses, the high volume of vehicles on and around these interstates has resulted in traffic backlogs, accidents, and diminished quality of life for Brooklyn residents. Alternative routes for industrial vehicles, commercial shoppers, and office employees should be explored so as to return local connector streets to Brooklyn residents.

• While many of Brooklyn’s older commercial retail and industrial buildings were built in the 1950’s and 1960’s, the City has attracted many new retailers, restaurants, and some industrial businesses. The Business Retention & Expansion Report helped begin the discussion with local merchants and industrial companies about why they operate in Brooklyn and what needs they have.

• The City has also established an Economic Development Administrator position, a point person whose mission is to help maintain the City as a competitive place to do business and is proactively looking to enhance its business environment.

• The City has a reputation of being a “business-friendly” community. It will be important to balance this with programs that protect residents from increased traffic congestion in order to provide an environment that is conducive to business expansion and growth.