

# 2 Introducing Madison Township

## 2.1 History

Madison Township was organized in 1811. Early surveyors knew the area as Township Number Eleven and it was later named for President James Madison. At 45 square miles, it was the largest township in the new State of Ohio. It has been part of Washington, Trumbull and Geauga Counties prior to becoming part of Lake County in 1840.

Madison Township in Lake County is one of twenty townships in Ohio that share the name in the state; other Madison Townships are located in Clark, Columbiana, Fairfield, Fayette, Franklin, Guernsey, Hancock, Highland, Jackson, Licking, Muskingum, Perry, Pickaway, Richland, Sandusky, Scioto, Vinton and Williams counties. Today, Madison Township is one of five remaining townships in Lake County.

Industry played a very important role in the early growth of the Madison area. In 1830, there were six distilleries, a carding mill, a cloth dressing and woolen mill, a chair factory and four tanneries. Iron ore was found in abundance in the bogs near the beach ridges in 1825. In 1831 Arcola, at the intersection of what is now US 20 and Dock Road, was the site of the largest industrial plant in the state, with two blast furnaces employing 2,000 ironworkers. The ore was nearly depleted by 1850, when charcoal prices rose and the iron industry disappeared.

The oldest community in Lake County is Unionville, which was established in 1798 as a stage coach and mail stop between Cleveland and Buffalo. It's post office was established in 1823. Unionville has many historical buildings including Unionville Tavern and the Western Reserve Land Office.

Unionville is a unique community in two ways. First of all, it is divided by the Lake County/Ashtabula County line, so half the community is in Madison Township and the other half is in Harpersfield Township. The other unique thing about Unionville is that it is not incorporated as a village, so there is formal government; it is administered by the Boards of Township Trustees of Madison and Harpersfield.

At the center of Madison Township was Chapintown, one of the earliest settlements in what was to later become Lake County. When Lake County became a county in 1840, Chapintown had three stores, two churches and eighty houses. Chapintown would later be known as Centreville. In 1867, Centreville was incorporated as Madison Village. Madison Village was on the major route connecting Cleveland and Buffalo. An early stage coach route went directly through the village.

Prior to the Civil War, the area had many Underground Railroad stations, including the Unionville Tavern, and history tells of many escaped slaves who passed through the region. Railroads arrived in Lake County in the mid-19th century, with two lines passing through the township and village.

The Madison School District, which includes the township and village, was organized in 1865. The fire department was organized in 1890.

In the 1890s, agriculture in Madison Township was dominated by field crops such as wheat, oats, corn and potatoes. In the early 1900s, onions became a prominent crop. The first winery opened in 1934.

Nurseries were first established in the area in the 1870s. The Nursery Growers of Lake County was formed in 1927 "for the improvement of trade and education" in the county. With a microclimate that is well-suited for certain horticultural crops, today nurseries define the rural landscape of Madison Township and northeastern Lake County. The Lake County nursery industry employs over 2,700 full and part-time workers and has an estimated annual wholesale figure of over \$90,000,000 in sales. Nurseries and wineries have long ago supplanted farms growing field crops.

North Madison, now the most densely populated area of eastern Lake County, was transformed from farms and nurseries to cottage-filled subdivisions between World War I and World War II. Many residents of Cleveland, Youngstown and Pittsburgh owned cottages in North Madison, where they would spend their summer weekends. When the Depression ate away at disposable income, World War II rationing limited driving, and once-exotic vacation destinations further afield became more accessible, North Madison became less popular as a resort area. After World War II, many of the cottages, not intended for year round residence, were winterized, while some others were demolished. Small houses were built on many lots that had not been occupied.

The Cleveland, Painesville and Eastern interurban railroad provided passenger service through Madison Township and in Madison Village until it was abandoned in 1926. Interstate 90 was planned in the 1930s as part of a transcontinental superhighway system; it finally opened for traffic in 1960.

## 2.3 Previous plans

### 1962 MADISON VILLAGE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The 1962 comprehensive plan drafted for Madison Village encompassed some parts of Madison Township, with an implied assumption that the village and township could merge in the not-too-distant future. In the decades following World War II, the population of Northeast Ohio was growing rapidly, along with its manufacturing and commercial base. The ambitious 99 page document reflected the optimism of the time. Rather than becoming a bedroom community, the 1962 plan envisioned Madison Village as a mostly self-contained industrial satellite city. The plan anticipated that the rapid population growth in Lake County at the time – 20 new residents a day – would continue unabated, eventually causing increased development pressure in the eastern end of the county. The plan foresaw Madison Village accommodating over 55,000 residents by 1985.

Preservation of semi-rural and small-town character, and the future of the area's farms, nursery industry and vineyards, were not addressed by the plan. Much of the area north of the village center, now occupied by some of Northeast Ohio's largest nurseries, was slated for industrial development. The plan called for protection of elements that contributed to the "lore" of the area, stating "the surrounding land should be developed to complement rather than destroy the character inherent in them." The plan called for highway service business development of the area around the OH 528/I-90 interchange; only now is such development taking place.

The anticipated population growth and industrial expansion never occurred and very little of the plan was implemented by the village or township.

## **1975 INVENTORY OF EXISTING CONDITIONS**

In May 1975, the Lake County Planning Commission released the Inventory of Existing Conditions Report for Madison Township and Madison Village. Although the document was not a formal plan, the text occasionally offered some general recommendations for alleviating deficiencies.

## **1982 MADISON TOWNSHIP AMENDMENT**

In Ohio, township comprehensive and area plans are technically amendments to a broader county plan. The three-page *Madison Township Amendment to the Lake County Comprehensive Plan*, approved in November 1982 included some broad guidelines governing land use and roads, and a future land use map. The land use map reflected the assumption that the Lakeland Freeway would be completed through Madison Township.

## **1994 MADISON TOWNSHIP COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

The current plan guiding development is the *Madison Area Comprehensive Development Plan*, adopted in 1994. The plan is largely a general inventory of then-current conditions, and presents few long-range goals or policies. The future land use map of the 1994 plan is little changed from that of the 1982 plan.

## **US 20 CORRIDOR PLAN (DRAFT)**

To address issues regarding traffic, aesthetics, and strip commercial development along North Ridge Road, Madison Township officials authorized the completion of a corridor plan for the area adjacent to and near the road. In the words of the plan, its intent is to:

- Improve the safety, traffic flow, and capacity of US 20, in the face of increasing commercial and residential development in the area.
- Improve sewer and water service and make the area more appealing for quality middle-end retail and office uses.
- Increase the diversity and quality of commercial and retail uses along the corridor.
- Halt and reverse the pattern of unplanned strip development, and channel retail and commercial uses into well-defined, healthy nodes.
- Improve the appearance of the corridor, including architecture, landscaping, business signage, and other elements of the built environment, so it presents a positive impression of the township, fosters a distinctive sense of place, and becomes an attractive gateway between Lake and Ashtabula counties.
- Preserve the viability of the nursery industry along the corridor.

At the time this plan was written, the second draft of the US 20 Corridor Plan was complete. The plan includes many goals and policies concerning transportation, land use, utilities, and the built and natural environment. The plan also calls for strict site design, architectural, landscaping and sign regulation; limiting of semi-industrial uses; riparian setbacks for Arcola Creek; access management; and a new zoning resolution.

The US 20 Corridor Plan will often be referenced in this comprehensive plan.

## 2.4 Surveys

In recent years, people have been besieged with surveys of every kind; long marketing research-related phone calls, political and opinion polls, requests to fill out customer satisfaction cards at restaurants and businesses, and more. Although the public may be faced with “survey overload,” it is still one of the most effective and efficient ways to gather citizen opinions about civic and planning-related issues.

In the planning process, it is important to know the thoughts and opinions of “stakeholders” – residents and businesspeople that may be affected in some way by the plan. The findings of planning-related surveys help shape the plan, and justify its goals and policies as reflecting the will of the stakeholders. It also offers planners and township leader’s insight into problems and issues that may not be readily seen. If survey findings are acknowledged and reflected in goals and policies, the result is a plan that residents are more likely to take ownership.

A written survey that received 228 responses from township residents (and 92 responses from Madison Village residents) was conducted as part of the comprehensive planning process. This section describes the surveys and their findings. (The plan appendix includes more detailed survey results.)

Resident survey: question 1						
<b>Do you live in the village or township?</b>						
<i>Response</i>	Total #	Total %	Village #	Village %	<i>Twp #</i>	<i>Twp %</i>
Madison Village	92	28.8%	92	100.0%	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
Madison Township	228	71.3%	0	0.0%	<b>228</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Question 2** asked respondents to choose up to three reasons why they decided to live in the village or township. 63.2% of township residents chose “small town environment” among their responses, compared to 3.9% who chose “suburban environment.” 35.1% chose “Like the house that you now own or rent”, and 32.5% chose “Close to family, have always lived in the area”.

Resident survey: question 2									
<b>Choose up to three important reasons why you decided to live in the village or township. (check up to three)</b>									
<i>Response</i>	Total			Village			Township		
	#	% surv	% resp	#	% surv	% resp	#	% surv	% resp
(01) Small town environment (village)	71	22.3%	8.4%	61	66.3%	24.1%	10	4.4%	1.7%
(02) Rural/semi-rural environment (township)	150	47.0%	17.6%	6	6.5%	2.4%	144	63.2%	24.1%
(03) Suburban environment	15	4.7%	1.8%	6	6.5%	2.4%	9	3.9%	1.5%
(04) Convenient location, close to work	53	16.6%	6.2%	18	19.6%	7.1%	35	15.4%	5.9%
(05) Close to family, have always lived in the area	99	31.0%	11.6%	25	27.2%	9.9%	74	32.5%	12.4%
(06) Madison School District	52	16.3%	6.1%	16	17.4%	6.3%	36	15.8%	6.0%
(07) Safety, security, lack of crime	81	25.4%	9.5%	30	32.6%	11.9%	51	22.4%	8.5%
(08) Like the house that you now own or rent	120	37.6%	14.1%	40	43.5%	15.8%	80	35.1%	13.4%
(09) Housing that was affordable	82	25.7%	9.6%	28	30.4%	11.1%	54	23.7%	9.0%
(10) Close to Lake Erie	54	16.9%	6.4%	6	6.5%	2.4%	48	21.1%	8.0%
(11) Climate, weather	4	1.3%	0.5%	0	0.0%	0.0%	4	1.8%	0.7%
(12) Distance from urban and inner ring suburban problems.	60	18.8%	7.1%	14	15.2%	5.5%	46	20.2%	7.7%
(13) Something else (type reason)	9	2.8%	1.1%	3	3.3%	1.2%	6	2.6%	1.0%

**Question 3** asked about residents’ long-term plans to stay in the village or township. The responses of township residents implied that they were less mobile than Village residents; 65.2% of township respondents stated that they would live in the township permanently, compared to 63.7% of village residents. No township resident planned on staying for only one or two years, compared to 5.5% of village respondents.

Resident survey: question 3						
<b>How long do you plan on staying in the village or township? (check one)</b>						
<i>Response</i>	Total #	Total %	Village #	Village %	<i>Twp #</i>	<i>Twp %</i>
(01) 1-2 years	5	1.6%	5	5.5%	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
(02) 3-5 years	4	1.3%	1	1.1%	<b>3</b>	<b>1.3%</b>
(03) 5-10 years	9	2.9%	2	2.2%	<b>7</b>	<b>3.1%</b>
(04) Until I/we can afford to buy a larger or nicer house elsewhere.	11	3.5%	1	1.1%	<b>10</b>	<b>4.5%</b>
(05) Until I/we retire.	28	8.9%	6	6.6%	<b>22</b>	<b>9.8%</b>
(06) Permanently, unless there’s a situation where I’m/we’re forced to move.	204	64.8%	58	63.7%	<b>146</b>	<b>65.2%</b>
(07) Don’t know / not sure	54	17.1%	18	19.8%	<b>36</b>	<b>16.1%</b>

**In Question 4**, residents were asked to rate the quality of community services and attributes. Township respondents expressed strong satisfaction with public safety and emergency services, and parks and recreational facilities. Scoring at the bottom were the public sewer system, visual quality of commercial areas in the township, trails, recreational opportunity for children and teenagers, and public transportation. The ratings given by township residents were generally lower than that given by village residents.

Resident survey: question 4

**Please rate the adequacy or quality of the following community services and attributes, from 1 (poor) to 5 (very good). Rate as many as you want.**

Response	Total			Village			Township		
	Mean	Median	Mode	Mean	Median	Mode	Mean	Median	Mode
(01) Roads	3.31	3	3	3.50	3	3	3.24	3	3
(02) Parks and recreation facilities	3.53	4	3	3.53	4	3	3.53	4	4
(03) Hiking, biking and walking trails	2.85	3	3	2.80	3	3	2.88	3	3
(04) Public sewer system	2.96	3	3	3.37	3	3	2.76	3	3
(05) Public water system	3.44	3	3	3.60	4	4	3.36	3	3
(06) Police protection	3.80	4	4	3.99	4	4	3.73	4	4
(07) Fire protection	4.06	4	4	4.21	4	5	4.00	4	4
(08) Emergency services (911 and ambulance)	4.08	4	5	4.21	4	5	4.02	4	4
(09) Refuse collection and recycling	2.93	3	3	3.22	3	3	2.80	3	3
(10) Public transportation	2.77	3	3	2.74	3	3	2.78	3	3
(11) Community arts and cultural facilities	3.15	3	3	3.16	3	3	3.15	3	3
(12) Public schools	3.67	4	4	3.73	4	4	3.64	4	4
(13) Recreational opportunities and diversions for children and teenagers	2.63	3	2	2.86	3	2	2.55	3	3
(14) Code enforcement	2.92	3	3	3.23	3	3	2.81	3	3
(15) Diversity and quality of businesses in the village	2.75	3	3	2.65	3	3	2.79	3	3
(16) Diversity and quality of businesses in the township	3.08	3	3	3.32	3	3	3.00	3	3
(17) Visual quality of the village center	3.44	4	4	3.54	4	4	3.39	3	3
(18) Visual quality of commercial areas in the township	2.86	3	3	2.83	3	3	2.87	3	3
(19) Greenspace, farmland and nursery preservation	3.42	3	3	3.63	4	4	3.34	3	3
(20) Employment opportunities	2.19	2	3	2.11	2	1	2.22	2	3

**Question 5** asked residents what one thing is most needed to address issues facing the village's built and natural environment. About 32% of township residents chose "slowing growth and development", compared to 29% of village respondents. About 41% of those surveyed answered "more coordination with the township and between local governments", compared to about half of Village residents. 18.9% answered "stronger land use and zoning regulations." 2.3% answered "more public funds", compared to 7.1% of village residents.

Resident survey: question 5

**What one thing do you think is most needed to address issues such as traffic, housing, growth, and open space preservation? (check one)**

Response	Total #	Total %	Village #	Village %	Twp #	Twp %
(01) Slowing growth and development	76	31.0%	20	28.6%	56	32.0%
(02) More coordination with the township and between local governments	106	43.3%	34	48.6%	72	41.1%
(03) Stronger land use and zoning regulations	44	18.0%	11	15.7%	33	18.9%
(04) More public funds	9	3.7%	5	7.1%	4	2.3%
(05) Other	10	4.1%	0	0.0%	10	5.7%

**Question 6** asked residents to choose two environmental and open space assets that they feel are in the greatest need of protection. Wooded areas, Lake Erie, and farmland and nurseries were considered to be among the most important assets.

While no part of Madison Village touches the Lake Erie shoreline, a larger percentage of village respondents (54.3%) stated that Lake Erie was among the resources needing the most

protection, compared to township respondents (46.9%). Although Arcola Creek lies entirely in the township, a higher percentage of village respondents (33.7%) ranked it as an important environmental asset, compared to township respondents (22.8%).

A higher percentage of township residents (43.9%) stated that farmland and nurseries was among the resources needing the most protection, compared to village respondents (37%).

Resident survey: question 6  
**Choose up to three environmental assets you believe need the most protection. (check three)**

Response	Total			Village			Township		
	#	% surv	% resp	#	% surv	% resp	#	% surv	% resp
(01) Wooded areas	146	45.8%	17.0%	49	53.3%	19.2%	97	42.5%	16.1%
(02) Farmland and nurseries	134	42.0%	15.6%	34	37.0%	13.3%	100	43.9%	16.6%
(03) Scenic views, view corridors	52	16.3%	6.1%	16	17.4%	6.3%	36	15.8%	6.0%
(04) Quiet, lack of noise	82	25.7%	9.6%	23	25.0%	9.0%	59	25.9%	9.8%
(05) Air quality	55	17.2%	6.4%	15	16.3%	5.9%	40	17.5%	6.6%
(06) Arcola Creek and adjacent riparian areas	83	26.0%	9.7%	31	33.7%	12.2%	52	22.8%	8.6%
(07) Lake Erie	157	49.2%	18.3%	50	54.3%	19.6%	107	46.9%	17.8%
(08) Dark nighttime sky	29	9.1%	3.4%	6	6.5%	2.4%	23	10.1%	3.8%
(09) Groundwater quality	112	35.1%	13.1%	28	30.4%	11.0%	84	36.8%	14.0%
(10) Other	3	0.9%	0.4%	0	0.0%	0.0%	3	1.3%	0.5%
(11) Don't know / not sure	4	1.3%	0.5%	3	3.3%	1.2%	1	0.4%	0.2%

**Question 7** asked what kind of development was more appealing; houses on large lots with little open space and farmland preserved, or houses on small lots with more open space and farmland preserved. Compared to village respondents, township respondents were less receptive of development where houses are on small lots, but more greenspace is preserved.

Resident survey: question 7  
**Would you prefer to see ... (check one)**

Response	Total #	Total %	Village #	Village %	Twp #	Twp %
(01) Houses on large lots, with little common greenspace preserved, or	136	48.7%	32	38.6%	104	53.1%
(02) Houses on smaller lots, with more common greenspace preserved	143	51.3%	51	61.4%	92	46.9%

**Question 8** asked what kind of residential development was more appealing; small-lot development that resembles a traditional village, or larger-lot development that resembles a more conventional suburban subdivision. A smaller percentage of township residents (62.7%) than village respondents (72.3%) – but still a majority – favor development that feels similar to a traditional village.

The responses to questions 7 and 8 indicate that township residents may be somewhat receptive to alternative forms of residential development such as new urbanist and traditional neighborhood development, and conservation and cluster development.

Resident survey: question 8  
**Would you prefer to see ... (check one)**

<i>Response</i>	Total #	Total %	Village #	Village %	Twp #	Twp %
(01) Residential development where lots are smaller, but the architecture and built environment feels similar to a traditional village, or	181	65.6%	60	72.3%	121	62.7%
(02) Residential development, where lots are larger, but the architecture, built environment and overall feel is more like a typical suburb	95	34.4%	23	27.7%	72	37.3%

**Question 9** asked users to judge the importance of various issues that may be addressed in this plan.

For respondents from the township, drainage and floodwater retention, natural environment in general, water availability and open space preservation were rated at the top, followed by traffic congestion, sewer capacity, nursery and agricultural preservation, and nuisances and code enforcement. For respondents from the village, drainage and floodwater retention, water availability and sewer capacity were rated at the top, followed by traffic congestion, commercial architecture and site plan quality, nuisances and code enforcement, and open space conservation and preservation.

“Traffic, vehicle circulation and congestion” was scored as an important concern by both township and village residents. However, traffic count data from the Ohio Department of Transportation and the Northeast Ohio Areawide Coordinating Agency (NOACA) shows that traffic congestion in the area is low.

Resident survey: question 9  
**The following are issues the comprehensive plan may address. Rate how important you feel these issues are, from 1 (not important) to 5 (most important). Rate as many as you want.**

<i>Response</i>	Total			Village			Township		
	Mean	Median	Mode	Mean	Median	Mode	Mean	Median	Mode
(01) Sense of place and unique community identity	3.70	4	4	3.75	4	4	3.68	4	4
(02) Residential development and growth in general	3.63	4	4	3.76	4	4	3.57	4	4
(03) Traditional village/town style residential development	3.68	4	4	3.82	4	4	3.62	4	4
(04) Commercial and retail development in the village core	3.42	3	3	3.60	4	4	3.34	3	3
(05) Strip commercial development outside of the village core	3.14	3	4	3.39	4	4	3.04	3	4
(06) Commercial architecture and site	3.93	4	4	4.04	4	4	3.89	4	4

planning quality									
(07) Commercial and retail use diversity and quality	3.86	4	4	3.96	4	4	3.82	4	4
(08) Business sign size, height, placement and design	3.37	3	4	3.59	4	4	3.27	3	4
(09) Economic development and attracting industry	3.78	4	5	3.94	4	5	3.72	4	5
(10) Traffic, vehicle circulation and congestion	4.15	4	5	4.27	4	4	4.10	4	5
(11) Sidewalks, bicycle lanes and paths	3.58	4	5	3.84	4	5	3.47	4	5
(12) Access management (number and location of driveways and turning lanes)	3.66	4	4	3.74	4	4	3.63	4	4
(13) Open space conservation and preservation	4.09	4	5	4.03	4	5	4.11	4	5
(14) Nursery and agricultural preservation	3.89	4	5	3.77	4	5	3.94	4	5
(15) Community facilities and amenities	3.71	4	4	3.82	4	4	3.67	4	4
(16) Parks and recreation facilities	3.88	4	4	3.87	4	4	3.89	4	4
(17) Natural environment in general	4.23	4	5	4.10	4	5	4.28	5	5
(18) Drainage and floodwater retention	4.43	5	5	4.62	5	5	4.35	5	5
(19) Arcola Creek	3.87	4	4	3.93	4	5	3.84	4	4
(20) Nuisances and code enforcement	3.95	4	4	4.04	4	4	3.91	4	4
(21) Noise and vibration	3.82	4	4	3.94	4	4	3.77	4	4
(22) Landscaping and trees on private property	3.32	3	4	3.29	3	3	3.34	3	4
(23) Landscaping and trees along roads	3.62	4	4	3.54	4	3	3.65	4	4
(24) Overhead utility lines	3.48	3	3	3.48	3	3	3.48	3	3
(25) Sewer capacity	4.15	4	5	4.39	5	5	4.05	4	5
(26) Water availability	4.34	5	5	4.56	5	5	4.26	5	5

**Question 10** offered statements regarding the built environment and other qualities of the village, and asked respondents to rate how strongly they agreed or disagreed with them.

Regarding **small town and semi-rural character**, respondents as a whole strongly agreed with the statements “The semi-rural character of the township should be preserved” (+1.25, median +2, mode +2) and “Existing farmland and nurseries should be preserved” (+1.07, median +1, mode +2). There was mild agreement with the statement “Farmland and open space should be visible from the roads” (+0.63, median +1, mode +0).

Respondents mildly agreed with the statement “Residential building lots should be large” (+0.48, median +1, mode -1). Respondents were not totally unreceptive to small lots; there was some agreement with the statement “Smaller building lots are acceptable if a residential development is very well-designed, and offers a large amount of open space” (+0.16, median +0, mode +1).

Regarding **land use**, respondents as a whole agreed with the statement “Semi-industrial uses should be limited to industrial zones (+1.05, median +1, mode +2). Residents agreed with the statement “The village center should have more shops and restaurants” (+0.64, median +1, mode +0) and “The North Madison area should have more shops and restaurants” (+0.75, median +1, mode +2).

Regarding **growth and development**, respondents as a whole agreed with the statements “Urban sprawl in general is a concern” (+0.78, median +1, mode +2), “New development should be close to areas that are already developed” (+1.00, median +1, mode +2), and “Residential growth in the township should be limited” (+0.38, median +1, mode +2). There was mild agreement with the statement “Vacant and/or underused land close to the center of Madison Village should be developed” (+0.24, median +0, mode +1)

Regarding **aesthetics**, respondents as a whole agreed with the statements “High-quality architecture and design, short signs, and plentiful landscaping should be required for commercial uses in the village” (+0.86, median +1, mode +2) , “Overhead utilities should be

placed underground” (+0.66, median +1, mode 0) and “Businesses at the I-90 interchange should have short, tasteful signs” (+0.51, median +1, mode +1).

More so than village residents, township residents agreed with the statement “The quality of residential development leaves a lot to be desired (+0.72, median +1, mode +2).

Compared to village respondents, township respondents were far more ambivalent about the statement “Madison Village should be visually distinctive from Madison Township” (+0.07, median +0, mode +0),

There was slight disagreement with the statement “Prefab metal buildings should not be allowed in commercial and retail areas” (-0.14, median 0, mode 0) and “Public art, like sculptures and fountains, would enliven Madison” (+0.05, median 0, mode 0).

Regarding **transportation**, respondents as a whole agreed with the statement “Roads should include bicycle lanes if possible” (+0.67, median +1, mode +1). Respondents were neutral to the statements “Roundabouts/circles should be used for traffic calming in some areas.” (+0.04, median 0, mode 0).

Regarding **quality of life issues**, respondents as a whole agreed with the statement “Madison needs more diversions for young children and teenagers” (+1.00, median +1, mode +2). More so than village residents, respondents disagreed with the statement “If gasoline prices get too high, I may leave Madison to move closer to work” (-0.68, median -1, mode -2).

Resident survey: question 10  
**Rate how strongly you agree or disagree with these statements, from -2 (strongly disagree) to 2 (strongly agree).**

<i>Response</i>	Total			Village			Township		
	Mean	Median	Mode	Mean	Median	Mode	Mean	Median	Mode
(01) Urban sprawl in general is a concern.	0.76	1	2	0.73	1	2	0.78	1	2
(02) Residential growth in the village should be limited.	0.36	1	1	0.45	1	2	0.33	1	1
(03) Residential growth in the township should be limited.	0.27	1	2	-0.01	0	1	0.38	1	2
(04) The village center should have more shops and restaurants.	0.68	1	0	0.76	1	2	0.64	1	0
(05) The North Madison area should have more shops and restaurants.	0.80	1	2	0.92	1	2	0.75	1	2
(06) Existing farmland and nurseries should be preserved.	1.07	1	2	1.08	2	2	1.07	1	2
(07) Farmland and open space should be visible from the roads.	0.60	1	2	0.54	1	1	0.63	1	0
(08) New development should be close to areas that are already developed.	0.91	1	2	0.70	1	2	1.00	1	2
(09) The quality of residential development	0.59	1	0	0.28	0	0	0.72	1	2

leaves a lot to be desired.										
(10) High-quality architecture and design, short signs, and plentiful landscaping should be required for commercial uses in the village.	0.95	1	2	1.16	1	2	0.86	1	2	
(11) Semi-industrial uses (machine shops, body shops, heavy equipment rental, etc) should be restricted to industrial zones.	1.16	2	2	1.42	2	2	1.05	1	2	
(12) Madison Village should be visually distinctive from Madison Township.	0.23	0	0	0.64	1	2	0.07	0	0	
(13) Madison Township should be visually distinctive from surrounding townships.	0.41	0	0	0.45	1	0	0.39	0	0	
(14) Public art, like sculptures and fountains, would enliven Madison.	-0.03	0	0	0.02	0	0	-0.05	0	0	
(15) Businesses at the I-90 interchange should have short, tasteful signs.	0.51	1	1	0.51	1	1	0.51	1	1	
(16) Vacant and/or underused land close to the center of Madison Village should be developed.	0.33	0.5	2	0.55	1	2	0.24	0	1	
(17) Smaller building lots are acceptable if a residential development offers a large amount of open space.	0.16	0	1	0.14	1	1	0.16	0	1	
(18) If gasoline prices get too high, I may leave Madison to move closer to work.	-0.62	-1	-2	-0.46	-1	-2	-0.68	-1	-2	
(19) Residential building lots should be large.	0.46	1	2	0.38	0	-1	0.48	1	1	
(20) Madison needs more diversions for young children and teenagers.	1.01	1	2	1.03	1	2	1.00	1	2	
(21) Overhead utility lines should be buried.	0.67	1	2	0.71	1	2	0.66	1	0	
(22) Roads should include bicycle lanes if possible.	0.73	1	1	0.88	1	2	0.67	1	1	
(23) Roundabouts/circles should be used for traffic calming in some areas.	0.05	0	0	0.07	0	0	0.04	0	0	
(24) Prefab metal buildings should not be allowed in commercial areas.	-0.08	0	0	0.09	0	-1	-0.14	0	0	
(25) The small town character of the village should be preserved.	1.33	2	2	1.35	2	2	1.32	2	2	
(26) The semi-rural character of the township should be preserved.	1.17	2	2	0.96	1	2	1.25	2	2	

Question 11 asked residents to rate the quality of life in the township or village. About 47% of township respondents rated the quality of life as “excellent” or “very good”, compared to 58% of village residents. 45.2% of township respondents rated it only “good”, 6.8% rated it “fair”, and 1.4% “poor”.

Resident survey: question 11						
Overall, how would you rate the quality of life in Madison?						
Response	Total #	Total %	Village #	Village %	Twp #	Twp %
(01) Excellent	20	6.4%	8	8.9%	12	5.4%
(02) Very good	135	43.4%	44	48.9%	91	41.2%
(03) Good	128	41.2%	28	31.1%	100	45.2%
(04) Fair	25	8.0%	10	11.1%	15	6.8%
(05) Poor	3	1.0%	0	0.0%	3	1.4%
(06) Don't know / not sure	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

## 2.5 Future challenges

### URBAN SPRAWL AND PRESERVATION OF REMAINING SEMI-RURAL CHARACTER

In Madison Township, much of what can be called “semi-rural character” is gone. Frontage development (strip residential) along the township’s long roads blocks vistas of nurseries, fields, woods and open space. Narrow but deep building lots remove some of the region’s most valuable agricultural land from production.

A disconnect is found throughout the planning process in Northeast Ohio. Residents value a semi-rural environment, and the presence of farmland and open space. Preservation of semi-rural character was considered one of the most important priorities of future village planning efforts. However, residents generally prefer the type of development that has the most potential to damage the bucolic feel of the township, and consume its farmland, woodlots and open space – large-lot single family development and frontage/strip residential development – to alternatives that will have less impact.

### **CREATING A SENSE OF PLACE**

Sense of place includes the characteristics of the built environment that make a place special or unique, and foster a sense of authentic human attachment and belonging. Places that lack a sense of place are sometimes referred to as placeless. Placeless landscapes are those that have no special relationship to the places in which they are located – they could be anywhere.

Outside of established areas like North Madison and Unionville, there is little that physically distinguishes Madison Township from surrounding communities. Residential development is typical for a northeastern Ohio exurban community, with increasing frontage development lining its long roads. The township zoning resolution has no architectural design regulations, and has basic standards for signs and landscaping. Recent revisions to the Ohio Revised Code provide more authority to Townships to address these areas.

### **CHANGING DEMOGRAPHICS**

In Lake County and throughout the United States, household types are becoming more diverse. In 1970, about 44% of all households in the US had children, and only 17% of them were single-person households. The 1960s and 1970s saw the suburbanizing of the United States and the spread of suburban-style planning and zoning, and was the period when child raising dominated household concerns. It was expected that communities catering to households with children, and fashioned appropriate land uses.

In 2006, only about 35% of all households in the US have children, while another 26% are single-person households. By 2040, the US Census Bureau predicts that about 27% of households will have children, and single-person households will remain at about 26%.

Because of changing demographics and shifting housing preferences, the current supply of single-family detached houses on large lots may already exceed the demand projected for the next decade, according to a study by Arthur Nelson in the Autumn 2006 issue of the *Journal of the American Planning Association*. On a national scale the demand for attached, small lot, cluster, and other high-density options is likely to outpace the demand for detached houses on large lots. However, in Madison Township and Lake County as a whole, the bulk of new housing continues to be larger detached houses on large lots, catering to a shrinking market of traditional families. The national trend has yet to become evident in Lake County, including Madison Township.

The percentage of Lake County residents older than 65 has been increasing since the 1970s. Older residents may want to remain in the city, town or village where they lived for so many years, but cannot maintain a larger house on a larger lot. With few options available for them, except a small number of patio home communities in the township and village, many senior citizens are forced to find suitable housing elsewhere.

### **RAILROAD LINES**

The township and village are bisected by the very busy Norfolk Southern and CSX railroad lines. There are no grade-separated crossings in the village. Lake Street, the busiest north-south street in the village and township, crosses the railroad lines at grade near the village center. Throughout the township and village, many obstacles prevent the construction of a grade-separated railroad crossing, such as inadequate space for a bridge with a gentle slope, and the siting of businesses and historic buildings that would make their demolition necessary.

### **EMPLOYMENT AND TAX BASE**

The 1962 comprehensive plan envisioned Madison as an industrial satellite city. Today, the industrial and professional employment base of the township and village is quite small, and many residents commute to Painesville, Mentor or Cleveland for work. Most development consists of single family houses. Numerous Cost of community service studies have shown that the cost of providing services such as public safety and education to residential development is far greater than their contribution to the tax base. This is verified in a 2008 edition. Although much of this is offset by agricultural uses, nurseries and vineyards are increasingly subject to conversion to residential uses.

Communities with an unbalanced tax base are often quick to welcome any commercial or industrial development, regardless of its appropriateness or any negative impacts it may have. Uses that gravitate towards highway exits are often visually intrusive; such development near the Interstate 90 exit could harm the small town character of Madison Village.

## **2.6 Assets and opportunities**

### **I-90 EXIT**

The I-90 exit at River Street (OH 528) makes Madison Village and the southern end of Madison Township far more accessible than other locations in eastern Lake County. It also provides an ideal location for industries and services that depend on close proximity to the Interstate highway system. Water Tower Drive in Madison Village was developed to provide sites for businesses that want to take advantage of the nearby I-90 exit.

### **NURSERY INDUSTRY**

While Madison Township and Madison Village do not have a large industrial base, the area is the center for the nursery industry in northeast Ohio. The presence of large nurseries, which provide jobs and a large amount of tax revenue relative to the services they require, also provides a greenbelt around the village center, and creates a unique visual environment that contributes to sense of place. The nurseries also create opportunities for agritourism.

### **LAKE ERIE**

Public access to Lake Erie is limited in much of Madison Township. However, increased lakefront development can benefit the township, by creating a destination for visitors and area residents, and the village, by funneling additional traffic through the village center. Guidelines and plans established in the *Lake County Coastal Development Plan* will help to achieve this goal. There is a large amount of underdeveloped and undeveloped land in North Madison within walking distance of the lake, presenting an opportunity to retrofit the area and create a unique destination and traditional neighborhood. The presence of Lake Erie is

responsible for a unique microclimate that makes Madison Village an ideal location for nurseries and vineyards.

### **NORTH RIDGE ROAD/US 20 CORRIDOR**

The US 20 corridor is the most highly traveled (with the exception of I-90) and built out corridor in the Township. Future installation of sewer lines will make this road even more attractive to commercial, retail and limited industrial businesses. Long term growth should be guided by exterior design guidelines, improved landscaping and stormwater management techniques and access management principles.

