Crescent Springs Small Area Study

Task Force Meeting Minutes Location: NKAPC Commission Chambers Tuesday, October 28, 2009 6:00 – 7:30 P.M.

ATTENDANCE:

Bobbie Baker – Crescent Springs Resident Residing within Study Area Joe Baker – Crescent Springs City Attorney Barrie Creamer – Crescent Springs Resident Residing within Study Area Matthew Damon – Crescent Springs Resident / Student at Villa Madonna Academy Eric Haaser – Crescent Springs Resident Dawn Johnson – Crescent Springs Resident Daniele Longo – Crescent Springs Resident Bob Mueller – Crescent Springs Resident Louis Prabell – Crescent Springs Resident Scott Santangelo – Crescent Springs City Council Member Tom Vergamini – Crescent Springs City Council Member Edward Dietrich – NKAPC – Project Manager James Fausz – NKAPC Keith Logsdon – NKAPC

ABSENT:

Ben Bratton – Local Resident Bobby Chipman – Crescent Springs Resident Residing Within Study Area Jim Collett – Mayor of Crescent Springs Andy Eisner – Crescent Springs Resident Matthew Johnson – Crescent Springs Resident / Student at Covington Latin George Ripberger – Crescent Springs City Employee Mark Rogge - – Crescent Springs Resident / KCPC Representative Scott Siefke – Co-owner of Crescent Springs Business within Study Area Greg Sketch – Crescent Springs Resident Bill Toebben – Owner of Crescent Springs Business within Study Area

1. OPENING COMMENTS, MEETING DATES, AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Dietrich started the meeting at 6:11 p.m. by asking for approval of the minutes. Many members of the task force did not recall the July meeting minutes and deferred approval to the November meeting. Chairperson Vergamini next discussed the proposal to change meeting dates for the November and December meetings to avoid holiday conflicts. The task force agreed to new meeting dates of November 18 and December 16.

2. PUBLIC MEETING DISCUSSION

Mr. Dietrich entered into a discussion of the public meeting and comments that were received. He noted that most people did not submit comments as only 7.5 sheets were recorded from the approximately 70 people that were in attendance. Ms. Baker noted that most comments were made orally. Mr. Dietrich agreed and then described that most written comments centered on the fact that single family residential was





not included in the plan, transportation improvements would force existing businesses to relocate, redevelopment increases competition for existing businesses, and that increased traffic congestion was a concern.

Mr. Dietrich next asked the task force what they heard at the meeting. Ms. Baker noted the biggest concern she received was that no one liked the idea of four or six lanes on high street. She noted that even three lanes would take houses on one side of the street and that the church would likely be affected. She also mentioned that attendees could not see the benefit of adding lanes on High Street because most of the traffic was going to Hazelwood. She added that attendees did not like the idea of changing Hazelwood to right-in, right-out and they did not understand the necessity of limiting access. Mr. Ripberger noted that he received the same comments about High Street. He also mentioned that he responded that while High Street might not warrant more than two lanes currently, changes made on Hazelwood would affect High Street and the need for additional lanes.

Chairperson Vergamini noted that a lot of the comments he got that were skeptical were from people who thought changes were going to occur quickly. He also added that some people were concerned that fast food restaurants would not be successful if they moved to the less visible locations on High Street. Mr. Logsdon asked the task force if they felt that interstate travelers would get frustrated and get back on the interstate if they could not get to these restaurants by the Hazelwood intersection. He added that a vast majority of people would continue down to High Street and patronize the businesses. Mr. Haaser added that appropriate signage would help if these businesses moved to High Street.

Chairperson Vergamini also mentioned that he heard several comments about bridges. He noted that people asked whether there would be ways to get into the study area other than High Street or Hazelwood. Mr. Haaser added that he heard comments from people stating they believed that traffic would be improved with a bridge over the railroad connecting Buttermilk Crossing and Buttermilk Town Center. Mayor Collett noted that he also heard comments reflecting the need for better accessibility and not making traffic worse than it already is. Mr. Logsdon reminded the task force of previous discussions of bridges by stating the bridge would be ineffective until traffic generators on the Dolwick Connector were developed. Mr. Fausz recapped discussions that indicated a bridge would likely increase traffic in the study area and add to problems with traffic and land use limitations the study was trying to resolve.

Chairperson Vergamini and Mayor Collett finished the discussion by stating the most commented item in their opinion centered on traffic.

3. DISCUSSION OF MAJOR ISSUES

Mr. Dietrich entered into a discussion of major issues currently facing the study. The three main topics he presented included:

- Traffic congestion on Buttermilk Pike
- Access within the Sub Area A
- Transportation through Sub Area B

Mr. Dietrich presented alternatives and considerations of several different scenarios that corresponded with the three main topics. These points are included in the spreadsheet at the end of this document. Diagrams of the major issues were also presented, which are also included with this file.





a. Task Force Discussion

Discussion surrounding these major issues focused mainly on the idea of phasing the recommendations. The task force felt phasing the plan would make the recommendations easer for the public to take in and would provide them a better understanding of the study being long range. Phasing also would provide clear steps toward implementing the study in full over time.

b. Task Force Decision

The task force decided the loop road scenario pictured below allowed the study area the best chance for redevelopment. Again, phasing of the scenario was described as a major component and the task force suggested the phasing be described in detail when the idea was taken back to the public.



c. Phasing Discussion Specifics

The task force believed phasing would likely begin with the addition of the connection between Ritchie and Hazelwood (near Chipotle). They commented that the connection between High Street and Hazelwood in front of the Toebben building would likely be challenging and may be difficult to achieve. Additionally they commented that High Street would need to be improved before modifications to Hazelwood could take place. The task force believed the right-in, right-out at Hazelwood would likely be the last piece of the plan to be implemented.

4. NEXT STEPS AND WRAP UP

Mr. Dietrich reminded the task force the meeting date for November had changed to November 18, 2009 at 6:00 p.m.

The meeting ended at approximately 8:45 p.m.





Issue	Alternatives	S #	Considerations			Notes	Rank	
	Widen Buttermilk Pike - two left turn lanes into Hazelwood and possibly High St. Widen Hazelwood and possibly High St	A 1	between intersections	Minimal improvement on Hazelwood - majority of vehicles want to turn left soon after entering street.	Improvements on High St will likely improve redevelopment potential			
	Hazelwood/Grandview/Buttermilk Pike intersection right-in/right-out with eventual widening of westbound Buttermilk Pike	A 2	the corridor.	Provides longer stacking lanes on Buttermilk Pike	Hazelwood would probably not be widened	Changes will occur in incremental steps. (1) widen High St. (2) widen Terry Lane (3) widen Buttermilk Pike		
4 intersections within 1/3 of a mile			Highway Retail potentially relocates to High St.	Improvements on High St will likely improve redevelopment potential	Hazelwood area likely becomes general retail and office			
	Do nothing		Increased traffic congestion as time progresses	People may start avoiding the area during peak traffic flow	Eventually changes must be made to improve traffic flow			
Access within sub area 'A'	Improve existing roads- widening Hazelwood and Terry	A 1	Improves access somewhat to rear areas	Hazelwood likely continues to be congested due to numerous left turn movements.	Land uses likely remain fragmented, and will appear less orderly.	Less potential for larger redevelopment projects due to poor access		
mproving access hroughout sub area A' is one of the key components to	Loop road connecting Ritchie to High St with a road closer to Buttermilk Pike	A 3	Provides best access to entire area.	Highway retail moves closer to Buttermilk Pike reducing left turn conflicts that are currently an issue on Hazelwood	Makes for a more efficient land use pattern with high traffic generating land uses closer to Buttermilk Pike	Area will appear more orderly and planned.		
redeveloping the area.	Do nothing		Redevelopment in remote area is very slow	Hazelwood continues to be congested due to numerous left turn movements.	The land use likely remains fragmented, and will appear less orderly.	Less potential for larger redevelopment projects due to poor access		
	Widen/add lanes Buttermilk Crossing at Buttermilk Pike, re-align Buttermilk Crossing and Grandview, add small (2 lane) connecting road into Buttermilk Towne Center	B 1	If Hazelwood becomes right- in/right-out realignment of Buttermilk Crossing and Grandview becomes more important.	Provides prominent entrance into Sub area 'A' and Buttermilk Crossing retail development	Provides access and connection to Buttermilk Towne Center (Remke/Home Depot) but is less prominent than B2 due to magnitude of roadway.	May have to widen bridge over railroad in the future when Buttermilk Towne Center experiences complete build out.		
north side of Buttermilk Pike	Widen/add lanes on Buttermilk Crossing at Buttermilk Pike, re-align Buttermilk Crossing and Grandview, add wide (4 or 5 lane) prominent entrance into Buttermilk Towne Center	B 2	If Hazelwood becomes right- in/right-out realignment of Buttermilk Crossing and Grandview	Provides more prominent entrance into commercial areas on both sides of Buttermilk Pike and ButtermilkTown Center	Buttermilk Crossing Shopping Center gets a boost and becomes tied into Buttermilk Town Center	Potentially draws traffic away from Anderson Road/Buttermilk Pike intersection		
	Add bridge over RR, enlarge Buttermilk Crossing at Buttermilk Pike if necessary. Do not realign Buttermilk Crossing and Grandview	K	Connects Buttermilk Towne Center and Buttermilk Crossing	May have to widen bridge over railroad in the future when Buttermilk Towne Center experiences complete build out.				
	Do nothing							
Plan	Objective	A 2	Highway rotail likely mayor to		l Outcome	Hozolwood and Tarmy Lange stress	Notes	
rsignt-in/rignt-out only	Better traffic flow on Buttermilk	A 2	Highway retail likely moves to High street.	High St. becomes congested with Highway retail making access to remote areas more difficult.	Ritchie becomes farther removed from main entrance and more difficult to redevelop.	Hazelwood and Terry Lane close to High St will likely redevelop with general retail and office		
Loop Road only	Access is improved to remote areas	A 3	Highway retail may or may not move along new road close to Buttermilk Pike (change in zoning may affect this)	If highway retail does not move Hazelwood remains congested impeding access to back of the study area.	Changes may improve redevelopment potential along High St especially if the highway retail moves up along Buttermilk Pike	Northeast corner should redevelop with more immediate access.		
Both (right in/right out and loop road)	Better traffic flow on Buttermilk Pike	A 4	Improved access to all areas	Highway retail moves closer to Buttermilk Pike reducing congestion on Hazelwood or High	Ritchie Ave and areas to the rear of Subarea A have better chance of redveloping with improved access	Land use pattern is more orderly and planned presenting a more appealing site for redevelopment		

